



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**DRAFT MINUTES: February 7, 2019**  
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 Members Alexander Lew and David Hirsch.

Absent: Osma Thompson

Chair Furth: Welcome to the February 7th meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. Would you call the roll, please?

[Roll Call]

Jodi Gerhardt, Current Planning Manager: Board Member Thompson is absent.

Chair Furth: That's correct. She advised us in advance that she would be unable to be here.

**Oral Communications**

Chair Furth: Now is the time for oral communications. Is there anybody who wishes to speak on an item not on the agenda? Seeing none, I will go on to the next item.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Furth: Are there any agenda changes, additions and deletions? Seeing none.

**City Official Reports**

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

Chair Furth: City official reports? Transmittal of our schedule and attendance record and tentative future agendas.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. Related to the future agenda, you'll see that we're going to have a prelim for AT&T. We'll have the 695 Arastradero, 2342 Yale, and 1700 Embarcadero is likely to fall off. There's some stormwater measures that we need to make sure are appropriate in the area they are proposed. We want to make sure those don't affect the site plan before we bring it forward.

Chair Furth: Thank you, and... Go ahead.

Ms. Gerhardt: There's also an addition that the Chair has asked for. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to get it on this agenda, so we'll talk about it next time, and that is a discussion with the Director about ARB recommendations versus actual decisions that the Director is making.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

## Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 190 Channing Avenue [18PLN-00043]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing 1,951 Square Foot Office Building and the Construction of a new three-Story 8,769 Square Foot Office / Residential MixedUse Building. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (In-Fill Development). Zoning District: RT-35 (Residential Transition Zone District in the South of Forest Area Phase 2 Coordinated Area Plan). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at [claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:claire.hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org)**

Chair Furth: Okay, the first public hearing item we have today is a quasi-judicial item. It's 190 Channing Avenue. This is in the South of Forest Area Coordinated Area plan, Phase 2 district of the city, which has its own unique zoning. All 300 pages of it. And it is a request for approval of a major architectural review to allow demolition of an existing 1,950 square foot office building and the construction of a new three-story, 8,760 square foot office and residential mixed use building, which is a larger office footprint, but staff can tell us what that is. With regard to the environmental review, it is exempt as infill development. The zoning district is Residential Transition Zone District, RT-35. Before we hear anything further, does anybody have any extramural communications to report? I can tell you that I did go back and watch the tape of our 2016 hearing on this matter, preliminary hearing on this matter. I also, at the architect's request, met with him on site, and it was helpful to be able to identify the boundaries of the property. I think I told him about my feelings about Italian cypress, but otherwise there's nothing relevant to report.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to disclose that I visited the site and I met with the architect in my office at his request. I didn't learn anything that's not in the public information.

Board Member Lew: I visited the site yesterday.

Chair Furth: David?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I visited the site a few days ago. No discussion with the architect.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Staff?

Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good morning, Board Members. The project before you today is a mixed use development at 190 Channing Avenue. The project is located within the RT-35 zone district, as you noted, within the boundaries of the South of Forest Area 2 Coordinated Area Plan, which is often known as the SOFA 2 CAP. The Comprehensive Plan land use designation for all parcels within these boundaries is SOFA 2 CAP. The project includes demolition of an existing building that was historically used for automobile repair services, D&M Motors, but that was legally converted through a tenant improvement and use and occupancy permit to an office use in 2017. The existing building is proposed to be replaced with a three-story mixed-use development that includes office on the first floor and four residential condominium units on the second and third floors. And the City will separately process a vesting tentative map for condominium subdivision that includes six condominium units on a single parcel. Some of the key considerations for the ARB today may include input on the project's consistency with the SOFA 2 CAP performance standards and the performance criteria outlined in 18.23 of the municipal code. Staff has concluded that the project is on balance, consistent with both of these. However, as noted in the staff report, there may be some opportunity areas to improve consistency, particularly with respect to the open space. We encourage your feedback on the parking and the setbacks as well. Staff recommends that the ARB recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Community Environment based on the findings and subject to conditions of

approval as outlined in the staff report. With that, I will turn it back to you and recommend that you hear from the applicant as well.

Chair Furth: Any questions of staff before we begin? I have one question. What is the setback of this building from Emerson?

Ms. Hodgkins: The setback along Emerson.... It's noted in here as 1.5, but I thought it was actually 3.3. Oh, yeah. On the site plan it shows 3.3.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions before we hear from the applicant? Okay, seeing none, we may hear from the applicant, who will have 10 minutes.

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects: Good morning, Chair Furth, members of the Board. My name is Ken Hayes with Hayes Group Architects. I'll be making the presentation on behalf of my clients, Karla and Cole Dawson. Unfortunately they couldn't make it today, but I'm sure they're watching from wherever they are. Before I start, I'd like to thank Claire Hodgkins for helping us bring this application before you. I'm also joined by Gary Laymon with Guzzardo Partnership, the landscape architect, should you have questions for landscape. As Claire pointed out, the site is a corner site on Channing and Emerson. It's about one-sixth of an acre, not a big site, 7,600 square feet in the RT-35 sub district of the SOFA 2 CAP. It's surrounded completely by RT-35, so there's no setbacks imposed by a residential adjacent to it. The buildings, the use originally was protected, when I was here in 2016 it was a protected use because auto service was considered retail, retail-like. Council changed that in 2017, early 2017, and the owner wanted to convert it to office space, as Claire pointed out. Here are some pictures of the existing D&M auto shop. This is down Emerson looking, let's say north. This is from the corner looking across the asphalt parking lot. It's basically a 1,950 square foot concrete block building with surface parking. The program that we developed with the owner was to provide a mixed use building, residential and office, with an underground garage. The top floor would be a unit for Cole and Karla, their personal unit. On the second floor they would have three multifamily units, and on the ground floor would be Cole's... There's two office spaces on the ground floor. The small one would be Cole's private office with a garden for himself, and the larger one would be for rental. We also were charged with trying to get this to work as a single-exit building, so that was key on such a small site. We've been able to do that. When we were here in 2016, we had three options, and this was the option that we kind of had focused on that time. Just briefly, this is the underground garage. The entrance hasn't changed, in the same spot. We had two lift systems back then because the retail part required more parking. We have since eliminated this lift here. We still have this lift system over here. On the ground floor the building was closer to this oak tree than it is proposed to be now. It was also closer to Channing, and we've increased that setback by almost 50 percent. It was, like, six feet, and now it's 8 1/2 feet. And then, on the second floor, which is here, we had the three units. We still have three units. Large terraces on these units were discussed at the hearing in 2016, and on the upper floor is a unit for Cole and Karla. This is the imagery that we had back then, very modulated form, kind of layered. We're picking up on the cantilevered aspect of the roof of the Creamery building down the street, kind of in this moderne style. This is the view from the corner. This is the view from Channing. I think the comments obviously had to do with these large cantilevered balconies. At the hearing, your comments that we wrote down and have since discussed is: Is retail use appropriate? Well, that's kind of off the table at this point since it doesn't, it's not mandated, and your comment back then was the lifts don't really work for retail. You want to see more trees and site amenities, plantings, benches. Wanted us to address the oak tree, which is a nice asset in that SOFA area. The balconies seem large, and you had concern about neighborhood transition. I want to compare these side by side. This is the site plan, and walk you through what the changes were there. This was the retail space previously, and it was set back from the street, from the corner, and we've now proposed that that becomes office space. We've simplified the form at that location. This would be Cole's office; this is the office that would be for rent. More street trees, site amenities, so we have marina strawberry street trees. This is the oak tree that we're concerned about. We've created a site wall that is bench height and it's topped with a wood bench, so you're not sitting on a cold stone seat. We've created some seating area in the covered porch. The setback line, previously you can see on the left, it's much more the building was on the setback. We've now stepped the building back 8 1/2 feet, and then, created blue

stone paving as an accent feature around the building. And then, this planter here has a Chinese fringe flower, a colorful flower in it. Down below grade, the trees on the upper left-hand corner. This was a big move of, how do we address that? We basically eliminated parking, carved out the garage at that level, at the main ground floor level. The building used to come closer to the property line and the oak tree. We've pushed that building back now 10 feet, and created room for the canopy of the oak tree. That's open space there. Comparison perspectives from the corners. The concerns were, I think, just the shadows and the cantilevered balconies, a little bit overbearing for the community. What we've done is we've consolidated the program basically into a more defined form, a simplified form, yet we still have the cantilevered roof for solar protection, and also to tie it back in like we originally wanted to do with the Creamery building. Street transition, the upper drawing is the Emerson frontage, so kind of relating to the building. The dental building across Channing. Our building is about 22 feet high at that point. I think theirs is about, maybe the same, maybe 24. And then, along Channing itself we have the Jewish Life building here, and it's a block that has kind of punched openings, so we've done a similar fashion here, and again, consolidated that program and created openings within that block. We felt like that tied in pretty nicely, and again, like I said, we still have the cantilevered roof to relate to the Creamery building. Basement level, you can see that that lift is gone, circulation is the same. We still have this lift. The ground floor, simplified form. We're set back from Channing there. The garage entrance is in the same location. This is Cole's office and his garden. The second floor has one, two, three units. They range from about 600 square feet to just over 800 square feet, and they all have an individual balcony that's protected. And then, on the upper floor, we have Cole and Karla's unit with the outdoor balcony and the balcony off the study on the side. Just the elevation views of Channing. Very simple form with some nice accents. The building height I believe is 38 feet to the top of the elevator, and we're at 35 at the top of the parapet, which is the height limit. This is the view from Emerson. The materials include a cut limestone base to define that two-story block, western red cedar on the underside of the canopies up above. They do have kind of a residential feel. Smooth cement plaster, horizontal metal cladding that kind of relates to the old industrial aspect of the SOFA area. We have a decorative metal screen here at the stair, so that that stair becomes an open stair to the elements, but still protected from a security standpoint. And it adds a little bit of interest. Actually, it's probably easier to see here. I don't think we updated the rendering, so, we have that located there. And, of course, high-performance glass, solar, sun shading, clear glass rails to reduce the scale of the building. And then, this is the shot again from the corner. I'm happy to answer any questions that you have, and look forward to an approval of the project. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Do we have a speaker card? Benjamin Cintz? Good morning. If you could spell your name for our transcriber, and then you'll have three minutes.

Benjamin Cintz: Thank you. [spells name] Good morning, Board Chair, Vice Chair, and Board Members. I presently live in the Midtown area of Palo Alto. Prior to that I lived in University South near SOFA 2. My father operated an auto upholstery business in what is now called SOFA 2, and I lived in SOFA 2 as a child. As a teenager, I worked in a camera store in downtown Palo Alto, and my law office is presently located in Palo Alto. My family owns the medical dental building across the street known as 882 Emerson Street. I have seen many changes take place in Palo Alto. I consider the proposed project to be a very positive change to SOFA 2, for the following reasons: It adds housing units, which I think is sorely needed in Palo Alto. The project cleans up the site and removes what is primarily an asphalt parking lot and cinderblock building. I think it's great that the parking is underground, and that there are no issues with parking lifts. I like the idea that small office space is being provided. I think that augments SOFA 2 and Palo Alto, which I think has a reputation for being a very innovative place for businesses to start, and I think the small office space helps accomplish that. I also like the outdoor terraces and the activity they will provide, and the new street trees, landscaping and pedestrian amenities. I thank you for listening to my comments. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much, Mr. Cintz. Anybody else wish to speak? Applicant can rebut that if they wish. Applicant declines. All right. Are there questions from Board Members before we deliberate? David? This is questions, not comments yet.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I like the building very much, and only some technical questions, really. The samples that you submitted don't actually have the screening, a screening sample, do they?

Mr. Hayes: Mr. Hirsch, no, they do not. It would match the metal siding. It's not a manufactured screen, it will be a custom screen. It will...

Board Member Hirsch: It's not a standard screen, in other words.

Mr. Hayes: No, no.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, so you really couldn't make a sample.

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, thank you. I might have more on that, on other parts here. On the façade on Emerson, it will be a, sort of wide-opened glassed façade. How do you create privacy on that street as more population is likely to be in that area at some point?

Mr. Hayes: Privacy for the ground floor, or...?

Board Member Hirsch: Ground floor.

Mr. Hayes: The ground floor? Because the upper floor, the actual living part of it is set back a little bit, so the terrace provides some screening. I would imagine on the interior, we typically would provide lines that would come down if they needed to have privacy. We've always tried to encourage our ground floor users to not have blinds because the whole idea is to want to be able to see in, to create some life and activity. I'm not real concerned about privacy in the office space, but if they have a conference room and they need to project something, I'm sure we would have blinds on the inside to come down.

Board Member Hirsch: All right. I notice there was really no section through the driveway down to the parking that I could find. I'm just curious, if a car pulls in and is kind of in a waiting position at the top of that ramp without cutting off pedestrian traffic along Emerson, can it sit there?

Mr. Hayes: Absolutely. There's about... There's probably 40 feet, so I would imagine you could have two cars...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: .... turn.

Mr. Hayes: No, you would be on the ramp.

Board Member Hirsch: On the ramp.

Mr. Hayes: You would be on the ramp, yes.

Board Member Hirsch: How far in before the ramp begins from the...?

Mr. Hayes: We're meeting the City's requirement, so it's five feet from the property line. If you take that and say how far is that from the sidewalk, it's about two to three more feet from the property line. Two and a half feet, I think, so you have seven and a half feet. A car would have to be on the sloping part of the ramp...

Board Member Hirsch: The slope, okay.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: Understood. Is that a likely condition, that somebody...?

Mr. Hayes: The calculated peak morning trips per hour, the peak hour, is two in, and in the afternoon it's three out. I think it's unlikely with such a small building that you're going to have multiple cars waiting. I do want to point out, because you're likely to have questions about the puzzler lift, we have used them before for offices and for housing. The lift is in the most remote part of the garage, that if somebody drives down, they're have their fob and they'll notify the lift, and the lift will make open, you know, will make a space available, so that when they drive down, they can pull immediately into the space. If another car is coming right behind them and they need to park in the lift -- because that's how the protocol is going to be -- they would need to wait for that first car to be deposited, and then, for an open space to come. That takes about 44 seconds. That second car would be able to wait in the garage at the garage level because the lifts, if you look at the... The lifts are way off to the... The lifts are over here. A car could come down and wait here while a car is parking, and once that car is parked, they could pull in. But I'm not anticipating a lot of demand, people stacking.

Board Member Hirsch: I guess another part of that answer could be that the car could pull down and let its passenger off down at the bottom and take the elevator up.

Mr. Hayes: Right. True.

Board Member Hirsch: You could do that.

Mr. Hayes: Absolutely.

Board Member Hirsch: There's the electrical... It's in the courtyard, behind the garbage there.

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Hirsch: How do you get to that? Suppose there's an emergency.

Mr. Hayes: There's a path down... You can either come through the office space, so, the office space opens up to it, if they're open.

Board Member Hirsch: Right.

Mr. Hayes: Or, there is a path along here. This is a six-foot setback with a railing so you don't fall, and then the trees. You can come in that way, as well.

Board Member Hirsch: That leaves you enough space to get through to that...?

Mr. Hayes: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. The reason I question was to know if there was another access besides the office, should something happen when the office is closed and locked, etc.

Mr. Hayes: Right. It might be that... This would be the only way, here, and it might be that when we get into the permit phase, the fire department is going to want us to provide a shunt trip in front of the building so they can shut the power off that way.

Board Member Hirsch: That passes fire department...?

Mr. Hayes: It has in the past, yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Mr. Hayes: We'll have the electrical equipment in the basement or in the garage, and we'll have a shunt trip at grade. It will be next to the Knox box.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. I don't see a detail at the planter against the wall and how that really will work, especially in inclement weather, what happens...

Mr. Hayes: You're talking about this planter here?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Mr. Hayes: Along Channing?

Board Member Hirsch: Along Channing, yeah.

Mr. Hayes: I think we might just have a section shown there. Yeah. That section is Section 2 on A3.3, but it's just an overall building section. But, of course, it will be a, a lined planter.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, you know, it's a construction detail.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: I'll leave it up to you to solve that one.

Mr. Hayes: Okay.

Board Member Hirsch: Bikes on the site? Where are they?

Mr. Hayes: There are two bike racks, one here and one here, if you want to look on your screen. There's one there and one there, so two bikes kind of at this main entry courtyard. And then, if you go below grade, there's a locker here and a locker here.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Terrific. Thank you, yes. One of the bigger issues is -- and we have better horticultural experts on this panel -- but you have some very solid trees on the neighbors' property there, next to the adjacent property on Emerson.

Mr. Hayes: Uh-huh.

Board Member Hirsch: It's almost like a solid wall there.

Mr. Hayes: You're talking about these trees here?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes?

Mr. Hayes: The cypress?

Board Member Hirsch: It looks like a solid wall in the drawing, too. I mean, my consideration would be, what about the neighbor who would put something up on that side, you know? And their light is cut off. It's as if there's a [crosstalk] building...

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Hirsch: ... at this location.

Mr. Hayes: Right. This building... Technically, this building could have been built on that setback. We are 25 feet back from that property line, for obvious reasons, with the ramp and all that. We do have a three-story building, so we were concerned about privacy.

Board Member Hirsch: I know that's your concern. We're concerned about the neighbor.

Mr. Hayes: Right. That parcel next door is 25 feet wide, so it's very narrow, a very narrow site. With the cypress that we have there, from the third floor, by the time anything would ever get built on that site next door, you wouldn't be able to see that site at all. You'd see the cleaners across the site if you're on the third floor looking out. We've only been addressing it from the standpoint of our occupants looking to the adjacent parcel and not the other way around.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, but I would recommend a lighter...

Chair Furth: David, before we get to recommendations, can we finish our questions?

Board Member Hirsch: I think that's about... Okay.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: Otherwise, I'm quite pleased. I think it's vastly improved over the early rendition of it, and ...

Chair Furth: Alex. I'm going to cut you off. Alex.

Board Member Lew: I have one question for you, Ken. On Unit C on the second floor, you have a bedroom and a bathroom. I was wondering if you could explain the windows to me and how they work on the elevation, and with respect to the balcony on Unit A. The balcony on Unit A. And there is a window, there's a bedroom window that looks out to the neighbors' balcony.

