



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: December 21, 2017
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, Alexander Lew, Osma Thompson

Absent:

Chair Furth: Good morning, welcome to the first meeting of the 2017-2018 ARB year and the last meeting of 2017. I call the meeting to order and ask that the roll call be taken.

Chair Furth: That brings us to the next sort of item which is that the City Council has appointed Osma Thompson for a 4-year term which begins today. She has a Masters in Architecture from the California of art and is employed at the architecture firm DLR Group, Kwan Henmi and we look forward to her participation.

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: I don't have any cards for oral communications which are the time to speak about items, not on the agenda. Does anybody wish to do that?

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: If not, any changes to the agenda?

City Official Reports

- 1. Transmittal of the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, and Administrative Staff-Level Architectural Review Approvals**

Chair Furth: Any comments on the City Official reports?

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 380 Cambridge [15PLN-00249]:** Consideration of Major Architectural Review to Allow Demolition of Three Existing Commercial Buildings Totaling 32,083 Square Feet and to Construct a New Three-Story Commercial Building Totaling 35,000 Square Feet. The Request Includes a Design Enhancement Exception to Allow the Project to Exceed the Height Limit by 8 Feet. In Addition, There is a Request to Waive an Off-Street Loading Space. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15332 (In-Fill Development Projects). Zoning District: CC(2)(R) (Community Commercial with Retail Shopping

Combining District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Furth: Our first – sorry, I apologize for the throaty voice. Our first action item is a request for the ARB's recommendation to the Direction of Community Develop on a project at 380 Cambridge. This is the Cambridge Ave; the applicant Cambridge Investments proposes to demolish three existing office buildings and replace them with a new three-story commercial building of 35,000-square feet. The existing buildings that would be taken down total about 32,000-square feet. The zoning is community commercial and the site is also subject to the retail shopping combining district. In addition to the Major Architectural Review, the project requests a Design Enhancement Exception to allow it to exceed the 35-foot height limit by 8-feet and a waiver of the requirement for an off-street loading space. As an infield project and already developed area, it is exempted from the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act. Because this is a quasi-judicial hearing, we hear evidence and make findings based on that evidence. We are required to disclose information we received outside of this hearing. I will start by reporting that I have visited the site with the applicant's representative, Steve Pierce. I viewed the building from the adjacent street and parking lot only and all the information that I received in that meeting is either in the packet or the emails following up from Mr. Pierce that has also been distributed to everybody. Anybody else?

Board Member Lew: I will disclose that I reviewed the ARB minutes for a nearby building which is at 350 Cambridge which is a three-story building with a (inaudible) Weekly.

Chair Furth: Anybody else? Also, this project or at least this site was previously reviewed in March of 2015 in a preliminary review and reviewed the tape and two of us were actually at that meeting. The planner for this project is Sheldon Ah Sing, may we have the Staff report?

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing, Project Planner: Yes, thank you for that introduction. You've covered a lot on this project overview but just to go over kind of the context of the area. This is with the California Avenue Parking District, it is one block removed from the California Avenue and the street does include some low to medium intensity development. A lot of professional services kinds of offices, as well as a lot of parking for both surface and structure parking to support the retail and other commercial activity along California Avenue. There's multi-family to the rear and that affects this property in a direct way in that otherwise underlying zoning district would have a height limit of 37-feet but since it is adjacent to and within the City of multi-family, it's height limit is at 35-feet. Then adjacent to the project site is a PTOD project and that project is at 40-feet so there's a little bit of difference in the height in that area. As mentioned previously, this project was subject to a previous ARB meeting, a preliminary forum. At that time the project was a renovation of the buildings, some demolition involved but not as it currently is today proposed to demolish all the buildings. Some of those comments there had to do with the massing and the variety of architecture on the façade and so the applicant has addressed those in different ways and the applicant will be able to respond to that in their presentation. In summary, the project does include two alternatives and in your packet a majority of the sheets are associated with Alternative One which is a 35,000-square foot building, three stories in height, 30,500-square feet of office space, 4,500-square feet of retail space at the ground level, 35-feet tall and there's a waiver of one loading space that's requested and then there are fourteen parking spaces that are provided that has to do with the new net square footage. The other existing square footage that's being demolished has already been assessed through the parking district. Then you have Alternative Two which is the same as Alternative One and this is just several sheets in the back of the plan set except they are requesting the building to be 43-feet tall or an 8-foot height increase so we'll talk more about that. Just a little bit of zoning overview, retail services use is required on the first floor just because of the overlay district. That's a new addition to this site recently and then you have, as I mentioned, a 35-foot height limit because it's adjacent to multi-family, 2.0 FAR. Then, as I mentioned, it is within the California Avenue Parking District, daylight plane does apply to the rear. So, this is just a kind of brief look at elevations, the applicant will go into a little more detail about this but I'd like to recognize from this is that the fenestration and there's the garage access there to the left. There's a central lobby area in the middle of the building, there's (inaudible) fenestration for the retail spaces and there's a little – it shows a little bit about what the

signage would look like perhaps in the future for the tenants. So, more into the elevation on the height, this building this is Alternative One, you have the 35-foot building. They have here at the top of the floor to the top of the second floor at a 12-foot height and then you see where the office has also had 11-foot height. The section below shows more of the inside of the buildings where from the floor to the ceiling of 9-foot 5-foot – 9-feet 5-inches height and then when you drop the ceiling it's down to 7-feet 8-inches. This has to do with the site plan showing the 10-foot setback in the rear along – as also along the side which abuts the City's parking lot. That's where some of the greenery would be for the project and some of the screening that's required between the multi-family and this building. Alternative Two is a very similar design, it just kind of stretches the building up 8-feet and then what happens here is that you have increased floor to ceiling for each of the floors. So, they would add 3-feet for the retail first-floor and then they would add 2-feet 4-inches for the other floors above that. We have received some public comments, there's been a lot since the submittal of this project to the City with a neighbor in the back. The neighbor in the back has a unique health issue, there's been a lot of conversations also between the applicant and this neighbor in particular and the applicant has made some concessions and the design and trying to accommodate this person through construction. You'll probably hear some of that today from the speaker, as well as maybe the applicant will touch upon that. The (inaudible) also has some concern about replacing older buildings and having some unaffordable leases because now the office space would be more valuable. Then also in general, the height request there's been some comment about that as well. Some conclusions to speak to is that we want to seek feedback and direction on the overall design but we also would like you to spend some time upfront and focus on the height alternative; just give us some feedback and direction on that. Also, just before we get to the recommendation, that we have just some (inaudible) policies that may apply to this project and (inaudible) the compatibility and the quality of design of the project. These would be accessed at a later hearing when the project does come back, I just wanted to throw those out there. The motion is to conduct the public hearing to continue the item to a date uncertain so that completes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions and as I mentioned the applicant is here with a presentation. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Are there any questions of Staff from the Board before we hear from the applicant? Is the applicant here? You have 10-minutes.

Mr. Steve Pierce: Good morning Madam Chair, Members of the Board. I'm Steve Pierce, project applicant, this morning you will be hearing from Mike Castro our architect; as well as Bruce Jett, landscape architect and I will come back and wrap up with our rationale for the DEE. Thank you.

Mr. Michael Castro: Good morning, I'm Michael Castro, I'm a principal at Brereton Architects and the project architect for this project. About 3-years ago Green Heart had asked Brereton to take a look at a sight on Cambridge and we went down there to take a look at a site that had three adjacent two-story buildings. At that time the idea was to reface the buildings and put a new frontage on Cambridge to try to give a repositioning of the building. We found out since when we went – that the buildings were, I would say not a major contributor to the street or the neighborhood. The building materials where a little disparate, you have lava rock as one of the materials, vertical board and baton for the wood on one of the buildings, and then their third buildings – the first two buildings were actually sister's buildings. They are almost a mirror image of each other but the third building was a very low two-story building which was so low that the actual mechanical runs where on the roof. They couldn't actually make any mechanical distribution in the floor itself so we talked about the site already. It's located only one block away from California Street and the existing buildings, as I mentioned before, these two are more or less mirror images of each other and 380, which is the one to the East, is the lower building that had a different floor to floor. The idea too that we had for the building was to try to have a contiguous floor plate so that became a problem as well with developing this site. In our first presentation, we're thinking about just demolishing the 380 building and trying to get all the floor plates to align. That was something that after time developed into taking down all three buildings and making a better office building on that site. So, as you can see on this, the streetscape, we have to the West which would be to the left, a condo building and then to the right, we have a public parking lot and another office building to the far right. The two immediately adjacent buildings are the condo and the next building over is that office building

and as you can, the materials there are mostly stucco, exposed beams on the building to the right. As well as some large windows and some decks. So, our site plan, for the most part, is – as was mentioned earlier is there's a required setback on the North and a self-imposed setback on the East. The self-imposed setback allows us to have egress from one of the exit stairs, as well as gives us a green connection to the right of way from our backyard. The ground floor plan, this site parks itself and the ground floor plan shows that we're tucking the parking behind retail so that we have retail on the street front. So, all the parking is entered at the far left of the site, we're treating that elevation a little bit differently intentionally and we'll see that when we look at the elevations of the building. The second floor has a two-story or has an opening which allows a two-story lobby. That was intended to give a little bit more scale to the entry to the office building itself on the street. So now we have a two-story reading of the lobby for the office building. The third floor has a small little deck, again to accentuated the entries to the building and again, as you can see, it's a contiguous floor plate all the way across. All the mechanical is centered on the roof and screened. The elevations, you know we were very careful of holding the lines there but we're also trying to break up the mass of the building by creating different events on the façade. So, as I mentioned before, you enter the garage on the far left on the West side of the site. That is treated as its own pavilion, it's clad in stone versus the rest of the building that is actually in stucco. It's a transition between the two which is a glass with spandrel glass transition zone I'll call it. As you turn the corner to the East, the three-story glass façade turns back all the way to where we have our shear wall. That same glass system is introduced again on the back façade which is 10-feet back from the property line. The only blank façade we have now is actually on the West which is right against the condo building. As mentioned earlier about the heights, we're 12-foot floor to floor from ground to second-floor and 11-foot floor to floor from that point on. This doesn't give us too much space with dropped ceilings and/or even if you have an exposed ceiling (inaudible) structure. I think we're about 8-foot 4 to the (inaudible) structure but that forces us to take mechanical through the structure so that's one of the reasons why we're asking for the DEE later on. This is just showing the setback on the back and how we're screening that with the landscaping and how that mass relates to the residential multi-family or the multi-unit residential in the back.

Chair Furth: Pause for a minute because although we have working microphones, we do not have a working recording system other than everybody's phones and Staff is going to attend to that so take a break.

Mr. Castro: Ok.

[The Board took a short break due to technical issues.]

Chair Furth: We are at the moment in recess and we hope to be back in business shortly. Welcome back to the ARB meeting in the heart of Silicon Valley. We apologize for the inconvenience to everybody, we are resetting your timer, let us begin again. You don't need to repeat everything but anything you want to be sure is on the record you should.

Mr. Castro: I'm Michael Castro and I'm the principle at Brereton Architects and the project architect for this project. What I was mentioning is that when we went out to the site on Cambridge, the three parcels that were next to each other had two adjacent buildings, they were sister buildings and the third building was different floor to floor. They were all two-story buildings and we began with thinking this is a reskinning project to try to give a new face to Cambridge and repositioning project. It developed into a new building so that we can achieve the best architecture and create a contiguous floor plate. So, the existing buildings as I mentioned – So, the two-story buildings are flanked by two three-story buildings. To the left, there's a condo building that's about 40-feet high and to the right is an office building which is on the other side of a public parking lot. The two buildings architecture introduces stucco, aluminum glass, exposed steel beams, glass canopies, and decks. We have a setback in the back that's a required setback and we have a self-imposed setback on the right side of our building which is the East side of the building. That self-imposed set back allows us to soften that elevation, as well as gives us egress path to the right of way and allows the landscape to continue to the right of way. The building parks itself and the entry to the parking area on the West side of the building and the parking is screened by retail uses.

The second-floor we have a two-story volume which allows the building to be – entry to be preserved as a two-story entry from Cambridge and that's capped with a deck which sits above that two-story entry. The mechanical is centralized on the roof and is wrapped by a roof screen. The elevations had a very conscious effort to break up the massing so the area where the parking garage is entered on the west is actually treat it as a separate pavilion where a transitional zone of aluminum glass and spandrel glass between a stucco building that has a center entry for the office building. Which, as I mentioned before, was two-stories a deck on top. The glass from the front elevation, the Cambridge elevation wraps on the East side of the building back to our sheer wall. We have a green screen or an opportunity for landscape to up that wall to soften that even further. The facing the residential to the North, we have the same glass system which is setback 10-feet for the setback and allows other than a blank façade facing the neighbors. The only blank façade that we do have is to the West which is against the condo complex and that is – that wall is right on the property line. The floor to floor heights is 12-foot floor to floor from the ground to the second floor and an 11-foot floor to floor from second to third and third to roof. This only allows mechanical to have its runs through the actual structure. So, we'd have to come up with either opening in the steel beams or have a Joyce system that we go through so we're still working that out. I think currently we're looking at just W-sections or steel beams. This section on the right is showing the set back at the entry to give that a little bit more emphasis from the rest of the façade. There's a large entry canopy that this figure is showing, the triangulable figure. The rear set back introduces landscape roof screening – landscape screening to the neighbors in the back and this is the multi-unit residential complex to the north. Context wise, the architecture and the neighborhood, as I mentioned earlier, has several different materials introduced. We're trying to pick up from those materials, the predominant materials that you're seeing on these adjacent neighbors are masonry to the right, stucco, aluminum glass and some exposed steel. As you can see the three-story volume on the left with glass and stucco and then you have other stucco buildings and some wood panel buildings. Our adjacent neighbor currently towers over the two-story structures that are existing on the site. The materials that we're introducing for this building include metal panel, spandrel glazing, cement plaster or stucco and stone tile and the stone tile is in the pavilion area of the building. So, this is the proposed building, as you can see we have that pavilion that's visually separated from the rest of the building which is an intention to break up the mass. The massing is also broken up by the arches that we're creating in the setback in the center. The glass turns the corner on the East and the windows on every floor have sun shading devices above them. At the ground level, it's actually extended even further as canopies in an opportunity for signage. This gives you more of straight on elevation and you can see clearly here the deck on top of the 400 in the center of the building, which again is to accentuate that center which is the central entry of the building. This is the parking garage here and the reason why the parking garage is off center is because of code to allow a certain distance from the property line. The base of the building is meant to activate the street, there's ultra-clear glazing or low iron glazing to make the storefronts for the retail as clear as possible, as engaging as possible. The signage – you have opportunity to put signage on the canopy, the façade above the entry doors and hang it – also being hung down as banners. The idea here is that we have an active street front, we're hopefully going to give emphasis to have a connection from California Street across as a cross connection through if you have successful retail on Cambridge. As you see we're introducing bike racks next to our main building entry as well. Now I'm going to introduce Bruce Jett who is our landscape architect.

