



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: June 21, 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 Robert Gooyer.

Absent: Board Member Alexander Lew, Osma Thompson.

Chair Furth: Good morning. I call to order the June 21st meeting of the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board. May we have the roll call, please.

[Roll Call]

Chair Furth: Thank you. We have two absences, of which we had advance notice.

Oral Communications - see below

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Graham Owen, Associate Planner: None for the current agenda.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

City Official Reports

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

Chair Furth: Which includes future ARB schedule. It's item number 1 in our packet.

Mr. Owen: Item number 1. We have two upcoming dates in July. The first is July 5th, 375 Hamilton Avenue. That's one of the projects that we're reviewing today. If there's the need for the third hearing on this project, that's the date we're tentatively scheduling this for. Three-two-two-three Hanover is a new office R&D building, and we are moving forward with that date -- July 5th -- for the next hearing. That's a second hearing. July 19th, AT&T prelim for small cell nodes, that's been pushed off to a date uncertain. And then...

Chair Furth: It will not be on July 19th?

Mr. Owen: It will not, no. And then, 250 Sherman Avenue, Public Safety building, I believe that one is still going on the 19th?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: No. No. We are waiting for plans to come in, maybe today, and we're looking towards a meeting in August for that project. Public Safety building.

Chair Furth: All right. Okay. Thank you. Any questions about these dates? Okay.

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 375 Hamilton Avenue [17PLN-00360]: Recommendation for a Request for Approval of an Architectural Review Application for a Five-Level, 50' Tall Parking Structure, With One Below Grade Parking Level, Providing 325 Public Parking Spaces and Approximately 2,000 Square Feet of Retail Space Fronting Waverley Street. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Environmental Impact Report was published May 18, 2018 and circulated for public comments. Zone District: Public Facilities (PF). For More Information Contact Chief Planning Official Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.**

Chair Furth: Item number 1 [sic] is a public hearing, it's a quasi-judicial public hearing, and it concerns 375 Hamilton Avenue. It's a request for a recommendation on architectural review approval of an architectural review application for a five-level, 50-foot-tall parking structure with one below-grade parking level, providing 325 public parking spaces and approximately 2,000 square feet of retail space fronting Waverly. And, perhaps more important for us today, there is a draft Environmental Impact Report, which was published on May 18th and is being circulated for public comment. One of the purposes of today's hearing is to take public hearing on that environmental document, and also to hear any comments from the members of the Board. As you can...Oh, so sorry, we'll get there in just a second. We have some, is that right?

Mr. Owen: We have one speaker who would like to speak.

Chair Furth: Super. We will get back to Item 2, and we will do Oral Communications.

[The Commission returned to Oral Communications]

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: We have so little. It's nice to have it. Oral communication is the time for any person here who wishes to speak about an item that's not on the agenda, but which is within the scope of our operations here, is welcome to do so. I have a card from Jack Morton. Mr. Morton?

Jack Morton: Thank you, members of the ARB. Just wanted to express our appreciation for your patience with the process. Cal Lab [phonetic] is very, very anxious about the changes that are going to occur, both because of the garage, and of course, the police building. We wanted to be sure that you have on record, you know, we're very anxious that the area have adequate parking, but when it comes, again, to the public building, we're also very concerned that the police department seems to want to move all of its, let's say emergency stuff from East Bayshore down to a closed area. It's something that the community doesn't feel is appropriate there. We just want to be on record that when that comes up again, we'll come back and express the...We didn't want to surprise anybody, that the closed yard that was part of the original design is something that's a very big concern to both the neighbors, and particularly, for the businesses. So, get that on record, and thank you very much for hearing me this morning. Again, our appreciation for your patience with this process. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anybody else? We don't have a date yet for that to come back to us, do we?

Ms. French: Well, we are expecting the plans this week, and we are targeting August 2nd, but it's not set in stone at this point. We're shooting for that.

Chair Furth: But it should be...

Ms. French: We're shooting for that, yes, August 2nd.

Chair Furth: August 2nd. Thank you. Anybody else wish to speak on oral communication? All right.

[The Board returned to Item 2.]

Chair Furth: We'll try again on Item Number 2, which is still a public hearing on the downtown garage proposed at 375 Hamilton Avenue, and in particular, on the Environmental Impact Report, which has been available for some time. Before we do this, this is quasi-judicial. Does anybody...? I think we've all visited the site, correct? Multiple times? Has anybody had any communications outside of our board meetings they wish to or need to report? I have. I met with staff, with Brad and others, before this meeting, to go over what they planned to present. The one piece of information that I had not focused on, which is not to say it was not in the literal mountain of information they gave us, was the need to relocate electrical and telecommunications lines, fiber line, that presently go from Hamilton towards CVS. They go through the existing parking lot. And the affect that that has on their choices and preferences with respect to open spaces around the edge of the project. Having said that, staff report, please.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Thank you. Today, the purpose of the hearing is to conduct the comment, the public testimony hearing on the draft Environmental Impact Report, which you received the binder of. These are at the libraries and on line. They were circulated to the state clearing house, as well as the county notice of preparation and availability. The second piece of today is to hear from the architect on the modified project plans, and hear about how these comments that were provided on February 15th were addressed in the revised plans. Finally, your comments as the three members present, as to anything you would like to see come back at the July hearing. Right now, we have said we're coming back on July 5th, as all members are available. This was noted as a value of this Board, to have all five members present to make a recommendation to the City Council on this project. On the screen -- and this was in the staff report -- is the process that we've been through. The Environmental Quality Act of California requires several stages of review. We opted for the scoping hearing to be conducted by the Planning Commission back last year, May 31st -- more than a year ago now -- and then, the City Council had conducted a pre-screening meeting regarding the changes proposed to the public facilities zoned district to accommodate public safety building, essential service buildings, and public parking garages. We then had two preliminary hearings, one with the HRB and one with the ARB -- yourselves -- back in the end of summer last year. Then we had our first formal back in February. This is the second formal hearing. We try to do public buildings in two hearings. Obviously, the need for five members, you know, gives us the opportunity to have a third hearing because that has been expressed as desired. Then, as far as the Public Facilities' own development standards ordinance, that was approved by Council on June 11th, just last week, and it will be going back, a second meeting on June 25th. They did approve all the changes, and as noted, the Council will be reviewing each of these projects that comes through with these exception to the zoning standards. Then, we're looking towards going back in the fall to Council with this project, the downtown garage. Some of the issues that were identified previously were this pedestrian path from Hamilton to CVS. It's a path that's traveled today through a parking lot, so it will continue to be traveled through a parking lot. But, the experience is a bit modified, coming from a plaza that goes past the bicycle and, with strollers now, stroller parking, through the garage, angling over to this pedestrian alley, the improved alley that would have features including pedestrian amenities, benches, landscaping. And then, there would be this other alley exiting over to Waverly. The first-floor ceiling has been raised to 12-6 to provide a more spacious head height for the pedestrians walking through there. The architect will cover this in detail. Then, we have our second issue, which is the Hamilton setback. The response has been to increase the setback from Hamilton. It is now a three-foot setback, otherwise known as a four-foot encroachment, into the seven-foot special setback. It is better aligned with the AT&T building, which is the shaded building to the left. What this has done is it has reduced the number of parking spaces provided in the garage at each level. The third issue is...that's right, there's these little...okay. Trying to get to the next slide. There we go. Key issue three is the architecture and the landscaping, which the architect will cover in his presentation. There are some key features of the concrete use, with the punched indents on the Hamilton side and not on this side. And then, we have vines growing up with cables. We have some durable concrete use in the alley to allow for all of the logistics there. And, we have alley plantings that are going to be working with the shade. We have a letter that's coming forward....Not? Okay. So, there's a letter that will be coming forward from the

landscape architect that will discuss the plant materials chosen. That will be available at our next hearing, if not before. We do have stormwater planters that will be at grade in Lane 21 here, but then, in the alley there will be some raised planters, and along Hamilton. We do have more street trees showing in the new plans that we've received, so two additional trees on each of the frontages. That is the new look here. We have a little more detail on the art that is to be used at the stair enclosure and over the driveway entry. The fourth issue was the property owner, the adjacent property operations along the rear of the Waverly businesses. I did forward to the Board a couple additional letters that were not in the packet. Those are available here for the public if they are interested to see those, behind me here. One is dated May 10th, and that one is to Ms. Wong, the property owner of 550 Waverly, and the other one is to Holly Boyd, and that was dated February 26. I guess that's the end of my presentation. Oh, yeah. Just a brief review. We have the Downtown Urban Design Guide with our Hamilton district. A lot of the...Just a reminder of what this guidebook was seeking, including strong corners and pedestrian links, outdoor amenities. It's what we've got here. Let me turn this over now to our architect to make a presentation. Do you have any further words for...?

Mr. Owen: No, not at that is point. Let's get the architect.

Chair Furth: Good morning, Mr. Hayes. You have 10 minutes.

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects: Good morning, Chair Furth, members of the Board. My name is Ken Hayes with Hayes Group Architects. I'll be making the presentation on behalf of the project team. Most of them are here in case you have questions. Michelle Wendler and Gordon Knowles from Watry Design Group, as well as Lorraine Ahlquist and Lynn Marie Boovay [phonetic] from WSP, the environmental consultants, and Terry Murphy from my office. Just to refresh on the salient points of the program, the physical program, we still have five above-grade levels and one basement level. We have reduced the parking count to 325 spaces from...Did I do that?

[Brief pause, adjusting slide presentation.]

Mr. Hayes: We're back to the salient aspects of the physical program. Three hundred and twenty-five parking stalls down from the 338. We've increased the bike parking, almost doubling that. There was some expense on the retail space, so that's 1,955 square feet now. We're showing the plans with the future solar voltaic system on top of the building. We're all familiar with the site. It's a two-thirds of an acre asphalt parking lot on the corner of Waverly and Hamilton. Lane 21 is behind. The property is zoned PF. Surrounding properties are CDC, GF, with a pedestrian overlay predominantly around it. The properties that are in green are historic properties, so we know the Category 1 historic post office across Hamilton Street. At the back of the site here is Lane 21, and that's a one-way alley to the left, to Bryant Street, essentially. I want to point out that on the corner, we are widening the sidewalk here by extending the curb out. That's going to be about 18 feet, I think, in the end, and then, the sidewalk along Hamilton is also being extended out to match the curb, and that will be about 14 feet on that frontage. What we heard in February -- and thank you, Amy, for introducing the project -- the special setback, I think Council on June 11th probably has eliminated that from the site development requirement, but this was a concern that was expressed at the last hearing. Also, this pedestrian alley, why do we need the pedestrian alley? I'll talk a little bit about that. And then, there was some comments regarding the strength of this connection between Hamilton Avenue and the rear alley and CVS, as well as the introduction of more bicycle parking and perhaps some stroller parking, as well. This is the new site plan. The building has moved essentially three feet in on Hamilton here to better align with the AT&T building. We've done that by going to minimums pretty much inside the garage, but still compliant with the City requirements for parking space design here, and a 22-foot-wide ramp to go below and to go above. The alley is needed for a number of reasons, and ironically, it is actually a setback that is in the site development regs for the PF. That may have been modified now by Council, but that is a 10-foot side setback. We are respecting a 10-foot setback here, even more than that, as well as the back of the building, a 10-foot setback there. The alley is needed for many things, including required openings in the garage, that we can have a naturally-ventilated garage. We don't have to have mechanical ventilation. It's there to alleviate some of the construction costs associated with underpinning of the Thai Pan

restaurant building next door, and it also creates a wonderful pedestrian linkage to one of the main circulation elements of the garage, the stair that extends from the basement to the top of the building. There will be pedestrian enhancements in the alley that I'll talk about a little later on. We also are bringing our utilities in there, so the utilities that are being relocated, that actually comes through the parking lot now, will be in a joint trench in that pedestrian space below grade. At the expense of three automobiles in this location here, we've made a stronger entrance, I think, for this connection to get through the building. You bypass the bottom of the ramp on the safe side of the garage. You would cross here in a crosswalk, run past the vertical stair element, and then, circulate in the pedestrian alley there. The garage has been raised 12 inches to create a little more welcoming feel as you walk through the garage. None of this precludes someone from wanting to walk straight through the garage like they do now, through the parking lot, but we think is a nicer experience. The bike area, as I said, has increased by about 50 percent, and that will be a secure bike area for strollers and bicycles, easily accessible. You can take your bike out this way or take it back out to Hamilton. On the elevations, there were some concerns. This is Hamilton on the scale, and use of the concrete, and maybe the power of that façade and the arcade, as well as the size and detailing of what is that stair tower. So, the changes that we've made essentially to limit the use of the concrete, reduce the scale of that façade and the arcade, reduce the size of that stair element itself so it really is something that circumscribes the stair itself. And then, we've completely changed the rhythm of that façade, so instead of it being a very repetitive, kind of colonnade sort of statement which was referencing the post office, we still have that rhythm here, but it's really at the pedestrian scale, and we've created a horizontal band that picks up on the building next door. That serves as a place for the vertical fins to kind of rest and provide visual support for them. Syncopation has changed. We have the perforated metal here, the perforated metal at the exterior stair. The share wall has moved in its location and it will have vines growing on it, as well as a pattern that's kind of reminiscent of Spanish Colonial architecture that are, essentially, just shadow pockets in the wall. We have benches along this side, as well as we're still celebrating the metal work that you find on the post office at this ground floor to provide visual screening into the garage. On Waverly, the comments were pretty much the same, although there was the added comment that the proportions were a little odd. I agree, it was a little bit stubby on this side at that location, but the idea here was that that was a two-story element that related to the Thai Pan space. We all agreed that that wasn't necessary, so the new proposal has, we've reduced the concrete, we no longer have that two-story element. We introduced the horizontal shade across the top of the retail space, and then, a transom element that ties into the Thai Pan doors in front of that façade. We've also reduced the size of that stair enclosure, and I think, in general, the proportions of this with the elimination of that two-story piece have changed to a much more elegant expression, using the metal fins in that terracotta color. This gives you an idea of what that looks like there. This element here is at the end terminus of the pedestrian alley, and that's at the stair. This is a view of the pedestrian alley from before. The Thai Pan building is superimposed in front. There was concern over the success of this alley, as well as the viability of the landscaping. We have talked with the landscape architect, who has assured that the California grape or the lilac as a vine would be fine, both in a sunny and a shady exposure. They have a preference for the California grape. It would be great to hear what your preference is. It would also be nice to hear what your preference is on the paving because they've given you two alternatives on the paving in the alley. This essentially shows the rhythm of the façade there, and we've introduced the photovoltaic panels above so you can see what that's like, to terminate the top of the building. This is the rendering of the corner, but from Waverly looking down the pedestrian alley. You can see the board-formed concrete at this first story. Those openings are then infilled for retail storefront with dark anodized or dark bronze frames that are topped by this metal canopy that serves as a visual support for the vertical fins that provide the openness for the garage, and it ties in visually from a color standpoint with the tile roofs in the neighborhood. The top of the building is terminated by the photovoltaic panels, and actually an extension of that structure to provide a visual terminus when you're on the sidewalk. That was something that was talked about before. This is a view from the corner, shows the stair element in the corner and how the façade is treated down that side of the building. The artwork actually is incorporated onto this perforated metal. I'll talk about that a little bit more in a second. We're still celebrating the metal work of the stair that descends out of that canopy. Gives you an idea of that plaza space. This is our renderings of Hamilton, showing the pedestrian benches, the vegetation, as well as the metal screen work that sort of limits views into the garage. This metal panel wraps the corner. This is the pedestrian alley. The festooned lights that run down that alley

will provide some visual experience. I think this is a great way of providing connections to the street. Did that include my 30 seconds, or...?

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Hayes: I'm just about done. We've eliminated the trees from the service alley at the back but we extended this plant around a little bit to create more plantings and provide areas for some benches. But, I believe there's still 12 or 13 feet across this dimension here for any kind of service to get back there. This is the rear corner of CVS where, again, the board-formed concrete has this stand-off and wire system for the vines to grow on that wall. Tapestry is our public art, and we really wanted it to be integrated with the building. It's about creating an awareness of the topography of the Palo Alto foothills through sections of topographic data that then is incorporated into the perforated metal panels. We thought it was a really intriguing idea. We had talked once before about how the perforated panels visually could work. We had some images last time that then, with further collaboration of the design team, we thought, wow, what an opportunity to integrate that artwork with the bronze corner perforated metal. That would occur both here and at the entrance itself into the garage. I look forward to your questions. That's my presentation. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Are there questions of the applicant before we hear from other members of the public who might care to comment? I do have one speaker card. Do you want to defer your questions or ask them now?

