



# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES: February 21, 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, Osma Thompson and David Hirsch.

Absent: None

Chair Furth: ... 2019 meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. If you could call the roll, please?

[Roll Call]

## Oral Communications

Chair Furth: Now is the time for oral communications. That's a time for anybody in the audience who wishes to speak to an item that is not on the agenda. I have no cards. Does anybody wish to speak under oral communications? Seeing no none, we'll go on.

## Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Agenda changes, additions and deletions? None of those?

## 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 the ARB meeting schedule and attendance record and tentative future agenda items.

Jodi Gerhardt, Current Planning Manager: Yes. Related to the future agenda, we're going to have three items on the March 7th agenda. Mercedes will not be heard quite yet. We will have the 233 University. We're not going to have the Master Sign Program. We will have 375 University, and then the 180 El Camino will be heard.

Chair Furth: Those are both preliminaries. Whose Master Sign Program was that? That we're not hearing?

Ms. Gerhardt: I believe that's the hospital.

Chair Furth: Okay. Thank you. And then, we had talked about scheduling some other additional items at our future meeting, namely an item to discuss projects recently reviewed by the Board, and what has happened to them since. That will be on our next agenda, as well? In some format or another, which we will figure out?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. I will work with the Chair to figure out that agenda item.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anything else anybody wants to put on a future agenda?

Board Member Thompson: I just wanted to note, I will have a planned absence on July 18th. July 18th. A long time from now, but...

Ms. Gerhardt: You'll be absent that day?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, thank you.

Chair Furth: Yeah, we probably should start thinking about our summer schedules. Thank you, Osma. That's a good reminder. All right.

### **Action Items**

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 695 Arastradero [18PLN-00333]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Construction of a new Single-Story Approximately 5,400 Square Foot Building With a Partial Basement for Mortuary Use. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to 15303. Zoning District: RE (Residential Estate). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at [Claire.Hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.Hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org)**

Chair Furth: Our first public hearing item is a quasi-judicial matter. It's at 695 Arastradero. It's a request for a recommendation for approval of a major architectural review to allow the construction of a new single-story building of approximately 5,400 square feet, with a partial basement for mortuary use. The planner is Claire, and the applicant -- sorry, I meant to make a note of this -- the owner is the Alta Mesa Improvement Company, and the architect is John Barksdale. Could we have a staff report, please?

Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good morning, board members. I'm Claire Hodgkins, and I'm the project planner. As you noted, the proposed project is located at 695 Arastradero Road, at the existing Alta Mesa Memorial Park. The entire cemetery is a 72-acre site comprised of six parcels, and the proposed project is located centrally within the park on a 47-acre parcel. The site is zoned RE Residential Estate, and the land use designation is Open Space Controlled Development. The project includes a new 5,400 square foot single-story building with a partial basement at the existing Memorial Park, and the building would be used for services and service receptions -- it's a reception pavilion -- and the building would not be visible from outside the Memorial Park. Some key considerations are just the proposed materials of the project, the proposed design, and the parking and circulation. In particular with respect to the proposed design and circulation, board members during the preliminary hearing had noted in particular some concerns about the front entrance not being defined enough, so it wasn't clear where the main entrance would be. And generally, about the circulation on the site. The applicant has added ADA [American Disabilities Act] parking at the front and a turnaround at the front to define that entrance. And then, also provided a more defined kind of entrance feature to really clarify where the entrance to the building is. Staff recommends that the Architectural Review Board recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Community Environment, based on the findings and subject to conditions of approval of the project. With that, I'll turn it back to you and recommend you hear from the applicant as well.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Before we do that, since this is a quasi-judicial matter -- we heard it before the study session -- has everybody visited the site?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site on Tuesday.

Chair Furth: David?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, visited the site.

Board Member Thompson: Yes, I did.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I visited the site several times.

Chair Furth: As have I. We've all visited the site. Does anybody have any ex parte communications to report with the applicant or anybody else? Nobody does. Thank you. If we could hear from the applicant?

John Barksdale, Applicant: Good morning.

Chair Furth: Good morning. You have 10 minutes, and if you could spell your name for the transcriber.

Mr. Barksdale: My name is John Barksdale [spells name]. I'm the architect on the project. At our last ARB hearing, two suggestions were brought up. One was a concern about the vehicular and pedestrian circulation, getting to any services in the new building. Secondly, it was unclear as to where the main entrance was. We had four possible candidates, only one which was to be the main. We were unable to change any of the roadway circulation because the established roadways have grave sites right up to the edges of them. That obviously cannot, they cannot be moved. The site as it is is what we have to work with. Normally visitors to the cemetery come in and they know where they're going, and they go directly there. If they don't, the first building they'll see is an administration building, they'll stop and get directions. But for services, what Alta Mesa does is their staff goes out and becomes traffic directors. They have specific plans as to where they want people to park so that the other parts of the cemetery are still freely accessible. They have them on site, and they also have some temporary signage. They'll be directed on past the administration building, and the next building that they will see is this one. They'll come directly into it. We've added this new entrance canopy to make the entrance more obvious, and we have a turnaround, a circular turnaround in front of it for people who want to drop people off and go on and park. Otherwise, they'll continue around this circular site and parallel park. If that parking is all full, they'll just continue on down into the cemetery roadways and parallel park otherwise. In addition, we've added a sidewalk around the perimeter of the site, leading in two directions to this new entrance statement, so that people can get on that as soon as possible and get off the road and get to the entrance. As far as the entrance goes, as I say, we added this canopy with a pyramid-shape skylight on it, which gives it some height and protection from the elements. It comes right up to this drop-off area. On the rear of the building, we have a service entrance which had glass side lights and a glass transom and a wood door. We have played that down with solid siding material and painted alloy metal doors so that won't be confused as an entrance. On the sides of the building, we have these courtyards which are integral with the design and function of the building, a very inviting.... But they are enclosed with these four-foot-high niche walls, which have a niches on the outside that are, people can visit without going into the building. There is a walkway to those. We have minimized that entrance to that area and screened them all with shrubbery to keep people, to discourage anybody from thinking that that is a way into the building. We hope that that satisfies the concerns of the Board. That's all I have to say. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of Mr. Barksdale?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, if I could, please.

Chair Furth: Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: The circle you're engraving in the pavement in front of the proposed building, what is the diameter of that? Can you say?

Mr. Barksdale: I don't have that off the top of my head. We made it fit a normal vehicle.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's my question, I guess, really, is that is it possible for a car to make that circular turnaround?

Mr. Barksdale: Yeah, it is. We also wanted it centered... I mean, I could make it bigger, but it wouldn't be centered on the building access.

Vice Chair Baltay: Would it be possible to get that measurement today somehow? If you could just scale it off the drawings for us, or something? It just seems to me that it looks a little bit tight and I'd like to check that. Thank you.

Mr. Barksdale: Okay.

Chair Furth: I had one question about the landscaping. I'm looking at Sheet L1-1, or L1.1. Of course, what I was trying to figure out was to what extent are these local indigenous drought-resistant plant materials capable of providing what you want. I think of plumbago and nandina and olives and many of these plants as not local. I was wondering if you could tell me a little bit more about that. It's not key as to which ones are local indigenous drought-resistant plant material and which ones aren't.

Mr. Barksdale: No, I... The landscape architect recently moved his office from Palo Alto down to Monterrey. I discussed it with him, whether he should be here or not, and he suggested that if you had some concerns about the landscaping, that possibly we could make it a condition of approval and have whoever is concerned about it deal with it at a...

Chair Furth: Thank you. Appreciate it. Any other questions?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I do.

Chair Furth: Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: What are the possibilities that the area, that kind of columbarium area around the perimeter, will be used at the same time as a service that would be within the building?

Mr. Barksdale: Is that...? You're not going to do that, or are you?

Female?: [Off microphone, inaudible]

Chair Furth: Could you repeat that into the microphone, please? Or introduce yourself? Again.

Marilyn Talbot: I'm Marilyn Talbot, I'm the general manager. We generally coordinate services so they're not at the same time. So, other than visiting maybe those outside niche walls, people can still visit them, but we wouldn't have a service at the same time we have a service inside the building.

Board Member Hirsch: In the area in the perimeter, the columbarium area where you have niches...?

Ms. Talbot: The outside niches?

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, could you lower the microphone so it's going to pick up your voice a little better? Thank you.

Ms. Talbot: Are you talking about the niches that are proposed on this building?

Board Member Hirsch: Niches area.

Ms. Talbot: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: What are the possibilities that somebody would be visiting at the same time as the service?

Ms. Talbot: Oh, that could be a possibility.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Ms. Talbot: Yeah. We have separate entrances to those niche walls.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. Okay. What are the possibilities that there be a regular mausoleum service happening at the same time as this reception area?

Ms. Talbot: We coordinate everything. We consider traffic control and coordinate where services are. We tend not to have services at the same time so people can have their privacy when they have their service.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. As it might affect parking, you would direct the traffic in such a way?

Ms. Talbot: Yeah, we're pretty, we're very proactive in parking, just because it's difficult just getting there, trying to get up Arastradero Road, and people, by the time they're there, they're a tad agitated, so we're very proactive in parking. And we schedule services so they don't conflict with other people's services.

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you, yeah. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Claire, did you have something you wanted to add?

Ms. Hodgkins: I do. I just want to note that I did put a condition of approval indicating that there wouldn't be multiple services happening at the same time, that the addition of this pavilion wouldn't mean more traffic for the area because the services would generally be coordinated, which was noted in the applicant's proposal.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions before the...?

Board Member Thompson: I had a quick one.

Chair Furth: Oh. Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: For the niche wall that's in the four quadrants of the two sides, is that...? In the renders you don't actually see the cavities. Is that something that will be covered? Or will the urns be visible?

Ms. Talbot: They're generally covered with a, right now, granite. They're covered with granite, so it is like little spaces that are covered. They are all covered. And then they've got little rosettes with a tamper-proof screw on it so nobody can mess with them.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so that will just kind of look like a wall from the outside.

Ms. Talbot: Yes, it will look like a, you know, it's usually polished granite, so it looks reflective on there. It's all clean.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Anything else? I'll bring it back to the Board for discussion, then. Osma, do you want to start? Oh, and we have a model to look at.

Vice Chair Baltay: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Sorry, Is there anybody in the public who would like to comment on this project or application? I have no cards, but does anybody else wish to speak? Seeing no one, I will close the public hearing part of this proceeding and let's start. Osma, do you want to go first?

Board Member Thompson: Sure. Although.... Are the materials over there?

Chair Furth: Is there a materials board? Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: In general, after visiting the site, it was quite evident that the design seems to sort of sit nicely in the landscape. The pyramid skylight seems like it will have a nice relationship with one of the other buildings that's further back in the site. I'm not actually sure which building that is, but there is a building that has a pyramid roof on there, so, in that sense, it's kind of thoughtful architecturally to do that. In general, I didn't see very many issues with the design. It seems like it will be a nice, quiet, thoughtful space. One concern I had is potentially in the back where the service entrance is as it abuts that adjacent building. That space could get kind of dark, potentially, but I don't know that that is anything that you can avoid, necessarily. And then, I did have some questions about the niche, which you answered for me. In general, I would say I'm pretty supportive of this project. I'm curious to hear what my other board members think.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Peter. Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Wynne. Thank you. I generally agree with Osma. It's a good project and I can recommend approval. I would like to discuss a little bit the turnaround in the middle there, in the front. By my scaling of your drawing, it's about 29 feet in radius, so just less than 60 feet in diameter. For a residence, that just barely works. For this type of service and building, I don't think it's quite big enough. I think just by twisting a building a bit and shifting it over, you probably can get that to work just a tad better, and I think it's probably important that it does comfortably accommodate even a larger vehicle turning around there. Or else you shouldn't have that circle and imply that that's what you do there. So, it's a small detail, but it's just not quite the right size yet. I think if you just rotate the building slightly, you can keep it centered on that while you add a few feet to the diameter. Other than that, I think the building planning, the way it fits on the site, is nicely done. It's logical, and clear, and practical. I have a second question or thought or concern, I guess, about the massing of the building. I have the building model here, and I'll point to my colleagues that it has four bump-outs, two bathrooms in the front and a kitchen and a service area in the back, that to my eye just fight the basic architecture. You have this clean, simple, high, white parapet defining the form, and it's clean, and simple, and timeless, and everything you would expect for a building of this function. But, having these bump-out below, it sort of violates that. They break the simplicity. And you can see that in the way you've detailed it. It's a tricky roof condition to work with. I guess I'm just wishing it wasn't that way, that it was all inside that clean, simple form. That said, it's well executed, so I don't suppose I can fight it too much, but it's just not as nice as I would like to see it. I do think the choice of materials is elegant and high quality and will fit very well where you're building this building, so that's all nice. My last thought -- and again, it's a nit-picking thought -- is that you have a bicycle rack right next to the front door under your pyramid-covered parapet entry area. It just seems the wrong place to put a bicycle rack. There must be someplace else on the site you could meet that code requirement for the few people who do ride a bicycle to one of these services. Those are my thoughts. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation, and thank you for the revisions of the project. I can recommend approval of the project today, with the exception of landscape. I think the landscape needs to come back to subcommittee. I don't think it meets the findings for native plants. I think there's

only one native plant... Yeah, and then, the budalooa [phonetic] grass is North America native. I think a couple changes, maybe to the ground covers and a few of the shrubs, I think you can easily meet the findings.

Chair Furth: I was thinking trees, too.

