



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
MINUTES: January 17, 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: Welcome to the January 17th, 2019, meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. If you could take your seats and cease other conversation, that would be helpful. Could you please call the roll?

[Roll Call]

Jodi Gerhardt, Current Planning Manager: Thank you. All present.

Chair Furth: Thank you

**Oral Communications**

Chair Furth: Now is the time for oral communications. That is a time to address us on something that is not on today's agenda but is within the scope of what we do. I don't see any cards for oral communications, do I? Let's see. These are all for items 2 or 3. All right.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Furth: Agenda changes, additions and deletions. I know we have one. We will not be approving the minutes of December 6th and December 20th because of production delays. Anything else?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, that's correct. That's it. I have comments on official business.

Chair Furth: All right. Anything from the board? No agendas changes, additions or deletions.

**City Official Reports**

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

Chair Furth: Any official reports from staff? We have the transmittal of our schedule, and attendance record, and tentative future agenda items. Staff?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. I just wanted to update the tentative future agenda. Seventeen Hundred Embarcadero will be delayed one hearing. The other items will be going forward on that date.

Chair Furth: Okay, thank you.

## Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 4256 El Camino Real (18PLN-00096): Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review for a new 51,861 Square Foot Five-Story Hotel Including 100 Guest Rooms and Below-Grade Parking. Director's Adjustment Requested for a Reduction in Required On-site Parking (15%) and Loading Space Dimensions. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration was Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is Being Circulated for Public Comment Between January 7, 2018 and February 6, 2018. Zone District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org).**

Chair Furth: Okay, our first public hearing item is a quasi-judicial matter. It's 4256 El Camino Real. We're asked for a recommendation on the property owner's request for approval of a major architectural review for a new approximately 52,000 square foot five-story hotel, which has 100 guest rooms and below-grade parking. The applicant is also requesting from the Director - not us - an adjustment for reduction in required on-site parking of 15 percent and loading space dimensions. The environmental assessment on this project is in the form of a Mitigated Negative Declaration that was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and is being circulated for public comment between January 7, 2018, and February 6, 2018. The zoning district is Service Commercial, and before we hear from the project planner, Sam Gutierrez, I would ask that we disclose any outside communications or information-gathering outside this hearing. And I wanted to say that I made another site visit, extensive, this week to view the Palo Alto Redwoods from the, what's currently the Su Hong parking lot. Other than that, no discussions or information. Osma?

Board Member Thompson: No, I haven't, other than to be invited to go to the Redwoods, which I haven't done yet.

Chair Furth: Right. Oh, I should note that we have extensive correspondence from the public and the applicant which was emailed to us previously, and we have physical copies, as well. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site yesterday.

Chair Furth: In the rain. Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: I visited the site. I didn't speak to anybody else, no.

Chair Furth: David?

Board Member Hirsch: I visited the site and didn't speak to anyone.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Staff? Could we have the staff report, please?

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning, Board members. My name is Samuel Gutierrez, I'm the project planner for this project here, located at 4256 El Camino Real. This is the second formal hearing for this project. Let's dive in here. Just on the cover page is a quick note. You can see here in the presentation that this is a revised elevation per the Board's previous direction at the hearing in November. Should note that the Chair indicated the distribution date of the environmental. It's listed as 2018; that's actually an error in the staff report. It's 2019. It's January 7th to February 6, 2019. This year. It's still in circulation this year.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Sorry for not catching that.

Mr. Gutierrez: Continuing on. The first ARB formal hearing for this project as it went through prelim months before that was on November 15th. The ARB provided comments on the project regarding the renderings and the submitted plans. They wanted more detail. The applicant provided that and revised the renderings and clarified the color changes on that. There were comments about the façade interconnection, and the frontage, the design of the stairs. There are two stairs. There was one on the south and one located closer to El Camino. They provided redesign of those stairs. The roof form edges were also something that the ARB commented on and the applicant provided some additional details on that. There were comments about pedestrian furniture, window details. There's a window sample floating up there. The lobby entrances, as well. Clarification on color material changes. Consistency with the samples and the renderings. And, additional landscaping information. Just quickly to go over the project here. The project was revised in accordance with some of the ARB comments, and that resulted in some shifting in massing, particularly at the rear. I'll go into future detail later in the presentation, but that resulted in some square footage changes to the project overall, so an increase in square feet from 51,300 square feet to 51,861. But there was no change in guest rooms. It's still 100 guest rooms, and the parking count didn't change. The mechanical lift systems did change. They just changed manufacturer, but they meet the requirements per code, and they are providing 17 aisle lay spaces. The rear stairs were further integrated into the building. Again, that accounted for some adjusting in massing, which then resulted in some change in square footage. The materials as well were revised, and you have another sample of that. Here you can see a nighttime view, which was one of the renderings that was requested, just to see how this would potentially look. You can see some lighting effects on the building. This is a daytime view of the revised design with... There was a question about the color variation of the material on the front, so this has been revised to show that there is no color variation, in particular with the paneling, the wood paneling. This is the site plan, just to show some of the changes. There's actually some seating added to the façade in the front along El Camino. I'll go into greater detail on that. In addition to some of the massing shifting on the inside, that resulted in some loss of conference rooms that were previously proposed, and reconfiguring of the café/restaurant area, along with some other changes on each floor. Here you can see the rear building massing changes. You can see the previous design towards the rear, which abuts the Palo Alto Redwoods condominium community. The design on the left, you can see that the rear form was taller, and they had the stair tower closer to the rear. And on the right, you can see on this section that that was revised, brought down lower, and the stair, the rear stairs was better integrated into the building's massing, further away from the rear property line. This is the other stair tower, and in particular, to the... Closer to the El Camino frontage, and that is adjacent to the common open space of the Palo Alto Redwoods property. Where the pool is, the ARB had some comments about this stair tower, and you could see the previous design on the left, and the new design. There were some material changes on the building to try to accentuate this piece better as a part of the building form, and there was some blue form changes. To note in the staff report, staff is not quite sure if this is what the ARB intended when they provided comments, so we welcome a conversation from the ARB if this meets and satisfies what you were looking to see as far as changes and better integration of this piece to the overall building form. This is the rear elevation of what I was previously talking about, how the building would appear when viewed from the Palo Alto Redwoods community. The roof forms have been brought down lower and the massing pushed further away from the rear property line. This is the site elevation. Again, it was revised to note the material changes on the sides of the building because the ARB did comment on making it a nice building among all four sides of the building, not just the front. That was some clarification. Again, not quite clear if that meets the intention of the ARB's comments, so we would welcome that to be discussed. Here, you can see the sidewalk treatments. There are two images there. You can see on the top image, that's the building façade directly adjacent to the outside - semi-outside, I should say - eating area of the café/restaurant. There are some new planters and bench seating integrated on the El Camino sidewalk. There is some concern because the planter bench area to the south, you can see on the top right, the distance is under eight feet from that planter box to the tree that's proposed there. That might cause problems as the tree grows, and we've lessened that sidewalk. We recommend that that might be modified, and we'd welcome the ARB's thoughts on how that should be changed or removed. The other bench seating near the porte-cochere is on the lower photo and the lower site plan section there. There's a lot of actual room there. The sidewalk clearance from the actual bench to the curb is over 12 feet, but again, that tree to the planter area of the bench seating is about nine foot, 10 inches. There is some leeway there for the tree to grow and still have a decent size

sidewalk. Again, perhaps the ARB might feel that we should cut that back. We would welcome that conversation. There was, in the submittal, some parts that we felt were lacking. The signage in particular lacked some details. That might be something to go to subcommittee, or to be a condition to go to its own individual, separate submittal for approval, as well as the landscaping and photometric plans. They don't seem to quite correlate correctly, so that might be something to go to subcommittee if the Board feels comfortable with recommending that. I'll turn this over to our environmental consultant to discuss the environmental documents.

Karly Kaufman: Good morning, Board. My name is Karly Kaufman. I'm with Rincon Consultants. We help the City with the CEQA process for this project.

Chair Furth: Excuse me, could you spell your name for our transcriber?

Ms. Kaufman: Sure. [spells name]. Just a little overview of CEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act. Its core purpose is really to disclose environmental impacts, and of course, to try and reduce those impacts through mitigation measures where feasible. And, to identify ways to avoid or reduce those effects. Also, to foster interagency coordination, in this case, for example, inviting Caltrans to weigh in on the environmental impacts. And also enhance public participation in the planning process. On the public participation, we are currently in the middle of a public comment period, the only comment period for this project. As Sam mentioned, it started a couple weeks ago and will be going through February 6th, and we are welcoming written comments on the draft MND. After the comment period closes, we will be preparing responses to those comments, and preparing the final initial study MND. These are the areas that we examined closely in the initial study, Mitigated Negative Declaration. The kind of blue-highlighted issue areas are ones where we do find that potentially significant impacts could occur and mitigation would be required. I know this isn't a lot of detail. It's just kind of an overview of the mitigation measures that we've identified for this project. But, as you can see, there are a couple related to biological resources, specifically nesting birds and tree protection. A few mitigation measures to address the discovery of potential archeological resources that might be buried beneath the site. And then, geotechnical design mitigation measure to reduce potential impacts related to unstable soils and seismic safety. We also have a construction-related noise mitigation measure, pretty extensive, to address construction noise since there are noise-sensitive receptors, the residences immediately adjacent to the site. And then, also, a mitigation measure related to some site access and circulation considerations, in order to reduce potential traffic safety hazards. As I mentioned, we are currently in the middle of a public comment period which will close on February 6th. This is the information for folks that are interested in providing written comments, to either mail them or email them to Sam Gutierrez. And then, the next steps after that are, as I mentioned, will be to prepare them for final IS-MND and responses to comments. Thank you.

Mr. Gutierrez: Just to inform the Board, today you were handed additional copies of the public comments for this project. We did receive a number of comments, again, for this project, and they center on the height of the proposal to the adjacent multifamily complex, the Palo Alto Redwoods; the potential shadows cast on their common area, which is the pool, an open space area, and their individual units; and the overall design and compatibility with the surrounding area and there on El Camino; any impacts of the proposal regarding traffic noise and to the adjacent redwood trees. As far as many of these comments, they are similar from the previous comments that we did receive, and in particular to the Redwoods' concern. Included in the previous presentation in the packet, there was an extensive arborist tree preservation and protection plan submitted, and that was also included in this one. So, we believe we have covered the issue with the redwoods in the sense that we analyzed them, we saw any potential harm, and developed a mitigation plan for monitoring and mitigating any potential harm to the adjacent redwood trees, from the Palo Alto Redwoods community and the redwood trees that are on site as well. Just to circle back. Some key considerations for the ARB, just to summarize the presentation, is the façade integration; the stair tower changes and relocation; changes to the building roof forms and reduction in height massing towards the rear of the project; the pedestrian seating; material variation on all sides of the building; signage; landscape lighting of the exterior, exterior lighting. Staff recommends that the Architectural Review Board take the following actions: Recommend approval of the proposed

project with the requirement of subcommittee review for the items indicated earlier; to the Director of Planning and Community Environment, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval. Alternative actions over and in addition to the recommended action: The Board may recommend approval of the project with modified findings or conditions; continue the project to date uncertain; or, recommend project denial and revised findings. That ends my presentation.

Chair Furth: Thank you both. Any questions of staff or the consultant? I have a question of the consultant. The last issue that you mentioned on your list was sort of a micro traffic analysis close to the site. Could you take me through what the problems are and what the mitigation measures were?

Ms. Kaufman: Sure. We look at site access and circulation issues primarily as it relates to a question of potential operational safety hazards, as those are maybe considered a physical impact on the environment. The mitigation measure has two specific recommendations, and these were developed in consultation with the traffic consultant, Hexagon, who prepared the transportation analysis. One of them was to add a convex mirror at the bottom of the ramp, or... Sorry. Let me just make sure I'm doing it absolutely correctly. Okay, thank you. Down to the garage to assist drivers with the sharp turn. There was a concern that the turn at the bottom is a little sharp, and to avoid potential conflicts, convex at the bottom of the ramp. And the other recommendation has to do with site visibility from the driveways, so adding a red curb between the two painted driveways to provide parking there, such that there would not be any vehicles parked there that could block site visibility from vehicles exiting the driveways.

Chair Furth: There would be no parking in front of the... This would be the porte-cochere, which is most of the frontage.

Ms. Kaufman: Yeah, I believe so.

Chair Furth: At least it would be posted, and it...

Ms. Kaufman: Yes.

Chair Furth: ...it would be marked for no parking.

Ms. Kaufman: Yes.

Chair Furth: And a lot of the correspondence we've received has been about concern for people entering and exiting the Palo Alto Redwoods drive. Did your analysis discuss that, or is that more a part of the traffic engineer's study?

Ms. Kaufman: I believe that, that would have been covered in the traffic engineer's study but I'm not sure how much that was considered in their analysis. We can have them respond to that in writing.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: Could I add to your comment?

Chair Furth: Sure.

Board Member Hirsch: Do you also study the size of the curb cut relative to the sidewalk? Is that part of your study?

Ms. Kaufman: I know that they do look at those types or sizes to make sure that they are compliant with code. I can have them provide a more detailed response, but I believe that is something that they look at.

Ms. Gerhardt: The traffic study was reviewed by the City transportation department -- our Office of Transportation, I should say -- and they do have standards for driveways widths, given certain sizes.

Board Member Hirsch: Do they consider the amount of sidewalk and limited sight? Is that a part of that study?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, so, we do have vision sight triangle requirements on the parking design facility standards for commercial projects, so that was a consideration. And this project was revised to accommodate the required two lanes. The frontage is different and that frontage, that porte-cochere with the two driveways and curb cuts, is designed to fit a certain number of vehicles efficiently and safely. That was looked at by the Office of Transportation and analyzed. There is actually a turn-in radius study also included in the plan set. It was a part of that analysis.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Can we hear from the applicant, please?

Mircea Voskerician, Applicant: Hi, my name is Mircea Voskerician...

Chair Furth: Good morning. You have 10 minutes, and once again, I need you to spell your name for our transcriber.

Mr. Voskerician: Yes. [spells name]. I represent the owner. The owner is not here today due to some travel constraints, but we have the entire team here - the architects, and Randy Popp, and our hotel consultant, who will be available to answer any questions. And obviously any questions for me. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Randy Popp: Thank you, Mircea, and good morning to the Board Chair, Vice Chair, and members of the Board. Thank you for your time here today. I'll just jump in quickly and... That's awfully small. Sorry about that. Our agenda is to review the previous ARB hearing comments, and specifically what we're planning to do today is talk about the 12 items that were open discussion items that came out of the last hearing. Our goal for today, as Mr. Gutierrez has suggested, is to secure project approval consistent with staff recommendation. We're happy to finalize any details the ARB is not resolved with at subcommittee, but our goal is to move the project forward efficiently toward plan check submittal. There is lots of detail in your packet, obviously, and you've had some time with that, so I'll just go through this at a pretty high level and come back to any elements that you feel we need to discuss in more detail. You asked us to provide more context along El Camino. This is a site that is in the midst of an area that has a variety of building types and heights. Certainly within this area there are single-story structures along El Camino Real, plenty of examples of buildings that are touching the 50-foot height limit, or beyond. To our east is the office building, of course, and to the west is the Palo Alto Redwoods. It sounds like you all have had a chance to go out there, but I'll just describe that very briefly as a dense residential development, award-winning, very nice project. Make sure that you all understand that that is a four story over garage that is roughly touching the height limit as well. You asked us to revise the design along El Camino to make the building more consistent. Our goal and our mantra in this is similar, but not the same. We want to promote consistency in materials, and generally, in particular, the balcony, eve and horizontal datum lines have been adjusted to allow the two sides of the building to be more consistent. But we still want some variety to break down the massing and create a bit of interest. Again, the goal here is to be not repetitive, not cookie-cutter. You asked us to better integrate the rear stair element, and initially we just changed the color. We made that more muted. I think that was shown in the staff report very nicely. We determined that rather than making that a one-off, we wanted to better develop that as part of the building language. We've repeated that material at the stair that is on the east side of the building, as well. Again, our goal is to create interest and some controlled variety. You asked us to think about the roof edges and increase the fascia height. We've thought about that quite a bit and we've tapered our

overhangs a bit more than we had previously. But we believe there is enough fascia. It's slender and refined. It takes effort and control to achieve this look. It's intentional, and it's consistent. The deep shadow lines it creates as an edge against a sky we believe will be quite nice. In keeping with the topic of roofs, you asked us to revise the roof forms to be more consistent. It's pretty clear in the elevation I think how successful this is in bringing order and calming a portion of the building at the rear, where much change occurs, that two, to three, to four, to five-story elements come together very nicely. I'd actually like to just thank you for this comment. I think it was a great suggestion. All right, here's your night rendering. I'll just tell you, I'm not a fan of this. It's a marketing rendering, to me. Color is distorted, lighting is exaggerated in order to make it look right. I'll just tell you, you have staff to thank for this being a part of the packet. I was really resisting it. But, for what it's worth, I hope this helps your evaluation. You asked us to add more pedestrian benches along El Camino Real. We're struggling with that a little bit in terms of the dimensions, but we have integrated them with the front elements. The grand boulevard is not quite at critical mass yet along El Camino and Palo Alto, but hopefully each piece as it is added will begin to reinforce the ideas and goals in a positive way, and we are glad to be consistent with that. You asked us to better describe the windows and the detailing. We have a series of different concepts, with subtle changes between them in terms of depth of recess and how materials either wrap into or overlap the edges of the windows. But, again, promoting consistency and knitting the building together are one of our guiding principles. It's not a patchwork of greatly varying details, but rather a fine palette meant to integrate the whole. We had some discussion about revising and enhancing the lobby entrance. We removed some upper-level planting and refined the design of the entry and the transition through to the rear. I want to just point out that I think one of the really significant elements of what our entry will be about is some attention that we're going to be focusing on public art in this area, in the lobby, which will go through a public process of its own. It's not developed yet. We're working with Danielle Wohl Art consulting, who has a fabulous amount of experience developing murals all over the world, and she'll be working with artists to do something spectacular in our lobby. Okay, so, let's spend a little bit of time talking about the placement and type of exterior materials all around the building. The Trespa at the north wraps around the west now, expending into the courtyard. At the east, an organized collage of materials allowing for interplay between the Trespa and the cement plaster at the front and transitioning to a more residential cement lap siding at the rear. Groupings of windows varying within the material frames further break down the mass and scale. Within your packet are some very detailed elevations and some call-outs that show you exactly where the materials go, but we also brought samples for you to see what we've got, and colors that are accurate to reflect the materials that we've selected. If you have any questions about that, I'm happy to go through that with you. You asked us to clarify the landscape lighting. We have prepared a page here that shows you that we've got in-ground lighting that is defining the stream bed as it moves through the building. At the rear, we've got some overhead market lights that are adding twinkle to the courtyard. At the front there are bollards and sconces for safety and pathway lighting at the drop-off area, and in the far rear, within the area of the, what I'll call the Redwood path, we've got downlights and wooden bollards to allow you to move through that space safely at night without causing any disruption or glare. I'll close with the last of the items, which is the landscape palette. Our goal here was to create a variety of texture, color and scale. We've got materials that are low maintenance. Almost all of this over podium. It's compatible with the activity, the solar access, and the plantings that are already in place on the site. It's water-efficient and long-standing. That's all I have for today. We had a pretty compact list of things to address and I hope that we've covered those appropriately for you. As always, we're here to answer any questions that you have. Thank you for your time.

Chair Furth: Thank you for your presentation. Are there any questions? We'll hold the bulk of them until after the hearing. Anybody have anything that can't wait until after we hear from the public? When we've had a chance to look at the materials board, if staff could put them over on the wall there so the public can take a look. And then, the sample window is over here. And there is a sample board here. Trespa, whatever. Okay. We have several speakers this morning. Our first speaker is Stephanie Tranz, to be followed by Jean Kvasnica.

Female??: [off microphone, inaudible]

Chair Furth: Is there any objection?

Female??: No.

Chair Furth: Everybody is fine with that. Which speaker card are you under?

Female??: [off microphone, inaudible] and Peter Mills. (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Reitman?

Female??: Reitman. R-e-i-t-m-a-n.

Chair Furth: Yep. Do you have two more, so you can follow... One more, so you can... Two more, so you can follow our procedures? We have **A Mason** [phonetic] ceding.

Sharlene Carlson: She's going to be ceding to another speaker.

Chair Furth: Oops. Our rules require that we have, what? Five people? Groups of five. Sorry about that, but they do. How long is your presentation?

Ms. Carlson: Peter and I have maybe...

Peter: Five minutes.

Ms. Carlson: With the letter, six...? Six to eight minutes.

Chair Furth: You may have six minutes. Why don't you proceed? If you could introduce yourself and spell your names for our transcriber.

Peter Mills: Good morning. My name is Peter Mills [spells name]. I'm an owner of a unit at the Redwoods and a member of the board of the homeowner's association. I have a few comments to make, and then, I want to read a letter from one of the residents.

Chair Furth: All right.

Mr. Mills: Today, we are only providing brief comments on behalf of our homeowner's association, consisting of 265 residents living in 107 units on a 2 2/3 acre residential parcel. A number of homeowners have written letters to the ARB and we will let them speak for themselves or have others read their concerns into the record. We have many concerns that have already been made part of the record, but we again state that our concerns have not been taken into account or adequately addressed as the project scope has expanded on this small half-acre lot to a 100-room hotel with two levels of underground parking. We are not against development, but we object to this project because of its massive scale and its inconsistency with the neighborhood. We've repeatedly stated that there is not one single thing about the development that will benefit residents of the Palo Alto Redwoods or the neighborhood overall, and there are many things that will cause harm. Today, we restate that nothing about the project benefits the neighborhood. The traffic, pedestrian safety, parking, loading zone, the potential to kill the redwood groves, are all primary concerns of ours. We've repeatedly asked that the project be scaled back and provide neighborhood benefits. Last session, we asked that the Director's exemptions for reduced parking and loading zone be denied. We again ask that the ARB require the developer to scale back the project, and that the Director's exemptions be denied. The project is simply too huge. We are not Manhattan. The reduction in parking and off-street loading area benefits no one but the developer, who doesn't have to suffer any of the bad consequences of this bad design. The neighbors and the commuters all suffer. It seems unusual to have the second formal ARB hearing shortly after the release of the environmental impact report but before the public comment period for that report ends on February 6th. We will provide comments on all environmental concerns as part of that comment



process and we will speak to them fully at the next ARB hearing. We are not ready to comment today. At this point, I'd like to read a letter from one of the residents...