Vice Chair Baltay: No. Architect Hayes, could you tell me in a little more detail the spacing of these terracotta-colored aluminum panels, the vertical ones that seem to make up the bulk of this [crosstalk]?

Mr. Hayes: Sixteen inches on center.

Vice Chair Baltay: They're mostly transparent, is that right, then?

Mr. Hayes: I believe they're two or 2 1/2 inches wide, at 16 inches on center. That's not the true width, I don't think.

Vice Chair Baltay: I see. They're 2 1/2 inches, 16 inches on center?

Mr. Hayes: And I think they're about 16 inches deep. There's a detail, Board Member Baltay, in the drawing set. I'll tell you exactly.

Vice Chair Baltay: I ask the question because some of the renderings make it look like a solid wall. I just want to [crosstalk]...

Mr. Hayes: I think it just is a function of how obliquely you're looking at the rendering or the drawing.

Vice Chair Baltay: And what is the design intent behind putting those there? Is it to be transparent, or to be solid?

Mr. Hayes: It's to be both, essentially. It's to change that look of the building as you walk along the street, but also to provide a consistent vocabulary, I think, for the façade where we need to have this openness quality for ventilation.

Vice Chair Baltay: Do you have some sort of safety screening behind that?

Mr. Hayes: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, there will still be the 42-inch bulkhead or, in some cases, the safety cable. I think that's shown on the...On A 3.5, Drawing 3.5, Detail 4.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I have a speaker card from Elizabeth Wong.

Elizabeth Wong: I have a thumb drive. Is it possible to...?

Chair Furth: Staff will help you with that.

[Short pause while setting up thumb drive]

Chair Furth: Good morning. You have three minutes.

Ms. Wong: Okay. Good morning, members of the ARB. My name is Elizabeth Wong. I am the manager for Waverly Post LP, which owns 558-560 Waverly Street. I want to point out a few things before my main speech, and that is that in the Watry Design letter dated May 7th, on the third page, under Materials, Colors, Construction -- Okay, no, no. The paragraph right before that. It says that the height of the AT&T building at 75 feet serves as a backdrop to our building, meaning the garage. That is 50 percent shorter. Well, this building is not 50 percent shorter than 75 feet.

Chair Furth: I think we agree with your arithmetic.

Ms. Wong. Let's see. Going over to the staff report, on page 6, it talks about the elevator penthouse would reach a height of 63 feet. That is much more than the 50 feet or 58 feet that is usually allowed. It is a very tall elevator. My other thing on the same page, under Setbacks and Floor Area, it says that there is a 16 feet 7 inches from the rear wall of the Waverly Street property. Okay, so, my property is recessed three feet. It is preposterous to count my property as to be part of that thing because I can put a wall right on my property line at any time. So, basically, that 16 feet 7 inches should not be mentioned at all. It should be more like 13 feet. And the views, this is the view of the 558-560 Waverly, and none of the considerations of this building have been taken into account, other than the 10-foot setback. Could I have the second slide? These are the views that we have presently from a second-story office. We have three bays. This is one of them. Let me show you the second one. This is the second one. Here's the third. And we have side windows that also show us side views. All of this will be disrupted by this huge building. Could I have the view of the, you know, the whole building, that is part of the Ken Hayes presentation?

Ms. French: (inaudible)

Ms. Wong: Yes, I am done with mine.

[Short pause while locating slide.]

Ms. Wong: Yeah, this one. This building is super massive. There's no need for all the vertical, whatever it is called. I would much rather get rid of all of that and have an organic, open building, so the people who are parking their cars can avail themselves to that beautiful view that I showed you before. This building, you know, I think, talking about the appearance of the building, I think totally, you know, massive. I would save all that money and put the greens on the back sides of the building that the passer, you know, the way for the passengers, for the pedestrian pass way, because that's where you need it.

Chair Furth: I've given you an extra minute and a half. Could you wind up?

Ms. Wong: Yeah. So...

Chair Furth: You've already had that extra minute.

Ms. Wong: Okay. Lastly, I want to mention that I received no letter from the Public Works, or whoever is doing this. It wasn't addressed to me, it wasn't mailed to me. It happened to be...I found it, okay? But it wasn't addressed to me. I did not receive it. Nor did I have any communications with them, which is a shame, because some of these things could be easily voiced in private conversations with staff.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Wong: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Is there anybody else who would care to speak on this item before we bring it back to the Board and staff? Mrs. Wong, Board Member Baltay would like to ask you a question about your comments. Would that be acceptable?

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Mrs. Wong. I've read various correspondence from you over the course of the review of this project, and I have great regard for your active civic in the community. But, I have to say I'm confused as to what you really want with this building. I'm not sure if I understand you to be saying you just don't want a parking garage there, or you want some sort of modifications. If you want modifications, what are they? What would you like us to do?

Ms. Wong: Yeah. The modifications are elimination of the vertical slots. I think that the pedestrian walkway at the west side of the building, the back of 558-560 Waverly should be wider. I think when you have a garbage truck backing into there, you know, the truck is so big and the doors are so wide, that if my next door neighbor builds to his property line, it will bang the doors of the garbage truck, or whatever truck, service truck there is there. There's one big thing that I'd like you to do, and that is to either have staff record an easement, or record some sort of access, for us to be able to access to the back of our building through an underground tunnel, or to allow us to pay in-lieu parking for any parking that we might need in the development of this building in the future.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anything that staff wishes to comment about before we deliberate up here?

Brad Eggleston: I'd just like to comment...

Chair Furth: Could you introduce yourself for the record, for the benefit of our transcriber?

Mr. Eggleston: Oh, I'm sorry.

Chair Furth: I spoke right over you. Would you do that again?

Mr. Eggleston: Brad Eggleston, Assistant Director of Public Works. I just wanted to say I'm perplexed about why Ms. Wong didn't receive our correspondence. We will definitely look into that. We thought that she had that.

Chair Furth: Yes?

Vice Chair Baltay: One last question for staff regarding the photovoltaic assembly on top of the building. My understanding is that that is possibly going to be built, but not for certain. Is there any way to assess how likely it is that that will be put on top?

Mr. Eggleston: Well, it's complicated because it has to do -- at least partly -- with the incentive programs that the Utilities Department offers for local photovoltaic projects. I think you're aware, and I think the Board even saw the proposals for the photovoltaics that were placed on top four of the City's five existing

parking garages, and we were able to enter into a lease with an entity which provided that because Utilities Department was offering a 16.5 cent per kilowatt hour price under what they call the CLEAN program. That program is now entirely filled and the future rate will be much less. Essentially, we've got to assess the feasibility under future programs that will exist, of how we might do that.

Vice Chair Baltay: If I could follow up. If this program allows you to put solar panels on top of the building, will those panels be put on per the design of this architect? Or will it be done the way you did it on California Avenue.

Mr. Eggleston: Per the design of this architect. Our intent is to, rather than the process that we had with the previous garages, our intent is to bring the design through the Board so that we have an approved design for the potential future installation. And then, if we did that, it would be in accordance with [crosstalk]...

Vice Chair Baltay: You're going on the record to say that if solar panels are put on, they'll be put on per this design.

Mr. Eggleston: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Eggleston: Or we would need to go through another process. I can't speak for what the City might do in the future.

Chair Furth: In fairness to staff, the future Council can do what it wishes.

Mr. Eggleston: Yeah.

Chair Furth: But that is in the intent at this point, and you would not view yourselves as having an approved photovoltaic design other than this one.

Mr. Eggleston: That's correct.

Chair Furth: Robert, any questions of staff?

Board Member Gooyer: Nope.

Chair Furth: I had a question. The stormwater handling landscaping. Is it at grade, essentially, is that right? As opposed to the higher landscaping that's in raised planters? I was just wondering if there...

Mr. Eggleston: I believe the higher landscaping is the C-3 stormwater treatment, but I'll let the architect clarify that.

Chair Furth: I'm still a little...I have carefully studied most of these documents, but could you explain to me where we have landscaping that's at my feet, and where it's at my knees...

Mr. Hayes: Sure.

Chair Furth: ...and how you made those decision.

Mr. Hayes: And I can understand the confusion because I think there's some conflicts on the drawing. In the alley at the back, Lane 21...I'm sorry, the alley, the pedestrian alley and the rear of Thai Pan, those two spaces will have raised planters. That's all drain-through for C-3. All the planters are for C-3 at the back...

Chair Furth: And "C-3" means...?

Mr. Hayes: This is the stormwater...

Chair Furth: The technical term for stormwater...

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, sorry.

Chair Furth: ...treatment, handling. Whatever.

Mr. Hayes: Correct.

Chair Furth: Reabsorption.

Mr. Hayes: And the planters in Lane 21 we're showing as being low, but there's a likelihood that they will need to be -- where's Gordon? -- higher.

Mr. Knowles: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: You need to come and speak in the microphone.

Mr. Hayes: This is Gordon Knowles with Watry Design.

Gordon Knowles, Watry Design: Good morning.

Chair Furth: Good morning. Could you introduce yourself for our transcriber?

Mr. Knowles: My name is Gordon Knowles. I'm working with Warty Design. We're the architects and structural engineers.

Chair Furth: And how do you spell your last name?

Mr. Knowles: As in Beyonce. [Spells name.]

Chair Furth: Thank you, I'm sure she'll get that.

Mr. Knowles: She's a distant relative. The planters to the rear of Lane 21 are low-level. They're at grade. They will still be used as C-3 or stormwater treatment. However, the planters at the moment are in the alleyway to the west of the building, the 10-foot alleyway between Thai Pan and the building are raised planters. They're also stormwater treatment. They're raised, in part, to help the treatment, but also, with deliveries coming into that alleyway, they protect the planting in that area. Our landscape architects feel, in working with our civil engineers, that the low-level planters will still work for stormwater treatment to the rear of the alleyway, and we didn't want to create any other larger planting areas on that alley. However, that's our current design and the current thinking.

Chair Furth: My concern is that the existing planters -- meaning the ivy -- is constantly stepped on and in, so whenever you have foot-level planters, we're going to be very concerned about what you put in them so they don't get trampled and don't present a hazard. Trying to understand the plants better.

Mr. Knowles: I understand your comments. I believe there's a lip to the planter, but it's not raised as the others, which are, I think 2 1/2 feet off the ground.

Chair Furth: Well, speaking as a member of a family where two people have broken their legs, tripping on things of this design, I'll be interested to see what you have.

Mr. Knowles: We can [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: I wasn't either one of them. Thank you. Anything else?

Mr. Hayes: Mr. Knowles will actually be, if there is a hearing on July 5th, Mr. Knowles will actually be doing the presentation because I will not be here.

Chair Furth: Thank you. And I should mention that two of our members are unable to be here today. We thought that this was an important decision for everybody to participate in. They will be able to watch the tape of this, and I'm sure that staff will make sure that they get all the slides that we saw today, both Mrs. Wong's and Mr. Hayes', so that they will be up to date when we do that. And we appreciate that this is not easy, but as it's been pointed out, this is a very big project. Okay. Robert?

Ms. French: May I just jump in, just for a moment...

Chair Furth: Certainly.

Ms. French: ...to -- thank you -- to address the 16-foot-seven-inch note that Elizabeth Wong did state. It's an error in the staff report. It should say as per plan, 16 foot, 7 inches from the rear property line, or the adjoining line between this property and those Waverly properties.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, what page?

Ms. French: Page 6, or packet page 13 of the staff report. The bottom paragraph says, you know, 16 feet 7 inches from the rear wall of the Waverly Street properties. It's not. It's from the rear property line of the...

Chair Furth: Got it.

Ms. French: ...adjoining.

Chair Furth: So, even if the Thai Pan building...I'm getting a head shake from Mrs. Wong, so I will let you all address that off line, and we'll have consensus on that, or at least our best attempt at it, before our next meeting on this subject. That brings up a question that I need you to go over again. I'm so glad I brought my magnifying glass. Those are very small drawings in the staff report, at least if you read them on paper. With the revised Public Facilities District, what is the required setback along Waverly?

Ms. French: The ordinance allowed for Council to approve...

Chair Furth: Anything.

Ms. French: ...anything.

Chair Furth: So it's zero.

Ms. French: It's project-by-project.

Chair Furth: But it's zero, is the required minimum setback.

Ms. French: Zero is required, yes.

Chair Furth: And what is the required minimum side setback for the other parcels along Waverly? Is it CDC, or whatever it is?

Ms. French: So...

Chair Furth: The buildings are built touching, but is there a required setback?

Ms. French: On which street? Sorry.

Chair Furth: Waverly. The Waverly frontage.

Ms. French: Zero.

Chair Furth: Okay. So, the pattern of law, by law, is zero.

Ms. French: Correct.

Chair Furth: But...

Ms. French: It's only because of the PF zone that a setback would be required at all on Waverly.

Chair Furth: But traditionally, the PF zone has required a 10-foot setback?

Ms. French: Correct.

Chair Furth: That might have been what people were anticipating. Thank you. All right. Anything else?
Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay.

Chair Furth: And just to continue, we will have our detailed discussion of the building at our next meeting, but this is a good time that shouldn't go to waste.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. Based on the modification, or I should say, the modifications that we sort of requested last time, I think the building has improved a great deal. I also have a bit of concern, as I had last time, of the verticality of the middle slats. It just seems, depending on where you, you know, as you said, I'm guessing, as you said, the idea was when you walk by it, it changes. But, like standing on the corner of Hamilton and Waverly, you can begin to understand the relationship with the various portions of the building. I think if you're walking on Waverly, the way to design this now, especially if you're approaching the building going...what would that be? I guess south on Waverly. That seems like an awfully massive 3 1/2 story, solid, flat wall. I have a bit of a problem with that. I can appreciate the Hamilton elevation where you've got some different materials, different textures, and I think it works there. But, the Waverly one, I just think, not that I was a big fan of the previous design, but there was more variation on that design than you have now. Interesting point. The comment came up about the solar voltaic panels. Actually, I liked the design with the panels on it better than without them. I've always been a fan of, like I said, a building having somewhat of a top or something of a distinction, and when those panels aren't there, that isn't there. The panels are almost acting as a cap, which I like. Even though I'm not a fan of raising the building any further than it needs to be, but somehow or other, I think it works better. Also, just the gap makes that a whole statement at the top, and I think it looks a whole lot better. I'd be tempted to say even without the panels, we should put something up there that addresses that. I know, you're looking at me as though that's not going to happen, so, fine, I understand.

Chair Furth: (inaudible) to people yet.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay, let's see. I would say at the moment, the problem, like I said, I have is, is that...I'm just not a big fan of the verticality of those panels. They're just too big. It makes it look too institutional. Not that I'm saying this needs to look like a bunch of homes put together. That's not the point. But I think it's a big step forward, but I'd like to see a little more variation. I'd be willing to say

even if there was a concrete panel on the Waverly side that eventually would become a, sort of a green wall, I think I'd be happier than with what I see now. That's it for the moment.

Chair Furth: Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning, thank you. I'm going to follow right up on what Robert was saying because I agree with the thread he was doing. I just agree that the vertical panels, especially on the Waverly elevation, give the building a very large, solid-looking wall, and certainly from some angles, it will just be solid-looking wall of some 35-feet tall, or so. I think that's going to cause a lot of public outcry. It's not going to be a popular building, and I don't think it will look very good that way. It just enhances the boxy-ness, the verticality of the parking garage. I understand the difficulty of the architectural challenge when you don't have windows and you don't have other elements that are usually used. That's why we have one of our best architects looking at this. I can offer a few ideas or thoughts that I have, looking at it. You have a horizontal element above the retail store frontage, and if that could be enlarged, perhaps a greater overhang, the way that it's done on the Walgreen building, or thickened somehow. It would just take your eye off of the piece up above it, which is ultimately going to be there. It's a parking garage. But, I think the Walgreen's building on the other corner of the same block is more successful because of the large overhang. And maybe that's something you could integrate into it. A second thought is that, do the top of these vertical panels need to be as high as they are? Could you pull them down a little bit? Maybe articulate them more from the vertical concrete columns and let the safety railing behind it stepping back, perhaps. Give you some articulation at the top of the building. I agree completely that with the solar panels, the building looks much better, even though it's much taller. I don't have much confidence that that's going to be built.

