



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES: April 5, 2018  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

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

Absent:

Chair Furth: Good morning. Welcome to the April 5<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Architectural Review Board. Could we have the roll call, please? Thanks.

**Oral Communications**

Chair Furth: Now is the time for any member of the public who wishes to do so to speak to the ARB on a matter not on the agenda but within our purview. Are there any...

Board Member Lew: We do have one. David Carnahan.

Chair Furth: Do we have one? We have David. I believe there's a card I've just buried it. Mr. Carnahan. For the tape, C-a-r-n-a-h-a-n I think.

Mr. David Carnahan, Deputy City Clerk: Good morning Chair Furth and Commissioners or Board Members. Please don't bury me anywhere else today. I'm here to speak with you about Board and Commission recruitment. We've -- the City's extended the application deadline for one position on the Historic Resources Board and three positions on the Human Relations Commission. So, we're hoping that you all if you have not yet or if you have reached out to community members and would be willing to reach out to a few more to see if they are interested in either of these bodies. The deadline is now April 23<sup>rd</sup> at 5:30 p.m. Again, we're looking for -- to fill one position on the Historic Resources Board and three on the Human Relations Commission. I will pass out flyers for you to serve as a reminder to reach out to a few folks to consider having them consider applying.

Chair Furth: Thank you and how is it that we have an opening on the Historic Resources Board?

Mr. Carnahan: Beth Bunnenberg resigned prior to the end of her term.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Certainly, she's given us long and wonderful service.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Furth: Alright any agenda changes, additions or deletions Staff? Board Members?

**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: Then let's go ahead to City official reports. Our schedule, attendance, reports on matters that have been approved. Any comments? Just note that two of us are staying behind today for subcommittee. Not me and we have at our next meeting 2755 El Camino Real, a 57-unit proposal back for its third review and a first review on 3945 El Camino Real, Comfort Inn renovation. Thank you.

**Action Items**

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3265 El Camino Real [15PLN-00312]:** Request for Architectural Review for a new Three Story Mixed Use Project with 282 Square Feet of Commercial Space and Three Residential Units (4,492 Square Feet). The Applicant Also Seeks a Variance to the Minimum Mixed-use Ground Floor Commercial Floor Area Ratio and Design Enhancement Exception to Reduce the Required Driveway Width From 20-Feet to 16-Feet six-Inches. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated for Public Comment From March 23, 2018 to April 23, 2018. Zoning District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the City's Consultant and Project Planner Adam Petersen at APetersen@m-group.us.

Chair Furth: Alright if we could have Item Number Two which is a public hearing/quasi-judicial on 3265 El Camino Real. This is a request for architectural review for a new three-story mixed-use project with 280-square feet of commercial space and three residential units totaling about 4,500-square feet. There's a request for a Variance to the minimum mixed-use ground floor commercial floor area ratio and a request for a Design Enhancement Exception to reduce the required driveway width from 20-feet to 16-feet 6-inches. A Negative Declaration has been circulated for our consideration and I guess the comment period has not yet ended is that correct?

Mr. Adam Petersen, Project Planner: That's correct.

Chair Furth: Public comment period will continue till April 23<sup>rd</sup>.

Mr. Petersen: Correct.

Chair Furth: Alright. Staff report, please.

Mr. Petersen: Alright good morning Chair Furth, Members of the Architectural Review Board. I'm Adam Petersen from the Planning and Community Environment Department. I'm here today to present the project at 3265 El Camino Real. As Chair Furth noted this is an architectural review and request for a Design Enhancement Acceptation in a Variance. The project proposes three residential units and about 280-square feet of commercial space on this site. This is a – as noted this project was previously reviewed on December 15<sup>th</sup> of 2016 and on June 1<sup>st</sup> of 2017. The recommendation before you today is a recommendation for approval to the Director of Planning and Community Environment. The project is located in an urbanized area of the City. It's predominately surrounded by other commercial type developments. To the left of the screen, you'll see a hotel. It's a two-story hotel and beyond the hotel is another three-story sort of mixed-use type building. There's a single-story restaurant located to the right of the project and behind the project is a parking lot and parking is also on the other side of the street along El Camino Real. When this project came before the Board at the June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2017 meeting there were some various items that the Board noted that they wanted to see. The first was a material and colors board, that board is before you today. It's on the dais for you take a look at. The Board also had questions about the breezeways. Those breeze ways remain unchanged. There is a breezeway sort of on the second level and the third level that provides access to the residential units. To two residential units that are located in the back. It's sort of individual access there. The driveway width, again that remains unchanged. It's about 16-feet at the garage door opening. If this project were strictly a residential project

that driveway width would be acceptable but because it's a mixed-use project it triggers a need for a wider driveway. The Transportation Divisions reviewed that and there's been no comments about the driveway width. They are fine with the acceptance that's being requested and the again the reduced driveway width enables the driveway to essentially remain the same on the site. There was also the problem at the last hearing of a deck that was over the drip line of the tree. The applicant has removed that deck. The floor plans have also been amended on the second-story – second and third-story of the front unit along El Camino Real. There's been a bedroom that's been removed and sort of this play space that's been removed and instead, you have a vaulted ceiling in that unit. It creates a little bit more of a logical floor plan and then it also reduces the massing of the building along El Camino Real. There were comments about the size of the commercial retail space and that again remains unchanged. There were questions about the proximity to the restaurant located to the right of the project. Again, the front of the project is located along the property line but other portions of the project are located 10-feet or more from that side property line adjacent to the restaurant to try to buffer that. To try to give some space and try to buffer that and lastly, the project does provide two entrances. One to the commercial space and then one to the residential units. This is the site plan. Again, there were also some questions and some issues regarding the rear deck and sort of this opening and some potential safety questions. The applicant has proposed to enclose this area with a metal screen so to really separate the driveway and the entry area from the backyard – from the play space area. As you can see there is a separate residential entry at the front and there is also an entry to the commercial space at the front. Whoops, excuse me. This slide here presents the proposed front oblique rendering. The new rendering that you see is at the top. This is what's before you and you can see the bottom – you can see the rendering at the bottom. They've really reduced the mass in this area. They've pulled this back and lost a bedroom. They've also gone with sort of a metal lattice screen around the stairway just to try to again reduce the mass adjacent to the parking lot for the hotel. I think really quickly I want to go through some of the materials that you'll find here. You'll find some stone veneer along the front, along the garage door that's sort of framing the garage door. You're going to have a stucco finish along the main front of the building and then you're also going to have aluminum (inaudible) screened windows as well. Again, these are renderings. You'll see the back of the building on the top left and on the lower right you're going to see just a simple front elevation of the building. So again, as noted the entitlements are for a Major Architectural Review, a Design Enhancement Exception to reduce the driveway width from 20-feet to about 16-feet and a Variance to the ground floor commercial office space requirement. Staff did prepare an Environmental Review for this. It was circulated from March 23<sup>rd</sup> to April 23<sup>rd</sup>. We haven't received any comments to date and the initial study and Mitigated Negative Declaration includes the standards Condition of Approval or excuse me, standard mitigation measures related to items regarding construction noise, cultural resources and biology. So, based on this information the recommendation before the Architectural Review Board is to consider a motion or to consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration and recommend approval to the Director of Planning and Community Environment. Thank you and I'm available for any questions that the Board may have.

Chair Furth: Any questions of Staff before we hear from the applicant?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Board Member Lew: I just – oh, go ahead Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Sorry Alex. I'm supposed to know the answer to this but why is the Mitigated Declaration or the whole EIR thing required to begin with?

Mr. Petersen: This project is actually located in the plumb area of the City. There's groundwater intrusion and so we wanted to make sure that we documented that plumb area and then disclosed that to the public with the Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: You also had noted possible concerns about noise and biological resources.

Mr. Petersen: That is correct, yes.

Chair Furth: That probably could have handled them with standards conditions. Thanks. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Adam. You've included the Variance Findings in the ARB packet or just a narrative about that and I think in the past I'm understanding that was like the purview of the Planning Director and not the ARB. I just wanted to – if you want a – if you're looking for comments from the Board about that?

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: Thank you Board Member. We – that's correct. It is the Director's purview but what we like to do when there's a Variance with an ARB application, we like to daylight that so the public has a chance to at least see our thinking. Certainly, if the Board has comments or perspectives we certainly welcome those comments.

Board Member Lew: Then my second question or comment is in the Findings I think you used – well it's on numerous – it's all throughout the Packet but you use the word Heritage tree in reference to the oak tree. I think my comment is my understanding is that I think we in Palo Alto we use the word protected or regulated. Heritage tree means something that the Council has designated for like a cultural or a historical artifact or object. That's all that I have, thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you so shall we hear from the applicant? You have 10-minutes.

Mr. Lait: I'm sorry if I missed this but were there any disclosures to report?

Chair Furth: Oh, first of all, has anybody visited the site? You can just...

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I visited the site Tuesday morning.

Chair Furth: I visited the site on several occasions.

Board Member Gooyer: So, did I.

Board Member Lew: I've visited the site on previous occasions not recently.

Chair Furth: It hasn't changed a lot as far as I can tell. Does anybody have any conversations they'd like to disclose or need to disclose? Alright, we'll proceed, you have 10-minutes.

Mr. Bob Iwersen: Good morning members of the Architectural Review Board and thank you for hearing our project at 3265 El Camino. I am Bob Iwersen with Hunt Hale Jones Architects and I represent the (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: I'm sorry to interrupt your flow but for the transcriber could you spell your name? You'll be glad you did.

Mr. Iwersen: I-w-e-r-s-e-n where ever – whoever the transcriber is.

Chair Furth: Great thanks.

Mr. Iwersen: Alright thank you. We've had several formal and informal review between the Planning Department and yourselves. I think hopefully we've reached a point where we have something that the City of Palo Alto can be – of which they can be proud. So, with that real quick – let's see if I can – is that right? Ok. To go back to the site and how I see the site and some of the challenges yet I think something that we can – we turned into benefits especially it's not a Heritage oak but what's the term? I guess it's the – and so but the fact that it's bounded on three sides. We had to keep a street tree and maintain the curb cut which we apparently are going to be doing at this point. We will diminish that a little bit since

part of the curb cut goes onto the adjacent property line and that it's part of the Cal/Ventura corridor. Then the site context is mixed and it mixed with what the desire of the future is with what it presently is and so those for me are some of the major elements of the site. From our previous reviews, if you can see the slides up here, our initial scheme when we came into the Planning Department and that's where we discovered the street tree needed to be kept. The next view was where we realized that we did not quite meet the fifty percent build to line and so we came up with this project. Then we discovered the Heritage oak with another version but we didn't quite meet the fifty percent build and then we were a little bit too tall at El Camino and we tried to pull everything away from the Heritage oak. Then it was the wrong character and then it was too massive and so we ended up -- in a way to accommodate all these issues we ended up with this latest project you saw which had some peculiarities. Then when it went through planning again there was some planning comment where we were miss calculating the residential portion a little throughout the whole project. So, we had to diminish a little bit of the residential and that included, which I think ended up being quite a nice solution, is enclosing the stairwell. We did actually on the east property line pull back a little bit so that there is some opportunity for openings on the east property line, not all of it. Then also we had to accommodate through engineering the back-flow preventers and the gas meters which we had thought we had resolved earlier but they needed to be brought all the way to the front. So, there's a lot of challenge at the front of the building trying to come in and provide all the services as well as an entrance. So then where your concerns which we hope we addressed and one of them was the bow window at the front. We brought that to the same character as all the other windows using the same window. It's an aluminum clad window, Anderson window, that does meet our ETC values for the front. I think the nice part of that is when you get to the interior it will have a wood finish so it brings a more residential feel to the interior of the unit. The other item that we have addressed is the residential entry. That was deemed a little too subtle or a little to diminished along that side and so we just wanted to enhance it a little more. Then we also had the issue of this opening and the turnaround space that we thought we needed for the cars that went out towards that nice little oasis in the rear. We found out from transportation that we had enough backup space so we were able to screen that off and secure it which was another concern. So, we have a man door from there but it will be secured and we still want to screen it though to allow for airflow into the garage. Then I want to address the curb cut issue as well or the louver as well. That was one concern that was brought up as far as whether or not it met the El Camino Real Design Guidelines. I think in recent years that has proven to be something that's made a little bit of a comeback. You can see it on some of Stanley Saitowitz's buildings such as 8 Octavia and Octavia Market on Harrison Street and several other buildings. I think it can be quite an elegant for that window which provides light but you still want some privacy from El Camino. I think it's a dynamic part of the front elevation as well. So here are our solutions to these issues and you can see the little more opening of that corner. Especially with the stairwell becoming sort of a latticework and a detailed of layering of metal work around the stair. Then the enclosure of the rear and really isolating that little oasis in the rear of the building. Then the entrance to the units to the residential portion has come out a little offering a little bit of shelter for people as well as for the mailman who comes in and drops off the mail. So, -- and packages. That we hope is an improvement to the project. Finally, I would like to discuss the curb cut which is actually not 16-feet. It's 16-feet at the garage door, it's 18-feet for the drive isle itself. While it is a 20-foot requirement that kind of points towards a larger project which has a lot more commercial and a lot more residential aspect to it in the mixed-use aspect. We're only servicing seven cars and it seems like a reasonable solution to cut back to 18-feet from 20 and then we do have a standard 16-foot garage access door. Then the other comments that came up where our detailing issues and I brought a more robust board if you care to pass this around (inaudible). (Inaudible) from a siding standpoint we will be -- the base of the building on El Camino will be a limestone finish with a granite cap. A black granite water table which will, in a very traditional way, extend beyond the limestone base. Then the remaining of the El Camino façade will be stucco and we feel this is a durable material, a durable aspect for El Camino and it will be scored in a more contemporary way as far as the stucco itself. So, we feel that's an appropriate material as we -- in front of El Camino and then we -- as we step back we get to a more residential application with the premier version of Hardy. Then, however to make it as sort of this tension between urban and residential, I want to penalize it with these easy trims which that's not really a good example of easy trim there. It comes in a much larger -- the metal reveal joints but you can do corners and you can horizontal and vertical that will actually meet the depth of that -- of a staggered lap that we would be

having for the siding. Then we would be – to add privacy around the decks we'd be using a (inaudible) screening metal which we think is quite elegant and nice and that will be through the project. That will be what we're using at the rear of the – at the screening for the garage from the rear yard. Then – whoops I guess I kind of went ahead of my screen here. So, this is kind of an idea of or an imagery of what we'd be – of how we see the screening at the stairs. Then there's the other metals along the line, the copings, the – and then the cladding of the windows and such that we feel are appropriate for the urban yet residential aspect of the project. Thank you very much and I'll be willing to answer any questions.

Chair Furth: Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure. To save me diving through the plans the opening on El Camino for the garage entrance, the opening through the stone wall. What part is 16-feet and what part is 18-feet? (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Mr. Iwersen: The 16-feet is just the garage door itself and then there's – it's a – the curb cut itself is going to be 18-feet and then there's a little bit of an area over there for staging of the – when you bring out your garbage for the garbage trucks to pick up. That will encroach a little bit on the 18-feet but – so it's actually 20 – let's see, I have to take a look at the drawings. It's actually 20-feet wide on the – I think it's 20-feet for the garage opening or for the actual opening.

Vice Chair Baltay: As I'm looking at your elevation at the El Camino level, what's the width stone to stone on that portal opening?

Mr. Iwersen: Stone to stone is 22-feet.

Vice Chair Baltay: 22-feet and the reason it's not symmetric is why?

