



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES: June 6, 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: meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. Jodie, would you please call the role?

[Roll Call]

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: The first item on the agenda is oral communications. This is a time to speak to us about items that are not on today's agenda. I don't have any speaker cards. Is there anybody who wishes to address us on a matter not on the agenda? Seeing no one.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Agenda changes, additions and deletions. Staff is indicating they have no requests, board members have no requests.

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, please.

Jodie Gerhardt, Current Planning Manager: Yes. On the schedule here, we show that Board Member Baltay would be out on 6/20, and Board Member Thompson would be out on July 18th. Just let me know if there are any other vacations beyond that. Yes? Microphone.

Board Member Hirsch: I am out on the 20th, too.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, Board Member Hirsch will be out on the 20th as well? Okay. And then, we have cancelled the July 4th meeting.

Chair Furth: I will be out.... I will have resigned before the August meeting. Or I have resigned effective July 30th, so that will be my last meeting.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, July 18th, we have as your last meeting.

Chair Furth: Right. And at the moment, we're still... It's getting quite close, so can we pretty much think we're not going to have a second meeting in July, that we just have that one?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, I believe we'll just have the one.

Chair Furth: Cool. Not that we don't love it. We obviously wouldn't do it otherwise. On June 20th, the agenda items are the Macy's Men's redevelopment, that is Wilkes Bashford and Restoration Hardware.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Furth: That's a big project.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. This is its first formal. It's had a prelim, but this would be the first formal, so we're going to try and focus on the site plan for that.

Chair Furth: Excellent. And then, 3000 El Camino Real, the Palo Alto Square Master Sign Program?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. A fair amount of signs for that project.

Chair Furth: Those are the high-rise buildings and the theater?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes.

Chair Furth: All right. Any other comments from anybody on the Board before we turn to our next item? A new personal record, I got through all of those items.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 1700 & 1730 Embarcadero Road [18PLN-00186]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Site and Design Review, and Design Enhancement Exception to Allow the Demolition of an Existing 18,000 Square Foot Vacant Restaurant Building and a 15,700 Square Foot Audi Service Building and the Construction of a Two-Story 84,900 Square Foot Automobile Dealership That Combines two Brands (Mercedes/Audi). The Applicant has Also Requested Zoning Amendment to Change the Zoning of the Site From CS(D) and PC to CS(D)(AD), and Design Enhancement Exception (DEE) for Build-to-Line Setbacks. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated for Public Comment From March 15, 2019 to April 22, 2019. Zoning Districts: CS(D) & PC-4846. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Emily Foley at efoley@m-group.us

Chair Furth: Our first public hearing of the two that we'll have today concerns 1700 and 1730 Embarcadero Road, otherwise known as the Ming's site. This is a request for approval of site and design review and design enhancement exception, to allow the demolition of an existing 18,000 square foot vacant restaurant building and 15,700 square foot Audi service building, and the construction of a two-story, 85,000 square foot automobile dealership that combines Mercedes and Audi. The applicant has also requested a zoning amendment to change zoning of the site from CS(D) and PC – Planned Community, an obsolete zone – to CS(D)(AD) – AD is for Auto Dealership – and design enhancement exception for a build-to-line setback. Environmental assessment is a mitigated negative declaration, which is fairly complex. The public comment period on that formally closed on April 22nd. And I'm sure staff will tell us about previous reviews of this site. Before we do that, though, has anybody discussed...? First of all, have we all visited the site?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: I have, yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: And I have, as well. Oh, and I should also note that the planners' names are reversed on our two items today. It will not be Emily Foley presenting this; it will be Sheldon Ah Sing. Does anybody have any communications or discussions concerning this project to report? Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I spoke with Jeff Levinsky and Karen Holman about their opinions on the project. Jeff Levinsky emailed all of us a report, so it was just explaining the report. And my discussions with Karen Holman were also about his report, and other opinions on the project.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: I just wanted to disclose that I did additional research with regards to the bike path option that we have before us. I did research on using, it's called the Strava heat map. Basically, it's a privately held GPS tracking company, and they track cyclists' and runners' movements. I did look at that to see where people were going. It was actually fairly useful. It did show that bicyclists are using that area very differently than runners. The bike path is actually for both, so I think we should actually consider it, factor that in.

Chair Furth: Okay, so, that's for the applicant to hear, that we've had this additional data on bicycle and runner traffic you may wish to address. What's the name of this database you looked at?

Board Member Lew: It's called Strava, and they have a thing called a heat map, and it's available...

Chair Furth: Oh, this is the one that revealed the location of secret military bases because of all these guys running, wearing...?

Board Member Lew: Yes. And it's publicly accessible on their website.

Chair Furth: It is available.

Board Member Thompson: Did you find that a lot of...

Chair Furth: Let's not discuss it until we get to the hearing.

Board Member Thompson: Oh, all right. We'll wait to hear.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to disclose that I met two members of the public who expressed concern about compatibility with the Baylands Design Guidelines and pointed out some calculation issues regarding the FAR [Floor Area Ratio] calculation of the proposed project.

Chair Furth: David?

Board Member Hirsch: Nothing.

Chair Furth: And I also did some additional research, and technically, it was just reading city documents. I took a look at the City of Palo Alto sea level rise adaptation policy recommendations adopted by the City Council on March 18, 2019, and the many, many, many documents that it links to concerning projections of sea level rise in this area over the next 20 to 30 to 40 years. And I have raised that question and concern before, so I think the applicant was well aware of that. And staff, too. All right. After all of that, Sheldon?

Sheldon Ah Sing, Project Planner: Thank you for the introduction. Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner. I do have a PowerPoint presentation today, a lot of information I'll try to distill for you, but I'm also available for questions. The applicant is also here with a presentation. They also have a video.

Chair Furth: Oh, Sheldon, one thing I wanted to say, this is a complicated project, and don't rush. We need to absorb what you're saying.

Mr. Sing: Yes. It's one of the first times I've actually heard that from people, not to rush. I will take my time, thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Sing: The project overview, it's approximately a 4.82-acre site. It's not only just the Ming's property, it's also the Audi property, so there are two separate properties, is something to remember. They are maintaining those properties, 1700 and 1730 Embarcadero. The request would be for a zoning amendment for the PC property to go to CS with a D overlay, an AD overlay.

Chair Furth: Could you explain what those are?

Mr. Sing: The "D" is a site and design combining district, and those are in places where they're ecologically-sensitive, so it would be like in Hillside, or in this case, the Baylands. There's separate criteria findings for that. The other portion is the Ming's site is presently zoned CS with a D. Does not include the AD, for some reasons. All other properties in the area include the AD, but at the time when the hotel – I'll go through that a little bit – hotel was evaluated, that AD overlay was not considered.

Chair Furth: There's no auto dealership overlay.

Mr. Sing: That's correct. That's part of the zoning amendment. You have the site and design review, and that takes into account the special findings for being adjacent to the Baylands. We had to go to the Planning Commission – I'll mention a little bit about that meeting. And then there is the design enhancement exception, and that is for the build-to-line setback because that is a requirement of the CS District. The other component that was a part previously was the tree canopy for parking lot shading. That's been removed and withdrawn because the project now complies with that requirement, so it's no longer needed. Background of 1730 Embarcadero. This is the existing Audi site. It has a PC, Planned Community 4846, and there's a previous PC number on there that established the original dealership back in the '70s. It was updated to include actually the AD provisions. That was a few years ago. All of the auto dealerships that had PC on them were updated with the AD provisions, including this one. It does include a new showroom that was done a few years now, maybe three years ago. That was completed. They actually had a broader, extensive plan for the site. They only built the showroom component of that. That includes about a 19-foot setback and has a 21-foot ceiling. And why that is important is because under the AD combining district, showrooms have a max of 20 feet in height. That ends up being a non-conforming situation; to rectify that is to drop the ceiling to comply. That would be our recommendation. And we mentioned this in the last meeting. It just didn't get a lot of traction with all the other things going on. Background for 1700 Embarcadero, the Ming's site. As mentioned, it's a CS(D). The existing former restaurant has been vacant now for a while. It's a two-story building with a large parking lot. There are a number of trees in the parking lot. There's a big setback along Baylands, primarily because there are these PG&E overhead lines. There was a plan to approve a plan for a hotel. That never went through, so the property got sold. There was an event to place a dealership on that property. This is the site plan for that. The showroom was oriented towards Baylands. Deliveries were along Embarcadero, similar to what we're seeing now. The building had a 50-foot height. There was concerns that when we got to Council, about the compatibility with the surroundings. It was too tall. Wanted to evaluate the floor area ratio [inaudible], bird-safe windows, looking at Transit Demand Management. The landscaping maybe wasn't appropriate for the area. There were also some cost implications of intersection improvements. That project was around 62,000 square feet, so by comparison, the building that's on that site is approximately 55,000 square feet.

Chair Furth: Could you say those numbers again?

Mr. Sing: The proposal that went to the Council was 62,000 square feet, and the building that's proposed on that site – because remember, they are two separate sites, so they are calculated differently – is around 55,000 square feet. For the City's gross floor area. The math is about 7,000 square feet less. This area shows a little bit of the site context, the proximity to US 101. You can't see the site based on some of the vegetation and elevation changes from 101. You come off of the off-ramp there, kind of come down, and you start seeing the site, and that's in your packet. Some people would say this is the gateway. It's not officially a gateway in the comprehensive plan, but nonetheless, it is a visible site because it is at a major intersection for the city. Surrounding that, you have the airport in the distance. You've got some large buildings with big setbacks, and those are characteristic of the zoning, which is the ROLM, and that's the Light Manufacturing District. You have two car dealerships including Audi, so you have Honda next door. Then you have the golf driving range, and the Baylands are immediately adjacent to the Audi site. That is visible from the trail. A view from that trail at the rear of the Audi site. There are eucalyptus trees there now on the site. Those are to be removed and replaced with big-leaf maple and valley oaks, and those are regional type of plantings rather than the eucalyptus, which isn't. I'll have a simulation of what that will look like later on. As I mentioned, the project did go to the Planning Commission on March 27th, and there was a lot of discussion about the appropriateness of the use and the zoning, and that's part of what the Planning Commission looks at, are those legislative actions. They did add a condition regarding migratory birds and replacement of mature trees, and those are included in the conditions of approval. They did not want to see the removal of the trees for the bicycle path. I have a few sites to kind of mention that, but that is definitely a trade-off on this project, is you have those trees that are along Baylands. They are mature. They provide some canopy there. However, if you remove those trees, you replace them, you can't have any trees or structures that are over 15 feet because of the overhead lines. And PG&E could come in at any time and really lop those existing trees if they wanted to, just to maintain it. There was another condition added for lighting, regarding lighting levels in comparison to existing conditions. The applicant did come back with a pretty robust lighting study, and we can talk more about that in a bit. As I mentioned, they talked about appropriateness of the use of the area. They were concerned about the site being zoned CS, and the hotel, that didn't go through. Now we have this dealership; what happens if the dealership doesn't work out? They just wanted to get a better understanding of the use of that site. Of course, there were comments about the compatibility with the Baylands. The last meeting that we were here, April 4th, there were a number of things that the Board had concerns about, and the public had concerns about. There were concerns about the carwash noise. The carwash is an ancillary operation of the facility that would be used for, it's my understanding, washing cars that may be displayed outside, or cars that are serviced, you know, as part of the service that they offer. The car wash is exterior, it's located along the property line which is adjacent to the neighboring property, and the neighbor had concerns about the car wash noise. In response to that, the applicant, on their own, came up with an acoustical report. They had some recommendations on top of the mitigation measures that we proposed. Part of that was to extend the wall at the entrance and the exit of the car wash. These are solid walls that would be extended out. In addition to that, adding automatic closing doors, so when there is one car that is being washed on the inside, both doors are closed, and then, one would open up as you exit. That was found to reduce the noise of the car wash to an acceptable level. There were concerns about lighting, obviously, with the Baylands being adjacent. Lighting is a very sensitive issue for habitat. The applicant proposed very specific directional lighting and program lighting control system to adjust those lighting levels at those critical periods of the day. There were issues about street elevation to address more of a commercial aspect, to address more of the Baylands. You can see on the revised drawings – and I'll go through those – that they included more screening – that was a suggestion that staff had – on the building. They planted a lot more plants. They now have a net of... I'm just counting. The shade trees, a net of 12 additional trees, and they have a lot more ornamental type of trees, as well. The building includes more glass. The parapets to the parking deck include some fiberglass, so that reduces the mass of the building. The color is, though they maintain their branding, but we believe, and look forward to direction from the Board, that what they chose was purposeful. Then, there was integration of the bike path. As I said, this

is really a big trade-off here. If you keep the trees, the only way to put a bike path is to put the bike path on their property. That's really the only way to have that. You can't do it as proposed because the trees are in the way. They straddle the property line, as well as some are in the City's right-of-way. The bike path is over the property lines; I have exhibits about that. They also provided better renderings, and those are included in your packet. The applicant will go through a lot more of those. In summary, to reiterate again, the properties are to remain separate. The service drive really forms a break between the buildings there at the property line, and that upper floor of the building setback at that point, of where the buildings are close to each other. The major constraint from the site is the 80-foot easements along Bayshore. As mentioned, no structure is permitted there. It's an above-grade easement, it's a below-grade easement. Vegetation can't be taller than 15 feet, or structures can't be taller than 15 feet, so that's a major constraint. That's why you see a lot of ornamental types of plantings in that area. They're adding western redbuds there. Those are the most appropriate, probably; maybe some other ones that the applicant will be open to suggestions for. The buildings are designed in such a way that there will be some crossover. The service drive can be shared amongst the two buildings. That would depend on how they want to integrate those services. The site, you can drive around the site and the perimeter. The plans include a traffic layout of how they would achieve that. The project, the base flood elevation for the site is 10.5 feet, and they have to raise the site by one foot. The finished building elevation will be at 11.5 feet. The car wash does not have to be in that same range, so that's the one exception, but the site will be built up. Just a little bit of comparison. I'll let the applicant go more into it of what they've done, but they've added more glass, they've changed some of the thickness of the horizontal elements, some of the coloring. In the renderings, you can see what they did there. The one that went before the Board in April had a very muted color, kind of tannish, and I think some of the comments were to make it more like a commercial building. It is a commercial building. So, they opened up that corner with some glass, and you can now see the stackers better. There are some louvers that were added to the side along Bayshore. You can see here some of the plantings. As you know in renderings, they can turn those on or off. It's kind of hard sometimes when you have the landscaping; you can't see the building. This is the difference between the showroom on the Mercedes. You can see that the horizontal roof element above the showroom is thicker. That was a comment from the Board previously. They have responded to that. And then, I think maybe the function of the rendering being better, you can see the variation of the landscaping there. They tried to take cues from the eye clinic across the street from Bayshore. This is along Bayshore here. You can see some of the changes that they've done. They've added those screening louvers to go towards the front of the building along Bayshore, towards Embarcadero. And then, that transitions, once you get past the stairwell element, that transitions to the louvers being screening with plant material on it. It's more of an integration towards the Baylands. This is the rendering that shows the landscaping layer being turned off. This is from the rear of the Audi, looking at Mercedes. To the left, kind of behind it, would be where the car wash would be located. You can see here what those screenings would look like on the buildings. And then, you also see some of that fiberglass that's being used for the parapet there, so you can see how that breaks up the mass. Below those fiberglass screening parapets would be some additional planters. Those were originally on the other submittal, so we feel like they've made a good attempt at integrating with the Baylands with landscape material on the building. This is strictly from the rear. They're looking at the Audi building, and what they've done there, you can see the screening, you can see the car wash building to the left beyond the, I believe that's an enclosure for the backup generator. And then, just to go over some of the site issues. The Audi site is adjacent to the Baylands. That's obviously a big concern. The Mercedes site is buffered by the Audi site, as well as the adjacent building, so there's no direct interaction with the Baylands preserve as the Audi site. There was a lot of attention that was made to adding more landscaping back there. You have the big-leaf maple, you've got the oak trees back there. Those are replacements of the eucalyptus trees. The 80-foot utility easement that I mentioned, the height limit is 50 feet, and that is a combination... I'll step back a little bit. The CS District has a height limit of 50 feet. The AD overlay also would allow building sites to go up to 50 feet. So, while the rest of the area has an ROLM, and in comparison, they do have AD combined district, their floor area is .3 FAR. The base for AD is .4. If you're going to have a dealership

building, you already have a bump up. Then there is, for the AD, you also have the inclusion of the showroom bonus of .2. Again, if you're going to have a dealership, you're going to have a bigger building than the rest of the buildings out there. The height limit for ROLM is 35 feet. The AD allows you to have a 50-foot height limit. There's no build-to line setback for ROLM. There are no context design base criteria for ROLM. With the CS they are proposing and maintaining, you have a little more findings in there to get a better-looking building, so just to let you know, there are trade-offs there, whether it's ROLM or the CS with the AD. They could propose what they're proposing out there. The design has an exception for the build-to setback, but essentially, they can design what they have proposed. Now, with the bicycle path, there is a gap in the formal bicycle lane path along the frontage of the project to the Geng Road trail. We had suggested early on to bridge this gap somehow. We thought maybe they could do something on site. In discussions with them, they found that that was problematic because of some security, having people on their site. We did provide an alternative to have that go along the street. As you can see, this is one of the major constraints of, at the intersection is the tower, the utility pole, a number of utility boxes that are out there. And then, you can see here where the trees are, and the height. They're obviously over 15 feet. What they did in this round, this iteration, was the existing trees are gone. As I mentioned, that's the only way to put this design that straddles the property line. In this scenario, they maintained the number of trees, plus they added some additional trees. But they are smaller trees, ornamental trees. They're the western redbuds. But those are compliant with the PG&E requirements. What you do have is an eight-foot path and a two-foot shoulder, the five-ten foot planter strip in places. This is something that we ran by our Transportation Department, and they are supportive of that. As I mentioned, there is a design enhancement exception. The build-to line just simply can't comply with that along Bayshore with the easement. It could comply along Embarcadero, but as we have described in detail in the past, there's better on-site circulation with the larger setback along Embarcadero. As I mentioned, the parking lot tree canopy is no longer an issue because of the added trees. I do want to mention with respect to design enhancement exceptions brought before the meeting, to my attention, that we are missing a couple of findings, so if there is a recommendation here, we'll need to include those two findings with your motion. Thank you. Then we have the Baylands Master Plan. It's a big component. They have a design guide in there, talking about the use. Only muted natural colors, choose materials and finishes that will not weather. Preserve the horizon line with low and horizontal elements. Mount fences, enclosures; reduce the size and heights of signs. And, design for practicality. And then, I provide this picture of one of the examples in the regulatory documents that shows this is a good example of the building. Here this project uses muted colors, a lot of glass, some roof elements, and I think if you look at the Mercedes project, we believe that there's some complementary there going on. Is this building, the eye clinic, horizontal building, you know, it's got a small footprint, but it looks like it's taller than one story. The project site, typically in a dealership, you would have a smaller building, and then you would have a sea of parking around it. I think some would say that that's a negative aspect of car dealerships. And I'll go back a couple slides here. I guess we could look at what the Ming's site is today. You've got kind of a modest-sized building, a big parking lot, and you've got a bunch of Audi cars out there right now. That's an example of real-world, mock-up of what your typical auto dealership would look like. What they've done with this plan is, they've integrated all of that. They have very little surface parking for display, customer parking on the surface. They've internalized all that with parking structures that are exempted from floor area. So, yes, they do have a bigger building, but it's because they're putting all the negative aspects of the dealership inside. The project does include bird-safe windows. The plans are very clear about that. We may have some questions, more about that. They have addressed the lighting with a photometrics plan. They have a lighting control system. It sounds very sophisticated. If that needs to be adjusted throughout the operation, we can work with the dealership to do that. The project does include landscaping that is very consistent with the Baylands, consistent with the newer development in that area. In particular, with that buffer between the Audi site and the Baylands preserve. There was a mitigated negative declaration that was circulated between March 15 and April 22nd. We identified that there would be potential significant impacts to biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, noise and transportation. We

received one comment letter regarding tree canopies, and we believe that with the revisions to the project, that that concern has been resolved. We do have the response to comments. Those are before you. There's a copy out on the table behind. Those are on the City's website. We did hear a number of public comments on this project. We heard about massing, heard about FAR, height, noise, compatibility with the Baylands. And, I think as I mentioned previously, about the project will be a bigger building. I don't think you're going to get a one-story dealership anymore, based on the economics. But we have to make sure that we are designing it in a way that is compatible, and I think that's why we are here today. These are all very valid comments for a project like this, and the AD District does allow for additional FAR. It exempts some floor area, allows for additional height, and that all equates to a bigger building. We don't use volume as a measure. We use strictly floor area, and in areas where we had to make interpretations because of the stacker, for instance, is a kind of unique type of use of a floor area, we did that. If we need further direction on that, we're here to take that, and work with the applicant on that. The next steps would be with the ARB to review the architecture, review the design enhancement exception, have a recommendation to the City Council, and the City Council will review that. Adding discussion, public comment, [inaudible] majority, recommend approval with conditions. We know we want to add the additional design enhancement exception findings. If you can't make the findings, then, you know, you'll want to forward a recommendation of denial to Council. In any case, we just want to make sure that [inaudible] is very clear what those issues are. With that, I conclude my presentation, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you may have. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Sheldon. Just to be clear to us, usually we make recommendations to the Director of Community Development. In this case, because it's a site and design review, this project has gone to the Planning Commission, it's come to us, it will next go to the City Council, and that's for the site and design aspect of it. In addition, there is a zone change. Is that right?