Board Member Lew: I was not thinking of trees. I think I would support Peter's comment about the turnaround, and Peter's comment about the massing. That did not pop out at me as being an issue. I didn't really see that at all when I was looking at the plans. Anyway, that's where I am. I can recommend approval.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: You answered my question about controlling the services. That was a primary concern because I thought it would impact the site quite considerable with double services, having so many more cars potentially. And I was a little.... No, that was fine. Your answer was good. You know, this is a very spiritual kind of building, and I think you shouldn't comment on it without giving credit to the architect for having created kind of a symmetrical building, which in this case I think works very well in the circle that it's enclosed in. And I think the massing is notable, that it maintains that symmetry throughout the building. I like the materials, with some exceptions. I think the stone materials are good, but there's a lay-in ceiling on the inside, and that's not an emotionally-appropriate kind of ceiling, with the recessed lighting in it. I would much rather see a wood ceiling, which I think would be a better feeling. I'm not so crazy about anodized aluminum oak coverings on the courtyard spaces. I would wish that they would be wood, and you have some examples of wood that you're using on the building which you could very well use as a canopy for those outside areas. I think, however, my biggest concern is the potential lack of privacy between people using the service area inside when they come out to the courtyard -- courtyards, two of them -- and if there were any, anybody having a private service outside in front of their own niche, family niche, there's a conflict there. I don't think the answer to that is by putting some planters around to create more privacy there. I think you need another visual separation between them, which could easily be accomplished with placing glass above to get to a level that's above eyesight, without changing the nature of that area at all. And then, if on the inside it was, you defined the area between the outside and the inside with some kind of a raised element, I think you would be able to create a better separation between the possible conflict between privacy outside, people visiting their personal niche, family niche, and activity on the inside, which is going to lead to people talking outside, meeting with each other. I don't know if you can do a separation that's scheduled so that nobody is outside. That might be an answer, but I think you really could do it with a better sense of privacy. With glass inserted, we look at this a lot, where it relates to people using outside dining areas where the street is nearby. And you could certainly use a glazing that isn't visible through, you know, that is decorative. I'd like to ask you to think about that. I would agree with... I think the planting, by the way, is very good. I looked at some of the plants and they seemed to be high enough to create the privacy for the, sort of columbarium use of the outside. Those are my concerns. I think this definitely could come back to committee because it's 90 percent of the way there. Thank you very much for the nice presentation.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you for the presentation, thank you for the design. Thank you for taking into consideration our concerns at the earlier session. I think part of the reason this building fits in well is that some of the other buildings were also Mr. Barksdale's work. He's nodding, so he has a long experience of this space. I have a lot of confidence in the operation's ability to manage traffic flow and parking. I appreciate thinking about privacy. I think the materials are good. I like the design. From my notes, I have six items that have been raised. All of us thinking that if, at most, it needs to go to subcommittee. Is that correct? I'm getting nods. Osma?

Board Member Thompson: I actually, I had a quick question.

Chair Furth: Yes?

Board Member Thompson: Of the applicant.

Chair Furth: Yes?

Board Member Thompson: I notice that in your model, the niche walls are curved, and in the plans they're faceted. Do you know what the design intent, or what the final...? Should we look at the model or should we look at the plans?

Mr. Barksdale: They're faceted now. The problem is they're each, they are 12 by 12 niche covers, and they're three high. We found that if we try to do that on a curve, they would have to kind of miter the edges of these covers and they wouldn't go together very well. It would be difficult to fit them nicely, so we opted to do same shape, but in three facets, so we can get straight surfaces to put these 12 by 12 niche covers tightly together.

Chair Furth: It's the plans that represent your current thinking, not the model.

Mr. Barksdale: The plans are correct. The model is...

Chair Furth: Thank you. An earlier phase.

Mr. Barksdale: Earlier, yeah.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions? Okay, so, I think we have consensus that landscaping should be referred to subcommittee so that we can make the finding with respect to native drought-resistant plants. David raised a comment about the anodized aluminum covering. Does anybody share his desire for different material?

Board Member Lew: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Isn't it exterior? I thought he was talking about courtyard coverings. Did I get confused? It's central courtyard. Which one are you concerned about, David?

Board Member Hirsch: Is the metal on here?

Chair Furth: Where is it on the...? I misunderstood where you were saying it was, perhaps.

Board Member Hirsch: It's a medium bronze.... Oh, that's the storefront.

Chair Furth: We don't generally look at interior materials. I was trying... I thought you were talking about something...

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I did. That was a lay-in ceiling grid on the inside.

Chair Furth: Right, which is probably not in our purview. But I thought the trellis was outside.

[crosstalk]

Ms. Hodgkins: Are you talking about the trellis at the entrance?

Chair Furth: Yes, the entrance trellis.

Ms. Hodgkins: I think the entrance trellis is...

[crosstalk]



Chair Furth: So it is an exterior material.

Board Member Hirsch: And the sides, as well.

Chair Furth: We're only talking about the exterior materials, right?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, no, I talked about two.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, with respect to the ceiling, I believe that's not within our jurisdiction because it is an interior feature and it's not... We can comment but we can't direct.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, I think you can comment on it.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Yes, it's a comment. That's fine. Just trying to make notes here and get clear. What about the materials for the exterior outside coverings, trellises? Were you suggesting they were inappropriate, David?

Board Member Hirsch: I think they're using wood elsewhere. We have Ipe wood sliding service entrance doors. You could match up those elements with a wood ceiling. It would just feel better to me as a mix of materials.

Chair Furth: Okay, well, that is an exterior material. Anybody else have comments on that?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think you need to balance that, though, David, against the desire to have a very permanent-feeling building. And wood will wear and require constant maintenance. My experience is that after 10 years, a wood trellis never looks permanent. I'm not sure it's a fair burden to place on them. I could see perhaps suggesting that they consider some alternative metal material than an aluminum extrusion, but maybe make a suggestion. But I don't think wood would be a good choice. Just shooting from the hip here.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson, you had a comment?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, actually, it just made me notice, maybe another question potentially, just to clarify. The aluminum trellis that's on the sides, that's a different material than the structure that's holding the skylight? The skylight is the zinc?

Chair Furth: That's a question for the applicant.

Mr. Barksdale: No, I think it's all, it's all anodized aluminum. They have on other buildings tried to use brass, but the maintenance was too much to keep it up, so we chose aluminum for the window areas. I just carried that through to the trellis. I agree it would be great, but they are very concerned about maintenance. These buildings are... This building is not under the Cemetery Act, but all the other buildings have to be designed for an eternity, not have any combustible materials, or anything that won't wear forever. As I say, this is not required under that, but in keeping with that, they just are not... They don't want to get into a situation where there is constant maintenance to the materials on the building. That's why aluminum was chosen, and then, we just carried that through, consistently through all the metal elements on the outside of the building.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Yes, thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay. I don't hear a consensus for asking for a change in that material. Turnaround perhaps needs further study to make sure it works? Is that correct?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. Oh, you mean whether I reacted that way?

Chair Furth: No, no, I'm just asking, I'm trying to isolate the elements that might lead us to a motion that might pass, so I just wanted to find out on the turnaround.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, it would be nice if we could ask the applicant. It seems to me, looking at the site plan, if you rotated the building ever so slightly, you could shift the circle more into the middle of that Y-shaped existing roadway and get maybe five or 10 more feet in diameter, which I think would make all the difference. Unless I'm missing something....

Chair Furth: Could you respond to that, Mr. Barksdale?

Vice Chair Baltay: ...it seems a very easy change to make.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Barksdale: I'm not entirely happy with the... Even with it centered on the building, it isn't centered on the roadway either. I would be more inclined to eliminate it and shape the curb to give us the full radius, which is probably about, I'm guess about 80 feet diameter. If we gave them the full area there to turn around and just shape the drop-off area to accommodate that and forget about the circle. The other option is just to make the circle bigger. What we have done is this building is on the same access as the mausoleum behind it. We could certainly turn the building, but then...

Chair Furth: Are we looking at Sheet SK-4, basically?

Mr. Barksdale: Yes.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Barksdale: You can see that the access of this building is perpendicular to the side of the columbarium behind it. That's the reason for that. And of course, that puts that turnaround off-center on the driveway fork there, where the road forks. If we were to turn the building, yes, we could make the turnaround bigger. That would all be fine. But then, the question is whether that would look odd at that slight angle off of the building behind it.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is there any particular symbolic relationship to the mausoleum, or reason these buildings have to be on exactly the orthogonal grid? I don't think you'd notice it at all...

[crosstalk]

Mr. Barksdale: No. Just the proximity. And yeah, there isn't really a strong parallel access to that building anyway. Most of these elements are coming in at a 45 degrees.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll suggest to you that the way it is now with the entrance just every so slightly off center of the roadway, I think it might look like a mistake in the end, that the building is not centered on the road as you approach it. And I don't think anybody will notice whether it's relating exactly to the mausoleum behind it. And again, I don't think any of these affect my ability to recommend approval, but it just strikes me that it would be so easy to rotate or shift the building so that on direct approach, it would look good.

Chair Furth: Okay, let's... Bike racks. That's the first time I heard us requesting that the bike racks not be by the front door. I can just understand why that makes sense here. Any...?

Board Member Lew: It's happened on other projects, as well.

Chair Furth: I just wasn't paying attention. Okay.

Board Member Lew: There are places like the country club...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Sure, where you really don't want it at the front door.

Board Member Thompson: How does the rest of the board feel about that? Because I don't mind it being at the front door, as...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: I have no opinion.

Board Member Lew: I think the code is it has to be within 50 feet of the front door. Why don't we put the condition that it needs to be within 50 feet and they can...?

Chair Furth: You can make your own decision about what you want. The applicant can. Would somebody like to make a motion? Oh, I didn't bring up the issue of additional walls to screen the niche areas, glass walls. Is there any support for that suggestion?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: David. But I don't see any...

Board Member Hirsch: That's my major, major concern about the project.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Board Member Hirsch: And unless we can be assured that there's not going to be a conflict... If you look at a, what is it, four-foot-six, four-foot-nine niche wall there on each of the perimeter areas, somebody standing there would be a part of the event happening on the inside, I just don't see that as a good relationship at all. If those niches were to be used. If you can assure us that there's never going to be a conflict between the use of the perimeter area, and that would be scheduled not to conflict with the service on the service on the inside...

Chair Furth: Okay, David, at this point, I'm really asking you to talk to us, not the applicant.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Thompson: Go ahead.

Chair Furth: Okay, I'm trying to wind... I thought for once we could get through a project in less than an hour, since we all like it. But that's all right. I don't support additional wall space. I think the applicants are good at scheduling their events, and I think it cannot guarantee that somebody won't get the desire to go visit a niche at some point, but I am, in this case, completely willing to defer to the owners' judgment on this issue since they are successful operators of a memorial park.

Board Member Thompson: I also agree with you on that. I'm not supportive of changing the height of the niche wall. I kind of like the interplay.

Chair Furth: I do support having the subcommittee look at this orientation issue. I do think it's important to have a good drop-off access point. I think that if it's possible to rotate it a bit so that you can get a bigger defined circular area, that's well worth it. Our biggest concern before was that we had this... I at least had this vision of women in high heels, tromping through the grass, trying to find out where they were going, and you addressed that. I like that, and I think by rotating it you can make it big enough to really work. So, unless the applicant objects to us asking the subcommittee to look at that, I think we're ready to make a motion.

Board Member Thompson: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Was that a triple negative?

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Osma's going to make a motion. Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: I'll move that we approve the project subject to the conditions of approval, and revisit the turnaround radius, or referral to subcommittee with respect to the entrance driveway radius, and as it relates to the building orientation.... Was there something else on your list?

Chair Furth: Landscaping.

Board Member Thompson: Landscaping. Anything else?

Chair Furth: And we were going to modify it to say that the bike racks could be anywhere within 50 feet of the entrance, as chosen by the property owner.

Ms. Hodgkins: With relation to the landscaping as part of that motion, is there something specific such as...

Chair Furth: Yeah, it doesn't meet, we cannot meet the findings because of the shortage.

Ms. Hodgkins: Okay....

[crosstalk]

Ms. Hodgkins: Okay.

Board Member Thompson: Need to see more appropriate landscaping to meet the findings.

Chair Furth: We're not questioning the beauty or attractiveness, but we have a requirement that, to the extent possible, it use regional drought-tolerant materials that provide good habitat. Right? This park is a good habitat for a lot of birds and insects, I'm sure, which are all becoming in increasingly short supply in this world. Is there a second.

Vice Chair Baltay: I will second that motion.

Chair Furth: Motion by Board Member Thompson, second by Vice Chair Baltay. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed say no.

Board Member Hirsch: No, with the comment that I think it could come to committee, but I'm very concerned about the perimeter walls as I've described them.

Chair Furth: Thank you. The motion to refer to subcommittee passes 4-1, with opposition by Board Member Hirsch, for the reasons stated.

**MOTION PASSES 4-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER HIRSCH VOTING IN OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION TO APPROVE.**

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. Look forward to seeing the project.

Mr. Barksdale: Thank you.

Chair Furth: And David, thank you for explaining your reservations. I always forget to ask people to do that, and according to our procedures, we do that. Do we need a break before we go to the next item?

Board Member Lew: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Okay, we're going to have a one-minute break for staff to reorganize themselves.

[The Board took a short break.]