Mr. Iwersen: Well partially – let's go back and take a look at the front elevation here. Whoops. We could bring it down I guess a little bit more, I think that's a reasonable request. The – oh the vision triangle. That's why we – the vision triangle for when you exit out. Right, that's why we're there.

Vice Chair Baltay: So, through the Chair could I ask Staff to example what the vision triangle thing is.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Mr. Petersen: So, the one comment and the one issue that came up from the Transportation Department is that because you are exiting the site and going onto El Camino Real. They do need a clear vision triangle and it's basically – I'm trying to (inaudible). It's basically you need to be able to look beyond a wall and see diagonally so that's why that corner is pulled – it's recessed or it's not as wide.

Vice Chair Baltay: So that's for safety for (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Mr. Petersen: Correct, it's for safety purposes.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...vehicles approaching from El Camino.

Mr. Petersen: Right so it's for safety purposes for vehicles along El Camino, it's for pedestrians and cyclists who are on the sidewalk. It's for all safety purposes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you for that question.

Chair Furth: Any other questions of the application? Osma.

Board Member Thompson: The material for the louver in the front is that on the material board?

Mr. Iwersen: It is on the material box. It will be an aluminum louver but it will be painted so with a powder coated finish.

Board Member Thompson: Could you point it out on the (inaudible)? I kind of missed it.

Chair Furth: Any other questions? Does any member of the public wish to comment on this proposal? Hearing none I'll close this part of the hearing. Any further comments from Staff before we deliberate? Alright, start on the left, Board Member Gooyer. Comments?

Board Member Gooyer: Well I must admit it's – this project has had a great improvement since the first couple of times we've seen it. It's come a long way. The problem that I see with it, it's just too big for where it needs to go. I mean there are some sites that are just tough to develop and this is one of those. I'm well aware of that. The problem is I mean we're being presented here by a mixed-use project which has about 4,500-square feet of residential and the commercial end is a one car garage so to me that's not mixed-use. That's putting a one car garage little I don't know what you'd put in there for a walk by commercial space between two areas that aren't commercial so you'd literally have to find it. I don't see that would even be a viable commercial space. Like I said it's come a long way but I just can't see that – it doesn't work for me. I can't see the justification of this project. I mean it's a shame that not all sites are readily developable but to me, this is one of those that isn't.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Well I can recommend approval of your project. I think your project has changed over the years far more than any of the other projects that we've seen. I think that it goes back – I think ties back to what Robert just said, it's a very difficult site, it's narrow, you have suburban parking requirements or mixed-use requirements and you have that – and the oak tree. It's a challenge and we've seen other – the Board has seen other difficult sites on an El Camino and they've required a lot of creativity to get them to work. I think the – in the spirit of the code I think the hardest thing on my end is the minimal – the very small commercial space but I'm willing to still recommend approval of the project. I can recommend that the DEE as well for the narrower driveway. I think you've made a lot of progress on the building. I think that the front façade is – you've provided a lot of depth and a lot of high-quality materials in there and a lot of detailing. The – I think also, in particular, the residential entrance is way better than it was previously and so I can recommend approval. I did want to point out a couple little thing. One is in the Conditions of Approval I think the Staff has recommended there's a Condition of Approval for no planting within 10-feet of the oak tree trunk. That's pretty standard in Palo Alto as well as I think a lot of California Native Plants Society recommendations. They don't want any planting near the trunk of the tree and you're showing planting near the trunk.

Mr. Iwersen: Oh, we are? Ok.

Board Member Lew: Near the trunk and we do that because – the recommendation is because we don't really want to add any irrigation close to the trunk where it will cause root rot. And then also on – for Staff under – on Page 21 of our Packet, this is the ARB Findings. There's a reference to Oxford Avenue which I believe is for another project so maybe we could edit that and make it – I don't know exactly how to edit it but I think something is not quite right there. That's all.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. I can support this project. I find it to be – let me start it's a great presentation, it really is. It's really well put together. I can understand what's going on and the material board you just showed us especially is wonderful and how well it shows what's going on. I can commend to Staff that it's the kind of thing you should show another applicant because it really clearly explains to us what they are thinking. What I find I'm thinking is that it's a very refine details and very high-quality materials and it shows in the plans, it shows in the material board and it will show in the finished project. I think the design also has come an awful long way. Robert is correct, it's a very challenging site. It's

challenging because of the Zoning Ordinances and the tree and their location and I think you've done a good job getting three houses in there. That's what the City needs and wants and I, of course, agree that it's ridiculous to have a 200-square foot commercial facility there but that's the politics that be. That's the way the code is and I think you'll make some use out of it. I think you've also done a good job respecting the neighbors the way its set back from the motel to the left is well done. I think it will be a good neighbor that way. I think to the right you didn't show the large palm tree which sets off that part of the façade as you're coming up El Camino. I think again the tree and the building will complement each other very nicely so it's a good architectural touch. I also find it refreshing to see you're rethinking the trash and the bicycle and the utility, all those details that have to be dealt with and they've been dealt with on this application. Many times, what we see is that's not dealt with. It's pushed off till later and it affects the design. It's wonderful, it's great that you've tackled those issues, you've resolved them; you've put them on paper. That said I wonder if there's a way to get that masonry poured entrance off El Camino to be symmetric. It bugs me that it's wider on one side than the other and if that is being cut off for a vision triangle it's certainly not the direction traffic is coming from so it doesn't make sense from an automobile safety point of view. It seems to me you could put some sort of a buzzer or a warning system with the door which is recess back there. There must be some other way to solve this to allow that symmetric façade improvement so if there's a way to get that done I'd really encourage Staff to help them navigate through the transportation logistics. It would really make a difference on the façade composition and I mean it's the garbage cans you're showing there. It really is better to shield them off. I've also noticed that there's a monument sign for the motel which is right on the property line there which will need to be moved. I understand that will have to be a separate application from the motel property owner etc. but I would like for the Architecture Board to at least be able to say that if it were a similar monument sign, just pushed further along the street and have the parking slightly reconfigured that's certainly very acceptable. I'd just hate to see another round of applications for the motel owner and a lot of paperwork for something that has to be changed but it's the one thing where you didn't show what's going to happen on that sign and I wish that were dealt with. Lastly, I read through the Mitigated Negative Declaration and it's fine, it's all pretty straightforward. I just find it crazy that Item 4-D references bird's nests in the oak tree in the back and for some reason, this application is being required to either not build during bird nesting season or to provide an on-going arborist or bird watcher to make sure that the bird nests aren't hurt. While I'm all for helping birds, it seems, to me, an unfair requirement. Every other residential development in town near a tree is not required to hire a bird watcher to protect the nests and it just doesn't seem fair to me to have to develop that level of mitigation. It's fine if this is a 100-unit apartment building. If this is a large office building. If the tree is a central important thing but these guys have been pushed around by this tree all the past couple of years and this just seems to add insult to injury. So, I would support if the Staff can find a way or if we can find a way to just remove that requirement. Again, it's Item 4-D in the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Thank you.

Chair Furth: I guess we're to me or Osma, have you spoken? Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Hi there. Yes, this is one of my first time looking at this project. I did get a chance to look over the meeting minutes from the June 1<sup>st</sup> meeting and I've passed by the site a lot of times in the past. Unfortunately, didn't get to visit in the last two weeks. I really like the concept in general of the breezeway in the back. That's really exciting. I feel like the façade still – it's close but it's not there for me right now. In particular, I take a big issue with the louver screen on the – you know that long louver screen on the side. It's still – I understand the comments from the last meeting that it become more proportional which I can see that you've tried to do but it still feels like a wall in general. It seems like that part of the façade seems ignored in the way that it's being rendered and even in the material choice. It's true I've seen some of Saitowitz's stuff that you were referring to but I don't know that this is performing in that way. In that sense it's a huge – still, it's a big sore thumb. I think there's really some exciting ways to deal with that given that you have a stair in plan. There are really exciting opportunities for filtered light that aren't the solution that I think could contribute to the project and to the street. In that sense, I think that's a big item for me. I do appreciate the presentation with the material board. It is very helpful but at the same time, I'm not a fan of the limestone choice. It's quite dark and I don't know that's its as high quality as it could be. I agree with my Board Member – Board Member Baltay about the garage symmetry. If there's a way to make it more symmetric in some way,



maybe there's – I was just looking at it in the plan. There are some potential things that I think could be done to sort of create a little bit more balance there. Let's see what else. The material for the stair enclosure – the image that you show as the president, even that's a very strong, heavy grid with a heavy gauged metal. It's a little imposing. It's sort of hard to see why it would be nice to go up a stair. Now that we can see it from the front it might be nice if there's a concept in there about including greenery and that might make it a bit nicer but even that material I'm not a huge fan of. Let's see, the screen in which you're screening the garage, I didn't see a material on there for that. The material between...

Mr. Iwersen: It's the (inaudible) material. It's a fairly large sample.

Board Member Thompson: Is that the...

Mr. Iwersen: Yeah.

Board Member Thompson: Ok. That – I actually really like that one. I think there's something there in terms of the filtered light and maybe that's a concept that you can kind of bring into these other areas that call for filtered light. That kind of does it in a little bit more of an exciting way than these other kinds of ways that seem a little bit more oppressive. Yes, and in terms of the commercial area, you know I understand that it's small. I still think a little bit more – it seems like it's sort of is recessed in the back and that's a choice to bring more of the façade in the front. As – because the façade needs a lot of work I wonder if there's more that could be done to bring more prominence to the commercial area to actually make it usable because you have it and it needs to get used. So, if there's a way to detail it a little differently such that its sort of is a different thing I think that could benefit the project. As it stands I think it still needs a bit of work and I would like to see it again.

Chair Furth: Well I'm prepared to support the project as submitted. It is a pleasure to see how responsive the applicant and their architect has been in thinking about how to modify their earlier proposals. It is a complicated site. It is a set of uses that are highly desired by our City as evidenced by the City Council and our new Comprehensive Plan which we all now have copies of to read from cover to cover before the next meeting or at least to get the policies. I actually like the way this looks and more to the point perhaps I think you've created attractive places to live. I was looking at a lot of projects in the City this week that have been forced to build around oak trees and, in every case, there are losses of building space. In every case, there are enormous enhancements of the quality of that building space – that build space once people live there or work there. So, I actually am in support of the policy and in it's supportive your response to it. I think building residential on El Camino presents a huge problem in terms of noise. I think that – it was interesting to read the noise study part of the Negative – Mitigated Negative Declaration. I think that – I'm always curious as to what's going to happen on those balconies but living on a somewhat heavily traveled but much smaller street myself I do notice that there's a psychological benefit to having that additional construction outside my big windows. It gives an additional sense of privacy and buffering and I think that you've managed to provide outdoor spaces that are going to be quite sheltered from the noise. I've been thinking a lot about the Variance and the zoning constraints within which you and we are working. I actually like the recessed commercial entry. I was buttonholed on the way over here this morning when I was walking to City Hall by somebody who wanted to tell me how much we hated all of our development going to the sidewalk and how much he preferred recessed spaces. I think having this space to step off the sidewalk before you enter the commercial space is a good thing. I like this. These certainly are traditional of developing downtown and this is clearly not downtown but I would disagree with the idea that moving it forward makes it better. I trekked to Oakland – well drove to Oakland earlier this week to go to somebody's textile design studio and her showroom was a heck of a lot smaller than this but I drove all the way over there to be delighted by the work she does. In fact, I wonder what the chances are of this being essentially a work/live space for somebody who both lives in the area – lives in the project and uses that as the public –the place to interact with clients. So, it's a tiny office or retail space for somebody, these are three units in an enormous housing deficit but I can make the findings for approval. I'm not particularly bothered by the asymmetry but I – and I'm very aware of the problem that happens when you come out of a driveway and people on bicycles or on foot with headphones come charging by without any regard for their own

safety. So, I would not be in favor of modifying that unless the Transportation Department felt that it was quite safe. That's it for me. Does anybody care to make a motion? Oh, and with respect to the bird's nest, I'm not going to try to deal with our standard CEQA requirements today but I think the comments are worth noting.

Board Member Thompson: With regard to the bird mitigation I disagree. I think it's important to protect in place with nests.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to push this along but I wonder if I could ask Osma, are there changes to the façade that could earn your support? What if we pushed back on the louvered grill or something like that?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, maybe. I think -- yeah if there was a way to conceptually show how that would change I think potentially -- I wasn't prepared to support this project coming in because of how much the façade needs work. In terms of just concept, I mean maybe. I don't know. I think it needs some high concept of filtered light to actually show justification for creating such a flat façade. Especially when there's so many more exciting things. There's a landing there, there could be other type of fenestration or -- and such. You know there's more opportunities there.

Vice Chair Baltay: When I look at the floor plan this is a window in front of stair next to the kitchen and over a two-story space so the notion of it protecting privacy I don't really buy. I think it's an architectural element that the architect seems to want. Generally, I want to give the architect that sort of latitude. They are the architect and I don't want to be designing from here but it's better if we can earn your support to approve this. So, I'm wondering if, for example, we suggested that that be redesigned and come back on a subcommittee. Do you think that would work for you?

Board Member Thompson: I think I'd want to see that and I'd want to see the stair enclosure again.

Vice Chair Baltay: What's -- what would we want to do with the stair enclosure?

Board Member Thompson: It's heavy and oppressive. It needs -- its kind of a -- I don't know. It's not -- I don't know that it's in conformance with the El Camino street frontage.

Board Member Lew: Can you clarify? You're talking about the stair inside that unit at the corner or the exterior stair with the metal mesh?

Board Member Thompson: The exterior stair with the metal mesh.

Board Member Lew: I would be fine if those two elements came back to subcommittee and I would -- I think the Board would need to be clearer -- as a majority the Board would need to be clearer. Give clearer direction as to what we're looking for in those.

Chair Furth: I certainly agree with that. I mean we appear to have three votes to move the project ahead. It's always good to get more consensus if we can but I would be reluctant to refer this to subcommittee unless we were quite clear what we are looking for. Since I'm not looking for anything I leave it to the three of you to figure that out if you can.

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Baltay: Let me make a motion and Osma you should feel free to second it or I mean to amend it with changes on things you wish. I recommend --- I move that we recommend to the Director to approve this project as submitted with the condition that the garage portal be made symmetric by widening the left-hand piece so I'm looking for a second on that motion.

Chair Furth: I'm not going to second it because -- I realize this is a non-second -- because I'm not in favor of widening it unless the traffic -- transportation experts feel that it's safe.

Vice Chair Baltay: Far enough, let me rephrase that. I recommend that we -- I move that we recommend approval the Director of Planning with the request that the garage portal be widened on the left-hand side to be symmetric if the applicant can prove that the vehicular safety is satisfactory to the Transportation Department with some other mechanism. Perhaps a timer or I mean a beeper or something but it has to be safe by City Standards of course.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: Do you want a friendly amendment about...

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Chair Furth: ... referral to...

Board Member Thompson: So perhaps -- so I'd like to make a friendly amendment...

Chair Furth: Start there.

### **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT**

Board Member Thompson: ... to see this project again in subcommittee with regard to further development on the louver side of the project that further creates more conformance with El Camino in terms of openings and filtered light and further creates a different sense of scale than -- a smaller sense of scale, than what it's creating right now. In addition to that louver area, the mesh around the stair I would also like to come back to subcommittee for also a less oppressive material and construction.