Mr. Sing: That is correct.

Chair Furth: And that concerns the Audi parcel.

Mr. Sing: The subject change is for both properties because Ming's does not have the AD.

Chair Furth: Oh, Ming's is without the Auto Dealership designation, and the other one is still a Planned Community.

Mr. Sing: That's correct.

Chair Furth: Audi is still a Planned Community. Both of them would be... Audi is obviously already an Auto Dealership-designated property; Ming's is not.

Mr. Sing: That is correct.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: The Ming's site was a PC before the...

Chair Furth: Yes, I remember...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ... and that's why it doesn't have the...

Chair Furth: That's why it's missing the Auto Dealership.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: This is an area various city councils thought would be appropriate for auto dealerships. All right. Questions of staff before we hear from the applicant and the public. Anybody?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. A detailed question, Sheldon, about the height and FAR calculations. The height limit, is that measured from natural grade existing, or some variation because of the flood plain?

Mr. Sing: The height is taken from the finished grade that's adjacent to the wall. We don't measure it from existing grade and penalize the site.

Chair Furth: Wait a minute. If it's depressed, I mean, if it has to be... So, even if they have to elevate the structures because of the flood plain, they don't get additional height? They measure from the new finished grade, right?

Mr. Sing: That's not. Not the existing grade.

Chair Furth: Not the existing grade, the new, improve grade.

Mr. Sing: That's correct.

Chair Furth: And that's a foot higher than the existing grade, in this case?

Mr. Sing: Yes.

Chair Furth: So it's one foot above...

Board Member Lew: No, it's much higher than that.

Chair Furth: I don't think that's right.

Board Member Lew: There are sections in the civil drawings that show more like 4 ½ feet.

Chair Furth: About 4.5 feet above existing grade.

Board Member Thompson: Can you point that out because I looked at that this morning and it looks like just one foot.

Chair Furth: I think it would be good to get this straight. One of our problems is we used to measure things from mean sea level, and now, that's constantly changing.

Board Member Lew: If you look in the packet, page C02.02, there are six sections that show existing grade versus the proposed grade. It's taken from Embarcadero and East Bayshore and to the adjacent property on East Bayshore. And also, in back of the Audi dealership, towards the Baylands, and then towards the Honda dealer. It's all there.

Chair Furth: It is all there. Can you take one of those sections and explain to me what it's showing in terms of change?

Board Member Lew: Sure.

Chair Furth: I see these dotted lines.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I know. It's hard to read. I actually marked it up in color just to make it easier to read for myself. Basically, you're going to see the grades stay the same around the property lines, and then it's going to slope up as much as 4 ½ feet.

Chair Furth: Towards the building site.

Board Member Lew: Towards the building, yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: And just to clarify that any building on this property would need to do this [crosstalk] up to meet the flood regulations.

Chair Furth: Yes. That's the point.

Vice Chair Baltay: My question, Sheldon, is where is the base line for the height of the building measured? Is it from the finished floor elevation – the FFE – of 11.5, or from the BFE of 10.5? You already said it's not from the existing grade, but there seems to be about a four-foot difference there. Why are we measuring that from the floor of the building?

Board Member Thompson: Sorry, can I make an extra comment? On CO1.00, if you look at the existing grade, it shows the existing contour lines, and it's true that where the existing parking is is lower, but if you look at where the base of the existing building is, that's being shown at 11 feet. It looks like they just extended that over so that they could keep the same floor. I think also the Audi dealership is at the...

Board Member Lew: I think the difference is, when you go to Ming's, you have to go up half a flight of stairs. Right? I think they're actually... Because the new building has a bigger footprint, they're raising more of the site.

Board Member Thompson: But they're keeping the existing grade of the existing building.

Chair Furth: I think part of the reason we have a question, I mean, there are two issues that are of concern to us. Well, three. One is just trying to understand what we're reading. The second one is trying to understand how this building and development respond to flood hazard. And the third one is trying to understand what people will perceive. Because people don't perceive our formulas; they perceive the building as it is built. If the building pad is higher elevation than Bayshore, for example, they're going to perceive that different. How does the building pad from which you're going to...? The finished grade from what you're going to measure, how does that compare with base line? I'm sorry. Bayshore. I know everybody else can read this, but I...

Mr. Sing: Your existing building is about 10.76, just slightly above the base floor elevation. And they need to get a foot above 10.5, so that's where the 11.5 comes in. And the height is measured from the adjacent point of the wall to the grade. There's not a formula that says they need to be out a foot, or two feet, or five feet away, [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: And then, they are raising their pad around the building as well, so it won't be this sudden pop-up.

Board Member Thompson: They're keeping this elevation.

Chair Furth: On the one hand, that pad is three to four feet higher than the sidewalk. Am I right? They're nodding at that. We'll let them address that issue later. They know this almost as well as my colleagues do.

Vice Chair Baltay: I was just hoping to have in the record that it seems like we're measuring the height of the building from, essentially the finished floor of the main floor of the building, which is where the grade is just outside it. Is that right?

Mr. Sing: It's from, on the outside. It's not the floor; it's on the outside of the wall. That's the grade.

Vice Chair Baltay: That that is the same as the inside, in this case. Is that right?

Mr. Sing: It could be, yeah. That could be the case, yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: We're assuming that the exterior grade is more or less flush with the floor around the perimeter of the building.

Mr. Sing: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. The second question is, as I asked last time as well, about the car stackers, and how we count them, bulk versus volume. My understanding is that regardless of the height, the car stackers are counted once. Sort of like the footprint of them, because they're not useable space inside. I

just want to understand if that's the largest footprint, so to speak, or just the part of one floor. How do you go about really understanding how you apply the FAR regulations to the car stackers?

Chair Furth: And just to be clear on what our question is... And we all understand that we did not write our code thinking about the latest in technology, which is constantly evolving. But this particular stacker has a footprint at ground level, and it goes up, and then it goes out. Is that right? It spreads to a larger area on upper floors, or not?

Mr. Sing: There is a cantilever portion toward the front.

Chair Furth: It has a larger area on upper floors. A larger footprint on the upper floors than on the ground floor.

Mr. Sing: Yes, one component of it.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Go ahead and answer the question, sorry.

Mr. Sing: Right, so, in that case, it is kind of a new technology, and we made an interpretation of how to address that space, and we did it in such a way that we counted that as part of the one floor that was being cantilevered over. It wasn't a separate floor; it didn't cause for additional gross floor area. If that's the case, maybe there's a different direction, and then, if we're going to take that, and if we didn't have conversations with the applicant in the past, they'll have to adjust accordingly.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm just trying to understand. I mean, it's up to you to interpret the code, these kinds of things. But the car stacker counts once towards floor area. Which floor counts once? The smallest or the biggest?

Mr. Sing: We counted the floor, and that's like... That's 10,000 square foot. Square.

Chair Furth: The ground floor.

Mr. Sing: The ground floor.

Board Member Lew: They have all the calcs in the packet. On Sheet ZA102.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you, Sheldon.

Chair Furth: And just one more question, Sheldon. I know this is in the report, but it's so big. What code section were you interpreting when you did this? You can get back to me later on that.

Ms. Gerhardt: You're asking about FAR?

Chair Furth: The floor area calculation. Is based on...?

Ms. Gerhardt: It comes out of the definition, 1804.

Chair Furth: I knew you'd know.

Ms. Gerhardt: Gross floor area. And this is, I was saying this last hearing, but in the Research Park, we have many vaulted lobby spaces and things of that nature, so that's the sort of rationale that we're using.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: Also, the automotive, the relay section, has further clarifications on square footage, so it exempts, like, the covered passageway on the ground floor for cars. If it's not used for servicing, it's exempt. And that's also where they mentioned the 20-foot height limit for dealer showroom areas. It's very specific in the AD overlay.

Chair Furth: Great. Any other questions of staff before we go to the public hearing?

Board Member Thompson: I had a question about, it was sort of a pink and purple FAR calcs on Sheet ZA102. There are two vestibules that are shaded in the dark pink as dealership services, and I just wanted to double-check that those are still dark pink, or if those should be light pink. That's kind of where the car, I think that's where it goes into the little rotating thing.

Mr. Sing: You're talking about the two square areas and...? I apologize, I've seen a lot of iterations; just make sure we're looking at the same thing. You're saying purple? Or pink?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I'm just wondering if this is the latest, or if there was...? Because I saw a different exhibit that was showing them as light pink. I just want to confirm.

Mr. Sing: Yeah. It should be pink.

Board Member Thompson: It should be light pink? Okay.

Mr. Sing: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: These two vestibules...

Chair Furth: Should be colored differently. In Sheet ZA102, the exhibit which colors different areas pink and purple, is an error, and the two vestibules to the right-hand side of the sheet that are adjacent to the pink area should be pink.

Board Member Thompson: Because they're considered showroom.

Chair Furth: They're showroom space. Okay. Could we hear from the applicant? Once you're set up, you have 10 minutes to proceed. And I should note that we have a materials board up here, and a key to it.

Mr. Sing: Just to clarify, this past week, we were making some... There were duplicates in the sheets and the plans, and that's why you probably saw all different pink or purple. But the ZA100 summary sheet is an accurate depiction of what the floor area is.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, thank you.

Chair Furth: Sorry, this is or isn't accurate?

Board Member Thompson: He's saying that this is inaccurate...

Chair Furth: But the other one is right. The calculations are good. Thank you. Or accurate.

[Applicant setting up PowerPoint]

Lyle Hutson, Architect: Good morning, Madam Chair, members of the Board, staff. My name is Lyle Hutson. I represent YSM Design. We are the project architect for...

Chair Furth: And once again, we have to ask you to spell your name for our transcriber, and feel free to speak slowly. If we need extend your time, we will.

Mr. Hutson: My name is Lyle Hutson [spells name]. I am the project architect, representing YSM Design for the project in front of you today. Again, thank you very much, Madam Chair, Board members and staff. Again, staff has done an excellent job presenting this project. No way to do it in its entirety, so I'm sure there's going to be plenty of questions, and I think we want to make sure that we get to all of your answers and all of the questions that you have. Separate from the presentation that Sheldon made, we have a little presentation, maybe showing a little more graphically what this project is all about. You've seen this before, so I'm not going to be overly verbose about what the concept is here. This is an automotive facility that shares two separate projects. The Audi project is an existing showroom and service facility. The existing showroom was approved and built a few years ago under the AD that you have been reviewing. The service department back behind that abuts the Baylands was also going to be

a separate phase in this that was never completed, and this project allows us the opportunity to complete that project, as well as utilize the adjacent Ming's site for a separate franchise. These are two separate franchises. They have one ownership group. They operate independently, yet they have some back-of-the-house sharing of circulation only. They both have their own service departments, parts departments, refuse disposal. They do share the car wash in the back behind Audi, again, as well as circulation back behind. The challenge of this site certainly is, first and foremost, the circulation.... Excuse me, and the easement that we have with PG&E, which is further compounded by a significant number of utilities, both private and public, in Embarcadero and the Bayshore street frontages and shared areas. It's been a challenge from the very beginning to put together a project that has enough viability to make use of this land. The hotel was a huge proposal. Didn't work, wasn't compatible, didn't make it through. The previous car dealership, similar, same manufacturer, but a different approach. We've approached this a little bit differently. Rather than having the vehicles out in front, we're taking advantage of technology and the opportunity to do something very unique here, and further the automotive business in the way they sell and service automobiles. That's basically taken up with the interior car storage system, taking virtually all of the frontline display and taking it inside. We have one vehicle display out on the front, in the frontage area. There are some areas on the outside of the building that we would use for transition to drive cars in and out. Those could also be used maybe as some display, but essentially no car slots, no parking stalls, no city parking stalls are used for vehicle display, which is totally different than the Honda dealership or many others that you see. We're trying to take advantage of the technology and a different way of selling cars. We're taking those cars off of the front. We're putting them inside. There's no need to wash those cars every day, as most dealerships do, so you've got hundreds of cars – and literally, in this case, there are hundreds of cars on site – that will be within the stacker, not out on the parking lot in order to display those. I won't go into the way the system works, but we've internalized that. That also allows us to minimize the vehicle washing. We have a car wash on site. We can go through the sound mitigation measures and the location of that as needed. We did take into consideration the previous Board comments very carefully, and concisely going through what our concerns and what your concerns were and trying to meld those two together. Sheldon did a very admirable job describing what we've done with regards to our materials and our finishes and our colors and our adaptation of the transition to the Baylands with the significant addition of the green screen louvers, both to the Bayshore side, the Audi side, and the rear of the Audi, and the rear of Mercedes. So, whether there is a visual connection from the Baylands to the back of the dealership, there was some comment about being institutional back there. I think we've addressed that, in addition to making that a transition from green to even greener in the Baylands. We did take into account some additional glazing in front and make this become the commercial project that we feel like it should be as it relates to the sale of automobiles. All glass is, as been described before, is bird-safe glass. We've committed to that 100 percent everywhere. We have glass, in an effort to minimize that. I will talk just briefly about our lighting. That was a huge concern last time, and we have a full comprehensive package for the light levels, the mitigation of any lighting towards the Baylands, which is a significant number, way less than one percent, or one-foot candle, which we maintain... There's virtually no poles in the back behind Audi to facilitate lighting. We've eliminated any up lighting to the building in an effort to really trying to keep the product, the vehicles, the significant individual aspect, and not the building itself. We're not highlighting the building with up lights or anything like that. Transitioning maybe to the bike path and the transit portion. You can see on the slide the yellow area, which is the bicycle bridge that goes across 101 and onto Bayshore, very close to where the Bayshore entrance is, and the bike path there. The proposal before you today still maintains the shared bicycle and pedestrian path that shares some of the private property and some of the public property along Bayshore and Embarcadero. The significance of that is that the existing trees need to be removed in order to provide the size path that's required by City Traffic. I assume that that is an industry standard or a nationwide standard for when you have a combined path with pedestrians and bicycles. And you can see the same path basically in the Baylands itself, so it's similar to that in size. That shares pedestrians and bicycles. The bicycle path is for any bicycle, and it basically takes the cyclists going one way – which would be north on Bayshore – off of Bayshore, onto our property behind the drive aisle,

across the front of Bayshore, around the power line structure, if you will, across Embarcadero, and then back out onto the street once it passes the Audi dealership. We're basically circumventing that portion for pedestrians and the bicycles. We're not making any judgment on that at all. We could be persuaded either way, but the presentation that you have before you took into account considerable effort by staff to get us to a point where we could get traffic – bicycle traffic, I presume – off of Bayshore and Embarcadero on that right-hand turn. This shows the location. I think you've seen a number of times where we are in relationship to the Baylands. We back up at the Audi project, backs up directly to the Baylands, and Mercedes does not yet. We've treated the back and the sides of both buildings similar to the point to where we are hopefully setting a precedent for other projects and other developments, that we can integrate the green with and habitat with the Baylands, even though we're not either directly adjacent or visible from. The existing site, a number of comments have been made by the City. Public comments, we've talked about volume. There is no volume measurement as it relates to codes. That's just not the way it's calculated. Please pay particular attention to the fact that this is two projects, so the numbers maybe that have been reported are combined numbers and should be treated separately. We are actually a smaller project than certainly the previous dealership, and certainly the hotel. The fact that we have taken some 300 cars off of the street and put them in – between 250 and 300 cars – that would be, if you had city parking area with drive aisles, that's approximately 70,000 to 90,000 square feet of parking area that we're not using out on the street or in a parking structure. I just wanted to make sure that that was reiterated. And you can see, there is our massing study with the appropriate heights on our building and the adjacent buildings, and I think we very well complement the neighborhood and the transition from Embarcadero and Bayshore to the other commercial projects. You've seen this before. This is the massing elevation study between our building, which is four feet higher than the street elevation because the street doesn't change, so we do have to make a transition to some 4 ½ feet from the street on Embarcadero and Bayshore up to our project.

Chair Furth: Excuse me. About how much more time do you think you would need?

Mr. Hutson: I'm just going to go through this. Maybe three minutes.

Chair Furth: Is the commission willing to...? Is that acceptable to the Board? It's my call, I say yes. You're over by one minute, so try to wrap up [crosstalk].

Mr. Hutson: Okay.

Mr. Sing: You have a video, too, by the way.

Mr. Hutson: Site development, we've indicated before. Again, this is just a reiteration of the parking and traffic flow with the bicycle path and pedestrian path in blue. In front. This is an illustrative plan with the provided landscape and buffers between vehicle areas. And again, these are all in your package, so I won't dwell on those. You have a material and color board in front of you with physical samples today. You can flip it over and see the... There's another board as well that has the, they're basically the same. You can just see what the materials and finishes are. There was a desire to have more illustrative renderings, and I'm going to go through those real quickly. This is the Audi. This is the front of Mercedes with the vegetation. This is without the trees, showing the redbud trees.

Chair Furth: Could you do that one more time, please?

Mr. Hutson: Oh, good question.

Chair Furth: Don't... Never mind.

Mr. Hutson: It shows, typically. Thank you. With and without. Each one of these is showing with and without the proposed vegetation. It's kind of hard to see the building, but...

Chair Furth: That's fine.

Mr. Hutson: Again, as it's proposed from the corner of Embarcadero and Bayshore. And then removed. The corner; removed. We do have some cars that come out of those three doors. Those are our delivery vehicles. There are no parking spaces devoted towards new cars. This is Bayshore. Pretty much obscures the building. The lower half. The back portion. You can look at these a little closer to see the proposed louvered screens. They're a green screen with plugged planting in between and irrigated. They don't come up from the bottom. Each one of those areas is plugged for the vegetation, and those occur, some on Bayshore as we transition around to the back of Mercedes, along the back of Mercedes, and all along the back portion until we get to the rear portion of Audi. Audi has a different base color at the ground floor than Mercedes does. That's a corporate identity issue. But additional vegetation that we've added, along with shade trees along the back where the car wash is. And you can see, without the trees. View from the Bayshore before; and view after. We are absolutely trying to hide the back of the building from visibility, yet still meet the transition and the vegetation to allow... We're not just blocking it off. We're integrating the back of our building, and the sides as well, to the Baylands.