**3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2342 Yale Street [18PLN-00233]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Minor Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of Two Existing Residential Units and Construction of a new Two-Story Duplex Building and Detached Garage Building. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: RMD (NP). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Emily Foley at [efoley@m-group.us](mailto:efoley@m-group.us)**

Chair Furth: Applicant's request for approval of a minor architectural review to allow the demolition of two existing residential units and construction of a new two-story duplex building with a full, habitable garage, basement level and attached garage. It is exempt from CEQA. Small infill new construction. The zoning is RMD Neighborhood Preservation, which is why it's before us. First of all, has everybody visited the site?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Chair Furth: Five out of five. I visited the site.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may, if we could just change up for two seconds. We have a person who would like to speak to Item 4 but needs to leave very shortly. Could we just hear that comment and then move forward?

Chair Furth: We can do that. Let me finish asking people if they've had any ex parte communications with anyone with regard to this project.

Vice Chair Baltay: No.

Board Member Thompson: No.

Chair Furth: No one has had any communications with anyone with regard to this project. Okay. We will pause briefly on this and go to item number 4...

### Study Session

- 4. Various Sites (250 Hamilton Avenue in database) [17PLN-00398]: Request by Sure Site, on Behalf of AT&T, for a Preliminary Architectural Review of the Deployment of 17 Small Cell Wireless Communication Facilities on Utility Poles and Streetlights in the Public Right of Way, in Downtown North and University South neighborhoods and adjacent to Monroe Park, Green Acres and Town & Country. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. Formal Application will be Subject to CEQA Review.**

Chair Furth: ...which is a study session. Okay. I have a conflict of interest on this one so I will step away -- because I live there -- and let the Vice Chair deal with this.

[Chair Furth left the chamber]

Vice Chair Baltay: Very well. We're going to open the agenda item number 4, just to take public comment. We have one speaker card from Mary Elizabeth Plowder [sic]. You'll have three minutes to speak. If you could spell your name, please.

Mary Elizabeth Plowden: Yes, thank you. It's Mary Elizabeth Plowden.

Vice Chair Baltay: Plowden, I'm sorry.

Ms. Plowden: Sure. [spells last name]. Thank you. Sorry, I have to leave for work in a minute and I just wanted the opportunity to say a few words. I'm relatively new to Palo Alto. I've maybe lived here three years or so, so this whole process of understanding how to comment and how to participate is new to me. I tried to get up to speed around the last cell phone tower issue as it relates to Crown Castle and Sure Site. It was just approved a few weeks ago. I received another notice in the mail about these 17 nodes that are planned for parts of downtown. One of the approved sites in the last go-around with Crown Castle and Sure Site is across the street from my house. My bedroom is actually co-located with the height of the antenna. Which, for my husband and me, provides great discomfort. My husband is actually an oncology surgeon, so he helps people deal with cancer all day long. So, for us, it's a very deeply... It's a hard topic. The latest review of these 17 sites that I've taken a look at, one of the nodes is actually on a street lamp right outside the building where I work. When I say "right outside," I mean if I look out my window and look at where the node will go, my desk is co-located with that node." Now, I've got one across the street from where I sleep, and I'll have one right next to where I work. Speaking specifically about, you know, beyond just general concerns, I'd like to say that I did some work last go-around as it relates to the radius of the radio frequency of these towers, and there were different nodes of radiation within which you would not want to be collocated. Obviously, this is a new project. I don't have the specs for the new project, but it's surmisable that if you are within 15 feet of this node, it's probably not something you want to be exposed to on an ongoing basis every day. And I just want to bring up that the streetlight that has the sign on it right now that's on the map of these 17 is, again, right next to the office where I sit. And I have many other colleagues that also sit in that office day to day, within 15 feet, the wall of our office, of the streetlight. So, I just wanted to come out and say that for me, that's deeply concerning again. I also just wanted to mention that I'm getting these notices as a resident of Palo Alto. My colleagues, they live in Redwood City, they live south of Palo Alto, they're not getting notices like this, so they're going to be within 15 feet of these nodes. And it's not just my office. There are many other offices where that's probably the case. And I realize that there's maybe a public newspaper requirement to post meetings like this and findings, which is entirely insufficient in today's world and media, where people don't necessarily read the published paper version of the Palo Alto daily news, or wherever we put that. Notification to people that work next to these nodes I think is extremely important because if they don't get these things in the mail as downtown residents, they might also want the chance to comment and participate. Lastly, I would say that given... I have two of these now within

striking distance of my everyday life. As a mom, as a resident of Palo Alto, I think we should just think more broadly about what we're doing in the city as it relates to all these nodes. We just approved five, 17 more. When we talk about the health effects, do we think about the aggregate health impacts? I'm not talking about the ...

Vice Chair Baltay: If you could wrap it up, you're 30 seconds over.

Ms. Plowden: Sure, sure. Not just the radius right next to the streetlight, but if you think about the aggregate affect of people like me that live and work in downtown Palo Alto. Do we know what that means in the longer run health-wise as it relates to all of the RF emission? Thank you very much.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you for speaking. Okay, we'd like to close that portion of the meeting to public comment and return back to agenda item number 3. Thank you.

[Chair Furth returned to the chamber and resumed discussion of item 3 regarding 2342 Yale Street.]

Chair Furth: Thank you. To return to agenda item 2342, which is item number 3 on our agenda, the applicant... The owner is Abdel Ismail, and the architect is Amer Ismail Design Build Group. If we could have the staff report, please. And if our new planner could introduce herself.

Emily Foley, Project Planner: Hi, good morning. My name is Emily Foley, and I'm the project planner.

Chair Furth: And Emily, could you spell your name for our transcriber since you're new?

Ms. Foley: Yeah. [spells name]

Chair Furth: Thank you

Ms. Foley: As we mentioned, this is for 2342 Yale Street. It is a duplex project, and this is the first time that it's come to the Architectural Review Board. The proposal is to demolish two existing residential units. It's a single-family home in the front and a second kind of apartment-style unit over the existing garage. The proposal is to construct two duplex units, so two attached units with the detached garage in the rear. Each unit is pretty much identical, so there are four bedrooms including a finished basement in each unit. The site context is in the College Terrace neighborhood. As previously mentioned, it's in the RMD NP zone, and the Neighborhood Preservation Overlay is why it is at the ARB meeting today. In the general neighborhood area, there are single and two-family and multiple-family residential on three sides of development, and neighborhood commercial small office buildings to the north across the street. For the site plan, it's a duplex, so the two units are attached, but the second floor roof forms are slightly separated with decks in between. The parking is in the two-car garage, and there's one uncovered space as required by the zoning. There is useable open space. Each unit has a 99 square foot deck and a 59 square foot deck. The front unit has 483 square feet of useable open space, and the rear unit has 422 square feet of kind of landscaped open space. These are the current elevations as shown in the project plans for the front and rear and for the two sides. The entrances are defined, as well as the two units being pretty much the same, so the two sides of the building look very similar. As previously mentioned, this project is not subject to CEQA, and staff is recommending approval at this time.

Chair Furth: Is there a materials board?

Ms. Foley: Yes. The applicant said that he was going to bring an updated materials board.

Chair Furth: If we could have that, please. Thank you. Any questions from staff before we hear from the applicant? If we could hear from the applicant, please. And if you could, as everyone does, spell your name for our transcriber. When you introduce yourself.

Amer Ismail: Sure: My name is Amer Ismail [spells name]. Our objective...

Chair Furth: Excuse me, I forgot to tell you, you have 10 minutes. Which we will now start.

Mr. Ismail: Okay. Our objective is to build a duplex that will help improve the area. Currently, the existing building has kind of a zero lot line along with the adjacent buildings, so we think the building we're proposing improves that.

Chair Furth: Could you speak a little closer to the mic? I'm sorry, our mics require that you be quite close.

Mr. Ismail: Okay. We feel that the building we're proposing improves that by following the setback requirement on the left side, and the driveway on the right side separates this building from the current neighboring buildings. In the design, we tried to follow the guidelines as closely as possible. One was we placed the garage in the back of the property to mitigate its visibility, and also kind of match the neighborhood. The driveway, we tried to minimize the width of it as much as possible. We also proposed some Hollywood strips with landscaping in the middle, and providing a planting strip on the right side for screening landscape between this property and the neighboring property. Our original design, we had kind of a larger second floor, so we reduced that door by increasing the footprint of the building. That way, kind of minimizing the second floor walls. We also, also to meet the guidelines in terms of height and massing and scale, we set back the second floor walls from the first floor walls all around by about three feet. We located two upper floor balconies in the center of the building, that way separate the second floor from each unit, again, to kind of minimize its mass. Also, that helps with the roof scale, as well. And we took into consideration the windows, so they don't have direct sights, and are proposing screening landscape in the appropriate areas.

Chair Furth: Does anybody have any questions before...? Of the applicant's architect? Doesn't look like it. I had one question. Do you know how many bedrooms there are in the existing buildings on the site? Total?

Mr. Ismail: There are... I believe there is a total of, maybe six bedrooms.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Okay.

Board Member Thompson: I had a quick question.

Chair Furth: A quick question before we hear from the rest of the public?

Board Member Thompson: I just... Oh, well. It was a material question. Should I ask later?

Chair Furth: Yeah. Why don't we ask questions later? The applicant will have a chance to respond to the public, so let's hear from them, and then we'll do a second round. You may be seated. I have one speaker card from Taylor Brady, professional engineer. And Mr. Brady, if you could spell your name and give us your address, if you would.

Taylor Brady: Absolutely. Yes, my name is Taylor Brady. [spells name] I was already going to begin my speech this way, so, in the interest of full disclosure, I will say that I am a resident of 2342 Yale Street in the College Terrace neighborhood, occupied Mayfield. I'm also a licensed civil engineer in the state of California. My license number C-88568, in the event that any present here today would like to look it up through the Board of Professional Engineers, Land Surveyors and Geologists. I have practiced structural engineering since earning my bachelor's and master's degrees from Stanford University in June 2013 and March 2016, respectively. Germane to the discussion today, I've been the primary structural designer on numerous residential buildings of similar type and scope to the proposed project, as well as many more commercial, industrial and multifamily residential structures of significantly greater size. I'm here this morning to publicly express my opposition to the proposed demolition of 2342 Yale Street. Since my vested interest as a renting resident of the subject property is obvious, I will not belabor the point. However, I would like to focus my speech on three other points. The first is the incompleteness of the most recent drawings currently available to the public by Palo Alto's Accela citizen access portal as of



2200 hours on February 20, 2019, i.e. last night. The second point is regarding the historic nature of the property and its situation in the College Terrace neighborhood, and the third point is the impact of the demolition on the City's more broadly-stated goals of sustainability and affordable housing. The most recent set of drawings available for the project is a set dated November 19, 2018. While these drawings may meet basic requirements for an architectural set, in my professional experience the design reflects a project at the end of schematic design, with only the basic massing and architectural program established. Critical details such as wall and floor assembly, waterproofing fenestration, drainage for decks, and guardrail attachments are not present in this set. Moreover, while a building of this type is feasible to construct, no structural system has been designated either for gravity or lateral loads. Looking more closely at the presently-submitted drawings, it is possible to see that with buildings and different floor layout levels, the level, structural framing for discontinuance bearing elements -- that is, beams and columns -- will need to be specified. Additionally, no lateral system is proposed, and while myriad systems are possible for such a structure, perhaps timber sheer walls or steel moment frames, a careful inspection of the present architectural program and fenestration reveals that such critical structures are not accounted for. They are not continuous walls which could be used as sheer walls, no are their locations for frame elements fit. If the structural system is (inaudible) accommodating the present architectural program, then the gravity and lateral systems will require numerous discontinuous elements, each of which will have to be individually designed, and which is not, again, while feasible, an insignificant design task. This is to say nothing of the structural details that will be required for construction of the presumably truss roofs. The connection of discontinuous vertical (inaudible) elements to supporting members, and more.

Chair Furth: Mr. Brady, I forgot to tell you that you have three minutes, so would you take another minute to address your other issues?

Mr. Brady: I suppose so. I'll just sum up this section really quickly. I just think that it would be in the City's best interest to review and comment upon much more complete drawings before proceeding with a permitting process. Regarding the historic nature of the building, it is admittedly of amateur and local interest, but it is these footnotes of our neighborhood and our town's history that are, those that are being erased. Frank Miniker [phonetic], the builder of the building, was one of the earliest occupants of the College Terrace, or what became the College Terrace neighborhood, and Ranis Smithian [phonetic] Mayfield before it was annexed by the City Palo Alto. Individual structures such as this one may not have the polished cordials, the prettily-painted balustrades which draw the attention of architectural historians, who are mere decorative fetishes for the prominent styles in the neighborhood. Although I do happen to think that the periwinkle channel siding and elegantly-curved rafter tails of 2342 are worth noting. Nevertheless, the eccentricity of such lots and their placement, the way they permit access to thoroughfares in the neighborhood, is a unique aspect that cannot be discounted in assessment of the building's place in the neighborhood.

Chair Furth: Thank you I'm going to stop you, but some people may have questions for you. And if there is any written material you want to submit, or drawings, please do. Does anybody have any questions of Mr. Brady before we go on? Okay, thank you. Anybody else wish to speak to this item? All right. Does the applicant have any responses to the comments? Or anything else you wish to say? Okay. Staff have any comments after hearing from the public?

Ms. Gerhardt: I just wanted to comment on the adequacy of plan sets. It is a planning application. We do normally get schematic drawings at this stage. But one thing that I do hear the resident saying is that maybe the later structural design will be very complicated. So, we do ask, because we have architects on our ARB, I think you can speak to a little bit. Related to historic, we have done an historic analysis of this property and it was deemed to be not historic.

Chair Furth: Who did the analysis and what were the standards used?

Ms. Foley: It was a DPR -- Department of Parks and Recreation -- primary record report. It was probably Page and Turnbull, but I don't have that right in front of me.