Vice Chair Baltay: If you don't mind let me clarify that. You're asking that the large louvered cover over the window on the right-hand side of the façade be redesigned to meet the goals that you just mentioned or the whole façade? I can support redoing the louvered window and stair but I want to be clear that that's what we're asking them to reduce.

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Not everything else.

Board Member Thompson: Just those two areas.

Vice Chair Baltay: I can accept that amendment.

Chair Furth: Discussion.

Board Member Lew: (crosstalk) Robert needs to...

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I'm fine.

Chair Furth: So, I still don't understand what -- I understand -- you're very clear as to the areas you want to address. You want this large louvered window to the right of the façade and the left exterior stairwell screening. I don't understand what it means to make this more in conformance with the El Camino Real. I do understand about filtered light and more -- so does this mean at night, for example, you'd see light through it differently than in the day? I'm not -- I understand the filtered light part. That's about it.

Board Member Lew: So, do you know – so in the El Camino Design Guidelines there's a picture of the I think it's the Wells Fargo Bank on El Camino and California. It has screens covering all of the windows.

Chair Furth: Right, it does.

Board Member Lew: That was a popular thing in the – like Edward Earl Stone, late 50s/60s and I think the guidelines say they don't like it because it is blocking views and transparency and making things more interesting. I mean they're trying to screen something and...

Chair Furth: Yeah because you're trying to hide something and that's bad.

Board Member Lew: Right and we're trying to have it more open and interesting and visually interesting.

Board Member Thompson: I think also the bigger thing in addition to that is that it's a big wall of blank really right now on that side which is a problem. So, if there could be a way to break that scale and maybe create some more visual interest I think that would be what we would need.

Chair Furth: Part of my problem is this is a very skinny site and you charge by on El Camino Real this is just a flash so I don't see it as a big blank wall but that's one person's opinion.

Board Member Lew: I think is it the sidewall that's blank because it's on the property line but it's not long. It's not going down the full length of the property line. It's just a relatively short wall.

Vice Chair Baltay: Don't forget there's a nice palm tree just to the right of this building which really compliments the sidewall beautifully and I think the whole façade actually. It has the same vertical sense about the louver.

Chair Furth: Then the direction to make the stairwell less oppressive. How would we translate that into perhaps clearer language? Maybe it's all perfectly clear to the applicant.

Mr. Iwersen: I'll take – I can understand what Osma's getting at and I'll work it – designing it in a more careful and delicate way.

Board Member Thompson: Ok.

Chair Furth: Alright. Are we ready to vote or does – ok. There is a motion, I forgot to say this last time, made by Board Member Baltay – Commission – Vice Chair Baltay. I can never get the last names right. Seconded by Board Member Gooyer to approve the project as submitted. There was a friendly amendment which added that this project should come back to a subcommittee for further work on two items. The louvered window screen to the right – on the right portion of the façade to provide a better opening and filtered light more consistent with the El Camino Real Design goals and a reworking of the mesh around the stairwell to make it less oppressive. All those in favor say aye. Opposed?

Board Member Gooyer: Nay.

Chair Furth: It passes 4 to 1. Board Member Gooyer dissenting. Would you care to amplify on your dissent?

**MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER GOOYER OPPOSING.**

Board Member Gooyer: I don't know the – it's like I said, you've come a long way on this but there are just too many things that. It's one of these things if you take one or two items at a time then it's really not the big of deal but there are like six or seven things that I don't really like about this. I think it's just

trying to put too much in spot. It's tough to do but that doesn't mean – and also it just seems like an impractical place to put three residences.

Chair Furth: Alright, thank you.

Mr. Iwersen: Thank you very much Board Members.

Chair Furth: We'll give Staff a minute to set up before our next item which is 620 Emerson Street.

[The Board took a short break]

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 620 Emerson Street (17PLN-00331):** Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Minor Architectural Review to Allow Demolition of an Existing Single Story Building and Construct a New Two Story 4,256 Square Foot Commercial Building for the Expansion of Nobu Restaurant. The Project Includes Replacement of Three On-Site Parking Spaces with Five In-Lieu Spaces in the Downtown Parking Assessment District. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: CD-C(GF)(P) (Downtown Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Furth: Alright our next item is a public hearing, it's quasi-judicial concerning 620 Emerson Street. A request for a Minor Architectural Review to allow demolition of existing single-story building and construction of a new two-story building of about 4,250-square feet to permit the expansion of a Nobu restaurant and the replacement of three on-site parking space with five in lieu spaces within the Downtown Parking Assessment District. This project has been found to be exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act. May we have the Staff report, please? Oh sorry, has anybody – first of all, we should report on our visits to the site and conversations that we may have had about this project. Osma.

Board Member Thompson: I don't have anything to disclose.

Chair Furth: Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I've visited the site numerous times and I also has a telephone conversation with community member Elizabeth Wong who relayed to me that she has great concerns about the City allowing the in-lieu parking exception to be made for this project. It wasn't entirely clear in my conversation but she said she had some sort of traffic report that proved her position that parking could be accomplished on this site. I just thought it was important that everybody here – at least that was my conversation with Elizabeth Wong that she claims that the case. Thank you.

Chair Furth: I have visited the site repeatedly both on foot and by car.

Board Member Lew: I have no disclosures.

Board Member Gooyer: Just maybe reiterate that what needs to happen. I mean I assume visiting the site was just part of the normal routine of what we need to do. I didn't – this is the first time I've heard that we really need to indicate that we've visited the site. I figured that was given.

Chair Furth: Well it often is. The only reason for disclosing that is if something has changed since we visited.

Board Member Gooyer: I mean ok yes, I visited the site but you can pretty much assume – I mean I've done that to all the projects but it...

Chair Furth: We'll assume that you have unless you tell us otherwise.

Board Member Gooyer: ... only when you talk to someone specific associated with the project then you indicate that sort of reference. Ok, just checking.

Chair Furth: Alright, staff report, please.

Mr. Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Hello, good morning to the Board Member. My name is Samuel Gutierrez, I am the project planner for 620 Emerson here and this is the second hearing for this project. Jumping into the presentation you can see at the start of the presentation there is a new rendering that reflects the previous Board comments from the previous hearing. So, the project overview it's a demolition of the existing building and the construction of a new 4, 063-square foot building. Now on the title of the Staff report, it does indicate 4,256-square feet because that was the original intent of the project. There was that question of if they could use this bonus square footage in downtown and they cannot so they had to revise the project. It is going to be within the allowed FAR of one to one so no bonus square footage is allowed. The project is still involved with the hotel next door, 180 Hamilton. The Nobu restaurant that there is going to expand over to 620 Emerson via some openings in the interior of the buildings. One for front of house and one for back of house for workers to cross through and for patrons and whatnot. There is a new trash room still included. The green roof, backflow preventers are still hidden into the building façade and they are not visible at all even with the new design changes. The two street trees that they propose are still there within the planter boxes that they propose and the parking situation that's existing at the site is three parking on site for the assessment number with eleven paid in lieu. They propose no parking on site with five in lieu spaces. I will go into the parking and the kind of analysis that we conducted per the concerns for the first hearing so we went more in-depth this time around. Just to show you again this is the existing building. It's the former location of the Stanford Florist Shop so it was of retail use. Retail is similar to eating and drinking in our use category so it's not a dramatic change of use. Also, the parking Downtown Assessment District has a mixed ratio so everything parked the same, it doesn't change. So, going just through the key project changes, again the floor is ratio was changed on the plans. There was a question by the Board to provide an updated sheet with a block area diagram and that was provided in the plans set. The rooftop mechanical equipment was screened. There were some questions about it being screened and potential so they did propose a louvered system that's shown in the plans; kind of an enclosureish type setup. It's more of a screening system, it's meant to be fifty percent open so it's not fully enclosed. There's a lot of airflow but it creates this angle louver system so you cannot see the equipment itself. The project also includes a new planter box in the recessed entry. There were some questions about the entry not drawing in pedestrian attention. It just – you could walk right by it. You won't know that that's the entrance so they did add a small planter box at the inside to kind of pull your eye there a little bit more, soften it up. You know draw some more attention. Then there was a question about where would the signage go on this building. There was no indication of that. The plans do show that as well now. They don't have a proposed sign yet but they do indicate the location that they intend to put it on which is on the new awning for the building. The bathroom location, there is currently an agreed upon a covenant with the City and the property owner to – if the access internally were to close at any point between 620 and 180 Hamilton then the 620 sites would need to provide bathrooms. So, they will plumb it and have it bathroom ready and there is a revised bathroom plan because there was a question about the feasibility of the bathrooms that were suggested so they do have that. Here's the proposed building elevation. As you can see there is the future signage indicated, the planter box that I did go over in the entrance and there was actually the addition of public seating in the window area. That was pushed back a bit and benches were added so that's public seating on the – within the property so it's not actually in the public right of way where these benches are located. They're actually located within the private property so they gave up a small amount of square foot to provide that amenity for pedestrians. Just to briefly touch again the in-lieu parking, the code does provide in lieu parking provisions based on this code section here, 18.18.090 (d). Based on the analysis I'm just going to go over after this slide, this is why we feel this meets this—these conditions to make it feasibly not able to provide the parking on site and they can go in lieu. Of course, the site area is less than 10,00-square feet so that's one of the thresholds as well. It's only 4,063-square feet. The Findings for the in-lieu parking, the covered trash enclosure, and the rear access door are required as part of the new building. They are building a new building in the – within almost exactly the

footprint of the old. The old doesn't have a trash room and it was a florist shop. The new building will house a restaurant. The restaurant use would be more waste intensive just by the nature of a restaurant versus a flower shop so they do require a new trash room. Currently, the trash for the building is located in the alleyway and the other buildings down the alleyway along Emerson, they also store their trash there. They are existing buildings, that's just how it's been. The new building is required to have a trash room and that access to that door needs to be maintained so that width of the door needs to meet certain standards per our code. The code is – excuse me, the standards are that free access to all of the waster receptacles needs to be maintained so you shouldn't have to move several waste bins to get to the one that the service vehicle is coming to pick up. For example, if they are coming for the compost they should have to pull out the waste trash plus the recycling and in this case the recycled oil or refuge oil from the restaurant to just to get that one and then push it in. It's supposed to be a clean efficient process so that width of that door should accommodate these bins just being slide out readily and then pushed back in so that the next pick up could occur pretty efficiently. So that's an impediment for the width of the site in the rear towards the alley for the parking. Also, the alley is narrow, it does meet the 25-feet but it's pretty close to that. I mean it's actually just under 25-feet when I went out there and measured it a few times. It's actually 24-feet 9-inches so it is a tight space and it is a 90 degree turn in the alley and you have angled parking from 164 Hamilton. Also, we have a public light pole in the alley there and telecommunication box with a bollard so that kind of creates some more impediments to the parking area so it minimizes it. Again, given the narrowness of the lot it makes it not feasible to have underground parking and the ramps themselves need a certain slope to be acceptable by us. So essentially, I show this in the few slides coming up, the vehicle would enter into the underground parking and immediately – nearly immediately touch the ramp to exit the parking. Then there would be a curb cut needed on the actual Emerson frontage through the sidewalk and the elimination of two spaces that are currently on the street for the public to use. That wouldn't be pedestrian friendly to have a curb cut there and a car coming out. Again, it's once you get into the garage it becomes a problem to turn and circulate into parking spaces. If parking were to be required on site it would be a limited number. It would be maybe one possibly that could work with the conflicts that I mentioned including the other requirement that there be an egress exit path outside of the building towards the rear. For the size of the building and the use the building will require that and that also needs to be maintained clear. So, all these clear widths have to be maintained in the rear so we feel that these are the Findings that we could support this all going in lieu because the site is just so impacted. If the configuration of the alley were different and this was a corner lot for example and you're turning right off of the street, it would be a wider driveway, wider curb cut, there would be a space – a wide space for pedestrians to understand that hey this is cars coming out. We see that all over downtown but this 90 degree turn and the alley with backing up into angled spaces and light poles and just the required widths that we need kind of add extra layers to this situation. These are the conditions for the alley. As you can see the picture on the top left shows the other businesses, the other restaurants and how they store their waste and wait for pick up. That will no longer occur with the new building. On the lower right you can see the existing building and their actual recycle bin there. They store it next to that light pole that you can see next to the blue recycle bin so that would be pushed into the building and free up that alley also for cars to turn in and out and service vehicles to come in and out. This was the previous kind of parking analysis that I – that was shown during the first hearing. This shows the one conflict for one configuration for parking, angled parking, and how that just doesn't work. You're backing into the building, you're backing into the light pole, the telecommunication equipment, and you're also going over another property line. That area is indicated in that shaded area yellow so then that becomes problematic. This is another example of just straight – if you were just to pull in straight to the rear. We still run into some conflicts and that's not even accounting for all these required clear widths of the trash enclosure opening and the egress exit and so on. So, the further analysis that we did was well what if we pushed everything deeper and we then actually show the required egress pass and the trash openings. This is the configuration here and we still have issues with the trash enclosure not being readily accessible so that would be a problem. We could only accommodate at best two spaces and have an egress path and that would actually push further into the site. Another configuration was if we had perpendicular parking. Of course, that just doesn't work, the backup area just isn't enough for that work and that again pushes deeper into the site. We tried angled parking so as you go into the alley you would go straight down but then you'd back up and have to do a number of turns to actually reorient yourself to the one-way alley making it difficult. We still have

not all of the parking being able to be accommodated on site. The five spaces still wouldn't work. We'd have to push further in and they pretty much would have an extremely small building. The next slide here is the underground parking scenario with ramps. We show here that the ramp going down and then coming up would create a new curb cut in the sidewalk and then the illuminate of the two spaces that exist right now on Emerson. It also creates a bit of a blind spot. I think anyone who's walked in downtown, we have some alleys that exist like this and if you're walking and a car kind of pops out its not the most pedestrian-friendly orientation so we wouldn't be supportive of that. If you look the parking space, you can get into the garage but then orienting yourself into a parking space is extremely unfeasible. They would need a very elaborate mechanical system to shift and move cars all over this parking garage and it just wouldn't really work for a restaurant use with different customers coming in who aren't familiar with that system. Again, this just shows that angled parking again with the accommodation of the egress path and not even accounting for the required trash area to be clear and have that free access. So that one space that's show on the bottom of this diagram could work but then we don't have that clear path to the trash and we have concerns about the backing up into the other parking space that exists from 6 or excuse me, 164 Hamilton there. With all of these changes done and the parking analysis done, we feel strongly that could be fully done in lieu instead of on site. Our recommendation to the Board is that the Board approve the project with the Findings attached and the Conditions of Approval and recommend that approval to the Director of Planning. One thing I should note and it's on – in front of you is that there is a slight change in the Conditions of Approval and that only is a typo on Condition Number One the date. It shows say the plans submitted to the City 3-26 and I believe it says 3-2 on there so that's the only change on the Conditions of Approval. Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: I do have to say that's the most thorough explanation as to why we need to have – get rid of those three parking spaces I think I have ever heard.

Chair Furth: Well I'm sure we're not going to leap to any conclusions before we hear from the public but it was a very thorough response and we appreciate it. That's what we asked for. Are there any questions of Staff before we hear from the applicant? Osma. Peter. Alex. I have some. Could you take me through the loading – plan for loading because there's no loading zone?

Mr. Gutierrez: Sure, so two things when it comes to downtown. So, the Downtown Design Guidelines encourage the loading zones to actually be utilized in the alleys and this would be a service alley down this way. Again, the portion – I think its High Street that you enter in the alley, it's a one-way alley, that all is parking and as you make that 90 degrees turn that alley is no longer for parking. It's for service pick up as the photo showed for the bins so that is the loading zoning and unloading zone for the site. Now the other thing is this site is under the required 4,999-square feet threshold for it to require a loading zone. So, it's so small that it doesn't require it.

