



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES: May 16, 2019
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

F

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Wynne Furth, Vice Chair Peter Baltay, Board Member Alex Lew, Board Member David Hirsch, Board Member Osma Thompson.

Absent:

Chair Furth: Good morning. I'd like to call to order the meeting of the Architectural Review Board of the City of Palo Alto. This is our regular meeting of May 16, 2019. Could you call the roll please?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Good morning everyone.

[Roll Call]

Ms. Gerhardt: Great, everyone's here. Thank you.

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: Thank you. We have a space on our agenda for oral communications. That's the time to speak to a matter that's not on the agenda, but that is subject to the ARB's purview. I don't have any speaker cards. Is there anybody who wishes to speak in oral communication? If you could come up to the microphone and give us your name and address?

(no mic)

Chair Furth: Oh, great. We'll hear you in Item two. Thank you.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: Any agenda changes, additions or deletions?

[The Board moved to Approval of Minutes]

City Official Reports

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

Chair Furth: Let's see, I guess we're on City Official Reports, is what I'm going to.

Board Member Hirsch: Madam Chair.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm going to have to, which I didn't mention...

Chair Furth: Could you speak into the mic.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. I would like to be out on the same day that Peter's out.

Chair Furth: You know you have to speak very, very close to our mics. They're not...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Chair Furth: That would be June 20th?

Board Member Hirsch: June 20th.

Chair Furth: So, Board Member Hirsch would – Vice Chair Baltay and Board Member Hirsch would be missing on June 20th.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. Will everyone else be present?

Chair Furth: I will be.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah, I'm planning to be there.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, so we'll still have...

Chair Furth: You'll have a quorum.

Ms. Gerhardt: We'll still have quorum.

Chair Furth: Well, we will miss you, but thank you for letting us know.

Ms. Gerhardt: And then as far as the next hearing June 6th, we will be hearing the Mercedes Project, and then also the former Cheesecake building is coming in for a renovation. We're hoping for Mercedes, it's the third hearing. For Cheesecake it's the first hearing, but you also had a prelim, a recent prelim on that project, so we're actually hoping to get recommendations on both those projects.

Chair Furth: I'm sure you will. It may or may not be the one you want, but yes.

(unknown male): One way or another.

Action Items

- 2. 567 Homer Avenue [18PLN-00145]:** Request for Preliminary Architectural Review to Allow Demolition of an Existing 1,292 Square Feet Two-Family Residential Building and Construction of a Three-Story, Three-Unit Residential Project. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Project will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: RM-30 (Multiple Family Residential). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Furth: All right, we have one public hearing item today, an action item, which is, concerns 567 Homer Avenue. I think it's actually a double address. It's a request for preliminary architectural review for a project that would demolish an existing 1300 square foot two-family residential building and construct a three-story, three-unit residential product, project, sorry. The Environmental Assessment is not a project,

though I presume you're going to double check on the historic, possible historic nature of the building before you make that determination, because it would not be exempt if it were, I think. The zoning is RM-30, multiple family and the project planner is Sheldon Ah Sing. Sheldon.

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing: Yes, good morning. I do have a power-point presentation for you and the applicant is here also. So, this is an application that is subject to the preliminary review, and that's an opportunity for the applicant to present a project prior to formal submission, and also an opportunity to get feedback from the various departments of the City and the Board. We try to get these projects expeditiously to the Board upon submittal and that way we're not going back and forth a lot on the details, which we will get to during the formal application. So, just, for this project in particular, you may notice some inconsistencies with scale on the drawings or that maybe code provisions, like the windows, may not be appropriate for egress, but just, or daylight plane for instance, we're just showing the daylight plane that goes through the building. But we did want to get enough information back to present to the Board, so you have sufficient information to present, at least enough direction and feedback for the formal submittal, which the applicant wants to do within the next couple of months. So, with that said, the application is preliminary for three units on a 0.17-acre site, 7500 square feet, and the request would be eventually for formal major architectural review. It is on Homer. It's a two-lane one-way street. The context of the area, you do have some, a mix of kind of lower intensity with the Channing House across the way, which is a little more intense, fenestrated by those large redwood trees. You do have some newer developments along the street there that's more in the context, maybe, of the area. On this site you have one a one-story, but two-unit building, so those would be replaced with three-story, about 4500 square feet. That's just at the FAR that's allowed for the project. What's proposed for the building is a contemporary type of design. The heights of the plates are ten-foot height plates. You probably would think that's a little bit tall, but we do want to get feedback on that. The exterior walls would include some integral muted colored stucco accented with some wood paneling for the balcony rails as well as for the surrounds of the windows. The windows are aluminum framed and there's a uniform pattern to them, although it's kind of narrow. I think I've identified that already, in the fenestration. So, it's either squares or vertically oriented, instead of rectangles. The stairwells of each unit are really in plain view. There's a lot of fenestration there, so we may want to have some feedback about that as relates to privacy. Each unit would have three bedrooms and different configurations. So, we want to have some focus here, as the project will need to address as I've identified, the daylight planes. We do believe that the open space arrangement access could be better defined for the site just so it meets the findings. We are seeking some comments and directions from the Board regarding the scales and mass of the project in and of itself, and then kind of how it relates to the neighbors, as well as on that note, the design in the neighborhood context of whether or not this design is appropriate. Is there enough landscaping as proposed? And then other areas of interest by the Board that you may have. So, with that we do recommend that the Board review and provide us comments. There's no formal action requested. We do identify that, yes, the site may be potentially deemed historic, so that will have to be vetted out in the formal process, but we do have a scope for the applicant to consider regarding our third-party consultant to review that. So, with that, that concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may be. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Before we ask Sheldon our questions, has everybody had a chance to visit the site?

