



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: May 17, 2018  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

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

Absent:

Chair Furth: Good morning. Welcome to the May 17th meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. Could we have the roll call, please?

**Oral Communications**

Chair Furth: Are there any oral communications? This is the time on the agenda for people to speak on matters not on the agenda but within our jurisdiction. I have no comment cards and no volunteers from the audience.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Furth: Staff? Anything?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: I was just confirming our future agenda and it looks like it has stayed the same, so far. We don't have this on the agenda, so I'll just put it out there as information. There are co-changes that went into effect May 10th, some of it around noticing. There's some gross floor area changes, things of that nature. I'll make sure that we send you a copy of those changes.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: (inaudible) of course, went to public hearing, as well.

Chair Furth: All right. You'll get those out to us this week. How are you doing with your moving?

Ms. Gerhardt: We are all in a temporary location. I think we're called the "newsroom." There's about 10 of us in one room.

Chair Furth: And you're on the first floor now?

Male: Right next door.

Chair Furth: Yes, our reception is still on the fourth floor, so that's where we would ask people to go first. But, yes, we're physically on the first floor.

Chair Furth: For those of us who went looking for you on the fifth floor and saw the hazard notices.

Ms. Gerhardt: And saw the construction, yes.

Chair Furth: Good to know that you're somewhere. All right.

### **City Official Reports**

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

Chair Furth: And our upcoming agendas are as submitted? You don't expect any changes in those?

Ms. Gerhardt: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: All right. Anything else?

Board Member Lew: On June 20th, there's going to be the first meeting of the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan. On Wednesday, June 20th, at 5:30.

Chair Furth: That's here at City Hall, Alex? Is that at City Hall?

Board Member Lew: I don't know --

Chair Furth: People can find it on the city website.

Board Member Lew: Yes, I don't know the location. It's not final. I think it's a hold-the-date time and not an actual meeting announcement.

Board Member Lew: Well, we look forward to hearing about your progress. All right.

### **Action Items**

#### **2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 356 Hawthorne Avenue [17PLN-00367]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing Four-Unit, 4,032 Square Foot MultiFamily Residential Development and Construction of a new 4,561 Square Foot, MultiFamily Development Comprised of Three Detached Residential Units Each With an Attached Single Car Garage. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: RM-15 (Low Density MultipleFamily Residential). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Phillip Brennan at [phillip.brennan@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:phillip.brennan@cityofpaloalto.org)**

Chair Furth: Public hearing. It's quasi-judicial. It concerns 356 Hawthorne Avenue. We are asked for our recommendation and request for approval of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of an existing four-unit, 4,000 square foot multifamily residential development, and construction of a new 4,500 square foot multifamily residential development comprised of three detached residential units, each with an attached single-car garage. This is exempt from CEQA. The zoning is RM-15, Low Density MultipleFamily Residential. Project planner is Phillip Brennan. Phillip?

Phillip Brennan, Project Planner: Good morning to the members of the Board. Just want to provide a brief reminder of this project. It's proposing three new condominium units, detached, a one-story bungalow unit and two two-story units along Hawthorne Avenue and Bryant Court. The max residential density for this is three units, which is being provided. This item was previously heard during its first formal before the Board on March 15th. At that meeting, the Board provided the applicant with specific guidance to guide the applicant in helping make the Board's findings to approve this project. Those comments were

related to further distinguish the units from one another through materials, colors and architectural style. Comments were provided to revise the color scheme of the exterior, color scheme of the units. Again, see how to further distinguish them, and also provide more warmer tones and blend into the surrounding neighborhood a little bit better. And, to incorporate more appropriate native species into the landscape plan. The applicant received that feedback and has responded by further distinguishing the units by making the street-facing units, modeling them after Craftsman-style type architecture. As you can see on the left of the centerline was the proposal that was presented at the March 15 hearing. On the right of the centerline are the new proposed units. As you can see, added detail has been incorporated into the design, including sunburst pediments, gables and corbels. The color scheme has changed, as well. The applicant has provided a material board with color swatches, and they've also responded by incorporating more native species into the landscape plan, replacing six of the originally-proposed species with western redbud trees, Sonoma sage, bush anemones, and other native grass and shrub species. The project is compliant with the Comprehensive Plan and all applicable design guidelines. The one issue that still remains is the consistency with the performance criteria outlined in the code regarding trash disposal enclosures being located as far away from abutting properties as possible. As you can see in the highlighted portions of the schematic here, the trash enclosures are abutting the shared property lines on the left and right of Unit 3 and number 2. We've written in a condition of approval to have these enclosures moved closer to the units to comply with the performance criteria. That is a consideration we would like the Board to discuss. Otherwise, staff is recommending that the Board approve the three-unit multifamily condominium project based on findings and conditions. I know the applicant has a presentation. I'd like to welcome Michael up to the Board.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of staff?

