



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES: May 2, 2019
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Wynne Furth, Vice Chair Peter Baltay, Board Members Alexander Lew, Osma Thompson and David Hirsch.

Absent: None

Chair Furth: Good morning. Is staff ready? All right. I'm calling to order the May 2, 2019, meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. Could you call the roll, please?

[Roll Call]

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: The first item on the agenda is oral communications. This is time for any member of the public to speak on an item not on our agenda. I have no speaker cards. Is there anyone in the audience who wishes to speak on a matter not on the agenda? Seeing no one, we'll go on to the next matter.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Agenda changes, additions and deletions. Are there any? Hearing none.

City Official Reports

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

Chair Furth: City official reports. Transmittal of the ARB meeting schedule and attendance record, tentative future agendas, and recent project decisions.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. You'll see in Attachment A we have cancelled the July 4th meeting. We don't think we need a special meeting at this time, so we'll leave the schedule as such.

Chair Furth: I just wanted to note that I believe I will be here on June 20th.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. Do you want me to change that on here?

Chair Furth: Yes, please.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. That would be great. And then, for May 2nd, for the next hearing... That is not correct. I believe it's May 16th. We have two potential items, 4256 El Camino, which is a new hotel project, and then, 567 Homer, which three residential units. It's possible one of those items may still drop off. We are making some decisions later today.

Chair Furth: Thank you. And that new hotel is not new to us. It's a...

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Furth: Thank you. It would be a third hearing. All right.

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 233 University Avenue [18PLN-00344]: Recommendation on 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 Revise the Entrances, Revisions to the Walls Along the Interior and Rear Lot Lines, and Brick Details. 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.**

Chair Furth: Our first action item for the day -- and in fact, our only one -- is a public hearing, it's quasi-judicial, on 233 University Avenue. The staff is asking for a recommendation on the applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow for the 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. The project includes alterations to the ground floor to revise the entrances, revisions to the walls along the interior and rear lot lines, and brick detailing. The project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act as infill development. The zoning district is CD-C with a ground floor retail, I guess, and pedestrian overlay. The architect is Ken Hayes, and it's the Mills Family Trust, is the owner. If we could hear from the staff.

Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good morning, Board members. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner. The project before you today, as you noted, is 233 University Avenue, which is located on the corner of University and Ramona. The project actually includes two addresses, which is 233 and 235 University. As you noted, it's located within the CD-C(GF)(P) zoned district, which is Commercial Downtown Community with a ground floor and pedestrian combining district. Existing uses of the site include the Mills Florist Shop The Tap Room, and the hookah lounge. Just a brief overview of the project, again, of the different components. Rehabilitation of an existing brick masonry building to meet current seismic standards, use of seismic rehabilitation bonus, transferred development rights, and existing mezzanine floor area, which would be removed from the existing building. Would be used to construct a new second floor office addition and an open terrace above the second floor. It also includes addition of a trash enclosure on site, ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act] compliance upgrades, and revisions to the façade on the ground floor to create more windows and to create an access to the office. I just wanted to go through some of the key revisions that were made since the last hearing. The ARB had commented on the rear and interior side walls in particular, so they've revised the materials on the rear and the side wall partially to use some stucco and some of the metal to kind of break up that façade. They've also added a few non-operable windows that would be fire-safe. The ARB had also commented on the brick detailing, so they are going to be keeping the existing brick capitals that would be flanking the sides of the doors, as well as a brick trim to be added or retained on the top portion. There were some revisions to the retail entrances. The ARB had commented that they felt that the entrances should have been located closer to the corner of University and Ramona. The retail entrance along Ramona was moved slightly closer to the

corner, not quite as close as I think the ARB had commented on, but there were some grade separation issues that the architect has been trying to work around, so I just wanted to note that. There are two designs proposed. The applicant is proposing sliding doors for the retail doors along Ramona, but they've provided an alternative that would include doors that open up, swinging doors, which is what staff would recommend for the site. The ARB also recommended improvements to the pedestrian experience, so there was a small addition of a seated bench within a window along Ramona. We did look into some benches along, adding a bench in the public right-of-way, but Transportation Division and Public Works engineering had some resistance to that. They felt that this would not be the best location. There was a lot of different things going on in the right-of-way already and they didn't feel it was a wide enough right-of-way to be putting in benches within the public right-of-way. The street trees have also been revised. Originally, they were proposing to remove all three street trees. The mature street tree right at the corner of Ramona and University is now going to be retained, and they have proposed some smaller, medium-sized trees for the two additional trees along Ramona, which staff felt was a better option, but was more in line with the utilities in this letter and would be more compatible. There was a question that came up about just what the office restrictions are in general in Palo Alto, so I wanted to provide some clarity about that. There were three different restrictions. There are now two because the Downtown cap has been removed. The Downtown cap included all non-residential, not just office. The two that are remaining are the citywide limit on new office and R&D [Research and Development]. This is adding 4,400 square feet of new office. There's somewhere around 500,000-or-something square feet that can still be added. There's also an annual office limit. I think I noted in my last staff report there was somewhere around 20,000 that was still available, and again, this is adding 4,400, so it wouldn't exceed any of those requirements. Staff recommends that the ARB consider the proposed project, provide comments based on findings, and subject to conditions of approval. With that, I'll turn it back to you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I'd like to hear from the applicant. You have 10 minutes once you're set up.

[Applicant setting up presentation.]

