



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
DRAFT MINUTES: December 5, 2019  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

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

Absent: None.

Chair Baltay: Good morning. Welcome to the December 5, 2019, meeting of the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board. Could we have a roll call, please?

[Roll Call]

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Thank you. All present.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

**Oral Communications**

Chair Baltay: First item is oral communications. Are there any members of the public who wish to address the Board on an item that's not on our agenda? Seeing no one.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Baltay: Do we have any changes to the agenda, additions or deletions? Staff? Okay.

**City Official Reports**

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

Chair Baltay: Third item is our ARB meeting schedule and attendance records. Staff, do we have information on upcoming meetings?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. Our next meeting is December 19<sup>th</sup>. On that meeting, we're expecting to have three projects. The 702 Clare is a three-unit project; that will be its third hearing. There is 250 Hamilton, we just have to say it that way because it's multiple locations. Those are actually bus shelters on the Stanford Research Park area that are being proposed. And then there is the 1700 Embarcadero, which is the Mercedes and Audi dealership that we will be discussing. This is after Council has approved the massing. We would just be getting into the architectural details.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Yes?

Vice Chair Thompson: It didn't note in the minutes, but I won't be present for the 12/19 meeting.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma.

## Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [19PLN-00110]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of the Existing 94,300 Square Foot Macy's Men's Building Located in the Stanford Shopping Center and the Construction of (1) a Retail Building, Approximately 43,500 sf, (2) two Retail Buildings, Approximately 3,500 sf each, and (3) a Retail Building, Approximately 28,000 sf (78,500 sf in total). Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Baltay: Okay, moving on to our first action item. This is a public hearing, quasi-judicial, for 180 El Camino Real, a recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of the existing 94,300 square foot Macy's Men's building located in the Stanford Shopping Center and the construction of (1) a retail building, approximately 43,500 square feet, (2) two retail buildings, approximately 3,500 square feet each, and (3) a retail building, approximately 28,000 square feet, making for 78,500 square feet in total. Can we have staff presentation on that, please? Oh, excuse me.

Board Member Lee: Sorry, I just need to jump in. Unfortunately, I need to recuse myself due to my employment.

Chair Baltay: Yes. Grace will be recusing herself. And then, I'd like to also check if we have any other information from other members of the Board about the project. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site on Black Friday, as well as Tuesday at lunchtime. I also downloaded two aerial photos of the site, one from 1941 and one from the 1960's, maybe 1968. That's all.

Chair Baltay: Okay, Alex. Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I have nothing to disclose.

Chair Baltay: David?

Board Member Hirsch: [inaudible]

Chair Baltay: Okay. I'd like to disclose that I also visited the site several times, as recently as yesterday, and I'd like to tell my colleagues that I made some measurements of the driplines of the two oak trees along El Camino. Tree number 39 has an average dripline of approximately 35 feet, and tree number 72 has a dripline of approximately 22 feet, out from the trunk of the tree. I'm just saying that because that information is not immediate in the tree report here. I think that will be important later. Thank you. Okay, with that, staff report, please.

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning to the ARB Board members. My name is Samuel Gutierrez, project planner for this project, and for the shopping center. Here today, we're presenting the Macy's Men's project. This has been dubbed by the City for redevelopment at the Stanford Shopping Center, located at 180 El Camino Real. Going into the presentation, just to reiterate again, this involves the demolition of the Macy's Men's existing now towards El Camino Real and Sand Hill Road, that portion of the shopping center, and it's going to reconfigure that corner of the shopping center to accommodate three new buildings. Here is a bit of the history of the project. The first time this went before the ARB during the prelim is February 7, 2019. The second time was the first formal, and that was June 20, 2019. And then, it went before the ARB again on October 3<sup>rd</sup>. During that October 3<sup>rd</sup> hearing, we had comments and direction from the ARB, which we are here to address today. Here is just a breakdown of what was discussed during the last

hearing. There was some concern about the Wilkes Bashford building and its relief, including the bricks. There was discussion about having some more articulation of massing just to give that building relief and more interest, and the applicant has revised the plans accordingly to provide some of these reliefs in the building, a bit more articulation. The other concern was a bit about the El Camino sidewalk. There was some discussion there, and that was revised accordingly to the ARB's concerns of having the sidewalk that went fully to the El Camino curb. There wasn't really a buffer, it was too much of a sidewalk area that's too close to the traffic, so that was narrowed a bit. That was also revised in the plan set. And then, there was some discussion about some of the trees and saving some of them, and the replacement trees as well. That is something that is still being worked on. We do know the number of trees that have to be replaced. It's 229. Staff is working with the applicant to identify suitable replant areas throughout the shopping center because it wouldn't be possible to physically put that many trees in this project-specific area of the shopping center without removing parking or buildings, or something like that. There is a larger shopping center mass, and there is some areas that lack trees that could benefit from some of these replacements. The first option. In the previous discussion, again, the ARB felt that the other two buildings – Building EE with the two tenant spaces that's adjacent to the larger shopping center mass – was well done and completed for the size that was appropriate. And then, the Restoration Hardware building, being one of the new anchor tenant buildings, the architecture was found to be acceptable by the ARB, so there wasn't any more comments. But, again, Wilkes Bashford still had some refining to do. The project was broken up into some options presented to the ARB, the first being the two buildings that I mentioned – the smaller tenant spaces known as Building EE, and then, the Restoration Hardware building – with all of the site treatments, and then a pad for the future Wilkes Bashford building to come in later. That would come in as a separate application to be approved, but the site plan would be approved and those other two buildings would be approved, so that would move forward. This is the site plan of that. You can see that there is a building pad, not the actual physical building, but everything else has been reconfigured for that to come in later. Option 2 shows the same thing, except on the pad, of course, there is the building. This is the option that staff is recommending to the Board. Here, we can see the previous iteration of Wilkes Bashford building. This corner was refined, and the ARB found that to be well done along El Camino. But then, again, there was concern about the three smaller oaks on that corner, about preserving them. So, the building was shifted back to preserve those oaks. This is what that rendering would look like. Here is, again, the Pistache drive aisle off of El Camino as you enter the shopping center. You can see the Wilkes Bashford, the previous iteration there. This is the revised. If we go back, you can see on the corner where the storefront window is, there is a projection now, there, and then, the trellis... It's a little hard to tell because of the trees, but if you look, the trellis for the outdoor seating area extends further as well, and there are material changes there with the brick that are up there on the materials sample board that was recently submitted. Again, this is further down Pistache and facing what would be now the, I believe the LaBelle Spa, and the rest of the shopping center massing. That's the previous design that was brought before the ARB in October. Here is the new design. You can kind of appreciate more of that extension of the trellis on the right, and then, this projection here on the corner, and also the entry here off of the parking lot, is much more articulation and massing. It brings more interest to the building. Here is the greater parking lot side towards, facing towards Sand Hill. Again, this is the previous design, and then, here, you can see, again, that corner projection and a bit more of the leaf, the other façade walls of the building. Removing the trees, looking at how the building has changed, again, you can see the corners have these projections. You have minor projections in the extension of the trellises to give the building a bit more relief, per the ARB's instructions. This is the original floor plan of the building. It was very square. Here, you can see how some of the building changes. It's very subtle, but there's corners that project out, and then, again, towards the greater shopping center façade towards the interior, on the left there, you can see that straight end of the building starts to weave in and out. The corners project a bit more, and then, the other two sides of the building also have a bit more relief. Again, the bricks were also studied and modified, and there were examples in the plan sets, and some material samples presented before you. This is the El Camino sidewalk. Again, we looked at this with the applicant. I, myself, was there and met with the applicant's team and arborist, along with Urban Forestry, our city arborist, to go over how we can address this issue. We were able to extend the sidewalk a little bit, not to the full extent because of the protected oaks there. It would encroach into their dripline, so we're extending it towards El Camino, but not fully there. There's still a little bit of a strip of landscaping there. This is a top view, a site plan view of that. And then, here we can see the section, cross-section view of that extension, where the existing sidewalk is approximately five feet, and we gain about two and a half feet with the small little buffer area before the curb of El Camino. This here shows a

site plan of the three trees on the corner there of El Camino, on the lower right. You can see that they are now being preserved, and that the building was set back additional feet from El Camino. It's now 36 feet away from the property line, giving more room to not only the large heritage oak along El Camino's sidewalk, but the corner trees, to preserve them. With all these changes, staff recommends the ARB take the following action: Recommend approval of the project, Option 2, which would include the Wilkes Bashford building, to the Director of Planning and Development Services, based on the findings and subject to conditions of approval. That concludes staff presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Sam. Do we have any questions from the Board? Sam, could you tell me clearly, you moved the sidewalk closer to El Camino. What is the distance from the edge of the new sidewalk to the edge of the curb right now, under the proposed plan?

Mr. Gutierrez: We just expanded it, so it's keeping the same back of walk towards the shopping center, but it's expanded over.

Chair Baltay: My understanding was, originally it was right at the curb, and we were concerned about its proximity to the street.

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct, so, it's been shifted to 7.5 feet.

Chair Baltay: What is the distance now to the street? Between the sidewalk and the street. It was zero. How much is it now?

Mr. Gutierrez: It's about six inches. Half a foot.

Chair Baltay: They moved it six inches away from El Camino.

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Are there any other questions?

Board Member Lew: I have a quick question. This is about the transformers.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes?

Board Member Lew: The landscape plan shows that there's, like, a screening fence around the transformers that's six feet high. I was wondering if that had been reviewed for sight triangles at the intersection and the crosswalks.