Vice Chair Baltay: I have a question, please. Good morning, Phillip.

Mr. Brennan: Good morning.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you address for me, please, what the code requirements actually are regarding trash enclosures and bicycle lockers for projects of this nature?

Mr. Brennan: Sure. Our wastewater/stormwater division requires trash enclosures for multifamily developments. A separated area and covered enclosures.

Vice Chair Baltay: I guess I want to get into it a little bit more deeply. Do they define what they mean by "trash enclosure?" The plastic buckets that they supply us...

Chair Furth: They call those "carts."

Vice Chair Baltay: Carts. Are those considered enclosures, or are they required to build some separate structure?

Mr. Brennan: A designated area and structure to house the rubber containers.

Vice Chair Baltay: And is there anything in the codes specifically saying what they mean by "structure?" It's not common on residential stuff to build a garbage enclosure.

Mr. Brennan: Well, this is specifically for multifamily development.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. And for bicycle lockers? The same?

Mr. Brennan: I'm sorry?

Vice Chair Baltay: For bicycle lockers. What's the standard on that? What is the actual wording of the code?

Mr. Brennan: The standard for this type of development is one long-term bicycle storage unit for each unit.

Vice Chair Baltay: What does the code say? The actual words in the code are "storage unit?" Or is it just a storage area? How is it phrased?

Mr. Brennan: I don't have enough memory, but I can provide that.

Board Member Lew: There are projects that have closets inside the building where a bike could be located. We also have projects where there's enough space inside the garage, beyond the footprint of a car, where you could put a bicycle, so there's no locker or anything else. We've done it different ways in the past.

Chair Furth: While we're hearing from the applicant, perhaps you could find us the code sections that are relevant. Or maybe you have them already?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, we can find the code sections, but just to be clear, the same as Board Member Lew was saying, is that if there was a larger garage space, then these carts and these long-term bicycle spaces could possibly be accommodated in a garage space. But, that would need to be a slightly larger garage.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: I forgot to ask, have we all -- Alex, did you have something you wanted to add?

Board Member Lew: A question.

Chair Furth: Certainly.

Board Member Lew: Hi, Phillip. I have a question. On the drawings for unit, it's the first unit on sheet A-3, 0301.3. It's showing a front daylight plane on Hawthorne Street. Am I understanding, we don't have front daylight planes. I'm wondering if you could clarify that for me, please.

Mr. Brennan: Sure. Just give me one moment. [Short pause.]

Board Member Lew: Okay. Sheet A-301.3. I guess it's showing on the east elevation, which is drawing...Well, they're all named Drawing No. 1. There's a 45-degree daylight plane from the property line shown.

Mr. Brennan: And is your question --?

Board Member Lew: Is that correct? My understanding is that we don't have a front daylight plane. I know we used to have them on, even on just some houses, but we removed a lot of the front daylight planes because they weren't very useful.

Board Member Lew: This is the front of Unit 1.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, and that's also the unit that's on Hawthorne. I was wondering if it was the middle unit, but it's not.

Mr. Brennan: Unit 1 serves as the front unit, where if there was a front yard setback, it would be.

Board Member Lew: Okay. And then, is there...

Chair Furth: Excuse me. Unit 1 is Hawthorne?

Mr. Brennan: Hawthorne Avenue.

Chair Furth: And Unit 3 is Bryant Court.

Mr. Brennan: Right, yes.

Board Member Lew: Okay, thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry. What was the answer to that? There shouldn't be a daylight plane?

Chair Furth: There is none.

Mr. Brennan: There is no front yard daylight plane.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so it shouldn't be...

Chair Furth: It's Section 18.13.040-A, and there's a big chart, daylight planes, and it only prescribes them for the side and rear lots. The side and rear lot lines.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct, so on the east elevation -- this is still on 301.3 -- that east elevation on the right side, that's the daylight plane that's not necessary. The one on the left side is necessary because that's the rear.

Chair Furth: This means the notch that's currently being taken out of the gable wouldn't have to be notched anymore?

Ms. Gerhardt: The Dutch hip that's happening on the front of the house is not required, but it is an aesthetic feature.

Chair Furth: It's an option. There's a certain amount of confusion up here because this neighborhood is developed 45 degrees off the cardinal points, and so, we sometimes call north what's being referred to as east here.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, I'm just reading from the plans.

Chair Furth: Yes. Okay, are we ready for the applicant?

Board Member Thompson: Wait, one last question.

Chair Furth: Gentleman.