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects: Good morning, Chair Furth and members of the Board. My name is Ken Hayes with Hayes Group Architects. I'll be making a presentation on behalf of our clients, the Mills family. The Mills family joins us all this morning, as well as Terry Murphey from my office. When we were here... Let me quickly show you the existing building that I'm sure you're very familiar with. We're proposing this wall be removed. We're proposing that the brick veneer here be removed to reveal the former wall below, which you can see here in the bottom photograph. We did a little more reconnaissance, and up in the attic you actually can see the old brick work from the inside. You're looking out through what were the transom windows and you can see the column capitals... It's basically like a cornice, a stepped-out corbeling at the top of the columns. We're proposing that that obviously remain. That occurs along the front University façade for all three columns flanking each of the two bays. The building is actually double wide. It includes the road's façade there. At some point it was remodeled, I guess, by Birge Clark. That's the existing. At our hearing on March 7th - I can't believe it was that long ago - we talked, the comments that Planner Hodgkins just discussed. Improve the retail entry on Ramona, consider awnings along Ramona, consider exterior seats, consider additional brick detailing, provide more relief and variety along the property line walls next to the Stanford Theater. I think that was also at the back of the building. I think staff did a great job already, showing you the changes a little bit. This is the revised Ramona Street façade, and you can see here the idea of two sliding doors. There is a grade issue. We are able to meet the grade on University and on Ramona in this bay. Basically, you would walk right in from Ramona sidewalk at the same level as the interior of the store. As it goes this way, the sidewalk climbs; as it goes this way, the sidewalk falls about four to five inches. This is the natural place to put that opening. We're showing sliding doors, they would both slide open, or an alternate. And I rarely have an alternate for you, but an alternate would be, in that same bay, do a pair of swinging doors. The swinging doors most likely need to swing out, so there's a bit of an impact to the plan that I'll show you a little later. We would define those entries by canopies. This canopy was already

shown previously as the office entry. We would, taking Board Member Hirsch's comment about adding more canopies on Ramona, instead of doing it everywhere just sort of wholesale, we said let's just define the entry. So, we provided at the entry itself. Staff explained that Public Works and Transportation, they were not excited about a seat along Ramona along the right-of-way, so we've lowered the sill at the stair element, where there is a deeper recess. I think it's about 16 or 18 inches deep, and now it's about 18 inches high. There would be a concrete, precast concrete slab there that would be seat height. You could have a seat there by the office entry, to wait for a coworker or what-have-you. At University, we're also proposing, you can't walk out here because there's this five-inch grade separation, but we think it would be nice to be able to see into the store, so we're taking that sliding door concept, sort of like what we did at Poy-ya [phonetic] years ago. Those doors on the corner would slide open and stack over here, so the corner would be partially open, but there's a decorative rail to prevent people from walking in and out of that entrance. The entrance here remains. We show the brick detailing at the top of these columns that is existing, and then there's the existing frieze that we're then taking around the side of the building, and of course, the existing cornice at the top of the brick wall. This is the side that faces the Stanford Theater. Previously, we had it all as the vertical metal panel. There was some concern about, I guess, the monotony of that, so we've just accentuated the stair elements both here and at the rear of the building, so the stair has the metal cladding on it, and it also has the higher height, whereas the stucco wall steps down two feet in this area. Then we added fire barrier openings, so, as staff explained, non-operable fire-barrier openings, but they do allow light into the stairwell, and they start to break up that façade a little bit. Not much of it is visible from the street. This is the Stanford Theater here. Our building stops right here. We have the door that comes out into this exit, hopefully easement, and the metal panel again defining the stair, and then we have that sitting on a concrete base that wraps around to the sill at the Ramona façade. And then, in this location, we're able to get two windows in, unlike the other location. You can only get one because of where the landings are in the building next door. That is the presentation. Oh, no, I'm sorry, there's a few more slides. This is the ground floor with the sliding doors. In this area, if we do the swinging door, we need to set that in, so that would be an interruption, let's say, in the façade. But we could do swinging doors. Can't swing over the property line, which is why we have to set it back. This just shows the window location here, over in that stair, and then you see the canopies below in that area. And then the window here, and the window there. No other change. Just sort of overall shot from there. The view that staff had. A view from the street. You can see how this now breaks up. And then, with and without the tree. The camphor tree is, we've been requested to keep the camphor tree. You can see the building, and you can see the tree. That's my presentation. I look forward to any questions you might have, and hopefully we have support of staff's recommendation. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of the applicant before we start discussing this amongst ourselves?

Board Member Thompson: Is there a material board again? I think there was last time, right?

Mr. Hayes: [no audible response]

Chair Furth: Peter, any questions?

Board Member Hirsch: I'd like to ask, what's your preference...

Chair Furth: Closer to the mic.

Board Member Hirsch: Closer to the mic.

Mr. Hayes: The sliding doors.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Chair Furth: Peter, any questions?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. Architect Hayes, what is the offset on the metal panels defining the stairwells on the inside, the side walls of the building, between the plaster and the aluminum? Or metal. When you look at it...

Mr. Hayes: Two inches, it sounds like.

Vice Chair Baltay: Two inches...?

Mr. Hayes: You're talking about between the stucco, Board Member Baltay?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, two inches.

Vice Chair Baltay: Right there, between those two materials.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah. Correct. And this is not our building here, but right there, yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah, between those two materials.

Mr. Hayes: Right. Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: I had... Excuse me.

Mr. Hayes: The metal panels (inaudible).

Chair Furth: I had two questions. One is, what is the width of the new bench, the new seating area?

Mr. Hayes: Terry?

Chair Furth: Length, width, whatever.

Terry Murphey: The width is four and a half feet.

Mr. Hayes: It is about four and a half feet.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Hayes: Enough for two people.

Chair Furth: Or three slender ones. And when you use the sliding door, there's a column between the two of them as they open? Is that right?

Mr. Hayes: That's correct, yeah.

Chair Furth: How wide is the entrance?

Mr. Hayes: It's about four and a half feet.

Chair Furth: Each?

Mr. Hayes: Each panel is four and a half feet, so I would envision both of those being open, so it's going to look like you have nine feet and you can walk in, you know, around...

Chair Furth: And if you have...

Mr. Hayes: Six feet on the...

Chair Furth: ...swinging doors, how big is the entrance.

Mr. Hayes: Six feet.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions?

Board Member Thompson: I think Board Member Hirsch had a question about, out of the two - and correct me if I'm wrong - out of the two, the swinging door option and the sliding door option, which do you...?

Mr. Hayes: We prefer the sliding door option. I think that if it's used properly, it will... I mean, the swinging doors are always going to open and close, most likely. The idea behind it is that they could open it up so that they could have product displayed and you can walk in and around it. The swinging door option probably is not going to provide that.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, thank you.

Chair Furth: All right.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I think you may be seated. I'm sorry, Board Member Hirsch has one more question.