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I have.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Furth: So, we've all visited the site and look at the property at least from the street and look at the neighborhood. Is the applicant here and ready to speak? Great. If you want to just come to the

microphone and you'll have ten minutes. Please introduce yourself and we ask that everybody spell their names so that our transcriber can get it right.

Jerrick: My name is Jerrick and its spelled J-E-R-R-I-C-K.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Jerrick: So, the main architect I designed this project with is not present today, but I was also part of this project, so I could answer most of the questions today. And so, as mentioned earlier, the existing house is almost 100 years old and we will be seeking to introduce three attached units on the lot and each unit will be around 1500 square feet. And right now, we have all three units facing a different direction for the main entrance. The front unit facing Homer Street, we currently have the main entrance facing towards the Channing Apartment out front and with the huge out-front setback, this will allow front private space for that unit in the front. And then the middle unit will have some outdoor area in the center of the floor plan. And the back unit will have its private backyard in the rear setback. So, our main intent was to build high-quality homes in a very appropriate entry and compliment the existing neighborhood. The proposed project will allow opportunities for the residents in Palo Alto to see the contemporary design on the Homer Ave, and we mainly focused the design with the newest developed multi-family residence in the downtown area of Palo Alto. So, currently we are seeking to submit a plan for planning and review and for ingress and egress. Our submittal includes one site plane showing a main entrance and the vertical circulation of each unit. I could be taking questions if you have more questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I forgot to ask you earlier, but we're required to determine whether we have any conflicts of interest with respect to applications, and that means that the only thing that's listed about the owner of this project is that – I guess I'm looking at, it's different here. So, who is the owner of this project?

Jerrick: The company called HESTIA2.

Chair Furth: And is that a name specific to this project, or is it an ongoing corporate entity? I mean, is this an LLC for this corporation? Who is the real party? Who owns that?

Jerrick: His name is Jang Hyuk.

Chair Furth: Could you spell that for us?

Jerrick: J-A-N-G H-Y-U-K.

Chair Furth: Thank you. And who is the architect?

Jerrick: Mar, Weiss Mar.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Does anybody have any questions of the applicant or the applicant's architect, or of Staff? Okay. Then we will have public comments. Thank you, you may sit down.

(no mic)

Chair Furth: I have two speaker cards. The first one is from David Kwan, to be followed by T. Schaul. Mr. Kwan, you will have three minutes.

Dave Kwan: Thank you. Again, my name is Dave Kwan. That's K-W-A-N for the spelling. So, I'm the owner of the property on 750 Webster. So, it's one of the adjacent properties to this particular project. In reviewing the plan, now I'm not an architect so I'm probably not...

Chair Furth: Neither am I.

Mr. Kwan: I'm definitely concerned about the privacy impact on my property. The plan did address a couple of properties around the property, 734, 738, which is probably one of the three on Webster Street that it's going to impact, but nothing was stated about the impact on 750, 760. So, I'm definitely concerned about that. And then, as such, since it wasn't addressed in the plan, certainly I'm concerned about the ancillary impacts such as sunlight, noise, as well as scale. I think you guys asked that question about scale and mass. Certainly, I'm a resident of Palo Alto. This is just actually one of my many properties. I am concerned about the project size, just because I haven't seen many projects... I mean, I love the design, but I've never seen, or haven't seen many projects or haven't seen any projects that's three stories in nature or if that is, that must be a new sort of new way of doing things. So, I think that should be considered as well. So, that's my prepared comments.

Chair Furth: Thank you. If you could wait just a minute. Staff, which sheet, Sheldon, which sheet has, shows – this block has a very unusual lotting pattern. Which, I know you have a sheet which shows all that. Which one is it? It's really complicated interlaced lots. I know I saw it somewhere.

Mr. Ah Sing: Yeah, I think maybe the best one is A0.3.

Chair Furth: A0.3?

Mr. Ah Sing: Yeah, so basically you have the subject site is pretty detailed. It does show Webster Street and Homer, that's the intersection, so this property is actually the second property on Webster.

Chair Furth: Okay. There was another one I was thinking of.

Mr. Ah Sing: There's a better one?

Chair Furth: There was another one that shows how the lots interlock on this block. Maybe I was looking at another map. Any questions of Mr. Kwan?

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you, I'm sorry, I just don't understand which house is yours. As I'm standing on the street looking at this property, are you to the left or to the right?

Mr. Kwan: Looking at this property, we're on the right-hand side.

Chair Furth: It's in the Staff Report. Alex just pointed out that if we look at the Staff Report, Sheldon did provide us this.

Mr. Kwan: So, these three properties, (no mic), yeah, from the corner of Webster and Homer, the first one is 760, the second one is 750, which is my property, and then the next one I think is 734 or 738. Actually, I know the owner of 734 and 738 as well, and we're, I'm kind of expressing the concern on her behalf as well.

Chair Furth: So, you're...

Mr. Ah Sing: Packet page 15 is the location map.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Mr. Ah Sing: So, at the corner it's one property removed from that intersection, that's adjacent to the property.

Chair Furth: So, you're one in from the – the property that you own is one in from the corner?

Mr. Kwan: Correct. So, the corner property, I think is 760, mine is 750, the next one is 734. So, on the privacy map or chart I see pictures of 734, one corner picture. And that's about it. I don't see anything of 750. I don't see anything of 760. So, as such, I'm not sure that enough consideration...

Chair Furth: So, this particular parcel that's under development touches one, two, three, four, five other parcels?

Mr. Ah Sing: Yes.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Kwan: Yeah, so I expect that the tall middle unit that's proposed would have the most impact on 750. So, as I can imagine, that huge stairwell with all the windows would be...

Chair Furth: You're concerned about the stairwell?