Board Member Thompson: That part of the roof --

Chair Furth: Can we all be included in this conversation?

Board Member Thompson: -- is included in the daylight plane. Right?

Ms. Gerhardt: Can I have you ask again?

Board Member Thompson: Oh, sorry.

[crosstalk, inaudible]

Chair Furth: Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Just to clarify, the side of the daylight plane that does count is also the side that that roof gutter drain is slightly encroaching into right now?

Mr. Brennan: On the west elevation?

Board Member Thompson: It's shown on the east and the west elevation.

Ms. Gerhardt: No, on the east, that rear slight protrusion of the eve, eve protrusions are allowed.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: Any other questions before we hear...? Okay, I have some questions. Have we all visited the site? Yes? And does anybody have any conversations they need to report? No. All right. Nobody has had any extramural conversations, and we've all seen the site. If we could hear from the applicant. You have 10 minutes. And if you could spell your name for the record, our transcriber appreciates it.

Michael Chacon: Good morning. Thank you, Phillip. Thank you, Board. I am the architect of record. I'm here to represent the property owner. First of all, I'd like to apologize for missing the last meeting. I had a medical emergency, which I'm working through, still. It was just unavoidable. At the same time, I want to thank you for going through my presentation that I had prepared for that meeting. It seems like you did accomplish a lot without my presence. Hopefully we can wrap this up. That's my goal today. First and foremost, I'm going to respond to, basically, I did listen and review the video for the last meeting, and I'm going to respond to the primary three comments that came out of that meeting. That's my intent today. I do want to clarify for you right quick, though, the confusion that you're having about the elevations. Project north is up on the sheet, it's not to the left. You're looking at side elevations, so those daylight planes are appropriately labeled for the sides of the house, of all units. Okay? That should clarify what you're looking at. Okay. We don't need to go through all these. Phillip was kind of enough to go through this for me, where we substituted six of the species previously specified with native plants that Board Member Lew commented on the last time. I'm just going to move forward on that. Secondly, I'm not sure, I think Phillip may actually have an outdated image for what was, and what is, with regard to the street elevation for Hawthorne. Anyway, I provided you with that comparison right there. Is it fair for me to say that you're seeing what I put up there on your screen? Are you seeing...? Okay, great. Thank you. To the left was the previously-proposed design, and I didn't change the footprint whatsoever. I merely changed the exterior to try and accomplish the idea of addressing the differentiation that you required or requested between units. This has more Craftsman-type features on it. This is the elevation that faces the street, which is why I show this elevation. I don't need to go through that bullet list. You can see it for yourself, and basically it's covered in the elevation. The visual aesthetic, I think is what we're after here. And then I have the 3D rendering of it from Hawthorne without landscaping. And then, this is an approximation. Please note, that's probably a three to five year landscaped, developed, approximation. This isn't the first day that construction is complete with all the landscaping plan. But, ultimately, it would end up looking like this. Next is the center unit, Unit 2. Unit 2, I didn't change much, and I didn't change much because I was hoping the Board would allow the property owner to at least have one unit as they originally requested, as opposed to no units as they originally requested. I did add, however, a gable over the entry, realizing that it would help to identify the front of the house, even though it's in the center of the site, as the place where you enter. And when you think about it with where those sliding doors are and this imagine to the right, that's where a courtyard would be, and there would be a three to four foot high fence around that, to help identify that plush landscaping. But, it felt like since I was going through this exercise, and maybe I missed it previously, that this made a lot of sense, to add this gable here. I considered it, but didn't do it because of the daylight view that we were talking about in previous meetings, that the homeowner on Waverly was commenting upon. I considered adding a gable over the second floor, a larger window to the right. I thought that would add some visual interest, add a little more style to the house, because it is somewhat simple, I would admit. But, I really tried to maintain that valley of openness so that the neighbor would not see one more added-on feature