Board Member Hirsch: When you did your test from the inside, noting the corbeling, what was the condition of the brick on the inside?

Mr. Hayes: We have photographs. The brick on the inside looks fine. What we don't know -- and Board Member Baltay pointed this out last time -- is that when we remove that veneer that the Mills family put up years ago, not sure what it's going to be. We're, you know, we're hopeful.

Chair Furth: Yes, Board Member Baltay, Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Architect Hayes, what is your backup plan if you take off the facing veneer and the brick behind it [crosstalk]

Mr. Hayes: We don't have a backup plan yet.

Vice Chair Baltay: We're assuming this brick is going to be there, and look beautiful, and old, and weathered...

Mr. Hayes: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... and if it comes off and the backup brick comes off, too, what happens?

Mr. Hayes: The backup brick?

Vice Chair Baltay: The brick that we want to save. If you're not able to save it, what happens?

Mr. Hayes: Right. The brick that's there is a double-wide wall, so I wouldn't imagine it coming off when we pull the veneer off, but it might require removal of, if there's a mortar bond there, or... I don't know. Maybe they built it as a cavity wall, Board Member Baltay, and it's not an issue. But we haven't done that investigation yet. I wouldn't anticipate that bricks are going to come off.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I mean more when you pull the facing brick off, the brick behind it may be damaged. The surface of the brick may come off. It may end up being chipped or something.

[crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: The surface behind the brick is not (inaudible)

Mr. Hayes: It depends on how... The brick on the Ramona façade, we're going to save that. You know, it's also double-wide, so we're anticipating that given there's so much of it, that we'll be able to, when we build the new wall, that we'll have extra brick to be able to pick-and-choose the bricks that we want to use there. But the brick that's on this building has gone through a number of recladding over the years. I mean, the building was originally a stucco building, so that cement plaster was chipped off. And if you look at the brick closely, you see the remains of that cement plaster that was on there. I would anticipate you're going to get that same kind of mottled look. It might be fine in the end. We don't want it to look new, obviously.

Vice Chair Baltay: Can you clarify for the record, then, the intent is to remove brick from some parts of the building -- the old brick -- and clean it up enough that you can re-use the existing brick in other places.

Mr. Hayes: Correct. Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: You're going to go through the effort of cleaning the existing brick and reusing it.

Mr. Hayes: We're going to remove the brick that's there, and most likely, the brick that faces the inside is, I mean, we know that it's in better condition than the brick that faces the outside because it hasn't gone through that repeated plastering and removal of the plaster. We're going to take that brick and, you know, divide it into piles of use this/don't use that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Are your clients aware of the expense involved in doing that?

Mr. Hayes: [no audible response]

Vice Chair Baltay: Is that a yes or a no?

Mr. Hayes: Yes, sorry.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: It's not showing up for the record.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: I actually have one more question.

Chair Furth: Go ahead. Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: On the elevation on Ramona, I'm actually looking at the rendering in Sheet A4.1, which is the corner of University and Ramona. I think it's the one with the tree/no tree, but it's a sketch up-view.

Mr. Hayes: Oh, the sketch-up view.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. You can see it in this elevation, as well. There is corbeling at the top of the storefront, so, on the University side, there's sort of two striations of corbeling...

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Thompson: ...at the line of the storefront, and then just above it. And the one above it wraps around. But, I noticed on Ramona, the bottom line doesn't...

Mr. Hayes: Correct.

Board Member Thompson: ... continue.

Mr. Hayes: Correct.

Board Member Thompson: I just wanted to ask your intention in choosing that.

Mr. Hayes: We're giving priority to the University façade. I mean, it partially goes back to, you know, we're creating a new façade using recycled material, all right? This kind of goes to Board Member Baltay's comments about, you know, false historicism last time. We're not trying to...

Chair Furth: We're calling it "recycling" now.

Mr. Hayes: Right. Thank you. We're not trying to replicate it. I mean, this is a completely different design on this side of the building, and that's why we did not do the corbeling at that point. However, we felt it was important to bring the cornice around and the frieze around that side. And then, just let the corbeling capital at the slender columns that are on University, that is existing as the detail.

Chair Furth: Would you mind answering that again, using different words? I always forget what corbeling is. I know what frieze is.

Mr. Hayes: The top of the brick, we'll call that the cornice, so, we're going to wrap that...

Chair Furth: All right. The top edge.

Mr. Hayes: ...around because I feel like that's important for sort of completion of that...

Chair Furth: And I can't tell from looking at this drawing what the detail is there.

Mr. Hayes: It's a double step. Basically, the brick sticks out about an inch and a half, then an inch and a half, and then the wall. The same thing is true at the frieze, so, the frieze line is...

Chair Furth: The horizontal band.

Mr. Hayes: ...the next horizontal line down. Right. In fact, the corbeling at the column capitals is not unlike that as well. There's no...

Chair Furth: And a corbel is a decorative element that protrudes?

Mr. Hayes: The top of the column, yeah, instead of having a...

Chair Furth: Oh, it goes like that.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah.

Chair Furth: That 45 degrees...

Mr. Hayes: No, but it's corbel, though, Chair Furth, so it steps out. The existing steps out. It doesn't...

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: I just want to clarify. When you say "frieze," are you talking about the space between the two corbels?

Mr. Hayes: Well, I'm not talking about the frieze line, let's say -- or if you want to call it the architrave, or whatever -- but the horizontal line above the windows, about a foot above the windows. I'm just calling that the frieze line.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Sorry, just [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: The one that doesn't have a triumphal procession of Greek Gods?

Mr. Hayes: Right, that one.

Board Member Thompson: I was going to say, I didn't really see a frieze.

[crosstalk]

Mr. Hayes: Good questions.