Mr. Hayes: That balcony, that window is going to need to be frosted. That was provided last minute as a response to Fire.

Board Member Lew: It's an egress window, or...?

Mr. Hayes: The windows that face the driveway ramp, we were going to use those for egress, but Fire doesn't want to have a ladder on the ramp. So, they asked that we provide that window, and I said that's kind of strange because there's a balcony there. And I said we'll just have to make that, it will just be frosted.

Board Member Lew: Okay. And then, how does the...? You have a bathtub on the window wall, facing the driveway.

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Lew: And it looks like it's floor-to-ceiling glass. How is that going to work?

Mr. Hayes: We have the same kind of condition on the, in Unit A, and we're thinking that we would treat the glass, basically hold the tub away. It's probably not going to be a built-in tub.

Board Member Lew: It's a floating tub...?

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Okay.

Chair Furth: Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, for the architect, please. On the third floor, do you have any provision for blinds or valences on the inside of the glass walls?

Mr. Hayes: We do.

Vice Chair Baltay: Can you describe a little bit what that would be like? I think they will be visible most of the time when they're closed in the afternoon.

Mr. Hayes: When the blinds are down, they'll...

Vice Chair Baltay: Are they automatic blinds, recessed in the ceiling, or...?

Mr. Hayes: Yes, they're recessed into the ceiling. And I think we have a detail of that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you point me to that, please?

Mr. Hayes: No, we do not have a detail of that. The idea would be we would create a cavity for the blinds to be up so we can have a clean screen. When they're up, you'll see the reveal. When they're down, you're going to see them, yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. That's it.

Chair Furth: Thank you. What is the building setback from Emerson?

Mr. Hayes: Well, I would contend it's 1 1/2 feet.

Chair Furth: Eighteen inches.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah. And I'm not sure if there's a discrepancy on the site plan.

Chair Furth: On one of your plans it says 3.3.

Mr. Hayes: Is it measuring from...?

Chair Furth: I don't know. That's why I'm asking.

Mr. Hayes: Do you know which one...?

Ms. Hodgkin: I'm looking at it right now and I'm assuming that it was measuring to the very closest point. You can see kind of like...

Chair Furth: Which sheet are you looking at, Claire?

Ms. Hodgkins: Sorry. If you look at, for example, A2.2, you can see, you can see how the...

Mr. Hayes: Oh, it's measuring to the glass.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah. The 3.3 is measuring to the glass...

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Ms. Hodgkins: ...whereas the 2.2 is measuring to the, technically the closest point of the building.

Mr. Hayes: Chair Furth, this part of the façade, the stone is 18 inches back. The glass is three-foot-three back.

Chair Furth: Oh, that's where the three...

Mr. Hayes: That's what it is.

Chair Furth: Okay, thank you. And how high is the face, the floor, of the upstairs balcony?

Mr. Hayes: Twenty-two foot six inches.

Chair Furth: The one that juts over the driveway is...?

Mr. Hayes: Is 22, correct.

Chair Furth: Okay, and you're planning to have the trees grow to...?

Mr. Hayes: I did the section just because I had to convince myself, right? And I believe those trees grow four feet a year. Something like that. Right? And so, I think we were... I have it projected that they're at 18 feet in 2 1/2 years, so someone on the balcony... Because that site is 25 feet wide, if you have something 18 feet tall here and you draw the line, you basically don't see the parcel. You see the cleaners across that parcel.

Chair Furth: Does it...? I'm worried about light and air that's left on that skinny parcel after you develop. It starts out looking great because you have your driveway over there, but then you put a vertical wall right on the property line, and that's what's concerning me. I realize that's not a question.

Mr. Hayes: Of trees, you're saying.

Chair Furth: Yeah. Which the need for which is driven by balcony. Okay. Where would the signage for the office be? These are neighborhood-serving offices.

Mr. Hayes: I don't think Cole would have a sign.

Chair Furth: That's partly my point. These buildings are supposed to read as neighborhood-serving office space. Where would it go?

[crosstalk]

Mr. Hayes: If this was my office here, my entrance door is right there. Can you see my cursor?

Chair Furth: I can.

Mr. Hayes: Okay. I would put the sign right here.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Mr. Hayes: And that's not the entrance to Cole's office. Cole's office you can't see. It will be going in this way, so, if he has a sign, it would probably be in that courtyard, or at the courtyard.

Chair Furth: Thank you. And then, this is a question for staff, but Ken may want to weigh in. What buildings were you looking at when you decided one foot eight inches was an appropriate setback?

Ms. Hodgkins: We were looking at...

Chair Furth: And I'm concerned with Emerson, not Channing.

Ms. Hodgkins: Hold on one second.

Chair Furth: I've got my magnifying glasses...

[crosstalk]

Mr. Hayes: I'm sorry, your question was for staff, but...

Ms. Hodgkins: I was looking...

Chair Furth: Which sheet is it? You told us earlier and I...

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, it's in there.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Hayes: Eight-zero-five.

Chair Furth: Eight-zero-five, right?

Ms. Hodgkins: I was considering this to be the front setback, so, looking at some of the other...

Chair Furth: Considering what to be the front setback? Emerson?

Ms. Hodgkins: Emerson to be the front setback.

Chair Furth: Right.

Ms. Hodgkins: The shorter side. In looking at that, I looked at the Jewish Family and Children Services, which has a front setback of three-ten.

Chair Furth: It says 7.5 on this. Is that incorrect?

Ms. Hodgkins: No, that's the side yard setback.

Chair Furth: I'm talking about the setback as it exists on the street. Because when we're talking about context, it doesn't matter if it's front or side.

Ms. Gerhardt: Can we ask what sheet you're looking at?

Chair Furth: I'm looking at AO.5 [phonetic].

Ms. Hodgkins: Well, I would say that when I ...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ....answer my question. You didn't look at the...

Ms. Hodgkins: When I did my review, I was looking at front setbacks within the area for adjacent parcels, so I was looking in particular at the different corners and what the front setbacks were of those different corners, versus what the side setback was along Emerson.

Chair Furth: And so, the next parcel down Emerson looks like it has, like, zero setback.

Ms. Hodgkins: The drycleaner, which is the closest adjacent along Emerson, has basically a zero setback. The dental office has a front setback of 8-7.

Chair Furth: Sixty-seven feet, eighty-seven feet? I can't quite read...

Ms. Hodgkins: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Eighty-seven.

Ms. Hodgkins: Eight-seven.

Chair Furth: Somebody's got a setback of 67 feet, six inches.

Ms. Hodgkins: That's, again, the side yard setback, so when I was reviewing I was looking at what appropriate front setbacks were on the adjacent parcels. So...

[crosstalk]

Ms. Hodgkins: Oh, sorry.... No, she's talking about this one.

Chair Furth: Okay, well, that answers my... So, across the street, I show fronting on Emerson -- meaning the building that you see as a pedestrian, walking down Emerson -- first we have seven feet, then we have 14 feet, then we have 7 feet 9, 7 feet 8 1/2, 7 feet 4. Is that right?

Ms. Hodgkins: Correct.

Chair Furth: And then when you get south of this, you get into a residential neighborhood. I guess we're in old Palo Alto, historic Palo Alto.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah.

Mr. Hayes: Could I chime in?

Chair Furth: Not yet. Thank you. And that has a deeper setback, right?

Ms. Hodgkins: Correct. Correct.

Chair Furth: Okay. Yes, Mr. Hayes?

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Would you like to speak to this issue?

Mr. Hayes: I would.

Chair Furth: With my, with the forbearance of my colleagues up here.

Mr. Hayes: There's a little confusion and inconsistency in how we have measured the setbacks. The Jewish Center across the street, Mr. Cintz's property across Channing, and the other properties there that all have those numbers listed, we're measuring from the sidewalk because we don't know exactly where the property line is. We don't have surveys for all those parcels, so we're measuring from the sidewalk.

Chair Furth: From the sidewalk or the curb?

Mr. Hayes: The sidewalk. The back of sidewalk. Mr. Cintz's building says 8 foot 7 from the back of sidewalk, but there's at least 2 1/2 to 3 feet from the back of sidewalk to the property line. On our property, I'm assuming...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, you just lost me completely. We measure setbacks from property lines, but you're saying we don't have a survey, so we don't know what the actual property lines are.

Ms. Hodgkins: Exactly. What he's saying is he put in some extra because this property is set back three feet from the property line, so it may be...

Chair Furth: Or 18 inches, depending.

Ms. Hodgkins: No, it's... (inaudible). Yeah. What he's saying is that on a lot of these other properties, it may be that the property line is actually further in than where the back of walk is.

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Chair Furth: But they are still (inaudible) back from the sidewalk, which is what people perceive. People don't go around surveying...

[crosstalk]

Mr. Hayes: Our building would be 4 1/2 feet back from the back of sidewalk, 4 1/2 feet to 6 1/2 feet.

Chair Furth: This drawing did not advance your case.

Mr. Hayes: Didn't help you, right.

Chair Furth: However, so, when we look at 12 feet 9 inches for the u-shaped property further down the block, that's from the edge of sidewalk, right?

Mr. Hayes: They're all from the edge of sidewalk, back of sidewalk.

Ms. Hodgkins: I mean, I would also note that this is a corner property, so we would want to, in staff's opinion, we would want to encourage building up closer to the sidewalk on a corner property, whereas we might not be looking for that further down the block.

Chair Furth: And why would you want it closer on a corner property?

Ms. Hodgkins: To encourage the pedestrian atmosphere of the area.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Take a look at the corner of St. Michael's alley, the old St. Michael's alley, Watercourse Way, House of Hardware...

Chair Furth: Which are often...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: They're all on a diagonal.

Board Member Lew: Not all of them.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Now we're debating, so, let's...

Mr. Hayes: If we went across the intersection that we're on, the building across the intersection is defining that corner on both places.

Chair Furth: It sure is. No doubt about that. All right. Okay. I think it's... Okay. Peter, why don't you go through comments.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Thank you for the excellent presentation. On whole, I think this is an excellent proposal. The site planning is very thoughtfully done. It makes a lot of sense. The floor plan of the building is logical, it's very functional. I find the design is, on the whole, compatible to the neighborhood. It just fits right in. It feels good to me. I think having the underground parking is a real asset to the community. It's really the only way I see these type of projects working. It's really nice that you're out of the gate proposing this for us. I'm mildly concerned that we're relying so much on the stacked parking lifts and there's no... I don't see a provision for a quick in-and-out of my car, quick unloading of kids or groceries. There are families that might be living here, and I've always felt that you really need to have not just exclusively stacked parking. You just need some place for one or two people to pull in for 20 minutes while they run upstairs and get something. It would be really nice if there was a way to maybe change around. You have some electric vehicle stations that are dedicated to that, but if there were just one or two spots that were just open and useful, I think the overall functionality of the parking would be greatly enhanced. I also register a concern to the staff that this building has a very unique ownership structure, in the way that the owner of the building really will be living here and really controlling how the entire building functions. And it's very important that that parking be available to other tenants in the building and to the occupants of the retail or office spaces. I don't think that's always the case under projects like this. The owner could just decide that that garage is really their space, and while that may not be to the letter of the law, that oftentimes, I think, happens. It's important that we keep an eye on it and be aware of it and put in conditions or what-not. The parking is intended to be for all of the occupants of the building. I find I like the overall style of the building. I appreciate the stone plinth and the glass up above. And I think that the balconies actually work quite well for the residents, having all those spaces outdoors. It provides eyes on the street, it enlivens the community, and the fact that you're providing four apartments I think is really a plus to the community. It's wonderful to have, especially three small units right downtown like that, up on the second floor with balconies overlooking the street. I just can't see where that won't be a wonderful place to sit on a summer evening. It will enliven and help the community quite a bit. With that said, I'd like to step on the architect's toes a little bit with one suggestion that I find could improve the building. Architect Hayes, if you could pull up your overall perspective view of the building. You had it up a few slides ago. Sort of what I would call your money shot. The very nice view from the corner of Emerson...

[Locating slide]

Vice Chair Baltay: While he's pulling that up, to my colleagues. My concern is that the façade of the building along Channing is really more or less plainer all the way up, and I'd like to see -- right there -- I'd like to see if we couldn't get them to push back on the third floor the large glass walls on the left and right of the elevator core. From my reading of the plans, it could be pushed back a couple of feet and the deck railing could wrap around that, to get that same stepping-back effect that you have on Emerson. You would push back the kitchen area some, and perhaps let it go out the other direction to make up the space. But I think it would be a big improvement on the Channing Street façade not to have the building read so plainer all the way up. Just the three stories. The second thing you could consider doing, Architect Hayes, would be to raise the height of the stone plinth, the element that makes up the first two floors, perhaps just another foot. I think that would help your proportions, and honestly, would make the balcony on the third floor more pleasant. You'd have, the first foot of railing would be a solid wall, not just glass to the floor. But the proportions of this just strike me as a little bit top-heavy. With all due respect, I get the same feeling on your recent building at 240 Hamilton. You have a very high glass thing on the very top. It's very close to the edge, and it's very tall. I understand why you want it so tall, but by

pushing it back a little bit, by raising the stone plinth just a little bit, you mitigate the height effect without really changing the functionality of the use of it inside.

Mr. Hayes: Right now, the glass and the metal panel wall are 8 inches back from the stone, so that's not a flush relationship.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm saying put it back 4 or 5 feet. Wrap the balcony around it by just squeezing your floor plan a little bit. I understand that the elevator core in the middle, the refuse needs to stay that way, and it should. It looks attractive that way. But if you could step back the other piece from Channing, wrap the balcony around it, and then, change the massing portions of the stone, I think that would be an improvement to the overall massing of the building, especially as it's seen from Channing, or from the corner of Channing and Emerson. I throw that out to my colleagues to hear, for the architect to hear. Honestly, aside from that, I think this is just an excellent building and an excellent proposal. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation, and I think the revisions are all very well considered.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: In general, I support the project. The things that I think we need to address are, one is the compatibility with the historic building, which I think you have a letter from Mr. Brand, who objected to this item. I think he's referring to Watercourse Way at the corner of Channing and High Street. I think we have to address that. My reading on your design is that you have recessed the windows on Channing, the lower floor windows, right?

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, that's all recessed back, correct.

Board Member Lew: It's recessed, and the... To me, Watercourse Way, one of the character-defining things of that building, one of them is that it has the deeply-recessed windows. It also has that kind of brick or terra cotta...

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Lew: ... and in front of it is landscaping, as well. I think that you've made... I think that you have a deep recess. I think the landscaping, like the coleonema, makes the design linkage to bamboo. It's all very vertical and bright green and lacy. I think potentially you have, you could have a design linkage in your stone pattern. It could be, or may not be. Like, if you had a very, like, a fake artificial stone, it's all one inch high...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ...for example, if it were like that, it wouldn't really make a design linkage for Watercourse Way, but if you're using real stone, you have some say on the coursing of it, and that could make it... I'm just throwing it out there, that it could make a design linkage. And then, for the compatibility of all of that along Emerson Street, I think it matches very well, all of the massing and detail of the Emerson Street buildings. And then, I think my only other comment is... Or, I have two comments on landscaping. One is that I think here you're proposing new plantings underneath the existing oak tree. Everything that I know -- which is not a lot -- but like native plants like ivies, is to not put any new plants and irrigation underneath oak trees, like within 10 feet. I think you're showing that, so I was wondering what you're thinking about that. I think that maybe we should probably not do that. And then, I think there are native options for that, like... That do well under oak trees, like salvia spathacea, is native, indigenous, likes shade. Anyway, I was wondering about your thinking of that.

Mr. Hayes: Sure. Thank you for the question. We were thinking about what the oak tree would want, and certainly we're taking a lot of care relative to how we were repositioning the building, and how the paving

was working underneath that canopy and everything. Today, that's actually a building right there on the property line, so we're giving it some room to breathe and to live in there. We do have native plantings in there that would take the shade well. Our thought was to just create a little bit of a buffer there so we're not looking so much at the trash enclosure behind. Although the trash enclosure is going to be nicely detailed, still we just wanted to scale that back a little bit, mitigate that a little bit. That was our thinking on why we wanted to have planting in there.

Chair Furth: And there's no irrigation of that landscaping?

Gary Laymon, Landscape Architect, Guzzardo Partnership: There would be irrigation for that. But it would be on its own valve, so it would be sort of micromanaged for... We're not overloading the oak tree.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Thank you, Gary. Staff, do we have a new city arborist to replace Dave Dokkter?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, I was going to say, this wasn't commented on, but before anything moved to final decision, I can discuss again with our arborist and get his recommendations, and maybe add a condition of approval related to what plantings, if any, should be allowed to go in that area.

Board Member Lew: Okay, I would support having a condition of approval for that. And then... I would recommend, I can recommend approval today. And then, I think, so, with condition of approval. And then, I think we should, as a Board, address compatibility for the historic property, with respect to the historic property at Watercourse Way, which is Finding 2B. And I think there isn't anything in the draft staff language at this point.

Chair Furth: David.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm really not in agreement with a few of the other statements here. I think the building is very strong in terms of its defining the two-story elements to it, and I don't think any other additional setbacks are really needed. I really like the way it is set back at the corner. I think that's a nice way to turn that corner, and there will be a lot more things happening along Emerson at some point, and it's a nice soft relationship there to the corner. I like the deep recesses. I think that's really sufficient to animate that particular façade. I think maybe... I mean, you know, this is a building that's going to define the street development, and I find that it's a nice transition as a modern element there. Maybe somebody else will pick up some of that way of thinking along the block and make it quite consistent then, at that point. I hope that would happen. And I think that actual setback is sufficient at the corner. I don't think you really have to go any further than what you've done. Thanks a lot.

Chair Furth: Okay. Thank you. Here comes the minority report. It is a very pretty building. It is going to be much more attractive than what's there. It's going to be much more attractive than a lot of other buildings in the area. I think the most important thing about your development from the point of view of review is how adequately you protect the oak tree. It's identified as one of the two most significant trees, and the plan says we should add more oaks and redwoods. Personally, I would not plant a redwood anywhere near my house, but the alternative is to... I wanted to ask you, is it going to be necessary to prune that oak tree to accommodate the upper stories? Or is it set back enough so it won't be necessary?

Mr. Hayes: There would be a little bit of thinning on the building wall side, yes.