Chair Furth: [off-microphone]

Mr. Hutson: Okay. Yeah.

Chair Furth: You will have time to respond again after we hear from the public. Let's ask our questions after we've heard from the public, shall we? We have some public comment cards. First is Jeff Levinsky, to be followed by Karen Holman, and then, Wayne Kumagai. To be followed by Don McDougall. We'll call you out again. Mr. Levinsky, you have three minutes. Welcome.

Jeff Levinsky: Good morning, Board members. It's Jeff Levinsky [spells name]. I guess I'd like to talk about an issue that has already come up, which is the difference in size between this and the previous building proposal. As I put in my written comments, I believe this building is 51 percent larger in volume than what was proposed earlier. And the reason I'm using volume is because floor area is not a particularly good measure of how the public will experience the size of the building. First of all, as you know, about half of this building isn't even floor area; it's simply exempted from floor area, yet it's there. Parts of the building aren't being counted as floor area, although they should be counted as floor area. The ceiling height on some parts of this building is 40-plus feet high. And if it were the case that everything but floor area were invisible, then that would be great. But it's all going to be visible to the public. The comment was made that we don't use volume to measure buildings, but the fact is, that is how they are perceived. And, by the way, in the code, it doesn't say you're supposed to only use floor area to look at the mapping of a building. And, we do talk about building envelope in various parts of our code, the building envelope being the three-dimensional outline of the building. One of the rules we have is that when a building is grandfathered, it's not allowed to increase its building envelope, and that came up with the building right across the street from here, where even though the floor area was going to be the same, the Council looked at it and said, "No, its apparent volume is going to increase," and they turned that down. The Council and the public are sensitive, I believe, to these matters. I also have put in my comments on specific things about the showroom exemption, and you heard some staff remarks on that. The showroom exemption that was in the PC is not the same showroom exemption that is available if the sites get rezoned. Something that qualified under the old PC doesn't necessarily qualify for the showroom exemption under the new one. Finally, I think that this project has the potential to be a good one if the right design perspective is there, but as it stands, this will be the largest, most stand-outish building of its kind in the Baylands. There is nothing else like it in terms of the size of the building, and although I think they've taken it out of your staff report, in the previous staff report they claimed that it wasn't the largest, but we couldn't find any measure on which this wouldn't be the largest building around. Please keep that all in mind as you look at this project. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mr. Levinsky. Karen Holman.

Karen Holman: Good morning, and thank you. I concur with the comments of the prior speaker. By far the biggest concern with this project is the mass and scale. In spite of that, we still don't have in the plan

set context drawings, context photographs. They still aren't provided. FAR is not the driver here, but the massing is. It's also an up-to. Heights and FARs are up-to's. They are not guaranteed, and especially in a sensitive setting like this in the Baylands. I also disagree with the staff report where it says that this is not a gateway, technically. I refer again to the Baylands Master Plan, Map L4, defines Embarcadero Road east of 101 as a scenic corridor, and identifies the intersection of Embarcadero Road and East Bayshore as a gateway. It's clear there. Also, there were comments last time about how this isn't in the Baylands. It is. The guidelines talk about when reviewing or designing projects located in any part of the Baylands, the design principles and concepts should be applied in the service and commercial areas, as well as anyplace else in the Baylands. Twenty-three hundred East Bayshore started with a landscape plan, and that's what helped soften that project. This project isn't starting there. Another comment in the Baylands that this is a scenic route and gateway, and the importance of that compatibility. This is not El Camino. This is going to be a destination. I don't think anybody here is trying to stop there from being a Mercedes dealership there. But this is a destination, so I don't think there needs to be a big, showy building to attract people to it. It does not have a line of sight from 101. It doesn't have a line of site along El Camino Real. This building could be moderated to be much more compatible and fit into the Baylands. This is, because it's a rezoning also, you all have, in my opinion, more than the regular amount of discretion. A rezoning is very much a discretionary action, so you could require the trees to stay in the plan. Lighting and hours of operation are a big concern. The bollard lighting at the front are just hot spots of light. Even if you can't see the source of the lighting, it's still a hot spot of light, which is bad for migratory animals. The grade question has been raised. The large black tower, does it serve any purpose besides being a logo for the dealership? If there's a monument sign in the front, that identifies so that when somebody gets there, they know this is a Mercedes dealership. Again, this is not a site that you're going to be attracted to because you're seeing it from 101 or El Camino. What's the purpose of that tower? It's a large, large element. And taking cars off of the street or the parking lot, I'll give you that, but it's a very large trade-off to then have a massive building where much of the space is not counted. It's a trade-off. It's not necessarily the perfect solution to getting cars off the street or off a parking lot. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Our next speaker is Wayne Kumagai, to be followed by Don McDougall.

Jin: Good morning. Wayne has a doctor's appointment and he has to be...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, you need to be a little closer to the microphone. It does adjust.

Jin: He has a doctor appointment. He has to leave. He left.

Chair Furth: He had to leave earlier?

Jin: Yeah, he has a doctor appointment.

Chair Furth: Oh, I'm so sorry. And your name is?

Jin: My name is Jin [last name inaudible]. I'm the owner of the adjacent building, at 2479 East Bayshore. I want to point out, in my building, most of the tenants are [inaudible] residents. They are small business content, office. Many tenants came to me to speak of their concern for the car wash noise. They told me the existing car wash [inaudible] already generates lots of noise. They said that even closer to our side, immediately adjacent, no [inaudible]. They cannot afford that, so they consider to leave the space.

Chair Furth: You represent the party next to this property, and the tenants include lawyers and small businesses...

Jin: Small business....

Chair Furth: ... and they have reported that the existing car wash operations create noise that is a nuisance and a disturbance to them.

Jin: Already, yes.

Chair Furth: Already. Even when the doors are closed. Is that what you were saying?

Jin: Mm-hmm.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much.

Jin: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Don McDougall. To be followed by Terry Holzemer.

Don McDougall: Thank you, Madam Chair. My name is Don McDougall [spells name].

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. McDougall: I'm currently chairman of the Parks and Rec Commission, but I'm speaking on my own behalf, not on behalf of the commission. I'd like to comment that I think Mercedes and Lyle have done a very definite effort to accommodate the Baylands as neighbors. I think their spirit has certainly been correct. If anything, I'm disappointed that the Parks and Rec Commission wasn't, at some point, recommended to be included in the conversation by either Planning or ARB, since we are the neighbors, and we are the stewards of the Baylands, and I'm sure that we could have participated in making this a much more optimized relationship for the city. I appreciate the replacement of trees and so on, but I think maybe it would have been useful if we had been included in the discussion. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Terry Holzemer.

Terry Holzemer: Good morning, Commissioners. I'm here today...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, I still have to ask you to spell your name.

Mr. Holzemer: [spells name]. I'm here today as a resident and as a regular user of the Baylands. This is something that I've loved about Palo Alto, it's something that I care deeply about, and I think many of our residents do. I oppose the current design of the project, for several reasons. First of all, the building massing, which has already been described in much more detail than I'm going to describe it, but I believe it is one of the largest buildings in this immediate area, and it does not really fit in with the surrounding buildings at all. You're asking residents to, every time they visit the Baylands, to be presented with this massive car dealership standing at the gateway to what we consider to be one of the pristine and special areas of Palo Alto. I believe that this building, even though it has some benefits... I mean, I'm not against a car dealership at the location. But I do believe that this doesn't fit in with the surrounding community, or with the general ideas of what this area means to Palo Alto. Again, I would like to emphasize that I do believe this is a gateway to the Baylands, and this is a major environmental area to the citizens of Palo Alto. I'm just going to use one example. My wife and I regularly go out there and walk the paths, and one of the things we love about this area is that we feel that once we step into the Baylands, we're in a new place. We're not in the urban society that is really around us, but we're in a different environment. And I think it does relieve some of the stresses of daily life that all of us face – the congestion, the traffic. And this has to be protected, and I mean in a special way. I think the gateway is something to be looked at, not just in terms of does it meet the definition of a gateway, but whether it truly fits in with the spirit of what this area means. Finally, I'll just mention environmentally, I think it's important that the lighting and the migratory birds be protected. I think that this is an important area that needs to be looked at very closely. And not only just the birds, but the other wildlife that live in the area. This needs to be looked at very closely in terms of lighting, and just in traffic that people will come there to. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Shani?

Shani Kleinhaus: Good morning. My name is Shani Kleinhaus. I'm the environmental advocate for Santa Clara Valley Audubon Society.

Chair Furth: And I still have to ask you to spell your name again. We don't always have the same transcriber.

Ms. Kleinhaus: [spells name]. I have talked to Lyle about this project as a representative of the Audubon Society. He showed me a sample of the glass. I think the glass is a good selection. The UV on the building that is already there, UV doesn't work, a lot of the birds don't see it, so this etched glass is a better solution. I also want to say that he has been open to other suggestions. I asked for more enhancement of trees in the back towards the Baylands, and the response was that we could put a few more [inaudible] small trees in the parking, but we can also contribute trees to the Baylands to put along the fence, or somewhere else where it makes sense. I'm going to meet with staff later next week to discuss what kind of trees, and they offered to provide irrigation for those trees, to actually create some enhancement, both visually and for the birds. I wanted to say that the conflict between trees and trails, the trails are winning and we're losing our urban forest, and that's a big deal for us. And it's not only here. It's a lot of different places, not only in Palo Alto, where, oh, the transportation trumps the trees and the urban forest. And that's a big loss in [inaudible] trees. And I think we really need to think about to make... Applicants in general cannot just say, "Oh, we can only do one or another." We find that to be very, very difficult because we see the loss. And in terms of glass in general, I think minimizing glass in general, not only on this project, really is really important for heating and cooling and saving energy. The American Association of Engineers, including refrigeration engineers, no more than 30 percent. You can get to 40 percent. Once you get beyond 40 percent, you cannot have a glazing that actually is sustainable. And we need to start thinking about it on any building, and have lights for your feet, to start minimizing glass. That's really, really important for sustainability and for, in my opinion, also for aesthetics. But that's just... And it saves birds. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Is there anybody else who wishes to speak? Do I have a card from you?

Male??: I'm with the project.

Chair Furth: Okay, then I think we are ready to hear from the applicant again. You have another 10 minutes, and you may pick whoever you wish.

Mr. Hutson: I am going to abdicate some of my time to my colleagues. Again, thank you very much. I just wanted to quickly comment on the – I have my notes here – on what was discussed here, earlier. Designation project is correct. This is a destination dealership, but it also is going to be more than that. Once someone is at this location, they have opportunity for them to, while they wait for their car to be serviced, to get introduced to maybe an area of Palo Alto that they haven't seen before. Along those lines, I will share that the dealership has began a program with Audi to start with, since it's there now, similar to one they do in another location, where they provide bicycles to people who have their car serviced, to be able to rent those bicycles. They can use the Baylands. And if we can get loaner cars off the street for a few hours or a few days, it's a program that's been pretty successful. It's kind of a win/win. It frees up cars to the dealership, and it also provides an opportunity to use this. A similar project is in Colorado, and they back up to a wetlands as well. This is a program that will be coming. It's already... It's not impacted by this project, but I wanted to share that with you, that this is going to be more than a destination, as was discussed. The height is below the required. The allowable height limit is 50 feet. We do have a couple areas, and those are stair towers that are at 50 feet. The rest of them are down at 44. The comment about the black tower, that is a stair tower. We have to have a stair that goes down to and exits directly to the outside, and that is essentially the function of that one, and the other two stair towers. The car wash has been a continual discussion with our neighbors next door, and I think maybe there is some confusion. The car wash that is there now is nothing more than a detail area where they spray wash cars. It is not going to continue in this configuration. We are proposing an enclosed car wash that recirculates the water, captures the water that is used for the car wash. We have doors on the

car wash that will be closed. It's automatic, so the equipment will not operate unless the doors are closed. Once the equipment is finished operating, the doors open up and the car moves out. We have effectively taken that down to between 55 and 65 decibels for our neighbors. And I might also share that the noise study that was done indicates that the ambient noise level in that back corner is now 55 decibels. We're essentially about the same as the ambient noise coming from 101. That's part of the larger package that staff has regarding the noise study. Finally, I just wanted to say yes, we did have some communications with Shani and the Audubon Society regarding habitat and opportunity. We've committed to providing additional trees off-site if that's something that can be worked out within the City and Parks. Maybe that's not something that can happen, but if there is an opportunity to put some additional trees on the other side of the property, we're happy to commit to do that, and provide irrigation. With that, I want to turn it over to our landscape architect because I think they'd like to comment on the concept.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Puncerelli: Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the ARB. My name is Ken Puncerelli [spells name], and I'm with LAI Design Group, and we are part of the team as landscape architects. A couple comments that I heard at our last hearing. I'm going to run through them, there are about 10 of them. Number 1 was increase the quantity of native plants; more plants and trees; provide a better buffer to the Baylands; provide trees and shrubs that are native and/or regional and comply with the Baylands, so essentially provide a nod to the Baylands; screen facilities from the Baylands, as well as our neighbors in the office building south and east of us. We want both the bike multipurpose path and trees. We want to also buffer the bicycle and pedestrians from the dealership. And then, we also want that to be a safe pathway for both bicyclists and pedestrians. And then, also, with respect to scale of the building, wanted to see more transitions, more color versus all white, and some way to relate to pedestrian scale. A couple of things that have come up here also include the massing. I'm going to go through those one by one very quickly because I know there is a concern on time. On our prior plan, we had 61 trees. This plan has 126. The existing Ming's property had 52 trees. If you look at the combined properties – Audi and Mercedes – in the existing condition, we had about 19,000 square feet of shade canopy on both of those properties, in the existing condition. Today, on our proposed plan, we have over 63,000 square feet of shade canopy, which meets the 50 percent shade coverage per code. The prior plan had 5,300 plants. This plan has 7,300 plants in all of the landscaping areas. Effectively, what we have done is substituted all of our trees to native per the request of the ARB, and the same with the shrubs and grasses. The only places that are not native, that are accents, are in pots and containers near the dealership. We have increased the quantity of plants. Sheldon, if it's possible to bring up the color-rendered Master Plan, you will see that the trees that were removed along Bayshore Drive were replaced with ornamental trees that comply with PG&E height requirements. Those will provide a nice transition between the building, parking, and pedestrian multi-use area. And then, there is layering with plant material, so we've got grasses that are three to four feet high between the parking lot and the multi-purpose trail, and then, there's also grasses, the Mendocino grasses that we have that are between the multi-purpose trail and the street. Those are about two feet high because we can't go over that because of visibility and safety and sight triangles. We've actually created quite a nice environment. And with respect to the building massing, the quantity of plant material, particularly with trees, cuts the massing significantly. And because the building is not right up on the zero property line like a building you might experience in downtown San Francisco, where it's right at the property line and you look right up at a building, be it three stories or 20 stories, it does not have that feel. The building is set back from the property line, and you have adequate vegetation to transition so it doesn't feel imposing to pedestrians. The other detail we provided is, if you look at the site plan, there is a textured surface in the drive aisle along Embarcadero and Bayshore, and that is to replicate kind of a cobblestone pathway. Those stones are, the sizes of them are 18 inch by 24 inch, so those are in an attempt to be authentic, and also provide another texture and detail relationship to pedestrians. That essentially summarizes the significant changes. It's unfortunate that we couldn't pull up the plan, but I know you have it in your packet. We also have some color-

rendered sections showing Embarcadero and the parking, as well as Bayshore and the parking, so you can see the relationship of the landscape and pedestrian realm. I hope that that satisfies items regarding landscape, massing, bulk plane. And I think as Lyle and Shani earlier mentioned, our team is willing to add trees out into the Baylands. We can easily add landscaping irrigation to those areas beyond the fence. Thank you.

Chair Furth: You have another 20 seconds if you'd like to say something.

Mr. Hutson: You want to talk about lighting?

Chair Furth: Why don't we wait and see? We have seen your lighting plans. Let me see if we have questions. You only have 20 seconds left, so let's see if we have questions. All right. Thank you. I am going to take a five-minute break before we deliberate. We'll be back promptly. Anything anybody else wants to say before then?

Board Member Thompson: Are we asking questions after?

Chair Furth: Yeah, I would like to ask questions after the five-minute break. We'll be back in five minutes.

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Furth: I'd like to call the meeting of the Architectural Review Board back into session. We're considering a proposal for a Mercedes-Benz and Audi dealership on Embarcadero, at the corner of Embarcadero and Bayshore. I think we were on questions. Peter, you're up.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, to the applicant. I wonder if you could explain to me in more detail the lighting plans. It seems like you've done quite a bit of work on the lighting design. If you could walk us through that, please?

Chair Furth: Do you think that was well cued?

Mr. Hutson: Again, Lyle Hutson. Thank you very much. I'd like to yield this to our lighting consultant, who could answer any of those questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you. And we will take a quick pause here for mopping up spilled coffee, then we will continue.

[Cleaning up coffee.]

Chair Furth: All right. If you could introduce yourself again. And spell your name for the transcriber.

Frances Krahe: Good morning. My name is Frances Krahe. Madam Chair and members of the ARB...

Chair Furth: Could you speak up? That mic is a very... You have to be very close to it. It will adjust to your height. Thank you.

Mr. Krahe: As Lyle mentioned, we're the lighting design consultants for the project. We completed a study, which I believe you have a copy of in your packet, which included a proposed lighting plan for exterior lighting on both the Audi site and the Mercedes-Benz site, which would comply with the requirements of CALGreen, the California green building code, current 2016 version. Our study looked at two issues that pertain to lighting. The first is light trespass, illuminates, which is the value of foot candles that would leave the property and be incidental on an adjacent site. We conducted a computer study with the proposed lighting plan, analyzing the value of vertical illuminates at the project property line, in particular looking at the light trespass to the Baylands, but we also analyzed the light trespass to the adjacent commercial properties and the adjacent street frontage. The plan that has been submitted complies with the requirements of CALGreen, which is limited to 0.74-foot candles at the commercial or street frontage elevations, and .09-foot candles at the Baylands. Those two values are determined from a

table within CALGreen that stipulates that all urban census areas in the state of California are categorized as Zone 3, which is 0.74-foot candles, unless there is an exception or unique circumstance that would change that standard higher or lower. We used the most conservative value at the Baylands, which would represent the value in a pristine native habitat setting, where there essentially would be no ambient light. This is far more stringent than the existing conditions, which include parking lots that are illuminated to a standard that predates this current CALGreen standard. The new building design would dramatically improve the light trespass from this property to any adjacent property, including the Baylands, by about a 90 percent factor over what is the current conditions existing today on the property. It's a far greater improvement in terms of the environmental compliance of this proposed project versus the existing commercial uses on both the Audi existing property, and their adjacent neighbors on the two commercial properties flanking the Audi property, and the existing restaurant site. The second factor that we looked at is light with respect to glare and the brightness of the light sources, their visibility either off site or from, again, some sensitive use like the Baylands. Again, the project must comply with CALGreen, and there are very specific stipulations in CALGreen that regulate the brightness of the light fixtures that would be adjacent to any property line and visible off site. The lighting fixtures that are proposed in the plan meet that most stringent requirement for the backlight, up light and glare standard that's part of CALGreen, and they are also directional and oriented from the perimeter of the property, internally. They're not directed to any off-site location. Again, that's a far more rigorous amount of lighting control versus what exists there today, both on the existing property or any of the adjacent properties. On the basis of that plan and our analysis we presented to you, the project would actually reduce the light trespass and glare substantially from what exists today, and it would certainly not introduce a new source of light trespass or glare. If I can answer any further questions.