Ms. Carlson: Why don't you let me finish...

Mr. Mills: Oh, you want to finish that. Fine.

Sharlene Carlson: [spells name] I'm a board member of Palo Alto Redwoods. I want to make a few comments about ARB findings, because in order to recommend this, you have to make all of the findings that you have. We believe that you cannot make a finding under Finding #2, specifically a., creates an internal sense of order and desirable environment for occupants and visitors and the general community. The hotel absolutely does not create a sense of order or desirable environment for the general community, or our Palo Alto Redwoods community. B., preserves, respects and integrates existing natural features that contribute positively to the site and historic character including historic resources of the area when relevant. Palo Alto Redwoods is a landmark in the neighborhood, with our towering redwood trees. The property was a former redwood tree farm, and for decades residents have enjoyed seeing the towering trees close up and from afar. We fear that by damaging tree roots and reducing sunlight, trees will decline and die. Also, views of the landmark trees from El Camino Real for pedestrians and drivers will be blocked by the development. C., is consistent with the context-based design criteria. Although the hotel is allowed on a commercially-zoned property, it does not have the proper context to be so dense adjacent to a residential neighborhood next door. D., provides harmonious transitions in scale, mass and character to adjacent land uses and land use designations. The hotel absolutely does not provide harmonious transitions in scale as it will tower over properties around it and appear many times larger than adjacent structures. The tall but narrow street façade will be unprecedented in the area and will appear way out of proportion to buildings around it in aspect ratio. And finally, c. [sic], enhances living conditions on the site if it includes residential uses and in adjacent residential areas. The hotel absolutely does not enhance living conditions at Palo Alto Redwoods, the adjacent residential property. It is intrusive, it does not respect our privacy, blocks our views of the sky and sunlight, creates light pollution and noise at night, will damage our redwood trees, will create havoc for traffic flow, and post safety risks to children trying to get to school. The hotel meets none of the criteria for harmonious co-existence with the adjacent residents of Palo Alto.

Chair Furth: Thank you. You have... You've run out of time. If you would give the letter to staff, we can have copies made and be sure that it is in the record, and that we all get a chance... I guess we have it already, do we?

Ms. Carlson: Will... If another speaker comes up, will that person be able to cede several, cede time to...?

Chair Furth: The rules are baroque [phonetic]. You need five people, a group of five, at which point you can have 15 minutes. I'm sorry that they are so complex, but those are the rules that we have to abide by.

Board Member Lew: You still have 30 seconds.

Chair Furth: And I will give you an extra 30 for my interruption.

Ms. Carlson: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: Sure, if you can...

[crosstalk]

Ms. Carlson: Can we ask five people to cede time?

Chair Furth: Of course.

Ms. Carlson: Okay. We have Richard Reitman, who has ceded time. We have...

Chair Furth: By a show of hands, they have enough people ceding. You can give your name to our staff and then we'll have it for the record.

Ms. Carlson: And Ruben. Let's allow Peter to continue reading.

Chair Furth: All right.

Mr. Mills: Again, this is Peter Mills, and I'm reading a letter written by **Angel Rocha**, who is a resident of the Palo Alto Redwoods. *Dear ARB members: I'm writing as a nearly 25-year resident of the Palo Alto Redwoods to express my deep concerns about the 100-room hotel proposed for the adjacent property at 4256 El Camino. These concerns are not motivated by Nit-be [phonetic]. This property has always been zoned commercial and our residential complex has lived as good neighbors with various occupants, including Denny's and Su Hong, over the years. This particular hotel project, however, is still extraordinarily massive and dense and will block all daylight for a great many of our units, including all of the BMR units, regardless of time of year. You cannot permit this. The sun angle studies have been laughable. Throughout this ARB process, considerations of massing and neighborhood context modeling have been given a back seat to trivial construction materials and façade design. ARB has guidelines, I believe, to prevent new buildings from being incompatible with existing ones to ensure respect for the scale and privacy of adjacent residential development, and to assure that abrupt transitions are not designed in. None of these guidelines have been observed here. The developer has taken advantage of the high floor-to-area ratio allowed for a hotel to build this one within an inch of what is legal site coverage, but with little regard for the context of the neighborhood. I strongly object to another hotel being built next door, bringing with it additional traffic to our already-congested neighborhood. There are already close to 1,700 hotel rooms in a short 2 1/2 mile stretch on El Camino itself. We have Dinah's across the street, the Cabana a couple doors down, and the Palo Alto Inn next door, but at least they were designed with sufficient setback to allow light. The hotel corridor concept has been mismanaged to allow our neighborhood to become a dumping ground for structures with massive 50-foot walls that are extremely unwelcoming and create defensive blocks against the outside world. Please do not allow the construction of yet another one. Sincerely, **Evangeline Rocha**.* And just to support that last comment, the slide that showed the El Camino façade of the hotel clearly shows that to the west, all you see are redwoods. It's beautiful. You don't see any buildings. All the buildings are set way back from the street. And all of a sudden, you go from redwoods with a parklike feel to this massive 50-foot façade of glass and steel on the edge of the curb. It just isn't consistent with the neighborhood. Thank you.

Ms. Carlson: I know that we have one other person that was going to cede time, so, do we need to do that as part of this?

Chair Furth: Are you...? How are you doing for time on your presentation?

Ms. Carlson: I really don't know.

Chair Furth: I mean, other people who are not part of your group are welcome to speak.

Ms. Carlson: We'll let the other speakers speak. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Carlson: I did want to, I want to make one comment. I heard on the news today that VTA is closing down the Hotel 22, which is the... I just find it really interesting. That's the bus that runs up and down El Camino and where the homeless people often live at night. They're going to shut down the overnight aspects of it. Any place that's relying upon that particular public transit to get people to work, it may be quite impacted by that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. All right, so, Mr. Reitman ceded his time, I believe. Is that correct? And Ann Mason ceded her time? Neil Murphy? Good morning. If you could tell our transcriber which way you spell Neil.

Neil Murphy: Does it count for time?

Chair Furth: No.

Mr. Murphy: [spells first name]. "Murphy" is common.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Murphy: As a taxpaying citizen of Palo Alto, I place my trust in you to make decisions about whether a project is appropriate for the community. You make these decisions based on your stated findings, each of which you must make in good faith. This project does not meet Finding 2.e. - to enhance living conditions in adjacent residential areas. I live in the adjacent residential area. This project not only does not enhance our living conditions, but in fact, actively detracts from them. This project fails to enhance living conditions in adjacent residential areas by drastically reducing our sunlight. The photo you have in my email was taken at 7:30 a.m. two months ago. As you can see, we actually get quite a lot of bright, direct sunlight. Warm light floods my living room and bedroom for four hours each morning. The excessive height of this five-story structure means that I will personally be losing 50 to 70 percent of the sunlight I get to my home each day, as the sun will be blocked by the top stories of a hotel every morning. Even my shade plants will die, and I will no longer get to enjoy the warm, early-morning sun pouring into my home every morning. By robbing us of sunlight, this project does not enhance our living conditions in the adjacent residential area required to make Finding 2.e. This project also fails to enhance living conditions in our adjacent residential area by installing a permanent public nuisance in the form of illegally-parked ride share vehicles, double-parked delivery vehicles, and tour buses. You can see photos 2 through 5 in my packet. I've collected about 50 to 60 of these, demonstrating that this is what happens, whether a carport is provided or not. And that hotels in particular draw large amounts of this traffic. Inexplicably, the plans provide no accommodation for tour buses. Since the site is too small for appropriate accommodations, the only place for them to unload is the stretch of curb immediately in front of our exit. This is precisely where they will park. A red curb does not work, and I have extensive evidence. Exiting our facility will become less safe and maddening when we pull out and immediately run into a bus, truck or car blocking a lane of traffic. It makes circulation less safe for passing cars and does not enhance our living conditions. Your approval requires that you are able to make each finding in good faith. The City of Palo Alto has become addicted to hotel tax revenue and developed a perverse financial incentive to favor hotels over housing. I fear that this may distort otherwise rational decisions about development, which I voted for, by the way. I fully support the right project for this site. This isn't it. If you look at the first elevation, you can see that this hotel doesn't match the character at all. The one that shows the two surrounding properties. Please don't sell out my home and quality of life to fund an addiction to exploding city pensions. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Our next speaker is, is it Julie Baskind? Or did you cede your time? Miss Baskind?

Julie Baskind: [spells name] As a 30-year homeowner of the Palo Alto Redwoods, with a unit on the second floor facing the Su Hong parking lot, I am disheartened to see the proposed development progressing with neither adequate consideration of its 200-plus residents, nor the fully vetted packet of environmental documents. Attached, I have two pictures from my unit attached to my email. Where to unpack? We have an inadequate light and shade study, ongoing dewatering concerns, tree root destruction, a traffic study conducted on a Saturday in mid-June, with neither businesses, Stanford nor schools were in session, to the artificial benefit of the hotel. I must add my name to a specific concern for our collective residents. The sole reason we're not afforded suitable protection regarding light, height, privacy, density, noise, hours of operation, is that 4250 El Camino was randomly zoned CS - Commercial Services by the City of Palo Alto more than 35 years ago. We at the Redwoods were completely unaware of this. Diverse neighbors have lived in our residential complex since 1982, co-existing with a mix of

residential and businesses. To suddenly permit this incompatibility of dense project, massive project, inserting a proverbial square peg into a round hole, is an anathema to the detriment of a community that has lived peacefully in this neighborhood. ARB and the City have the discretion to make a reasonable and rational decision, and indeed, the obligation to its citizens -- ideally, with some compassion -- even if the developer has the legal right to exploit the situation to its maximum. We acknowledge the inevitability of change, but this decision affects more than 200 residents in an era where Palo Alto's major concern is housing.

Chair Furth: Thank you. John Hutar, to be followed...I think that's it.

Female??: No, I...

Chair Furth: Stephanie Tramz. Got it.

John Hutar: Good morning. John Hutar [spells name], Vice President and General Manager, Dinah's Garden Hotel. Palo Alto's reputation has long been in high regard for the inclusive and thoughtful manner in the way its public policy and development projects have evolved. Recently, this lens has come out of focus. We were pleased to see the applicant acknowledge publicly that the parking and traffic piece of this project still needs more thought. While it is true that the ride share economy has reduced the number of rental cars, alternatively, the ride shares generate more vehicular congestion. The applicant's traffic plan omits the reality of dealing with large motor coach buses, which are now a popular method of shuttling corporate guests to and from hotels and their corporate campuses. The motor coaches are arranged by the company hosting the meeting, not the hotel operator. Be assured, the buses will come regardless of whether the hotel can or cannot accommodate them. The review board also needs to incorporate the reality that hotel employees have been forced back into their cars and are now commuting much longer distances. A few years ago, having an employee commute to Palo Alto from Modesto or Stockton was an exception. In today's world, it is becoming the new normal. The work commute reality alone makes the thought of reducing the number of parking spaces a very bad idea. Any parking gained by fewer rental cars has been consumed by more employees being pushed back into their cars. One last point of the traffic study, which gave me a chuckle: Corporate guests who stay in Palo Alto hotels do not and will not use public transportation in any appreciable manner that would reduce traffic congestion in any noticeable way. Lastly, I'll close with a question for the review board. The applicant states that they will not market their restaurant/bar to outside patrons in order to reduce overall traffic congestion. What mechanism will be put in place to memorialize this promise, both for the current applicant should the project go through, and for future owners of the property? Will the City really take a position on mandating what portion of a business an operator can market, assuming it's a legal activity? Will the City really not allow an outside visitor from joining a hotel guest staying at the hotel for a drink or meal? I encourage you to stop paying homage to the growing of the transient occupancy tax. In the past 10 years, it has grown handsomely, from 5 million annually to over 25 million, some with increased inventory, but mostly due to the industry's efforts and growing average daily rate. I encourage you to return to using the thoughtful and forward-thinking processes that shaped Palo Alto into the stellar community it is. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. Jean Kvasnica?

Jean Kvasnica: Good morning, good morning. I'm back here again.

Chair Furth: Could you place the mic a little closer to your mouth?

Ms. Kvasnica: Yeah, right. Jean Kvasnica [spells name]. Okay, so, I live at the Palo Alto Redwoods and you've seen me before. I'm here regarding the redwood trees. Let me just read the letter that you have in front of you. [Reading] *I'm writing this letter with concern of a proposed hotel project at 4256 El Camino Real. I'm a homeowner at the Palo Alto Redwoods for 20 years, and during that time, I have overseen the health and maintenance of 60-plus redwood trees in partnership with our arborist, Henry Ardalan, a City arborist. As we all know, redwood trees are majestic. They are vital to the neighborhood.*

*They are vital to Palo Alto and its residents. Our grove of redwood trees being overshadowed by a 60-foot-tall project will be impacted significantly, and I'm sure we all know that. These trees are large, currently healthy, tremendous value to the quality of life and the mental health of those people living there. The ability to see blue sky for the towering trees, the privacy they provide, the sense of well-being. This would be taken away from the residents with this tall, 60-foot-tall hotel, blocking light, air and breathing space for these redwood trees to survive and thrive. It is no small thing to shut out the amount of direct sunlight. The trees need a circulation of air to keep them healthy. The project also proposes a 20-foot-deep hole dug for a two-level garage. Roots will be cut. To think the redwood trees would not be affected by this deep disturbance is to not understand how the roots are intertwined with each other to provide stability and nourishment. How can the ARB, a board who has the obligation and the duty to ensure the enhancement of our neighborhoods with reasonable and community-supported architecture first and foremost, find the proposed project reasonable to its neighbors and community, and enhancing the quality of our life, the life of the citizens of Palo Alto. This project must be disapproved for a more reasonable design that will enhance the neighborhood and the community it surrounds. Thank you very much.*

Chair Furth: Does Stephanie Tramz wish to speak?

Stephanie Tramz: Yes, please. [spells name] I am a condominium owner and a resident at Palo Alto Redwoods. I've lived at Palo Alto Redwoods for 20 years. I am recently retired from Stanford, and my condominium is my retirement home. I don't mean to be disrespectful, but I am very, very concerned, and I want to be frank about offering my remarks to this Board. I am amazed that this has come so far, so fast. For two years, this matter was dormant, and then, all of a sudden, upon five days' notice by mail, which I received five days before the hearing in my mailbox, there was a hearing on November 15, 2018, where all of a sudden, we hear about 100 rooms and five stories of hotel, plus a sixth story necessary for HVAC, etc. Somewhere, loomed out of nowhere this massive structure. It is absolutely inconsistent with the neighborhood. Dinah's Garden Court, which is an iconic and beautiful and historic part of Palo Alto, is right across the street, and it's two stories, or three at the most, and fronted by a garden. There's the Alexander Sea restaurant, which is just a story, across the street. These, what end up being six stories, are going to loom over not only our beautiful development, but the entire neighborhood, and going to stick out like some sort of grotesque aberration. Even the Hilton Garden hotel that was built down the street, finished about a year ago or so, only has four stories. It's a mixture of three stories and four stories with some sort of a topknot, but it is nowhere near the consistent mass of five or six stories that's being visited here. In addition to that, I am concerned about the fact that there has been this condensed, minimum, if it, if the notice is adequate, it is minimally adequate, reviving this monster project in November. And then, apparently there was an additional attempt to curtail the comment period for the Environmental Impact Report and bring it in for final approval today before our, even anybody had a chance to view the results or some of the complexities in that. Again, I don't mean to be disrespectful, but I am very, very concerned about how this has evolved. And I am frankly amazed that design staff are recommending approval of this structure because it will dramatically for the negative this part of south Palo Alto. We already have five hotel properties within a two-block area. We have the Hilton Garden Inn, we have the, Dinah's Court is there, there's the Cabana, there's the Marriott Courtyard, and one other. Homewood Suites. Homewood Suites recently built, is four stories. This will be far in excess in height over Homewood Suites. I am asking the ARB, please take a second look at all of this information because I agree with the prior speakers. I do not believe that this Board is going to be able to make findings that, Finding #1 that it's consistent with zoning and design guides. Well, I understand that exceptions have to be made for parking, exceptions have to be made for the six-story HVAC -- whatever -- and actually, when the City Council was running for reelection in November, there were many statements made by City Council members -- now elected -- who said they wanted to stop making all of these exceptions in favor of developers, and just have the City's processes being a tool for the proclivities of developers. Those are my comments. The details of the damage to our redwood trees, lack of light, lack of air, have all been explored by my compatriots. Thank you very much for your attention.

Chair Furth: Thank you for your comments. Anybody else wish to speak before the applicant responds?

Female??/Daughter: This is my mother, Anna Rubin, who is a resident at Palo Alto Redwoods since 2013, and this is her retirement home, and she lives in a condominium there, as well. She's a little hard of hearing, so I'll repeat her comments to you. She told me that she wants to convey to you that she is extremely concerned about the redwood trees. She lives in Unit 210-A in Palo Alto Redwoods, which overlooks the redwood trees. Some redwood trees, unfortunately, had to be removed a couple of years ago because of problems with the tree roots that came from adjacent properties, and also some internal property areas. That was incredibly unfortunate, and she just really wants to make sure that you help to take care of the rest of the redwood trees that are there. The sunshine would be completely gone from the redwood tree area based on the proposed development, and there would not be any sunshine in her unit either. Right now, her unit does not have a tremendous amount of light because that's the only façade that provides any real light. That's the only exposure, the one that's by the redwood trees. Her view of the sky and of the sun at all, which is only present in the morning, would be completely obliterated by the hotel. She's on the second floor. She is very concerned about the health of the trees, making sure to preserve the trees, and also what the façade from El Camino is going to look like for passing people, as well. Did I forget anything you said, mom?

Mrs. Halberstam-Rubin: No. I just wanted to second everything that our president of the association, Charlotte [sic], spoke before me. And basically, what my daughter mentioned. I look out the window and the only thing I see is the trees and a little bit of the street, the cars, and the sky. And I'm afraid that this very tall building that is projected to come up is going to obliterate my view totally from my condo. I enjoy very much where I live now, and I would like the Board to consider those things. Also, the traffic is going to be so tremendously increased. Thank you very much for listening to me.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Mrs. Rubin. Could you explain a little bit more about where your unit is, where the unit is?

Daughter: It's facing the parking lot and Su Hong directly, so it's...

Chair Furth: The building toward the City Hall site, or the San Jose side? There are two buildings that face Su Hong. Near the driveway to the Palo Alto Redwoods, or the other end?

Mrs. Halberstam-Rubin: I'm facing the right-hand wall of Su Hong right now.

Daughter: When you look out you see...

Mrs. Halberstam-Rubin: When you look at Su Hong from the street, the right-hand wall is where...

Chair Furth: Closer to the pool area, then.

Mrs. Halberstam-Rubin: Right.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mrs. Halberstam-Rubin: And then, the... I imagine that this building is going to take away some of the parking space which is now available at Su Hong, and this is where my view is also.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mrs. Halberstam-Rubin: So instead of seeing the street and the car and the sky, I'm going to see a big tall wall.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mrs. Halberstam-Rubin: Thank you.

Chair Furth: And for the transcriber Anna Rubin spells her name A-n-n-a, last name R-u-b-e-n?

Daughter: Yes, it's Anna, A-n-n-a, Halberstam, H-a-l-b-e-r-s-t-a-m, Rubin, R-u-b-i-n. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mrs. Halberstam-Rubin: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Larry Skarset, to be followed by Jeff Levinsky.

Male??: (inaudible) next project... (inaudible).

Chair Furth: Jeff Levinsky.

Mr. Levinsky: Thank you, Board members. [spells name] I'm here to speak on behalf of the PAN committee. PAN is Palo Alto Neighborhoods, and we've looked at this particular project, and I don't think I can really add a word to the wonderful comments that have been made by all the residents of the building. But what I would like to say is that as they brought out, the law does say very clearly that projects like this are supposed to respect the neighboring residences. It talks about sunlight, it talks about privacy, it talks about, you know, what you see, and such. And this is a problem that we see all over the city. There was another project that we participated in, where the City Council, on appeal, turned down the project because of its impact on neighboring homes. And we hear from people everywhere, and we think the laws that we have are really good laws. We would like to see them work and be upheld. And I appreciate that a design can come all this time to you and be so filled with details and everything, and yet it misses these fundamental aspects. I urge you to use your creativity and will to say, look, there's a better way to do this, we do want these projects to comply. I ask you to look at that today. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anybody else? Hearing none, the applicant has 10 minutes to respond.

Mr. Popp: I don't want this to come off defensive, right? That's not...

Chair Furth: That's an excellent idea.

Mr. Popp: That's not my goal here. But I...

Chair Furth: Mr. Popp is speaking, for the benefit of the transcriber.

Mr. Popp: Yeah, sorry, Randy Popp. Entitlement Consultant. I do want to address a number of the comments that have been brought up, though, and I think the first thing to say is that the staff report indicates very clearly, and without any hesitation, that this is a fully-compliant project. We have done extensive outreach, which led to significant changes in the massing of the building. We have the same FAR that we have virtually always had, but we've sculpted the mass of this building in a very dramatic way to move it away from the neighbors. And our closest wall to the neighbors' building is more than 45 feet. I understand the comments Mr. Levinsky's making, but I have to say that in an R-1 neighborhood, you can have 12 feet between buildings and it's perfectly acceptable. Setbacks allow that. We're 45 feet away from our closest neighbor. We've oriented windows away from their building. We've controlled how light and glare and all sorts of elements have been organized to really think about how to exist next to this other site. We've shown that the risk to the redwoods is minimized in an almost unmeasurable way. It's less than two percent likelihood that there will be any damage to the redwoods at all. For those of you who weren't here or missed it earlier, the City arborist has confirmed this. He came and spoke at our last hearing and was quite clear about saying that he has no concerns with how this building is organized and designed relative to the health of the redwood trees. I'll jump here really quickly and just go one more time to my diagrams that show the shadow studies and remind you that graphically what we've described is anything that is in gray is existing shadows cast by either by the redwood trees or the Palo

Alto Redwoods buildings themselves. The blue is what we're adding. And other than the absolute extreme points of the solstice, there is very little impact that our building will have that does not already occur as a result of the redwood trees and other site characteristics. I'll ask staff to address the transportation issues, but cars parked along the curb do not block traffic. On a divided road, safety and controls are naturally enhanced. The traffic study commissioned not by us, but independently by the City, does not indicate any of the concerns that have been described. Our approach is consistent with the requirements and we are a fully-parked project. I think that's really all I have to say. If you have other questions, if there are other things you'd like us to address, happy to do that. Our team is here to answer any of your questions today, and to help hopefully move this along. Thank you.