to the roof. I elected not to do that. Here is what it would look like without the landscaping. You can see where that gable really does help identify where the front entry is. I think it's a really positive change. This is what the landscaping might look like in three to five years after it's developed. You can see a split fence for the courtyard. That fence helps differentiate between the sliders and the front entry. The next unit, Unit 3, again, didn't change the footprint, but changed the color -- and you have that on the material board that I provided for you -- and added a trellis over the garage, an eve over the sliding glass door, which has a chain downspout from it. Little things like that to help soften it up. And then, the sunburst at the eve, at the peak of the gables. After the second post on the porch, as well, to really drive it home there's a porch there. And the color on the material board helps, again, I think, to address what you would ask for as a Board, to give you more warm colors, more earth tone colors, I should say. And then, here it is without the landscaping, and there it is with landscaping that's developed over three to five years. This is just a, as you see, north side. As I said, the north is considered, I think I said "up" when I stated "down" on the paper. Board Member Lew is shaking his head yes, I was confused, still. North is down, so the upper elevation is what the neighbors on Waverly would see, and the lower elevation of the site is what the neighbors from the Bryant side, the south side, would see. I just wanted to give you guys a sense of how that would look. That's a comparison. Sorry, excuse me. This is a comparison of north. Upper is what it was; the bottom is what it is proposed to be. I got ahead of myself. This is the same thing for the south side. Upper is what was proposed; lower is what is, what was previously proposed, and the lower elevation, side elevation, is what's currently proposed. You can see the changes from that perspective, as well, or from that elevation, as well. Those are the three questions. I didn't go ahead and prepare, but I will speak to the idea of the trash enclosures. In my previous presentation, I had a very long slide with many bullet points about why I felt like, first of all, consolidating the refuse for these three units didn't make sense. An enclosure didn't make sense, either. Phillip actually talked with the appropriate party about the enclosure and I believe they waived that part of it, consolidating it, but did not waive the part about locating the enclosures as far away from adjacent properties as possible. My argument is that this is developed, although it's RM-15, I do understand that, developed as three single-family homes. I've said that from the beginning. Now, that doesn't mean that they are three single-family homes. They are still a multifamily project. But, the intent for the occupants when they live there is that they will feel like they have their own home, their own yards, courtyards, entries. Unfortunately, it can't have its own drive for Units 1 and 2. It's a shared drive. But, Unit 3 has its own drive. We had the luxury here of having a through lot. We go from Hawthorne, to Bryant Court, so I was able to take advantage of that and have a driveway on the Bryant Court side. And because of that, I didn't have to have a 16-foot-wide clearance on the side of the lot for the shared driveway, which if you have three units in place, you have to have it 16 feet wide, which would have been quite an imposing width to try and develop the properties on. My argument really is that all the adjacent properties to this property, even though they are zoned RM-15, they are developed as R-1. And if anybody wanted to do some work on it, they would have the R-1 ordinance imposed upon them. They would follow R-1. And their trash enclosures -- they're not enclosures, but they might have an enclosure that's, not an actual overhead canopy, but it might have a little bit of a short fence with a gate in front of it, which is not uncommon to see in residential. Just identify where you keep your containers. It can be up against the property line. So, I'm basically asking that the occupants of these three units have that same sort of luxury because I placed these where it made sense, where you would use them, where you would go from the kitchen, where most of your refuse is collected, through the garage to this enclosure. That's for Unit 3, for example. And Unit 2, as well. These enclosures, when I say "enclosures," I'm talking about trash enclosures, trash receptacles. These receptacles would then be taken to the curb side easily, quickly, and not have to be traipsed through from the middle of your back yard to the street. Consistent with that is that the neighbor to the south on Bryant Court is here today. He commented on where those trash receptacles were located, and we responded.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of the applicant at this point? Osma?

Board Member Thompson: I could not locate where all the bike lockers were.

Mr. Chacon: In Unit 1, the bike lockers are at, what I would call the back of the house, away from Hawthorne. There's a bike locker back there, if you look at the site plan. And then, at Unit 2, it's next to

the courtyard. And then, at Unit 3, it's on the side of the house, what I call the south side of the property, next to the trash receptacles.

Chair Furth: You may sit down. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? All right.

Board Member Thompson: I'm sorry, I have one more question.

Chair Furth: You have another question of the applicant?

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Chair Furth: The applicant's architect.

Board Member Thompson: For the trash, how does it work? Do they have to wheel the trash out to Hawthorne for pickup every week?

Mr. Chacon: That is the standard of an occupant. I live in Palo Alto. That is the standard practice in Palo Alto, is that you wheel your enclosure to the curb. If, however, you would like for GreenWaste to go to your back yard or wherever to pick it up, you can pay them for an extra service. Or, if you're unable to.

Board Member Thompson: And that service is on Bryant, as well, even though it's a really tiny street?

Mr. Chacon: Yes, it is.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: Thank you. All right. Any further questions before we deliberate? Or, any further answers before we deliberate?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. I did want to clarify that we do have a general exception for storage structures that are not over six feet in height, that those could go two feet into a side setback and four feet into a front or rear. That may help accomplish some of the trash enclosures and bike lockers.

Chair Furth: Can you refer to the code section that we're dealing with here.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. This is 18.40.070(c), as in "cat."

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Furth: Oh, that's projections into yards. I was looking for the code section that requires bicycle storage and trash enclosures.

Mr. Brennan: In terms of trash enclosures, it's 16.09.180.

Chair Furth: Which I don't have a copy of. Why don't you read it to us? First of all, tell me which...? This is in our sanitation code, or something?