Mr. Gutierrez: This is for the entry off of Sand Hill you're referring to?

Board Member Lew: These are near the new... Let me get a sheet up. These are near the new cut-through street, between the cut-through street and the new Wilkes Bashford building. There are two transformers, and one is right at the corner, near the pedestrian crosswalks. And, so, normally we have a sight triangle thing that limits heights of fences to, like, four feet at those intersections so that drivers can see pedestrians.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes. That was reviewed by Transportation, and it had to do with the direction of traffic and the speed of traffic at that intersection, that the sight triangle would have been minimized because these were not moving at street speeds. These would be much more reduced, so the sight triangle distances, or the width of the sight triangle, gets reduced based on that speed. Transportation didn't feel that that was going to be that much of an issue at that point, based on the speed that cars would be traveling in the parking lot.

Board Member Lew: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Anything else? Okay, then, if the applicant could step forward, you have 10 minutes to make a presentation, please. If you could state and spell your name for the record.

Matt Klinzing, Simon Property Group: Sure. Good morning. My name is Matt Klinzing [spells name]. I'm an architect with Simon Property Group. As Samuel mentioned, we did split this into two options, as we had discussed last time, so that we have both the pad option and the building option. With that being said, we did also spend a lot of time on the Wilkes Bashford in particular because there was a lot of conversation last time about that. I wanted to talk through in the 10 minutes the details that we've gone into to try and address all the comments we heard previously. The biggest one being – and I apologize for the small scale of this, but I placed a red line around where the building used to be sited. And then, of course, shaded in is where it is currently in the plan. It's moved approximately 10 feet to the west. We also did some bumps in and out of the building, and the goal of that was obviously to move it out of both the tree protection zones and the driplines of the heritage oak, as well as the three trees down on the corner of Pistache. But, in addition to that, we have a limited dimension of eight feet that the Board would like to see for any sidewalks, so obviously we're concerned about maintaining that. That was the building adjustment to maintain those trees. Based on Urban Forestry and meeting with the arborist and everybody, they signed off, after looking at the trees, on that placement, that they would be okay for the trees. In terms of the building, as Samuel went into, we made a bunch of changes. We did do some pushes ins and outs. We added some materials, adjusted some colors of materials, and I was going to go through specific elevations now so that you guys can understand exactly what it is that we did. The first is the west elevation. This is the one that faces back towards the center, away from El Camino. On the top you see the previous elevation that we presented on October 3<sup>rd</sup>, and the one on the bottom is now the new one. There were comments made about breaking the parapet line, pronouncing the entry more, and having an additional material. What we've done is we've taken that central section and we've raised the parapet there, and we added an additional material, which is a gray brick. There was also conversation last time about the scale of the brick and if there needs to be more variety. We took a look at different size bricks. At the end of the day, what we landed on was using a Norman size brick that still obviously had the vertical dimension with a standard brick, but it has a longer foot-long dimension. We think that the horizontality of that gives a little more of a sophisticated look. In addition, the right and the left storefront pop-outs, or those volumes, were coming out inches. They now come out feet from the building projection. Here is a view from that corner that shows all those pieces coming together. Then, on the north façade, we again wanted to break up the massing, as was discussed. On the top you see the previous elevation from October 3<sup>rd</sup>, and the bottom, the current elevation. Starting on the right side of the building, we had a pretty long section of brick there. We've now reduced that to just be a section right at the corner. And then, you move over to a neutral zone of stucco, and then, the gray brick that sits just to the left of that is actually a recess that punches into the building. We think that, along with the trellis, gives a little more articulation to the building. We've also refined some of the metal details that we have, trim around the storefront. In addition to that, we've changed the color of the Prodema material that we had. We had something, it was a Nux that was darker. We've changed it to a lighter color, which is called Rustik, that we think is more complementary with the rest of the building palette. And then, here's a view of what that looks like now in elevation form. And then, as we get up closer, this is a more close-up view of the entry, where you see all these materials coming together. One other item we changed is there was concern last time about the detailing of how we were going to make the Prodema work on the trellis itself, that we would have dark edges. We looked at how to detail that, and we could detail it with lighter corners, but it was recommended instead that we go with a different material that is now on the board. That is a sublimated metal, which is an aluminum product. Yeah. And they are able to custom finish that to match the Prodema look. We think that that's going to have the more finished look that everybody is interested in. We did receive a question through Samuel, I think, from the Board, as what the end caps will be, because as you can see in the picture, you would see those end caps. Those end caps are also a sublimated metal material, the same product that is attached to the end. We thought that would obviously help solve that problem. The south elevation, we made a lot of changes, probably the biggest change. We start on the right, or the El Camino side. We used to have on the top a brick corner. That's now been changed to the stone. The reason we did that is, if you move just to the left, we have the three storefront windows there that were in a long band of stone. We've changed that to just a section of brick around the storefront windows, that then goes back to a stucco section. The reason for that, again, is because we didn't want long plays of material. It was stated last time, we need to break up the massing a little more. Again, those volumes were pumped out more. Where

they were inches before, they are now into feet projections. Then, as you move left, you'll see the center there. We originally had the Nux Prodema where we now have the lighter Rustik. As Samuel mentioned, we've extended the trellis another bay, two bays, to the west, and we've inset that section where we have the access to the patio from inside, and we've given that, again, the dark gray brick color. And then, over on the left, we've again broken that up with a different brick, and again, that projects out. We think the whole effect, again, is to try to break down that massing, as was requested in the last meeting. And then, here, again, are views of that, as Samuel had already shared. And then, an up close patio view of how that would all come together, the different materials, with the dark brick, the lighter brick, and the trellis. Finally, the east elevation. Formerly, there was no comments to this, but as we began to look at it and the ramifications of the material changes we made on north and south, necessitated a subtle shift, and that is to make both the north and south corners now that stone material, whereas one was stone and one was brick, prior. That then worked with the adjacent elevations, the north and south, so that it would all read together a little better. As Samuel mentioned, we've now pulled the building back sufficiently enough to the professional's recommendation that we are preserving the trees on the corner and safely out of the heritage oak tree protection zone, as well as the dripline. Lastly, this is the material sample board. A lot of the materials are the same. I'll just run through them real quickly so you understand what the changes are. The top left brick is what we had had previously. The next one, to the right from there, is the new brick, and that's a gray color. Again, it's a nominal height, but it's in the Norman width, a one-foot width, as opposed to a standard eight inches. On the bottom right you'll see the addition of the sublimated metal, which is the not-wood product that would be limited to the trellis pieces that are there. The balance of the trellis, we had a question as well on this, is a painted metal. That is on the board; it is listed as Paint 3. It's an off-white/white color that complements that not-wood material. And then, to the left, on the bottom, you'll see the lighter color of the Prodema, which is that Rustik material. That, in a nutshell, is all of the modifications we've made.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. With that, I'd like to open the meeting to any public comments we may have. Is there anyone who wishes to address this issue? Okay, seeing none, do we have any questions of the applicant before we start discussing? Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: The two bricks, are they going to be the same dimensions, or is one longer than the other?

Mr. Klinzing: One is longer. The lighter one is a standard brick, so it's the standard height, and it's an eight-inch length. But the darker one is a Norman. That's actually a foot, so it's a good four inches longer. Like I said, that gives it a different feel while still breaking on the scale. We looked at larger materials and it just felt too big. Like it needed to be broken down.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thank you. For the trellis...?

Mr. Klinzing: Yes?

Vice Chair Thompson: The rendering is showing the white and the wood.

Mr. Klinzing: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: But the brochure is showing all wood. Is it closer to what it's going to be in the rendering?

Mr. Klinzing: Yeah, I apologize. The material precedents, we obviously grabbed those from images on the web so we could explain it, and the one that was available showed it all as a wood color. But when you look at the actual drawings and the renderings, that's what it will look like. It's a white-colored metal for the main pieces and the main beams, the columns and beams, and the detail pieces – the slats – would be the sublimated non-wood, which is that extruded metal product. As a subtle detail, we always put those, I like to put them underneath the beams, because you always experience a trellis from underneath. When you put them on top, it always breaks up the view. But if you put them underneath, that's what you see, primarily.

Vice Chair Thompson: It will be that material, but in this color?

Mr. Klinzing: Correct, yes. What's on the board.

Vice Chair Thompson: Got it. Okay. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Anything else? I'd like to ask you about the proximity of the building to the trees. I wonder if you could tell me, from the center line of Tree 39 and Tree 72 – those are the two oaks on the corners – how close the building is to those, measured that way? While we discuss, you guys can [crosstalk].

Mr. Klinzing: I'm going to phone in a friend, here.

Chair Baltay: I measured, I scaled off your drawings, finding that Tree 39 is 29 feet from the corner, and the other one is 18.5 feet. But maybe you could check that for us.

Mr. Klinzing: I just checked, and we don't have that dimension. We've measured the overall, but we don't have the specific from the center line. We can certainly, obviously, get that for you, but we went out and surveyed the actual driplines, and then, made sure the building was out there. But we don't have that specific, from the center line, out.

Chair Baltay: Well, I'm trying to get a sense of whether the building really is within a dripline or not, because when I go out there, the dripline seems to be bigger than the dimension I'm seeing. I want to see if you can tell me what the numbers really are.

Mr. Klinzing: Oh, you're seeing a discrepancy between what you observed and what we're showing on the drawings.

Chair Baltay: Yes. The second question is: What is the measured dripline of each of those trees?

Mr. Klinzing: Gotcha.

Chair Baltay: Are you able to come up with that information while we're doing this today?