Mr. Kwan: The stairwell would stare right into my bedrooms.

Chair Furth: Okay, and 750 is developed with, what's on... I did go look at this, but I can't remember what is on your lot.

Mr. Kwan: Ah, just a house unit, building.

Chair Furth: A single-family house?

Mr. Kwan: It has two units, but it's essentially just, yeah, one, yeah, you could think of it as one unit.

Chair Furth: And when was it built?

Mr. Kwan: Oh, I don't know, but I think there is some historical significance to it too. I just know that back in the old days, (crosstalk).

Chair Furth: My colleague just showed me a picture. I've got it in my head now.

Mr. Kwan: Yeah.

Chair Furth: All right. Thank you. Any other questions of Mr. Kwan? Thank you very much. Yes. I remember the first initial is T. Shall. Mr. Shall. And if you could spell your name first.

Thomas Schall: Yes, I will. My name is Thomas Schall, S-C-H-A-L-L.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Schall: Thank you for hearing my comments today. I appreciate the Architectural Review Board's time on this. I live next door at 563 Homer Avenue, in a house originally built in 1922. It is on the back of a flagged lot fronted by a duplex, address 559 and 561.

Chair Furth: So, just before you – we won't take this out of your time, but if you could show this to us on the vicinity map.

Mr. Schall: This home, this lot will be directly adjacent to the project's lot. It is just to the, I guess, where is the compass here, so this would be just to the west, towards the foothills. The immediately adjacent lot.

Chair Furth: Oh, you're in the flagged lot.

Mr. Schall: I'm in the flagged lot, that's correct.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Mr. Schall: In 563, which is a two-story home built in 1922, and the duplex unit that was probably put there sometime in the 1940's or 50's in front. So, all together, the lot comprises three single-family units at 559, 561 and 563. I inhabit 563. I think I can speak on behalf of my neighbors in the front as well. This project, as I said, this project is directly next door. It's not, our homes are not seen anywhere in these photographs or any of the other depictions. We find the scale to be absurd, ridiculous. One of my neighbors said monstrous, when considering the three stories. I think that we collectively in our small community on that lot at 559, 561 and 563, have three, actually four intense concerns. One is the height, obviously. I know of no other three-story units, residential units in the neighborhood. This just seems to be completely out of scale. The second issue then, leads from the height and the glass nature of the structure, which is our privacy. We certainly think our privacy will be absolutely compromised and we would like to see that addressed very thoroughly in the design. And ultimately, also, our third concern revolves around density on that site. These are three, three-bedroom units. This is not a very large lot. It is a very narrow lot, as is our lot at, where my residence stands. So, the density. We find that there has been, again, a remarkable lack of – we don't know who is building the project. We would like to be able to comment more openly on the design. I understand this is a preliminary review. And with respect to the obvious talents of the designer and the architect, and I admire the elements of the design, but it is wholly inappropriate for this site, and we the residents and neighbors would like to see that addressed before a final design is ratified Thank you.

Chair Furth: Just, I have one question of you. So, this lot is not subdivided, is that right? Your lot?

Mr. Schall: My lot? Well, I rent. I've lived there for 16 years, so I'm not sure.

Chair Furth: You're entitled. Thank you. Any other questions of Mr. Schall? Seeing none, thank you so much for talking to us.

Mr. Schall: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Staff, so would you like to say anything further, having heard their comments?

Jerrick: With the concern on the Webster Street, properties on the Webster Street, so currently the existing unit has a driveway along the west side of the lot, and we actually relocated the driveway to the address site to provide more privacy for the property that's facing our lot on Webster Street. So, with the driveway setback, we allowed more space in between the Webster and our property. And as you could see on the elevation facing the Webster Street, the only window that's facing to that side is the vertical. I think you could refer to the elevation drawing on A1.3. So, right now I am discussing the northeast elevation on the sheet. It's the very top one. So, the window that's designed on that elevation is the vertical circulation, and the vertical circulation has a huge, three-story glass panel to allow daylight for the entire floor on that unit. And that's the, as you can see on the outer units, the windows that are on the room concerning privacy, it's very minimal, and we tried to reduce many windows as possible facing the Webster properties.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Anything else? Any further questions?

Board Member Lew: I have a question.

Chair Furth: Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: So, I think the ground floors of your units are showing like a front door and a back door, so like one from the side yard and one towards the driveway, and I was wondering which ones, which door were you thinking, which doors were you thinking were the front entrance door?

Jerrick: So, the front unit facing the Homer, the main unit will be the unit that's next to the living room. That's facing Homer. And the middle unit, the entrance is on the northeast elevation view, and the rear unit has its own private courtyard in front of the main entrance and it's located in the center.

Board Member Lew: Great. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any other questions before we let the applicant sit down? This is a fairly informal process, so anybody wishes to contribute further to discussions, wave your hand and I'll get you. But you could sit down for the moment.

Jerrick: Thank you.

Chair Furth: So, I had a question for Staff or my colleagues, which is, when I was looking at these area calculations, there's a reference to parcel three and there's gross area and net area and they're very different, and I was trying to figure out what that's about. I just misplaced the sheet. I also think it's not parcel three. I didn't know what gross and net area meant in this situation.

Mr. Ah Sing: I'm sorry, what sheet are you referring to?

Chair Furth: Somebody else can go on while I go find it again. Oh, take a look at sheet A04, Parcel three, gross area 2,663 square feet, net area 1765 square feet. I'm used to that subdivision where you net out the... But what's this?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, so, while many cities do do a net floor area, the City of Palo Alto does not. We use gross floor area. So, that's...

Chair Furth: And is that of the building? It must be, right?

Mr. Ah Sing: Yeah, that's of the...