Mr. Hayes: [Crosstalk] it could be separated from the panels.

Vice Chair Baltay: A trellis of some kind. Something. Anything really helps with the look of the building that way. Thirdly, and this is more on the Hamilton elevation, you have basically three different materials -- the board-formed concrete, the vertical elements, and then, the perforated metal with the artistic pattern. And they're all exactly flush along the top. To me, that just accentuates the boxy nature of the building. I'm wondering if you can't get some sort of delineation up and down, variation someplace to just mitigate the effect. I'm just following up on Robert's comments about the verticality and the blank wall look of it. I find it problematic. I'd like to speak to the perforated metal screening, especially with the idea of the topography as to the artistic theme. A year or two back, we had a, a North Face store over at the Stanford shopping center chose to use that same idea as their sort of decorative pattern on the front. I have to say, it's not very successful. When you walk by, you don't see a topographic map; you see a bunch of wiggly lines.

Mr. Hayes: That's abstract.

Vice Chair Baltay: And I caution you that it's something that's already an abstract concept for many people, and I think you really want to be careful that you're confident it's going to work. I don't think it works on the storefront of Stanford shopping center, albeit that's done differently, and that's two-dimensional. But, I think it's actually a very difficult concept to pull off, that looks artistic, not just like bumps on the wall.

Mr. Hayes: On North Face, you're saying, at Stanford...?

Vice Chair Baltay: North Face store at the shopping center, yeah. I mean, their contour lines are too thick, the colors are too bright. I mean, obviously it's a failure of execution, but I also wonder if it's not a failure of concept. That's what I'm questioning here. I agree that making this into a piece of public art is a great idea, and all along, Ken, you've been putting forth this idea of this muted transparency, and what do you see and don't you see. I think those are really powerful architectural ideas. I'm not sure that the contour concept is really the way to execute it. I can offer...So, that's the second thought about the perforated metal panels. I do think that the board-formed concrete with the small holes and the plants on

it is going to be very successful. It's a durable, strong material, it has an important structural purpose. The holes do somehow relate to a historical type of architecture that you're talking about, but in a contemporary way, I think it's a very successful treatment. I think that will be very good. I would like to see that somehow differentiated more, maybe just by the height of it. On a separate note regarding the pedestrian circulation down at the ground level, I have two things I think it would be nice if you could work on a little bit more. At the bottom of the staircase, I appreciate that there's a large plaza there, and it's great that we have wider sidewalks. I still don't see enough places to sit or enough landscaping at that corner where currently we have that restroom facility, and some trees, and some benches. Just an enormous number of people congregating around this area. Maybe in that area at the base of the stairs, somehow you could do something else to soften it a little bit. It would just feel a lot better that way. I think your idea of bringing the pedestrians through the parking garage is good, and I agree the way, the basic pattern you've done is really nice. It brings to mind, however, that the design of that bicycle enclosure is now more critical than ever. If it's just a chain-link fence, it's just not very pleasant. I'm wondering if you could show us -- or design for us -- something that really is attractive to walk past. At the same time, it would be really nice to have something like bollards or a pattern on the pavement, something that easily tells pedestrians where to go, so they do follow the path you've outlined, and gets them over to that alley on the side. I think that will be a nice alley. I've said it several times through this review process. The amount of people walking through that shortcut in the parking lot is huge. To respect that, if you could make the path really clear. Make it so you're not afraid when your child is with you that they're going to run into the cars, because there's such a clear delineation. Right now, it seems to be a painted pattern. But bollards, even planters if you could get something to grow there, or benches, or anything to make it welcoming and public will be welcome.

I'd like to go on the record. I've said this several times and I think it's belaboring the point, but I think the 10-foot setback from the Thai Pan building is excessive. I don't think the public alleyway there is necessary or going to be successful at that width, and I think the building would be better with a five-foot setback, either landscaped or used for surface parking. I think your technical needs could still be accommodated with a five-foot setback and the whole building would be better off with the extra space. I think that that decision has been made already, but I want to state my opinion on that. I do appreciate the extra setback on Hamilton Avenue. I think that's important, and much appreciated, to line it up with the AT&T building. Between that and widening the sidewalks, the building, as large as it is, will probably be large enough. It will probably work okay. Wynne, I have more comments about the EIR. DO you want to do that separately?

Chair Furth: No, let's do...Wait, yeah, let's do that last.

Mr. Hayes: Board Member Baltay...

Chair Furth: Don't let us forget to do the EIR comments when we finish this discussion.

Mr. Hayes: Through the Chair, may I have a follow-up question...

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure.

Mr. Hayes: ...on the first comment?

Chair Furth: Is your mic on?

Mr. Hayes: I think it is, yeah. Regarding your comment, your comparing the Waverly façade here, the canopy, to the Walgreen's. You're talking about this canopy here? Can you see my cursor?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, exactly. The horizontal element.

Mr. Hayes: As a more significant element, you're talking about? It's five feet deep right now.

Vice Chair Baltay: Right. I can't quite tell how deep it is, but I'm really thinking it's substantial enough that it gives you a sense of coverage as you're walking by.

Mr. Hayes: Walgreen's is a model that you prefer because it's probably eight feet deep, at least, I would think. Right?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think, I want to phrase that differently, but I think it's an element that might help reduce the impression of the height of the building, and focus your attention on the storefront, which is what we want.

Mr. Hayes: Okay. But that is the element you were talking about. Okay. Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Those are my comments, Wynne.

Chair Furth: Thank you. And you will remind me to get back to the CEQA issues. Thank you. I appreciate the resubmittal. I'm pleased with the expanded bicycle parking. I'm pleased that you're addressing the pedestrian experience. I echo the comments about the importance of that, and I hope when we see this next time that some of what you show us can give us a good idea of the experience of pedestrians and cyclists using this pass-through, what they'll see, what they'll experience. And, similarly, what the sidewalk experience is on both Waverly and Hamilton. One of the things I can't tell, you know, it's so misleading -- or interesting -- to look at the Waverly Street elevation, because nobody ever sees that. What will I see from the sidewalk on either side of the street? I suppose as you're driving, maybe as you near the church, maybe you can see the whole building as you look towards the hills? We can see the view from over there, and at the sidewalk. I think the actual experience of walking down the streets is very important in these buildings. I mean, the classic example being the President Hotel. Nobody's ever aware of how high it is because they're too busy looking at what's going on at street level. I agree with Elizabeth Wong that this is a very big building. However, I do not want to have it open with good views of cars. I prefer that it be screened as you have. I don't have a strong feeling about the vertical element. I do agree with my colleagues that this building works much better -- at least in the drawings -- with the photovoltaic system on it because it gives it a top, and it gives it a lightness, which it completely lacks otherwise. I think we're probably asking you to incorporate the superstructure, even if you don't get the - - which is most of the expense, I expect -- even if you don't get the panels in. I have worked on the other side of the City's feed-in tariff program and it's not easy. Certainly, that very high rate that the City made available made the finances work in cases where it wouldn't otherwise, if you were simply looking at the issue of what's the cheapest place to get electricity. I think that a major part of this element of the project is an aesthetic one, and I hope to make that point to the City Council. On the art element, I think we have seen a very unsuccessful attempt to use -- well, somewhat unsuccessful -- an attempt to use topographic map contours. Myself, I don't want to celebrate the hillside with a contour map. This is the former swamp that has been redeveloped as Palo Alto. We have our own interesting geologic character and history. One of the weirdest things about the town is that the banks of the creek are the highpoint. And myself, if you're going to do this, I would like you to concentrate on downtown, and I would love a neon interactive element that shows us water intrusion over the next 50 years, decade by decade. That would be real public art. It would alert us to what is happening in our town, which [crosstalk] often. So, go for it. I mean, let's have powerful, dynamic, useful, beautiful public art with a message. Those are my thoughts on that. One of the things I think I read in the staff report was that some of the reconfiguring you did of parking spaces involved bringing them up to standard City width. Did I misread that? Some of them were a little skinny before and now they're up to standard width? Or is that a complete misunderstanding? When you had to do the reconfiguration.

Ms. French: We'll look at that and have that later.

Mr. Eggleston: I suspect we might be talking about existing spaces in the lot, rather than the garage...

Chair Furth: Oh, but that led to...

Mr. Eggleston: ...but we'll verify that.

Chair Furth: You couldn't replace them one-for-one if you were doing that now.

Mr. Eggleston: Yes, and I believe we've always been planning to have the standard...

Chair Furth: It's a little ad hoc as it exists. Let's see what else I have in my notes.

Board Member Gooyer: While you're thinking of that, can I ask...

Chair Furth: Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: ...Peter a question? Your comment about the building and the width of the alleyway, if you want to call it. You're thinking of just shifting the entire building over to allow more space or setback on Hamilton?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. I'd like to go on the record, agreeing with that. I think you're absolutely right. I mean, I think part of the concept was because of the windows at that existing building, but the part that has always amazed me from the first time I saw it is, we're basically talking enormous windows on a property line. And how those things were allowed to be built in the first place, I don't understand. Because usually it's within -- what is it? -- three feet or five feet of a property line...Yeah, three feet. That's what I thought. It has to be rated, or wire glass, and this kind of thing, and they're not. I think because everybody anticipated years ago this will always be a parking lot, we can go ahead and just build it and it's no big deal. But, you know, things change. If we're doing the 10 feet because of that visual impact, or whatever, I don't think it's a valid point to use that as a criteria.

Chair Furth: I have a question for staff again, which is: To what extent is the width of that alley being driven by your proposal to use it for relocating utilities?

Mr. Eggleston: I think the location of the utilities is a significant reason why we wouldn't be able to close the alley entirely.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, I'm not asking that.

Mr. Eggleston: Right. I think you're talking about Commissioner Baltay's suggestion of the five foot, right? That, for us, I think is more of an issue with respect to two other issues. One is the openness for, I believe the first two floors. That would not provide the openness that's required to not have mechanical ventilation. We'd have to have mechanical ventilation on those floors, which could have a moderately significant cost. I think the bigger impact even than that would be during construction, the fact that we're having to build a basement level, and coming so close to another existing building, and the complexities of having the shoring systems.

Chair Furth: You think you need a full 10 feet to avoid shoring?

Mr. Eggleston: With the subterranean excavation. Yes.

Chair Furth: I'm seeing a lot of nods from your staff.

Mr. Hayes: The big issue really is the technical requirements around the building code. We can't have more than 25 percent of that wall open at less than 10 feet to the property line. That is dictating that we have to be at least at 10 feet so that we can have unlimiting opening, so that we can avoid a mechanical ventilation system and avoid running it, you know...

Chair Furth: That generates both noise and power use.

Mr. Hayes: Right. And I, you know, I really do believe...The more choices we have about how we move around our communities, the more democratic we become. I think that that pedestrian alley is something that is a good benefit. When you come down that stair, why force everybody down the CVS alley? Unless you own stock in CVS and you want them to shop there. Give them a choice. They can go out to Waverly via that pedestrian way. I feel pretty strong that it's needed for that reason, as well.

Chair Furth: We've heard a lot of rhetorical flourishes here.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, well...

Chair Furth: That's quite something. More democratic to have that. Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll vote for Ken.

Chair Furth: Avoid shoring and permits natural ventilation. I must say, it was interesting reading bits and pieces of the environmental -- meaning contamination -- study. What a lot of drycleaners we used to have. Every corner. And they relocated so frequently, bringing their hazards with them. I do prefer the altered Waverly frontage. I do think it was better not to try to echo the Thai Pan building. I never know how long those buildings are going to be with us, and when it redevelops, it might seem quite odd to have that. But, I think it looks better in its present iteration. Anything else anybody wants to say before we go on to the environmental documents?

Mr. Hayes: Paving preference?

Chair Furth: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Hayes: The paving preference? There were a couple of ...

Chair Furth: I always feel that's like you putting bright, shiny objects in front of us so we don't think about the big issues. I prefer California grape to lilac vine. I don't know what Alex will say. Anybody have opinions on paving materials? Nope?

Mr. Hayes: Okay.

Chair Furth: I think you're free to do what you think is best.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Environmental document comments. Thank you for providing it to us. We inadvertently got paper copies of the whole thing, which in some ways is interesting. Seeing the graphics at that large scale and being able to mark them up was great. I don't think I can imagine any situation under which the traffic study fine details or the contamination study fine details are something I can apprehend. But, thank you for the document. Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. On the EIR, I was wondering if we could modify slightly some of the phrasing on page 92. This is where you're talking about the cultural impact and context of the building. It's actually page 91, first. I think the first paragraph, you're referring to impacts to the, it says impacts to would be -- there's a typo in there -- but affecting the post office.

Chair Furth: This is the historic...

Vice Chair Baltay: Historic...

Chair Furth: ...resources section of the summary.

Vice Chair Baltay: The gist of my comments is I think this building does have an impact on the post office, and I don't think that's adequately addressed in here. I think the architect has mitigated those impacts, but I think it needs to be discussed in a neutral and thorough way here. And then, on page 92...

Chair Furth: Before you go on, Peter...Oh, you're still on the same thing. Sorry. Go ahead.

Vice Chair Baltay: I underlined things on the, it says [reading] *The design of the proposed garage incorporates several architectural elements intended to make it an appropriate and compatible addition to the Palo Alto downtown area. This includes consideration of the total building height, the character of the ground floor facades, and building setbacks.* I think the building is as tall as it can possibly be. I don't think it's doing anything to, special consideration for the area. I don't think that's a mitigation. It's implying that includes consideration of the height. It says further [reading]: *The building will be 49 feet 10 inches below the citywide 50-foot height limit.* That's not including the solar panels, again.

Chair Furth: That's not (inaudible).

Vice Chair Baltay: Push it up to 65 feet. [Reading] *The proposed building will also have a lower height than the building to the west, which is 75 feet tall.* That's sort of an editorial comment. The gist of my statements on all this is that the building is massive, and I don't think we should sugarcoat that and try to say no, it's not actually that big. I think we do ourselves a disservice. And a big building, especially across the street from probably the most important historic building in town, I think it's important to acknowledge that. Further down, the third, fourth paragraph, the proposed project, etc. [Reading] *Furthermore, given the restrained height and compatible design...* I don't think this building has a restrained height.

Chair Furth: I think that's a fair statement.

Vice Chair Baltay: Those are just editorial adjustments, trying to get the report to be a little more thorough. The second comment I address -- and again, it's detailed and picky -- I'm looking at page 2 out of 5 of a tree report regarding the condition of the oaks. [Reading] *The three Holly Oaks and one Coast Live Oak tree were determined to be in good health condition.* Fair enough. *The trees are in need of appropriate pruning, etc. Poor pruning in the past has contributed to Fair structures.* I'd like to see that last sentence just struck from the statement. The tree is in good health. Anybody who goes and looks at it can see that. And we're going to mitigate the removal of the tree, but I don't think we should try to spin it to say it's somehow not okay. Those are my comments on the EIR. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: I pretty much had no specific comments, but sort of the same concept of what I've read, that you're trying to sugarcoat the size of this place. No matter what you do, you can't sugarcoat that. It's huge. The reality is, we need the thing, so you have to just be a little bit more blunt about stating that that's the requirement.

Chair Furth: From a CEQA point of view, the question is whether this adversely affects the post office. If it does, then we need to acknowledge that, and if the Council still wants to approve it, they make a statement of overriding considerations and say we understand it does this, but because of the other compelling reasons, we're going to go ahead and do it anyway.

Board Member Gooyer: Like I said, I don't think it adversely affects the post office, but it doesn't enhance the post office. I mean it's...

Chair Furth: It's big.

Board Member Gooyer: It's big. Yeah, exactly.