Mr. Klinzing: Are we able to verify...? We're working on it.

Chair Baltay: Let's leave that as an outstanding question, if you could try to get that to us.

Mr. Klinzing: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Before we start, one last question for staff. On Option 1, you say that we're essentially creating a placeholder pad for this Wilkes Bashford building. Does that mean that the actual spot of the building has been fixed and we're agreeing to that? Or it just a conceptual sense that there's another building going in here?

Mr. Gutierrez: It's more of a conceptual sense. It does arrange the parking lot, of course, around that pad, but the building could be shifted if the Board feels it needs to be.

Chair Baltay: Great. Thank you very much. Okay. Perhaps, Alex, did you want to start us off on this?

Board Member Lew: Sure. I don't have very much to say on this that I haven't already said before. I think I was closer to recommending approval last time, so I don't have that much new to say. One is, on things that have changed, is the El Camino sidewalk. I did walk the entire length of the shopping center sidewalk on El Camino, and it really does have varying conditions. It does have the sidewalk all the way to the curb in one part because there's a bus stop, so if we do that on this section, it would kind of fit in. There are other places where there are street trees in a very tiny, narrow planting strip. There are London plane trees in there. I'm not sure that the six inches does anything. I think we've done that, I think we're proposing to

do that on, there's a new bike path on the Ming's Hotel site, and they found some tiny little Mendocino bunch grass to fit in there. Six inches isn't much. I don't know really know what we're getting out of that. I don't necessarily object to it.

Ms. Gerhardt: Sorry, if I may. On the sidewalk, part of that is coming from staff direction. We're trying to address the zoning code that says that a 12 foot sidewalk is required. We're already having to do a variance, though, to not do the 12 feet. We were trying to get a slightly bigger sidewalk, but if there's some other dimension that is more agreeable, then we're open to that.

Board Member Lew: I was not opposed to the previous proposal. The last time around, you were proposing an eight foot sidewalk going to the curb, and I was okay with that. There were other Board members opposed to that. And I think even just getting, like, the seven or eight feet width, I think helps, because you do have people, you have pedestrians, and you also have bicyclists riding on the sidewalk in this location because they don't feel that it's safe enough, and the City has sort of objected to bike lanes on El Camino in the past. I'm fine with all the changes with the Wilkes Bashford building. I think my general take on it is that it meets our findings. It's not a great building, and I think it really does suffer because I think you're trying to put a lot of different materials on it to break the long length along Pistache Place, and I think you're trying to do too much on just a façade treatment with very minor, very small projections and recesses. But, nevertheless, I think it meets the findings. You have, all the materials and colors fit in with the shopping center. Generally, the height is what we're looking for on El Camino, which is minimum 25 feet high. The massing, the contextual elevations, do show that the building fits in with the existing shopping center buildings. I think there have been some criticisms from Board Member Baltay about the parking lots being too chopped up and isolated, and I think I agree. I think I understand the comment. But I did look back through old aerial photos when the shopping center used to have a continuous parking lot all the way around it, and there were no sidewalks. There was one sidewalk into the shopping center and that was it. And everything else was just parking, and no trees. When we did the Sand Hill Road extension, the parking lots got chopped up because we added numerous sidewalks all the way into the shopping center, so it makes it less convenient for drivers. But it makes it much more interesting, much safer, and much more attractive way to get to the shopping center for pedestrians. I also did look at some of the old aerial photos to sort of see what the original, what was originally happening along El Camino with respect to the oak trees, and I think what I've learned from what I've seen is that there were no oak trees originally on that frontage. If you go back to the 1940's photo when the underpass has been finished, there was nothing there. I think all of that was planted. I did look... I think, Board Member Thompson, you're proposing to retain the trees on the corner, which is, like, 71...? Is it? Seventy-two is the larger one. I did look at those. Those are fairly small, but I'm fine with keeping them. And I also think that the landscape plan is generally, I highly recommend it. I think the ratio of native plants is very high. I think that's all very attractive. I think my only comment on the plants is that the western redbud trees, which we have on the new cut-through street, it's a very small tree, and it's a very slow-growing tree. I've been shopping for one for my house and talking to nursery people about that. I think I would recommend staff looking at the size of that tree. I don't have any tree sizes here, like, container sizes on here, but since that's the only street on the connector street, I think we should look at getting the largest possible for that particular one. Okay, so, I think that's all my comments. I'm curious to see what the other board members think. I think I'm recommending Option 2. I think I can understand if the Board isn't happy with the Wilkes Bashford building. I will support that. But I think it meets the findings.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. David, do you want to go next?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, to begin with, I think that some of the changes that you've made on the west side are quite terrific. They really answer the problem that I had with the scale of the whole end of the building at that point. The change in the brick, I think that's an excellent improvement to the façade materials. I found this building to be quite interesting from the onset, that this idea of materials moving along the outside of it and it changes its nature all the way around, with the exception of the kind of monitors of store windows, or whatever, that sort of project. And that new projection is quite an improvement, I think. I'm a little confused. Option 1 is we're going to – staff, if I'm correct – that's going to be a pad, and Option 2 is the building. Right? I would say, I'm prepared to support the building and the pad. The whole thing. I just don't think there are too many issues that could not be addressed. I think that



relative to trees, you can work on driplines and manage to prune the trees if necessary to make it work. My personal opinion is I don't think we should get too involved in it. You certainly moved the building, which is significant to my way of thinking. I do have some problems with – and you haven't hardly a way to deal with it – and that's the area that's on the west side that is the outside parking. Wouldn't that be nice if it were some sort of general plaza space? But then, what do you do with the parking? I understand that there's a conflict there, but it would really kind of set off that building if there were something more inviting about the way of getting in from that side. I think you've worked on all the materials quite well, so, as I say, I'm prepared to vote yes on this one. That's it.

Chair Baltay: Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: Hi, there. Sorry, I lost a pen [inaudible], so I don't want to lose this one. Thank you for your presentation. I'll kind of also try to keep it short. I agree with Board Member Hirsch, that the west elevation change is a thumbs up. However, north elevation, south elevation, east elevation – none of those really broke the parapet line, and as a result, still feel very massive. The west elevation is really the only elevation where you do that, and I think it's successful, but for the others, it seems like you focused a bit more on the planes, which I think is a good thing, but what the building suffers from is what we mentioned before, which is that it seems too massive, too big. And we mentioned the parapet line is the reason why, and on the long facades, it's especially more apparent. On the west façade, it's smaller, so it works there. But on the two big facades, the north and the south elevation, massing-wise, they are relatively unchanged relative to the parapet. It still feels like this big box that goes for a while. And that's my main issue. It almost felt like... I mean, I'm glad you guys did your presentation because when I saw this without that, it really felt like not much had changed at all, and it was sort of disappointing to see that. But, again, west elevation was really, that is the kind of improvement that we were asking for last time. It's just the north, south and east elevations are not really picking up on that change, so, for that reason, I don't think I can support Option 2. It's still a massing issue. The massing is relatively unchanged, and that's the main issue. And kind of what Board Member Lew was saying, you know, we don't... maybe... Yeah. Our job is to talk about the aesthetics and make Palo Alto, the future of Palo Alto good. And I think Building EE and Restoration Hardware is doing that, and the west façade of Wilkes Bashford is getting there, but the other three, which are very important because they face three very important sides, aren't there. I cannot support Option 2 as a result. The other issue with this package was also that the renderings were showing a lot of very solid trees that were covering up a lot of the building, so it was really hard to see that trellis extension, to really find those things that you did spend time changing, because your renderings had trees that covered most of it up. It was a bit of a search-and-see for me. I would say, in the future, depending on how this goes, it would be really important to show your design either with translucent trees, or no trees, just to really see what it is you're actually building. I had a lot of struggle with that. Also, the renderings for the corner elements on El Camino kind of depict a much deeper space behind that showroom window. It almost looks like that window isn't just five feet deep, or three feet deep. The rendering makes it look like you can see all the way and see people shopping. That's not true. There's, like, a staircase right there. It's a little bit deceptive in that way. I would also say, if this comes back, that an important thing to depict accurately. So, I'm in a place to not recommend Option 2. I can recommend Option 1. As far as the pad is concerned, I appreciate that you guys decided to respect the trees. If it's really the case that it is. You know, if the dripline is actually still into where that pad is. That dimension of the corner of the pad to the tree is really important, because if Board Member Baltay's measuring correctly, it still does encroach into the dripline, which would be a problem. Okay. That's all I got. Thanks.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. Thank you, everybody. To the applicant, do you have any dimensions you can give us about the building location? It's going to be important, I think.

Mike Mowery, Civil Engineer: Good morning. My name is Michael Mowery. I'm the civil engineering lead for the project. I'll introduce Ryan Gilpin, our project arborist. Based on your questions, we did just do some additional measurements to provide dimensions for Tree 39 and Tree 72, both the TPZ and the dripline and the canopies. I'll let Ryan present that information. Thank you.

Ryan Gilpin, HortScience Bartlett Consulting: Hi, my name is Ryan Gilpin from HortScience Bartlett Consulting. I'm the project arborist. For Tree 39, I measured it as 33 feet from the building, and for Tree

72, I measured at 18 feet from the building. Both of these would be relatively close to where the canopy dimensions are. We don't have specific dimensions as to what the canopy is, exactly where those buildings are.

Chair Baltay: To be clear, in your tree report, you have this exhaustive list of every tree and all these things, but you didn't measure the driplines?

Mr. Gilpin: I have the average canopy diameter of every dripline. The average canopy diameter for Tree 39 is 40 to 56 feet.