Chair Furth: I do have a question. Does anybody else before I ask mine? My question was about the landscaping on the upper terraces. Could you take me through the proposal?

Mr. Popp: I'd be happy to. As we've shown, the landscaping at the upper terraces is in planters. It's [crosstalk]...

Chair Furth: It's not going to be in soil.

Mr. Popp: That's how it's going to be. We've elected to leave more of the glass railing exposed and allow for vision into the aspects of the building, visual access through the railings. An option for us would have been to put a lot of planting up there, but honestly, it's difficult to maintain it. It's hard to control it up at that level. It's really meant to just add a bit of variety at the upper edge of the building. I honestly can't remember exactly what the planting is in those, in those planters right now, but it's in the packet. Sorry. This is Chris Lee from Studio T Square. He's the architect.

Chris Lee, Studio T Square: I'm the architect, not landscape designer. [crosstalk]

Chair Furth: You need to be close to the mic.

Mr. Lee: I understand the landscape designer has designed an irrigation system for those planters, to ensure the planter would be kept green and nice throughout the season.

Mr. Popp: The answer to your question is, it's fairly minimal, and it was intentionally fairly minimal.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Popp: Okay.

Chair Furth: Yeah, Alex, you have a question?

Board Member Lew: I have a question about the stormwater drainage. Old-school development, everything drained down to the storm drain. That's changed in recent years where it's retained on site. I was wondering if you could sort of describe what's happening with water on the site.

Mr. Popp: I don't have the drawings in the packet here but there are a series of bio detention swales that are designed on the site. Water that strikes the building or other impervious areas is directed to those bioswale areas on the site. It's held in that area or filtered in that area where, some period of time, it will eventually seep into the groundwater system, and in some cases, it's connected to a subsurface drainage system that orients that out to the storm drain system.

Board Member Lew: Thank you.

Mr. Popp: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Peter, you had a question.



Vice Chair Baltay: I have several questions for the applicant, please. First one, if you could pull up one of the sun studies, perhaps the March or September. It relates to just understanding your diagram, I guess. When I was out there at the site in the morning, I noticed ample sunshine around the swimming pool area. And as I read this diagram, it seems to be saying that your building will not cast any shadow on the swimming pool. And I'm looking at a 50-foot stair tower adjacent to the swimming pool. Can you explain what I'm misreading here?

Mr. Popp: I don't think you're misreading it. If you don't mind, would you clarify for me around what time you were out there?

Vice Chair Baltay: I beg your pardon?

Mr. Popp: What time were you out there?

Vice Chair Baltay: About nine in the morning.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah, so, I think that if you, if we study these diagrams here, and we've been careful to geolocate these and to orient these. It's not something that we actually construct. I mean, you're an architect, you're familiar with this. You put this information into sketch-up. It geolocates the site for you, it has all the solar angles, it predicts the solar angle at that particular date and at that particular time. It's our...

Mr. Lee: I will say, our five-story massing is mostly on the north side and the east side, so when the sun casts shadow, it casts shadow on the north side. We catch more shadow on the El Camino Real instead of on the south side or west side.

Mr. Popp: I think, you know, just to add to that, the orientation and sculpting of the building that we've done, you know, the placement of the massing, is quite intentional relative to the context around us. The cut-off point of our larger front block mass of the building is relatively consistent with where the Palo Alto Redwoods building elevates in height. And the gap where the pool area occurs is consistent with where our courtyard is. The intention here is that as the building -- which is oriented relatively east-west in that orientation -- occurs, the morning light streams through, the afternoon light streams through. And it's really only in the middle of the day that we're casting some more significant shadows.

Vice Chair Baltay: I don't want to cut you off, Randy, but if I could just be clear, then. On March 21st at 10 in the morning, you're saying that your building will not cast any shadow on the swimming pool. When I look at this diagram, that's how I read it. I'd like you to confirm that that's the case, that on March 21st at 10 in the morning, there is no shadow cast by your building on the swimming pool area.

Mr. Popp: That's what we understand based on our studies.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. My next question has to do with, I'm just continually confused about the sequence of how a guest comes into the building. I wonder if you could walk me through. If I do rent a car at the airport and drive to the building, how do I check into the hotel? Can you just walk me through the plan on that, please?

Olivier Severin, Hospitality Consultant: Hi, my name is Olivier Severin [spells name]. I'm the hospitality consultant. Typically, when a hotel guest comes on, right? Whether they're being dropped off by a third-party service or if they're driving their own car or rented one, typically what they will do is they will drive into the porte-cochere if they're being dropped off, and they'll come straight into the reception that way. If by any means they have their own car and they want to go down into parking, we typically have valet. They'll receive their car at the entry. If it's by any chance no valet or valet has gone down, they can drive down to the lower level as well, where there is a second reception area, where they come up through an elevator directly into [crosstalk].

Vice Chair Baltay: That's my question, if you don't mind. When I drive my car down to the valet booth and the valet drop-off -- as it's noted on the plans -- how do I then get back upstairs?

Mr. Severin: There's an elevator right there. If you see, there are two elevator cores.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you pull up that floor plan, please, for me? I'm just trying to understand the plans and I'm having a tough time reading them.

[Pulling up plans on overhead.]

Mr. Severin: These elevators right here.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. I guess those are the elevators in question. And where do I drop off the car again?

Mr. Severin: There is a valet stand both here, and there will be another valet stand somewhere in this proximity. Basically, the valet will receive the car here, they'll come down and enter the elevators here, going up into the reception.

Vice Chair Baltay: As I drop my car off, I walk across the parking lot to the elevator?

Mr. Severin: No. There is...You can't see it...

Mr. Popp: Peter, the cars will come down this ramp, circulate around, and pull up in this spot. Right?

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, yeah.

Mr. Popp: Then, you can exit your car. The valet will take it from you. You immediately go into this elevator that's immediately adjacent to that. Go into the elevator that's immediate adjacent to that and move up into the [crosstalk].

Vice Chair Baltay: Is that waiting lounge then for me to go into while I'm waiting for the elevator.

Mr. Severin: It's just the space in front of the elevator. The elevator should be pretty quick, within...

Mr. Popp: At that point, it's really a fire lobby in the garage, but yes, it's a waiting area.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. My third question has to do with just locating for me, please, where the roof details are. We've asked for some specific details of the design regarding that roof overhang. I just can't seem to find it in the drawings. I'm sure I'm missing, again, where it is, but could you point to me, please, the roof details we've asked for? The eaves? I'm particularly concerned with the large overhanging roofs facing El Camino, where it seems to be several feet of overhang. And you were eloquently describing the thickness of the fascia.

Mr. Popp: I'll agree that on A4.3, we have the roof edge detail for the building.

Vice Chair Baltay: Four-point-three is where the detail is?

Mr. Popp: Four-point-three, yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: And that detail is the detail...?

Mr. Popp: At the rear roofs of the building. If you're asking about the large overhang at the front.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes. Could you locate that for me, please?

Mr. Popp: Walking through my set here... I think we have that drawn in some sections, Peter, but there isn't a more at-scale detail of that.

Vice Chair Baltay: I see. Okay, so, that explains why I couldn't find it. Thanks.

Mr. Popp: That explains why you can't find it.

Vice Chair Baltay: My last question -- I'll be quick, Wynne -- if you could pull up your landscaping, your tree samples drawing, it was the last one on your presentation. Right there. Which are the trees that are under the redwoods in the back? You have some proposed screening trees, and again, just the way your schedule was drawn, it was really tough for me to follow. I just couldn't relate. Which image of these trees is the one that's at the back of the property, under the redwoods? Please.

Mr. Popp: Give me a second and I'll get that for you. [Locating slide.]

Vice Chair Baltay: To the chair. I'm sorry to ask such a detailed question.

Mr. Popp: Oh, no, it's fine.

Vice Chair Baltay: It's just so important to get the trees under the redwoods [crosstalk].

Mr. Popp: I'm positive I'm going to be able to answer this for you as clearly as you're hoping because...

Chair Furth: If you want to come back to it at a later moment, we can do that.

Mr. Popp: Architectural imagery...

Chair Furth: You've got your plant list on L3.

Mr. Popp: Okay.

Chair Furth: You've got your plant design, then you have your plant list. Why don't we let you think about that for a moment while we address some other issues, then we'll come back.

Mr. Popp: All right, that's fine.

Chair Furth: Any other questions about anything else?

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

Board Member Thompson: I actually have one.

Mr. Popp: Just one second.

Board Member Thompson: Shall I wait?

Mr. Popp: Okay, we'll get you that answer.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you. I just had a question about the exterior façade. You have oil-stained Hardie board and Trespa, and from what I understood, I just wanted to clarify, the Trespa is happening on the street side and on the east side, and then, the Hardie board is happening on the interior courtyard elevations? Is that correct?

Mr. Popp: Generally. Let me just walk you through that very briefly. If we look at the front elevation of the building, all the material that you're seeing that looks like wood on the front is the Trespa material. If we travel around the west side of the building, that Trespa material wraps around and just touches the corner here and is broken by that stair tower element. And at that point, we're going to transition to some of the more residential-focused siding, the Hardie siding. We've done that intentionally because it faces the Palo Alto Redwoods buildings. As you wrap around the rear of the building, all of that is the Hardie siding as it wraps around the south. And then, working our way back to the east again, the Hardie siding wraps here and tucks under. We've got a... This was that sort of collage of planes I was talking about earlier. We've got a panel of the cement plaster here that starts to create a break point, and then, the Trespa is slipping in, under and above the cement plaster that then transitions back out to the front of the building again. We've tried to really think about how we are wrapping this building, you know, applying that material in very specific places and for specific reasons, and having it stop and start at very logical points on the building.

Board Member Thompson: Does the base of the stair tower on the west façade, that's Hardie board?

Mr. Popp: That's correct.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so there is kind of a line where that...

Mr. Popp: Right, it aligns with the edge of the stair tower, where that occurs.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. That was my question.

Mr. Popp: We don't want to stop that material at an outside corner, and if you look at the interior of the courtyard, having that wrap in and under would be, it sort of breaks down the language of having that on the front versus the back. We pulled the Hardie board around the front just a little bit, and the Trespa, and the two of them touch right where that stair tower element is.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I think that's it for questions.

Mr. Popp: Underneath the redwoods, we have the madrone, the arbor vitae...

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you show me the image of that, please.

Mr. Popp: You're going to strain my landscape ability. Not in my presentation, but in your packet on L4.0.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm sorry, you had it on your presentation, an image...

Mr. Popp: I did, but what I had in my presentation is the architectural image of the plants. If we're going to be specific about this, if you don't mind, I'd love to go to L4.0 in the landscape packet, since you're asking to specifically identify the...

Chair Furth: Can staff get us the best possible image up there, please, so the public can follow this discussion?

Mr. Gutierrez: I can get that up, sure.

Chair Furth: You don't have L4?

[Looking for image]

Chair Furth: There you go. Thanks.

Mr. Popp: Okay, so, I don't know if you can really see my pointer here. Top row, second from the left is the arbor vitae.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm sorry, those are the plants you're putting under the redwood trees in the back?

Mr. Popp: Underneath the redwoods, okay?

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you very much for explaining that.

Mr. Popp: Oh, no, I'm sorry, it's not the entire top row.

Chair Furth: It's a mix.

Mr. Popp: Let me be specific about this, if you don't mind, if you'd like. The arbor vitae, which is second from the left on the top; the western redbud and Pacific madrone are the top two on the right. Second row, second in from the left, is the rosemary. Those are the plants that will be, those are the primary plantings that are under the redwoods in that area.

Vice Chair Baltay: Great. Thank you for explaining that.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Popp: Thank you. Thanks for the time.

Chair Furth: Okay, we'll bring it back to the Board.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board members, if I may, before we go into discussion, I just had a few comments.

Chair Furth: Yes, staff. Jodie.

Ms. Gerhardt: Related to the valet, we do have a Condition #7, which states that valet shall be present on the site 24/7. That is due to the reduced parking, due to the mechanical lifts, things of that nature. That would always be there. There were some comments about the public notice. You'll see in the staff report, we do talk about the public notice. Those get sent out 10 days ahead as required in the code, and also 13 days ahead it gets posted in the local paper. Regarding the restaurants and the advertising, we would be happy to put a condition in the project, stating that there would be no signage related to the restaurant as this is meant to be a restaurant for patrons. But, of course, we're not requiring that no public enter the site. There was a question about the Redwoods being zoned CS and if they were zoned RM, what would the differences be. The major differences there -- sorry, let me get my notes.

Chair Furth: If they were zoned RM 40-plus...

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Furth: ...which is residential multiple family density of more than 40 units per acre.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. The Redwoods property is over 40 dwelling units per acre, so it doesn't nicely fit into any of our zones, but it would...

Chair Furth: I understand. It fits nicely into our city.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, yes. But it most closely fits into the RM-40 zone, so if I use that standard, there actually would be no difference, had the property been zoned that. The only potential difference would be height and daylight plane, but because... It would have to be zoned, like, RM-30 or RM-15. It would have to be a lower-density project in order to change the height and daylight plane regulations.

Chair Furth: To summarize, they would be entitled to the same height, they would be entitled to essentially zero setback? The rear lot?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. It doesn't change the setbacks.

Chair Furth: But what makes this special is that the hotel use increases the floor area ratio. Right?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct, and that's any hotel and any commercial property.

Chair Furth: Got it. We had conversations about this back in 2017. The planner, Sam Gutierrez, provided me with copies of correspondence from 2017, in which we went through this issue and did establish that while the City has different standards for development near lower-density residential housing, it doesn't for something that's developed at the RM-40 density that Palo Alto Redwoods is. So, the anomalous zoning does not, in fact, provide less protection than an RM-40 would have.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. That's a great summary.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: Related to ride share, we would be happy to add a condition. It's our understanding that businesses can contact the ride share, the Ubers and the Lyfts of the world, and specify where they want their patrons picked up. We would be happy to include that condition, and that could be monitored through the TDM program. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anything else?

Male?? [inaudible and off microphone]

Ms. Gerhardt: Related to the tour buses, the porte-cochere is not designed to handle those. We have designed it to handle your standard FedEx-type truck, and we've done the circulation to do that. The curb in front of this property would be red zoned, so there would be no parking there. Tour buses, however, are allowed to park in parking areas along El Camino Real. We've started some discussions with police and Transportation Office. We are aware of the issue, but it really is more of a citywide issue that we need to handle at that level, versus a project issue. We are continuing to delve into that, but we don't have a whole lot of information from the community, so any information they can send us in about the issues, where it's happening, photos, things of that nature, would be helpful because we don't have a lot of that right now.

Chair Furth: Mr. Murphy's correspondence will be helpful in that regard.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, if he could email us the photos.

Chair Furth: I think he has. It's in our packet.

Mr. Gutierrez: That was received, I believe, yesterday.

Chair Furth: You will find it in the packet. Caltrans [sic] is a state highway. Does that reduce our ability to make decisions about curb markings, or are we okay?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, El Camino is a state highway. I mean, that's something that we need to work out with them. We haven't quite gotten to that level quite yet.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Okay, I'll bring this back to the Board. There's one thing I wanted to say first, which is that we are still in the environmental review public comment period. We know we're going to get more comments, and then we'll get response to comments from our consultant. We are an advisory

body. That's why we can make recommendations before the final environmental documentation is approved, and we do it frequently. But the environmental documentation we look at isn't usually as complex or contested as it is in this case. My point of view before we have our discussion is that I am not in favor of making a final recommendation on this until we have the complete environmental documents, which would be after February 7th. Is that right? That's when the public comment period closes?

Ms. Gerhardt: That's not a hundred... The document is currently circulating. It is a draft document. It is only a draft because we are asking for comments.

Chair Furth: That's right. That's the point.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. It closes on February 6th. And we did change... Thank you for bringing this up because we did change the circulation period on this. We had started circulation at the state before the holidays, but unfortunately, the rest of the circulation didn't quite get out with all of the holidays. We did receive communication from a Carmen Borg, a planner with a San Francisco attorneys' firm, asking about the circulation period, and we adjusted the circulation to give the full 30 days. That's why we have this new end date of February 6th. When we receive all the comments, then we will take time to respond to those.

Chair Furth: Right. And I'm just telling you this because it's not my usual approach to this, but I do think in this case it's going to be in everybody's interest -- including the applicant's -- to have the full documentation before we make a final recommendation. Having said that, who would like to begin? Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure, great. Good morning. Thank you. I've got quite a few comments here. Some of them we've already touched on. I find that the site planning of the building, the basic location and the massing, actually to be quite logical. Over time, the design has really worked hard, I think, to mitigate the impact on the neighboring building in the back by stepping down the building at the back, by creating an L-shaped building that tries to stay away from casting shadows on the swimming pool area by putting the bulk of the building up on front, on El Camino. Certainly the high parts of it. I find that that does create an enhanced environment for the living area of the building if you consider that to also be the public face of it, along El Camino. This is the kind of building that the guidelines anticipate and say that we should be building on El Camino. Buildings of this mass and size up close to the El Camino Real frontage. I find it, on that regard, I can easily make that finding, that it's required. I want to be clear that on that sun study I was asking questions about, I am skeptical that this building will not be casting shadows on the swimming pool area, and I would find that unfortunate if that were the case, especially after being reassured that it's not. I just put that out to my colleagues, that perhaps some additional verification somehow. It's very hard to read these thumbprint-sized diagrams. I have some concerns about some of the circulation items that we have been addressing relating to the transportation. When I go to the valet drop-off down in the garage, which is, I think, almost anyone driving a car will have to do that. It's such a tight, tight, congested environment. It's really unfortunate that there's no easy and obvious way to get back up to the lobby. I'm checking into what will be a very high-end hotel, and I have to sort of find my way 25 feet through the garage to the back of the elevator standing next to the parking area. It seems to me there should be some sort of a staircase taking me up to the lobby and some obvious visual connection. To be honest, I expect that during the design process, at some point, that might be changed, but I really would like to see some effort made to make a real positive connection from the underground valet drop-off to the lobby of the building. And I really would hate to see something like this get built, where the guests... Certainly, I would just walk up the ramp. It's a tight and narrow ramp with a sharp turn. That would be dangerous. And yet, you've created a situation that really promotes that. I could easily see a way to get a staircase coming up and it would really be a graceful addition to the building, just to connect the lobby to the valet drop-off down there. If I look at the... Let me come back. The one massing item that I have a continuing problem with is the stair tower on the north elevation. It's visible on Drawing A4.3 or on A5.2. It seems that you've changed the roof of the piece of the building adjacent to the stair tower to make it flat and a little bit taller, and then, raised the height of the enclosure around the stair tower. Both of those may be good compositional design features

for the façade of the building, but I think if I were sunbathing in the neighbors' pool area, I would find that just to sort of add salt to the wound. This is already a tall part of your building that's overbearing. I'd like to see you make an effort to really mitigate that. I think that was our comments earlier about the stair tower, to somehow make that look less like a tall, dark object, which is what it is now. And I think you've even raised the height of it. There's got to be a way to make that look lighter and more open and take the piece of roof next to it and slope it down, or something. But really consider the experience from the neighbors and their pool area, looking up at your hotel. This will be visible, and it's unfortunate the way it is presented right now. I would expect and would really like to see the signage, especially the traffic signage, be much better integrated into the design. Right now, your renderings show a series of neon or electric signs -- which are essential for this building to function -- just sort of slapped on the side of various elements around the porte-cochere. It really needs to be shown better how that is going to work so it's an integral part of the design, especially... And I think it's appropriate to see that now with the architectural review, not postponed as a signage thing, because it's so integrally part of the functioning of this hotel. For this circulation to work, you need these signs to direct people where to go. It would really be nice to see them integrated. I continue to struggle with the treatment of the windows on the façade. It seems to me there are three or four different kinds of window openings that are being put forth. On left side of the front they seem to be flush set somehow to the Trespa siding. On the right you have a plaster reveal with several inches of reveal there. On the back it seems altogether different, again. I understand that you don't want everything to be the same. We want some sense of texture to break up monotony, but this just seems to me sort of eclectic and haphazard. I just put that out there to see what my colleagues think about it. I have the same sense about the roof eaves, especially on the tall ones I was asking about earlier, at the top of the building. I see precious little detail, how they're really working. When I look at your renderings, if I describe the mass of the building on the left as I'm looking at it from El Camino, that roof piece seems to have almost no overhang on its right-hand side, where everywhere else it does. It's that lack of detail that I'm just finding painful to look at, and it really does need to be revised and thought through. I don't see any of the details in the plans again, and I understand you want to get this approved, but we've asked you once about it; I'm asking you twice about it. I think that when I approach the building, the porte-cochere has a very nice-looking soffit. It's an attractive surface with beautiful light fixtures. It's often the place where plumbers and fire sprinkler contractors run their pipes. I'd like to see some sense of how we're going to avoid having that surface be made less attractive. Again, I know that sounds detailed and fussy, but we're designing a hotel that's on a very compact site, and the transportation and the access and the integration of vehicles and people at these covered areas is critical. And making that ceiling at the entrance not attractive doesn't help get that to work better. Again, just some sense of detail and understanding that you guys have through it through would be appreciated. I find the mechanical screening on the top to be perhaps too tall. I'm wondering if you can't reduce that. As I read the plans, you have a 10-foot chilling unit, which is already pretty large, but you have an 11-foot screen around it. Is there any way to cut that back, or perhaps help me verify that it's really just not visible from the street frontage? Or from the back. I grant you that the code allows equipment to go some 15 feet above the 50-foot height limit, but the more we can reduce those screens, make them the absolute minimum to cover the equipment and... Just check your equipment. If you can cut it down to six feet, put the screen at six feet, you'll just so much reduce something. It's really not hard. It's not a big compromise. Perhaps just a little more thought at the moment. I'm concerned about the variety of materials and the changing of Trespa to Hardie board siding. When I look at your Hardie board sample there, that's the least expensive, the simplest Hardie board, and it is so sensitive to being installed correctly and detailed carefully at the corners, and at the windows. I don't see those details in the plans, and I don't see a sense of understanding of how that works. You're showing windows which have Hardie board siding not flush to the flange of the window, showing a sense of reveal. Which gives it a nice architectural character, but your choice of materials makes that extremely difficult to execute. I've had this nit-picking type of detail on other projects and I stand behind the sense that using things like fiber cement siding requires an exceptional level of detail in order to allow us to make findings that the building is of a high aesthetic quality. Right now, I'm not seeing the details, and I'm cautioning you that it's hard to do with such an inexpensive material. It's also unfortunate not to carry the same material around the building, especially when it has almost the same color and texture, appearance. Why not just use the same material? Lastly, on the landscaping, I have two concerns. One is the arbor vitae under the redwoods, I think is really a poor choice. It seems to me that the biggest thing it will do is further block



light for the neighbors. It's a dense, hedge-like plant. Secondly, I just don't understand how that is aesthetically compatible with redwoods, which have a light and gracious sense while still being tall and powerful, and a real sense of the bark. These just completely conceal that and fight it, in my mind. And then, you show images of some very attractive outdoor lighting on your patio out there, but it would be nice to understand how that's going to work, when they will be turned on. Again, if I were a guest at the hotel, I would find that wonderful. If I lived next door and those lights were on at 10 o'clock at night, I would find that really annoying. I think it's incumbent upon you to show us what you're thinking. There's no plan whatsoever for lighting design. And then, to really consider the impact on the neighbors. Again, that's not something that's hard to do. As a hotel operator, you can easily find accommodation. I'm ticking off many, many places that I'm still just not seeing full answers. I know you want to get approval, you want to get a recommendation today, but I'm finding that hard to do with so many places that aren't here, that we have been asking you for. That's the sum of my comments right now. Thank you.