Chair Furth: We're not calling for a finding of adverse impact under CEQA. We're simply saying that a more accurate description would be -- It's a really big building and it doesn't particularly complement the post office's efforts of, you know, materials or, you know...I wanted to say that I think the extra-wide sidewalk helps because it's not just the street width. I mean, one of the interesting things about this setback is, it's not just some line on paper. It's a built line. So, intruding into that setback, that's a real deal. When I was looking at, I think it was 1.5, one of the things it highlights is that a really important characteristic of a post office is it sits back from the street. It has garden in front of it, and that's a really important element of that kind of design. Of course, it makes it somewhat domestic and, you know, Mrs. Hoover said we're not having one of those federal buildings in our town, so ours is the only non-federal WPA post office in the country. One of the key elements of that was you put a garden in front of it, and you see that in a lot of civic buildings all over California -- courthouses, post offices, whatever -- often with roses in the says when we still had gardeners. Ours is more interesting than roses. Actually, it's a mass of weed trees right now. When I look at this, I was thinking, how would I make a sympathetic, supportive building across the way? I would set it back as far as I could so that I could have a similar stepping-back to another civic building. And then, do whatever I was going to do. I think it's unfortunate that we can't do that here, that we are under these constraints that push it forward. If mechanical lifts made it possible to do something else, that would be great, but that is not something we need to deal with. I am happy that you are thinking about wayfinding/space-finding technology for the building given its design, which includes a lot of, kind of closed-ins. I am curious as to how we'll signal to people who don't use them all the time where the pedestrian entrance is along Hamilton, that will signal that here is the point of entry for bikes and people. I think that's important. And I think that's it for me. Anything else from anybody?

Vice Chair Baltay: You might consider adding in the EIR a statement about the sidewalks becoming wider. I think that's easily missed in all this analysis that both...

Chair Furth: And it's important.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...on Hamilton and Waverly, the widened sidewalks actually do one thing towards helping the historic building across the street. It just gives you a little more space to have that civic breathing room Wynne just described for us.

Chair Furth: Also, I think you have, particularly in your revised design, you have a really strong upside for cyclists, which I hope you emphasize. This is a very bike parking-short space. You've heard me complain about parking in the ivy, which shouldn't be there anyway. It's a rat habitat. It's Algerian Ivy. But, you really, this is not, other than it's nice trees, this is not -- and it's convenient -- this is not a great civic space. We've got problems with trash enclosures, we've got problems with inadequate parking, we've got old pavement, we've got, I would say badly constrained trees. You're adding elements that are really improving this corner. We're going to have healthier and bigger trees, we're going to have much better bike accommodation, we're going to have much better sidewalks. This has some really non-parking upsides, which I hope you emphasize. Thank you. Anything from anybody? All right. Would you like us to continue this to a date certain?

Ms. French: We would request the date certain be July 19th, rather than July 5th.

Chair Furth: All right. I will say one other thing, which is that this is a very big project. I think it merits a very big sign on the existing parking lot so the general public is aware of this. We are using a sign about the same size as the one we use for a Verizon antenna. There is no comparison in the scope of the project, so I would suggest that this is a project worth trying to get people to come out for, and we have not succeeded in that, except for people who have very clear interest in the area. All right.

MOTION

Chair Furth: I would entertain a motion to continue this matter to July 19th.

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we continue this matter to July 19th.

Chair Furth: Is there a second, Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Second.

Chair Furth: All in favor say aye. And there is no opposition. We are done.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 3-0.

Chair Furth: Would we still be having a meeting on July 5th? We're anticipating a board meeting on July 5th.

Ms. French: There is an item already advertised for that meeting. It will be a short meeting.

Chair Furth: So the answer is yes.

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Furth: All right. Anything else? We are adjourned. Thank you. Sorry, we're not adjourned, we have two items. I am really out to lunch. Beg your pardon. I little over-focused here. We will take a five-minute break, and then we'll get on with the rest of our agenda.

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Furth: Okay, we are reconvened to deal with two other important items. But the scale is different.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [18PLN-00054]: Request for Architectural Review and Conditional Use Permit for Shake Shack restaurant to allow for exterior facade improvements and to allow for the sale of alcoholic beverages in an existing tenant space at the Stanford Shopping Center. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guideline Section 15301. Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Furth: The first one is a public hearing, a quasi-judicial hearing. The address is 180 El Camino Real, otherwise known as the Stanford Shopping Center. This is a request for our comments on the architectural review and conditional use permit for Shake Shack restaurant, to allow for exterior façade improvements and to allow for the sale of alcoholic beverages -- not our concern -- in an existing tenant space. This is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act, again, because of its small scale. Perhaps a more understandable way of identifying its location is it's proposed to go next to P.F. Chang's, where Wells Fargo used to have a branch. Staff?

Mr. Gutierrez: Good morning.

Chair Furth: Excuse me. Has everybody been do the site? Yes?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Chair Furth: Does anybody have any outside conversations to report?

Vice Chair Baltay: No.

Chair Furth: Nor do I. All right. Excuse me. Go ahead.

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning, Board. My name is Samuel Gutierrez. I'm the project planner for this project, and as Chair Furth just said, this is located at 180 El Camino, which is the Stanford Shopping Center. It is the tenant space that is directly adjacent to the P.F. Chang's restaurant, which current faces El Camino, near the intersection of El Camino and Quarry Road. This is the former location of Wells Fargo Bank. From my understanding they are no longer operating there. I think they just recently moved out. Moving into the presentation here, you can see a rendering of the proposed changes to this tenant space along the exterior here. I noted in the staff report that it would be facing the parking lot side because the other tenant facades face the Quarry Road side. This is the broader side that actually faces the large parking lot area of the Stanford Shopping Center, right there along El Camino. These are the existing conditions. You can see the Wells Fargo ATMs there. The way that the façade looks on the upper left corner there, and the upper right corner, you can see that that building -- noted as Building W -- right along that intersection point of Quarry and El Camino, that's where this tenant space is located. The lower left photo there shows you the view from Quarry Road, and that's even during the fall when that kind of plaza with the trees there doesn't have the foliage visible. It's difficult to even see that, but it still faces a public right-of-way. The lower photo on the right, you can actually see that side of the façade from that little parking lot area that's kind of tucked away there. It looks like a façade that would be suitable for a bank but, of course, that's going to change with this proposed use. We move into the project overview. The project is located within a standalone building there, with two tenant spaces, as I mentioned. The new façade involves some new materials, colors, and new windows. The change of use is going from financial services to eating and drinking services, the bank over to a restaurant use. And, because of that, as a result, there's a need for a much larger trash room than what was needed for the bank. New outdoor seating. That is associated with the covered patio area that exist there. They will be slightly modified, but for the most part, that is the existing area that wasn't utilized by the Wells Fargo bank. New signage. Some landscaping will go in, and also, to accommodate some of the access to the trash room, the parking requirement will change overall for the site. In addition to that, the covered outdoor seating area will modify the required parking for the site, which I'll go into later in the presentation. Just to briefly touch on the Stanford Shopping Center review process, we do have a review process for the Stanford Shopping Center for standalone buildings and exterior-facing tenant spaces. That means any tenant space that faces the public right-of-way. This is within a standalone building, so it does need to go through an entitlement process. If it were to be actually looked at in a larger section of the mall, this tenant space is still over the 35 feet in width, so it still needs to go to a planning entitlement. But, of course, this is a standalone building, so that's why we're here before the Board today to get your comments. Just to touch on the context of the mall, of course, there is a large amount of variation between all of the tenant spaces, as you can see in this photo. Outdoor seating areas are very common for the existing restaurants there, so it makes sense that they are proposing one for this project. You can see a different window for the different facades, the different retail stores that are existing in the mall. This project is actually proposing adding more windows to it, bringing it pretty consistent with what we expect of the shopping center. As we move forward, we're going to discuss the trash room requirement. Why does it need a trash room? Well, the eating and drinking use will require a lot more volume in trash room capacity than the previous financial services use. The Wells Fargo bank pretty much just generated paper, while this is going to be a combination of cardboard, paper, trash that can't be recycled, and compost. And then, of course, used grease. They do need to create one where there wasn't one previously. This is showing the location where this is going to be proposed, where currently there are some windows. I believe it's some back offices for the Wells Fargo bank that was there before. They're going to fill that in and create this trash room there. You can see two options for the trash room, one having a burger logo, the other mimicking what they propose the façade to have, which are these kind of moss and wood panels. The trash room doors would be painted to match that. You have to understand that the trash room itself needs free access at all times for when they do pickups. Currently, there are parking spaces located directly in front of the façade, in that section, so they do need to remove some parking spaces. The burger logo in particular was proposed because in the adjacent space to the P.F. Chang's, you'll see that there's a little bonsai tree metal panel decoration. It kind of takes that hard steel door and softens it up and makes it blend better with the façade, so that's where those options came from. Circling back to the parking, you see here on the top,

that's the existing condition there, kind of a circled area. They have two accessible spaces there. And then, on the proposed design, those accessible spaces have moved over to the left of that tree planter, and there's a new area that's been created for no parking. That's directly in front of the proposed trash room, so trash services could come and pick up the trash freely without worrying about customers throughout the day. That's also the same set-up that's for the adjacent P.F. Chang's trash room. That resulted in a loss of two spaces there to create this free access area for the trash room. The other thing to note is that the Stanford Shopping Center has a one parking space per 275 square feet parking ratio, and the covered outdoor seating areas count toward the parking requirement. They don't necessarily count towards the overall square footage limitation of the shopping center, but for parking, it does count because it is new service area that is covered. That wasn't previously included in the overall parking count because the Wells Fargo bank did not use that to conduct any service. It was just a refuge area, so it didn't get counted. We did count it this time, and the new outdoor seating area does result in three additional parking spaces. However, the shopping center does have enough excess parking to readily account for the increase in parking requirement. There is some landscaping proposed. They circle around the building, and it's actually adding more landscaping to this building at this end, which is a nice amenity. It does contribute to the pedestrian environment that the shopping center is going for, and is known for, I should say. However, staff does see that some of the planting here is not exactly meeting the findings per the ARB for local and indigenous plants. But, there is another conflict there because the shopping center does have a theme overall for planting, so it's kind of a fusion of the two, the greater City requirements, and then, this overall theme that the shopping center was approved to have. They did propose a good range of plants that do work well with the shopping center, and you can see how it goes around the seating area where previously there wasn't any planting, with the Wells Fargo bank. That does add more greenery to the area. Moving forward, as I said, it does not exactly meet the ARB requirements, but it does have two plants that are suited for our climate zone. But, staff would appreciate ARB's comments on landscaping to see how we could address this now and in the future at the Stanford Shopping Center, being that there is kind of a theme to follow at the shopping center, but we also have the ARB findings. They do have some plants that align with ARB findings. However, staff seeks the ARB's guidance on future projects and this one, on how much planting should be consistent with local and indigenous and suitable habitats for wildlife. Moving forward, there are two signs being proposed. They are proposed over the covered patios on both sides of the tenant space. They are individual channel letters with an associated burger logo. The burger logo is green. They are internally illuminated channel letters. We do have a master tenant façade sign program for the Stanford Shopping Center. However, it does not apply here. It is a standalone building and standalone buildings need to follow the general municipal code regulations for signage. However, we do try to steer it towards what's consistent at the shopping center so you don't have signage that is random for the standalone buildings, and then, as you go into the greater shopping center, you see different signs. We try to blend it as much as we can there. We do seek ARB's comments and recommendations on the options I showed you for the trash room because the burger logo, as I said earlier, will count towards the signage area limitation for that façade. Of course, the other option would be to match the façade design, so there would be no sign counting there. This is just an overview of the wall sign area. The reason this was included is because the El Camino Design Guidelines do apply. However, they're doing minimal work to the exterior area, so there is no need to increase the sidewalk. They're not building a new building. There is that 12-foot requirement for the El Camino Design Guidelines. But, what would apply from those design guidelines would be the sign reduction in size. On the bottom row of this table, it includes some information about the burger logo and the trash room doors. It's basically stating if we do go with that option, it would have to be slightly reduced to meet the El Camino Design Guidelines requirement for signage on El Camino. It would be rather simple to do that. The burger logo would just need to be reduced by a couple percent to meet that requirement. Here are the signs. One I noted as Sign A, and that's the sign that would be over the façade facing the parking lot, as I noted earlier, the broader one that had the Wells Fargo ATMs. Sign B would be the sign over the covered patio area that faces the grove of trees and Quarry Road. Sign B is actually smaller, as you can see here. It is a smaller area than the other tenant façade space with the larger covered patio, so they did reduce that in size. Also, that façade area is small overall, so the percentage allowed for signage goes down. Staff recommends to the ARB the following actions: Recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Community Environment, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of staff before we ask for the applicant to speak? All right. Who is speaking for the applicant today?

Jason Smith, Land Shark Development: Chair Furth, Board members.

Chair Furth: Good morning.

Mr. Smith: Good morning. Pleasure to be back in front of you once again. Sorry to hear about the North Face project. We'll get past that.

Chair Furth: That's just us.

Mr. Smith: Today, here, of course, we have the Shake Shack project in front of you at the corner of El Camino Real. I have with me our design architect, here to speak on behalf of the project. Should you have any questions, we'll be happy to answer those.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Smith: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Good morning. You have about nine minutes.

Justin Kyle, Michael Hus Office of Architecture: Good morning. All right, sounds great. Good morning, Chair Furth and members of the council. I'll be representing the design team for this presentation. I'm Justin Kyle, Michael Hus Office of Architecture in Austin, Texas.

Chair Furth: Our minutes are transcribed, so we need to have you spell your name.

Mr. Kyle: [Spells name]

Chair Furth: Thanks. You'd be amazed how many different ways people spell their name.

Mr. Kyle: I believe our planner gave a good representation of the project so far. I'll be speaking about some of the design features on the exterior façade as we move forward here. This is the existing condition of the building as is. What we're looking at doing is adapting this building with the Shake Shack standards that we use for plenty of projects across the states, taking those features and elements and trying to do our best job of blending it in with the unique features, within the context of Palo Alto. At this location, what we are going to be is removing the ivy in order to repaint the façade, and also repaint the trellis, as well. In no aspect are we considering removing the ivy entirely. We would like to encourage the ivy to grow back eventually. I just want to point that out as we have these images up here, with the Wells Fargo building as is. I'm going to try to get to the renders. Here we go. This façade is the north façade facing the parking lot. What we are proposing here is repainting the façade black or a dark gray and iron ore. The reason for this move is that typically, as part of the Shake Shack standard, they have an ATAS corrugated metal panel as part of their aesthetic feature. It's on many Shake Shack throughout. On the interior of those we also have the Shack itself. The ordering counter is covered in that ATAS metal. Because we don't want to necessarily use that in this space because we want to blend more in with the Palo Alto context, we're looking at instead using that same color and applying it to the existing brick. We're not covering any ATAS metal here on this façade, or at least on this portion of the façade. Also, we're going to be using a cedar board-and-batten cladding system that will be adjacent to the storefront here, not only to mimic this corrugated metal façade that we've used at other locations, but also, again, to blend in with the featured elements in the Palo Alto context. On this façade, we are going to be removing the existing trellis and replace it with a very similar trellis. The reason for this is to be more in line with the other designs we've used for Shake Shack. Also as a design feature, we will be removing portions of the existing brick façade. The reason for this is that this façade in this particular at this location currently has ATM machines there, not necessary for a Shake Shack. So, we will be removing

that portion and bringing in new storefront. As our planner reviewed, there are plenty of precedents in other mall locations for more storefront on these facades, so we are being more in line there. Also, as a result of this, we're going to be blending more of this interior/exterior and connecting our patio spaces with our interior dining space more clearly. As a tradeoff as well, this portion back here on this building is our back-of-house area. We don't want glazing in that location, so we're more or less moving the glazing from this location over to our front-of-house area. On the other side facing the park, we're going to keep that existing trellis. It continues and ties into the trellis covering the P.F. Chang area, which is our adjacent building. We will be removing the ivy temporarily along these concrete columns to repaint the concrete columns, but as you can see in this render, the expectation is that the ivy will be growing back eventually. We also will be expanding planter areas to not only capture this patio space, give it more of an intimate eating area adjacent to our front-of-house dining area, but also those planters we will be replanting with the same ivy to encourage it to grow back. Growing back onto the trellis, the columns, definitely, and also the ivy from the adjacent P.F. Chang's building, to growing onto our building, as well. We'll also be tying in with the general ecofriendly and encouraging growth and plantings in this area. You can see also that we're bringing the façade elements of the cedar board and batten around on this side, as well. An interesting aspect of this which is much more clear in our exterior elevations is we have a notched façade movement along these battens, so that we're creating this thin condition that comes at an angle, trying to mimic some of the moves that we have used in other Shake Shack locations, with moving the corrugated siding and various angles to encourage movement along the façade. That's primarily the design features that we're recommending for this location. Also on the interior, as well, we're presenting a very interesting feature element for the ceiling. It's a diamond-shaped pattern also using cedar. It's a fairly dynamic ceiling component integrated with lighting features, as well. We're looking at a tiered stepped system, not only to bring something dynamic and interesting into the space, but also trying to mimic some of these strong canopies from the local parks and area in general. That is pretty much most of the design notes that we are recommending for this location. If you have any questions?