Mr. Bruce Jett: Thank you, Michael. Bruce Jet with Jet Landscape Architecture and Design, I'm glad to be here today and answer questions and walk you briefly through our project here. Starting with the streetscape, I don't know which button to push so I don't – Oh, that's (inaudible), I don't want to push that one. We have been working on this project since I think about 2015 working closely with the City through – especially on the streetscapes, as well as the neighbors to get the landscape to a place where everybody's going to be happy. There was an existing Pistache tree right where the driveway is going to go now and of course working with the City arborist, we are going to take that tree down and relocate a new tree right to the left of it. Sorry, I can't really see this, here we go right here, that gets located – the square will be outside of the cone of vision or ingress and egress to those, to the parking garage. There are a several numbers of trees of existing Pistache that are going to stay here and then we'll be adding a new Pistache tree off-site and down the street in front of the parking area there. A few small trees to work with scale and softening along the North edge of the Northside of the building. As Michael

mentioned a vine screen attached to the building, as well as vines on the fence moving along that north property line there. Then as well as low to medium height shrubs planted along the pathway access. Across the back we are proposing – we're working with stormwater treatment plantings across the back, as well as tall screen plantings to help soften the building and screen views into the neighbor's backyards. We strongly recommend that bamboo be the plant selected there although we were asked for some options that could possibly be as successful but from a standpoint of immediate impact and height, I think that the bamboo is are recommendations though we're more than happy to hear the concerns of both the neighbors and the Committee here today. One concern I know that is often raised about bamboo is that it can be invasive. The reason it is invasive is because of the rooting structure called combs can do what they call run which means they will extend out beyond the plant and then a new shoot comes up. That can be quite easily controlled with barrier – with root barriers and if I may just address, we're going to continue to work with the neighbor on the fragrant issues. I have to say that through this process we've learned quite a bit about fragrant plants. One of the concerns they have was with the Pistache trees and we're working with – I mean the Pistache are already there on the street side so we're...

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Jett: That's required by us. Thank you.

Chair Furth: We have – now is the time for the public to speak, we have seven-speaker cards. If there's anybody else who wants to speak on this matter, the speaker cards are over there on the front ledge so fill one out and hand it to Staff down there. The first person to speak is Becky Sanders followed by Jeff Levinsky. Oh, and you have 3-minutes each and you'll get a yellow warning light when you have a minute left.

Ms. Becky Sanders: Thank you. Good morning and thank you for your service to our City. My name is Becky Sanders, I live in the Ventura neighborhood, I am the moderator of the Ventura Neighborhood Association. At our December meeting, twenty-five people gathered to discuss the impacts of concentrated development on Cal. Ave, Park Boulevard and on El Camino Real. Impacts on our residential quality of life and on our ability to do business and shopping in our own City. One of the issues that we touched upon was the erosion of true community-serving businesses in favor of software office development which adds to congestion, parking whoas, cut through traffic in our neighbor and diminishes our ability to shop and conduct business locally. Now rather than create bottom feeders out of mom and pops, how about brainstorming ways to encourage and support community serving businesses in our commercial centers in order to cut down on car trips and encourage biking and walking to services. A second issue that we are very concerned about is parking. We have our eye on the Evergreen South Gate situation and believe that Ventura will be up next for consideration for an RPP. It's important that the building not be allowed to be under-parked to us, the residents of Ventura. It just makes sense to continue to enforce parking code and not pretend that this building isn't going to add to congestion on the street if under parked. This leads me to my final point, off-road loading zones in highly congested areas is our key to maintaining traffic flow and safe biking in pedestrian routes. There is no reason that the builder should be given a gift of providing not proper loading zone, this is just our resident's opinion of course, but a disaster to have a president set of no off-road loading zones for new development. As other developments come online and they're allowed that same perk, our City streets will be checked with trucks parked in bike lanes and jetting out into the street further adding to our parking whoas. We need to keep the streets – street parking for customers and not for businesses that refuse to provide loading areas. Please preserve community-serving businesses, ensure adequate parking in a structure that was designed that makes sense, this one is a little weird, and require an off-road loading zone. Thank you very much for hearing me this morning.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Mr. Levinsky and the next person after that will be Paul [phonetics] [Machatoe].

Mr. Jeff Levinsky: (Inaudible) make this work? Good morning Chair Furth and Board Members. First, let's see, no, how do I make – (inaudible) Ok, alright, got it. Sorry, I agree with the Staff recommendation

that the DEE for the increased height is not merited and I hope you come to the same conclusion. Can I go down the next slide? Ok. As for the loading space, however, the lack of these is a genuine problem and it's a problem throughout Palo Alto. Here are some recent pictures from Edgewood Plaza where again we don't have sufficient or properly placed loading zones and as you can see, delivery trucks park in a bike area. There's actually a red curb in the middle picture that the truck is parked in and another delivery truck is there and they are double parking. Eliminating the sole loading space required for this project is allowed only if shared on-street loading spaces do not conflict with the Comp. Plan. There are no nearby loading spaces on Cambridge and the ones further away aren't the required size so a new one would have to be created. That would take away parking which is in desperately short supply, rather we should be looking for creative alternatives to on-street loading spaces and not pushing it into streets. It wouldn't necessarily require a second curb cut or taking space out at the front of a parcel. Instead, trucks could turn around inside – could enter the garage and use a turntable to turn around, a smaller turntable was recently put in over at 240 Hamilton just across the street. The bottom line is that we shouldn't automatically be granting these loading space exemptions and we should definitely not be doing it just to help maximize the FAR for the project. Parking is another concern, I was at a City hosted meeting just last night where residents and business owners agreed that inadequately parked buildings in the Cal. Ave area is pushing cars into Evergreen Park and plaguing it with problems. That's harming the healthcare businesses now on El Camino as well. This particular project is an example of the problem as the parking calculations in the plan and the Staff report erroneously undercount the spaces needed. In the assessment district, the practice had been to total the buildings needs and then credit it with a final number of spaces it paid into the assessment district for. So, this building needs 117 spaces, it paid for 102 and doesn't need to supply 15, however, the plans show it only having 14. If there were more time, I'd example the areas in the plans and in the Staff report calculation. Another problem is that not one square foot of the common area is attributed to the retail on the ground floor. While that helps their parking – reduce their parking requirements but it means that there – is that actually it?

Board Member Furth: That is your 3-minutes, you can finish your sentence, a reasonable sentence.

Mr. Levinsky: I just wanted to say that the proper way to do it is just to prorate the ground floor retail into the rest of the – with the rest of the building so that it gets counted in the parking calculation.

Chair Furth: Thank you. If you want to submit your written materials to become part of our record, as you know this is scheduled to come back at a later date. That's the recommendation (inaudible). Next speaker is [Mr. Machatoc] followed by Anthony Ford.

[Mr. Paul Machatoc]: Good morning Chair Furth and Board Members. I'm Paul [Machatoc] and I'm part of the Evergreen Park Neighborhood Leadership. We've been struggling with problems of parking and traffic coming from the Cal. Ave businesses and this project has us very concerned; Evergreen abuts this project. Let me first mention a small point, going – mainly the garage entrance has an odd curve in it appears to allow retail to be a bit larger. The curve will make it harder for customers to enter and leave the garage and there's probably a better way to solve this. The project doesn't seem to comply with our Comprehensive Plan's goal of making the community accessible. Our practice of not requiring onsite parking makes life hard for those who need accessible parking. The proposed building requires 117-spaces but we're allowing it to put in far fewer and then base the number of accessible spaces on the smaller number. So, normally the building would need five accessible spaces but we're letting it get by with one so where would the people who need accessible parking go? Parking in the neighborhood or some garage that's far away. It would be much better if the project provided more accessible parking on site where it belongs. Shouldn't Palo Alto be a leader in meeting the minimum requirement of the ADA, also compiling with its spirit and intent? Finally, we're concerned the proposed complete teardown and rebuild is only cost-justified if it provides office space for software and internet companies. These buildings being torn down once houses many healthcare and other professionals serving our community. Software and internet companies and administrative offices are not allowed in CC zones where this building is located. Our City has been lax in enforcement but the City Council resolved just a month ago to clarify that software companies are allowed downtown but they explicitly said they are not allowed in CC zones. That's consistent with the Municipal Code declaration that CC zone is for local regional

activities, not tech companies that serve worldwide customers. What you can do as a review Board to help us with this is first ensure the building is suitable for uses that are allowed in CC zones such as retail and community based serving businesses which tend to be small firms. Second, encourage Staff to remind applicants not to assume the City will look the other way and allow zoning violations. Thank you, happy holidays.

Chair Furth: The next speaker is Anthony Ford to be followed by Karen Price.

Mr. Anthony Ford: Good morning Chair and Board. Thank you for having this meeting and my name is Anthony Ford. I'm a resident of 420 Cambridge, we are a collection of four condominium townhouse that sits directly adjacent to the planned property on the westside. These were units built about 6-years ago and contain a retail business and a garage underneath. As a group collectively and I speak for others that we've discussed this, we collectively do not oppose progress. We're not (inaudible) and we except that there are some developmental needs at this premise because it is dysfunctional and esthetically needs to be upgraded. As neighbors we expect that the problem disruption and mess that will be created and noise and many other polluting features will be well organized, respectful and caring for residences; not just us but for the folks behind and so on. We do feel this is a component that adds insult to injury however and that really extends our patience in the manner of the proposed DEE to add additional 8-foot height above the existing allowed extension. I can only say that if you were living in a single-level house and had a neighbor who proposes to change your 6-foot wall to a 14-foot wall, you could imagine exactly how we feel about having an 8-foot additional extension above the current level. Cambridge Avenue is a very busy and poorly supported by parking. It's close to residents who like us are sort of ignored in this highly business oriented district and could question very seriously the need for this extension which has come in we suspect it's a bit like a trojan horse activity of the latter part of this proposal. In finishing, I think it's very easy to plan but one really seeks to create the most creative and non-disruptive plans and there's a lot of creativity that could have been brought forward to enhance, for example, floor to ceiling heights without needing this DEE. I know that my neighboring residences will also be expressing their concerns. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Ford. The next speaker is Karen Price to be followed by Birgit Warner.

Ms. Karen Price: Hello, my name is Karen Price and I have been renting an office at 378 Cambridge since the sense of 1979. I am a certified advanced Rolfer which is deep tissue bodywork, specializing in pediatric care for a wide range of issues. In addition to serving the women and children of Palo Alto for 39-years, I have done 6-years of groundbreaking research with Stanford School of Medicine on Rolfing for young children with Spastic Cerebralpalsy. Long-term professionals such as myself, lawyers, accountants, therapists etc. have been systematically displaced as software companies have replaced neighborhood businesses. The plans for the replacement of the three buildings labeled 380 Cambridge are open floor plan that can only be occupied by a large tech company. As other people have mentioned this is not legal in the California Avenue zoning. These companies add no value to the neighborhoods, they great increase congestion and lack of parking, as well as driving out local businesses. They destroy the character of California Avenue which is so highly valued. This area is zoned for professional, medical, personal service, retail and retail service. These are things people walk in and use. It is not zoned for RND, research and development and RND is allowed in RND zones. No one walks in and uses a service at a software company. In addition to traffic congesting and parking, these large companies and their multitude of employees greatly contribute to increasing carbon emissions and greenhouse gases. Currently, I live less than a mile from work and can walk. If I am displaced, both myself and my clients will have to drive much further, also exacerbating both traffic and carbon emissions. I know that Palo Alto is committed to lessening both traffic and emissions. It is imperative that we retain the very small stock of Class C professional office space still left, both for now and into the foreseeable future. This huge building will not help or benefit the people of Palo Alto at all. As it's happening with the rest of the country, only a few wealthy ones will benefit and the rest will suffer. I was able to rent my space at 27-years old with no money and start a lifelong career in a self-employed business serving thousands of people. I want another 27-year old to be able to do that as well. Thank you very much, happy holidays.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Birgit Warner to be followed by Matt [Vasca].

Ms. Birgit Warner: Good morning, my name is Birgit Warner and I'm here today on behalf of Robin Pfaff who owns one of the properties directly behind the proposed development. She's the one that Sheldon mentioned who has the immune system disorder which makes her extremely vulnerable to any air pollutant particulates and fumes or otherwise known as odors. This prevents her from being here today in person so that's why I am here and also means that the long construction project plan for directly behind her is a severe health challenge for her. She's been in discussions with the developer and the Planning Department over the last 3-years, working with them to develop plans to protect her health as much as possible. Her disability requires that her air quality be controlled both long-term and during the construction is especially important. The developer has been open to discussion and has already agreed to some accommodations. For example, they'll keep her apprised of the weekly construction schedule so she knows when she needs to shelter in place. They will also use the hypoallergenic plantings like the bamboo they are proposing across the back of the lot. She greatly appreciates that and thank you very much. We're not actively discussing ways to limit Robin's exposure to the unavoidable construction dust and odors and are making some progress. We will continue to work together in the current spirit of corporation to find mutually agreeable solutions. Our goal is to protect Robin's health without impeding this project's progress. Our request of you, as the Board, is that you make successful agreement a Condition of Approval for this project and add the agreed upon solution to the construction logistics plan as appropriate. The outcome of this matter has a very significant impact on Robin's health and we deeply appreciate your consideration and support. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. The next speaker is [Matt Vasca] to be followed by [phonetics] [Cabean Anoon].

Mr. Matt Vasca: Hi, my name is Matt Vasca, I apologize in advance -- I'm a single-family homeowner on the same block at this development. I apologize in advance because I'm very unfamiliar with this process. We learned just a couple days ago that this whole project was even happening. I talked to our two neighbors who are also single-family homeowners adjacent directly to the Northeast of this development. We are just now learning about it and hope that there's an opportunity to have some input regarding the potential impacts to our privacy and light. I assume that's the case and perhaps you could confirm that we're still early enough here to have some input.

Chair Furth: Could you -- which block -- which street do you live on Mr. Vasca?

Mr. Vasca: We're at 365 College Ave, our neighbors to the left and to the right all are single-family homes that are going to be impacted by this.

Chair Furth: Thanks, and the Staff recommendation that this matter be continued to another date so there will be other opportunities to participate. [Cabean Anoon] to be followed by [phonetics] [Anoshi Sing].

[Mr. Cabean Anoon:] Good morning, thank you for hearing me out. I think though -- my name is [Cabean Anoon] and I'm...

Chair Furth: I reread the rules this morning and I'm supposed to ask you what your address is.

[Mr. Anoon:] Yeah, I was just going to say that so I'm at 420 Cambridge. I'm actually Anthony's neighbor and I'm actually here to echo a lot of what Anthony was saying so I'll keep it short. I think people have made good points about how parking and zoning and things like that will change the character of the neighborhood and the community and I think those are good points. The specific point that I want to make as someone that's going to be right next door is that the exception for the height is going to have a huge impact on our home and both the aesthetics, as well as the property value frankly. For our home, in particular, that height change would actually wipe out any sort of light or view that we have in its entirety so that's a big change for us. I'm just here to say that I see any real reason for that exception -- to grant

that exception because it's going to have a pretty negative impact. I don't see any upside to balance that out so that's basically it.

Chair Furth: Thank you and excuse me, which unit is yours in the building?

[Mr. Anoon:] My unit is Unit One.

Chair Furth: Thank you. The next speaker is [Anoshi Sing] and I believe that's our last speaker.

[Ms. Anoshi Sing:] Hi, I'm also speaking – I'm here from 420 Cambridge Ave, also Unit One. Thank you for pronouncing my name properly. I'm here also to discuss the height exception. Right now, as the project currently it's at 35-feet and at 43-feet it would tower over our unit. Our views are limited by Anthony's unit in front of us and so the views that we really get from, as well as the natural light we get into our unit, comes a lot from the East. With the increased height of the retail space on our East, that would really severely impact us. It is a big concern for me, I have two young children, we have two little boys and it's a big deal for us so it would – I strongly feel that you should agree with the Staff recommendation and not go with the increased height. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. That ends the speaker cards I have so I'll bring this back the Board. First, are there any questions of Staff or the applicant? Sorry, you get to respond. Applicant please, I forget how many minutes.

Mr. Pierce: Again, Steve Pierce...

Chair Furth: I – you have another 10-minutes.