Chair Furth: I think it's on page 112 of our packet. What's the page? Is it 112? We're using the state standards, right?

Ms. Gerhardt: Absolutely. I don't know that we put the historic report in here, in the packet, because we weren't anticipating that that would be a major concern.

Chair Furth: Was that done in house?

Ms. Foley: It was done by Page and Turnbull.

Chair Furth: An old survey or more recently?

Ms. Foley: More recent. August 21, 2018.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Is that available to the public if they want to see it?

Ms. Foley: Yes, I believe it's uploaded to...

Chair Furth: Thank you. We had another question of staff. When we went out to look at the site, we didn't see any project sign. And we're concerned... I mean, it's odd not to hear from neighbors on a project in College Terrace.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, Board Member Lew had brought that to our attention I believe yesterday -- actually maybe two days ago -- so yesterday, we made sure, spoke to the applicant, and Emily made sure that the sign was up again. They found the sign. It had just been maybe knocked over, or something.

Chair Furth: Thank you. All right. Alex, why don't you start?

Board Member Thompson: Can we do questions of the applicant?

Chair Furth: Oh, questions, all right. You know what? I'm going to have us combine our questions with our comments, if that's all right. Go ahead. If it's a very basic question.

Board Member Thompson: Just a clarification on the balustrade, the guard rails for the balconies. The drawings are showing a different kind of perforation than the material board.

Mr. Ismail: Yeah, it was hard to model on the drawings the screening that we'll be using. That's why we included it on the material board.

Board Member Thompson: It will be the [crosstalk]....

Mr. Ismail: Yeah, yeah.

Board Member Thompson: ... on the material board. And is that kind of a gold finish?

Mr. Ismail: They have several finishes, but most likely we'll be picking a finish that will be matching the cladding on the windows and the doors, as well as the guard rails.

Board Member Thompson: Is that the darker...?

Mr. Ismail: The darker, yeah.

Board Member Thompson: Ah, okay, so they will be dark guard rails. I see. Okay. All right. That's all my questions for now.

Chair Furth: People in the middle hardly ever start. Why don't you?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. I want to disclose to the Board that I've also looked at some additional information on this project with regard to the historic houses on Yale Street. They're on the PAST website. So, I think the City has picked out the ones that are truly historic, and one of them is on the national, one or two of them are on the National Register. I think the City is paying attention to that. We don't have an historic neighborhood here like in Professorville, where there would be design guidelines. We don't have that in this particular neighborhood, however. I think my main concerns on the project are the location of the trash because it's next to one of the bedrooms, and...

Mr. Ismail: Actually, on the updated drawings, we actually relocated those to the back, behind the bike lockers.

Board Member Lew: Great. Okay, excellent. That's one. Two is the, the driveway width is only eight feet, and that might be fine for the Hollywood strips, if you're only parking in the back, and if nobody is ever parked on the driveway itself. But, I mean, I think normally I would look to something more like 10 feet, so you can actually, if there's a car there, you can walk past the car. That's a concern. Also, in the landscape plan, I think you're showing lawn in between the Hollywood strip driveways. I think my comment is that I think that looks good, but it's really inefficient to irrigate, so you're wasting a lot of water for a very little bit of grass. There are some ground covers that are really tough and don't require a lot of irrigation, and I was trying to look it up in my notes I have for other projects, and I couldn't find it. But I think there are recommendations out there for that. And similarly with the turfstone in the back. I think of all of my neighbors, only maybe 10 percent park in the garage. So, if you've got turfstone in back and people have parked there, I don't think that's going to work very well with the irrigation. I think that's another concern of mine. I think I'm okay with the buildings. Generally, to get more compatibility with the neighbors, I would ideally prefer siding and a steeper-pitched roof, but I don't think that our zoning really requires that in this particular case. I was looking through the zoning carefully and I don't think that that's part of the requirements on this particular site, so I think I can recommend approval otherwise. I think that's all that I have.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. David. Oh, it should be Peter. Going from the middle, out.

Vice Chair Baltay: Very well. Thank you for the proposal, the presentation, and thank you, Alex. I'm going to follow up on what you were saying, vis-a-vie the driveway being narrow. I have more fundamental issues with the basic site planning here. I don't think the garage the way it's oriented works, in the sense that certainly from the farther back space, it's next to impossible to get out of that without backing all the way down that driveway, and then the driveway only being eight feet wide makes it a very challenging task. It seems to me that you could rotate the garage and push it to the other side of the property where it is facing directly on the driveway, and then you might be able to back out in a hammerhead turn and turnaround and still use that space to accommodate your other parking. Then, when I was thinking about this more, I saw an earlier application you'd made with a totally different site plan, where you had in the middle between two separate buildings a whole parking arrangement, which seemed to make a lot more sense to me. And it just really left me scratching my head, thinking that you just fundamentally don't have a very good site plan here. You're covering up most of the property with this driveway, then trying to hide it as turfstone, and then, making it also function as the entrance to the back unit, pretty well ensuring that nobody is every going to actually drive back there because it's so tight to get back there, or to turn around, and to have to back back down the driveway. A lot of places just don't work, to my way of thinking. I'm sorry to have to say that to you, but at a core level, I don't think the site planning is really functioning well enough. I'd like to address a second comment I have, which again Alex touched on, and I think I draw a different conclusion. I don't think the building is compatible to the neighborhood. It's a neighborhood full of wood siding, detailed, more traditional-looking homes. And you have a very tall façade with not too many openings, and it's just plan plaster all the way through. You're saying it's a contemporary style, but I don't really see it that way. I just see it as being a big plaster box right now. That may be the case, as Alex points out, the zoning code doesn't explicitly prohibit that, but I think it does require us to find that the building is compatible with the neighborhood and fits into the character.

And I just don't think it does. I think it's... It's not a positive addition, the way it will look now as compared to what's there now. You don't have to copy what's there, but I think architecturally the style now is not fitting into anything. It's not really contemporary, and it certainly doesn't pick up on the cues from the charming buildings nearby. I think a wood siding, more detail around the windows, things like that would really help a lot to make it fit in. Or, if you wanted to be more contemporary, that's fine, but then really design it that way. Perhaps change your roof forms a little bit, accentuate the strength of the tall stucco facades. But right now, it's really not doing it for me that way. Last general comment I have is regarding privacy issues. This building is required to meet the individual review guidelines, and as I see it, you're proposing four generous-sized upstairs balconies, which are all... You're in a tight neighborhood, tight conditions here, looking over into our neighbors properties. So, your solution is to put a five-foot privacy screening in front of them. And certainly on the two middle balconies, the ones contained between your upstairs units, you have three solid walls, and then, all you have left on the fourth side facing out is now a five-foot metal screen. That's a very mean type of balcony. I can't imagine it being pleasant to sit there, even more so as the roof eaves come in on both sides. The space is maybe seven feet wide and the eave comes in almost two feet on each side. You're left with almost no sunlight, very little view to the outside. I'm left thinking ultimately this will be closed in and made into another part of the living space, or that screening will be torn down, violating our privacy guidelines. It just seems to me an inappropriate place to be putting a balcony. Or, you should be articulating the massing of the buildings such that these are on corners or somehow fitting in better. Right now, they feel like leftover spaces between two upstairs buildings that you're doing to meet the FAR [Floor Area Ratio] or lot coverage requirements. I'll grant you those are onerous and challenging requirements to meet, but they shouldn't be thought of as leftover spaces, which is what I see those balconies doing. I'm going to summarize to my colleagues that I think the site planning doesn't work yet, the building really needs to be more contextually compatible or architecturally different, and I have serious issues about the privacy due to those upstairs balconies. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. David.

Board Member Hirsch: I agree with a number of comments already made here. This is a block, it's kind of a unique and wonderful little block by itself. All these buildings on the block have quite an interesting character to them, especially the Painted Lady down the street, a Victorian honey of a building, you know? And I feel very strongly that you could have looked at your neighbors and picked up materials that would relate much better. I don't like the stucco particularly at all on the outside of this building. There are areas of Palo Alto, most of Palo Alto, in fact, where you have significant lots or space to work with, and the neighbors are a variety of styles. But this block is very consistent, and it should remain that way. You could very well have chosen to have a wooden look to the outside. I didn't realize, looking at the roof material color, that it wasn't a tile roof because it tends towards looking like a stucco-tile Spanish-style building, but doesn't make it into that category either. There's plenty of height capability here that you aren't using, and I think a lot of the possibility of making it a taller, more vertical building would give a much better dimension to this building idea. I'm impressed with the kind of planning of taking the same scheme in the front and rotating it around and making it work on both sides in planning. But, I agree with Peter that the question of how you deal with those outside areas on the roof don't seem to work well as an outside balcony, and how you would change that in planning, I'm not sure how you could do that, but I think you need to look seriously at that. This building cries out for a front porch. The proportions of the front of the building are really not pleasant at all. There's a lot of blank wall, one window over a kitchen counter, a corner window, change of window type at that point. I find the whole front to be unsatisfactory. If you look at precedents in all of Palo Alto, you'll find that a front porch and more generous kind of relationship to the street would be very important to this building and would work much better with a wood look to the building, as well. Wood siding, I would say, would be more appropriate to this building, and to this street. I would like you to study, I think, the outside proportions of the windows and bring back a better look to the whole building that way. In particular, when you make a decision to have an entry straight in from the front, and then the other one is in this rather narrow passageway for a vehicle, where perhaps vehicles would be stored -- In fact, you won't have any room to get in that door. But you do have an area in the back of the building where there's a yard between the building and the garage. I don't know why you don't really use that to create an entry

similar, with perhaps a porch as well, that related to that back unit. I really would like to see this building proportioned differently. A higher-pitched roofline would work much, much better in the scale of the street. You have recessed window frames in the stucco wall, whereas, as it was noted, there's a possibility for framing in such a way that you express the window better with a frame that you read on the outside. I think it would be a much preferred way of presenting this kind of a building on this block, and there's no other similar, kind of recessed window frame the way you're showing it. In general, I'm honestly not happy with the way the building looks at all, and I think more of a study of the Palo Alto housing would benefit this considerably, and in fact, more study on that very block, of the relationship to the neighborhood, would give you an opportunity to improve this project when it comes to us again. I'm not...

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: ...not in favor of...

Chair Furth: Oh, sorry. Sorry.

Board Member Hirsch: ...of voting for the project.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you for your presentation. Thank you to the tenant for coming to speak to us. Osma, I completely forgot you. So far to the left.

Board Member Thompson: And I went and saw the site and everything. I'll try to keep it short. Mainly everybody said what I've written down here, but in general, I'll just reiterate the ones that I think are important. I agree the façade is lacking. While there is a bit of stucco in the neighborhood, the neighborhood is made interesting by the siding and the paneling, and that level of detail is important for a residential feel. Also, the drawings are a little confusing. It looks like there's two types of railing, but they don't match what's on the material board. And in general, that level of clarity is really important for us to evaluate if this building really works in this context. The rails are rendered as white and they are not going to be white. They are going to be black, or very dark. That's a problem. There's also these extra ornamental elements at the entries that aren't very well detailed. It's a little hard to know exactly what's happening there. I understand it's a level of detail and scale, but in the face of this otherwise very blank wall, I don't think that relationship is very clear, or that it's working. And the material board should also actually have the actual materials versus just pictures. That's important, as well. Agreed that the lawn choice, the choice of using lawn, is not a very good choice, that there are better choices out there that are for water use and aesthetic. I didn't have these notes before, but after having heard them, agree that the narrow driveway is a problem. And the privacy of the balconies is.... I'm an extrovert, so I don't mind hanging out with my neighbors as much, but I think it potentially could be a big problem, that people might try to board up or try to... yeah. People add, like, extra things, and they always keep their windows closed, and that space, while it looks great on plans, not working out in real life. That's all I've got.

Chair Furth: Thank you, and apologies. I think part of the... I cannot support this project as submitted, and I'm sorry because I don't like to say no to proposals for housing, even when they're not increasing the housing. One of the interesting things about this is it seems... There are six bedrooms on site now? Seven, according to the audience. This one is eight, possibly ten, of the offices are actually used as bedrooms, which is a lot for a parcel with very little parking and very little bicycle space. My principle concerns are different. Our regulations doesn't protect the street as a historic neighborhood. It might well have been eligible, but College Terrace has not cared to be designated as a protected historic district like Ramona or Professorville. That was, in a sense, a neighborhood choice. The state standards are fairly explicit, and sometimes additional research turns up information that changes the results, but I'm going to defer to the study for the time being. I'll certainly go read it. But my big problem is this, the side of Yale that you're building is on is the boundary of the residential area that is College Terrace. The part of land that Stanford didn't get. Our historic holdout. And it's remarkably consistent. In fact, all those wood-front houses so tight together, it's almost looking like, you know, buildings on a wharf. They go one after

another, sometimes they almost touch. They have wood siding, they have framed windows, they are strongly vertical, and they're fairly simple. They stay in their boxes. They don't go off in odd directions. And to me, this building doesn't do any of those things. I will say the roofing material is consistent with the neighborhood, but in that neighborhood, stucco tends to signal multiple family or commercial across the street. On your side of the street, it's wood. This suggests to me the erosion of the residential neighborhood. It makes a hole. It's like there's a gap in the smile. I'll stop with the belabored metaphors. It doesn't meet our standards for requiring compatibility. I agree that we don't have the explicit requirements and neighborhood preservation standards that we do in some others for materials, but I think it fails to meet our other review standards. I think the driveway doesn't work. I think the orientation of the door onto the driveway doesn't work. I think the... And when I say "work," I mean that I think people living there will have difficulty using them without conflicts with each other. You try to design so as to minimize the irritations. I'm concerned that the open space does not appear to be functional to me, and open space is not just supposed to be a square on a plan. It's supposed to be something that adds pleasure to the neighborhood and the users because it's beautifully planted, or you can sit there, or there's a significant tree, not just something that meets our minimum dimensions. I can't be more consistent with that. I can tell you that I spent a lot of time working with historic preservation rules and they don't require that new construction look like it's old. In fact, they prefer that it not look fake-old. So, I can imagine a building that uses wood siding, and wood-framed windows, and a better relationship to the street, and more clearly signifies we're in College Terrace, that looked very modern, but it was clearly done by a designer who respected what's there and tried to design a building that not only looked good for itself, but made its neighbors continue to look strong. I wonder if it's a little too big. When I hear that the driveway is too narrow to be functional, and this is a tight lot, I think that maybe it's a little too intense a development for what actually fits on this lot. Also, the landscaping as proposed doesn't meet our standards, which require, where possible, the use of regional native plant materials that provide good habitat. I can't see any reason why that's not possible on this site. Staff, since we are not prepared to recommend approval today, judging by the comments received, what kind of motion would you like? What would you like us to do?