Chair Furth: Any questions of the applicant? Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. A couple questions for you. The vertical cedar boards, I guess I'm reading the plans right, but it seems like they are one-by-sixes projecting vertically away with a one-by-eight between them.

Mr. Kyle: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: And there's no overlap of the boards, so we have batten that covers a board on a board-and-batten siding. Is that right? They're just fastened next to each other?

Mr. Kyle: It's lesser board-and-batten and more of plank siding, with the individual -- There should be a detail in there, as well -- with the individual battens running in between the boards themselves. We're not applying the battens directly on top of the boards, but they're going to be a board, then a batten, then a board, then a batten.

Vice Chair Baltay: And then, what is the finish on the wood?

Mr. Kyle: What is the finish?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah.

Mr. Kyle: We're doing a clear seal.

Vice Chair Baltay: A clear seal finish. Is there anything on top of the...? You have the end grain of these boards then exposed to the elements. What protects that?

Mr. Kyle: We're showing a steel member that will be running horizontally along the top of the façade element. We're also separating the board-and-batten system slightly from the face of the brick at those locations, and then, tying into the brick using that system.

Vice Chair Baltay: You said there's a steel element that the cap of the wood trim pieces...? I don't see that on your renderings. Am I missing something?

Mr. Kyle: It's a very small steel element. We introduce it as we're working through design development, working with the architect of record on this. At this detail here, the storefront at the head, you can see that element expressed there.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Can you explain more about this notch you're talking about in the wood?

Mr. Kyle: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: I see that, in the plans, just seems to be a (inaudible) for a notch at an angle.

Mr. Kyle: It's a very subtle detail. Let's see if it's expressed. Here. There's a dashed line here representing that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Right.

Mr. Kyle: And what's happening is that we're taking the one-by-six and we're cutting a notch at an angle, about 45 degrees. Where this line crosses that batten, there will be a slight notch taken out. We're taking about half of the material of the wood out in that notch, so it creates this dynamic fin profile. That fin gets lower as this line continues along the façade.

Vice Chair Baltay: Have you used this material on other Shake Shack locations?

Mr. Kyle: The cedar?

Vice Chair Baltay: The cedar vertical batten system.

Mr. Kyle: Typically we use it interior. We use kind of reclaimed wood or interesting dynamic wood systems for feature walls. It typically has been used for interior locations.

Vice Chair Baltay: Have you used it on an exterior location.

Mr. Kyle: We've used exterior cedar for multiple projects in the Austin area, and in other areas, as well. This is unique for Shake Shack due to the Palo Alto context.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Other questions regarding the trash room door. Does the applicant have a preference?

Mr. Kyle: Our preference would be to use a Shake Shack logo for the burger sign right there.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Is there any member of the public...? Do you have questions? Any member of the public who would wish to comment on this project at this time? Having no comment cards and seeing no one, I'll bring it back to us. Thank you. Okay. You have...?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm sorry to keep coming at you. I'm wondering if you could explain about the landscaping at the prow -- I'll call it -- of the building. The sharp point. If I'm reading the plans correctly, it seems that there's a whole bunch of lavender put around that. Is that correct?

Mr. Kyle: Yes. Do you want to speak to that?

Vice Chair Baltay: This rendering here, that's good, yeah. Most of that is...

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Vice Chair Baltay: ...a lavender field?

Mr. Kyle: Yes. I'm trying to encourage some kind of a planting that would be appropriate for that location. This was designed by the architect of record for that portion. We've been primarily focused on the exterior façade itself.

Vice Chair Baltay: Has anybody investigated the...? Lavender, as I understand it, attracts bees, which might not be desirable next to a burger joint.

Mr. Kyle: That's a good point.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. It was just a question.

Mr. Kyle: We will review that with the architect of record.

Chair Furth: Also to confirm, the preserved green moss wall involves dead plants, not live plants. Right?

Mr. Kyle: They are preserved moss panels, yes.

Chair Furth: It's landscaping in the same sense that cedar is. Thank you.

Mr. Kyle: All right.

Chair Furth: Who went first last time? It's your turn. Okay. Go for it.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you for your presentation. I'll confess, at first, I just wrote down "looks great." As I've heard you explain to me more of the details, I have serious reservations about your use of the wood on the outside, and the way you're using it. The wood will expand and contract, so every joint, where you have these butt-jointed things will just open up. The wood will get wet on the top, and cedar especially, especially the cedar available these days, will decay. Within a few years, it will look really ratty. It just won't be attractive at all. I really encourage you to think of a way to get the aesthetic effect you want without having something that's so fragile, really. This type of cedar, a clear finish is the least-strong finish on a wood that's one of the least-strong woods. And this application, where it's exposed to weather very directly, I think you'll find it just embarrassing after a year or two. I think Stanford will find that...You don't see this too much around the shopping center. Usually there are more durable, higher-level materials, so I think you should really reconsider that choice of finish. I pulled up an image from the Shake Shack website. Same logo, same typeface, it looks great. It's right behind a brick façade, which has got a slightly industrial character to it. It seems to me that you have a really nice brick façade here, which is a very solid, durable material. Is there any way you could just stain that, or change the color of it, or something? You might find an easier, much more durable way to get the same effect. In any case, just looking at that. My bigger concern is that I think you should try to get more seating or some sort of pedestrian spot at the prow of the building, where you're showing a bunch of lavender. My favorite part about the Stanford Shopping Center is these wonderful seating areas, this wonderful landscaping. It's just really a pleasant place to sit and meet somebody to have a conversation. And this is a real opportunity to introduce that on, it's a fairly busy pedestrian thoroughfare diagonally out to El Camino. When I was out there last weekend, I could barely find a place to park. I was jostling around at this corner. There's a lot of people going around there. If you could introduce some small-scale public seating, benches, friendly planters with flowers that pick up on what's being done in the shopping center, I think it would be a really attractive amenity. People who are waiting for a table at the restaurant,

perhaps. What you're showing is just a bunch of lavender. Lavender is sort of a hot, dusty plant with bees around it. That's fine when you're out in wine country or something, but I don't think it's the right choice here. I'd like to see if you could get a little more focus on the pedestrian aspect at the corner of the building, and your landscaping and surface treatment. It's not a big deal. It could even come back on consent, but I think it needs to be looked at. The last thing, staff has asked us to comment on the door of the trash room enclosure. I don't know what to say. If you guys want to paint your logo on the door, it's fine with me. I think it's your choice. I think, again, putting the cedar slats on there is going to be a durability issue, especially with the trash room. Within a week, it will get banged up. When I was out there, that door is very non-noticeable. It's off to the side. You really have to look hard to find it, even at the very edge of the parking lot. Maybe we're making too big a deal out of it. My preference would be that you really focus on the prow of the building and the public interaction with it there. It's a real opportunity to make something special. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay. One advantage about going second, I thought I'd...When I first saw this, I've used the facilities in New York, I like the food, great, good addition to the neighborhood, so to speak. But, I agree completely. I've gotten the reputation of being a curmudgeon on this panel, or the naysayer, but I have to agree completely. The wood, I just have a real fear. I just don't think...I mean, that's one of these things, and you see it so often with residences, where they use rough wood or unfinished wood, things like that. It looks great for the first six months, and then it's going to go downhill real fast. You've got a brick façade that has lasted well. I understand you might not want the beige brick, but the thing is, that doesn't mean you can't modify the finish or the texture or the color of that brick. I agree that you could make it a much, sort of an edgier color or look to the brick, and it's already finished for you. I have no problem with the signage, that sort of thing. I also have to agree that this area, you know, if you're not familiar with it, is very popular. I didn't think so at first, but that diagonal across is a very heavily-trafficked area. And just putting some groundcover basically there, I think you're depriving yourself of the opportunity of having a whole lot more seating there, and opportunities for people to meet. The one nice thing about doing this in a shopping center which you don't have in another situation, where if all of a sudden you need five more parking spaces, it's not like, oh, we're stuck, we can't do that, because having seen the numbers, there is sufficient that you could go back and say, look, we need three more parking spaces, and that's a doable thing. That's the benefit of that. So, I pretty much have to mimic everything, other than the fact that I don't like the logo on the garbage. To me, those things ought to just disappear. You make them blend in or make them as non-obvious as possible. Other than that, I have to agree with Peter on this.

Chair Furth: All right. Well, thank you for your presentation. I have not patronized your building yet, but it was nice of you...somebody included the menu in the agenda packet, so that let us know what we're talking about. I know this site well, too. The fact that Building M exists at all is because of an effort to transform the shopping center, pull it out towards El Camino, pull it out towards our very big, heavily-traveled transit center, which is across the street. Stanford and the City have both put a lot of energy and money into that, moving utilities and building accessible paths and walkways, which is important to keep building on. Stanford, the shopping center has provided a really attractive seating area over towards Quarry Road. I'm always bugging them. One of the findings we're supposed to make is that there is adequate seating and amenities for people coming to the business, walking by the business, and working at the business. Whenever I see workers sitting on stand pipes for their lunch break, I know you haven't met that standard. This clearly is a place that can be used for that, among other things. However, I agree that there is a bench shortage at the moment on that access because I saw customers sitting on the curb, parking curb, to make phone calls. Because between the lovely seating right out at the corner of Quarry and El Camino, in that sort of wooded area you have, and the bench right in front of P.F. Chang's, there is nothing until you get to Terrain, and that is too far to have no seating. There's lots of spaces it could go. It might be in your triangle, it might be, if you and your landlord prefer, further out, but I agree that we do need pedestrian-friendly seating, which means arm rails, somewhere in addition on that site to support that aspect of it. At this time of year, it's a very heavily-wooded area in a nice, open, light

way. What do you think the existing vine on that building is? It kind of looked like Virginia Creeper, but I don't know.

Mr. Kyle: I think that would be a good guess, yes.

Chair Furth: Okay. I don't think there's ivy. And I would certainly be in favor of maintaining that, whether it's a...We know it thrives in this area. I don't know how it is for habitat support. I do not believe it's a local, indigenous plant, but it's an existing, important element of the success of that area, and I think I would support keeping it for that reason. I can't make the same argument for your other plant choices. Berkeley sedge is European. It's a misleading name. And in looking at the plants that you have there, I understand...It's great landscaping there, and I understand you want to keep the theme going, but I believe there are plants that would meet our criteria of being good habitat plants and good local plants and give you the same aesthetic effects as the one you have here. The East Bay Regional Park District has a good list prepared by Bart O'Brien, and there are other resources that could help on that, because I couldn't make the landscape findings yet. I'm fine with having dried moss as part of your building materials if you want them to be part of your building materials. It raises the issue of maintenance and how long they last, but I do not consider it a garden element. I keep bringing up my family. I've made a lot of wreaths with dead moss, but that is not landscaping. With respect to the trash enclosure, I say no to the burger logo. I think it's aesthetically unfortunate in that location. I think P.F. Chang's bonsai, which is a really elegant piece of metal work, I mean, it's two doors, and they fit together beautifully. They've got a very wide thing, it fits well, it doesn't suggest P.F. Chang's as a business. It's not a sign, in my opinion. This would be, and I think it's unfortunate, and I think aesthetically, it doesn't work. I would suggest not doing that. Do you have responses to our comments?

Mr. Kyle: Yes. Concerning the wood, is it the cedar specifically, or is it wood in general on the façade that raises the issue.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, cedar specifically, but wood in general I think will wear poorly. Even if you use IPA with really good metal flashing, you're going to have to finish it very frequently. Unless you can really have a design intent...I'll segue a little bit. We approved a synagogue a number of years back now, where the architect wanted wood on the surface, and he argued that the wood was going to weather in a way that was part of the design concept. That, I thought was a very successful use of the wood, to accept the fact that it will change. I think you have to make that argument here, that any wood you use on the façade is going to weather. It's a very strong sunshine on the façade of that building. Stanford has -- and Palo Alto insists on -- a very high level of aesthetic quality. Weathered wood is generally not that. It's a long answer to say probably steer away from wood.

Mr. Kyle: And in defense, one of the reasons why we went with a material that wasn't the brick for this portion is where we're replacing the storefront with solid paneling with the wood, we didn't want to try to attempt to match the exact same kind of brick there. Granted, we are painting it. We can look at other options for a more durable material at those locations.

Vice Chair Baltay: While you were talking I pulled up the Shake Shack website. There are about a half-dozen photos there, one of them of the Shake Shack logo against a brick background, which is exactly the same layout as what you have. It's just a different color brick. Is there a way just to change the color of the existing brick? That seems to me a simple solution.

Mr. Kyle: We are recommending painting it. Yes, we can look at options for using brick.

Vice Chair Baltay: It's just an idea for you. I mean, you're the architect, but clients like that kind of thing.

Mr. Kyle: Okay. We can definitely take a look at that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Our question to you really is, we need to decide if this is something that can be approved on a consent calendar, or if it has to come back, and how much time, and what changes you think you're willing to make. What do you think? Don't mean to put you on the spot, but...

Mr. Kyle: I think we'll probably have to review the material palate to see if we could replace it with something more durable.

Vice Chair Baltay: You need some time to think it through.

Mr. Kyle: Yeah.

Board Member Gooyer: I hate to say it, but I think it needs to come back.

Vice Chair Baltay: I do, too, but I wanted to hear what...

Mr. Kyle: Is this something that we could work with staff on?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure, you can, and we can probably make it a date certain, but I think it's still something we'll want to see because we're talking a major concept change. I mean, the brick, or you put some other face, I think it makes quite a change.

Chair Furth: Let me ask my colleagues and the applicant, to what extent are you retaining the existing materials and painting them, and to what extent are you removing them and replacing them? On the two facades.

Mr. Kyle: To the extent that, from the top of the storefront to the base of the storefront, we're looking at either covering the existing brick at the locations where we're retaining the existing brick, or covering that with this wood element that we're seeing here. Or, we will be replacing that existing storefront with the wood elements, as well. Past that, everything above that, we're recommending mostly to be painted brick, or painted the corner [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: You're painting the existing brick, or you would be...?

Mr. Kyle: Painting the existing brick, yes.

Chair Furth: You would be retaining that.

Mr. Kyle: Yes.

Chair Furth: Which we like.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is it possible for you folks to address our reservations about the landscaping and possible seating at the front of the building? Is that something that we can expect to see coming back to us?

Mr. Kyle: Yes. We can definitely look at that, as well.

Mr. Smith: I know there had expressed some concerns about extending the patio seating out to the front. I'm not sure if (inaudible) indicated. This would be more of a waiting area.

Vice Chair Baltay: Absolutely. It's not dining area, it's not part of your facility. It's a public amenity.

Mr. Smith: Public. Okay, yeah, because increasing the patio out there created a security issue, to be able to maintain that. But as far as the seating was concerned, they had looked at the adjacent park area and thought it would be sufficient to provide any type of a waiting area. But, it sounds like maybe not in this

area, as it may potentially be an issue, but maybe some benches along that area provided on the property.

Chair Furth: Well, one of the things that I think is an issue, and I know there is a tension between the landlord and the master tenant, about the issue of having seating where you don't want it and having seating where we think you need it. And there is a consensus that you need more, that there's this big... First, there is an opportunity. The people are there, and they're leaning against trees, or they're sitting on the curb, or they're...And these are your employees and customers, and they need more seating. You have become so popular that what was originally provided is not enough. I think you have a lot of choices as to where to put it along that access. In my view, it doesn't necessarily have to be in that triangle. I think there's consensus on that. But, we need to see more. If not more, somewhere nearby.

Mr. Kyle: Understood, and we'll...

