



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: December 20, 2018  
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: ... regular meeting, and I think last meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto for 2018. Would the staff please call the roll?

[Roll Call]

Chair Furth: You will learn more about David Hirsch when you read the biography that he's going to post on our website, along with the rest of us, including Board Member Thompson. He is a native of Brooklyn, and he went west about seven years ago to settle here. He is an architect, has been one for 50 years, and we look forward to his participation. He's already been following architecture and development in the city closely over the past few years.

**Oral Communications**

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Furth: Agenda changes, additions and deletions? I would note for us all that we will get to the minutes this month because we haven't, and as a member of the public pointed out, when we don't approve them, they don't go up, and then they can't see what we did. And I apologize for letting those slide. And I plead long agendas in my defense. And we will not do a reorganization when we elect our new officers until our next meeting in January. We have to get our work done, if we're going to have a full complement here, by noon.

**City Official Reports**

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

Chair Furth: Any comments on the transmittal of the ARB meeting schedule, attendance record, and tentative future agendas?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Related to the schedule for January 10th, it looks like the... Let's see. We've got the electrification project, is definitely going forward. The Crown Castle, though -- and let me make sure because there's too many wireless projects. Crown Castle Cluster 3 that's on the 10th is actually also, that's the same action item number 2, and in all cases, that project is going to be on the January 17th agenda.

Chair Furth: January 17th will be new telecommunication facilities, and then, there is a new building, which we have seen once before, at 380 Cambridge Avenue, coming before us.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, and I believe 380 Cambridge is also delayed until January 17th. It looks like it might just be electrification at this point.

Chair Furth: Okay. Thank you. Sorry. All right.

## **Action Items**

- 2. 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: An Initial Study is Being Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). 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).**

Chair Furth: The first item on our agenda is actually a matter to be continued. This is a public hearing on Crown Castle/Verizon Cluster 3, downtown north, multiple addresses. We need a motion to continue this matter at the request of the applicant. Is this to a date certain?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. The day would be January 17th.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Could I have a motion to continue item 2 to January 17th?

Vice Chair Baltay: Move that we do so.

Chair Furth: Second from somebody?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Furth: Motion from Vice Chair Baltay, second from Board Member Lew, to continue this matter to January 17th. All those in favor say aye. Any opposition? Hearing none, it passes unanimously.

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

- 3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3200 El Camino Real [18PLN-00045] Recommendation on the Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition for the Existing 16,603 Square Foot Motel and Construction of a new Four-Story Approximately 53,599 Square Foot Hotel. The Applicant Also Requests a Zone Change to Remove the Existing 50 Foot Special Setback Along Hansen Way. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) is Circulating Between December 5, 2018 and January 4, 2019. Zoning District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at [sahsing@m-group.us](mailto:sahsing@m-group.us).**

Chair Furth: Okay, now we get to the (inaudible) hotel. Item number 3. This is a proposed major architecture review to allow the demolition of an existing 16,000 square foot motel and construction of a new four-story, approximately 54,000 square foot motel on the same site, which is 3200 El Camino Real. That's the corner of Hansen, is it? Staff? The applicant has also requested from the City Council a zone change to remove the existing 50-foot special setback along Hansen Way. We have an initial study on this, which I trust we've all reviewed. Before we hear our staff report, has everybody had an opportunity to visit the site?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Not in a while.

Board Member Lew: I visited the site two times previously but not this time.

Chair Furth: All of us with the exception of Board Member Thompson have been able to visit the site recently. Does anybody have any conversations, ex parte conversations to report? No one does. I beg your pardon? Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Yes and no. I don't know if it would be considered that at all. I received a call from Mr. Heilbronner the day after I found out, the evening before, that I was going to be a member of this committee. It was just a call that was requesting a meeting by me with the architect, to inform me about the project. I wrote him back, and I have a copy of this here to submit, and said that I knew nothing about it yet, but would be doing due diligence, and would probably not have an opportunity to meet with him prior to this meeting.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Staff, this does bring up collaterally the fact that after our workshop on ex parte communications, the City Attorney's office and staff are going to get back to us with further recommendations. Maybe the January light agenda meeting would be a good time to do that. Okay. Staff report, please.

Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Yes, thank you, good morning. Happy holidays, Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner. Welcome, Board Member Hirsch. Thanks for the introduction. I'm going to skip a slide there because you did a good job with the overview. But with the site characteristics, the subject property is within the CS Service Commercial District, surrounded by very similar-zoned property. The topography is flat. The surrounding also includes mostly low-intensity development, although there are some projects that have been approved quite recently and will be constructed in the future, or have been constructed, so it is in transition and changing. The image on the screen does show the street context of the hotel. This project has had some prior meetings with the City in the past. There was a preliminary board meeting back in 2015 for the project, as well as two pre-screening meetings with the council regarding the special setback and the elimination of that setback. Then there was another preliminary board meeting back in 2017, and then, the last board meeting was in October of this year. And just last week, the Planning and Transportation Commission did review the project, and specifically, they looked at the special setback elimination. Some issues identified by the Board included: To provide some sunscreen on the southern side of the building; converting some of the rooftop space -- or two balconies -- where there are views; also some elevations, adding some balconies; reducing the number of materials used at the café corner; ensure that the café is visually inviting; increasing the use of some native plants to the landscape palette; and reducing the visual impact of the dark color of the eyebrows. The applicant is here with their presentation and they will go into detail about how they've addressed those issues. Those are also identified in the staff report and the plans. But what staff can summarize is that we believe that they have addressed these issues by the Board, and therefore, we do have a recommendation for approval to the Council. These are just some perspectives of the changes, kind of

what they've done. I think, most notably, they do have that curved and glass curtain wall feature at the corner. One thing to be maybe concerned about would be some privacy. We talked to the applicant about how to address that and they have some ways of how to deal with that. With the Planning Commission, at their meeting, they did recommend approval of the setback elimination, with some conditions, to the council. Some of these, just for your information, because they kind of dovetail a little bit into what the Board looks at. There was some concern about TNC, those are transportation network companies, those like your Ubers and Lyfts, that drop-off and pick-up along El Camino Real, because that curb cut would be eliminated there. Now, you have a little more curb space. Also, with the "pork chop" being eliminated there, you have additional curb space that would be red curb. We'll talk about how to address that. There also was concern about bicycle and pedestrian safety with the loss of that pork chop, how the bike lane would interface with the street and vehicles. They also wanted to ensure the project follows the context-based criteria, so that's right up your alley here, what the Board does. And then, there's a condition that you guys really deal with here, is that this setback elimination would be tied to a mixed-use project or hotel use project for the site. That's something that Council can take up and consider. Specifically, for the bicycle lanes, to show you what's there now, and then, what's being proposed. Really, the lane doesn't change and the striping on the roadway doesn't change. That intersection will change because the slip lane, the free right onto Hansen from El Camino, would be eliminated. That would just cause vehicles and drivers to be more cautious and turn more slowly, so that, we believe, we be a more safer condition. The other addition is where there is striping now, a thin buffer between the travel lane and the bike lane itself, there would be some physical vertical posts added. These are not metal or anything like that that would damage cars severely but would just add more tension for drivers to be careful of the bike lanes. More awareness there. It would also cause... This is for the entire length of that property. But we do want to include some conditions for the Board to consider, because of what the Planning Commission did bring up, was the owner designee shall demonstrate on the project's improvement plans, because they think it's the most appropriate place, are the locations of "No Stopping" signs along El Camino Real. The intent of these is to deter drop-offs and pick-ups on El Camino Real. Tied to that, we're also thinking another condition for you to consider is the owner designee shall, as part of the project's traffic management plan, include provisions to work with these transportation network companies to require drop-off/pick-ups at the Hansen Way entry of the project site. That's something that they can do. And we did speak to the applicant and they've agreed to these in concept. As part of the project, it's subject to CEQA, the California Environmental Quality Act, so we do have an initial study in circulation presently. So far, we have received no comments. That circulation period will end on January 3rd. The potential significant impacts that were identified were to air quality, biological, cultural and geological, and hazardous resources. Mitigation measures for temporary air pollution for construction, nesting birds, accidental cultural materials found during construction because we are digging two levels of basement, implement geotechnical report recommendations, as well as construction of this plan for potential hazardous materials they may uncover. After review of the project and the initial study, the Board shall recommend adoption, provide comments, or recommend changes as it may be necessary. Some topics of interest for you guys to consider. The top one has already been considered by the Commission, the elimination of the setback. But as well as elimination of that pork chop at the intersection; the consistency with the context-based criteria and architectural review findings; and compatibility with the South El Camino Real Design Guidelines. In addition, the parking does include a parking reduction. The project intends to provide valet service, and that will allow for the more efficient parking on site, and that type of parking alternative is really consistent with... It works well with hotel uses, so we are supporting that. Some next steps here is to complete the environmental process, and then, once we get through the Board's review, we would bring the project forward to the City Council for their consideration of the entire project. With that, our recommendation is to recommend approval of the proposed project to City Council based on the findings and subject to any conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. Again, the applicant is here with their presentation. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Could we have the materials board, please? If there is one. Does anyone have any questions of staff that they need to ask before we hear from the applicant? Hearing none, if the applicant could address us? You have 10 minutes once you are set up. And if you could introduce yourself and spell your name for our transcriber.

Yatin Patel: Okay. Good morning, Chair Furth, Vice Chair Baltay, Board Members. My name is Yatin Patel [spells name]. I just want to be brief in my own introductory remarks. Thank you again for the board members who have taken a look at this. We appreciate your feedback. Welcome to Board Member Hirsch. Personally, as the applicant, I really appreciate the last hearing and the comments that came out of it because I think, as you'll see, the project is much improved as a direct result of your feedback. I sincerely believe that. James Heilbronner is here to walk you through sort of the details of what we have done and made changes to. I will pass it over to him now.

James Heilbronner: Good morning. Happy holidays. I'm James Heilbronner [spells name]. Hi. We churned the comments from last time and I have a few slides to go through where we actually made some changes. The comparative renderings are before, previous and today. The primary changes are on the corner, which I'm trying to emphasize more vertically the elements and crystalize the proportions and the use of materials and distinguish them more. We've also done that throughout the building on the windows, incorporating that screen metal material we've discussed in the past between windows, so the windows are more, I'll say a vertical slot in the building, giving them more distinction and articulation of the façade. We've used the screen material throughout the building in a spot way to emphasize the use of that, and in-setting it with the windows works well. On the corner itself, the big change we made is opening up the podium deck behind the curved panel here. The metal material actually goes all the way to the ground, as does the glass, so you get a more vertical look without swapping out materials from the first floor to the second. It's more pure, and it will create some interesting shadows with the sun coming around the corner. The glass, same way. I think we were fighting for a long time the squareness of the building on the corner, considering that everything else is sort of rounded - the plaza, the corner itself -- and we always had a curved element going around the corner, but we were stuck sort of on the squareness in resolving the windows. We still have windows on the corner. That's always been the case. There's three rooms here. The glass is the same as we're using in all the windows. All the windows have blackout curtains and sheer drapes, so there's no issue of controlling sun or privacy on these windows any differently than all the other windows in the project. We still have the sign element posted out from the metal screening. We've emphasized the pilasters a little more and setback the eyebrows. I'll show you in another slide how we did that. And, of course, we've activated the balconies with landscaping, so all four floors have landscaping, although only three of the sections are balconies for people. They are all balconies for landscaping but limited for people, and we added the fourth floor on El Camino as private balconies and there's four rooms up there. Similar issues in the back. I think we've enhanced the greenery along the back wall, the north, I call it the north wall. You can see the slot windows here a little better. We've eliminated the bigger windows over the smaller windows in elevation so there's more consistency and there's verticality that we're trying to emphasize because the building is very spread out horizontally. This slide, this sort of isometric slide, demonstrates the landscaping. The second floor, then it's stepped back to the third, stepped back to the fourth, so every balcony on Hansen has landscaping, and the same on El Camino. Although these are people private balconies, as are all the ones on the second floor, that's the step-back solution for more activity and greenery on the building. This might be a little difficult to see but we've moved this eyebrow down to a line more with, end at the pilaster as this one is doing, and we also shrunk the eyebrow on El Camino. That's what these two red circles are. This shows the eyebrow stopping here, which is similar to how it stops on El Camino. The big conversation last time was the proximity of the café to the street and wanting to keep, of course, the plaza, which is seating for the public using the café or not along the street. We pulled the café out, so this shows the, in red where the café is now, compared to where we had it originally. We pulled it out more, closer to the street. There's signage on the street to get to it. There's two entrances in and out of the café, one on the El Camino side, one on the Hansen side, so that all kind of blends in with the outdoor seating. We've incorporated benches along the frontage on El Camino in these landscape pockets. That was a comment from Ms. Furth last time. Landscaping, we've changed some of the plant material to more native species. And I've got a large landscape plan if you want to see it closer because it's difficult to read. But the street trees dictated pretty much by the City -- or by the City, I should say -- in the tree wells, and we don't have a ton of in-ground landscaping, but a fair amount up on the balconies, which we took out the palms and changed the species there to be a little more native. And of course, those pots and plants get more attention from a maintenance standpoint than a ground scenario. These are just to show the changes of the plants on the second floor. And, last but not least, there was conversation or request for how the

thing is detailed. Generally speaking, all the windows and vertical elements are set in from the face of the façade. They are not flush, which I don't like, but they are recessed four, four and a half inches, consistently. The bigger elements on the corner, the screen material and the curved glass, is actually recessed about eight inches, so you have more depth because you're dealing with a larger mass of material from afar. As the building steps up, you have consistency, and the windows being set back, and this is an example of perhaps one of the ribbon windows on Hansen, or on the north side. You have that, what I've been calling a slot in the façade, a vertical element that distinguishes that element, which also has a metal screen element between windows. Instead of using spandrel glass, we're using the screen material. I think Mr. Baltay, you questioned a cap detail. We're using Alucobond or a similar product as a metal panel, and that comes with a cap piece that has the same reveal nomenclature as all the panels do here. And on the back side, that would be stucco on the balcony side where it's occupied. Those are sort of a summary of responses to the discussion last time, which was very helpful to sort of drive the pencil a little further into where we are now. I'm happy to answer any questions. I've got the large landscape plan if you want to see that.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I would like to see the large landscape plan. I don't have any speaker cards. Is there any member of the public who wishes to speak on this project? Seeing nobody, I will... Perhaps you could stay at the podium and I'll see if people have questions of you. Any questions of the architect?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, good morning. Thank you for the nice presentation. Could you clarify, please, on the fourth floor, the terrace or balconies facing El Camino, are those pedestrian-accessible?

Mr. Heilbronner: The second floor? Or fourth?

Vice Chair Baltay: Fourth floor. The top.

Mr. Heilbronner: Right. And then the third floor on El Camino is just the landscape balcony with access for maintenance of the plants.

Vice Chair Baltay: I didn't understand you, I'm sorry. On the fourth floor...

Mr. Heilbronner: Is guest access.

Vice Chair Baltay: Those balconies are accessible to guests.

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes.

Chair Furth: Second and fourth floors are accessible. Three is not.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Furth: And I forgot to ask our new member, David Hirsch, have you had an opportunity to review the minutes or the records of our previous hearing on this matter?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: You have. Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, but I would like to speak to the project.

Chair Furth: We're still at questions at the moment, of the architect. Does anybody else have any questions of the architect?

Board Member Lew: I have one quick question.

Chair Furth: Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: You have the low screen wall near the corner of Hansen and El Camino.

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct.

Board Member Lew: What is that? What is the wall made out of?

Mr. Heilbronner: Basically, that would be a masonry wall, stuccoed, and on top we have a glass panel to block sound, but not be as opaque from seeing the plaza.

Board Member Lew: Good. Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: I have a question.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Chair Furth: I'm just saying that for the transcriber, not that she can't recognize our voices.

Board Member Thompson: Oh, that's right. In our packet, we had a note here that said, "Provide sun screening on the southern side," and the applicant's response is, "Screen element extends from plaza floor to roof parapet." I was just hoping you could kind of show us exactly what you meant by that response.

Mr. Heilbronner: Perhaps the term "screening" is, we're not using the metal panel screens, if you will. We're using, really, as a decorative element, not as a sun screening device. We were talking about this large screen element, which used to stop here at the second level. Now, it projects all the way down to the ground, so, again, behind this strip of wall here, it's open. You could throw something over that wall and it would hit. If it's screening material, again, it's all decorative, not sun screening, so maybe it was a little confusing, what we wrote there.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. But this is not the south side, right? This is the north, like, northeast?

Mr. Heilbronner: Yeah, the back.... Sorry, I'll go back. The back, I call it the north side facing the fish restaurant, has, we had a vine screen wall here for growing greenery up against the building, and we're using that screen material again in the window, between windows along the whole back façade. Is that...?

Board Member Thompson: I think the note here is about the south, the southern side. These are both the north sides?

Chair Furth: Which side are you calling the...? You mean true southern, for screening purposes, right?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Chair Furth: Identify it on this plan. What does it say? Do you mean Hansen, or do you mean the rear of the property?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I guess it's the Hansen Way, kind of looking at the, where the porte-cochere, the Uber drop-off.

Mr. Heilbronner: Further down the street, right.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, in that direction.

Mr. Heilbronner: Right.

Board Member Thompson: There's a view, I think, that was in our packet.

Mr. Heilbronner: There's an elevation in your packet, yeah.

Board Member Thompson: I think it's [crosstalk].

Mr. Heilbronner: I think it's VR 4.... Oh, the back wall, right.

Board Member Thompson: This is the southern side?

Mr. Heilbronner: Yeah, next to the business park. That's showing it without the trees, which you won't even, realistically, with the redwoods that are there, you won't see that elevation. But yes, we changed the windows there to be more consistent with the whole building. They were just individual slot windows previously in the last.... We've taken that...

Board Member Thompson: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Heilbronner: Thanks.

