



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: April 18, 2019
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Wynne Furth, Vice Chair Baltay, Board Member Alexander Lew, David Hirsch

Absent: Osma Thompson

Chair Furth: Good morning. Welcome to the April 18th, 2019 meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. Would the Staff please call the role?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt, Current Planning Manager: Yes, good morning.

[Roll Call]

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Member Thompson is absent and excused this morning.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Oral Communications

[The Board moved to Agenda Changes]

Chair Furth: Oh sorry, oral communications. I didn't – does anybody wish to speak to the Board on a matter not on our agenda but within the subject matter of our Board? No? Thank you.

[The Board moved back down to City Official Reports]

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Are there any agenda changes, additions, or deletions? Is that a no?

Ms. Gerhardt: That's a no.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: Oh, I'm sorry, you can move it this way.

City Official Reports

- 1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2) Tentative Future Agenda items and 3) Recent Project Decisions**

Chair Furth: City official reports, transmittal of the ARB meeting schedule and attendance record, tentative future agenda items and recent project decisions. Staff, please?

[The Board moved back up to oral communications]

Chair Furth: Staff?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, so regarding the City official reports, we do have the schedule as Attachment A; again, showing vacations coming up. Also, today we have a subcommittee which will be Board Members Lew and Hirsch and then for the next agenda we show two items here. 233 University will continue onto the May 2nd agenda, the 4256 El Camino hotel project though will be delayed by one hearing to mid-May; May 16th I believe.

Chair Furth: Just to confirm that we anticipate canceling the July 4th meeting? Rescheduling it, doing something, not meet on July 4th. It would be July 5th anyway since the City can't conduct business on a holiday.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, we can. I will look at what items are coming up to see if we can just cancel it or if we need to think about a special meeting.

Chair Furth: Great and if we could do that pretty soon it would be helpful because people have complicated summer schedules if they're lucky. So, on May 2nd we only have the seismic rehabilitation and office addition at 233 University? That's all that's on the agenda?

Ms. Gerhardt: That is correct.

Chair Furth: Thanks. Any questions of Staff?

Board Member Lew: Well, on that agenda we should put in the report to Council.

Chair Furth: Yeah, the report to Council would be a good thing to add to that agenda.

Ms. Gerhardt: I will do that.

Chair Furth: Thank you, that will give us a deadline to meet.

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 233 University Avenue [18PLN-00344]:** Continue Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow for Seismic Rehabilitation of an Existing Single-Story Structure, the Addition of a Second Story for Office Use, and a Rooftop Terrace. Additional Floor Area would be Added Using a Seismic Floor Area Bonus and Transferred Development Rights (TDRs) The Project Includes Alterations at the Ground Floor to Provide Pedestrian Amenities. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15332 (In-fill Development). Zoning District: CD-C(GF)(P) (Commercial Downtown Community with Pedestrian and Ground Floor Combining District Overlays). For More Information Contact the Project Planner, Claire Hodgkins, at Claire.hodgkins@Cityofpaloalto.org.

Chari Furth: Alright, our first item is a public hearing, it's quasi-judicial, 233 University Avenue, we're going to continue the applicant's request for approval of a Major Architectural Review. You said this to allow for seismic rehabilitation of an existing single-story building. I'm not going to read the rest of this. May I have a motion to continue?

MOTION

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we continue this to May 2nd.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

SECOND

Board Member Lew: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Baltay, second by Lew. All those in favor say aye? Opposed? None, it's continued at the request of the applicant.

MOTION PASSES 4-0-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON ABSENT

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [18PLN-00265]:** Recommendation on Applicant's (Pacific Catch Restaurant) Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow for Exterior Facade Improvements to an Existing Tenant Space, including a Sign Exception for one sign, within Building E at the Stanford Shopping Center. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15301. Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org. (Continued to a Date Certain from March 7, 2019)

Chair Furth: Alright, next one is a public hearing, quasi-judicial, 180 El Camino Real which is otherwise known as the Stanford Shopping Center. This is a request for a recommendation on the request for approval of a Major Architectural Review for Pacific Catch restaurant to allow for exterior façade improvements to an existing tenant space, including a Sign Exception for one sign within Building E of the Stanford Shopping Center. Its category exempted from the California Environmental Quality Act because it's basically redoing an existing building. Does anybody have any – first of all, has everybody visited the site? Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I visited the site.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Board Member Lew: I have not visited the site since the last go around but I did – I will disclose that I did review the signage at all of the other restaurants at the shopping center.

Chair Furth: I look forward to hearing what you saw.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to disclose that I did go out to the site and when I was there, I bumped into the planner and some members of the applicant Staff. I didn't learn anything that's not in the public record.

Chair Furth: Ok.

Board Member Hirsch: I also visited the site this morning just to measure entries and...

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: ...and compare it to other entries into other restaurants – another restaurant in the mall.

Chair Furth: And I will say I did see it again when it was not raining and the walls look much better when they're not raining. I learned about the characteristics of that building material. Alright, Staff report, please?

Ms. Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning to the Architectural Review Board. My name is Samuel Gutierrez, I'm the project planner for this project here located at the Stanford Shopping Center. This is our second hearing and we received some comments at the previous hearing from the ARB regarding...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, Sam could you speak a little closer to the mic?

Mr. Gutierrez: Sure, so I'll just start over. Good morning to the Board, my name is Samuel Gutierrez, I'm the project planner for this project here at the Stanford Shopping Center. The – it's a little crowded here. The Board previously reviewed this at the first hearing and there were some comments that were received and the applicant revised the plans according to those comments. In starting the presentation here, you can see the updated elevation views and the adjusted signage throughout. So, this is just a break down of the ARB's comments, similar to what's found in the Staff report. The ARB had comments regarding more accurate site plans with greater details in regards to the pedestrian access related to the outdoor patio areas that are proposed with this application. The concern was that pedestrian access should not be impeded. The site plan was updated with additional dimensions and that could be found on the plan sheets A-101 through A through 101-C. Also, the signage was a bit of a concern, the previous sign submittal included with the Packet had more signs and the applicant revised the number of signs and reduced their size. However, did include a Sign Exception for one sign that's predominantly visible towards the Sand Hill – a broader elevation of the building. Then there was the concern for the common doorway, interior access, the – it was referred to the previous hearing as the rouge arch – between the Melt tenant space and the Pacific Catch tenant space. So, this submittal did include rendering elevation of the proposed design that the landlord, Simon Property Management, will be working on. There is an application in for that specific section of the building as well as the market area, the greater market area, adjacent to the Pacific Catch tenant space. Then there was a concern regarding the gas burning firepit and it should be revised to be energy efficient. The applicant did provide some spec sheets or information from the manufacturer regarding the energy efficiency. So, once again, this is the elevation view that was previously submitted. You can see that some of the signage was detached, there were some signs above the exterior patios, and then there was the logo sign on the façade. Then the signage has been revised to bring everything in line on the walls so the extra canopy signs have been removed though there is on facing the interior of the shopping center to identify the space. Here we can see the revised site plan. You'll note that there're more details about the furniture, trees, the existing light poles, and clearances to those objects. As well as there has been an updated or a proposed revision to the existing pathway that cuts into part of the loading space that's located right at the opening of what we call the market area where all the exterior seating for the public and the trees. As you can see it kind of bulbs out and creates a great pedestrian path to allow greater access around the proposed patios. Here you'll see a zoomed-in portion of the market area and again you can see how light poles will be adjusted and moved. So, we don't create as much obstructions for pedestrian between the exterior patio and that light pole for example. The market area, in particular, there were comments about the exterior fruit displays and produce displays for Sigona's. That was actually pulled in to their lease area now so if you were to visit you might have noticed some changes to that area so that's noted as well on this plan there. This is the – kind of a blow-up and an example of the narrowest points of the exterior patio area and again, it's just to demonstrate how the pedestrian path is going to be expanded by taking up a small portion of the loading area. Also, just demonstrating that these were mocked up in the field and there was some measurements taken for the clearances. Here's a comparison of the existing façade, the revised proposed facades or excuse me the previous facades, yes and here's the previous façade's signage. We had six signs before, they were oversized, the logos again were a little disjointed from the namesake of the business and that has been revised to reduce it to four signs only with the Sign Exception for Sign A which is on the broader façade of this building for a larger dimension sign. There's a break down of the dimension of each sign and here's a zoom in of – in particular of the Sign Exception that's requested. In reviewing this is actually was reduced from the previous submittal size but it's still larger than the other signs and the Master Tenant Façade Program for the mall. However, in looking at this elevation it's more auto-oriented so a larger sign does seem appropriate in this location. Especially when you're coming into the shopping center towards the market areas with the trees, which are now starting

to have leaves on them and getting a little fuller. You can't see some of the wall signs that this space has towards its kind of elbow, where it curves into the shopping center. So, this still gives it a presence and acknowledgment when cars are driving by in the parking lot area and it's visible from Sand Hill. This is just a comparison of the signs and again, as you can see, two signs were removed from the previous submittal. Moving onto the common doorway access area between the Melt and the Pacific Catch tenant space. We can see that there's a been a proposal to make this a neutral point, taking elements from both the Melt and Pacific Catch with the wood rectangular upper portion above the rectangular awning and kind of having a neutral tone painted façade there. You can see the existing condition on the top photo, that would be the arch in particular and again, that's under a separate application that has been submitted to the City. That would be coming to the ARB at a later day. Just to help the ARB understand that I tried to mock this up a bit. It's not exact, I am not an architect but it helps for the hearing purposes. As you can see the Melt elevation and then in the center would be this common archway and then this would be the Pacific Catch elevation. Then there was the fire pit question, there were concerns over its energy efficiency. So, the applicant looked to the manufacture and the manufacturer provided some information which is that this fire pit would not have a maximum burn flame and the manner in which the burner is designed with the air to gas mixture would actually make it burn more efficient than other burner types. I did learn that apparently, gas appliances don't have full energy star ratings yet so it – that would be something for the future but based on that information Staff wasn't quite sure if this updated information from the applicant was sufficient to meet the ARB's concerns. So, we do welcome that conversation from the ARB regarding that item. Again, the key considerations for this would be the pedestrian access around the exterior patio areas, the sign design and Sign Exception, the design of the common corridor doorway in if this was sufficient to meet the ARB's concern about what would happen there. Again, that's under a separate application that's forthcoming to the ARB and then the energy efficiency of the fire pit. The recommendation that Staff has for the ARB is to recommend approval of the proposed project and the requested Sign Exception to the Director of Planning and Community Environment based on findings and subject to Conditions of Approval. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, any questions of Staff before we hear from the applicant?

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning, Sam. Could you address please the impact on parking at the shopping center that this project does or doesn't cause?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, so the exterior patios do count as – toward parking, that area of the exterior patios and that is because it is covered service area. So, they are going to be serving people there and they do have covered patios with plastic solid type covers with a decorative kind of awnings that will roll back and forth for increased shading or more exposure to the sunlight. So, it does reduce the total or excuse me, it increases the required amount of parking for the shopping center but the shopping center does have excess parking per the code based on its square footage.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: I have a question.

Chair Furth: Yes, Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: The entry, main entry to the restaurant.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes?

Board Member Hirsch: Has that been adjusted at all or just dimensioned or what?

Mr. Gutierrez: I believe that has been slightly adjusted.

Board Member Hirsch: I think you passed – that's it, right there.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, that lower photo here, that has been adjusted with this...

Board Member Hirsch: Because of the additional...

Mr. Gutierrez: ...because of the additional extension, yes. Before you can see where the existing curve is and this have been brought open more.

Board Member Hirsch: Right so that's the attempt to make a change that would make it a more accessible space?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: Nothing else?

Mr. Gutierrez: No.

Chair Furth: Any other questions before we hear from the applicant? If the applicant could come forward, you'll have 10-minutes after you get set up.

Mr. Jason Smith: Good morning Board.

Chair Furth: Good morning and if you could once again spell your name for our transcriber.

Mr. Smith: Yes, it's Jason Smith, Land Shark Development Services Group, and pleasure to be back in front of you once again. Sam did a fantastic job going through the project. He really kind of left no stone unturned so I don't know at this time that there's a lot for us to go through other than to answer any further questions you may have of the applicant. I have here with as well Tom Fitzpatrick to – from the architect's office to run through everything as well and I welcome your questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Did anybody have any questions for the applicant? Alex? No. Peter? David?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I'm most concerned about the entry issue to the – the main entry to the – and secondarily concerned about the second entry which is on the plaza there, on the other side of there.