Chair Furth: How many feet do you think?

Mr. Hayes: It would be a very small percentage, in alignment with the arborist's recommendations. Probably in the order of five to seven feet.

Chair Furth: Five to seven feet? And that will have to be maintained, right?

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Chair Furth: Okay. I think it's crucial to add the condition that Alex mentioned. I would prefer that this was pulled back to not require taking five to seven feet off that side of the tree. That seems to me to be significant. I may be wrong. I haven't seen a drawing of it. I don't know what we're talking about. The idea is to have a healthy, well-shaped tree that doesn't look bonsai to accommodate new buildings. Because while there's a building on the site, it's not this tall. I am concerned about the floor-to-ceiling windows. When we've been concerned about them in other buildings designed by Mr. Hayes, when we have floor-to-ceiling windows in what is supposed to be office space or residential space, we all too often see floor-to-ceiling blinds or screens. We told some other projects in this neighborhood... I mean, the great thing about this, one of the great things about this proposal is it has underground parking, we're beginning to see something approval able. And we've had two other projects, three other reviews, in SOFA 2 that we have not been able to approve, and one of the things we've said to those other applicants is, "You've got bathtubs, you've got kitchen sinks, you've got all these things, backing up against floor-to-ceiling window? That's not functional design." I don't think it should be either. I think if you're going to have those uses, we should not be permitting floor-to-ceiling windows. I don't know what to do exactly about the office space because we're looking at a drawing where it looks lovely. It's not going to look half so lovely with opaque blinds there. One of the things I did ask staff was how many condominium units were going to be created. They said two for office and four for residential. Is that correct? The top floor is a one-bedroom flat. The bottom floor, as described by the applicant, is his private office, his personal office. That doesn't seem to be what we meant by neighborhood-service office. I'm not even sure if it's a permitted use. Depending on what his profession is. If it's a personal office or a household office, that's a residential use, and it should be reclassified as residential. I don't think that this project really meets the common open space requirement. I'm perplexed as to how that balcony meets the standards for a common open space.

Board Member Lew: On the second floor?

Chair Furth: Mm-hmm. How it's suitable for children, etc. But I just maybe don't get it. I'm sorry to take up time on the setback, but I think people are absolutely right, David's right, to say this is going to set the tone for development on this street. I find the staff's argument that having a building close to the curb enhances the pedestrian experience is a little confusing, depending upon the height of the building and how much setback you're talking about. We say that on El Camino Real because we have a six-lane street with a center divider, eight to 12 foot sidewalks, and what we're trying to get away from is cars on the edge of the street. But we're not trying to get... I don't think any of those things make sense here. I think that we have a lot of deep setbacks right now because we have all these automotive uses, which are going to change. And I do not think that the object should be to get things within three feet or 18 inches of the sidewalk. I don't think that is consistent with the development plan as it's emerging. It certainly shouldn't be less than the building across the street. I would think it should be more because I don't think that's the only building. That's the least-set-back building. I'm somewhat reassured by your saying that you would set corner buildings closer to the street than other buildings because if this is the pattern you're setting down this block, it's going to thud right into residential neighborhood. I think it's too close, under the Code. The underground parking is highly desirable. I have my usual question: Is it going to be gated so that somebody coming home at night has a secure access to their residential unit? Is that a nod from the applicant?

Mr. Hayes: Yes, yeah, it will be secured.

Chair Furth: It will be secured. Good. I tend to think that, you know, one of the things that this building definitely does that the SOFA CAP asks for is a variety of living units. You have a studio and three one bedrooms, right? One of the interesting things is that the staff report says that this helps our jobs/housing balance. I don't think it does. I think it adds more office demand. If you take this as straight office space instead of reclassifying that back office as residential, then it creates more space, more demand for housing than it's applied. This project provides.... Three bedrooms and a studio, so let's say four bedrooms. Four small households. And we add enough office space to more than generate that

demand under our usual standards. I think the findings that say that it makes that better aren't supported by the evidence. I do think that, on the other hand, it certainly intensifies development on the site, which makes for a more intensively-used core area, and that's good. I think it's lovely. I think it's a bit too close. One of the things about this building is it's really tall. The virtue is that it's set back, and I think that saves us from the problems of a very tall building this close to the sidewalk. Because what other tall buildings are...? What other buildings that tall are there? How tall is the building across the street? I forget. You've told me...?

Mr. Hayes: It's, like, 32 feet, and we're 35.

Chair Furth: It's 32 feet. So, we're going to make this constriction in the block here, and that's probably okay as long as we don't continue that march down the block. I have a bunch of comments on the findings, but we can discuss those after. Does anybody agree with me about the all-glass or (inaudible)? Everywhere I see around town, I see wastebaskets, and... I don't see how this is going to work.

Vice Chair Baltay: I made...

Chair Furth: Who wants a floor-to-ceiling window office?

Vice Chair Baltay: I made a comment that by recessing back that third floor of all glass, and then, by changing slightly the opaque edge to it, you really prevent seeing the bottom part of that glass from the street, which doesn't mitigate the interior functional problems of having a bathtub there, but at least you don't see it, which I think is our (inaudible). I agree with Wynne, that having floor-to-ceiling glass on a residential unit everywhere, those create functional problems on the interior and visual problems on the outside. I'm not sure that this design has a lot of that. There seems to be only one or two places that Alex pointed out and they are on the back side of the building. I don't think that's a make-or-break kind of issue.

Board Member Lew: But I think to your point, say your, you made the recommendation for setting back the third floor glass, so, the upper unit has the kitchen there. We have the back of the kitchen cabinets facing Channing.

Chair Furth: Not good.

Board Member Lew: I think to your point, Peter, setting back the glass would allow more different design options.

Vice Chair Baltay: I've made a sketch for myself. If I took where that kitchen is and just pull it back a few feet, wrap the deck around it, you've got a much more private situation. They can do whatever they want then. You can't see those counters.

Board Member Lew: [crosstalk] Right.

Vice Chair Baltay: And I believe that if you look at the rendering on the front page here, how strong that is on the vertical -- David Hirsch especially -- I think that's very severe. And by cutting that back as well seems to me a win/win in every regard. Wynne, I do want to be clear that this design style sort of needs these big pieces of glass to pull this off, so I'm inclined to give the architect the benefit of the doubt. They can solve perfunctional issues if their client is willing to go with that. That's what architecture is.

Chair Furth: Well, Peter, the precedent for all of this, for this neighborhood, of an office space, privately owned by somebody, you know, is, of course, the ultimate in shut-off buildings. It's diagonally across from Whole Foods. Where all the windows have been opaque for -- what? -- 40 years? Ever since Mr. Jobs bought it. I agree. I will defer to you all as saying that you think this could work. I certainly see it as problematic in other buildings around town. I certainly think if we're allowing it here when we discourage it elsewhere, we need to be clear in our minds why we're doing that. The other thing I'd like to talk about

is the balcony extending over, the third floor balcony extending over to what I think of as the south, but I guess it's actually the east, or something. West? As you go down towards Professorville. That is...

Board Member Lew: Over the driveway?

Chair Furth: Over the driveway, towards the adjacent property. We know the adjacent property is narrow. We know it's not going to be able to set itself way back. And we're allowing a residential balcony on an upper floor, looking out on it. The plan does say that landscape screening... It anticipates that we want significant outdoor spaces. I don't think this one is short on outdoor spaces. And it says that landscaping can be used to screen it. It does seem to me that an all-glass railing makes it even more of an intrusion looking back. I don't think that cypress provide very good screening or habitat. I think you can grow a very high hedge that might be less of an exotic plant and more of a plant that meets our standards. This plan does have a lot of exotic plants in it, which I don't know that kangaroo paws are great for local habitat, but maybe they are. Because that's our alternative. I do not support the balcony, but if the rest of you do, I would ask that we ask for a different and better approach to.... Than the cedars. Or the cypress. Whatever they are. The Italian cemetery plants.

Vice Chair Baltay: I wonder if I could chime in for a second, Wynne, because I also paused when I saw that balcony. It is large, and it's clearly looking out over the residential neighborhood from a distance. But this is a different zoning. The other people can also put, sort of apartment-style buildings, where we want life on the outside of the building, on balconies. And when I scratch my head and think, why do we have, in Palo Alto, there's very strong protections of privacy for R1 residential neighborhoods. It's very hard to put a balcony overlooking your neighbors' yard. And it's typically in a situation where you have rear and side yards. We don't want to have balconies from one neighbor looking into another neighbor's house, back yard, etc. But in the case where you have taller multifamily buildings, I don't think we want to start setting a precedent that you just can't have balconies on the back and side yard so they might look into other properties. What I'm hearing you say is, essentially, let's keep all the balconies on the street side only. I think that's...

Chair Furth: No.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... a limitation that I'm not sure is beneficial.

Chair Furth: I agree that people have an expectation of social ability on their balconies rather than privacy. But it just seems like such a viewing deck. And I don't think that having this very tall planting of cypresses is a good solution.

Vice Chair Baltay: The cypresses I find problematic. I think at four feet a year, they're very quickly going to overwhelm everything in the neighborhood, this building, as well.

Male?: How (inaudible) again.

Vice Chair Baltay: It may be that there's another plant that would give us 20 feet of hedge, or something.

Board Member Lew: Regarding the cypress, we have them on a lot of projects, actually, in the California Avenue area.

Chair Furth: Yep.

Board Member Lew: All of the Hohbach properties have them, like along Park Boulevard and... Is it Sheridan or Grant? And I have questioned the landscape architect who put all those in, about that. His response is that when you plant them next to the driveway ramp, (inaudible) soil volume, and they stay smaller than they would otherwise. And I've gone back and looked at them, and I think he is correct about that. They may be, like, half as big as they would be otherwise. And then, there is something that we can do, is look at the spacing of them. It doesn't necessarily have to be wall-to-wall, 100 percent

green space in there. For native hedges, typically you're going to want, they're going to be wider than what they have here. And I'll let Gary chime in.

Chair Furth: Specifically, how does this proposed row of cedars...

Board Member Lew: Cypress.

Chair Furth: Cypress, sorry. Meet this... Cedars would really be something. Meet the, let us make the finding that these are native plants when feasible, or other valuable habitat plants?

Gary Laymon: We have looked at a number of different plants to try and provide a solution in that area. It's a very challenging space, as you say. And other things we were considering is we want to have something that is evergreen, want to have something that's very columnar. We didn't want to have a canopy that was going to spread over onto adjacent property and have to be pruned back. We needed to be able to maintain access, as you were saying, for the meter reading in that area, so a pathway that goes between the driveway and the property line there. We wanted to have something we could limb up a little bit so somebody could walk through that space. We wanted to have something that was available in size immediately because the need for that buffer is going to be immediate upon occupancy. So, we we're using something that is available in the nursery that is tall and columnar. And, something that is both drought tolerant, and also provides a dense screen, albeit it will be tapered towards the top so it will be more of a feathered view, if you will, at the tops as opposed to what's at the lower elevations. I would expect that the trees would grow about four feet a year for the first eight or 10 years, and probably slow down after that, for the reasons Alex mentioned. There's a limited amount of soil area there, and frankly, they don't need to be any bigger than that, so that's sort of an optimum outcome in terms of the form of the trees themselves. What we've done is looked at the other balance of the planting in terms of the opportunity to be able to create native planting opportunities, as well as plant materials that support habitat, whether that be pollinators or nesting areas. Habitat for bees, birds, butterflies, what-not. There's plenty of that opportunity within the planting palate, and that was something we adjusted to, specifically to achieve that objective.

Chair Furth: Kangaroo paws are good habitat plants?

Mr. Laymon: Good for birds and butterflies and bees, yes.

Chair Furth: And you've got the right kind of milkweed?

Mr. Laymon: Yes, I do. [Laughter]

Chair Furth: I only got lectured about it the other day, so it's on my mind.

Mr. Laymon: Actually, I got lectured about it, too, because ...

Chair Furth: There's a lot of the wrong kind.

Mr. Laymon: ... at the nursery, they don't want you to make the plant so attractive that they don't migrate, they stick around, which is not what we want. We want them to be in transition. So, yeah, there's a whole... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: It may become moot shortly.

Mr. Laymon: I would like to clarify, Ken's brought up the image of the oak tree and its relative canopy. Five, seven feet is an over-statement of what the tree needs to be pruned. It would be less than that.

Chair Furth: For the record, Mr. Hayes is showing us a picture of the oak tree.

Board Member Lew: I looked at it yesterday and I did not...

Chair Furth: Yeah, I looked at it, too.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ...being an issue.

Chair Furth: Yeah, I looked at it and couldn't tell. Because I didn't know how much higher it was going to go. Okay.

Board Member Hirsch: Could I comment about the border on Emerson there, those trees that you're mentioning? I mean, look at the rendering here. Really, they are not, the corner rendering looking down Emerson, you don't show those trees at all. When did they occur in the process here?

Mr. Laymon: I believe the other rendering does pick up those trees.

Chair Furth: Yeah, it does. I think you have a problem showing us both the building and the landscaping.

Mr. Laymon: There we go. There. Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: Will it maintain? You know, I'm concerned. Does it...? You can promise us that it will maintain that amount of openness between the trees versus a solid wall?

Mr. Laymon: What we have is denser than what is shown here.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Board Member Lew: If you want it to look like this, I think we should put that as a condition of approval. If you want wider spacing.

Mr. Laymon: Yeah, we could thin out the trees. We'd be open to that.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: If the rest of you are satisfied with the plant, I would support the spacing.

Mr. Laymon: Yeah, we could reduce them by 50 percent or so. That would provide more transparency.

Chair Furth: (inaudible) do that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you address, please, the height of those trees? Alex hinted that they might not grow so tall. How big should we expect the cypresses to become?

Chair Furth: Ten years out, what are we going to see?

Mr. Laymon: I would expect them to be in the 20-foot range, thereabouts. They will grow rather quickly initially, but as the roots sort of reach the limit of the amount of soil area, they'll tend to slow down.

Chair Furth: We'll see. Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm going to plug once more, Dave Hirsch. If you could look at this rendering right here on the screen. The third floor glass on the right facing Channing is what I'm saying could be set back a little bit. Do you have any sense about that? That's what I'm talking about, taking that third floor glass, pull it back, and wrap the balcony.

Board Member Hirsch: It's a smallish building. My sense of that top floor is it's kind of a nice transition when you look at the side wall versus looking at it from this position, you know? I see that wall with large openings cut into it from the Channing side. And then, this, admittedly, the rendering disappears it. That's clever, but... But, you know, because it's all pretty white up there in the other area. The other straight-on, I think, wherever that one is, the straight-on one, Channing elevation. Those two wings on the left and right of the solid area there are going to be right on line with, you know, at present. I think the choice of materials makes a difference there.

Mr. Hayes: The glass at that third level above the limestone is set back eight inches.

Board Member Hirsch: Eight inches, right.

Mr. Hayes: And the reveal between the glass and the horizontal metal siding is two feet back. And then you have the metal siding eight inches back, and then you have two foot back reveal...

Board Member Hirsch: Right.

Mr. Hayes: ... and eight inches back.

Board Member Hirsch: My preference is I like it that way.

Vice Chair Baltay: What do you think about the concern Wynne raised, which I think I share, that on the left of these, that's a kitchen counter right behind that piece of glass there. That really is visible from the street. I mean, all the games you play, no matter what you do, that cabinet is right there.

Chair Furth: I don't think we're applying our standards uniformly if we approve this as (inaudible).

Vice Chair Baltay: And it's true that in the past we've pushed back fairly severely on that. But I think that is a very legitimate point, that having the kitchen right there, that close to the street with just glass, doesn't really work.

Mr. Hayes: It will be a spandrel glass, right? So, we'll... It will be a single pane, but will have a PBV interlayer. It will be a laminated glass product that will be translucent up to the countertop, but that fleshy material on the outside would be able to extend from the ceiling to the floor. You won't know what's behind it, but yes, you'll see that it has a different tone.

Chair Furth: I see, so, there's not going to be clear glass on the windows on...?

Mr. Hayes: Not below the countertop, no. It will be...

Chair Furth: Okay, well, show me the elevation which shows that.

Mr. Hayes: Well, you're looking at it right here. I mean, it would...

Chair Furth: I can't see a thing. What's the sheet number?

Mr. Hayes: Oh, um... Wynne, I don't think we.... Or Chair Furth, I don't think we show a line. It would be A31.

Chair Furth: A31?

Mr. Hayes: Correct. The railing is at 42 inches.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Hayes: And I would imagine we'll continue that line as a laminated glass across the kitchen so that it would, it would hide the ....

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Is that something that's in the plans that you submitted?

Mr. Hayes: No, but that's what I've been thinking how we would...

Chair Furth: This is a proposed...

Mr. Hayes: ... that's how we would resolve it, right? Work with it.

Chair Furth: Got it. It's not that it wasn't there.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah. We do a spandrel all the time. I wouldn't want to see a mullion.

Vice Chair Baltay: Architect Hayes, are you opposed to the concept of pulling the building back a bit from Emerson and perhaps pushing it out the other direction, just a couple of feet?

Mr. Hayes: We've looked at a lot of different options, and early on, we had a balcony on that side of the building, and we got push back on too much balcony space, move it back. So, we responded to those comments at the first hearing. I don't think that from the owner's standpoint, Mr. Baltay, that he would want to lose that kind of useable space out of his kitchen/dining/living. We've already shrunk it some.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think it would be the same square footage.

Mr. Hayes: I...

Vice Chair Baltay: Because you could push it the other direction to make...

Mr. Hayes: Oh, you're saying push it back there and push it out this way. Yeah. We're trying to match the... Compositionally, as you I'm sure know, we're struggling... Not struggling, but we're trying to get that block to be similar to the master bedroom block. I would certainly be comfortable talking to him about pushing it back two feet, but not wrap the balcony around. That would give you more relief on that side. Then we'd shift his kitchen down. He wants a larger terrace, so I don't think that Cole is going to be receptive to wanting to have, you know, make up that area somewhere else.

Vice Chair Baltay: Because we're sort of giving him the terrace hanging the other direction, which...

Mr. Hayes: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...you said, I mean... A little bit of give and take here is good.