Mr. Pierce: I'm – first off, I wanted to address our conversations with Robin Pfaff to the property to the rear of us and the solution that we're sort of – that looks like going to work best is that we're actually going to install at our cost an air filtration system at her home. Our current bid on that is about \$24,000 and this we fell. – now we looked at a number of solutions in terms of physical barriers, you know a number of things I won't bore you with but really being able to deal with the air that will be entering her home we fell this is really the best approach. So, we have basically brought on board an HVAC people who have done clean rooms and so forth and so we'll be – basically we kind of designed a system there and now we're sort of working out the detail of how that would work. With respect to the DEE, as it's been mentioned the maximum height in the CC2 zone is 37-feet and because we are adjacent to the RM-30, we have three apartment houses to our rear so the height is reduced to 35-feet. There are two findings that the Board will have to make for any DEE and one is that there are an exceptional or extortory conditions and secondly that it would not be detrimental or ingenious to the neighbors and certainly we have heard some comments in respect to that. The – with respect to that first condition, what's exceptional, well last year you know the City Council did see fit to require retail on any new structure on Cambridge Avenue. This was not a preservation of retail but really creation to retail because there really isn't much on Cambridge, it's sort of a marginal location. Unfortunately, within that change of the ordinance, they really didn't take into account, as I'm sure many of you understand at architects, that retail requires a much greater clear height than office space does require. On Page 59 of the book that you have, we've cited a number of the City Standards, as well as county standards and it is pretty much established that for a clear height in retail you need about 15-feet while an office is 9-feet so we have a 6-foot shortfall right off. We've – you know if we look specifically – well, I won't take time to – with the drawings but on Page 28, you've got our existing condition that is to say without the DEE and our floor to bottom of structure, not ceiling but bottom of structure, that's about 9-feet 5-inches in the retail space that we're now required to provide. Where in 15 would be much more desirable so we have a considerable shortfall there and likewise, at the office where we'd like to have 9-foot to the ceiling, we have about 8-feet 5-inch to bottom of the structure. So, everything is really quite tight which is why we've made the – this proposal. The real issue for us than I think for the City Council and the City that desires to have good successful retail basically seating retail on Cambridge is that we need and retail needs to have optimally configured space. We've got a real tough location to draw retail in, there isn't any on the block where we are and (inaudible) on Cambridge. So, we need to have well-configured space

that's going to attract the maximum – maximum attraction to retailers so that we can get somebody in who will basically would be successful there and will hopefully – I think is the goal is to kind of seed that street. What we don't want is this to have substandard space that we can't lease and that's we're – pardon me, that we're back to the City asking us, as some building owners have, to allow them to go to the office uses. That's certainly not the goal so what we want is really adequate height for that retail space. Now with respect to detrimental effects with the – to our neighbors, speaking to the neighbors to the rear, the situation now is that we've got a cinderblock wall and I've got a couple photos. I guess I'll send those to you but the cinderblock walls are featureless, they are right on the property line and basically, it's not a real attractive environment for them. It will be of course desirable with a new structure, we will be moving – setting that back 10-feet, we'll have a landscape buffer and on I think Page 59 of the booklet or pardon me, Page 63 we've sort of drawn a sight line of somebody standing in the backyard. That sight line is about what it is today, in other words having a taller building setting it back 10-feet. It basically allows the same sort of light and so forth into the structure – into the backyards of those homes or those apartments. Basically, again with respect to exceptional, we feel like we've been sort of put into a corner by the City Council by saying have retail but get the height to really have successful retail. Then with respect to our neighbors to the left, I'm actually kind of disappointed because we had reached out to them and offered to have a presentation and discuss with them issues and that was not followed up upon. We certainly would have liked to have dealt with that with them personally as opposed to hear it at the podium but certainly we – you know I understand the issues they have there. On the third-floor of those structures, there are certainly clear story windows two in the bathrooms. They are fairly high and two in the master bedrooms, again either side, they are sort of square windows to let in natural light. It's not like there's a great view, in fact if you look out those – if you were able to look out those windows because they are rather high, you'd be looking – you look over our roof and all of our air conditioning equipment is there now currently so it's a view, it's more of a natural light issue. That's certainly one that we would be – we would certainly work with our neighbors as we've worked with Robin to come up with solutions to that. Indeed they are a 40-foot building and we're allowed a maximum of 35 so there's some disparity there but I think we can certainly come up with solutions to a lot of that natural light. With respect to presidents also, I know too that 385 Sherman I guess is a relatively new building and is a 42-foot building and that's contiguous with RM-40. So, this is certainly happening but I think the more important issues is if we want retail, we need to basically create the spaces that retail needs to be successful and unfortunately the height allowed is 35-feet, it's so low that you can't take it out of the office floors because they are already substandard. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Pierce and I'll bring this back to the Board. Any preliminary questions from Staff for anybody? Staff – from the Board for the Staff or applicant?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, thank you. I have a question for Staff regarding the loading exemption and in your Staff report Sheldon, you mention there are various Comprehensive Plan policies that need to be found. Can you – do you mind just outlining really quickly what these Comp. Plan policies are regarding loading zones?

Mr. Ah Sing: Well, they don't particularly speak directly to loading zones but just in general, these Comprehensive Plan policies speak to encouraging design and reduce (inaudible) of street frontage that contributes to retail vitality. There's always preserving the ground retail space so in one sense if you were to design a site that has the loading space, that precludes the project from meeting some of those Comprehensive Plan policies but as with any project, it's not that they have to meet all the policies. There will become that may conflict so it's just on balance do they meet the policies?

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you repeat once more? You just said two or three of the policies are...

Mr. Ah Sing: So, one of them has to do with encourages a design that would reduce the (inaudible) of the street frontage that contributes to retail vitality and also preserving existing ground floor retail. So, if you were to place again the loading space on the site, it may conflict from retail having a space that is vital with the streetscape.

Vice Chair Baltay: Got it, thanks.

Chair Furth: Thank you, anybody else?

Board Member Lew: I have a question for staff, on the California Avenue parking (inaudible) district, my recollection is that it's closed. Is that correct? The additional square footage that they are proposing here has to be parked on site and there are no other options for them. Does that -- the square footage, the volume of that, does that count toward floor area?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: The floor area discussion and the parking is a little different but what you were saying about the parking district is correct. There are no additional spaces to be brought in the district and actually, it's closed but those credits remain. If they are adding to the building, then yes, that needs to be parked on site.

Chair Furth: Commissioner – Vice Chair Baltay, I think you had another question.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Yes, this is a question for the architect, it's regarding the – just the detailing on the façade. To save me from having to plow through the plans, what is the reveal between the white plaster frame and the actual glazing? How deeply recessed are the window walls?

Mr. Castro: You're 3-foot, about the size of your door swing.

Vice Chair Baltay: 3-foot...

Mr. Castro: Let me take out a plan here. The actual window wall is probably about 14-inches back, the doors are set back additional 3-foot in alcoves. The entry to the office building is plus or minus 8 to 10-feet and then we have recesses between the parking pavilion and the building; which again is set back probably about 3-feet from the property line. I tried to get this undulation on the Cambridge and break up the mass.

Vice Chair Baltay: So, I'm confused then, I'm looking at Detail 3 and 4 upon sheet 25 perhaps and it seems to indicate 8-inch recess. Am I reading that wrong?

Mr. Castro: No, you're reading that correctly.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Castro: So, that's just to accentuate the pillars coming down.

Chair Furth: Can additional questions? Ok, who would like to begin on commentary? Shall we start – would it make sense to start with talking about the Design Enhancement Exception first? Just to address the Design Enhancement Exception for height first. Do you want to start Robert?

Board Member Gooyer: It interesting you mention the whole concept of breaking up the masses and I just don't really see that. I mean it's a very large building with a very – with about a 15% or 20% change at one side. The – it's – my fellow Board Member here is (inaudible), the undulation between the glass and the framing and that sort of thing is 8-inches or so. To me, this is just a big square box which in itself might be ok but then when you're also asking for an additional 8-feet, I can't see that justifying or justifying that at all. It – I'm well aware that – I've done retail buildings for a lot longer than I want to admit and I can see the height variations deal with 20,000-30,00-square foot buildings but we're talking a couple of 1,500 to 2,000-square foot retail spaces. There's no problem with them being – the intent of these spaces is to be community serving spaces, not retail giants that you come from a couple miles to go to. I don't see any problem at all being able to fit the heights in the 35-feet. The whole concept would – I keep hearing all these things about we need all these heights. A very easy solution is make it a two-story building. I mean I know you don't want to hear that but that's the answer to it. You're trying to fit a

three-story building in an area that's been a two-story concept for years and has addressed the smaller communities or I should say the area on small services. The same thing, I agree – when I first looked at the second and third floor, obviously the intent is to put a large firm in there. There's no practical way to break that up into half a dozen smaller firms other than putting, for instance, a hallway in there and you really don't want to put a hallway in there because that wastes space. Hallways just – travel areas that – that doesn't pay the rent so the way it sits right now, I can't except the additional height. In fact, the design of the building, as far as I'm concerned, has a long way to go. As far as the parking – the loading space, I agree that it would be difficult and the problem is you end up with a larger opening to get a truck in there, that sort of thing but the reality of it is true. In so many of these areas, you see the trucks parked there in the morning or any time of the day because truck drivers are on a time schedule so they don't care. They are just going to double park right in front of the building and once you've got this massive truck sitting there, if I'm in my small little car, I'm not going to sit there and make a big issue about it or try and challenge the guy. I have to somehow or otherwise fight to go around them and if this was an existing building that never had the capacity or was in a historic area or whatever, then you kind of go well ok, it's the price of doing business. This is a brand-new building so if the requirement is that you need an on-site loading space, then I think it needs to be there.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Great so I've been struggling this one a little bit. I think my first reaction is kind of similar to Roberts but then I've been thinking about it a little bit more and I'm not – I think I'm – I have a – I'm not quite so sure about that position. I think I understand Mr. Pierce's argument for additional height and in some of the projects that I've worked in, in San Francisco, the City when they went through re-zoning for each neighborhood did increase the height limit in certain places. They increased it by 5-feet in order to get higher retail spaces; they did it on purpose; they did it in – it was strategic. On certain blocks where they knew that rents were going up and they wanted to add retail space in adjacent – on adjacent streets so that there was enough space for existing businesses and new businesses and that's retail businesses. Generally, I'm – I think that we should have that discussion if the City wants to add retail space, it should – they should be high-quality spaces and we should have that discussion. I'm not certain that DEE process is the right way to do it, we had a lot of problems with appeals here with regards to height and setbacks. It seems to me that the argument – we have to make a finding that there's something – some sort of special circumstance here and I don't really – I'm not sure that I see it. I think that what applies to your site would actually apply to many other parcels on Cambridge so it seems to me it should be a bigger discussion maybe perhaps with the Planning and Transportation Commission or the Planning Director if it's a variance. It seems to me that it's not – my take on it is it's not an ARB decision to make because it's a bigger issue. You did raise the height of the 42-foot high building on Sherman like the Visa Research is the current tenant and there are some units facing the park. I think there are four residential units facing the park and the City purposely put that in there and so we do allow that on Sherman and it's because there's the residential use behind it is either PC or RM-40. In this case, the residential use on College is RM-30 and so I think that those things mean something. I've been following the Comp. Plan updates and I do understand that Evergreen Park community – neighborhood wants a transitional area between Cal. Avenue and the single-family and multi-family areas. I think the rules were put in place on Cambridge for a purpose so I think it's fine to reexamine them but I don't think it's the ARB's purview. On the – do you want us to do building too or (crosstalk) (inaudible)

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Board Member Lew: Got it.

Chair Furth: Loading zone.

Board Member Lew: I don't necessarily have a position on the loading zone. I think I understand issues that people have outlined. My take on it is to have – my preference would be to have loading zones on the street. I think San Francisco does that, commercial loading zones. Usually the first and last spaces on

the block where it's easier to get a truck in, right? It's hard to get a truck in mid-block and I think I agree with Robert. There – the truck – UPS drivers are in a hurry, they are not going to pull in – well, they are not going to pull into a parking garage, that's my take on it.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: I found myself in agreement with my fellow Board Members. Put it this way, Design Enhancement Exception should enhance the design and I haven't heard any arguments why this does. I don't see any arguments why it does so I just couldn't make the findings that the building should be taller through the Design Enhancement Process. Board Member Lew's comments are appropriate that that sort of thing is a different kind of appeal that you would need to make. I'm also conflicted about the loading zone, I would like to a smaller type of loading zone on the property. Something that would deal with the kind of trucks that might well be coming to this building; more like the UPS truck, not a 45-foot long loading bay. I really wish we had a – not a black and white choice, doing nothing seems inappropriate. Reading the full extent of the code in this case also seems really difficult so I wish I had a better answer but I don't so right now I'm on the fence. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Commissioner Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: I also find myself in agreement with a lot of my fellow Board Members. There's – the building design in itself, you know using the spandrel to sort of hiding things of (inaudible) on a two-story solution in some ways. The current floor to floor height as you have it right now is sort of encroaching on inaccessibility in many ways. Having a huge open floor plan with 8-foot 5 height is very stifling on its own unless you break it up even more and then it gets a little bit more manageable. I don't think there's – I think you need to work with the heights that you've been given and make something better with that like having two-stories that have a lot of space. Even office spaces in that sense can breathe a bit more so that's where I find myself. Then regarding the loading zone, I actually think it's really important to take into consideration given that there is retail, given that there is going to be not just mail but also potentially other kinds of supplies that get delivered to this location. I think it's important to include that and I don't think it needs to be something that is sort of looking service, I think that can be very pretty. You could put permeable pavers, you know make that really nice and so I'm in favor of including that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. On the topic of the DEE, I couldn't make the findings that would allow the building to be taller. I understand the dilemma that's expressed by the applicant but I couldn't make the finding that they are unique circumstances. I couldn't make the finding that it wouldn't have any adverse effect on anybody else and I think this is really an issue about zoning. When you ask for or are granted an 8-foot increase in height for an entire building, I think it's not a Design Enhancement Exception, it's a zone change. With respect to the loading bay, it does seem to me that it's very difficult to put that on site on this site without further messing up the walk along the street which right now it fairly unimpeded. If we are going to recommend a waiver of that or modification of that, then the question is going to be where will people load? So, I would hope to see more analysis of that before this comes back to us so we're not looking at a building which complies with the zoning height so other comments on the project.

Ms. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: Chair, can I make a brief comment? Vice Chair Baltay had made a comment about the loading zone and wishing it weren't a black and white issue and the code actually does provide for some leeway to the Director to modify the dimension of loadings. So, there is some flexibility if you believe that loading is important on site, it doesn't necessarily need to meet the specific standards if we can find a reasonable, functional solution.

Chair Furth: That's very helpful Jonathan. Any further comments in light of that information?

Vice Chair Baltay: With that said I would certainly support a loading zone on this site with modified in size.

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, I was going to say the same thing. I agree you're not going to have a full-size semi coming there for the size of the businesses that are there so I agree. I would be more than willing to do that but I think there needs to be something there. As far as the design itself, like it said it – I keep hearing the concept about broken up façade and that's not really doing – that isn't the case. If you look at that entire façade, you've got about a 15% or 20% variation at one end and the rest of it is pretty much a single, large entity building.

Chair Furth: Ok, anything else or are you done? Alex.