Mr. Smith: Sure.

Board Member Hirsch: The main entry, what is the width dimension? You don't have a dimension in this new drawing for the actual width of the two side exterior eating areas and the front door to the restaurant.

Chair Furth: That's Sheet A-101C David, that is the dimension drawing. I guess it's on A-101B in a slightly larger...

Mr. Tom Fitzpatrick: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Mr. Fitzpatrick: That'll be better to look at. So, since our last meeting, we had gone back out and provided additional dimensioning identifying all the tree wells, all the hardscapes right up to those tree wells, curb faces, then relaying out our proposed patio. These dimensions have since been updated and provided additional dimensions as well. Really what we saw was an opportunity to have a nice wide entry into the building but also to have some circulation for the general flow on that outer edge of the tree well. So, you see that dimension that's called out, I think its 4-foot 6? 4-foot 10 so that outer edge of that tree well to the curb face is at 4-foot 10 allows for all that circulation on the outside but then what we found was there was a little bit of bottleneaking as you get just past that tree to where the trunk aided domes where in that loading zone. So, we actually worked with the Simon Group who's here today, Richard Wessels and we did

a full study from that portion on through the market. What we saw was an opportunity to remove the curb area that's dotted and have an additional platform and just a nice flow for people to circulate right through and on into the market place. In looking at that we also saw some obstacles, we had a bollard that we proposed to relocate, a light bollard and then a couple of light standards. We worked with the Simon Group and just wanted to see if there was an opportunity to relocate those just to get a nice big flow I think at our biggest spot where we're almost 8-feet. That also brought up a discussion about the staging and that kind of grew. So, at the last meeting, I think when you guys were out at the site you saw that the tables encroached closer and closer to us. Some neighboring tenants had moved over and kind of made everything congested so I think Richard might be able to speak a little bit to that today and how he's brought that back to that canopy line. Just an overall much better flow for that whole area so that's all been studied and presented today.

Board Member Hirsch: I had no specific problem with the improvements you made to the area between Sigona's and your outdoor area. My concern is more about the actual entry into your restaurant and the width of it. I went there this morning just to kind of compare it with the True Food which has approximately a 12-foot area in front of the restaurant. Free and clear for people to mill around outside while waiting to get inside. It's not probably as big, I think you're going to have a capacity of somewhere near 150 people inside of this restaurant when you're full up. You have a single entering into the restaurant and then you have a door adjacent to it and exiting for the exterior. I don't think it's an adequate space for the size of this restaurant. I was hoping that that would be part of what we would be reviewing today but I don't see any kind of improvement in that inner area between your two exterior eating areas and the entry to the restaurant. True Food has a double door into theirs and the space actually...

Chair Furth: So, David, since we're just doing questions at the moment.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: Rather than telling them what we think is wrong what's the question?

Board Member Hirsch: The question is what's the size? I haven't heard the dimension.

Chair Furth: The width of the entry.

Ms. Gerhardt: So, if I may? We don't have dimensions on it but it does look to be about 9-feet wide.

Board Member Hirsch: 9-feet.

Ms. Gerhardt: There is the planter there so there's probably about 8-feet of walking space.

Board Member Hirsch: Right, exactly, thank you.

Mr. Fitzgerald: Part of the thing too is we have a great benefit of having the market place too. We brought that fire feature; we have this additional area of being able to be out there. We don't really want people gathering at the front doors so our goal was to get them in the restaurant quickly. If they were to have parties that gather earlier, we're fortunate enough to be at the market place and there's seating out there. There're areas to gather so we do have ability to, if there's a large group, have some overflow and have them in that staging area. What we don't want is the restaurant just clustered with people at the front – excuse me – and blocking that and creating any sort of challenge. So, we looked at it as that being an opportunity to have an open area and also tie it to our restaurant in that way. Does that answer...

Chair Furth: And is – what sort of either Simon or Pacific Catch specific outdoor seating is there in that area if you're waiting for friends before you get admitted or...?

Mr. Fitzgerald: Yeah, there's a combination of tables and loose chairs.

Chair Furth: But that – these seem to be reserved, right? I’m looking for accessible – I mean there’s the seating over by Sigona’s on the Melt side. Is any of that space – are there any benches or other places to sit or perch while you’re waiting for your friends or waiting for anything? Since you don’t want us milling around the entryway, where would we be hanging out? I’m completely sympathetic to not wanting people milling in your entryway.

Mr. Fitzgerald: (inaudible) operations down too. Keith might even be able to offer some – Keith with Pacific Catch but we also have our own patio that is also is sometimes used as a place where they might get drinks and appetizers and then move on into the greater restaurant. As far as a proposal to anything between our patio and the Melt, no we don’t have anything proposed at this time.

Chair Furth: Ok, thank you. Board Member – Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, good morning. Could you explain to me how it works when people want to pick-up take-out food or if you have one of these driver delivery services where a driver stops a car, get’s food and goes on? How does that – how do they flow through your building?

Mr. Fitzgerald: I’ll let Keith with Pacific Catch take that one.

Mr. Keith Cox: Hi again, Keith Cox, the founder of Pacific Catch.

Chair Furth: Good morning.

Mr. Cox: Good morning. We have a couple of different ways in which we handle take out and delivery. One of the things that we tried to do in that market area given that it is a market area where people are shopping for their meats and their groceries and their specialty farm markets style purchases. They can come in through that market door near our patio, that second door, and come in and order something and get some Poke to go and take it home and do that sort of take-out experience.

Vice Chair Baltay: Excuse me, could you identify which door did you just refer too?

Mr. Cox: The marked door that’s in the market area, that second door does provide another access and entry into the restaurant. So, we imagine that, especially for people coming from the mall, from the other side, not just from the parking lot, that that is the entry that they can use into the restaurant. So, it’s not just the front entry for people coming from the parking lot but that second entry is people come down into the restaurant. They will be able to come into the restaurant and be greeted at that area as well because if you look at the plan within the restaurant, which I’m not sure we’re starring at here, but there is a counter were people can come up and if they wanted a seat in the restaurant they can be directed there. In terms of delivery drivers, if they come to pick up food, they could come into the front door and be directed to the take-out counter or they can come in through that side door. They are welcome to come in through either entry.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Cox: In addition, there – one of the things we did go out to look at and study is there are seven short term parking areas that are in the parking lot that Simon recently isolated. So that there are areas for delivery drivers to come in and park and it’s very short term and I watched as drivers came in and out of that sort of take-out and delivery zone.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you for the answer.

Mr. Cox: And again, just one last comment, listening as we’ve – we’ve got areas inside of our restaurant for people to come in and wait at the bar which is a common thing. That whole market area where there are a whole series of tables and chairs in that big area. One of the benefits of having that is in that overflow or gathering area that is well seated and quite wide and has some area for people to wait.

Chair Furth: So, just to have you expand on that a minute. This is a place where people bring their families, you see a lot of small children in very expensive restaurants. Where would I wait with my grandchildren if I didn't think the bar was a suitable spot?

Mr. Cox: Well, in the market area next to us there, I'm just looking it at here...

Chair Furth: When you say market area you mean Sigona? What are you referring to?

Mr. Cox: Oh, I mean the whole open space area under the trees that are next to our patio.

Chair Furth: Awe, the shared mall space or shopping center space.

Mr. Cox: Yeah, the common area. (crosstalk)

Mr. Gutierrez: That is what we refer to as the market area.

Mr. Cox: Oh, sorry, the common...

Mr. Gutierrez: It's not specifically Sigona's, it's just we refer to that as the market area.

Mr. Cox: Right, that's shared common...

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Cox: ...shared common area seating and a big open area and walk up for everybody including our restaurant.

Chair Furth: Ok, thank you. Any other questions? Could you tell me – this is for Simon's representative, this is for you actually. Land Shark would be fine here I'm sure. Tell me a little bit – I'm glad to hear that you have a short term – your accommodating to short term delivery needs and uses. Could you tell us a little bit more about that program and how it works?

Mr. Smith: Again there's – I believe there's five...

Mr. Fitzgerald: Seven spaces.

Mr. Smith: Oh, seven temporary spaces not specific to Pacific Catch but they're for the general mall use. Any delivery or pick up drivers would be parking in that area. The loading area adjacent to the market area is for commercial vehicles only and it's not for parking of short-term delivery vehicles and they will be cited. They get a notice of illegal parking, I actually got one yesterday.

Chair Furth: Oh, I'm so sorry, what were you picking up?

Mr. Smith: I was dropping off some blueprints to another location and so I know that it happens.

Chair Furth: Thank you for field testing this.

Mr. Smith: Yes, yes, and I have it so I can show it as proof but again, with those parking areas I think it will alleviate anybody parking in those areas and with the security that roams the mall, they'll be able to identify anybody who parks there that's not a licensed commercial vehicle.

Chair Furth: Ok. Anything else? Alright, I think we're ready to deliberate, thank you.

Mr. Smith: Thank you.

Chair Furth: So, I have one preliminary question Sam which is...

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes?

Chair Furth: So, re-designation of some of the parking is short term space, is that somehow does that fit in with our parking requirements generally other than it's a good idea?

Mr. Gutierrez: So, we have had this happen in some cases but that was specific to a tenant. So, there were previous tenants like Pink Posey for example that was in the shopping center and had dedicated parking. In that case, we counted it as a reduction in overall parking because it's not free to the public. Tesla, the boutique that's there actually on this side of the shopping center just a little way down, may have...

Chair Furth: Their car lot, yes.

Mr. Gutierrez: Right, they have their vehicles there and those are the essential test drive vehicles for people. Those count as an elimination of parking because again they are specific to a tenant. Putting short term parking, 30-minutes, that's not something that we've counted against parking because it's still free and open to the public so, it's not just limited to the Pacific Catch.

Chair Furth: That's helpful, thank you. Any other questions of Staff before we start talking?

Vice Chair Baltay: I want to make a comment about parking independent of this.

Chair Furth: Ok.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah, I'd like to just make a comment I guess about the parking situation and I understand that this is not directly applicable to this project but it really is in a way. As I understand it the mall has about 1,469,000-square feet and by the one space per 275-square foot ratio that's about 5,340 parking spaces and they have 5,430. So, they have a surplus of about 90 spaces, it's pretty tight. This restaurant is I think it's around 6,000 or something square feet and it results in a required parking space of 24 spaces. If I look at the City ordinance under a restaurant of this size, of this type of restaurant with a take-out service, they'd be required to have three spaces per 100-square feet. That would be a parking load of 198 spaces and we're requiring 24 and this mall is flourishing with restaurants like this. There's a noted and distinct parking problem out there and I think we need to all be aware of the fact that something has to change. The mall is under parked right now and it's not working and this is why it's not working. The difference between 24 spaces and 198 is big and we all know that 24 is not adequate for a restaurant of this size. It's important – I think it's just incumbent upon us to take note of that. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Alright, thank you. That also suggests something about the economics that could drive tenants to the parking to shopping centers rather than elsewhere if we're going to require vastly more parking.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, it's just not right that a guy putting a restaurant over on El Camino of this scale and size would have to put in an enormous parking lot. Just because they are a part of the mall they don't and yet we're also disturbed that our downtown can't flourish (inaudible)... (crosstalk)

Chair Furth: That's a real advantage isn't it?

Vice Chair Baltay: ... it's just not balanced.

Chair Furth: Alright, we will make a note, do a section in our annual report on parking. Alex, if you could start us off?

Board Member Lew: Sure, thank you for your presentation and I think overall, I think the design is very elegant. I think the biggest improvement that you've made is in the indoor/outdoor design of the restaurant.