Mr. Brennan: It's in the building code.

Chair Furth: Oh, it's the building code. I should know that. What does it say?

Mr. Brennan: It says dumpsters for new and remodeled facilities, new buildings and residential developments providing centralized solid waste collection, except for single-family and duplex residences,

shall be provided a covered area for a dumpster. The area shall be adequately sized for all waste streams and designed with grading and berm system to prevent water run-off and run-off from the area. That's referenced. And then, further guidance is provided through stormwater treatment and Bay-friendly guidelines and stormwater quality protection, which speaks to trash and recycling containers, must be covered to prohibit flyaway trash and having rainwater enter containers.

Chair Furth: Sure. Do they define "dumpster?" Because this kind of unit is not going to have a dumpster. They're going to have carts.

Mr. Brennan: Correct, and as Michael referenced, I spoke with staff from that division. They originally wanted a centralized dumpster area for this development, and obviously that wouldn't be appropriate. So, the middle ground was for them to provide covered trash enclosures for each unit.

Chair Furth: But that could be in a garage if there's space in the garage. I don't read that to say anything else. Once you decide that you're not going to do centralized dumpsters.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. The main issue with trash is that it needs to have a roof over it so that it's protected from the rain, so that we're not adding to any stormwater quality issues.

Chair Furth: As you know, I live in an infill project in this neighborhood, not within 500 feet, and we have alley collection. And we have small lots -- not this small, but small -- and everybody keeps their containers in the garage. The garages are designed with wide enough spaces on the edge so we have room for both bicycles and containers. I'm having a hard time understanding the functionality of going from my kitchen, outdoors to a collection spot. Are these garages big enough so that you can get those carts in and out? They're not. Okay. What about bicycles? Are there room for bicycles in the garage?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, so, for bicycles, we're looking at the parking section, which is 18.52.040, and Table 1 is all of our standard parking regulations, which includes bicycles, as well. For multifamily, that's one bicycle space per unit, and that's to be a long-term space. I can find further down, 18.54.060 discusses the details of what a long-term space is.

Chair Furth: Let's take a look. We don't have very many projects with unattached multiple units, do we?

Ms. Gerhardt: We've got a few as of late.

Chair Furth: Yeah? Well, we may need to think about these things. Okay, long-term bicycle facilities. [Reading] Long-term bicycle facilities are intended for bicyclists who need to park a bicycle and its components and accessories for extended periods during the day, overnight or for a longer duration... typically for employees, students, residents and commuters. The facility frequently protects the bicycle from inclement weather. Four design alternatives are available. Bicycle lockers accessible only to the owner or operator of the bicycle; a fully-enclosed space. I would argue that that includes a garage. Restricted access bicycle enclosures. A locked area. Maximum capacity of 20 bicycles.

Ms. Gerhardt: That's something, maybe like at the schools, where they have a bike cage.

Chair Furth: Right, or it says it can be within a garage. We've seen those. In multiple-family, a common locked garage is okay, or a multiple family dwelling unit storage locker. A locked area separate from the dwelling unit, secured by a lock that can be opened only by the occupant. Or a school bicycle enclosure, which I think we don't need to think about. Okay. It can't be inside occupied buildings? What?

Board Member Lew: I think in the past, people were worried that they would be converted to other uses.

Commissioner Gooyer: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Because we do it all the time. I mean, if (inaudible) this building, we allow them...I mean, we just finished approving a big project with bicycles. How are we going to put them in a separate structure? Okay. Street level?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think the idea, too, is that there would be easy access to leave...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: We keep telling people to make them convenient, yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, you're not having to drag your bike up to your unit, which would be normally the case in a larger multifamily complex.

Chair Furth: Should we separate it from vehicle parking and circulation areas by a physical barrier? Have a four-foot aisle? This is really difficult. Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Are we going to hear from the neighbor?