Chair Furth: So, is unit one really 3,000 square feet by our calculations, and unit three 2600 square feet, 2663? I'm confused.

Mr. Ah Sing: Maybe the applicant can describe what their program is. Whether this is going to be a rental or are they going to do a subdivision. That might be helpful.

Chair Furth: But that wouldn't have any... What I'm trying to figure out is the, what we think of as the area of the individual units.

Ms. Gerhardt: It's the size of the units, and we can ask the applicant to verify.

Chair Furth: Okay, if you could. I'm looking at sheet A04.

Ms. Gerhardt: Because we also have some numbers on the cover sheet as well.

Chair Furth: Right, and there's a big difference.

Jerrick: So, to direct you with the correct square footage of the units on this project, I would like to show A3.0. So, the floor area calculation, you could refer to the very top part of the list. So, it shows that each level square footage on each unit and the total of all these floors combined comes out to 4,487 square feet.

Chair Furth: And then you have additional enclosed space with the garages. Is that right?

Jerrick: Correct.

Chair Furth: That's another 9,000 square feet, 900, sorry. Oh, sorry. That's a lot of coverage. But the garage area that you're showing above, is that internal dimensions, external dimensions? I'll stop asking these questions in just a minute.

Jerrick: So, the garage square foot was not included in the square footage that's listed above. The above is only showing the living square foot.

Chair Furth: Right.

Jerrick: And to refer back to your question on the total square foot, we would have to add the garage space on each unit.

Chair Furth: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions? Okay. Who would like to begin? Okay, Alex, Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Thank you for coming in for a preliminary. I think this is a, I think will be a worthwhile hearing. I do like, when I'm looking at the floor plans, I do see like some very really great design elements within the unit plans, so I do want to encourage you to – I just want to thank you for that. But I think on this particular project the challenge for you is going to be complying with our context-based design criteria, which is in the zoning code. And really your building design has to fit in with the neighbors on the block. And so, at the moment I don't really see how it complies at all. I did want to point out two projects for you that are in the neighborhood that are three stories, and they are contemporary, but they still manage to fit in with the neighbors. So, one is at 557 to 571 Litton, and it's four units, RM-30 zoning. It's a 50-foot wide lot. It's four units but it's on a deeper lot than yours. And it complies with the daylight plane and it's fitting in with Victorian neighbors. So, and some mid-century buildings as well. It's a pretty eclectic street. But, for example, they have like wood siding, design linkage to the neighboring Victorian house. It has a modern shed roof, which is completely different than the Victorian houses, but it's sort of the same eaves and the overhangs, and this kind, and this wood, and so it does – I mean you look at, when I look at a photo I do see some connections to that. It also has like a stone base and low walls that tie into some of the more recent buildings on the street.

Board Member Thompson: Alex, could you repeat that address again?

Board Member Lew: The address?

Board Member Thompson: Yes.

Board Member Lew: It's called Litton Park. It's 557 to 571 Litton.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Board Member Lew: There's another project, three-story project, 455 Forest, which is City Lofts, and that's four units, three stories, contemporary. So, just having like the three-story wall, three-story high straight walls that you have, it's steps, they're all stepped, and it's tiered and so it makes some linkages to the shorter buildings, but it does step up. So, I think that's the most important thing is to work on the daylight plane and the massing. Also, for site planning, I think that we do need to sort of enhance the entrances, and also like mailboxes and trying to make it like a nice development. Typically, like the mail, the Post Office won't deliver it to individual, yeah, individual doors. So, we try to encourage you to make something nice and make an entrance element for all three units. I think in all of the other three and four-unit projects that we have on 50-foot wide lots, there is an issue with side yard, with landscaping on the side yards. Like along the side yards, because usually people run out of space on that. That's been a project – I think that's been a problem on all of the other projects as well. But they do, they have managed to add in like vines on top of fences and so I am looking for some, we are looking for some landscaping.

Jerrick: Yeah, we will try as much as landscape on the side walls as possible.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. You have, you're showing a shadow study, so thank you for that. Typically, we'll show in all the neighbors, the neighboring buildings, so you can actually get a sense for the impact of the shadows on the neighbors. So, please add that into your drawings.

Jerrick: Okay.

Board Member Lew: And then I think one other detail, two other details that I just want to encourage you to pursue is, one is like the heating and ventilation systems. So, we don't allow them in the setbacks usually for noise, like the air conditioner compressors. So, that typically has to be out of the setback. And then we do have some units, some projects where they put them on the upper floor decks, but then they're really exposed to the neighbors. So, they do need to be screened some way. So, like I would try to discourage you from having like say, for example, glass railings. You know, that would expose the condensers. Okay. I will pass it on to the other Board Members. Those were my big issues.