I think the weakest thing is on the existing building is the black glass at Max's really – I think is really sort of kills that pedestrian experience along that part of the shopping center. I think this will be a big improvement. So, I think the only – I have two – I only have two concerns on this particular project. So, one is I think there's one point where you just have a narrow 6-foot passage on the sidewalk. If I look at all of our – like the typical traffic engineers' standards like NACTO, they would recommend 8 to 12-feet in that situation if it were a City sidewalk, so that's one concern. I think in that particular location it may be fine. It's not the – that one doesn't have the most amount of pedestrian traffic relative to the rest of the shopping center. Then I think my second concern is the sign. So, I did review the signs for P.F Chang, Yucca de lac, California Pizza Kitchen, Flemings, True Food Kitchen, and I think they're all – I think they're following our 24-inch sign pretty strictly. I think the previous planners have enforced it very, very strictly and I think we – I think I would note, if I were opening a restaurant I would want a bigger sign. So, like I don't have any – I don't disagree with them for asking for a larger sign but I think we've been pretty strict about it and I think we should hold on to that. I don't think we're saying that this is like a mini anchor tenant and therefore gets a bigger sign. That doesn't seem to pass – I don't think that seems to pass with my sense of the frontages of storefronts. So, I'm thinking like on that same façade, on that same wall right, there's like Brooks Brothers, that's a fairly long façade. Yeah, it doesn't seem to quite make sense to me how to justify a larger sign but I'm open to approving it if the other Board Members feel that we can meet the Sign Exception findings. That's all that I have.

Chair Furth: So, Alex, you have concerns about the narrow sidewalk. Is that the corner up – if you looking – I'm looking at 101C. That's the upper left-hand corner of the upper left-hand patio? Is that the constriction point?

Board Member Lew: Yea, the 6-foot 3.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Or 6-foot 5.

Chair Furth: Right. Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I guess it's obvious what I'm concerned about here is the entry and the sidewalk width at the entry. The fact that there's a tree as an obstruction in the sidewalk at that point and there's a tree pit all around the tree that's not very attractive. I don't know, I don't think you've really made any comments or any designs that we have seen on how you're going to treat that tree pit. It seems to be me that there's...

[Unknown Female:] [speaking from the audience] Can't hear you.

Board Member Hirsch: Sorry, is that better? Ok.

Chair Furth: You have to be very close with these mics.

Board Member Hirsch: Ok. It seems to me that there has to be an alteration made to the eating – exterior eating area there that would allow the entry to be a double door. Even though you do have – and I noted it – some areas on the inside. I think they would fill up pretty quickly with some of the larger families that will be probably eating here and that it's likely to spill out onto the sidewalk. I think that the expansion into the lay by area there is a big improvement but that's not where the real constriction is going to happen. It's going to happen around the front door and either I think you need to either chamfer the seating area there to open it up wider to the sidewalk. As like my cohort here on the Committee said, that there's a required width for sidewalks and it's really too tight when it gets to be closer to 5-feet than 6-feet. I would think that for this restaurant the particular density of population here requires that to be a much larger entry; a significantly larger let me say that. There's already a 14-foot bay just about in the entryway area there and you're using some of that as an exit to the outside. I don't really – I see that as a conflict, just trying to squeeze too much into the bag in this area. I agree that I think this is a very attractive restaurant

and the textures and colors are going to be very enjoyable to visit for people but you really have to make – you have to spend some extra time on that entryway. Considering actually how you deal with the tree and how you deal with the overflow and people waiting. Just to ask them to wait around the corner doesn't seem to me to be sufficient to wait in tables outside. The secondary entrance is also very tight, the pickup. I'm not sure how you improve that out without losing one of your cooking areas outside but that's your problem. So, I think you should look into that a little bit more because that too is tight but in particular, the front entry just doesn't look to me like a front entry at this point. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning, thank you for the presentation. I share my colleagues' comments regarding the design of the building. It's attractive and handsome and it's a nicely selected pallet of materials. I think it will be a compliment to the mall. I share, echo, and probably go further with their concerns about the clearances on the sidewalk and the public right of way and the front door. If I could start at the top corner as I look at the drawing anyway there's a...

Chair Furth: What sheet are we on?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm looking at Sheet A-101B...

Chair Furth: B? B as in boy?

Vice Chair Baltay: B as in boy, yes. The top corner of sort of the outdoor area where its dimensions 6-feet 5-inches to the curb. I'm sure you have professional surveyors behind all this but when I quickly paced it out the other day there was more like 3-feet of space between the curb and the corner there. I think even 6-feet is really inadequate. There's quite a flow of people along that sidewalk and to be jutting in that far and then especially when you have a fire hydrant and I noted one other bollard or something in there. You just – it's just too much of a blockage to the public right of way along the sidewalk there and when you have a large flow of people. I think as you come further down in front of the entrance again, you have a tree with a light well there and it's less than 4-feet really. It's very tight around the front door and it's not just going into the restaurant but the public flowing around here. Sigona's, that little plaza is a very popular entrance area into the shopping center and there's a steady flow of people in there. We're really constricting it significantly. Even as you come around past Sigona's where it's improved if Sigona's pulls their stuff back the way they've seemed to have done but even then, it just feels to me that you've – you're being a little bit too aggressive with the size of your outdoor seating area. I think it needs to be reduced a little bit somehow by the entrance, by the sidewalk that's pinched and even internally in the mall. My other concern, I don't know how to address this, is the addition of what we called the lost arched last time, the design of that as proposed. I understand is not part of this application but it doesn't seem to me to be a very good compromise yet. It's 50 percent of one and 50 percent of the other which is not 100 percent of anything right now. So, I don't know when we can see if we can work on that but the materials aren't right yet. So, those are my comments, thank you.

Chair Furth: So, Peter the constriction points and the service entry façade and what else did I miss on your concerns?

Vice Chair Baltay: Well the constriction points and then the general nature of the front entrance. I support David's concerns about that.

Chair Furth: Tight, yeah. Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Oh, and I would like to say I support Alex's concern about the Sign Enhancement and cannot – I cannot support a Sign Exception here. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Well, starting with the most recently mentioned item I don't support a Sign Exception either. We've had a lot of tenants who have complied with it, I'm sure all of them would have been happy with a

bigger sign, and I don't think it's appropriate to – I don't think we can make the findings for an exception in this case. So, I would recommend against that. I think it's a really attractive building, I think it's going to take a frontage in an area of the shopping center which has, of course, looked quite sad ever since Max's Opera Café left and it didn't look that great from this side even when the Opera Café was there. So, this is a lovely building and will look a lot better. Having said that I think the patios are too big, I think that they have constricted the sidewalks to the point where they're not functioning properly, and they need to be pulled back. First of all, in the – I think it was the upper left-hand corner on these drawings that's – they need to be pulled back in so that there's a wider – either the sidewalk goes out or the building comes in the parking...

Vice Chair Baltay: It has to be bigger (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Whatever it is, it needs to hit at least 8-feet on that side to meet reasonable standards for people to go by. I also think that we have it overly constricted on the market area side. I don't know what the appropriate dimension is there. I can sort of see how you shortened the outdoor structure and these are structures. These are not just patios, it's not just differently treated paving, and these are very attractive, highly desirable eating areas, and they are used enthusiastically all over the shopping center. We had the same issue over by Anthropology. We ended up pushing that one back too, to allow enough pedestrian circulation through there, pedestrian stroller, whatever, so I think both of those need a bit more space. I very much appreciate the more accurate site plan. I differ to my colleagues, my professional colleagues, on their – they're the professionals, I'm not – on the width to – the width – the necessary width for the entrance from the parking lot to the building. It does look too crowded. I agree it probably should be a double door. I don't know how you do that but it's just not going to work the way people operate in real life. This is a very nice climate, people hang around doors, and then I will get back to my obsession which where am I going to sit down as I make my way from American Girl to Pacific Catch? I know we had a long discussion with the – by the way the applicant here, the property owner is Stanford University and the landlord for everybody is Simon and this is not simply a Pacific Catch application. This is an application for new use in an integrated area. I went by – I've done a lot of – a couple of field trips to see how Shake Shack is coming out and how the woodwork is holding up.

Vice Chair Baltay: So far so good.

Chair Furth: So far so good and I look at the benches that were installed on the diagonal walkway heading towards the main buildings and they're well used and they're attractive and they stop about 80-feet short of the corner. I see people sitting on the curb and I do not understand and I actually would like to hear from the applicant on this, from Simon on this. Why not more benches? Why not more places to sit when there's an obvious need for it and good spaces for it? Why – I would like to, if my colleagues support me, ask for more – require more seating along this area. It doesn't have to be right in front of Pacific Catch but it needs to be somewhere on that stretch because the demand is there and why not provide it? I'm dumbfounded because you're very customer oriented operated. So, I would not support the sign applications, I would support pulling back the patios, I would support a wider entry, and I would support benches. At least one, probably two that did not require you to buy a drink to use them along that frontage and I do agree that the effort to figure out a good solution to that service entry still hasn't made it. It's a complicated wall and I suspect there is a design solution that would suffice but this isn't it. So, does anybody want to make a motion or have further discussion or ask any questions of anybody?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to bounce to my colleagues an idea. I don't want to be designing this but if we were to establish say a 10-foot requirement for the sidewalk circulation, just splitting the difference with Alex's number and say that they just have to meet that number. Can we push this along if they come back on a subcommittee meeting at 10-foot clearance everywhere?

Chair Furth: Oh, I would be in favor of a subcommittee; 10-feet's fine with me.

Vice Chair Baltay: Would you agree (crosstalk) with that Alex? You're – this would – there'd be a lot of design involved to get that clearance.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may just offer, along California Avenue and University when we're talking about cafes on the public sidewalk, 8-feet would be the normal clearance that Public Works would require in those public instances.

Chair Furth: And I will say that one of the – it's crowded and one of the things that I think distinguishes the shopping center use is lots more strollers.

Board Member Hirsch: Is that 8-feet clear or does that also include other street furniture; trees or whatever within that dimension?

Ms. Gerhardt: That is 8-feet clear so yes, not including trees or anything else.

Vice Chair Baltay: Or maybe we can hear from the applicant what they might suggest through the Chair?

Chair Furth: Would the applicant like to comment?

Mr. Fitzgerald: When we left the last hearing, it was certainly about circulation and that was definitely the focus. There's wasn't a big push at that last hearing to look at the actual scale or size of these patios but in looking at the plan I think we're down to three pinch points if you will where we don't meet that 8-feet.

Chair Furth: Could you put up the other drawing Sam? Thanks.

Mr. Fitzgerald: So, starting at the top of the page it appears that that would fall under that threshold of 8-feet. So, if we could work with Staff to address that corner and widen that to the minimum of 8-feet, I think we would take care of that portion. The main entrance, we want the single door, we want the design in place that we have with that. With the double doors, that just offers a whole other design factor or operational thing that we don't desire but to your point, we also have a beautiful existing tree that we've planned around from day one. Never proposing to relocate it or remove it because it is a great feature. It's part of the center and it's full grown and everything else. Having said that, while we've improved the circulation to get to our front door, again, potentially we could work with Staff to just flare those corners of those patio entries and actually have chamfer corners. Make an adjustment to the seating and have good flow right into the store.

Chair Furth: So, as the layperson here, chamfering means you'd put another – you'd cut the corner, right?

Mr. Fitzgerald: Correct and I think that really addresses...

Chair Furth: Same as in furniture?

Mr. Fitzgerald: Correct and it just really would address the three pinch points that are being discussed today. You can see as you'd wrap the corner with a pretty sizeable improvement to remove the concrete, there's some good money being spent here to fix this corner if you will, and to maintain the 8-feet proposed. Simon is on board with us relocating some of their lights so that when you do make that pass, you're not in and out of patio chairs or tables. It's a completely uninterrupted flow from that point on into the rest of the shop. So, I think with those three adjustments I don't where maybe we...

Chair Furth: Ok, so the first adjustment would be getting to 8-feet in the upper...

Mr. Fitzgerald: Correct.

Chair Furth: ...left hand corner, the second would be chamfering the entry and what's the third one?

Mr. Fitzgerald: No, no those two chamfers at that location.

Chair Furth: Ok.

Mr. Fitzgerald: See so those two spots.

Chair Furth: You're right in terms of cost, I understand, thanks.

Vice Chair Baltay: There's still the question of the fire hydrant in the sidewalk that you're reducing the width next to that and you still have over by the Sigona's side. It says 7-foot 6 even with the relocated light pole. I'm afraid I'm not – to my colleagues – hearing an enormous amount of enthusiasm to address our concerns and maybe this just needs to come back as a redesign instead. I'm trying to work with you but I'm not hearing you working with us...

Mr. Fitzgerald: No, absolutely...