Chair Baltay: I'm sorry, could you say that again?

Mr. Gilpin: Forty to 56 feet. It's broken into the brackets that are important for tree replacement calculations, based on the technical tree manual.

Chair Baltay: It's between 40 and 56 feet.

Mr. Gilpin: That's correct. Average canopy diameter.

Chair Baltay: Average. The canopy diameter is the same thing as the dripline?

Mr. Gilpin: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay, and on Tree 72, what do you have there?

Mr. Gilpin: Ten to 27 feet.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. That's the information I was after.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may, the City's tree protection zone is 10 inches times the, 10 times the diameter. We're talking about 72 being 16 inches, so, therefore, the tree protection zone is about 13 or so feet.

Chair Baltay: And on Tree 39, that's 40 inches in diameter. What is that tree protection zone.

Ms. Gerhardt: Forty inches; 33.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Vice Chair Thompson: Do we still have a measurement distance of the corner of the building to the tree?

Mr. Gilpin: That's what I gave, the corner of the building to tree number 39. Thirty-three feet.

Chair Baltay: I heard them say 33. I scaled the... Is that to the building, or to the edge of the monitor, the glass thing?

Mr. Gilpin: Building. The closest point to the tree that I could tell in the drawings.

Mr. Mowery: [inaudible] structure.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I scaled it off the drawings at 29, but we'll take your word at 33.

Mr. Mowery: And just to know when Ryan was mentioning the overall dripline dimensions, those are diameters around the tree, so it would really be close to half. And I know, obviously, the diameter is [inaudible], but close to half of 56 is what you would compare to the 33 edge to the building. Does that make sense? Okay.

Chair Baltay: I see. The dimension you just gave for the dripline is the diameter, not the...

Mr. Gilpin: Diameter rather than the radius. That's correct.

Mr. Mowery: And the 33 and the 18 feet that we've given... Sorry. And the 33 foot for Tree 39 and the 18 foot dimension for Tree 72 are lateral dimensions from the tree to the edge of the building.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you, gentlemen. To my colleagues, and to staff, I guess. I'm a trained architect with a lifetime of experience, and I can scale drawings, and I scale this at 29 feet. I believe that number is reasonably close. I have a photo on my cellphone. I myself went out to the site yesterday, and I had a staff member go out as well, and we measured the dripline. You stand there with a ruler against the trunk of the tree and you go out until you're at the edge of the branches, 36 feet 2 inches, 32 feet 4 inches, 31 feet 3 inches. We measured that to the edge of the tree. So, when somebody says it's closer to 20 to 26 feet, I'm sorry, but that doesn't square with the dimensions I'm taking. And I think it's really important. When I look at your drawing, you're showing the dripline of the tree, showing it, you know, the jagged line here is more like 10 feet. I mean, it just feels like we're being spun here. These aren't really an effort to save the tree; it's an effort to fit the building where you want it to be, and push against the tree. With that comment... And we want to work with your information, of course. I'd like to address my colleagues here. Like David said, this is just two trees, and there are ways to build close to trees, and these trees have paved areas over a big chunk of their root zone anyway, so it's hard to see that you're going to impact the roots. I counted... Where are my notes here? The tree report says that you have 162 trees that are being impacted by the project, of which 86 are being plain-out removed. That's 53 percent of the trees, without even talking about these oak trees. They're already taking out more than half of the trees to fit this building where they're putting it. Plus, there is an impact on all these trees we're looking at. I went to the Comprehensive Plan, which is our bottom-line bible we're trying to follow. Plan No. N2.7 says maintain healthy trees in parking lots. Comp Plan N2.9: Minimize the removal and damage to trees. Comprehensive Plan 2.10: Preserve and protect regulated trees. I just don't see how we can find that they're taking out half the trees, plus they need to put this third building so close to these trees that I don't believe they're going to survive. I can show you photos I've taken yesterday of the dripline of Tree 39. The branches extend almost to the other side of the drive aisle that is adjacent to it. It's a 20-foot drive aisle. It's a very large, main bough of that tree, pointing right towards this building. I believe that will conflict, physically bump into the building. It will have to be removed. It's a major impact on this tree. All because the building really just is in the wrong place. That's the bottom line to me, is that the building is just in the wrong place, and you haven't really moved it enough. You've moved it a couple of feet. I'm not sure, again, about the 10 foot statement. Your drawings just don't clearly dimension these things. But I think it's not unreasonable for us to insist that these trees be preserved, and be preserved in a way that they will really survive. Not just that they'll make it through **plan shank [phonetic]** and we'll get half way through construction, when you realize that the tree is now dying, somehow. But rather, that it really happens. That means you stay away from it. We've had other projects with, I remember the Stanford Hospital, where they were close to these trees, and in the end, they stayed the dripline, plus a little bit. Then we did all the tree protection stuff. And those trees are surviving, but they're struggling. But we all know that when you build under the dripline, when your building touches the boughs of the tree. It means the tree's going to go. I drive in in the morning down El Camino, and it's the first thing I see from Palo Alto, is, coming over the San Francisquito Creek, coming into town, you're on that bridge at a stoplight. On the left is a very large redwood tree, next to the new park. On the right is all these oak trees along the shopping center. The Comprehensive Plan talks about the importance of preserving the entrance into Palo Alto and the way it looks. Removing this tree will not preserve that. Again, it's just a basic thing in the Comprehensive Plan. I believe the problem is that the building is just too close to El Camino. It will impact this tree, and it's incumbent upon us to protect this tree. Both of these trees. Again, if it were just one tree, if it were just, okay, can we do extraordinary measures, that's fine. But 53 percent of the trees in this project are being removed? I'm sorry, it does not have my support. I'd also like to state, for the record, my issue with the parking. I understand that not everybody agrees, but I'd just like to put it out there. With the Macy's store currently closed, I believe the parking lot in the shopping center is already maxed out. It's tough enough to find a spot, so, whatever the standard is, right now, it's really tight. We're proposing to add two new buildings to this project, to this site, at the same time as we reduce the parking by 165 spaces. I don't see how that's going to improve what's already, to me, a maxed-out situation. Regardless of parking ratios –

which is not what we're here to measure – Finding #4 requires us to find that the building does not, that it does not provide for the ease and safety of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. We also have to find that it's convenient vehicle access to the property. I can't make those findings on the basis of the parking alone, but between that and the trees, I'm just not there. Regarding the design of the building, I believe it has been improved. I find your changes of materials are much better, and I think they do meet the standards, as Alex said. I agree with Board Member Thompson's comments about the overall massing of the building, however, that it really hasn't changed the large look of it. Once you remove that tree – which I believe will happen with the design the way it is now – the massing of that building will be abundantly clear, and that's the first thing you'll see coming into town, is a large Wilkes Bashford building with windows that aren't windows. It does not have my support. I wonder if we have any other feedback from board members before we try to reach consensus here. I believe we're sort of stuck at 2 and 2.

Board Member Lew: Well, I will say, I visited the site on Black Friday, in the afternoon, and the parking lot in front of the Macy's Men's store was half empty.

Chair Baltay: Any other thoughts? Otherwise, I'll just put out there.

### **MOTION**

Chair Baltay: I move that we recommend approval of Option 1.

Vice Chair Thompson: Second.

Chair Baltay: Okay, all those in favor.

Vice Chair Thompson: Aye.

Chair Baltay: Aye.

Board Member Lew: Aye.

Board Member Hirsch: Can I speak to the motion?

Chair Baltay: Sure, okay. Let's hold back the vote. David, go ahead and speak to the motion, please.

Board Member Hirsch: I just don't know how we're going to go there with the thoughts that you just expressed. I mean, if the extent of the tree removals is that extreme, and the transportation issues, the pedestrian issues around this building are that extreme, are we talking really about allowing a pad to be built for a future building? And allow that and ...? It seems to me that everything is more extreme than that. You're almost saying, effectively, that you shouldn't have a building here. Or, it has to start all over. In that case, a pad is not a good idea. That's the sense I get from what you're saying, Peter.

Chair Baltay: To address your comments, David, I think those are the choices put in front of us now. I think we need to be careful that the parking... It's not something we really can make a decision about ourselves. When the staff, and the Transportation Commission and the Council decide that parking is adequate, we need to take that as what it is. I'm just sort of venting about it because I don't think it is, and this is my forum to put it out there. And I think the Board has consistently rebuffed that, and I don't think it's appropriate, as much as I support it, to hold the decision based on the transportation and parking issues. As much as I wish we could. I think the building needs to come back another, maybe 10 feet to be fitting, and I think the massing of the building is just a little too heavy, still. The roofline needs to adjust more, perhaps. Maybe more ins and outs or something as you go along that 200 foot façade? Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I think staff also mentioned that Option 1 is kind of a conceptual pad, that it's open to being adjusted, per our comments.

Board Member Hirsch: I don't know. If it's going to be constructed, that's where the buildings is going to be. It's a pad.

Chair Baltay: Staff, could you correct us? This is not giving them permission to construct the pad of a building, is it?

Ms. Gerhardt: No, it would just be permission to be basically rough grading. I mean, Option 1 would be giving them permission to do the parking lot, the sidewalk, those sorts of things, so you are sort of boxed in. But inside that box, there's still freedom to place the building wherever it needs to go. The box being just the pad, the location.

Chair Baltay: I guess I'm a little bit unclear. When I asked the question earlier, we said it was a schematic location. That means you're not boxed into the dimensions of that pad, but rather that corner of the parking lot of the building is getting a building.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. That corner of the parking lot, correct.