Board Member Lew: I'm generally ok with the building design as it's proposed. I think that making the garage entrance different helps. I think having the lobby portion in the middle recessed, I think that helps and having the balconies is good. I think the low iron glass is great and I like that the windows are turning the corner. You have some questions, I guess this – maybe we need to address this in the future is that you're showing a 7-foot fence along the side property line to the right, next to the parking lot so I was just curious how is that – what were you thinking because you're proposing windows like retail windows like floor to ceiling glass along there but then you also have the fence – a tall fence with vines so I would like to see more about that. Then I think my other question would be on the glass, I haven't looked at the regular glass for the upper floor windows but it seems to me that if you brought the lobby entrance -- like the central bay of your building with two different kinds of glass that might look kind of – it might look strange. Then also I would like to see a little bit more on signage placements possibly. I think you're indicating that it could be above or below the awnings which is fine and I think the – some of the problems that we get into later with actual tenants is that usually they want illuminated signs and so that gets a little more difficult to place on the awnings. So, if you had some thoughts about where those could go and the sizes that you think would work best, I think that would help. Also on the glass, sometimes we've had discussions – the Boards had discussions about what happens to the glass below desk height so on some of our buildings in Palo Alto, sometimes we'll put – the architects will put a film on the inside of the glass to sort of obscure anything that is stored below desks. At least from the outside, the same reflectivity and transparency reads the same from the outside or sometimes we've had – some people will put blinds on the lower portions so that could be screened separately from the upper shades – window shades. Yeah?

Male: Alex, could you show me the glass?

Board Member Lew: Yes, well actually if you could point out – because I don't think or are any of these low iron? These are just the upper.

Mr. Castro: (Inaudible)

Board Member Lew: Could you come up to the microphone please, Michael.

Mr. Castro: The center glass has been changed to low iron. I believe that is just clear glass so that will be ultra-clear glazing. The glazing above it is a light grey, little blueish, it's called Z-50 PPG and you're correct. I think that's an oversight in our actual rendering of our lobby that the glazing will be clear glass for the two-story volume that is. I think we're still going to keep the – well, it could either way on what's above at the deck.

Board Member Lew: Then I don't have the technical specs and I don't know that we need to get into it but I mean like a 50% -- if this is about a 50% visible light transparency, it's – (inaudible) – pretty dark.

Mr. Castro: No, it's actually one of the clearer gray glasses out there. It's considered clear glass but when we had the sample, we used that in a couple different high rises in San Francisco and it is – just has a little bit of a grey tint. It distinguishes itself from ultra-clear glazing.

Board Member Lew: Ok, I think my only – my main point is that we have new mixed-use buildings here in Palo Alto where people are putting this on the ground floor and to me, it doesn't work at all.

Mr. Castro: I agree.

Board Member Lew: So, I do appreciate the effort that you've made. Ok, that's all that I have on the building.

Chair Furth: Just for my enlightenment, what's the significance of low iron glass?

Board Member Lew: Think of the Apple store.

Chair Furth: Very clear.

Board Member Lew: Super clear.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Super expensive.

Chair Furth: Thank you, that's helpful. Commissioner – Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Yes, I agree with Board Member Gooyer, the building is too boxy. To me, it's almost a diagram of the zoning code on most sides. It's as tall as it can be, it's to the setbacks on three sides at least, there's really no reveals or changes on the roofline height, and the 8-inch recess on the façade to the glazing is not enough. In many ways I feel it just needs more development, it needs a better design. It's not exactly bad, it's just blah and we're looking for better than blah on Cambridge Avenue. So, I made a sketch for myself with just what the roof would look like with some variation on it and it's 175-feet long if I catch that. That's a pretty long single building on Cambridge Avenue, you're replacing three buildings with distinct feelings – characters to them. I'll be it those characteristics may not be perfect and could be improved but I think it needs a little – quite a way to go to improve, not just to replace. So, I feel the building needs to be much less boxy, much more varied and relieved and any more reveals both vertically and in and out horizontally. I won't say that I am concerned but I would like to see considerable more information about the impact of your building with the condominium, the residential building on the left down on Cambridge Avenue. Both residents are here speaking about that and you've made statements about how it's just a high clearstory window, they've made statements about their children being dramatically affected. I think we should get to the bottom of what the true impact will be. To that effect, if you could show us some renderings of how that building relates to your building right now, at least the renderings I have don't seem to show it accurately. As well if you could show it on the floor plans, on each floor what is adjacent to your building on their building? How is it impacted? It would help us a lot to make a determination on that. It is very important that you don't impact them any more than is absolutely necessary. With the neighbor in the back, again I find that it seems that you're making good work to accommodate her particular needs and it sounds to me like you're going above and beyond the call of duty, at the same time it is incumbent on you to work with everybody. The question that will come up is as the applicant's representative asked, are you willing to put that in a Conditional of Approval in the Staff report? This new heating system or ventilation system so I would expect that Staff will try to come back with an answer on that but to have to teeth in it, it would need to be required not just an offering at a public hearing. Another item that I'm quite concerned about is the whole pedestrian frontage of the building and it feels to me that you could do considerably more to enliven the pedestrian experience walking along here and that's something that the City is looking for very strongly. To make this retail spaces work to improve, Cambridge Avenue right now is not a strong commercial retail shopping center. We know that you know that, and the whole goal is to try to make it so. To do that it needs ins and outs on the building, places to sit, to stop, to put a bicycle. Not just to meet the minimum requirement with a bike rack in the middle of the sidewalk but to architecturally, to creatively make the spaces that are public in front of the stores, next to, as you come closer to the landscaping, with benches and other public amenities. With having your building give a little bit, step back a little bit from the sidewalk and I'm afraid I just don't see too much of that. This looks very corporate, very – after 5 o'clock

it's not very inviting and so I would like to see you do more to enliven the sidewalk area. Maybe – I want to come back to the DEE and the height and the whole parking thing...

Chair Furth: (Inaudible) Commissioner Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Hi.

Board Member Lew: Board Member Thompson, sorry.

Board Member Thompson: I would also agree with Gooyer that the massing is extremely oppressive in terms of it being unbroken in many ways. In fact, the one break that you have made on the left of the picture is very confusing and feels extremely unrelated to the rest of the design and I think it would – even just looking at the materials, the relationship isn't very clear why you've decided to single that part out and kept the rest of it sort of singular. Currently, the way the lots are designed, it's sort of on a 25-foot 50-foot rhythm and I think that does something to break up the mass. When you're looking at this again, it might be worth looking at that, sort of having a rhythm, having something where the breaking apart has consistency or sort of a relationship. Even just to look at the adjacencies, you know the buildings that are around you, it's one thing just to look at the materials and copy that which is less convincing than if you were to say well, this has a scale and it has a rhythm that is – it speaks to a certain level. It would develop your concept and make it much more convincing if you were to take those things into consideration. Even just the way that you've rendered the apartments on the left is that they have these striations and use that if that's something that factors into your design concept because right now, it does feel very foreign. It does not feel like it has a place here right now, even just the fenestrations, the way that you've detailed the fenestration on the larger building is different than how you've detailed it in the smaller break apart on top of the garage. Given that this is a relatively low building, why not (inaudible) windows? Something that can allow for passage ventilation, that would also change the ceiling that this currently giving if there are operable windows and there's a more human connection between the people that in the building and outside. I think it also is a little dangerous to call that thing a pavilion because a pavilion has a lot of connotation for public interface and it doesn't seem like that's getting accomplished right now.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Before we go back to the Design Enhancement Exception request, thank you for your presentation. I found the packet and the presentation helpful. I think it was interesting in particular to see the site lines with the additional read lines – rear yard setback. When I looked at this building I thought well it does have the kind of latticework elements that seem to be very popular in the Cal. Ave redevelopment. It does have the sort of light and creamy colors that are also popular but it has the massing and the overall impression that I'm more used to seeing on El Camino Real where you see quite armored, defended buildings because it's a big, wide, noisy street with lots of traffic and air pollution. This seems to me to be an inappropriate design for Cambridge Avenue in this block. It's too defended, it's too armored, it doesn't engage with the street and balconies are good, windows that open are good. This is a great climate still, more landscaping is essential, it needs more in and out so that – you know 175-feet without a bench, that's too long in my opinion. This is somewhat of an obsession of mine because I sprain my ankle from time to time but you need to be able to sit down. If you want to encourage pedestrian traffic or me meeting a friend in front of your building then you need to make it comfortable. With respect to the landscaping, it may very well be that bamboo properly confined is the best treatment for the back. I think you need more on the front to convert this block to a retail block. That's one of the hallmarks of much of Palo Alto retail and I'm puzzled that almost none of the plants you're choosing are either native or particularly good as far as I know for habitat. I think I – I think kangaroo paws are gorgeous but I'm not sure – I don't think this meets our new standards which require thinking more about native plants and plants that are habitat for birds or bees or whatever. Let's see if I have any other notes here I can read. I'm glad that you have much more light in your building than you did in the first proposal that you made to the City. I am concerned about the issue of whether the upper floors are designed for lawful uses and I look forward to hearing more from Staff when this comes back. Over and over again we see the demolition of buildings that provide smaller office space – community serving office spaces and big open floor plans which appear to be designed for tech companies and software

manufacturer. So, the choice of tenants is the applicants but the design of the building needs to be suitable for lawful uses so that's something else that I'm going to be looking at when this comes back to us. So, Peter, you wanted to speak further on...

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah so, I wonder if could just address my colleagues really but the applicant has made a couple choices here at the beginning. One is to get whatever parking is required at grade level and then to fit three-stories of building and that's what creates the boxiness. It's just trying to maximize that 35,000-square foot. There is an option of putting below ground, that certainly would alleviate the boxiness and give them extra space to modulate the building. It would also perhaps provide a little more parking, I mean god forbid you to go beyond the minimum. Clearly, it's necessary and if you put a basement there you could get probably twice that parking. Maybe some clever way to loading as well but I find myself on the one hand obviously the Design Enhancement Exception findings that are very hard to make. On the other hand, reading through the applicants carefully made presentation about the need for taller retail spaces, I find that convincing. The 12-foot floor to floor for retail is not doing it so when I think about -- and I listened also to the medical person presenting to us who explained that for her particular profession, I suspect that a tall ceiling is not as important for her type of office. So, maybe what's going on is that they've also decided to make two-floors of office that are taller, more software corporate type offices and what really needs to happen is the retail does need to have a taller ceiling. The other two floors, if you insist on having two-floors of office above it should be less tall. That would force you to find ways to do the mechanical in soffits around the edges or small localized units. There are other technologies to get around that so if you had say a 14-foot floor to floor plate on the first floor, then went down to 10-feet on the top two floors it would shift that nature of the building. It would make it more focused on viable retail on the ground level which we want. It would force the office spaces to be more suitable for smaller local businesses which we want. Maybe we should be stepping towards that and not stipulating floor heights but strongly encouraging it. With this design, we're sort of forcing retail less and commercial software development more with these offices.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree in the sense but on a lot of these things we mention the -- it has to go let's say 10-foot floor to floor. I'd rather just say I need an 8-foot ceiling and then have my engineer get creative as far as getting the air distribution or whatever the case is through whether it's an open web truss or whatever the case is. Then, as you said, even if we -- then you have the ability to, as you said, raise the ground floor somewhat because you're absolutely right. If this is going to be a community based small office space type criteria, 8-feet is plenty or 8 ½-feet or whatever and that you don't need 10-foot ceilings. I mean I've spent numerous years in offices that are 8-feet and never felt cramped by it.

Chair Furth: You're tall, right. Any other comments before we -- before I try -- yes.

Board Member Lew: I just wanted to point out that there's a sun-shading study on Page 53 and 54. I think we were -- I think the residents of 420 Cambridge had asked about sun impacts and I think some of the residents on College Avenue had also expressed some concern. I just want to clarify from the applicant, the sun shading that you're showing is the height that meets the current 35-foot height limit and not...

Mr. Castro: Correct.

Board Member Lew: ...the 45-foot height limit. So, I think I just want to make a general point, I think they can meet with neighbors privately to explain this but it seems to me with respect to 420 Cambridge is that their own building shades their site more than 400 Cambridge. That's just because it's not (inaudible) North-South in Palo Alto -- in this part of Palo Alto but as I'm looking at the sun study I don't see a significant impact on there. Just taking a quick look at it but I haven't seen -- a study for the higher height limit.

Chair Furth: To try to summarize what I think we've heard, I have not heard support for a Design Enhancement Exception for height. I have heard support for some sort of modified loading facility that would accommodate smaller trucks of the kind that might actually come to this site. I have -- I think

those are consensus and I think there's a majority in taking the position that the building that's presented is too blocky; too much of an integrated unit. There are at least two of us who find it not sufficiently pedestrian friendly in lacking in – what do you call that, going back and forth? Undulation. There are comments that have also been raised about the possibility to make it engage with the street more by having windows that open. There's been a request for landscape that is more focused on our relatively recently adopted requirement that it be good habitat and preferably native. A request that it be designed to be suitable for a lawful use which may be smaller rather – offices rather than software factories. Anything else folks that I have forgotten? Oh, a question about the 7-foot fence and how that relates to the windows that would be adjacent to it. A comment that underground parking might solve part of the blocky problem. This comes up over and over and over again, if you try to build the full FAR and have parking above ground we get very large blocky structures. It happens a lot in the proposals that we see. Anything else?

Board Member Lew: I think Board Member Baltay was looking for additional drawings.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Just be sure that you present clearly the impact of the building on the neighboring residential structures.

Chair Furth: I would say that we see buildings that are on easy sites and we see buildings that are on hard sites and you have a hard site. It's existing development, it's infill, it's in a neighborhood where clearly you don't want to – some of the buildings aren't worth emulating, some maybe, you're next to residential on two sides, you suppose to introduce a new lovely, attractive retail to a street that hasn't really done that so I don't think any of us are saying it's easy but we think it's possible. If I could have a motion to (inaudible)...

Vice Chair Baltay: I wonder if the Board is willing to push this farther and stipulate that the retail must be taller rather than leave it as a recommendation of all our comments summed up by the Chairperson. I'm just beginning to think...

Board Member Gooyer: Must be taller you said?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, the retail – the floor to floor height of the retail is at 12-foot, it's too low, it needs to be bigger. On the one hand, I am very uncomfortable we're very close to delving into the role of the Architect, not the Review Board. At the same time, I'm so tired of having these come back over and over again and we're fighting the same questions.

Board Member Gooyer: No, you're right but I think again that depends on having spent 20 plus years in designing retail. A lot of that depends on the scope of the entire volume rather than – this is a 1,500 or 2,000-square foot space. Those areas are going to be smaller than this or if not about the same size as this and you don't need 16-foot ceilings in a space like this, I'm sorry. I'm not saying that I wouldn't be willing to – I should say I don't care how high they do it but I don't think it should be mandated that it needs to be that. If that's the case, if we're requiring it here then it's going to set a precedent or whatever.

Vice Chair Baltay: I hear you, Robert, I hear you, I just – I'm not sure they are hearing us as much as I want them to.

Board Member Gooyer: Well, then you know I mean maybe it gets to the point where – this is sidetracking a little bit but it gets to the point where we're serious about indicating what we do up here. I mean it's not – and you're right, I've done this long enough and this is not lecturing or maybe it is lecturing but we spend our time giving criteria. Then, as you said, these things come back and it's like did they even listen to us? Well...

Chair Furth: Ok, gentlemen, now that we have vented.

Board Member Gooyer: We're not arguing the point, we're in agreement but it...

Chair Furth: I'm going to cut you off for the moment. We can talk about this further later and we are – we do want to give clear direction and I'm sympathetic to that point. One of the findings that we have to make it so that the space is suitable for the occupants for the intended use so this needs to be good attractive retail space. I understand Vice Chair Baltay's question to be, is there a majority of the Board that is of the opinion that it needs to be at least...

Vice Chair Baltay: 14-foot floor to floor.

Chair Furth: 14-foot floor to floor, anybody support that position? Dies for lack of a second.

Vice Chair Baltay: It wasn't a motion.

Chair Furth: I understand, I'm teasing you.

Vice Chair Baltay: I move – can I make a motion?

Chair Furth: So, the motion – yes, a motion...

MOTION

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we continue this project to a date uncertain.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second.

Chair Furth: All those in favor? Opposed? None, the motion passes 5-0 and who was (inaudible – mic shut off)

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0

Board Member Lew: Robert.

Chair Furth: Robert I think. Alright, we're going to break for 5-minutes and we'll be right back.