Chair Furth: You understand I'm working from art history rather than being a trained architect. All right. Any other questions? Okay, I think we're good. I'm sure we'll have more. Before we start discussing, I went back through, reading the minutes of your last meeting. We discussed dimensions of the front window bays. Osma had a concern about the relationship of the glossy aluminum panel and the brick. Peter had a concern -- somewhat -- about how the brick would actually be used. Room for street trees, and wall facing the Varsity Theater, the wall facing the alley. Canopies on both frontages, whether the roof elevations were a bit random. The retail entry on Ramona, the detailing of the brick, the seating, and the need to keep the windows open, which Alex mentioned. Okay. Staff, just to be clear, this is a building that is applying for a seismic bonus, so this has to be a rehabilitation rather than a demotion, and the walls to be retained as shown on Sheet A10 are the interior wall facing the theater? And the wall facing University, but not the wall facing Ramona.

Ms. Hodgkins: Correct.

Chair Furth: Thank you. That is, they can do whatever they want with that wall. Thank you. Who would like to begin?

Board Member Thompson: Okay, I'll begin. In general, I think it's nice that you stuck to your original design intent with this update, and in general, I would say the design is looking cleaner and tightened and more intentional. With regard to the sliding door or the swing door, it is rather strange that there is a column in the middle of it, but ultimately, I don't have a preference one way or the other. Just looking at these images, trying to envision what it would look like if that second bay on Ramona was punched in a little deeper, it might break the rhythm. At the moment, I think I'm leading toward the sliding door option. That seems like the right thing to do here. I do like the addition of the **senate posture** [phonetic]. I think it does break up that wall a bit nicer. In general, I would say this is a good update. Yeah, I don't actually have that much more to say. I'll stop there. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I can recommend approval today. When we get to findings, I have one minor comment on findings.

Chair Furth: Board Member Hirsch, David.

Board Member Hirsch: I concur with fellow board members. I also concur with Vice Chair Baltay's comment about the bricks, but I hear your sensitivity to it. I think you're going to be spending a little more time on it when you reveal it and find out what's there. In some ways, sometimes historic restorations, although a lot of the precedent is not going to really be historic, but in some ways, sometimes less cleaning is better than too much cleaning. So, whatever needs some sensitivity as to historic quality of what's there. I definitely prefer the sliding door. It's a narrow sidewalk, and it would be inviting. It looks more like the front of a building where you also want to open up and have some interior/exterior relationship. I come down strongly on your side on that one. And I think all of the other improvements that you made are definitely improvements. I really don't have any problem with what's been done.

Chair Furth: Anything else?

Board Member Hirsch: No.

Chair Furth: Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. I'd like to focus on two things. One is the notion of whether it's falsely historic, or not. I've been giving some thought to that because I'm, or at least I was at past hearings, concerned about the reuse of the brick in a way that implies that this is an old brick building when it's not. I firmly believe a lot of these bricks are going to be rebuilt and this will very much be a new building. That said, as I've walked up and down University, I really tip my hat to the architect. I think this is actually a very deft example of historical, you know, an appropriate way to introduce a new building in the old. The new work here, the building up on the top is clearly differentiated and it's very different, and while the brick may be new, the massing of the building, the modulational along the street, the way it respects the historical nature of downtown University Avenue, is actually very good. It really does tie right in. It fits with old, it's part of the old, and it's not falsely historic, it's genuinely the way the retail avenue along University has been, and this helps continue that. I actually find that that makes it very definitely an historic rehabilitation in the first order. It took me going out there several times to realize that. It's not just the material. There are much deeper aspects to it, so, in that regard, I think the building really is very successful at putting something new on top of something historic. I'm very pleased with that and can support it for that. I really leave it to the architect to decide if the door should be sliding or hinged. I can make the findings either way. With that, I'd like to segue into the second issue that I have, and I'd like to, I guess set Wynne up to take it further, but it's really a shame that there's not more of a pedestrian amenity outside of this building on the corner. It's a very active street corner in Palo Alto, and I don't think that will change with this building. Right now, there's a tightness about it. There's no place to sit, or to stop, or even a nicely-landscaped little garden. If you think of a similar street corner up by Paris Baguette, they've got that little recessed bench area. There's frequently a guy playing a guitar at lunch there. It's a more pleasant street corner somehow. It attracts pedestrians. People want to be there. And this is not doing that, and it's a shame. This seems like an opportunity, with such a big project, to ask the applicant to somehow provide some sort of pedestrian amenity on the corner, be it a recessed landscaped area, or some benches, or things like that. I understand that the multitude of public departments within in the City have issues with benches perhaps, or recesses, or something, but I think it's fair to say, just ask the applicant to figure it. To go back to Public Works and find a place you can put a bench, or two benches. And not just on a window sill at the far back corner, but on the corner of the property where the people are, where there's a lot of activity. I'd like to see us as a Board just push back on that some, and not just accept the Transportation Department saying there's no room for a bench. I walked around there extensively and there is room for benches, there is room to do things. It's not expensive for the applicant, and now is the time for them to push to get this done. I think we should be doing that. Wynne, your turn.

Chair Furth: We didn't disclose our most recent visits. We have all seen the site, correct? And Peter and I have walked up and down that block. Thank you for your presentation. Thank you, staff, for the report. I think it's an attractive building. I don't think anybody is going to think it's old. I believe the applicant has choices on its materials, their materials on the Ramona side. I think if this is what they want to do, it's their building. But I'm sure it doesn't feel like that when you are going through the review process. And I think it's handsome. One of the things that has concerned me a lot is whether this looks and reads to the person walking by as retail space. I went and walked up and down University and the side streets some more, because last time I really looked at this carefully, I was working for the City. We were working on historic issues on University, and the first version of retail we had on University, the windows went down to about -- what? -- 36 inches, there was a vitrine above that, and the doorway was really strongly marked. You were channeled into the doorway. If you look at more recent buildings, if you look at Keen Shoes, for example, those buildings have floor-to-ceiling windows, and they've figured out how to use them as retail space in a way that's very engaging and inviting. So, this is sort of transparent building is what's replaced our previous design. But as Alex pointed out in our last meeting, to make that work, the City has to insist that it stays transparent. One of the things it says in the downtown plan is that corners should be open. And on a lot of corners, that means the building is notched. The building is recessed from the corner, so you get more space. But if it isn't that, at least you see through the glass from one frontage to the other, so as you walk around the corner, you see the people on the other side. Actually, I

realized when I went and looked at Keen's more closely, they actually had what I think we call a vitrine? I'm not sure. They have an improvised display window where I think the backing is about two or three feet back, and it doesn't go floor to ceiling, so you can see around it, and there's things in front of it. It's open, but it gives them more display space. So, if we are to approve this, I would want to talk about a condition that would ensure that that happens. The other thing that has concerned me about -- oh, where's the sign...? We have a signage exhibit somewhere, right? Because without signage, it really doesn't read "retail."