Chair Furth: David, I think you had comments.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. Okay. You know, it's kind of an interesting project, and thank you for its submission. But it's kind of ill placed to begin with. I kind of like the side elevation and think of it as almost like a streetscape from the side. But we don't have that situation here. You have a long, deep, narrow lot, so my concerns are that in your planning of the whole project, it's really, you've really – it's not consistent and it, to me, isn't logical. It's on a tight site designed for three separate condominiums. To have extremely tall floor heights, extravagant two-story spaces, wasted potential floor space above garages and hidden courts. When it's a right site, you really have to make the most use out of all of the square footage available to you. And you're not doing it. But the remedy above garages and hidden courts, to use that space. And I think that the City should enforce the daylight plane restrictions and limit the height to two stories, or minimize the third story in response to issues of neighboring privacy, which have been discussed, and transitions in relation to the neighboring setting and context. Expressing the exterior stair towers with a wall of glass overwhelmingly dominant element facing neighboring properties, and especially unacceptable design choice, even if the entire structure is reduced to two stories, still unacceptable. With the dwellings on a fairly narrow, but deep site, it becomes critical to take special care to describe the landscaping, including paved areas, plantings, including existing trees. Although it's noted that the trees were not, in the planning study were not significant in any way, I think that there's an opportunity to save some of the trees. You haven't either shown us photographs of the landscape that's there and whether or not there is anything that could be kept in the front. You need to show us the car parking in more detail. Fencing, as mentioned. Privacy areas, you've left areas completely gridded with no indication of any plantings and how they're going to be used, or with your recessed courts, how they work with that. You've left us no indication of how the garbage is going to be stored, where it's going to be stored, collected, etc. The textures and materials list that you really need to show us some indication of how you intend to treat those spaces. The lighting, there's nothing about that. We understand it's very preliminary, but you have to have some thought about how the project is going to be landscaped, just beginning a project. These are especially important here, because the pedestrian access in this type of project, it's the same as the vehicular access, so the residents of the rear units walk through the parking traffic areas. I think for us it's going to be very critical knowing some of the previous questions that have been asked on other projects. We're going to want to see all of that landscaping in your final, but an indication of how you're going to do that in the preliminary would have been useful to us. So, if you want to look at the projects that are very nearby that are worthy to look at in different styles, even if you keep a more modernist style, visit 649 and 637 Homer, just a block away. They're really very well-done projects. And I'm not saying copy the style or the, you know – I'm saying look at how they're done, because the proportions are good, the materials are really rather wonderful, and they are two very differently styled projects. Also, take note of how those particular projects enhanced the Homer Street façade. Again, they do a very good job on the front unit of making that, even though it's a deep three-story dwelling unit, of making it look like it belongs on the street face, along with other quality projects in the neighborhood. And it would be exactly of that quality. I think that's all I have.

Chair Furth: Thank you David. Board Member Thompson.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you. Thank you for your submission. Normally I don't like to comment on clerical errors, but the drawings did have a few in there that made it a little difficult to review. I think especially printing black and white, this is a little hard to differentiate what was wood, what wasn't wood, what was maybe another material. So, in your resubmission, I would definitely encourage color and materials board, a physical one, and then detail your elevations a bit more to give us a better idea of exactly what's happening with the design. Aesthetically, in terms of the design, there's a lot of, it's kind of an interesting choice, the choices that you guys made to slope the stair rails, but not to slope any of the other roof elements. A lot of the neighboring structures have a lot of slopes, and you know, I was kind of looking up the precedence that both Board Members Lew and Hirsch called out and all of those precedence kind of have this element of sloping in their silhouette and in their sort of façade. And so, I would kind of recommend having I would say an attitude on the slopes. I don't know that just sloping the stair rail on its own is adequate for the neighborhood. And the other element in the neighborhood, which is also a quality of the style, is the small-scale detail that is prevalent everywhere. And, yes, this is a really schematic design and so I can understand that small-scale detail hasn't really come in, but oftentimes it doesn't. Oftentimes, you know, this style, the modern style stays pretty big scale in terms of the muse. And so, I think there's opportunities, if you want to stay with this style to kind of integrate a smaller scale element and maybe that's in some of the material choices you have. Even in this rendering, it's, I think you have some pop outs that look like they're sided in wood, but in the rendering, it still looks kind of like one sheet versus like a bunch of small lines. So, when you guys come back, I would say in your presentation, definitely highlight where you want to have small scale elements in your structure, just so that we know how you're trying to relate to the context. The first sheet where you were kind of showing all of the adjacent structures, that was really helpful. And that would also kind of be a nice way to tell your story. With the privacy impact on the stairwells, in terms of design intent, there could be a way to accomplish, you know, a really bright circulation space. Maybe it's a skylight that could help mitigate some of these privacy issues that the neighbors are having, but still keep the feel that maybe you're looking for in that area. I agree with Board Member Lew that your shadow study should have the neighbors in the surrounding context in there. And then, I did like that in some places you're expressing the slab. It does break down the scale of it. I wasn't exactly quite sure what material that is that's kind of expressing that floor slab. I guess that's kind of related to my previous comment that when you have your elevation, maybe like call out what each of these materials are. And then, also, if there's like dimension to it. Like, is that slab sticking out, is it, you know, kind of inset or something, just to get a better idea. Okay. I'll just leave my comments there for now.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Vice Chair Baltay

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you for bringing this application to us. I understand how challenging it can be to meet all of the requirements and the neighbors' concerns and City Staff. Nonetheless, I'm afraid I agree completely with my colleagues that this has a long way to go. I'm afraid you really just, it's just not ready yet. The neighbors' concerns about privacy and massing are well founded. Alex's and Osma's and everybody's comments are good. I'd like to offer you some, I guess advice. I put these drawing sets together all the time, and there's a lot of stuff just lacking on the plans. It does seem that you perhaps made a checklist of some kind, but I'd like to advise you to take control of your design team first of all. Who is the designer? Who is the surveyor, the landscaper? Who is the owner? That information needs to be out here, and you should be in charge of how it's all presented. It's very haphazard right now. Your drawings need to have a correct scale that's consistent. It's usually a quarter inch or eighth inch per foot. These are basic things, but it makes it very tough to review, and I suspect it makes it hard for you within your team to communicate as well. You need to show the orientation of things, north arrows. You need to really have some color renderings and images so we can understand, and the neighborhood and the community can understand what the finishes are. Color printing is really not a big deal these days. You also need to pare down a little bit. You have floor plans and project elevations shown twice basically. One set just for the buildings and one for the whole thing. They're all at the same scale. They're showing the same information. It results in an overabundance of irrelevant information. You also need less technical information. We really just don't need to see the sewer line and water line, how it's being put together. I