Vice Chair Baltay: ... to really address what we're doing.

Mr. Fitzgerald: ...and I'll tell you...

Vice Chair Baltay: I don't want to discuss it with you anymore.

Chair Furth: Any other questions of the applicant or comment? Ok, let's – thank you. So, I have on my notes from people's areas of concern the design of the service access, the accessibility of the main entry, the sidewalk constriction in the upper left-hand corner, the circulation – oh, I have a question for Staff. So, in terms of the tree, the existing tree which I'm sure nobody supports moving right? I presume none of us support moving? Ok. What is the tree well situation there? What's the foot experience along there? Is there a cover or how does it work?

Mr. Gutierrez: From what I recall there's no cover. There's just little, I believe, lights that up light it but there's no cover. It's a circular tree well and then around it there's a little bit of dirt that is pretty close to level.

Chair Furth: That seems like a bad idea to me. What else have I left out here of our summary of concerns? Ok, and I care about seating along that wall. Alright – along that frontage. Was there something adjacent?

Mr. Smith: There is a cover around that tree currently.

Chair Furth: There is?

Mr. Smith: Yes.

Chair Furth: Ok.

Vice Chair Baltay: Can I try again with the Board? Could we try to come to some just minimum clear width required for circulation issues so that they can come back on a subcommittee?

Chair Furth: I think it would be great to come back on a subcommittee.

Vice Chair Baltay: If we say 8-feet minimum clear width everywhere, that means between fire hydrants and light poles and trees. Does that address the concerns about circulation?

Chair Furth: It addresses mine. If you – if my more experienced colleagues think that works on the Sigona side.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, it's a compromise. I had suggested 10 but 8 seems to be the City standard as much we have something.

Chair Furth: Ok.

Vice Chair Baltay: Does Staff feel that's something that can be reviewed in house?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yeah, we could review that, yes, I believe.

Chair Furth: I do appreciate the reconfiguration of the sidewalk; I think that will be a big improvement.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, yeah, they have the option of reconfiguring the sidewalk too. It's not – something has to change just so that the width is appropriate. We like the design of the building it seems so David, does that address your concerns about the front entry thought because it's not...

Chair Furth: The chamfering?

Vice Chair Baltay: It would bigger because of the clearance from the tree but otherwise...

Board Member Hirsch: I think there's going to be an awful lot of in and out movement into this restaurant and I would still prefer they provide a double door at the entry. I just think this inaudible large, large restaurant and...

Vice Chair Baltay: Do you think we could give them a minimum...

Board Member Hirsch: ... so I would widen the actual entry to allow for a double door unless they can squeeze it into the opening that are presently there.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think you have me on board with you as far as making the area wider but I'm uncomfortable stipulating what kind of door they have to have. It seems to me that's a chose they can make.

Chair Furth: I figure that their expertise on the operation of their own restaurant is superior to ours and if they think a single door works well for their operation, I differ to them.

Mr. Smith: Again, that width is 8-feet.

Chair Furth: I'm more concerned about the fact – I believe the fact that there's going to be lots of people outside that door.

Vice Chair Baltay: But are we comfortable saying it needs to be a 12-foot width outside the entry...

Board Member Hirsch: I would be comfortable with that.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... instead of 8-feet?

Chair Furth: I'd support that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Again, we're really designing the thing here but we want to get you guys on your way and we're looking for some way to meet everybody's concerns a little bit. Alex, what do you...?

Chair Furth: You happy?

Board Member Lew: Ok, I would agree with David. When I look at the elevation of the entry, the single-entry door, between two patios, covered patios, it's not just – if it where – the patios weren't covered then it would seem more open.

Chair Furth: Or you could step to the side.

Board Member Lew: Right and so I think David's right about that. I'm willing to give on that if they're going to chamfer the patios.

Chair Furth: So, Alex...

Board Member Lew: I'm willing to meet halfway.

Chair Furth: Excuse me, Alex, are you saying that you would also support a double door? You prefer a double door (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Board Member Lew: I don't want to say a double door; I'm just saying it looks narrow.

Chair Furth: It's too constricted.

Board Member Lew: It's narrow and it's constricted by the covered patio. It doesn't – it looks like to me that looks like a side door; it doesn't look like an entry door.

Chair Furth: That's my biggest problem is it doesn't look like an entry.

Board Member Lew: But I do like the overall effect of the building with the indoor/outdoor effect and the garage -- the roll-up garage doors. In a way, the whole thing is an entrance so I'm willing to compromise on that.

Chair Furth: Does anybody agree with me that we need seating on that side?

Board Member Hirsch: I agree.

Chair Furth: David agrees.

Vice Chair Baltay: Oh sure, I agree with that, that's fine to request as a subcommittee item.

Mr. Smith: And we can address that with Simon as far as placing additional shopping center seating along – between (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: That's all I'm asking, thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: But that seating would not be able to impede on the clear width we're talking about.

Mr. Smith: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: In that 8-foot, I want to clear, is really clear width. It's not two 4-foot spaces.

Mr. Smith: Correct, this would be just on the opposite side of that bar patio. There would be some additional shopping center benches placed there as well so that the customers could then use the benches on both sides of the restaurant as seating area.

Chair Furth: Every time you have a new popular restaurant this is a big issue. I'm assuming this will be a new popular restaurant.

Mr. Smith: Yes.

[Unknown Male:] [off mic] We'll study that along with...

MOTION

Vice Chair Baltay: Ok, so I'd like to make a motion that we approve this project subject to the following revisions being made and coming back to our subcommittee for a final review. The first being that there be a minimum clear width of 8-feet on all the public sidewalks or all the sidewalks around the exterior of the outdoor seating areas. Secondly, that additional benches be placed let's say within 20-feet of the front entrance?

Chair Furth: (inaudible – off mic)

Vice Chair Baltay: Ok so additional benches be placed outdoors near the front of the entrance to the restaurant. Did I miss anything?

Chair Furth: Yeah, you're going to chamfer – you're going to do something about the entry.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I think that the 8-foot – meeting that 8-foot is what requires that.

Chair Furth: Oh, I thought we were going to chamfer the corners or something to widen the entry to the front door.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I was – in order to go 8-feet away from that tree...

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, so Staff (crosstalk)

Mr. Smith: Well and then that will likely be a result of us going back...(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: Ok fine.

Mr. Smith: ... to retain that 8-foot clearance.

Vice Chair Baltay: To clarify, at the tree, I would measure the 8-feet from the edge of the circular opening in the sidewalk, not just the trunk of the tree. Someplace where people can walk...

Mr. Smith: Understood.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... and we're looking for an honest effort to meet that clearance requirement. I think that will require chamfering or something at the front entrance...

Chair Furth: Fine.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... and giving them some design choice. Those were...

Chair Furth: And you recommend denial of the request for Sign Exception.

Vice Chair Baltay: And I recommend that we recommend denial of the Sign Exception request.

SECOND

Board Member Hirsch: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: Motion by Board Member Baltay – Vice Chair Baltay, second by Board Member Hirsch. Any further discussion? All those in favor say aye? All those opposed no? Hearing none, it passes 4 nothing. Congratulations, we look forward to seeing the project.

MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON ABSENT

Chair Furth: Who would like to serve on that subcommittee? We'll appoint it right now. Don't all leap up at once. David?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll do it.

Chair Furth: Peter and David, thank you.

Mr. Smith: Would that be a date certain subcommittee or...?

Chair Furth: It's whenever you're ready to come back with Staff. They don't -- that goes on our agenda but it's -- that's the only notice.

Mr. Smith: Thank you.

Chair Furth: You're welcome, thank you. We're going to take a 5-minute break while Staff sets up so we'll be back at 9:45.

[The Board took a short break]

Chair Furth: We're back in session. I forgot one thing in the previous matter -- hearing matter which won't change the results at all. I had asked -- I expressed my concern before about having conspicuous consumption of natural gases by having an outdoor fireplace in the patio. I went back and reread the Resolution 9649 of the City of Palo Alto about getting carbon-neutral gas supply and we are still in the era in which we are being carbon neutral with respect to natural gas by buying offsets. We are giving up our electric or gas ranges later in the future. So, I still think we have an interesting ethical and survival question about whether conspicuous consumption of natural gas is a good idea when we're trying to reduce that. It's sort of like do you turn off the fountains during a drought or do you leave them on because everybody should have the chance to look at that one little bit of water? I don't know but I decided it wasn't something that could be used -- should be used right now to recommend against approval of a project.

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 565 Hamilton Avenue [18PLN-00313]:** Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of Existing Structures and the Construction of a Mixed-Use Building Containing 19 Rental Apartments and up to 7,450 Square Feet of Office Space. Three Existing Parcels will be Merged. A Variance is Requested to Allow Protrusion of Roof Eaves and First Floor Canopy Into the Hamilton Avenue Special Setback. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15332. Zoning District: CD-C(P) and RM-40 (Downtown Commercial and Residential Multi-Family). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us

Chair Furth: Alright, as soon as I find my agenda Packet, our next hearing item is a public hearing, quasi-judicial one on 565 Hamilton Avenue. It's consideration of a Major Architectural Review to allow demolition of existing structures and the construction of a mixed-use building containing 19 rental apartments and up to 7,450-square feet of office space. Three existing parcels will be merged, a Variance is requested to allow protrusion of roof eaves and first-floor canopy into the Hamilton Avenue special set back, and the environmental assessment is that this project is categorically exempted from the provisions of CEQA per Guideline 153232. The zoning is CD which is Commercial Downtown, CP that's a pedestrian overlay so a portion of its commercial and the rest of it is RM-40; Residential Multi-Family. The planner is Sheldon Ah Sing. Before we turn to Sheldon the property owners are Althea and Eric Andersen and Mark Frapwell, the architect is Aidlin Darling Design, and first of all are there any disclosures to be made either of visits to the site or conversations outside of this body which looked at this in a preliminary basis before. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site yesterday.

Vice Chair Baltay: I visited the site early this week.

Board Member Hirsch: I've visited the site a couple of times now.

Chair Furth: And I have as well. If we could have the Staff report, please?

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing, Project Planner: Yes, thank you. Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner. I do have a presentation for you this morning. The applicant is also here with their presentation. As described in the introduction the project is a formal review of development of nearly 30,000-square feet mixed-use building on a half-acre size area and there will be three parcels that will be ultimately merged. However, the zoning districts would remain so there's to be split zoning on the single parcel. It is at the corner of Hamilton Avenue and Webster Street. It's in an area that transitions from the commercial area into residential. The areas characterized by some taller buildings that have been built in recent times. There are also some a sprinkle of smaller building such the ones that are on the site. Then across the street is the religious facility building that's very dynamic and expressive. So, this project did receive the benefit of a preliminary ARB on May 3rd in 2018. So the comments at that time, and that is the picture of the previous submittal, to focus the building outward to address the street, to augment the landscaping on the ground, to provide a more urban and open connection to the street for ground-level residential units along Webster by removing some of those wood screens, study the massing to create a greater different orientation between the office and residential spaces, to break up the horizontal massing by adding more variation, look at using a warmer tone and color that's more indicative of Palo Alto, and to aim to provide more parking on the site. So that is what's being proposed here and also to strive to be a good neighbor to the building at 530 Webster. This is sort of like a comparison of the before and after along Hamilton Avenue. You can see that the colors are more warm, they've added more landscaping to the bottom, and I have more pictures of close-ups and renders as well as the applicate will go into more detail. Then you have the Webster Street elevation and changes there. You can see how the massing relates to the adjacent buildings. For the project summary, you have a three-story mixed-use project, 40-feet is the height limit and that's what they're hitting up against. There is an offset in the Floor Area Ratio. There are two zoning districts so in this case – I have a separate slide on this but just for the sake of having a better site plan that there is some space that's offset such as circulation and utility area, trash area. I guess I have another slide that goes into detail about that. There are nine existing dwelling units on the site and with implementation of the project there will be a net of ten additional units and these are rental units. So, because the project does provide and proposal rental units to fulfill the City's affordable housing requirements, the developer will need to pay an impact fee. So, there's no on-site affordable unit that's being proposed. The project does propose to have parking in the basement as suggested last time. They did add mechanical parking so of the 55 spaces that are proposed, 50 of those are within the mechanical lifts and they have five that are standard spaces and that meets the code. However, with that the requirement and based on the current code, 67 spaces are required for the projects. That's both for the commercial and the residential. There's a new code that's going to be in effect that reduces that amount to 60 spaces so the reduction that they're proposing now is 18 percent and that request would go down to 8 percent. How they're meeting that is through a joint use reduction, so with the commercial uses and residential uses they have offset in peak demand times for parking. Commercial is typical during the day, they don't operate at night, residential is more at nighttime. So, as it turns out the actual peak demand is around 10:00 am in the morning and that amount would be 52 parking spaces. The project provides 55 parking spaces. The project also proposed a pretty robust Transportation Demand Management Plan that demonstrates that joint-use parking would work on the site. The project also requires – also requests a Variance as I said and I have a separate slide for that for the special set back. So, for the FAR I thought this was probably one of the better exhibits to use just because it was fairly simple but as I show here there's two – there's a commercial district and then there's the RM district and I have the zoning line that goes through there. There are other circulation areas that are being shared and offset. The offset between the commercial district site and the residential site is 816-square feet. So, the commercial site is lower by 816-square feet and the residential side is higher by 816-square feet. As there is – there you can see our – the utility rooms, trash rooms. If you had to separate those you really create a lot of inefficiencies to have separate utilities that include – for an entire site includes the parking