Chair Furth: Nobody else chose to speak. All right. Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. First of all, as far as those two items, I think that's real overkill. I mean, every other single residence just has the three bins standing on the side of the house, or in the garage, or whatever. Doesn't have a whole structure built over it. But it is what it is. And the same thing. In my garage, I've got four hooks hanging there, I have two bicycles hanging from those four hooks, and my car is parked underneath the bicycles. It's very easy to get to. So, to me, that seems overkill. As far as the project, I think the revised presentation does a lot to improve how it blends with the adjacent neighborhood. The biggest concern on any of these types of projects is how the actual detailing is executed as far as trim and that sort of thing. I can only go on the assumption that it will be done properly, and if that's the case, I can accept the project as it is.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for the revisions. I can recommend approval of the project today. With regard to the trash, I think I agree with staff, which is no enclosure, but try to get them as far from the property line as possible...? My recollection is that's what staff has been doing on other comparable projects. I think there's been like a dozen of these three-unit projects around downtown and I don't recall any centralized trash location at all. These are all 50-foot sites. Maybe on some of them, some of the trash containers were in the garage, possibly, but it seems like they are very constrained sites. And I think I do recall one of the neighbors on Bryant Court said there was concern that the trash was next to the bedroom window, so I would support moving them, particularly on that particular unit, farther away, if possible. And then, on the bike lockers, we've done it different ways on different projects, and I think what's being shown here is fine. I think the only other comment I have is I think the previous set that you had, I actually think I preferred that design to this current design. But, I think the current design is approvable. I think it was cleaner lines, cleaner colors. There's something about, on small units, just to keep it simple, and to my eye, they're starting to get a little cluttered. Okay. That's all that I have. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. I find myself in agreement with what Robert offered regarding the building design. I can recommend approval for that part of it. I'm only chagrined that the bike lockers take up precious outdoor space, and I'd love to see some alternative, given that the code is obviously complex, and I defer to staff and whatever the applicant comes up with. I can recommend approval. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Hi. Regarding the front elevation, I'll start there. I do like the changes that you made. I did notice one item, which I'm not sure if it was a design choice, but on page 301.3, the west elevation, the top right part of that elevation has part of the building sticking out, and the roof, you can see the roof line behind a roof line. In some of the other buildings on the street, those roof lines are aligned. I wondered if that was a choice, or if that may have been an oversight, that maybe you might have wanted to align them so that you do get those cleaner lines...? That's one thing I noted I'm sort of willing to hear more on. I actually like the sunburst choice on Bryant street. I think it makes that elevation look a lot nicer instead of another building on that road that kind of (inaudible). Regarding the trash enclosures, it's true. A lot of single-family residences don't have really good infrastructure for their trash. Everybody just keeps the bins either in their garage, and it's kind of too bad, in some ways. I kind of appreciate that maybe there's something that's pushing this project to think of a better solution than just to have your bins out. It's kind of ugly. I think more could be done. And I think, in some sense, you do have some cushion in your design that you could somehow include a trash enclosure that's close. I mean, speaking from someone who hates to take out the trash, the idea of going outside of my house and across the street to take out the trash sounds even worse. So, I think having a solution that keeps it as close to the house, to the kitchen, garage -- whatever -- as possible, I think that's really important to the project. I would support changing what's on here to get there more. I actually did have a question on other kind of passive systems. I wasn't sure if you looked at a gray water system. You have laundry on site, you have irrigation on site. I know a lot of homeowners have been re-tricking their houses backwards so that they can kind of do that. But, given that this is a new construction, I was wondering if that's something that you guys considered, to use gray water. Or might consider.

?: (inaudible)

Board Member Thompson: Oh, okay.

Board Member Lew: I think the laundry to gray water was in the notes somewhere that I read.

Board Member Thompson: It is? I didn't see that.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's a current green building requirement, that the house be re-fitted for potential gray water use of laundry equipment in the future. They have to have a diverter valve. But there's no requirement beyond that at present.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. I didn't see that anywhere, but I think it's...

Chair Furth: It's a building code requirement, right?

Vice Chair Baltay: California Green Building Code, yeah.

Chair Furth: So, that will be done.

Mr. Chacon: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Chacon: It's not in the drawings because it doesn't...

Chair Furth: Right, because it's not something that's subject...

Mr. Chacon: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Could you come to the microphone, please? Since we asked you a question.

Mr. Chacon: First of all, it's a California Green Building Code requirement. It doesn't show up in design drawings. The appropriate time to put that information in the drawings is for building permit application. That's when CalGreen...However, it's also in this set because the green building checklist is in there, in the set, and it calls for that.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Thanks.

Chair Furth: That's a very satisfactory answer.

Mr. Chacon: Can I clarify two things?

Chair Furth: Of course.

Mr. Chacon: Each one of the enclosures has fences around them for the receptacles. They're not just thrown up against the fence, first of all. It doesn't seem like you all are reading that properly. And, there are bike lockers for all three of these. There's no contention about bike lockers. Each one of these units has a bike locker.

Chair Furth: I think we understand it has a bike locker. We're just questioning our own codes requirements. We don't need to torture you with our dissatisfaction with the code.

Mr. Chacon: Right. That's my point, really. I met the code, and it's there, so I'm not sure why it's being discussed.

Chair Furth: Partly because we are not familiar with every in-and-out of our code. Each application that comes before us presents issues. Sometimes they're novel for some of us. You've got the floor.

Board Member Thompson: I think I said most of my comments.