Chair Furth: Any other questions?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: The floating element that's in front as you look at the previous design, or the present design, is there a reason that that is so close to the, turns a corner and is so close to the existing building, versus connecting the restaurant around the corner, more on the outside of the, closer to the property line?

Mr. Heilbronner: You mean, is this particular element here being further...? Why is it so close to the building?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Mr. Heilbronner: We were trying to partially screen areas up against the building from a seating, so you have a choice in seating. More protected nearby versus out in the open. We're out of room on the El Camino side. We're really at the property line right there. But as it turns the corner, there's more property, if you will.

Board Member Hirsch: Does it have anything to do with the property line itself? Is there a reason why it's [crosstalk]?

Mr. Heilbronner: No, not really. On El Camino, yes. I can't go any further towards the street because we're on the property line. But right where it turns the corner and heads down in this area, there's room in the plaza. It's not a property line issue.

Chair Furth: I think if you look at Sheet DR2-2, you get a pretty good sense of it.

Board Member Hirsch: DR2. Well, I'm looking...

Chair Furth: [off microphone, inaudible.]

Mr. Heilbronner: Right. Yeah, that's a good depiction of the property line and, of course, the El Camino requirement for a 12-foot sidewalk, and other objects that push the building on El Camino to where it is. On the Hansen side, the property line, there's probably, there's a little bit of room in the plaza where you could push out things to the property line. Not a lot. It is a big swath of land along Hansen that's City-owned, so the property line... The building on Hansen is really up against the property line except when you get to the plaza. There's a little space there for...

Board Member Hirsch: Are you saying in the area that shows with seating right now is City-owned?

Mr. Heilbronner: No. A piece of that seating area is still on the property. That doesn't have the panel wall over it. I think that's what you're asking about.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, because, I'll speak to it a little later, but my concern is that it's columns and obstructions close to the building there, and it kind of obscures the sense of the building being there at all by being a rather massive piece of cloaking element right in front of it. You look at it from certain perspectives and you kind of lose the sense of continuity of the façade.

Chair Furth: Any other questions of the applicant? All right, then we'll bring it back to the Board. Thank you very much for your presentation.

Mr. Heilbronner: Thank you.

Chair Furth: I would also, you know, we often critique the documents we get and the presentations we hear, and I would like to thank you for the large-sized landscape plan, for the marking, identifying of native and non-native plants on your landscape. Generally a very readable and approachable set of plans. Thank you. All right. Who would like to begin the discussion? Alex?

Board Member Hirsch: I would. Since I'm...

Chair Furth: All right.

Board Member Hirsch: ...new to the project, I've looked at it very carefully and found it to be a very interesting one at that. But I have some opinions about it that I'd just like to express today, both for my fellow board members and for the architects. I find it a very successful building in numerous ways. It adds layers of stepped structure both on Hansen and the El Camino side of the building. These effectively relate this long, horizontal mass to the street on Hansen and narrow width on El Camino. The window pattern on this stepped elements are varied and successful, but the dramatic cantilever corners extending horizontally beyond the projections and integrate comfortably -- these are the eyebrows -- comfortably with the mass. I like the way those elements are related to the mass of the building itself. Each of the projecting stepped floors has an exterior deck with planters, a generous amenity for a hotel, and as fellow board members have said, it really should be able to be used by the hotel guests. The other plan decisions appear to work very well. The entry at the rear of the lot under the porte-cochere. But I note that some proper signage somewhere on El Camino will be necessary to direct clients to that particular access point. First, the front exterior corner reserved for an open café and inviting the neighborhood in is a great amenity for El Camino. And the respect for the sidewalk design and change of the pork chop intersection is an excellent idea, I think, too. The sidewalk planning is, I think, very good, you know, separating the pedestrian and bike traffic at that point. It improves the Hansen Way crossing. From this point on, the most recent design begins to run counter, in my opinion, to the overriding concept of projecting stepped elements, modifying the longitudinal shoebox shape of the building. At the corner of Hansen Place, the horizontal possibility is broken by the vertical advertising wall metal screen. I want to explain that a little bit more. A major glass curve is introduced at the corner that bears no relation to the hotel function within, and I personally don't like to see buildings that have some relation, and that is an apartment, a specific unit in the building. And the fact that it's all glass in the corner, a massive amount

of glass, isn't in any way related to the function of the interior. The element that we were just discussing before, that free-floating mass over the café below and merges into the building, causes you to... I just think it's an uncomfortable relationship, and it's why I brought it up. I mean, I'm not opposed to the idea of something that sort of completes the corner and makes interior space and exterior space very clear, but I don't think that's very successful at it. I think, in fact, despite the fact that there is a problem perhaps with the ownership of the corner, or whatever, and the property line, I think that's something that could have been -- or could still be -- negotiated in some way with the City. Because after all, you've done some major improvements to that corner and the way in which you moved around it and into the dining area there, outdoor dining, you could, in some way, enclose the whole thing and make it feel like it's part of one return of the building to the outside line, rather than to align or devise that space into kind of two areas. In terms of your response to that, I find that there really ought not to be a separation that way, and that umbrellas or whatever you use for shading work very well on the outside. You could continue that if necessary for the, whatever is closer to the building. And I would rather have seen a perimeter wall in some way, and in fact, a lesser massive wall at that corner. The lesser wall would reflect the way in which you treat the porte-cochere in the back by a module less than the vertical dimension of that. And you could eliminate a lot of columns, as well. It's a constricted area and I don't think it really works very well. Less-important southwest and west and north facades with the recessed stucco panel at the vertical window line begins to look more like a -- to me, at least -- to a rather bad federal office building somehow. I find that it could be improved, and that the horizontality of this building should be improved by adding perhaps another stucco level horizontally in the same band as the metal. That reflects the color of the metal and would then tie the building together, the actual step areas where this would direct your eye to those most-important aspects of your design. You might bring the metal panels between the windows forward to that line and make that horizontal connection. To discuss these in a little bit more detail at Hansen Place corner, if you can refer to the drawing close-up illustration -- Can we get to that? The very first one, called "New Version 11-14-2018." It's a close-up version.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Member, are you looking at the perspective drawings?

Chair Furth: Which plan set are you looking at, and which sheet?

Board Member Hirsch: I'm looking at the illustration plan.

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't know that we have those drawings loaded up. We'll see what we can find.

Board Member Hirsch: Comparative perspective.

Board Member Thompson: Is it this one?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. No, no. Here.

[Locating drawing Board Member Hirsch is referring to.]

Mr. Heilbronner: On this elevation, there's a blade sign out on El Camino for the café.

Board Member Hirsch: Do you have a slide of...?

[Locating drawing Board Member Hirsch is referring to.]

Board Member Hirsch: Well, if that's difficult to get, okay. Let's just... We can all...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ...and staff knows which drawing we're looking at.

Board Member Hirsch: Right. But you know what I'm talking about, this area we're talking about. The close-up, right? Obviously, you're not going to have glass there. It's going to be planted, right?

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. And that's in your planting plan, I'm sure.

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: I'd like to... Actually, I'd like to also ask staff, is that an important area on the outside of that planting where you have benches shown?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think we do try and have some public benches where people can feel comfortable sitting down, even if they are not patrons of the café. We do want some greenery, giving a little bit of a buffer between the street and the building. But there is no regulation on the exact size and things of that nature.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, so, my opinion is, in the first place, it's funny that you don't, you show people walking on the outside, but you don't show people sitting in that recessed area there. That is part of the café, right?

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes. This slide shows the café is back here. This is the plaza with the umbrellas and...

Board Member Hirsch: I'm talking about the area where the exercise room is on one side and there's a conference room on the other side.

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct. There's an entrance to the café directly off the sidewalk, and there could be small tables...

Board Member Hirsch: There could be tables there, right?

Mr. Heilbronner: We show....

Board Member Hirsch: Access to the coffee area. If the dining area and café, as well, is filled up, people will go there.

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes. We show tables...

Board Member Hirsch: Tables in the plan.

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. It functions basically the same way as the other side, with the dining room. There needs to be some form of privacy in that area, and separation, and sound barrier, just as you had it on the other side.

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, so, I don't see why -- or perhaps I disagree with other board members here -- why there isn't a barrier of the same nature right there, whatever you call that wall, with glass above it.

Mr. Heilbronner: In a prior design, we had another screen wall on the El Camino side. We looked at that again carefully and we're trying to open up visual back to the building, more open to the café so you see

it, and we were focused that most people would sit in the plaza area, not on the El Camino side where it's noisier. That was our...

Board Member Hirsch: That was your first concept, which I liked.

Mr. Heilbronner: Okay.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay? I mean, I think that...

Chair Furth: I don't think we need to argue it, but if you could present your point of view, and...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: Yes...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ... to have a chance to speak.

Board Member Hirsch: The other aspect that I like, that I guess I disagree with my board members on here is that you turn the corner with that wall, so it sort of defines the planting area, the entry area. You don't do that in this drawing, so you've removed it because of previous criticism of that aspect. Okay.

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: Also, let me get to what concerns me the most, actually, about this building, is this very corner, this very corner on El Camino and the verticality of it. My personal preference, again, is that you keep some of that horizontal line moving through the area here. I liked, for example, the way in which you dealt with the ground floor with a planting wall on that side. Sort of all of these elements, to me, don't come together as well as they could. I don't see the sense of a rounded corner at that point because it doesn't relate to the function, except perhaps at the cafeteria level itself, and the coffee shop. But I don't, I don't see the reason for that kind of a vertical expression when the basic building here is like a shoebox, and it's horizontal. That comment, we could discuss more. I know that would require some façade redesign, and I'm aware of that, but I think that it's worth considering. If the building were squared off and the proportions were nicely done, the window corner related more horizontally with the rest of the building, and in a squared-off corner, I think you'd have a unit inside that relates more to the function of what's behind it. It's just one unit in that whole building. The other aspect of that -- and I'll finish up with this -- is that the balcony on the second floor extends around the corner now, not just over the dining room, and is supported by the columns that are outside. I understand why you would turn the corner rectangularly further out because the dining room is there below, so there's no reason in my mind why that couldn't be a planting deck, just as the rest of the facades are on that level. The façade that faces towards Hansen Place is a planting deck. Is that correct?

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes, this balcony deck here is guest room balconies over the dining area, correct.

Board Member Hirsch: So, it could extend around the corner and simply go back into the building, but there's no real reason why anybody would really, although you show people out on that deck, is there a real reason why people would use a deck like that on a second floor over a dining area?

Mr. Heilbronner: Frankly, we cut a lot of the... We cut the podium out in this curved area. We left a small area here for hotel guests to use the balcony as a public area. I'm not sure that would be a highly-used area. Could be used for photo-taking, or just to go out and sit, but it's not a huge area. It's a small, urban, kind of plaza area.

Chair Furth: I'm going to stop this discussion at this point so we can hear from other board members and hear each other's comments. And then, if the Board has a second round of comments, we can do that. Yes?

Ms. Gerhardt: Related to this discussion, I just wanted to let board members know that covered canopies, canopies that cover these dining tables, are considered FAR, even when they don't have walls around them.

Chair Furth: They would exceed the allow floor area for the project?

Ms. Gerhardt: It would change the FAR of the project, yes.

Chair Furth: And is the FAR already close to the limit, or do they have extra space left?

Mr. Heilbronner: Yeah, it is close. Very close.

Chair Furth: Thank you. We could calculate that if this was the consensus of the board. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation and thank you for the very clear set of drawings. It was very useful. I can recommend approval of the project today. I have, I think, as we've talked before, I think the project is exemplary. I think the building top, middle and base are all done very well. I think you've included a lot of ground floor uses that are very attractive and will attract pedestrians. Staff had some comments about, from the PTC. I also had a concern about a car drop-off on El Camino. I actually had noticed that before you had mentioned that. Sometimes we've done continuous planter strips in those locations. I know that Transportation wants a minimum sidewalk width, walking width, so I do understand that is an issue. You have cars going by at 40 miles an hour close to the curb, making a right-hand turn, you know, having more landscaping can be better. I think the other thing I think about, too, is just the way the intersection is configured, you know, the crosswalk isn't anywhere near that section. The actual crosswalk is way up closer to The Fish Market. It's just because the intersections are kind of offset. I think regarding compatibility, I think that the new building will work with a lot of the new buildings that are under design and construction in the vicinity. And then, I think, my only main concerns is, one is, like, the stucco color is white, and my main concern would be on your northwest façade late in the day during the summertime, that we might get a lot of glare at that time. I did look at the solar angles and I think that could be an issue.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, Alex, which...?

Board Member Lew: This would be facing The Fish Market.

Chair Furth: The Fish Market façade?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, so, I'm thinking.... I looked at the sun angles and it might be an issue. There are large trees on El Camino and also on the back of the property that may help mitigate that. And then, I think my other concern was just that the L3 wall sconce, it's like a Kichler fixture, and I was wondering if there was a better option for that. I do like that that fixture is a downlight, but I was wondering if there was maybe something, if there's a higher-quality fixture than that. That's all that I have.

Chair Furth: To be clear, are you recommending changes with respect to the glare problem on the northwest façade?

Board Member Lew: I'm just putting it out there for the other board members.

Chair Furth: Okay. You raised a concern. Okay.

Board Member Lew: White buildings have come up before. We get comments from people in Portola Valley, and they can see our buildings. They can see our buildings, and they were saying, "We don't paint our buildings white. Why are you allowing all of these white buildings in Palo Alto?" People can see it, even though we may not.

Chair Furth: I think it's fascinating that they think we should look like them.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: We don't say that to them. Board Member Thompson. But I understand the concern.

Board Member Thompson: For the record, I'm a fan of white buildings, as I'm sure you know. In general, I would say that there are elements of this building that have improved greatly. I think there are other changes that could potentially be controversial, but I'll start with the good stuff. I actually really like this lot that you have introduced in sort of the southern areas.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, Osma, could you translate that for me? What are you saying you like?

Board Member Thompson: Oh. In this image of the southern façade, I think the original comment was actually about adding shading to the southern façade because it's exposed to sunlight. However, you have recessed the... I think the slot I'm talking about is the vertical stacking of the windows and recessing it four inches. Board Member Hirsch mentioned it looked like a federal building. I think it looks nice. I think it's better than what you had before. I think the recessing will help. Obviously more shading is better, so I wouldn't oppose if you decided to add some dimensionality on that side to actually protect your building from sun. But what you have is still an improvement over what you had before. I actually appreciate that order, I appreciate the terracing that you've done on that side. Appreciate the colors being lighter. I think mainly the controversial element is probably your corner. And also, sorry, I'll just mention... Yeah. The protected bike path is appreciated, in general. But, yeah, so, going back to the corner, the glass element. In general, I'm not a fan of spandrel glass or glassy things, usually for environmental reasons. But you actually, on the north side here, so, if you're going to have glass anywhere, this is probably a fine place to have it. What I actually kind of miss from the older drawings was that deck that wrapped around the corner. I understand that you've taken it out to sort of add more verticality to the corner. That deck could be a really nice spot for parties, or people who want to hang out on the hotel but not actually be on the street. I actually miss that. It's funny, I think we're sort of getting into the nuances of preference here. In general, I would say that, yes, in terms of meeting the design guidelines, your base, middle and top are fairly well defined. This particular corner is sort of missing that top element. You sort of intentionally deleted it. You've kept your top element elsewhere on the building and deleted it from the corner. You could argue that that's okay, that you still have it as part of the building. It could be nice, though, to keep it in the corner. In general, though, again, I would say, mostly it's more improved. Again, the loss of the green wall on the ground because of, I guess the change in that corner, is something to be missed. There are some things in your old plan that I think were nice that I don't think we asked you to get rid of, that are gone now. But it seems like easy things that could be resolved in a subcommittee. Unless, of course, this element of that corner façade, if we were discussing sort of more heavily, that could potentially become controversial and not solvable in a subcommittee.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Vice Chair Baltay.

Vice Chair Baltay: Good morning. I do want to thank the applicant for the really detailed and useful color and material board, the numerous 3D presentation images. It really helps a lot for us when we're trying to evaluate the design. Staff, if you could take note that this type of presentation is much appreciated. I support Alex's comments strongly. I think he's got his finger on the right direction for this building and I can make the findings to recommend approval. I have a couple of things that I'd like to really emphasize, especially to staff when this gets to a further level of review. The curved window wall on the corner is complex and expensive to build, especially when you have curved pieces of glass. That's what these are, is curved. If they come back and say, well, it turns out it's too difficult to build, we want to make it

square, or change the shape, or something like that, that's a distinct architectural change and will need to come back to the board if they're going to change that. Assuming that what they are presenting is something they intend to build, and it's important, in my opinion, that it be built as to what we see here. I'm just putting that note of caution out there, that it has to be this way. The same thing goes, in my opinion, for the balconies on the fourth floor facing El Camino. I think it's really important to have those be pedestrian-accessible balconies that guests can actually go out on. That really enlivens the street experience for the public and it's very important. I just can't really make sense looking at the plans whether there's really doors there, or whether these balconies are intended to be that way. The applicant says they are, that's great, let's make sure that's in the record, and it remains that way throughout the development of this project. Same comment, again, applies to the depth of the window reveals. We're talking four inches and eight inches on the major elements at the corner. Those are great design features that I don't see supported in this application. In other words, there's no real clear details documenting that. I'll take you at face value that's what you intend to do, but I'm mentioning it to staff again. Let's be sure we check. To recess a window four inches into a wall means the wall has to get thicker somehow. It's not that easy to do. It's not just write that on the window spec and you're done. And again, if it comes back and it's only two inches, that's a significant change to the design, and we are, in part, approving this because of those details. So, it's important that we follow through. The last detail that I don't see an answer on -- and maybe if this comes back to a subcommittee -- would be the top of the, I'll call it the vertical decorative wall with the Hotel Parmani round sign on it. It's to the left of the curved glass. The top of that decorative element, as I understand it, that's a perforated metal screen of some kind. You'll need some kind of detail or cap or something to practically terminate it, and visually, too. I think it's important that it be thought about. I'm sure it can be done. I just don't see any evidence of what you intend to do, and I think it's important that we see that. Those are really a series of comments that are just things that I want to be sure that we focus on as the building gets further developed. Lastly, I agree with Alex, that the white plaster is, I think, too bright. When I look at the sample over here, it's extremely reflective, and over The Fish Market building, and probably on Hansen Way, it really could be toned down. Just be a little bit less reflective in the sunlight. But I can support the building as its shown. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I have a question. Staff has a comment.