Chair Furth: Any further questions?

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Chair Furth: Everybody seems to have it, so, starting on the left. Alex.

Board Member Lew: I wanted to just follow up. Karen Holman had mentioned bollard lights, and I think there are some shown in the architectural renderings, and then you have the lighting plans which show them only in one particular location. I was wondering if you could clarify for everybody that [crosstalk].

Mr. Krahe: The architectural plan showed bollards at the bike path, pedestrian path at the project perimeter. If we were to locate those bollards on the project site to illuminate the bike path, that would be in violation of CALGreen because those lights would be projected across the property line to illuminate the public right-of-way to a value that exceeds the limits of CALGreen. So, we've removed them from the lighting plan. If they are to light the path, they would need to be located in the public right-of-way or the easement and not on the project site.

Board Member Lew: Our code is tricky.

Mr. Krahe: Yes.

Board Member Lew: I have one other question, a follow-up question. Now you have, on the light fixture, type SA and SA1. I was wondering if you could explain how that light fixture works. I did look on the website and it didn't really explain it very clearly. And then, on the fixture SA, which has the extra flood light, what is that extra flood light illuminating on your project.

Mr. Krahe: If you look at the rendered elevations of the project that are at the back of the packet, you can see that the light poles that are along the Mercedes frontage to Embarcadero and Baylands, they are oriented... the distribution of those light fixtures is asymmetric, so it's oriented from the light pole back towards the building façade and the roadway that's internal to the Mercedes-Benz frontage. They're just lighting the roadway. They're really just for circulation...

Board Member Lew: Internal circulation.

Mr. Krahe: Correct.

Board Member Lew: Great. And I think you said "Baylands," but I think you meant East Bayshore.

Mr. Krahe: East Bayshore, that's right.

Board Member Thompson: Are they on in this rendering?

Mr. Krahe: They are.

Board Member Thompson: And they are the tall ones?

Mr. Krahe: Correct.

Board Member Thompson: And they're shining down on the ground?

Mr. Krahe: They're shining down, but they're canted and oriented down and back towards the building.

Board Member Thompson: So, the actual glass element of that light...

Mr. Krahe: No. The glass is symmetrical and cylinder. Internal to the glass is an optical glass that orients the light in that direction.

Board Member Thompson: The glass doesn't light up.

Mr. Krahe: Correct. It's clear. It's not a bright lens surface. The light source is above, within the opaque section that's above that clear glass lens. Like I said, it's directional. It can be symmetrical or asymmetrical. And in the case of the study that we presented, they are asymmetric.

Board Member Lew: If I may ask a follow-up question. On sheet 23 of our packet, which is the lighting plan, or lighting rendering, what is illuminating the...?

Mr. Krahe: There are lights within the exterior façade canopy. There is a canopy structure outside of the building glazing, and there are downlights within that roof structure that are lighting down, to light the walkway and the stairs and the platform that leads into the showroom itself.

Board Member Lew: Okay. And I think that those don't appear on our drawings.

Mr. Krahe: They do appear on the lighting plan, that's part of the lighting plan.

Board Member Lew: I see.

Mr. Krahe: It may be difficult to read because it's quite small. Yes. A surface cylinder that's mounted to the canopy structure of the...

Board Member Lew: Okay, I think it's just that we don't have the fixture for that. Okay. Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry. On that rendering, so, the bright strip at the base of the building, that's not its own source of light?

Mr. Krahe: Correct. It's separate.

Board Member Thompson: It's reflecting the light.

Mr. Krahe: Correct.

Board Member Thompson: Off the canopy.

Mr. Krahe: Yes.

Chair Furth: And do I – excuse me, Osma – do I understand, if I look, for example, at Sheet 23, and it shows this, it looks like it’s an illuminated dance floor, that that’s not the way it would appear in real life?

Mr. Krahe: I’m not sure I understand which...?

Chair Furth: Look at sheet number 23. A very bright band along the floor.

Mr. Krahe: Well, these are...

Chair Furth: It’s the artifact of the rendering, not the actual experience of the lights?

Mr. Krahe: Well, I would say it’s very difficult to represent night lighting in any sort of printed view. These renderings are generated from the calculations...

Chair Furth: I’m not criticizing the rendering. I’m trying to understand the experience of driving by at night.

Mr. Krahe: But to be clear, the lighting values inside the showroom are substantially higher than the light values on the roadway and on the path. In order for us to meet the threshold at the project perimeter, the lighting level at the pathway and the road is relatively low in comparison to the lighting level that is required and necessary for lighting the walkway up to the building, which is approximately 10 foot candles, and the lighting within the showroom, which is much higher. Those values are all established by code and by recommended practice of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America, which is the professional standard that the lighting will be judged by if there’s any questions of performance or liability.

Chair Furth: Well, let me ask a really dumb question. When this is closed, how brightly illuminated is it?

Mr. Krahe: Well, it can be substantially lower in terms of the internal lighting. And I think we’ve described that in the plan, that there is a sequence of operations, and there is a dimming schedule which responds to the use of the facility. After dusk, it would be at one level; later in the evening it could be reduced gradually over the course of the evening. I think that after hours, late at night, there would be some internal lighting for security and safety for people inside the building, but it would be substantially less than it would be right after sunset.

Chair Furth: And it would not be display-level lighting. It would not be designed to look at cars from the road.

Mr. Krahe: No.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Other questions? Board member Hirsch. David.

Board Member Hirsch: You know, a major feature of the building is the stacking units. I’m looking at ZA400b, and I don’t see the stacking units in this at all. It’s a dramatic element in this building. Are you turning it off at some hour?

Mr. Krahe: The plan is to illuminate the stacking units, again, from dusk... I mean, they’ll be illuminated during the day and the evening at a minimal level for safety, but they are rendered in the studies with some feature lighting after hours, after sunset, but that would gradually decrease that brightness as the building was less occupied.

Board Member Hirsch: Building goes to sleep, in other words.

Mr. Krahe: Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Mr. Sing: Just to interject, on Packet Page 27, condition 6 is regarding lighting.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: I have a question on lighting in a different area. The rooftop parking deck has long been a concern of mine, that it not be too brightly visible from off the property. Can you walk me through, how is that being lit now? And what are you doing so it's not visible through the translucent parapet wall?

Mr. Krahe: The lighting that's proposed is mounted to the back side of the parapet wall where there are opaque sections, and projecting light across that parking deck surface from the perimeter. There are no light poles, there are no tall light structures above the roof deck.

Vice Chair Baltay: All the lights up there are below the level of the parapet.

Mr. Krahe: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: And when they are on, is the parapet wall brightly lit because it's translucent? How much comes through the parapet wall?

Mr. Krahe: I don't believe where we've located it is where we have opaque sections, so that it's not visible. And it's not intended to light the parapet wall itself. It's projecting light away from the parapet wall to the interior. What you're seeing in these rendered views is the brightness of the light on the ground surface adjacent to the parapet wall, not the vertical surface of the parapet wall.

Vice Chair Baltay: On rendering ZA400b, which is the nighttime view of the corner Board Member Hirsch was just referring to, would this be showing roof deck lights being turned on and it will still look this dark?

Mr. Krahe: They are on in those rendered views, correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: They're on in that rendered view.

Mr. Krahe: Yes, exactly.

Vice Chair Baltay: Parking is on, and it's still like this.

Mr. Krahe: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: I have one more question.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: On page 24 and 25 of the lighting report, are the interior lights on to their full brightness that they would be during operational times?

Mr. Krahe: Yes. In those rendered views, they are, yes.

Board Member Thompson: As well as the parking above?

Mr. Krahe: Correct. I should point out, though, the calculation for the exterior lighting at the property line includes only the exterior lighting. That is the regulatory standard. It does not include interior lighting.

Board Member Thompson: That's the numbers we're seeing...

Mr. Krahe: Correct.

Board Member Thompson: ... on the ground.

Mr. Krahe: Correct.

Board Member Thompson: But the images here...

Mr. Krahe: But the rendered views include both the interior and the exterior. Otherwise, the building would just be a black mass, so we included the interior lighting to illustrate the relative brightness between the exterior site lighting and the interior lighting.

Board Member Thompson: Are there additional streetlights that are not being shown here for the sidewalk?

Mr. Krahe: Correct. We didn't show any of the public streetlighting or any offsite light that was adjacent.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Thanks.

Chair Furth: Any other questions before we turn to other areas? In terms of lighting?

Vice Chair Baltay: In terms of lighting, yes.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much.

Mr. Krahe: You're welcome. Thank you.

Chair Furth: At least you know we do read your report. Other questions? Let's start with you, Alex. Or we can do them by subject matter; whatever you want. Let's talk about the car wash. Let's talk about noise. The only discussion of noise I heard concerned the car wash, it's location and operation. Any questions on that topic?

Vice Chair Baltay: To the applicant, could you...?

Chair Furth: Board Member Baltay, for the transcriber.

Vice Chair Baltay: I would like to understand how the automatic doors work when the car wash is in operation. Is it possible for the doors to be left open and the car wash to be functioning?

Mr. Hutson: No. The automatic controls on the car wash are that the internal equipment, the car is driven into the door, tracked into the door, those doors are closed, and once those doors are closed and they are electronically noted as closed, then the operation can begin inside. That's both the blowers and the car wash. Once that's completed, the doors open up. They're high speed. The manufacture is Light Tech [phonetic], but they're a high-speed coiling door that goes up and down very quickly, intended for a wet surface and high cycle uses.

Vice Chair Baltay: I just want to be really clear that, you're making that statement into the record, and that's something that is not easily changed later then. That the doors cannot be left open when the car wash is functioning.

Mr. Hutson: That is the way that...

Vice Chair Baltay: It's automatically built into the [crosstalk].

Mr. Hutson: That is automatically built into the way we are planning the car wash.

Ms. Gerhardt: And staff will be adding a condition of approval.

Chair Furth: Will you specify a particular design, or just the function?

Mr. Hutson: I think we had that as a mitigation measure early on, that we offer that...

[crosstalk]

Mr. Sing: If I could just interrupt. On Packet Page 29, Condition 14, has to do with the issue of automatic doors. We have that covered.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: I have a question about...

Chair Furth: David, could you wait a minute, please?

Board Member Lew: I have a follow-up, too, on the car wash. I just wanted to make a comment to my Board members. When doing a site visit, I did walk the property, the neighbor's property at 2479 Embarcadero Road, and they do have, like, a patio out in the back, very close to where the proposed car wash is located. It seems like most of their open space is in the courtyard, and it seems like that patio table, I presume it's for the smokers. It's far away from any entrance door. It's in the parking lot. It's not like a... It's like an afterthought.

Chair Furth: It's not habitable space that we should really be working extremely hard to protect.

Board Member Lew: No, I actually disagree with that statement. The back of that property has a very low chain-link fence that looks over the Baylands. If that were being redeveloped, I would put the open space facing in that back area and not have it walled off in a courtyard.

Chair Furth: Alex, is one of your points that this is a very valuable piece of this site, if and when it's redeveloped?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: So, adverse impacts from this project on that property, we should be thinking about that [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: We should think about, not just the existing conditions, but just the... I think we should factor in the potential for that project site. But looking at the noise study with the doors closed, it seems to make a dramatic difference. I've never seen a car wash with doors before, so... But the study seems to make it work.

Chair Furth: Before I hear from the rest of you, I will say that I have never seen a car wash that didn't have a lot of sociability around it. And maybe this is just one lone employee, driving it over. But they do tend to be lively, slightly noisy scenes. I'm concerned that... We tend to locate our nuisance aspects of our properties to the edges, and I'm concerned about that here.

Mr. Hutson: Could I address that?

Chair Furth: Just a second. David, you had a question on the noise issue?

Board Member Hirsch: No, no. A whole other issue.

Chair Furth: Okay, then we'll wait. Osma, did you have any questions on this?

Board Member Hirsch: But it's [inaudible].

Chair Furth: In a minute.

Board Member Thompson: Not on noise. On landscape.

Chair Furth: Peter? Alex? Do you have any further questions on this issue?

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, to state the obvious, I want to be sure there's a roof on the car wash, so it doesn't have an open ceiling.

Mr. Hutson: Yes, sir.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Hutson: May I address the Board?

Chair Furth: I appreciate that. If you could identify yourself once more, for our transcriber.

Mr. Hutson: My name is Lyle Hutson. Just to call your attention to the noise study, that the ambient noise level is very close in that area where we took readings. As it is now, as it stands today, for 20 minutes, I believe, the noise study was done that it's, again, 55 decibels in that location now. I think we're proposing maybe that it could be up to, in certain areas, at the end of the car wash, at 65 db.

Chair Furth: Thank you. We appreciate that. All right. Those are our questions about noise. Those are our questions about lighting. Let's talk about landscaping. Are there any additional questions of the applicant about landscaping? Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: A couple questions. The green screens that are being shown around the back of the whole project, how confident are you that those will be green and actual...?

Mr. Puncerelli: Sustainable. Okay. The speaker is Ken Puncerelli with LAI Design Group. We're very confident. We will run drip irrigation up to those areas. They will be irrigated and, of course, maintained with the rest of the property.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you. And for all the other renderings that we have been seeing, are those pretty reflective of your design?

Mr. Puncerelli: Yeah, I would say that the renderings that show the redbud trees, that's for a period of about two weeks per year. We just actually experienced the redbud trees at our last board meeting, and for the rest of the year, they're just a green, lush tree. They're a nice little tree, and they'll really soften the massing that everybody was concerned about. They don't drop any berries or fruit, so they're not a nuisance. Won't impact pedestrians walking or cause a mess, either in the public realm or on the dealership property, with respect to a fruit, or yellow jackets that might be attracted to dropped fruit. They are actually quite a nice, low-maintenance kind of tree, and they are native to the area.

Chair Furth: And at this elevation, they are evergreen?

Mr. Puncerelli: They are, for the most part, yeah.

Chair Furth: I did think on the elevations they looked like crepe myrtles.

Mr. Puncerelli: Yes, and that was the choice of the renderer that selected that. Yes.

Chair Furth: They were disturbing.

Mr. Puncerelli: No, you are spot-on with your plant ID. I caught that at the last ARB meeting.

Vice Chair Baltay: How confident are you that these really are what redbuds are going to look like? Because what's shown in the renderings is crepe myrtles.

Mr. Puncerelli: Yeah. That's a valid question. The shape and the form of multi-stem trees, they look like that. I would say that, you know, those were conservatives. I would say that the redbuds will actually be more lush in terms of their tree canopy than what was shown.

Vice Chair Baltay: It's unfortunate, because the redbuds I think have a different foliage color overall effect. These are very bright pink.

Mr. Puncerelli: Well, that's the flower. And I think that was legitimate. But the vegetation, the leaf is a heart-shaped leaf, and it's about as big as my hands cupping around right here. Like a large cup of coffee. The circumference of that.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: I realize that there are a lot of constraints here, and while we don't want fruits and things that will attract animals, I understand that you've got a lot of constraints here. I think of a redbud as being a bunch of sticks, some of the time of the year here.

Mr. Puncerelli: Yeah, I mean, they are deciduous.

Chair Furth: And that they don't do any screening.

Mr. Puncerelli: Yeah. They are deciduous a part of the year. That is true. And we do have a fair amount of understory that is evergreen. So, in every part of the site plan, there are layers of plant material, from shade canopy trees like the oaks and the big-leaf maple, to understory and ornamentals like the redbud trees, to then large shrubs and grasses that are evergreen and have winter interest.

Chair Furth: Thank you. You have heard that there is great distress from many people about the prospect of removing trees, and I'm concerned with a building that goes up to 50 feet from a slightly elevated pad, I usually want to see significantly sized screening trees. And I'm not sure we've got that. Or landscaping. Whatever form it takes. Okay. But that's not a question; that's a policy statement. Any other questions on landscaping?

Mr. Puncerelli: Yeah, and part of that, Madam Chair, just to respond to that, part of the locations where we have those redbud trees out in front of the building, you'll note that we have that 80-foot PG&E easement.

Chair Furth: We are well aware of that.

Mr. Puncerelli: Yeah. And the elm trees that are there currently grow much taller than that, and they've already been hacked by PG&E, and they could come back and do it again.

Chair Furth: We understand that they are at their mercy.

Mr. Puncerelli: Yes. That it's a great statement.

Chair Furth: We had considered the thought that maybe PG&E would like some favorable public relations as of late, but we don't think that's going to help us here. Thank you. I think that's it for landscaping. Bike and pedestrian circulation. Comments? Questions? I think we're doing okay on landscaping, if you'd like to be seated.

Mr. Puncerelli: All right. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any comments or questions on bike and pedestrian circulation? No questions? Okay. Questions on anything else? David.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm wondering about access to the site, you know, and the site circulation traffic-wise, coming to the site for clients. The ones who come off Embarcadero are, is that the major entry? Or is the access road really the...? From Bayshore. Is that the major entry? Which way to come onto the site?

Mr. Hutson: There are two entrances for the Mercedes site and there is one entrance for Audi. All three entrances are multidirectional, in and out. The majority of customers coming in for service would enter off of Embarcadero. Customers could enter off of Embarcadero or Bayshore, and likewise you could come from either direction. Bayshore coming the other direction is, south of Bayshore is also a two-way

entrance. Circulation is all along the front and not around the back for customers. Does that answer your question?

Board Member Hirsch: Not 100 percent. I mean, I'm sort of concerned that, you're coming off of Embarcadero to go straight into the service area, the doors that are between Audi and...

Chair Furth: Sheldon, could you put a site plan up so we can see what we're talking about?

Mr. Hutson: The vehicular access can also turn right at that location to access the rest of the parking lot.

Board Member Hirsch: Right. And there's really no signage at that point to say where you're going to park on the site.

Mr. Hutson: I don't believe we've addressed wayfinding signage at this point in time.

Board Member Hirsch: But you would be doing that at some point?

Mr. Hutson: There would need to be some wayfinding as you enter in, to direct sales customers, if you will, to the right, and service straight in. And there's a fairly lengthy drive there, as well as inside the building, so we don't anticipate any queuing and backing up cars and... It's fairly lengthy.

Board Member Hirsch: Right. Okay. You're still maintaining an entry, although the major entry seems to be off the parking lot now. But you're maintaining an entry in the, kind of center of the car display and the canopied area in the front? Facing Embarcadero?

Mr. Hutson: No. There's no entry there.

Board Member Hirsch: There's no entry there?

Mr. Hutson: No.

Board Member Hirsch: So, the exclusive entry into the showroom is from the parking lot.

Mr. Hutson: Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. That's good.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: I might have more.

Mr. Hutson: I'd just add to that, that that's both vehicular and pedestrian at that location.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. The renderings show, in particular in ZA404, you know, the close-up renderings where the trees are not part of it, show the glazing, and we've been looking at the samples of the glazing. And you're showing it as if it's clear glass, so you're going to really be looking through it. Is this just a rendering issue? Because normally glazing kind of gives you the sky, you know? There are some parts of the renderings that... ZA403a, for example, have a, a tone on the glazing which really more represents the, kind of the sky. How do you see that really working? Because it's a really important aspect of this project.

Mr. Hutson: The glazing is clear glazing. It's dual pane, dual glazing, clear glass that's also coated for performance. In addition to that, all the glazing will be the Avitech bird-safe etched glass. It's not a film. We had some discussions with the Audubon Society about the films and applied bird-safe scenario, and that is not what we're doing here. We're promoting full etched glazing, so any of our exterior glazing would be of that type. What you see on that, on the color board. The additional portion is a fiberglass cow-wall that we're putting, that's basically up on top. You can't see through it. You won't really be able to see a car or anything through that, but it does provide a different surface and texture as it relates to

that upper level. And that was intended to bring the scale down a little bit and provide a little interest, along with our green area.