Ms. Hodgkins: We just have the boxes of generally the location...

Chair Furth: I know, I'm sorry. What sheet are they? A3.1?

Ms. Hodgkins: A3.1.

[Looking for document.]

Chair Furth: I didn't use my magnifying glass. I looked at that, I thought that was a decorative brick element a little. Brick diamond rather than the signage, rather than something that had a **tree** [phonetic] in it, indicating "sign." Thank you for that explanation. Okay. It actually exacerbates the problem with the door entry because nothing tells you where the door is. As I come into this retail space, you've got all these bays. I guess you're adding a canopy.

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Chair Furth: And that's supposed to tell me where the door entry is. I guess I would think that the sign would be over the doorway, as well. Those are my principal concerns, and I look to my colleagues to tell me whether they think those things have been addressed, and if they think there's a condition that could help with the other. Okay. My next comment, thank you for adding the four-foot bench over by the back entry to the theater. That would at least be a place for some of the workers who presently perch on the curb. But, staff, I cannot share the view of the City staff that there's no room for benches along this sidewalk. I know I walked it a number of times. I thought about opening car doors, I thought about bicycle racks, I thought about utilities, I looked at all the access points, what we used to call manhole covers. I looked at the telecom facility sitting on the corner within 20 inches of the curb, if we're that worried about doors opening. That's a prime place for a good bench. And I don't know what our ability is to force relocation, because there's things that we've placed in actual... We placed an actual mailbox, didn't it?

Ms. Hodgkins: I believe so. When I had originally asked Public Works about it, they said it's not moving.

Ms. Gerhardt: It would have been done (inaudible).

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah.

Chair Furth: Whose is it?

Ms. Gerhardt: Likely AT&T.

Ms. Hodgkins: It's likely, yeah, AT&T.

Chair Furth: Which is much harder to deal with than some of our people who don't have as many entitled rights. They are doing some work on the sidewalk. What are they doing? What's the proposed change to the sidewalk conditions around here? Around the building?

Ms. Hodgkins: I know that the sidewalk is being repaved. Grates are being added around the trees, and then the improvements to the tree wells and the soil volume underneath those. And then there's two new bicycle racks being added in the public right-of-way.

Chair Furth: And those tree well grates, are those the rubbery kind that we have along the railroad track? Or are they steel, firm, or aluminum, or whatever? Can you stand on them?

Ms. Hodgkins: My understanding was it was the, not the rubber grade, such... Yeah. I thought they were metal. My understanding was that they were metal.

Chair Furth: I believe our current planning manager is indicating that that is correct.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. The grates downtown are standardly metal.

Chair Furth: So that they provide a better walking area.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Furth: When I look at that sidewalk, other than the problem with the AT&T facility -- which keeps you from opening the door, by the way -- it just doesn't make any sense to me that there's no room. There are big tree well spaces, which at this point are just dirty holes in the sidewalk, all of which could accommodate benches that were designed to go in or around trees. And I think we should require it. And I think that... I went back and looked at all of the City documents, and I couldn't find the old section in SOFA 2, which talks about how much bench per frontage. But this is not, generally speaking, a narrow sidewalk. You have eight feet-plus in most areas, right?

Ms. Hodgkins: It's about eight feet, yeah.

Board Member Lew: That is narrow.

Chair Furth: But that's before you get to the street tree, right? It's six feet to the street tree? How many feet to the street tree? I'm sure the applicant knows.

Board Member Lew: I think it's a 12-foot sidewalk.

Chair Furth: It's big. It's got... [crosstalk]

Ms. Hodgkins: Eight feet to the...

Mr. Hayes: To the tree.

Ms. Hodgkins: I think it's about seven to eight feet to the tree.

Chair Furth: Yeah, but how far to the curb?

Mr. Hayes: Twelve.

Chair Furth: Twelve, yeah. It's not skinny. And I'm not arguing that you necessarily couldn't put...

Mr. Hayes: Clearly do a furniture zone.

Chair Furth: Pardon me?

Mr. Hayes: We could clearly do a furniture zone.

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Mr. Hayes: I don't know why...

Chair Furth: I think we need... I think what happens is pedestrians become a very low priority. First we've got telecom facilities. Then we've got car doors. And then we've got bike racks. Well, we have more people walking up and down that street than we have bicycling, and you shouldn't oppose bicycles and people, and pedestrians. I mean, we're still people when we get on bikes. So, I would like to add a

condition for additional seating in the public right-of-way, on that block, in a manner acceptable to the City.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, just to reiterate that we have talked to Public Works and our Transportation Department, you know, Claire has talked to them, and both of those departments have said that there is not sufficient room. I think we would need at least some other options. We can certainly go back and talk to that staff and push on that issue a little bit more. We can see about...

Chair Furth: I'm not arguing it needs to be in front of this building, either. That would be better, but I'm not saying it has to be. I'm talking about the half of the block between, you know, the University (inaudible) half the block, is what I'm thinking.

Ms. Gerhardt: You're talking about along University, or are we talking about...?

Chair Furth: I'm talking about Ramona.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, we're talking about along Ramona. This block of Ramona, but not necessarily...

Chair Furth: And I have not actually focused on University. If there's good room there, fine, but it is more heavily used.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, I think some of our other, other parts of University have the bump-outs where we have benches. We don't have that bump-out here. But if you're asking for a bench along Ramona, we'd have to just take a closer look at it. We haven't looked at the rest of the block.

Chair Furth: I'm asking for attractive seating along [crosstalk].

Ms. Gerhardt: I understand, and we certainly want to comply with that. We just don't have all the information, and the information that we do have is suggesting that we can't put a bench, at least in front of this business.