Chair Furth: David, Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I certainly agree with a number of those comments just made, and like I said, would somewhat reduce my concerns. The materials, I would like to see uniformity of a material that is wood-like throughout the building. I don't see any reason for variation on that. And in terms of the other materials, I'm maybe not as detailed as has just been described, but I like the variety of it, and it isn't a, kind of a single material selection here that dominates, or window pattern that dominates. I find that to be appropriate to this kind of a use. I'm concerned, as I mentioned before, about the, really, the destruction of the sidewalk, with a double entry on one side, and then, parking as well. It's not a very wide site, and it seems to me that the sidewalk is pretty much destroyed by this entry. Not that I see any other way around it, but the scale of the hotel just requires this kind of drop-off entry. And in fact, that's the other problem with bus, buses at the front of the building, because it reduces the place that buses can park if they're dropping off at that location on the street. I think that the problems of valet parking could probably be solved, and that does relieve the front area somewhat. But it certainly isn't complete. Then you have the seating, which was recommended by this Board, and the seating, I guess, is useful for a bus. Will a bus really sit there? I think that needs to be studied from the City side a little bit more to see if it's possible to maybe eliminate one of the lanes that enter into the porte-cochere. You know, I have kind of an interesting comment about the hotel and the verity of it. I look at it on one side as a very symmetrical design, and the other side as a very, sort of causal design. It reminds me of the, sort of the Senate and the House of Representatives. Senate on the right, a smaller scale. House of Representatives on the left is a little different and its design more casual, with many more rooms on that side as well. But I'm confused about the roof lines, even so. It seems to me that there is a sloping roof line on the left and straight on the right, raising up towards the front, and I don't quite understand why, in fact, those two couldn't be the same kind of a roof line. And then, the same appears in the back. I know there is a series of kind of sloped lower roof elements that step up towards the hotel. In a sense, they're trying to make the scale change different in order to relate a little bit more to the Redwoods community behind. But it seems to me that, that doesn't look like it belongs on this building somehow here. There's a complete change in the nature of the rear projections, stepping down. One would have to go very far through the planning process earlier on -- before I certainly was a part of this project -- to see if maybe that could be pulled in closer to the building, and not have so many steps at a lower level. Again, I don't think it's possible really to make changes in the hotel design, basic design to accommodate that. I would look to try to do a different window pattern on the back that simply was similar to the rest of the hotel. Those are my major concerns. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. We'll come back to you, or anybody else who wants to add anything. Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Hi, there. Thank you for your presentation. I also just wanted to say that, I want to thank all the members of the public that came and spoke. It's really great to hear everybody's opinions on this, and it's nice to see the turnout. Firstly, I'll say I do appreciate the night render, so thank you for that. I think it did help evaluate this building because I think it does bring things out. There are a lot of comments that Board Members Baltay and Hirsch have mentioned that I agree with. There is, I think, a struggle with the material, at least at this moment. The Trespa doesn't have that level of

complexity that your previous render had, from last time. I almost want to say that your project suffers a little bit more now by choosing a, sort of less-complex material, less higher-quality material. I appreciate that you're using it in a way that creates a lot of detail by creating a horizontal striation, but I don't now if it's enough. It's something that I'm struggling with a bit. I do agree that the building is very massive, and I remember some conversations the last, maybe not the last meeting, but the one before, about maybe considering having this building having a better relationship with nature and its surroundings. And while I see that in terms, at least in the back you've attempted to step down, there's still not a very good relationship the actual design of the building has with, with nature, I would say. In that sense, I think the project suffers a bit. The collage on the southeast side façade of the four different types of materials definitely, it seems more disjointed than harmonious, and it would be nice to see if there were ways that you could treat things that sort of has a bit higher level of harmony. That also goes to the different types of windows and such. There's sort of... It's a lot of different pieces, and I think we're looking for something a bit more cohesive. I'll also echo Board Member Baltay's note on the shadow studies. It's true. This building is located on the northeast, so I don't know that it would cast shadows necessarily on the neighboring structures as much as it would just sort of block skylight. But, it's true. I'm not 100 percent convinced that those shadow studies are accurate. For example, there is an image that shows that it is creating a shadow on one of the adjacent buildings, but it's not showing that it would be creating a shadow on the floor of the adjacent building. I would agree that I'm not sold on the shadow studies. In general, though, I think there is still so many issues with this building that I don't know that I could approve or recommend approval for this. I'm not convinced the massing is doing everything it can, and contextually speaking, I don't know that it works very well. Not that it couldn't get there, but at the moment, I actually think this is a step back from what we saw last time in terms of the development of the design. I'll leave it there.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, I have a lot of comments, and they are all over the map. I do have a whole...

Chair Furth: Really?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: You should see the back of his drawings.

Board Member Lew: I have lots of comments on findings. I might, if the Board is thinking about not approving it, I might wait for the next meeting on that.

Chair Furth: I think anything that's substantive is very important.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. And I have some general thoughts on the project, and also a lot of little nitpicky things. I was thinking maybe just doing the, just mentioning the nitpicky things first, just to get them out of the way before I forget about them. One is the, I think you have some gates on the front for the transformer and the trash access, and I think I asked for consideration of a design for that, and I didn't see it today. I think I would lump that together with Peter's comments about eave details and that kind of stuff. On the exterior lighting. I think I do agree with the comments, previous comments about the, the twinkle lights in the courtyard. Also, in your lighting plans, you're showing new cobra headlights for the street lights. I just want to point out that the City has been changing the street lights on El Camino, so we actually have two different types of fixtures. There's a high, and a low. I didn't see that in the conditions of approval. They might be in there, but we normally... I've seen that on other projects, say, for the Mayfield housing at Stanford, on El Camino. That was put in there. I think maybe staff should, you could just double-check on that. The new light fixtures are on the recently-completed America's Tire on El Camino and Arastradero, so it's... Yeah, the intent is to implement it everywhere. Also on the plans, I think there are some inconsistencies regarding the street trees. Some of the plans say that the trees are going to be relocated, which I think is highly unusual for a London plane. And then,

the planting plans are showing new trees on the planting, on the planting list. I think that that needs to be reviewed. Also, on recent projects, we've changed the planting... What do you call it? The planting tree wells? We do have different designs in front of the Hilton Garden Inn, as well as the Mayfield housing. They chose to do something different to try and enhance the growing conditions for the trees. And those designs differ from the El Camino design guidelines, which I think recommend the tree grates. And we don't have tree grate detail in here. I don't know if it's absolutely required, but it's in the guidelines. On the signage, I think there is a traffic sign proposed for the porte-cochere, and it seems very confusing to me. It seems to me to point to people... You have to point people to drive on the sidewalk, as I read it. I think that's all of the nitpicky comments that I have that haven't been already mentioned by other Board members. In general, I think I can make the findings for compatibility. I looked at the site yesterday again, and I think the choice of materials and stepping of the building actually can fit into the site. I think it does look a little too, it looks a little too tall and a little too vertical. It is a little bit taller than the Hilton Garden Inn and the Homewood... Is it Homewood Suites? Both of those structures are slightly smaller. They were built under the allowable floor area. They were built at 1.75 floor area. That was their choice. Also, I'll just mention that in, like, Mountain View, their hotel floor area is 1.75. To me, that looks better. You get a little bit more stepping than a full 2.0 floor area. And I would say a 2.0 floor area hotel that was recently built was the Clement here, near University Avenue. But I do understand the 2.0 floor area was put in by the Council. They've approved them on other projects, so I will respect that. My personal choice is to have something slightly lower. On the building design, I think I can make the findings. I think all the suggestions, I think cumulatively will actually help make the design even more compatible. And I think we should mention that this project, like, far exceeds the zoning code minimum recommendations. In the CS zone, there is no setback requirement for the rear or the side yard. And if I look at the site plan of this project, it seems to me to be fairly close to the Palo Alto Redwoods, just in terms of site planning, and layout, and footprint. It doesn't seem that different. It is five floors, but they've squished the floors. They only have eight foot ceilings on, I think the first four floors. Most of the other hotels have taller ceilings, is my recollection. Especially on the first floor. I think the Hilton Homewood Suites has a very tall first floor. Yeah, so, I think I can get there. And then, I won't talk about the findings, but I will say, in general, I think we do need to address the resident's comment about number 2.3., which is enhancing living conditions in the vicinity. Maybe I'll go into more detail next time, but I would just...

Chair Furth: I think now would be a good time.

Board Member Lew: Well, I would say in general, maybe if we do it at the next meeting, I'll get into it in great detail, but for, like, 25 years, my grandparents lived on the top of Nob Hill, right next to all of those big, fancy hotels. And they purposely did that, and they purposely wanted to be there instead of down in Chinatown because it was a really attractive, safe environment. And that was because of the hotels. I mean, it really... I don't think having a high-end hotel district and housing are incompatible, just based on my experience in that area. I think it was actually nicer, having the two together. And I think that... I think I heard on other projects that residents don't like the idea of the hotel there because it brings in a lot of transient uses and people, but I actually think at the higher-end level of this type of design, I think it does not do that. If I look at the Hilton Homewood Suites, you know, it used to be this, kind of a run-down Motel 6. And now, there is a new hotel there. It actually looks very nice. I sort of zig-zag through there on my bicycle, on the new bike path back there, and it all seems very nice, and seems much nicer than it was before it was redeveloped. So, I think this project can actually enhance the site. And then, the other thing I wanted to mention, too, for staff, if maybe we have another, if we do have another meeting, is if we could review the arborist's report. There's something in there that I've never seen before, which is the tree root scan. And I don't actually know how to read that report. I've never seen one before. It seems very interesting. That may go a long way to placate concerns about the trees. Okay, so, I think that's all that I have at the moment.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you to the applicant for the thoughtful and large, generally large-scale presentation, drawings and packet, and member of the public for their comments and photographs and information about all of this. And to my colleagues for their careful thinking. Gone into full lawyer mode, yellow legal pad and everything. But first, I wanted to say that I do think that I would like to wait until

we have the completed Mitigated Negative Declaration. I say that for two reasons. One is, it addresses issues of concern at our level of approval, so I want that information. Secondly, this is a highly-contested project and site, and I think that when we prepare and think about our findings in this situation, they need to be ready for Prime Time. They need to be the kind of thing where a third party looking at them would look at them and say, "Yep. You made legally appropriate findings based on the evidence presented to you and the standards which you are to apply." And I feel much more secure doing that when I have the complete set of documents. I defer to my colleagues and their superior expertise on issues of how these various materials will work. And my concerns when we started the hearing were the following: First of all, I needed to be reminded that the Redwoods is not suffering from the fact that they are zoned CS rather than RM-40. You may disagree with the City's general approach to how commercial development should interface with higher-density residential, but this is our approach. And as Alex points out, the development pattern in the Redwoods shares a lot of elements with the proposal here. The City is moving away from our previous approach to El Camino, which I have watched since 1964, which was not very attractive. It was a sea of asphalt with a building plopped in it. Occasionally, a little landscaping. The Redwoods is a big exception to that, and so are some of the hotels, including some of those in the vicinity. But that was our overall design pattern for the last 15 years. We've been moving towards a plan which brings buildings closer to the sidewalk, seeks to have sidewalks which are attractive for pedestrians, and puts parking underground when we can. Having said that, the biggest issues for me in this project are, one, are we adequately guaranteeing the health of the trees? It really doesn't matter what else we get right if we get the trees wrong. Saying "I'm sorry" or "oops" is not going to address that loss, and I think we all understand that, and we need to be as secure as possible. I agree with Peter, that while some of the trees that you have proposed -- you, the applicants, have proposed -- under the redwoods seem really appropriate. Some of them do not. The arbor vitae, for example, seems to me too dense, the wrong aesthetic approach, and likely to cast additional shadows on what's already a very shady area in Palo Alto Redwoods. When it comes to light and shadow, I wish we were still back in the era when we had three-dimensional models we could pick up and turn and shine flashlights at. It's hard to understand the relationship of the Palo Alto Redwoods buildings, particularly the residential units, and this hotel. I think when I sit out there and pace off the distances and estimate the heights, that the step-backs are effective. That you are not creating the kind of really unacceptable darkness that you would have created if you had built what's permitted, if you proposed what's permitted -- which I don't think we would have allowed -- 35 feet at the rear yard setback, for example. But I'm not entirely confident in it. I don't know how staff can give us greater confidence in the shading and light studies, but clearly that's something some of my colleagues would like. If we have managed not to significantly reduce the quality of the open space for a use, and if we have managed not to cast residential units into darkness, then I think the light and shadow issues will be okay. The site is narrow. This is one of those many, many sites on El Camino where you think, "If only they got the next door parcel." But they didn't, and this is the one they propose to develop. This Board can't really address the issue of whether we have too many hotels, or if it's a good idea, or if we sold our birthright for more transient occupancy taxes. What we can address is how this building works in this setting for people who go by it, people who use it, people who live behind it. One of the things we learned is there already is an existing curb real estate problem here, that the City has not figured out how to deal with very large vehicles. Certainly, when I see a tour bus go down my skinny little street, I think, "Wow, we really have not designed our city for this." We have a different issue on a state highway. But I would like to know. One of the things that Mr. Murphy's presentation tell us is there's an existing problem without this hotel, and so, anything more that the City can tell us about curb management, not just in front of this building but a couple hundred feet in either direction, would help. It's interesting to have the Cabana Hotel next door, which is old school. I mean, it's built Las Vegas style, like Las Vegas used to be. And apparently, because it was going to be a card club. Great big parking lot in the front, building, high building set way back, big fountains. It's the antithesis of this, and I don't know how long its going to last in its present form. I'd like to see an analysis of how it might work from edge to edge. Can they go park the buses in the Cabana parking lot? In terms of pedestrian experience, hotels can, and higher buildings can, make residential experiences better. I have never lived at the top of Nob Hill. I do have a great-great aunt who impressed my father immensely by living in the upper stories of the St. Francis. He aspired to do that. Instead, he lived with us till the end of his life. But I do live behind an almost 50-foot building, which buffers my home from a heavily-trafficked area and makes it significantly quieter. It's well-designed, it has nice materials, and it's some number of

feet. It's about 45 feet away from the nearest residential unit, so it is possible. And the gardens it maintains have improved our neighborhood, even as the coffee shops and restaurants that are part of the high-rise office buildings in my neighborhood make it a better, livelier, safer street. And this could happen here. I do think the seating is important, both batches of seating. I think the one within the two driveways of the hotel is more part of the hotel experience, so I think both units are important, and I would like to see if there's a way we can have the eight-foot clearance, as well as the appropriate trees. Because we asked for an eight- to 12-foot sidewalk in part because we want things other than open space there. We want trees, we want seating, we want a good experience, and I think those are both important to that experience. I would hope that at some point, that eating place in the hotel is a neighborhood amenity where I can go and meet a friend because I live nearby. This hotel does not have conference facilities on site. Is that right? That's correct, right?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct. It has one small room that could be used as a conference room.

Chair Furth: Right. Right. I think we may be able to move towards better managing of Uber and Lyft and their ilk by a fairly vigorous crackdown on where they drop people off and on. For the hotel, we obviously already have a problem of where they drop people off and on for Palo Alto Redwoods and its other neighbors. That's going to take a culture change. Which we may move towards. But I want to hear more from staff on this bus issue because it's a big problem. And I don't know. It may not be particularly exacerbated by this hotel. It may be a wider problem, but I'd like to hear more about what's possible. I would like much tighter and more specific findings addressed to each of the issues raised by the public and the applicant. We try to give clear direction. I hear clarity on wanting more details in some areas. Staff, we're a little... The driveways, and I presume other facilities, lead to a kind of ragged street tree presence here. This may be the best we can do, but I'd be interested in knowing what the best we can do for street trees along this section is. You don't have to tell me today. I find the landscaping in the upper levels a little too much like vases on a mantelpiece. It's too small. I can understand that you made a choice to have not much, but I don't think it meets the need to tie this building into its setting, where you're surrounded with high-up vegetation. I think it would be much better to have more extensive, significant landscaping there. I know it's possible to do it at altitude, and I think it would be a better, more approvable project if that were done here. Osma, what were you saying when you said that this building didn't engage with nature very much?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. I think you're kind of hitting it a little bit. There's not a very good relationship the structure has with its surroundings in the same way that the adjacent buildings, I think, have with nature. I think you're right, that if there were increased vegetation on the upper floor, there would be a much more concrete relationship. And not just on this floor, but around the sides, and so on.

Chair Furth: I will just say that I'm always struck by the beautiful green walls, old-school green walls in downtown Palo Alto, by which I mean the ficus that has been growing over on... two blocks that way. On Emerson. The next alleyway entry down from... What is our huge hotel? The Epiphany. I wouldn't mind seeing some significantly low-tech greening of this building. By which I mean indestructible, low water, sturdy plants growing up the walls.

Board Member Thompson: I think it's possible the neighbors would also appreciate seeing more green and high-quality material next to the green, versus just a big mass of plaster.

Chair Furth: It's very different, looking at green... Sometimes in my neighborhood, you also get birds nests. But it's a possibility that might work. Anybody else want to summarize, clarify, ask? Everybody is looking at their papers. Is that a no?

Vice Chair Baltay: I could emphasize the importance of more details regarding the exterior finishes and materials. Everybody here has given you somewhat differing takes on the same problem. I think it really comes down to the architect. Think really carefully what materials you are using and how they fit together. How do they trim to the windows? How do you do the corners? When you take a material like Trespa or Hardie board and just show a corner of a building where it's beautifully wrapped around in a

computer, that's not what the craft of building is about, and that's not what we're trying to get here in Palo Alto. I really plead with you to please think about that. Don't just give us the same thing and say, "Well, figure it out in subcommittee." Respect our request to try to really understand these details carefully. I know you're able to do it. I've seen it done on other projects on your team. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Mr. Popp, are you asking for me to reopen the public hearing?

Mr. Popp: If you don't mind. I'm just not... I don't have enough clarity on a particular item here. We're at the end of the second hearing, and ...

Chair Furth: Could you just tell me what your item is?

Mr. Popp: Yes. I'd like to speak about the exterior materials because we've gotten some very conflicting information about the direction we should take on that.

Chair Furth: Let me see if I can get some clearer direction for you.

Mr. Popp: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Peter, your direction on this.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, you're showing a building with a series of horizontal siding boards, and yet you're using Trespa, which comes in large rectangular panels. It's not a horizontally-activated material. I think that's pretty clear that that doesn't fit the intent of your sketches here, unless I'm just not understanding how it's put together. And to be honest, I don't understand how it's put together because you're not telling us how it's put together. You're showing Trespa next to Hardie board, which are very similar in appearance, and it looks to me like a budget-saving measure. And yet, we're asking for consistency. Pick one or the other. Or find a third material that gives all these things. There's loads of great stuff out there. I'm sorry it's not clear, but I think I'm speaking for the group, saying that what your presenting is not doing it. I think a lot of us agree that idea of sort of horizontal siding gives it a slightly residential sense, which helps tie it into the Redwoods complex behind you. The color seems about right, but it just needs more thought. More in-house design revisions.

Chair Furth: Does anybody else have any comments on this?

Board Member Lew: I do. After one of the previous hearings, I did look at the Trespa site. My recollection is that they do have a siding version that's not only panels. Maybe if we can get more details from the architect on what they want, exactly are proposing, because it may be different than what you're thinking about. But I generally agree with you.

Vice Chair Baltay: The Trespa sample over there is a 12-inch square.

Chair Furth: Osma?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. In general...

Chair Furth: Go ahead, Osma, then we'll address this.

Board Member Thompson: In general, you have a massing that is quite big, okay? And could get on the shoebox level. And you're using a material to break down the scale, which I think is the right move, because when you have a mass like this, you need to make it digestible to the eye. When you do that, you're trying to break down scale. I don't want to speak for others, but I kind of agree with what Board Member Baltay was saying, that the use of Trespa in this scenario could be used in a way that does not break down the scale adequately. Could be used in a way where, depending on how you detail it, it wouldn't be of a high-quality aesthetic. I think what we're asking for is that the building as you have it

right now, as it's massed, in a poor material, would make it very hard to recommend. But if you were able to clad it in a material, maybe not Trespa, maybe something else that is authentic to the design intent, that would be nice to look at, that has complexity and scale and variation, that's detailed beautifully, then your big mass is much more easier to digest and a lot easier to accept. That's kind of where I stand on the Trespa.

Chair Furth: That sounded pretty articulate to me.

Board Member Thompson: And then, also the fence material. I don't think we have a sample of it. All we have is this render to look at. And I think there was also something in the packet that didn't have the right color. I think it had a silver version of the fence as a picture. I think better integrating also that design with your structure. I'm all about cool materials, but if they don't work with your building, then I think there's, there's something more to look into there.

Chair Furth: Alex, do you want to add anything, or are you good?

Board Member Lew: No, I have nothing else to add.