Ms. Gerhardt: I have a question, as well. Board Member Baltay, you were asking about the balconies on the fourth floor, those being accessible, but when I'm looking at the drawings, those are actually roof elements (inaudible).

Vice Chair Baltay: Precisely. Thank you, Jodie. That's why I'm bringing this up. I believe I asked the applicant that question already, and they affirmed that those are intended to be pedestrian-accessible balconies for the guests in the hotel. I'd like very much to make sure that that stays in the record, and that's what gets built.

Chair Furth: Could the applicant confirm that the fourth floor balconies facing El Camino and Hansen are accessible? To guests?

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes, absolutely, the fourth floor El Camino side, which in plan reads like a...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, just on El Camino.

Mr. Heilbronner: I'm sorry. Fourth floor, El Camino, yes, they are private balconies for each of the...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: You can step out onto them.

Mr. Heilbronner: Yes. Absolutely.

Chair Furth: Thank you

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, I just want to clarify. Sheet DR3.3, we have the fourth floor. It's currently shown as a roof on El Camino, and then, there is also some space on Hansen. I just want to be clear what we're asking for. We're just asking for the El Camino side to be balconies?

Vice Chair Baltay: I feel the El Camino side must be balconies, yes.

Chair Furth: Discrepancy in the illustrations of the plans, not... Does not reflect the applicant's intention. Okay? Staff can make a note of that so that we don't have to put it in our motion, should we arrive at one. I have a question about the screening material above the fourth floor. I guess it's on the roof. Is that right? This? That's mechanical screen? I'm looking at this. A setback mechanical screen quite a ways back, is not visible from the sidewalk?

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct. It would... The sidewalks immediately around the building...

Chair Furth: Well, obviously.

Mr. Heilbronner: ...mechanical screening is 10 feet tall under the allowance of 15 feet.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Mr. Heilbronner: Sorry. And...

Chair Furth: And it's set in from the edge of the building.

Mr. Heilbronner: Correct. You wouldn't see it from the surrounding streets. You would see it coming down El Camino from far away...

Chair Furth: Okay.

Mr. Heilbronner: ...as an image.

Chair Furth: Thank you. The reason I'm asking staff is we just had a big discussion on a hotel on San Antonio about an overly visible mechanical screen that was much bigger than it needed to be. Made the building to be... How do you say this? Appear to be much taller than we had originally approved. I don't have a... We talked about doghouse screens versus comprehensive screens, and I don't have problems with a large screen if it's sufficiently recessed. I'm going to propose that if we do a subcommittee, this go to subcommittee to... I think it's clear on what our intent is with regard to... Did you have a comment?

Mr. Heilbronner: The exact height of the screen needed is a function of the height of the mechanical equipment?

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Heilbronner: We're totally open to a condition that the screen be as tall as the mechanical equipment...

Chair Furth: Be minimized.

Mr. Heilbronner: ...it might be eight feet, 7-foot-8 instead of, right now...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Yeah, it's the difference between the approach of having a large, sort of simple screened rectangle, and having smaller.... Yes, staff?

Ms. Gerhardt: Just to clarify, the screen doesn't need to be as tall as the equipment. We've many times done line of site diagrams, so it can be...

Chair Furth: I think we are all clear and don't have any disagreement about what our goal is here. Everybody is nodding. All right. Thank you for your presentations, and thanks to everybody for their careful reading of the plans and the project and their comments. I'm trying to read my notes. I had a question for staff. Where would the red curb be on El Camino? The entire frontage?

Mr. Sing: Presently, that's the condition, so the only change would be eliminating the pork chops for the additional curb space, as well as the elimination of the existing curb cut.

Chair Furth: You're telling me it's red all the way now and it would continue to be red?

Mr. Sing: It's red now where there is curb.

Chair Furth: The entire frontage would be red. No parking.

Mr. Sing: Right. That's correct.

Chair Furth: I'm interested with, I think Alex or somebody mentioned the idea of having high landscaping along there, along the edge of curb. This is a state highway. Can we do that? Making up three foot highway landscaping along the edge of the curb there?

Ms. Gerhardt: We would obviously need to confirm, but the only thing that we usually run into trouble with is additional trees near the street.

Board Member Lew: If you look at, like, you know, Arbor Real project at El Camino and (inaudible) or Charleston, it actually has a continuous planter, and I don't know how tall the plants are. Maybe not three feet. Maybe two feet. But, like, in that particular location, there's no on-street parking, and you have traffic right at the curb. It's nicer to have a buffer...

Chair Furth: Yeah, I think this is a...

Board Member Lew: ...in that kind of location.

Chair Furth: I think this is a really good idea. I think you all know that I like planted pedestrian barriers that subtly explain to people that, no, you're not going to walk through here. They need to be tall enough and heavy enough. I mean, a classic one is pittosporum tobira, which is not my favorite plant for this site, but I would be in favor of having the landscape revised to have a planted pedestrian barrier to make it perfectly clear that this is not where you drop anybody off, or catch a cab. I think that would be much more effective than any amount of signage or red curbs. That would be one thing I would suggest. Alex, you'd like further review of lighting, at least one light fixture.

Board Member Lew: I threw that out to the other board members.

Chair Furth: I doubt that any of us disagree with you.

Board Member Thompson: Which light fixture was that?

Chair Furth: Um... I'm sorry, go ahead.

Board Member Lew: L3.

Chair Furth: There is some discussion about color. I know that Board Member Thompson emphasizes the importance of light-reflective colors for low electricity use, whereas others are concerned that it will be so reflective that will perhaps generate more electricity use next door. Is it possible to move towards a less-reflective and still environmental-effective shade of white? Query? Comment?

Board Member Lew: My thought is... My comment about the white is only for the west, sort of that northwest wall. And it is northwest, not true west, so I'm a little bit more flexible on the... And then, the other thing, the other issue with white, it does show...

Chair Furth: Grime.

Board Member Lew: ...it shows dirt more, and also, if they're proposing a smooth texture, a smooth white texture will show all of the stucco cracks more so than a rougher, more textured and darker color.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Thompson: We keep the color and add more texture on that side. That could help with glare.

Chair Furth: Okay. From my notes... Let's see, what else did I want to say. Oh, I'm so grateful for the wider sidewalk, for the protected pedestrian... Sorry, bicycle path. It's always complicated when dealing with the California Department of Transportation, with their road here, and I appreciate that we've been able to get much more pedestrian space. I think the sharper corner will lead to slower turns, so that we'll have improved pedestrian and bicycle situations. And I think you have made the most neighborhood-friendly hotel design in the city that we have seen. So, congratulations. We really appreciate what you have done. We probably have some very friendly hotels downtown, but actually, I don't even think they do as well. This is really, really impressive. Thank you. Perhaps we need to have a bit... First of all, is there support for...? I heard differing opinions on the design. I only heard David's -- Board Member Hirsch's -- critique of the fenestration and design elements along Hansen, but I heard... Would anybody other than David care to revisit the design of the floating element?

Board Member Thompson: You mean the...?

Chair Furth: The curve.

Board Member Thompson: The curve. Yeah.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Are we discussing the canopy?

Chair Furth: It's the vertical thing that goes like this.

Board Member Thompson: The podium? Is it a podium, actually?

Chair Furth: It's a line.

Board Member Thompson: Kind of a skirt that comes along the front.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ... a lot of **Izo-zahki [phonetic]**, in the Museum of Contemporary Arts. He always has the, he calls it the Marilyn Monroe curve.

Chair Furth: Well, I vote no. Is this curve...? This is really a stupid question, but better answer it. Is this a free-floating curve, or does it have a floor connected to it? It's a free-floating curve. It's a free-floating curve.

Board Member Thompson: It's only free-floating for part of the corner, and then it becomes a floor...

Chair Furth: Well, I'm looking at this.

Board Member Thompson: ...just after the...

Chair Furth: It's all the way around the corner, it's free-floating.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, but if you look at the plan DR3.2...

Chair Furth: Right.

Board Member Thompson: ...and you're looking at the second floor plan...

Chair Furth: Yep.

Board Member Thompson: ...you can kind of see that it sort of joins up with the floor, right where that planter starts on the plan...

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Board Member Thompson: I think in the previous proposal, that whole...

Chair Furth: It was balcony all the way.

Board Member Thompson: ...the whole thing was deck.

Chair Furth: Right. Now they're proposing it as...

Board Member Thompson: Which was (inaudible).

Chair Furth: ...free-floating vertical wall. Straw poll. How many of you are satisfied with the applicant's most recent proposal, on that regard?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm satisfied.

Chair Furth: Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, and I think.... Yes. I would just say that, in my mind, it meets the findings.

Chair Furth: Right. In other words, they get to choose if we can make the findings. It's not whether we would design it that way, but does it meet the standards of the City. It's your building.

Board Member Lew: And then, also, if it were a deck, then it would impact the privacy of that, of the second-floor room right there.

Chair Furth: Okay. And David, you would like it to be revisited?

Board Member Hirsch: I would, yes.

Chair Furth: Okay. Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, I'm fine with it. If I could, through the Chair, just address the Board. I think all of us as a whole feels this is a pretty good building. We've been through it three or four or five times. They've had this curved element for months, if not years. I think we need to stop just going over and over and hammering away at it. This meets the findings. It may not...

Chair Furth: In your opinion.

Vice Chair Baltay: In my opinion. The curved glass, David, you're right, it doesn't reflect what's inside. It's not what I would like to do myself, but...

Chair Furth: Well, before we... That's fine.

Vice Chair Baltay: It meets the findings. I think...

Chair Furth: I'm going to keep driving you guys to a decision here today. I think I have your point. I had one other question, which was the other highly-discussed element seemed to be the rounded glass tower. My only concern about that, I mean, it does surprise me. I'm not sure why it's a choice, but I can't say that it shouldn't be. It does relate to the very curved corner and the curved element. The problem we usually have when these are hotel rooms is that the odd placement of curtains leads to a certain amount of visual chaos. What we usually do when we have highly-visible windows like this is we have a condition about curtains and automated screens. I don't know if that works here. Thoughts, please. Alex.

Board Member Lew: On this one, it's not just a regular hotel room. This is a one-bedroom, so, the bedroom is not on the curve. That's just living area. I don't think there's nearly as much issues with curtains and what-not than a typical room.

Board Member Thompson: The bedroom is on the curve. If you look at the drawings.

Board Member Lew: I was looking at the plans and I thought the bedroom was on...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Is the bedroom in the corner? On these? I'm asking the applicant here.

Mr. Heilbronner: Just quick clarification. The curve is three rooms, second, third and fourth floors.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Heilbronner: They are guest rooms with beds. The plan shows that they are king bedrooms. And the glass is probably 25, the width of the glass, probably 20 percent wider than a normal window. We'll have blackout curtains on the radius with sheer drapes on them, just like every other window in the building has.

Chair Furth: They'd have to have really good-looking outsides to those blackout curtains.

Mr. Heilbronner: Okay.

Chair Furth: Yes. They typically aren't that good-looking on the outside. All right. Because otherwise, you wouldn't want to mess up your lovely building. What else have I forgotten here, folks? Any other matters that we should discuss as a group?

Board Member Thompson: Do we want to talk about that light fixture? I finally managed to pull up the lighting plan. It's E4.0.

Chair Furth: Well, I'm anticipating that this goes to a subcommittee, so I would let the subcommittee deal with it.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: But that may not be the consensus. Okay.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Could I have a motion please? And then we can debate that motion if necessary.

Board Member Thompson: I'll move that we approve this project subject to findings and conditions to a subcommittee, where we can revisit the lighting fixture, the treatment of the northwest wall in terms of...;

Chair Furth: Materials.

Board Member Thompson: ... material.

Chair Furth: Color and texture.

Board Member Thompson: And...

Chair Furth: I think staff asked for a condition that the Transportation Demand Management Plan include a provision that -- What's the technical term for Uber and Lyft?

Board Member Thompson: TNC.

Mr. Sing: Transportation Network Company.

Chair Furth: That transportation network companies be advised that pick-up and drop-off must take place in the Hansen porte-cochere? Is that what it is?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah.

Chair Furth: And I would like to add that the subcommittee review landscaping.

Board Member Thompson: (inaudible)

Chair Furth: We're still composing a motion here. It's not a friendly amendment. It's a collaboration.

Board Member Thompson: It's very helpful.

Chair Furth: I'm just trying to list everything we have here. To provide landscaping along El Camino Real designed to discourage pedestrians from crossing that sidewalk into the street.

Ms. Gerhardt: Mechanical screen?

Chair Furth: And mechanical screening be reviewed, and I'm getting a note here, details at the top of the wall which contains the sign for these buildings. It's the wall that would be reviewed as to details at the top of it, not the sign.

Mr. Sing: Chair? Sorry.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Mr. Sing: There was that condition that staff had suggested regarding no stopping signs on El Camino. Was that something that...?

Chair Furth: And consider no stopping signs on El Camino. Because I think if you landscape it adequately, you may not need to do that, but you may need to. That would be something for the subcommittee and engineering, traffic engineers. Yes?

Board Member Thompson: And could we also add that maybe the applicant consider keeping that deck as we've seen it so far along the corner? Just to consider if... Because I think in all the previous applications, that deck turned the corner around.

Chair Furth: Is there a majority of support for that point of view? Would anybody back that?

Vice Chair Baltay: No, I don't think that's a good idea to ask for that at this point, Osma. I think it starts to affect FAR calculations and things like that.

Board Member Thompson: But it's been there in all the previous.... Okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: It just feels late to me.

Chair Furth: I don't think you're going to get support for that one.

Board Member Thompson: It is my motion.

Chair Furth: It is your motion. Go for it.

Board Member Thompson: Just that they consider it.

Chair Furth: All right.

Board Member Thompson: You know, it doesn't have to be something that...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Consider with the [crosstalk].

Board Member Thompson: I mean, it could be the subcommittee takes a look and it doesn't work architecturally.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Vice Chair Baltay: I will second the motion, including the considerations you mentioned.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Peter. Is there brief discussion? It's only because you people want to catch your airplanes and do justice to the other matter. Any other discussion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye. All those opposed? You have to say it audibly. The motion.... Oh, I'm sorry, after a while it gets automatic to hit the microphone button. All right. Well, the vote is...

Board Member Hirsch: On the record, I'm voting against.

Chair Furth: Thank you. The vote is 4 in favor, 1 against, the 1 against being Board Member Hirsch. And the matter is referred to subcommittee.

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

Chair Furth: Thank you very much for your application. Thank you to staff for your work on this project. We will have a two-minute break before we go on to the next item, which is a public hearing on 2321 Wellesley Street.

[The Board took a short break.]

**4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2321 Wellesley Street [18PLN-00178]: Request for Architectural Review of a Two-Family Residential Project. This Application Will Also be Heard by the PTC on December 12, 2018 for a Zoning Map Amendment to Change the Subject Property From R-1 to RMD(NP). Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of CEQA per Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: R-1 (Single-Family Residential). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez (samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org)**

Chair Furth: This hearing is, I would note that it is ten o'clock and we are on item number 4, which is 2321 Wellesley Street. This is an unusual request for us. It's a request for architectural review of a two-family residential project. It will also go to the Planning and Transportation Commission. Wait a minute, will go? That's not right. That's earlier. It's been to the Planning and Transportation Commission. Is that correct?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct. It went last week.

Chair Furth: Right. For their recommendation on a zoning map amendment to change the property from R-1 to RMD with a neighborhood preservation overlay. It is exempt from CEQA. Mr. Gutierrez. Oh, first of all, has everybody visited the site?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Nope.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes.

Chair Furth: Yes, yes, everybody with the exception of Architect Thompson. I will note that I had never been down this little stub of Wellesley, which dead-ends into the College Terrace Library and small park. Thank you. Staff?