Chair Furth: And highly visible, I'm sure you're going to want, and beautiful, and all that. And then, I personally think you need to provide plants that triangulate between our standards that require that they be suitable for growing here, indigenous if possible, and provide good habitat. I think that some of the choices here could easily be made differently. We went through some of these, substituting some of these very particular plants out of an earlier proposal. They are popular with landscape architects.

Mr. Smith: And then, that's where this palate initially came from, is a past approval...

Chair Furth: Exactly.

[crosstalk]

Mr. Smith: ...taking that palate and [crosstalk]...

Chair Furth: We have moved the goal posts. Definitely.

Mr. Smith: Correct.

Chair Furth: We're putting a bigger emphasis on the fact that the plants we traditionally asked for are not thriving as well in our changing climate. That we are in more periods of prolonged drought, and as we become ever more urbanized, trying to keep our population of butterflies and birds and, to an occasion, bees, but they're...not honeybees by a restaurant. Need support, too.

Mr. Smith: Understood.

Mr. Kyle: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thanks. And, of course, you have that great big property with a lot of wonderful plants on it, so, you're an important resource for us all.

Mr. Kyle: Thank you so much.

Chair Furth: Would you like us to continue this to a date certain? What do you want to do, staff?

Mr. Owen: I think it depends on how much time the applicant requires to turn around another plan.

Chair Furth: When would you like to come back?

Mr. Kyle: I'll have to review with my design team.

Chair Furth: We could do a date uncertain, if you prefer.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, I think July 19th.

Chair Furth: Why don't we continue it to a date uncertain and you can re-advertise when you're sure what you're comfortable with. I don't think that should hold you up, right? (inaudible) staff.

Board Member Gooyer: And you can still work out the nearest possible date for you, but then it works for you, and you're not stuck with something in case something comes up.

Mr. Owen: Just as a reminder, the tentative calendar right now is pretty minimal right now in terms of the number of items that we have in the next couple of hearings. We would need to re-notice the application...

Board Member Gooyer: That's why we're saying a date uncertain is probably (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Maybe we should continue it to July 19th and bump it if necessary, because it could get caught up in the noticing deadline.

MOTION

Chair Furth: I would entertain a motion to continue this item to July 19th.

Board Member Gooyer: I move that we continue this to a date certain of July 19th.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: All those in favor, aye? It's approved.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 3-0.

Chair Furth: We'll see you on the 19th unless you talk with staff and pick another date. Thank you.

Mr. Kyle: One more item. Just confirm with the Board, is it the consensus that we do not want a Shake Shack logo of the burger on the trash door?

Chair Furth: You have a 2-to-1 split on that.

Board Member Gooyer: Theoretically, you might take a shot. There's going to be five of us, but...

Chair Furth: You know where two of us are.

Mr. Kyle: Right, sounds great.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Kyle: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Bye bye.

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

[The Board took a short break.]

4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3406 Hillview Avenue [17PLN-00438]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Site and Design Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing 62,500 Square Foot R&D Building and Construction of a new two-Story Approximately 82,030 Square Foot Office/R&D Building. This is a Designated Project Under the 2005 Mayfield Development Agreement. Environmental Assessment: An Addendum to the Mayfield Development Agreement Environmental Impact Report has Been Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: Research Park (RP-5(D)). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Graham Owen at Graham.Owen@CityofPaloAlto.org

Chair Furth: We are on agenda item number 4. This is a public hearing. It is quasi-judicial, so I'm going to ask you if you've had any external conversations. It's at 3406 Hillview Avenue, which is the corner of Hillview and Coyote, is that right? It's a request for approval of a site and design review to allow the demolition of an existing 62,500 square foot R&D building, and construction of a new two-story approximately 82,000 square foot office/R&D building. This is a project that makes use of Stanford's entitlements under the Mayfield Agreement of 2005, which limits the scope of our current review in ways that it wouldn't otherwise be limited. We have reviewed this project officially once before. The planner is Graham Owen. Any disclosures? Board members?

Vice Chair Baltay: The meeting we had yesterday, is that...?

Chair Furth: We had a staff meeting. We had a pre-meeting meeting with the staff, as we often do, in which they went through the agenda items with us, and they informed us that...What did they inform us? What did we learn that we didn't know?

Vice Chair Baltay: The landscape plan.

Chair Furth: Oh, we talked about the concept of a landscape reserve in calculating parking. I should also say I went up again and looked at the site yesterday, including the full-scale materials board. Has anybody else been up there recently?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I've been up there.

Chair Furth: Peter was up there, as well. It's very interesting to see it with the changing seasons and what happens to the hillsides, and the grasses, and what-not. Staff, please.

Graham Owen, Project Planner: Thank you, Chair Furth. I have a brief presentation, and then I'll turn it over to the applicant. As you mentioned, this is a Mayfield Development Agreement project sponsored by Stanford University. This is also a site and design review application. Typically, site and design review applications are reviewed by both the ARB, as well as the Planning and Transportation Commission, but, as this is a Mayfield project, the ARB is the only hearing entity, outside of an appeal to City Council. This is for an 82,030 square foot office R&D building, plus an additional 1,000 feet of traffic-mitigating FAR exempt floor area. It is subject to the Mayfield Development Agreement, as well as the EIR, and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan that was prepared as a component of that agreement. As you mentioned, this is the second hearing. The first hearing was last month, May 3rd. There were a couple general comments. There are more specific comments that were included in the staff report. The Board specifically focused on the open space and Hillside context, and also the representation of the landscaping, in particular in the upper area of the site. Also, one of the larger comments was the perspective of the frontage of the building, in particular from the corner of Coyote Hill and Hillview. The Board also recommended some changes to this other façade, which is this façade that's facing SAP, kind of interior lot line, so that it might be enhanced and also match the quality in general of the other facades. And then, also, one of the other things was visibility of the mechanical roof screen, which was located on the section of the roof that's closest to the intersection. There are comments about that. I'll go through it briefly. This is the site. The surrounding context: You have Coyote Hill to the west, SAP and a number of other office/R&D buildings to the south, VMware's campuses across Hillview from the site, and

then, PARC/Xerox is to the north. This is the proposed site plan. The building is located, again, at the intersection of Hillview and Coyote Hill. There is surface parking on the upper module as well as wrapping around to the back of the building. And then, there's one level of garage parking underneath the building. This is the updated perspective rendering from the corner intersection of Hillview and Coyote Hill Road. The previous rendering didn't show the trees that were proposed in this area, so this is a more representative rendering. Additionally, one of the bigger changes is the seating that's been added to the, the kind of platforms that break up the staircase. Here is a representation of the changes that have been made to the southern façade. The façade on the top is from the first hearing, the May 3rd hearing. Had a little more concrete forms. This second hearing, we're looking at the façade that's on the bottom. Has a little bit more spandrel and kind of a terracotta section. Also, a different mullion pattern, and just a larger use of the darker materials. This is a section drawing showing the mechanical screen and the perspectives from the public right-of-way on Coyote Hill and Hillview. As you can see, the mechanical screen has been dropped in total height by about three feet, a little bit over three feet, but the location is generally the same. One of our recommendations with this is to either relocate it so that the line of site from the right-of-way is more fully screened from these perspectives, or to lower it in those areas so that it's terraced. Key issues. Again, the Hillside context, I think is obviously the biggest concern or comment with this application. You have adjacent open space agricultural use. Also, even though this is a site and design review application, you have both the ARB findings as well as the site and design review objectives to meet with this application. With that, we do recommend approval of the project, but I know that there are probably some additional comments that have been raised, in particular at our pre-ARB meeting, which we should discuss further with the applicant. That concludes my presentation.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of staff before we hear from the applicant. If we could hear from the applicant, please.

Jason McCarthy, Studios Architecture: Thank you to the Board...

Chair Furth: Good morning.

Mr. McCarthy: Good morning.

Chair Furth: You have 10 minutes.

Mr. McCarthy: Thank you. My name is Jason McCarthy with Studios Architecture, and I'm happy to speak on behalf of the project. We really appreciated the dialog with all of you in our last hearing and we genuinely feel like we came away with a lot of great suggestions, and we feel we're coming back today with a much-improved project, a much richer project, for your feedback. We're going to focus the conversation on our responses and the rationale behind them, but just to reorient us all to the site again, we are located at a prominent corner, deep in the Research Park at Hillview Avenue and Coyote Hill Road. That Coyote Hill presence really was a major influence and an inspiration for our design team all the way through the project, and continues to be so today. In particular, as Graham mentioned, I think one of the major areas of our conversation in a previous hearing was this entry corner and this first impression of the site. I think you challenged us to really increase the amenity and the comfort of that stair and make the site more a place to be occupied and to be enjoyed, not just something that we're passing through. Gary, do you want to add to that?

Gary Laymon, Guzzardo Partnership: We really took your suggestions to heart in looking at this as more of a people space, not just a transition space, but really a place to be able to linger. As a result, we've reoriented the space, we've enhanced the materials, we created seating, wood furniture with sustainable wood that can be durable, with backs and armrests, so it's really very comfortable. Shade by virtue of the oak trees that we have in that area; comfortable lighting; enhanced paving material. It really feels like a very warm, inviting space. This actually occurs in an area where we happened to have a lot of the plants, which are really featured as a part of our biological input relative to birds and bees, and to really enhance the native qualities of the site and be able to celebrate those kind of interactions with nature.

Mr. McCarthy: The landings were really embellished upon and the pavers are accent materials that are representative and analogous to what we're using at the main entry plaza, so really trying to create these intermediate landings as new destinations within the site. You also asked us to consider where the stair should land at the top of the site. This is something we've considered very carefully, and we certainly recognize the importance of that. But, I think we never really fully addressed that concern, or explained it well. Part of the justification for why we landed where we have at the top of the stair is because we want that stair to really address the full network of the pedestrian connectivity on the site. It needs to allow people to find their way both the front door if they're a first-time visitor coming off of a bus, or if it's an employee coming in at the eastern entry, they have an equal sense of access and direction. We feel that corner position makes the most sense, but it also, we think, has the benefit of really connecting in a more logical way to either direction of travel. It also connects into the stair up to the significant elevated platform or deck area that you see in the upper-right image. This view of the project is a little bit of a birds-eye perspective, but you're looking into that eastern plaza area, and I don't think we really illustrated that well before. It's articulated, it has architectural cues and wayfinding, scale and massing, a certain level of detail that we think is celebratory of that as a primary entry, as well as the front door. We're still recommending that the stair terminate at that front corner location for those reasons. The other area that you asked us to look at very carefully was this south façade. We took all that to heart, as well. I think what we've come back with is a much more appropriate level of detail, a level of scale in terms of the composition, and really bringing this façade into the diagram for the whole project. We really talked about this project being a composition of geometries intersecting, having some dynamism in that intersection, and the composition of those pieces. In a sense, I think you had challenged us to make this more so like the other elevations. We feel like we've done that. We've used these wood volumes to interlock a bit more into the terra cotta volume, and as Graham mentioned, we've added that wooden spandrel to really draw that line across the project and have a larger scale composition, we think. That also is complemented with a little bit further detail and articulation of the window lines. We've added an additional horizontal sun shade at all of the windows here. That adds another level of articulation to the façade that we think, on reflection, we found was a bit flat in the previous version. In doing that, I think we've addressed many of your comments, and also enhanced our sustainability performance and daylight control for it. We feel that that has deeply enriched this side of the building. Coming back to the conversation about the roof screen location. This is something that we have studied very carefully and considered from the project's outset, and again, as you see in this updated rendering, the height of that roof screen is lowered substantially. Still somewhat visible, but we think very well screened by the trellis and by virtue of the fact that the roof screen is set back fairly politely from the roof edge. You can see on these sight line drawings, there is some visibility, but again, we think it is an appropriate element and not ostentatious or overwhelming the image of the building. I think, again, we maybe didn't really explain the design intent well enough in our previous demonstration of the project. Again, this is part of our composition, it's part of the architectural composition of the façade. We think that it's complementing this sort of energy and dynamism that will attract innovation clients and tenants to this type of building. Its position is purposeful in its composition, and we're treating that very carefully. We think it's a successful balance of these intersections and overlaps and so forth. But, there are other functional rationale, as well, certainly not the least of which is the optimization for photovoltaics. We're really being challenged by Stanford -- and we love that challenge -- to really begin to make buildings highly productive for photovoltaic solar production for energy. In this position, we feel the project has a better capacity for that photovoltaic array. A third element to add is that it's positioned in a way that the shafts that would come down from this roof screen enclosure, as well as any major duct crossings, can avoid that central double-height space. If you remember, that glassy spine and the double-height space, we have a large opening in the second floor. All of that is at the center of the building to bring daylight in and really, again, have this social heart for a culture of collaboration, a culture of innovation. All of this is really possible in terms of the scale of this roof screen by virtue of having a very efficient, highly energy-efficient building. We have a highly energy-efficient envelope and high-efficiency HVAC units, which have actually led us to having approximately 50 percent of the area of a traditional office building of this scale. The actual enclosure area is substantially reduced from what you might see on many of the other buildings in the Research Park. That's also amplified by the fact that we're doing a cantilevered structural design for the roof screen elements. The walls are cantilevered out rather than having a kicker element, so that's allowing us to really constrain the area of this volume. But, nonetheless, we actually think that

volume is complementary to the elevation and to the design. While on this slide, I'll shift into the conversation about bird-friendly design. I don't think staff brought that up again, but it was something that we talked about and we are considering very deeply in the design. We did add or increase the amount of what we feel are those strategies suggested by the San Francisco bird ordinance and Audubon Society guidelines, strategies that include areas of fritted glass, ornamentation on the building such as the horizontal sun shades, solid components, particularly solid construction near the corners of the building where birds might be more likely to try and shortcut, and a number of other elements of the design that adds to this as an overall, what we feel is a very bird-friendly design. Certainly at the south, being more solid helps to offset the portions of the building that are more glassy.

Mr. Laymon: Briefly, I'd like to go through some of the aspects of the landscape design that you mentioned before.

Chair Furth: Excuse me. That's your 10 minutes. How much more do you think you need to complete this.

Mr. Laymon: Three and a half?

Chair Furth: See if you can do it in three.

Mr. Laymon: All right. Do my best. One of the things that was very influential...It's interesting you mentioned the seasonal quality, how you were experiencing that. That was very important in terms of looking at how the landscape design worked overall. A lot of the renderings depict the site as being very green because that's sort of traditional to how things get rendered. But, in reality, the landscape is really going to be transition with the nature, with the hillside. A lot of diversity within the parking lots in particular. It's not a typical grid or an orchard of trees that you would see on many projects, but it has a hierarchy of landscape. You can see there's a street tree that's highlighted here in red. A great diversity of plant material within the parking lot, which will give it a sense of softness. I think that, in addition to the organic nature of the parking lot itself, will also give it some softer qualities. The landscape design incorporates all the good circulation measures we've been talking about to make it a very pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment, and really connect people to the site, make it very clean and efficient. Very rich material palette has been used throughout. And, like we said, many native species that were really enhanced by virtue of our conversations with Stanford's biologist, to really create not just a visual connection, but an actual habitat connection back to the surrounding open space areas. We've also studied the biotreatment areas and looking at that as an opportunity to be able to help celebrate our story about how we're treating water. Incorporating stones into that, which are kind of used throughout the landscape design, which was a nice feature back to the open space. We also looked at the views to the parking area relative to Coyote. It's a very important view area. In this plan here, you can see we're using substantial size plant material to help buffer that view from the street passing by. You can see in the texture of the planting, again, very soft, organic forms of really nice mixture of plant materials to create a softened feeling there. You get a real strong buffer to those parking areas off of Coyote Hill versus what we have today. I think that's been very successful. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I had a question about circulation diagram L6.0. It identifies the PARC Café and the VMware Café. Are they open? Going to be open to the tenants of this building?

Mr. McCarthy: Yes, they are.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Good cuing from the audience there.

Mr. McCarthy: I knew that.

Chair Furth: Could support staff, could (inaudible). All right, thank you. Before you leave, do my colleagues have questions they'd like answered? Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: Maybe through the Chair. We had discussed in that meeting yesterday about a landscape...?

Chair Furth: Okay. Thank you. We will bring it back up to staff. Anything staff wants to add before we deliberate up here and begin to ask more questions?