Chair Furth: All right. I guess it's my turn. I like the modifications to Unit 3. I think on that very small scale, extremely eclectic street, should work well. I regret that there may not be enough space in the garage for them to substitute as bike lockers, and I do have a feeling if it were my unit, I would want a bike locker that could be easily converted to a different use. But, this is within the applicant's choices, I think. I do think that the trash enclosure on Unit 2 should be as far as possible from the adjacent property and as close as possible to the people who are going to be using it. I think you dealt with that in your proposed framings, but you might want to confirm that for me. The proposed conditions, rather.

Mr. Brennan: Yes, that's included in the conditions.

Chair Furth: Condition number four, right?

Mr. Brennan: Yes.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Sorry.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Does anybody want to make a motion, or does anybody want further discussion?

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we recommend approval of the project as presented, with the conditions of approval in the staff report.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that motion.

Chair Furth: Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye?

Furth, Baltay, Lew, Gooyer: Aye.

Chair Furth: Opposed?

Board Member Thompson: Wait. I had a question. Sorry. In the conditions of approval, that's talking about moving the trash away from...

Chair Furth: Condition number four says: As required by the multiple family performance criteria outlined in Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 18.23020 (a), and upon review and approval by the Planning Department, the applicant shall relocate the trash and recycling enclosures of Units 2 and 3 off of side yard lot lines shared with abutting lots to a location as far from neighboring residents as reasonably possible.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: I think they got it. That passes unanimously. Thank you for your submittals and resubmittals. We look forward to seeing the project built.

Board Member Gooyer: As I was saying, it seems like the bin storage, or whatever, is going to become the storage unit, and the bins will probably be standing outside. Just like every other garage is.

Chair Furth: I want to say, in my neighborhood, we have an alley, and we all keep our trash cans in our garages. But, we may not keep our cars in the garages. At least not the second one.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Chair Furth: Okay. I want to propose that we do the minutes before we do our study session, while we're sitting up here. So, if we could go to items 4 and 5.

**4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 5, 2018.**

**5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 19, 2018.**

Chair Furth: Those are the minutes for the meetings of April 5th and April 19th of this year. Any comments? Let's start with April 5th. Oh, gosh. When did we discuss Raphiolepis? I have a bunch of clerical errors. I notice that the transcriber has asked for help on plant names and...

Board Member Lew: That's the next, the April 19th.

Chair Furth: That's the next set. I didn't put the notes on it. Okay. Any comments, additions or corrections on April 5th?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: Under item number 8, which is the subcommittee item, the transcript there is actually the board talking about the subcommittee item. The Board was discussing the subcommittee item. But the actual subcommittee did meet and approved the revisions that were required of the subcommittee.

Chair Furth: In other words, there's no transcribed minutes for the subcommittee.

Board Member Lew: We don't normally do minutes. We usually just put one little line item, saying that the subcommittee approved...

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. I can check those. There is supposed to be a couple sentences or two, a summary of the subcommittee decision.

Chair Furth: But what they did was put the header in the wrong place, so it looks like the Board discussion is subcommittee discussion.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Chair Furth: Anything else?

Board Member Lew: Yeah. And then, the second subcommittee item was number 9, which was the 180 Hamilton, and the subcommittee approved the landscaping revisions.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, the subcommittee approved the landscape changes and we'll get that summary in there.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

### **Motion**

Chair Furth: May I have a motion?

Board Member Lew: I'll move that we approve the minutes for April 5th, 2018.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: With the amendments suggested by Board Member Lew. All those in favor? Opposed? They are approved unanimously.

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

Chair Furth: Draft Architectural Review Board meeting minutes for April 19th, 2018. Any changes or corrections?

Ms. Gerhardt: On this one, there were some plant names that even I didn't know, so I purposely left that in there.

Chair Furth: I certainly know how to spell arctostaphylos. I don't even know what Lyonothamnus is, but I think we could get that.

Board Member Lew: It was muhlenbergia (spells name) and arctostaphylos (spells name). Manzanita for everybody else.

Chair Furth: Yeah, manzanita would be fine.

Vice Chair Baltay: And I'm right in thinking, Alex, that you looked that up in advance, right?

Chair Furth: No. I know how to spell arctostaphylos.

Board Member Lew: I grow native plants as a side hobby from...

Chair Furth: And he labels them.

Board Member Lew: It's from all the stress of architecture...The plants don't talk back to you like architecture plans.

Chair Furth: What about Lyonothamnus? What do you think that was? I'm looking at page 4. It's on the plans.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I don't remember what that is. It was a tree. Right?

Chair Furth: Well, either we'll send it to you, or you'll let it stand, right?