Mr. Hayes: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: And if you could get that balcony to come around with the railing, it will make a big difference, at least from my point of view, about how much of this kitchen spandrel glass I have to look at. Which isn't described. And I don't think it's a big compensation, a big loss. I can easily see the layout of that kitchen/dining area being equally functional.

Mr. Hayes: Well, it's certainly not something I would want to do on the opposite side, as well.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll grant you, that side has the large tree right there and it's not as important.

Mr. Hayes: No, I'm sorry, I'm talking... Well, there as well as...

Chair Furth: You mean on your interior lot line, right?

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, interior ramp side lot line.

Chair Furth: I don't think we're asking for that there.

Mr. Hayes: So, these units need to be accessible, right? The minimum balcony is going to be four feet on that side. So now, I'm going to be close to five feet back from the face of the stone. That's why I was starting to suggest that we don't wrap the balcony around, if you want to know my (inaudible).

Vice Chair Baltay: On occasion, we put planters in that kind of space, make it three feet with something growing there. You don't need to physically walk there, but...

Mr. Hayes: So you don't have to have access back to that, that space.

Vice Chair Baltay: From the street, you get the continuous railing line, you get the sense of setback, you get the reduced modulation of the building. I don't really care whether somebody can physically walk to it. That's not our intention. Or my thought anyway.

Chair Furth: I mean, one thing, you know, we talk a lot about wanting residential to look residential and mixed use buildings to look like they're mixed use. And one of the ways you signal that I think is with the decks you have, the balconies you have. We don't have the kind of multiple entries that we sometimes talk about. I think it would be very helpful if you pulled it back enough. I mean, planting up there would certainly solve the privacy issue.

Mr. Hayes: I'm sorry that my client is not here today. I mean, this is something that he is very involved with.

Chair Furth: I understand.

Mr. Hayes: I'm reluctant to say yes without...

Chair Furth: Of course not.

Mr. Hayes: ...consulting him. Is it possible that this is something...? At the same time, we'd also love to see this project main forward. It was February of 2018 when we submitted for ARB review and this is our first hearing. Would it be possible to come back to a subcommittee and we could show you options on that component, and I could get my client's feedback. I just don't want... Yeah, I'd love to say, great, let's get it approved, but at the same time, I need his feedback.

[crosstalk]

Mr. Hayes: Fair enough.

Vice Chair Baltay: What I'm looking for you to tell me is not what your client wants, but you as the architect. Is this the kind of...?

Mr. Hayes: Actually, it could work either way.

Vice Chair Baltay: Perfect. That's what I wanted to hear.

Board Member Hirsch: I'd like to chat a bit about what Peter has brought up here concerning that floor. Yes, it's correct. If you have a kitchen, then you really have to kind of find a way in which you deal with

the bottom of the glass that's different from the top of the glass. It gets pretty complicated, so it would see there are other possibilities. Maybe you could do a significant recess just at the line of your masonry wall below, up to the point of the kitchen cabinets, and just have low cabinets at that wall, and then...

Mr. Hayes: That's all we have, are low cabinets [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: I have a suggestion.

Board Member Hirsch: That would be like a large reveal at that point...

Chair Furth: I have a suggestion.

Board Member Hirsch: ...could work.

Chair Furth: Let's try to fashion a motion and see if we can get this on its merry way. It's been an hour and a half and it's... It's a very large single-family house in some ways, and it's making it complicated. And it's also multiple units, and it's also... It's also the theme-setting project, and ... It's not that you're not worth the time, but I think we should get on with it.

Mr. Hayes: Right. Let me just point out, it's not a big unit. It says 2,400 feet, but if you take the elevator, the stair, and the circulation around the stair out of it, it's an 1,800 square foot unit.

Chair Furth: And it's a lovely place. And I'm not saying they're going to rattle around. I'm saying maybe they would stash their children down a floor, but...

Vice Chair Baltay: To my colleagues, I'm okay sending this to a subcommittee for revisions [crosstalk]....

Chair Furth: Everybody fine with a subcommittee?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, me, too.

Board Member Lew: I am, too.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Oaky, good. All right, so, if somebody would make a motion to recommend approval on the condition that it be referred to subcommittee to deal with the irrigation, the planting and irrigation under the oak tree; modifying the Channing frontage of the third floor kitchen area to provide better privacy and appropriate integration of the wall material with the use; and... what else?

Ms. Gerhardt: Is that just the kitchen or the bedroom, as well?

Chair Furth: You want both sides?

Board Member Lew: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Yeah. I guess it's going to subcommittee. Did anybody want it modified over on the oak tree side? Oak tree corner?

Vice Chair Baltay: I feel strongest about the kitchen side, so I'll leave the request at that.

Chair Furth: Well, why don't we say at the kitchen side, and the bedroom corner if desired by applicant.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: I would include it for the moment... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Oh, you would? Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: I was trying to respect your thoughts earlier, David.

Chair Furth: Okay. And the bedroom. The Channing frontage on either side of the central core. I think we've had enough... The record will show what the concerns were. What am I forgetting that people brought up? Oh...

Ms. Gerhardt: Any comments about setbacks or blinds?

Chair Furth: I... I think I've lost the setback argument, so I'm not going to add that. The review of landscaping with regard to the spacing of the plants along the driveway, with a concern for the light and air in the neighbors property. That these not become overly dense or overly tall. I would like us to modify some findings. If you look at Comprehensive Plan consistency, I just think you're saying things that aren't true. It doesn't improve the Jobs house...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: Can you show us which page?

Chair Furth: Yeah, I'm on... You know what? I don't have numbered pages here because I printed it out. I'll find it.

Board Member Lew: Tell me which policy and I can tell you the (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Great. It's Attachment B, second page, and this is the discussion of policy, Goal L-1.

Board Member Lew: Okay, packet page 20, the first one, L-1...?

Chair Furth: Yeah. And I think we're saying that... I just would like to make a note of the fact that while it provides... How much additional office space is there? I believe there's an increment of 3,400...? It's about 3,500 more square feet of office space than presently exists?

Ms. Hodgkins: I think it's just under 1,000.

Chair Furth: A thousand?

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Chair Furth: I thought it was 1,950 before.

Ms. Hodgkins: It's 1,950 before and...

Chair Furth: Perfect.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah. Maybe just over (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Okay. I picked up the figures from somewhere else. And that's counting all the office space, right? Not including the private office space. Okay. And forget the whole thing. But where you talk about setbacks and wanting buildings closer to the sidewalk to enhance the pedestrian experience, that doesn't strike me as true in SOFA. But, do my colleagues disagree?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm not sure what setback Comprehensive Plan thing you're talking about, Wynne, but I think it...

Chair Furth: Let it go.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...fits pretty nicely in that neighborhood. I walk around there all the time and it, this is just about how they are.

Chair Furth: All right.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think. I mean, when you go off into the residential area...

Chair Furth: This is mostly a note to staff for future use. It's different when you're looking at this scale street than it is when you're looking at the.... Okay. Never mind my mutterings about findings.

Vice Chair Baltay: Do you want me to make that motion?

Chair Furth: Sure.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, so, so moved, what Wynne just said. [Laughter]

Chair Furth: Is there a second? I'll second for purposes of debate. Any discussion? All those in...

Board Member Lew: I would propose an amendment, that we add to finding number 2.b, about compatibility with respect to the before building.

Chair Furth: Oh, right. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: And I don't think there's any language in the draft findings.

Chair Furth: All right, would you [crosstalk]?

Board Member Lew: And then... well, I mentioned it. I think the recessed windows contribute, and I think the stone pattern may contribute, so maybe the stone pattern should be reviewed by the subcommittee.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, review to subcommittee for enhancing the...

Board Member Lew: Yeah, finding 2.b.

Chair Furth: ... pursuant to finding 2.b. Fine.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll accept that amendment.

Chair Furth: So will I. Anything else?

Board Member Lew: To follow up on your comment, Wynne about blinds on the windows. I do agree with you about that. In the past, for example, on the Walgreens building on University Avenue, staff is required that whatever blind or wall goes behind the glass has to be set back. We did it there. I think we also did it on the Equinox gym on El Camino, although they've covered the windows, even though I think we have a condition of approval there. We've typically done it where ground-floor retail was required, so this is kind of a different, this would be something different, requiring, like, an office use to have a setback for blinds. I just want to say it's been an issue and we've tried to come up with solutions in the past, and sometimes they work, and sometimes they don't. If you want to do something, I'm saying we could try.

Chair Furth: Why don't we refer the question of whether there should be conditions as to blinds or window coverings, refer to the subcommittee? In this case, I tend to think it's an owner-occupied building and we're going to be at the mercy of the owner, who is probably going to be motivated to have a beautiful building....

[crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to condition it that we see a detail of how the blinds are going to be installed, in some detail. What blinds are going to be used, on both the commercial and the residential portions of the building.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is that okay with you?

Chair Furth: Yep. That's a better way to go. Okay. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Four-nothing.

### **MOTION PASSES 4-0.**

Chair Furth: More or less (inaudible). First hearing in years.

Mr. Hayes: First hearing in years, right. [Laughs]

Chair Furth: We're going to take a 10-minute break (inaudible).

[The Board took a short break.]

### **3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI JUDICIAL. 702 Clara Drive [18PLN-00068]: Consideration for a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing 3,560 Square Foot, Four-Unit Apartment Building and Construction of Three Detached SingleFamily Homes Totaling 5,000 Square Feet. 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: RM-15 (Residential Multi-Family). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us**

Chair Furth: Item number 2 [sic], also quasi-judicial, located at 702 Clara Drive. Consideration for a major architectural review to allow demolition of an existing 3,500 square foot, four-unit apartment building and construction of three detached single-family homes totaling 5,000 square feet. This is exempt from CEQA in accordance with Section 15332 for infill development. Planner is Sheldon Ah Sing. Sheldon, if you would remind us who the applicant and architect are.

Sheldon Ah Sing, Project Planner: Sure. That is Tony Shi and Gilbert Fernandez.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Sing: They are here in the audience. Thank you for the introduction, and just a little overview here. Demolition of an existing four-unit apartment building and construction of three detached residential dwellings. The request is just for an architectural review. The project is located at the intersection of Sutter Avenue and Clara Drive. The site is zoned RM-15 multifamily. The topography of the area is flat, and there are a mix of single-family and multifamily residential. This property is actually at the boundary, the border between multifamily and single-family, so across from the project are single-family homes. The site does include, as I mentioned, a four-unit apartment building constructed in 1954. That would be demolished. For future, the project would be a one-lot condominium subdivision. That's the intent of the applicant. Three two-story detached dwellings...

Chair Furth: It would be a three-lot subdivision?

Mr. Sing: Just a one-lot subdivision. For condominium purposes.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Mr. Sing: The lot's not big enough to separate to single-family. Total would be just under 5,000 square feet. Each of the units have the same floor plan. The one in the middle is reversed. Three different architectural styles for the project, and we'll go through those in a little bit. And then, there are private open spaces in the rear of the dwellings, as well as common open space areas in the front and along Sutter. For zoning overview here and consideration, there would be a reduction of one dwelling unit. As a result, the project would have to pay a housing in lieu fee for .75 dwelling unit equivalent. The project is considered multifamily based on the number of units and the definition in the code, and the project is consistent with the development standards, including the setback height, daylight plane, etc. This is the site plan for the project, and while the project has three units, there are two units that would share a driveway, so there would only be two curb cuts along Clara Drive. Street trees are being preserved along Sutter and the open space area includes some benches that are sheltered away from the street, and pathways that lead from the sidewalk there. The bicycle lockers are located in the patio areas in the back. The applicant will go through and describe more of the details of the architecture, but in general, one dwelling unit would be a Spanish type of design, the other would be Craftsman. The other, we had a harder time trying to characterize it, but there's a lot of stone that's used in the front. And then, we have here the proposed side elevations of the project. With respect to the environmental determination, the project is considered infill. The project does not create any significant impacts with respect to CEQA, and would be categorically exempt pursuant to Section 15332, which is for infill development projects. Again, the project is, we find, consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. We are seeking comment on the architectural design and site plan. The project did not have the benefit of going through a preliminary review, so this is really the first time that the Board is seeing this project. The recommendation is to consider the information presented and provide comment, and continue the item. That concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. As I mentioned, the applicant is here with their presentation. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Sheldon. Any specific questions of staff before we hear from the applicant?

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you define, please, or describe how the low-income housing, 25 percent reduction, works? What is the applicant required to do?

Mr. Sing: There is a formula, and based on the number of dwelling units, there are .75 dwelling units that would be required, but since there's a fractional unit, they have to pay a fee, and that's an in-lieu fee. They would be responsible to do that at the building permit portion.

Vice Chair Baltay: Approximately how much is the fee?

Mr. Sing: It's \$68 per square foot.

Chair Furth: That was \$68 per square foot?

Mr. Sing: Yeah, I don't have that number, but I can say...

Vice Chair Baltay: Staff, if you could answer that.

Mr. Sing: ...just from experience where I had another project, it had .5 dwelling unit, it's not a high number. It's...

Vice Chair Baltay: But just total dollar amount, ball park.

Ms. Gerhardt: We can find that for you in a minute.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: And if you could introduce yourself and spell your name for our transcriber. And if there's anybody who wants to comment on this article, this item, if you could submit a speaker card to the staff, that would be helpful.

Gilbert Fernandez: Good morning. Hope the staff and the Board is doing okay. My name is Gilbert Fernandez. Do you want me to spell that for you?

Chair Furth: Yes, and we (inaudible).

Mr. Fernandez: [spells name]

Chair Furth: Thank you. If you could lift the microphone a little closer to your mouth, thanks.

Mr. Fernandez: How's that? Okay. I'm representing the owner, Clara J LLC, and also the manager here, Tony Shi. Also we have here the landscape designer, Dakotah Bertsch. I'm destroying your last name. Let's move forward here. We have, kind of like a recap over Sheldon's.... Let's see, am I doing this right? We are in the multifamily RM-15, lot 10,018 square foot. We are conforming to the front setback, 20 feet, which would be facing Sutter, and the street side, 16 feet. Interior setback, 10; rear, 10 as well. And our intent is to demolish the existing four....? I believe it's four... Let's see. Two-story...? Is it four? Yeah, it's a four-unit two-story multifamily apartment building, and to construct three condominiums to look as if it was three single-family homes. We decided, since it's a corner lot right in the middle of multifamily and single-family residential, we decided to make them look as if they were single-family. Since they face, since this kind of faces more of the single-family area instead of facing the multifamily, which I, to kind of also... Do the architectural and blend it in instead of making it look like as they were all the same. Move forward from there. As you can see, right here on the bottom is the existing structure, again, looking like an apartment complex. We come up to our design, which is looking more of a single-family design. Here are the homes surrounding. This is from across the street. And again, more blending into what's surrounding this corner lot. As for the window design for the second story, we are looking at obscure glass, which are more of the larger windows that are facing the other homes in the area, but for the bedroom windows that would be facing the residential side, we have them as smaller windows with high sills. As for going into landscape design, we are adding additional trees as well, just to add more privacy to those single-family home areas. The (inaudible) redwoods are to remain untouched, and as part of construction, we will be adding the tree protection to make sure they remain in good condition. Again, you can see here, here is the site plan here. The rear is facing the multifamily apartment complexes, which from the second floor, they are about 40 feet back, but we will be adding new trees to minimize the privacy issue. As you can see on the interior setback, we do have, you can see we have the... You can see into these sides of the single-family homes, but on this side, we do have the high sill, which is about 66 inches from the finished floor. Those windows I believe are two by two, and those will be all along that side of this home here, which is Home A. In the front, you can see it's pretty far from the front portion of the homes. As far as the privacy part, I don't believe it's an issue. We are adding trees, but again, those are not really impacting the privacy. And also, kind of the same on the right side, on Sutter. Again, we do have existing redwoods that are adding to the privacy, the impact. Here is the right and left elevations. You can see on the very top, as I mentioned, we do have the smaller windows 66 inches from the finished floor. The larger windows are from the... let's see... I want to make sure I give you the right information. Those will be from.... Sorry, I want to give you the right information. [Looking for information] As you can see, the left elevation on the second floor, the larger windows, those are going to obscure glass as one will be in a master closet and one will be in a master bathroom. They will be obscure for privacy, privacy for the floor plan, and for the single-family homes on the outside. Here is the material we are using for all three homes. Again, they will be separate design so that, again, they don't match each other. Here we more have a stucco with a lighter finish. Here's the stone we will be using for the columns, and also for the entrance for the garage. That's going to be a round roofing tile, and the

windows and doors are going to be more of a darker brown fiberglass. For the Craftsman style, we're going to use more of a lighter, lighter gray-bluish color, and again, a more different stone for the columns, with a Class A shingle roofing. Again, the doors and windows are going to be fiberglass, the windows will be a different lighter off-white, with the doors being more of a darker gray. I know the rendering doesn't seem like that, but it comes out different in the rendering. Then we come to Home C, which is more, I would more call it, like a Texas-style home, adding the shutters to the windows, which will be a lighter gray wood finish. We are using stone more in the front. We do have stucco, which will be more of a darker bluish-gray, and it would have a flat tile gray roofing, tile roofing. The doors and windows will be more of, like a coffee brown. Other than that I appreciate your time, and hope you consider this project.

Chair Furth: Thank you for your presentation. Are there any questions of the architect before he sits down? All right? Oh, Alex?

Board Member Lew: One quick question for staff or the applicant. You have a 10-foot public utility easement along unit A, or House A. I was wondering what restrictions are there with regard to planting underneath the easement. I'm just thinking on the recent project that we had on Alma. I think there was a restriction on trees, or something. I just wanted to try to understand if the privacy between you and the neighbors, if it needs to be only in architecture, or can it be in architecture and landscape?

Mr. Sing: I'll jump in. The restriction is that you have overhead power lines there. Trees are, for maintenance purposes, you want to have them lower. Shrubs probably are more preferable.

Board Member Lew: Okay, and there is a, and this is an overhead, here?

Mr. Sing: Yes, it is.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Sing: I guess this is a good time for us to respond to the Board Member's question about the affordable housing. When we did the calculation, it ended up being \$64,584.

Chair Furth: Not designed to replace the lost unit at all. This is simply a token amount.

Vice Chair Baltay: So, \$64,000? Thank you. Could I ask a question of the landscape architect, please?