Mr. Owen: Nothing.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I'm going to take advantage of our small numbers today and I'm going to go with my comments first. As far as I can tell -- and I defer to my colleagues who read plans better than I do and are less seduced by pretty drawings -- to me, the southern façade looks much improved and quite acceptable. I think they're agreeing with me on that one, so you can tick that one off your box of things to do. My concern is that we appreciate the fact that you have a significant amount of underground parking, and that that's what we're going to have in terms of underground parking. But, we have a new Comprehensive Plan, which is even more aware of how dire our straits are with respect to the viability of this plan. It is a place for humans to reside. And we have a transportation element that really emphasizes the need to get out of our individual cars and use other approaches for mobility. It says that Stanford operates a terrific TDM program for its academic center, and that it is working on a program for the Research Park -- and I think you mentioned that in passing yourselves. And, it sets some goals. I actually put little sticky things in here, if I can find it. On page 79 it says that we're going to do more transportation demand management, and we're going to have a goal of 30 percent reduction in the Stanford Research Park of single-occupant vehicle trips. And, as you all pointed out, and you designed this site, it's got a lot of good support. I mean, the bad thing about the Research Park is it is a 50's model of computers whirring in the woods, and everybody driving to get to them. That creates a lot of problems in transportation, in housing, and global warming. This building, Graham, this building is one parking space per 350 square feet?

Mr. Owen: That's correct.

Male?: Three hundred.

Chair Furth: Three hundred.

Mr. Owen: Sorry, did you say 3,000?

Chair Furth: Even worse. I don't know what your rule of thumb is for how many people you expect here, but we're providing something not far off from a parking space per employee. What would you say?

Mr. Owen: That's what it would come out to. Pretty close, yeah.

Chair Furth: Yeah. That's excessive if we're trying to get the significant kind of reduction. We have not adopted lower parking standards. I mean, the other thing from our point of view is, your projects are always really interesting for us because you do not have a lot of neighbors who are going to be inconvenienced if there is parking overflow. You're the opposite of trying to fit something in downtown. But, we do have the notion of a landscape reserve, which says that as long as you've shown us where you could put the parking if you needed all of it, don't build it all now. This feeds into my second issue, which is the way that this site currently addresses -- is next to -- the open space, and the way it would be if you develop it as you're proposing here. I spent a lot of time tromping around in the high, dry grass, trying to figure out where the edge of the proposed parking lot would be in relationship to the existing imported Spanish grasses, and the fence line up there. My perception is that even with your thoughtful use of plants over in the corner, this is going to be a significant loss, and that you're going to trade a soft edge to that open space for a whole lot of parked cars, and that's not a good deal. So, I would like to explore the idea of addressing those related problems, that this is too much parking for this building if it's going to meet the standards to which Stanford and we aspire in terms of vehicle usage and the encroachment, the ever-getting-closer, to this edge. Which, right now, in its own somewhat funky way,

works. One interesting thing about this design -- and I'm certainly not going to propose you change it -- is that for all the lovely work you've done to get us from the corner of Coyote and Hillview, the main building entrance is a parking lot entrance. It's a car entrance. And I don't think in the future we're going to be seeing that so much. I'm hoping that if I work my way up the staircase from the bus stop, I'm going to be able to go into the secure employee entry and not have to walk all the way around the building. This is not something that I'm proposing that you change now, but I'm thinking we're going to look at differently when we look at future proposals. Those are my opening thoughts.

Board Member Gooyer: My question then is, are you talking about requiring something at this point?

Chair Furth: I'm suggesting that we explore the possibility of being a landscape reserve. I don't know that we have the power to require it, but I'd certainly like to work with the applicant to consider it, see what their constraints and desires are. When we get the full board here to finish this project off, we see if that's a possibility. I don't know if we have authority to require it. I suppose we could, on the grounds that we can't otherwise meet our standards of compatibility with the Comprehensive Plan. But, I think you need a lot more arithmetic before you come to that conclusion.

Mr. Owen: If I may, just to answer that question about requirement. Landscape reserve in our code is a method for the director to adjust the required parking. It typically is something that you'd see an applicant offer, and then, that is considered by the Board and approved by the director. That's the typical way in which [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: And I'm suggesting that even as we used to use level of service as our circulation metric and now we use vehicle miles traveled, maybe we should be using it more tactically and strategically. I have no idea what I meant by that, but what I'm trying to say is use it. Assume that it is better to have as little parking as possible but meets the uses of the building, rather than, fine, extra parking? We're all for it.

Vice Chair Baltay: I've been struggling with this building, and I spent quite a bit of time last Saturday, walking this site, trying to get under its skin, thinking about it. It's a beautiful piece of architecture, and it's a high-quality landscaped design. Why am I just not really ecstatic about it? And I think it gets to the root of what Wynne is talking about, that this is so much still an auto-centric mindset on this building. One thing I notice when I'm out there is that there is a lot of pedestrian traffic. One thing I notice around Palo Alto is that we're changing so fast to a group of people who don't just use our cars all the time. We have bicycles, and buses, and Ubers, and electric scooters -- It goes on and on and on. If any place is going to embrace that, it's Palo Alto. The Research Park especially. You're full of employees, people who want to embrace that. And yet, the building doesn't do it. So, I put it to you that you need to have a pedestrian connection to that street corner, where the people come, where the arrival is. That pedestrian connection needs to go to someplace important in the building. It needs to link to a door, to an entrance. It needs to do it visually with something on the façade. It needs to do it practically. It's hot out there, so you're not walking up a staircase and then 200 feet along a building because you don't have a badge to get in the employee entrance. It needs to celebrate and bring you to a front door. The design also needs to say this is an important corner. This is where you're arriving from. I think what's missing is the recognition that that is going to be the way the building is perceived more and more, as people don't arrive in a car. That's the corner they're coming from -- Coyote and Hillview there. Everybody starts their journey into this building from that corner. Boy, it feels like it's just a second-thought, still. You've done a great job landscaping that staircase. I'd love to have it in my back yard. It's really beautiful. But it's not the entrance to a world-class research facility in a world-class part of the country. Everything we're doing here is fantastic, and this is still sneaking up to the corner, and as the architect explained, we couldn't decide if we go to the front or the employee entrance, so we split the difference. We don't want you to split the difference. We want you to celebrate the entrance to the building, and to really come to the middle of it. That's sort of a fundamental conceptual problem I've been struggling with on this building, that it just isn't relating outward the way I think it needs to. The second thing I feel even more strongly about is the fact that you have this incredible open space up Coyote Hill. It's stunning, and it's fewer and fewer spaces we have, and we're trying to hard to preserve and celebrate that. I was bothered last time by the landscaping, that the coloring of the renderings make it look like there's a golf course next to a

wild space. I'll grant you, that's not the case. It's very sensitively done landscape architecture. But, putting a parking lot within a couple feet of that, with a retaining wall to make the grades work and stuff, really is the problem. That parking lot needs to be 30 or 40 feet away from that, so that the landscaping has room to flow, to become part of that open space. It's just a core problem that we're creating large amounts of surface parking right up to the edge of an open space preserve. I find that's just a fundamental flaw in the design. That parking lot should not be there. You should have additional space to let the building gradually transition into this precious open space. I think Wynne pointed out the arguments with the Comprehensive Plan, why this is, in a sense, too much parking. You can see what it's doing to the building. I think the findings we have to make, or the recommendations regarding ecological balance on the site design, also support what I'm saying. The building is just not balanced in its relation to the open space, and the cause is the parking lot. I'll leave it at that for this moment.

Board Member Gooyer: You know, it's interesting that you say that because I was thinking the same thing, that luckily, the way this thing is designed, there are entrances on both sides, but they are stressing the parking lot side, if you want to call it. But, I could even justify it more making that the main entrance if, as you said, that parking lot was gone. The thought was, that main entrance overlooks the hill. Then it's a little bit more of a rationale as to, that's why we made this the front entry.

Vice Chair Baltay: The hillside is so beautiful.

Board Member Gooyer: Exactly.

Vice Chair Baltay: It's stunning, how gorgeous that...From the front door of this building, if you weren't looking across a parking lot, it's to die for. I mean, it's every millionaire's dream to live in a place like that.

Chair Furth: Billionaire's, Peter. Billionaire. Any other comments, Robert? How do you feel about the south façade?

Board Member Gooyer: The south façade is a tremendous improvement over what it was the last go-around. All in all, other than this whole parking issue, which we've all struggled with a bit, I think it's come a great deal...Or, I should say it's improved a great deal, so, at this point, I could probably approve it on the architecture of the building.

Chair Furth: How about the roof screen element?

Board Member Gooyer: I like the revised screen. I'm fine with it.

Chair Furth: Okay. And I don't particularly have a problem with it. I did have a question. One of the issues that we've dealt with recently is what happens to a building when you add photovoltaics. I can't remember. On this one, do we have a drawing of what that would look like?

Mr. McCarthy: Give me a second to find it. There is a roof plan.

Chair Furth: I know there's a roof plan, but I mean a perspective, an elevation, a rendering.

Mr. McCarthy: Sorry, no, we don't have that illustrated.

Chair Furth: That has turned out to be really important on the buildings, as you've heard...I don't know when you came this morning, but in the buildings we look at, these are becoming almost standard features of larger structures. They often make the buildings more beautiful, and then sometimes, in the case of the City's own efforts, they make them even worse. I'm not referring to the downtown garage. We think they look better. The building is finished by the photovoltaics. I think for this level of design, it's important to have an idea of what you have in mind.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree, I agree. Again, like I said, I don't want to sit there and design it for you, but I think because it's become a much bigger issue, I mean, we've all run through that thing where we've left it to the subcontractor to put up the panels, and all of a sudden, you walk in and it's like, oh, my God, they've ruined the whole concept or design of the building by doing whatever they ended up doing.

Mr. McCarthy: There is a small photovoltaic array as a Phase 1 installation, and that is proposed to be the ballasted style, which is a very low-profile.

Board Member Gooyer: You're wanting to see it.

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, if you're familiar with...

Board Member Gooyer: Okay, well, that's ...

Chair Furth: All you need to do is describe it to us.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: Obviously, if that's the attempt, based on the screens that are there, you'll never see it, then we don't have a problem with it. But some of them...

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, yeah, we're not doing the stanchions and the...

Board Member Gooyer: Okay, okay.

Chair Furth: You're not doing a carport on top. Right. We need to be sure it's part of the record and part of what we understand so that that will be clear to us all in the future. I'm probably a little easier to...I don't know how much parking could or should be removed. Of course, I would love it if the building flowed into, you know, you could look up the hillside, and I'm sure from Stanford's point of view, we've preserved the hillside, now you want another 40 feet? But, I do think that what is proposed is too close. I would like to know from staff what options we can offer them. Of course, good to talk to the applicant and find out what might or might not be attractive to them. It is a building that opens in both directions and I presume can be programmed flexibly, depending on how uses evolve. It's taken us 15 years to get this Comprehensive Plan, as opposed to the 10 it's supposed to, and now we're actually reading it, and it calls on us to change.

Mr. Owen: To your point about the landscape preserve and what we can require, I can take a little bit out of the code, Section 18.52.050, which is our parking and loading standards, and in particular, allowable parking adjustments. Again, it would need to be something that's offered by the applicant and is reviewed by the Board and approved by the Director. In terms of what the upper limits are...

Chair Furth: There are existing rules. Before we get around to changing them to implement the plan, what could we offer?

Mr. Owen: The absolute maximum would be a 50 percent deferral, which...

Chair Furth: That would take care of all service parking, I think.

Mr. Owen: Right. I think one of the things, in looking at a landscape reserve, we need to look at what are the operating characteristics that are proposed with the initial tenant, which I don't believe they've selected a tenant at this point. Landscape reserves is one of these ideas where you don't necessarily know what the occupancy is going to be, and therefore, what the parking demand is going to be, at least at the outset.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Owen: If it's an R&D use with heavier equipment and fewer people, that's different from more of an office tenant, for example, you're cramming in...

Chair Furth: R&D, when it's all done, staring at computer screens.

Mr. Owen: Right.

Chair Furth: Well, I think it would be very helpful to us to know what the range of possible things is. I'd like to see a sketch of what various reductions would look like. I know traditionally, being able to offer a lot of parking has been a good thing for landlords. That's going to have to change. It's going to have to be offering other things. For our next meeting, that would be very helpful. Anything else we want to say before we continue this to whenever you want it continued, when we have a full board?

Mr. Owen: If I may, it might be worth...

[crosstalk]

Mr. Owen: ...hearing from the applicant about the idea of the landscape reserve.

Chair Furth: I think we have an applicant (inaudible).

Tiffany Griego, Stanford Research Park: Good morning. My name is Tiffany Griego, managing director of Stanford Research Park. I'd like to comment a little bit on our TDM program. We formed a Research Park Transportation Management Association several years ago. We staffed it with two full-time employees, and we have five consultants. It is an extremely well-staffed effort and we are deeply committed to it. In many respects, the goals that the City of Palo Alto shares that are articulated in the comp plan are our goals, as well, and you're clearly articulating them today. We want to see our TDM efforts be extremely successful. We work very hard with the members of our TMA to create a series of incentives to draw people out of their cars. Carrots and sticks is an approach that a lot of people hope to take, but we have never really faced a situation that we're facing today, where we have deliberately reduced parking as a stick approach to encouraging people to ride transit. It's an interesting new frontier we're going to have to talk about because we want to see the reduction that you want to see. I'll comment on this back RP-5 District. It officially takes about 25 minutes to ride a Marguerite shuttle from the University Avenue station to this part of the Research Park, and we have heard a fair amount of complaints from people that it just takes too long. It's not a last mile. It's close to three miles. It is well served by transit, like we talked about last time, but I'm trying to give a little bit of a context as to what we face back here. Now, because there are so many large-scale employers that seem drawn to that pastoral back corner, it's VMware, it's Tesla, SAP and Xerox Park. They happen to be the ones that are most committed to working with us on transportation programs. You have this unique issue where it's far away in location and it's somewhat painful to get back there in duration, but you have a strong commitment. So, those companies tend to have the lowest SOV rates of all the companies in the Research Park. It's just an interesting dynamic back there. We are hopeful that we can secure a tenant for this building -- we don't have one yet -- and that they can leverage this strong partnership that these companies have collaborated to run private long-distance shuttles to and from San Jose, San Francisco, and really make sure that this building links in, this tenant links into that system. That is our hope. We don't have a tenant yet. I also want to add a little bit of context because another part of my capacity in this role is making sure there is a strong strategy around curating the buildings that we bring to the Research Park market. As you know, we don't control everything. But, curating them with a very strategic mix of tenants. Turning now to our goals around tenancy, we have been in discussions with former mayor Pat Burt and current vice-mayor Eric Filseth to try and identify a strategy for bringing more life science and biotech to the Research Park. At our peak, we were 45 percent, and now we're six percent, so we've lost our standing in that particular segment. They drive less, or they occupy buildings at a different density. Everyone knows that, and that's kind of the appeal of that particular sector. Another initiative that we've been talking about with the City,

largely due to the fact that there's a point of sale associated with Tesla, is this automotive tech-mobility industry, so we've worked hard to bring them to the Research Park. They are ready-made partners for our TDM program, so that's an exciting initiative, as well. In that, we've noticed that the car companies, they drive. They drive. And they also use the parking lots to park some of the R&D. We can't yet predict the utility of the parking lot, and we want to do the right thing, but we stand before you today with a bit of uncertainty around who is coming here. In terms of options that we would think about today and want to propose, and really see if we could get concurrence today instead of coming back to another meeting, we were thinking we could enhance the amenity space to the five percent rule of thumb that the City, I think, has been increasingly embracing. We have 1,000 square feet of amenity space proposed, but we can go up to something like -- I'm rounding -- 4,000 feet. And we feel comfortable doing that. That deletes 10 parking spaces right off the bat. They would not even be in landscape reserve. And then, we were thinking that the area of concern as it relates to the transition to the open space is the new impervious surface, that this current plan we've proposed encroaches beyond the existing parking lot that already is there. I think someone has a diagram that shows before and after -- "after" being this plan -- and there's a delta in terms of impervious surface that you can see when that plan is shown. Blue is now, what we're proposing... I mean, not what I'm about to propose, but what is before you today, is blue. Red is the existing circulation. We've counted the number of spaces that are kind of net-new in terms of impervious surface near that corner and it equals 26. If we change the amenity space and delete the need for 10, we'd be comfortable putting the other 16 -- for a total of 26 -- into a landscape reserve. And, we were talking with Graham about, how does landscape reserve work? We don't have experience with it in recent years. We don't know that there are other folks in the Research Park who have it. Well, in recent years. I think it's kind of a legacy thing. One issue that I just want to be honest about is...