Chair Furth: I'm really asking you how practically it's going to be done.

Mr. Gutierrez: They could use the rear alleyway. They could also since they have the interior connection utilize the loading zone for the 180 Hamilton side because there is an interior connection to the back of house. This scenario in particular because there are these connections, it just seems more likely that the restaurant tour will utilize their loading zone on the Hamilton side and just send everything through the Nobu on the Hamilton side. Then continue through their interior connection at the back of house to the 620.

Chair Furth: Which Condition is it that talks about supplying the bathrooms when they're no longer – when they no longer have access to those in the hotel? It's 45? 46? That's just about the walls. I couldn't find it which doesn't mean it wasn't there.

Mr. Gutierrez: I know that that's referenced in the agreement that the City has with the property owner and I believe – one moment.



Chair Furth: I agree. 45 addresses filling in the walls again. I think it does it in a fashion that's not sufficiently clear.

Mr. Gutierrez: Oh yes, it's under...

Chair Furth: I can't find anything about bathrooms there.

Mr. Gutierrez: No that should have indicated the bathrooms (crosstalk)(inaudible)

Chair Furth: I only noticed this last night or I would have called you sooner.

Mr. Gutierrez: No that should have indicated that the bathrooms also be restored.

Chair Furth: So, it's somewhere in the vicinity of Condition Number 45 before this thing gets done and where is the access to the roof garden for maintenance?

Mr. Gutierrez: This was something that I've vetted with the Building Department to see what would actually be required for access and what is allowed for the Building Department. This could actually be achieved a number of different ways. They could utilize a ladder to go over the building, they can also access it from the 180 Hamilton side, there is just a small railing barrier so it could be accessed that way

Chair Furth: (inaudible-off mic)

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes. You could access it but it's not – it doesn't have a physical cut out path. You could...

Chair Furth: (inaudible-off mic)

Mr. Gutierrez: No there is no doorway.

Chair Furth: (inaudible -off mic) Where the water? Where's the spicket? Where's the hose? I do notice that the transcriber managed to get me last time even though I forgot to turn on my mic. Somebody else helped.

Mr. Gutierrez: Well on the...

Chair Furth: The applicant but I – if you don't have a quick answer.

Mr. Gutierrez: They indicated to me that they would provide some irrigation on there on the rooftop garden.

Chair Furth: Great. I'm sure they'll comment on it. Any other questions before we go? Alright, applicant please, you have 10-minutes and if we could have your name and its spelling for the record.

Mr. Greg Stutheit: Hello everyone, good to see you all again. My name is Greg Stutheit, I'm with Montalba Architects. That's spelled S-t-u-t-h-e-i-t and thank you for having us back to continue our discussion about the new Nobu restaurant located at 620 Emerson. As you'll remember when we were here previously we had some good discussions pertaining to the pedestrian experience of the new restaurant as well as the neighboring hotel located the corner of Hamilton and Emerson. We had identified a few things to study further. Those things are to clarify how operations are envisioned as working on the site when complete, to focus on creating a more pedestrian-friendly experience, the relationship of the project with other properties adjacent to it and then finally the experience of the green roof. So, you can see we put together here this diagram of the first floor when the facilities are complete. In pink here, we've outlined the existing Nobu restaurant and this kind of is envisions as serving as the hotel restaurant so this will provide room service, breakfast and so on for the hotel. Then the new hotel or excuse me the new restaurant we have circled in blue here which is what we're here for today and this

is more of a destination hotel or excuse me, I keep saying hotel. More of a destination restaurant but it is connected to the existing restaurant through this sort of back of house access. That allows the operator to use the kitchen simultaneously together. In between the two, we have this yellow zone which is awaiting sort of lobby pre-function area if you will. It contains a shared bathroom that both restaurants are able to use and sort of a little lounge area here. As to access to these spaces the existing restaurant is accessed off of the corner here off of Hamilton and then the existing drop off to the hotel doesn't change. That's here off of Emerson and both of those access points basically remain the same and then we're adding a third access point which is down here off of the Emerson sidewalk. A patron can enter any of these three spaces to then see a host and to either continue to their table or to a waiting area where they can wait for their table. Trash and loading as we mentioned before is envisioned back here in the rear alley. This is how these neighboring restaurants to the south operate currently and how we will be operating. As Samuel mentioned there is another loading dock over here and of course with this access kind of allows either/or to be utilized. So, here's some photos of the existing conditions, this is the existing building. You can see the massing and height of the building is roughly the same as the existing building to the south. The existing façade isn't overly pedestrian friendly. There's a small entryway right off of the sidewalk with a little canopy over it. The rest of the façade is fairly flat, kind of painted stucco with these flat windows in the front. If I go to the next image here this is our revised proposal and this – we're proposing to maintain the elevation as far as the height and massing of the building to kind of marry up with the building to the south but we're not proposing to do so with the windows in the front. I know there was some discussion about that previously but after kind of walking the street and internalizing a little more, we felt that having a difference actually as you go down the street and fenestration provides maybe a little more interest to the overall street façade. These windows are still quite large, they are approximately 11-feet tall so it's not like we have kind of a limited opening there. We've added a little planter in the front to kind of soften the entry and draw people towards that space. Then some integrated wood and bronze benches here along the glass line. A place for people to congregate in front of the windows which connect the interior and exterior there. We've – in this image we've taken the tree out so you can actually see this a little bit better. We've pulled the canopy in towards the center of the building and kind of aligned it with the windows to make it stand on its own a little more. It still has kind of the same massing as the belt course at the adjacent hotel and it's rendered slightly differently so it's sort of reinforces the same but different kind of notion there. We've tried to make a similar sort of relationship between the ground floor of the hotel and the new façade here. The rhythm and materials are sort of again the same but different. We're using this raked stone façade here as a background to the street whereas in this area we're using it more as an accent to draw people into the entrance there. This image for the entrance shows how this works. We have a little bit larger alcove that we're going into and then you turn to the right and this kind of large teak door with a glass light in it sort of draws you into the reception area on the other side. This entry area allows people to get off of the sidewalk and negotiate the door and the entry free from the pedestrian flow of the sidewalk there. Here's another image of that in plan. You can see it's approximately 8 ½-feet wide and about 5-feet deep. I'm going to actually skip back to this other entry a little bit. So, we liked the idea that the façade actually provides a break between – if you look here the façade of the hotel here and the building next door. I guess ironically you could consider it a little bit like the ginger palette cleanser that you get with a sushi meal. Now if I – let's see, I'm trying not to lose my place here. Back to the entry plan you can see here in this image we've pulled the fenestration back a little bit to provide these benches and that helps the articulation of the façade so it's not quite such a flat façade again the street. We talked previously about how our intent is to light the stone from above with this linear light fixture which kind of draws out the beauty of the texture of the material. Then this is just kind of a summary of the materials that we're planning on using. There's this bronze paneling, stone kind of rendered in two different ways either flat or textured and this teak wood. Just a little taste of what the interior will look like as well as the streetscape when it's all done. Finally, that brings us to the view garden on the roof. In this image, you can see how we have these conference rooms in the building next door that are not part of the project but they take advantage of this area with the views that you get out into this space. The garden is bound on the three other sides here on the second floor by wall and then that separates these mechanical areas in the rear which Samuel mentioned before that we're looking at providing some screening over the top of as much of the area as we can. Here you can see how even the upper levels of the hotel benefit from

the view of this garden area. This is the second floor of the hotel, it comes out, there's actually an exterior space here and then overlooks the garden. I think I'm running out of time.

Chair Furth: Excuse me, how much more time would you need to complete your presentation?

Mr. Stutheit: This is actually the last slide.

Chair Furth: Well why don't you finish your thought. Finish your slide description.

Mr. Stutheit: We have just updated a little bit our planting plan to sort of reinforce the Japanese feel of the garden. You can see some imagery at the top there and with that, I think I'll pause. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I have two cards from members of the public. If anybody else wishes to speak to this matter. Do we have any questions before we hear from the public or do you want to differ those? We'll differ till after we hear from the public as well, thank you.

Mr. Stutheit: Thank you.

Chair Furth: First card Martin Bernstein to be followed by Elizabeth Wong. You have 3-minutes.

Mr. Martin Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Furth. Martin Bernstein, I'm a neighbor, I live in the Victorian house immediately behind the restaurant – the proposed restaurant. A couple comments, first I support the beauty of this project. I think it's going to be a great and attractive addition to the quality of the neighborhoods so thank you for the great design. I certainly support on Packet Page 83, it's your Condition of Approval propose Number 8, trash room shall be closed and locked during non-business hours. That's great. I know people with their Catalacs, I mentioned Catalac the last time, it's a shopping cart, coming around at early morning hours to salvage material. So that'd be really great for noise issues. My bedroom is up on the second floor behind the restaurant. The – I'd like to suggest you consider one more condition and that's door number 103. That's the exit door for pedestrian use. If that could be a condition that after business hours keep that door – actually keep that door closed during business hours. The reason I ask that is there was a Condition on other restaurant in that alley further down the alley that be kept closed during business hours and not propped open. The condominiums on the -- further down the 600 block of High Street have their bedrooms facing that alley also and that became a condition. So sometimes the doors are propped open of those other restaurants and then the noise comes right in – right through business hours. That was door number 103. I do notice and I do thank the applicant for moving some of the rooftop equipment further away from the rear alley property line. I see that on the plans there's a screened louver for some of the mechanical work. I think in the Stanford Industrial Park there was a – I think an Exception that if you have mechanical equipment only that enclosed space does not count toward FAR. So, I don't know if that would apply for the Downtown District. The screening – I see the louvers are facing a certain way so any sounds would at least be directed away from my house. If there could be a consideration for an Exception for FAR that the mechanical space with the louvers on them if that becomes solid wall at least on the vertical wall if you could consider that as an Exception to FAR and not that counted. Again, it was not to – the reason Stanford Industrial Park had that Exception that mechanical equipment in a space does not require FAR because don't penalize the user for FAR. In general, I'm in support of the project. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Elizabeth Wong. You have 3-minutes.

Ms. Elizabeth Wong: Yes. Good morning Chair Furth and Members of the ARB. My name is Elizabeth Wong, I'm here to represent Yo LLC who as a purchase agreement to – for the purchase of this property. I sent a letter that there are three things that I mostly concerned about. The parking, the loading, and the bathrooms. This property, this project is in conjunction with the Epiphany Hotel. The Epiphany Hotel is huge and I never understood why a hotel could not be put on the top floor of this hotel. That would have a terrific view and it would not have all the problems that we are facing today. In looking over the different parking configurations that they proposed, there are many that would allow at least one parking

space. The parking options for this project has not been exhausted. The underground parking with a turntable that was required for 240 Hamilton was not considered for this project. Parking lifts were not considered so at least two or three parking spaces could be accommodated. The trash enclosures are not that big for a project – for a property of this size so they could be side by side with parking and with the trash bins. By the – I – most of the alleys behind properties are only 20-feet. This one is 25 and it's not totally straight. It has a little room and so I just don't see how the parking can just be so causally eliminated. The three existing parking spaces have been used as parking and loading zones for decades. This is – they're eliminating and setting a precedent for eliminating parking spaces at the rear of the property when it is convenient to the property owner. There is a major conflict with parking and loading. On the third point which is the bathrooms, there is mention of a recorded easement that Epiphany Hotel will give to this place. There's just no formal recording of this situation and there's no formal recording of the requirement for the property owner of 620 Emerson to restore the bathrooms at the time when the City requires it. I just wanted to make a point is that this project has been going on for over a year and I have made many requests to meet with Mr. Gutierrez and he has never granted me a meeting.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to comment on this project? Hearing nothing we'll close this part of the hearing. Pardon?

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: I'm sorry just if you want to...

Chair Furth: (inaudible) I'm sorry (inaudible). Yes.

Mr. Stutheit: I'm not sure I have much to add to what Samuel has presented. We did bring a traffic engineer basically on board to the team to help us kind of study the different applications of parking in the rear. There are definitely a lot of complications with it that from a safety standpoint and making sure that we have – you know similar to the last project actually. Making sure that we have enough space to see as you're backing into the alley really makes it challenging.

Chair Furth: One of the – Martin Bernstein brought up the issue of adding a Condition that door number 103 not be propped open during business hours. Is that acceptable to you?

Mr. Stutheit: Yes.

Chair Furth: Thank you and could you explain to me how the garden is maintained and from where?

Mr. Stutheit: Well as Samuel said the garden came be maintained in its existing form from the adjacent building essentially. So, you can just access the garden from that area but if that access were to become unavailable we would have basically a ladder that you could go over the higher portion of roof which is right here from this lower portion over and then gets to the planted area there. We are planning on doing a full irrigation system in the roof so it's not – we won't be hand watering things.

Chair Furth: So, the plants, the dirt, everything would be lugged through the hotel?

Mr. Stutheit: Yeah, essentially.

Chair Furth: Who owns – maybe I need to ask Staff but who owns and a right to use the diagonal parking that – before the alley bends to the right?

Mr. Stutheit: That is the property owner to our west. I'm actually not sure who the property owner is but it's there – it's on their property.

Chair Furth: It (inaudible)?

Mr. Stutheit: I'm sorry?

Chair Furth: It's not the hotel?

Mr. Stutheit: No, it's not the hotel's parking.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions for the applicant? Ok, thank you.

Mr. Stutheit: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Samuel.

Mr. Gutierrez: I was going to say that that's the parking for 164 Hamilton so that's a different building, different property owner.

Chair Furth: So, it goes House of Foam, 164 Hamilton...

Mr. Gutierrez: Yeah.

Chair Furth: ...and then this.

Mr. Gutierrez: I'm actually not – I don't recall off the top of my head.

Chair Furth: It's a relatively new building.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yeah, it's the newer building and I'm not sure what businesses is actually in there. I can't remember.

Chair Furth: It's a little opaque. Discussion, I'll start at the other end. Osma or am I doing – that's what we did last time? I'm confused. This is our third item. I guess we're back... Alex, you go first. Oh, it does matter, I've gotten complaints.

Board Member Lew: I can recommend approval of the project today. I do like the revisions that you've made to the front façade. I have a couple comments is that for the parking studies, is that – for the Building Code if you provide one space then it has to be handicapped van accessible. So that's actually the space of two spaces and then those typically have to be reserved for the handicap users. So basically, this whole discussion is really – to me is really irrelevant. There is – I think the larger – there is a larger issue which is because we have the blended parking ratio downtown that something that uses less parking like retail space. Once it gets converted to restaurant use it does require more parking at peak hours and that's just a general problem. I would say the – you know I've been doing studies of how Palo Alto developed – downtown Palo Alto developed and the things with the alleys were added ad-hoc over years. They generally weren't planned – most of them weren't planned. Parking on site was not an issue when we had horses so these are things that we just have always worked on incrementally over the years and will continue to do so. That's just the way I've – that's just the way we've always done it and you can go back and look at articles in the 20s and people were complaining about parking then. So, like nothing – this it the same old story here. On the – I did want to comment on the roof garden. I think it's very attractive. It's mostly non-native plants and I did want to follow up on one point is that which I had mentioned briefly on sustainable design and stormwater treatment. Generally, if you have a garden without drought tolerant plants you need an inch of water per week to irrigate it generally and something on a roof would require even more. Things on planters require more water because we use a – typically we use a lightweight soil that doesn't retain a lot of moisture and it's done typically because of the roots get compacted. If you look at – we get 15-inches of rain per year over 52-weeks and you're irrigating 37-weeks of the year and you're capturing rainwater maybe 15-weeks a year so like it's not really a great design – sustainable design strategy. It's great to have a garden and I do support the roof garden but it's not – to me, it's not the greatest sustainable design element. That's all that I have on this one. I do – I would support the Condition of Approval for door 103 as well as a requirement for the bathrooms to be revised if and when the restaurant site is separated from the hotel. That's it.