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning to the Board. Happy holidays, and happy new year, after this last hearing of the year. I am the project planner for this project, as Chair Furth indicated. This project is a little unique in that the requested zoning change that comes along with this project requires ARB review of the design. Let's start here. The site correction here on this first slide, it's the wrong date. Of course, today is the 20th, so that's a small correction there. This is a sketch of the proposed design for the new home on the site, 2321 Wellesley. As we move forward, we can see that this is an application involving a zone change and design review for a new two-story, two-family duplex with a detached carport. The existing zoning, just to discuss that briefly, is R-1, and the requested zone change is to change to the Residential two-unit, multiple family district, the RMD. But there is also a combining district in this location, and that's the Neighborhood Preservation combining district, sorted as NP. That's the mechanism, or the combining district has a, as a trigger for the ARB review, and that's why we're before you today. Here, you can see that the zoning of this site is actually with the R-1. It's highlighted in that yellow band there. It's the little appendix of the R-1 District directly adjacent to the College Terrace Library. As you can see, the RMD(NP) zone surrounds it, so it is the only R-1 parcel on this side of the street. That's what went before PTC last week. The Neighborhood Preservation Combining District, per the Code Section 18.10.140, requires review by the ARB to maintain the visual and historic character of the existing neighborhood, maintaining existing structures, and to assure that compatibility of design of new residential units with existing structure on the same or surrounding properties. If the site were to be bigger with this zone, they actually could have more units, but because of the size of the site, they only

could actually produce two. That's some of that language there, where they say, you know, more units. If the site was much larger and only had two units, perhaps it could add another third or fourth, and the ARB at that point would review its compatibility with existing units there. These are the existing conditions. This is, again, a satellite view. You can see that the lot is empty. Adjacent to it you'll see the apartment structure on the left, and then, on the right side of this image, you'll see the College Terrace Library. And then, across the street, the single-family homes. This is the site. It's been vacant for approximately 30 years. There's the College Terrace Library. The home directly across the street, single-family, single story. Further down the street we have a mixture of partial two-story and full two-story. And this is the adjacent apartment complex to the site. The zoning difference, I wanted to touch briefly on that. The R-1 zone has different allowances for FAR and coverage than the RMD, as well as the ability to move... Excuse me. The ability to have two units is on, is allowed per each zone. The R-1 would allow two units with a single-family home and an ADU, which has size restrictions attached to it and associated with it. Also, the ADU would have laxer parking regulations, but the RMD zone, which is a requested zone change, you actually have more stringent parking requirements because you have to have additional parking for that. And then, the distribution of square footages is more lenient in the RMD. You can do more of a proper duplex rather than a single-family with an attached small ADU. This is the proposed design here. You can see it's a two-story Craftsman-like house. The secondary unit would be located in the basement, with the primary unit located above on the first floor and the second floor. This is just a cross-section, so you can see the light wells leading to either side of the basement unit and how that relates to the upper floors above. You can see the kind of sketch of the carport structure that was proposed in the rear. This is a layout of the proposed landscape plan. There is a redwood located at the far rear corner of the property. There isn't very much construction going on in the critical root zone. That was much of a concern to staff when we reviewed this application. There are some more extensive landscaping proposed in the front yard area that you can see there on the left. And just to go over the timeline for this application. You are aware, this did go to Council on pre-screening on October 2, 2017, where they were mostly supportive of this moving forward. This went to PTC hearing on December 12, last week. The PTC did support the project, and before the application could move on to its next phase, which would be formally to the City Council for a decision on the zone change, the PTC, which already made a recommendation, but the ARB also would need to make a recommendation to Council before we can move to that stage. Some key considerations would be the, the existing neighborhood has a mixture of architectural styles and densities, so how is this compatible, this proposal is compatible with that. The site is, of course, directly adjacent to the College Terrace Library. It's the larger parcel, and the architecture is different as a public facility. And its use is different, of course. And it is next to the apartment building, which is far more dense and large in massing than the proposed structure itself on the site. Another consideration would be submitted landscaping, as it has some local and native plants, along with some non-native plants. The recommendation for the Board is that the Board recommend approval of the proposed project to the City Council based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval. Thank you. That concludes the presentation.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Could you show us those slides of the buildings and the vicinity again, a little more slowly?

Mr. Gutierrez: Sure. This is the College Terrace Library.

Chair Furth: The site is over to the right in this slide.

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct. It would be located here, where this vehicle is. That's the empty lot there. And this is directly across the street from the site, so, if you were standing here where this vehicle is, directly behind you would be the subject site. You can see a single-story home there, and adjacent is another single-story home. As we move further down the street, so, this is further down the street to the left, this is the... I'm not sure quite what that architecture is. It's kind of Craftsman-y, mixed...

Chair Furth: It's a larger house.

Mr. Gutierrez: It's a larger house, exactly.

Chair Furth: With a (inaudible).

Mr. Gutierrez: And then, to the furthest end of the little street here, on the corner is a newer home, two story. And then we have the apartment building that's directly adjacent to the site. A little difficult to get a clear image of what it looks like because there is a lot of tree cover there. Taking it from this angle rather than at the angle directly adjacent to the site was a better vantage point of the architecture of that building.

Chair Furth: And then, behind that, there is another apartment building, which sort of backs up to this, to the rear portion of this lot? When you walk on this lot, you see rear balconies or something, from that building behind it?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, and that's why I included the aerial.

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Mr. Gutierrez: It's a larger site in the back, and there's kind of the carports here that you can see in the image for this apartment building. There's another apartment building here, as well. It kind of backs up to this end of the site.

Chair Furth: And those buildings front on California? Or whatever that street is. California, right?

Mr. Gutierrez: I believe so, yeah. That's California.

Chair Furth: And so, the apartment building that is to the left, that's parking, basically, and driveways adjacent to the site. Is that right?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct. If you were looking at the site here, you could actually see where they store their trash bins for that site, and it's a driveway right here that leads to the rear where the carports are.

Chair Furth: Not what we would permit in the current code for trash storage.

Mr. Gutierrez: No, no. It's an existing condition. Of course, if they were to...

Chair Furth: And the extensive greenery on the other side, adjacent to the City park, is that on this parcel, or is it on the park parcel? Or both?

Mr. Gutierrez: It's a mixture of both. It's a little hard to tell. I've actually visited the site and it's a little dense under there, so I'm not quite sure...

Chair Furth: It is dense.

Mr. Gutierrez: ...how...

Chair Furth: A lot of happy birds.

Mr. Gutierrez: ...how it all is located there. It seems like it is a mixture of the two, or goes along the property line.

Chair Furth: Okay, thank you. Any other questions of staff before we hear from the applicant? Seeing none, if we could hear from the applicant. You'll have 10 minutes for your presentation. And if you could identify yourself and spell your name for our transcriber.

Jack Culpepper: Thank you. Good morning, Chair Furth, and Vice Chair Baltay, and members of the Board. My name is Jack Culpepper [spells name]. I'm the owner. I grew up in College Terrace and have a

once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to move back. That's why I'm here. Looking to build a really high-quality house. Looking for high-quality design. With that, I'd like to introduce architect Glen Jarvis and discuss the design. Thanks very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Mr. Jarvis?

Glen Jarvis, Jarvis Architects: Yes. This is our third hearing. We first had an informational hearing with City Council about the zoning change, and that was October 2017. And they said they liked the building, and they recommended we proceed with the application. And then, last week, we were before the Planning Commission, and they thought that this was, this zoning remnant would be better in the RMD zone, and it would be a more consistent block face and fit better on that side of Wellesley. What the difference in this proposal is, is that we get two good units instead of a house and an in-law unit. We get an extra 500 square feet. It's an increase in parking requirements, and it's a more detailed review, but probably most importantly for this house is the daylight plane. We get an extra five feet of daylight plane in the RMD zone, and what that does is it allows to have a full second story without dormers because you don't have to sit down from the property line, the roof plane, so much. That big roof plane allows us to have a good solar array. We can get enough solar panels in to make this a zero net energy project, and it will be carbon-free, too. Let's see. We have a good basic Craftsman house here, good story, traditional Craftsman house that fits in a historic neighborhood quite well. It's a house that has many signature features. It's designed to be of fine quality, good materials. It will be nice. It will be wood on the inside, besides shingles on the outside. I mean, wood trim on the inside. The landscape is designed with minimal watering, native plants. It will exceed the landscape requirements. We will exceed the green building requirements. And, we are requesting no variances. We just feel that this design meets and exceeds everything that Palo Alto is asking for. Do you have any questions?

Chair Furth: I'll find out. Any questions of the applicant from staff, or from board members? Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Just a quick clarification. In the render that we're looking at, basically that part that's kind of in shadow, that's all glass, right?

Mr. Jarvis: Pardon?

Board Member Thompson: Is that all glass, the...?

Mr. Jarvis: There is a carport in the back corner.

Board Member Thompson: No, sorry. The front elevation of the building, you have a, sort of a bay window pop-out, and then, there's a window above it, and then, that triangle...?

Mr. Jarvis: Oh, that, up in the triangle is wood paneling.

Board Member Thompson: This is all glass?

Mr. Jarvis: No, that's wood paneling.

Board Member Thompson: This is all wood paneling.

Mr. Jarvis: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. It was kind of shaded a little differently, so I wasn't sure.

Mr. Jarvis: Yeah, sometimes it's hard to get the, you know, when we color the rendering, it...

Chair Furth: I think we've got it now.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: It's wood. Any other questions?

Board Member Thompson: Wait, sorry, just to...

Chair Furth: That's all right.

Board Member Thompson: ...be clear. The shingles, do they continue, or do they stop?

Mr. Jarvis: The shingles go up to the top of the window. And then we have the wood paneling above it. And that's a pretty traditional feature. Often you see it as vertical boards and batten, that type of an idea.

Chair Furth: That's Mr. **Maybeck** [phonetic] saving money.

Board Member Thompson: Okay. Thank you for that.

Chair Furth: Other questions? Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. Thank you for a nice rendering here. Nice to get off the computer and use your hand and pencil. Really wonderful. I'm wondering whether this zone -- and maybe this is more a question for staff -- requires building department issues. How have you addressed them? I'm thinking about full bathrooms in cellar areas. I might be a little confused here because what's called the cellar in New York is different than what is here.

Chair Furth: Are you asking if this is code compliant? Are you asking if this conforms to code?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, whether it conforms to code. Is that a question I should address...?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. Yes. This, if the rezoning goes through, then two units, two full units would be allowed on this property. They are proposing the second unit to be in the basement, which means that as a full unit, that basement could have a full kitchen, bathroom, and would be required to have that, as well.

Board Member Hirsch: The new zone takes care of those issues, right?

Chair Furth: The building code permits all those things to be built at this level. Staff is nodding their heads. Any other questions?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, one more. In such a determination, how do you decide what level the first floor is versus the cellar plan? You have it three steps up at this point.

Ms. Gerhardt: Basements are allowed to be... Or, actually, the first floor is allowed to be three feet off of the ground, off the grade level, so, as long as it stays that three feet, then the lower level is still considered a basement.

Board Member Hirsch: To continue with that a little bit further, does that require any outdoor light and air requirements that are specific to that?

Ms. Gerhardt: The Building Department is going to have access requirements. That's why we do allow the excavated features, intervening lightwells or below-grade patios. You're seeing those on the plans.

Board Member Hirsch: And just one final one. The lightwell, the lightwells, then, every lightwell has to follow that requirement?

Ms. Gerhardt: Lightwells can be three feet wide, so some of these could be potentially smaller, but the Building Department has reviewed this project and...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: ...feels that it, at least at this point, meets the code.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. How about ventilation in rooms below grade? A requirement for amount of ventilation?

Ms. Gerhardt: We're getting a little deep into the building code and it's not my specialty. But again, the Building Department has reviewed it and believes that it's...

Board Member Hirsch: And they approved...Okay, thank you.

Chair Furth: But just very briefly, these bedrooms require exterior access, and we do require a certain amount of light and air. Any other questions? I had a question. I'm very glad that this lot is being reconfigured. You are speaking to a lot of experienced Craftsman residents. Not in this town. Tell me about the light and air in the lower level unit. I know that you have a patio, I know that you have a staircase. I understand that it will have to have, the excavations will have to have protective railings around them. What I want is reassurance that there will be enough light and air -- primarily light -- in the lower level. Could you explain the fenestration to me and how the light is going to get there?

Mr. Jarvis: Most certainly. We're limited by having the main floor at three feet above grade. We're doing...

Chair Furth: We're sorry about that.

Mr. Jarvis: ... We're doing the very best within the allowed lightwell areas to provide the light and air to the lower unit. We have maximized the allowable lightwells that the building code allows, or the planning code allows. And in that, we have lightwells on both sides of the living space that are at the level of the basement. One is six feet deep, the other one is seven feet deep. The full width of the living space, so we have light on both sides of that. One of the bedrooms has a window facing into that lightwell. Another one, a high window up on the driveway. That window in that bedroom meets the egress requirements for the fire department. And the bedroom on the other side has, we have a lightwell that is not all the way down. We could put it down as far as we're allowed, but that meets the egress requirements for that bedroom and gives it its privacy. And the railings was the other question, and we're looking to have an open iron railing. We want them to be as airy as possible and it's not just going to be an extension of the wall. The lightwells face, both of them face the side yards and not the rear yard, which can be used by both parties. When you're in this basement unit, you do have privacy. There's privacy also because the library has a hedge row going right along the property line, so that's giving us a lot of separation between the public and the private space in both, you know, both in the basement and above. And the apartment house on the right-hand side as you look from the street has about 25 feet of driveway, plus our 10 feet. So, it's 35, 40 feet of separation on that side, and we're looking to see what we can do to make that fence nice. They store their dumpsters against that fence.

Chair Furth: They do. We wouldn't allow that now, but they do.

Mr. Jarvis: Yeah, and... Anyway. We're doing our best...

Chair Furth: You don't have landscape that out.

Mr. Jarvis: ... with what's there.

Chair Furth: I understand that you're doing your best, so, will I need to have the lights on all the time if I lived down there? We don't have a long tradition of basement apartments in this town. And I'm used to basement apartments in areas where, you know, it's five or six or seven feet to the first floor.

Mr. Jarvis: Right, right. You normally get four or five feet in a Craftsman house. You get... They're normally, like, three feet of crawl space under them, so, this is just down a foot from normal. But I think that we, you know, I think this basement unit is going to be pretty nice.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Of course, Mr. Hirsch, Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: The first floor is required to be at least four feet? Is that what you're saying? Or could it be five feet off of grade, or...? At least three feet. Now, could it be four feet...?

Chair Furth: No, it's the other way around. We only allow them three feet.

Board Member Hirsch: We only allow...Okay.

Mr. Jarvis: Yeah, we're stuck with a three-foot requirement....

Board Member Hirsch: You're stuck with that.

Mr. Jarvis: ... and if you were to lift it a foot, we would be in the daylight plane on the library side.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: David, if they do the first floor higher than three feet, then all of the basement counts as square footage.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Furth: These regulations were adopted when there was a lot of concern about perceived mass of buildings. Generally speaking, semi subterranean living spaces only became popular here starting about 30 years ago. Maybe even less. I came here 20 years ago, and they were just beginning to cause a controversy, so the regulations have been designed to lower it, basically. Any other questions of the applicant or the owner? Seeing none, we'll come back here. Comments? Public comments? I have no speaker cards. Does anybody care to comment? Seeing no one, we'll bring the deliberations up here. Staff have any comments at this point? They do not. Osma, why don't you start.

Board Member Thompson: You pick the person that hasn't seen the site.

Chair Furth: Okay. Peter, why don't you start.

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure, glad to. Glad to start out. I can make the findings to recommend approval. It's a handsome Craftsman-style house in a neighborhood full of Craftsman-style houses, amongst other things. I did scratch my head for a second that it's next to a fairly, what Palo Alto would consider a historic building, a library, and should it be the same architectural style. But I just don't think you could make the finding that that contextualism would need that. It's similar to the houses in the neighborhood and it certainly looks residential, so I think it's quite contextual. Osma beat me to the question about the gable end treatment above the shingles, and I agree that that's a traditional detail. I'm not sure it's executed as traditionally as it ought to be. Perhaps you could just take a suggestion and think about it once more, whether it needs that grid pattern of solid wood pieces, and if it's not a little bit too low down on the façade. But either way, it's going to be fine. The only other design issue I had was that the carport is really out of character with the rest of the house, and I understand you're facing severe daylight plane restrictions with two back sides of the carport, where the property line abuts. Typically, we build a gable end facing the public and leave the back end of it hipped. It's maybe not the perfect architectural

solution, but it meets the daylight plane requirements and stays within the character of the house. Lastly, I'll comment to the staff that there is a live oak tree on the adjacent property to the right, which leans over quite a bit on the property. I suggest that we have an arborist verify that the new construction of the basement will not impact the neighbor's live oak tree. The canopy was not shown on the survey, but it extends, clearly, over this property. I just can't say whether it will be harmed or not, but we should be careful about that.

Chair Furth: Board Member Baltay, you're talking about which property?

Vice Chair Baltay: The property to the right...

Chair Furth: As you face the house from Wellesley.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...as you face the house. There is a live oak tree. The trunk of the tree is shown on the plans...