Chair Furth: David?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I'm still concerned about the street and the sidewalk, and I really wonder whether or not the whole building would be more, more open than just a car access point to a building. And whether or not it's worth our while to really think about the pedestrian. Although when I was there, it was close to noon and there was really nobody on the sidewalk. It was not particularly a pedestrian movement on that sidewalk. I wonder whether back when, we couldn't have created more of a lay-by and moved the sidewalk in the site and had a more generous plaza in front of the building. This may not be possible at this time. Structurally, it changes the building significantly. But in the future, maybe we should think a little bit more about how, how we integrate a, a smaller building where it impacts the street and the pedestrian access and guest movement. In particular, there's a conflict between buses, access of normal vehicles to the site, onto the site, parking, and those I don't think are adequately answered with the building. Aside from the materials and details which all other Board members are more concerned about here, I think that kind of an urban planning issue is a very significant one here and should be addressed in hotels in particular. I find it really a major issue, in my mind, on this building.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I've heard two things. One is that the Board is generally supportive of your notion that you need visibly small and different. We don't want a big, uniform, monolithic mass. It needs to be beautiful. It needs to be a pleasure to look at. And, of course, it needs to last. And that the wall is perhaps an opportunity that's been missed so far, to be beautiful and pleasant. And some serious concerns about just the whole question of whether we are adequately designing buildings to accommodate the reality of transportation modes today. Which I think has come up in every single hotel we've dealt with. And you've heard the comments that generally our hotels have come in at less than a full 2.0, and some cities have a lower standard, but this is the standard that our City Council has adopted.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: I would accept a motion to continue this to a date uncertain. Or do you have a date you want to specify?

Board Member Lew: Isn't it better to specify the date?

Chair Furth: They don't know when the EIR docs are going to be ready.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: We can specify a date...

Chair Furth: We can specify a date...

Board Member Lew: ...and then they can, they can still post...

Chair Furth: ...which the public will know about, the applicant will know about...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ...and if we need to postpone, we can. Would that be a better move?

Ms. Gerhardt: It's just a difference of noticing. It's not a huge difference. I think that the Board has asked for a lot of details and we'd like to get that right before we come back. I would actually recommend a date uncertain.

Vice Chair Baltay: Very well. I move that we continue this project to a date uncertain, subject to the comments that have been previously made.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Furth: Second by Board Member Thompson. All those in favor say aye. Hearing no opposition, this passes unanimously.

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

Chair Furth: Thank you all for your participation. Thank you all for your hard work. We're going to take a 10-minute break before we hear our next matter.

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Furth: We are back in session, if the applicant for item 3 would like to come talk to us.

### **3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 380 Cambridge [15PLN-00249]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow Demolition of Three Existing Commercial Buildings Totaling 32,083 Square Feet and to Construct a New Three-Story Commercial Building Totaling 35,000 Square Feet. In Addition, There is a Request to Waive an Off-Street Loading Space. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15332 (InFill Development Projects). Zoning District: CC(2)(R) (Community Commercial with Retail Shopping Combining District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.**

Chair Furth: Okay. Item 3 on our agenda is also quasi-judicial. The site is 380 Cambridge. It's a recommendation on the owner's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow demolition of three existing commercial buildings with a total area of about 32,000 square feet and constructing a new three-story commercial building totaling 35,000 square feet. There is also a request -- but not to us -- to waive an off-street loading space. The environmental assessment is that this is exempt from the provisions of CEQA because it is infill. I forgot last time to mention who the applicant was, and who the architects were. I'm sure the applicant will tell us that if the staff doesn't. Any disclosures? I will start out by saying that I visited this site previously and visited it again on Wednesday.



Board Member Lew: I also visited the site again yesterday, and I actually did go back to College Avenue and sort of peeked through all of the apartment, the gaps in the apartment buildings, towards the back of the proposed project site.

Chair Furth: Anybody else?

Vice Chair Baltay: Go ahead, David.

Board Member Hirsch: Visited the site this past week.

Chair Furth: Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I also visited the site, again, this past week.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Thompson: I was sick and could not visit.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson is excused for illness. May we have the staff report?

Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Yes, good morning. I'm Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner, and I have a presentation. The applicant is also here with their presentation. The project is located at 380-400 Cambridge, three properties, three adjacent buildings. The request is as stated - to demolish all of those and to create a new building. The project has been around for a few years now, it seems like, and the code has changed a couple of times, as well as we have been to the Board, last in December 2017. This image here shows that the project is in the context of a California commercial district, as well as showing some of the properties adjacent along Cambridge Avenue. At that meeting with the Board last, there were some comments, and the applicant has had some revisions or responses to those. Some of the big ones here are mentioned, the others are included in the staff report. But the ones here worth noting would be the massing needs to be broken up, and the applicant has responded to that with some revised elevations and some significant changes to the materials. Another one is to provide or look into providing the loading space on site, and the applicant has explored those options. We'll go into more detail about that later in this presentation. Some other things would be, how does the project be more pedestrian-friendly? On the north side of the building now, adjacent to the City's parking lot, there are opportunities there for outdoor seating, as well as a balcony on the second floor for the tenants. Also, notches are on the façade on the first floor, at the sidewalk, to provide more landscaping opportunities, places to put bike racks, as well. Another issue was to address the neighbors. There were neighbor concerns on the south side with the residential building there, as well as the existing residences to the rear of the property. The applicant has made a lot of outreach effort in addressing those issues, and the applicant will explain some of those. And then, there's some concern about having large floor plates, and the plans were revised to demonstrate that those plate spaces could be demised in ways that are more flexible.

Chair Furth: And just to be clear, for those of us who aren't specialists, "demised" often refers to death. You mean leased, right?

Mr. Sing: Yes. Separated, so, in a way that they're not just the single type of large floor plates. I think the concern was to have (inaudible). These could be subleased or...

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Sing: ...in smaller spaces. The project is consistent with the zoning code. There is a request for a waiver of the loading space, and that is included in the zoning code. The project does maximize the floor area. The majority of it, the office space, 30,000 square feet, that's on the second and third story, and then there is retail that they are actually keeping on the first floor and expanding upon, and they are providing 15 parking spaces. A little more detail on that. They're adding just over 2,400 square feet of

new commercial space on the ground floor and just 512 square feet of office space. The height limit is being maintained. Last time, they were trying to get an exception to that. As I mentioned, they are maximizing the FAR. The total addition of the square footage of this project, demolishing everything and adding new, is 2,817 square feet. It is within the California Avenue Parking District, so they did pay into that district. In all, they just have to provide 15 additional parking spaces, so that's what they are providing on the site. The daylight plane applies to the project, and that is at the rear. They are compliant with that. And then, these are some of the renderings of the building. I'll let the applicant go into more details, but you can see the changes from the previous iteration on the top to the bottom, and they've recessed some portions of the building. They've added some more pedestrian-friendly outdoor spaces on the ground floor, as well as on the upper floor along the City's parking lot. They've introduced some warmer colors and materials, as well. Here's another rendering of that. This elevation, again, shows kind of differences between the first iteration that you saw and the second iteration. This was the iteration. Both had the 35-foot height. And then, the ground level shows you some of the differences. There was more landscaping along the north side of the building in the first iteration, but you will see that now, more of that open space is toward the street, so it does make the street scape a little more pedestrian-friendly, but still provides access for the bike lockers and garage in the back. Moving on to the loading space, this was one issue where, the Board had some concern about it and asked the applicant to go back and look at it more. The existing condition now for the property, there's a curb cut along the north side of the property, and that's adjacent to the City lot. That would be eliminated with this project and create a new curb cut on the south side. But, in all, the amount of parking spaces along the street would remain the same. Lose one, gain one. Per the code, one loading space is required to be on site. However, a waiver is permitted by the Director of Planning. It's either a whole space or some kind of dimensional space change - width/length/height. The applicant has looked at several options and those were included in your packet, as well as we have a summary in the staff report. In general, on that street there are nearby loading parking spaces. They're not necessarily adjacent to the site, but there is opportunity to do that. If you can see on the other drawings, if you do provide a loading space within the building, you would have to depress the garage for the control of the height. For a UPS truck, for instance. And in one instance, if you maintain just one curb cut, then that truck would have to back up in the garage and then go out. Or, if you wanted to make it a little more reasonable for the truck driver, then you would have to have two curb cuts. One of the findings for the waiver of a loading space is, does it conflict with any Comprehensive Plan goals and policies? There is one that encourages the expansion and retention of retail space, and also pedestrian-oriented street scape. In the case here of having two curb cuts, that obviously would change the design of the building, which is, as it is designed, more pedestrian-friendly. Also, maximizes the amount of retail that you would have. If you were to add the loading space on site, you would lose a little under 1,000 square feet of commercial space on the ground floor. For those reasons, staff is supporting the waiver of the loading space. Regarding the public comments -- and these were neighbor issues -- there has been a neighbor in the rear with some unique health issues. There's a speaker here today that will talk to you about that. Also, in front of you this morning, there was some correspondence that came in, a two-page Memorandum of Understanding between the owner, the resident, and the subject property owner, having to do with how to address construction impacts and operation impacts of the project. Those led to some of the constraints regarding, for instance, having native plants on the site. Part of it was this constraint. The other issue was neighbor to the south regarding shade from the building. In both instances, the applicant has been in contact with neighbors, resolved the issues, and design changes to the building have occurred. Regarding the environmental determination of CEQA, we are recommending determination that the project is exempt from CEQA because we believe it is an infill project. In conclusion, we believe that the project has responded to the Board's concerns and issues, and we also believe that it appears to have met the required findings for architectural review. The project does appear to have justified the reasons for the waiver of the parking space for loading. The project did meet findings for CEQA exception. With that, we recommend approval of the project subject to the Director of Planning, and based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions? Seeing none, if we could hear from the applicant. You'll have 10 minutes to speak after you spell your name.

Steve Pierce, Applicant: Madam Chair, members of the Board, I'm Steve Pierce [spells name]. I am the project applicant. Just echo a couple of things. We have met with our neighbors to the south. There are four condominiums, two of which we share a common property line. And in deference to those, we've changed the massing along that wall, along that side of the building, as well as reduced the height of our building. Now it's about seven feet below the height of the condominiums to the left. Have continued our conversations with Robin Fath [phonetic] to the rear. You've got a letter there, so we've got an approach. We're going to build a, basically an air filtration system for her, so that will mitigate any kind of issues relative to our, to the construction. There's been pretty much wholesale changes to the building in response to the Board's comments last time we were before you. One of the things I'm excited about in particular is being able to kind of gather some of our open space on the front right of the building, to create space for a sidewalk café, to kind of animate what is now a pretty dead zone. Let me turn things over to our project architect, Michael Castro, who will fill in the details. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Michael Castro, Architect: Good morning, members of the Board. My name is Michael Castro [spells name]. We've been working on the project now for over two years and gave us a good opportunity to work with our client, but also gave us a chance to actually make this building right. We've presented the last time. We understood your comments, and I'm going to go through that generally, and then, get a little bit more into specifics that may not be ready, items that are brought up to date. Initially, the main comments were that the massing was too much. It was overwhelming. We wanted to break down that massing. We wanted to put materials that became a little bit more tangible and address the pedestrian level. The other thing at the pedestrian level, we wanted to create these ins-and-outs that would make that pedestrian experience a little bit more interesting. You'll see some nooks that are in between some of these massing elements that are in the elevation. That began itself in the first iteration but never really got to a level where we are today. The main thing that you're looking at from the original design is two primary masses with a transition space in between, and the entry was integral to one of the larger masses. Now, we're taking that entry, allowing that to be another separator, making it really two different buildings, but the one building to, I'll call it the west, or to the left of your screen, is actually broken down again in its massing. Done that with recesses and with balconies. Again, this building is brick all the way up, with the transitions being in metal and glass. The building on the right is brick up to the second story with an attic of metal and glass. Again, we're trying to give a little bit of variety. We're trying to break down the massing in different ways. Two things it does is try to create the apparent two-building look, than one large building. That was tried in the beginning, but as you can see, it was a little bit more uniform. I'm going to go through these relatively quickly. I'm just going to stop at some of the key points. These are our neighboring buildings, and as you see, our site is between a residential condo building and a commercial building across the parking lot. The existing buildings right now, we're feeling this is going to make a big impact in the neighborhood by improving the architecture. The main thing on the site plan is we had a remote transformer that was in front of the parking lot. We're bringing that closer to the building. We're trying to condense everything related to our building in our footprint. Again, you know, on the floor plans for the second floor and the third floor, we show it demised or broken up into smaller tenant spaces because this building can be demised. The idea of the core design was to give a lot of variety to what can happen in this building. The roof is screened, and we went through that before, but the main thing to see on the roof plan here is that the third floor up to the roof is set back, and this was the result of our meetings with adjoining neighbors, to allow the maximum light and air into their spaces that have windows. The location of these light wells were right in front of where the windows are into the units. The elevations, again, you can see how it's broken into the two major masses, and the undulations on the ground floor. The far right, we'll get into a little bit more later on. It's almost like a micro plaza. The façade that's facing the parking lot has one blank wall, which we think is an opportunity for artwork. We're hoping local artwork. But about one-half of that façade is actually decks recessed, giving covered open space as well as amenity space to the building. You'll see in the plan, too, that that deck is along Cambridge, as far away from the adjoining residential as possible. This is the rear elevation, and this is 10 foot setback from the adjoining residential buildings to the north. Okay. Materials, we have two material boards against the wall there, but primarily it's metal, it's aluminum panel, stucco, which is the back of the building, and brick veneer. And the brick veneer is

going to be on a, basically a stucco construction with the brick being the face of that, of the finish. Those materials were picked up from what we saw when we walked down Cambridge and adjoining buildings. We have examples of brick, we have examples of plaster, and examples of metal facades, just in, you know, a block radius. Again, what we're doing... This is taking a view, looking what I'm calling, we're calling west, the left side of the plan. Looking northwest. The attic is metal and glass, as I mentioned earlier. We broke down the scale of that with the size of our window pane, so you'll see some intermediate horizontal mullions to break down that scale even further. And, we detailed the brick so that there's interest in the detailing, it's not just a blank brick façade or a level brick façade. We have corbeling that happens around the arching, and we have some other steps and corniches that are implemented into brick to give it interest. This is a view looking at the Cambridge façade. Like the other scheme, we have a central commercial entry for the building, for the second and third floors. That is off of Cambridge. And, we have some retail entrances. The retail floors, ultra-clear glazing, and the upper floors are, right now it's z50, PPG z50, which is a light-gray glazing. The ground floor gives opportunities. We have sun shading devices, which give opportunities for signage. We also have a fascia of metal panel that's above the doors that allows another opportunity for signage or numbering of the doors, of the addresses. There's also opportunities with the columns for blade signs. We're showing some hoops out front for additional bicycle parking, and again, this is looking at the arches that are corbeled back to the metal façade that slides behind it. And then, we have the metal extending out to create these decks on the far east side, which today is more or less a driveway. We're trying to create a little micro plaza. This is a little bit detail of the entry into the main office building, and to the left is, again, retail at ground level with the office above, and decks and the other recesses created. This is a close-up image of where we're peeling back the building on the east side, on Cambridge, which allows for a possible tenant to extend out a coffee or a café. It is also an opportunity to put some more green and planting in there, so it's a buffer as well as an amenity. It's also a relief in the sidewalk. It gives a special event along the length of the building. This is just an overview, just to see how the relationship of our building is to its neighboring buildings. To the north, or to the back of our building, we have a daylight plane, which we are within. We have a 10-foot setback, as well as a setback from our neighbors to the north. And we're having a visual screen, which is a, I believe, a seven-foot wood fence with bamboo right now as a screen, a planted screen. Again, with our meetings with our adjoining neighbors to the west, we created light wells that are specifically related, as I mentioned before, to the windows of the units. These are some sections that indicate that. Some more three-dimensional views. The intent, too, as we were talking, what would they prefer...

Chair Furth: Excuse me, you hit your time limit. Could you take about a minute to wind up?

Mr. Castro: Sure. We're on the last slide. I just wanted to point out that these light wells could be also accentuated by planting walls of green. We gave that opportunity to the neighbors, asked them to tell us their preference, whether they want to do it with color and reflectivity to get more light in, or if they want to do it with planting. That's an open area, but right now, we're showing planting.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Castro: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any questions of the applicant's architect? Not at this time.

Board Member Thompson: I got one.

Chair Furth: Sorry. Board Member Thompson has a question for you.

Board Member Thompson: Can we go back one slide really quick? Your neighborhood slide? What's the material that's facing the neighborhood? I kind of see that the brick stops at that corner.

Mr. Castro: Yeah. The brick is a primary material on Cambridge. It returns to where it would potentially be visible, and then it turns into stucco. The back of the building is stucco up until where it converts to

brick again on the other side of the building, on the east side. Let me just go back on the elevation really fast. Stucco wraps the building and dies in this inside corner. You have stucco to...

Board Member Thompson: I was talking about the other side, on the neighbors' side.

Mr. Castro: Okay. This is the brick, turning the corner from Cambridge, and this is, it's hard to read, but it's actually doing something like this in profile. Which, this is a light well, this is a light well, these two rectangles, and this is all stucco.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so it's a little bit different than your render.

Mr. Castro: No, the renderings are consistent.

Board Member Hirsch: (inaudible)

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, the brick doesn't turn the corner in the render all the way, as far as it's showing in this elevation. Next one.

[Locating slide]

Board Member Thompson: That one. Kind of see how that face of that building...? Yeah, where your mouse is right there.

Mr. Castro: Yeah, the intent is the brick returns that one bay.

Board Member Thompson: That whole wall is brick.

Mr. Castro: Yes. And it goes up to our parapet and returns down.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: I have a question.

Chair Furth: Yes, Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: On the balconies, it's an aluminum covered steel structure that holds up the balconies in the front?

Mr. Castro: Yes. On the east side it's a steel frame, exposed steel frame...

Board Member Hirsch: Steel frame.

Mr. Castro: ...painted the same as aluminum.

Board Member Hirsch: But the cover is aluminum throughout on the...

Mr. Castro: Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: ...fascia.

Mr. Castro: All the fascias, all the mullions, are aluminum.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. And the same is true of the pop-area on the right-hand side that's metallic? That will be a steel structure as well? And then, covered in aluminum?

Mr. Castro: I thought you were talking about initially this...

Board Member Hirsch: The area on the top. Well, no, not ...

Mr. Castro: The area on top is, yeah, it's... The building itself is going to be a concrete building.

Board Member Hirsch: It's a concrete building.

Mr. Castro: It's going to be a concrete building. We're going to have the equivalent of a curtain wall on the front, a curtain wall wrapping the building. But you're going to have some type of light-gauge metal framing that's going to be behind the metal façade, which is going to be aluminum on the top attic.

Board Member Hirsch: And then, just to continue that, the area that is the balcony is thinner dimension, so is it exposed steel?

Mr. Castro: It's going to be concrete clad aluminum.

Board Member Hirsch: Pardon? It's a concrete...?

Mr. Castro: Yeah, so, it's going to be concrete deck extending out, and then, you're going to have a fascia of aluminum.

Board Member Hirsch: Held up by a steel structure there, which is...

Mr. Castro: Held by a concrete structure.

Board Member Hirsch: Concrete? I'm sorry?

Mr. Castro: Oh, not on the, on the decks on the far right? That's exposed steel, steel columns.

Board Member Hirsch: That's exposed steel?

Mr. Castro: Right, and exposed steel beams. That's the only exception to the concrete structure.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Chair Furth: Okay. I have three speaker cards here. Larry Skarset, to be followed by Karen Price, to be followed by Birgit Werner.

Larry Skarset: Hello. My name is Larry Skarset. I'm the owner of the.... [phone ringing]. My name is Larry Skarset, owner of the Cambridge Barber and Beauty Salon. I'd like to give thanks to the... [phone ringing]. This is awful.

Chair Furth: Take your time.

Mr. Skarset: I'd like to give thanks to the City for giving me a small independent owner doing business in the city. I started cutting hair in Palo Alto when I was 20 years old. I'm 72 in a few days. I've had a wonderful experience here. Met a lot of wonderful people. It's a diverse community, it's a great place to do business. I've been able to flourish, but have a lot of concerns as a small business owner, just to pay the rents and keep everything going. As you know, the retail business is going through a tough environment and small mom-and-pops just cannot make it in this valley anymore. People... The rents are just too high. I know that capitalism is, business is business. Times change, I know, and concerned, but I'm concerned, and a lot of people are, in the community is overbuilt, and the commercial buildings, and the rents, and the owners of the building. They think they can just build buildings up and everybody is going to flood in there. Dot-com startups. I've been here 50-some years, I can see them go up and

down, start-up, start-down. That's not my problem. When they get the building, I'm sure they'll get the tenants to come in. A question that I have, and I'm reading through these plans, is will the displaced tenants like me have a chance to come back into the building, and at what price? I know the rents will be higher. It's a concern for a lot of people in this valley right now. I love the area, but it is getting to be where the valley is looking like it's getting to be the people who have wealth, and the people who don't have. You're either going to have to go with the times, or not. I know this is probably going to be approved, but I'm looking right now to find another space, but it's not easy to find another thing to go to. But the Lord has been good to me, so I'll be able to, to go on. I don't like to see Palo Alto get too upscale and the average guy cannot... And I'm concerned about the younger people. Will they have the opportunity I had, to start up a little small business? A donut shop, or any kind of a business. Will they be able to do it? I don't know. And I thank the City for giving the opportunity to work here these many years. I've done very well. But it's a struggle for a small business right now. I think the City should give us some concern to some of those things. That's all I'd like to say.

Chair Furth: Mr. Skarset, are you a tenant in the buildings that exist on the site right now?

Mr. Skarset: Yes, I'm the owner of the barber and beauty salon.

Chair Furth: Got it. And your name is S-k-a-r-s-e-t?

Mr. Skarset: Correct.

Chair Furth: All right. Thank you. The views you expressed are widely shared.

Mr. Skarset: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Karen Price?

Karen Price: Hi. Good morning. Almost good afternoon. My name is Karen Price. [spells name] I have been renting my advanced rolfing studio at 378 Cambridge Avenue since the spring of 1979. I'm here to ask you to please not approve the demolition of the three office buildings known as the 380 Cambridge Avenue Project. The size and scope of this project does not fit Cambridge Avenue at all. It will destroy the character of the street and look like a fortress in comparison to the other buildings, no matter how you try to prettify it. The current three buildings are lovely, as you've all been there and seen, with inner atriums, skylights, and most importantly, small office spaces that adjoin to perfectly accommodate either a sole professional such as myself, or a growing small business. We desperately need to keep our rapidly-dwindling supply of affordable office space. Once it's gone, there will only be very expensive offices that only well-funded tech companies or financial institutions can afford. As we speak, there are three large office buildings under construction just around California Avenue, in addition to several recently completed. They will bring hundreds of workers and greatly increase our already overly crowded roads and strained parking, while denying valuable services to the community. As the population keeps increasing, the demand for services such as family law, accounting, psychotherapy, bodyworks such as rolfing, also keeps increasing. We simply cannot afford the rent in these new buildings. By forcing us and our practices out of affordable offices in Palo Alto and into increasingly remote communities, we not only increase traffic congestion and eliminate walkability, but end up denying the very services that people need, and that are truly the fabric of our community. These large buildings that are going up all over Palo Alto are like mushrooms after the rain, and just as toxic to our community. Please do not approve this project. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Our next speaker is Birgit Werner.