[The Board took a short break before hearing the next item]

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2370 Watson Court [17PLN-00306]:** Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review for a Master Sign Program That Would Allow for Changes to Donor and Tenant Names That are Consistent With the Master Sign Program Without Subsequent Planning Review. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15311 (Accessory Structures). Zoning District: ROLM (E)(D)(AD) (Research Office and Limited Manufacturing Subdistrict-Embarcadero With a Site and Design and Automobile Dealership Combining District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Furth: We are back in session, still without our usual recording system but with a makeshift one. The next item on the agenda is a public hearing, it's quasi-judicial, it is for an approval of a Master – a Major Architectural Review for a Master Sign Program for 2370 Watson Court. It is exempted from CEQA, Staff if we could have the report.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Thank you. Good morning Board Members, Claire Hodgkins, project planner. I'm just going to give a very quick presentation today. This project, as you mentioned, is for a Master Sign Program at 2370 Watson Court. Essentially the City requires at Staff level a Discretionary Review for any changes to a sign so what's being requested today is a Master Sign Program to allow for – to set the parameters for future changes to tenant and donor names on the sign without having to come back for an additional Discretionary Review Process. I do want to be very clear that the sign itself in terms of the size, the materials and the location of the sign has already been approved as part of a previous Architectural Review Approval at a Staff level. The project before you today only include the parameters for that future – for those future changes to the sign. The process following the ARB recommendation today, the Director would make a decision on the project and as you noted, the project is exempted from CEQA in accordance with Category 11 exemption for on-premise signs for a commercial facility. There are a few relevant guidelines, mainly the Sign Ordinance, the Bay Lands Master Plan, and Design Guidelines are applicable to the project and the Airport Land Use Plan. That's – as outlined in the report, the project is consistent with all of these plans and ordinances so the recommended motion today is the ARB take the following action. Recommend approval of the Architectural Review application based on findings and subject to Conditions of Approval included in the draft finding and the Condition of Approval. The applicant is here today, I don't believe that they are planning to speak unless – but they are available if you have any questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of Staff? I have one, what does the Bay Lands Master Plan say about this signage in this area?

Ms. Hodgkins: It simply provides parameters the same as it does for all signs within the Bay Lands area.

Chair Furth: The red and white isn't usually what we do in the Bay Lands.

Ms. Hodgkins: Right so it does look at more natural colors so – or muted colors I think is the language which typically red does not constitute. The reason we made a decision on the color of the sign was essentially just that we do like to give some flexibility for – it is kind of a Stanford color. The sign across the street has a very similar signage so it fits in with the context of the area and it's being used minimally.

Chair Furth: Thank you so it's Cardinal not red, ok. Does the applicant wish to add anything? Hearing...

Ms. Vivian Jones: My name is Vivian Jones from Stanford University School of Medicine and I'm here if you have any questions and if you need me.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Comments from Board Members, start this way. Osma?

Board Member Thompson: At the time I don't see any reason right why we shouldn't go with the Staff recommendation. I'm open to hearing my fellow Board Members opinion on this matter but currently, that's my position.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: I have no comments. I can support this project as presented.

Chair Furth: Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: I can support the project. With regards to your question about the Bay Lands and the red color. It was an issue on the building next door when the eye clinic came into the existing building and it was discussed at length and it was deemed approvable.

Chair Furth: Thank you for that backstory. Board Member Gooyer.

Board Member Gooyer: There really isn't that much to discuss, it's fine the way it is.

Chair Furth: (Inaudible) I would entertain a motion.

MOTION

Board Member Gooyer: I move that we accept the or approve the – I shouldn't say approve, it recommends approval of the project as it's presented.

Chair Furth: Subject to the findings and conditions in the Staff report. All those in favor? Second, sorry?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Furth: Seconded by Board Member Lew. All those in favor? No opposed, that passes 5 nothing, thank you.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0

Ms. Hodgkins: Thank you.

Chair Furth: I believe that's a new land speed record for us. We wouldn't want you to think that we're not taking these things seriously but because the plan had already been approved, that changing that approval to a Master Sign approval was a bit of bureaucratic housekeeping.

Study Session

- 4. 4256 El Camino Real (17PLN-00357):** Request for Preliminary Architectural Review for a new 51,266 Square Foot Five-Story Hotel Including 90 Guest Rooms 96 Parking Spaces. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zone District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Furth: Alright, we are ready to move to Item Number Four, I do have speaker cards for that. If anybody else who hasn't submitted a speaker card wants to submit one, they are right there so Staff report, please. Well, I should introduce it.

Board Member Lew: Well wait.

Chair Furth: Well, I should let everybody set up, alright. What have I done with my agenda packet? Item Number Four is a request for Preliminary Architectural Review for new approximately 51,000-square foot, 5-story hotel with 90 guest rooms, 96 parking spaces and because this is a Preliminary Review, there is no CEQA; no California Environmental Quality Act Review. The zoning district is CS and because this is a Preliminary Architectural Review nothing will be done in terms of making a final recommendation today and our procedure is a bit less formal. The project planner is Samuel Gutierrez, whenever you are ready.

Mr. Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Thank you. Once again, my name is Samuel Gutierrez and I'm the project planner assigned to this Preliminary Application. It is located at 4256 El Camino and it is for a new hotel. This did previously go before the Board for a preliminary hearing so this is a second preliminary hearing and just to go in a little on the background of it. Here you can see the existing conditions of the site. It currently has a restaurant use which has been in operation for quite a while and has gone through different restaurant ownership so that is the conditions of the site. It's a small building, it's just a large at-grade parking lot towards the rear, and it's pretty open. Moving onto the proposed project here, it's the new multi-story hotel with 90 guest rooms totally 51,266-square feet of floor area with 96 parking spaces so that would be a FAR of 2.0 to 1. The height of the proposal ranges, it is nearing the maximum height of 50-feet along the El Camino frontage. That tapers down to approximately 34-feet to the rear so

it's a step-down kind of approach to the rear of the property. It does have a 12-foot wide sidewalk per the El Camino Design Guidelines so the frontage is stepped back a bit more than the current building that's there which is a small restaurant. We do have a couple of issues that came up with the review of this prelim that we discussed with the applicant at a DRC meeting. Starting with a large portion of the front...

Chair Furth: Excuse me, could you spell out the acronym so or could you – DRC is?

Mr. Gutierrez: Developmental Review.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yeah so that's Developmental Review Committee with all the City departments that would be involved with this review of this type of application so that ranges from planning to utilities, Public Works, fire etc. So, moving back to one of the main issues, one of the issues that we discussed with the applicant at the Developmental Review with other City Staff was the frontages is largely dedicated to vehicle movement. There are a large carport porte-cochere and driveway in the front and also, we have a parking layout that's mostly mechanical lift system in the garage and the code requirement for the non-mechanical lift parking spaces is two spaces or 10% of the overall parking, whichever is greater. The 96 spaces in this proposal so they do need at least 9.6, they don't have that currently and we do have some question about the functionality and the efficiency of the mechanical lift system. They are a three-tiered lift and they do have a tandem setup so there's on lift system that places behind another so you will drive through one to get to the other. The other issues that we identified to the applicant where that portions of the below-grade parking garage would count as floor area. They are just void empty spaces, there's not very many, I do have an example to show you of that so that was something that was noted to the applicant so they are potentially over their FAR now. The transformer location -- this type of building would require a large transformer for utilities and the location that is currently proposed would not have the clearance for installation and for maintenance. They do need a 35-foot height clearance above the transformer. I was told from utility engineering that that is for a crane because these utility transformers are extremely heavy and require a crane to install. The development would also lead to excessive excavation for the below-grade parking so the Redwoods are something of a concern on the adjacent property. The applicant did submit a revised arborist report from the previous prelim, however, it is kind of a preliminary arborist report. It does give additional details but a more thorough surveying of those Redwood's root systems would be needed in the future application. Then the site is listed as a housing inventory site in our Housing Element so it's going for fully – it's going to a pure hotel use so that's something that we did note because we would be losing a housing inventory site per the Housing Element in the code. Just a quick overview of the site plan here, you can see the large carport port cochere, the location of the transformer on the North right corner of this layout and you can see how the down driveway crosses the accessible path of travel; as well for these at-grade surface parking spaces. Towards the rear of the property on the left side of the site plan, you can see the Redwood on and adjacent to the property. That is where this advanced surveying of the root system that needs to be conducted in a future application. The —this is the below-grade parking plan, you can see that that's the tandem systems thereof the parking lifts that are suggested. If you look to the left of the driveway as you enter, you'll see this notched area that's kind of a void space. It's not really needed for turning radius so that would be an area for example that would count as floor area against the total. Just to the lower, I guess South portion of this map, you can see that there's a void area that's long, kind of rectangular beyond the tandem parking spaces. That kind of void area would also count as floor area, it's not serving a function for accessibility or for parking. We also did receive a number of public comments from the neighboring multi-family complex and Staff did have a number of meetings and email correspondence with the neighbors. I can say that the applicant has been in correspondence and has had a meeting with the neighbors as well to try to address their concerns. These are part of the concerns, the height of the proposal involution to their multi-family complex. The Municipal Code allows the height of 50-feet if it's not located within 150-feet of a residential district other than RM-40 or TC zone. So, I did look into the density and zoning of the adjacent complex, it is zoned CS so it's not a multi-family or excuse me, it's not a residential zone and based on their density, even if it were to be a residential zone it would be RM-40.

That would be the closest zone that would fit their density and their approximately 43 units per acre. Per the code, it wouldn't impact the height of this proposal in any way and it's wouldn't force it to lower in height. The other comments from the neighbors were regarding the potential shadows that would be cast on their open space of their complex. The overall design compatibility of the proposal with the surrounding area, the impacts of the proposal in regards to traffic, noise and the adjacent Redwoods and then the project being converted into housing. There were questions from the public about this project going into housing and again, reiterating my earlier point, the current zoning doesn't allow for this to be a pure housing development. The key considerations that we're asking for you to take here are the parking layout and carport porte cochere driveway, the site plan, the potential shadow that this development would cast on the adjacent open space, the proposals overall design compatibility with the surrounding area, the open space on site and the conformance with the El Camino Design Guidelines. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of Staff? We have speaker cards from about nine people, the first speaker is Sharlene Carlson to be followed by Neil Murphy.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: Typically Chair we let the applicant speak first.

Chair Furth: Don't know why I forgot that, I apologize, of course, we do, let's hear from the applicant, please.

Mr. Gutierrez: We do have a presentation from the applicant and they have a supplemental video to show as well.

Chair Furth: Ok so good morning. I apologize for overlooking you. This – you have 10-minutes.

Mr. Chek Tang: Good morning, thank you Board Members. My name is Chek Tang, a partner with Study T Square and I just want to bring up our holiday greetings to you. Our client representatives extend his greetings from Romania, he could not be here today but we'll try to answer as much of the question from the ownership point of view as possible. We do have our team, Chris Lee who is my partner, as well as our hospitality consultant who represents the owners is also, Eric (inaudible). One of the things that I think when we left the last meeting we were given a directive to really work with the community and the neighbors to resolve a number that were confronting us. There was a lot of really constructive comments from the Board and from the community that I think we've taken to heart. Then in addition to that, I think we worked very closely with Sam, Staff and other agencies to really come up with some – we feel is a workable solution that we even heard this morning with early projects. We (inaudible) present it to you but I think we wanted to make sure that we state that we have heard the comments and we've really, in good faith, addressed all the comments not only from the Board but from the community as well. Let me see if I can work this, how do I advance this? Oh, I'm sorry, wrong button. I think it's really important before we get into the project before the previous proposal to the new proposal to really kind of refresh on the context of the site. Obviously, we have our community behind us, the Palo Alto Redwood behind us. This is the image of probably the frontage on the South – I guess the West, Southwest side that's really confronting us and addressing kind of the rear property line, there's a lot. If you look at these photos here it's along the pool fence area. The condo building actually kind of slide onto our project site, it fronts onto the pool so there's actually quite a few – quite a bit of blank wall that's fronting our site here. In addition, on the Southside we have essentially an office warehouse facility that has a fairly large blank wall also there. Another thing to highlight is there almost like a screen of Redwood trees to the South of the project that is really a buffer between us and the adjacent property. I think it's important to note also some of the things that we heard from last time that I think we have really addressed. There is shadow impact, some of the comments from last from the Board was the shadow impact on the residential portion onto the Palo Alto Redwoods and we have reconfigured substantially the site plan to address that issue. We have some issues about insufficient loading and parking – surface parking area drop off zone. I think we've worked very hard to work with Staff to address that as well. The courtyard was a main point of concern being the narrowness of the courtyard and with the reconfiguration of the building, we were able to really open up the courtyard. Especially relative to the pool area of the adjacent

property. We worked very closely with Staff also to create a much more activated – truly activated street edge on ECR (El Camino Real) in addition to kind of the circulation that needs to happen within the port cochere area. Bike parking was actually relocated, all the bike parking on site at some of the very, I think pedestrian friendly area so that it could co-mingle with the pedestrian activity. It's not just kind of in the back and in the dark kind of forgotten area. There were some concerns about the bamboo trees along the side yard opposing the pool area. We've actually looked at that and I think the main issue with that is about kind of screening so by reconfiguring the site plan, I think the need for screening has gone away. In additionally, we're also proposing other, not as invasive kind of planting along the side property line. In terms of the architecture, there were comments about the façade being too complex and disjointed. I think we've taken a fresh look at it, really work on the massing. Not just kind of cosmetic changes but really looking at the massing and how the building addresses the street well on ECR and how it breaks up the massing on the back as well. Obviously, we've been working very hard in protecting all the Redwoods around the site and we've been working with the City arborist and our own arborist to have a game plan for that as well. I think it's also important to note the adjacent community's concerns and our -- (inaudible) our project director on the owner side has worked very closely with the community. It's gone back and forth numerous times, we actually have revisions on the design that we have actually vetted with the community to get their input before we even document it on the design and so several of these are highlighted on this slide here. Signage, we're – to be used to direct traffic so that we can prevent blockage on ECR. I think in the reconfiguration of the site the ramp actually becomes a stacking distance down to the garage so that there's not stacking onto ECR. Then also the actual port cochere or the kind of service area, we're going to sign that and do the landscape articulation so that we can make those circulations clear. I won't address the dimension issues, those were just really purely just to address the comments. Then back to the Redwood trees, again we've worked with both the City arborist and our arborist to address those concerns. Many of the traffic safety noise concerns will be part of the EIR that will be moving forward with once we've settled on the site plan. Construction process, obviously we'll be having to do that as part of the condition of approval. The shadow, we have reconfigured the site plan so that there is essentially no shadow in fact on the Palo Alto Redwood project. Then one thing that I think is really important to note is we not seeking any variation from the zoning ordinance for our zone. We are consistent with all the heights and zoning provision on the project and then we are also consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Last time we came before you we had some – several condominium projects that were part of the hotel plans. Since we've change the program for three units of extended stay, you know townhomes rather than having any residential on site so it's essentially all hospitality uses on site. There was a comment from the community – I think this is the only thing that we have not responded to the community, that there was a want or a desire for this project to change from a hotel use to a residential use. I think from ownership point of view, that's not the best use for this site. That a hotel is something that brings more benefit to the community. Onto the design itself the diagram shows, on the top, the previous scheme and then the new scheme. I think as you can see on the upper diagram there's a three-story edge basically aligning along the Palo Alto Redwood's property where we've reconfigured so that that are has the lowest massing. There's essentially no physical massing along that side with the exception of kind of the five-story element that's on the front adjacent to ECR. In terms of creating a little bit better circulation on site, we have carved out this port cochere to accommodate both onsite parking, I think that was one thing that was talked about, as well as on-site loading so that we have less impact on ECR – the circulation on ECR. That's one thing that we will show the alternative (inaudible) as a comment from the [DRC]. We – again, we have illuminate the residential units to provide full, 100% hotel or extended stay program onsite. You see on here, those are the tree extended stay hotel, kind of a townhome use so the idea is folks who might stay here longer than a week and that's a little bit more home environment for them. The hotel itself is actually kind of a diagram like this so that most of the density or kind of the wall is along ECR and as it steps down to the back, that it drops down to three and four-stories here. The other thing that we're also aware of is if we look at the site plan is there's an opportunity along this frontage here and even also here to provide some public art. Also, the intention is working with the Public Art Commission is not only the public art would stop here, there's potential bringing the landscape feature as part of the public arts program.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. Are we ready for the public hearing – public comment? I think we are ready for public comment now, let's hear from the general public. The first speaker card I have is Sharlene Carlson to be followed by Neil Murphy.