Chair Furth: I would be happy if it was in front. I think it would be a significant improvement even if it were in front of an adjacent business. And perhaps it would be helpful to have them come explain their thinking on this. I know it's a very complicated environment, and I respect their expertise. I'm not sure I'm in alignment with their priorities.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, so, I'm wondering, you know, potentially we can do subcommittee, if other Board members agree.

Chair Furth: Why don't we hear from the applicant? Do you have any thoughts? I know that you've looked at your own frontages and block.

Mr. Hayes: We had proposed benches, and we talked with Planner Hodgkins, and she then reviewed that with Public Works, and they said no, so we took them off. We thought that we could have benches, I think we flanked the tree, right? On Ramona. We were in favor of that. I think if you really study it, there's probably room. It's just that I'm not sure that Public Works wants to get involved in that.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: I'm not suggesting they should.

Ms. Hodgkins: I think my concern is just that I don't want to put a condition of approval that the applicant is, you know, not going to be able to comply with because it's not Planning that's going to be approving that... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: I understand that. I don't want it to be a condition where they just say, "It's optional, we say no," they're not going to do it.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think that's why the subcommittee, you would have a second chance. We could bring in, you know, Public Works and Transportation to that subcommittee, and we could have a deeper conversation. And if you're convinced at that point that there's no room for it, then the subcommittee could say that it's not needed.

Chair Furth: I wouldn't say it wasn't needed; we'd say it wasn't feasible.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Furth: Well, I don't even know if I'm going to have three votes on my side, so, let us go. Okay. Anybody have any further questions or comments?

Board Member Thompson: I had a quick question. It's about the rails. It's being called a cane rail, at the corner.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, it's just a horizontal flat bar.

Board Member Thompson: And there's sort of three tiers, it seems? Two tiers...? And what's the height of that with relationship to a pedestrian on the street? I see there's a four and a half inch grade change on that floor and sidewalk.

Mr. Hayes: Right, so, it's about 12 inches to the top of the rail. From the interior floor.

Board Member Thompson: On the sidewalk it would be, like, 16 inches?

Mr. Hayes: On that corner, yeah. Yeah.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Hayes: I mean, we don't want someone to try to walk over it. The intent is to not allow people to walk in there, but to see product that's on display and feel like they can easily go in. Or if there's seating inside like at Hoya, they'd be able to be connected to the sidewalk.

Board Member Thompson: By code, do you have to go up to 27?

Mr. Hayes: No. I mean, it just would... Cane rail, basically, so, as long as it's within the 27 inches and lower, the cane would pick it up.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah. Thank you, though.

Chair Furth: Anybody else?

Board Member Lew: I have a comment on the sidewalk and the bench issue. We've discussed this... I've been on the Board for a long time and this has come up on a lot of streets, including El Camino. We've talked about it with urban designers on our El Camino Corridor Plan. Those urban designers, their recommendation was, if you want things like benches, that you need 15 feet of sidewalk area to get the trees, benches, bike racks, and all of that in there. And the thing is that we don't really have that with our 12 feet, so, I do not support putting a bench in the right-of-way.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: I'd like to add my opinion to this. I think that walking on that street and going to the movie theater has always been a really significant corner, and now I think we can really kind of celebrate it. The uses are going to be vastly improved, and in respect to the entire University Avenue feel, I think it really is going to be significant to push hard for the benches, and to push hard for a push-out in urban design change at that corner. If it doesn't work on University, maybe it could work around the corner. I would advocate with getting together with Transportation and pushing very hard to do a

street improvement. I don't think in any way this is related to the building itself because it's been an improvement already, so, we can look forward to that happening. But, I think it's a very, very significant corner, especially for pedestrians here. I want to note that bicyclists are required to get off their bike on University anyhow, so we should take an extra look at the pedestrian at that corner. It's very, very busy almost all the time, and it will be more so when this is improved. I'd like to celebrate that corner with a quality urban design improvement of the streetscape.

Board Member Lew: If you actually look at all of the blocks on University Avenue, you'll see that several of them have bump-outs for pedestrian areas, and that was done on purpose back in the early 70's. So, we have bench and seating areas. They're not on every single corner, but they're actually there. I've actually drawn all the blocks downtown and you can actually look and see where they are placed. But they did not put them on every corner. And maybe they should have, but they didn't. And it seems to me that you're asking for something that's beyond the scope of this project.

Chair Furth: I worked on the tail-end of that project because it took a long time to get the art elements together, for example, and I agree; those are big, engineered modifications of University Avenue. And I'm not asking for anything like that. I'm asking for respite. I'm asking for mobility. I'm asking for access. I agree that it's better to have a wider sidewalk, but we don't have a wider sidewalk, so it's either smaller benches, simpler benches, for all I know there are backless benches with hand rails, which let you get up and down when you're having difficulties. They can be the kind of subtle benches that architects are always proposing to us. You know, horizontal spaces. But there's room for something that small, and there also are ones that are adapted to going around tree wells. We have these beautifully-designed corners, and then we have corners like the corner of Nobu, where the sidewalk wasn't really up to the level of the improvement, and I want something similar than those elaborate designs, and I do think it would be appropriate.

MOTION

Chair Furth: Okay. Would somebody like to make a motion? Oh, Alex, is there another condition you wanted to mention?

Board Member Lew: It was just findings.

Chair Furth: The findings. Sorry.

Ms. Gerhardt: Related to conditions, I just wanted to clarify that for windows, condition number 20 on packet page 31, if you can review that for a second, I believe that addresses the concern of transparent windows.

Chair Furth: That says, "...interior areas in front of first-story windows are to remain free of storage or other interior-focused elements. All ground floor windows shall remain transparent to allow views into the tenant space, consistent with Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 18.30(A).055. In areas on the second floor where blinds are provided, all drapes, curtains, shutters, blinds or other window coverings visible from the street shall be beige, white, or an off-white color, or lined in beige, white or off-white unless otherwise approved by the Director of Planning." Any comment or opinions on that? I don't have any opinion on what color blinds they use upstairs. I think we hardly see them.

Board Member Thompson: I think I'm fine with it.

Chair Furth: Is the applicant fine with that?

Mr. Hayes: Yes, we are.