say that because that's what I mean by take control of your design team. Focus on what's important now. Don't spend money on engineering details that can be and will be worked out, but aren't necessary now. Distract our attention, but also more importantly, yours. You really need to show the context everywhere. Every drawing should be showing the neighbors, the trees, the views from the neighbors. It's really important. Shadow studies without neighboring buildings are meaningless. The whole purpose is to show the impact on the community. You need to show many more 3-D images. What would this look like from the street. Again, with the computer technology available to us, it's a fairly easy thing to do, and it's critically important. Just take charge of the process. Insist that your designers show you that kind of information. You'll find it informs your own decision making, as well as being able to make it something we can understand. And then lastly, you really need accurate area calculations. I know this is preliminary, but I found myself so skeptical that I actually went into one of these plans, and I'll give you this sheet later where I measured very carefully, figured out the scale and found you to be about 20 percent off, under measuring the space of some of these rooms. The Staff will carefully check all of that. There's no chance it will fly. But you do yourself a big favor by measuring carefully now. What happens is that the whole building, because you're on such a tight square footage count, you just can't easily shave 100 square feet here and there. It just doesn't work. I promise you, having designed many buildings like this, that the area is just the first thing you've got to be thinking about, and it has to be measured accurately. So, that said about your presentation and design package, I'm going to talk next about the circulation on your site, because it just doesn't work. I'm looking at drawing A04, and you really don't have a place for cars to turn around on the property to get back out again, which would result in people backing out onto Homer Avenue, which is just not acceptable. It takes generally about 25 feet of width at the minimum. And just try it for yourself. Go to an alley and see what it takes to do that, because you're going to be trying to sell these units or attract tenants to these units, and when the parking is so tight that everybody's denting their car, you're not doing yourself any favors. The same thing applies to actually getting into these garages. You have to be an excellent driver to even begin to consider it the way this is done. It's such sharp corners, such tight turns. Having been through the process in Palo Alto, it's not going to fly. You will be forced to address these things, and it is so painfully difficult to shift these things around on a tight project like this. You need to get it all straight. For what it's worth, there is a Public Works requirement that the apron of the driveway be five feet from the property line, however, that's so restrictive on narrow lots like this, that we have historically found that to be grounds for a variance, and you can put the driveway closer to the property line. In this case, that just makes a lot of help that you can get a little more room to do a turnaround. So, consider that. That is possible to ask for a variance on that. And you will need some landscaping buffer along the sides of your property, where the fences are. You can't have the driveway right to the fence. You need some landscaping buffer and that takes at least a foot or two of earth to make that work. I'd like to make, excuse me, there's a lot of pages here to flip through. I think your massing of your building really is just too tall for the neighbors in the context, and I think you've chosen finishes that accentuate rather than diminish that. The white plaster is both obnoxiously reflective to the neighbors, but it just enhances the appearance of the mass. Choosing to have ten-foot plate heights, which is above average for a residential, for small residential units, is something you may well feel you need to do to make up for small spaces, but it has to be done with incredible skill and delicacy. What you've done here is just stack 30 feet of height next to existing one-story houses. That just isn't appropriate. You have to meet basic egress requirements. Things like that with your windows, and I'm sure you'll get to that as you go through with more detail, but if your designer's not thinking about it now, it results in very different proportions on windows, which changes the look, which is what we're after here. So, it's actually really important to think about that kind of stuff. The fully glazed stair tower is an attractive element if this is in a field a quarter of a mile from anyone, but consider the privacy impact on your neighbors. And it's not just whether somebody is reading a book on the stair tower, looking into their yard, because they're not, but the neighbors' perception of privacy. Having essentially 20 or 30 feet of glass brightly lit at night leaves them feeling violated, even if there's nobody there. It's just too much. It's too insensitive. It's too inappropriate to have such a large amount of glass that's six feet from a property line, eight to ten feet from a neighbor's house. It's really too much of an impact on privacy and Palo Alto has very strict requirements about privacy impacts. You're not even allowed to have second floor decks really that look into neighbor's yards. And you're proposing much more than that. I'd like to echo some of David's comments about the floor plans. They really just don't quite make sense. You have incredibly small bedrooms, less than the code requirement of seven feet as

far as I can tell, in places. And you have to consider who's going to be living here. You will have a very difficult time renting or selling or even using these rooms with seven-foot wide bedrooms. That's just not possible. It is the code minimum, and you're not even at that. At the same time, you have a number of spaces that are just extra space at the end of a staircase or something. Another ten square feet just hanging out there, and as David pointed out, especially on extremely tight buildings, you have to be very efficient with your design. So, while the individual details of a floor plan aren't really our purview, we do have to find that the building is functional, and I certainly could not find that this floor plan is functional. In almost every step, it's just pieces, parts of it that don't make sense. My last comments were going to be about the landscaping, and at the start you need to be more clear which trees you do and don't have to work with. So, it's a live oak up at the front, not a redwood. And while Japanese maples are beautiful trees, I'm not entirely sure they're really going to do the trick. You're basically putting in four Japanese maples and calling it a landscaping scheme. And it seems to be you need to really be focused on both creating a cohesive street appearance, but also really using your landscaping to ensure more privacy for the neighbors. And I think lastly, you really need to focus that you have indigenous plants. That's one of our requirements, and I don't think Japanese maples meet that. But you just have to take seriously our request that you create a planting scheme that's native plants that are drought tolerant. So, I really appreciate your effort and look forward to seeing what you guys come up with, and if Staff would allow me, I'll just give you this package of drawings which I redlined for you. I'd really like to see you take these comments to heart. Thank you very much.