Board Member Hirsch: It's a glass material?

Mr. Hutson: It's a fiberglass.

Board Member Hirsch: Fiberglass.

Mr. Hutson: As you see on the material, that's an actual sample. It's transparent, but some...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Mr. Hutson: And you can see, we kind of did it with an image behind it. There's kind of a vehicle behind it. That's pretty typical of what you'd see. Maybe a darker silhouette if there was a car there, or a person there, but you will not be able to tell if it's a car. And that's intentional.

Board Member Thompson: I have a follow-up to that.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Is it okay if I ask my follow-up?

Chair Furth: Can't hear you.

Board Member Thompson: The etched glass on the bird-safe glazing, the material sample, the pattern on the material sample is linear, whereas in the image on the packet, it's a bit more [crosstalk].

Mr. Hutson: There's been a couple different iterations. Early on, we had the more freeform bamboo portion. At this point, we feel like the building is still linear, and that may be more of an advantage of the linear pattern. There's also a dot pattern, but all provide, by industry standards, as bird-safe glass. We're open to interpretation, but we feel like the vertical etched lines provide the same purpose as an organic shape. And may be better for bird-safe situations being not organic and being more linear.

Board Member Thompson: I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr. Hutson: There is a discrepancy. It [inaudible], if you will.

Board Member Hirsch: I have another question about your entry on the parking lot side. It shows rather heavy framed doorway within it. Am I looking at it properly there?

Mr. Hutson: You are correct. The heavy-framed doorway further to the front of the building – Is that what you're referring to?

Board Member Hirsch: Mm-hmm.

Mr. Hutson: Yeah, that would be our main entry into the showroom, and that's somewhat of a corporate ID standard, that heavy entry with the block around it.

Board Member Hirsch: Is it heavy like that for security reasons?

Mr. Hutson: It's not heavier than any other door. It's a metal storefront door. The surround around it is the black metal that you see. There is nothing there for security. It's no different than any... It's just wider so we can get a vehicle inside. It needs to be wider than a pair of six-foot man doors.

Chair Furth: All right. I'd like to shift this conversation now to materials. Thank you for the materials board. I thought they were particularly useful with the attached drawings and keys. The Baylands general design principals as they apply to this building say that the Baylands itself are a natural, have a natural color palette. It's a study in muted tones, and in this building, they say use only muted natural colors,

choose materials and finishes that will weather without degrading. Anybody have any questions about the materials?

Vice Chair Baltay: No questions.

Chair Furth: I have a question for my colleagues here, which is, when I look at this, these very tiny samples – and that's not a critique of the materials board – is this...? I don't see a label on this one.

Mr. Hutson: Well, there should be on the picture, if you look, if it has fallen off. That is the metal panel for Audi that's existing now.

Chair Furth: This one here?

Mr. Hutson: Yeah, the representation there is kind of the...? No? Okay. That's the Audi, it would be listed as the Audi Centrix silver.

Chair Furth: And you're proposing to continue to use this on...?

Mr. Hutson: No, just representation of what's there now.

Chair Furth: You have a large X across it, in my view.

Mr. Hutson: Okay.

Chair Furth: And then, the ACM2, I understand that it's in the recessed... I'm looking at the Embarcadero frontage; that appears in the recessed section of the elevation.

Mr. Hutson: Correct.

Chair Furth: How much of that is there? Of the [crosstalk].

Mr. Hutson: Actually, that's not a significant material that we have. It's just another... It's the same manufacturer and same material so when we change a color, we're not changing the attachment type and the way it's done. It's underneath there, underneath that canopy.

Chair Furth: You just lost me. When I drive by, as a layperson, where do I see this?

Mr. Hutson: You're going to see it underneath the canopy of the front of Mercedes-Benz.

Chair Furth: Okay. Okay. All right, any other questions?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I do have a quick...

Chair Furth: What's your subject matter?

Board Member Thompson: It's materials. The ribbed metal panel, we don't have a sample of the actual ribbed, like, how thick that is, or...? In terms of the scale? Because that's just the color, right? It's not...

Mr. Hutson: That's correct. Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Hutson: Yeah. We were limited today by your staff on the size of the material and the color board of what we could do. Last time, I had a physical sample that I brought, was 12 by 12, and that was dismissed.

Chair Furth: We understand there are challenges; we do not have a ...

Mr. Hutson: Right, you do not have a profile sample of the ribbed panel on that board.

Chair Furth: All right. Other subject matter areas. Sustainability. Members of the public talked about not using too much glass. We talked about sea level rise. Sheldon, just for fun, while we're talking about something else, would you put up the picture showing the city's anticipated sea level rise during the life of this building? What do you anticipate the life of this building to be?

Mr. Hutson: I don't have an answer for you on that.

Chair Furth: Well, let's assume 20 to 30 years.

Mr. Sing: I have the website that we discussed on Tuesday. This is at zero, no change. The diamond is the Mercedes site.

Chair Furth: And the City is anticipating... We have a set of standards based on the state and area standards... Go ahead, Sheldon.

Mr. Sing: Right. This is existing, so, as we go through whatever simulation you want to see, this is the existing condition. As we go with the higher sea level change and what that will look like, you'll notice that the building is still under water because that's the existing condition. But the other buildings around it that have been completed recently are done to the standards today, which is one foot above the flood elevation, which would be very similar to what this project would be.

Chair Furth: Well, show us. Hit 25 centimeters.

Mr. Sing: That's 25 centimeters.

Chair Furth: That's the anticipated rise by 2050.

Mr. Sing: That's 50.

Chair Furth: That's 50. That's a foot and a half. That's two feet.

Mr. Sing: Seventy-five. We'll probably just keep it there. You'll see the other buildings are peeking up above.

Chair Furth: Kick it back to 25, which is our... We're doing a study. I'm always impressed with the work that City staff and City Council have already done on these issues, but our new sea level rise policy really kicks in, in 2020, so this project is a bit ahead, and this may be in an area from which, as they say, we need to plan an orderly retreat. But it does appear that this building is of an elevation which is a reasonable one to do at this time, which was my big concern, that we weren't [crosstalk].

Mr. Hutson: Our proposed building is not shown in this. This is the existing...

Chair Furth: Right, but we're looking at the islands, and you would be an island.

Mr. Hutson: Correct.

Chair Furth: Is what I believe this shows.

Mr. Hutson: I think that's the intention of the FEMA numbers and the numbers we were [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: We find that we're not always in perfect sync with the federal government on climate change issues.

Mr. Hutson: Is your anticipation – maybe I just ask the question – to be higher? Or...?

Chair Furth: It's constantly shifting. We do have a lot of publications referenced in our document. They have a range of predictions. The more recent predictions are for more sea level rise. This doesn't particularly talk about issues of surge and loss of wetlands, which would lead to more flooding. And we won't really have a City definite position probably until next year, but they are certainly chastening.

Mr. Hutson: I would think that traffic is a main concern because the roads are what drive the contours of your developed property.

Chair Furth: I mean, a more longer-range theory is that we will be retreating to the freeway at some point, but who knows? But I did want to understand the relationship of our present standards to these current projections. The City sea level rise report has a range of things for the next 30 years, so that's 2050. Remind me what they are. I lost that page. It's about a foot, right? We're predicting about a foot in the next 30 years?

Mr. Sing: That would be correct, yes.

Chair Furth: Yeah, so this is about, roughly.

Mr. Hutson: So it would be said, if we only had a 30-year life span for the building, we can redo the whole area [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: Yeah, you may not be able to... Well, if you're not selling nothing but fossil-free fuels by then....

[crosstalk]

Mr. Hutson: I'm pretty sure that will be a thing of the past, 30 years from now.

Chair Furth: Okay. Show us 50. Because you're in between. Those buildings are still above water. Because one of our concerns is that the more capital investment there is in that area, the more it's going to be expected in terms of trying to protect it. And I'm not going to argue that a Mercedes dealership is as essential as a hospital, but it would be unfortunate to spend a lot of money on land that we had to abandon. Thank you. Okay. We've talked about on-site circulation for clients, landscaping, noise, lighting, glazing, materials, signage for wayfinding, sustainability of the design. Okay. Any other things we want to ask questions about before we bring the discussion back to us? Thank you very much. Anything staff wants to say? All right. Well, let's begin discussion. Who would like to start?

Board Member Thompson: If I could ask Board Member Lew to start, and then also discuss your research on the Strava.

Chair Furth: All right, Alex. I'm going to try to take notes so we can keep track of our issues.

Board Member Lew: Okay. On the running and bicycling usage in that area, it does show a lot of bicyclists using East Bayshore primarily, going north through east Palo Alto. But that data may be – what do you want to call it? – impacted by the creek widening that's been ongoing for several years. But it does show people using the old bike path along the San Francisquito Creek, and it actually does show people using the new bike path that's been relocated because of the creek widening. But I think the takeaway is that there should be something continuing across Embarcadero, going north to East Palo Alto. For the runners, it really shows them crossing the bicycle bridge just north of Embarcadero and continuing on to the Baylands, and going out to, like, Charleston Slough and Bixby Park. I think that proposed path is actually very useful for them. Did you have anything in particular? My takeaway is that I think it's needed.

Chair Furth: It's crucial.

Board Member Lew: I think it is. And I think we've gone through the tree issue before. When we had the golf course renovation, most of the non-native trees were removed, and the golf course was changed into more of a link style, windswept dune landscape, right? And they took out the...

Chair Furth: A traditional, throw-back golf course.

Board Member Lew: Right. I think the City is on board. My take on it is that the City is okay with removing trees and going back to something more like a grasslands type of, and coastal sage scrub kind of landscape, instead of a more conventional suburban landscape.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Lew: I have one last comment. I think there's a proposed bottle-filling station in front of the Mercedes dealer, and I think that is really critical. Earlier, when I did several bicycle rides around San Francisco to Palo Alto, and the bottle-filling thing is actually very critical. There's one in Burlingame, and then, all the other ones are really substandard. I think the station with the benches...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ... street furniture you're in favor of.

Board Member Lew: Yes. It's not in the perfect location, but I'll take it.

Chair Furth: All right. Does somebody want to make a motion, or does somebody want to discuss issues?

Vice Chair Baltay: Can I lay out some stuff here to my colleagues?

Chair Furth: Yep.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm having a hard time with this project, ultimately. I just read through again the findings. Two, 3, 4 and 5 all address significant issues about design quality, contextual compatibility, functionality, some of the issues David was mentioning. The landscaping. Just too many places. I keep looking at this and feeling it's just not there. I'll go backwards. The crepe myrtle-esque trees on the front just don't work with this building, and they certainly don't work with the Baylands. They don't look at all like that to me. The layout of this, this curved front with the front door in the middle of it, except it's not a front door anymore. And the access to the showroom is sort of off the middle of this parking lot. The architecture is not telling me where to go, and this is something that we discussed last time. Just the overall choice of the materials just seems sort of bright, and modern, and Mercedes-Benz-ish. But it's not the Baylands. I keep feeling like, wanting to just have something that tries at least to be toned down, natural-looking. Maybe not all of it, maybe the glass piece in the front can be different, but somehow... Almost every design decision keeps coming back to it being bright and shiny on all four sides of the building, everywhere we go. I just don't buy the fiberglass panels up on the roof. I think they are going to be bright when they're lit from inside, and they don't look at all like the Baylands to me. The grass panels on the side of the building, I just cannot imagine those surviving the test of time. The maintenance on those will be horrific. You'll need an elevator for the landscape guy to get up there to do anything. It's not a realistic architectural solution. The Baylands is asking for permanent, simple, background, low, organic-colored buildings, and this design solution seems to take us away from that. Over and over again, as I've looked through these issues, I just keep saying to myself that the pieces aren't coming together. I put it to my colleagues that, this is the third review, they're asking us to make a decision, and I think the decision of let's send this to Council to decide is the wrong one. I think we need to take a stronger stand, and perhaps just say no, this should not be allowed the way it is right now. Maybe the last thing, which I'll end with, which is probably the most important, is, to me, the bike path. I think it's not unreasonable that we need a real bike path there. I think it's also not unreasonable that we want to keep those mature trees. This is a very large building; we already have some large trees that would otherwise be allowed. If we cut them down, Alex is right, that we could grow new trees, but the trees that we're allowed to put there are really small and not appropriately scaled. They don't fit with the Baylands, and they certainly don't accentuate or complement this building. And yet, the solution is to fit both, and that requires the applicant to do some additional compromising on their property somehow. And I come back and say, look, 30 years ago, this would have been a PC application. What that means is that you're making a trade. The applicant wants to trade the land use, so they're doing other things to the public benefit. To me, the bike path is a clear and needed public benefit. I think the trees are also a

clear and needed public benefit, and I think if the applicant is asking to do a zoning change, asking to put a larger building than would otherwise be allowed, we need some public benefit coming back. I think we've made it clear and asked this several times. Again, the pieces aren't dropping, so, at some point, we need to stop asking. And I think if we put this in front of the City Council, it's going to be very hard for them to try to parse that kind of stuff out. It's clear to us, it was clear to the Planning Commission, that the trees are needed, and the bike path is needed. I just don't see the pieces coming together. Unless I can be persuaded otherwise, at the moment, I'm of the opinion that we should recommend denial. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay. Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Thank you to my board members for their feedback, and also thank you to the applicant. This packet was a lot more detailed and it was a lot easier to read, so I really appreciate the enhanced renderings and the enhanced information that was in here. I'm also having trouble with this project as well. Actually, I think architecturally, you did respond to a lot of the feedback we were giving. I look at just the front corner view that you would see from Baylands and Embarcadero, there's a lot more horizontal datums. You're using two tones to break the scale of this massive thing down, which is effective in many ways. I will say, I'm not convinced by GL-2, which is that fiberglass material. In the renderings, it looks a lot more clear, so it looks like it's breaking down scale, but when I'm seeing the actual material, it looks quite opaque, and it looks like it will blend into the rest of that wall and make that wall bulky. But if I were to just look at how this is currently being presented, I think a lot of effort has been put into reducing the scale, and in terms of all the iterations we've seen so far, I would say this is the best version of this dealership that I've seen to date, just given massing and sort of how the material treatment is, except for the GL-2, which actually is an important aspect of it. I'm not going to brush it off and say that it's not, because if that part was solid, I would have a bigger problem with the design. And also, the green screens that kind of go around the back – and I've heard some conflicting opinions about that – that's a really nice addition to the project. I almost wish it was more integrated into the front façade just because, you know, it kind of makes the back of the building look nicer than the front of the building, at least at the moment. In terms of architecturally speaking, if you're going to have a dealership here, this is a decent iteration, with a few adjustments. That said, there's a lot of public comment about scale, about massing. A lot of concern about how appropriate this project is, which shouldn't be ignored either. I think that's why I'm having a bit of a hard time, because architecturally, I think with a few adjustments, I could get to a place where I'm okay with this design, but it's true in terms of how appropriate it is for the location... I don't know. That's sort of the warring part in me. At the moment, I'm a little split. But there are still two more people on the Board we haven't heard from, so I'll just leave it there for now.

Chair Furth: Thank you. David?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I agree that this is incredibly better than what we've seen before, and I'm bothered by certain aspects of it. But a general look at the building, it seems to me that there's a front of the building, and a sales area of the building, and the back of the building, and a service area of the building. I feel pretty strongly that there should be some distinction made between the two when you have an opportunity with the stair tower to make that separation between the two functions. However, I note that it's 96 feet, 7 inches from the street front, and I'm wondering if you could actually push the... This is a detail, but it's really important to me, that you somehow push that staircase out so that you make a distinction, because it will really make a significant distinction in the shapes of the sales and storage area on the front from the back of the building. That's a smaller consideration maybe, but important to me. I think the manner in which, what you call the front of the building now; it's a little hard to say what's the front. There is a, sort of a strange relationship between the curved wall and the display areas and the real front of the building, which is the one you emphasize in most of your renderings here. The front of the building here seems to me to be from the parking lot, and it's important to show the trees, and the trees ought to be appropriate to the scale, which I think they are. I wish they were the

same color all year long. I find that to be fairly successful. I agree that the panel at the top could just be glazing, some kind of a glazing, other than the panel that's shown, so it keeps the crispness of the glass surface all the way to the top of the building. I think the rendering, actually, which I stated before, is a little bit inaccurate because it won't be quite that transparent in reality. There will be kind of a skylight cloud layer on the glass, and I don't think that would be a bad result. But it doesn't come across too well here. In terms of the entry, I think that the entry ought to be more glazed coming in through that doorway. I really disagree to the Vice Chair that the building is not a successful building. It is a showroom, after all. The scale of it, the first-floor scale is quite high. Eighteen feet, I think, for the first floor. I think the scale and detail of the building is good for the product they are selling, which is a beautifully-detailed car, and there is some care – a lot of care, in fact – in the support of the roofline as an overhang. I almost wish that we could go back to a darker element above it so that the entry was more emphasized, but previously the Board decided that you shouldn't have that much black on the building, so the compromise with a metal surface for the second level seems to me to be fine. And the scale of it shows up on the drawings, even though we don't have a sample here today. I feel that the planting idea for the back of the building is not a success at all. I would really rather see the walls be entirely planted, or alternately planted on the back of the building. What is shown back there is really the back of the building, and admitted, but let's have some consideration of the Baylands and the softness where it faces, and not put strong shapes on that wall that draw attention to it. I feel very strongly about that. I think you can plant a lot of the back of the building without having separate, smaller, vertical elements to it. And that would make a significant distinction, and it would be a pleasant place to actually be for those people who use that area. But don't draw that kind of attention to it. It doesn't make sense. But very important, I think, is the stair tower, pulling it forward. I don't know how that works with the zoning, but if it were a freestanding wall of some sort, could that intrude into the setback? Is that setback a requirement? Then you have the symbolic symbol of the Mercedes facing the street there, but it's pulled forward and you make a distinction between the front and the back of the building. Overall, I would say I feel this is a successful building. The materials are high-tech, the car is high-tech. I think they belong together, and I would like to see it move forward. Also, this is the last meeting we're going to have for the Board, I believe, so it's really important for us to be on board or not be on board. This is our last statement that we're going to make, and I want to make a statement I think it's a nice project and I want it to proceed.

Chair Furth: Okay. Alex, do you have any other comments?