Chair Furth: Yes. If you could introduce yourself and spell your name for our transcriber.

Dakotah Bertsch, Landscape Architect: Yes. [spells name]

Vice Chair Baltay: Very simply put, the plant list seems to have quite a few native and low water usage plants. Could you address if that's correct or not? We have a policy here that we use native species.

Mr. Bertsch: Yes, that is correct. The street scape is primarily meadow-style planting with a lot of native and drought-tolerant bunch grasses. The screening in between the units is myrica californica, a native shrub.

Chair Furth: A very fast-growing hedge.

Mr. Bertsch: Yeah. I included it there to provide privacy between the units. And then, other trees are redbud, semi-native, and arbutus, not native, but also drought-tolerant. And then other shrubs, including pineapple guava and pittosporum, are also drought-tolerant.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. A second question would be, on the redwood trees along... I forget the name of the street. Sutter. On Sutter street. Do you propose any landscaping in that buffer zone, I guess I'd say? Where you have the redwood trees?

Mr. Bertsch: The area in between, or directly underneath the redwood trees and along the fence there, where the picnic tables are, is just a mulched common use area.

Vice Chair Baltay: You said picnic tables. Could you tell me where those are?

Mr. Bertsch: I'm not sure how to pull up this screen.

Ms. Gerhardt: Sheet L-2.

Chair Furth: (inaudible, off microphone) two square structures.

Mr. Bertsch: Correct, yeah. That area is accessible from the front driveways as well as from the street via stepping stones. It's about 760 square feet of common use area.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you.

Chair Furth: Could I ask a question? Are there...? Are there edging bushes between the sidewalk and the useable common area? I can't quite...?

Mr. Bertsch: Not bushes, but tall grasses. Directly along the common use area is Calamagrostis, feather reed grass, which grows fairly tall, with the inflorescences [phonetic] getting up to maybe five feet. And then there are large kay brush [phonetic] tundra petulum [phonetic].

Chair Furth: This is designed to give a certain amount of privacy and buffering from the sidewalk?

Mr. Bertsch: Correct, yeah. The existing redwoods also grow pretty low, so they provide some screening down to probably five feet.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you. Any other questions? Oh, I forgot to ask. Did we all go visit the site? Did anybody not visit the site?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to disclose that I visited the site. While I was there, I spoke with the neighbor who lives across the street, Clark, at 703 Clara, who expressed to me concern that this project would increase the parking demand on the street.

Chair Furth: Okay. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site yesterday.

Chair Furth: David?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I visited the site.

Chair Furth: David visited the site. I visited the site. Didn't talk to anybody. Okay. Does staff have anything they wish to add? You can sit down if you'd like.

Mr. Sing: Nothing.

Chair Furth: Okay. Anybody wishing to comment from the public? Seeing nobody, bring it back to the board. Who would like to start?

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Good morning. Thank you for the presentation. I have a pretty serious, basic problem with your design, which is the fact that you have the same design for three houses, yet each house goes on a different configuration of the property. The one on the left has a 10-foot easement, which is a potential space for outdoor usage of some kind, and yet, the configuration is such that that's where the garage and a study is. You can't easily access that space. The house in the middle is tightly constrained, and yet, your configuration leave you having no space on either side of that. The house on the right has potential to have enormous visual impact on the street corner and the potential usage of that space, and yet, it's the same design floor plan all three times. Each house needs to be designed individually for the conditions of the property, the area, the piece of space that it's on, and I just see you failed to do that. It's really just a fundamental issue to me. We're looking for high quality design, a high standard, and it means not using the same floor plan three times. It just doesn't work. There are so many issues that come out of that I don't want to go into, but I just see that as an absolute. You have to take each design and make it fit what's going on around it. I'm concerned that you have a nine-foot-tall second floor and it makes the houses look overly tall, at least as they are designed now. I'd like to see you either choose an architectural style or use a motif that accentuates and works with that height, or, just reduce it down to maybe eight feet on the second floor. What you have now, the houses are small and they're overly tall, especially the side along Sutter Street, where it's a nine foot first floor and a nine foot second floor, more or less stacked up. It's not attractive, and it's not appropriate to have that on the corner of a busy pedestrian street in a residential neighborhood. I'd like to see you provide us with a good quality rendering of what the building will look like from the corner. When I was out there walking around, it was quite obvious to me that that's how this building is perceived much of the time as people drive up and down Sutter or go in and out of Clara. I think you owe it to the community to show, what will this project look like from that corner? I'd also, I guess the same question applies to designing each house individually, if that's what your goal is. You've taken basically the same floor plan and put a different couple of materials on each one -- some shutters on a window, a different color stone on one or the other. I think it needs more thought and more design effort to really articulate what these things are. Architectural styles are not just changing shutters on a window or paint color or trim. It goes deeper than that, and I really would like to see you, if your goal is to have different style buildings, I can support that. It's an eclectic residential neighborhood with many different styles. But then, they really should be different styles. You might consider changing the roof pitch, changing the height of some pieces. Relocating how the front door works. All of these elements of architecture that just need to be designed. I'm afraid I just don't see that happening here. As it stands, nothing very positive, I'm afraid. I'm sorry, but... It's not even ready to be reviewed, really, in my opinion. It needs to be designed more carefully for all three buildings. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Peter. Those are my thoughts exactly when I visited the site. I don't think this is a desirable project, but I do support a three-unit project on this site. The only thing that I have in addition to what Peter has mentioned is that there's, I think the trash is not working. It's not coordinated right now with the landscaping. I think you're showing shrubs and trash together, all in a very small, like three and a half foot side yard. I don't think that that works yet. And I think, too, I think you really just need to simplify the design of the roof forms and the materials. There is something really nice about this neighborhood. It's actually very different than some of our more traditional neighborhoods in Palo Alto. There's a real nice simplicity and elegance there, and it's completely lost. I see the most minimal design linkages in your design to the buildings on the block, and I just want to encourage you to try to keep it simple. We have lots of three-unit projects in the downtown area that work really well. I think we can, if you ask staff, I can make a listing, give them to you, of things that went through the Board very easily. I think they've been built, they've turned out really well, they've aged well, with each owner making some changes to make it a little more personalized. I don't see any reason why that could not happen here at this location.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. David?

Board Member Hirsch: I think this project is going to look very interesting from a drone viewpoint, when you're looking down on these three exactly-identical roof plans. These are three identical plans except they are flipped. My biggest concern is that applying three different styles to these identical buildings isn't appropriate, especially when they are so close to each other. They really ought to look more like a single project somehow, in which case I would suggest you choose one of the styles and perhaps change colors, trims, make them individual in that respect. My preference would be whichever one comes closest to a Craftsman. Because that's wonderful housing in Palo Alto, in my opinion. And the Spanish. I don't say they don't exist nicely on a block, but they need to have air around them and space on the sides. These do not. They're identical houses. The planning is really pretty terrific on the inside. The side windows, yeah, you can do it with obscure glass, and then they might work. But they're awfully close to each other. It's too bad the site is just that tight, and if you're allowed by zoning to have three houses, then that's what will occur. In that case, you've done a pretty damn good job in the planning interior. I agree about the garbage, and I wonder why you couldn't switch the garbage and the electrical panel and gas so that you take advantage of the area of the staircase on the inside to recess it on the outside, so you can put the garbage pails out of the way of the two side, of the side yards. I'll admit the utilities will have further to go, but it's certainly possible to do that and provide a space for appropriate closer-to-the-front-door garbage collection. I'm particularly concerned about the condominium type of planning here and the liability of one owner to the next, and the cleanliness of the whole site. I hope that somebody reviews the condominium plan to see that you've taken into consideration that the actual access to the garage is very tight, and if your car isn't exactly placed, there's a lot of problems there. I think you better work on that aspect of it, and Planning should review that with you. I really also think that the front porch, at 3-feet-7 depth, isn't really a porch at all. It doesn't look like a porch. If you have any room to play with front yard or back yard, give it more space in the front so that's a reasonable entry. You have a few railings and details that I don't appreciate either. They don't really, from drawing to drawing, they don't seem to add up too well in terms of height requirements for rails. What is the area way in the back that's described? It's not described. Is that just ventilation to the crawl space? Architect, can you respond?

Chair Furth: What sheet are you looking at?

Board Member Hirsch: Looking at A-4. Below the window in the back yard.

Board Member Lew: I think those are sliding doors.

Board Member Hirsch: Is that a door and... [crosstalk]... from that one little room?

Board Member Lew: My reading of that is a sliding door onto steps.

Board Member Hirsch: That's a very small room to have an exit out of it. I don't understand what the purpose of that is. All right.

Mr. Fernandez: I'm not sure which area you're looking at.

Board Member Hirsch: Moving on. Moving on.

Chair Furth: Could you put Sheet A-4 up?

Board Member Hirsch: The roof lines, you know, that's another deck in the back yard.

Mr. Fernandez: It's a sliding door for, to exit out to the back yard, and those are just, it's a landing with some steps.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. I'm mean, it chops up the back yard, where you have some space you could use for outdoor cooking, or whatever. It doesn't really do anything for you there, that I can see.

Mr. Fernandez: Okay.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm really concerned about the vehicle parking in the front. Has anybody in Planning looked at that as a transportation issue?

Ms. Gerhardt: I guess if you could explain the concern that you're looking at.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, my concern is just getting in and out with cars to parking spaces without... And my concern is that the condominium plan and liabilities that might happen owner to owner here. And also cleanliness of the side yards that could be a problem. I'm also concerned about the water off the roof. You have an awful lot of roof lines and valleys and gutters. The drainage plan for the whole area where there are some side yard concrete pads that you have, I would hope that the issue would be addressed that you could for sure show us that swales, or whatever you're going to provide for drainage, would really be working in areas as tight as that, and that you don't simply drop water off the roofs into the air conditioning system in the center there. I think you need to look at that pretty carefully.

Mr. Fernandez: Well, the plan would be that...

Chair Furth: Excuse me. We're going to comment and then you can talk to staff later, but we won't have a dialog.

Mr. Fernandez: My apologies.

Board Member Hirsch: Now, my major concern is that, my major concern is the style idea here, and I think that, you know, it says, "each home to have its own design, all different from the others." Well, they are all the same, so, if this is allowed, this building, I would only approve it if my suggestion is taken, that you choose one of the styles that you have here and they all three are the same, the difference only being paint color, or stain color, or whatever. I would prefer the middle one, but you choose what you think is the best to sell condominiums with. I don't know.

Chair Furth: Thank you for your presentation, thank you for your project. I agree that this is a good, a difficult but good location for three units. My comments are, to a certain extent, the same as my colleagues. I don't think the units are overly large. I think these are reasonably-sized houses. I think you've picked a good size and number of bedrooms and spaces like that. But, I have two big concerns, and they really flow from each other. By using the same plans where you have an interior lot next to somebody else, an interior lot within your own project and a corner lot, you're not taking advantage of the potential for open space, relating to those trees, thinking about the importance of looking at the Sutter frontage as one comes down frontage. You can sit if you'd like. You end up with not very useful open space. For example, I guess it's building A that was mentioned, you have some open space there. That could be landscaped. That could be beautiful. That could give you a sense of light and garden. But you're not orienting the interior of the house towards it. And when you look at the spaces... And the same, I think, might be true of this big asset you have with the landscaping and redwoods over on the outside. I don't know how much you can do. I live in what looks like a townhouse. They are technically single-family detached dwellings with zero lot lights and crosswalk easements. But the result is that we have private spaces outside that are wide enough to be useful. Whereas, what we have here is seven-foot fences next to two-story buildings in a very narrow area. I don't think you're getting useful space. I don't know, staff can work with you on this, but it would be much better off if somebody got half of that to themselves and somebody else got half of the back to themselves. You actually had useful, useable space. This just doesn't do that at all. With respect to the style of the buildings, the building that's there is actually a graceful building. It fits well on its site, you know, it kind of retreats, it has that nice symmetry. The colors are subtle, it has big trees behind it. The first impression isn't, "Oh, here's an apartment building in the midst of single-family houses," it's, "This is a nicely-designed building, a little old, but it doesn't push itself forward too far." These are small streets. These are tight, these are tight little streets, so I think it's important to have houses which, to a certain extent, recede rather than impose themselves unnecessarily on the front. I find these designs way too complicated. These are small

houses. I think they would be much better off much simpler, without so many ins-and-outs, and roof pitches, and what-not. I myself think that Board Member Lew's suggestion is good. We have a lot of good-looking infill housing, three units, that have a kind of integrated, simplified design that says these are well-designed, well-thought-out houses, they're good places to live. They were all built at the same time, but I'm not bored looking at them. I don't see an overly broad frontage. I really do not support having a Craftsman, and a Spanish, and a Texas ranch. It's too jarring. It doesn't give the opportunity for any kind of visual harmony and ease. I like the palette. I would want the planting along Sutter Street to be... I have to go out and look at those dimensions again, but to be significant enough so that's actually a useable space. Whether it's useable because it has beautiful plants in it with places to sit, or its useable in some other way. You know, there's a bit of a play structure... I don't know what's permitted. But not something that is so open to the street that nobody would ever feel comfortable sitting there. I mean, there's some optimal use of that space, building on the redwoods, the sidewalk, and the fact that you have a significant width there. I don't know what it is, but the open space can be much better in terms of usefulness, places to sit, places to see, places to look over -- with luck, places to cook and eat -- than it is now. Those are my comments. Anybody else have any comments?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to follow up on what you were just saying, Wynne, about the open space, because I was surprised to understand that there is a picnic table. This is but a 20-foot-wide area under these redwood trees along Sutter, and what they've created is essentially a mini public park. I'm not sure if that's what we want to be encouraging. The idea of the open space being common is for the residents in these houses, and having a public-type space, but that's clearly not a public park, and yet, the house itself is fenced off by a linear six-foot fence. They can't see it, they can't go to it, they can't tell who is hanging out there. It's not their space. They're not going to have any ownership of that. I know we've struggled with this idea of, what should these open spaces be? I guess I'm curious as to what we all think about that.

Chair Furth: Do you have something to say, Alex?

Board Member Lew: Well, here's what I'm thinking. Each house should be able to have, like, a patio with a table. And as they have it now, there's no way of actually doing that. So, I would say, start with that and get rid of the picnic tables. Whatever is left in that redwood area can be something else. It can be part of the street side setback and landscaping. But I wouldn't recommend putting tables like that out there. It should be private. And then, something else can happen in the remainder of the open space setback.

Chair Furth: I have two thoughts about that. If it's possible not to have a six-foot-high fence between Home C and that area, it would be good. One of the banes of Palo Alto is the fences that back up to commonly-owned landscaped areas, so that the commonly-owned landscaped areas tend to be neglected and ignored and not well maintained. If they are part of their visual yard, then I think you tend to do a little better. I'm not sure what the point of that six-foot fence is. Because we ordinarily don't need to wall off street-side yards like that.

Board Member Lew: Well, there are other places in Palo Alto where they put the fence right at the back of the sidewalk, on the street side setback. I see a lot of those.

Chair Furth: Right, no, I... Well, you can't put it in the...

Board Member Lew: People do it, I know that people do it.

Chair Furth: Well, we're not going to encourage that, right? We allow three foot fences... [crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: This space could be a wonderful front yard for the corner house. You could have their front door come in off of that, and you could get some typical front yard spaces that are common or open.

Chair Furth: And it would work.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah.

Chair Furth: You can see what we're saying, is that the different phases, the different frontages, the different frontages of this parcel give you a chance to build much better houses with much better garden space than this proposal.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to also comment on David's comments about the parking and the driveways and stuff. And then, picking up on what I heard the neighbors tell me. I'm thinking about it, that right now, the condominium has a very large parking yard on the left where the people who live there park, for the most part. It seems to accommodate a half-dozen cars, at least. I think David is pointing out sort of a quirk to Palo Alto's regulations, doing residential. You really can do this tandem linear parking. You can share the driveway in a manner that makes it really challenging to actually park on it. And I think you're right, that it's unlikely you'd have two cars actually parked on each property, or six cars all on the property, the way it is currently working. So, the neighbor's point that the parking is going to be impacted is probably correct. I think this does meet our code right now. This is a legitimate parking arrangement, and those are rules that have been pretty carefully worked out through the City. This is what the citizens want. And I guess I'm also wanting to comment that it would be lovely to get at least one of the units coming in of Sutter, but those redwood trees are important, and I don't think you can drive underneath them with a driveway. And actually, as I look at this with the other street trees, it looks to me like there's only two places where you could put these driveways to begin with. So, I'm sympathetic to the applicant trying to meet many masters here. Looks like you only have two places and it jams it all together and makes it really challenging.

Chair Furth: [off microphone] Yeah, (inaudible) redwoods, you're right.

Vice Chair Baltay: What I can say to you, I've done many, many projects like this in Palo Alto. Get a little more creative. Push your arborist, your landscape architect, the City staff, a little bit, that sometimes a little more flexibility with how you deal with these trees makes for a much better project. And the reality right now is that you really haven't got good parking for these houses. They meet the code, it's true, but not much more than that. If you could find a better way to have each house have some extra space, a place to stop and pull off to the side, third car parking spot, you'll be a lot happier. The neighborhood will be a lot happier. It just takes some creative energy to pull that off.

Chair Furth: All right, so, would you like this continued to a date uncertain, or...?

Mr. Sing: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: I would like to make one additional comment here...

Chair Furth: Yes?

Board Member Hirsch: ... relative to Alex's comment about the back yard. I really don't see why you couldn't just eliminate the entire structures out there, provide stairs down directly from the living room area, and utilize the back yard in a much more effective way. You've sort of cut it off by having to have a formal deck in the back. Backs of buildings generally don't have to look like fronts of buildings, so columns and decks back there are really not necessary. I mean, it will take some additional design of the façade perhaps to make it work, but you do have the capability in the back to have a significant area which could be used as was described for various family gatherings.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: I think... Can we get a motion to continue this matter to a date uncertain?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll move that we continue this matter to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Lew: I will second that.

Chair Furth: Motion by Vice Chair Baltay, second by Board Member Lew. All those in favor say aye. Hearing no opposition, it passes 4-0-1, with Board Member Thompson absent.

**MOTION PASSES 4-0-1.**

Chair Furth: Okay. Let's have our next item.

[Setting up for item 4.]