Chair Baltay: And what I'm saying, I think the building is still too close to those trees. It's clear that the pad then can't be that close to those trees. I would hate to see them grade for that and then find out the building can't be there. And I'm assuming that Option 1 is not giving them permission to do that. Is that the case?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. The pad could remain at its current elevation with no grading happening on that pad area. It would just remain as is, and the site work would be done all around it.

Board Member Hirsch: Doesn't answer it for me.

Chair Baltay: Is it possible to have Option 1 just state that we're not granting any permission to do construction where this building is being located, but rather, this is where we conceptually agree another building could be placed? But they still need to go through the process of designing the building and getting it approved. That's the way I interpret Option 1.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, there would be no construction on the pad, but there would be construction all the way around it. Not including the tree area, but there would be construction of the sidewalk.

Board Member Hirsch: How does that...?

Ms. Gerhardt: The sidewalk along El Camino, I mean, Option 1 would give them permission to change that sidewalk along El Camino. It would also give them permission to change the parking lot that's adjacent to Wilkes Bashford.

Chair Baltay: It seems difficult. I mean, you can't build a parking lot and then decide... If the building wall moves even a foot or two, that affects the whole thing. You can't just put the parking lot there and then, if the building wall has to move even a little bit, it doesn't work.

Board Member Hirsch: Doesn't work.

Chair Baltay: It needs to design the parking lot in conjunction with the building it's adjacent to. Would this come back to us before the parking lot design gets finalized? Or should we be asking the applicant these questions? How does this pencil out? I'm just sensing a discrepancy of what's being proposed and what I believe we're saying.

Ms. Gerhardt: If you take a look at Option 1, if you take a look at G1.1, just the second page of the plan set there, it shows the sidewalk along El Camino being new. There's a sidewalk along Pistache. I mean, there's, you know, four sidewalks surrounding that pad. Our initial take was that those four sidewalks could be built with Option 1. Now, maybe we take those sidewalks out, so the pad, you know, sort of grows.

Chair Baltay: It seems to me that sidewalks along El Camino and Pistache Place certainly aren't going to change, and that could be done, and that's something that needs to be fixed as they do the project. But the other two are integrally connected to the building, and exactly where the building is going to be.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, so, we could just make that change to Option 1, that the two interior sidewalks adjacent to the pad would not be approved as part of this Option 1, and that those would come back with the building.

Chair Baltay: I think that's the case, yes. Is that a clear, common understanding, then, that that's what we're approving?

Ms. Gerhardt: We probably should make a friendly amendment, just in case.

### **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO MOTION**

Chair Baltay: Could you state that clearly for me, please, what it will be?

Ms. Gerhardt: What I understand is that the two interior sidewalks adjacent to the pad would not be approved as part of this motion, and that those would come back when the Wilkes Bashford building comes back.

Chair Baltay: Okay, I will use that phrasing as the amendment to the motion. Do I have a second for that?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so, any further discussion on this? With that, we'll have a vote on the motion I've made. All those in favor? Opposed? None. Hearing that, the motion carries 4-0.

### **MOTION PASSES 4-0. BOARD MEMBER LEE WAS RECUSED FROM THE VOTE.**

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Thank you very much. Let's take a five-minute recess while we get Grace back here. Thank you.

[The Board took a short break. Board Member Lee returned to the meeting following the break.]

### **Study Session/Preliminary Review**

3. Receive an Introduction on the Objective Standards Project and Provide Feedback to Staff.

Chair Baltay: Next agenda item is a study session regarding, is item number 3, a study session to receive an introduction on the Objective Standards Project, and to provide feedback to staff. Staff. Good morning, Amy.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. I have with me Hang, who is our... Sorry, you can your last name. She is our housing planner. It is her last day, unfortunately, with the City, but she's here to give an important presentation on objective standards. You knew this was coming. We talked about this with the Council on – or you talked to them – on Monday.

Hang Huynh, Senior Housing Planner: Good morning, Chair, Vice Chair, and Architectural Review Board. I'm Hang Huynh, the senior housing planner here. I'm giving you a brief, high-level introduction about the objective standard project that staff has underway, and we have a consultant on hand that's, she's actually doing right now. The items I will go over today, I would like to go over what state housing laws have pushed this project, or where staff is undertaking this project, and go over the definition of objective standards, and the ARB's role. There have been many state housing laws that come down, most importantly to increase housing production. It has come as things of accountability and streamlining. The Housing Accountability Act prohibits cities from denying or decreasing housing projects that meet objective

standards. While SB 35 is known as a by-right housing bill, so, if projects meet the objective standards and affordability requirements for the City of Palo Alto, at least 50 percent of the housing units for a project of 10 or more units needs to be affordable, for lower incomes that's 80 percent of the area median income. Together, legislation has pushed cities to really view the code, to see that all the codes are objective. The entire part of this project is [inaudible] Title 18, to see if there's any subjectivity in the code to modify, to make it objective. What does it affect? Housing Accountability Act and SB 330 affects all housing proposals, and even mixed-use projects, but at least two-thirds residential. And then, SB-35, again, applies to multi-family with at least 10 units and 50 percent affordability. What is objective standards? Objective standards are standards that meet no personal or subjective judgment, and they are verifiable and knowledgeable before the application is submitted. To think of it another way, objective standards is quantifiable, measurable. Here clearly is a good example of what an objective standard is. Clearly you see, if you go to, if you want to know the minimum setbacks, you go to, RM-20, you know the setback is 20, and therefore, it's a quantifiable number associated with that. Here's the opposite of what we want to help modify. These are examples of subjectivity in our code. We want to find language such as these, and add measurable or quantifiable figures to make it more objective. The ARB's role is to view housing projects with objective standards, and that's why staff wanted to include the ARB in the beginning of this project that staff has underway. Again, staff, this is an introduction of what staff is doing, and we are actually coming back to you in three separate meetings in the future, the first one starting in January. If you have any preliminary feedback or initial comments, I'll take it now, but we do have three meetings set up for you guys in the future. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: I think we will have some comments for you. What I'd like to propose to my colleagues, though, is that we first understand what the applicability of these regulations are going to be. In other words, which kind of buildings or which projects will they apply to. And then we can address the issue of helping to find what is objective versus subjective standards. Does that make sense, to tackle it that way?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Baltay: I have, right out of the gate, a question regarding, in your first slide you showed – maybe you could back up to that. Where you stated what does it... No, right there. The Housing Accountability Act applies to all housing proposals, but that seems to be an older act. Is there some changes to that that's driving all of this, or is it the other two that are regarding affordable housing?

Ms. Huynh: I think for the Housing Accountability Act, it affects two or more units, but I think for our city, multi-family is three or more units. But I think going forward, I'm going to discuss with our consultant to really define this for the next meeting for you, to clearly...

Chair Baltay: Okay, let me just stop you right there. Housing Accountability Act, you said applies to two or more units.

Ms. Huynh: This is what I'm [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: And it says, "all housing." So, the IR process is not in the least bit affected, right?

Ms. Huynh: Oh, yeah, no. Again, also, I forgot to mention that SB 2 is funding this project, so the point of the SB 2 funding is to help facilitate more housing, and its focus is on multi-family housing, not single-family homes.

Chair Baltay: I'm just, when I first saw this line and saw "all housing," wow, that's a big change.

Ms. Huynh: Yes.

Chair Baltay: But single-family, the IR process is not impacted by any of this.

Ms. Huynh: I don't believe so.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And this doesn't have anything to do with ADU's or things like that. There's a whole series of rules about that.

Ms. Huynh: I don't believe so, but, yeah. I would this make this for our next meeting. Or our consultant will.

Chair Baltay: No, I understand. I just want us to be clear so we're going into this. Then, SB 35 and SB 330 all have triggers of how affordable the housing is before these regulations apply to it. It's only for housing that's low income, or portions of it are low income?

Ms. Huynh: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Can you speak more clearly to that? What kind of projects do these regulations apply to?

Ms. Huynh: SB 35 applies to multi-family projects with at least 10 units, I believe, and at least half of it has to be affordable. And "affordable" means for lower incomes with 80 area median income or below.

Chair Baltay: I'm just trying to catch all this. SB 35 is 10 or more units?

Ms. Huynh: I believe so, yeah. Multifamily.

Chair Baltay: And 10 percent are affordable. Isn't that required by our code anyway, right now?

Ms. Huynh: Fifty percent.

Chair Baltay: Fifty percent are affordable. What is the code threshold right now in Palo Alto for affordability?

Ms. Huynh: Fifteen percent.

Chair Baltay: Basically, we're going from 15 to 50 percent.

Ms. Huynh: If a project comes in and they have 10 units and half of it is affordable, and they meet all the guidelines and requirements of SB 35, they can ask for the streamlining.

Chair Baltay: Streamlining.

Ms. Huynh: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: And if a project comes in today and they have, they have to have at least 15 percent be affordable units anyway, right? That's the current code? The trigger shift is really, when it's more than 10 units, it's from 15 to 50 percent.

Ms. Gerhardt: This is an option that the developer could choose.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And SB 330, how does that...? Again, it says, "all housing proposals," but clearly not single-family, again. Where does SB 330 step in?

Ms. Huynh: I believe any [inaudible] act, so we need to make clear that we have these objective standards and checklists before the applicant submits.

Chair Baltay: For what kind of projects does SB 330 apply?

Ms. Huynh: I believe it's two or more units, or, I think, for multi-family, three or more units.

Chair Baltay: Can any of my colleagues help on this? I'm just trying to get a sense of where these things apply. So, it's two or more, or three or more units?