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I'm fairly aligned with Board Member Hirsch on this one. Generally, I think this is a successful project. I do have some significant reservations, though. But I think I can get to recommend approval with some additional conditions of approval. Largely, I think there have been several revisions, and I think they were done thoughtfully, and I think they were done well, since our last hearing. I think generally, I will say that if I look at the rendering proposed here, if I look in our Baylands design guideline book with the project across the street, that they are compatible, generally, in terms of massing. If I look at the building footprint size, if I compare lengths of facades of this project to the neighbors, I think they are fairly similar. I don't necessarily think this project is over-scaled, even though it is taller; I will definitely acknowledge it's taller. But at least from the public's point of view from the street, that it's stepping, and you've broken up the massing. I think the curved element makes the design linkage to the project across the street at 2450 Watson Court. I think we do have some issues with the colors. I think the black stucco color is not acceptable, and I do have issues with the black metal panel as well. I think it makes the façade much too dark. I will acknowledge that there are some other high-contrast colored buildings on Embarcadero Road. There's one across the street next to the golf course, 1755 Embarcadero, which is a light-colored concrete and has black glass. So, there is some precedent for darker colors, even though they don't necessarily comply with our Baylands design guidelines. I'm okay with the car wash if it has the closed doors. I think the landscaping, I'm very happy with the increased native plants. I think that that's actually done really well, and I think that the bunch grasses make a design linkage to other recently done projects nearby in the Baylands. I think the lighting plan was done

really well, as well. Thank you for making those revisions. I think we do need the cut sheet for fixture SD, which is not in our set. And I think we do, as Board Member Baltay had asked previously, that we do need the top floor of the garage, the parapet lighting, I think resolved with the glass guardrails. I think we should do the bike path, pedestrian and bike path. I think that's critical, and I'm willing to forgo the existing street trees. I'm a little concerned about the curb ramp at the corner as it's shown currently, so maybe we can follow up with staff on that later. It seems kind of unusual in there. And then, I think my main reservation is just on our findings. I alerted staff that we're missing findings 2 and 3, the DEE findings, and I think that's absolutely critical. I think we do have to address that. If we don't address it, I think that we're looking at trying to get... I think people would appeal our recommendation just because those are missing. I think those are critical. Also, I think Karen Holman had mentioned that contact space criteria, and I mentioned this at the last hearing. I don't think there's anything in the staff report except for setbacks with regards to the contact space criteria in CS zone. I think we do need to do that. There should be some documentation, photos or street elevations that show this building with the neighbor's and how they are compatible or make design linkages. And then, lastly, I have two broad comments. One is that the auto overlay was intended to allow car storage, so I think it's fully... I think the intent of the code is to figure out a way to get vertical car storage in on these lots, and to keep auto dealers in the city for tax revenue purposes. And then, secondly, at our last hearing, I think there was a lot of concern about where the Baylands start and where's the gateway. If you actually look across the street at Watson Court, there is a Baylands Gateway sign, and I think the intent is that all of the landscaping from the freeway all the way out to the Baylands is part of Baylands. And I think if you look at things like the new Facebook Building 20, or if you look at some of the, there's the North Bayshore-specific plan in Mountainview. I think our neighbors are really on board with making suburban development part of the Baylands. Like the Facebook Building 20, you have a nine-acre roof. And like Shani Kleinhaus has been documenting, they've been counting all the birds for the last three years up on the Facebook roof, and sort of tracking it and how well it's working. I think they've found that the native plants and trees attract more wildlife than non-native trees. And they actually have the numbers to back it up. In Mountainview, Google is removing some buildings entirely for more egret habitat, and then, they're building taller buildings elsewhere. I think they are making big design moves and they're not afraid of having a bigger building if there's more habitat. I would argue that we should do the same and not try to hold on to a 1950's notion of what Embarcadero Road currently looks like. That's where I am. I would not be able to make the findings with the black. I think black is just a bad idea anywhere. I would support a dark gray, an integral color stucco. I could get there. With the metal panel, I could go with a charcoal, but I can't do the solid black. So, that would be a "no" recommendation if those aren't changed.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you to the applicant, thank you to members of the public, thank you to staff. I know you've been through a lot of iterations of these plans, constantly moving. I hope we've been consistent up here. I know we are in our own minds. Starting with the land use. The City Council has been ambivalent about this location for auto dealerships. We actually recommended approval of one and they said nope. But that was about a particular proposal, councils change their minds. I'm operating under the assumption that the proposal before us is for an auto dealership that the Council wants here, or believes could be well done here, and it is consistent with the general plan. I do favor indoor car storage. I think it is a much better use of land than having asphalt heat sinks with cars moving around on them. Or ferrying them from Fremont, or wherever they are ferried from these days. So, I am willing to accept a larger building because you put the cars inside. And I will not get into discussions about how the floor area ratio should be calculated because I defer to the city attorney and the city staff and the City Council on those issues. I will say that I think that the building should not be any bigger or appear to be any bigger than it needs to, so it shouldn't be doing grandiose elements. I do think the bicycle path is essential. I'm bothered that we can't do both. I spent a lot of time working on pedestrian and bicycle access over private properties with Stanford, and if there was a design that gave us better landscaping and a bicycle path, both of which I think are essential, that's what I would favor. I think that the siding and elevations are acceptable given the present level of our planning. It's an interesting choice to build a building of this scope and intensity in that location. I believe that lighting has been adequately addressed.

I believe that it is possible, it is likely, that the noise abatement will work with respect to the car wash. I wanted to ask, what's the landscaping, or buffering, or whatever, of the car wash on the adjacent property? Is there any? It's right up against the fence, right?

Board Member Lew: It's a chain-link fence.

Chair Furth: I don't think that's okay. I don't think it's okay to put that use smack up against your neighbor without an attractive wall or landscaping, so that location is not acceptable to me. I couldn't make the findings with regard to that. Landscaping. I agree that it's better to go up than out, if you also provide habitat, whether it's [inaudible] boxes on the roof, or significant landscaping on the site. I don't think I see that here, do I, Alex? Do you think there's a big increase in the volume of green and tree? Significant?

Board Member Lew: They're adding a lot of oak trees.

Chair Furth: You think that could be a significant help?

Board Member Lew: Oak trees are considered...

Chair Furth: Oh, I think oak trees are great.

Board Member Lew: ... considered, like, a keystone, or whatever. Keystone plants for attracting wildlife.

Chair Furth: Yeah. With respect to the green screens, I like the idea of greening those walls. I do not think that is a good way to do it. I don't know that down in the Baylands, you plan ficus all over it and let it climb, but I think that that landscaping should be simpler. And we didn't talk about what plants might be plugged in there, but I just don't believe that that's feasible or likely to be habitat-useful, or any of those things. But I think it would be possible to plant those walls significantly with plants that would be useful. Judging by the number of birds nests I find in the vines on my wall. That could be modified to be useful. I agree with you about the water bottles. I don't find the materials... I don't understand how to make the findings about muted natural colors and materials that weather nicely with this materials board. They don't match, to me. It would need to be changed. It looks too bright, it looks too shiny, it looks too high contrast. I tend to go look at the sites again the morning before the meeting, just to remind myself of what's out there, because it's amazing what I forget. And I drove north – what I think of as north – on East Bayshore, and I was really startled to see how much architectural harmony and landscaping harmony there is along that road. I mean, admittedly the flying club is a little bright, but it's also very small-scale, and a flying club could be a little frivolous. But you do see Baylands tones, you do see a lot of grasses, you do see a lot of sycamores, you do see a lot of... And we have an interesting issue here because Baylands, left to their own devices, are all marsh and very few trees, but I don't think you can... If you're going to have buildings, I think you need to have trees. There's more harmony than I thought, which hardened my feelings that the building we see here is going to leap out in a way that I think is undesirable, so I would want those colors changed. I will also say that, you know, the Baylands design guidelines, some of them are clearly designed just for the park that we were building, and our other improvements over there, but some of them clearly – equally clearly – apply to the whole place, as we all know. One of the things I found myself thinking is – if I can go find page 11 again – in addition to the bright and shiny materials, identity signs should be low to the ground. And that, in my mind, doesn't mean you can only have monument signs on this building. But it does mean that I'm opposed to seeing a Mercedes logo in the sky as I drive along that building, that road. I don't want that element; I don't want signage up there. I want it way lower. As to the beauty or integrity of the building itself, I do think it looks much better [inaudible] materials. I'm not convinced – and I believe the landscape architecture needs more work. I believe that the car wash needs to be visually, aesthetically insulated from its neighbor. I think they've addressed sound, but that's not the only element. When you put an unattractive... I don't mean it isn't a beautiful little building, but when you put a less-desirable use next to your neighbor, you need to make it attractive. It needs to be really good-looking and operate in a way

that doesn't make them feel like they are in your corporation yard. I don't know... There was much discussion of the location of utilities, and I found myself thinking, you know what? It costs money to locate utility boxes, but it's not impossible. It's just money. And if the Council decides that they wish to go ahead with this, I would hope that they would give direction that we put significant time and energy, and if necessary, somebody's money, into doing what you need to do to have significant landscaping screening this very tall building. And, good pedestrian/bicycle access. I don't know how that's done. I don't think we're there yet. So, would somebody like to make a motion?

MOTION

Chair Furth: That was a rather loud sigh.

Board Member Lew: Why don't we let Peter try to make the motion, then we'll see where that goes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I'm not sure I want to make a motion yet, but I want to just talk to my colleagues. This is the third review. They want us to give them an answer. I don't think we're there with an answer yet, unless it's an enormous list of conditions as well. Maybe it's worth asking the applicant if they want to take one more try, come back to us again, see if staff will tolerate us extending this yet another month. Because I agree with everybody that it's a project that could work. It is a handsome building. It's more a question of compatibility. And it's really a shame not to try to make it work. So, through the Chair, could we ask the applicant and staff what they think we should do?

Chair Furth: This would be continuing to the first meeting in July. Right?

Vice Chair Baltay: I don't know when, but just to see...

Chair Furth: Well, you wouldn't be here.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... see if the applicant would like to have a chance to try to address once more some of these concerns.

Chair Furth: Having heard our discussion up here, would you like us to vote this up or down today with respect to our recommendation, or would you like to come back one more time?

Mr. Hutson: We would come back one more time.

Chair Furth: We're always happy to engage.

Ms. Gerhardt: I just want to clarify that, you know, if we came back on 6/20, that would be very quick. It wouldn't give us any time for changes.

Chair Furth: Well, we also would be missing two people.

Ms. Gerhardt: So then, we're talking about July 18th. Board Member Thompson would be absent at that time.

Board Member Lew: Let me ask staff, when were you thinking that this would go to Council? Like, if they have recess, as well, during the summertime.

Ms. Gerhardt: Well, exactly, and because we were at three hearings and we've had some preliminary reviews on this project, the Director was certainly hoping to take this project to Council before their summer break. That's the direction that I've been given so far. If the applicant agrees and the ARB wants to recommend a fourth hearing, I will bring that to the Director. I mean, I would assume that if the applicant is on board, it probably would go over a little more favorably.

Chair Furth: Well, I do think it would be much better for the City Council to have a positive recommendation from us.

Ms. Gerhardt: And I do think that Council definitely looks to the ARB for design comments. It would just be if there are policy concerns. Then we would leave that to the Council.

Chair Furth: Well, I think that when we sit here, we assume that this is a use and a project that the Council has indicated they want to have happen, and that we're not arguing that this isn't the use that should happen here. And as far as I can tell, we're not arguing about square footage calculations. We'll let you deal with that and City Council. I think we're pretty clearly dealing with the findings that we're required to make, and the fact that this is in the Baylands. I think one of the things we often deal with is the context issues, and we are still missing those elevations and drawings, which they're going to need for the further steps of this process. Is that right? That's a missing piece of the packet.

Board Member Lew: And the DEE findings.

Chair Furth: And the DEE findings. And, of course, we want to be sure that the many things that the applicant has told us that they are committed to doing are all properly reflected in the record. You had a comment?

Mr. Hutson: Yes, if I may address the Board. Before you do make your decision, I've taken notes here today, and we see quite a few varying comments. I hope that we can come to some agreement as to what you'd like to see when we come back because I feel like we need...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: You're completely entitled to a consensus, so we'll do a quick series of straw votes and see where we are. Okay.

Board Member Lew: [crosstalk] comments, as a senior member here...

Chair Furth: Absolutely, and even as yourself, Alex.

Board Member Lew: [crosstalk] ... seen, and I've seen the Board make different types of recommendations on this situation...

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Lew: ... and I would just point out one example. There's the College Terrace Center, which was a PC zone, so it was going to everybody in the city. And the Board was under pressure to move it along to the Council, and it did, and we made a long list of conditions of approval. And in the end, that building had a lot of problems with color, and lighting, and whatever, and those were all addressed after the fact that staff had been spending a lot of time resolving the lighting problems, the building was repainted...

Chair Furth: And the building owner has been spending a lot of time addressing those problems.

Board Member Lew: Right. So, it just gets to the point, like, where the Board was okay with the massing, but we had reservations with a lot of the other details, and we let it all sort of slide down the road. And the problem is, when we do that, we don't necessarily get to, we don't really get the follow-through on there. I think on really prominent sites, we actually do need to follow through. If it were a smaller project mid-block somewhere, and, you know, most people wouldn't notice. But on a very prominent site, I think it's really important that we do address all of the issues.

Chair Furth: Okay. I'm going to start going through them, and the ones I miss, you can tell me about. The first one would be the black metal... Let's talk about materials. We do want you to pay serious attention to the requirement in the Baylands Design Guidelines with respect to colors and materials. Nobody wants them to use Corten steel, right? We don't need your Mercedes logo in Corten steel. But the black metal panels and façade are not acceptable. They are too dark. The GL-2 material, which is the parapet edging, is not acceptable. What is it that you want, guys? Go ahead.

Board Member Thompson: With regard to the GL-2, I find that it's too opaque for the way that it is currently presented. It sort of contradicts what's in the rendering. I could be okay with an opaque material so long as it's differentiated in some way. Right now, it seems too similar.

Chair Furth: You don't want it to appear to be an extension of the material below it.

Board Member Thompson: Or next to it.

Chair Furth: Or next to it. It's supposed to contrast with other materials. Is that right? Any other guidance on that material?

Board Member Hirsch: My sense is different. I would like to see a glazed material. I think it reduces the mass of that area, makes it lighter feeling. I prefer a glaze material, which you can back up with opaque behind it.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, so, you want glass?

Board Member Hirsch: I think it should be glass.

Board Member Thompson: I could be okay with the see-through material.

Chair Furth: If it's see-through, are we seeing cars?

Board Member Hirsch: No. No, it's not see-through because you're going to be looking at the ceiling anyhow.

Board Member Thompson: [off-microphone]

Board Member Hirsch: Oh. This area. Oh. Oh, I agree. Okay. It's not the one that... Okay.

Board Member Thompson: Are you okay with the potentially opaque material, which is different from the parapet?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Could we actually, maybe point exactly where you're talking about, so that staff understands the location?

Board Member Thompson: I'm looking at Sheet ZA404.

Chair Furth: [off-microphone] ... on the board.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, it's used as part of the parapet around the parking.

Chair Furth: And in the drawing, it shows it as, I mean...

Board Member Thompson: It looks very different.

Chair Furth: It looks very different.

Board Member Thompson: In the material board, it looks very similar.

Chair Furth: [off-microphone] ... the photograph, not the material board.

Board Member Thompson: Unfortunately. Yes.

[Board Members looking at materials board.]

Board Member Lew: Okay, and I think GL-2 needs to be resolved with the lighting.

Board Member Thompson: Agreed, yeah, we wouldn't want it to spill, spill light from up there.

Chair Furth: [off-microphone] We don't like spill over...

Ms. Gerhardt: Microphone.

Chair Furth: Sorry. We don't want it glowing in the dark, nor do we want it blending into the materials. We like the fact that it presents a marked visual contrast in the materials board photograph.

Board Member Thompson: It's nice because it breaks down the scale. That's why we like it.

Chair Furth: It does. Actually, they have us looking at the clouds through it, which may not be realistic.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Chair Furth: But it needs to not blend into the adjacent materials. Okay.

Board Member Thompson: Can we talk a little bit more about the black material?

Chair Furth: Why don't you do that, Alex?

Board Member Thompson: I have a note, an addition, but I just wanted to chat about it with the Board because it might be a little different than maybe what you're thinking. In the past, when we commented on more muted tones, especially in the iteration before this, we kind of got a beige that did not work at all. It's a question to the Board. I wonder if it might be worthwhile to ask the applicant to maybe bring a couple ideas forward, because there's a danger, if you come out with one and it's potentially not a good solution, we might deny it again. But if you come forward... Because I think, you know, the thing I like about the black is that it's bold. And it's true, black sustainability-wise is not a good choice; in the Baylands, it's not appropriate. But I think another bold color like orange, or something that could be bold... Okay. I see your face. That's fine. [Laughter] And nobody has to agree with me. I'm also the only one that loves the green screens in the back. You know, something that... There's a potential hit-or-miss situation here because it's such an important part of breaking that [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: I'm going to say to you, I like bright, bold colors. I have a really hard time identifying the bright, bold color that's going to work on Bayshore with respect to the guidelines. I do believe that with great color consultants, you can get, you know, two different shades of cattail that look great together, that are contrasting, that are natural. It could be a rich brown. I mean, there are all kinds of things that could work. But I will be opposing it if I don't think it fits in that basic daylight..

Board Member Thompson: That's fair. That's totally fair. I just...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Thompson: ... ask the applicant to come back with more than one solution, given that it's, it's a bold choice. Right?

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: I would support that. And I think I agree with your assessment about the way the color is applied now, emphasizes the horizontalness, and it breaks up the massing. I don't want that to change. I think that's all working really well. I'm on board with that.

Board Member Thompson: There's a danger that if you go to, like, a muted beige and a muted gray, that could all blend in together...

Board Member Lew: No, no, no.

Chair Furth: We agree [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: My thought was just lighter and not necessarily making it all the same.

Ms. Gerhardt: Are we saying the placement of the colors is...?

Chair Furth: Here's what we're saying. We're saying that we like the fact that they have designed it in a way that it breaks up the elements, it's not monotonous, they do a good job of handling that huge building in a way that makes a lot of changes. So, we do not want monochromatic. It's not like you want earth tones, we'll show you earth tones. We don't want it monochromatic. We do want contrast. We do want liveliness, I'd say.

Ms. Gerhardt: You just want the black to be muted.

Chair Furth: This particular black is going to lose at least three votes. You can count. So, lively, beautiful, with these kind of massing shifts that they've managed to do here, but not this bright and shiny. And not that black. Is that fair? I'm getting nods from at least three votes here.

Board Member Hirsch: The palette here is a black and light contrasting palette, but I think that you can get subtleties with black and a darker gray, or something like that, that would work with what they're showing.

Chair Furth: Well, I'm not convinced that you can do that and meet the design guidelines, but I think there are dark shades that could work.

Vice Chair Baltay: To me, it's just a matter of being, the Bayshore design guidelines call for earth tones, muted colors. It's grays, I mean, browns and greens, more than blacks and whites. And I just think we have to find something that fits that design guideline. It's not optional. We have to meet the design guidelines.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, so, related to materials, I think bringing some color options is good. I think, you know, there are regulations on the size of the material board for us to keep. There's no regulations on the size of materials that you can bring into the hearing.

Chair Furth: You just have to fit in a file drawer.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. But you can bring...

Chair Furth: But feel free to bring in... I mean, Stanford has come in with four-by-four feet.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. You can bring in a sample to the hearing of any size that the applicant can carry. I'm hearing no Corten steel.

Chair Furth: That's a joke. It's because the Baylands – I shouldn't joke – the Baylands guidelines talk about Corten steel as being sort of the ideal weathering material, and this is not part of the design here.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. We'll take that out.

Chair Furth: It would be interesting.

Ms. Gerhardt: And then, about the GL-2 parapet. The photo on the materials board is more the transparent see-through look, and that's what we're going for. We want it differentiated from...

Chair Furth: I think we have a complicated problem here. One is, it can't glow in the dark.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, and the lighting [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: There's a lighting issue. The second one is that there's cars behind that, right? You may not want to see things particularly clearly. But the third one is, we like the way they have differentiated the levels and made the building look lighter and a little more fun.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, and it helps to break down the scale with the differentiated materials.

Chair Furth: It does. Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. That's materials.

Mr. Hutson: Relating to the materials, this is now the third time that we've gotten the same, we like black/we don't like black, or no, we don't like black, we do like it, we don't like it. Maybe there is a way we have a working session, because this sounds like you all want to be included in picking colors and materials, and we'd like to be able to accommodate that, but I'm just not sure if we come back with... You know, maybe there's a way to do this collectively and get through this, and not just kick it down the road and be, you know, let the City Council manipulate the findings the way you're doing. I just want to be...

Chair Furth: I could appoint a subcommittee to go consult with you about color options.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good idea, actually.

Mr. Hutson: This is a big part, and...

Chair Furth: I don't think it violates the Brown Act.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think if we're headed towards... If we're heading...