Ms. Gerhardt: I would ask that we continue to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

## **MOTION**

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

Board Member Hirsch: I second that.

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

## **MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY WITH A VOTE OF 5-0.**

Chair Furth: Thank you. It's not unusual for us to be unable to approve a project on its first vision, and I hope that working with staff, you can come to a project that we will be able to approve. Thank you for coming to speak to us, and we will go on to our next item. Before we do that, I need to say that I will not participate in the next public hearing item because I live at 216 Everett, and therefore, live in the neighborhood.

## **Approval of Minutes**

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

Chair Furth: Maybe while staff is getting ready for the next item, we could review the Architectural Review Board meeting minutes for October 18, 2018. Any comments?

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I'll bite into that, sure. I think the minutes for the meeting itself are fine, but I'm quite concerned about the way the subcommittee hearing has been presented. This is the second time we've talked about it. Right now, it's very confusing which items are being discussed in the subcommittee meetings. If you read it, it states one of the projects and has a few comments about what happened. It doesn't say which committee members were involved in that hearing. And then, below that, it segues into comments which I think are about the police station project, but it doesn't say that it's that project. And again, it doesn't identify who is speaking. It seems to me just deficient. We need to have minutes that capture that stuff.

Ms. Gerhardt: So, let me ask... [crosstalk] ...

Board Member Lew: ... on page 17 of the minutes.

Ms. Gerhardt: Page 17 of what minutes?

Board Member Lew: And there are two subcommittee items, and one of them...

Ms. Gerhardt: Are we talking about October 18th?

Board Member Lew: October 18th. And one of them should be the public safety building, and it's not... There's no header for that public safety building.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, so, I can take a closer look at that. We don't normally list out... I mean, we can list who the subcommittee was. We don't normally list out who said what. It's meant to be more of a summary. But we can definitely put who was there.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think it's important just to list which board members were making that decision.

Ms. Gerhardt: Certainly.

Chair Furth: Thank you. You can add those. Also, at one point in the sign discussion -- I'm sorry, I've lost it, I think it's on page 8 -- it says "ready" instead of "read." Talking about reading signs and it says "ready." I'll try to find that and let you know. That's just a clerical error.

Board Member Lew: Peter, do you want to approve the minutes as corrected, or do you want them to come back?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think we should approve them and let staff correct it because it's really been quite, quite late now.

Chair Furth: Yeah, a long time.

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll move that we approve the minutes as corrected.

Board Member Lew: I will second that.

Chair Furth: Motion by Baltay, second by Lew. All those in favor say aye. Opposed, none. Thank you. Maybe we have time to do one more set?

## **6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for January 10, 2019.**

Chair Furth: Okay, January 10th. Let's see, that was the one on 4256 El Camino and 380 Cambridge. That was a long meeting.

Board Member Thompson: I'll move that we approve the minutes. Oh, sorry.

Chair Furth: Any comments or changes?

Vice Chair Baltay: I noticed one thing, I think it was this meeting, where we were discussing with Randy Popp -- And fortunately, they only came to me yesterday, digitally, so I don't have a page to reference to, but there was a comment in there where Randy Popp and I were discussing something, and a whole paragraph was attributed to me when I think it was Randy speaking. I have to dig it up. Give me a few minutes to find it, I guess.

Chair Furth: I think that's a clerical, which we can correct afterwards. Staff is nodding.

Vice Chair Baltay: Then go ahead with your motion.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Thompson: All right. I'll move that we approve those minutes for January 10th, with the correction by Baltay.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Vice Chair Baltay: Second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Thompson, second by Baltay. All those in favor say aye. Okay. No opposition.

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

### **7. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for January 17, 2019.**

Chair Furth: And the final set is January 17, 2018. Any comments, corrections, etc.?

Board Member Thompson: I'll abstain. I was not present.

Vice Chair Baltay: I believe we had a subcommittee item on that one as well, and again, there's no record of that in the minutes. Again, I think that could be corrected without coming back to us, but it is important.

Chair Furth: All right.

Board Member Lew: The subcommittee item on page 63 of the minutes, the subcommittee reviewed the details, the driveway gate and the height of the light poles. And also, on page 56 of the minutes, which is with regards to one of the cell projects, David had referenced several times the CAC report. I think what he intended to say was the CTC report, which is Columbia Telecommunications Corporation, and they're a city independent consultant. That occurs multiple times.

Chair Furth: And it should be spelled out the first time it occurs. Not by the speaker, but by the transcriber.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Lew: I'll make a motion that we approve the minutes for January 17, 2019, as corrected.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Hirsch: Second it.



Chair Furth: All right. All those in favor say...? Let's see. Motion by Lew, second by Hirsch - Is that right?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: All those in favor say aye. We are caught up on our minutes, the first time in many months. Thank you.

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

Chair Furth: I am going to ask to be excused for the balance of the meeting. I will leave it to my colleagues to take care of everything else. We will have a five-minute break, and then we'll get to the rest of it. Apologize for the delay. All we can tell you is we're doing better than we usually do.

[Chair Furth left the meeting.]

[The Board took a short break.]

#### **STUDY SESSION**

- 4. Various Sites (250 Hamilton Avenue in database) [17PLN-00398]: Request by Sure Site, on Behalf of AT&T, for a Preliminary Architectural Review of the Deployment of 17 Small Cell Wireless Communication Facilities on Utility Poles and Streetlights in the Public Right of Way, in Downtown North and University South neighborhoods and adjacent to Monroe Park, Green Acres and Town & Country. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. Formal Application will be Subject to CEQA Review.**

Vice Chair Baltay: ... a preliminary study for small cell nodes at 250 Hamilton Avenue. It's a request by Sure Site on behalf of AT&T for a preliminary architectural review of the deployment of 17 small cell wireless communication facilities on utility poles and streetlights in the public right-of-way in Downtown North and University South neighborhoods, and adjacent to Monroe Park, Green Acres and Town & Country. Staff report, please.

Rebecca Atkinson, Project Planner: Good morning, board members. The project description for this preliminary... Oh, Rebecca Atkinson, Planner. The project description for this preliminary architectural review is as described. I'd like to thank AT&T for filing a preliminary architectural review application, for many reasons, including the transparency notice and opportunity to provide early comment that this application provides to members of the public and the ARB, prior to the formal applications coming in. Thank you for that. In terms of a project overview, the number of nodes that you see in your project application and project plans are 17. It would be one or multiple clusters coming in at formal application. The locations are generally within the downtown area, University South and Downtown North, and adjacent to other neighborhoods, and adjacent to Town and Country. One node is on El Camino Real near Monroe Park, and another node is one Arastradero near Green Acres. There might be future phases -- we don't know -- potentially up to 33 nodes, and currently AT&T operates macro sites and has an existing DAS system. Here are a couple maps. These maps are also attachments to your staff report and it shows the basic location of the nodes and distribution. AT&T proposes to utilize existing streetlight and wood utility pole locations, and there are a variety of design configurations that they will review with you today. Please pay special attention to the specific equipment proposed for the purposes that the equipment differs in size and capacity, and as such, influences aesthetics. I'd like to highlight that this application will debut 5G to Palo Alto, in which case the majority of nodes would have both 4G and 5G antennas and radios. Staff outlined some anticipated design changes for streetlight and wood utility pole designs on packet pages 78 and 81. If you are interested in seeing the 5G design more closely than what is presented is the staff report on page 80 and in the project plans, we do have a photo in our site presentation of the San Francisco 5G mock-up that AT&T provided to us. I just showed in the staff presentation some of the basics of the proposed configurations, and AT&T will review these designs more specifically. While processing applications before us, staff is also continuing to look into the latest

technologies and designs elsewhere. Staff is beginning to see designs for streetlights with radios integrated into the pole, and access through panels with top-mounted antennas, as well as poles that also host the radios and antennas within the poles themselves. Staff also noticed emerging new radios that continue to become smaller than what we have seen in some other applications. Departments are reviewing the technical site constraints at each of the node locations, such as trenching relative to street trees, the presence of underground basement, and noise and compliance with FCC safety standards, will be reviewed with formal applications. What we hope to achieve today is to receive detailed early feedback from the public and Architectural Review Board members. We also hope to discuss the key questions from AT&T on siting, design configurations and screening. These questions will be posed in their presentation, as well as on packet page 96. We'd also like to discuss topics raised in the staff report, including node design and screening, nodes in scenic areas, nodes proposed near historic buildings and districts, and nodes with marketing banners. Please see packet pages 82 through 87 for identification of some of the specific nodes that intersect with each of the aforementioned topics. For further clarification, staff reviewed the alternative to the corner locations presented in the project plans and it appears that these alternative locations might be less visible in general and follow throughs on original ARB feedback on other applications that corners are not preferred. While these would be locations that were alternative to Node 33, Node 34 and Node 35, and AT&T will be outlining those alternatives in their presentation. Staff also had a question for ARB members, and primarily the AT&T team, staff had a question regarding the wood pole design on Encina: Given that the equipment orientation and placement does not currently comply with standard clearance and other requirements, is it possible to utilize the configurations similar to streetlights on this wood pole? For preliminary architecture review, it is an informal and non-binding application and there will be no motion that aggregates ARB member feedback. At places, I will provide you copies of correspondence that we've received since the staff report publication, as well as additional materials. And I'd be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Rebecca. Though this is not a quasi-judicial matter, I'd like to offer anyone a chance to disclose any communications, or tell us if you've visited the site. David?

Board Member Hirsch: None.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex?

Board Member Lew: I visited all but one of the sites on Tuesday.

Vice Chair Baltay: Osma?

Board Member Thompson: I've had no communications and I haven't had a chance to go to all the sites.

Vice Chair Baltay: I visited the sites. I also received emails from, I guess engineering companies who proposed various kinds of vaults and ways of pushing forward other technologies for this, which I've asked Rebecca to photocopy and pass out to the Board, just so you can see. I also looked into some the radio equipment that's available from Ericsson, the company the applicant is proposing, and this is in response to information I saw in the packet, but there is an additional radio being manufactured now for underground use, which I thought interesting for the Board to see. I'd like to disclose that that information is out there. With that, the applicant can make a presentation. You'll have 10 minutes. If you could state and spell your name, please.

Angela Kung, AT&T: Hi, Board Members, thank you very much. [Setting up presentation]. My name is Angela Kung. I'm a director of external affairs with AT&T. [spells name]. I'm here to give you a little bit of an overview first about just why we're here, and then we'll go into the most important part, which is obviously the design aspect of it. Right now, you all know, I'm sure, demand for wireless is on the rise. Everybody has a cell phone; 77 percent have smartphones now. We have households that rely primarily on wireless. There's no more landlines. Some houses still have them, but 60 percent of households are wireless, don't have landlines now. And 76 percent of 911 calls are on wireless phones. So, data and the ability for capacity is becoming more important than ever, and especially in a town like Palo Alto -- as you

guys know -- with small businesses, 98 percent of small businesses rely on wireless technology. What we have been able to do is provide this -- and you'll see here, it's a small cell. And what small cell -- just to give you an overview of it -- is basically, it's offloading from a macro. Macros are what you historically see on, they're kind of disguised as trees, or on top of buildings. What this is doing is this is taking off capacity from there so that more people can be on their phones, doing whatever, be it data, or be it calls. You'll see here a macro is much bigger, but it's a longer distance. And then, you'll see that a current small cell 4G is about, it's the light pole standard, and it goes up to 1,200 feet. Then, when we get down to 5G, it's still a light pole, so it's the height of a light pole, but then you're going to have an even shorter distance, but it's able to do more with technology. This is kind of a comparison of the three different heights, next to a human being. You'll see here that, this is able to show you how it works, from the macro to the small cell to the user itself. We're really excited to unfold this technology here in Palo Alto, but also, 5G is part of this. The reason why this is so important is the new technology is going to be for internet. It uses things for AV, for all, kind of the next step. What 4G and 5G are able to do, because we're able to do it on small cell, this technology is able to be smaller, better, and also less intrusive. What we have been able to do here with our 17 sites is we're going to show you how the design we have and the options we have, and we're hoping that we get your feedback and thought on this actual design. I'm going to have Laura Meiners from Sure Site who is, on behalf of AT&T, is going to talk about the actual designs themselves.