4. **QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [18PLN-00324]: Request for Preliminary Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of the Existing 94,337 Square Foot (sf) Macy's Men's located the Stanford Shopping Center and Construction of a new three-story stand-alone retail building, approximately 43,581 sf, two retail buildings, approximately 3,506 sf each and construction of a new stand-alone retail building, approximate 28,000 sf. (Total of 78,593 sf) Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org**

Chair Furth: All right. We are now on action item number 4. This is a quasi-judicial hearing. The address is 180 El Camino Real, meaning the Stanford Shopping Center. It's a request for preliminary architectural review... It's not quasi-judicial, is it? We're not making findings, etc., etc. It's not quasi-judicial, it's informal. To allow the demolition of existing 95,000 square foot Macy's Men's store, located at the Stanford Shopping Center, and construction of a new three-story stand-alone retail building of approximately 43,600 square feet, two retail buildings of approximately 3,500 square foot each, and the construction of another stand-alone retail building of approximately 28,000 square feet, for a total square footage of 78,600 square feet. That's a reduction, is it? In total square footage?

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Correct.

Chair Furth: Okay. The planner is Sam Gutierrez. Mr. Gutierrez? Oh, does anybody have anything they want to disclose, even though we don't have to? We've all visited the site frequently, right?

Vice Chair Baltay: I visited the site expressly for this project.

Chair Furth: Okay, we've visited the site for this project, and we've spent a lot of time on the premises. And a lot of money, it's noted. All right, gentlemen. Gentleman. Sam.

Mr. Gutierrez: Thank you. Once again, my name is Samuel Gutierrez, I'm the project planner...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, Sam, you need to be a little closer to the mic.

Mr. Gutierrez: Okay. I'll start over. Samuel Gutierrez, project planner for this preliminary application, and planner assigned to the mall in general. Let's dive into the presentation here. This is just a montage of basically the proposal, the shopping center. Just to frame people's minds around this location, you can see a map here on the left, a larger photo of basically the project area within the shopping center. I've included some photos to reference where these entryways are to this project area. You have the El Camino frontage on the top, the Pistache entry to the shopping center off of El Camino in the middle

picture there. And then, on the lower picture on the right is the Sand Hill entrance to the mall, and the Macy's Men's building directly follow that entrance. Moving to the overview of the project, this project involves the demolition of the existing Macy's Men's retail building and changing the surrounding parking lot configuration to develop two new stand-alone buildings. One is the Restoration Hardware building, which would be three stories. Another is a Wilkes Bashford single-story retail building with a mezzanine level. And finally, two new single story tenant spaces directly adjacent to Building J. That would be the building that is directly adjacent to the Macy's Men's building now, and that's the location of Jeffery's and future Blue Bottle site, and a day spa.

Chair Furth: (inaudible).

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes. There are some site constraints that do modify the site plan as identified in the staff report. There are some significant utilities that run under this portion of the shopping center, and as a result, the site plan that you see before you is configured in a way to address some of those constraints because they cannot really be abated. If you go into that, this map here shows that there is a regional water line that runs through the parking lot of the project area, right there near the intersection of Sand Hill and El Camino. It is a major regional water line and it would be difficult to place a building there, or orient the building to fully front El Camino because of that line. That accounts for some of the site planning choices here. This is the existing Macy's Men's building, and below it is the proposed Restoration Hardware building. That would be the change that you would immediately see as you enter into the shopping center off of the Sand Hill entryway. Or driveway, excuse me. The Restoration Hardware building is, again, intended to be a three-story building with a rooftop glass-surrounded restaurant, rooftop garden that can be accessed from that restaurant, and second floor terraces. It has this kind of continued theme of rooftop activity as it tiers down, and then, new ground-level landscaping, as well an outdoor sales area on the ground level. It continues this kind of indoor/outdoor theme throughout the building. The second floor terraces continue that theme from the upper floor, and then, that ground floor area, which isn't clear in this rendering because it would block the facades, but that ground floor outdoor sales area would have a wall around it. In some of the plan sheets, you can actually see that wall kind of being referenced here and there, but it's not clearly shown in this rendering. Also, there was some concern about some of the massing on this building as it's proposed because it's not typical of other buildings in the shopping center. Now, we do have tall buildings, which is the Bloomingdale's building, for example, which is on the other end of the shopping center along El Camino. But, the walled features, some of the proposed lighting around it seems to be a larger scale, so that was a point of discussion that we'd like to see the ARB's focus on. The second component of this development is the Wilkes Bashford building. This would be the building that is in the current empty parking lot area fronting El Camino. Again, this was planned in a way to avoid that water line that's adjacent to it here. It will trigger El Camino Design Guideline requirements for the 12-foot sidewalk at this portion of the shopping center block, if you will. It also has a mezzanine located inside of it, so it's not a true two-story building, but it does have a mezzanine level proposed within it. And again, the El Camino Design Guidelines would trigger that requirement because it's not so far pulled off of El Camino; it's right in front of El Camino, and would modify that frontage. The final part of this proposal here is the new two-tenant spaces that would be adjacent to Building J. They are proposed to be retail tenant spaces, potentially small restaurants. There is a separation between these spaces and the restoration hardware proposal. There will be a new aisleway in between them -- excuse me, drive aisleway -- and that is proposed to be elevated, and will also have a different texture to the aisleway in the parking lot to identify it as a different area than the larger aisleways that have circulation for traffic there. This would be the transition point also from the greater shopping center massing to the Restoration Hardware building, which would be the biggest building at this end of the mall. That is another point that the, that we request the ARB look at and see how that transition forms and massing and scale would work. Just to focus in a bit on the site planning for this section because it would create a new drive aisle and parking in the pedestrian walkway that doesn't currently exist. You can see here that there is a proposed pop-up shopping area, and that's referenced in the staff report.

Chair Furth: [off microphone, inaudible]

Mr. Gutierrez: This sheet? On the project plans? I'm sorry?

Chair Furth: Which of our sheets is this?

Mr. Gutierrez: This should be...?

Chair Furth: J-1?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, I believe so. Let me double-check. Yes, J-1.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Gutierrez: On this sheet, you can see that this area is indicated to have a pop-up sales area that's located between the two new tenant spaces. The applicant will dive further into detail into that. We did discuss that pop-up sales area, or possibly events, or something, could be addressed through a temporary use permit for whichever events or sales they may have there. But it would be consistent with other retail operations at the mall. Again, this is a preliminary submittal, so there are some components of it that are not fully detailed out. For a formal submittal, we would require any code conflicts to be addressed prior to coming back to the Board, and some of these items -- but, of course, not limited to them -- would be parking, car and bicycle, lighting overall for this end of the mall, landscaping, C-3 planning, changes to the utilities on site, screening of those utilities, trees, and shading requirements. And loading for the parking. Again, just to reiterate some key considerations for the ARB to look for here. The scale, mass, transitions of the proposed buildings in relation to the shopping center; pedestrian orientation/scale of the proposal; access to the site for all modes of travel; consideration to apply from applicable policy documents; the El Camino Real Design Guidelines. There is also the Master Tenant Façade & Sign program that was approved for the shopping center. This involves new buildings that would be stand-alone. We would like to see some consistency, so with that document, it just has this cohesive feel at the shopping center. Of course, the architectural design, theme, and preservation of existing landscaping. Staff recommends that the Board provide informal comments, and no formal action is requested. That concludes the presentation.

Chair Furth: Remind me again what the zoning is.

Mr. Gutierrez: It's CC.

Chair Furth: Thank you. All right. Any questions of staff before we hear from the applicant? Seeing none, if we could hear from the applicant, he'll have 10 minutes. If you would introduce yourself and spell your names.

Matt Klinzing, Simon Property Group: My name is Matt Klinzing I'm with Simon Property Group. [spells name]

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Matt Woods: My name is Matt Woods, I'm from GHA Design. [spells name]

Jordan Brown: My name is Jordan Brown with Restoration Hardware. [spells name]

Mr. Klinzing: We're going to diligently use our 10 minutes to reiterate a little more, go into a little more detail...

Chair Furth: We don't time you for the spelling.

Mr. Klinzing: Samuel just [crosstalk]...

Chair Furth: This is a (inaudible) building, so... And this is a preliminary review, so, why don't you take 15 if you need it. Don't go too fast.

Mr. Klinzing: Oh. Yeah, relax. All right. Well, just to highlight, we put our presentation together, kind of give you some of the... Since this is multiple building, some of it has to do with project planning. And if you've been to Stanford Shopping Center, outdoor center, we...

Chair Furth: That's not an "if." You may assume that [crosstalk]...

Mr. Klinzing: We take a lot of pride in how our common areas work. We see here in the view that we're over the view of Sand Hill/El Camino Real. You see the existing Macy's Men's building, the existing single-story Fleming's, and a run of single-story shops. Here, as proposed, the revised development from the same vantage point. You see now the new Restoration Hardware, the new Wilkes Bashford building, and what we're referring to as Building J because they all have letters. And a new internal street that would cut between those, so, for a juxtaposition of scale. This is our existing site plan at that corner. A large open lot along El Camino and Sand Hill. One of the things that has always, I thought, been a detriment to the center is that the majority of the anchors when you go there are pulled away and separated, so we have internal circulation. Macy's Men's in its existing configuration is one of those that does not. So, if you're coming east from a pedestrian standpoint, one has to walk around the Macy's building, vehicularly, or go around it, or make your way through that passage that was from the Ralph Lauren building that's now Jeffrey's. We think one of the advantages of now switching to this new proposal is that we bring a lot of those urban village planning principles back. By separating what is now Restoration Hardware and the two speculative retail spaces, we have really an internal pedestrian/vehicular street that we think connects the east and the west a lot more. In addition, the new Wilkes Bashford and the Restoration Hardware buildings provide a little more of that street edge, the urban wall that I know that the Board is interested in, I believe, for planning principles in this area. We think it picks up on, down south, we have PF Chang's, and now the new Shake Shack, and that whole edge, and how we're beginning to kind of anchor the site. I'm going to turn it over now to Ms. Brown, who is going to go into a little more detail on the Restoration Hardware design.

Jordan Brown, Restoration Hardware: The proposed building design represents our next generation gallery design at the Stanford Shopping Center. Over the past several years, RH has reimagined our stores and transformed them into more inspiring furniture design galleries with a dynamic hospitality experience integrated into the footprint, with a full café offering. Our architectural designs follow basic principles of balance, proportion and symmetry, and the integration of an indoor/outdoor experience throughout the space. Our buildings incorporate large windows on all elevations, filling the rooms with natural light typically found more often in a home-like setting than a traditional box retail. This is a photo of our Melrose Avenue gallery in West Hollywood. It's actually the inspiration for our next generation galleries. The gallery shown on the screen showcases steel bi-folding doors that welcome the public, metal louvered awnings, and Juliette balconies that embrace the climate. And a one-story lo-ja [phonetic] at the front elevation, which helps break up the building's overall massing and give our stores a more pedestrian scale. You will also note that our rooftop gardens with heritage olive trees continues to carry the same language that we're proposing for here in Palo Alto. Here's a close-up of our courtyard garden entrance that showcases the architectural elements discussed previously, and highlights a fully transportation point of entry. You'll also note that the exterior metal material palette and color -- which you will see on the sample boards in front of you -- in West Hollywood, as well as our project here, we're proposing using our signature hand-troweled venetian plaster with complementary cast stone details. That's on the one board. Yeah. On that same board is also the black-painted metal sample. That would be representative of our awnings and our balcony details. The high-level craft of materials speaks to our attention to detail, as do other features, including a pedestrian-friendly mix of bluestone pavers and decomposed granite that you'll note on the second material board. I would also add the one detail here that I believe is called it, is the... Can I zoom in on this at all, or no? Probably not. Are the exterior light fixtures that are shown on this photo, that are also proposed for the Stanford Shopping Center here. The overall massing in elevation and drawing typically tends to look a lot larger than it is in actuality. The glass box is a fully-transparent glass box with a decorative chandelier inside that is a crystal chandelier

with nuanced candelabra 15-watt lamps. It reads typically in elevation like a much larger massing than it actually is in reality. Our new hospitality experiences within our next generation galleries embrace the outdoors with the glass conservatory rooftops, and bring in ample natural light and feature crystal chandeliers, a central stone fountain, and interior trees that help provide dappled light to our diners enjoying their refreshments below. You'll also note that the palette continues from the outdoors to the indoors as well for consistency of experience. This is another photo of our West Hollywood gallery that more closely shows the heritage olive rooftop garden that would be similar in feel to what we're proposing in Palo Alto. The café in Palo Alto will be the central focus of the rooftop, and these European-inspired rooftop gardens will be flanking the hospitality space, showcasing our outdoor furniture collections.

Mr. Klinzing: Thank you. Next on the agenda is the Wilkes Bashford building. The material sample boards are between Ms. Furth and Mr. Baltay there. I won't go into a lot of detail; they are clearly labeled. Our goal in looking at this building, since it's a pretty big footprint, we wanted to break it down. We have complementary set of materials we tried to break down to scale along it, so where we have storefront, where we have entrances, and where we change in materials, we wanted to bring it down to size. The other thing we did is we have the introduction of trellis on the front. Well, really all front because it's a 360-degree building. But similar, again, to the building that currently houses Shake Shack and PF Chang's, or the current residence of Wilkes Bashford over on the other side of the property, we have those trellises. This is a view now looking as you would enter from -- and I always mispronounce this -- Pistache Place, as you come off El Camino and you're looking northwest now. Now, one of the factors that we realized is that with all the mature trees we have along El Camino, as well as along this run, that we really have a window of view that's 10 to 12 feet. That's really where you get the majority of the site corridors in. A lot of our detailing, be it storefront, front entries, signage, is really focused towards that. We wanted to create a broken-down façade that brought down the scale again of the mezzanine, while providing glazing up there and bringing it down to patron scale. This next view is now switching areas. We've got an overhead prospective view of Restoration Hardware to the north, and what we're calling Building J to the south. And as Mr. Gutierrez brought up, we see an opportunity here. Now, we have the introduction of an internal street. Well, we also want to make sure that we have pedestrian and patron safety, and we have, you know, the amicable integration of the vehicles and patrons in this area, so we're choosing to table-top the entire thing. Where you see the light strips that are on either the right or the left are actually ramps up. Where you see the patterned surface material that is where the cars are now, is really flush now with the adjacent sidewalk surfaces. We do this in a few areas. We want to make it feel more like a plaza and a little less like a sidewalk and a street, and it gives the pedestrian a little more control. At the same time, we are cognizant of the fact that we need to introduce either bollards or planters, or other material that keeps the safe separation of patrons and vehicles in this area. One of the things that's unique in the center, and you see rendered, kind of an Airstream trailer, because that's just one possible thing. But there are always trends in retail, and one of the trends that's currently coming about is the idea of pop-ups. This is where you would have retailers that may have brick-and-mortar elsewhere, may not have a significant brick and mortar, but want to have a physical presence. So, build an event around them being in place for a week or so. One of those trends is to be in Airstream trailers; others is other kind of build-out. We see a great potential here because it allows for this space to be used as that kind of space, as well. We don't just have an un-animated façade that runs along here. It would allow a point of interest from time to time. When those are not in place, this would be an area we would have moveable furniture where patrons could occupy as a small seating area. This is a view now looking at the corner of that. Restoration Hardware would be off to the right, so we've got the Building J in front of us. Kind of puts together what the entire concept is. If you think about two retail spaces, which in essence is what these are back to back, they have stock rooms and service towards the rear, and they have storefronts towards the front. We wanted to do that, but we also wanted to bring it around to one of the north corners. One of the opportunities here is to have these as cafes. These are speculative, so it's a fancy way of saying we don't know exactly what they're going to be yet. They could be retail, they could be food-related. But if they are food-related, we want to embrace that corner and allow outside dining areas to go. As we continue our planning, we're interested in having that happen. The other thing we wanted to do -- and it's kind of hard to see -- you see the green wall behind one of the trees there. We have a recess that is between the two buildings that happens mid-block. That's because typically

when you get to a side portion or a retailer, you can end up with some pretty solid walls, where they want to actually have merchandizing racks at back of house. We think by bringing that back, that broke down the scale somewhat and made it less un-animated. At the same time, the use of the seating area in the center or the pop-up retail help to animate that a little bit. That really concludes our presentation. What you have in front of you are some additional views, at Mr. Gutierrez's suggestion. We provided them because as we come forward to the formal review, there are a couple changes that we wanted to suggest. One of them is in this area. Just as I said, we're looking at speculative retail. What's shown on the current view is a pretty significant setback to that green wall. We're looking about eight to ten feet. Our leasing people looked into that and said, "Yeah, we might want to have a little more space actually to lease there." So, we've actually reduced that in that view to only about two feet. Not the eight to ten feet, but two feet, but it does give us more flexible lease space that they could use for different venues. The other two shots, one is of Wilkes Bashford in this shot, and currently we're showing storefront that's on the corner. As that tenant has been looking at the merchandising and the layout, they've really seen a great advantage to how they lay out the interior space to that corner for some of their sales floor. What they are suggesting, what they would really like to do, is to push that window up now to midblock, facing east. The last view you have there is a view from El Camino looking beyond the heritage oak, and that is the storefront that would look out onto El Camino. We offer those just as a precursor to coming back or the formal presentation.

Chair Furth: Anything you want to ask before we let the applicant sit down? I think we'll talk for a while. Staff, could you put the site plan up? I just want to be sure I understand which building is where.

Mr. Gutierrez: Sure. One moment.

Chair Furth: And explain the wall around Restoration Hardware.

[Putting up site plan]

Chair Furth: And I think we'll focus first on site planning, and then we'll talk about buildings.

Mr. Gutierrez: Sure. Just using the applicant's presentation...

Chair Furth: Sure.

Mr. Gutierrez: ... since it's up, conveniently, we can see the Restoration Hardware here in the upper left portion of the site plan. That is actually taking up part of what is an existing drive aisle and a parking lot. And then, the other half is actually taking up the existing footprint of the Macy's Men's building. That would extend down here, connecting to Building J, where these two new retail spaces are proposed.

Chair Furth: Right now, we can drive around Macy's Men's store?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Chair Furth: And after this, you couldn't, except in this table-raised thing.