Chair Furth: Okay. On the text supporting Finding #2, at the top of page 23, at the end of the first paragraph it says, "The proposed building also steps back, reducing the perceived height of the building from the pedestrian perspective along University." I think we should also say that there is a change in

materials, which also supports that. I'd like to go on record supporting strongly the idea of getting benches of some kind. In order to make the contextual-based findings, one of the requirements is that the project promotes pedestrian walkability and connectivity through design elements. I think that's clearly what we're talking about here, and we're well within the scope, Alex, of requesting something. I think our condition should be along the lines of providing at least two separate seating areas on the exterior of the building. It could be within the envelope of the building if the applicant is forced to make that work, but maybe that will give them some incentive to push with Public Works. If they didn't agree with your drainage system, Architect Hayes, you would call them yourself rather than let Claire call them. And I'm sure you're very persuasive. Maybe you could lend a hand in this issue and try to find a place to get some seating on the outside of the building, either in the public right-of-way or within the envelope of your building. Say, cutting away that corner. Which I'm sure you don't want to do, but I think we should condition it upon having at least two exterior seating areas.

Chair Furth: Would anybody like to make a motion? Okay. I'm sure, incidentally, the applicant and the applicant's architect are doing whatever they can to get this project to a place where they can proceed and get a good and wonderful building and environment. I move that we recommend approval of this project, subject to the findings and conditions set forth in the staff report, with the modification to the finding... Alex, what was your finding comment? Or did you have one? Did I get that?

Board Member Lew: It's just minor comments. Under Finding #2...

Chair Furth: Page, please.

Board Member Lew: ...page 22, it says, "The area is comprised of various commercial and residential buildings..." I'm only aware of commercial buildings here.

Chair Furth: True, so, delete "residential." I knew somebody was going to read this really carefully and thoughtfully.

Board Member Lew: Well, somebody has to read it, and it's always... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Yes, they do. We take turns.

Board Member Lew: No, well, it's usually the senior... Clare Malone Prichard used to be the senior person and she would read through them very carefully, so I'm taking up her role.

Chair Furth: Thank you. We appreciate it. I tend to only read the ones I'm upset about.

Board Member Lew: On page, same finding, page 23, it says, "The proposed project is consistent with the findings to provide high-quality materials and finishes in a neutral color palette..." And, like, the dark metal color is not really neutral, but it actually provides a design linkage to the Stanford Theater annex.

Chair Furth: You want to say a "good" color? What do you want to say instead of "neutral?"

Board Member Lew: Let's just say, strike "neutral," right?

Chair Furth: Okay. Perfect. That's on page 23.

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Chair Furth: I think we strike the whole thing, right? We don't...

Vice Chair Baltay: (inaudible).

Chair Furth: I don't think "palette" without "neutral" helps. Okay.

Board Member Lew: But I think the colors are working with the neighbors, so... Anyway. Doesn't matter.

Chair Furth: Suitable colors? Appropriate?

Board Member Lew: It's fine.

Chair Furth: Contextually-appropriate colors. That's real garbage-y. I'm going to say "contextually-appropriate colors." Why use one word when six will do? Okay? Any others, Alex?

Board Member Lew: No.

Chair Furth: Okay. And I am going to also recommend adding a condition, that this be referred to subcommittee for review of the provision of two seating areas on the exterior of the building or in the public right-of-way. If there a second?

Vice Chair Baltay: I will second that motion.

Chair Furth: Further discussion? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? You are through with us. Thank you.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much for the project. We look forward to seeing it. So glad that probably the building is not going to come down before you get to rebuild it. Been looking at that list for 20 years. I'm sure you have, too. I must say the night life provided by your tenants makes my walk home in the dark feel more comforting because there's always somebody there. And I will miss the florist. Take care.

Approval of Minutes

3. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 7, 2019.

Chair Furth: All right, we have a couple of sets of minutes. And, Claire, thank you very much for all your work on this project. For the record, I guess I should say Planner Hodgkins, but I don't seem to be able to manage that. All right. Minutes of March 7th. Any comments or corrections?

Board Member Thompson: I emailed a correction just this morning.

Chair Furth: Yeah, at one point, it's a comment that I made to Board Member Thompson. I asked her what sheet she was referencing. She didn't ask herself what sheet she was referencing.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, we have that email, so we will make that correction.

Chair Furth: All right. Is there a motion? We were all there. Anybody can make this motion.

MOTION

Board Member Thompson: I move that we approve the minutes of March 7th.

Chair Furth: Second?

Board Member Hirsch: Second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Thompson, second by Hirsch, to approve the minutes of March 7th. All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Hearing none, that passes unanimously.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 21, 2019.

Chair Furth: Board meeting minutes from March 21, 2019. Any comments, corrections?

Board Member Lew: We need to add, on page 54, we need to add the action that the subcommittee made for 3200 El Camino, which is the Parmani Hotel.

Chair Furth: And what was that?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I think we approved it. We looked at the materials...

Chair Furth: Did you make any changes?

Vice Chair Baltay: That needs to be in the record.

Chair Furth: Did you add additional conditions as part of that, or did you have different materials submitted?

Ms. Gerhardt: I wasn't present at the subcommittee. Do you want us to bring those minutes back, or can the subcommittee recount, or...?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, I think that, in my opinion, it's okay to just have the staff planner put down something. But I think it always should have, at the minimum, it should say the subcommittee approved it.

Chair Furth: And if they provided revised materials or plans, those should be noted in the minutes so that we know which version of the plans and materials board...

[crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: ...pink façade change? Remember, we did the color on that one?

[crosstalk]

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, we looked at the...

Vice Chair Baltay: ...flaming pink (inaudible).

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: So it's kind of important... [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Looking forward to (inaudible).

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, so we do, staff normally does a summary memo at the end, so it sounds like, unfortunately, that language...

Chair Furth: That should be attached to the minutes.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, that language should get into the minutes.

Chair Furth: If you would attach it, that would be great.

Ms. Gerhardt: I'll make sure.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: And then, on page 11 and 12, there's something that's confusing. I think I understand what happened, but I think item 3 is listed twice. And I think you actually did read the heading twice.

Chair Furth: I read it wrong, yes.