Chair Furth: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Yes, I think the modifications you've made are very nice and it – I can approve the project the way it is. Interesting point of the last time we were discussing this we talked about making the overhang different on the two so they didn't – because or to make a distinction between the two. Now that we've got a separation between the two awnings or overhangs I don't know if it wouldn't even be that bad of look if the – from a material standpoint they were the same but I can go either way on that. I'd be interested to hear what some of the -- my fellow Board Members think. As far as the parking I agree by the time you turn two of those parking spaces into accessible or one big accessible space it sort of becomes a moot point. One of the things though and we usually don't look into the interior of these things but on your sheet A-1.02, you have that design for in case we lose the – in case you lose the ability to go to the restrooms. The design that's been proposed I have a feeling is not probably in the best interest of the restaurant. You're losing your prep kitchen completely, you're then creating this bottle – this 3-foot bottleneck that all the traffic goes through a blind alley bottleneck that 3-foot wide of all the kitchen staff at one time going back and forth. That's going to become a mess. My suggestion would be that we could put some reference that or a requirement that says if those walls get closed then they need to redesign to create a new bathroom but I don't think this is the solution and I don't think they ought to be stuck having to follow this particular floor plan because I don't think it works. So, I'm open to hearing what my fellow Board Members have to say about that but all in all, I can support the project as it is.

Board Member Thompson: I can also support this project as it is. I agree with Board Member Gooyer and Lew's comments. Also, on the bathroom, I think that makes sense as well. Yeah, I appreciate adding the benches – the integrated benches. I think it does a lot to bring some relief to the façade. I had a slight concern about the planters being in front of the benches. It looks like it kind of concatenates but it seems like they're free standing and so that's ok with me. I appreciate also the slight difference between the façade materials from the hotel. I think it gives a little bit of independence while still having a nice relationship to both sides so I can support this project.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. I also can support the project and concur with the comments me fellow Board Members have made. Let me just go further in two aspects then. One is on the roof garden, we're under the requirement that landscaping be native and drought tolerant etc. as Alex pointed out. By my mind, this is not landscaping. This is an architectural feature, this is a specific element that reinforces the design part of this building. It happens to be a Japanese restaurant and a Japanese garden and that's why I find it acceptable. I just want to put it out there to the public. We're not changing standards but rather this is not really landscaping in the sense that the code intents it to be. That's why I believe it's acceptable. On the question of parking, I find that the Architectural Review Board is required to make Findings, notably Finding Number 4. The building is functional as presented. We are not entitled, required or empowered to decide what the parking requirements are. The Staff has determined what parking is or isn't required and how it's going to be done. Given the situation presented to us, it is functional and I don't feel that it's appropriate for us to go beyond that and question whether in lieu parking right. That said be very careful it's a president you're setting. I've said that before but I can support the project as it is. I do also support Mr. Bernstein's request that door 103 be kept closed at all times. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I have a question of Staff. I guess it's Condition Number 14, it says that the planters get moved every night? Are you serious?

Mr. Gutierrez: That's a Public Works Condition.

Chair Furth: Ok but which planters and where do they go?

Mr. Gutierrez: That would be the front planters and they would just be stored somewhere inside the restaurant. I didn't feel the need to try to designate an area. I mean that could be right next to the front desk or where ever they'd like.

Chair Furth: (inaudible -off mic) what – how that would work in a way that makes it look like significant landscaping was there and then had happily moved every night?

Mr. Stutheit: So, we were...

Chair Furth: Is it on wheels?

Mr. Stutheit: Yes, we were envisioning them with casters underneath so that you could wheel them basically into the entryway because there's enough space...

Chair Furth: It doesn't have to go inside.

Mr. Stutheit: ... there to put them there. These where – we're envisioning these as sort of like a (inaudible) – I forget what you call it. A Mountain Pine so it would be something a little more (crosstalk)(inaudible)

Chair Furth: So, you might have to lock them down actually.

Mr. Stutheit: I'm sorry?

Chair Furth: You might have to lock them actually.

Mr. Stutheit: That may be true, I don't know but yeah so, they would be not something that grows (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: So, they're going to look terrific, I'm going to like it, they are not going to look precarious?

Mr. Stutheit: Sure.

Chair Furth: Well we have a lot of landscaping on casters in the Stanford Shopping Center and some of it which wouldn't be very good on a high traffic sidewalk like this but if you're ok with that I'm not going to object to it. Thank you. I think it looks great. I really appreciate the change. I notice that one of the things that's in our Staff report when we talk about conformance with zoning, I saw analysis with respect to the commercial Downtown District but not in connection with the combining districts. I think it's helpful to have those standards in that as well so that we focus on those issues early because we're going to eventually. I appreciate the seating. I think it no longer looks like a private club. This project is interesting because it only works if it's integrated with the hotel. It needs the hotel for bathrooms. I think it needs the hotel for loading. I'm – I know that the existing buildings which are old have no trash storage within them and I'm glad that this will improve that one – this will remove one dumpster out of that whole string down there? Maybe two? I don't know that much about the timing of restaurant loading but you can't get down that alley in a motor vehicle very easily or maybe not at all if you both have dumpsters and a vehicle parked there loading or unloading. I want to know if since we have to have a recorded covenant which is going to authorize shared use of the bathrooms, if its possible to include access to that larger loading zone that – up to code load on Hamilton to extent possible because I think this is a problem and this is a brand-new building and it should be creating a problem. I don't think that -- so I will say I – with to the extent that our commentary is interesting I think that Elizabeth Wong's point about not suddenly having an exception that swallows the rule is important. I also think that this alley with it's L joint and it's backing – the diagonal parking backing out into it which is a bit unusual, the narrowness of this site, the need for larger trash access and the fact that if we did have a single parking space it would actually be two and it would be reserved for people who needed accessible parking make its infeasible on this site. I don't think there's anybody who would support an entrance on the – a curb cut on Emerson. That would go against everything we're trying to accomplish here and so I support if the Director is interested, this particular permission to use in lieu fees instead. We're missing a Condition, an important. Oh, Condition Number 46 says that we need a seismic evaluation of the existing building before we tear it down? That's a question.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, that's from the Building Department. I think the concern is for the adjacent building as well so while they're removing the existing building, there would be no damages to the adjacent buildings. So, it's an older building, it's not up to code at all now and that's part of the reason why it's being...

Chair Furth: The Epiphany Hotel is not up to code or this building?

Mr. Gutierrez: No, this building, the 620.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Gutierrez: That's part of the reason why it's being torn down rather than just being modified as existing because it doesn't meet fire code exactly today. It's more grandfather in.

Chair Furth: This says that this is going to be torn down because of the change in – this is – sorry, it says there's going to be a seismic evaluation for the change of occupancy. That makes no sense.

Mr. Gutierrez: Again, that goes to that because the building...

Chair Furth: Is this so nobody gets hurt when it's torn down?

Mr. Gutierrez: No, no, no.

Chair Furth: I'm completely missing this.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, so in the Building Code you have a great occupancy now because of the restaurant use so the occupancy code is different and because of that the seismic – from my understanding -- I'm no expert in the Building Code. From my discussions with the Chief Building Official, he wanted this condition there just to make sure that as this building is being torn down and the ground underneath the building gets checked out for seismic. So, when they're doing their engineering they submit for plan check its sufficient and meets today's standards for the new building.

Chair Furth: That's not what this Condition says. I understand that they would need a soils report, I understand the that new building needs to be up to seismic standards, I understand that we need to not kill people when we're taking down the old building even if we have an earthquake during the process but I suggest that Staff take a look at Condition Number 46 and consider revising it. So that it more accurately reflects what you've just told us. Would that be acceptable because this doesn't not make us look very reasonable?

Mr. Lait: We can look at that. I mean it's going to be a new building so I think we're...

Chair Furth: Right so why are we doing a seismic study of the one they're tearing down.

Mr. Lait: We'll follow up on that. Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah it looks like it was probably left over (crosstalk)...

Chair Furth: I think its boilerplate.

Board Member Gooyer: ... from when they were planning on keeping the building and not tearing it down.

Chair Furth: It doesn't address the issue you did address so I'm going to suggest that we revise that. Much more seriously Condition Number 45 does not adequately describe the kind of documentation you



need in order for the City to have an enforceable right to insist that the openings between the two building be closed if they no longer have rights. Well first of all if they have rights of access to the bathroom and to the loading and to apparently access for garden maintenance through the hotel property so long as these properties are operated in an integrated fashion. Secondly that when that stops they close up the walls, they build new bathrooms – this is a different set of people at this point – and they redesign the roof garden so that it can be adequately maintained from the property itself. None of those things are discussed in this and if I were asked to interrupt this to Staff saying what are we suppose to do here? I wouldn't know the answer. That was my rant. I do think it looks lovely and I do like what you've done with the rhythm of that block and I like the pause that this building creates between the Epiphany and the existing more ornate structures.

Vice Chair Baltay: (Inaudible) make the motion.

Chair Furth: Ok I'll make the motion.

Board Member Thompson: Oh wait, I have a quick question for the applicant. For the roof, garden irrigation is there any looking into reusing reclaimed water from sinks or from the kitchen to go towards the irrigation of the roof garden?

Mr. Stutheit: In general no. The – most of the water that comes from the kitchen has to be run through a grease interceptor before it's released and to be honest, we haven't really looked that far into it. We felt that was enough of a stumbling block to kind of – I'm sorry?

Board Member Thompson: Sorry I didn't catch that last bit. What did you say?

Mr. Stutheit: We felt that the treatment that had to occur with the wastewater was enough of a stumbling block to – that wouldn't be – really make that feasible. If you're talking about reclaimed water from the facility. Yes.

Board Member Thompson: That's right. I mean usually, I think reclaimed water comes from sinks from bathrooms...

Mr. Stutheit: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: ... and laundry space. I'm assuming the bathrooms in the new location are not being reused for anything?

Mr. Stutheit: No. In fact, for some technical reasons the bathrooms...

Board Member Thompson: Just the sink.

Mr. Stutheit: I'm sorry?

Board Member Thompson: (inaudible)

Mr. Stutheit: So, no, the short answer is no.

Chair Furth: I should also say that I don't share Peter's conclusion about the landscaping. I think if you water it, it's landscaping and I would want it to use to the extent practical regional indigenous drought-resistant plant materials capable providing desirable habitat that can be appropriately maintained. Anybody else have any thoughts on that? I've seen some very creative Japanese gardens losing low water plants.

Board Member Lew: Say you have the monkey flower, there's Mimulus and that to me could be substitute...

Chair Furth: Sticky or unsticky?

Board Member Lew: Sticky. You could use that as a substitute for something like an azalea but it has a dormant period all summer long where it looks dead. So, to me, like I would use it in my own garden but I could see a hotel, they want it to look perfect all year round and to me, that's not going to – it would not work in that particular environment.

Chair Furth: You don't think *saliva greggii* looks good all year round?

Board Member Lew: It looks good most of the time, yes. I use that plant a lot. It's not really native, it's from New Mexico.

Chair Furth: I know but it's good habitat. Excellent habitat. You feel that they have used it to the extent feasible for this kind (inaudible) view garden?

Board Member Lew: I was going to give them a pass. I think the garden – I would say it looks good as it is...

Chair Furth: I wouldn't doubt that.

Board Member Lew: ... and you're saying is there could be a substitution? I would say maybe there could be.

Chair Furth: Would you be willing to take one more look at your garden and see if it's possible to include plants that meet our standards? You will look and not see. It's a 4,000-square – its how many square feet is this garden?

Mr. Stutheit: The garden is about...

Chair Furth: Planted area is very small isn't it?

Mr. Stutheit: Yeah around 1,000-square feet I think.

Chair Furth: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Stutheit: I think it's around 1,000-square feet but I could be wrong about that. That's just off the top my head.

Chair Furth: Do you have your landscape designer here?

Mr. Stutheit: No.

Chair Furth: I'm having trouble with this one. I want to support the project.

Board Member Lew: I'm not a horticulturist but I would – my take on the plants is that they would provide zero habitat value.

Chair Furth: Oh absolutely.

Board Member Lew: That's my take on it from just my own experience with gardening.

Chair Furth: Except for snails.

Board Member Lew: So that's where I am at on this one.

Board Member Thompson: Its really more I think – I mean for me it's really more like the water consumption. That if there's a way to alleviate that by using reclaimed water? I don't know if the hotel has laundry (inaudible)

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Well I'm going to move approval of the plan as submitted with the following modifications. That we add a Condition that the door designated as door 103 on the plans that opens up into the rear alley be kept closed during business hours to reduce noise for adjacent residents. Secondly, that Condition Numbers 45 and 46 be written to establish that as long as these properties are to be operated jointly, the restaurant has access to the bathrooms, loading zone and garden maintenance access through the hotel property and that this is a document – recorded document enforceable by the City. That is also provides that should these properties – should the (inaudible) testament – should the hotel no longer care to grant this access that the restaurant building will be modified to comply with code independently. I'm going to recommend and include a provision that the landscaping comes back to subcommittee to demonstrate that it has used, to the extent practical, regional indigenous drought-resistant plant material capable of residing a desirable habitat that can be appropriately maintained knowing that this is a very constrained garden and also a small one. Is there a second?

Board Member Gooyer: I have a quick question on that and it goes back to my comment about the future bathrooms, the drawing that's in here. I suggest that be eliminated because I don't think this is helping them any. It's just restricting the...

Chair Furth: Well at the moment there's no requirement for any bathroom anywhere and I'm just saying they have to have bathrooms. Not that it needs to conform to this plan.

Board Member Gooyer: No, I understand that. What I'm saying is that we're – on requirement 45 we're saying that it needs to be modified. So, I mean if we have – if you have the drawing here and (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Chair Furth: Ok saying these are plans as submitted.

Board Member Gooyer: ... this gets approved I think we ought to just eliminate this particular future detail which gives them more flexibility.

Chair Furth: I think they've got – well why do they have more flexibility? They can always come in and change it. It's an interior layout.

Board Member Gooyer: Because I'm a...

Chair Furth: Well ok, adding a provision that bathrooms (crosstalk)...

Board Member Gooyer: Let's put it this way I just don't think this design works.

Chair Furth: ... be provided as indicated or in an alternative design.

Board Member Lew: The bathroom – the internal bathroom layout is not the purview of the Board.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok.

Board Member Lew: I think all...

Chair Furth: I think we're ok. That's certainly based on the (inaudible). Also, excuse me but was that a request that the door be kept open at all times except when used or simply in business hours?

Board Member Lew: Closed.

Chair Furth: Closed, sorry, that's backward. I'm asking Martin. Did you want a condition that the door 103 be closed at all times or during business hours?

Mr. Bernstein: Let's see well I assume that when it's not business hours the door is going to be locked and so my request is that be closed during business hours because I know the other restaurant down when it's open the noise comes right on through to the other residences.

Chair Furth: Ok, I'm ok with what we have. Thank you.

Mr. Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Furth.