Chair Furth: Oh, got it.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... but there's no canopy indicated. But on visiting the site, the canopy clearly overhangs this property. I don't believe it goes as far as where the basement will be, but we should be careful about that. It's a simple matter. Other than that, I think it's a handsome design, and I see no reason it shouldn't go forward. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: I used to live in Lockridge [phonetic] and I used to walk by a lot of houses that looked just like this in Lockridge and Elmwood, and I think you've done an exemplary job of matching the styles. And I think I can make the findings, as well. I would say my main issue is that the basement unit, I think is sort of undesirable, but I don't really see that that's... I don't quite see that in our findings. I would just point out, like, in Boston, like in Cambridge and other towns in New England, they would take the traditional form that you have, and they would do all sorts of interesting interlocking units. Like, my grandparents' house had a three-bedroom house on the top two floors, and then there was a two-bedroom apartment below their house, mostly on the first floor, and then, like, it had one bedroom up on the second floor. And then, the upper part of the house actually had a very steep staircase that connected down to the basement. A really crazy, you know, very steep staircases and what-not, but it allowed all of the units, both units, to get natural light and have porches that faced the back yard or the front yard. And then, the basement was mostly mechanical and utilities-based. I think this is a missed opportunity here, but I will support the project. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. Well, thank you for your application. It's definitely really charming to look at hand-drawn things. Sort of, not new for me, but definitely unusual. But it's nice to see. I can see that a lot of elements are really well thought out. I apologize, I haven't had a chance to see the site, but I looked on Google Earth and staff report, and it does seem that with the other varying architectural styles that still look very residential, that this would work in that context. I will echo Board Member Baltay's note about the treatment under the gable. I think it's just a... The one downside of showing plans like this is that there is a big of vagueness as to what's actually happening. There's no keynotes on the elevations to indicate what material is actually happening there, which is why I had that question. But in general, I would say that this is a really exciting project. I can recommend approval, but... yeah. Just saying, in the future, it would be helpful to have more keynotes just in terms of understanding exactly what's happening on these exterior elevations. There's still some other hatches here that I can guess. Like, I think I know what that is, but I'm not 100 percent sure. I mean, I thought that was glazing for a second because that's how it was rendered in this print here. So, yeah, in general, I would say I'm pretty supportive. Yeah. Just a few little caveats here and there. That's all. That's all from me.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Who hasn't spoken? David?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I agree with fellow board members on most of what was stated. I have one specific concern. I'm not at all happy with the fact that you can't go up another foot and somehow... Which would make that cellar unit certainly a lot better. The left/west side elevation. I'm wondering if it isn't possible, since you duplicate the window pattern on the floor, of the floor above, you might change the stairway access to the ground so that it provided a bit more light and air in the primary bedroom. I think I'd ask you to look at that. That's on page 3. I know you've solved all the issues of light and air as you described them. I think it's kind of a shame that on the east elevation, you don't have another small window facing out towards the driveway, sort of make that a symmetrical room. On that elevation, it would be possible to do so. Just one moment. It's a little unfortunate that the owners of this house will have to go quite so far to get to the garbage collection, which is on the, kind of opposite side. But I don't think there's an easy way to solve that one, so you've probably done as best you can. Unless there's some way to do it to the back yard, and then it's a long pull for the pails to get out to the street. It's a little far to go around the face of the building there, and I hope the paving would allow you to get there easily. I note that you don't have any plantings shown above the, that strip that's next to the recessed area and the cellar there, the outdoor deck. Although you have a fence, and you said there is planting all along there, I'm not sure that's consistent, so, I'm concerned that whatever fence design -- which is really rather minimally shown in these drawings -- has a way to create privacy to that cellar open space. I think you might look at that, how to detail some of that. I think those are pretty much my concerns. I might have one more. Yes, I have one more item, but it has nothing to do with the ARB. I didn't find a way to get to the cellar from your first-floor plan. It seems to have two closets and no door to the cellar. I'm sure you're going to be correcting that on your own. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Thank you for your project. It's good that the lot, which has been without housing for 30 years, will have two units on it. I was interested that you chose a style that is very different from the library that dominates this court, this court, but I think it's an eclectic neighborhood, and this is certainly an acceptable style. I am very concerned about the quality of life in the basement unit. I understand from hearing previous discussions of this and from my colleagues that it's very difficult to get adequate light into a basement unit given our codes. And I think -- this is to staff -- I think you need to rethink that with respect to second units at the lower level. It's not okay to say we're encouraging second units, and then, encourage second units which are too dark. And it's one thing to say we don't want your fifth and sixth bedrooms in your very large house to push your building up high, but this house does not have particularly high floor plates. I mean, you haven't done 12-foot ground floors. Sometimes we see houses where they've been extended to the next. These are moderately-sized first and second stories and an inadequately-sized basement. However, I don't think that it's enough to make me vote no. I took a look at the NP findings which, of course, it's interesting, because they are mostly designed to keep downtown north and -- which is my neighborhood -- and College Terrace, they're designed to discourage the tearing-down of structures. When you tore it down 30 years ago, that's a done deal. So, we are required -- it says here -- to foster retention of existing single-family structures; not going to go. Maintain existing historic and general character of the neighborhood -- I think I'm okay with that. And, we're supposed to review the design... Let's see. We could have design guidelines for College Terrace, but I gather we do not. Is that correct?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct. There are no design guidelines. That code section in particular says that the ARB, at its discretion could come up with...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Right...

Mr. Gutierrez: For each area where the NP is overlaying.

Chair Furth: Exactly, but it's never happened, so really, the hurdle for this building to go over are the ones that we generally use when we're doing design review. I can make all the findings except the one

with regard to landscaping. I appreciate the California wax myrtle -- the Myrica -- which grows like a proverbial weed. I spend a lot of time whacking it down. But I think you've got it in a good location. I appreciate, I guess it's the ceanothus and a few other things that you have, but I think predominantly the landscaping is what you would see 30's, 40's, 50's, 60's Craftsman, which is charming but doesn't meet the code. In my opinion. I have three concerns, all of which are relatively minor. One is I think the landscaping needs to be addressed a little further so that we do have significant more volume of native plants. I do understand that some of these are good habitat plants, though I don't think Cecile Brunner is particularly. But I don't know. And I would like staff probably to be looking at the landscaping and railings around the lightwells to assure that they are done in a style that maximizes light and air and privacy -- that's going to be a trade-off -- to the basement unit. And then, I had a question about the... The reason I asked the question about the interaction between this house and the park is that, at some point, that park may be more intensively developed and/or used. We have the trash enclosures adjacent to the park, but they are enclosures, so that shouldn't be an aesthetic problem. Is that correct?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct. And also, the trash enclosures for this property, you're going to have landscaping, as well.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Gutierrez: And then a fence, as well.

Chair Furth: Staff, can you take me through what's on the border between...? I'm having trouble reading the landscaping and lighting plan. What's between this property and the park in terms of landscaping and fencing?

Mr. Gutierrez: When I visited the site, I could just see a lot of overgrown landscaping, so it was difficult to tell...

Chair Furth: Why don't I ask the applicant, then?

Mr. Gutierrez: Okay.

Chair Furth: Could you explain how the border is going to be? I'm sure you want good visual and privacy screening, as well.

Mr. Jarvis: We have the trash enclosure against the building, and then, we have a walkway...

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Jarvis: ...and then a fence, and then a hedge row that's on the library property.

Chair Furth: And tell me about the fence.

Mr. Jarvis: I'm thinking it's a six-foot board fence. We're trying... I think that finalizing the design of that is really standing out there and looking at how transparent the hedge row is. Because we would... We're trying to make it feel as natural as possible. But the park is, the open part of the park is towards the rear of the property, and this hedge row extends down the length of the building. And so, from the park side, you're not going to see much of this building. You might see the roof.

Chair Furth: Yeah, I mean, I... Sometimes we use fencing, which is basically board frame with good-looking, heavy mesh in between that lets the plants grow through and light and air circulate and doesn't present your basement tenant or yourselves with an abrupt view of a fence. Thank you. Okay. Any further discussion.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. On the native plants finding, I tend to disagree with you because I think they have enough representation of native plants. And then, the ones where they've departed, things like wisteria, the climbing rose, honeysuckle -- They aren't native options.

Chair Furth: But they've been around a long time.

Board Member Lew: But there aren't native, there aren't... I've tried some of them, like there's a native clematis that I've been testing out, and it's just not...

Chair Furth: Vines are not our strong point.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. It's just not there. I would say things like star jasmine and stuff, like, yeah, that could be replaced. Also, things like lavender, which isn't native, is...

Chair Furth: Very popular.

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ... with hummingbirds and what-not. I don't know. Is there a particular...?

Chair Furth: Well, I don't really understand the point of, um, pittosporum.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, that could be replaced. Pittosporum and star jasmine. But I think the list is generally good.

Chair Furth: Like a lot of things aren't. And I do agree that our local butterflies and bees and birds are very fond of lavender. Okay. I had fun looking up some of these plants, actually. They are very interesting. Okay. Would anybody like to make a motion?

Board Member Lew: I have one last comment.

Chair Furth: Yes?

Board Member Lew: Or two last comments. One is, you've got the trash on the left side, and we have these rolling carts, and you've got all these stepping stones, so I don't think that that works very well. And then, I think the other, my last comment is, normally we don't allow air conditioning units in the setbacks, and if you're doing net zero, I'm presuming you're not doing air conditioning, but normally we will have some sort of condition that there's no mechanical equipment in the setback areas. Because sometimes on houses like this, it's tough to find a location for them.

Vice Chair Baltay: May I offer a word of advice to you? The Board is concerned about the basement units being habitable. I've designed dozens of basement houses in Palo Alto. If you add a foot to the depth of the basement, you're stuck making two more treads, but you're left with a nine-foot ceiling, which gives you a lot more flexibility to make the rooms more habitable. You'll be fighting plumbing drain lines and any kind of air ducts in the ceilings, and having that extra foot, you will be really happy later when you have to drop some soffits. It just gives a quality to the space that is really lacking because of the daylight, which you (inaudible). Just advice.

Board Member Lew: I completely agree with that. That's very well... I think that's really important.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Board Member Lew: And then, I think the other thing, too, on basement lighting, and from the basements that I've seen in Palo Alto, having... If you look on the basement unit, having the living room on Sheet 2 of the basement plan, having the living room and dining room, having windows on both sides,

and having things go down... Like, having doors going all the way to the ground. That actually helps a lot with the light. The basements that I've seen that have done that are actually pretty, they are pretty nice.

Vice Chair Baltay: I move that we recommend...

Chair Furth: I think the applicant had a comment.

Mr. Jarvis: I really looked at that having a nine-foot ceiling, and what I was concerned about was that I was trying to keep the top of the wall in the courtyard as low to your eye level as possible. Trying to find a way to pull that, even pull that courtyard wall down a little bit, so when you're in the room, the proportion of that courtyard wall looked as low as possible. And by giving... We have a beam that goes through the middle of this living space, so I'm trying to break it up into two rooms, but they are totally open on both sides as a way to make that work. But I just wanted to say I thought about that, and I'm happy to review it, too. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Okay. Would someone care to make a motion?

### **MOTION**

Vice Chair Baltay: I'll move that we recommend approval of this project as submitted.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Board Member Hirsch: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: Any comment? I think... Could we add a condition that staff will review access to the trash enclosure? Because I don't... I agree that they don't go very well over stepping stones. The access path to the trash enclosure? And work with the applicant for an increase in native plant materials. I think our conversation made it clear that we think, generally, it's a lovely design. And no mechanical equipment in the setbacks.

Ms. Gerhardt: Is this a friendly amendment?

Chair Furth: I'm trying it as a friendly amendment. We'll see what happens.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's friendly. I'll receive it.

Chair Furth: Does the seconder agree?

Board Member Hirsch: I agree.

Chair Furth: Okay. Anything else? All those in favor say aye. Aye. Well, our first unanimous vote of the day. Thank you very much for your proposal.

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

Mr. Jarvis: Thank you. Thanks for your comments.

Chair Furth: And we'll take a three-minute break before we go on to the major item of the morning. Which they are all major for the applicants and for the City, but this one is Verizon.

[The Board took a short break.]

## **5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. Vinculums/Verizon Cluster 2 in Barron Park, Palo Alto Orchards, and Charleston Meadows Neighborhoods, and Next to Stanford**

**Shopping Center [17PLN-00170 File Uses 250 Hamilton Address]: Request by Vinculums (for GTE Mobilnet dba Verizon Wireless) for Seven Small Cell Node Tier 3 Wireless Communication Facility Permits on Existing Wood Utility Poles in the Public Right of Way. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15303. Zoning Districts: Node Locations are Adjacent to R-1 Zones and CC Zone. R-1 Zone: 4206 Suzanne Dr, 3715 Whitsell Av, 785 Barron Av, 792 Los Robles Av, and 3993 Laguna Av; R-1(S) Zone: 4193 Wilkie Wy; CC Zone: Across from 213 Quarry Road Next to Stanford Shopping Center Parking Structure (180 El Camino Real). Alternative Node Locations for Three Primary Node Locations are Adjacent to R-1(S) Zone (362 Carolina Ln, Alternate for 4193 Wilkie Wy Node), R-1 Zone (4013 Amaranta Av, Alternate for 792 Los Robles Av Node, and R-1(10,000) Zone (904 Los Robles Av, Alternate for 3993 Laguna Av Node). For More Information Contact the Project Planner, Rebecca Atkinson at [Rebecca.atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org](mailto:Rebecca.atkinson@CityofPaloAlto.org)**

Chair Furth: We are on our last major hearing item of the day. This is a public hearing. It's a quasi-judicial public hearing on the proposed Vinculums, on behalf of Verizon, Cluster 2 in Barron Park, Palo Alto Orchards, and Charleston Meadows Neighborhoods, and also one next to the shopping center. What these are, are seven small cell node Tier 3 wireless communication facility permits on existing wood utility poles in the public right-of-way. This action is exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, in accordance with guideline section 15303. The specific locations are 4206 Suzanne Drive, 3715 Whitsell Avenue, 785 Barron Avenue, 792 Los Robles Avenue, 3993 Laguna Avenue, 4193 Wilkie Way, and across from 213 Quarry Road, next to Stanford Shopping Center, a/k/a 180 El Camino Real. There are also proposed telecom installations at 4193 Wilkie Way, 4013 Amaranta Avenue, as an alternate for the 792 Los Robles Avenue node, and 904 Los Robles Avenue, alternate for 3993 Laguna Avenue. And I should warn you that this seems to be a moving, moving proposition as the applicant seeks to find acceptable locations in these neighborhoods. I understand that we have one member of the public, Andrew Mellows, who needs to leave in a few minutes. In the past we have, with the permission of the applicant, let that person speak first so they can be on their way. The applicant is indicating consent, so, Mr. Mellows, if you could come, give us your name and spell it for our transcriber, and you will have three minutes for your comments.

Andrew Mellows: Thank you very much for making accommodation for me. My name is Andrew Mellows [spells name]. I reside at 791 Coastland Drive.

Chair Furth: (inaudible)

Mr. Mellows: I reside at 791 Coastland Drive.

Chair Furth: Thanks.

Mr. Mellows: I've been a Verizon customer for over 20 years. I stuck with Verizon because coverage was so good wherever I went while traveling for work. Meanwhile, my cellphone service at home in Palo Alto required moving out to the front yard to avoid dropping calls. The situation has improved in the last three years. According to the recent article in the Bay Area News Group, written by Kevin Kelly, the current debate involves antennas that will be mounted on light poles. From what you've just said, I think that may not be true, but I'll continue. I asked the representative of the applicant if there had been any discussion about replacing the light poles with more robust structures that would house the equipment safely and support the lights. His reply was that it is complicated because of coordination with other utilities using the same poles. It is not clear if this means lights are hanging from utility poles, or if utilities are hanging from light poles, but the latter seems unlikely. My question, the crux of my point: Has anyone considered just replacing light poles with combined appliances that have cell structures inside them? It seems like, you know, the space is already there. There's no conflict with other utilities. And it seems like a sort of universal solution. I don't know if that's been considered. Anyway, obviously, Verizon does not want to use vaulting because of the cost, although my monthly contribution should be helping

with that. Finally, my feeling is that whatever we allow is a stopgap measure. We want good service, but we think cell towers are ugly and dangerous. We accept the incredibly ugly utility poles and wires over most of our city without question, and I believe the fear of radiation from cell towers has been proved to be unfounded. I wish I could simply fess up to the necessity of installing a robust and dedicated system of **tires [phonetic]** that could be shared by various providers and accept the aesthetic cost of supporting the cell service we want. You can certainly put a cell tower in my back yard if it was permitted. Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I'm sure they all made note of your address. Thank you very much. All right. Staff? Oh, first of all. Has everybody...? I'll put it the other way. Who has had the opportunity to go visit the sites?

Vice Chair Baltay: I have.

Chair Furth: I have.

Board Member Lew: I visited the sites, but I missed one of them.

Chair Furth: All right.

Board Member Thompson: I have not.

Chair Furth: Osma has not. David?

Board Member Hirsch: No, I have not.

Chair Furth: David has not.

Board Member Thompson: I'll be better in the new year.

Chair Furth: Okay. It's not easy. This is a lovely, rambling, twisting, well-planted neighborhood. And I found myself frequently lost. But it was enjoyable. Staff? Oh, and I have not had any.... Oh, I've had two conversations during the course of this. I came across **Mrs. Song [phonetic]**, whose correspondence is in our packet, who expressed her regret that she could not take time away from work to come to our hearing, and her letter is in opposition to the installations. And I also ran into an unnamed member of the public who was in favor of more telecommunications facilities, though he understood they were unsightly.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to disclose that I disclosed the project with the city attorney, Albert Yang, yesterday, though I didn't learn anything that's not already on the public record.

Chair Furth: All right.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Okay. Good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. With me is the project planner, Rebecca Atkinson, who has been a dedicated member, speaking with public citizens who call in and write in about this project. On the screen... There we go. The map on the screen shows the location of the proposed small cell nodes that are to be installed by the company, Vinculum, so that Verizon, the carrier of wireless, can locate there. This is not a co-location of multiple carriers, just one carrier. The description of the project is on the screen. Basically, seven wood utility poles that exist would receive antennas and equipment to provide for LTE service and future 5G service. Verizon seeks additional capacity and increased signal strength in areas that do not have such access to PCS and AWS signal coverage. They can describe that if they would like to. The applicant has provided a detailed alternatives and vaulting analysis. They will go over that in their presentation. The applicant also removed three nodes earlier on in the process. Those are noted on the screen. The five nodes that staff has set up for approval are on the screen - Node 101, 153, the alternative Node 155-F, the alternative Node 157-E, and Node 163. We are seeking comments on Node 104 and Node 154. We are not resolved

with those two as far as recommendation. The aesthetic conditions that we are looking at are focused on the clearances, providing additional street trees -- or amenity trees, as they are called -- and possibly eliminating equipment, or slim lining the equipment, as far as that goes. Those are the types of conditions we look to add to approvals of such projects. We are also interested in comments on possible alternative designs. This is the first of the seven nodes that we are recommending. Sorry, first of the seven nodes that we are talking about today. The midblock node at 4193 Wilkie is the one that staff believes is approvable, and the node at 101-B is also midblock. The one on the left we believe we can add some trees to increase the screening. One-fifty-five, we are suggesting 155-F as the alternative, would be the better of the two. Both of these are midblock locations, but we think 155-F has more screening from existing mature trees. Then, 157, we are suggesting 157-E, the image on the right. There are no trees really needed to be added at this node. Then, 153, this node has no alternative that's proposed. We believe a new amenity tree could be added to improve the screening. Node 163, this is kind of the outlier node at Stanford Shopping Center, not in a residential area. There is one issue, which is the electrical step-down equipment, which is above grade, ground-mounted. And because it is an underground area as laid out in the SUMC Design Guidelines, we are looking to have a different setup for that electrical cabinet. And we also kind of question whether this wood bayonet needs to be this tall because there are no clearance issues, we think there are no clearance issues on this one. And here is Node 104. We have... This is Suzanne, so this is one of the ones that we're not, it's not fully vetted here with their proposal. They are proposing a tree across the street, and it doesn't really screen the tree very well.