Board Member Lew: But in the minutes, it looks really weird. Maybe we should just take one of them out, even if it actually happened.

Chair Furth: It's probably accurate, but unnecessary.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. It's item 3 on page 11 and 12.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Is there a motion to approve with the corrections noted?

MOTION

Board Member Lew: I move that we approve the minutes for March 21, 2019.

Chair Furth: Second?

Board Member Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Lew, second by Thompson, to approve the minutes of March 21st. All those in favor say aye. Opposed none. Passes 5-nothing.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Furth: We have no subcommittee items today, is that correct? There are no subcommittee items today.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

5. North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP)- Board Member Lew

Chair Furth: Board Member Lew, a report on the North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan.

Board Member Lew: Nothing has happened since the last ARB meeting, but the next meeting will be on May 22nd at 5:30, here in City Hall. They are three hours long. And website for the project, there's a dedicated website, which is PaloAltoNVCAP.org. All of the materials for future meetings and past meetings are posted at that website.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

6. Architectural Review Board Annual Report to City Council: Review of Draft Letter

Chair Furth: We don't have a draft letter of a report to City Council, so we will punt on that one. I wanted to report that I went to a meeting at the Mitchell Park Library, sponsored by the City. Is it Save our Groundwater? Save our Palo Alto Groundwater? At which Christine Lit [sic] - better double-check the name - an engineering professor from the University of California, made a presentation on adaptation to sea level rise. And I believe it's going to be posted on the City website. I recommend it to everybody. Basically, she talked about how we might make an orderly retreat from the Bay, and the two cities in the Bay Area that are going to be hit hardest by the first meter of sea level are San Raphael and Palo Alto because we have the most low-lying land that isn't in wetlands. Good thing most of ours is in wetlands. And that the line of retreat is probably 880 on the East Bay and 101 on our side. And that while the San Francisco Creek Joint Authority is working on thinking about levees, and I guess other groups are, too, that her argument is that the levees could hold back salt water, sea water, but they also hold in ground water and surface water. And that, furthermore, the rise in sea level will lead to essentially the pushing up of ground water and the raising of ground water levels inboard. I don't think anybody ever thought this was simple, but it's perhaps even less simple than we thought. And her recommendation is that we think about floodable development -- which I'm sure we've all seen in various areas, for these areas -- and she went on with other, perhaps more visionary responses that were done. And her argument was that there are places around the Bay which are very hard hit, which suffer from a lot of other disadvantages, so, while they might be eligible for funding from the resources board for global warming impact aid, they're not organized enough to take advantage of it at this point. Whereas we are not particularly eligible, but we have hundreds of organized citizens really engaged in this issue, plus a very

complex and I think pretty sophisticated City response. And it will be a couple years before the City has its sea level rise reports together, but we are working on it. Her argument is, so, Palo Alto is rich, Palo Alto is smart, Palo Alto is vulnerable, Palo Alto should go pioneer something. But meanwhile, we should have floodable development in these areas. I recommend the...

Board Member Hirsch: What did she say about the Baylands?

Chair Furth: They're going to go under. Essentially that we need to retreat, and that we can have development there that can accommodate being flooded from time to time. She's worked in Japan, where the airports float; at least one does. She's worked in The Netherlands, where they dug canals to absorb the extra water and pile it up nearby to provide some elevation. And she's worked in Venice, she said, where what they do is they just get flooded. They keep abandoning the lower floors of buildings. That's one approach. And the flooding for a while will be intermittent. But as we learn from some of the... You don't put electrical facilities on the ground floor, certainly not in the subbasement. You don't put the hospital infrastructure down at the bottom. You think about how to retreat. She also had cheerful things to say about our practice of capping volatile organic compounds doesn't work so well when the water washes the cap away. But that's for another day. So, her basic advice is that we need to look at those maps and face the fact that this is, we're not talking distant future; we're talking near future. We're talking within the lives of the buildings that we're looking at. The Public Works Director was there. The Groundwater Management person that the... What is it? Santa Clara County...? What's it called? Water District? What is our big management...?

Ms. Gerhardt: There is the Santa Clara Valley Water District.

Chair Furth: Santa Clara Valley Water District. They're all there, they're all working on it, and it's coming sooner than I might have thought. But it's a very intelligent, interesting and engaged thing. She's a very entertaining speaker. I recommend the tape. Or the video.

Ms. Gerhardt: The event was co-sponsored by Save Palo Alto's Groundwater and the City, and the guest speaker was Dr. Christina Hill from UC-Berkeley. And there is a City webpage, you know, if you just Google for Palo Alto sea level rise, there's a City webpage.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Next week on May 9th, at SPUR (San Francisco Planning & Urban Research), the San Jose location, there's going to be a presentation on Palo Alto's housing crisis. Our Planning Director will be there, as well as Liz Kniss and some members of Palo Alto Forward. This is SPUR, which is San Francisco Planning & Urban Research, they also have additional offices in Oakland and San Jose. This is at the San Jose location at six o'clock on May 9th.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. How's the Los Angeles airport going?

Board Member Thompson: It's going well.

Chair Furth: Good. We're everywhere. All right. Anything further before we adjourn?

Board Member Hirsch: You know, I'd like to ask that we kind of -- and I asked Jodie...

Chair Furth: Could you speak a little closer to the mic?

Board Member Hirsch: Closer, yeah. Information on the small cells, the meeting that took place with City Council, and then the resolution that was passed by them. We should really have an updated copy of that. Also, it started out with Councilman DuBois, who said that he included the ARB in the requirements as they move forward, and then it was eliminated. I thought we should really have the whole process of that, from beginning to end. Peter spoke at it. But it sort of left it with us kind of not specifically in the picture, and I would prefer that somehow or another we get back in the picture, somehow, if we can.

Because I think we add to the discussion on this quite considerably. I asked Jodie to put together the paperwork that happened during that meeting and pass it along to all of us.

Chair Furth: If you could just give us the links to the appropriate minutes, and also maybe at our next meeting, let us know what the rules are now, and if there is a proposal to continue to change them. Thank you. Thank you, David. Anything else? Well, it's 9:45, and we are adjourned.

Adjournment