Mr. Lait: So, Chair I just want to note for the record that the applicant representative has agreed to that Condition about door 103 and your motion still needs a second.

Chair Furth: It does.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second your motion.

Chair Furth: Discussion. We done? All those in favor say aye. All those opposed? Passes unanimously.

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

Chair Furth: Chair Furth: Thank you again for the hard work. This has been a morning of people coming back after doing a lot of work. I know we don't manage to address everything to everybody's satisfaction but we appreciate the work you do. Oh yeah, I'll have one comment for Staff which is one of the – it's sort of a post-hearing comment. Every time I walk down that alley or drive down it there is a worker standing amongst the garbage cans with a cell phone taking a break. I hope that as we keep moving forward on this alley we keep thinking about that. In fact, I forgot to say this so it's not binding on anybody but there is a space...

Mr. Lait: For a bench?

Chair Furth: Where a bench in the alley. We'll take a 5-minute break. Be right back.

[The Board took a short break]

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [18PLN-00055]:** Request by Jason Smith, on Behalf of the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University, for Minor Board Level Architectural Review of Façades and Signage Changes for new Tenant, Jeffrey, in Building J at Stanford Shopping Center. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guideline Section 15301. Zoning District: Community Commercial (CC). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Furth: Back in session. We are on Item Number Four, also a quasi-judicial hearing, 180 El Camino Real which is, of course, is the Stanford Shopping Center. Request by Jason Smith on behalf of the Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior University for minor Board Level Architectural Review of facades and signage for a new tenant, Jeffrey, in Building J which is one of the ones that fronts on El Camino Real quite a way back at Stanford Shopping Center. Categorically exempted. We got a message from Samuel last night or yesterday which included as an attachment a copy of the Stanford Design Guidelines. Whatever they are actually technically called. Staff report? Oh sorry, any conversations? I'm going to assume site visit unless informed otherwise. Any conversation to report? Thank you.

Mr. Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Thank you. Yes, once again I'm Samuel Gutierrez the Project Planner for this project here at the Stanford Shopping Center located at 180 El Camino. On the beginning slide here you can see the proposed elevation for the new store that would be for Jeffrey. It's a retailer. Going just to briefly overview why we're even here for the shopping center and how does the shopping center get reviewed. Yeah, exactly. There is a Master Tenant Façade Program that was approved for the shopping center. I'm sure as your quite familiar, anyone who visits the shopping center knows it constantly going through change so in order to manage that we developed this Master Tenant Façade and Sign Program to help streamline things there because it's just a constant moving or growing and changing center. The design – excuse me, the Master Tenant Façade and Sign Program has some requirements for architectural review should any of the one-off tenant buildings such as the Bloomingdales or the building that houses P. F. Changs or Flemings or Neiman Marcus. Those were to be proposed to go through changes those would need some type of entitlement meaning they would need Board review or Staff review depending on those changes. The other requirement is that all those tenant spaces that are smaller in the much larger buildings with multiple tenant spaces, they would need review and that review would be determined based on the length of their façade. So, anything that is greater than 35-feet in length comes to the Board. This project is greater than 35-feet in length so that's why we're at the Board and it does face El Camino Real so that's the requirement. Any tenant space that has a storefront that is 35-feet or less than it would just require a Staff level application for that review if again it faces on the outside of the shopping center and some type of public right of way be it Sand Hill or El Camino and so on. The Master Tenant Façade Program was approved back in 2015. Just wanted to put that reference as these tend not to come up quite frequently. This is the map that kind of is a guiding map of the shopping center with these locations indicated that would be subject to these requirements for additional review. These green lines indicated on Buildings basically J through M indicate those tenant spaces that are subject to these requirements of 35-feet – that 35-foot threshold via Board or Staff level. The filled buildings, orange and red, those are the buildings that we consider the stand-alone tenants; the Macy's, Bloomingdales, Neiman Marcus and so on. Those if they come with some type of modifications to their building façade changes or square footage changes then they need to come before the Board. If there's a minor change, for example, they want to install a different sign or something that might be reduced down just to Staff level but that's where we would evaluate and see if the changes are minor. Landscaping or something might be Staff. A whole wall section of the Bloomingdales that's multi-storied to change that faces El Camino would definitely come to the Board for example. So, this is a zoomed in location map, it's rather difficult to get a location map in our mapping software because it will indicate the whole site which is extremely large so this is a zoomed in portion that actually indicates the tenant space that we're speaking of now. That's highlighted in that pink color there next to the Macy's. This has a unique feature like colonnade feature that you'll see in the next slides and to my understanding it uses to be the Ralph Lauren site.

Chair Furth: But our local historian just pointed out that once upon a time it was Joseph Magnin. It's Joseph Magnin. Way back when I was an undergraduate, yes. Oh, I didn't remember.

Vice Chair Baltay: I remember Ralph Lauren. That's as far as I can go.

Chair Furth: So, pity, you're so inexperienced.

Mr. Gutierrez: This is the existing building as it is now, the tenant space that we're looking at. It has that colonnade feature, the arched display windows, it's sat vacant for a number of years and this is proposing to change that to accommodate the new tenant. We can see that there's mature existing trees along the peripheral of the building and we do have some pedestrian lighting there. The project overview is the renovations of the existing building within the Stanford Shopping Center to accommodate this new retail tenant named Jeffrey. They are a clothing apparel store.

Chair Furth: I think we've established that most of us actually know who they are. They've had very good publicity rolling out recently.

Mr. Gutierrez: They will be removing that colonnade feature that you saw on the previous slide and the design is a minimus glass type of design. The storefront does have larger display windows now. The previous slide you could see that the existing façade just have these small sections that would be utilized for a display area and the new design actually has it much larger with glass panels. They are proposing a new illuminated sign over the entrance. Just a single sign that indicates Jeffrey as the tenant space. They are also proposing to repair the planter areas around the trees. Some of them have fallen into disrepair. They are split, cracked and lifted so they will recondition those planting curbs around that planter box. We have a new façade so that is a requirement to clean up that space as well and this project doesn't result in any changes in floor area so it won't impact parking at the shopping center. The shopping center is a mixed parking ratio so nothing ever changes there really as far as parking unless the building footprint actually gets bigger as far as square footage and floor area. Here's a different perspective of the proposal. The glass kind of storefront with the removal of the colonnade removes these large pillars that exist there and creates a wider area for pedestrians to walk. The trees which are very nice when they are full do also kind of eat into that pedestrian walkway with the curved area that surrounds them. The removal of the colonnade does improve the pedestrian experience though it does remove the awning. The essential cover over the pedestrian walkway. It does open it up and creates better access. This is a detail for the signage that's proposed. It's the illuminated sign just indicating Jeffrey. It does meet the Master Tenant Façade and Sign Program requirements for the letters to no exceed 24-inches in height though the overall sign area indicated does exceed 24-inches but the individual letters do not. That is accounted for because the 'y' at the end of Jeffrey is obviously lower case so it pushes down but it is the same size as all the other letters there. So, it still meets the requirements and as far as the square footage threshold it's not exceeding any of the allowed sign areas. The – again going back to the removal of the colonnade, we see it as increasing the pedestrian area. I visited the site, of course, and the columns are large and bulky and you can't really – nobody really walks in between them towards the furthermore projecting columns. They walk closer to the storefront so it's almost like as if there was a barrier there when there really isn't so I think that this would allow pedestrians more free access which is similar to what we see further down the way as we approach the Bloomingdales Store for example. We are going to maintain the existing trees, we're going to repair the curbs there so that is also going to be an improvement to the site. They are again cracked and not in the best condition so that will redo those curbs around the planter area for the trees. It doesn't impact circulation; this project isn't modifying the mall in a manner that would really change how people get to the mall. It would still be the same access as if the existing building – the existing façade where to be there, nothing has changed. Again, there's no increase in FAR or parking and the façade materials and signage are consistent with the Master Tenant Façade and Sign Program. The project will bring a new retailer into a space that has been vacant. It's a rather large space and has been vacant for years. With all this, we recommend that you recommend approve to the Director of Planning and Community Environment based on the findings and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval. I will note that the Findings for whatever reason weren't printed with you Packet but they are provided there.

Chair Furth: Any questions of Staff – (inaudible) my light. Any questions of Staff before we hear from the applicant? What's the minimum sidewalk width between the planters and the building under the new proposal?

Mr. Gutierrez: I don't recall off the top of my head. I'd have to look into that.

Chair Furth: The applicant I'm sure knows. Osma, yes, you have a question.

Board Member Thompson: Is any of this subject to HRB review at all?

Mr. Gutierrez: No.

Chair Furth: It's never been stable long enough to become historic. Probably the whole thing. Alright if we could hear from the (inaudible).

Mr. Jason Smith: Good morning Chair.

Chair Furth: Good morning, you have 10-minutes and if you could spell your name for the transcriber we would appreciate it.

Mr. Smith: Yes, my name is Jason Smith with Land Shark Development Services here as applicant on behalf of Stanford and Simon Properties. I have with me today the project architect, Darren Machulsky and also Matt Woods from GH+A Design to further discuss and review the project with you and answer any questions you may have.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Smith: I'll pass it off to Mr. Woods.

Mr. Matt Woods: (crosstalk) Hello, I'm Matt Woods from GH+A Design. This design...

Chair Furth: I'm not sure the mic is picking you up.

Mr. Woods: Sorry. I'm Matt Woods from GH+A Design. This design responds to actually Jeffrey's brands very tightly. Jeffrey is an up and coming new brand, he has a store in Chelsea, and he has a new one in Phipps Plaza. His brand is really about being very sharp-lined, clean-lined, a very tone on tone white. His Chelsea store is exactly that, it's a very lofty space and it's in Chelsea. His second store in Atlanta is in a shopping center interior so this is actually the first time we get to kind of explore all those elements in an exterior environment and it also picks up his favorite things which are symmetry and also this big lofty space which was a great fine. He's very excited for this. The plan here is we'll be removing – this is a demo plan so removing everything from the curb towards the building over top this existing Ralph Lauren space. We're stopping at that 5-foot line which this mouse is showing which is actually existing – that's where the display boxes start for the Ralph Lauren store so we're going to be using that existing foundation to build from. The trees -- again (crosstalk) the trees are perfectly symmetrical exactly as we like them. The entry sits exactly as Ralph Lauren has it so that works out perfect for us. It also kind of breaks down the larger façade when the trees are fully bloomed so it's really quite nice. We're going to be removing the existing columns and colonnade through here and that's half of what the push is obviously too kind of repave and clean that whole are up. Interior to that display box there's a breakout area in here and this hashed area is indicating where we're going to be dropping the display boxes. Right now, they are presently at about 24, 18-inches off the ground so we're going to take those down a little bit to increase the visuals for the display units. The displays units as we have them designed are going to be 24-feet wide by 12-feet high of glass, clear glass with very controlled LED illumination on the interior which is really about shining on the actual object for sale and less about washing the sidewalk. The existing roof right here, this portion of roof, again we're going to try and salvage as much of that as we can. This is the portion of colonnade everything is being removed and a lot of the stud systems that are in there are already in place, some of the structure and we're going to try and salvage as much of that as we can as well. This are in particular bumps out, there's Urban Outfitters in the one side and there's another tenant on the other side open. This area bumps out about 5-feet so we'll be taking this clean white glass and wrapping the corners on each end so it carries on that same language. This is the façade here. Basically, the lower portion where it's opaque is spandrel glass and this 12-foot tall by 5-foot wide. The upper portions are 14-foot tall by 5-foot wide and then the clear glass areas are the again back to the 12-feet by 5-feet. About as clean as you can get. Again, white on white with white detailing and white interior. Completely tone on tone. The signage sits into that 26.25-square feet. Simple, clean, face illuminated LED with a metal edge to it. These are some blow-ups – you know what I missed something here. Let me backtrack. The one thing that we are doing a little different is existing right now there's a 26-foot high parapet. The Ralph Lauren store is a tiny bit below that. We're going to come up and meet that line so we don't look like we're just applied to the front of this façade. So, we're just trying to clean that whole ledge up and give it a little bit more substance to it. Again, existing conditions and this is really sort of exemplified where we're heading with this. There's a rear façade that matches this to the interior of the mall concourse, basically carrying the same language right through working off the existing

conditions. This is a section cut through the front window, again very schematic. This is the existing buildings. I'm not sure if your familiar to much with this façade but there's a 10-foot high – starting at 10-foot there's a concrete grade – ok pre-cast that runs all the way up to 26-feet. Ok, so we're...

Chair Furth: I think you can take it for granted that we're all very familiar with this area.

Mr. Woods: Well that allows us to actually come in front of that a little bit. We built our display windows off that so you don't notice any of that. We're in front of it at the 5-feet and we can bring our display units up to 12-feet without interference so that works our nice and clean. Then there's an existing roof area in here with its own drainage system that we're going to rework. That's kind of where we're at. Thank you.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)? If you could stay there for questions. Anybody have questions? Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Is there a material sample or a material board?

Mr. Woods: I believe you have a material board, yes. It was submitted, right?

Board Member Thompson: Where is it?

Mr. Gutierrez: I misplaced it. I didn't bring it down right now. I didn't have time to find it.

Chair Furth: Could you send a runner?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yeah, that's what I was trying to do, bring a runner.

Chair Furth: It's that one.

Mr. Woods: It's a clear white glass with an interior layer. It's not back painted. It's going to be a sandwich panel with the aluminum – you've probably seen it before, the aluminum core on the back. It's for structural strength. It's a pretty good size piece of glass so it's a clip-on system. No mullions...

Chair Furth: We'll get the materials board. Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you for submitting this additional detail. I just want to understand the existing Ralph Lauren bump out of about 5-feet has a roof that's down lower and you're proposing to remove that roof and add a new one above it or to keep it? The detail shows a new roof element and a new wall extended about 6-feet taller. How are you – yeah, right there.

Mr. Woods: Right where we have right here. This area hasn't been fully explored yet because we don't have permission to touch it so our best interest is we're going to try and salvage as much as we can. Worse case scenario if we have to remove the roof then we'll fill that place back in on top. We're not touching the roof on the other side of it which is the rest of the building.

Vice Chair Baltay: So, what I'm going to want to explore is whether you need that full 5-feet of bump out off the sidewalk. I mean you have essentially the existing building and you have this additional 5-feet that you're using for this lovely glass piece. Does it have to be 5-feet? Can it be less than that? Is that unreasonable?

Mr. Woods: This is – that's actually what's there so it's concrete as it comes out and drops down so if we step back then we'll have a little lip there.

Vice Chair Baltay: Or you have to remove the concrete but I'm wondering what else has to be changed? Is it the roof as well or (inaudible)(crosstalk)



Mr. Woods: I think you're digging into exactly the same thing we were talking about because underneath of this is probably where the – its (inaudible) – foundation is so we might be digging a wedge out of that or something. To make a decent display area in here and building off that existing concrete pre-cast that's behind it the interior space being like 4-foot 6 is pretty comfortable and allows us to cast light properly for display.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: The display windows or whatever, tell me about their depth and their design.

Mr. Woods: 20-feet wide.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Woods: Just under 12-foot interior and they're accessed from hidden doors from the interior.

Chair Furth: How far back? How deep are they?

Mr. Woods: They're – well it's minus wall width so it's a 5-foot offset so it's 4-foot 6.

Chair Furth: That far – that deep.

Mr. Woods: Yeah.

Chair Furth: So not a vitrine, thanks. Alex. Robert.

Chair Furth: (Inaudible) questions let's just wait a minute to get the materials board or do you want to start discussing? Fine.