management and the electrical because there's – the site is in a flood zone. So, if you had those split up it's just not really great, it's not efficient for the City, it's not efficient for the garbage hauler to pick things up. So, we thought that it was ok to arrange the FAR, Floor Area, in that way. Regarding the Variance, there are – it's a 17-foot special setback and as described in other meetings there's not a real reason for this special setback. Aside we're thinking maybe it's for allocations of future right of way for turn lanes or more landscaping, utilities, but in this case, the 17-foot setback does exist in this area. The applicant proposed to protrude into that on – with several occasions here. The two big ones would be with the canopy that's over the entry of the ground floor for the commercial and the residential on Hamilton as well as the roof eaves for the site. There are other protrusions such as there's a concrete fin wall, there are also some window frames, Staff wasn't really supportive of those elements. I think the key here and what makes sense are the canopies and the roof eave and those two are things that we think we can support for the site for the Variance.

Chair Furth: Excuse me, did you say you could not support the other ones? I couldn't hear what you were saying.

Mr. Ah Sing: Could not.

Chair Furth: Thank you,

Mr. Ah Sing: Right, could not support like the concrete fin as well as the protrusions for the window frames but the canopy and the eaves, those make sense for Staff. Here's a cross section of you have the basement and how the site would be arranged. You have I think about 12-foot plates – 13-foot plates for the building and the mechanical lifts would be able to handle sport utility vehicles. Not the largest of vans, not the full-size ones necessarily but those are – would be consistent with the code. Then just showing some renderings here about the project and how they meet some of the recommendations from the Board previously about adding some landscaping along the streetscape and removing the wood screens. The applicant will go more into their objectives and design objectives for the site. Here's a shot from that intersection and in conclusion we believe that the project responses to the preliminary ARB comments. We want to receive feedback on this proposal as stated, portions of the Variance request are acceptable but not all of them and we acknowledge that there will be a Zoning Code update that will change the parking requirement so just keep that in mind. So, for a recommended motion we do want you to consider the proposed project and provide feedback on the project design to Staff and applicant and continue the item to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: And remind us or tell us why you want it continued rather than having a recommendation? Because you're waiting for the zone change or what?

Mr. Ah Sing: I don't know if it's that really because – the request is either 18 percent which is under the 20 percent maximum for the parking. It does bring it down to 8 percent but we just – we don't have the findings in the one..

Chair Furth: We're not ready to go.

Mr. Ah Sing: So, you know that's – we're kind of thinking about it but we don't have the findings before you today to make that recommendation.

Chair Furth: Got it, thank you. Alright, any questions of Staff before we hear from the applicant? The applicant, please? You'll have 10-minutes when we get you set up. If you could spell your name, your organization's name for the transcriber if that's necessary.

Ms. Roslyn Cole: Sure, my name is Roslyn Cole with Aidlin Darling Design. [spells name] Thank you, yes, please. Ok, great. I'll keep my timer, make sure I'm good. Great, good morning. As I mentioned I'm Roslyn Cole with Aidllin Darling Design and we're the architects for this project. I'm pleased to be back here again presenting this to you. We have made a number of changes and we think they're all for the

better. As Sheldon has mentioned the project is at the corner of Hamilton Avenue and Webster Street, it's at a point of transition between the commercial businesses along Hamilton and then the adjacent residential neighborhood. It's really a nexus where there's a change in character and height and then scale. This project is really trying to mitigate between all those pieces. There are a number of constraints that we worked with for the design of this project. Firstly, the 17-foot setback along Hamilton. Our neighboring building to our west is 10-feet forward of us which creates a very awkward transition at that location but we're working to that 17-foot setback. We have a 0 to 16-foot setback along Webster but our adjacent neighbor at 530 Webster is set 20-feet back. So, we set a constraint for ourselves at matching them and being at that 20-foot setback to be respectful. Because of the nature of Hamilton Avenue, the request was to place the driveway on Webster so we've located it to (inaudible) existing utilities along that street. Then lastly, we have five mature Redwood Trees on the adjacent lot in the top left corner; the northwest side. So, we need to set our building back to provide enough space for the root growth and protect those trees. So, the design that we have come up with works to those constraints and creates an open courtyard building that is – that is rung by residential spaces and the offices. It provides a green center to the heart of the building. Rather than providing individual balconies for use as a gesture to outdoor living, we chose to aggregate the area into a more meaningful and useable space such as the central courtyard and the roof terrace. We have a number of project goals for this project that I just want to repeat briefly. To allow for the seamless transition between the commercial and residential neighbors, to integrate into the existing neighborhood and respect the privacy at 530 Webster, to enhance the existing nature environment and also provide new opportunities for connecting with nature, to construct a building with a strong sense of permanence and timelessness and use materials that are textured, honest, and natural in color. As you can see this was our preliminary ARB design, we came to you last May and received some very valuable feedback. We have changed the design significantly. We're redesigned with your comments in mind and we think that it is a much better building for it. We feel like the building is nuances in its approach to the two streets and it just works well with the environment. I'd like to walk through a series of slides that represent each of the individual items we heard from you and how we responded and do this quickly. So, we heard from you to request to break up the horizontality, the massing and reduce the wrapper like effect of the building. So, we redesigned the facades by using floor to ceiling glazing and then partnered with ribbed panels at the upper two floors to create a vertical rhythm across the façade. The metal panel at the stair here basically is a counterpoint to the metal frame at the office which provides an additional visual relief. Then double height glazing that wraps the corner from Hamilton to Webster creates a welcoming and open corner. The three-stories are still clearly legible with our concrete base, the horizontal banding at the floor lines and a strong roof expression. We were asked to increase the differentiation between the office and the residential spaces and we've done so by adding a metal surround and a deeper canopy to clearly delineate the office space from the residential. You had noted the awkward offset between our 17-foot setback and our neighbor and suggested that we look at bridging that gap. So, we've done so by extending the canopy and the roof eaves to visually soften that transition and this is why we are asking for a Variance for these pieces to really try to resolve the awkwardness at the intersection here. In order to augment the landscape design to be more generous to the street, we have provided a great deal of layered and extensive landscaping throughout the project. We basically have 93 percent by area of drought tolerant and native species and we're increasing the mature tree canopy by over 5,000-square feet. Lauren Ewald of Fletcher Studio, the landscape architect, is here today and she can answer any questions you have about the landscape design. In order to provide a more transparent view in the courtyard from the street, at the time it had been a classy lobby, we pulled the lobby away from the center of the space and created a clearly visual opening into the courtyard. In order to be a good neighbor to our neighbor at 530 Webster, we have amused the floor to ceiling glazing and the expression of the floor line to reduce – as well as the roof terrace which was apparent in our last submission – to decrease the apparent mass of the building as it comes to our neighbor. We've also studied the windows along the north side and looked at ways to make sure that we retain the visual privacy between the two buildings. We also have a privacy fence and a landscape buffer that benefit both properties. There was a suggestion that we try to activate the corner more and provide a stronger connection to the street for the residential units on Webster. So, we've done so by pulling the lobby away from the center and towards the east. We've also created a covered terrace at the corner which as stepped terraces that cascade down to the corner at Hamilton and Webster. Then we have a similar terrace, stepped terraces, at the

two residences that are clearly visible. There are private but visually open patios for the residential uses. We're then augmenting this by adding public art within the entry terrace here with a viewing bench that basically welcomes the public to the corner. We think we've created a much more urban condition at this important corner. You had asked us to look at increasing our parking and we have work with the City to be able to use mechanical lifts for this space and for this project. So, we have been able to increase our parking count from 39 to 55 stalls. The plans themselves haven't changed significantly with the exception of the move of the lobby over to create the open courtyard. We still have our Redwood grove garden in the upper corner to protect the roots of the trees and provide additional outdoor space. Really the heart of this project is the central courtyard which provides that biophilic space that benefits the residents and the users as well as the community who now have a direct visual access into the space. As we move up the office and the residential spaces stack around that central courtyard and then as you get to the third floor it's all residential units ringing the courtyard. Then with our open terrace towards Webster Street which really helps reduce the mass along the side and provide that additional amenity for the occupants. The materials, as shown in this precedent, are similar to the ones that we had presented to you last spring. We still are proposing to use board formed concert, wood soffits, and trellis elements. A metal brise soleil at the office and the fiber cement board panels. However, the fiber cement board panels have changed significantly and we have looked at using a warmer color so it's the warmer of these two colors and a material that has a ribbed texture. This ribbed texture is something that provides both kind of just a textural quality at the human scale but it also provides a shadow effect through the day as shown here. We think this brings kind of a subtle, dynamic façade – dynamic quality to the project. So lastly just to walk through these renderings quickly, you see the elevation here with the more vertical expression and the clear designation of the office. The open terrace and the open terraces at the residential level in the corner, that's a view from Hamilton Avenue and how we fit within the neighboring environment; the church to the side and how we're knitting ourselves to those heights. Along Webster and how we are working to the existing building at 530 Webster Street with the open terrace. A view into the courtyard that's not fully visually open and then lastly a view from the corner where you see the lush landscaping within the two setbacks, the inviting entrance, and then the glazing opening above. With that, I look forward to your comments.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Does anybody have any questions of the applicant's architect? Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: Questions for Staff.

Chair Furth: Any questions for Staff?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. They're proposing mechanical parking lifts in the basement and yet this is an area within the flood zone. Those lifts would be below the base flood elevation, is that permitted?

Mr. Ah Sing: We did work with Public Works regarding this issue and everything is to their satisfaction.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: I have five speaker cards. The first speaker is Jeff Levinsky to be followed by Kate Crane. You'll have 3-minutes once you're set up.

Mr. Jeff Levinsky: Thank you. Good morning, Board Members. It's Jeff [spells name], I'd like to talk about the parking issues. For a mixed-use parking exemption, there's supposed to be a specific kind of parking study done but I didn't find that in the materials available to the public. Among – they're asking for the mixed-use parking, these are going to be expensive residences and the occupants are certainly going to have cars but they're also touting here a TDM that's going to tell people they don't need to drive to work because they can use transit, bike, and walk. So that means that more cars will stay at the building during the day from the residents because they're not moving their cars. So, the parking study ought to reflect that and of course, we don't have the parking study to even look at that. It's also going to rely heavily on the stacked parking as you've heard. A Palo Alto resident whose building on El Camino uses stacked parking came to the last Planning Commission meeting and described in horrible detail the

problems that she and her neighbors have. The stacking units break down frequently, it takes days to get the parts from Europe, peoples cars get stuck in the unit making it impossible for them to get to work or to school, if you have small children you have to -- you can't use the stacker units basically because you can't have the kid in the car when you go into the unit but you can't leave the kid unattended next to the car. All of that should be reflected in the parking study, how's this going to work? The City approved a mixed-use permit over at 636 Waverley, a building that also has offices on the lower floors and residences above. I checked this morning; it took literally seconds to find that someone in that building who works there got a residential parking permit so obviously that building is not properly parked. The parking study for this building ought to explain why our previous parking studies turned out to be wrong. This project also proposes to unbundle parking which raises another concern. Over at 101 Lytton, there's the Chamber of Commerce and it has -- there's service and underground parking but the president of the Chamber was spotted parking her car in the neighborhood. When asked why she said well, it was the parking fee charged by the landlord was too high. So, unbundling let's the owners earn more by charging extra rent for their parking but that encourages people in the building to park elsewhere. That too should be in the parking study, how's that going to work? He's a simple suggestion, why not add a condition to the TDM or to the project overall that the residents and the workers in this building will not be able to get parking permits? They're not paying into the Assessment District so they're not entitled for that reason and that way we can see if the owner really believes that the parking in this building will be adequate for the building. I also hope you'll comment on the appearance of the building which to me still looks cold and soulless and not compliant with the character of other buildings that we have in that area. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Levinsky. Kate Crane to be followed by Roberta Ahlquist.