Ms. Sharlene Carlson: Good morning, my name is Sharlene Carlson and I have resided in Palo Alto Redwoods for 20-years. Today I am speaking as President of the Board of Directors of the Palo Alto Redwood Homeowners Association. A multi-family neighborhood community of 117 homes with approximately 275 residents living on 2 2/3 acres next to and behind the Sue Hung property. Collectively, we object the revised development proposal, 4256 El Camino Real. The association provided written and verbal comment to you in the first study session and we again are providing written and verbal comment in this study session. Our written comments are included in your agenda packet, along with a report from an independent arborist that the association retained, Smith Tree Services – I'm sorry, Tree Specialist. We do want to emphasize that we welcome a new neighbor with whom we can reasonably and comfortably co-exist but regrettably, what we face today is not acceptable to us. We previously provided demographic information about our multi-cultural neighborhood community, ages newborn to 96, with a growing number of families. About numerous architectural awards, we received when the building was completed in 1983. About the care, the developer took to build around existing Redwood trees to create a unique oasis in a former Redwood tree farm and about the attention the association has paid to preserve the architectural integrity and the trees in our beautiful, private Redwood forest. We also previously expressed concern about the proposed dense development design and the impact it would have on our people and property. Nothing about the proposed development benefits our community but there many things that present potential harm. Unfortunately, we still have ongoing concerns which other speakers will address including parking and traffic safety, density, tree health and environmental impact. We do appreciate the efforts that the developer has made to meet with us and address some of our concerns. However, we do not agree that they are resolved and for us, everything remains either unresolved or questionable of the concerns that we raised. The ARB has a difficult challenge of trying to balance build to right versus right to light and Palo Alto Redwoods appreciates the time and attention that you give to weighing our concerns. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. The next speaker is Neil Murphy to be followed by Jean [phonetics] [Crossnika]. Your handwriting is better than mine but not flawless.

Mr. Neil Murphy: Good morning, my name is Neil Murphy and I've been a resident at the Redwoods for 6-years and like my neighbors, I am concerned about this project. It creates several serious safety and traffic problems for our stretch of ECR with the flawed carport design, insufficient distance between the exit and left turn light, questionable puzzle parking, and illegal parking. First, the proposed carport design will back traffic up on ECR. What happens when valets bring up several cars into a full carport and more cars are trying to enter from the street or when UPS and FedEx show up at the same time? Where does the garbage truck park when another truck is in the loading zone? This design will cause cars to block the sidewalk where our children bike to school and obstruct circulation as our residents leave our driveway. Second, the proposed location creates insufficient distance for exiting cars to make the left turn light. Drivers who need to head North on ECR after leaving the hotel will try to cross four lanes of traffic in less than 100-feet or (inaudible) blocking southbound vehicles. This creates a safety hazard for passing cars and interrupts normal circulation. Third, the puzzle parking has been increased and the more moving parts something has the more likely it is to fail, especially as machinery ages. What – if there's a malfunction in the first tandem lift, cars in the second are inaccessible until it's resolved. What happens when multiple guests want their cars and a mechanical malfunction occurs? How does this effect carport congestion? Additionally, the construction depth of the garage may threaten our foundation and infrastructure. Forth, illegal and dangerous parking will occur in front of the hotel despite no parking zones. There's no location for tour buses to unload and as we see it at the Hilton Garden Inn, buses and ride shares will park illegally in front of the hotel despite signs and red curbs. This blocks visibility for drivers both exiting and passing. Since the sidewalk is not hotel property, they have no reason to actually enforce the no parking zone there. This is also a low priority for police and we see this at the Edgewood Plaza where delivery trucks park illegally and block traffic despite signage. Those plans included commercial loading spaces but once built, the drivers take the path of least resistance and its naive to

pretend this won't also occur here. In reality, this proposal exacerbates the dangerous situation that no one will take responsibility for actively mitigating after the fact. To conclude, the proposal will create safety hazards and worsen circulation on ECR with its flawed carport design and insufficient distance between the exit and turn light, questionable parking technology and illegal parking. Thus, fails to meet ARB finding Number Two, to enhance living conditions in the adjacent residential areas. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Murphy. Jean [Crossnika] to be followed by Julie Baskins.

Ms. Jean [Crossnika]: Hello, good morning. I'm here to talk about my passion which is the Redwood trees. My name is [Crossnika], I live at the Palo Alto Redwoods where for the past 17-years I have been the Chairperson for the maintenance of our Redwood tree with the contracted arborist for 20-years. His name is Henry Elan, City arborist with Menlo Park, California. We have well over 117 trees with a number of them eligible for (inaudible) in California statues. When we became aware a 50-foot tall building being developed next door, we started to be concerned for the health and the care of the 28 Redwood trees in our grove that would be impacted and the quality of life these trees provide to homeowners. In early October I met with the developer's arborist, Kielty Arborist Services for a walkthrough of this particular area so he can measure the diameter of the trees and the distance from the common-sense area. In the summary report, our trees were identified to be in poor condition, although we have been diligent in taking care of them through all the various water conditions. In late October, we contracted a completely independent arborist, Moki Smith of Smith Trees Specialist, to provide us with a completely independent assessment of the condition of our trees with the view of determining what might be of ultimate impact in construction on the Redwood trees. In the initial report, our trees are identified as being in good condition and showing evidence of consistent and appropriate care including irrigation. In order to acquire a deep assessment of our tree condition, we asked the City and the developer to perform the following various tests. One soil to determine the mechanical and chemical profile of the soil, water analysis to determine (inaudible) irrigation of water, live tissue testing to determine nutrient status of the tree. These tests would give us a better understanding of exactly what condition our trees are in but for our purposes today, there are three main areas of concern we want to call out at this time. Above ground portions of the trees providing benefits to privacy and screening, air quality and quality of life. Two, below ground impact of grading and excavation of a multi-level building close to the canopy and root base increase and three impacts and mitigation of the trees; (inaudible) above ground. The trees provide privacy screen, air quality and quality of life for the homeowners who benefit from the overall aesthetics. We have concerns the amount of sunlight and wind which is vital for the health of the tree will be severally compromised with a 50-foot building. We wish to emphasize we considered a so-called shade study as presented to be inadequate and we ask the City to ask the developer to get a more sophisticated, more independent shade study of the entire property. Some areas of impact of loss of sunlight, of course, would be the loss of lower limb structures, privacy, the only greenery would be at the top and the homeowners would just see trunks outside their windows. Also, we would be susceptible to dry rot on outbuilding which would be a significant cost. Two, below ground, the impact of grading – Oh, I guess I'm done.

Chair Furth: You may finish your sentence.

Ms. Crossnika: Ok, thank you. The impact of grading and excavating for multi-level building so close to the canopy and encroaching on the root base (inaudible) would severely impact the root system of the trees. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you Ms. Crossnika. The next speaker is Julie Baskins to be followed by Evangeline [phonetics][Inroacha]

Ms. Julie Baskin: Hello, good morning. My name is Julie Baskin and I've lived at the Redwood since 1988. While prior speaker identified ongoing concerns resulting in traffic congestion, parking issues, and trees preservation, my focus is the environment and totality. The developer has not addressed issues raised previously and specifically, they are one, health impacts from air, sound, noise pollution both during and after construction. Smoke impact, Palo Alto Redwoods in a non-smoking environment. We see no

designated smoking area and the wind typically blows from East to West. The loss of light, the developer shade study included in your packet does not adequately address the loss of light. As mentioned before, an independent study should be a requirement. Safety risks, especially for the children and families either walking or biking to school at peak commute times. Safety hazards, as a result of illegal and dangerous double parking including vision impairment along with a perpetually blocked white lane on ECR. Finally, number six, loss of privacy, the revised proposal diminishes privacy of all windows facing the development. Guest in 27 hotel units will look out directly into the living rooms and bedrooms and balconies of 18 of our homes. The proposal includes privacy fenced gates, excuse me, made of glass and glass does not insulate noise, in fact, it transmits noise. Glass is also fragile and shatters, representing a safety concern. As a community, we hope the ARB will give consideration to how the project will impact our residents in the neighborhood from a quality of life perspective. Someone else couldn't be here so I have the summary sheet, can I have another 60-seconds to read theirs?

Chair Furth: You still have another minute left.

Ms. Baskin: Oh ok. In summary, the revised plan does not provide harmonious transitions in scale, mass and character to adjacent land uses. It does not enhance living conditions in the adjacent residential areas, therefore, the project is inconsistent with required ARB Finding Number Two. Until this project is redesigned to reduce the scale and mass of the buildings and to integrate with the existing neighborhood, the required findings cannot be made. To recap what was expressed back in our opening remarks, we unequivocally disagree with the developer's conclusions that they resolved all of our concerns in the 9/3 – September 30th correspondence. There are still many unresolved issues with the project as it exists today and in fact, ironically, they are the same issues the ARB raised with the developer during the August study session. In summary, the Palo Alto Redwood is a hidden gem, isn't it similar to the kinds of residential neighborhoods the City is hoping to achieve?

Chair Furth: Thank you, Ms. Baskin. Evangeline [Inroacha] to be followed by Josephine [phonetics][Shooster].

Ms. Evangeline [Inroacha:] Good morning, thank you very much. My name is Evangeline [Inroacha], I've been a resident of the Palo Alto Redwoods for more than 22-years. I'm very concerned about this hotel project. I feel like our neighborhood was declared a hotel corridor and has been allowed to become, as the Palo Alto Weekly put it, all string and no pearls. I want to ask if anyone has been paying attention to what is actually happening on the ground? In 2008 I think there was an economic resource associate study commissioned by the City that said at the time there as 1,865 hotel rooms in all of Palo Alto. Now within walking distance of the Redwoods, we have 19 hotels with 1,595 rooms on El Camino alone. One of these has already submitted plans to nearly triple from 36 to 97 rooms. That's over 1,600 in a stretch of less than 2 ½ miles, just in the blocks of El Camino between 3200 and 4500. I suspect this may undercount because all I could do was map the area and look upon Trip Advisory but if we were to include the mass of Merits that are going on San Antonio and who knows what else is under consideration for properties not vacant. Surely there are thousands of rooms and if the City insists on more hotel rooms, I do think the burden should be more equitably shared throughout the City and not continue to be dumped on our neighborhood. This particular dense hotel project with almost 90 rooms in a long stretch of 50-foot high walls is unsuitable in the neighborhood. The project as draw is too bulky, significantly effects our daylight for many of our units, including all 12 of our BMR units. It endangers the health of our redwood trees and it adds to the already fragile traffic circulation and bike safety. This is just another in a series of massive buildings being built along El Camino. I would make a plea, I don't think there's in a whole region another multi-family residential development that has outdoor walkways amid more than 100 trees, most of them Redwood and a number of an oasis of green spaces and also provides easy access to public transportation, good schools, workplaces, community services. It seems to me we are actually the kind of housing that the new Comprehensive Plan wants to see more of and that Palo Alto should protect. We recognize that the property next door is zoned commercial and we've lived peacefully with Denny's and Su Hong as next-door neighbors for over a decade. This project has proposed – it just offers nothing of benefits to those about to live in South Palo Alto. There are no

amenities for the community, no invitation to walk and pause and nothing pedestrian-centric at all. Thank you very much for your attention.

Chair Furth: Thank you, [Ms. Shooster.] The next speaker is Julie Handley. I beg your pardon, yes, I got ahead of myself. [Ms. Shooster]?

[Ms. Josephine Shooster:] (Inaudible), good morning, I'm Josephine Shooster and I have to put my glasses on because I'm really old. I'm 87-years old and have lived in the Redwoods for longer than any of the other participants, for 32-years. I moved to Palo Alto because of the Palo Alto philosophy of people/trees and that's why I am here. I've served as president of the Board of Directors when we had a \$2 million project and I remain on the Board as the Senior Member because of my experience. For 32-years I've enjoyed the beauty and convenience of this great Palo Alto neighborhood but I now fear that these features will disappear. Since I no longer drive, I'm spending more time at home and shall be severely impacted by this project. I often cook for the Veterans Trauma Center as part of a group and I also cook Italian food for friends who cannot any longer cook because I can do that even though I can't drive. I'm an active citizen of Palo Alto and have started fundraisings across the street at the Pacific Art League which is a 95-year old Art School and gallery. I started the fundraising there several years ago which is still going on so I am an active Palo Alto citizen, not just a resident of the Redwoods. My home is 50-feet tall and this hotel will definitely impact air and light. I did not move to Palo Alto to live in a cave and that's I will be living if this project is approved. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I believe the next card I have Julie Handley to be followed by Robert Moss.

Ms. Julie Handley: Thank you very much. I'm Julie Handly, I have Dinah's Garden Hotel and also the property (inaudible) by Alexanders so I'm directly across from this project. 4261 for Dinah's Hotel and 4269 for We Trade It Well, it used to be Trader Vic but it's now the (inaudible) by Alexanders who is my tenant. This is John Hutar who we – they very kindly allowed me to bring up, he's my General Manager, he is an expert hotelier. Recently he GMed the (inaudible) Hotel in San Francisco, prior to that the Sofie Hotel in Redwood Shores and prior to that Nikko. He is an expert in hotels and he will speak very shortly about the hotel aspects and the safety aspects and the (inaudible) aspect. In my case, this is a legacy property that I inherited from my parents. I have slightly over 5-acres, it's a hotel, 129-rooms and I recently did a quick and easy -- had an interior do a quick study for me. If I was allowed to use this kind of density, I could build over 1,200 units on my property, making me the person most likely to profit from this kind of density and I am adamantly opposed to this project. I feel that it is totally contrary to the legacy in Palo Alto. My hotel has also been referred to as a hidden gem, we are Number Two on Trip Advisor out of 27 hotels in Palo Alto. At this point, I would like to turn this over to Jon who can talk a little bit about the reality of running a hotel with this kind of density and the challenges it represents.

Mr. John Hutar: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. We'll restart the timer for your new speaker since I have cards for both of you.

Mr. Hutar: Thank you. Our comments remain unchanged that we provided in written form at the last hearing. The density of the project has not changed, perhaps become even more dense. The issues that the developers spoke to as resolved, we respectfully disagree with and would still remain very much open and unresolved. The parking puzzle, I can tell you from 30-years of experience, 20-years a hotel General Manager will be an operational nightmare and will have overflow onto ECR. When you have that much mechanical equipment in tandem and deep with the unpredictability of when guests will want to arrive and depart. Inevitably the car that needs to be retrieved will be the deepest and while they've talked about provisions on the driveway for overflow, it will bleed out because you have vendors and deliveries and UPS trucks and all of that inevitably happening concurrently. As it relates to the architectural designs, Dinah's as I pointed out in my last talk to you, in April of 1958 opened with accolades from the architectural community and having a massively dense structure like this across the street from an oasis and an architectural gem that is still revered as forward thinking would just be a shame for Palo Alto and everything that we stand for in our values. Thirdly I recently had a conversation with a colleague who

manages a similar property that just opened in Santa Cruz with this parking puzzle. The number one problem for them is parking. The biggest detractor on Trip Advisory and biggest detractor with their guests is the parking situation which is just a nightmare to manage. We are open to competition, that's everyone's right but to jam that much density onto a parcel and a neighborhood that is currently lovely would really be a shame. We concur with, I think we can say 100% of the points that were respected with our neighbors, the Redwoods, who have previously spoken.