Board Member Lew: Thank you so I can support the project. I think my main reservation was the glass. In looking at the renderings I was thinking that maybe it was very – it was like you were looking at mirrored or reflective glass and we have issues with that with regards to bird strikes and whatnot. If it's a white...

Mr. Woods: It's a white glass.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, then I think that resolves any issues that I have on this one. So, I can recommend approval for this one. Just for history sake, I would say this was the Joseph Magnin store. It was one of the original tenants and that was from 1956 to 1984. Then Stanford Shopping Center carved it up into small stores called the inner circle and half of it remains but they never – they did not do well. It failed pretty quickly. There was not enough – there wasn't really a strong enough anchor to bring people out to that section of the mall so I think – so then Ralph Lauren came in 3-years later and that's why we still have that – they kept that passageway partly.

Mr. Woods: They took the Ralph Lauren Store...

Board Member Lew: They used both sides.

Mr. Woods: ... since it was empty they left it as a concourse temporarily.

Board Member Lew: It was still – it was open. It was kind of like an interior/exterior space and so I do kind of miss that but I do understand that...

Board Member Gooyer: Leasable space.

Board Member Lew: It's leasable space but there's – but even when it was all open they had trouble – the shopping center had trouble...

Board Member Gooyer: No, you're right.

Board Member Lew: ... bringing people there. I think that's – it's always been a quieter section of the mall so I think I can understand trying to go big and bold and simple and clean. I think that makes sense and I think that what you're trying to do with the display windows is very sophisticated. That's where I am on this one. I'm done.

Chair Furth: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree it – the mall has some sections where it gets to be awfully busy and ornate and everything else and a little bit too much. This is very nice. Very nicely done. I can approve it as it is.

Mr. Woods: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Chair Furth: I think it would be approvable even if you weren't starting from the very low base from which you are starting. I think that that's been a kind of disserted, not very well-maintained space for a long time. I'm sure that Ralph Lauren's design made sense at the time but it hasn't for a long time and sometimes the abandoned section of shopping malls are well used for art or for a passageway or whatever but this is just been a kind of walk by it, ignore it, leaves blowing in space so this will be good. Doesn't – everybody have a chance to look at the materials? Somebody want to make a motion? Oh sorry. You haven't had commentary, sorry, go ahead.

Board Member Thompson: I think it's very attractive certainly. I grew up in Palo Alto so I've an emotional connection to the architecture over there at Stanford. I mean that was always the icon for Stanford Shopping Center for me so emotionally it's a little hard to let go but this is quite lovely. It's sort of hard to deny that. Those are my comments.

Mr. Woods: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: I have nothing to add. I can support the project.

Mr. Woods: Thank you.

Chair Furth: So, you have if not three generations, three cohorts of people who have shopped in this particular site. We may not be priced out of it but...

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: Definitely. Now would somebody like to make a motion?

## **MOTION**

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we recommend approval of this project.

Chair Furth: A second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye. All those opposed? Passes unanimously. Thank you.

## MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0

Mr. Woods: Thank you very much.

### Study Session

- 5. QUASI-JUDICIAL. 695 Arastradero Road (18PLN-00046):** Request for Preliminary Architectural Review of a Proposed new One-Story, 5,400 Square Foot Reception Pavilion With a Partial Storage Basement on a Central Portion of the Alta Mesa Cemetery. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: RE (Residential Estate). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at [Claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org)

Chair Furth: Our next item is 69 – is a quasi-judicial hearing, it's a study session is that right? On a request for – well Preliminary Architectural Review of a proposed one-story, 5,400-square foot reception pavilion with storage basement at the Alta Mesa Cemetery at 695 Arastradero. Shall I assume that everybody had visited the site? So Osma has not seen it. Anybody – has everybody else seen it?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: Yes. Whenever you're ready. Oh, any conversations?

Vice Chair Baltay: (inaudible)

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good morning Board Members, Chair Furth. The project before you today is a request for Preliminary Review for a proposed project at 695 Arastradero and the project is located at the Alta Mesa Memorial Park. This is actually a 72-acre site that is comprised of 6 parcels and the project is located on a 47-acre parcel that is zoned residential estate. The project would include a new building that is 5,400-square feet in total and that is 19-feet tall. It would include a partial basement to the depth of 11-feet. The intended use is for funeral services and I just want to also note that the building would not be visible from the public right of way. I think that's an important thing to note. Some key considerations for you today is just the proposal materials that they're using and we'd like your feedback on that. The proposed design architecture and any comments you have on circulation or parking at the site or landscaping as well. So next steps there's – this is not – no formal recommendation is requested at this time but following this hearing the applicant may elect to file for a Formal Application for a Major Architectural Review. With that, I turn it back to the Board.

Chair Furth: Any questions of Staff before we hear from the applicant? Applicant, please. Good morning you have 10-minutes and if you spell your name for our transcriber.

Mr. John Barksdale: Thank you. I won't take that long. My name is John Barksdale, I'm the architect for the project working for Alta Mesa Improvement Company. Alta Mesa has noted a need for more onsite funeral services where services for interment and receptions and memorial services and burials all happen on site without going to different venues for one death. The variety of services range from somber funeral services to joyful memorial services and they also require events that have formal seating all the way up to tables and chairs for caterers type events. There are – there is an existing Chapel in the new mortuary and there is small Chapel in one of the columbarium but they've on occasion proven inadequate for the size of the service. Sometimes they have to spill out into the lobby and into the joining courtyards so that's the need for this larger reception pavilion which needs to accommodate all range of events. So, the building is located in the heart of the cemetery and it's aligned with the main cemetery entrance road, the building, and the entrance. There is a need we feel for architecturally for solidity and gravity. It's appropriate for the cemetery – excuse me, the cemetery while at the same time unlike maybe the columbarium and so forth is to provide an uplifting environment. The way we did this was to create a plan floating roof with a limestone plaster parapet that somewhat mimics the adjacent columbarium around the building with height and simplicity. Which is supported at two corners with the

large columns of the same material and at the other points with limestone clad elements – lower elements that appear to be holding the roof up which would function for the ancillary facilities for the building. In between these elements would be large expanses of glass looking out into the cemetery. There are -- this floating roof extends beyond the footprint of the building on two sides and along with some low niche, walls formed courtyards. The idea is that the visitors would come through the entrance which is going to be flanked by the limestone elements in the lower area and then hop into this higher element that is – has these great vistas of the foothills and the cemetery on both the east and west side. That's the thinking and it's to provide both a conservative somber feeling but once inside allow for a more joy and a more pleasant experience. The – there's a model that I have there that probably describes it better. There's two – the lighter limestone is what we hope to achieve with the plaster for the parapet and the column. The darker limestone which would be large pieces of natural stone veneered to the low walls around. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any questions to the applicant?

Board Member Thompson: In the first rendering on the front page there's a trellis. Sorry view of the entrance.

Mr. Barksdale: Oh, that page.

Board Member Thompson: There's a trellis which I noticed wasn't on the model...

Mr. Barksdale: Oh this.

Board Member Thompson: ...but is – are we to assume that this is more in tune? There will be a trellis in front of the entrance?

Mr. Barksdale: Yes, the – this roof that extends beyond is almost a square shape. After where it covers the exterior spaces outside the footprint would be large openings cut in the roof and a trellis that's inset in that. What that does is gives a feeling of enclosure for the courtyard. It would also since this is the east and west side it protects – provides sun screening for the large floor to ceiling glass that's adjacent to it.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any other questions? (inaudible)

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. I guess I'm going to throw out two thoughts from – mostly from visiting the site that this is a blank piece of land in the middle of what's really a parking circle or a driving circle. It struck me that your site planning just didn't really work in the sense that everybody getting into this is walking not just across a parking lot but across probably the most busy driving area of the whole facility. It's really going to be very awkward to be coming into what's intended to be this axial, symmetrical, formal entrance and space with a very formal, sincere, very emotional feeling about it and yes, you're navigating past everybody else driving by. It was obvious to me when I was there walking around and within a minute somebody pulls up in a car and asks where to go and I have to watch out for the lawn and the garden caretakers and stuff. It really makes me feel like I'm walking across a busy street right to the front door and you sort of have that problem because you're surrounded by a roadway. A ring around this whole thing but I think you need to really find a way to modify not just the building and the piece of land but the way the parking and the circulation work to get an appropriate entrance for the building. It just feels like it hasn't quite been recognized that the front door just faces onto a very busy or potentially busy piece of pavement. Even if you just put some sort of changes to the pavement or a walkway or a parking pattern but something to just make it comfortable. So, I'm taking my mother on my arm and we're slowly walking into this facility to a very important service. We don't want to be thinking about who's driving past us or about to hit us and yet that's very much what you've set up here with this formal entrance and stuff. So, I just throw that out to you that I don't think that's been resolved or even

thought about and it seems like it needs that for a building of this magnitude and importance for what you're saying. My other comment and again its very much an architectural thing but when I drive in there's the older building on the left has a very stately, powerful presence to it and then the mortuary and the columbarium and all these very older, stone, big buildings. Almost like you'd find on the Stanford Campus and I don't find any connection for the new building. There's no sense that this is another facility as part of this larger operation which I would think you'd want to have and yet this new one sort of just feels like it just landed here without really looking around first. Somehow – I would certainly want that if I were designing this. I would want to be looking at these other buildings. Maybe not coping their style, that's a different thing but somehow it just feels to me that this is come out of an architect's head without really looking at the site. Maybe it's the first thing – the first comment as the first issue that site planning needs a little bit more work. Then lastly, I just commented to myself that you were saying the idea of a floating roof and yet you have this heavy stone roof with a big column in the corner dropping down and it really isn't a floating roof over this trellis and opening. Its these heavy blocks of masonry material so let me leave it at that but those are just my gut reaction looking at this, that it just doesn't fit quite yet. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: If memory serves correctly that older building on the left is new right? The Chapel is new. That was – it was one of the – it was when I – yeah, within 10-years? Because I was on Board at the time. I remember (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: Aging really well. (crosstalk)

Board Member Lew: So that's the thing, is in California you can't judge...

Vice Chair Baltay: You see I don't know Alex. I've been around but I don't go there too often.

Board Member Lew: I think – my thinking was similar to Peter's and I was wondering if you could explain – I guess there's something that I don't quite understand. If I'm coming here for a service, how would I know that I need to go to that building versus the existing mortuary building? The Mediterranean style one or how does – this building seems similar to the – there's a columbarium. It seems similar to the small columbarium building so I was just wondering how do I know that I need to get here? Then once I get to the site there are four different doors, right? I mean there's side – the courtyard entrances and there's a service entrance on the back and how would I know which one is the one that I need to enter?

Chair Furth: Could you give us your name and it's spelling before you answer? Thank you.

Ms. Marilyn Talbot: Sure, Marilyn Talbot, T-a-l-b-o-t, I'm the General Manager of Alta Mesa Improvement Company. We do quite a bit of signage so the new building that's only 8-years old has signage on it and we do have – we have Staff for managed parking and directing people. The last thing we want is for people to come on site for a service and not know where to go. So, we have temporary signage that we put out for services and then we have permanent signage that directs them where to go. We're very involved with managed parking, managed directing people on where they go. The reason why that building on the left is more let's say California architecture, that was the architecture that was there originally so we didn't want to change it drastically when we built that building. This new building compliments a Birge Clark building but not what he's known for. It's more modern, something you see in LA and that was his design, Birge Clark, so we didn't want to go back and forth with his building because I know how everybody is very concerned with Birge Clark design. His building is very modern.

Chair Furth: His building at?

Ms. Talbot: Behind this building is a columbarium that has had or a mausoleum that has had nine additions to it and the original façade of that whole building is actually a Birge Clark building. The one at the top left-hand corner.

Chair Furth: On the plans, it shows as existing mausoleum/chapel/crematorium?

Ms. Talbot: Yes, so we've been there since 1904 as a cemetery, 1932 as a crematorium and 2010 with a funeral home. We're in a situation now where there's lots of traffic and people want to go one place to do everything and not throw them back onto the roads for traffic so that's what this is a trying to accommodate.

Chair Furth: Alex, sorry to interrupt. Go head.

Board Member Lew: Ok thank you for that. Then if I could go back a second just on the entrances, is there a way that you can provide more distinction between the front entrance versus the side courtyard? I guess when looking at the – to me the courtyard – the side courtyard entrances, at least to my eye seem like the main entrance even though they're not on axis at the road.

Mr. Barksdale: Well actually the courtyards have – are defined by these little niche walls that have niches on the outside and there is actually will be iron gates that only open out between the walls and the niches and the niches and the column because they don't – they are not visitors that are visiting in the niches to enter into the courtyard when there's a service going on. So, it's really -- they're only there actually for fire exits out of the building. Then I may point out that – whoops, what happened? I want to get to the pictures of the existing building. Thank you. I actually designed the columbarium and the Adobe Creek mausoleum there in the middle and the funeral home at the bottom. There was an existing building, early California type building there used for administration originally and when we did this building we had to do a historical – architectural historical study and their recommendations were the building was not significant because it had been modified enough times. So it was alright to demolish it but they felt that was part of the older cemetery and that we should keep that style but if you look at the columbarium which is on the second – the one on the left in the middle and look at the mausoleum on the right, I think you can see the similarities in the parapet line with the large openings and the support for that – those walls. A parapet coming all the way down, similar to the column that we have on the – that are on the east and west side. My feeling is what we're trying to do is we want to be consistent with the other solid concrete buildings on site but we don't really want it to read as columbarium or a mausoleum. We've picked up those elements and that's really the purpose of the parapet running around. Also, it's to conceal the solar panels that will be on the roof and we have a depression in that roof over the ancillary facilities where we're going to put the mechanical space. Then on a lot of these buildings, you'll see that they'll have some solid stone walls or concrete walls that come down and then there'll be between them will be some either niche walls or crypt walls that have granite or natural stone covers over them. We picked up on these lower elements that are below the limestone roof with similar stone-clad buildings to pick up on that. Again, there's kind of a fine line, we didn't want to create another columbarium that people would be confused about going to and whether they'd want to go into a columbarium for a memorial service. That's the thinking behind all this and as Marilyn explained with the managed parking, there's going to be parking all through the cemetery and that's the nature of the beast. When there's a burial they do the same thing, they park along the road and then they gather at the grave site and so this will be similar. We had to place the accessible parking right at the entrance but with the managed parking we don't see a problem because there will be somebody there directing traffic and telling them which building obviously the service is in and we're not looking for large signage. There will be some sort of sign that indicates the building but it won't be a really large sign. It will mostly be by direction.

Board Member Lew: Ok thank you for that. I think my take on it is still I think that the trellis elements that you have on the side courtyards are very attractive and I think to my eye is not – if I hadn't been here before – been to the site before, I would think that those are the front doors even though you do have the low walls around it. Let's see what others think.

Chair Furth: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I can see with this much of a mixture to deal with it's tough to – and you don't want to make it look like any one particular item. What I do like about the building is that it has a timeliness to it that will allow you to blend in nicely but the biggest weakness of it is, I have to agree with

some of my fellow Board Members, that the front door is really almost an afterthought. I'd rather see either a higher portion over the front door with either to function as a porte-cochere so you actually know that that's the front entry. I'm not a fan of expecting signage to do what the building ought to do. In fact, I'd rather see less signage where it's that obvious that any moron could know exactly where the front door of – where you need to go. Not you have to have four or five signs to get that person there. I think one of the areas – like I said I have to agree with Peter is that it's more of a planning issue. That I think there ought to be a very definite that's the front door. Even if like in a hotel on a porte-cochere where you drop grandma off or something and then go park or something. Not where you have to find the parking and then walk into the space. I think there needs to be a more dominate entrance here and then I think it works with the rest of them because you do pick up the various elements of all the – I'm glad you didn't put a tile roof on it to try and match something else. That building stands alone by itself and plus or minus whether what works or doesn't work is not really the issue. I think this, in this sort of format, does begin to work with the other four buildings on the site.