Chair Furth: Excuse me, are you saying you do want a recommendation from us on 104, or you do not?

Ms. French: We would accept comments on this. The applicant has indicated -- and they will discuss this in their presentation -- they indicated that they are thinking to continue these, these two, the 104 and 154. We present it here because the ARB may wish to comment on these anyways.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. French: Node 104, we don't think the screening is working on that one. The Node 150.... Sorry, that was 104. Node 154, we think a tree could be added here and this equipment could be rotated counter-clockwise 90 degrees, and in that way improve matters. You're familiar, with the last meeting we had on December 6th, we had discussion about our consultant. We hired a consultant firm, CTC, and they prepared reports for the Crown Castle project. They are currently preparing a report for this project. We do not have it available today, timelines being what they are. The scope is on the screen. They are preparing a report to meet these scope items. They...

Chair Furth: Amy, could you go back?

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Furth: I couldn't read that that fast.

Ms. French: Okay. I'm happy to go through these. The scope of the CTC is to conduct site visits and inspect the proposed locations; to verify documentation provided in the application; to look at the onsite coverage and capacity tests; to conduct an independent review of the applications for compliance with FCC guidelines on human exposure to radiofrequency and electromagnetic fields. And, examining the area around a proposed site to identify suitable alternative locations; and, identifying potential site design changes to enhance the aesthetics. That's what they are looking at. Their findings are anticipated to be similar to those that they came up with for Crown Castle. Those are on the screen. And of course we don't have those yet, but they are anticipated to be similar to the Crown Castle findings. Their recommendation is likely, again, to be to try to reduce the size of the components, camouflaging the equipment, the cabinets, and to potentially eliminate the 700 megahertz technology from these sites. There are other methods available that are smaller in size, but of course, as we learned at the last ARB meeting, when you introduce the smaller technology, smaller size radios and antennas, the likelihood is

you have to increase the number of poles. So, less radio units are needed, shorter antennas are needed, when you go with that other technology. Also, with the recommendation is... That's basically Design Alternative 1, is to consider these smaller, lower-power antennas, and those could be mounted on the pole top. Design Alternative 2 would be the ground-mounted cabinets, potentially, you know, traditional, more traditional-looking utility cabinets that are not mailboxes, or fake mailboxes. And then, those would lend themselves to shrubs, etc., to disguise them. And then, the Alternative 3 would be vaults. The applicant is going to present to you the feasibility study that they have done node by node, so you can understand that they have done that work to examine vaulting for each site. Here's the images we presented at the last ARB meeting, showing the micro cell design, where the smaller antennas can be on the top of the pole with the radios just underneath. Or, they can be mounted on the side. The radios in the next slide are much smaller in dimension. The comparison here on the left is the proposed RRU 32 radios, and those are 27 inches long. The ones on the right are the Erickson 2203 micro cell units, and those are, you know, much smaller. As far as the size, they're square, seven inches, 7.8 inches.

Chair Furth: Amy, could you go back to the previous slide?

Ms. French: Yep.

Chair Furth: The design on the left is a staff proposal?

Ms. French: No, it's not a staff proposal, and it's not an applicant proposal. It's the CTC report, prepared these images as a, kind of a diagram, a cartoon diagram, if you will, to kind of illustrate what that would look like if we were to, you know...

Chair Furth: And the image on the left shows nothing attached to the pole except the antenna radio installation at the top of the pole. Is that right?

Ms. French: Yeah, so, these are not showing the type of shrouding or anything else. Just kind of the general location of the antenna and [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: But this would be it, right? Would there be other equipment on the pole, as well?

Rebecca Atkinson, Project Planner: It's my understanding there would be a need for an electrical disconnect, but in general, it would be slim and clean, as represented in the [crosstalk].

Chair Furth: This drawing doesn't show us anything on the pole as far as I can tell, except something on the top of it. Is that what it would be? The cable, perhaps?

Ms. Atkinson: Generally, yes.

Board Member Lew: Wynne, if you read through all the documents...

Chair Furth: I've got nine-tenths of them.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, but I think that the.... I think Vinculum is saying that there would be, at least with, if there were... Maybe I'm mixing (inaudible). With the vault system, I think that they were larger cables. I'm not sure.... There's no shrouding shown at the moment, right?

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: Just keep this in mind.

Ms. French: Okay, sure. We can continue with the presentation...

[crosstalk]

Chair Furth: ... point of view of the public, in particular, what their poles would look like. This is very different than what we [crosstalk].

Ms. French: Right. Just, again, the applicant is not proposing this solution. This is alternatives that our consultant has put out there for the City to wrestle with as we look at these applications.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Ms. French: The goal of today's meeting is for the ARB to recommend the conditional approval of five nodes, and using the architectural review standards, we have these wireless communication facility permit development standards, we have not put findings in front of you. We just have the generic findings, and those are in the packet. We also have two conditional use permit findings we have to make, weaving the planning and community environment director... The conditions of approval are in process. Again, here we are. Next steps for the public. Today is our discussing of the proposal, hearing from members of the public, public testimony. We've received quite a bit of comment, and we do have at places some of these comments. In fact, they are as recent as Tuesday of this week. And then, there would be a request for a recommendation to the director, and the director would, you know, try to make a decision following the ARB hearing. Or, the Director could refer this to the Council to make the decision. If the Director makes the decision, then there is a 14-day appeal period which could be individually for each node, appeals. Rebecca's contact is listed on the screen. And we do maintain a website, the City Manager maintains a website, and we try to keep those updated with the most recent information.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any questions of staff before we go on? All right, we do have a number of speaker cards, but first, we should hear from the applicant. You have 10 minutes, and please introduce yourself, and spell your name for the record.

Jeremy Stroup: Good morning, Board members. My name is Jeremy Stroup [spells name]. I'm with Vinculums Services, and today, I'll be representing Verizon Wireless. The 10 applications before the Architectural Review Board represent Cluster 2 of the Verizon Small Cell Project. These include seven proposed primary nodes, with three proposed alternate nodes, located on wood utility poles. Because more than one viable candidate was found for three of our applications, these three alternate nodes have been made available for the ARB to choose the most appropriate pole location in relation to their primary pole candidates. If the ARB chooses an alternate, the primary pole would be removed from project consideration. Three nodes were removed from the original Cluster 2 submittal due to insufficient vaulting solutions at these locations. The staff report includes a copy of our project description. In this document, we described our pole selection process, and we're prepared to address any questions you may have prior to choosing which of the three alternative poles are most appropriate. Cluster 2 nodes are located within the Barron Park, Charleston Meadows, Palo Alto Orchards, Fairmeadow, and Stanford Shopping Center neighborhoods. Just a little background for our newest ARB member. This project began in June 2016 when the Palo Alto City Council voted in favor of a master license agreement, allowing Verizon Wireless to attach its equipment to City-owned utility poles. After the agreement was signed, Verizon worked with multiple city departments to understand the City's ordinances, and to best facilitate the Palo Alto small cell project. After three ARB hearings, this Board recommended approval of our Cluster 1 design. These included shrouding the pole-mounted equipment and cabling to offer a more streamlined, cohesive look; removal of ground-mounted radio equipment; shrouding the wooden bayonet installed between the top of the wood utility poles and the antennas; reducing the standoff distance from equipment to pole; and, working with the Urban Forestry department and a city-approved arborist to identify opportunities for Verizon to provide amenity trees near poles to screen equipment. Because this is the recommended design by this Board, Cluster 2 incorporates all these elements. The Board also requested that future nodes be undergrounded to the greatest extent feasible. We exhaustively explored this option, and I'd like to share those findings with you today. Placing radios in an underground vault requires a great deal of engineering review. Because of this, Verizon has a limited number of approved vault designs for in-field usage. The interior dimension of the vault you see on your screen is approximately four foot by six foot, which requires an excavation dimension of approximately 10 foot by 18 feet. This is the smallest approved vault capable of holding our proposed equipment in Palo Alto. This

photo spotlights one of the biggest fundamental challenges we face when attempting to underground equipment in the right-of-way -- Limited space. Underground vaults require a significant amount of equipment, more than just the approved pole-mounted equipment. They must include noise generating fans to keep equipment cooled; venting to allow hot air to escape the vault; water pumps to expel accumulated water from within the vault; and, most importantly, they must be large enough to fit a technician to work safely in and around the vault per OSHA standards. In order to install underground vaults in Cluster 2, we also worked with City staff to establish parameters for feasible vaulting locations. If any of these parameters were present at a location, the location would be deemed infeasible. These include interference with existing underground utilities such as residential sewer laterals, city sewers, natural gas mains, underground high-voltage power lines, and city storm drains. Excavating within drip lines of protected trees such as coast redwood and coast live oak trees is prohibited. Private property such as driveways or residential walkways cannot be encroached upon. Finally, CPAU requires excavation setbacks of five feet from any utility pole and guywire anchors in order to maintain the structural integrity of the pole. There are conditions that would significantly interfere but do not necessarily preclude vaulting. They are excavation within the drop lines of private and city trees, necessitating their removal; extensive redesigns to residential landscapes such as re-routing private fences, and the reclamation of perceived residential front yards located within the right-of-way; residential gas and water lines; and the installation of bollards to prevent cars parking on top of the vault where no such bollards currently exist today, sometimes in perceived residential front yards located within the right-of-way. We also have Verizon and (inaudible) parameters. Small cell technology was designed to place antennas and radios closely together to improve uplink performance. In your packets we have provided vault feasibility reports for each node, detailing these specifics. These reports have concluded that none of our proposed node locations are feasible to place underground vaults. And once again, just to reiterate, we've removed three nodes from the original Cluster 2 submittal due to those insufficient vaulting solutions at those locations. We are prepared to address any questions about our vaulting analysis today. Verizon has also performed community outreach efforts to better inform the public of our project. These include posting an informational website, holding community meetings, and fielding phone calls and emails from the public. We also constructed a mock site at 1350 Newell Road for public viewing. This Board directed Verizon Wireless to explore the option of placing equipment underground to the greatest extent feasible. As we have demonstrated by our analysis, this is not feasible for our seven primary node locations, nor the three alternate node locations. Staff recommends conditional approval of Node 101 at 4193 Wilkie Way; Node 153 at 3715 Whitsell Avenue; Node 155-F at 4013 Amaranta Avenue; and Node 157-E at 904 Los Robles Avenue. We concur with staff and request this Board affirm these recommendations to the Planning Director. Staff also recommends conditional approval of Node 163 at 180 El Camino Real, requiring that any proposed ground-mounted equipment be eliminated or placed underground with proper tree protection, and without impacting the tree scape outlined in the Stanford Medical University Center design guidelines. Because undergrounding the ground-mounted electrical transformer would not impact Verizon's radio equipment, Verizon is requesting the Board recommend conditional approval to underground all ground-mounted equipment, to the greatest extent feasible. Verizon will work with staff and CPAU to identify an appropriate location. Staff recommends the denial of both Node 104 at 4206 Suzanne Drive, and Node 154 at 785 Barron Avenue, due to visual prominence or lack of screening, visibility at an intersection without screening, proximity to curbs and existing driveways, reduction of sidewalk clearances, and equipment facing the street. Because Verizon received approval of a corner pole location at an intersection in Cluster 1, Verizon is requesting clarification from the Board today about visibility and appropriate screening from intersections and request a continuance for those two applications in order to implement ARB guidance, unless ARB finds them to be satisfactory. These sites are an accumulation of over two years of collaboration between Verizon, City staff, the ARB, City Council, and the residents of Palo Alto, to create custom designs that meet the unique needs of this community, while also meeting Verizon's network needs to increase coverage and capacity. They also represent the previously-recommended ARB design of our Cluster 1 sites, and the approved design of both Planning Director and the City Council. This collaboration has produced a state-of-the-art small cell network designed specifically for the residents of Palo Alto. Lastly, I'd like to just note that the alternative designs that were presented today by staff are for a different project and do not apply to these applications. They are not part of our proposal. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. For the record, could you give me the node numbers on the two items that you wish to have continued?

Mr. Stroup: Yes. They are Node 104 and Node 154.

Chair Furth: One-oh-four and 105.

Mr. Stroup: One-fifty-four.

Chair Furth: One-fifty-four. Glad I tried that one. One-oh-four and 154. That matches my previous notes. Thank you. We won't continue that until after we hear from the public, but let's remember to do that as a first thing when we start discussing. Thank you for your presentation. I have four speaker cards. Everybody is entitled to three minutes. I should tell you that Board Member Baltay has to leave at noon, and some of us have to leave shortly thereafter, but we will do our best. We do have a lot of written communications. I should also remind you that we have no jurisdiction or expertise, particularly with regard to the issue of safety of this equipment, with respect to human health. We do have a letter from the public, which encloses a copy of a local congress person's letter to the FCC, stating that the research that purports to show the safety of this equipment does not perhaps... Does not, in their opinion, adequately address 5G technology. But, again, we have no expertise on this. We are limited to discussing aesthetics. The first speaker is Jerry Fan at 3715 Whitsell, to be followed by Michele Pridmore Brown, perhaps. Mr. Fan.

Jerry Fan: Thank you. My name is Jerry Fan. [spells name]. I live at 3715 Whitsell, and I, together with our neighbors Saeid on 3810 Whitsell, Grady on 3818 Magnolia, oppose the proposed antenna equipment, and request alternatives solutions like undergrounding or moving to another site.

Chair Furth: For the record, you're Node 153.

Mr. Fan: Right. Thank you. The first thing I want to mention is that the pole actually sits well within the drip line of two Coastal redwood trees. If you'll look at the slide, I've included an image there. That's taken directly from the bottom. The picture that Verizon showed in their simulations is not an accurate representation of what is actually there. The pole is also, it's really close to a tree. I think the branches would be endangered, and the tree, which is a protected tree, would be a hazard to that tree. Power poles have been proven to show, responsible for past fires in Napa, Sonoma, and most recently, the devastating Camp Fire in Paradise that basically destroyed the town. The pole is in full view from our windows, and also front door. Our neighbor at 3810, directly from the front and the bedroom windows. It's also in full view from the house across the street from us. I think it's also... Lastly, it is also visible from the intersection, the four-way intersection, because our property is on the corner. There is no issue currently with coverage because Saeid, at 3810, is a Verizon customer. He's never had an issue with cellphone or data. He's gone as far as pole -- sorry -- Bol Park, which is, like, half a mile away, no issue with coverage. So I'm not sure I believe Verizon's claim that they need to improve that. Lastly, the equipment is ugly, and it's intrusive, and I think is more suitable to an industrial zone and not suitable for a quiet residential neighborhood. I mentioned before that the simulated image is really nothing less than an attempt to minimize the ugly equipment because they simply chose the best side to represent the simulation. If they had chosen, you know, this side, it would be a lot more intrusive, so, I don't think their simulation is accurate. I just want to point out that I mentioned that it's within the drip line of the Coastal redwood trees. I don't want to damage those trees. Our city's name -- Palo Alto -- means "Tall Tree." I think it's important to note that in my, in my proposal. Lastly, you know, if you do a cursory, just a cursory Google search about undergrounding equipment, you'll find examples in Europe from Ericsson and Swisscom, where they were able to put an under-grounded vault within a manhole. So, I think it's inaccurate to say, like, it's not, not feasible, based on their current guidelines and recommendations.

Chair Furth: Okay, thank you Mr. Fan.

Mr. Fan: Sorry, one last point. Andrew Mellow, who proposed that he wants an antenna in his back yard, I will take that trade.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Fan: Thank you.

Chair Furth: And our next speaker is Michele Pridmore Brown, to be followed by Tina Chow.

Tina Chow: Hi, I'm actually Tina, but Michele had to leave. She gave me a print-out of what she wanted to read. Can I read it and give you guys a copy?

Chair Furth: You're speaking on behalf of Tina, or do you have remarks of your own?

Ms. Chow: I am Tina. Michele, who had...

Chair Furth: Why don't you do your remarks first.

Ms. Chow: Okay.

Chair Furth: Sorry. And with respect to Tina Chow's comments, you can submit them to staff, but...

Vice Chair Baltay: She's Tina.

Chair Furth: You're Tina. Michele's comments. Yes. You can submit them to staff. They can make copies available and we'll read them if we can. I'm typically one speaker behind on names, so I apologize. In this case, I was ahead.