Laura Meiners, Sure Site Consulting: Thank you, Andrea. My name is Laura Meiners [spells name] with Sure Site Consulting, representing Ericsson and AT&T, to present this preliminary review application for the deployment of 17 small cell wireless sites. We have been following the progress of other wireless carriers and we are taking feedback from those hearings into consideration. We are looking forward to your recommendations and input on our preliminary design prior to moving forward with our formal application submittal. As we move through the following slides, please note that everything presented is also in the staff report. The slide showing now is the list of our 17 sites. Three are 4G only. Thirteen have 4G and 5G equipment on streetlight poles. We only have one wood pole with 4G and 5G proposed. As Rebecca mentioned earlier, these are mostly in the Downtown North and University South neighborhoods. We do not have any sites adjacent to residential zones or residences. This is a map of sites. Rebecca also showed you a map of the sites. This is presented to help visualize where the sites are located. This slide provides some history on how we came to our proposed design. We have received staff comments and recognize the constraints shown. Addressing the constraints, we recognize that we are presented with opportunities to improve our design, including providing a uniform, streamlined aesthetic design for all sites; concealing the 4G antennas and radios in one shroud on top of the pole; concealing the 5G antennas and radios also on one shroud just below the 4G antenna; and, installing all other equipment in underground vaults or pole boxes. This is the slide showing our corner pole alternates. For these three sites, the primary (inaudible) selected is a pole located on a corner. This is discouraged per planning guidelines, as Rebecca said, so the three alternate sites are presented for your consideration. This slide shows our most recent design configurations. I would like to point out that we have received comments from utility staff to remove the disconnect box on the face of the pole as shown on the most recently submitted plans. We are now proposing to install a fuse disconnect in the adjacent pole box. In the following slides, we have equipment specifications shown that call out the dimensions of the proposed equipment. We are happy to discuss the proposed equipment further with the Board. This is our Configuration #1, which is our light pole with just 4G equipment proposed on the top of the pole. The shroud seen in the photo contains the antenna and the radios. Here is the equipment specification for the shroud containing the radios and the antenna. Our primary design option for light poles Configuration #2 is our 4G plus our 5G equipment. This is the primary design option for 13 of our light pole sites. It includes all equipment and one 4G shroud on top of the pole, plus one 5G shroud located below the mast arm. Here is our equipment spec sheet for the 5G site. Configuration #3 is our wood pole. We are proposing 4G and 5G equipment on the pole, and enclosing all equipment in one 4G shroud on top of the pole, plus one 5G shroud side mounted to the pole. We have checked the clearances and we do believe they meet the current clearances, but we are happy to take any recommendations on the design of this wood pole. This is the equipment spec for the 4G antenna on the wood pole. This is our primary design option for the radio shroud on the wood pole. We do have an alternate radio shroud option presented on slide 23. For the light poles, we do have other alternate designs we would like to

present, including this Alternate Design #1, the side-arm design. This includes space for four radios and the radio will be mounted above the pole. Also, our holster design, which is our Light Pole Alternate Design #2. This includes space for five radios and the antenna mounted to the side as shown. Here is our alternate radio shroud for our wood pole. This shroud proposes a decreased height but increased depth and width. This slide presents some questions for the ARB, also shown in the project description. Thank you for your time and consideration. This concludes our presentation and we are open for questions and discussion.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Do we have any public speaker comments, or cards? Seeing that we have no public comments, I'd like to see if there are any questions from board members.

Board Member Hirsch: On the alternatives on the wood pole, what are we being asked to review today? Your preference on those...? Could you go back and show us clearly which ones are the alternate?

Ms. Meiners: Can someone help me with the slide? [Locating slide]. This is our primary design option.

Board Member Hirsch: Where is that on the pole? Do you have the elevation somewhere?

Ms. Meiners: I'm sorry, the presentation is being slow. The proposal is shown here on the photo sim. It's located below the power line. Is that the power line or the com line? I think it's a com line, actually. I believe the bottom is, the bottom of the shroud is proposed at, I think, 11 feet. I think we can move that a little bit closer to the com line if necessary. We also have this alternate radio shroud that could be mounted up to 16 feet or so.

Board Member Hirsch: There are different elevations to other connections to wood poles. Is that correct to say? Or are they all standard elevations so that you can fit your radios into areas that are absolutely clear of other competition with other utilities?

Ms. Meiners: If I'm understanding your question, you're asking about the clearances to the com line, or...? I'm not...

Board Member Hirsch: I'm just curious about why you make a choice of one of these as your preference versus the others.

Vice Chair Baltay: David, let's get to that as we have a discussion. I'm looking for more focused questions. Does anybody have...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... anything specific? I would like then to ask you to address quickly because we did have a member of the public speaking regarding radiation from your cells. And that is not, I understand, our purview. Nonetheless, we had somebody make the effort to come here. Could you address, please, that public member's concern about having it close to them?

Ms. Meiners: I can do that. We definitely want to address the concern to the public, and we did prepare some preliminary emissions reports and submitted them to staff. According to those reports, the emissions are less than one percent of the allowable public exposure limit, including 0.35 percent for a person standing on the ground, and 0.89 percent for a person directly adjacent on a second story area.

Vice Chair Baltay: At what distance is it that amount?

Ms. Meiners: I believe it's 10 feet.

Vice Chair Baltay: Ten feet, okay. Thank you. Last question I have, quickly, if you could tell us about the disconnect switches on the streetlight poles that are now being relocated in the ground. Is that absolutely correct?

Ms. Meiners: Yes. Yeah. We had received initial comments from the utility staff that they wanted the disconnect box being mounted to the face of the pole consistently at eight feet. During a meeting subsequent to that -- I believe it was earlier this month, actually -- Utility staff said that they would prefer if we remove the disconnect box from the face of the pole and install it underground in the pole box. And we can do that. That's possible. It's called a fuse disconnect. And we will go forward with that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: Can I add a question to that? How big is that disconnect switch?

Ms. Meiners: The one that we are no longer using? I'm not sure because we're not using it anymore. The fuse disconnect is very small in the box.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: The switch, David, was about six inches square that was mounted on the light pole. But I'm hearing you say that switch is not any longer part of the proposal, or will not be.

Ms. Meiners: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, great. I'd like to bring this back to the Board. This is just an informational-type meeting so we're just offering comments. I'd like to, after everybody says their piece, see if we can get some clarity of direction for the applicant, if it's confusing. Lastly, I'd like to point out to my colleagues that on the applicant's description on page 96, there is a list of questions, 1 through 5. I think they are good questions and we should be cognizant and try to address our comments towards those, as well as anything else. With that said, David, why don't you give us a start?

Board Member Hirsch: I mean, the clarity of this presentation is quite amazing to me. The consistency of each description is very clear in your.... It's why I didn't visit the site, because I think you told me enough information right here that one could say immediately that it answers most of your questions, most of a question one might have. Certainly my questions anyhow. I think this equipment is, may I say, considerably better than what we've seen before. I wish it would become a standard for Palo Alto. And this is really important to say because the City really has to speak up as to what is going to be placed on their streets in neighborhoods. In fact, that decision really should be made by the Council, I guess, and I would urge that that statement is underlined in our comments today. I think we need to get there soon because these are going to happen. This is an essential change in our technology to date. Undoubtedly, five years from now it will be very different, but right now, I think it's very, very important to make this decision. And so many other people had concerns in our last presentation. I would hope that the City would react to this right away. I urge Planning to make that happen. I really don't have too much to say. I think a disconnect switch is a very reasonable-sized element. Peter mentions that he has seen other equipment that might be even a little bit smaller than what you're presenting, and we would always look for the smallest possible to achieve what you need to achieve. But I'm incredibly pleased by the presentation. Obviously, you have a little bit of an advantage here because you have all these downtown poles that are steel poles that you can wire through the middle. You don't have exposed cabling on the outside of the wood pole. The wood pole is always going to be the question, I think, throughout the city, but I think we need to work very hard together to find minimal impact on the environments in our neighborhoods. That's really all I have to say.

Vice Chair Baltay: David, could I get you to address some of these questions? They're talking about which arrangement on these light poles are we interested in. And I hear you being positive, but which one are you positive about?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, okay, so, to repeat what I was saying before, there is such limited space on these poles when you have all these other facilities connecting to them. I would always say let's go for the most minimal one, minimal impact. Although aesthetically, I kind of like the technical ones that are more exposed. I think in the end, for this community, it would be better to minimize the impact on the pole with mass of radio enclosures. Probably I would say the simplest one of the three is the one to choose. It will just be less visible.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Alex?

**2:02:15**

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. I think many of the locations are good. I think a lot of those locations are mid-block with evergreen trees. I think many of the locations work well. The ones that I made notes of fall into, I guess I have four categories. One is, there are some that are next to three- and four-story buildings, so, for example, 26, 27 and 31. And the one that I will highlight is, for me, 27, which is the one at the Walgreens building at University and Bryant, that there's a balcony directly opposite the proposed pole. The balcony, I think, is at the height of the antenna, so, to me, that is a concern. There are some that are on very narrow sidewalks, and I think those are 24 and 31. Many places in Downtown, we have 12-foot sidewalks, so you're going to be 10 feet away from the building. But in some places, we only have... I don't know exact dimensions, maybe six or seven feet, or eight feet. Those are the old streets that have not been widened like some of the newer streets. I think that's a concern. And then, it presents the challenge of, like, what does this look like up close? If I'm six feet away from this shroud, what do I see? And I've been on the Board for a long time, we've never really looked at them that closely. Usually we looked at the mock-up and they're up at the top of the telephone pole, but I think that we would actually need to see something up close, especially if you've got ventilation screens on there. Like, what is that? It looks fine in the rendering, but I really want to see something up close. Third is that I think there were some that are on corners that were exposed. I think Rebecca mentioned that. I only looked at two... There are ones that are exposed, some of them on corners, and Rebecca mentioned those. The two that popped out at me were 34 and 35. I think, Rebecca, you mentioned 33, and I looked at 33 and thought that was okay. There are some that are just in open areas, like the one on Arastradero is very open. Without trees. And then, I think my last comment is on color. You're proposing things on new and existing, or on existing poles. And then, you have some streetlights in Palo Alto, it's a mix of all different things. And I like the ones that are generally, like, the dark green color, but, for example, 35, which is I think at High and Everett, is a brand-new pole. It's shiny aluminum. And then, the thought of adding a shiny aluminum shroud on top of that just seems to me, like, not appealing. You proposed alternate locations, but I haven't reviewed any of the alternate locations. I would just say that I think the color is a concern to me for the ones that are very bright and reflective. I did not look at number 38 on Encina in person. I would just say as a caution, I think the Board as a whole has a problem with the wood pole ones. Sometimes it's really the nitty-gritty things. Like, the rendering may be okay, but the amount of standoff from the pole, if there are exposed wires, or anything like that. Usually we've had trouble with those, but we've had some approved. Tried to minimize the amount of standoff, tried to all the wiring. I think that's where I am on there. I don't have a strong preference between the different types of, the different cabinet boxes that you have shown there. For me, it's more of the... I think I would have to see it in person. I think the issues that I've noticed before is, like, if it's overhanging a sidewalk, and then the clearance to pedestrians. The ones where I've seen, where you've trying to overhang something above the sidewalk, it's only like nine feet or so, seem way too low to me. I really do like to have them up taller if possible. I think that's all I have, prepared comments. And then, I didn't notice this list of questions on page 96, but I will take a look at that while some of the other Board members are speaking.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Hi there. I was looking at the alternate location for 33, 34, 35. Based off of what I can see off of Google maps and how you've rendered them here, I think your original proposal location poles are furthest from adjacent buildings. The alternates that you've proposed seem to be a lot

closer to either residential or office buildings, so I would disagree with the alternate locations just based off of that quick analysis. That would be my response to one of your questions, question number 4 about the alternate. I don't like all three of the alternates, basically. Going to question 1 about which design option is preferable, Attachment D, and in your presentation, don't have renders of what your alternates would be. Is that right? You're showing me just this object, and I have to guess what this object is replacing in your render, rendering. I think that makes it hard. I think Board Member Hirsch was asking, for example, for the alternate wood pole equipment, what equipment is that piece replacing? It sounds like it's replacing the bigger one with the smaller one, so that wouldn't make sense to me. For the holster solution, I don't exactly understand where that goes on the pole. I don't know if the rest of the Board would be okay, but I was going to ask the applicant to explain exactly how that goes and where it goes on the pole because that could go anywhere. And I actually don't even know what scale this is at, if it's holding a bunch of stuff. If you could provide clarification on that and for the side-arm radios, what object...

Vice Chair Baltay: Osma, could you finish anything else you have to comment on, and then we'll get to that.

Board Member Thompson: Sure.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to go over that in more detail.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. For the wood pole shroud, it looks very messy as you proposed it. I'm not ready to approve that design, or not ready to believe that that's the best solution for that wood pole design. If you just look at the drawings, and the rendering is a little blurry. If you look at the drawings, it shows the equipment a bit more in detail. It looks like there's a lot of extra surface-mounted stuff in addition to the equipment, like the conduit. I thought that was extra structure for a second, but I think it's just conduit. I think that could be better resolved aesthetically. For the uniform design for all sites, in general, I think Alex has a point. If there's some poles that are extra shiny and that is not a good thing, I would say it makes more sense to do something that is site-specific, as a general thing. Your question on number 5 about shroud skirts over the mast arm, I'll need more clarification on that when we get the applicant to come back. And then, you have a secondary 4G equipment enclosure type, which is the art-wrapped utility box. I actually think that's pretty cool. In Los Angeles, they have a bunch of these in Downtown, and the art on them is incredible. It really makes the streetscape so interesting. I saw one that was, it looked like a stack of hundred dollar bills, but I didn't know it was a utility box. I just thought it was just a really cool piece of art. I think that's a nice opportunity, and if we're stuck with having to do something like that, that's a nice way to make lemonade out of lemons. Okay. I'll (inaudible) for now.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, so, what I'd like to do is, before I offer any comments of my own, is to step through with the Board. I see two different conditions here. One is antennas and radio equipment mounted on streetlight poles, and the other is a wood utility pole. On the streetlight pole, I see three different proposals of how to put the equipment and the antennas on it. I'd like to make sure we all understand which of those three options are and get each Board Member to express a preference. If I could, with the applicant coming forward, help you, my understanding is that the first option is a shroud on top of the streetlight which contains both the radios and the antenna. That's Alternate D-1. Am I reading that correctly?