Ms. Handley: That would be correct.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Hutar: Anything else Julie?

Ms. Handley: Nope.

Mr. Hutar: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Mr. Moss.

Mr. Robert Moss: Thank you. I'm sure you've heard of two of the biggest problems people have in Palo Alto are traffic and parking and this proposal will worsen both along one of our most congested streets, El Camino. It's too big, it's bulky, it's under parked and the under parking is verified by the fact that they are talking about using mechanical lifts. The first principle should be scaled it down so that all parking can be accommodated at grade or perhaps in an underground garage. If you can't do that, the building is too big and they can't do that now so the building is too big. Second, if you look at the pictures they had a long El Camino, it's a very poor attempt to meet the El Camino Design Guidelines and speaking as one of the people who created those Design Guidelines, the building is too blocky, too bulky, it doesn't have any consistency with any other building along that street in that block and so it should be scaled down and made much more attractive. Right now, all they are trying to do is jam in as much development on that site as they can possibly fit. It's not a good way of doing things. We have to be very careful about what's allowed along El Camino because we're having some real major problems with some of the things that are being built, especially in Mountain View, in creating real traffic jams. You drive along El Camino even as late as 10 o'clock in the morning, it's totally congested and this is going to make it worse. So, scale it down, cut it back to the point where parking is accessible and adequate on site without going thru these mechanical lifts. By the way, there have been some – this is unusual to have mechanical lifts on projects in Palo Alto but in some areas where they've allowed them, they occasionally had failures and when you can't get your car up or down on lift, it creates a real problem. That's not a good way to be parking so as the reviewers of the design, I think you can find a lot of problems with the way it's laid out and the appearance of the buildings and that's got to be improved also. Right now, all they are trying to do is jam as much as they possibly can on site and ignoring any consistency with the rest of the community, that's not good. We need to have something that's more consistent and more compatible and especially traffic and parking.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Moss. Anybody else wants to speak? Then we will end this part of the proceeding. This is a – beg your pardon, this is a study session so we don't always do disclosures but does anybody want to talk about other communications that are relevant to this matter?

Board Member Gooyer: I have a question I guess to the applicant. What exactly is the function of the timeshare units or how do they work?

[Mr. Eric ??:] Good morning Board, my name is Eric (inaudible), I'm the hotel consultant with the project. The – those three units are more extended stays. So, for example, if anyone has ever stayed at a Residence Inn where somebody can come in and they'll have a small kitchen area and a separate bedroom area. It's just a way to capture a different type of clientele that may be coming in for a month, two months, two weeks and they are looking for a little bit more than just your standard guest room.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, thank you.

Chair Furth: Anything else? Anyone else?

Mr. ???: I don't know if I could just have a minute to maybe just address just a few of the concerns?

Chair Furth: Not right now, thank you.

Mr. ???: Ok.

Chair Furth: But you're -- certainly you are welcome to respond. You another 10-minutes but I thought if we got any specific questions that people wanted to address that would make that more efficient use of their time. Ok, 10-minutes to respond.

Mr. Tang: Thank you. Since we had not quite enough time to present our project, I would just address this because some of the concerns were mostly about the kind of larger policy issues. From our belief, we believe the land use -- our project per the land use is fully compliant and I understand the Comprehensive Plan allows for the kind of building that we're proposing but it's a lot of qualitative quality that the Board has to evaluate. The way we have done the project is really putting all the density and kind of the street (inaudible) per the Comprehensive Plan on El Camino Real and on kind of the South end of the building to create much less impact on the neighbors to the North and to the West. That's something that I think, as you can see in your package, is really important. Then another topic that was mentioned is the circulation of parking and the diagram that you see on the screen, I think just in a quick summary is all the loading services including perhaps buses -- shuttle buses that drop off folks that actually pull in the port cochere. Along with Uber drivers who want to drop off or pick up there -- the clients can have a full utilization within that port cochere area. However, we have an alternative plan that we can show you quickly for your comment of recommendation from (inaudible) Transportation Department. In terms of the protection of the Redwood trees, one of the things that I think is a really critical item for us to really think about is if you look at the garage plan which I don't think this is the garage plan. The garage plan actually follows a setback of the building like this so if you look at the relationship between our garage footprint and the tree canopies, that's the reason why we setback the garage footprint. In order to have the root bulb for the Redwood trees to be protected and also have plenty of room to grow. For the shadow study, we can definitely as part of the EIR process and also the noise studies as part of the EIR process, we'll come forward with much more detail but I think to also note, right now there's no street wall along ECR. So, as we put this building on ECR, the noise level at the back of the site should be reduced as a result so that could be validated when we have the noise report. The massing study I think is really important to also note that we have a component of the building where the five-stories is really where this darker color is and the extended stay area is actually two-story on the back. It's even lower or shorter than the existing condo building here as a respectful kind of gesture both this kind of blank sidewall, as well as the condominium here. As well as the massing transition from a five-story down to a four-story and a three-story condition to really address that issue. Then the other thing is in terms of privacy that by reorienting this -- these extended stay units, none of these units are -- have the public face fronting onto the neighbor's property. These on the upper floor of this -- these units here, essentially (inaudible) with this blank wall and the public face is actually fronting onto the courtyard. In addition to a gate here that separates this more active area off the courtyard to kind of this rear, what we call it a more sculptural garden, of a much more passive garden back here. I think our project has really looked at all the comments from the Board, as well as from the community and we respected those comments. In terms of the architecture, I think one of the things that are important to note is that we have created -- actually changed the program, the entire program so that the lobby is kind of in the center, mid-block of this project with the bar, the lounge area with outdoor seating spaces to really activate ECR. Unlike the Hilton Garden -- the Hilton down the street that is kind of just a straight wall so that's another thing that we have responded too. The other thing that is important to note is also on the back roof that kind of cascades down, what we've done is changed our mechanical system so the PTAC System, (inaudible) System so that we can actually don't necessarily have to have

mechanical that's on the roof on the rear of the site. The only mechanical system on the roof is really up front where we have the restaurant, the bar, and the common area. I think it's really important to note that this is a project that I think we worked long and hard at and not only considering what is there right now. The Comprehensive Plan requires us to look at this project to the future of Palo Alto and these are the kind of projects being called for. Now, architecturally I think we've heard your comment about there was a street wall, there was too much height along the adjacent property line, and there wasn't enough breakup and we literally broke up the building to that in terms of the street presence. We still keep the street wall but have a kind of a finer grain modular in terms of the architecture. Also breaking up not a disjointed material uses but much more kind of unified kind of a feel but I think the idea of having to – now is a balance between incorporating all the operational things that are required of the hotel – the operation of the hotel and also creating that activated street scheme. The port cochere that we're talking about that we're look – we'll continuing to work the landscape architect to create a really nice paving area so it doesn't feel like an asphalt port cochere. It's really almost like a pedestrian plaza within in that whole area of the port cochere. With that, I will just end with I think we have been taking these comments to heart from a design side, from a land use side, from an environmental side and we'll continue to work with the community on creating conditions that would be acceptable for everybody in terms of the construction, mitigation. We look forward to all our other engineers to validate the finding – hopefully the finding that we have in terms of shadow and noise. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: You still have 3-minutes if you'd like.

Mr. ???: Thank you. I just want to say that we appreciate all the comments from the community and the local hoteliers. Just a couple quickly addressing the issues, one of the things that have really changed over the last 2 to 3-years is if you take a lot of the hotels here in downtown when it comes to parking is the use of Lyft and Uber. A lot of people that are coming to the hotels and the type of clients will be a very heavy corporate clientele. They are not even driving their own cars now because they give some hotels 25%-30% -- they are actually using Uber and Lyft to get to the hotels which does help the hotels from a parking standpoint because they are not using their own cars. Sant Cruz could be a little bit different because it's more of a leisure market so you have a lot more families that go there so you definitely would have less people using Uber and Lyft. Where in the Palo Alto market you definitely have a lot of people now utilizing that. Hilton Garden Inn for example, which I work with that brand, they have 147 units, we're only going to have 90 so from a use of tour buses and those types of groups, that's not necessarily going to be something that we're going to have a lot of. I'm not going to say we're never going to have it but the Hilton Garden Inn can have a lot more buses because they have teams and different sporting events and that type of clientele so we wouldn't have that much of a parking issue outside. A hotel would be definitely 100% non-smoking and we will have a designated smoking area to address that and like I said with the hotel, from a traffic flow standpoint, even when the hotel is sold out and there are 90 cars coming in and out. It will probably still be a little bit less than what comes and go from the restaurant that has been there in the past. Ownership is definitely committed to making that property a success and working with everybody in the local community.

Mr. Tang: I also wanted to add since we have about 15 seconds left. We're multi-tasking with the lift system, the (inaudible) of the lift system on how the threes stack would work. Generally, a concern might be found if this was an individual resident operating it but this entire system, whether it's the stand along parking or the lift, is actually all operated by the valet Staff. I think this will give you an illustration of how it works and also because of the ramp condition, as well as the stacking distance within the garage itself, it creates plenty of stacking that's outside of the port cochere and ECR so thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions from the Board of the applicant?

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure, you told me that you have – you told us that you have at-grade parking. Could you point out where that is?

Mr. Tang: There is a handicap spot here, a parking spot as well as another spot here at grade. In addition – so these are now double-wide, kind of a drop-off area so you could actually park here for a taxi or Uber as well.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Could you explain how a service truck actually gets into that loading dock, please?

Mr. Tang: So, the idea is they can pull in and back into this spot and I think is where we have provided per code a 42-foot loading area but one of the things that we would probably ask the Board to consider is what if we were to go to a smaller size loading area? That allows – this allows for basically a full (inaudible)...

Vice Chair Baltay: So, a service truck is going to be backing up in the middle of the port cochere in front of the hotel lobby to get into that spot, is that correct?

Mr. Tang: Yeah and...

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. How about the garbage truck, how does that pick up the trash from the enclosure there?

Mr. Tang: The garbage truck would also – well, first of all, we went – we talked to the waste management and their initial thought was actually they would pick up the trash off of ECR instead of pulling into, that's their preference. So – but we have made a provision that a truck can actually pull into here and be able to get out so that they don't have to back – kind of back out onto ECR.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm sorry but I see a trash room shown on the edge of the ramp, is that correct.

Mr. Tang: Right here, yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: So...

Mr. Tang: So, they can be pulled out here for – during the pick-up time if the waste management company decided to use ECR as the access or our Staff can pull the trash out here as the trash truck comes into this area to collect.

Vice Chair Baltay: Ok, thank you. Second question if I could to staff and maybe it could just help clarify this? At one hand you said the site is zoned so it cannot be used for residential and on the other we're told that the Comprehensive Plan says this site should be used for residential. Is there a mechanism that which we could push this to be different than what's being proposed through that?

Mr. Gutierrez: Sure, so it's not the Comp. Plan in general, it's the Housing Element that identifies this as a housing inventory site. So that is has a potential of producing housing units per the Housing Inventory Study that they selected specific areas throughout the City where housing could potentially be.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is the intention that the zoning code would need to be changed to put that into effect then?

Mr. Gutierrez: Well, this does allow mixed use to be done there so they could have mixed-use residential with some commercial component or the mixed hotel with residential as they previously proposed in the previous prelim. To do pure, just 100% housing, yes, that would need to be some type of a zone change.

Chair Furth: Anybody else have questions of Staff or the applicant?

Board Member Lew: I have a question for Staff. So, if there's an EIR being done for this project, does that means it's going to the – be reviewed by the Planning and Transportation Commission and then certified by the Council?

Mr. Lait: (Inaudible) an EIR for the project?

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Mr. Lait: If an EIR is required, it does get certified by the City Council if there's a finding of significant – like a statement of overriding consideration. If it's short of that, then the Director (inaudible).

Board Member Lew: It would be a Director's decision. Ok, thank you.

Chair Furth: Anybody else? I had one question so how many sites – how – sorry, how many units were identified in that Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan for this site?

Mr. Gutierrez: That's actually listed in the Staff report...

Chair Furth: I'm sure it is.

Mr. Gutierrez: ...and it is listed as having – one moment, 17 units but a realistic yield of 12.

Chair Furth: Thank you so that's an assumption of a combined non-residential and residential use or not?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Mr. Lait: Yes.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes.

Chair Furth: This is a study session, we're trying to give direction to the applicant. We don't have the Environmental Review yet. Before we start, we are of course an Architectural Review Board, we don't make the decisions on what's the appropriate zoning or the land use. Your comments are interesting to us and of course to the Council as well but our purview is to look at the proposed use in the context of the existing zoning and the existing built environment and see if we can make the findings that we need to make before we recommend approval. The burden of proof is on the applicant and who would like to start? Alex?

Board Member Gooyer: Fine, I'll go. I mean it's one of these things where do I start? It – initially it almost – when I saw it, it almost looks like the preverbal – I think what is it? The tail wagging the dog; that these three long stays, as you call them, units in the back seem to be driving the rest of the site. They've got some nice room around them and everything else but it is only three out of ninety spaces. So, having said that going to just the initial concept of when you drive up. You go into what looks like a parking garage and that becomes the port cochere. Yet then you go back out of the port cochere and that the actual front door is actually not under what I would classify as the port cochere. It just seems really strange to me and then the same thing with – you've pretty much indicated – I mean just simple things like if the trash truck is there. They literally have to walk over, take the dumpsters, roll them along the side of the building, across the accessible parking space ramp and then out. So, this stinky garbage truck is sitting there under the building for 10-minutes while the guy's roaming around. Which to me, if I'm coming to this hotel and we all know it's not going to cost \$6.95 to stay here, that it – it's just not really a slightly first impression of the hotel. The same thing with the idea of a UPS truck will come across the port cochere and then back up into the other space which as soon as he's backing up, immediately pretty much stops everything going on in the port cochere. I mean it's that sort of thing that – and I think the reality of it is, you need to give less, I don't know, presence to the long stay units because the reality of it is, I think we're in agreement that the long stay units in most cases are probably for business people who are here for a couple months or working Silicon Valley. First of all, from what I see here it almost looks like they have their own little backyard which I think is a waste of space. No guy who's been working 8-hours or 10-hours a day is going to sit out in his little backyard in the hotel. If those three