Ms. Chow: All right. So, my name is Tina Chow. [spells name]. I live in Barron Park neighborhood. I have a PhD in civil and environmental engineering, and I'm a professor at UC Berkeley. I care a lot about creating cities which are safe, resilient and beautiful, and inclusive to all. I'd like, with my comments, to re-emphasize that Verizon should put all ancillary equipment underground. Undergrounding makes sense, and it's feasible for all of Palo Alto, not just downtown. Verizon can do this. It's just more expensive to them. I think we should consider many issues. First is to consider safety. Fire risk is increased, as we just heard, with heavy equipment mounted on utility poles. We know that utility poles have been implicated in the recent devastating California fire. Second, neighborhood aesthetics. Cell towers are not pretty, and it looks even worse with equipment hanging off the poles. Just as an example, the alternate Node 157-E, which is shown now, would be completely visible from inside the properties at 899, 900, 904 Los Robles, and at 4008 Laguna Way, in addition to being visible from the two nearby intersections. And then, Node 154, which was just mentioned by Verizon, is easily visible at the stop sign across the street, as an example. So, for aesthetic and various other reasons. In addition, home values will decrease if cell towers are placed so close to homes. And there are alternatives where cell towers could be limited to specific setbacks, which is 200 feet from residences. Then, next is the increased noise. Even if Verizon says that they will use quiet equipment in their initial pole-mounted insulation by not including batteries, there is nothing to prevent Verizon from installing back-up batteries with loud fans at a later date, and they have done this before in Palo Alto. Finally, our city needs to be inclusive to all. Electro magnet hypersensitivity -- EHS -- is a recognized disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Greater setbacks from homes will help. Electro sensitive people also fare better when ancillary equipment is vaulted. Vaulted equipment is flush to the ground and is not a problem for people in wheelchairs or for people using bicycles or strollers. I've studied the vaulting reports that Verizon has submitted, where they say that there are sewer and gas lines, yet they have done undergrounding in other communities like ours. So, doing the vaulting is feasible. Cables can be longer to consider different vault locations, for example. The staff has kindly requested input from the community, and I say that if the proposed sites do not allow for vaulting, then new locations must be found. There is no reason to compromise our neighborhoods for the convenience of Verizon. Finally, the cell service from Verizon is presumably for us

residents. If you go to Verizon's website to sign up for their cell phone service, it shows full coverage over Palo Alto. It's unclear what they're trying to communicate if you zoom in and see if the maps are showing full coverage. It's a little deceiving when you're trying to figure out what they're talking about. Over the past year, you -- the ARB -- and the City Council have received hundreds of letters from residents who object to Verizon's plan. Very few letters have been on the other side, and I would argue that those people have been unaware of what Verizon really wants to do in our neighborhoods. I'm asking you to please continue to protect and enhance the quality of life in our beautiful city by directing Verizon to put all equipment underground for all the cell towers it wants to install in Barron Park. I think you for listening, and for all that you do to support Palo Alto residents.

Chair Furth: Thank you, and if staff would make a copy of the other material and distribute it to us and the public, we'll be able to take a look at it. The next speaker is not Michele Pridmore Brown. There is no next speaker. Anybody else wish to speak?

?: [inaudible and off microphone]

Chair Furth: Our rules only permit people to speak in larger groups or for themselves. I'm sorry about that.

?: [inaudible and off microphone]

Chair Furth: I've asked staff to make copies and they will do that now, and distribute it to us and leave it at the public comment table. They can find somebody to do that. Our rules... Basic rules on this are things that we receive before the meeting starts, we make copies of and distribute if we don't already have them on the website or some other form of distribution. But, I'm sorry, we didn't know that we would be running this late, and she didn't have an opportunity to submit it earlier. Or speak earlier. All right. Applicant, would you care to respond? You have 10 minutes.

Paul Albritton: Good morning, Paul Albritton, outside counsel for Verizon Wireless. Good to see you again, and thank you for all...

Chair Furth: You still need to spell your name.

Mr. Albritton: Okay. See if I can do that.

Chair Furth: And give us an address, actually, under our rules.

Mr. Albritton: It's Albritton [spells name], and I'm at 155 Sansome Street in San Francisco. Outside counsel for Verizon Wireless, and again, thank you for your time today. As you heard, this has been a Verizon Wireless project that's been in process for two years, over two years, in fact, so I want to reiterate that we have now, with these additional five nodes now, a total of 16 nodes that are before you, of the 93 that are being proposed by Verizon. And we are actively looking at vaulting solutions, but these are the sites where underground utilities, adjacency to trees, lack of space, required bollards, and phasing into front yards and so forth, preclude vaulting, and I think staff agrees in their recommendations that these are the sites that can go forward without vaulting. And I want to reiterate that we have a unique design that we worked over a year with your board to come up with a shroud that's narrow, covers all the radios, hides all the cables. If you've been to the mock site -- and I hope you've been to the mock site -- it includes a shroud for the bayonet itself that tapers up to the antenna, and we believe of all the facilities -- and I've been involved in these facilities up and down California -- is the best concealed and most aesthetically acceptable of this type of wireless facility that's being put forward by Verizon Wireless. You saw some early pictures from CTC. That's related to another project, not our project. And the low-powered radios that may have been suggested there require three to four more radios than what Verizon is proposing. We put 400 of that type of small cell in San Francisco, in addition to 70 of the slightly higher power, middle power radios. The benefit of the radios that Verizon is

proposing for these poles, and they've been designed to fit the verticality of the pole within that shroud, is that we need fewer poles by a factor of four. So, that's...

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, a factor of four, did you say?

Mr. Albritton: Yeah, it takes three to four times as... If I may, the wattage of the radios, of the smaller radios, is about five watts. The wattage per channel of the radios that we're proposing today is about 40 watts. We're covering an area of approximately 1,500 feet radius as opposed to 500 feet, which is the smaller radios. If you go to the smaller radios, then you just need many more of them. On my block in San Francisco, there are three small cells on light standards around my block to provide service to a very dense urban situation, which is actually, you've got some smaller radios in downtown Palo Alto right now. They fit in in certain circumstances, but that's not the technology that we are proposing. That's we propose the technology that we are proposing. And I don't want to get legal, but I will for a moment, to say that case law is that you can't dictate the technology that we use. In other words, you can't tell us that we have to put in a tower, a macro tower instead of small cell, so that we have to put in small cells instead of a macro tower, that we have to use little radios instead of big radios. That aside, this is the technology that Verizon believes is best for Palo Alto to provide the service is needed in 4G. There was a mention of 5G by the staff. This is 4G, and there are no present plans to upgrade these to 5G. This is a 4G proposal. We can speak to any of those suggestions that were made. The CTC report for Verizon has not been released. I have to say that two years ago, Verizon agreed with the City Attorney's office and we have a written agreement that CTC will not be looking at the coverage and availability of different frequencies and megahertz with respect to this application. That, again, is because of a legal position that, as a telephone corporation, Verizon has rights to put telephone equipment on telephone poles without the evaluation of what the necessity is. All that aside, this is a two-year process to come up with a design. We spent quite a bit of time getting permits and building the mock-up, revising the mock-up, to come up with a design that was acceptable to your Board, and I have to say, to the City Council. We think that if you have been to the mock-up, it is an aesthetically-acceptable design for utility telephone equipment on a telephone pole. We strongly believe that vaulting creates many impediments to what we do now and in the future. Vaults don't have a future. The radios are getting smaller, as I've described, as we densify a network, and the smaller the radios, the closer they have to be to the antennas so that there's less signal loss in a vault. These are 10-year permits. They are apt to be obsolete, certainly to be obsolete within that timeframe.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Albritton: We encourage you to follow the staff's recommendation, and we're here to answer any questions you may have.

Chair Furth: Does anybody have any questions of the applicant?

Mr. Albritton: Last footnote is we did submit over 400 Verizon customers who had sent a text message of support for the facilities. Thank you.

Chair Furth: I have a question for you. But, before I ask it, does anybody else have any questions of the applicant?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I do have one, but...

Chair Furth: All right.

Board Member Thompson: ...I can wait, actually. Or do you want me to go now.

Chair Furth: We need to be focused if we can, but...

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. In terms of structural analysis of pole mounting, so, the proposal that you have right now, you've done a thorough structural analysis that this is feasible and will not compromise the structural integrity of the existing pole?

Mr. Albritton: Yeah, that's a great question. We have. The structural analysis is called an **oak-out [phonetic]**, and we've done one, performed one on each of these nodes. They are included in the construction drawings. Just to note, the **oak-outs** themselves, what's considered maximum load is 38 percent of what that pole can hold. That includes all existing infrastructure, so it's going to be cable, cable lines, power lines, and any other equipment that's located on it. It can only go to a maximum of 38 percent and we are well under that. If there's any new poles, actually the threshold goes down to 25 percent, so we are well within what **oak-outs** deem safe.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Board Member Thompson: Thanks.

Chair Furth: The question I have is that we have a letter, we have a lot of letters, but this one is from Dan Adams at 3550 Whitsell, who complains about the noise from pole-mounted equipment, that he says based on what's out there already, is audible within 50 feet, and it's within 25 feet of the... He's talking about particularly his situation next to number 153. These things are noisy, you can always hear them. Not necessarily code-violating noisy, but disruptive-noisy. Can you tell us about when and how they make noise?

Mr. Albritton: I hope you all don't remember that when I was before you six years ago, five or six years ago with the AT&T project that was approved for nine of these nodes in Palo Alto, that your board removed the battery backup, and the City Council required battery backup for the AT&T system. The AT&T system has two by two foot battery backup boxes that have fans...

Chair Furth: Not lovely.

Mr. Albritton: ...that keep them cool. No. In fact, the Verizon design is far superior to that AT&T design.

Chair Furth: You have a better client now?

Mr. Albritton: In fact, I don't represent AT&T anymore. But the point here is that Verizon is removed the battery back up from this design, so here are no moving parts in this facility. There are the radios that have no moving parts. They have fins in the back that keep them cool. And then there is the antenna. There is no moving part and no noise from these facilities. Unlike the AT&T facility, unlike the Comcast boxes which have battery backups, and unlike other battery backup units for AT&T and the light speed project, there is no mechanical parts, no noise from these facilities. They've been designed...

Chair Furth: So, our letter writers also say Verizon says there are no batteries, but once we approve these, there's nothing we can do to keep them from adding batteries at a later date. Could you comment?

Mr. Albritton: Yes. That's addressed actually in your staff report. They reference a federal law that allows wireless companies to modify existing facilities. It's generically called Section 6409 of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012. But because we have... That laws says that we can't defeat the concealment elements of our project, and we have put a shroud, we have carefully shrouded all the parts of it. I've described to you how it's vertically integrated into the pole. Anything that deviated... Even if it qualified for that, it would have to go through a review by the department, but we can't do anything that's going to modify the look of what we have now, and I think that carefully restricts what we're able to do. But we'd have to go through permits, we'd have to comply with noise ordinances and all sorts of things. You've also -- sorry to go on so long -- you've changed your law since AT&T was approved, so that now we have to get a conditional use authorization, which means we have to comply with the

general plan LDN noise levels. The problem we're having with vaulting is we cannot comply with the LDN noise levels that are now applied under your general plan...

Chair Furth: With respect to adding batteries to your installations on the pole, are you saying that this would not be possible without further City discretionary review.

Mr. Albritton: It would not be possible without further City review. If we were able to actually come up with something that was...

Chair Furth: Both invisible and inaudible?

Mr. Albritton: Yeah. Then we might be able to have an administrative review, but it would still require...

Chair Furth: Well, we're not particularly interested in building permit-style review. What they want reassurance about is that they will not find themselves listening to fan noise because the City had to approve it based on your approval today.

Mr. Albritton: Right. We have no plans to do that, and...

Chair Furth: They don't find that reassuring.

Mr. Albritton: ... and given the battery technology of today, I don't know how we do that and remain within our current concealment.

Chair Furth: Do you believe both sound and visible appearance are covered by the shroud, you know, the stealth rules? In other words, the rules say that you can't -- according to our city attorney -- the rules say that you can't go ahead with a cell, a hidden approach, an aesthetic approach, and then, modify it in a way that eliminates that stealthiness.

Mr. Albritton: That's correct. You can't defeat the concealment elements.

Chair Furth: Exactly. And are you saying that applies to sound as well as visible?

Mr. Albritton: Noise is not referenced in that act that I mentioned to you.

Chair Furth: What I hear is that they are correct, that there could be batteries at a future date that could create noise that might not be subject to City discretionary review.

Mr. Albritton: And my response is that because conditional use authorization is now required for a Tier 3 wireless facility, we have to comply with the general plan day/night average noise standard, which is approximately 53.6 dB at the property line. That's an almost impossible standard to meet. If we were able to meet that 53 dB at the residential property line, that would be a pretty quiet battery.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions of the applicant before we bring this back to the Board?

Mr. Albritton: And we don't think any vault can meet that standard.

Chair Furth: I beg...?

Mr. Albritton: I'm sorry. We don't think any vault can meet that noise standard. That's our problem right now.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Okay. Well, we have 15 minutes before we lose a board member. I just want to note that we do not have our consultant's report, and we do not make any determinations about adequacy of cell coverage, and we do not make any determinations about radiation or any of those

things. We are making recommendations on issues of aesthetics and whether this is minimally intrusive. But CTC does make recommendations about location of equipment and alternatives that are based on aesthetic judgments, right? That's why we had that series of photographs last time.

Ms. French: That's correct.

Chair Furth: We're missing part of the reporting that we would generally have. And the other thing... This is just an observation for my fellow board members. It's been going on for four years, that we have not managed to make neighborhoods feel very good about this, at all. One of the things that really struck me in looking at Barron Park is what a different environment it is for installing equipment than any of the other ones that we've looked at. They are the reverse of an undergrounded neighborhood. They have more than an average number of poles. They have lots of equipment dangling from them. They have no sidewalks, generally, so it's a completely different street-side environment. And I find it pretty confusing. I also find it unfortunate that when we have a clean utility environment, when we have undergrounded utilities and light poles, it's pretty easy to determine that typically-proposed equipment doesn't meet the standards, because the standard is a very clean environment. When we get to Barron Park where they are already coping with a tremendous number of wires and were really damaged by the advent of cable television and those low-hanging, thick, heavy cables that loop through their trees, it's harder to be protective. I simply say that. I am open to comments. Do you want to talk about these node by node? Do you want to talk about the project generally? Peter, first of all, what do you have to say?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd like to start, Wynne. I'd like to pick up where you just left off because I think us as a board, the city as a whole, the City Council even, when they upheld the appeal, I think did the opposite. Didn't really address. We have to make findings here. They're predominantly affected with the aesthetics. In our findings, I'm going to refer to Finding #2e.

Chair Furth: Page?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm reading Architectural Review Board findings.

Chair Furth: Packet page?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm reading from page 22 of our packet. This is just printed on a previous application, but these findings are part of the statute which we operate under. Says that we have to find that the project has a unified and coherent design that enhances living conditions on the site. I call special attention to the word "enhances." "Enhances" means to make it better. I'll turn to the next finding, Finding #3. We're required to find that the design is of a high aesthetic quality, etc., etc. The last phrase says that enhance the surrounding area. With those in mind, I think all of us have had the approach that these utility poles are ugly. These equipment mountings on the poles are okay because they're just making it a little bit more ugly. It's a bad situation, we're just making it a little bit worse. It's okay because it's already bad. And that's where I cannot make that finding. They're supposed to enhance the living conditions, enhance the situation for the community, for the aesthetics in our area. I put that to my colleagues on the board. We're starting a slippery slope of allowing just incrementally worse. Nobody is arguing that these are an improvement, and that's what we're expected to find. That's what our findings require. That's what we need to be doing here. I think we should be putting forth a standard requiring that all pole-mounted equipment, or all ancillary equipment to these antennas needs to be concealed. It needs to be somehow out of sight. Obviously, it could be underground. It might also be concealed in some existing infrastructure that is already in place, perhaps. Or concealed by some existing landscaping. The City needs to come up with a clear definition of "concealed" needs to be, but in general, it probably means vaulting these things. And I think we have to say that that's the only way to meet the findings we have. I'm comfortable coming around, saying that the antennas on top of the poles do enhance the living condition. They don't detract aesthetically from these poles, I think, and I think my colleagues have found that repeatedly over applications. The antennas are not the problem, be it on street lights or on wood utility poles. The pole-mounted equipment does not enhance the condition. I'll refer you to photo simulation of Node 104 or Node 101. Both have very nice photo simulations showing what it will look like,

and I do not think you can argue that this is an enhancement of the neighborhood, which is what is required in our findings. I'd like to comment on the applicant's statements about vaulting. If they are allowed to define the parameters such that you need a vault that is four foot by six foot inside, and then state that you need a space that, I heard one of the dimensions was 18 feet on the exterior to put that in place, when they define the parameters that are being required, it does make it next to impossible to do. I've seen many other examples of underground equipment that could be vaulted in much smaller situations. Could it be such that a technician doesn't need to get into it? How can it be that the staff is showing us antennas that are the size of a small traveling suitcase? I think there's far too much uncertainty with what the technical requirements really are to be putting forth such stringent stipulations regarding vaulting. What I feel is that the applicant is not seriously making an effort to conceal this equipment by other means, of which vaulting is one of them. Lastly, I've been cautioned by the attorney, and I think it makes sense to include some sort of caveat that whatever we require of the applicant has to be feasible. We're not out to stipulate something that's not possible. I think the applicant has used that term before, and we had on a previous application that we approved that it had to be concealed to the greatest extent feasible. I think we have to expand the concept that "feasible" means maybe that particular location, that particular pole is not feasible because the equipment can't be concealed. In that case, finding another pole where concealment options are feasible. If we allow ourselves to define "feasible" as only within a given location, we severely limit what can be done. Our definition of "feasible" has to be such that other locations are considered as well, so that the concealment of the equipment is possible. Again, I point to my colleagues that Findings 2.e. and 3 require us to find that this be an enhancement of the area, and I don't think that's possible, what we're showing today. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Peter, just for the record, so that somebody reviewing our discussion would understand why they're not an enhancement, give me a few words.

Vice Chair Baltay: Very well. I'm looking at photo simulations showing the pole having a slender, tapered effect with strictly wires on it, and yet I see this brown metal box approximately 10 feet tall, maybe eight feet above the sidewalk. I don't think that looks better. I think it looks part of an ugly utility pole. It's only a little bit worse.

Chair Furth: But it's worse.

Vice Chair Baltay: Unfortunately, that's not the finding we have to make. And I think you can make that for every one of these simulations. I think that's even the case on the very nice test case that's been put in place for us in town. There's certainly been an effort to show that. I just can't find that it's an enhancement.