Ms. Meiners: Attachment D-1, I think. [Locating slide]

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm looking, to my colleagues, on page 100 of our packet, has a black-and-white small image showing that shroud on top of a light pole. That is one of the options. Staff, is this...? We just want to get a really clear understanding of what's going on. Is that correct? Option D-1.

Ms. Meiners: Right.

Board Member Thompson: Wait. My understanding is that D-1 is the 4G, and then, the other one is not an option. It's 4G and 5G. It's a different type altogether.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think that's right. The 5G is a separate type of shroud and a different configuration.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. I guess what we want clarification is, what is the alternate to 4G?

Ms. Meiners: Okay. This is our 4G-only site, as proposed. This is our primary design option for our 4G-only site. If we go down here.... [navigating slides] ... Okay, so, here is our Light Pole Alternate Design #1 for our 4G radios. This basically would go on the side of the pole near the top, and the dimensions are... what site is it? Yeah, this is, basically it would be mounted on the side with the antenna mounted on the top, which would be a shorter antenna than what is proposed currently. If you're concerned about the height of our equipment, you'd probably prefer this option or the other alternate.

Vice Chair Baltay: To clarify, option attachment D-2 has some sort of side-mounted radio equipment with an antenna still on top of the pole. Okay. And that includes this thing you call the "holster." That's just another way of side-mounting equipment?

Ms. Meiners: Right. The holster design does include the 4G antenna, however.

Vice Chair Baltay: I see, that's the 4G antenna as well as the equipment on one device.

Ms. Meiners: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. You can see that lack of clear images, showing what these look like, is leaving us all befuddled. When you come back we would like to see...

Ms. Meiners: You would like us...

[crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, if we want to go with that. I'm going to try to give you clear direction of what you should put your time into. The third option, as I understand it, is some sort of street boxes. Am I reading that right? For 4G equipment? That's the art boxes?

Board Member Thompson: Please, before we go away from this design option alternate on page 106, I just wanted to bring the Board's attention to this little tiny picture that's in the bottom-right corner. That looks like a little rendering of what that might be.

Ms. Meiners: That was included in the spec sheet, and that is not an accurate representation of what that would look like because it would have an antenna also on the top.

Board Member Thompson: And the side-holster one doesn't have a little render.

Ms. Meiners: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. For 4G, the third option is ground-mounted equipment, and what you would be proposing is art-wrapped utility boxes. That's a...

Ms. Meiners: We are calling the... excuse me. We are calling the design options that are acceptable to AT&T but not acceptable to staff the secondary design options. Anything under secondary design option is not acceptable by staff, including the art-wrapped utility boxes, which is not allowed per Transportation staff.



Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. Then I'd like to point out, if we're still talking about street poles, the 5G equipment, which is the newer technology, is only being proposed as a different shape shrouded equipment with an antenna that's mounted near the top of the utility pole. What page is that image on? What would that look like?

Amy French: Packet page 80.

Vice Chair Baltay: Page 80. Yes, that's very good, Amy. On packet page 80, we can see what a 5G antenna looks like. It's mounted just below the mast of the arm holding the light head itself. And there is no option for 5G equipment? That's what the choice is?

Ms. Meiners: Not at this time. However, we are amenable to receiving any recommendation from the Board.

Board Member Thompson: Is this image 5G and 4G together or just 5G?

Ms. Meiners: This specific antenna shroud is just for 4G. The image...

Board Member Thompson: 5G.

Ms. Meiners: I'm sorry, 5G. Oh, that is 5G and 4G. The 4G is on top and the 5G is around the pole.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, then, I'd like to state that, just to give an example for the rest of my colleagues, is that I prefer the pole-mounted equipment on top of the light pole in a shroud, even if it's a little bit taller. And I'm okay with the 5G antenna the way it's shown in the rendering there. I think that would be a good standard to show the City. I do not like the idea of a side-arm mounted radio, and I do not like the ground-mounted equipment. I don't think those meet our standards. I'd like the rest of us to comment on those choices, please. David?

Board Member Hirsch: What are the boxes on that illustration 80? Those are down below. They have nothing to do with this particular equipment?

Ms. Atkinson: I can answer that question. The photo on page 80 is of a mock-up from San Francisco of 4G. An antenna and radios, as well as 5G antennas and radios. And instead of having the radios and other equipment as proposed for Palo Alto underneath the 4G antenna, some of the equipment is actually mounted on the pole here. This was an actual mock-up that we wanted to show, you know, absent a mock-up here in Palo Alto. But it's my understanding from the visuals and the elevations in the preliminary project plans that the equipment that's shown in this photo as side-mounted to the pole would instead be top-mounted.

Board Member Hirsch: Only on top. Okay. That's perfect.

Vice Chair Baltay: What is your preference, David?

Board Member Hirsch: On the top.

Vice Chair Baltay: And are you okay with the 5G equipment and the shroud proposed?

Board Member Hirsch: The way it's aligned below, absolutely.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex?

Board Member Lew: Now I'm confused. Most of these are supposed to be the 4G and 5G, right? You're saying 13 of them are 4G and 5G? But that doesn't seem to match up with the simulations, right? The simulations are showing mostly the 4G option.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, it doesn't match up.

[crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: Much of our work has been concerned with 4G installations at this meeting and in previous ones.

Board Member Lew: I know, but the problem is that this project is really about the 5G, right? Most of the locations that we're looking at?

Vice Chair Baltay: Most of the locations seem to have some 5G component, and all of those I think are that shroud-mounted near the top of the pole. Oval-shaped.

Ms. Atkinson: I think what would be most helpful for the applicant and staff in regard to the bigger picture is any kind of feedback about the mounting of the 5G equipment because it is being debuted here in the preliminary for the first time in Palo Alto. And any comments that you might have about the projects planned as proposed, because the applicant team did select what their primary design configuration would be, and also wanted to show other design options that had been considered, in case you wanted to add and further supplement anything. Staff is very much interested in as much feedback as you could possibly provide, as well, because it will all go into formal applications that are anticipated to come quite soon. Thank you. And staff's questions are actually outlined in the staff report. Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Okay, well, I'm generally okay with the pole top-mounted antenna, but it seems to me the San Francisco mock-up is a contemporary pole, cobra head pole, and most of the poles downtown are traditional, fluted poles. I think in the past, we've had some other operator, some other companies propose pole top-mounted equipment, but they would replace the whole pole. But I think this, as I read the plans, you're just attaching things to existing poles. I think the San Francisco model may be problematic. I think that I need to see some sort of mock-up or sample of the shroud that you're proposing with the vents because I've never seen anything with the vents before. And if there are screens or louvers on the vents, I am interested in that. And I have no other recommendations until I see that. I think I'm fine if City staff doesn't want to consider any of the secondary alternates. I'm fine with that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Osma?

Board Member Hirsch: Peter, sorry... (inaudible).

Vice Chair Baltay: David, it's Osma's turn, please. Osma, I want to hear what you think about these. Sorry, everybody, I want to keep us focused on stepping through this. It's so confusing. I want to go piece by piece. The question now is these options for the 4G equipment and whether the 5G shroud is acceptable. Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so, from what I understand, the image that we're looking at on page 80 of our report would be an alternate to everything that's in the drawings right now. As it's proposed. At the moment, I think the 5G equipment that sort of sticks out, I think could actually be better integrated into the pole. It's close, it's almost there. It's almost compact, but I actually think it could be even more compact and streamlined so that you could get a really simple partee of, like, a whole pole. And it sounds like from what we've seen that that's possible at other places. I would say I'm not yet satisfied with the image that we see on page 80, even though I would say that aesthetically it's the closest to anything... It's the closest to what I think it could be, out of all the other design options.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. David, what were you going to say?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, sorry. On your A.33.4, you indicate -- that's in our set of drawings -- you're indicating that in case there is a banner bracket and banners for a particular street, you're going to

mount some of your radios...? Can I say that's what they are? Below the banner. Which is a little different than what you would mount if you were doing it just underneath the...

Ms. Meiners: If I could address that. We've had a recent meeting earlier this week with Dashed-up [phonetic], and they had some questions, which we are addressing, and we are hoping to be able to move the banners slightly down so we can put our 5G equipment on top.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. (inaudible, off-microphone)

Ms. Meiners: Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Thank you very much. That's good.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. I'd like to bring up another question about the streetlight designs, which staff has brought up. We have in Palo Alto several different styles of streetlights. Some are clean, polished aluminum or steel, some are fluted with painted green. Should the applicant and should staff be pressing for a single design that's consistent through the city, or should we be looking for several designs that are more appropriate to each installation? And any detail questions we have regarding. Like Alex was mentioning the ventilation slots on the shroud, regarding how well that fits into the pole itself. What kind of feedback can we give staff and the applicant? David, why don't you start with that.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, well, I'm all for consistency here, with the whole city, if we could possibly do that. Make an aesthetic decision on a lot of this and be very consistent throughout the city. That seems to me the logical way to do it. Unfortunately, there are a number of companies sort of competing for their poles, I guess, and to me, that's very unfortunate, that we should make the aesthetic decision. It seems like there's a lot of variety in the manufacturer of some of these items. And some of them are obviously aesthetically better than others. And perhaps functionally, as well. I don't know. We can't speak to that. But aesthetically, absolutely. And I think if we could agree ourselves, we would present an idea for the Council to reconsider citywide materials like this.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex, you've already touched on this a bit, but do you have anything to add?

Board Member Lew: I think they need to be site specific because the poles are so different. I would say maybe one for traditional poles, the fluted ones; one for, sort of the more modern, cobra head type ones; and then, third would be the wood pole on Encina.

Vice Chair Baltay: Osma, what's our thoughts on this?

Board Member Thompson: I think I touched on it earlier, but I would agree with Board Member Lew on that front. I still think that, you know, amongst all the poles, there could be minimal design intent where, you know, it's not like we're seeing this one with the vents on one, and this one that's really small on the other. But if we could try and tailor the really small, minimal, compact design, and then alter it per the site specificity, I think that would be most appropriate.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. I agree with Osma and Alex, that we have existing -- unfortunately, David -- several styles of light poles in town, and I think these new installations should match the style of the poles that exist. I think it would be possible to come up with two or perhaps three standardized sets of details, how do you fit onto a fluted, traditional pole, or a modern steel one? I wish we could do it all as one standard, but I think you need to have at least two, if not three, different types of installations. Alex's comments about the detailing of how these shrouds fit and mount is critically important, and it needs to be carefully studied as the applicant brings forth an actual proposal. One last thing on the streetlights. Staff has asked us to look at some streetlight proposals that a manufacturer is making, integrating the equipment into the light. Rebecca, could you show us what that is again so we can give you feedback on that? This is not obviously a direct, something the applicant is requesting, but staff has asked for our feedback on this issue, and I'd like to see what we think about that.

Ms. Atkinson: Thank you very much. Let me go ahead and pull up an example slide from the staff presentation. But in general, thank you very much. Streetlights, you know, obviously the standard function, but also, streetlights are becoming used for other matters at this point. I think that we're seeing the marketplace evolve all the different functionality for streetlights. We'd like to get some feedback on that, so let me go ahead and find that portion of the staff presentation.

[Locating slide]

Vice Chair Baltay: While she's finding that, the question I think is that manufacturers are making poles that integrate this radio and antenna equipment into the streetlight, and I think staff is asking for our opinion, if that's something that the City should consider. Here we go, Rebecca.

Ms. Atkinson: It also seems possible, I mean, these are just examples that we found on the web, but it seems possible that these poles come in designs that match our style placement guide for poles on El Camino, poles on Cal Ave, and poles downtown, as well as, of course, any number of more standard, you know, aluminum, maybe, bright and shiny. I think you can pretty much make a selection of any pole type.

Vice Chair Baltay: And Rebecca, to be clear, these would be just replacements on specific locations, it's not a throughout-the-town location. We're not changing every light pole in town. These are just in addition to the ones we already have.

Ms. Atkinson: The current policy identified by Public Works is wherever the style placement guide calls for a certain type of pole, those are replaced when work is done on a new pole. For example, any of the poles that are proposed on and between Lytton and Channing in the Downtown area would be called for, you know, streetlight replacement in order to cumulatively move our, you know, move the aesthetics forward in that direction, consistent with our policy. The downtown design guidelines also call for streetlight replacement, so that action is very consistent with our guiding documents. In any case, you would expect to see in a formal application streetlight replacement for those nodes downtown in an identified area. You'd also expect to see streetlights replaced on El Camino, and so forth. It's standard to this type of replacement as projects move forward. And, if you have a new pole, there might also be an option, instead of one that does not have the capability of incorporating the equipment into the pole, potentially choosing a pole that does have the ability to have the equipment integrated. From my early research, it appears that a pole with the integrated capability would be slightly wider than the more streamlined octagonal fluted design that we currently see downtown, so staff would be interested in feedback on that. It seems like a fair trade-off to get the more, to choose a pole that might have the capability of putting the equipment inside.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thanks, Rebecca. Osma, what's your feedback on that, then?