spaces – they can still be two-story and everything else but if they are integrated into the hotel more, whether they just become part of the overall design. Where it isn't one of these oh, look at our long – our three unique space units, then I think that gives you more flexibility to be more creative as to the space around it. As to the design, unfortunately, it's funny where you show some sort of – I mean various ideas of look, this is the concept that we're interested in and in almost all these things the one you're using as an example is a much better example than what you're doing. I'm not saying you can't achieve that but that's the way I see it. Also, the unit on the left to me almost has sort of a riparian look with the roof and all that and I like that but the thing is, it's tough to make that work on a 5-story building. It's sort of like creating a 5-story bungalow. I mean I've seen people try to do that it and it just really doesn't work. The roof is too small, it doesn't have enough of an overhang if that's the case and I'm not saying you need to do it that way. All I'm saying is that if you take that approach, which I like, but you haven't taken it far enough; it's still sort of a plastered-on type concept. When we did the first one there was, as you said, one of the comments was that it was trying to do too much. I think there's still some of that there, that you're trying to do too much in the spaces. Especially you see it in, for instance like the A2.1 elevation or I should say perspective and there's a whole lot of stuff going on there. I—maybe it's also the type of thing maybe as an architect I'd walk by and look at that but in the overall scheme of things, I don't know if people are going to – I think the main impression is it's going to look busy. Rather than oh, look at all the nice detailing and because of that, it's the same thing like we had with one of the earlier projects. There's not enough undulation in that, I know you have an attempt to do that but it's the same thing with the walls; is that there's only like about a foot type of thing and because of that I understand where – what you want to do with it. So often, let's face it, the reality of it is you can't lose the floor area or whatever so it's tough to make it work and still try to carry off the thing on the right side. Let me see and go through some of these things. The – I've never been a real big fan of the lift systems but they are getting better but if you have it so that basically 98% of your parking is that way, you're going to have a lot of people who just don't want to deal with that stuff. They are going to be some that are and I do agree with you though that let's face it, now a day with Lyft and Uber, why bother taking the – you know you take a rideshare there. That alleviates a lot of it but it still doesn't do anything for the person who drives their car up and just needs to park it for a few minutes. You either have to go into the whole lift system -- other than the two accessible parking spaces there really is – because we all – you know there's no space to park up there. You and I both know yes, you leave the space for a car to be parked up there but the first time I leave my car up there, I will walk out of that – I will have eight bell captains or whatever people coming up to me and say hey, you can't park there. I mean that's just the reality of it so you leave the space but it never really is going to be used that way. Let's see, let's see, I tell you what, that's good enough for me at the moment. Let's see what some of the other Board Members have.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. I have to be honest and say that my first reaction was negative when I was looking at your drawings. Then as I looked at it more carefully and was looking at what your – and looking at your revised design, I do see that you have tried to protect the privacy to the Palo Alto Redwoods, that you've tried to step the massing down to minimize sun shading so I do want to acknowledge those improvements. I think I do want to acknowledge that you've tried to make a larger entry area and add ground floor uses that are visible from the sidewalk so I think that those are all improvements. The – I think the – my biggest issue on this project is going to be the architecture. The way I look at it is it's always going to be really difficult putting in a hotel use because our Zoning Ordinance allows them to be twice as big as other uses. So, that's just – like off the bat that's – it's a difficult problem and that the Board has previously really been very tough on the architects for hotels and trying to get really rigorous designs. We do have the Hilton – the home – what is it, Homewood Suites by Hilton? Which I think is a 1.75 floor area building and I think that one turned out well, considering. Then we have also had the 2.0 floor area building – hotel which is the – (inaudible) next to the Westin. The Board really insisted on rigorous proportions, meticulous details on that one and I don't see it happening yet on this project and I'm a little concerned about it. Say for example your port cochere, I think your columns are just like a foot deep and that does not – that's not going to cut it at all and so I could go around the whole building and find things that I don't like. I would mention that one, I think on the south

property line I think you're showing one – like a white section of stucco and then maybe a tan section of stucco but they are actually all on the same plane and typically the Board here has not liked that kind of situation. Where it's just a 2-D architecture so I think you have a long way to go. I guess I'm saying that I'm generally in support of the part of the building. I think this is a – I think given the site, that's probably the best arrangement that I can come up with. With regard to landscaping, I do want to point out that we do have a revised finding for landscape. That should be in the packet and a couple things that I noticed in the landscape design. One is the – they are showing Nadina along the perimeter and that has poisonous berries to both birds and mammals. It's from China and I would encourage you to find something that more native and more wildlife friendly. There are plants that grow under --- that have evolved to grow under Redwood trees. They typically require a lot of water so I don't know if they can work within the water use budget that we do require you to do but I want to encourage you to try to do that. Then to factor in that most of those plants are used to growing in acidic conditions because of the Redwood trees so factor in all of that and try to provide habitat for wildlife in that area. Most of those plants are used to growing in dark conditions and they (inaudible) symbolic relationship between the different species. On the sun study, I think I was actually surprised at how minimal the impact were on the property – on the Palo Alto Redwoods. I think that's probably because of the solar orientation of the project so I think that was looking actually fairly good. I think the residents have – the neighbors have issues with the study that's been provided but I actually – when I was looking at it yesterday, nothing popped out at me as being inaccurate just doing a cursory look at it. If there are specific concerns with it I'm – I would want to know the actual details of that. On the massing, I think there – on the El Camino frontage, I do like the 5th floor set back on the right-hand portion of the building and I think it's setback 10-feet. I'm concerned that the left-hand portion is not a setback as well. I think we did require that on both sides of the Hilton Garden Inn and I think that setback is working. I think that is working on that particular building. I don't – I think like Robert I'm not crazy about the way the back of the building is looking but I think I understand why you're doing it. We have a low-income housing project nearby on Charleston that did that stair stepping massing down and I didn't really like it and the way it looked on that particular building either. In the end, it actually worked for the neighbors so I don't want to discourage you from the stepping but yeah, it's not looking pretty at the moment. That's all that I have at the moment. I think it's – I guess having to say it's headed in the right direction, thank you.

Chair Furth: Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. I agree with Board Member Gooyer's comments regarding the overall form of the building, front and back. I agree as well with Board Member Lew's comments, his insightful notions about the detailing and stuff are spot on. I don't want to repeat it but you really need to listen and pay attention to that. I think the one good thing I've seen on this revision is that you have stepped the building back at the back to acknowledge the neighbors sense of privacy. I think it is a positive thing to be stepping from five to four to three-floors at the back. I did have a chance to look into some of the residential units and the impact is significant. I would advise you to see if that's possible as well to put yourself in a resident's point of view. It might make it a little bit more understandable why they feel so strongly but I do think you're doing things in the right direction. I want to focus the majority of what I'm talking about today on your sort of site planning, transportation circulation because I just don't think it works. I'm sort of surprised that you're planning to build this fairly expensive and fancy hotel with – I mean I could go on and on. A loading dock right next to the front door, a garbage truck that's blocking the pathway down, no realistic parking situation, those aren't at grade parking spots. Those are accessible units, nobody can really park there and it just doesn't work. You just heard it from another experienced hotelier telling us that this stuff isn't going to work. I don't have to be a hotel architect to look at it and tell you it just doesn't work. Unfortunately to make it work, it's going to revise big chunks of the rest of this design. You've got a lot of work ahead of you but I promise you that it has to work. You have to be able to drive in, drive out safely, greet a guest, park properly, find the front door, it has to look nice, there has to be space around it, these are all basic things that just aren't happening. I don't know what to say, I'm frustrated in the sense because this the same stuff that we saw in the first project. You came out of – no, please wait. You came at us with 90 stacked parking garages downstairs and we told you need parking spaces at grade and we're looking at two accessible spots at grade. It still doesn't work, it doesn't work any better than it worked before and in order to make it work you're going to have

to make some changes to the rest of your plan. I don't know how much more to drill away at it but it doesn't work, it doesn't work so you need some form to get it better. The last thing is that I did have a chance to also go into the swimming pool area of the adjacent residential unit and I'm having a hard time either understanding your shadow study or being able to check if it's true. It seemed to me that the shadow study didn't properly present the current situation there, at the time I was in there and it's also very difficult to read. I was quite concerned that that swimming pool area has fairly open sense about it to the southern sky and it does seem to be important that whatever you do, not to impact that greatly. So, I would think a shadow study of the impact of the building on that open swimming pool area would be important. A shadow study that really clearly shows what the sun looks like on that, maybe that's a good place to do one of these videos so that you could show the community. It might be a great gesture if you could design a building that minimizes that study and present it in a way that everybody can understand and then get they're by in on it and come back to us with something everybody agrees too; that would-be a (inaudible) thing. I'm going to leave it at that, I support what everybody else said and I think you need to rework your circulation. Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Hi there. I mean I'm going to reiterate a little bit but not too much. One of the first things I noticed when going through your whole package was yeah, the sun studies, they are extremely unconvincing. They don't illustrate in the same way and I thinks in part to the fact that it's in color so I would recommend for your next shadow study use just a white model and that way we can really see how the sun is traveling across all these times. Even for the trees I would say use this, I mean these shadow studies are more than just to know what the impact is. I would even recommend to use that shadow study to inform your massing because it's quite evident that in some of the other designs of the buildings around that there's a sensitivity to the trees and the shadow studies are informing where the building should really be. In that sense, it may be that when you're looking – when you're analyzing the results of your shadow study, it might give you an idea of how to inform your massing so that it actually gives you the best outcome. That sort of leads me to other parts of the presentation that a lot of the renders are aerial views which no one really ever sees the building from this vantage point. I would recommend more views from street level and from pedestrian level. I also would really like the trees to be much more transparent because, in a lot of these drawings, they are obstructing a lot of the architecture which makes it hard to evaluate what's really there. In that sense also, it's sort of comes down to what you can see which right now is the beige and the wood which in this current rendition it's unconvincing as a (inaudible). It sort of hard to understand exactly what the concept of this is but I think you have a lot of rich resources around you. You know there's a really great development that surrounded around trees and maybe why not integrate that into the concept of this architecture? I think it would make the hotel appealing to sort of embrace the landscape, to embrace the nature around and integrate that more into your design. I think it would make it – even if you have to lose a couple units here and there or something. Bring it down and I think integrating trees and landscape, something native would actually make it a much more desirable and potentially more valuable at the end. Then in terms of other elements of the massing, just pay attention to the roof line because I feel like this would look so different from ground view and a lot of your presidents are for a lot smaller architecture which when they are used they are applied to a bigger thing it doesn't translate in the same way. I'll leave it at that.

Chair Furth: Thank you and thank you all for your presentations and thank you to the neighbors for coming. (Inaudible), a complicated project so I'll focus on a few things that are a particular concern to me. One of our findings, of course, is that this is doing a good job with existing natural features. The existing, at this point, natural feature is the Redwood grove, even though it was originally a Redwood farm. That has to be, in my mind, a big driver of all design. At the moment we have some rather conflicting tree reports but we're talking – we're not asking for tree reports here to decide whether it's ok to take a tree out. We're asking for tree reports to find out what do we need to do to preserve and enhance the health of those trees? So, I'm not going to be able to recommend approval of something unless I'm convinced that that's been done. It may have been but I can't tell. Secondly, I was not really able to understand the shadow study in a useful way and I think some of my colleagues have pointed out why those drawings might be difficult to understand. I think there are two –everything is important, of

course, if you live in the area but I think there are two areas of particular focus. One is the pool and clubhouse area, it seems to me that that's an important public amenity for that large community of people so I'm going to be very – I'm going to want to see that it will continue to be attractive when this project happens. The second one is the below market rate units which are largely on the bottom level right? At the lower level of the Palo Alto Redwoods?

Mr. Gutierrez: I believe so. They are in the taller tower buildings and I think they're in the four-story buildings.

Chair Furth: Well...

Mr. Gutierrez: I can't confirm exactly (inaudible)...

Chair Furth: Maybe the neighbors could – maybe the Palo Alto Redwoods could?

Female: Yes, I can confirm that there are 12 BMR units and they are in four stacks up three floors. Some of them are in our Area A and Area B and they all face the Redwood grove behind the Su Hung property.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Well, I'm glad to know they are on various different floors but none of the units which presently have good or adequate light should be insignificant darkness once this is built. I mean I think that one of the findings that we have to make is that it enhances residential life on the side or next door and if it gets too dark, it won't pass that test. On the architectural design, I have two comments, one is this is a building that people see at fairly high speeds. They're – I mean not always, sometimes you see it at 2 miles per hour but often people go by fairly readily so I think it needs to make a pretty strong, pretty unified statement. There are beautiful buildings along El Camino but if you're going to notice them, they have to really be well woven together. If it's too subtle, we don't get it and on the other hand, if it isn't well detailed we'll quickly be bored by it and won't find it attractive. When I look at the elevation on the cover, it really presents a very unattractive view. I understand that the entrance to the garage is recessed but it looks like the big view I'm going to get as I approach this site is garage entrance into dark space and that's not consistent with our design requirements or with the South El Camino Design Guidelines I suspect. Then that relates to probably a much more serious problem which is how the circulation works and part of it is we now have a City code that says that properties can be developed with puzzle – with lift systems. It requires how many – it requires ten surface parking spaces roughly, (inaudible)?

Mr. Gutierrez: It requires two or 10% of the overall parking, whichever is greater...

Chair Furth: Do we (inaudible)...

Mr. Gutierrez: (inaudible) so it would be the 10%.

Chair Furth: Do we round up or down? So, that's ten spaces and that means...

Male: You can't have nine (inaudible).

Chair Furth: I understand. You can have a fee but yes so, it's ten and I don't see them. They need to not only be somewhere but they need to be available and useful. This project seems to be trying – struggling with the issue of a transition in land use and a transition in transportation. One is the – you can almost see it as moving from suburban Palo Alto to downtown and probably the biggest example of that is the trash enclosure right by the front door. There are neighborhoods – urban hotels where I expect to see that because there's no other space but this is a brand-new site. If the trash company is willing to say we'll pick up late enough so that there's no traffic but not so late that you disturb everybody's sleep, then that might work but in the absence of a condition like that, it doesn't. When I look at the patterns of circulation, essentially this is an all valet or drop off operation is what you're telling me and it's not designed to work well that way or send that message fast enough. If I come waltzing in here of El

Camino, I don't have much margin of error. I can't pause and look and try to figure out what's happening. I need to get off the road and into your site and then I need to be able to do whatever I'm supposed to do without causing more congestion and conflict. I do not, at this moment, see how that works. I would support my colleague's comments on landscaping. I don't have any objection to the density and total volume per say if they can be made to work on this site. The City Council made that decision and it's our job to see if – your job first of all and then ours as reviewers to see if all the other City standards can be met on this site at that density. At the moment, it's not in my opinion for the reasons I've discussed earlier. Anybody else has anything they'd like to say?

Board Member Lew: I'd forgot to talk about design linkages and making transitions to the neighboring buildings. I think we have a couple things, we have the El Camino Design Guidelines and we actually have two sets of them. We have our – we have the existing building which was – how do I characterize it? It seems like they were built from a different time period and different aesthetic and I think that can be a challenge on this particular site. So, the existing buildings mostly have wood or shingles and say the restaurant at Dinah's is sort of oriented inwardly instead of towards the street. Cabana Hotel has a huge setback, again Palo Alto Redwoods has a large setback and they are more suburban. I do want to encourage you to try to make more linkages with those – with all of those building because they are going to be there for a while and so I do – I think some of the attempts your showing with the wood or a simulated wood façade, I think that's a step in the right direction. It seems like the stucco color is very light and bright and it seems more appropriate on some of our other part of El Camino. It seems to me to stand out in this particular location but I think you should try to show the Board what you're trying to do. I don't think you're – I don't recall seeing a drawing in here showing those adjacencies. I think the one area that I think maybe the weakest perhaps is next to the – I guess this Thomas Foods next door, that outside corner. I think it's actually very visible from northbound El Camino and how your building turns the corner right there. I think that that's – that could be better.

Chair Furth: Excuse me. Thank you. Does Staff have any questions of us?

Mr. Gutierrez: Not at this time.

Chair Furth: I would entertain a motion or I guess actually this is done isn't it? We don't need a motion.

Male: We don't need a motion.

Chair Furth: We're done. Well, thank you so much for coming. I know that both you and the neighborhood has spent a great deal of effort on this and we look forward to seeing the next iteration.

Approval of Minutes:

Chair Furth: There are no minutes for our approval.

Subcommittee Item

Chair Furth: There are no subcommittee items.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Chair Furth: Are there any Board Member questions, comments or announcements?

Board Member Lew: Yes, the Council extended all of your terms by six months.

Chair Furth: Someday that would be a great piece of news.

Board Member Lew: It was mostly internal workings of the City Clerk. It was not because you're doing a great job.

Chair Furth: Though I'm sure we are doing our best. Thank you all so much, thank you, Staff, we're done. Sorry, we're adjourned

Adjournment