Ms. Kate Crane: Hi there, I'm Kate Crane [spells name]. Palo Alto desperately needs affordable housing, this is not going to be affordable housing. I'm wondering why the City Council continues to approve projects like this? This is clearly out of step with the Comprehensive Plan. Where is the accountability? I feel like we're saying one thing and continuing to approve projects where we're saying one thing and doing another. Why is 7,400-square feet of office space included in this project? There was a ballot initiative that got 3,000 signatures, the City clearly -- the citizens, people who live here, clearly do not want more office space and so much office space is included here. The current structures, these three little buildings, are low scale. I hear the designers talking about this being generous and keeping -- it looks to me like its towering over the existing structures and I agree with the previous speaker who said this looks kind of cold and soulless. I completely agree with that. It's so close to the street, why is it allowed to be so close to the curb? I hear that they made an improvement but to me, it does not seem like it's far enough back from the street. One of the current buildings at least is historic, why is that just allowed to be knocked down? I don't know if that's been addressed already. Why is there no environmental impact? Am I misunderstanding something? Why are they exempted from an Environmental Impact Study? There's a petition, just in the past week, that's gotten 140 signatures. I couldn't find contact information for this Council -- for this Board. I would love to share that. There are many comments from people who live in Palo Alto expressing opposing. I can read one or two. Carol Kaparsky [phonetics] says, "It's absolutely wrong and against PA's Comprehensive Plan to replace a dozen or more affordable housing units with luxury apartments and office space. We need affordable housing; we do not need more office space." Karen Uork [phonetics] says, "When will someone stop the destruction in Palo Alto and causing people to leave just so the wealthy can become more greedy and pack as many people in here as possible." Thank you for your time.

Chair Furth: Roberta Ahlquist to be followed by Marie-Louise Starling-Bell.

Ms. Roberta Ahlquist: [spells name] I'm representing the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom Low Income Housing Committee and I'm a neighbor in this -- a block away from this very overdeveloped proposal. Many neighbors are going to be impacted by this. The scale and design does not fit within the neighborhood but I want to address parking first. If you look at the City Code, A-01, it doesn't provide enough parking; 67 plus parking units are needed. It's a 13.4 percent reduction to this, only 55 parking spaces; why? How will the mechanized parking work? The TDM parking reduction of

three spaces plus nine, 50 of 55 mechanized car park places under the area of A-2.0 and A-5.6. The below-grade garage levels headroom is 15-feet less before slab. You – how will mechanized parking work there? The street parking is now significantly tight day and night. The church doesn't have enough parking, the residents around don't have enough parking. How many workers are going to be in the office space and why are we having office space? Why not 7,400-square feet of below-market housing? The scale and design of this and the elevation are not compatible. It says it's three stories but it's higher than the three-story building on Hamilton across the street from it. It's higher than – much higher than the two-story building which is not at all like this building in character and structure. It's totally out of context. It sounds more like the proportion character -- oh, more than 100 wide glass windows, floor to ceiling; 130-foot overhang with eave lines. They're out of context with our neighborhood. It's a modernist building in a neighborhood that has peak traditional wood frame buildings with small windows, not floor to ceiling. This is horizontal, big giant windows going across it. This is very out of context in character. We hope that you will ask them to reconsider this building. They're also going to take down 50-foot trees, Magnolia trees, that have been there forever. Why is there no environmental review? In the first proposal, they talked about it as being condos, now they're talking about it as being rentals. Well, 14 low affordable rentals are going to go down if this project gets approved and that's going to be high-income housing and office space that we don't need. If you look around the downtown there are all kinds of signs saying office space for rent. Please reconsider this project. Also, why not put solar if you're going to be sustainable and put weeds and cactus and so on around the grounds? Why not solar? Thank you.

Chair Furth: Marie-Louise Starling-Bell to be followed by Mary Sylvester.

Ms. Marie-Louise Starling-Bell: (inaudible – off mic) spell my name, it's so long.

Chair Furth: We can wait.

Ms. Starling-Bell: [spells name] Thank you. So, I'm a resident at 530 Webster and I'm home a great deal so I know a lot about what goes on with traffic and it is a very sorry sight often. There is a street light, as I'm sure you know, in the corner of Webster and Hamilton. That street light happens to be a very long-time lasting light before it switches. Now that can be changed, I'm sure, however, the traffic on Webster is really difficult because we have so many deliveries from FedEx and UPS. We do have the post office as well but these trucks come and they stop and park double. I think they figured they can park wherever they like for how long they like because it's their job. Well, they hinder traffic very, very much. From this project description, I don't know if the garage is going to have its entrance and exit toward Webster or towards Hamilton. Either way, I can see it as a huge problem because that part of Webster between Hamilton and University already has traffic that goes into the parking garage. So, it has traffic coming out to Webster, it also exits to Cowper, that's true. This is a lot of traffic and I often see almost accidents there already because of trucks or vans parking and then people come out of the parking garage. So, I know I'm harping about this quite a bit but I think in a City in Palo Alto this is a very, very difficult thing. Anyway, beyond that, I wanted to only to quickly say that the space we're in on 530, I believe the building is just about 100-years old now. So, I much agree, I'm not necessarily against a modern building but I am against it in our neighborhood which it really doesn't fit. It's going to be straight across from the church and also from other buildings actually. So, it says sum up, maybe that says I am done.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much.

Ms. Starling-Bell: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Mary Sylvester.

Ms. Mary Sylvester: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Mary Sylvester and I'm a 40-year resident of Palo Alto. I'm here to speak primarily about the demolition of affordable housing at 565 Hamilton. I realize that is probably a bit outside your scope but there are some critical points I'd like to get on the record. I've spoken before at the PTC and City Council on behalf of renter protections for the last 18-months. As a community member, I was actively involved in trying to preserve 75 moderate-income

housing units at the President Hotel on University Avenue. Over 100 people were impacted by that eviction. It was a very diverse community of residents, many of whom have been public serving individuals. I know three teachers having worked in the school district for 17-years who were an elementary school teacher as well as a high school teacher here in Palo Alto and one private school teacher. Here we're spending a lot of time trying to develop local teacher housing and we've just lost housing for three teachers who have had to leave this community. Finding replacement housing for these individuals has been a nightmare. I've been in touch with them, many have had to leave Palo Alto. This has to be taken into account, particularly when our Comprehensive Plan calls for the retention of affordable housing. Before demolishing any further housing, we need replacement housing in place. When is enough, enough? When are we going to back up our words with action? Then as to a couple of the design features about the project and traffic. Specifically, as to traffic, I agree with Mr. Levinsky, we need a comprehensive traffic study for this project. I know that corner well having worked at Hamilton and University for many years. I no longer ride my bike downtown because of the parking in that area. We have a church at Webster and Hamilton which is a wonderful member of our community. They're an engaged member. They provide community child care, meeting space for non-profits, and that area is grossly under parked. Not only for the church, local residents, as well as people who work in the downtown business district. I'm not very concerned if the project calls for 67 parking spaces that we're not looking at reduced spaces; perhaps down to 60. Call me a Luddite but I am not one to use mechanized lifts. Maybe the residents or tenants will. If the new landlord is serious about really having an effective TDM, offer train and Lyft passes. The bike facility is a non sequitur. Most cyclists have their own bike tools and they can always find a corner to – in the garage. I don't think that should be touted as anything significant. Tree removal is a great concern and frankly, with this underground garage, I would like to see our wonderful groundwater non-profit, which is sponsoring a public forum next week on Wednesday, have a look at this project and study the impact on the aquifer. Thank you very much, I realize I went over.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anybody else wish to speak? The applicant has time to respond; 10-minutes.

Ms. Brandy Bridges: Hello, Brandy Bridges [spells name]. I'm Brandy Bridges with Wilson Meany and thank you to the Board for hearing our project today. Thank you to the members of the community who cared enough to show up and state their perspectives. It's all super valuable input and much appreciated. I think we've made a truly earnest effort to propose a project that we think will be beneficial to Palo Alto. We all know that there's a housing crisis in the Bay Area. I think one of the positive elements of this project is that it does increase the housing stock. There's a net gain of 10 units. We're not proposing penthouse apartments in Palo Alto, we're not proposing luxury for-sale condos. These are smaller units in a downtown area that are within walking distance of the Caltrain and we think that's the right kind of product that's appropriate for this market. The proposed units will replace three buildings and they are quite lovely to look at as you walk and stroll down the street. Unfortunately, they've outlived their useful life. We did have an assessment done of the property, there's foundation issues, other issues that really make the structures unsuitable for long-term, ongoing occupancy. I personally believe that as a community we can and show provide housing affordable to the lower or moderate – more moderate-income residents. It's essential, we need that and this project does contribute to that goal in accordance with the Municipal Code. We'll be paying a very large fee into the Affordable Housing Fund that will help provide the type of housing that's needed in a fashion. The project also – in terms of the trees, we did talk with the City about whether we should keep the trees or replace them. The City Arborist visited the site and they would prefer that we replace the trees because some of them are in poor condition due to damage done over the years as different utility work was done in the area. Also due to the lack of the soil volume available for the growth and so they prefer that we actually replace the trees and do so with a different species that's native to the area. In terms of parking, this project provides 55 parking stalls on site. That's a huge improvement over when we were here last year. We – your feedback was great and did work with the City to find a way to make the lifts function. Under the new ordinance effective May 2nd, 60 parking stalls will be required for the site but we did do a study, similar to the one that was mentioned that's been reviewed by the Transportation Department, that indicates that peak parking demand for the project is only 52 stalls. So, with the provision of 55, we're providing three more than peak parking demand and I think it's nice to have that kind of margin of protection there because

estimates are estimates. I think architecture is subjective. I would say that we are surrounded by buildings that are so different from each other. We have the little building in 530 Webster that's historic and just gorgeous. We have the – I can't quite remember how the planner phrased it but the unique architecture of the church and then on the other side kind of more modern structures with the office building adjacent. So, it's a really tricky corner but we've done our best to try to smooth that along and kind of bridge the gap between our different neighbors. In terms of the TDM Plan, we are proposing a TDM Plan. The TDM Plan does include some Caltrain passes and there is annual monitoring of the plan so we would be required to measure the trips to and fro each year to make sure that we are providing the 45 percent net trip production that's required. On the parking lifts, that came up several times, I think the attitudes towards parking lifts are shifting. Some people appreciate the protection that having their car up in a lift affords, some people aren't quite there yet, and those people likely would not choose to live at this property frankly. In terms of the lifts, we did opt to not use the overseas manufacturer that's commonly used in projects exactly for the reason stated by the member of the community. We chose to instead use a local provider. Most issues can be resolved within 1-hours because they're typically software issues. If there is an issue and someone's car is stuck, the company will reimburse -- as we're having a service plan, the company will reimburse \$50 for that resident to use a Lyft ride. So, I think that these – we've tried to be very thoughtful. I think the one piece of feedback that did not come up today or rather was kind of mentioned was the need to do extensive environmental analysis. Even though this project is an infill project, we have done extensive environmental analysis or rather I should say the City had done extensive environmental analysis. There was a traffic study and acoustic study, a noise study, and a historic study all done for this project, even though it's an infill exempted project, just to kind of check the boxes and make sure that we meet all the criteria. That study is all available online, I downloaded it myself earlier this week, and so I hope that information can be located by the public so they can become informed about the project. I think that with that I'd like to leave plenty of time for you all in case you have questions so thank you.

Chair Furth: I had one question which is really for the room as a whole. One of the questions that people have asked is why is this project not all residential? Could you take us through that analysis?