Board Member Lew: There aren't that many native trees.

Chair Furth: We're trying to balance between, you know, unwise use of scarce public resources, and our feeling is it really ought to be correct.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, I would welcome an email with some of the plant names.

Chair Furth: All right. Well, Alex, I think you've got the expertise.

### **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Subject to any clerical error correction, can I have a motion to approve these? I'll move approval.

Board Member Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Furth, second by Thompson. All those in favor? Opposed? All right.

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

Chair Furth: We have a study session, and again, let's take our last regular agenda item before we go do our study session.

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

Chair Furth: Board member questions, comments or announcements? Anything? I have one.

Board Member Lew: You said you could update us on the appeal for the Verizon project...? Is there a date for that?

(long pause)

Board Member Lew: Okay, I don't need the...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Well, while you're looking that up...Is it something that's likely to need a board member in attendance?

Ms. Gerhardt: I can confirm that and let you know by email. Maybe I'll just email you the date and let you know if someone needs to attend.

Chair Furth: I have a report or comment. I went and toured University Terrace, which is the housing that was constructed pursuant to the Mayfield Agreement, at the top of...? Is it California, or is it Stanford?

Board Member Lew: California.

Chair Furth: California. And the University is happy to have any of us tour it. Now is a good time to do it because the condominium buildings aren't fully occupied and there's still unoccupied single-family residences. It's fascinating to see a project that I thought I was not going to live long enough to see built out. I was really impressed by many aspects of it. We don't see a lot of development at that density, we don't see a lot of development with that many common amenities. I mean, there are common rooms, there's a swimming pool, there are a number of parks. A lot of the things that the neighborhood in College Terrace worked hard to get, like continuation of the street grid, fairly compatible detached dwellings facing them, no driveways. It's interesting to see how it's worked out. It's really interesting to see the landscaping and the stormwater control. Everything is in full bloom. I'm sure if you talked to staff, they can arrange it, or you could talk to Stanford directly. I was impressed.

Board Member Lew: And the Board had minimal involvement in that project.

Chair Furth: The reason the Board...We did still have ARB approval, and I don't know that the applicant considers it minimal, but...

Board Member Lew: For the size of that project, it was minimal.

Chair Furth: This is 158 units. About 70 acres. It's interesting to see something at that density in this area that's built more recently than 1970.

Ms. Gerhardt: You're speaking of the houses on Cal Ave.? Yeah, 180 units.

Chair Furth: One hundred and eighty units.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah. About 68, I want to say, single-family, and the rest in the two multifamily buildings.

Chair Furth: The other thing that's interesting about it is that these are neither studio nor one bedroom. These are all either family, or we both need offices, units. They have a lot of room. These are not small units. Go take a look.

Ms. Gerhardt: And back to your original question about the appeal on wireless, it looks like it's on the Council agenda for May 21st. I will confirm very quickly if we need the ARB attendance.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Is there a cut-off for that tour in terms of, like, how late we could...?

Ms. Gerhardt: There is no tour at the moment. Actually, staff was wanting to have a tour and we're still working out the details with Stanford. There isn't a date or anything at this moment.

Chair Furth: This was sort of a tour for the battle-hardened veterans. Because we negotiated this, the City and Stanford, and left a lot of things open. They had performance standards, but not a whole lot of other things. It's interesting to see what they did. They did have a very long consultative process with their future customers, who they knew because it's faculty. I think that had some interesting impact. And Guzzardo did the landscaping. When I was there yesterday, they said to extend the invitation to everybody, so, there you go. I recommend you take them up on it.

## **Study Session**

### **3. Study Session to discuss the South El Camino Design Guidelines.**

Chair Furth: All right. I think there's nothing left but our study session.

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't think we need the recording. We were going to do this more round-table style. Did you want to stay where you are?

Chair Furth: Do we have a table we can sit around?

Ms. Gerhardt: Or, we can sit around the table here. There is the table in the back, as well.

Chair Furth: I think the table in the back would be great. Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. Okay.

Chair Furth: All right. Well, this meeting is not adjourned, but the study session part of it will take place over there. And because it's a study session, we will be taking no decisions, we'll only be making recommendations.

**Study Session Summary:** In a roundtable setting, the ARB briefly discussed all 10 Guiding Principles, such as the 12-foot sidewalk requirement. From there, the discussion focused on how to create an "outdoor room" along the El Camino Real (ECR) corridor. The Board suggested the use of 2-4 story "background" buildings, with entrances facing ECR, and having a proper base, middle and top. Several photos were shown of the base, middle and top concept. Color changes and window size changes are some techniques to accomplish this goal. The ARB appreciated the time to discuss these issues.

**Adjournment** 11:41 a.m.