Chair Furth: We do it with your tenants.

Ms. Griego: You do?

Chair Furth: We're doing it currently with another building.

Ms. Griego: I understand that. I heard that. I wasn't aware of that. I don't have recent experience with it. If a company like Tesla approached us three or four months from now, after today's approval, if you will, of a landscape reserve, how do we then have them speak for themselves in the process, to potentially deploy those 16 spaces? That's a question that I would like to ask because I think I don't totally understand. But, our intentions would be to not put that parking in the rotation. It would cost money to obviously convert that into 16 parking spaces. It wouldn't be our goal. It would just be if they raised a concern. I'm just using them as a hypothetical. That's a little bit of what we would like to query back in order to hopefully conclude this issue today in a way that feels...

Male?: (inaudible)

Ms. Griego: Oh, okay. Yeah. Anyway, I'll leave it at that. I'm available to answer any other questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Ms. Griego. Question, Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: Let me...

Mr. McCarthy: This is a quick illustration of where that 26 could pull back. That would open up quite a bit that transition.

Chair Furth: Where is the existing parking lot?

Mr. McCarthy: The red lines represent the... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: That's what I thought.

[crosstalk]

Mr. McCarthy: There's a bunch of dilapidated structures and the old volleyball court up there.

Chair Furth: Yeah, and the picnic tables. Okay, that's the existing paved, paving roads, approaches. And the blue is your present proposal. And we don't have a sketch of what a slightly-reduced...

Mr. McCarthy: Sorry. The dashed line represents what was in the submittal package, and the solid blue at the southern edge is now the new proposal on the table, of reducing 26 spaces.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Board Member Gooyer: I look at it a little differently, in that seeing as though you say you don't have a tenant yet, it's a little different if you landscape-bank -- whatever you want to call it -- don't put in a big chunk of the parking lot, and then you get a tenant. This is a desirable place to take your company, and you want to be in this area. When you come in, you begin to see, this is the parking spaces that I have, and you adjust accordingly. If you show someone, here, you could have another 200 parking spaces, but, you know, it's your option whether you want them or not, not too many people are going to say, you know, yes, I agree, I'll just get rid of them. Now, if you already had a tenant and you promised them 400 parking spaces -- whatever the number is -- and then, you come back and say, well, we're only allowed to give you 300 now, they'd be upset. If you come in and you say, here's the space you have, and you have 300 parking spaces, and they don't know about the extra 100 parking spaces, so to speak, I don't think it's going to be as big a detriment on your sale-ability or lease-ability of the space. In another municipality, we had two situations where we talked about landscape banking. The council I was on was very divided at that point, but we went ahead and we did it on both cases, and to this point, no one has ever come back and questioned it or asked about it. In fact, we've had comments about, why were they able to have all that nice landscaping? They don't think about the parking so much, but it's just, wow, look at all the nice landscaping. That sort of that thing. And I'm not saying that that's a guaranteed situation. We looked at two particular items where it was, you know, real iffy. We have to start somewhere. That's always the problem with this. It's that first step. It's the first person that gives it a shot, or the first company that gives it a shot, and it's not like if we do it that way, you'll never be able to get the, let's say the 100 parking spaces back. If it becomes very obvious that it becomes an issue, you haven't spent the money to do the parking lot anyway, so it's not like you're paying double for that piece of development. I look at it that way.

Chair Furth: Okay. We have two questions we need to address. One is whether we want the whole Board to consider this project. I'm afraid the answer is yes. We think you need -- I hesitate to say this -- the wisdom of all five of us on this project. We're mindful that this is a Mayfield project, and we're mindful that we're all trying to do the right thing here. We're mindful that we're competing with Detroit and south San Francisco for tenants. You are. This looks to me like it could be a significant improvement. I can't understand it all yet, but it does look better. I think we are going to continue this item. Peter, what would you like to add?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm just going to say no, I don't think it's a significant improvement. I think it's a marginal improvement, and I think that entire upper parking lot just shouldn't be there. I want to be crystal clear. If I had to vote right now, I would vote no to the entire project. I think fundamentally it's flawed. Maybe Wynne's going to make it so we don't vote today, which is to your benefit. But, I think if we were to say we're just going to have the entire upper parking lot put in a landscape reserve, you might be able to sway some votes.

Chair Furth: Well, I think that we don't know enough to make informed decisions today. I think that there are a number of possibilities, that we've got a number of responsibilities, as does Stanford, and we should continue this to a date certain or uncertain, depending on what you want.

Mr. McCarthy: Can I ask a point of clarification?

Chair Furth: Sure.

Mr. McCarthy: If we do continue to a future date, do we have your general consensus around the architecture? I think Board Member Gooyer supported it. Will we be revisiting the full design with the full Board?

Chair Furth: I think...Well, the short answer is, yes, because there's five of us, and they are entitled to vote as they wish. I think the three of us think you did a great job on this southern exposure, so you've already got three votes out of five, so you've got that one. And, you have a 2-1 split on the roof screen, with Board Member Baltay not supporting the present arrangement...?

Vice Chair Baltay: I don't support the roof screen the way it is now, no.

Chair Furth: Right.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think that could be easily changed.

Chair Furth: That's right. You probably have a better recollection of what our other board members said at the last meeting than I do, because I'm sure you parsed it carefully.

Mr. McCarthy: I think the primary issue that we're particularly concerned with is the commentary around the entry. I think it's been intertwined with the discussion about parking. I just want to be clear that we're trying to address a very complex site that has many faces. There is no backside, as we've talked to this project. And, the accessibility from pedestrians is vital to the project. We totally agree with that. What we're struggling with is we need ADA parking, and that has to be near the front door, and so does the elevator. So, when we looked at this very early, we studied alternates for how to position the building. The traditional role is put it in the middle of a sea of parking and have an apron of parking between the building and the street. As a compromise to that, we have this split entry, which we think is a successful compromise. We think that it gives you the benefit of pedestrian activity on the site, invites a lot of use of the site, but also has a very comfortable access from pedestrians coming off of Coyote Hill. The grades are much more pleasant there. And, it's addressing that front door need, which is very much celebrating the view of Coyote Hill, which we really want to celebrate and cherish. Where I hope to have a majority support is around not redesigning or repositioning the whole building to start over. I haven't heard any suggestion of how to address this conundrum of having a site which is accessible from every angle.

Vice Chair Baltay: Why can't the stair come to the, what I presume is the employee entrance, the other end of the front entrance? You're talking about a main central space where you celebrate diversity, etc. Why can't that be a second front door?

Mr. McCarthy: That's something we talked about as a possible compromise, is to add an additional pathway [crosstalk]...

Vice Chair Baltay: I mean, it seems to me, if the stair went to that other entrance spot, which is what you see, you address all the things I'm talking about.

Ms. Griego: May I ask for you to point out...?

Chair Furth: The (inaudible).

Ms. Griego: I'm not following.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree. I mean, I think there's a definite front side and a back side to this building. You can see it just by the architecture. I'm having a hard time finding a straight-on view of the, quote, secondary...

Chair Furth: Employee entrance?

Board Member Gooyer: ...or employee entrance. You see it on a 45-degree angle, but I really don't see anything that shows me exactly where...

Mr. McCarthy: Sorry. We added that into this... [crosstalk]

Board Member Gooyer: I mean, that tells me right there that...

Vice Chair Baltay: Right there.

Board Member Gooyer: Okay, that's, well, I mean, it's a partial one. It's definitely not to the same quality of the other one, but it could easily be made as such. That's the benefit with that. That's why I looked at it initially, that if you remove the point that says "main entry" and work it so that, with some slight modification of the stairway, I agree that it could be a two-sided... And that would eliminate the concern that this Board has. And who knows? Maybe people in the future won't use it at that, but if someone comes up on their scooter, or their bicycle, or walks, they don't feel like they're going into the back door, that they're actually going in the front door. Like I said, you've come a long way at making that look like a second one. It just takes a little bit more.

Chair Furth: I can only speak for myself. When approaching a number of buildings in the Research Park, if you're not part of the elect, if you don't always do it, that can be very confusing. You get a lot of signs saying walk around the building, and then you wander through the corporation yard, and then you get to another sign that says Do Not Enter. That's part of what is important, is to know, where am I welcome? Where am I heading to? Where am I not going into somebody's back yard? I do not envision a redesign of the building in any kind of large way, or re-situating it. I do understand that the Americans with Disabilities Act requires that access be to a front door and not a less-attractive door, that that's one of its principles. You don't have to come in through the back. But I don't think that stands in the way of what we're talking about. And while I don't want to see buildings in the future which are quite so car-oriented, this is a building in process, and I have different standards for this one. Maddening as this all may be for you. I'm not asking for a major redesign. And I don't also require a flight of stairs straight up from Hillview.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree.

Chair Furth: That's not inviting. That's intimidating. But, it would be good to know where I'm going when I get there, and have it read as welcome to our building.

Mr. McCarthy: Can I offer a possible middle ground there, in hopes of having some clarity on direction for where we might go from here? There is, in the revised design, we've embellished a landing here, sort of midway in the ramp, if you can see the cursor here. In terms of desire lines across the site, you're sort of likely to either be going to the bus at this corner, across to other sites beyond, or you're likely to be going up the hill, up along Hillview Avenue. One thought is to enhance this landing further, make it another of our bench seating terraces and have a stair connecting down from that eastern plaza. It doesn't necessarily have to go all the way through to Hillview because I don't think that really lands you anywhere particular. But, I think adding that would, again, reinforce this as a significant access point to the building.

Chair Furth: Any responses?

Board Member Gooyer: I agree. Like I said, they don't have to be equal, but right now, the building definitely has a front and a back.

Mr. McCarthy: Yes. And operationally, with high technology clients and companies, there's always going to be a front door, and usually they want it to be as small as possible. And then, the elite few who are deigned entrance really get to have their play.

Chair Furth: I think we have said as much as we can say. You know, clearly we don't have consensus up here. We're not unanimous in our views, but I think we're unanimous in our goals, which are a minimum of parking, in terms of both what you're entitled to and what you need. And, more space between the edge of your property abutting the open space and development. The other things that these wrap-around parking things do is they deal with fire, and you're next to an open space. The asphalt is part of the barrier. The cars aren't, usually. If you've ever been to Taniha [phonetic], you know, the reason Taniha sits in a sea of parking lot is because that's their first-degree buffer in fire. I don't know what else we could say, except that very much appreciate your ability to generate useful and informative graphics for us, and seeing very clearly from staff or the applicant what a reduced...I mean, Peter is saying move it all, so one of the calculations I want to know is, how many parking spaces is that? So we'll know if it's even possible. If it's not...Whatever the answer is, then how many parking spaces could we remove to get significantly better, to not encroach on the existing, introduced, but not viewed as native grasses.

Board Member Gooyer: Rather than stating a number, I'd like to see them redevelop that area and see what...

Chair Furth: See what happens.

Board Member Gooyer: ...you could do as far as saving, you know, tightening that area up. Rather than just saying you've got 30 percent, or 20 percent....

Chair Furth: I have no idea.

Board Member Gooyer: ...or whatever the case is, is that, you know, make it so it's viable for you to have a lane of double-sided parking, basically, (inaudible) parking right up to what you're now calling your main entry, but not include that whole area in the back. Now, whether you get some parking over near the street, that's one thing, but it still keeps it away from the field that's there.

Chair Furth: Okay. I think we've probably done as much as we can do in terms of clarity? Do you want to say more, Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: I would like to see a change to the stair in the front to what you call the employee entrance and do something about the parking. Then you would have my support. You want clarity. I think that's clear.

Ms. Griego: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Mr. Owen: If I may, we have the option, of course, of deferring this item to a date certain or uncertain.

Chair Furth: What's the applicant's preference?

Mr. Owen: We could ask them. I know that the ARB meeting on the 5th of July -- that's coming up rather quickly -- we only have one item on that, and it's also a Research Park project that's similar in terms of the size. It might be. It has landscape reserve...

Chair Furth: It has a landscape reserve.

Mr. Owen: ...questions, so it might be good or bad to have that on the same date.

Chair Furth: Whatever the applicant would like.

Ms. Griego: We think that project is very different than this, so...

Chair Furth: Oh, it is.

Ms. Griego: ...probably not related.

Chair Furth: It is. It just uses the same legal technique.

Ms. Griego: For different reasons. What would be another date beyond July 5th? A lot of us are not here, we just realized.

Mr. Owen: The 19th, and then August 2nd, are the next available dates.

Chair Furth: We have a pretty open calendar.

Ms. Griego: Do you know who would be in attendance? Will you have the full five on the 19th? [No audible response.] Okay. That date works. We're here. July 19th. Yes. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Anything else?

Erik Sueberkrop, Studios Architecture: Yeah, hi. Erik Sueberkrop with Studios Architecture.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, could you spell your second name for the transcriber.

Mr. Sueberkrop: [spells name] Can we put on the site plan again? We're doing a lot of work with high-tech folks now, Google, and Facebook, and others, and some of them are renovations of buildings which have multiple entries. We're being forced to take out all those entries because they want it secured to one entry. And we share your interest in making the corner important, trying to generate a connection to the street. That's what we did at 1450, and it was very important to us. We tried to do that here with the building, and we think, you know, some tenants will have that entry flowing and open. It just depends on the tenant. But ADA here rules quite a bit in terms of where we're going to access. You're going to have the drive on the west here for fire, for ADA. We're going to have a lot of asphalt. The width for fire trucks is pretty wide. I think having some parking on the west just seems natural because you're going to have it anyway. You're going to have to asphalt it anyway. It seems like both things sort of flow naturally. We can certainly reinforce your comments and come back to you that way, but I think just to give us a little more clarity, I think in terms of getting rid of all the asphalt on the west side, I don't think it's possible.

Chair Furth: Well, I think you have a division of opinion here.

Board Member Gooyer: I think you're overdoing it when you say we're asking you to get rid of all the asphalt on the west side. There's already a roadway that goes there that's double-loaded with parking. We're not asking you to get rid of that, obviously. What we're talking about, what we'd like to see removed or greatly reduced is the set-alone parking area adjacent to the property line. Nobody ever mentioned getting rid of all the parking on the west side. The thing is, because the roadway is very clear, there's no ADA issue because that entry, no matter what you do, is going to be as prominent as the other side. We're actually increasing the prominence of the other side. We're not diminishing the, quote, ADA side, so I don't see any issue from ADA or fire. It's got a straight shot through the entire thing.

Chair Furth: Just to be clear for all of us, it's the, what I call the upper parking lot. The part adjacent to, actually west on this map, that concerns us, that we don't like, that we would like to see gone.

Board Member Gooyer: Right.

Mr. Sueberkrop: Okay.

Chair Furth: And what's possible, we don't know. And, of course, we have no control over what your tenants do. You have some, but, you know, they're going to use these buildings. All we can do is provide possibilities.

Mr. Sueberkrop: Right. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

MOTION

Chair Furth: May I have a motion to continue this to July 19th?

Board Member Gooyer: I'll move we continue this to a date certain, July 19th.

Vice Chair Baltay: Second.

Chair Furth: All in favor say aye. Opposed, none. It carries.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 3-0.

Chair Furth: We anticipate a full complement, and unless we're lacking a quorum, I would anticipate that we will go with whoever is here.

Study Session

Chair Furth: Okay, we have no study session.

Approval of Minutes

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 17, 2018.

Chair Furth: We have minutes for May 17th. I propose we defer these until we have everybody back.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I don't think there's any reason why...

Chair Furth: I move we continue the approval of the minutes to the next regular meeting. Second?

Vice Chair Baltay: Second

Chair Furth: Seconded by Board Member Baltay. All those in favor say aye. All right.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 3-0.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Furth: Anything more from staff before we go? We have no subcommittee items today.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Furth: Any Board member questions or announcements?

Board Member Gooyer: Nope.

Chair Furth: Thank you, staff. We will see you in a few weeks. We are adjourned.

Adjournment