Chair Furth: Osma.

Board Member Thompson: I think – I'm a big fan of your schematic as you have it. I agree with my fellow Board Members, definitely through the side courtyard was the front entrance and I think unfortunately you have a schematic where you can develop it a little bit more to accommodate – I feel like it's in a good place now where you can develop front entrances and things like that. I appreciate the trellises in the roof/canopy areas and even the wall areas. I think the concept of a really heavy base but then there are these filtered lights that sort of take your eyes up. That concept is very compelling and I encourage you to bring that more throughout other design elements as you get there. I think in terms of circulation there's something to consider in terms of accessibility, drop off areas and even just pedestrian circulation around the area. The site plan didn't seem very clear. It doesn't seem easy to walk – say you are at the wrong entrance to get to the right entrance. There doesn't seem to be a clear path. It just seems to be these little courtyards but nothing that connects everything all around. I would maybe consider having something that circles the property. I appreciate its connection to at least the pictures that you've provided and I think it's on its way. It's looking really nice.

Chair Furth: Thank you. You know it's a cemetery which wears its age well. I mean it shows a lot of eras. What – on-page SK-2, what are the shaded – oh, those are open space easements. That's what those shaded areas represent?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yes.

Chair Furth: I just – sorry I finally saw what I was trying to read. I think they're open space easements.

Ms. Talbot: We were originally 75-acres and when we went to put our fence up or permanent fencing around our property back in the late 70's they realized that Miranda Road was very, very narrow. We got an open space easement for exchange of 3-acres of land that starts at Arastradero and ends at our property. It became up open for a long, long time until the little girl got hit on Miranda and now they've developed it as a walkway. We still have the open space easement.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Got it.

Ms. Talbot: We're never going to put structures there.

Chair Furth: Got it. Then is there a distinction I should understand between a mausoleum and a columbarium?

Ms. Talbot: Yes. A mausoleum can house cremated remains and full casket entombments where a columbarium is just cremated remains.

Chair Furth: Got it. Thank you for the history of which building came when and which are yours. Which one is Birge Clarks façade?

Ms. Talbot: The top left.

Chair Furth: Mausoleum Number 1?

Ms. Talbot: Mausoleum Number 1 but it's had nine additions.

Chair Furth: Many changes.

Ms. Talbot: Yes.

Chair Furth: At least I have it right on my plan. The use that you proposed, of course, makes a lot of sense and this space looks like it would be well suited to the purposes that you're talking about. It reminds me of the first reception – seated reception area in the Chapel of the Chimes where you just walk into this simple space with chairs. It's not tied to any particular religious tradition. It's quite welcoming and well-lit but I had the same problem of figuring out where am I suppose to go and how am I suppose to get there? Particularly if I'm wearing high heels, not that I do very much. Even as I was driving through just looking it was hard for me to figure out the functions of the various buildings and I think I agree with my colleagues that this building needs to announce itself by its own self, not with signs. I understand that you manage traffic intensively but this building should be designed to make it clear where I walk and how I get there. It may need more sidewalks or walkways or pathways around it. The parking spaces might need to be more carefully delineated. Certainly, the loading area – yes?

Ms. Talbot: We are going to delineate the parking. I'm for that very much because if you don't delineate the parking...

Chair Furth: It's very inefficient.

Ms. Talbot: Yes, extremely and we're not going to allow parking on certain sides of the street.

Chair Furth: How as this parcel used – this area used before this proposal?

Ms. Talbot: It's just been open land. Prior to 1980, it uses to have ponds in it and ...

Chair Furth: But it wasn't a rose garden?

Ms. Talbot: No, never that.

Chair Furth: It looks like a rose garden.

Ms. Talbot: No, it was – right now it just has shredded bark...

Chair Furth: Ye, I know.

Ms. Talbot: ... and we just put that in there just – we're a cemetery that needs lawn but I'm totally trying to find ways to more efficient with our water. We do water with well water, we have five wells on the property but we're very efficient with it. Not only is our lawn and our plantings all drought tolerant so it was a way during the drought times to not have to water that area. So, we took out all the lawn and put that in.

Chair Furth: Well I'm going to be very supportive of your non-lawn proposals. I do find the building to confusing both as to which of the buildings I would be going to and more importantly how would I get in it when I got there? I think you have great landscaping opportunities around this building. I mean you



heard us trying to figure out how to put wildlife habitat on the roof of a restaurant downtown. Well I mean I've certainly spent time in the English cemeteries where they allow – you know they are 500-years old and they allow half of them become bunny habitat at a time.

Ms. Talbot: We do have Jack Rabbits living on the property.

Chair Furth: I'm sure you do but this an area I think could be both very beautiful, that could really help with the navigating part of this problem and that could be great, low water, beautiful, locally based landscaping and good habitat so I'm going to be looking for that. I notice that you have the same number of stalls for men and women in your bathroom. I'm wondering if you have enough for women? Maybe you just have extras for men. Those are my comments. I'm not even going to ask for a bench as I usually do but I do think more seriously you may – I think you have some that are why I'm not asking.

Ms. Talbot: Yes, on the outside. I'm totally into benches too for people to site.

Chair Furth: Yeah people need to be able to sit down.

Ms. Talbot: Yes.

Chair Furth: Particularly at emotionally fraught times.

Ms. Talbot: There's benches out for the cremation niche walls. There are benches in the walkways there for them.

Chair Furth: So, this I both a columbarium and a reception area?

Ms. Talbot: Yeah, we don't necessarily call this a columbarium. It will have freestanding outdoor niches.

Chair Furth: But that's why the design right?

Ms. Talbot: Yes.

Chair Furth: That's what's confusing us about the entry.

Ms. Talbot: Yes.

Chair Furth: Any other comments?

Mr. Barksdale: May I ask a...

Chair Furth: Of course.

Mr. Barksdale: I haven't been particularly happy with the entrance cover. The corner of the roof just pops out and I'm not sure it's adequate. Along with your comments now I'm thinking – what I've been toying with was changing that simple corner to turn it out and have it come at out as you say more like a portecochere with some columns. I do could that to emphasize the entrance to as much as necessary. Then we'll have to deal with the outside circulation in with sidewalks or how the parking is laid out or something. I think we can accommodate that.

Chair Furth: Any comments from anybody?

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah that – either that or even put something that's higher or bigger at that point where there – so that becomes the focal point and actually show the entry. That's the main thing. It's the weakest...

Board Member Lew: Well that's the back, Robert. I think you mean the other corner.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, either way.

Chair Furth: New buildings, old buildings, front, back.

Mr. Barksdale: Same problem.

Board Member Gooyer: Well but I meant either way. Ok, so the thing is over here rather than over here. The principle the same. You know if it's done like this then – and then like you said to have some sort of a turnaround or...

Chair Furth: Loading spot.

Board Member Gooyer: That it actually is the entry and that may mean some redesign of the actual driveways or that sort of thing. I think it's probably – the main thing is there's no real focal point.

Chair Furth: The most obvious entrance marker is the handicap spaces and that shouldn't be the way it is.

Board Member Gooyer: Right and that should be it.

Vice Chair Baltay: I would really encourage you to consider changing the roadways as well just the building. I don't think you're going to achieve a good solution without some change to the traffic circulation and you have the latitude to do that. It's not actually that hard or that expensive. Give your architect a little more reign to go beyond just the footprint you've told them.

Board Member Gooyer: Right.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think you'll be really pleased with the solution.

Board Member Gooyer: Rather than having to put it somewhere in a green space now and not (crosstalk)(inaudible)...

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: ... by not giving yourself the flexibility of possibly moving some of the roadways around.

Vice Chair Baltay: It's not just pointing – making parking space that are striped on the ground. I think it needs more than that. You need to be changing asphalt.

Chair Furth: One of the – I had this point that keeps disappearing. Well, we've been looking at proposals all morning that have really clear fronts and backs and this building does not. People are going to approach it from every side and that makes it even more complicated in terms of making it clear where the front entry is because you have so many opportunities to get mixed up. It's not like people are all coming from...

Board Member Gooyer: That's why the entry needs to be a focal point.

Chair Furth: Exactly.

Board Member Gooyer: Whether that – the easiest way would be to make that higher than the rest of it.

Board Member Thompson: Another way would be in terms of – you know you have some really pristine geometry like that top part is a square and it could be that you break that rule at the entry. That –

maybe that's not a corner, maybe that extends out and you get a deeper recess with your lobby. I think the reason we were responding to the courtyard areas as entries is because there's this recess. There's this space and so it feels like a gathering space from the outside and so if you were to create that kind of recess or gathering space at your actual entry then I think it would draw the eye – because right now because it's ending in a corner it feels like the end of something. If it were to break that and come out somehow then it might feel like oh, this is different than everything else, maybe that's the entry.

Chair Furth: Yeah, I look at these three pathways into the building from three different sides but as I think you pointed out earlier that there's no pathway around the building. I mean then I'm back in the traffic, that's not ideal. Anything else?

Board Member Gooyer: Nope.

Chair Furth: I think – were we clear on our concerns but of course not the solutions.

Mr. Barksdale: Yes, thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Anything else you'd like from us? Look forward to seeing you.

Ms. Talbot: Thank you.

Ms. Hodgkins: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Anything else you need from us?

Ms. Hodgkins: No.

### **Approval of Minutes**

#### **6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 7, 2017, and February 1, 2018.**

Chair Furth: We have the draft Architectural Review Board minutes for December 7, 2017, and February 1, 2018. I have a stack of clerical errors which shouldn't be much problem but there was one motion where I forgot to say who – to restate who made the motion. It's on Pages 6 and 7.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: What meeting day?

Chair Furth: I'm about to find that out. I think it's the second one. The pages don't have footers that tell you that. It's the second set, it's February and it's the motion...

Board Member Lew: Which item?

Chair Furth: This goes on for pages and pages. It's pages 6 and 7 but that's not very helpful to you is it?

Mr. Lait: We can take that offline and address those issues.

Chair Furth: Oh, it's the park. It's the approval of the sign program for the park so it just doesn't say who made the motion and who seconded it and I'll give you the others. Any other changes or corrections? Somebody like to make a motion to approve the minutes?

Board Member Lew: Ok and then...

Chair Furth: I want to split the two.

Board Member Lew: There's....

Chair Furth: (inaudible) Sorry. There's Item Six and there's also Item Seven and I didn't receive the minutes for Seven.

Chair Furth: That was my point on Seven. We don't have those minutes. There's no live link to that and the agenda.

Board Member Thompson: I was going to ask are we emailed the minutes? Oh, ok. I don't think I saw that.

Mr. Lait: So, December 7.

Chair Furth: I'll take a single motion for both if there's no further changes.

### **MOTION**

Board Member Lew: I will move that we approve the minutes for December 7, 2017, and February 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Is there discussion? All those in favor say aye. All opposed? Approved unanimously.

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

Mr. Lait: So just so I'm clear so...

Chair Furth: Pardon me?

Mr. Lait: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: I didn't think either one of them was working.

Mr. Lait: (inaudible) motion to approve for December 7 and February 15.

Chair Furth: 1<sup>st</sup>, sorry but that should have been February 1<sup>st</sup> and the ones that we have not taken action we'll differ are February 15<sup>th</sup> and March 1. If you could resend the email and check that link the Staff report. I didn't notice this till – I always read these things last and I didn't notice this until last night.

**7.** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for February 15 and March 1, 2018.

Chair Furth: The second set there's no live link to so we'll not do that today.

Mr. Lait: That's fine if you didn't get that but we do send these via email in advance and ok. So, February 15 and March 1 we're not doing today?

Chair Furth: That's right.

[The Board move back up to approval of the minutes for February 1 and December 7]

### **Subcommittee Item**

- 8. 3001 El Camino Real [16PLN-00097]:** Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Roofline Changes and the Stair Enclosure Design. Environmental Assessment: Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was adopted on October 23, 2017. Zoning District: RM-30 (Medium Density Multiple Family Residence District) and CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at [clairehodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:clairehodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org)

Vice Chair Baltay: Before you end the meeting Wynne.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: This is the subcommittee item. (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Ok then we have a subcommittee item 3001 El Camino Real and which is this? Remind me what this is?

Vice Chair Baltay: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Then you wanted the ARB to be aware of the applicant's intent to submit an application for changes to the RM-30 building design. Want to tell us about that?

Mr. Lait: Ok are we – I think we're in subcommittee, right?

Chair Furth: Well no. You wanted the ARB to be aware of this. It's on our agenda as subcommittee item.

Mr. Lait: But it's – let's see it's a subcommittee item and it's – that's just more of a...

Chair Furth: I agree that it's a subcommittee item but I just wondered if you could...

Mr. Lait: We're not agendized for a Board discussion on it I guess is what I'm saying. It was a comment in a report.

Board Member Gooyer: I assumed that because I'm on the subcommittee today, mine had it in there and the rest of you didn't but they're in all the Packets?

Chair Furth: Yes.

Mr. Lait: So just so we're clear so there was a change. This is our way of letting the Board know what the change is. It's not a Board discussion but it as...

Chair Furth: No but if you could clarify what the change is that would be helpful. We're not going to violate the Brown Act.

Mr. Lait: No, I understand that but I just want to make sure procedurally what we're talking about. So, this is not something that is – that unit density change isn't so much an ARB issue but it is something that we wanted to make the Board aware of. Particularly as the subcommittee gets together and looks at the exterior modifications so I believe that there was a change from – well you'll – Claire can clarify the number of units that it was reduced and the other changes.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Sure, so we just wanted again to make you guys aware that they are anticipating a submittal of an application. We haven't made a determination yet on exactly what that process is going to entail but we just wanted to make you aware that they are thinking about changing the design of the RM-30 building to be townhomes. Some of the changes that this might include as far as Staff is aware thus far is this would not change the overall floor area of the building nor would it change the height of the building in a substantial way. It might even be a little shorter than it was before,

however it would change the design to include stoops that would come out to the Acacia Avenue which was something that the ARB had commented on and wanted originally as part of the design. It also eliminates the elevator so the reason – we’re not asking for the subcommittee to provide any response or anything on it but the reason I had brought it up is because there are two designs in that subcommittee packet and one would reflect the design as approved currently and one would reflect the design without the new elevator and the stairs redesigned.

Chair Furth: You’re not asking the subcommittee to approve that redesign?

Ms. Hodgkins: No, we are not.

Chair Furth: Got it. Well, we look forward to you figuring out the process. That was an intensely reviewed project. Thank you. We will leave it to the subcommittee. The meeting is adjourned.

Conclusion: The subcommittee recommended to approve changing the cornice back to the original design and changing the stair towers in the RM-30 building.

- 9. 180 Hamilton Avenue [17PLN-00171]:** Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Landscaping and Lighting. Environmental Assessment: Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CD-C(GF)(P) (Downtown Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org).

Conclusion: The subcommittee recommended to approve the revisions dated March 28, 2018, with no additional conditions. The changes to the landscape plan were viewed to be sufficient and the LED lighting fixture was an acceptable quality and intensity.

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

### **Adjournment**