Jerrick: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Please sit down, but I have comments too. First of all, thank you very much for coming to us with your preliminary plan and thank you for coming to us with a project for this particular light, lot rather. I think it – it's a cross between lot and site. I think it's particularly due for redevelopment and I think there's ample evidence that in this City you can build three units on a lot like this in a way that provides good living spaces for the people who move into this site, and also enhance what's around them. And that's the requirement. We have to find that your project will essentially be a good place for people to live and that it will enhance life for the people around. And on a long, narrow lot with many frontages, that's not easy, but it's certainly possible. I wanted to talk a little bit about context, because we have to find that you're appropriate in this context, and you're in a very complicated context. You have Channing House, which is huge. You have really a quite beautiful street with very healthy live oaks and other big trees going all the way up to City Hall, essentially. Actually, even beyond that. City Hall kind of destroys the wooded look when you get there, unfortunately. You have a bigger mix of building types than I realized until I went to look at your project. Much of what appears to be single family isn't. You have these really deep lots with more units in the back, so that's part of the pattern. I think that when Channing House built the Lee Medical Center, they really improved the link of Channing House to the rest of the street by building that structure that's a little over two feet, two stories, but essentially presents as two stories using really beautiful materials and beautiful detailing, and it's soft. Much softer than Channing House itself. It's got deep plaster elements. It's got a number of soft shades. I don't think they every used white. So, I'm not saying that your project should be like that, but that's an example of beginning to build things that make more sense with the other residences around. I did find your packet confusing, even for a preliminary review, and I do urge you to work closely with Staff about what makes it possible for us to understand your project well enough to give you meaningful comment and, we hope, approve it. Having talked about context, which I think is basically heavy landscaping, greenery is the dominant thing, as you go down that street, subtle design. Buildings are pretty recessive there. They're not particularly in your face. And generally, privacy, because of the lands - because of the scale of the houses and the density of the landscaping, those are the three aspects of your project that I think I would like to see significant improvement on. In terms of massing, these buildings, these units, I mean they're 1500 square foot units. That's not excessive. That's a reasonable size for a residential unit. But you've made these look bigger than that, and I don't think that's ever going to work on this site. They need to look as small as possible for what they are. They need to be modest and unassuming and quietly elegant. That's going to work better in this site. In terms of privacy, we need to understand how every window works with respect to all the adjacent property owners. Not so much on the ground floor, of course, but... For two reasons. One is, they overlook other people. Sometimes fretted glass helps that

problem, sometimes it doesn't. And you also need to think about light. We really don't want to be illuminating the neighbors' yards. And I would say that this big illuminated tower wouldn't work 40 feet back from the property line. It just isn't – if I, I live in a very small, I live in a 1400 square foot house on a very small lot that was built in infill in downtown north, but it's designed so that we all have perfect residential privacy. None of our windows look into anybody else's windows. Our side yards are private. You have a tougher assignment here, because we have a back alley that solves all our problems. But that's the goal, so that people have private or reasonably private usable spaces, both indoors and outdoors on your side and next door. And landscaping needs to be a much bigger part of this project. I don't know whether you're going to grow vines up trellises on the building walls. I don't know if you're going to put trellises over the parking access. But in order to get the level of landscaping that this project needs in order to be approved, you're going to need a lot more green mass than just a few low-lying things will do. When you have tall buildings, you need tall landscaping. And if the building becomes shorter, it doesn't have to be quite so high, but it needs to be proportional. If you're going to have a third story on part of this building, then I need to see two story landscaping before it's going to seem adequate to me. So, do you have any other questions of us, or does anybody else have any comments before we wind this up? Seeing none. Okay, we look forward to seeing you when you come back with this project. Thank you. Oh, and if the next project set is small scale, that would be more useful for us, though you'll have to work with Staff to make sure that the, what you elect to put on each page is sufficiently small, so that we can actually read the plans. All right, we'll take a two-minute break and then we'll go on to the rest of our agenda.

Approval of Minutes

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

Ms. Gerhardt: Actually, I don't believe that everyone got a chance to review the minutes, so we'll move that forward to the next agenda.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Yes, those are the Minutes of April 4, which we'll review at our next meeting. And no more changes in vacation schedules or agendas?

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

[The Board moved to Official City Reports]

Subcommittee Items

Chair Furth: If we can come back into session. Alex, oh, we have no subcommittee items, correct?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Furth: We hardly have any items at all these days.

Ms. Gerhardt: Ah, well...

Chair Furth: Could you comment on that? Is there a backlog back there, or, what's happening? We were so busy.

Ms. Gerhardt: Well, I hardly have any Staff, number one

Chair Furth: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: I'm down to three permanent Staff out of five, so we're looking to hire, but then, you know, HR is busy as well. You know, I do have some extra consultant help here and there, but that's part of it. But then part of it is just not as many large projects. So, that's the other half.

Chair Furth: All right, thank you. Well, we're sorry you're without Staff. That's not good for anybody, particularly applicants and the community. Okay.

5. North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (HVCAP) – Board Member Lew.

Chair Furth: North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan Report Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: There's nothing new to report. The next meeting is Wednesday, May 22nd, which is next week at 6:00, here in City Hall.

Chair Furth: Okay And last time you reported a big website to us, right?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

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

Chair Furth: Well, unfortunately, I cannot provide you with a draft of our Annual Report to Council because my life is more chaotic than I had hoped. But I did want to go over, and part of it is, it's difficult to draft a document when you sit on a board and your drafts aren't private, and I don't like my intermediate thoughts wandering out there. So, and also, we don't have the minutes of, we just got the minutes of April 4th, which was the last time we discussed this, so I couldn't go back and read the minutes. Having said that, I wanted to at least go through the topics we were talking about, and the assignments we had. So, Alex, you were writing about, remind me.