Mr. Bridges: So sure, I think that – when we first looked at the project, we said to ourselves gee, we know Palo Alto is not in favor of more office product so we ran the numbers this way, that way, the other way. With an all residential project, we would have to basically be for sale luxury condominiums and we think that a better project for Palo Alto was smaller rental units. The office does provide a bit of an economic engine to kind of help make that happen. The other reason is that the parcel is – has mixed-zoning so one portion is CD-C(P) and then the other portion is residential. So, we've tried to just stick to the zoning that's in accordance with the Comprehensive Plan and provide a project that exactly meets the requirement zone of the Zoning Ordinance and is kind of consistent with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations so I hope that's answering the question.

Chair Furth: Anybody else have any questions?

Ms. Bridges: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any questions of Staff before we start discussing this project? Ok, Peter, why don't you start?

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, yes. I think this is a handsome building. I think it will be an addition – a positive addition to the neighborhood and the community. I think it is different than the buildings around it but I find that acceptable and maybe even appropriate. This is sort of what's created Palo Alto over the years is good, high quality, interesting design that takes us into the next century and onward for the next generation so I support that. I also support the Variance application including the small concrete fin wall down in the front. I think that's a positive addition to the design and if the overhang is ok, that should be ok as well. I do feel that some of the housing units have less daylight and privacy than perhaps they should. Particularly Units Number One and Two, those are the two ground floors ones with the yards that open to the street. I'll grant you, we asked you not to have fenced enclosures there but what you have

now is going to make them very tough to live in. I don't know what the answer is but it's a common problem with residential development having ground floor units on a busy street. As you've heard from the community there's a lot of traffic and pedestrians on that road. Additional Units Number 15 and 16, upon the top, are the ones with really the only windows looking in on the open courtyard but they have, as I can read the plans, a fairly large roof overhang over them and pedestrian traffic in front. I think they're going to feel like a single-loaded motel room kind of situation and I would agree that you have some skylights in the back but there might be a way to refine the design of that. Lastly, as I'm looking at the plans carefully it seems to me you have 13-foot floor to floor height on both residential floors; 13-foot 2 on the second and 13-foot 1 on the third which probably translates to a ceiling height inside of close to 12-feet which I can understand as the architects is really desirable. It certainly feels nice but it does contribute to making the building feel taller and more out of character and if you could just reduce that some, I think that would be beneficial. Most residences don't need 13-foot floor to floor heights, especially for these smaller type apartments. Like you said they're not luxury condos so I think that's an issue to think about. With that I'd like to hear what my colleagues have to say, thank you.

Chair Furth: David.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm kind of looking for the elevation – sorry, looking for the elevation too – because I didn't really see that it was 13-feet high. That – coming from a Brown Stone in New York where maybe 10 or 11-feet is the height of the (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: Scoot a little closer, you have to be a little closer to the mic, David.

Board Member Hirsch: Ok. 13-feet, I agree feels high. I also want to start by saying I think it's a very handsome building and congratulate this Board for having pushed to change the original scheme to this one. I think it's a vast improvement over the earlier scheme. I really like the materials a lot and the textured feelings of the building and the landscape relationship to the street. In terms of the relationship to the neighborhood, maybe it's a bit unfortunate that we get this far away from the center of Hamilton and that it continues to develop as a mix of commercial and new residential but I think that's the way the City is going. Hamilton is very much of the character of this building, the newer buildings on Hamilton. I think it's very nice to have a corner building that really makes an incredible corner here and that it's quite so glassy and open at the top and a courtyard scheme all of which I think works to the advantage of the building. I have some other concerns though. I do not quite understand the patio next to the office wing. What's its purpose? Just to provide handicap access to the building or does it have some other reason for being? I had a thought that isn't really what we normally do is that maybe you could put some skylights in there and light some of the below-grade parking or whatever. It's a bit of a waste of space if it's just a minor entry into the building because the actual residential entry, after all, is at the corner of Hamilton and – what's the adjacent block here? And Webster, Hamilton, and Webster so that's where most people will come. They'll come either from the garage I assume, up through a staircase where they come to the street or however; be picked up on the street. That's the major entry to the building and I don't quite see the purpose except as a kind of decorative element; an opening to the center space. There's a couple of apartments that I think ought to be reconsidered and this isn't really what we do but the one that's next to the Redwoods courtyard in the back is a really badly planned unit. I would just ask you to consider how you could improve that. The actual light to the interior, which is more of a Building Department issue than ours, just isn't adequately planned. You're using windows that face a courtyard are over a kitchen which means that the 3-foot base is already taken up and what are you going to do? Have strip windows between the kitchen and the upper cabinets or no upper cabinets? It doesn't – to me, it doesn't work. On the ground floor maybe, you could switch some of the mechanicals to that corner and have a different unit at that corner. Those to me are kind of the runts of the litter and need some thinking but the rest of the apartments, of course, are beautifully planned. The exterior proportions are terrific I think and the choice of materials. I'm intrigued about the GFRC material. I've never seen one with ribs like this before so that's a new find since I've been working on buildings. I think it's an excellent possibility there to work with a vertical division more. It's more like a reflection of board and baton so there might be some historical connection there with wood construction. I don't see any area in this building for tenant storage and I'm looking forward to the possibility of there being less parking despite what many of the critics

here have said. At least enough to provide for some storage areas in the parking level. Let's see, you know I just think that this is also something unmentioned but this is a kind of a new socializing kind of a building here which I think is a great addition to the way in which housing should be designed where the tenants have a space where they can gather on the top. That hasn't been mentioned and I think it's a really great thing. I've again seen that on some rooftops in New York City where they use the roof for not just seeing the view but to socialize and I see – I would hope that would be a trend in housing. It becomes like a family affair and certainly good for this generation. So, all told we're not winding up at this point, I guess I'm allowed to say that it's a very nice building. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Ok I do want to take a high-level pass at this at some of the comments made by the public. So, I think the Council is aware that we have a housing issue, particularly an affordable housing issue. The City is working on – currently working on the North Ventura Plan which is the area near Fry's and El Camino and Page Mill Road and the City will be embarking on a Downtown Specific Plan. The primary focus of the two plans is to add housing. The City is aware that we are way behind on building affordable housing; way, way, way behind our regional housing needs. We're doing ok on market-rate housing but we are desperately behind that. So, I think the Council is paying attention to that and we are working on it. On the building, I think the – I think is a very handsome design and I think you're – the firm – the architect's firms work is very sophisticated. It may not necessarily show in the drawings at this point but I think we can see a re-indication on like the materials board and the level of details that the drawings have been provided that this is going to be a great project. You've done -- the streetscape perspectives that you've done are actually I think the best that I've ever seen and I've been on the Board for like 10-years and this is really very well done. I think it shows that your cornice line is matching with the neighbors across the street on Hamilton and as well the two-story glass is matching the design of the building next door. I think that's actually working really well. My only reservation on the massing is with the 530 Webster building and that is massing and also landscape. I was debating whether or not it needed to step down to meet 530 Webster and I think that I – but I do understand that you're trying to do the third-floor terrace. The third-floor terrace is looking towards the church so I've been sort of bouncing that back and forth in my mind. I think maybe it's just a landscaping issue and maybe the massing is fine. On the special setback, I will support the Variance that's at the discretion of the Planning Director. I think I would also support the fin. I think my understanding of the special setback is that the 7-feet is for road – for the actual road width. Many, many streets downtown have been widened 7-feet for the roadway and my take on it is that the 17-feet is to provide a 10-foot landscape transition to the residential areas toward Middlefield. I don't know if that's true or not but that's my interruption of it when I look at the zoning map. On the third floor terrace, the lighting seems to me to be pretty bright. I think it was like 25-foot candles. I do see notes on the Lighting Plan that its dimmable and that it's going to turn off at 10:00 and I was just wondering is – can it be an occupancy – can it be – can some of the lighting be on an occupancy sensor? So, I understand if you're doing certain kinds of things on the terrace you might want the 25-foot candles but there would be other times where I wouldn't really want that on as a user. If you're just hanging out, I really wouldn't want a task level lighting there so I was wondering if there's some flexibility in the controls for that? On Units One and Two I think there were some previous comments by the Board Member and I think we had – I think I had commented about the fence on the previous design. Since that time, I've had conversations with a couple of women, one on the Board, that they're not comfortable in their own front yards which is crazy to me. I'm always working out in my front – you know landscaping and gardening in my front yard and I feel comfortable with that. I'm amazed about how many people aren't and to have a patio door facing the street without some sort of little fence or hedge or something seems – something seems to me not quite right. I do support the three layers of landscaping that you have in there. I think that all is handsome and I think that all looks good but I'm really just concerned about the privacy because it's a patio door and not a front door. On the neighboring building at 530 Webster, I think you're proposing a Coffee Berry hedge and the new fence and I was wondering if the neighbors had reviewed that and commented on that and if you had considered trees in addition to the shrubs? I think we have Performance Standards and I'm not sure exactly how they would work with the apartment building but I think with houses we do require the trees and the shrubs. Maybe we – we may not require that for apartment buildings next door so if maybe Staff

could take a look at that and if the neighbors could weigh in as well. There is bike parking in the basement which is appreciated. I think it meets our code and I just wanted to throw out there that on some other projects in Palo Alto and some other projects that I've seen in Berkeley is that we're putting—some developments are putting the bike parking at grade and that's really to make it really convenient. That's the easiest, most convenient, and accessible mode of transportation instead of going down to the basement, crossing the basement – right, if you go down the elevator you have to walk to the other side of the garage and then back out to go up the elevator. I would just throw that out there. I'm not going to require it because it's not in our code but I would just say that other Cities are trying to do that at grade and provide windows and glass and repair stations that could be used just as common areas. Not just bike parking but it's actually like nice lounge space. I think that's all of the comments that I have. I can – I mean I would actually – I could probably support the project today if we were doing that. I know we don't have our findings but I think it's – I think you're at that level. That you're very, very close. Oh, and then one last thing, on the parking count so we do have – I think maybe Staff could look into this. We do have the City Loft Project on Forest Avenue that was completed by a former Board Member on the – here on the ARB. It was high-end townhouses like – you know like each townhouse had their own private elevator, that kind of high end, and my understanding is that they did not have two cars per unit. It was one car per unit maximum and my memory is fading but it may be that some of the units did not – some of the owners did not even have cars so I think we have to look at that. If you – if you're living in a suburban part of Palo Alto you would probably have two cars but I think it's a different – my hunch is that it's a different kind of person who's buying these units. I could be wrong about that but I think it's, as you mentioned, it's self-selecting. If you don't want lifts, you're not going to rent a unit in this kind of location in this building. Ok, Wynne, I will pass it back to you.