Birgit Werner: Hello. That's Birgit Werner [spells name]. Good morning. I'm here today on behalf of Robin Foff [phonetic], who owns one of the properties directly behind the proposed development. She has an immune system disorder which makes her extremely vulnerable to air pollutants, both particulates and fumes especially. This prevents her from being here in person today, and also means that such a long

construction project so close to her presents a severe health challenge. Last year, we asked for your support for reasonable accommodation for Robin's disability. Today, we're happy to tell you that we have a Memorandum of Understanding with Greenhart [phonetic] that mitigates some of the air quality effects on Robin without impeding the progress of the project. Among other items, the MOU includes a significant upgrade to Robin's air filtration system for the duration of the construction, and the careful choice of some hypoallergenic landscaping plants. It also acknowledges the need for full communication and cooperation throughout the construction, and the ongoing operations of the building. The full text of the MOU is attached to the letter in your packet. In closing, we would like to thank you, the Board, for acknowledging Robin's concerns. Sheldon, thank you very much for your understanding and patience through this whole, very long process. Steve, we are most grateful for your generosity. Thank you to you and your team for working with us to address Robin's concerns in a meaningful way. You've really gone out of your way to be a good neighbor. Thank you, and thank you, all.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. Jeff Levinsky.

Jeff Levinsky: I have just a few minutes to thank, to say "good morning" again, Board. [spells name] Paul Machado from Evergreen Park and I spoke at the previous hearing on this project, and a concern that we raised was about the parking calculations and such. That has not been fixed in what you have before you, so I'm going to walk you through it as carefully as I can. If you look at page 5 of your current plans, it has the parking calculations for the project. Right in the center of the middle column, it says that there is a common area of 1,716 square feet. That's all on the first floor and includes two regular bathrooms, two bathrooms with showers, a lobby to get to those, elevator and stairs, utility areas like electrical and trash. Further down in that column, the common area is all considered part of the office space. Well, if you're trying to lower your parking requirements, that's a great idea, because office space needs less parking than retail. But if the common area is only for the offices, then there's no restrooms and no showers for the first-floor tenants and customers. There's no utilities for them. That's not believable. Unless the City says it's okay now to have retail without bathrooms or utilities, please ask that the common area be apportioned between the retail and the office. That's problem number one. The other problem is that the calculations actually are ignoring the way the City has always done things for the Cal Ave assessment district. For every other new building or expansion I've seen in that district, the City totals up how much parking the entire new building needs. It then subtracts how many parking spaces the building paid in to the assessment district for in the final year that it was paying in. The new building must then provide the difference. They need so much, they paid in for such much, they have to provide the difference. But that's not the way these plans list. As far as I can tell, the buildings paid in for a total of 102 parking spaces. That's according to the most recent records I have for the district. That was for three different uses, not the two uses -- retail and office -- that are claimed in these plans. Instead, the plans are using a completely different calculation where they only are providing parking for the additional space, and they are assuming that the existing space is properly parked. Big shocker to everybody in this room. Not every building in Palo Alto is properly parked, so you can't assume going forward that the building you have is properly parked, especially when you know it has three uses in the assessment district, but now it only has two uses. It just doesn't match up. I think I'm getting through here. I'm going to ask you to have the calculation be corrected. One other really quick point. You saw a slide where they were talking about restaurant and outdoor café use. Well, they don't have enough parking for restaurant use because they are parking for retail, which needs less parking than restaurants. And that outdoor area is FAR, so it would need to be in there, in the calculation, too.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anybody else? Applicant has 10 minutes to respond. Or provide any further information.

Mr. Pierce: In responding to the parking question. First off, we're not going to be having a restaurant. It would be, at most, a coffee shop where you might warm things, but no full kitchen, etc., etc. With respect to the lobby area, that is indeed the entry to the office, which is why it is designated "office," and the... What was the other point I was going to make?

Chair Furth: Bathrooms and showers?



Mr. Pierce: I'm sorry? Oh, yeah.

Chair Furth: Questions about bathrooms and showers.

Mr. Pierce: Bathrooms and showers, thank you. With our retail, which is true of all retail that goes up, the tenant improvements for those retail spaces would include bathrooms and so forth, so that they are properly served. The bathrooms that are included in the building are related to the office use and to meet all the standards with respect to that. But again, with retail, individual bathrooms would be added to retail units, depending on what tenants we ultimately have.

Chair Furth: Any questions of the applicant? I have a question. In the Conditions of Approval, it says that the required bicycle parking has to be on your site as opposed to on the sidewalk. Where is it now?

Mr. Pierce: There are two components...

Chair Furth: I know it's here somewhere, but I got lost.

Mr. Pierce: ...two components, one being the publicly-available bicycle parking, which is along the sidewalk where you have the hoops and so forth. And then, within the parking garage itself, there is a locker for what we call private parking, or basically private bicycle use. Maybe Michael can point this out.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I thought that wasn't what we... I thought we required more [crosstalk]...

Mr. Pierce: Yeah, if you look in the upper right-hand corner...

Ms. Gerhardt: Sheet 13.

Chair Furth: There's a lot of sheets.

Mr. Pierce: That's designated for the tenants' bicycle use.

Chair Furth: Okay, thank you. I have a question for staff about that. Take me through what the code requirement is for bicycle parking for this project.

Mr. Sing: Yeah, so, for...

Chair Furth: I think I'm too used to hearing Stanford Research Park standards, which are different.

Mr. Sing: Yeah, so, there's a combination of long term, which are the ones that are in lockers, and there's also the short term.

Chair Furth: Where's the on-site short-term parking?

Mr. Sing: As is proposed in the plans, those are drawn on the sidewalk, but they would have to be...

Chair Furth: [Off microphone, partially inaudible] ...have to be moved. My question is, where are they going?

Mr. Sing: Right. Where they would go? They would go into the notches that are provided facing the street. For instance it looks like there's some room that's at the entry, the main entry to the lobby there. There also could be some opportunity where the micro plaza is, as well. Those are the places, the opportunities where they could put the bike racks.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anybody else have any questions. Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, to staff again. Sheldon, could you address the, the question was raised about the bathrooms counting towards retail or commercial or office space. As I look at the plans, each floor seems to have its own suite of bathrooms, presumably for the tenants of those floors. The ground floor bathrooms would seem to be for the ground-floor tenants. And if the applicant is stating that that's not going to be the case, do we have a mechanism to ensure that?

Chair Furth: It's hard...

Mr. Sing: I think the only way to really ensure that is a Condition of Approval.

Vice Chair Baltay: A Condition of Approval is only enforced by public complaint, though.

Ms. Gerhardt: No, we're going out and inspecting these properties before they are occupied. If we're requiring bathrooms in that retail space, we would be able to verify that before it is occupied.

Mr. Pierce: I might also add that the showers are in those ground-floor bathrooms, which are designated for the tenant bicyclists.

Vice Chair Baltay: I have no problem with how you want to use your building. Mr. Levinsky made a good point about the parking calculations, and we have to be fair. Those are the rules. If that space is for the benefit of retail people, it changes the way you do the parking calculus. I'm asking staff if we have a means of making sure that is ultimately the case. I think what Jodie said is true. Then we have to make sure there are additional bathrooms put for your new tenants. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Anybody else have questions? Sheldon, is there any seating for the public other than in the small plaza?

Mr. Sing: That would be the only place that's shown on at this time and really would have the most space for it.

Chair Furth: So the answer is no. Thank you. Anybody else? Okay, Osma, why don't...

Board Member Hirsch: I have a question.

Chair Furth: David?

Board Member Hirsch: Access to this deck area, it's specific to that tenant that's adjacent to the upper floor?

Mr. Castro: Yes, it is. Each floor would have, whatever adjoining tenant would be next to that deck area would spill out onto a deck area. Or have that opportunity.

Chair Furth: For the benefit of the transcriber, that was the applicant's architect responding. I have one question, staff, while people are looking at their plans here. In the Conditions of Approval, it says that changes shall be submitted to the City for approval if the project is to be developed not according to this plan. It's passive voice. Who has the authority to alter the plans after the approval?

Ms. Gerhardt: The applicant would propose modifications and City staff would review.

Chair Furth: Any staff member can modify our, the official decision?

Ms. Gerhardt: No. This would be, we normally keep the same project planner on a project the whole way through.

Chair Furth: So, if they came in and asked Sheldon for a change in what we recommended approval, Sheldon would have the authority to do that, under this.

Ms. Gerhardt: He would be reviewing those changes and making sure that they are in substantial conformance with what was approved.

Chair Furth: Thank you. That part isn't in here. Though I was sure that's what you did.

Board Member Lew: I have a question for staff. I was wondering if you could explain the zoning requirements in the CC-2 zone regarding, say, professional services versus office.

Mr. Sing: Give me a moment to look that up.

Ms. Gerhardt: Was there a specific regulation that you were asking about?

Board Member Lew: No, I just, I thought that we should address Karen Price's concerns about professional services being squeezed out of Palo Alto by office uses. I think it's come up before in other zones. I think we've talked about it in the, on other projects.

Chair Furth: The most dramatic example was our high-rise brutalist [phonetic] building, which was full of small offices.

Board Member Lew: Right. Yes.

Chair Furth: Different zoning.

Board Member Lew: I think, was there not CC...? That might be CC, too, as well.

Ms. Gerhardt: We're looking this up, but I think the City, in all of our zones, you know, multiple uses are allowed, either permitted or with a conditional use permit. The City has limited ability to control the change between two permitted uses.

Chair Furth: The question is, is there any... Personal services such as these two described by the people talking to us today are allowed, but is there any restriction on just straight office use? Or is it, is it not, is there not?

Board Member Lew: Well, the office is also subject to the, to a cap, right?

Chair Furth: Right.

Ms. Gerhardt: In CC-2, administrative offices are not permitted. Professional and general business offices are permitted.

Chair Furth: Remind me what a general business office is.

Ms. Gerhardt: Travel agents, things of that nature.

Chair Furth: Would a law office be permitted? Would a software designing firm be permitted?

Ms. Gerhardt: Software designing is generally considered research and development, but it does fit into other categories as well. Sheldon is looking up some definitions right now.

Chair Furth: Well, while you're looking into those, why don't we talk about design issues. As you know, this is a sore point in many projects that come before us. Osma, thoughts on the design of the building.

Board Member Thompson: Sure. Thank you for your presentation, thank you for the material board. That's always really helpful. And thank you to the public for speaking. In general, this is a much bigger improvement from what we saw last time. I think the way that it breaks down the scale is definitely, it accomplishes it better than your previous design. I also think the palette is aesthetically sound. It has a nice consistency, it's not too complicated. In that sense, I appreciate the aesthetics of your project and your design a lot more than what we saw last time. I don't actually have too much to say on this one. I'd kind of defer to my colleagues about contextual elements. I'm curious about that back façade, if anybody is going to see that. In general, I would say this is a big improvement. I'm curious to hear what my other colleagues have to say.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: Great. Thank you for your presentation. I think the packet was very clear. I think I agree with Osma, that the building design is much improved. I think I can recommend it today. I think the change to brick makes it compatible with other buildings on Cambridge, on the next block, at 350 Cambridge, as well as the parking garage, that are both clad in brick. I also think the addition of that corner porch on the side of the building, I think is a great addition, and I think that also makes design linkages to the building across the street at 375 Cambridge. The concerns that I have I think can be easily resolved. One is at the garage entrance, to maybe consider some sort of soffit or header to help screen all the fire sprinklers and what-not that usually pop down below the floor. The ceiling, rather. Second item is that maybe consider automatic timer window shades on the back windows on the second and third floors. That would help with light pollution to the neighbors on College Avenue. I did look at those units and it seems like they have exterior stairs and balconies facing the back, and they really don't have a lot of planting on their side of the property line. I think the bamboo will help, but it will take time for that to get established. Also, too, I've seen some new projects with underground garages, which is a little different than yours, but they use color inside, just in the entry area, to really help make it known that there is parking behind there. It's a minor comment, but I think that that might help. On the plantings, there's just one plant -- and being nitpicky -- and they are the heucheras. I think those are fine. They're mostly natives or hybrids of native plants. Minor concern is that they don't have a long life span. They usually peter out unless they're in the perfect location, where they'll multiple on their own. On the light fixture, I think my understanding is that there isn't a cut sheet yet submitted. Maybe it's here, I haven't seen it. I think I saw a note that it was in a separate, that would be in a separate submittal. I would say maybe consider a shielded fixture or a down light. I would say as an example, there is a new project at San Antonio, (inaudible), nearby Mountainview, where there are wall sconces all around the building, pointing out. To me, it adds a lot of visual clutter. I think it's nice to have accent lighting, but I think it's better to have it, I prefer to have it shielded. And then, my last comment is on findings. I think on Finding #2, which is on page 209 of our packet, is that I think we should mention that the proposed project has a new rear setback and planting along that property line, whereas the current building has a solid concrete block wall right at, right on the property line. I think that that is actually an improvement to the neighbors, even though the building is an extra story taller. That's all that I have. I think I can make a recommendation today.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Alex. Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. Thank you for the very clear presentation. I share many of Alex and Osma's comments. I'd like to jump right into a couple of items that I think are correctable, but still of concern to me. I'd like to direct my colleagues to Sheet 36, where I notice the second bay, the one to the left of the bay with the café sign, has a structural post in the middle of the open bay there. I call that out because several places, I see you just haven't aligned the architectural façade on the street with your structural grid. And I think it needs to be aligned. And I think that can be done. It may be giving your structural engineers a bit of a nudge, but having this post where it is here just caused me to look at the plan and there are three or four locations along the California Avenue façade where you have structural posts, which are not the visual structure of the building. And I think that is just unacceptable. I'm looking at your main floor plan where you're locating the transformer and backflow valves, and at least the backflow valves seem to be right in the café there. I'm looking at Sheet 12, on the right on side where

you have your covered terrace, and it says, "possible location for backflow valves." And your lovely rendering of that café clearly doesn't have backflow valves; it has people having coffee. And I think it should, and I think you should find another place to put these backflow valves, preferably even the transformer. My wondering is if you can't stick them in the two back corners of your parking lot because you can't use those spaces for parking. Right now, you have trash in one and bicycle storage in another, and maybe there's a way to tweak those around. My third comment has to do with the driveway entrance in, and you have, again, on the left, more backflow valves possibly there. On the right, you have an odd extension of the retail space. I'm sure that's just something to do with the floor area, trying to maximize it, but you really make a difficult parking lot even more difficult to get into. If you could just simplify and make it clear that that pathway is into the garage and not have to jog to the left, and then back to the right again. There's got to be a way to tweak that to get a more clear drive entrance into the garage. Those criticisms aside, I find it a very handsome building. I'm really excited about the way you've used the brick. You've used it in a way that feels like Palo Alto. I don't know how to quantify that, but it feels right. I've had an office downtown, California Avenue, and it really does fit that area. I'm very attracted to the details, the reveal at the edge of the window bays, is really nicely done. It's a very deft hand involved, and I really hope you are able to carry that through to the level of detail that I'm seeing in the renderings. It's really beautiful and will be a handsome addition. Okay. All that said, my biggest concern about this building has to do with the loading zone, or lack thereof. I don't know that that's a thing within the architecture board's purview, ultimately. I'd like to bring it to my colleagues' attention, however, that if a building this size in this area cannot find a way to accommodate a loading zone, which is mandated by the code, I don't see what building would. I think we're opening a Pandora's Box-type situation where every project is now going to use the same arguments they are for not being able to fit a loading zone. We've seen over and over again that lack of thinking about these sort of transportation issues and secondary issues to the functioning of the building just cause repeated headaches. In this case, you're going to see delivery trucks, and there will be many, many UPS, FedEx, Uber-type things on the curb in front of this building. There's a lot of people who will be working here, and there's just no accommodation for that, aside from, as I read the staff report, there's a public loading zone on the curb about 100 feet away. I just don't believe that that will be effectively used for this building. The trucks will park in front, they will double park. And I understand that you can't get a 15-foot-tall space for a tractor trailer to pull in here. That's not realistic. But I wonder if there's not a way to take that entry driveway, clean it up, make it a bit wider. Maybe you can tweak the height of it a foot or so. It seems to be 11 feet now. If you had about 12, you could fit UPS trucks and stuff. And then, with some signage, you might have a way to at least get some people to pull in there. Yes, they are blocking traffic, but you're finding a compromise that will make your building more livable. It will let us try to accommodate some of these things we're looking for within our code. But really, I put it to my colleagues that I don't see how, if we can go along with this exception to the loading zone here, if it can't be done, where will it be done. I leave it at that. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: David?

Board Member Hirsch: I'm in 100 percent agreement that this is a terrific addition to the whole California street area, Cambridge street in particular. It's a beautiful building, and it's modest in a wonderful way here. I would hope that a lot of other commercial buildings would look just like this. But I differ a little bit with my colleague about the truck parking/loading issue here. On the size of this building, I just don't think you have the room to do anything. And I would say that that's something that City Planning and Transportation should get together on and make a loading time limit on the front of the building to allow for those things to occur, either... Well, I would say before normal parking hours in the area, something like that, to allow for some kind of a loading/unloading. I have a number of smaller items. I think the bikes that are part of the building layout in that far corner downstairs are way too far and won't attract bikers, and that your tenants in this building, that you could offer something on the wall of the back of the commercial space, some kind of wall hanging for bicycles. I give it to you, a challenge to design something that's more accessible to the bikers, to make it more easy for them to come to the building. Then you can have other uses in those spaces back there that are the end of the building, as my colleague suggested. That if you could take the backflow preventer down there. If it's not allowed to be down there because it has to be on the first floor, that might be another hang-up in providing for that.

But certainly, you could take some of the mechanicals and stick them in the basement space. That would improve the café a lot at that end of the building. There's a change in elevation between, on the right hand side of the building there as you face it, and there's no kind of recognition of that, either on the street side -- How do you get back up? A question I could have asked before when you were responding to questions, but I'm assuming, therefore, that there will be a way within the café or that area that's going to be commercial, and use the outdoor space, that you can step back up to the street level. Or do you step down into that plaza level? As I saw it, there's a step-down. You can answer the question after I'm finished. I'm curious as to why there are so many entries. I gather it's probably you have to stay flexible to allow for, maybe two tenants in each one of the spaces. But, what you haven't done is you haven't changed your rhythm on the ground floor, which I appreciate is a very useful thing in the design of this building. I'm okay with that idea, and assume that that is what you were thinking of. This is a, although it's asymmetrical lighting at the entry, I think should be symmetrical on the face of the building, so it points it out as a place of entry. I think you only have a light on one side. I would suggest you incorporate one on the opposite side. The car gate and getting into the garage structure, the garage area there, I'm curious as to how you do that. It's always kind of tricky because you have to come up over the sidewalk and then down into the garage. A car pulling into that location, will they go up and then down? And is the gate automatic, or how does that really work? Is it open all day long and then closes at some hour? In which case it's difficult to plan on when someone is coming in or out. In particular, coming in if they have to pull out of the line of traffic or something to get... And you wouldn't want them over the sidewalk, so I think you should spend some time thinking about how that works with the gate there. Either they come in part way and the gate is further down, or... I don't know. One way or the other, figure that one out. I would like to suggest -- and I really forgot to say this in the previous project -- that you have some operable windows in the office spaces upstairs. I think, you know, we have wonderful air here in Palo Alto. Don't lose the opportunity to open a window and get fresh air into those offices there. It would be nice, maybe, if you allowed that deck on the right-hand side to be useful to everybody. It would mean a little, maybe loss of card or area where you could access the deck for that whole floor. No reason why these people can't meet each other on that deck. It seems like it's a nice feature and you'd want to have some more public use by the tenants on that floor. I think that, you know, I'm a little surprised that my colleague didn't talk about how you detail the upper steel structure coming out, or upper lighter-weight structure coming out of the brick façade and that detail.

Vice Chair Baltay: These architects seem exceptionally capable.

Board Member Hirsch: I accept that. I absolutely accept that. I think that this is a beautiful... And that segues into my final, which is it's a beautiful building. It's a simple building, it's a nice commercial building. It has a rhythm that's really quite wonderful, and I'm looking forward to it.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you to the applicant. Thank you for the clear presentation. Thank you to the members of the public who came to speak to us. All right, you guys, you had your chance. My time. First, about the things that I think are serious concerns but we have no real ability to address. That's the loss of spaces suitable for small personal-service buildings. We sit up here and look at a very large number of new commercial proposals, almost all involving tear-downs, and they almost always replace smaller retail spaces, smaller office spaces, with big, large floor plates suitable for software manufacturing, or associated enterprises. And the applicant here has responded to our request to do a building that can at least be leased to smaller organizations and entities, and I don't know -- I'm only partly joking. I mean, you begin to see as we strive to accommodate personal services businesses, which require physical presence in the community, like the two that spoke this morning. You know, so, you end up with coffee shops where you can get your hair cut. I mean, you get these hybrid businesses, but we are not really able to address that concern, and it's probably best addressed to Planning and Transportation and the City Council, because we are more narrowly focused in our review of this project. But, thank you for coming to speak to us. The staff hears you, and they will filter your comments up. Okay, the building itself. It's very attractive. I really appreciate the work the applicant has done to work with his neighbors, whether they're immunologically vulnerable or aesthetically vulnerable, and I think this is impressive, and I appreciate it, and it's successful, and it's a good-looking building. I have a couple of questions. One is parking calculations, particularly involving assessment districts, are beyond my pay

grade. I do not find it reasonable to have four sets of bathrooms on the ground floor. I think it makes sense to have -- as you have them -- two sets, you know, one set of bathrooms on the ground floor accessible to all those businesses, and calculate the parking accordingly. It is not reasonable to have operating restrictions that make no sense and are counterintuitive in an effort to get to a particular parking result. If you need to do a parking variance, do a parking variance, or deviation. But I have not made these calculations. I don't know what your detailed standards are with respect to these, so I leave it to you to check them in light of the public comments. But I also believe that it's important to have interpretations of the plans that make sense as the building is likely to be used, and not some artificially-constrained analysis that's driven by a particular result. I like the... I'm concerned also about the public short-term bike parking. I could not remember the term "short term." That it needs to be at the front, it needs to be visible, it needs to be accessible. I have spent a lot of time looking for bike parking in this neighborhood while trying to track down an accountant who kept having to move in order to find a tenancy, and ended up bicycling to the Baylands, because I'm a little behind on Jack Morton's address. I think it's great to have them as street furniture if the City is willing to accept that. I do understand that's not the same thing as providing on-site parking, but it would be good to have the City consider the possibility of doing both. At several points... Am I confusing things over there?