Board Member Thompson: The images that we're looking at on our screen right now are aesthetically a lot more coherent than anything else we've seen so far today, so I would be in favor of choosing a pole that would have this kind of integrated equipment. I wanted to clarify. In this image that we're looking at, would that integrate all the equipment that we have seen on these poles so far?

Ms. Atkinson: Staff just gave these as examples, as opposed to... I mean, I could have put, like, four more, or, you know, a few... In this case, one example has the antenna top-mounted and the equipment inside the pole, radios, and in the others, the antenna is fully integrated within the pole. Now, these examples are for 4G only, it is my understanding. They don't necessarily have this yet for 5G, although it could be coming out any day. I'm not sure. But I guess in the case of the AT&T application, the idea could potentially be to still have the 5G equipment strapped and mounted to the outside of the streetlight pole, but have the more streamlined version for 4G.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex, your thoughts on that?

Board Member Lew: Yes, thank you for doing the research, Rebecca. The last time that I looked at integrated types of poles they had really huge pedestal bases that were just ungainly. It seems like a lot of progress has been made on these designs, so thank you for that. I guess the thing I'm thinking about is that, that this kind of design may work where we have a very exposed corner without any landscaping. I think that could work well. I would think that the more traditional acorn type of light might be problematic in that, the light poles. For example, on University Avenue, are very low. They're pedestrian oriented. And I would imagine that, like, AT&T, their need for height would completely change the character of the street. We would have to look at the height of the traditional acorn-looking fixture. So, I would say yes, I think, if it can work, great. My last thought on that is that all this stuff is going to change, so tacking stuff onto existing poles may seem not so great now, but it may be actually the better option in the long run because these things will change, and presumably get smaller. And why get stuck with a chunky-looking light pole for a hundred years? I would imagine that the cell phone, that all of these antennas, the lifespan is going to be shorter than the light poles.

Vice Chair Baltay: David.

Board Member Hirsch: I'll backtrack a little and agree with what several have said about there being a number of varieties to solve the problem. I'm not suggesting that you don't have that option. But it seems to me that in the drawings I've been looking at, I'm noting two different types of higher streetlight fixtures already accounted for in the shroud system that's been presented here. It seems to me that there's been considerable thought by designers about the kind of light fixtures they will be placing the shroud and upper element on. I found that easy to read on the drawings. The acorn fixture is a light fixture. I think it's probably too low for what you're presenting and should be kept as a decorative light fixture. I think if it's that low, as Alex says, it really probably wouldn't suffice for your equipment on top of it, if I'm not mistaken. That's what I'm noting, that on University, for example, there are lower fixtures that are just light fixtures. They have no other equipment on them. And they are an older fixture, as well, so it's nice to keep them just as they are. In fact, it would be nice to have more of them rather than less. Lighting in Palo Alto is pretty bad. Again, I prefer as much at the top of the pole as possible, especially where a pole is a more modern pole. I don't think I... And again, the switching on the pole seems to me to be reasonable, and the idea of having to create a vault for a switch seems ridiculous to me because it has all kinds of other problems with switching that's like that. And the poles are easy, the metal poles are easy to cut a hole through and put a switch through and connect everything together. Again, I'm very pleased with the way it's been presented, except that somehow or other, between the applicant and City planning, we could be seeing these alternatives better described.

Vice Chair Baltay: David, we're trying to discuss the manufactured light poles and whether we agree that they are a good option.

Board Member Hirsch: Did I miss the point?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think I hear you saying you're sort of okay with that? Rebecca pointed out a manufactured light pole that incorporates the antenna.

Board Member Hirsch: And the manufactured light pole, which is the one on the left in this drawing?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think this image on the screen is an example of a light pole that is manufactured outside of the town, outside of AT&T.

Board Member Hirsch: Because, I mean...

Vice Chair Baltay: Which has all these functions built into it, but it is a little bit heavier-looking.

Board Member Hirsch: Oh. Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: What's your take on it?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, in a traditional setting, I would say that that's a really nice choice.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. I'd like to caution the.... I hear Alex's words of wisdom, I think, that this technology changes fast. Light poles don't. You want to be very careful, starting to introduce an additional light pole design which is maybe not great, and we're stuck with that. Even if the antennas and everything else changes. Not that it doesn't look better, it does, as Osma pointed out, but these are multifaceted decisions. If I could shift us now, if we're done with streetlight poles, we have one application, one proposal with a series of equipment mounted on a wood utility pole over near 75 Encina. And I don't understand how that incorporates the 4G and 5G equipment. Your proposal is just not clear to me. Maybe the applicant could explain to us again what is proposed to be mounted on that pole, and staff could tell us what sort of feedback you're looking for on that.

Ms. Meiners: Happy to. If you look on the plans that you have, I believe it's...

Vice Chair Baltay: If you could speak into the microphone directly. Thank you.

Ms. Meiners: In your plans, it's in the 38-sheet series, site 38. The radio shroud is the lowest piece of equipment mounted on the pole. It's mounted to the face of the pole. And the radio shroud specifications were noted in our presentation this morning. Above that are the com lines. Above that is the 5G antenna and radios in one shroud, side-mounted to the pole. Above that is a power line, and above that is our 4G antenna. Now, there's a pole top extension there to meet the safety requirements of GO 95, which states that between the power line and the antenna on top, there must be a six-foot separation.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. That helps a lot. Osma, what's your take on that?

Board Member Thompson: I think I mentioned it earlier. I think there's a way to integrate this design so that it looks less clunky. All this stuff is really tacked on, a lot of exposed brackets and structure... I think it can be designed better.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex?

Board Member Lew: My take on it is this one would not pass the ARB's vote, based on our previous proposals.

Vice Chair Baltay: And your particular opinion, Alex.

Board Member Lew: No, I think I would agree that, I think that the... I think the lower cabinet boxes, I actually think they need to be shrouded, just based on other projects that we've looked at.

Ms. Meiners: That is the shroud. For our radios and our ....

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: Right, but I think you've got two, you're showing two or three different boxes on the lower part.

Ms. Meiners: There is only one very large box below the com line.

Board Member Lew: Okay. I thought I was looking at two. I think in the past, on other projects, there have been three, and we've required one shroud over all three boxes. And the shroud becomes really big, but it hides all of the different sized boxes and stuff. I thought I was looking at two. I could be wrong.

Ms. Meiners: There are two rows of vents. That might be confusing to you. The two rows of vents.

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Ms. Atkinson: I think staff has a similar interpretation as Board Member Lew when looking at the elevations on Sheet A.38.4.

Board Member Lew: There are two side-by-sides? Okay, well, I'm not sure what I'm looking at. I would say you've got a variety of different, between the 4G and 5G and the boxes, I think you're asking... Yeah, I think that's too much. I think we actually always tried to simplify. Just keep it simple. I think this would not be acceptable.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, and David, your opinion on this particular pole?

Board Member Hirsch: I like it.

Board Member Lew: You voted no on similar things that looked just like this.

Board Member Hirsch: Well... Okay, maybe it's just my preference. But, you know, I don't think we can really create a shroud that takes care of everything here. This is a wood pole, is that right?

Ms. Meiners: Yes, this is a wood pole, and there are three attachments, total.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. Well, it's a hard problem to solve, the wood pole, and no doubt it's our hardest problem in the city, here.

Ms. Atkinson: Staff would like...

Board Member Hirsch: Somehow it cleans up some of the stuff that's just tacked onto the wood of the pole itself. The free-floating quality of the attachments seems to work, to me, here. I'm really confused by it all, but I know the problem is that this is going to be what we see all over the city. Right? Because only in certain areas do we have the metal poles. That being the case, there's no specific historic design to the pole and the connections like there are on metal poles. I prefer the B pole in New York City to all of the engineered poles that happened ever since the B pole, which is a very Victorian, wonderful pole. But when you get to modern technology, something has to give, and in my view, I think this would work in the communities because it actually is trying hard to keep all of the wires and all of those things close to the pole. I think there is a relationship there. Technically, it's more modern in that sense, that it makes those connections as minimal as possible, and just shows them the way they are. That's my preference.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Let me address this issue. It's something we've been struggling with on the Board for quite a few applications now, and in my opinion, the side-mounted equipment on the pole is absolutely unacceptable. I cannot recommend the findings that it's an aesthetic improvement in the town. And I believe the best way to do is either to put the equipment out of site, underground, or, as we've seen several times, staff is pushing now to somehow conceal the radio equipment within the shroud above the utility pole. If we all note that the antenna itself is some nine feet above the pole. We've seen applications on the streetlights where the radio equipment, which is smaller and smaller every cycle, is somehow concealed within that shroud up on the top. That just, to me, it's a visual extension of the pole, and in a metaphorical way, that is out of sight. It's so high up, it looks like a continuation of the pole and you just don't see it. Whereas what Alex has been pointing out, when you have these large boxes close to the street, they're really unsightly. They're not attractive. I don't think they are a technological advantage to our society, David. I just think they're ugly and we can do better. I strongly encourage staff and the applicant to find ways just not to mount stuff like this on the pole. I'm left wondering what you can do about the 5G equipment. Is it always this self-contained package of antennas and radios in a rectangular or square format? Or is there a way to streamline it more? I have opposed in the past shrouds mounted on the side of the pole, but Alex is pointing out -- I think very correctly -- that even a year ago, staff worked hard with other applicants to come up with shrouds that were long, and elongated along the side of the pole, that carefully sealed and integrated all of the equipment. I believe there's even a mock installation in town over near the library, which is obviously much better than this one. That would be a preferable solution, although I still think there's other things

we can do. But that's trying to give feedback to the applicant, and I'm not hearing strong support for pole-mounted equipment. Certainly not in this fashion. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I'm (inaudible) on the wood pole. I think, if I'm reading this correctly, you're not showing any shroud around the bayonet, and I think we've asked for that on other projects. And I think that has worked well. So, if you do go with the wood pole route, I would ask for consideration of a shroud around the bayonet.

Vice Chair Baltay: Osma, would you like to add something?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, this is actually... I would agree with Board Member Baltay and Board Member Lew. I also wanted to mention, I know we moved on to the wood pole, but just briefly, to respond to some of the comments that were made on the integrated pole where all the equipment was inside this new design for a pole, I think while it's true that equipment does get smaller, it's also true that there's very little desire to get rid of it. Sometimes it just stays there and accumulates, so, for that reason, having an integrated solution I think is preferable. Or aesthetically a better way to go. That's all.

Board Member Hirsch: Can I go on a little?

Vice Chair Baltay: A little. Help yourself, David.

Board Member Hirsch: "A little." All right. You know, you have to take a look at the reality here. To run these wires up the side of a pole the way it's done now, they tack on a metal cover, or whatever it is, that shrouds the wire going up the pole, and it's absolutely ugly and doesn't relate to the equipment whatsoever. You know, I'm making a case here that you've made a case for, actually, it being more exposed and on its own, you know, and related to its own self. And could get rid of a lot of the wiring that's just attached to the pole. If you take the wiring at the pole and then you put something, other equipment, and then you shroud that in something else, you're hiding all the reality of these systems. So, aesthetically, there's something to be said for just exposing them and let them do their thing on the outside of the pole, free. Because they are tight connections the way you've designed them here, and I like it. I think it's very appropriate here. To shroud everything is to hide it for no reason. It just adds another layer. I think the piece on the top that you've done on all the metal poles is fine. It expresses what it is. And then, we should carry that idea on the wood pole, as well. It's going to be all over the city, and when they modernize and make it... And I agree, Peter, if all of that, a good piece of it could be held at the top, then that's perfect, you know? And then we won't have as much down below. But if we can't do that for the technical reasons you've described, I think we should just let it hang out there.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. To staff and the applicant, I think we're wrapping up here, but do you have any questions or last comments? From staff, perhaps? Anything?

Ms. French: Just an announcement, I guess -- and Jodie can cover future meetings, generally - I just wanted to mention that March 21st, we are targeting coming to the ARB with prescriptive standards for wireless. We collectively as a team are approaching and working to get feedback from carriers on the various options and thoughts that the City is having about how we would prescriptively write an ordinance. This is going to be on your docket in the coming month.

Vice Chair Baltay: Amy, do you feel that you have an understanding of the position of the various board members on these issues?

Ms. Atkinson: I think everything is really worthwhile and food for thought. Thank you very much.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, now is your chance....



Ms. French: That was Rebecca, and then, I would concur that we've gotten the full discussion today for a prelim. I think that was maybe even better than we expected to have, you know, kind of everybody weigh in on these specific things.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. And then, to the applicant, who is pushing us to all this. You have the last word. Any comments or questions?

Ms. Kung: No, actually. Thank you so much. We're actually going to take everything you guys said, put a lot of thought into it, and see what we can do, work with staff to best propose the best option for you guys, so when we come with our permit, we're hoping that you guys will be very satisfied.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. With that, I'll close this agenda item.

Board Member Hirsch: (inaudible).... Just one.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, David, one last...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: How does it all work with the stop clock?

Ms. French: This is a prelim ARB application, so as a rule, it's not a project under CEQA and it's not subject to permit streamlining. When they come in with a formal application for major architectural review for a Tier 3 application, there will be an associated shot clock. And we're looking at the 60-day rule that, in the past, and it became effective this January.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, everybody. This meeting is adjourned.

#### **Subcommittee Items - None**

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

#### **Adjournment**