Chair Furth: Thank you all for coming to speak to us, for thinking about the project. Thank you to the applicant, it's a very responsive response from you all. Sometimes we speak up here and feel that nobody heard anything we said and this is not one of those occasions. You, of course, as we talked about, you have the problem that you are proposing to remove very attractive buildings and landscaping set way back further than the law presently requires. If you had come in to replace an eyesore you would get a different kind of reception but you're not. You're also part of a phenomenon where we're losing people that we don't want to lose and we're losing housing units that we don't want to lose and this has been a particularly very sad year for downtown Palo Alto. When I – I think Alex is right to say that the Council knows this, it's sophisticated and thinking about it and is working seriously to address it. So, when I look at this project as a project, I generally find it a good and attractive project. I know it can sometimes feel that we're rearranging deck chairs here but that is what we're doing and well-placed deck chairs matter. Good places to live, good places to walk by, good places to work. I don't mean to tribalize what we do. I like the fact that it's much more open now. I like that the corner is glass. We often have concerns with floor to ceiling glass because it's floor to ceiling in front of the back side of kitchen cabinets or something like that. You have not fallen into that trap; these seem to work which I appreciate. I like your open, private spaces. I live in downtown north, I live in infill housing that I could never to afford to buy now, and we have small private gardens. My backyard opens onto an alley which is frequently traversed and we actually took out our solid fence and put in one that you can get air and light through and see through if you're walking by. So, we find that the plants and that kind of open fencing – I think it's 50/50 – works well in terms of providing psychological privacy and keeping animals from moving faster than I can and I think it does work under those settings. There are a lot of times you just feel comfortable sitting out there having coffee in the sun and so I think there would be some kind of solution that would work. I think the idea of looking further at your landscaping and fencing and privacy with respect to your neighbor on Webster and getting specific responses would be good because for that it's all about function. Does it deliver the kind of view and privacy that people want? It does seem to me that the building could be shorter and that would be a good thing. I really can't say that I think that this architectural style is wrong. It's a really – I actually think it's good. It's an incredibly complicated setting that the Methodist Church is certainly one of the more striking and idiosyncratic examples of church architecture in the town. It's a very good setting for concerts and a lot of other good things. It is completely under parked. There is a major parking garage across the street but looking at that, at the not particularly distinguished architecture across Hamilton, at least I've never been able to figure out how it's distinguished, and then looking at the charming building on Webster. I think this is a pretty good mix

of modern materials, clean design, and softness. This is not a building says we're not really here, we're going inside and closing the door and ignoring you. So, I think it makes forgiven the loss, starting with an empty lot, I think it makes for an attractive experience to walk by. I do agree with Alex that having some surface level bike level parking is good. I mean if I bike – I do bicycle downtown, I bicycle through this area, its admittedly challenging but if I go to visit a friend in this apartment I would like to be able to lock my bike without going to – you know people who are coming here by bike to the offices or the apartments will do more often if they can – otherwise we will lock our bikes to the street trees and that's a bad thing. I worry when I see the lovely covered spaces with light flowing into them like on L-104, I keep thinking well is that at dawn but then it's not dawn because that's not the direction that this space – looking at cut Number Two on L-104. So, I'm going to be concerned about how light actually works there and how that becomes a welcoming and attractive space and not a tunnel or a cave in an undesirable way. That was a big issue when we were looking at Design Within Reach and the spaces they were building there. Note to Staff, there's tons of garbage now in that public way through there. There's trash littering there, there's – never mind, I'll talk about that later but it needs a look, it needs attention. That's another way to make this very unattractive. That won't happen here but I would like to know for sure how that is going to work in terms of light and materials. I agree on the setback and my final thought on the height, it's going to depend on how the particular horizontal plans in this building relate to the other buildings but I do think it could be significantly shorter without a loss to the people living there. Anything else anybody wants to say and does the applicant have a question? Did we leave you confused about anything? Ok. Board Member Baltay – Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Chair Furth. I neglected to mention that I'm concerned about the location of your accessibility handicap ramp. It seems to me you come around into your covered terrace next to the office building off of Hamilton rather than coming in by the front door of the building; the way every able-bodied person enters. I just find that disturbing. It seems to me that you have adequate room and it's not that high of a climb to integrate in a handicap ramp to the front door of the building so everybody's going through the same door. Secondly and this is in response to Board Member Lew's comment about Units One and Two on the street. I'm scratching my head wondering if those really are viable apartment units in that location? You have substantial green public spaces on both sides of those units and yet Alex's comments really do hit a point with me. That a number of people will feel uncomfortable opening their unit to the street in that location. It's an active, busy area and if the result is in a few years from now somebody puts up a wood fence to claim their garden, all of this has been for not. As I look at this and then consider Chair – David Hirsch's comments about your Unit Number Three in the back where the Redwoods are. The ground level unit doesn't seem to have any outdoor space but maybe there is a way to not have the two residential units on Webster at the ground floor. Instead, go for some more of that visual entrance into the yard. I find it very attractive what you have off of Hamilton, looking sort of past the sculpture under a covered area into a large garden area. That's a motif that's used throughout history with architects and it really can be quite successful. So, that's just an idea of looking at this and thinking about those ground floor units again so I'm throwing those two thoughts out to you. Thank you.

Chair Furth: So, you'd be removing two units from the frontage?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, I think they would put two units else ware.

Chair Furth: Oh, like where the mechanical...

Vice Chair Baltay: Mechanical maybe or up on the third floor if you made that open area one unit smaller. I don't – I'm not the architect here but.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: So, when I've worked on housing projects, we try to design them for a lot of different types of people and there are people who do want the ground floors units. It's not – what do I say? I'm just saying it's pretty complex but there is the kind of person who wants that ground floor unit

and they don't want to walk up the stair or go up an elevator. They might like this unit but they might have issues with the privacy. I think – I guess I'm saying let's try to – I would recommend keeping the units at the ground floor and then work on the design but I think it's fine to do a study to relocate the units as well. I'm (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm by no means saying I think they have to be relocated, I'm rather just sort of musing out loud. I mean reacting to what you said, I guess.

Chair Furth: Ok. Any questions? Alright. Thank you, everybody. Are we continuing this to a date certain?

Mr. Ah Sing: No.

Chair Furth: Alright then I'll close the public hearing and I guess – we don't even need a motion, do we?

Ms. Gerhardt: We – yeah it would be good to continue to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Ok, would somebody like to make a motion to continue this to a date uncertain.

MOTION

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion we continue this to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

SECOND

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll that second, sure.

Chair Furth: All those in favor say aye? All those opposed? Hearing none. It's continued to a date uncertain. Thank you all.

MOTION PASSED 4-0-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON ABSENT

Approval of Minutes

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for February 7, 2019.

Chair Furth: Do we – we have two sets of minutes to approve. Are people ready to approve the minutes? Anybody have any comments on the minutes of February 7th?

Vice Chair Baltay: There was one section where I was quoted saying something that they weren't clear of and I confess I'm not clear of either looking at them so I'll just leave it at that.

Chair Furth: Ok, alright. Could I have a motion to approve the minutes of February 7th?

MOTION

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we approve the minutes of February 7th.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

SECOND

Board Member Hirsch: Second.

Chair Furth: Second by Hirsch. All those in favor say aye? Hearing no opposition, it passed four nothing, one person absent.

MOTION PASSED 4-0-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON ABSENT

6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for February 21, 2019.

Chair Furth: Any comments on the minutes of February 21st, 2019.

Vice Chair Baltay: no.

Chair Furth: Ok, motion, please?

MOTION

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we approve the minutes of February 21st.

Chair Furth: Second?

SECOND

Board Member Hirsch: Second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Baltay, second by Hirsch. All those in favor say aye? No opposition. It passed 4-0-1.

MOTION PASSES 4-0-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON ABSENT

Subcommittee Item

7. **190 Channing Avenue [18PLN-00043]:** Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Landscaping and Revisions to the Third Floor Setback Along Channing Avenue, as Well as Other Clarifying Details on the Windows, Stone Pattern and Garage Security Gate. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15332 (In-fill Development). Zoning District: RT-35 SOFA II CAP (Residential Transition). For More Information Contact the Project Planner, Claire Hodgkins, at Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

(See summary memo attached below)

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

8. **North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) Update**

Chair Furth: Before we go to the subcommittee item, Board Member Lew do you have any reports on the North Forest – that’s Ventura right?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I noticed, it should be North Ventura.

Chair Furth: North Ventura but the initials are right so go ahead.

Board Member Lew: So, the Board – the Ventura – what do you call it – Committee met last night and the Committee was broken up into three different groups and they came up with three alternates which will be

studied by the consulting Staff. They're going to condense it down to two alternates which will be forwarded to the Council for discussion.

Vice Chair Baltay: Are those designs Alex available to the public?

Board Member Lew: I think they will be and there is a dedicated website for the project. I don't have the website in front of me but I will bring it next time but the intent is to have that all available. There has been some criticism that questions and comments aren't really being responded too. So, I think the Staff is going to try to figure out a way to add feedback or responses on the website.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

9. Regional Water Control Plant – Construction Status

Chair Furth: Regional Water Quality Control – what's this? Regional Water Control Plant?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes.

Chair Furth: Water Quality Control Plant maybe?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, I think there was just a questions last hearing... (Crosstalk)

Chair Furth: Oh, from Board Member – Vice Chair Baltay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct, about the landscaping being absent. There are two different permits on this property, none of them have been finished, and so I don't have many details but we haven't finalized the project. So, I assume that the planting will go in before the projects are finalized. We will require that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. To finish my stuttered comment about Design with Reach, we spent a lot of time thinking about how to deal with that interesting covered area. I think they came up with a pretty design and it is literally being trashed. So, could Staff...

Board Member Lew: I've noticed that too on... (crosstalk)

Chair Furth: Repeatedly.

Board Member Lew: ...two or three separate occasions, it's not a one-off problem.

Chair Furth: No, it's the new designated dumping zone. I mean there's two things happening, one is somebody's putting trash containers there and the other – who shouldn't be and the other one is that people are dumping packing material. It needs to be addressed soon.

Ms. Gerhardt: Ok, I will speak with Code Enforcement. There was a trash room for that project.

Chair Furth: Yeah, I know, it's nobody's trash area.

[Unknown Male:] (inaudible – spoke from the audience)

Chair Furth: I don't know who's doing it, I doubt it but that space is not – it's not moving towards a destination alley or whatever we call them. Except for a group of users, we maybe didn't want to encourage.

Board Member Lew: But can the -- the front façade and the glass and the storefront, it looks great.

Chair Furth: It's beautiful.

Board Member Lew: That's really well done.

[Unknown Male:] (inaudible – spoke from the audience)

Chair Furth: Oh, well, details.

[Unknown Male:] (inaudible- spoke from the audience)

Chair Furth: You and falling water. That was a pun. Let's see, anything else? Anybody – oh, so we're not – Alex and I are not ready to bring back the annual report but we will be at a light agenda. I do hope that we get to see the TDM when we get the – this project we just listened to back because that's one of the things that we've been requesting.

Ms. Gerhardt: So yes, you're saying annual report...

Chair Furth: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: ... to put that on the agenda for the next hearing and then yes, for 565 Hamilton. I believe we had the TDM report in the Packet but I believe there's another report about the shared spaces so we'll get that in there.

Chair Furth: Great, thank you. Oh, and one other thing, what did the Council decide to do with the review of small cell wireless facilities? WCFs.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, the Wireless Facility Ordinance change was approved. I don't have details on it and if anything was changed but I don't believe so.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I was at the meeting as was David Hirsch and it's true, the Council approved the ordinance as proposed. However, they also asked for some refinements or studies to be done of possible refinements. Quite an extensive list that was debated in detail but they wanted for it to come back within a period of 1-year. So, Staff essentially has 1-year to address a number of the issues that we and many other Boards and Commissions dealt with to see if they can come up with refinements.

Board Member Hirsch: There was also mention about coming back to us informally, not as a required hearing of any sort but to bring back material to us. I think it would be useful if we had the minutes of the meeting to see what came from that; specifically, how it might relate to us.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, so the minutes of the Council meeting are available online or should be very soon so I can send those to everyone.

Chair Furth: (inaudible – off mic)

Ms. Gerhardt: We are adjourned.

Chair Furth: Yes, we are adjourned.

Adjournment



Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Review

TO: Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects, 2653 Spring Street, Redwood City, CA
94063

SUBJECT: 190 Channing Avenue [18PLN-00043]

DATE: April 24, 2019

FROM: Claire Hodgkins, AICP, Planner

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE

The application, and plans dated April 4, 2019, were reviewed by the ARB Subcommittee on April 15, 2019 in accordance with condition of approval #5(a-f), as stated below. The ARB Subcommittee comprised of Board members Lew and Hirsch.

5. ARB SUBCOMMITTEE: Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the applicant shall return to the ARB subcommittee for approval of the following items, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Community Environment:
- a. Show that the planting and any irrigation beneath the Oak tree is compatible with the Oak or otherwise modify the proposed planting and irrigation to ensure protection of the Oak tree.
 - b. Modify the Channing frontage of the third floor kitchen area, to provide better privacy and an appropriate setback from the second floor below. If desired by the applicant, the third floor bedroom may also be setback further from the Channing frontage.
 - c. Revise the proposed tree planting along the interior lot line to provide more spacing for light and air between trees.
 - d. Provide a detail of how blinds and/or frosted glass will be installed on office and residential windows.
 - e. Show the location and a detail of the proposed garage security gate.
 - f. Provide further detail of the stone pattern/materials to show that they contribute to the compatibility of the project and the nearby historic building.

At the meeting, the Subcommittee agreed with the revisions presented with no conditions added. The applicant shall ensure the changes presented in the subcommittee are reflected in the plans submitted for building permit(s). In addition, this Subcommittee Review letter shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s).