Mr. Gutierrez: So... I think I can do this now. [Adjusting slide] This is what the existing site plan looks like here.

Chair Furth: Got it. Thank you.

Mr. Gutierrez: As you can see, there's the drive aisle here, and then, the existing parking lot.

Chair Furth: The exit ramp, mm-hmm. The place where you can usually find parking, yes. Do you have a comment?

Vice Chair Baltay: Same or the applicant, could you explain the wall around Restoration Hardware and the two ends? I'm confused. I'm looking at these very nice renderings of an elevation of a building...

Ms. Brown: Thank you for asking.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...and staff is telling us there's a 12-foot wall. Explain, please.

Ms. Brown: I actually, I meant to note the clarification when I was up here previously. There are actually not walls around the entrances, they are hedges around the entrances, embracing the landscape. That's both the, on both sides of the gallery.

Vice Chair Baltay: Are they solid? Are they transparent? Can you see through them?

Ms. Brown: They are semi-permeable, obviously, in the form of any hedge that would be.

Vice Chair Baltay: Would there be like a metal structure in the middle of it, or anything?

Ms. Brown: No, it would just be a hedge. We typically do, like a very manicured, tailored boxwood hedge. If you're thinking... Yeah.

Chair Furth: How high?

Ms. Brown: The proposed height I believe is...? It's around nine feet. I apologize. I don't have that information.

Chair Furth: Pretty good for boxwoods.

Vice Chair Baltay: Nine feet. And what is the purpose of the hedge?

Ms. Brown: Both entrances have outdoor merchandise, so when you're walking into the gallery from either direction, they enclose the outdoor merchandise space. They are semi-enclosed in terms of a welcoming façade, as well as if you look at, actually, like... This is the interior entrance courtyard here at our West Hollywood gallery, but they would serve as a similar purpose to this, where it would provide additional ground floor pedestrian access to seating and retail space.

Chair Furth: They are outdoor sales space.

Ms. Brown: Yes.

Chair Furth: Looking at RH-4, west rendering...

Mr. Klinzing: I just want to add in, sorry, just to make it clear when you talk about the walls, they do frame the outdoor sales space, kind of create their environment, but there is also that 20-foot opening that is open as you walk by it.

Chair Furth: The 20-foot...?

Mr. Klinzing: There's a 20-foot opening if we look back... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: I'm looking at RH-4. Would anybody ever see this, or are there hedges in front of it?

Ms. Brown: There will be partially a hedge in front of it, and partially it will be open. The middle section here that you would see, you would still see the 20-foot opening that Matt is referencing here. The hedge would just be in front of either wing. It would not be blocking off the entire façade.

Chair Furth: And how high would that be compared to the screens coming down? The wooden...?

Ms. Brown: The awnings coming down?

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Ms. Brown: The awnings sit at about 12 feet, and the hedge sits below that.

Chair Furth: The lower edge of the awning is 12 feet.

Ms. Brown: Correct.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anything else before we go back to site plan? I'll start with a question to my colleagues. I appreciate, for years we've been asking Stanford to move its commercial activities closer to, you know, good-looking buildings closer to El Camino. Part of the idea was that we would have a pedestrian connection, so there's that diagonal where PF Chang's and Shake Shack are that, if you're really adventuresome, connects you to the transit center. And now, this is the other end of it. I still find this a very unfriendly place to bikes. Once I try to get on the campus, I mean, Stanford spent a great deal of design effort to make Sand Hill itself very bicycle-friendly. It's got dedicated turn pockets and all kinds of things, and it's fairly heavily used. And that's where, until the train comes in and we no longer have a level crossing, that's where there's a lot of access from, if you want to ride a bike from downtown Palo Alto, you're probably going to go on El Palo Alto and across there, which takes you to that exact corner of the shopping center. I would be wanting to know how that's going to welcome bicycle travel. I think it's going to be important. You're not going to take a lot of stuff home on your bike from Restoration Hardware, but they deliver. And so does Wilkes Bashford. That's one of the things that's in my mind. Similarly, I think it's great to relocate the pedestrian pass-through from the El Camino to the midway point. I like the idea of relocating the drive-through where it is, but I'm very concerned about having back-up parking conflicting with bicycles and what-not. It looks like the very worst of Bryant Avenue. Those are my questions to you about site design. Generally, I'm not hostile to having buildings out there, but I am concerned about the circulation. Site plan comments. Let's start with you, Peter.

Board Member Hirsch: I could, I would...

Chair Furth: Oh, start with you, David? Okay.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, sure. Yes, I've had the same kind of bicycle issues that you've had, but to be honest, I think it's almost more important to also focus on those who are coming to this mall and parking here and trying to make it around Macy's at present, which is a real pain in the butt. And I really appreciate the fact that you're improving that incredibly well here, and that the passage between two very attractive new facades there is going to be quite impressive. But I'm bothered by the parking that's in between, and the small piece of the parking overall on the lot. There's I think maybe 13 or 14 cars there, and they're backing out into traffic, and it's a main kind of passageway around the whole facility to get from one side to the other. Wouldn't it be possible to make that into more of a pop-out or some more active kind of pedestrian way, and to eliminate some of the parking? I know parking is critical to a shopping center, but it's a small amount of cars considering how important that passageway is around to the other side. Other than that, I think the placement of the new buildings is excellent. I'd have more to say about them specifically after we get off the site plan.

Chair Furth: Okay. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Yes. I have similar concerns that have been mentioned before about the site plan. I really don't like the parking in front of the building. It's very uncharacteristic of the shopping center, and I don't think we want to start going down that path. And then, too, I do like the connector street. I used to use the Macy's Men's connector thing a lot, and I don't do it anymore. I don't see that many people using it.

Chair Furth: It's abandoned.

Board Member Lew: I think it used to be... Well, we used to have to do it before Sand Hill Road connected, right? It was actually... It was effectively a street.

Chair Furth: Alex grew up here, and I first went to the shopping center in 1964. So. As a freshman.

Board Member Lew: So, for the old-timers, it was a magnet, right?

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: And emporium. And those were the two anchors. The regular Macy's was not there. It was all just on this El Camino frontage. On the site planning, I don't object to anything that you're showing at the moment. In the back of my mind, I'm thinking the next project that comes along may make everything worse. Like, you've got... Like, I think this is fine.

Chair Furth: Would you put the site plan back up, please?

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I like having the Wilkes Bashford there, I think can work. At Christmastime, when you have parking, I think that's not quite so ideal to have, like, an isolated parking lot by itself in the corner. But, like, the rest of the year, it could be fine. Just in terms of the building planning, I think having pop-up restaurants at corners and stuff has worked really well at the shopping center. It brings in a lot of people. I do like to see, like, the kids come after school, in the front of the shopping center. I think that's nice. And I think the placement of the roof garden café on the Restoration Hardware at this location, on the site near the creek, and it has western views of the hills and sunset, I think is really ideal. And then, I think I emailed a question to staff. I do have some nitpicky things about the tree report, but we can get into that at the next hearing. I think it's too detailed at this point. In the back of my mind, I'm wondering if the raised street is... In the back of my mind, I'm thinking that maybe it's overkill, and maybe it's not necessary. But I throw that out. Elsewhere in the shopping center, like over by Bloomingdale's, you've done colored and textured pavement, and I don't know how the rest of the Board Members think, but it seems to me that that might be more in keeping with the rest of the shopping center.

Chair Furth: Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. I have two overriding thoughts that have been going through my head as I've been looking at this. One is, I think both the Restoration Hardware and the Wilkes Bashford buildings are just too close to the Sand Hill and El Camino, vis-a-vie the trees. There's very healthy live oak trees that have been well maintained and are really important trees, and your Wilkes Bashford building is very close to those on El Camino. I think the Restoration Hardware is also pushing very close to those buildings, to those tree groves, and I think it's really important that we preserve those trees. My second thought, and this is from, for the past 25 years I've been driving around that Macy's Men's store, and what's going through my head is after I've gone around that and I want to get over to the produce place, I've got to go through this series of dogleg curves to work my way around the jagged edges of the shopping center. And the way you've placed this new drive aisle between Restoration Hardware and the LaBelle Day salon, I still have to do one of those dogleg turns. You're not taking the opportunity to straighten it out altogether, and you could if you just line it up. It's another 20 feet further back. What it would mean is that you couldn't build the new retail speculative spaces that you're talking about, or at least not at that location. But, the advantage I see in just basic driving functionality around the shopping center I think would be huge. If you could straighten out that drive aisle, you would just save having to, everybody having to do that quick turn. Many, many times, I've almost hit somebody. I've watched people talking to a kid, dropping somebody off -- There's a lot of commotion, and it's not a good place to have these kind of complex turns. So, if you have a chance to straighten it out -- which you do here -- I think you should look at that carefully. It also gives you the opportunity to have more of a visual connection all the way through to Wilkes Bashford, or even potentially out to El Camino. By moving that,

you'd be able to pull the Restoration Hardware building a little bit further from Sand Hill Road, which would give more buffer on the trees. Second big comment for you is that we have to make a finding that the place is functional. In my opinion, right now, the parking situation at the shopping center is not functional. I cannot tell you how many times on a Saturday, or any time in December, you really can't find a parking place. It's hard. It's really tough. And it's dangerous, and it's frustrating, when people are looking for something and just can't find a place to park. And it's not good for your shopping center either. And what I see you doing here is creating what I think will be more demand. A rooftop restaurant on Restoration Hardware, and Wilkes Bashford with its isolated parking area there. It may be that you have a lot of parking places maybe on the entire other end of the mall, or something like that. There is a whole process staff will go through, I'm sure, for counting how much space you have, but from my point of view -- and I will be evaluating it this way -- it has to be functional. And when you create isolated pockets of high-intensity demand like you have at Restoration Hardware, and clients who are going there who do not want to walk a quarter of a mile to get back to the store, and you don't really have, in my opinion, sufficient parking for, you've created an unfunctional situation. I bring this up because almost every commercial application we look at in Palo Alto, we're pushing hard for people to put underground parking, to go through the extra trouble to really provide appropriate and sufficient parking spaces. In my opinion, you should be considering doing that here. You have two new buildings. There's no reason you couldn't put additional parking under these buildings and solve the problem you have with not enough parking. Because I think this is just creating a problem on the parking side of things. Those are my thoughts. Parking is an issue, and straighten out the drive aisle.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Lew: To continue the subject on parking, I'm not crazy about the north elevation of Wilkes Bashford and the parking [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: No kidding.

Board Member Lew: That's a design detail maybe for the building, but I think that that's not really the most idea configuration. Especially with handicap parking and the design required for that. I think that I would lump that together with Peter's comment.

Chair Furth: My turn. The most... You know, the shopping center is sort of our Disneyland. Ever since you started building the entire building as these signs of the store, it's had that wide range of fantasies going on. Sometimes bright pink. And the least-appealing photograph in all of this, drawing in all of this, is this view of Wilkes Bashford as you come down El Camino. And it looks terrible. Now, it wouldn't look that bad in real life because there would be landscaping, but it's going to have to be pretty dense. It looks like... I mean, I look at Restoration Hardware and I think, well, so much for mid-century modernism. And then, I look at Wilkes Bashford and I think, well, here it comes back a little bit, as if it were in the desert. But to have that façade fronted by cars, as what you see, it's this really unattractive view. This one, right? Where is this coming from? Exterior View 1? Where's that from.

Board Member Lew: There's another view...

Chair Furth: Anyway...

Board Member Lew: ...with the (inaudible) in it, though.

Chair Furth: Yeah. They're just... not good.

Board Member Lew: This one, right?

Chair Furth: Yah. This is not a look anybody wants.

Board Member Lew: That's WB-7.

Chair Furth: Yeah. And partly, I don't... To get back to the site plan again, it is interesting to figure out what happens when you orient the building that way and you have all that parking over on the side. How do you get good-looking view from El Camino? And maybe you just plant the heck out of it, but that doesn't seem to be what we're seeing yet. I don't think there should be parking on this passageway between Restoration Hardware and Building J. I just think that's an invitation to bad things. It's so few parking spaces. I used to live near a place where Nordstrom had 20 really convenient parking spaces and then there was everything else, so everybody was always looking for those 20 spaces. You have even fewer here. And the amount of... I just don't envision that as being a well-functioning parking area at all, and I don't think it should be a parking area. I think it should be dedicated to getting pedestrians, cyclists, and if necessary, cars, through there, but not, um, at a very low speed. I'm sure we've all, I mean, we've all got all these wonderful examples of places we've experienced, but I have been in this, the section of Paris around the new library? Viva-tech? [phonetic] You know, really doesn't privilege cars; it really privileges pedestrians and bicycles. So, when you drive through there, the drive aisles are very constrained by low physical barriers, and you don't accidentally run over somebody because you can't go that fast. I, at the moment, would not be supporting parking over there. The Wilkes Bashford parklet may have similar problems. I don't know. But I'm not supportive of that present proposal. Or a cut-through with parking.

Board Member Hirsch: That's interesting comments you've made just now. It makes me kind of think that it would be possible. After all there are garages just to the south of here, so, I would think your encouraging people to use those garages and maybe could free up space at the, what is called the front of Wilkes Bashford. And the back isn't as attractive. It's kind of an attempt to look like the front, but the front is really on the parking, the major parking lot side. Regarding the link that's between Restoration Hardware and the other J building, which does a good job of keeping the courtyard behind it in the rest of the J building, the façade is really fun. I mean, it...

Chair Furth: We're still on site plans here, David.

Board Member Hirsch: Oh, we're still on site plans. Okay. I'll stick there, too. I just think it's possible to... Well, I wonder if it isn't possible to create a better façade and entry into Wilkes Bashford from the opposite side. It sort of is pretending to do that, and then, it doesn't really do it. I think you should really consider that, based on the comment that it should be accessible-looking, you know? And not just be loaded with cars in front of it. But I understand there is a utility issue there, but still in all, the access road that has a cute name to it there -- I can't read it -- I don't know how heavily that would be used that you couldn't create a crosswalk somehow across there, to get into it or to do some better landscape planning that allowed you to get to the center of Wilkes Bashford.

Chair Furth: Alex, what were you saying about the Wilkes Bashford parking?

Board Member Lew: On the north side...

Chair Furth: And the north is...?

Board Member Lew: The Sand Hill Road side. You've got parking...

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: ...and there's a walkway, right?

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: And the trellis.

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: With handicap parking, you're going to have...

Chair Furth: Big blue signs.

Board Member Lew: ...big blue signs right up against the trellis.

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: There's minimal trees because they're trying to squeeze in all the parking.

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: And it's just not really, it's not the best. I think what they're showing is workable, but it's not really the best design possible.

Chair Furth: What about the parking spaces over at the Restoration Hardware end of Wilkes Bashford? That goes in from both sides. Is that right?

Board Member Lew: I'm not sure where you're... Oh, I see. Right. If I understand it correctly, to the left of Wilkes Bashford, that's where the water line will be rerouted.

Mr. Gutierrez: I'm sorry, which water line are you referring to? There's actually two. There's actually a main water line that comes near the intersection of Sand Hill and El Camino...

Chair Furth: And that's a Hetch Hetchy line?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes. That's the main one that...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: We're all grateful for the water.

Mr. Gutierrez: And then, there's other water lines that currently exist that run diagonally through the site, but those are drainage lines, so those are more manageable and will be modified.

Board Member Hirsch: Is it possible to move Wilkes Bashford at all? You take the same volume of building. Could it move more to the center of the...?

Ms. Gerhardt: As long as its not closer to the corner. It's that very corner of El Camino and Sand Hill that has the Hetch Hetchy line.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, so you can't get any closer to that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Not much.

Vice Chair Baltay: To staff, do we have a build-to guideline for the El Camino Real part of this? I mean, are they supposed to put the building up at the property line in the front, along El Camino?

Chair Furth: And are they going to have to widen the sidewalk?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, they would need to widen the sidewalk, and then, we do have that build-to requirement, which is a 12-foot setback, which creates that effective sidewalk. It does create that situation, but we do have that problem where we can't fully utilize that frontage because of that water line for the Hetch Hetchy.

Vice Chair Baltay: And what if building the sidewalk wider hurts the oak trees?

Mr. Gutierrez: There are sidewalk treatments that could be done. There is a large oak. It's seen right there at that corner, the north corner of the Wilkes Bashford along El Camino. There's a large heritage oak there. And the sidewalk would be sensitive to that and make sure that it wouldn't, you know, somehow degrade the health and longevity of that tree. There's possible treatments for soft sidewalks, rubberized soft sidewalks, things of that nature.

Vice Chair Baltay: But what if it turns out that the entire frontage, it's not just one oak tree, there's half a dozen pretty healthy live oak trees there, and they are all within, I'd say six feet of the sidewalk right now, which is a standard-width sidewalk. Are we just going to have 50 feet of rubberized sidewalk there to make it 12 feet wide? How can you build the building to that without taking the oak trees out? I'm just trying to elaborate.

Board Member Lew: Can I push back on the staff, on the design guidelines? I think it's the South El Camino Design Guidelines. It was not originally intended to go all the way up. Historically, we've had a 25-foot special setback on this northern part along the campus, and I think that's gone away. But I think there's room for all of our concerns to be addressed and to get a wider sidewalk somehow.

Chair Furth: Yes, we want good pedestrian access and really healthy trees and dense landscaping.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, we want all of the above, and we'll figure out a way of making it work.

Chair Furth: [inaudible, off microphone] The good thing is you've got a lot of space.

Vice Chair Baltay: The reason I've been pressing this is I think the building is just too close to El Camino. It really needs to be another 25 feet further back to let the sidewalk and the trees really have space, and I believe, to just present a better image of Palo Alto coming into town.

[crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: ...the design guidelines are important. We can't just ignore those. Like what Alex is saying, I think this is maybe not applying to this far north on El Camino.

Chair Furth: Okay. Any other comments on site plan before we move on? Okay. Do we want to talk about landscaping and plants first, or do we want to talk about...? I have some generic comments on landscaping.

Vice Chair Baltay: Can I give a...? With Chair's consent, before we move on on that, I'd like to see if we can't speak with one voice on the parking question. What I was throwing out there is that, to me, it's not just a matter of meeting the numerical requirements in the zoning code, but making the parking and the shopping center be functional. That might mean you have to do more work in this area than just meeting the numerical quantities. Like I suggested, putting in underground parking, or something. But I'd like to see if the Board supports that strong a statement or not, so the applicant has a clear sense of where to go with it. I've made it clear how I feel.