Vice Chair Thompson: Two or more.

Chair Baltay: It's two-plus units, so a duplex would be under the jurisdiction of SB 330?

Board Member Hirsch: It seems to me that the intention here is housing projects that are mandated by the state, they're certainly not concerned with two or three units, you know? The intention is that it's a large-scale housing development, you know?

Board Member Lew: I don't think that's necessarily correct. I think, generally, yes. But there is concerted effort to add ADU's – duplex, triplexes and fourplexes – which we call, like the "missing middle" housing typology. There is an effort to include those as well as part of the solution to the housing crisis.

Ms. Gerhardt: If we take a look at packet page 88, under SB 330, the second paragraph there talks about SB 330 shortening the approval timeframe, but also, as of January 2020, jurisdictions will be prohibited from imposing new subjective design standards on housing development where housing is an allowed use. Objective standards must be available for the public and must be used as the uniform benchmark.

Chair Baltay: Again, Jodie... Sorry to keep coming back to the same thing, but when I read those words, "prohibited from imposing new subjective design standards on housing development where housing is an allowed use." Well, the R1 zone in Palo Alto is a zone where housing is an allowable use. Does that mean we can't modify our IR regulations? IR regulations are inherently subjective.

Ms. French: I'm guessing that the housing developments is referring to multi-family housing again, not single-family.

Chair Baltay: Could you guys help us define, what do they mean when they say, "housing developments?" What is that defined as?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think for today's conversation, we should be using "multifamily," but we will go back and clarify that for the next hearing.

Vice Chair Thompson: It also – just to clarify – it says, "new subjective design standards." Is "new" a word that doesn't need to exist there? Is it just saying any subjective design standards? Because we have existing subjective design standards.

Ms. French: That's a good question. When I read that out loud, I said, "Oh, that's interesting," myself. We will have answers in January.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Grace, go ahead.

Board Member Lee: I have a question regarding SB 330, and I just want to make sure, does that apply for, again, the 50 percent affordable housing? Low-income affordable housing? It's just not called out, and I assume that it does, when we're talking about those projects.

Ms. French: I think it might mean all multi-family housing developments, but we will, again...

Board Member Lee: Oh.

Ms. French: Yeah, I don't think that relates to the ones that are 50 percent affordable.

Board Member Lee: Okay. I mean, I do understand the 60 days versus 120, to 90. And then, my second follow up is, since many cities are facing this pressure and this need, I'm wondering if staff can present a summary of what other cities are doing, and other review boards. I'm curious to see. Also, I am wondering

if the City of Palo Alto, when we say that there is, for the city of Palo Alto, there's a current standard, do other cities have different standards? And how does that actually apply? How is that determined?

Ms. French: I imagine other cities are facing this same urgency to amend their codes, so it's going to be interesting to learn what the other cities are doing. Typically, you have a little bit of time to implement something. For instance, we're going to be implementing an urgency ordinance on accessory dwelling units, most likely sometime in January. There's a grace period of about a month to get things done. So, other cities are in the same boat, and we'll connect with other cities and see what they're doing. But there's not a lot of benchmarking in other cities because they are in the same situation.

Board Member Lee: And then, just a quick follow-up, it sounds like the plan with Lexington and those three meetings are, you know, deliberate in terms of dates, and that, you know, per the contract that they have. But we cannot extend beyond that. We really need to make those three meetings happen by a certain date in order to make a recommendation to Council?

Ms. Huynh: Yes, I believe so. And they are also going to PTC.

Board Member Lee: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Alex, were trying to say something?

Board Member Lew: Yes. For staff, when I was looking at the scope of what you guys have to do to revise the code, it seems huge. It seems to me, of the sections of the code that I'm really most interested in, would be the, is the affordable housing overlay on public facility lots. Because that's new for us, relatively new. It's sort of untested, it seems to me. And I think, if I understand the Council's intent, is that it's mostly for, like, downtown parking lots. And it seems to me like, of all the projects that we have that are controversial, they're often downtown. And then, on top of that, the Board in the past has had lots of issues with things like alleys, corners, pedestrian amenities. And also, we have, some of the parking lots are next to plazas and parks, so I think there would also be concerns about a new project in those locations. It seems to me like that's the one that I think needs a lot of attention. We don't have that many affordable duplexes and fourplexes. There's an affordable duplex in Crescent Park, there's an affordable fourplex in Downtown North, but there are not a lot of them. I'm not quite so concerned about changes to the code in some of those areas. I think we can get that to work. But, yeah, definitely the urban downtown ones, I think we'll need to look at that really carefully. Also, I have a question – and I don't need an answer – is really that the... It's about parking reductions. I know the Director of the planning code just changed recently, last year, about that. A lot of senior housing and affordable housing request parking reductions, and I was just trying to figure out, how does that play into the whole review process? Those are also usually community concerns because neighbors don't want to be overrun with overflow parking. I think that that would be an issue that the community would be concerned about. And then, I think Councilmember DuBois was mentioning something happening in San Mateo. I think there has been some discussion about requiring setbacks on the top floor in lieu of any other discretionary design review. And I just wanted to put this out there. I used to work on affordable housing projects a lot, and we generally did not set back the top floor. I think it's a very useful design **noof [phonetic]**, and I think that can work really well on market rate projects. I did want to put out there that affordable housing projects that I work on, the units that can be as small as, the smallest I've done is, like, 225 square feet, unit. That's units at Stanford. A lot of times the one-bedrooms may be 600; two-bedrooms might be 700 or 800 square feet. And if you're stacking units and you're building up, there's nothing to cut up at the top floor. It's possible to put a different type of unit up on the upper floor, but it's really hard when you're working at these very small dimensions, and the units can't really change size because of ADA. You have to have these huge clearances in the bathroom and the kitchen, and it's a lot of wasted space. I could make a smaller unit if it weren't for ADA, but we do have to include that in the project. It's a tricky one for me. Maybe it's just a change of material and color, or something like that, and maybe not a change in setback on the top floors. And then, I have one other comment which I think can be harder to address. A lot of our projects recently, the Board has asked for, like, sun studies, and in our code, it just says to limit the amount of shading on neighboring properties. We have no standard whatsoever. We do it, and we go through the exercise to show to the neighbors, and I think it's a useful exercise to do. But I find that very tricky. What do we do

with that? It seems to me that that's something really important for the neighbors, and that's something really difficult to quantify. Those are my main concerns.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, Alex, Los Angeles, you know, is increasing their shading. They like shade in Los Angeles. I don't know if you've been reading that. But you mentioned a lot of things which I think I would agree that those are... Basically, what you're saying is that these are not subjective standards. These are objective standards, a lot of these elements that you talked about just now. So, just to have some feedback with you.

Board Member Lew: We have things, you know, like... I have notes. Like the building massing and facades should not be walled off or oriented exclusively inward. Right? What does that mean? You know? Like, what does that mean? And if you use, there's a project here on Alma, and part of it is inwardly oriented, but part of it is very expressionistic and outwardly. How would you determine that? How do you quantify that? We can't. There's no way we're doing that. Or we have something that says, like, all exposed sides of buildings shall be designed with the same level of care and integrity. I think architects understand that, but if you try to put that in a number, good luck. I mean, I think we're just... We're just going to have to give a little bit on some of these things. Open space. Useable private space shall be appropriate to the character of the building. I can, you know, I can understand where that's coming from again, but that's totally subjective. I mean, that's just... Yeah. I think we're really going to struggle with some of these.

Board Member Hirsch: You know, I have sort of a different take on, having read this now, and looking to sort of apply it to Palo Alto. I mean, it seems to me that – and you mentioned it, Alex – parking lots are the best available place right now for supportive affordable housing. And what my experience is, we start with something called a proforma. It's a layout. And a similar experience with affordable and supportive housing for quite a few years. This is where it begins. So, in our areas there, we have some really great benefits to us, and that is that the City owns the land of the parking lots. That gives us flexibility in different ways, I think. One of them is that a developer won't necessarily build straight-up housing that is in masses much more than it needs to be because the land doesn't cost as much. Or that we could insist that that be the case, you know? That the building shouldn't be overly tall within an area and create a scale relationship to, say, California Street, which is very low in height. I think that, you know, while we're asking for this zoning study, we should also be looking at all the available property. You probably have that in your files as it is, where are all those parking lots. And investigating the possibility of using those for this kind of improvement, which I think is coming down the pike no matter what we want to do or care to do here. It is going to be an insisted improvement in every one of the towns now. So, looking ahead, I think it's really important to analyze what's available, what are the kind of proformas that you would need to develop to make these projects work, along with the zoning. By itself, it isn't complete enough. The other thing I think you have to think about is that these are going to be probably developer housing. That's my guess. You have any comment about that? I mean, we don't have an agency that builds housing here. In New York, we had not for profits who built the housing. Right? Who built the housing based on them being designated as the developer. But there is no such organization here.

Ms. French: There are non-profit organizations here that work with the City of Palo Alto. We – the City of Palo Alto – do not have our own agency, if you will, but our housing planner, Hang, works with the Palo Alto housing corporation, right? And there's MidPen housing, there's...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, but specifically, kind of very low-income developers. Is that correct?

Ms. French: Their focus is affordable housing. Correct.

Board Member Hirsch: It's actually really supportive housing, would say. Probably. If I guess correctly. You know, not just affordable, but it's the very lowest level of affordability.

Ms. Huynh: The most recent project is for 59 units for, very low-income households of 60 percent area median income, with 21 units for adults with intellectual and development disabilities. So, supportive housing with that, too.