[crosstalk]

Ms. Gerhardt: If we're headed towards the fourth hearing and we bring options to that hearing, I think that serves the same purpose.

Chair Furth: All right. I leave it to staff. I assure you that we don't want to pick the color.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think it's a great idea, Wynne, to let maybe Alex and Osma work with them a little bit more.

Chair Furth: If the city attorney doesn't object, if staff could work with Alex and Osma, who I will temporarily appoint to a very temporary subcommittee on the issue of materials, that would be great.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ... figure out a way to work.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, we will ask.

Vice Chair Baltay: Do you need a motion to do that?

Chair Furth: No, I'm doing this. I have the authority to appoint the subcommittee. I know that. Because I sympathize with the confusion. All right. Landscaping. Green screens. I am still concerned that there is a better tree than a Western Redbud to be used in Palo Alto, because my experience of them is that they are pretty sketchy some of the years. I would like either better evidence, or a better tree.

Mr. Puncerelli: Can you point to one that you like, Madam Chair?

Chair Furth: [Laughs] But we have really skillful people on the staff, so if staff could work with applicant. And the goal is it has to be clean and tidy, it can't provide, you know, a danger to pedestrians or bicyclists, you don't want undesirable insects. But we want as much year-round biomass as we can get there. And if there's more than one tree, that's fine, and if they, you know, in many places, we want deciduous trees because we like trees that show what the season is, provides good lighting. But in the case of this building and that street, I want trees. Given the... And, you know, may have to keep pruning them. I mean, I realize we've got many problems but... trees. The goal here is that when I drive down

that street, when I get close – drive up the street, north – when I get close, I think, oh, there's this beautiful dealership there, and look, it's a Mercedes dealership. Not that I see the sign from a great distance, or that it drags my eye away from everything else that's happening.

Ms. Gerhardt: You're discussing the street trees on...?

Chair Furth: They're not exactly street trees. I was talking about the Bayshore frontage. Whatever is on the Bayshore frontage.

Ms. Gerhardt: East Bayshore frontage, yeah. And we're looking for evergreen trees and doing [crosstalk]...

Chair Furth: We're looking for green mass.

Ms. Gerhardt: And do we have...?

Chair Furth: Do we have consensus on that?

Ms. Gerhardt: Do you want to do a straw vote?

Chair Furth: Alex disagrees. Okay, Alex. Let's get this hashed out quickly.

Board Member Lew: My understanding with the redbud trees, and there are a whole bunch of non-native ones, or, like, United States-native ones. But they're one of the last trees to drop leaves and one of the first trees to leaf out, so I don't really understand the comment.

Chair Furth: Okay. I've been looking at some redbuds recently that are very stick-like, but, you know, good documentation, I'll be convinced.

Board Member Lew: They are stick-like. They're not really large canopy trees. I think of it more like a, more like an accent. More of an accent-size tree.

Chair Furth: Do you think there's room for anything bigger?

Board Member Lew: Fifteen feet is nothing for a tree. And when you get into evergreen trees, it's even fewer. You have far more choices with the deciduous trees than...

Chair Furth: [off-microphone] Pretty much oaks.

Board Member Lew: Well, magnolias, [crosstalk].

Mr. Puncerelli: My other concern, just to bring to the Board's attention, is meeting the 50 percent shade canopy criteria. If we eliminate those and put in evergreen trees, we won't be hitting that.

Chair Furth: Oh, I don't think we're talking about firs. I don't think anybody is going to argue for that.

Mr. Puncerelli: Or we go to a non-native and we shoot for an evergreen there. That's why I was looking for some direction. If you had a penchant towards something, we're happy to plug it in.

Chair Furth: It's completely covered with – what? – Chinese elms now, or something?

Mr. Puncerelli: Yes. Which are non-native, and they were hacked, but they still look cool.

Board Member Lew: There are London Planes across the street. Those can be pruned...

Chair Furth: They can be [crosstalk]...

Mr. Puncerelli: Yeah. In France.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I would think that maybe that's possibly an option.

Mr. Puncerelli: They don't look that great.

Chair Furth: That could work, actually. It would strongly tie it in to the rest of the trees out there. Most of us think they are native. And they could be maintained to be... I know it's seasonal, but they can be pretty spectacular. And they are French.

Board Member Lew: Well, there's a California sycamore, as well. But I think typically the London Plane is specified here in Palo Alto.

Ms. Gerhardt: Should we do a straw poll on the trees?

Vice Chair Baltay: Is there any support on the Board, insisting on keeping the existing trees?

Chair Furth: I don't think we have the power to do that because I don't think... I don't think there's a design that preserves the trees and the bicycle path without a big change in the design.

Board Member Lew: They're also doing a huge grading project here, which doesn't really help the survival of existing trees.

Chair Furth: And I think the Council, if they wish, could address that issue and say you need to put a path through right here, or there. But I don't think we have that power. I think those trees are very much at the mercy of PG&E. I think one of the things that's happening here is that as we shift to indoor parking, we're losing some of the canopy trees that we had before on these sites. I mean, right now, it looks like a woodland. So, I wouldn't be able to support that, except as a comment to Council. And I do think the bike path is really important. Anybody else?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll support Alex's comment about the trees and the idea towards, things like the London Plane trees, I think are a right direction to go.

Chair Furth: Yeah, so, trees that are as big and significant as possible. If they're deciduous part of the year, that's a legitimate trade-off for good cover the rest of the year.

Mr. Puncerelli: I just would hate to spec a London Plane tree and have expectations not met, because the only way they actually look good when they are pollarded is when they're above 12 to 15 feet above the ground. And then, you have a mass above there, which is almost like a tree wall.

Chair Furth: I have a question. What about the landscaping between the edge of the PG&E easement and the building itself? On that frontage.

Mr. Puncerelli: There are grasses between, as the understory for the redbuds, between the trail and the parking lot. And then, between the building, our building is right up against the PG&E setback, so anything that we have underneath there is, again, limited to 15 feet.

Chair Furth: This is what's driving me bonkers. It's why I wish it was three feet back.

Ms. Gerhardt: The landscape plan is on L3.

Chair Furth: Right.

Ms. Gerhardt: There does look to be some space outside of the easement.

Chair Furth: That's what I thought when I looked at it one day, but....

Ms. Gerhardt: There are four trees proposed in that area?

Chair Furth: In those little finger junctions, right?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, there's a live oak...

Chair Furth: Is that where the oaks are?

Ms. Gerhardt: There's one live oak.

Mr. Puncerelli: I mean, where we can, we will absolutely add some canopy trees, but I know the civil engineer has been adamant about underground utilities as well.

Chair Furth: On your site?

Mr. Puncerelli: Yes.

Chair Furth: I'm talking about close to your building. I'm talking about close to your building.

Mr. Puncerelli: Yeah. There are BMPs in there, as well, for storm drainage.

Board Member Thompson: Maybe it's something the subcommittee could discuss. You know how you were saying that we...?

Chair Furth: We can't have one or two people think about it. We can't have one or two people work with them.

Board Member Thompson: Right. Anyway...

Chair Furth: This is expressing my frustration point of view.

Mr. Puncerelli: Let's find another tree or trees to mix in, and if they are not natives but they meet the objective, then let's plug that in, and hopefully you're open to that. It's tough to find all of... You know, I've got many masters, and I want to please you all.

Board Member Lew: But some do design by committee. Let them come back.

Chair Furth: You can come back with it, but the standard that I'm thinking of is that I want significant softening of that prospect with landscaping in various places, so that when I go back there, I do not feel overwhelmed by bright, hard surfaces, but I feel amply buffered by green [inaudible]. All right.

Mr. Puncerelli: That's fair enough. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Chair Furth: Next. Alex, you had a comment about the curbed ramp at the corner.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, that's just a minor detail.

Chair Furth: Well, let's get it out. You'll talk to staff about that, or...? You said it was odd.

Board Member Lew: It's very unusual. Has Transportation gone through that really carefully?

Mr. Sing: Transportation has looked at the plans, but what particular sheet are you referring to?

Board Member Lew: It's right at the corner of Embarcadero and East Bayshore. It's just the connection of that to the proposed bike path, is unusual. I think it's a minor detail that staff can resolve. I don't think it's a board-level issue.

Chair Furth: All right. Have we told you enough about back wall landscaping, back side landscaping? Do you want more thoughts from us on that, or are you clear?

Vice Chair Baltay: Can we be clear on these green panels on the back sides of the building, mostly? I feel strongly that those are very inappropriate.

Chair Furth: Because they're too busy and...?

Vice Chair Baltay: I don't think they're functional, and I don't think they go with the Baylands. It needs to be something much more integrated, and something that's much lower maintenance.

Board Member Hirsch: I want to second that.

Mr. Hutson: Can I just comment on that?

Chair Furth: Please do.

Mr. Hutson: That was one of the things that we had a communication with the Audubon Society, about providing incidental habitat as well, and that was something that we felt like we could participate in and provide some habitat area. I walked next door to Honda and saw the nesting swallows up inside the canopy area and causing problems, and dropping, and everything else. One of the things that the Audubon Society and I discussed was the opportunity to use the back half of those green screens as they angle away from the wall, and be able to provide a horizontal area that they... We wouldn't provide the scenario, but it would give nesting opportunity and a place to do that. That seemed to be a nice option that we were looking at. I am participating tomorrow in the review at Building 20, to look at how they do that and how we might incorporate those. I'm fully happy to remove them all and put it back the way it was. I don't think it's a good opportunity to have green growing up from the ground, and that's why we have the planters at the top of the space. Those are our BMPs that we treat the water from the run-off at the time, up there, as opposed to sending it back down. This was a continuation of doing landscape on that wall. I'm perfectly open to it, but I will tell you that that was one item that was looked at from a design standpoint, and a habitat provision.

Vice Chair Baltay: Let me throw at you an attempt to sort of architecturally explain my thought process here. If I were traveling through the Italian countryside and I looked across one ravine to another, I might see an old stone building that climbs up the side of a wall. It's fairly large. And you might see a bunch of landscaping growing on or integrated with that building, which feels really integrated into the landscaping. And if you got into it closer, what you would see is that the wall is actually stepped back. They make places for pockets of landscaping, pockets in other parts of the building. Within that architecture itself, the way it climbs out of the ground, even. What you have here is a 30, 40-foot tall concrete wall, and now you're trying to decorate it with some landscaping. And what I think you need to do is get a little more modulation in your architecture, your building, to then allow all these wonderful things you're talking about to take place. That's what I think we're asking for by integration.

Mr. Hutson: In the original proposal last time was you can see the planting areas up high at the roof deck area, that we do have there. We've kept it low because we didn't want to have cascading plants over the side that look like some errant window box. But it's serving multiple purposes for habitat, as well as softening that edge and treating our water. If the desire is not to integrate the wall and the landscape with... And we were kind of given direction that we wanted not to see your building at all, as opposed to sort of that transition. We kind of did it both ways. Again, I understand what you're saying, and we're trying to work with the Board and the concept. I am not one for application of element or application of ornamentation. I will not do that. I won't suggest to my client that we do that. And that's not what this is. This has a very specific purpose and a use of why we angled them away and why we did them the way we did. The heights can be adjusted there. We played with that a couple of times. But again, they were very purposeful. They mimic the louvers that are on the side of the building, at the glass, in gesture, as we translate from Bayshore to the back of the building. That was our anticipated transition. Certainly not the same element, but simple vernacular of the louvers. And they're not moveable, so I should probably indicate that. But again, we're here to absolutely, whether it's a committee or we ask for a vote to move us on, you know, we're comfortable either way. I just want to make sure that we get some clear direction because it just kind of sets us up for not being able to, you to be able to recommend one way or the other, and us not to be able to satisfy the concerns of the [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: Okay. Go ahead, Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Well, I do think maybe not all of our heads are in the same place here, because I actually think that that part of the building is pretty awesome. I like the angles, and I like that it's kind of architecturalizing the landscape. It's not trying to be landscape; it's trying to stylize it in an interesting way. And now that we've heard that there's this relationship with the swallows, that it could have... As long as it doesn't get VE'd out. That was actually my only note here, that because it looks like an appliqué, it looks like something that could easily be taken out later. I think I agree with Board Member Baltay... Sorry, VE is Value Engineered...

Chair Furth: I know that now, but I don't know if the general public does. We don't want it cut out as a cost-saving measure.

Board Member Thompson: Yes. Which we wouldn't want to happen. But I kind of agree that, you know, I like them there. I think the building greatly benefits with them there. Without them there, the building is a lot harder to look at. But if there could be... It sounds like maybe – and correct me if I'm wrong, Board Member Baltay, but you want something a bit more integrated, rather than something applied to the façade?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I suppose integration is an important aspect to that.

Chair Furth: Alex, do you have any comments on this aspect?

Board Member Lew: Generally, I'm in support of the green screen. I've used it a lot, and we've seen it on a lot of projects here in town. To me, it's all in the details, on how it's done, because it can look really tacky, or it can be beautifully integrated into the building. And I haven't seen enough yet to see if, you know, to see that it's actually integrated well into the building. Like the mounting brackets. If they are end caps, how is the edge that's projecting out from the wall, like, how is that supported? Because normally there would be a big mounting clip. But I am in support conceptually of the design that you have today.

Chair Furth: David, do you have a comment on this?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, yes. I feel that as a rain screen, it could be done many different ways. That you have a series of bays in the back of the building with transparent material on top of some of them, and others more solid. You ought to really integrate the idea of how those planted areas work with what's above it. I don't see the reason for it being a separate rain screen off the wall. I don't know if the Audubon Society ought to be telling us which way to put those on our buildings. Maybe I'm not familiar with exactly how they function entirely, but if they are off the way, then the screen could be related to the bay, and answer Peter's comment here as well. And it really ought to start from some base. The base is clearly black, and we have these rain screens kind of hanging over it. And the pattern really doesn't have any meaning to me at all whatsoever. I think if you have it, the more green, the better, so do it bay, by bay, by bay, and follow the pattern that you already have.

Chair Furth: All right. I favor greening these backsides. I'm fairly skeptical about, I mean, I'm not trying to garden this. I think that they are tricky to do, and tricky to maintain. But that is your choice as to whether or not you are comfortable undertaking that, and if you believe you can maintain it, I believe you can. I think that Alex is right, that really well-designed materials and finishing and plant choice which would be more about what has good habitat value than anything else, I would support that when you came back with it.

Mr. Hutson: I think we're moving towards a real opportunity here, to make some suggestions and to refer this. We're happy to do that, not only with the colors, but with this. If we make it as a non-louvered, you know, green screen, adaptable wall in every other bay, or something like that, you know, allows us to manipulate that and do that and use that as a, you know, a simple condition of approval. I think we can get there. It sounds like. I think we're all... This is kind of what I was hoping...

Chair Furth: I think you can get there. I wouldn't argue for kicking it out today. I'm sorry. We're just not going to go there. But, yes, most of us, you have at least three of us who believe some kind of screening application that has good habitat value, you consulted with the appropriate people, you figured how to maintain it; you're good.

Mr. Hutson: Can I ask, how do we then get, if staff has said that there isn't a guarantee that we get an additional meeting, I mean, what is the...?

Chair Furth: Then the Director will just take it to City Council. Right? Staff? Yeah. They'll just say they don't care; we've heard enough from you. But we would like to get it finished at this level with the details [crosstalk].

Mr. Hutson: Yeah, that's what I'm saying. If we could do something and conditional it today, and everybody...

Chair Furth: And I'm telling you that I don't have consensus on that. Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Could I clarify, just to clarify your interpretation of what you're hearing from us on the green screen? I don't think anyone wants less green on that wall.

Chair Furth: That's correct. Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Right? So, if you were to have... Because I think what you have shown in your renderings, it's nice because it's, a good percentage of your façade on the back is green, and I don't think we want any less than what you're actually showing right now.

Chair Furth: Good point.

Board Member Thompson: I heard you say take it away from one bay and put it somewhere else, but that would give you a big hole that doesn't have green fill. I just wanted to clarify that I think we're all in support of the amount of green you have there, and...

Chair Furth: At a minimum.

Board Member Thompson: At a minimum. Yeah.

Chair Furth: Okay. Anything else?

Board Member Lew: We do have some green screen on parking garages in town. You might want to look at VMware, and also Stanford Shopping Center. And then, there are lots of smaller applications that you'll see here downtown, like on University Avenue and High Street.

Chair Furth: Well, also the city garage at the corner of... What is that? It's the street that dead ends into the Apple store. Across from [inaudible].

Board Member Lew: Oh, it's not Kipling, it's the other one.

Chair Furth: What is it?

Male??: [inaudible].

Board Member Lew: No, no, no, it's the...

Chair Furth: [crosstalk] Castle? No.

Board Member Lew: It's okay. We understand.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ...But that's an interesting green screen because it's completely overwhelmed the sculpture in it.

Board Member Lew: Oh, you're saying Bryant. Across from the senior center.

Chair Furth: Yeah, Bryant.

Board Member Lew: Okay.

Chair Furth: Has an exuberant green wall. With bird sculptures. If this could have real birds, we'd be real happy. Anything else, folks? I think we've given our direction on the big issues. We have a group of two people for staff to consult with. Yes, Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think we've talked about colors and landscaping. On the car wash, do we have that page, Sheldon? We just want to show you on the car wash that right adjacent to the car wash is a solid wall, but on most of the perimeter it would be that open fencing. Is that acceptable, that it's just solid by the car wash itself? Or do we still want to look at that further? The perimeter fencing is what I'm talking about.

Mr. Sing: Yeah, if you look at Sheet 408.

Ms. Gerhardt: It's hard to see, so we can get some more images in the next set as well.

Mr. Sing: That shows the exit of the car wash.

Chair Furth: I'm still looking for Sheet 408. Which sheet is it in the packet?

Mr. Sing: It's 408, CA408.

Board Member Lew: The other sheets just say existing fence to remain, so I was presuming that was all chain-link.

Mr. Sing. Yeah, I think the idea is that the fence would remain, and the reason for that is the footings of the solid wall would impede some landscaping, so to get more landscaping, maintaining that fence was a better option.

Board Member Lew: And I would say, at least in the plans, the coffee berry is, like, a 10-foot plant, and there's a five-foot landscape area, and there's a footing, and then there's like a two-foot grade change. I think that that's all... At least in the set that I was looking at, it didn't seem resolved yet.

Chair Furth: The planting that's proposed wouldn't fit.

Board Member Lew: Also, too, I just want to comment on the...

Chair Furth: Excuse me, Alex, before you... Were you saying that the coffee berry wouldn't fit in the indicated space?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, it's like a 10-foot plant in a five-foot space, and there's a footing for the car wash, presumably. And also, there's the existing chain-link fence, and part of it has barbed wire. I was wondering if we could remove the barbed wire because that's not allowed in our, it's prohibited in our fence code.

Chair Furth: What's anybody's view on the side of the car wash, or the frontage adjacent to the other commercial property there? Not the Baylands exposure. I'm trying to find a good...

Board Member Hirsch: You know, the plan on O-3, you really can't put the car wash anywhere else.

Chair Furth: No, I'm not arguing for relocating the car wash, but isn't that...?

Board Member Hirsch: There's space between the car wash and the fence to the neighboring property.

Chair Furth: And is that landscaping that I'm seeing?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: There's a whole bunch of bushes. There's all these little bushes shown on Sheet 003.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Mr. Hutson: We have a 10-foot setback there, so we're set away, a good way [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: Okay, there's ample room for landscaping there.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: Absolutely. Yeah.

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: That's what I was asking staff, and that's not the answer I got earlier, I didn't think. And the plan shows what? Is that where the coffee berry goes?

Board Member Lew: I don't think it's 10 feet. I scaled it yesterday and I didn't get 10 feet.

Chair Furth: All right, let's confirm that, that we think it should be 10 feet back. Perfect.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. It is.