Chair Furth: Alex?

Board Member Lew: I actually was thinking similar things, although I didn't mention it when I was speaking beforehand. My take on it is, if you have underground parking, it would give them more, even if they don't need it numerically now, it actually gives them more flexibility in the future. Long term it's, to me, a better strategy. But it's more expensive.

Vice Chair Baltay: You might say it's more functional.

Board Member Lew: Functional, yes.

Chair Furth: David, do you have a position on that?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I'm... I find it's kind of frustrating...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, I can't hear you.

Board Member Hirsch: That's a whole other study, I'll admit, and maybe it's worth it at this point to suggest that that take place. Because what's happening here is this becomes a, sort of a private lot for Wilkes Bashford and RH. And that's a little different than where the car storage areas are for the rest of the mall. I'm bothered by that, just based on my comments made up here. Definitely, I think that the area, the connector between RH and the new J buildings should be without cars, and then that connection around to this site is going to be well improved. But Wilkes Bashford seems like a bit of an eyesore at that point. You're looking only at the side of it, not the front of it, when you're coming around the corner from the inside, and you really are looking over the sea of cars to look at the real façade for it on the parking lot side. And then, there's sort of the pretense of a façade on the back side to make it look like a front. I just find it problematic. Although I like the building itself, I find those viewpoints problematic. And again, yes, it extends far towards El Camino, as far as it can go. It's a hard site to deal with and I just don't think it's been dealt with rather well here.

Chair Furth: Staff, I have a question. I'm looking at the Stanford Shopping Center Master Tenant Façade and Sign program, and you can clearly see privileging, making clear the wayfinding for pedestrian, cyclists, people coming from downtown Palo Alto from the transit center, etc. Did we have any thought about what we wanted to do at the other end, or was it so not part of the building program when we thought about it earlier that we don't?

Mr. Gutierrez: Could you...?

Chair Furth: I mean, we drove that policy hard to get the connection, the pedestrian connection, so there is a pleasant way, without dodging cars, for a pedestrian to get from El Camino to the heart of the shopping center. It's a very deliberate, I would say successful -- now there's many places to stop and eat -- connection. At the other end, we have a different situation. I'd say it's more bicycle-oriented. I see a fair number of pedestrians, but not that many. But do we have any policy of having decent, inviting access from the street to the shopping center at this end?

Mr. Gutierrez: The end you're referring to is the Neiman Marcus end?

Chair Furth: Menlo Park end. No, the Menlo Park end. I'm staying on El Camino.

Mr. Gutierrez: Oh, okay, I'm sorry.

Chair Furth: I'm looking at the packet page 143. I'm looking at the bottom right-hand corner. Contrasting it with the bottom left-hand corner.

Mr. Gutierrez: For that corner, we would just utilize the general policies that we have for multi modal connections, but there isn't a specific policy for that particular corner.

Chair Furth: Okay. Fine. Okay. I do think we have a problem here. I don't think the parking is going to work. I mean, you're going to put a really attractive café on the roof of Restoration Hardware, you're going to put more next to J street. Those are big generators of presence. You're going to intensify the outdoor uses. And it's already clogged. You know, years ago, we moved all the major utilities from the middle of the shopping center around to the edges, to try to keep the gas lines from going where they shouldn't. And I like the fact that once you get over into the main body of the shopping center, you don't have to think about cars. You can just wander, and people do. And on the southern frontage, that works,

too, because you can make your way, one simple crossing over by Bloomingdale's, and you're good. We seem to be adding attractions without making it easy to get there except by driving, and then we don't have enough parking. I don't support parking along that little intersection between what was Macy's and the J building. I guess ideally I would prefer the cars still stayed on the periphery and the pedestrians went there. And I would prefer... I think we get much better results with underground parking. I sure don't think that this is any place for electrical charging parking. It's way too at a premium, and people stay when they do their electric car charging. Even if Wilkes Bashford is going to attract a lot of electric cars. Okay. Let's get on to... What do you want to talk about next? I want to talk about -- You gave me the opportunity -- I want to say something briefly about landscaping. Which I love this sort of hanging garden proposal for Restoration Hardware. I think, though, it should take, acknowledge the fact, as Alex mentioned, that this is right next to the only creek that runs to the bay anymore in San Mateo county. San Francisquito is a big deal, and Stanford has put a lot of energy into preserving that and enhancing the space along it. Formerly an Ohlone settlement and burial place. And the landscaping ought to acknowledge the presence of what's over there. And it's true that we've had, you know, olive trees here for, I don't know, almost 400 years, but we have a pretty strong policy in favor of using landscaping that's either native or can be shown to be a really good habitat. And you've got... You're going to have plenty of birds living up there. I think the indoor plants are your own business. Those are not really things we go to for habitat, but I think the other ones, you should be thinking a lot more about that. So, whatever it is, I think it needs to be tied to that creek front and that creek environment. There's a big bird population there, including some fairly unusual ones, and this could be... You're not going to get peregrine falcons, but this could be a real enhancement of that situation for birds. Anybody else on landscaping, generally? Okay, let's talk about the buildings. Who wants to start?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll start. I think the Restoration Hardware building is wonderful. I think it's really going to look neat. It's really exciting that we're part of what's a change in the way we do retail. It's a big change. I'm a high-end retail architect in Palo Alto. Restoration Hardware is a big player in our business these days. They really sell quality stuff that... I'm not trying to plug Restoration Hardware, but they're coming along, and if they want to put money and stuff into our town to build a real showcase, I think is great. And what I see here is high-quality design that is a really neat way to mix people shopping and dining and checking out their products. I can see my clients going there all the time. I love it. I think it really looks good. Kudos. Hats off to you. I'm not quite sure I understand why you need a nine-foot boxwood hedge around your wonderful-looking building. And maybe that's the kind of thing we can see as you refine your designs. It seems a shame to close it off like that. I'm much less sanguine about the Wilkes Bashford building. To me, it just looks like a, sort of a 20- or 30-year-old modern-styled box. It's got some elements that are trying to be nicer, but the basic corner that you come from El Camino is really big and forbidding-looking. I don't see it as being the first building I see when I drive into Palo Alto. I just don't get it. It's not working at all. I see all the windows are closed off, so they're strictly a merchandise display. There's no sense of what's going on inside the building. I think if you want to put buildings up on El Camino, they have to do a lot more, a lot more to show the life inside and to make it active, and not just have, the few windows are token display windows at best. You're showing even a service door of some kind as the very first door I see when I look into town. And obviously that can be changed, but it's indicative to me of the mentality I see a lot of with this kind of commercial architecture, which is designed from the inside-out. And I'm sure it's wonderful for the merchandising displays on the inside. You mentioned that you've already got questions about shifting windows for the merchandising, but when you want to put a large new building right on El Camino, and it's the first thing you see driving south from San Mateo county, it's really, really important that it looks really good, and just put our best foot forward. This is the shopping center, and this is Palo Alto. To me, it's not even close yet. I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: I have the same comments as Peter, and I think I would add, is that I do like the material palette of the Wilkes Bashford store, as well. I think it reads very lightly in the renderings, but when I look at the materials and I think about the other new buildings at the shopping center, I think it actually fits in fairly well. And I think staff had asked about comments on the height and transitions. And

I think I would point to staff, maybe on the Bloomingdale store, I asked for a contextual street elevation of the shopping center. Maybe we can pull that up and we can re-use that. I found it was very hard to get a sense of the scale of the Bloomingdale's just looking at the plans in isolation. Maybe we need to do the same exercise on this one and get a street elevation of the shopping center. Generally, I think having a 30 to 40 foot cornice, and then stepping back the top floor works, and I think that's what they're showing. I think they're showing a 32-foot cornice on part of the Wilkes Bashford, and I think the Restoration Hardware is somewhere around 40 before it steps back. And so, just generically, that's what I normally look for on buildings elsewhere in town, so I think that that can work. And then, something that I noticed, too, which I think, I don't have a recommendation at this point, but I think that the lighting that's shown on the Restoration Hardware is very different than the new lighting elsewhere on the shopping center. And maybe it's far enough away where it doesn't really matter, but I would say, like, at the new entrance to the shopping center, you have lots of new pole lights, and it's a very different kind of lighting. I think it's probably all LED lighting. It seems to be completely different than what's being proposed around the Restoration Hardware. I could see an argument maybe that the Restoration Hardware thing is more appropriate at this location, closer to Sand Hill Road and the creek, but I think it will look very different. That's all I have on the buildings. I think generally it's, generally it's okay, although I do share the same criticism as Peter on the Wilkes Bashford.

Chair Furth: David.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I certainly agree with everybody who likes the Restoration Hardware here. I think it's going to be a great asset to the mall. And although there has been so much comment about the Wilkes Bashford and the parking issue, and just access and movement around it, and what is the façade, I hope that doesn't get in the way of keeping Restoration Hardware exactly where it is. I think some ground-level views of the building, even with the hedge in front of it, might clear up the issue of how you do that, or maybe there's other ways to explore it, the perimeter to the Restoration Hardware. But this makes a nice addition, even if it isn't in an internal portion of the mall. If you do eliminate the parking in front between Restoration Hardware and the J building, I think the exterior pedestrian way around that corner will be, will work, certainly better than it does today with the Macy's there. But then, the Wilkes Bashford, I think it's really a question of working with, somehow, the parking/transportation issues for the rest of that end of the site, up against El Camino. And talking about the building itself, I like the way it moves, the variety of the front of it, that it's taller on the El Camino side, that it has, really, a real nice feel to it, which seems like it's repeated again in the new portion of the J building, and a little more clarity. Since it's such a long building and those are divisions that are very minimal in depth at the façade, I would have just suggested that somehow they are separated from each other slightly, and there was more integral lighting in the forms as they move out towards the parking lot. I'm concerned a bit about the fact that it looks to me like a building from the Southwest rather than somehow a building from this area. And that those light textures to the outer materials, the light tans, even with stripes on them as the recent rendering shows, doesn't distinguish the volumes as well as the elevation drawing does. The elevation is really very successful, but the separation of colors on the façades is better there than it really is in the rendering. It bothers me considerably because it's intent, the intent of the variety of materials on the façade seems to work well, certainly in the elevation and not in the rendering. But even more important, really, than that is the fact that access to it is more difficult except by going into a private parking area, and that's not the way the rest of the mall seems to work. So, I think it really has to be studied as to whether this is the best location for that facility. And I agree with the other comment about making it pedestrian-friendly and bike friendly at that corner because you're kind of caught at the other side of the street, and then, you want to come to this area, let's make it accessible to bicycles. I wonder if there's a better use for that whole corner as an inviting area of the mall, versus this Wilkes Bashford facility here. What seems to me it's done is, not just because of the easement issue, but because of emphasis on the different commercial uses that Restoration Hardware gets a good position against Sand Hill, Wilkes Bashford is sort of what's left over, in a way, at that corner. And I'm not convinced that that's the best location for that facility. That's about it. I think that the pop-up store and the new addition, the J, works really well, and is a nice counterpoint to the Restoration Hardware and its style and modernist look, versus a more traditional Restoration Hardware that is going to be quite delightful from pretty much

all sides, from Sand Hill side, as well as you're coming to the intersection of El Camino, a lot of traffic is going to see that and be intrigued by the beautiful design. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I think you brought us things that look like they're going to be very appealing. When you do that height diagram that Alex was asking for, if you could continue it north enough so that we understand how high the trees are over there as well, that would help me. So we see what happens from the Menlo Park side. I am very interested in what you do about the hedges around Restoration Hardware. In some of those sketches, the Restoration Hardware building, I guess because it has a certain amount of Venetian inspiration, is reminiscent of Terman, the Terman building. Stanford really got it, you know, it started out strong with Richardson and his big, massive, Romanesque design, and then it sort of wandered off in the wilderness. And then, Terman -- as in the engineering school -- commissioned a building that was, you know, it provided its own heat, didn't require extra heat, and didn't require fuel to heat it, and it used blinds for shading, and it used heavy stucco. And it was really very much like this. And sort of this beginning of the turnaround of architecture. It was built in 1968. Before...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: This is the one with the reflecting pond that was supposed to bring in the...

Chair Furth: It wasn't entirely successful, but yes, it cooled the computers. One of the things that concerns me about the big entry into Restoration Hardware is that when we were having brown-outs, Restoration Hardware downtown insisted on leaving its doors open and air conditioning the great outdoors. So, I'm interested in knowing how you handle that, since that was a little frustrating. I'm sure you've got it all figured out, but we would need to know. I do think you need probably underground parking. You certainly need much smarter parking than we have now. You know, if a smart parking place tells you at every aisle there's going to be a parking place, where the space is, this is a very dumb parking lot. It could lead to very unhappy situations, and sometimes already does. One of the things that we look at is, you know, we're supposed to make sure this works for everybody, and that includes the people working in these buildings, and where do they take their breaks? You have some spaces way over towards PF Chang's where people can sit, get a lunch or coffee break and get some fresh air. It's a little more challenging if you're at Nordstrom. If you're going to build all this additional space here, I think we should be thinking about that as well. Other than that, look forward to seeing it when it comes back again. Thank you. So, continue... No, we're not going to continue this. We're done with the preliminary review. Does staff have any questions for us? You understand what we're trying to say?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, I believe so.

## **Study Session - no items**

### **Approval of Minutes**

#### **5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for October 18, 2018.**

Chair Furth: Minutes. Which some of us have read very carefully. The first item is minutes of November 11th, right? Not October 18th. Is that right? It's not what it says here, right? This is wrong?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, October 18th, we do need to bring back to you. There was a subcommittee language missing, and so we need to give that to you still.

Chair Furth: November 11th, we do have?

Board Member Lew: I didn't review it.

Vice Chair Baltay: I didn't see them.

Chair Furth: Okay, it's not on the agenda, it's on... I thought it was going to be corrected on the agenda. All right, skip item 5. Item...

Board Member Lew: Wait, wait, wait. It's on the agenda, so I will move that we continue the minutes for October 18th.

Vice Chair Baltay: Second.

Chair Furth: Okay, moved by Lew, second by Baltay, to continue item 5. Item 6, draft minutes...

Board Member Lew: We should vote.

Chair Furth: Oh, sorry. All those in favor say aye? All those opposed? It passes 4-0-1, with Board Member Thompson absent.

#### **6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 6, 2018.**

Chair Furth: Item 6, draft minutes for December 6, 2018. I thought it was really good transcription, by the way.

Board Member Lew: Yes. I will move that we approve the minutes for December 6th.

Vice Chair Baltay: Second.

Chair Furth: All those in favor say aye? Hearing no opposition and four yay votes, it passes 4-0-1.

#### **7. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 20, 2018.**

Chair Furth: Minutes of December 20, 2018.

Board Member Lew: Yes, this is a different story.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Do you want to take this one, Alex?

Board Member Lew: Well, okay, so, I will do it in order of importance.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Item number 5, which was the cell phone towers, I think on page 54, it says Board Member Hirsch voted no. But I think that was me.

Vice Chair Baltay: If I remember right, it's literally correct. Wynne asked David if he was voting for or against the cell phone tower. He said, "nay," which is recorded. The transcriber interpreted that to mean that he voted against the motion.

Chair Furth: And he didn't.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex voted against the motion. David voted for the motion. That's my recollection. I think it's important that we all be very clear because it goes in the record on an important issue.

Board Member Lew: Okay. And then, I have lots of smaller comments.

Ms. Gerhardt: Can I just...? That was on item...?

Board Member Lew: Five. Page 54. And then, the other little things I'll give to you. It's just names, name spelling, and stuff like that. It's all highlighted, they're all items that were highlighted by the transcriber.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Motion?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll move that we approve the minutes from December 20th, with the correction as noted about the vote, and small corrections Alex will give you.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Furth: Moved and seconded by Baltay and Lew. All those in favor say aye? Hearing no opposition, it passes 4-0-1.

### **Subcommittee Items**

- 8. 3128 El Camino Real [17PLN-00462]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Trellis Design, Landscaping, Benches and Building Color. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: CS (Commercial Service). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Adam Petersen at [apetersen@m-group.us](mailto:apetersen@m-group.us)**

At the meeting, the Subcommittee agreed with the revisions presented with the following conditions added:

1. The owner or designee shall use City standard concrete color and texture at the base of the brick wall fronting the project site along El Camino Real.
2. The owner or designee shall plant *Nandina domestica* behind the brick walls fronting El Camino Real as directed by the City Landscape Architect.
3. The owner or designee shall include planting alternatives that are native, indigenous, and drought tolerant, including, but not limited to buckwheat, ceanothus, and/or eriogonum.
4. The owner or designee shall employ the color scheme proposed at the December 6, 2018 ARB Hearing, comprised of Chelsea Gray HC-168 and Iron Mountain 2134-30, with aluminum trellis system a Cityscape color.

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

Chair Furth: Any Board Member questions, comments or announcements?

Board Member Lew: There was a community meeting, first community meeting for the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan on Tuesday night. And I'm guessing there were maybe 50 or 60 people in attendance. It was well-attended, but it was attended by one, kind of one set of demographic people. We didn't really get a broad cross-section of people. It went well.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to report that I attended the City Council meeting on Monday night -- I believe David Hirsch was with me -- where they discussed the appeal of the Crown Castle small cell node cluster in Downtown South. The Council upheld, or denied the appeal, and upheld the Director's ruling on that project.

Chair Furth: Okay, and if we want to discuss that or any other matters further, that has been reviewed by us and then approved differently by staff, we can do that at our next meeting, when it will be on the

agenda. All right. Anything else before we adjourn this meeting? And just tell us at our subcommittee. Also, more than one person has requested that we move these meetings along faster. That requires everybody's efforts, and we will do that. Typically we want everybody else to be briefer, but we will do our best. What's your norm, Alex?

Board Member Lew: One hour per major project. And I would say, like, shopping center could go longer because it's really two projects. But like the Channing, we spent way... We spent way too much time on that one, given the issues and the size of the project.

Chair Furth: I would argue that as the first approvable thing in SOFA 2, it was an important project. But I agree that it took a while. All right. We'll do what we can. We are adjourned.

## **Adjournment**