Board Member Hirsch: I mean, I think that these programs are for a variety of housing types, and I just... I think it's kind of an error to just look at the zoning without looking at how these projects will be developed. And it seems to that a proforma development would show... You know, a proforma, you know, do you realize what that is? I mean, how it's done, made? People write a proforma and they describe the entire process of financing a project.

Ms. Huynh: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: And it would be very, very useful to know that. The other thing that's quite flexible here is that the City owns those parking lots, and that's a major improvement possibility for us, or a major opportunity, I think, for Palo Alto. The cost of the land is so exorbitant in this area, that to have that opportunity. I just see this study as something that's kind of too ethereal, you know? I like po-tay-toes and you like po-tah-toes, you know, sort of thing. I'm concerned with what they're going to come up with, Lexington.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think the City could certainly look at its own properties and see what could be developed on those, but we also need the objective standards for private property as well, because we are going to have market rate developers that come into town, and we need to be able to apply the objective standards to them as well.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, understood. Understood. Except there's very few of those private properties, really, in the city.

Board Member Lew: I'm not sure that that's necessarily true. I think we have, like, 441 Page Mill Road, which is mixed use, which has, maybe like eight or 10 units up on the third floor, affordable units. Those are privately built. Stanford's Mayfield housing. They partnered with... Bridge? Maybe it was Bridge. You know, affordable Stanford housing. And I think they may have actually taken out the Stanford requirement. I'm not sure. I was looking into that recently, but I didn't get a conclusive answer on that.

Ms. French: We're also dealing with market rate housing. This is not affordable housing. The objective standards are for market rate housing, so, those we can certainly anticipate, although it probably doesn't pencil out so easily, so we don't get a lot of those from private development, given land prices. But we have to be ready. That's who we have to be ready for. If we are developing our own properties, you now, we don't have to worry so much about the objective standards because we have the strings on that to control and review all of those.

Board Member Hirsch: I mean, I'm mentioning all of this because we could do more now, and if we were just to do a zoning study by itself, an abstract sort of project, we could look at specific sites and look at the issues that are going to affect that particular site when you develop it in a certain way. You know, to provide a certain number of units. How do you deal with the parking issues in those sites where there are parking lots right now? That creates a whole different kind of realm of housing typology. That's my concern, that it isn't broad enough as a study right now, and I would recommend that the City broaden it to be ready when it really happens. Too many planning studies sort of end up paper.

Vice Chair Thompson: A couple of things. These new ordinances, there's sort of this fast-track, new process that sounds... It's not quite... Well, it's new to us. But I just wanted to clarify that this study is really just to define, we're defining the standards, but is the process going to change as well, in addition to their being new standards? Of, like, how we're involved, if we are at all, with this?

Ms. French: My understanding is, if we do get one of these that's streamlined, instead of the usual, longer, 120-days, or whatever, it's 90 days. So, that's going to be quite the rush on our part to get that done. So, yes, I would imagine that the ordinance that comes forward to Planning Commission and Council is going to reference certain types of projects have a shorter timeframe for review and approval.

Vice Chair Thompson: Do you think that because it's a smaller timeframe, are we...? I mean, I understand creating objective standards. That's sort of its own project. I'm more curious about process.

[Baltay and Hirsch side conversation, inaudible]

Chair Baltay: Sorry.

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry. I'd love to know what you guys are saying. But, yeah. I'm just curious about this expedited timeframe. In that timeframe, are we coming up with a new process, and if we are, would be talking about how ARB is involved with that?

Ms. French: I'm guessing that will be part of our conversation with you in January, is, you know, how the ARB can best participate in our shortened review time. For instance, we have a development review committee of all City staff that get together and, you know, within the first 30 days, and make comments on projects. Perhaps that's a time to have ARB representation – if not the whole board, a subcommittee of two, let's say – that could be there at the earliest opportunity, and then, some other kind of shortened process that wouldn't involve three meetings, as we normally get with large multi-family projects.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah. Because I wrote here, like, a new process could be to just meet with applicants really early, quite early on, before everything is in its final, beautiful, rendered, you know, like, pristine, this is the final thing, how do you feel about it. But something early and more schematic might be a way to streamline so that they don't go down the path that's not desirable. I feel like with design guidelines and design standards, it's sort of one of those... I was really conflicted when it comes to that because, on the one hand, it encourages good things, but on the other hand, I think it can also limit design. We're all thinking about, like, what is Palo Alto going to look like in 10 years, 15 years? We're wondering, what is good design, and what will good design be for Palo Alto? And how can these design guidelines help an applicant, versus make them, sort of corner them into a place where they're not really sure what to do. Which sometimes design guidelines do. On that note, I'd kind of encourage discussion, at least on the objective standards, of ways to integrate small-scale design, like a residential quality thing, like... I don't know if it's... I'm not really quite sure how to word it, but I think there could be way to sort of measure scale and rhythm in a building, and also, just kind of small-scale elements that encourage a residential feel, like balconies, or shading, things that can be small that give the appearance of a residential outlook. I know that there's other design guidelines that explicitly say if there's a residential that needs something, that it shows on the exterior that it's a residential thing, like balconies, or like awnings, or canopies, and other things. That could also kind of tie into a sustainability open space incentive as well. So, yeah. That's kind of my notes.

Chair Baltay: Okay, David, what do you have to say?

Board Member Hirsch: Something rather significant for us is that we get these incredible packets from our architects submitting. You know, they're so complete and wonderful, and then we tear them apart. Not always. It seems to me that this kind of project, once again, requires another level of review, and that is sort of a wire diagram of what's possible in areas where new development will be happening. You see a certain relationship to the mass, the form, the street scape, etc., in areas where you'll be developing a lot of housing, perhaps. We have a chance to look at something. I mean, that seems to me to be kind of an objective way to look at things. You know, you look at what the neighborhood structures are like, and you don't want a humongous tower on that site. So, what's reasonable? You do that with a wire diagram of some sort that we would maybe get into the process early, and then, if we could agree that that seems like it's reasonable, then the next step is develop. But if you don't do that, you have the possibility that, give this to a developer and he says, "The only way I can make this work is by going out another three floors." You know? And that happens. It happens. For reasons that Alex described, you know, that you want to build a building, if you're building small units, just the same way you want to build it straight up, all the way. I could show you a book here of New York buildings that are all that way. But New York is a very high-zoned, special area. I think that's very serious, to think about it that way, because I don't think Palo Alto is going to like it if they get to that point, where buildings are out of scale with the neighborhoods, and solve the housing problem, but are out of scale. It's important to figure out how to arrange our input in this, to help you really find a way to build new buildings that are not out of scale.

Board Member Lee: You haven't had an opportunity, Peter, to make comments, but may I also...

Chair Baltay: Please.

Board Member Lee: You're welcome to go first.

Chair Baltay: [inaudible]

Board Member Lee: Okay. I'm very encouraged that there are these housing accountability acts and these two SB... I think it's very much needed. One of the things that would be really compelling is to present to the Board in further meetings, from staff, in terms of how many affordable housing projects we have been able, and how many housing units we've been able to reduce in the last few decades. I think it's very dismal. There's an incredible need for housing, and I just want us to do the best with the City in terms of moving forward, as you've requested. Thank you for the introduction, knowing that three full meetings will come from a consultant. And hopefully we'll do it in the timeframe, by March 2020, and really assist in this effort. Something that I feel very strongly is that we do not want to create another layer of review. That's really not the direction we want to go. I do want to encourage the Board to really think about the timing of these projects. And to speak to affordability, you know, I think all of us have been involved in affordable housing and know housing well. There are incredible constraints in terms of being awarded tax credits or public funding. There are actually constraints in terms of open space, just how much open space, and even residential scale. And the things that Osma just came up with in terms of the difficulties regarding design guidelines – Absolutely. It can push you in a corner. However, design guidelines can encourage in a way that is helpful in terms of scale, rhythm, climate, comfort, of users, so I do want to point out that in that way, it does begin to guide. At the same time, it would be terrific if maybe the development review committee, maybe that's a forum where, in that early meeting, there is some ARB development. Maybe there's a way to circle back, knowing that on these affordable housing projects – at least 50 percent – there's very little time, and they've already been through the wringer in terms of actually getting the funding, and there's a deadline for them to actually build to be able to be awarded the funding, the dollars for those projects. So, I do not in any way encourage the Board to create more layers of review or extend the process or to be fighting against the intent of the Housing Accountability Act and these two SB's. I feel like we should really remember that this is an effort to accelerate housing development that is very much needed, and expedite and streamline the approval process. I just want to bring us back to that point. That is the objective, and how we do it, it is going to be a challenge for the City staff and for all of our boards to work together to get it done in time.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Grace. I'm trying to parse in my head how this affects and how we can help. I come back to, for example, a project we reviewed, I think it was 702 Clara Drive, within the past year. I believe it's been approved now by us.

Board Member Lew: It's coming back to us. We shouldn't talk about that particular project.

Chair Baltay: Oh, okay. That's what I wanted to find out, if it is. If it's not, I won't mention it. Let me then hypothetically talk about an applicant proposing a three-unit housing development some place in the residential areas of Palo Alto. To me, that's typically the kind of thing where we have an enormous beneficial impact on the project typically. Many of those come to us in, honestly, fairly dismal form, and we're able to really get improvements that make the project much more palatable to the community. Those are almost always market rate housing things, developers looking to improve the value of their property. And certainly, we want that kind of development happening in town, but I think that's the place where the subjective review is incredibly valuable. But it comes back to my first question here, and I just feel I just don't know yet. But Senate Bill 330, when I read the write-up you're giving us, seems to say that all housing projects will now have to have objective standards. Not market rate or below market rate, just all of them. Is that really the case? Are there triggers for affordability or size? Or is it just all housing projects?