Ms. Gerhardt: No, sorry. There are times where the short-term bicycle parking can go on the sidewalk, so I think we're going to triple-check that.

Chair Furth: Yeah, I think that it can be very accessible and useful there. At several points in the staff report and in the discussion of why this is an appropriate project in terms of pedestrians, it says that there will be seating, but it's not a condition of approval. I think the seating that meets that condition needs to be permanent, not the kind of chairs that get bundled up and taken in at night as part of a café use. I think a building of this length in this neighborhood needs permanent bench seating with arms so that you can stand up, even if you're a bit frail, that will be accessible at all times to the public, not just as part of buying a cup of coffee. On the plants, I understand you have particular constraints here because of the sensitivities of your neighbor. Alex, it seemed really short, I mean, I'm okay with replanting heuchera every five years if that's what you need to do. Coral bells, basically. But we seem to be pretty short of native plants or habitat plants, mostly because there are a lot of street trees. You're okay with what they presented? First I thought "N" stood for "Native," then I realized it stood for "No." Not native.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I think I agree with the staff recommendation on this one. There are special circumstances on this one.

Chair Furth: They are so constrained. Okay. I will defer to you and the staff on that one. Other than wanting permanent bench seating and good-faith parking calculations, which we don't do, loading space is 45 feet long? Is that right? What are the dimensions?

Mr. Sing: That sounds about right, the standard.

Chair Furth: And the height?

Mr. Sing: The what?

Chair Furth: The height? The minimum height for a loading space?

Mr. Sing: I'll have to check that, but it's...

Male?: [Off microphone and inaudible]

Chair Furth: Fifteen? Twelve?

Male?: [Off microphone and inaudible] Fifteen by 48 by 12, (inaudible).

Chair Furth: That's, a lot of trucks aren't going to get accommodated by that anyway. Or are they all under 12 feet, I just don't realize that?

Male?: [Off microphone] I think I got it wrong. It's 15 vertical and 12...

Chair Furth: I think so. Okay, 15 feet vertical, 12 feet by 45. I think Peter's point is well taken. Our loading zone standards seem to date back to a more suburban time when the typical commercial development was a building with a surface parking lot, higher ratio of asphalt to building. And this is a big building for this area, and it doesn't reasonably accommodate it. I'm satisfied by the analysis presented by the applicant and the staff, to say that an on-site parking space radically changes the building. I mean, basically it knocks it over from one side or the other. Which you could require if you decide that a waiver is not appropriate. But it's a fiction to think that we're going to get any loading zones out of this code. So, the question to staff is, if not, what's the proposal? We have surface parking lots, we have curb, but we're going to have to manage our street sides differently if we're no longer going to, if the redeveloped buildings are not longer going to have loading zones. I'm also in favor of trying instead to have somewhat smaller spaces within the surface parking lot that's enclosed by this building, that would accommodate some of the smaller vehicles that come in to do deliveries. I'm bothered by that bowing-out section of the building that narrows the access into the parking lot. I think that makes it unnecessarily difficult, both for the people who are bound to walk in and out that way, and for somewhat larger vehicles that are likely to use that space, and who would like to use that space. And I don't quite understand why it's there. With respect to the opening into the garage, I think the big problem... I vastly prefer what you're doing now to what existed, but I think the challenge with these essentially two-lane width garage entrances is to have them not look menacing, gaping, unattractive. And I think it can be addressed with paint, and with light. In some cases we do it with plants, but that's when they, you know, the first story is recessed. But I think this needs more work. LED lighting seems to give opportunities for really good illumination so that you don't look down into a dark... I realize that you're not looking down on this one, but you don't look back into a dark cavern. You can see all the way. And I think with paint and light, and for all I know, design details, you can do that, but I think it needs to be done, and should be done. Because one of the things that makes walking along a sidewalk less appealing is this sense of this dark, unknown space adjacent to it. Those are my thoughts. Anything I'm concerned about I think can be referred to a subcommittee, but I did not take notes on everybody's concerns, except to note there were some concerns about lighting. Would somebody like to make a motion?

Board Member Lew: At the last... I just wanted to follow up on the discussion about the loading zone. I think at the last meeting, I mentioned what San Francisco does. On a street similar to Cambridge, on the first, the first two spaces on the block are yellow loading zones. There are two because that way a truck can fit into them. And that's only at certain times -- in the morning, when they're doing deliveries. At other periods of time when there really aren't very many deliveries, those spaces are just regular metered spaces that the public can use. I think that that's a smart way of doing curb management, where you don't really have... You don't have a lot of space. And you really don't want every... Does every building need to have its own loading zone? No. Sharing it where possible, and using it when it's not needed, is, to me, the smart way of doing it.

Chair Furth: Smart curbs for the smart buildings.

Board Member Lew: Yes. And then, I found the cut sheets, so, thank you for that. I found them in the set, so I retract my statement about that.

Board Member Hirsch: I have one other comment.

Chair Furth: Yes, David?

Board Member Hirsch: Very minor, but you're using thinny-thin [phonetic] bricks on the outside here. Are they individual bricks or panels, by the way?



Mr. Castro: They're individual bricks.

Board Member Hirsch: Individual bricks, okay.

Chair Furth: Could you address your comments to the mic?

Mr. Castro: Sorry. They are individual bricks. They are actually laid into the equivalent of a stucco construction, and then they are mortared. They're going to be hand-applied.

Board Member Hirsch: I would just suggest, very minor, but I like, of course, the corbeling around the front, but couldn't you double that on the higher spaces when you come to the roof level? Just give it a little more heft at the top of that building. Consider that.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, what was the first...? They're what bricks? I didn't understand the first word you used.

Mr. Castro: Face bricks. They are face bricks...

Chair Furth: Got it.

Mr. Castro: ...that are put onto a backing of stucco.

Chair Furth: I heard it visual, and it was going to...

Mr. Castro: Okay.

Chair Furth: Brick veneer.

Board Member Thompson: I think also, just really briefly... This is Board Member...

Chair Furth: Sorry, Osma, I'm having trouble hearing you.

Board Member Thompson: Oh. I just wanted to echo agreement on the loading curb idea. Also echo agreement about the structural post that Board Member Baltay noted. I did see it, and it would be nice to have that coordinated so it's not sticking out. I also echo Board Member Hirsch's note about operable windows, allowing air in, and automatic roller shades. It is a south-facing façade, and while you have, you know, nice recess on your windows, I think that would help greatly. And I'll also echo straightening up the driveway, just relocating that backflow preventer. Yeah, those are the notes I took.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Would somebody like to make a motion?

Board Member Hirsch: Can I do the first one? Can it be my first?

Vice Chair Baltay: Go for it, David.

Chair Furth: Prepare for amendments.

Board Member Hirsch: I propose that the ARB approve this project.

Chair Furth: Recommend approval.

Board Member Hirsch: Recommend approval.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to add to that, if I may, a friendly amendment.

Board Member Lew: We need a second, second it first, then we can add to it.

Vice Chair Baltay: I second the motion.

Chair Furth: Any further discussion?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to add to my second a few conditions of approval. I'd like to have the structural posts on the California Avenue frontage to be aligned with the visual structural alignment of the building. Secondly, I'd like to see the drive aisle be straightened out by removing the notch in the retail portion of the building, and having the backflow valves located at the back side of the property someplace. And then, I agree that we should request some sort of automatic window shade system on the top two floors of the building, at the back. That's number three. What was...?

Board Member Thompson: Operable windows?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, you're going to have to make that one.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Those are my additions.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Vice Chair Baltay: Oh, yes, and that the parking entrance lighting and paint colors... You want that consent calendar, or just have it reviewed?

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Vice Chair Baltay: Be sent back to subcommittee for final approval. Is that necessary?

Chair Furth: Or just staff. Staff's fine with me. Staff, does that concept make sense to you? Staff is indicating they feel confident they could get the desired result.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, so, the paint colors and lighting at the automobile entrance to the parking be reviewed by staff, to meet Chair Furth's comments.

Board Member Hirsch: What about (inaudible) cellar?

Vice Chair Baltay: There's no cellar, David.

Board Member Hirsch: No?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, there's no cellar.

Chair Furth: Surface area.

Board Member Lew: Benches.

Chair Furth: Benches.

Vice Chair Baltay: And then, that permanent benches with arms be proposed along...

Chair Furth: Provided.

Vice Chair Baltay: Provided on the sidewalk.

Chair Furth: Or on the California Avenue frontage.

Vice Chair Baltay: On the California Avenue frontage.

Chair Furth: Sorry, Cambridge.

Vice Chair Baltay: Cambridge. I keep saying California. It's Cambridge Avenue frontage.

Chair Furth: You didn't say Oxford.

Vice Chair Baltay: And lastly, that operable windows be investigated by the applicant if...

Chair Furth: And used if feasible?

Vice Chair Baltay: And used if feasible. You okay with that?

Board Member Thompson: Sure. Yeah, that's fine.

Vice Chair Baltay: Used if feasible.

Mr. Sing: One clarification. Sorry. For the backflow preventers, on page 12 and 13 of the plan set, there's an Option 2 that's indicated. It's on the opposite side of the building. Would that be acceptable.

Vice Chair Baltay: No. I'm afraid the backflow valves really need to be not next to the driveway or not in the café. We're talking about some place at the back side of the building.

Ms. Gerhardt: I just... I don't know that that is 100 percent possible. We need to speak with Utilities and Fire to see where those can be located.

Vice Chair Baltay: Then I would, what I would say is, to that restriction, if it's not possible, then it should come back to a subcommittee for approval.

Chair Furth: Alex, (inaudible).

Board Member Lew: Yes. I had a comment about the findings.

Chair Furth: Okay, well, let's see if David accepts those friendly amendments.

Board Member Hirsch: I accept.

Chair Furth: All right, so, we have a motion and a second, and a group of friendly amendments accepted. Discussion? Alex, you had a comment about the findings as presented in the staff report?

Board Member Lew: I previously mentioned that to staff.

Chair Furth: Well, if we're going to make a change, we should make a change. What's the comment?

Board Member Lew: Under Finding #2, I would add that there is a new setback along the rear, and planting, where there is currently a zero setback to a blank concrete wall.

Chair Furth: Thereby enhancing living conditions and providing a more harmonious transition? Thank you. Anything else before we vote. Okay. Motion by Board Member Hirsch, second by Vice Chair Baltay, as previously stated. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed? Hearing none, it passes unanimously.

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

Chair Furth: Thank you very much to you, the applicant, to the staff, and to the public speakers who came to address this, as well. This now goes to the Director of Planning and Community Environment to make a decision. Thanks. Just as a reminder, we have no study session today. We are not going to approve minutes because they are not ready. I'm going to recuse myself and not participate in public hearing item number 4, Crown Castle/Verizon Cluster 3, Downtown North, because I live in Downtown North. I will turn it over to Vice Chair Baltay. You want a five-minute break?

[The Board took a short break.]

[Chair Furth recused herself and left the room]

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, back in session. Chair Furth has excused herself. I'll be chairing the last item here.

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. Crown Castle/Verizon Cluster 3, Downtown North Multiple Addresses [17PLN-00450 File Uses 250 Hamilton Address]: Request by Sure Site (on behalf of Crown Castle to Lease to Verizon) for Six Small Cell Node Tier 3 Wireless Communication Facility Permits Poles in the Public Right of Way on Six (6) Wood Utility Poles. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15303. Zoning of Node Locations is Public Facilities, Adjacent to These Zones: RM-30 (205 Everett/251 Emerson, 243 Hawthorne and 258 Waverley); RM-D (NP) 482 Everett and 301 Bryant; RM-15 (201 High). For further background information, please refer to the City's website under the project file number 17PLN-00450). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Rebecca Atkinson at [Rebecca.atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org](mailto:Rebecca.atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org).**

Vice Chair Baltay: It's item number 4, a quasi-judicial application by Crown Castle/Verizon Cluster 3, Downtown North, multiple areas. A request by Sure Site on behalf of Crown Castle to lease to Verizon for six small cell node Tier 3 wireless communication facility permits, poles in the right-of-way on six wood utility poles. Staff report, please.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes. Good morning, or is it good afternoon? Chief Planning Official Amy French. We're back today with Crown Castle Cluster 3, six wood pole small cell wireless communication nodes in Downtown North. This project is to expand 4G service with pole top antennas and equipment mounted to the sides of the existing poles. Verizon, the company that would lease the equipment from Crown Castle, seeks additional capacity and increased signal strength. Before we get into project specifics, I would like to note we forwarded public correspondence to the ARB yesterday by email. Rebecca just passed out additional public correspondence to ARB members at places. They're on the back table, as well. The City is tasked with making decisions on Tier 3 wireless node projects within a restricted timeline known as a shot clock, where a decision is due in short order. We are faced with a recent FCC order that will require a 60-day turnaround on these types of projects going forward. Our attorney, staff Albert Yang, is here with us today, and he can answer questions about the FCC legislation, and can provide a quick summary regarding the upcoming ordinance revisions. And then, I will resume the presentation on this specific project.

Albert Yang, City Attorney: Thanks, Amy. Albert Yang, Deputy City Attorney. Staff is currently working on an ordinance that responds to a recent FCC order. That order is being litigated by a number of municipalities, but the courts recently denied a request for the order to be stayed, so it is in effect now. It's likely to take some time before that litigation is resolved. Part of the big-picture vision in terms of bringing this ordinance is for the City to work with the carriers and try to develop a menu of design options that we can then use to avoid having all these case-by-case projects come to the Board. I'm sure we will be providing updates on that as it progresses.

Ms. French: Resuming now. All six small cell wireless communication nodes are next to residential structures in the Cluster 3 proposal. Here are the node numbers, pole numbers, and addresses on the screen, abutting the red way [phonetic] where the poles are located. Next. After the staff and applicant presentations, the ARB will take public testimony if there is anyone here from the public, and will be able to then consider the proposed approval of the six nodes. Packet pages 263 to 264 provide bulleted considerations for the ARB's discussion. Please note the City municipal code provides 11 wireless communication facility permit development standards, and a recommendation from the ARB is to be based on the six architectural review approval findings. In addition, the Planning and Community Environment Director must be able to make the two conditional use permit approval findings as well before approving the project. And then, staff is tasked with preparing conditions of approval to go along with the ARB recommendation and the Director's decision. On the screen are two recently-submitted visual simulations of Crown's equipment. The one on the left is the bare equipment painted, without a shroud. On the right is a shroud. In other words, a piece of metal that goes around the equipment, and there is space between the metal and the equipment. Staff hasn't received plans that correspond with the shroud. Now on the screen are six questions that staff has regarding the recent visual sim. We note the Planning Director will not be able to act on design until staff can perform a code compliance review of the equipment orientation, and to ensure safety. Now, we have proposed amenity trees on three nodes, and possibly one more, depending on feasibility. We note these tree opportunities on packet pages 255 to 258. We have orientation concerns for this equipment noted on packet pages 263 to 264. The findings of the City's consultant, CTC, are up on the screen. We can come back to those if you would like, later. Now, the existing wood pole for Node 20 is on the screen, without the proposed antenna and equipment. Just as-is today. The applicant will actually be showing the photo sims of each of the nodes. Staff believes a better screen tree is possible at this site to help with the screening. Then, now, Node 21m1, which is also another place where we imagine a street tree could be helpful. Next, we have Node 22m2. We have, yeah, another street is a possibility here, so, improving the tree coverage and screening. Then, Node 23 would be removing that transfer pole, the extra pole there. That would be a condition of approval. It's not needed. And Node 24, we would also condition to remove the transfer pole. We also think the holly oak that is there is rather small. It could be replaced with a more robust tree. Node 32. There isn't any room for a new tree because of the existing utility boxes there in the planting strip. Now, these drawings next up are images from the CTC consultant report that showed pole-top mounting and side mounting of equipment. The Board had previously recommended that all facilities be vaulted, but this has not been feasible in the past, and the CTC report does not include that vaulting has become any easier in the past year. As a result, if the Board is unable to make findings to recommend the proposed design, staff seeks Board input on the pole top alternative. The applicant and staff kind of disagree on whether the pole top design is a feasible alternative. We have our final slide. This provides the next steps and staff contact information. We'll let the applicant make their presentation, unless the Board has questions of staff.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, Amy. Before that, I'd like to make sure, if there are any disclosures to be made. I will disclose that I visited the site several times over the past few weeks. Anybody else?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site yesterday.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I visited the site partially. Not all of it, but partially.

Board Member Thompson: I haven't had a chance to go last week.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. Then we have a staff, an applicant presentation. You have 10 minutes. Please spell your name for us.

Rochelle Swanson, Sure Site Consulting: [spells name]. I'm the government relations consultant for Crown Castle. Thank you again for having us, and good afternoon. I do want to show, as before, I've brought the team so that you can ask direct questions of the subject matter experts. We have Ernesto Figarolo, [phonetic], who is our RF engineer. We have Todd Threw, who is our A&E designer, who will be speaking, I imagine, quite a bit about orientation, what the limitations can be with GO 95. We also have

the construction manager, Dick Stoddard, and our PM is VJ Ridavari [phonetic]. Our manager of government affairs is Sharon James [phonetic], and our legal counsel, Michael Shonafelt. As staff had noted we did provide some updated sims. We took advantage of the fact that the item was continued because the last time was so late in December, and I know that those previous sims were a little dark and hard to read. I apologize that it took kind of up to the last minute to actually get them all turned around, but I'm hoping that it will actually make it easier to be able to render a decision today. I do want to just remind everybody that Crown Castle is a C-lec [phonetic], which means that we qualify to be a public utility, and that, therefore, have special status in the public right-of-way. I'm a little bit different from a carrier, so while it is true that the intended tenant is Verizon Wireless, Crown is a C-lec and a separate entity. I also did want to note that I reviewed the packet of the community comments and the preponderance of them was really to other projects and not this one here in particular. And, some concern over the new FCC order, which is understandable. I know most cities and counties are very curious to see what's going to happen with that, as that's been moved back into the 9th Circuit. The reason, as before, same with the other clusters, is this is a coverage and capacity issue. As more and more people are using their phones for data, voice, it requires, of course, more facilities. And so, while it's true somebody may see four bars on their phone, it doesn't mean that they actually will be able to hold and carry a call, or especially download data. What we're really seeing now are more capacity than what used to be coverage. I won't belabor too much the fact that everybody has a phone. And I apologize... I'm sorry. I thought staff was moving this along. I forgot. As mentioned before, we do have updated sims. What I've done is I've put each one up here, so that with their specific questions, both Todd and Dick can come up and answer specific questions. There are two options. The first one is having the radio equipment on its own, painted, as Amy has said. The other one is to do a shroud because I know that that has also been raised as a preferred design. I know sometimes in other jurisdictions, when comparing the two, they actually see that the equipment just painted is a little bit smaller footprint. I wanted to make sure all of you had the opportunity to see them side by side. On this little slide here, it was handed out to you as the GO 95, which is General Order 95, which prescribes safety and distances that are required when mounting equipment on utility poles. And it doesn't just apply to wireless. This applies to anybody doing that. This close-up here is reflective of the simulations that are within your packet, within the drawings, where it does show the connectivity there between the shroud and the top of the pole. Under GO 95, that's required to be visible for inspection. I will let Todd speak to that a little bit more. And then, following there are all six nodes and the equipment, as you can see, like I said, either outside with it being painted, or with there being a shroud. And I know there is some concern from staff on orientation, and as noted in the handout that I know Rebecca gave you on GO 95, you can see the limitations of where those are located. I certainly understand the need for aesthetic impacts. There are safety requirements that dictate where the equipment can face on certain poles. And then, I will just quickly hit this. Really, what we're looking for is feedback from you as to the preference on the equipment being located within a shroud or without the shroud. I will let Todd go ahead and come up and quickly talk about GO 95 and what the limitations are for some of the equipment orientation, as well the covering of the shrouds. While it does show the photo sims it can come down and cover that equipment, that's not compliant necessarily with the state law, as well as the general order from the CPUC. Todd, if you want to come up.

Todd Threw, Costal Communications: Good afternoon, Board members. I kind of wanted to say "this morning" as well, but that was more of a preference, you could say.

Vice Chair Baltay: If you could state and spell your name.

Mr. Threw: Absolutely. This is Todd Threw [spells name], from Coastal Communications. We are the design firm for Crown Castle on this project. As Rochelle was stating, the orientation of the equipment on the pole, there are different aspects that go into that. One is order GO 95, that states... It basically controls climbing space for access to the pole for anyone working on the pole. It needs to allow quadrants that are open. We also take into consideration safety factors. Not having the equipment out over the street, which would put anyone on, working on the pole to be in an unsafe work environment with vehicles coming down. We try as much as possible to not have them facing the homes as well, so, instead, putting them away from traffic where somebody would be working on the project. I believe on

each one of these -- are we scrolling through? Scrolling through -- on this instance where... Is this 20 right here? This is 20. We have called for the equipment to be on this position here, basically over this bush. Oncoming traffic would then not be an issue with safety for the, anybody working on the pole, away from traffic, out on the street, and away from the home, not facing directly towards the residence. As you can see, as Rochelle was pointing out, the two different types of equipment configurations, whether completely shrouded, bulkier box, but all enclosed, or without and all painted. This site, as well, we're able to put the equipment, again, basically over the shrub area on the side of the pole. Again, same configuration as 20. This is site 21, where it is away from the oncoming traffic to provide safety.