Chair Furth: Okay, we're going to specify that it's 10 feet back, it should be landscaped. We're not going to argue, settle that here. They say it's 10, I'm going to go for it. If it's less than 10 feet, then we need to figure that out. Are we talking about the same...? But there needs to be sufficient space of adequate landscaping or attractive fencing. Yes, we need to wind this up. Okay. Anything else we need to say or can say? We really need to go. Yes, Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: I was just making sure if there were any other issues, but I think we're good.

Chair Furth: Would you like us to continue this to a date certain?

MOTION

Chair Furth: I'll move that we continue this to a date uncertain. Can I have a second?

Vice Chair Baltay: Second.

Chair Furth: All those in favor? All those opposed. It passes 5-0. If staff wishes to do something [inaudible].

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

Chair Furth: Thank you for patience. I know these aren't fun hearings when you're dealing with a complex project, but we appreciate that it's in a very sensitive area.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 375 University Avenue [19PLN-00103]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Renovation of an Existing Approximately 13,000 Square Foot Restaurant Building (Former Cheesecake Factory). Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CD-C (GF)(P) (Downtown Commercial With Ground Floor Retail and Pedestrian Overlays). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@mgroup.us

Chair Furth: Next item is a public hearing on 375 University Avenue, recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow the renovation of an existing 13,000 square foot restaurant building, formerly the Cheesecake Factory. It's exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with guideline section 15301, existing facilities. May we have the staff presentation, please?

Emily Foley, Project Planner: This is, as we mentioned, 375 University. This is an architectural review application. They are updating the façade of, as we mentioned, the former Cheesecake Factory. There's no change to the FAR or the overall building height, and as I'll get into a little later, on the rear they have added a new window and light fixtures on the alleyway. The site is located downtown in the Downtown Commercial with Pedestrian and Ground Floor combining district zone. It is between the Crepevine and Paris Baguette restaurants on University Avenue, and there are retail and office uses in the surrounding area. This item was previously at the ARB on March 7th as a preliminary application. Graham Owen was the planner at that time. If you recall, overall, the changes were perceived as an improvement. However, there was a need to look at additional modifications on the alleyway, and I will get into the changes that have been made to address that. This is the site plan. They aren't changing the building footprint, but they have applied to divide the space into three devisable, rentable spaces. On the exterior, they are proposing to obviously remove the Cheesecake Factory branding and make it more generic to accommodate a variety of potential tenants. The proposed material includes a stone veneer, which is a light color, as seen from the samples, with a darker color acting as a base at the bottom. The stone veneer wraps about 14 feet around the sides, and then it transitions to a painted cement plaster in the same general color tones. There's also metal awnings added to the front, along with that kind of grate pattern at the top of the building. This also shows the rear elevation which has the window where the Cheesecake Factory logo sign previously was, as well as adding two light fixtures to the alley. This shows the side elevations. The height of the building is not changing from what is existing. The project is generally in compliance with the required findings. However, there is no landscaping proposed as a part of this project, so Finding #5 for landscaping may need to be discussed. And then, in terms of the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines, this is considered a place alley, so, as previously mentioned, they are adding a window and light fixtures on the alley, and they are also going to be able to store the waste bins inside the building and not have them on the alley. As previously mentioned, this is exempted from CEQA, and staff recommends that the ARB recommend approval to the Director.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Has everybody viewed the site?

All Board Members: Yes.

Chair Furth: Everybody has viewed the site. Does anybody have any extramural discussions to disclose before we proceed with the hearing?

All Board Members: No.

Chair Furth: May we hear from the applicant, please? You have 10 minutes after you spell your name.

Steven Ohlhaber, C2K Architecture: [spells name]. It's great to be back in front of you again. We were here a couple months ago with a preapplication meeting. I don't know if you remember. We got great feedback at that time, so I think we were trying to address a couple of the items that were brought up. But, for the most part, the design has just been further refined, and basically kept as we were with the preapplication, except for a couple modifications. Would you like me to go through it for the record again, the presentation?

Chair Furth: Only anything that's changed, I think.

Mr. Ohlhaber: Okay. The existing Cheesecake Factory building did encroach over the property line, it did have an encroachment permit on there. And then, working with Public Works and Planning on the building, it has been pulled back so that the façade is in line with the property line along University

Avenue. One of the other comments that came up was about dumpsters on the place alley behind the building. All dumpsters are currently inside the building. They were with Cheesecake, and they will be going forward. If you do go to the site, take a look at the dumpsters that are out there, are not part of this project. There is an inside service yard that is enclosed behind the rolling gate on the back of the building, and that's where all the recycling and trash and composting will happen. Also on the service alley side, there was a comment if the building could provide a little bit more lighting to help enhance the service alley. We did go back through the site. There is a streetlight back there, but we are proposing two downlight sconces, one at the service alley entrance right by that, and the other on the other side of the building where there is actually another entrance. We're adding two light fixtures to the back of the building to help add to that service alley presence and make it a little more appealing, but not over-lit. Apart from that, we did do a minor refinement with the base detail. As we got into looking further into the details of the... please keep going forward. [Adjusting slide presentation.] One of the other charges was to take a look at the base detail for the building. Looking at the character of the building, it's a very modern building. We're using very recta-linear forms. One of the things that we think is very neat about the detailing is how we have these sort of steel portal frames that go around and create the openings and frame the openings into the building. In looking at the base of the building, we decided to keep the base in plane with the stone up above, so the effect is that the stone itself recedes right by the steel edge, so we have this perfect insertion right by it. And to play the difference in material is to use a reveal in the base stone so that the top stone comes down, stops at a point, there's a reveal in the darker gray base stone, and then, it continues on to the same profile. So, when all that returns back to the steel, we have a very clean line, we don't have any overlapping materials, and it looks like almost the whole building has bene machined to fit together. Roxy just wanted to point out that the rear window is actually, in an earlier version of the building, were existing where they are today, so we're sort of bringing back a little bit more of the presence of the prior versions of the building. I'm happy to move the materials. Does anyone want a closer look?

Chair Furth: Yes, if you could bring them up here, please.

[Moving materials board].

Mr. Ohlhaber: Okay. The stone on the base that you're handling now is a flamed granite. It will have a texture on it, as well. The stone up above it is a variation of a Mexican limestone. This is the color palate for the stucco cementitious plaster repainting of the building. The body of the building will be in this P-2 color. The accent is P-3. You only see that at the back, and what it's trying to do is duplicate the idea of base around the back and the alley side, give it a little more base to the building. What you see here is the underside of the main awnings at the front. The intent was to try and provide a little bit of a natural, woodier tone to soften up the experience as you walk underneath the canopy at the street level. And then, this is the painted steel structure. This is a mock-up of one of the window frames in progress. The idea is to bring up more of a bronze color, a dark bronze, then up here, black. I think in our original presentations, we weren't even going pure black. We're trying to pull out some of the red tones that we see in the stone, and we see in the paint colors.

Board Member Thompson: [inaudible]

Mr. Ohlhaber: That's the base. Correct.

Board Member Thompson: [inaudible]

Mr. Ohlhaber: This is the accent at the back. And the rest of the body is this color here. All the dark colors will be matching [inaudible]. What I was just explaining was where the different paint colors go. The P-3 color, which is the darker of the two paint colors, is only in the rear alley area and acts as the base for the building, trying to mimic the stone that we have on the front. The P-2 color will be the body of the building, and again, that color is chosen to sort of work in harmony with the new face stone that happens on the primary elevation, so we have a cohesive-looking building from a distance, and as you

get closer to the University side, you then can see the stone elevation. Oh, that's a good point. One other part of the packet that we wanted to show, there was a comment about the fire department connections on the front of the building, making sure they are within the four-inch projection that's required by ADA. What we are doing here is showing you a cut sheet of a fire department projection that has a four-inch maximum projection.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. Is there anything else you'd like to tell us before we open it up for public comment? Any public comment?

Roxy Rapp: [inaudible]

Chair Furth: For the benefit of the microphone, Mr. Rapp likes the project. Anything more from staff?

Ms. Gerhardt: I did want to reiterate, on packet page 79 in the staff report, this alleyway is meant to be a place alley, not just a service alley. It is meant to be a gathering place for pedestrians, so we are, in a sense, trying to clean it up. Any comments related to that would be helpful.

Chair Furth: I have one comment for staff, which is, on page 88 it says: "The existing trash facilities in the service alley will need to be brought into the structure to meet current stormwater standards." But I understood the applicant's architect to say the existing trash is handled in the building, that the unfortunate trash receptacles that we see in that alley are not from this building. They are from other buildings. Is that correct?

Mr. Ohlhaber: Correct.

Chair Furth: People are nodding their heads, so that is a yes, so we should correct that item in the report on page 88. So that we don't cast aspersions on an innocent building and its owner. Okay. Questions or comments?

Vice Chair Baltay: To staff, could you address, please? The plans show that the sidewalk is being replaced. Can you confirm if that's the case?

Ms. Foley: The issue with the sidewalk is that the engineering department determined that the existing pavement was in good shape and did not need to be replaced.

Ms. Gerhardt: No, the sidewalk will be replaced. It will be City standard, similar to what is in front of Design Within Reach. And it will have just a basic gray color with the brick trim.

Chair Furth: If I could editorialize, which will go very well with the building. The restored sidewalk. Thank you. All right, we've clarified it on trash, we've clarified it on the sidewalk. Anything else? Alex?

Board Member Lew: I have a comment on the light fixture, the one, I think it's F-1, that's mounted up high. I think my comment is, can that be...?

Chair Furth: Alex, could you refer me to a page?

Board Member Lew: Yes. Exterior lighting is on the front. It's Sheet A320. Fixture F-1. The cut sheet says it can be either up light or downlight. I was wondering if we could do downlight. Or, I guess my question is, if you wanted an up light...?

Mr. Ohlhaber: Yes, you could. The intent is up-down.

Board Member Lew: You want both. And staff can correct me – I think we're trying to discourage up lights. In our performance standards. Maybe the performance standards don't trigger in this particular location because there aren't residences nearby. Generally, we try to discourage up lights, although you can go around downtown and you'll see them. Anyway, that's my only comment. We'll see what other Board members have to say about that.

Chair Furth: Peter, any comments?

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Mr. Rapp, for bringing forth such a nice project. I think this is really high-quality materials, high-quality design, and I'm sorry you had to wait so long to get your turn. But I can fully support this project. I have one change on the findings, just the verbiage on page 84, for finding number 2, the last sentence. The height of the existing building, it improves the existing street scape, etc. I'd like to say the height of the existing building, and by incorporating design techniques typical of older one-story commercial buildings on University Avenue. It's just justification for the design. So that this whole finding would then read, "The area is comprised of various commercial, retail and restaurant buildings, one and two stories in height. The proposed project maintains the overall feel of existing streetscapes by not changing the height of the existing building, and by incorporating design techniques typical of older one-story commercial buildings on University Avenue." That's it. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any other comments?

Board Member Thompson: I would agree with my fellow board members. It's a really nice project that you have here. I don't really have very many comments. I think I made a comment back in the day about it, but I'll ask again. The storefront that's facing University, are any of the fenestrations high up, are they operable to release hot air? Nope? Did you guys look into that at all?

Mr. Ohlhaber: The building is designed to re-use the existing MEP systems with the appropriate economizers to bring it to code. There wasn't really any demand for making those operable. It seems like an interesting feature, but there really is no need for it in the building and how the mechanical system works.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. I still think it would be nice, but I don't need to fight anybody about that. It's just more passive, it will save you more energy probably if you have it, and it doesn't sound like it would compromise the design at all. That's my only comment. Oh, for up light, I could go either way, for trying to reduce more up light. The building will still look really nice if that fixture shows down. That's where I'm at.

Chair Furth: Board Member Hirsch, do you have comments?

Board Member Hirsch: No, it's basically the same question about the lighting. If that fixture allows it, it could be somewhat up lighting as well as down lighting. But I wouldn't emphasize the up, but it might make an interesting feature out of it, to have it both up and down. But mostly down. That's about it. I like the project very much.

Chair Furth: All right. I like the project, too. I'm glad to know that the trash is fine, I'm glad to know that the sidewalk will be changed. I agree with Osma that buildings are much more charming, let alone efficient, when they have windows that are operable in the upper story. And if you could add operable windows without compromising the HVAC, I would be in support of that. On the up-down issue, staff, are we indeed trying to eliminate up lighting? Or reduce it?

Ms. Gerhardt: We're not near an airport or other things like that, so there isn't a true regulation, but most cities are always trying to reduce up lighting to allow the natural sky to show through.

Board Member Lew: There's something in our performance standards about up lighting. The issue that's not clear in my mind is if the performance standards are required in this particular location.

Ms. Gerhardt: The performance criteria talks about minimized visual impacts of lighting on abutting or nearby residential sites, and from adjacent roadways, so it does discuss roadways.

Chair Furth: But that's not... Okay.

Board Member Lew: Roxy has up lights on some of their buildings downtown, and others [inaudible], and it does look... And it is attractive.

Mr. Rapp: Right. At the corner of Bryant and University, where [inaudible] is. I like it, especially at night. Pedestrians walking down will be able to see the column. I wanted to make the column stand out. I would lower them a little bit. I think the architect has them a little bit higher; I wanted them a little bit lower, like maybe three feet lower. And then, also we have, in the sidewalk, to shine up on the column, so I think it really causes some interest. It makes the building safer when pedestrians walk by. It's not dark. We plan to leave those on.

Chair Furth: All right. Thank you. Well, that brings up an interesting point because I tend to agree with the owner, that those light fixtures, if they are indeed going to shine up and down, would look good a little bit lower, so they have more building to illuminate. I'd be in favor of letting staff and the applicant agree on what the height of those light fixtures should be. I note that there is good pedestrian seating right next to this building on the corner; therefore, it doesn't need a bench. Not that I'm letting go of my drive for mobility downtown. I had one other thing... Well, it can't have been that important. Oh, what about the window? Osma and I believe that upstairs windows on a façade like this, at least some of them should open transom style, or casement style, or whatever, so that in the future, if somebody wants to let the hot air out, they can do that. Any thoughts? Do we have a third vote?

Board Member Lew: No.

Chair Furth: Okay, that's a no.

Vice Chair Baltay: I support your concept, but I just don't see the architectural findings to support insisting on them. I agree in principle, but...

Chair Furth: We would just say it's for sustainability.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, it's more of energy-saving [crosstalk] future functionality.

Vice Chair Baltay: But I think the HVAC system is probably a lot more efficient if you don't mess with it by opening the windows. Just leave it alone. That's what the engineers will tell you. They've told us in the past.

Chair Furth: And you guys always believe the engineers. We've so noticed that.

Mr. Rapp: The other problem with operating windows, I don't want to say I'm anti-restaurants, I just feel that we have enough restaurants downtown. Next door, the larger space is going to be a non-restaurant use. Beta [phonetic] is going in there, which has all the latest technology, etc., which I'm very excited about. And I wanted to get a bookstore, but because of the length of time, I lost them. And as you know, retail is really hard. I'm talking to a very exciting use, which is a, it's called the coffee bar. In the daytime, it's coffee with health food, things like that, and at night it becomes a wine bar. If you have food, it's not good to have windows that are open where the flies could fly in and everything.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: The other thing with natural ventilation is humidity. I've worked in a naturally ventilated office, and it had the benefit of skylights and windows on two sides of the building and having that was really critical in trying to keep the building cool. But even then, once you put people in, especially with restaurants – less so, I would imagine with retail – even if you got all the windows and things, it still gets humid and...

Chair Furth: I think we'll accept it as given, thank you. We don't have the three votes.

MOTION

Chair Furth: Would somebody like to make a motion?

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we approve this project as submitted.

Board Member Hirsch: I second that.

Chair Furth: Okay, I'll just note to staff that you're going to correct that one thing in the staff report, about they are not presently littering the alley. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed. You passed.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

Chair Furth: Let the record show we didn't hold you up at the ARB.

Mr. Ohlhaber: Thank you so much.

[The Board took a short break.]

[Board Member Hirsch left the chamber.]

Approval of Minutes

Chair Furth: We have minutes, but we need to go, so we're going to kick over the minutes. Is that all right? All right.

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 4, 2019.

Chair Furth: Is there a motion to approve the minutes of April 4, 2019? If you have any clerical corrections, give them to staff. I don't care, we have a quorum. Let's go.

Board Member Thompson: I don't remember seeing these.

Chair Furth: Having completely lost track of...

Board Member Thompson: When did these get sent to us?

Chair Furth: ... lost control of the... They're on the agenda.

Board Member Thompson: Oh, it's in the packet?

Chair Furth: Well, that's not going to work. I'm sorry, Jodie, we're going to have to continue them. Three of us read them. All right. Would one of you two make the motion?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I'd like to correct, please, on page 21, Packet Page 122, I am quoted following Alden saying, "it's approximately 43 feet," then I say, "I want to be sure I understand this, it's a 43-foot-tall volume that's counted only once." Not "discounted."

Chair Furth: All right. Any other corrections? Motion please.

[Board Member Hirsch returned to the chamber.]

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we approve the minutes with that correction.

Board Member Lew: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Okay, motion by Baltay, second by Lew, to approve the minutes of April 4th. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed. Any abstentions?

Ms. Gerhardt: Is that a 5-0?

Chair Furth: Yes.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 18, 2019.

Chair Furth: All right, what about the minutes of the 18th of April?

Vice Chair Baltay: Those were good.

Board Member Thompson: I was not present, so I will abstain.

Chair Furth: You will abstain. Motion, please.

Vice Chair Baltay: Move that we approve the minutes of April 18th.

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Baltay, second by Lew, to approve the minutes of April 18, 2019. Thompson will abstain because she was absent. The rest of you, all in favor say aye. Opposed, none. Passes 4-0-1.

MOTION PASSES 4-0-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER THOMPSON ABSTAINING FROM THE VOTE.

Subcommittee Items

6. 180 El Camino Real [18PLN-00265]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Increase Pedestrian Pathways, Outdoor Seating, and Reduce Signage Sizes. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Furth: There is a subcommittee, and I will leave them to that.

Board Member Thompson: Who is on the subcommittee?

Chair Furth: Peter is. Who else is on this? We appointed it at the time.

Ms. Gerhardt: Who got it in their packet?

Board Member Thompson: It wasn't me.

Chair Furth: I did.

Ms. Gerhardt: Uh-oh.

Chair Furth: Oh, shoot. [Laughs].

Ms. Gerhardt: You can pass it to someone else.

Chair Furth: All right, I'm going to just let Peter handle that. I have to...

Vice Chair Baltay: [inaudible]

Chair Furth: Okay, I'll come. We'll get it done. Are they here?

Ms. Gerhardt: I texted them. I hope they arrive soon.

Vice Chair Baltay: To be honest, I find that it's okay the way it's been submitted.

Chair Furth: We'll take a very quick look at it.

Ms. Gerhardt: It will be a very quick subcommittee then.

Vice Chair Baltay: We can do it right now.

Chair Furth: Just get the applicant over here. All right. Thank you all.

Board Member Lew: There's one other item.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Furth: Alex, any reports?

Board Member Lew: The North Ventura May meeting was cancelled. The next meeting will be... It was done on purpose. The next meeting will be a joint meeting with the Council next Tuesday, and I think... The Planning Director wants Council's direction before they spend any time or money going down a dead-end road.

Chair Furth: All right. Thank you. Any other reports, comments or announcements?

Board Member Lew: Tomorrow there is a meeting at Lucie Stern with Scott Wiener to talk about housing.

Chair Furth: Yes. Well, my thanks to the Board members for your persistence and patience and courtesy during a difficult hearing. And also during a very simple one. We are adjourned.

Adjournment