Ms. Huynh: We just need objective standards for all housing projects, and the focus is multi-family housing.

Chair Baltay: So, this hypothetical three-unit for-market project in a residential area in Palo Alto, these standards would apply to that. I want to be clear because that's, I think, really what it's going to come down to for us. Developer takes a 10,000 square foot lot some place in Palo Alto; removes one old house

and wants to put three new buildings for sale or rent, at market rate prices. Will these standards apply to that? Is that required, to have objective standards now, going into the future?

Ms. Huynh: I believe so, but I think we'll come back with more clear...

[crosstalk]

Chair Baltay: ... I don't want...

Ms. Huynh: ...concrete answer, because I'm giving you a really unsure answer, and I'd rather have the consultant come back with a clear answer for you.

Ms. French: We need to not continue pressing. There's other... Yeah.

Chair Baltay: I mean, I don't want to press you on it now. What I want to do is make it clear I think it's really important to carefully identify which projects these standards will apply to. Because what I'm sensing, what I'm hearing, is that we're going to rewrite our entire code. And I think when you read these laws more carefully, that's not necessary. A large portion of what we have is fine, and it can stay the way it is. And I think we need to be very careful before we tear apart everything we have, to be sure of what we're doing it for. Because I think all of us would agree, if you're coming in with a 10-unit-plus affordable housing project in town, we'd all love to accelerate the process. I think all of us would agree that we want to reduce our aesthetic standards to get these things built. That's the purpose of these laws. I don't think there'd be nearly as much consensus on a three-unit development in the middle of an R-1 neighborhood. And I think that's what we want to identify first. Is that really the issue? Is that what's going to happen here? So, if I could suggest to staff that you be sure we address that issue, try to find clear answers to what does it apply to.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do need to get back to you with that answer. As far as rewriting the code, we do have some good basis to start with. I mean, we do have context-based design criteria. It's just that that criteria is currently subjective, and we need to make it more objective. We're not starting from scratch, but we are having to mold these to be more objective.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Then, my second thought – and I wonder if you could parse this through – would be to then create a fairly tight objective standard. For example, every unit must have a balcony. You have to set back above the second floor. That are really quite restrictive. They would be difficult to meet. Or, your option is then to go before ARB or a subjective review. Is that going to be legal under this new set of laws? In other words, we have a published standard. If you want to exceed that standard, then you go into a subjective review with a greater timeline. That might be an answer, then. I think, Jodie, honestly, to make subjective standards objective is going to be challenging. The moment you say no more than 10 percent shade on a neighboring property, there will be some problem with that. Or it's just useless. It's very tough to analyze all of that. That's my second thought, is that, is there a way to get a trigger system instead? Is that legal under the code? My last thought is just regarding the schedule. You've published that we're going to have three ARB meetings starting at the beginning of November. It's at the end of November, and we're talking about having the first meeting in January. I don't think the schedule is going to hold, and we'd love to try to help accelerate and make that work. Are there any ideas from everybody else? What can we do to do our part in a timely fashion? Should we create a subcommittee where we can meet with you guys more frequently? Is there any way we can help, in advance, establish the agenda for these meetings? The calendar produced by Lexington on page 96 of the packet is, I believe, already out of date.

Board Member Lee: and staff, I'm wondering if, are the agendas full for January and February?

Ms. Gerhardt: We will make room for this topic.

Chair Baltay: I'm sure we have special ARB meetings just for this thing, so we can do them on a different timeframe, or something...?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think, luckily, for good or for bad, our agendas have not been completely full lately, so I think we're okay in that regard. But we certainly could add hearings if need be.

Chair Baltay: Okay, well, I'm looking at this schedule proposing to get readings from the Council back at the end of the summer, and I just don't see having five meetings between the ARB and the PTC in that timeframe.

Ms. Gerhardt: I do wonder if, again, the context-based design criteria, that is through a couple different chapters, you know, the multi-family chapter and the commercial chapter, and other places. Maybe we want to divide up some of these sections to a subcommittee, or something like that.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, I guess, honestly, when I look at this, I'm feeling like a professor looking at a student coming to me with a thesis topic that wants to study the history of Western Civilization. You're not going to rewrite the zoning code completely in the space of nine months.

Ms. French: How about, when we come back to you in January – it will be January 16<sup>th</sup>, I believe – we can have a proposal involving some assistance outside of the ARB meetings with subcommittee use.

Chair Baltay: Yeah. I guess... That's absolutely good. What I'm really saying is that whoever in the Planning Department is working with Lexington to manage their process needs to hold them accountable to creating realistic schedules that we can follow. And if necessary, pare back. Maybe three ARB meetings isn't going to happen. Maybe four subcommittee meetings instead. But when you produce it like this, when it's just clearly unrealistic and out of date the day it's presented, we just lose the confidence of everybody. And if this makes the project a three-year project, which I think isn't going to fly. These laws are effective in a month. That's my feedback to you. Let's push our consultants to be realistic on this schedule, as well. Anybody else? Okay, then I think we're done with this action item. Thank you very much. I'm sorry for the hard questions.

### **Approval of Minutes**

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for October 17, 2019.

Chair Baltay: We're going to move on to the next agenda item, number 4, which is meeting minutes from the meeting of October 17, 2019. Do we have any comments on those?

Board Member Lee: I had just a comment on the November 7<sup>th</sup> minutes.

Chair Baltay: Okay, we'll get to that in a second.

Board Member Lee: It was just a small one with Osma's... I think it says Board Member Lee says I will not be here on the 19<sup>th</sup>. It actually is Board Member Thompson.

Chair Baltay: Is that November 7<sup>th</sup> or the October 17<sup>th</sup>?

Board Member Lee: Draft minutes of November 7<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Baltay: Let's hold on one second. That's the next one.

Board Member Lee: Oh, sorry, is that the next one?

[crosstalk]

Chair Baltay: On agenda item number 4, minutes of October 17<sup>th</sup>. Do we have any comments? If not, can I get a motion.



Board Member Lew: Yes. We need to add the subcommittee items for both sets of minutes. Subcommittee action.

Chair Baltay: Yes, that's true. Staff? This is the third or fourth time we've been asking you about getting the result of the subcommittee put into the minutes. How can we get that done?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, and normally we add the memo, and that did not happen here.

Board Member Lew: For the November 7<sup>th</sup> one, Osma and I were on the subcommittee, and we approved...

Chair Baltay: Alex, if we could...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ... project.

Chair Baltay: That's the next item, Alex. I'm going to move that we continue item number 4 to having the minutes completed with the subcommittee items. Can I get a second for that?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Baltay: Any comments on that? Okay. All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries 4-0 [sic].

**MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.**

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

Chair Baltay: Now, item number 5. Grace, you were first.

Board Member Lee: Just a small revision. It was Board Member Thompson who said she would be absent at the December 19<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chair Baltay: Which page is that?

Ms. Gerhardt: What packet page?

Board Member Lee: It is on the first page.

Vice Chair Thompson: Package page 130.

Board Member Lee: Oh, sorry, packet page 130. At the bottom.

Vice Chair Thompson: I guess we have a similar voice.

Chair Baltay: Okay, is that it, Grace? Okay, Alex, what were you saying about November 7<sup>th</sup>?

Board Member Lew: Oh, a subcommittee. The subcommittee did approve the project. This is on Hamilton Avenue. They did approve the two-foot height reduction and a change in material from Equitone to TAKTL cement board.

Chair Baltay: I don't see anything about the subcommittee in minutes. Am I missing something? Jodie, is it just plain not there?

Ms. Gerhardt: I'm looking, because there should be at least some conversation about it.

Board Member Lew: I think on this one, it was confusing because we did the subcommittee before the end of the meeting.

Chair Baltay: That's right. This was the earthquake drill. It should be in the middle.

Ms. French: Packet page 150.

Vice Chair Thompson: That's right.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. Maybe we need to delay these, as well.

Chair Baltay: I would like to, yes. I just want to be clear, the subcommittee item is described, but the action is not described. Is that right?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: Yeah. I move that we continue this item as well, so that the subcommittee action can be written into the minutes. I'm looking for a second.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: Any comments on that? If not, all those in favor? Opposed? Okay, the motion carries 4-0 [sic].

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

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

6. North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP)

Chair Baltay: Item number 6.

Board Member Lew: North Venture CAP, the next meeting is tonight at 5:30, here at City Hall. The consultants will be reviewing three alternate schemes that will be studied and developed for the Council to review. The next meeting in January, we'll also be working on the alternates.

Chair Baltay: Any questions of Alex? David? No? Okay, with that, we are adjourned. Thank you very much, everybody, thank you, staff.

### **Subcommittee Items**

7. 2342 Yale Street [18PLN-00224]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Architectural Review Application That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to Materials, Trash Enclosure, Bike Locker and Related Lighting and Circulation. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of CEQA in Accordance With Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: RMD (NP). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Emily Foley at [emily.foley@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:emily.foley@cityofpaloalto.org)

8. 250 Sherman [17PLN-00256]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to the Tower Design for the Public Safety Building. Environmental Assessment: Certified Environmental Impact Report. Zone District: Public Facilities (PF). For More Information Contact Chief Planning Official Amy French at [amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Baltay: We do have two subcommittee items, and that was board members Thompson and Lew handling those. Thank you, you two. Okay. Thank you, everybody.

**Adjournment**