Female??: (inaudible)

Mr. Threw: Absolutely. As Rochelle was stating, with the pole shroud, where in the designs that you see in your design packet, we left a gap that shows the mounting bracket to the pole. That's for the visual inspection that the state requires, the California Public Utility Commission requires for visual inspections on an annual basis, to be able to, to make sure that everything is safely adhered to. By completely covering up that bracket, as was put into the sims basically as a request of staff members here at the City, to be able to give that representation, but what that does do is it prevents that visual inspection, which is a safety factor and would prove to be a liability. The shroud itself is 72 inches long. It's six foot tall by 24.5, 24 1/2 inches wide, and it is, proves to be a... All equipment can be enclosed in it, but at the same time, it is a bulkier situation. You know, the equipment without the shroud is an eight-foot-long configuration to be able to maintain the clearances as proposed. It is a longer overall design, but it is more, from a visual standpoint, a cleaner look. On this site here, again, we are proposing to place it away from traffic. It would be facing toward down the street, away from traffic, and again, not over the street, and adhering to the clearances for GO 95 for climbing space. As Rochelle pointed out, this pole, the transfer pole, I think, that was stated by Amy, is one where when the City replaced the existing pole, they did not have an opportunity to remove the old pole. I believe that probably the phone company has not done their transfer yet. That would come out; the equipment would be on the new pole. In this instance, this is one where we would be facing on this side of the pole, towards oncoming traffic, because of the restrictions on how the cables are all attached to it, the phone cables, the risers brackets. We are not able to put it on any of the other quadrants that we have in the previous sites. Again, on this site, it would be the same instance where the City has a pole that they would be removing. We would be placing it on a quadrant that would be on the side.

Vice Chair Baltay: If you could take 30 seconds to finish up, please, I'd appreciate it.

Mr. Threw: Absolutely. Pole number... The last site is the one site where we do have it facing towards the home because of the risers in question that are coming down the pole, because of the attachments on the pole, that there is no other quadrant where we could attach.

Vice Chair Baltay: Finished?

Mr. Threw: Thank you, Board members. Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. At this point, I'd like to open the meeting to any public comments or testimony. Do we have any speakers? Seeing no speakers, we'll close the meeting for public comments and testimony and bring it back to the Board. Do we have any questions for staff or the applicant? Osma.

Board Member Thompson: You were mentioning that there was something that had to be visible for safety. Is that depicted in these drawings, this thing that would have to be visible? Or is that something that we have to imagine would be visible?

Mr. Threw: If you look at the site that's up on the board right now, we show the bracket as it comes down to the pole.

Ms. Swanson: And it's also in every site in your plan set drawings. The photo sims that were actually included in the plan set itself shows that, that bracket as it reflects the design.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so, it would be the shroud, and then there would be a band that's kind of white and black?

Mr. Threw: Right. It can be painted to match the pole. It can be painted the color that you want. But if you see the bracket that comes down from the shroud, that's actually the attachment to the pole itself. That's what needs to be visible for a visual inspection from the ground level.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. All right. That was my question. Thanks.

Vice Chair Baltay: David.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. I have a question for staff. Has the CTC [Columbia Telecommunications Corporation] report been passed on to the consultants here? The applicant?

Rebecca Atkinson, Planner: Yes, it has.

Board Member Hirsch: It has? In December, or when was that done? We received it in December.

Ms. Atkinson: All at the same time.

Board Member Hirsch: Same time as we received it.

Ms. Atkinson: Yeah, yeah. Everybody has received it.

Board Member Hirsch: You are aware of what the planning consultant submitted to your...?

Ms. Swanson: You're referring to the CTC report?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Ms. Swanson: Correct, where they were looking at size, and that if it were smaller, it would require more sites...

Board Member Hirsch: okay.

Ms. Swanson: ...to... That's the part you were addressing, correct?

Board Member Hirsch: Uh-huh. Okay.

Ms. Swanson: Thank you, yeah, we did receive it.

Board Member Hirsch: Have we started board discussion, or no?

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex, any questions?

Board Member Lew: I have a question. I think this may be for staff. I think on previous wireless applications, I think staff has mentioned that you don't like equipment hanging over the sidewalks. In this particular one, like Node 32, it does. I was wondering, where does that concern come from?

Ms. Atkinson: The concern regarding sidewalk...?



Board Member Lew: Of having equipment overhanging the sidewalk. Is that really a visual concern of the City's, or is...? I'm just trying to figure out where, what is the root of that previous comment.

Ms. Atkinson: Generally, it comes from a couple different places, including Comprehensive Plan policies to, you know, enhance the site. Also, in regard to street scape design coherency, and so forth. In some instances, bicycles are allowed to ride on sidewalks, and in general, narrow sidewalks. It leads to a more compressed and enclosed environment.

Board Member Lew: Thank you.

Vice Chair Baltay: I also would like to clarify a couple of things with staff, I guess. We have quite a few pieces of information that have been and are being given to us. I want to understand quite clearly what the application actually is. We have a packet of design materials that was provided a few weeks ago. It's the formal submission. And then, there are a number of photo simulations that seem to go with that. Are they same design, just different renderings of it? Or are there changes to the design in the photo simulations? And if so, how are we supposed to evaluate that?

Ms. Atkinson: The presentation, the project plans, and the project description, and all of those things that were sent with your packets for this meeting were also sent for your original December 6th meeting. All of that is the same. On January 8th, staff received updated visual simulations as described by the applicant team in their presentation. Correct. There was a cover memo saying that they analysis of these visual simulations is not included in the staff report, and that we would have remarks subsequent to that. We have received a question from ARB members, in which case we provided a staff response, which is in the correspondence before you, where we're acknowledging that staff found inconsistencies, and so did the applicant. The applicant provided additional updated visual sims, further updated visual sims on a couple of the nodes. And I think that the overall... I guess the point that staff was receiving from these visual simulations was that the applicant was showing that there was a possibility of having equipment shroud. It wasn't demonstrating what orientation it would be on any one particular, you know, but just the, the simple takeaway was just that the equipment could be shrouded. That was the basic takeaway. There wasn't any accompanying plan set, nor could we do any kind of co-compliance on the visual sims.

Vice Chair Baltay: Are we then fair to assume that what we're reviewing here is not entirely defined? It's not clear whether, at least in the application, it's shrouded or not, or what orientation on the pole these, the equipment is amounted. Is that...? I'm just trying to understand clearly so we know what we're voting on.

Ms. Atkinson: It's staff's understanding that the action or recommendation today would be on the project plans and project description as sent, as you saw on December 6th, as well as, you know, again, in your packet for this meeting. The project plans are, you know, reviewable, and staff provided the, you know, the topics of draft conditions, including in regard to equipment orientation, horizontal and vertical clearances for safety, and other aesthetics, and amenity trees, and so forth. So, the basis of a recommendation would be upon the orientations and so forth, and the project plans.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. And then, for the applicant, please. There have been a number of suggestions made throughout the community that the equipment could either be mounted in vaults underground, or be mounted on top of the pole, concealed in the same shroud that the antenna is concealed in. Can you address whether those are feasible? Because I notice that you do not put those in any of your applications.

Ms. Swanson: I'm actually going to let my designer and construction person (inaudible) something you guys want to be able to weigh in on, on the size for feasibility. What we proposed is what we feel is feasible.

Michael Shonafelt, Attorney, Crown Castle: Good afternoon, members of the Board. Michael Shonafelt. I'm legal counsel for Crown Castle. And it's more of a technical question you ask, but it might help to

have a bit of legal backdrop on this as well. Yeah, those two avenues are foreclosed under, as infeasible vaulting for a myriad of reasons that Todd can probably explain from the technical perspective. Also, with respect to the pole-mounted radios at the top, those are, by necessity, a smaller radio. I think it's an Ericsson 2203, if I am correct. The smaller radio does not allow for the same reach of the RF signal, and it also requires a dropping of a band of service. Really, what happens, roughly speaking, is you're reducing your RF coverage by almost half. We've been taking the position we did with the Director's decision on Cluster 2, that the requirement of those radios, yes, it produces a smaller form factor, but it also has a commensurate reduction in our ability to achieve the RF signals. It kind of amounts to a prohibition of service, and that is a term of art in the law, under the Telecom Act of 1996, that local regulations cannot result in a prohibition of service. But we consider that to be a prohibition. Roughly, when you reduce the size of the radios by that size, you're also requiring almost double the amount of nodes to achieve the same footprint. You're actually, ultimately, having a proliferation of vertical elements and nodes in cities when this happens. We are looking at the pole-mounted equipment as the viable option, and that's sort of the legal backdrop. It's kind of a technical and legal question.

Vice Chair Baltay: I hope you can appreciate, that was a technical question, not a legal one. I'm asking if it's feasible to put vaults in the ground, or if it's feasible to put radios on top of the poles.

Mr. Shonafelt: We can speak to that [crosstalk] ...

Vice Chair Baltay: The answer I'm hearing you tell me is that the radios on top of the poles would have less range...

Mr. Shonafelt: Right.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...therefore, you would need more of them.

Mr. Shonafelt: Correct.

Vice Chair Baltay: And regarding the vaults?

Mr. Shonafelt: Todd can speak to some of the vault issues, But... Yeah, go ahead.

Mr. Threw: Absolutely. The issue with vaulting the equipment would be the existing utilities would be underground, whether it be water, water laterals, sewer, sewer laterals, tree, tree roots -- Everything that would be impacted by that, for the excavation needed to place the vault for the equipment that would be planned.

Vice Chair Baltay: And if I could ask, how many times have you explored vaulting this type of equipment, either here or in other communities? Has it been done before?

Mr. Threw: Explored before, yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Has it been installed before by your company?

Mr. Threw: By Crown Castle? There have been some, yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. Well, thank you. That's my question for you. I'd like to bring it back to the Board, then. To my colleagues on the Board, I'd like to try to focus our discussion. It seems to me that the fact that we have antennas mounted on top of the poles concealed by a shroud is something that we can agree on. It seems to me that the location of these poles is something that we don't have a whole lot to discuss. Rather, the issue, I believe, is regarding the pole-mounted equipment, whether it's concealed by a shroud or not, whether it's painted, how it's oriented, or even whether we want pole-mounted equipment. If I can get consensus that that is the question, I'd like to discuss that question. Osma, what do you think?

Board Member Thompson: I was going to say, I think the antenna also is up for question, as well, at least on my end, given that we've seen smaller options, and also given that what is visual here versus what we have in our packet is not one and one. Even if what we're looking at on the screen is painted, it won't look like what's in these visual simulations. Or at least I'm not convinced that's the case.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm just trying to get us focused on what I think the real issue is, and it seems to me that all of these applications have an antenna mounted on top of the pole. I just want to see if we're all on board with that basic concept. Alex, do you have any sense about that? Just to focus on that first.

Board Member Lew: I think I'm with you here on this one. I think we've gone through the antenna a lot on the, like, on the Vinculum one. I think staff gave us three different options, as I recall, on how the pole top antenna, you know, the options for that. I don't know, I think we've gone through that before, so I'm comfortable with where it is.

Vice Chair Baltay: David, what's your take on it?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, as I mentioned before, I went back to review the CTC comments that they made considering a micro cell system, versus the one that's being proposed, which would have a much, much smaller antenna and extremely smaller other pole-mounted equipment. I asked staff if this, if this consultant -- or actually applicant -- had reviewed that, and I'm sort of understanding that the legal response was just made on that system. I think it... Let me just answer your question. I think, therefore, it is important for us to review that possibility, as well.

Vice Chair Baltay: But, to be clear, that's still... Equipment or antennas mounted on top of the pole.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, but it's a different size...

Vice Chair Baltay: Different size. Very well.

Board Member Hirsch: [crosstalk]

Vice Chair Baltay: And then, does anybody have questions or concerns regarding the actual poles that have been selected? There are six poles proposed throughout the community. Is there any dispute about the location or selection of those exact poles?

Board Member Hirsch: Again, I have some questions because they don't have, as was sort of advertised by the company, they don't have tree, locations where they are really shaded by trees, or obscured by trees. Some of them are quite open.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Peter, to answer your question, I do have concerns about Node 32, which is the one on High Street. That's just because the radios would be overhanging the sidewalk.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, so, as I see it, the issue is one of pole-mounted equipment, primarily. Even, Alex, your comment here, the reason you're concerned about the location is because of the pole-mounted equipment. I'd like to put it out there front in center for myself that I don't think we should allow pole-mounted equipment. I don't think we can make Architectural Review Finding 2e. regarding "to enhance the general environment of the community." I want to throw that out there to my board members, and then we'll start a discussion on whether you buy that, or whether you think we should try to find changes that make pole-mounted equipment work. Osma, why don't you start?

Board Member Thompson: With that on its own, I think the pole-mounted equipment as we've seen it, I'm with you on that. The option that we saw with staff where it's connected to the antenna, where the equipment is mounted on the pole but it's in the shroud of the antenna, I wouldn't be opposed to that

necessarily because it seems to have a bit more of a cohesive look. But the pole-mounted equipment that we've seen so far, the items that stick out that are sort of in the middle of the pole, I agree that it does not meet Finding 2e.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex?

Board Member Lew: I actually, I kind of disagree. I think that there are, some of the locations are better than others. But, I think that there are places that have enough screening where pole-mounted equipment is feasible. I would just say, as an example is the 22m2, which is the one on Bryant Court facing the park. There's existing pittosporum and existing magnolia trees, and those are both evergreen plants. I think that those help obscure the equipment. There are other locations, however, where they are really minimal, there's minimal landscaping, or the trees are deciduous and the equipment is much more visible. I would say that, yeah, the 22m2 that has the evergreen trees. And also... Which is the one with the oak tree? Is that 24?

Vice Chair Baltay: Let's try to be [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: Hawthorne? There's one on Hawthorne that has an evergreen tree as well.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex, I'm hearing you say that...

Board Member Lew: Here, it's 23. 22m2 is the one on Bryant Court, or Bryant Lane, and there's a magnolia. Twenty-23 on Hawthorne, and there's a big oak tree. I'm comfortable with those two. The other ones, I have some reservations about, but it seems to me the, like, the worst one, the one that has no screening, is 20. And 21m1. There's a small deciduous tree, so it's fairly exposed.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay. David?

Board Member Hirsch: The reason I referred to the CTC recommendations for us to consider, or for the City to consider, is that the antenna is reduced in size significantly. Some parts of the transmittal machinery can be located in the upper portion of the pole. And I would probably agree with this consultant or this applicant that it will be very difficult because of the limitation of the run of the connectors to have successful use of any vaults in the street. I think one way or another, very few of the poles will be able to use the vaults for locating their equipment. This was one of the major concerns of a lot of the letters that we received about the system, is that they said put it in the street, and I think that's just going to be impractical. If you consider all of the recommendations of the CTC report, you get reduced RF emissions from this site; higher data throughput capability; greater compatibility with 5G architecture deployment strategies. With those improvements, I don't know why... And especially because the actual transmitters on the poles will be significantly reduced. I think that if you showed this committee that kind of a system, you would probably not even get any objection to where the location of those transmitters were on the pole. They are so reduced in size. It is the transmitters, in fact, either in a shroud or not in a shroud, that the location where they are, that's really the major concern here in the city. You can eliminate the issue of vaults and just understand the aesthetics -- which is what we deal with here -- will be so radically improved if you changed your system. Now, okay, it means you have to add additional locations with a smaller portion of these elements. I'd like to know why that's not reasonable.

Vice Chair Baltay: David, I'm trying to keep us focused, not on telling them what to do, but rather...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... We have an application in front of us which has pole-mounted equipment 10, 15 feet above the poles at six locations. How do you feel about that equipment as presented?

Board Member Hirsch: As presented, I... As presented, I don't accept that. And the last meeting, the same was true. At eight feet above ground level, they are there because you have interference at other areas, I gather. You can't put it anywhere else. You tell us that there's a maintenance issue here, and I don't really accept that. Usually you can locate them almost anywhere and go up in a lift and that becomes your way of repairing them, so they could be higher. Except they can't be higher now because you'll have interference with other lines on the pole, or there's no dimension that will allow for them to be moved up. I think the technology is there for doing a better job on this city, to locate more of them throughout neighborhoods where they will be less seen.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. What I'm hearing is that at least three members of the Board are not in favor of pole-mounted equipment due to Finding 2e. Alex, is there any way to get you on board with us?

Board Member Lew: Based on my understanding from previous cell phone projects. I would say no. My understanding, we're not supposed to be changing the technology that they've selected, so if we have the CTC report, that's fine, the City can ask for it. But I'm not going to make any recommendations on that.

Vice Chair Baltay: I don't think we're trying to recommend how to do what they want to do. I just want to make a clear statement about the pole-mounted equipment, which is what's in front of us in this package.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: And what I've heard you say is in four cases out of six, you also have concerns about it, but in two of them, you don't.

Board Member Lew: Yes. I think my, my split with the rest of the Board is that you guys have said no pole-mounted equipment anywhere, and that's not my position. My position is it can work in locations where there's screening. It's just a difference that I have on this. And I think the Council has been clear as well on their position on this.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to ask the rest of the Board, then. Do we want to concur with Alex, in the sense that under conditions -- for example, with good landscape screening -- pole-mounted equipment should be considered? Or should we be categorical about it, that it's not? I'm trying to get us to speak with a voice, to come back to the staff with a clear recommendation, and this is sort of what the issue is coming down to. Osma, what do you think about Alex's take on it?

Board Member Thompson: I think I might just disagree, in the sense that if there is a better design out there that is better suited for this application, regardless of if there is screening or not, I would be in favor of a better design, rather than potentially a clunkier design that had screening.

Vice Chair Baltay: David?

Board Member Hirsch: No, I'm pretty firm. I think there's legal issues here, too, so, I would really like to know if there's time on the shot clock to ask the additional proposal. When is the shot...? You know, this is separate from what you're asking me. What is the legal status of this project?

Mr. Yang: The City has a shot clock that expires in early March. We can always seek additional time, but the applicant must agree to that. I guess I'd like to also just address one comment that Board Member Lew made, which was about whether or not the City or this Board should be dictating equipment. That's not what we are looking to do here, but it is certainly within the Board's purview to comment on design and size, which I think many of the comments have been directed at.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, now, as I say, I'm pretty firm about it. I don't think that... I mean, I've seen this kind of equipment in other neighborhoods as well. I don't find it acceptable on any... Even though I know the applicant here has tried hard to find good locations or workable locations, it's not good enough. The equipment is simply not attractive on street poles. The street poles, which are quite high in Palo Alto, are already an eyesore. Most upscale communities put them underground. I'm not saying that we should have that all over. It's unfortunate the City can't put, can't relocate everything underground there, all of the electrical services. But it's not going to happen, so I think it's up to the applicant here to find a better solution. And I think they might be out there, technically they're out there, and if it required us using more poles where there is less material on it, then it's something we should be considering.

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Baltay: So, then, to my colleagues. We're left with the choice of just recommending denial, or trying to recommend approval with a condition that does not allow pole-mounted equipment. At the last meeting, we tried to figure those, that verbiage out and weren't successful. Does anybody have any ideas how we could recommend approval but still require that, with the condition that the equipment not be pole-mounted? Hearing that nobody has an idea, I recommend that we... I move that we recommend denial of this project as presented.

Board Member Thompson: I'll second.

Board Member Hirsch: I'll second. Oh.

Board Member Thompson: Oh. Beat you to it, David.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to address that motion, then, since I just made it. I think there are ways that this could be achieved with the equipment mounted elsewhere than on the pole, but we don't know enough of how to put that out there, and we don't want to be in the position of telling you what to do. The Board is concluding that the package as presented to us does not meet the Architectural Review Board Finding 2e in particular, regarding the aesthetics of pole-mounted equipment. For that...

Ms. Swanson: May I ask you a question, Chair Baltay?

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure.

Ms. Swanson: I wanted to clarify something, Board Member Hirsch, is that we received the CTC report the morning of the last time we were here, December 6th. That's why you're not going to see anything reflected in, that's based on that. And because of the proliferation of the poles. When you're talking about the non-pole-mounted, I know when we were here before on another application, we had some pretty specific direction about it all being on the top of the pole, and what that would look like. And I recall, you were very open to the creativity of being able to move, like, the mailbox, over across the street. So, I appreciate the not being able, you know, giving us, you know, commandment and direction, and wanting a better design. We concur with staff about additional landscaping and trees where appropriate. Node 32 can go up to 9 feet, if it's the 8 feet that concerns you. That is a very limited orientation on that particular pole because of climbing space and risers that are coming up and not facing the street. I understand what you're saying, is even with elongated, smaller radio equipment just being painted, you still feel like that...

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm sorry to cut you off, but we don't want to keep talk... We've been talking about this for months.

[crosstalk]

Ms. Swanson: I'm sorry, I was [crosstalk].

Vice Chair Baltay: The position of the Board at this point is that pole-mounted equipment does not meet the architectural review findings.

Ms. Swanson: Okay. Just... period. Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Okay, let's call that to a vote then. All those in favor, aye? Opposed? Abstains? Okay, the motion carries 3 to 1.

**MOTION TO DENY PASSES 3-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER LEW VOTING IN OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION.**

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Ms. Swanson: Thank you.

**Study Session**

**Approval of Minutes - Not approved due to production delays.**

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

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

Vice Chair Baltay: Seeing that we have no minutes to review, and there's no further business, I close this meeting of the Architectural Review Board.

**Subcommittee Items**

- 7. 4115 El Camino Real [17PLN-00280]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes and Clarifications Regarding Details, Security, and Maintenance. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Section 15061(b)(3) That the Project is not Subject to CEQA Because the Proposed Revisions Will not Have a Significant Effect on the Environment. Zoning Districts: CN (Neighborhood Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us**

Vice Chair Baltay: We do have a subcommittee hearing, which will take place after the meeting is closed. Thank you.

**Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements - not addressed.**

**Adjournment**



# Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Review

---

TO: Mircea Voskerician, 572 Chimalus Drive, Palo Alto CA 94306  
SUBJECT: 4115 El Camino Real [17PLN-00280]  
DATE: January 23, 2019  
FROM: Sheldon S. Ah Sing, AICP, Consultant Planner

---

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE

---

The application, and plans dated January 7, 2019, was reviewed by the ARB Subcommittee on January 17, 2019 in accordance with condition of approval #4, as stated below.

ARB SUB-COMMITTEE. The following items shall be reviewed by the ARB Subcommittee prior to approval of any demolition, grading or building permit issuance:

- a. Basement garage signage and security gates;
- b. Colors, materials and specifications for the project;
- c. Specify light pole heights;
- d. Describe the maintenance for the open space areas; and
- e. Provide enhancement of the blank left/west wall

At the meeting, the Subcommittee agreed with the revisions presented with no additional conditions added. It be noted that the Subcommittee agreed that no change is necessary for (e) and that (d) would be fully fleshed out during the tentative map process.

The applicant shall ensure these changes are incorporated into the design and this Subcommittee Review letter shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s).

*Copies sent to:*

Project File

Mircea Voskerician, 572 Chimalus Drive, Palo Alto CA 94306