Chair Furth: Okay. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for the presentation, and I think that the photo simulations were actually very well done. I think also your vaulting and alternative report was actually very well done. I do have a criticism of the site plans, and I had that same criticism from the last application. The site plans, there are a lot of out-of-date things on the plans, and in some cases, they are actually incomplete. I'll just give you an example. Like on Node 101, there is an addition in a garage at 381 Carolina that are not shown on your plans. They are shown in some of the photos. Node 155, the house is not shown. You're just showing trees, but somebody's house is actually there. Node 155-F, there is a new house under construction, and I think you're showing the old house. And on Node 163, this is on Quarry Road, there are some existing vaults that are shown on your, you are showing them on your utility plan, but then they don't show up on your site plan. I think there could be some coordination issues with the new and existing vaults. I'm generally supportive of the staff recommendation. I think the most troubling ones were, to me, were 104 and 154, and that's just because the sites are more visible. There are less street trees. There are driveways where new screening trees cannot be added because of the existing driveways, so I do think that those are more problematic. My hunch is that on 104, there might not be a better location. I looked at the alternative report. One-fifty-four, I think I'm in agreement with staff. I think that maybe that could work somehow. And I think to Peter's comments, I haven't really thought

about the findings in detail, but I think that you're trying to change the policy. The staff policy is stealth and minimize size, right? And you're actually taking it one more step and saying "concealed," and I think that's where you lose me on that. And then, we'll have to debate with staff on the issue about enhancements, enhancing the sites, so I haven't really thought about it. Maybe, Rebecca, if you have any thoughts about that.

Ms. Atkinson: I think at that point, the development standards are in your packet as an attachment, and the development standards from our wireless code specifically talk about concealment, stealth and camouflage screening. I'm looking specifically at Development Standard (i)(6).

Chair Furth: What page of the packet are you on?

Ms. Atkinson: Packet page 178. And at the same time, Board Member Baltay is exactly correct in regard to Architectural Review findings, packet page 180, 2.e. and 3. You can just compare the language. Again, just to reiterate, concealment, screening, camouflage, stealth, are all words that are important to the development standards.

Board Member Lew: My take on it is that "stealth" does not mean concealed or hidden. It means unobtrusive. And I think, the way that I've been thinking about it is that the proposals, that the mock-up that they've shown, has met the definition of "stealth" in many locations. Because at least in the previous locations that we've seen, you know, we've had more street trees, more landscaping. I do think that Barron Park is more challenging. We don't really have the same level of street trees. The street widths are different. They are definitely more visible than in previous applications, so I do think that that is a concern. Anyway, that's all that I have. I do support the staff recommendation at this time.

Chair Furth: Board Member Thompson, have we heard from you? No.

Board Member Thompson: Not yet. Thank you for your presentation. Thank you to the public for reaching out to us. It's quite clear there are a lot of opinions on this. I think the place where I'm at right now is, is that it seems that there are several options at bay. There are possibilities of potentially making this even more stealth in the sense that we're seeing potentially that there could be smaller antennas, smaller equipment. Some of these other things that we've looked at look like they could be, you know, better meeting the stealth criteria. I wrote a note here that depending... I don't know. After having seen the Crown Castle proposal that had the smaller antennas, these big ones now seem a lot more bigger. I'm at a place right now where I'd almost rather smaller ones and have more of them, rather than have these gigantic ones, just in order to maintain that stealth element. And to your point, Board Member Baltay, I think you are right. I think that it is not enhancing our surroundings. And it's true, I think we've been looking at this as, you know, just kind of how do we make this just a little less worse than it is. But at the end of the day, it really should be making things better. I appreciate your point, and I'll echo that as well. I think there are a lot of opportunities, a lot of kind of interesting design options. Not that I'm thinking of things. Like there is, there's options, I think, to make this better than what it is right now. I think that's what's clear to me, at least after this presentation and this hearing, that there are alternatives that are better than what we're looking at right now. And for that reason, I don't know that I'm ready to support what we're looking at right now. I'll leave it right there right now because I know we are pressed on time.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: We seem to be living in a world in which everything gets more cluttered. This effect is shown here, as well. These light poles, you know, used to start out with just a light on top of them, and now they have all kinds of garbage. Keep it simple. I agree with my cohort to the left here. To research this more and find better equipment, smaller equipment. You're a great big company. You have the capability of doing some more in-depth research. I know the effect of building vaults. I've seen that with Con-Ed in New York, how it disrupts the street and affects all other kinds of relations. But you should consider research to find places where vaults can work. I really think we're not also looking at

some other aspects of this that, the cabling that you put on the poles ultimately is going to be very large in diameter. Doesn't show up in a lot of the illustrations. But I'm particularly concerned about the boxes that are located much lower down on the pole and why they need to be there. Eight feet is ridiculously low and those are going to be extremely visible, and they are very big. I would say that I think this needs more study for those aspects described.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I've been thinking about this application and I appreciate that Verizon works in a lot of different settings. Of course, it's always difficult for us because the telecommunications companies have been very effective in removing most discretion from us, ever since we had telephone companies. Because they have licenses and powers to do things in city rights-of-way that other kinds of organizations don't. And part of the City's problem is that the City ordinances direct us to make a set of findings, which I don't think Verizon can meet here. And the City can change its rules, and reasonable people can differ. You may recall that when we did approve a project, it was 3-2. But I think part of the problem in Barron Park... One of the things about Palo Alto is there is a great deal of diversity between and among neighborhoods. Barron Park is a small-scale, intimate neighborhood. They have narrow streets, they have no sidewalks, and they are heavily wooded in most places. And one of the results is that houses are quite close to this incredible array of telephone poles, utility poles of other sorts, cables, etc., etc. And as you drive through, you see a lot of telecom equipment already hanging in various places. I think that the neighborhood might very well choose lots more little radios. I don't know. But the fact is I can't... If this was the only way to do it, then I would have to look at our findings in light of what's possible. Because it's our job not to pick out one rule, like the sound standard, and say, "Well, we can't meet that, so therefore, we're going to violate five others in order to meet that one." If they had to be this way, I might say, well, this is the best color paint, or something like that. But I'm not... The record doesn't support that. There are alternatives. We can't pick your technology, but we can tell you what the standards are. And in this neighborhood, in most of these sites, these are too visible and too big for me to make the findings. And we also have some slightly-less-than-ready-for-prime-time plans here. We can vote if somebody wants to make a motion, or we can ask if the applicant is willing to continue it. Or whatever is the Board's pleasure. Staff?

Ms. French: Well, a continuance is problematic because we have a shot clock that forces us into a decision.

Chair Furth: By problematic you mean impossible?

Ms. French: Well, no, not impossible. That word would refer to if the applicant were unwilling to extend the shot clock. This is something we don't have clarity on at this moment.

Chair Furth: We are a recommending body. What would you like from us?

Ms. French: Well, I would think you'd vote on this application that's in front of you and...

Chair Furth: Well, let's do the easy thing first. Let's vote to continue.... Which two nodes? One-fifty-four and 104? To a date uncertain? Can I have a motion to that effect?

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure. I move that we continue 154 and 104 to a date uncertain.

Chair Furth: At the request of the applicant. Is there a second?

Board Member Thompson: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: All those in favor say aye. Okay, that takes care of two of them.

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

Chair Furth: All right. That leaves us with the rest of them, and we have recommendations... Let's start with the outlier. Let's start with the Stanford request, which is in an area subject to the, to a particular plan. There is undergrounding, so, where are we now? I heard something about underground vault is possible there. Where are we on that one?

Ms. Atkinson: In this case, we have the Stanford University Medical Center design guidelines, which call for a tree scape and other aesthetic parameters designed for a boulevard environment. Staff and private developers and so forth have not approved above-ground equipment since the design guidelines were put in place.

Chair Furth: I'm sorry, what is staff's recommendation on this one?

Ms. Atkinson: This is, there are... It's possible to recommend conditions of approval. We think that would be applicable in this case, such as in regard to placing the electric, the electrical-related equipment underground, or eliminating it altogether. The applicant indicated that it's impossible to put it underground. That is different than the proposed pole-mounted equipment that would still remain on the pole. Staff is also investigating the possibility of not having the wooden bayonet extension because the reason for the extension, typically clearance for power lines, is not applicable in this particular location. That's still another point of analysis.

Chair Furth: The applicant, is your design final on this one now? We're talking about 153...? Is that right?

Ms. French: One-sixty-three.

Chair Furth: One-sixty-three. It's very small print.

Mr. Stroup: On 163, we are... So, to clarify, the ground-mounted electrical step-down transformer is what's above ground, and what staff is recommending that we either remove or place underground. We agree with staff that we could get conditional approval that would allow us to work with staff and CPAU to find a spot in that area next to the mall where we could place an underground vault for that step-down transformer.

Chair Furth: All right. I would entertain a motion on Node 163, to recommend approval with the relocation of -- make sure I get this right -- the transformer to an underground vault. Is that what's being proposed? I'm getting a nod out there. Is there a motion to that effect?

Board Member Thompson: I have a question. Would it be worth discussing if we wanted to move, for the rest of these nodes, that we ask the applicant to look at...

Chair Furth: I think it would. I just wanted to see if we could get this outlier dealt with first.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, I think it's relevant, though.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Thompson: Okay, so, you're proposing to...

Chair Furth: I'm looking at the Stanford campus proposal. Staff believes it should be shorter. Is that correct?

[crosstalk]

Ms. French: Staff believes the antenna on the pole top is obviously necessary, but the extension between the antenna and the pole is not necessary. Because of clearances. The applicant can verify that.

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Okay, well, I'll make a motion recommending approval upon the condition that the antenna height is minimized. That, of course, assumes it's still legal. Is this one of our City poles?

Mr. Stroup: Yes.

Chair Furth: Okay. Of course it is. That's why you're in front of us on this.

Mr. Stroup: We'd also like to note that the language for conditional approval to underground the electrical step-down transformer be to the greater extent feasible. We are willing to work with staff and CPAU to locate.

Chair Furth: I'm willing to accept that language but I'm hoping that I see some good results. Is there a second to my motion?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Furth: Motion by Furth, second by Lew. All those in favor?

Board Member Lew: Aye.

Board Member Hirsch: Aye.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could I clarify, Wynne, before we vote?

Chair Furth: Yeah.

Vice Chair Baltay: Is the pole-mounted equipment still on the pole in this motion?

Chair Furth: Go ahead.

Vice Chair Baltay: As I see it, you're still allowing the pole-mounted radio equipment. All they are talking about is the transformer. There's a difference. Is that right?

Chair Furth: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: So...

Chair Furth: And the reason I'm saying it is, because of the location. I think it can handle it. But if you disagree, you vote note.

Vice Chair Baltay: I find the same reasons I found before. Just clarifying.

Chair Furth: Okay. Let's vote. Does staff have something they wanted to add? And the staff's recommendation is to approve with the shorter antenna and the undergrounded transformer?

Ms. French: Correct.

Chair Furth: Okay. All those in favor say aye. All those opposed.

## **MOTION FAILS 2-3, WITH BOARD MEMBERS HIRSCH, BALTAY AND THOMPSON VOTING IN OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION**

Chair Furth: That motion fails 2-3. Would you like to make a counter motion?

Vice Chair Baltay: Let me make a motion because I'm about to leave. I recommend approval of all the remaining nodes, with the condition that all auxiliary equipment be completely concealed to the greatest extent feasible.

Chair Furth: I think they're going to say that's what they already have done. I don't think that's going to get us anywhere.

Vice Chair Baltay: Sorry, I'll withdraw...

Chair Furth: That's a non-second. Appreciate the effort.

Board Member Lew: Somebody could second his motion.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm trying to find a way that we can approve this, let them go forward, stop the shot clock business, but say what we want, which is for the equipment to be concealed.

Chair Furth: Well, I don't think that that's an alternative. I think we're always going to have... Or at least I think it's, it's so indefinite that when we did this before, we got exactly what they proposed in the first place. The telecom community.

Board Member Thompson: I'd like the applicant to explore an option that actually meets our criteria, where it seems like there are other options that can have more stealth and... I don't know what the wording of this motion is, but in general, I'd like to see a better site plan, one that's more up to date, one that we can actually trust, and a design, or even options of designs, that actually enhance the surroundings. And I think that is possible.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's a motion to continue with that request?

Board Member Thompson: I guess.

Chair Furth: I guess I want to say... I mean, if the applicant doesn't wish to extend, we don't really have the option to... You know, you're going to have to proceed without our recommendation, so perhaps we should just give you a staff... We should tell the staff what we want, and the decision-makers can either reject our suggestion or not. But I think we have consensus that in these, I'm going to use the term Barron Park, though I gather there are more neighborhood names, that in the Barron Park neighborhood with its narrow streets, heavy vegetation, houses relatively close to the street, absence of sidewalks, the proposal does not meet the standards of the Architectural Review Board because it is too large, and too visible, and too intrusive. And that we recommend that the applicant and the City work to find alternatives which would reduce these negative effects, by undergrounding where possible, and perhaps by using smaller equipment, even if it's more frequently installed, as an alternative. I think all we can try to do with the information we have, and the complexity of the rules with which we and they deal, is to tell you what the sense of the Board is. If that's an accurate sense, then I'd say let's tell you that, and best of British luck as you proceed.

Vice Chair Baltay: That's a motion to do what, exactly?

Chair Furth: Advise staff that that's our recommendation.

Vice Chair Baltay: We're moving to advise staff...

## **MOTION**

Chair Furth: Yeah, because I don't think we have the... I mean, Alex has pointed out that the plans are incorrect. Several of us feel that the equipment that they are proposing, that the visual impact of the equipment they are proposing is not sufficiently unobtrusive or stealthy to allow us to make the permitted

findings. And that you should know that we would prefer it either underground or using a different configuration which substantially reduces these adverse impacts. We don't make decisions. All we ever do is recommend.

Vice Chair Baltay: Let me try to put us out of our misery. I recommend that we recommend denial of this project based on the reasons Wynne just outlined.

Board Member Thompson: I'll second that.

Chair Furth: Any further comment? Okay. All those in favor of this recommendation say aye. All those opposed.

Board Member Hirsch: Nay.

Chair Furth: Four to one, we recommend denial of this project as proposed.

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

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you, all.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Peter. Merry Christmas, Happy New Year.

[Vice Chair Baltay left the meeting]

Chair Furth: You know, this is not a happy... We tend to be very unhappy with telecom communications companies because they are very powerful, that from our point of view, they're an arigopoly [phonetic]. They get to shape the rules, from our point of view, in their favor and against us. But we also all want the service they provide. And we certainly are... Thank you very much, Rebecca, for handling the tremendous number of public comments and variable factors that we deal with. I recommend to the neighborhood and to us that we keep struggling to find something that is livable. Thank you.

### **Approval of Minutes**

**6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for October 4, 2018.**

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

**8. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for November 1, 2018**

Chair Furth: I'm going to make us vote on minutes, hoping that somebody has read them. I have.

Board Member Thompson: I have not read the minutes. I'm sorry.

Chair Furth: Don't confess. The law actually, administrative law permits to act as if you had, so we're going to get these up on the record. Okay.

### **MOTION**

Chair Furth: May I have a motion to approve the minutes of October 4th? I have some minor clerical errors I'll give to staff.

Board Member Lew: I also had comments, I sent them to staff previously, regarding subcommittee, regarding subcommittee items.

Chair Furth: All those who were there -- David can't vote on this -- All those in favor say aye.

Board Member Lew: You make...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Thompson: Am I allowed to...? I can't...

Chair Furth: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: Were you there? Yes.

Board Member Thompson: I was there.

Chair Furth: I should not have asked if you'd read it. All those in favor say aye.

**MOTION PASSES 3-0-1, WITH FURTH, THOMPSON AND LEW VOTING TO APPROVE AND HIRSCH ABSTAINING FROM THE VOTE.**

Chair Furth: Okay. I hadn't realized that there's such a cost to the public on our not acting on these because they don't get up on the website.

Ms. French: I'm sorry, was that both sets of minutes, or just the first set?

Chair Furth: That was October 4th. October 18th? Any comments or corrections?

Board Member Lew: I had previously sent a comment to staff about the subcommittee items.

Chair Furth: Is that the one...? Which was the one where we had the study session?

Board Member Thompson: I don't know that I was there for that one.

Chair Furth: Okay. I think you weren't present for the study session, right? Or were you? This was on ex parte communications.

Board Member Thompson: I was not there for that.

Chair Furth: So we can't act on whichever one that one was. Which one?

Ms. French: October 18th minutes are continued to the next hearing, meeting?

Chair Furth: Yeah. And then, October...? November 1st? I would move approval of those.

Board Member Thompson: I also don't think I was there for that one.

Chair Furth: Can you check those? Let's see, I'll take a quick look. We may not be able to do this. I apologize.

Board Member Thompson: Sorry, Chair.

Chair Furth: Well, you couldn't... If you weren't there, you weren't there. That's not your fault.

Ms. French: Okay, so, we can continue both of those to January 10th.

Chair Furth: I just want to confirm that... Are you confident you weren't here on November 1st?

Board Member Thompson: Pretty confident.

Chair Furth: All right. I'm sorry. We need to continue those.

Ms. French: Okay.

Chair Furth: Yes, all right.

### **Subcommittee Items**

Chair Furth: Any subcommittee items?

Ms. French: None.

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

Chair Furth: Board member questions, comments or announcements?

Ms. French: No announcements from staff.

Board Member Lew: I have an announcement. So, 429 University Avenue went to the Council on Monday. The applicant had appealed the Director's decision to partly deny the project and it was partly to approve the project. The Council voted 6-3 to approve the project, with Holman, Kou and DuBois opposed.

Chair Furth: All right.

Board Member Lew: That ends a very long, long saga.

Chair Furth: None of which I have had to follow. Since I have a conflict of interest with regard to that matter.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you for that.

Chair Furth: Well, welcome, Board Member Hirsch. Thank you. Look forward to the new year. Thank you so much to staff. Would you please particularly convey our thanks to Alicia Spotswood for her really good service as our support person. Thank you.

Ms. French: Certainly. Will do.

Chair Furth: (inaudible) Clerk's Office for getting our new member sworn in.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

### **Adjournment**