Board Member Lew: I don't have the, I didn't bring the list with me. (crosstalk) So, one of the topics that you wanted me to work on was the curb management, and so I have a couple of bullet points about what's happening in like San Francisco and Mountain View with regard to Uber and Lyft and buses. And I think there's a name now for those, the Transportation Network.

Chair Furth: Yeah. I mean, I noticed, I was at Auerbach in Berkley, and clearly, they have reconfigured Bancroft to deal with the fact that a very large number of people arrive there and depart there, so there's all these people leaning out with their phones, fairly comical. Okay, so curb management. Just a second while I find your document, somewhere closer than my desk.

Ms. Gerhardt: I'm just reading through the April 4th minutes, scanning through them, and it looks like parking standards was a question.

Chair Furth: Well, there was the issue of parking with respect to...

Ms. Gerhardt: Or surface lots?

Chair Furth: A couple of things surfaced, so to speak. One was parking standards for the shopping centers, in light of the changing nature of retail. Yes.

Board Member Thompson: I don't think I brought this up last time, but could I rate a little section on the state of aesthetic elements involved and like the state of architecture as it stands today in terms of similarities and stuff that we've seen massing wise. You know, kind of aesthetic elements that a lot of applicants are implementing, and how they relate to Palo Alto's aesthetic?

Chair Furth: Sure, please do. One of the things that Jodie pointed out were most, all these things are worth raising. We're most helpful when we can suggest code changes or standard changes. I know the

section I'm writing on mobility, by which I mean pedestrian mobility, and you know, that's street furniture and you know, what it takes to make an area really accessible for people who need to sit down from time to time. That's the sidewalk, like the curb, is a very contested space. There's trees. There's endless, what used to be called manhole covers. There's vaults. There's Telecom facilities. And there's parking, you know, for cars, there's parking for bicycles, there's doors swinging open. And so, if we just ask, as we did with respect to the redo of the Mill's Building for parking somewhere, sorry, benches somewhere, seating somewhere on the sidewalk, the answer is going to come back, no, it's really busy. But if we have another standard for people to contend with that says, you need X feet in a block or something like that, then it becomes something that we have to figure out how to do, rather than something that's just too complicated to do. It's similar to what happened – you know, we saw for years, we saw the plans for Charleston Arastradero, which is a big reconfiguration of the street, the sidewalks, the medians with lots and lots of trees. When it came back to us for implementation, more than half the trees, as I recall, were found to be impossible because of utility conflicts. So, we need to figure out another way of doing these things. So, I was going to write about, I was going to write about trees in two contexts. One was, we have, I was going to try to tie this stuff to the General Plan. And there's an initiative to have more trees, and one of the things that we've been noticing, two things about trees we've been noticing is that when you get underground parking that goes all the way to the edge of the property, you reduce your chance for significant trees. And another one is that when you start having two- and three-story buildings where you used to have one story buildings, you really pull the canopy in. It's really visible on Litton, for example. You used to have spreading trees, and now you have straight up trees. But, yeah, so write about it and tie it to it if you can. Alex, I'm still looking for your document. Did you find it?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. I think it might, in terms of like codes and standards...I don't know, I think it might help with the context-based criteria and also just design neighborhood design guidelines. Just given that, I guess, context is starting to change and it would – I don't know. It sounds like it might be worthwhile just to highlight the stuff that we think is worthwhile, and then also just highlight the big aesthetic moves that some applicants are implementing that are less successful. And then also, a lot of applicants sometimes kind of ignore the small-scale stuff, and that's a comment that comes up, so yeah.

Chair Furth: Okay. So, I found Alex's document. One of the sections that Alex was going to write about was the loss of spaces for small business surfaces, and he cited Berkley's report that retail is stagnant downtown, restaurants are up in downtown, personal services are down in downtown, but up in outer areas. San Francisco zoning now requires new large, approximately 10,000 square foot ground floor commercial floors, to carve street-facing spaces for smaller tenants. And I will say that some of the more heartrending testimony we've had is from small businesses being displaced. So, Alex, are you willing to do small business displacement? Or do you just want to take what you gave me and weave it into something?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I don't have any other ideas about that, besides those two. I think there should be more than that. And I wasn't actually proposing this to go to the Council at this time. I think the Council is interested in it, and I think I forwarded the San Francisco zoning item to Staff.

Chair Furth: Well, I'm in favor of including reference to the issue, that this is what we've seen.

Board Member Lew: And I will keep it brief. How's that?

Chair Furth: That's always your approach, right? Got it.

Ms. Gerhardt: So, I wanted to note as well, I was speaking with Amy French the other day about, you know, past Boards and how this was run. She did bring to light that the ARB previously had guidelines, and so these could be, you know, guidelines of how, what needs to be in a project in order for the ARB to make the findings. So, that's another possible way, besides just codifying it into the Municipal Code. Of course, if it's in the Code, you know, it's...

Chair Furth: A big process.

Ms. Gerhardt: It's a big process. I mean, it's easier to implement sometimes, but you know, sometimes guidelines can be good as well if there's, you know, if a project can't meet all guidelines, you know the ARB could still weight that.

Chair Furth: If you could track down any copies of those, those would be interesting to see. Well, I mean, we use the Downtown Guidelines all the time.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah. I think she was speaking mostly to El Camino in the way that the El Camino signage, that we do reduce signage on El Camino. That was one item that she brought up.

Chair Furth: Okay. So, that was one topic. One was an issue of tree loss when the reduction of landscaping in CS and other districts when underground parking replaces surface parking lots, because where once parking lots were asphalt seas and then became landscaped asphalt seas, and now we're losing those trees.

Board Member Lew: I think we decided to put that on the back burner the last time we discussed this.

Chair Furth: I don't see that in the notes, but okay.

Vice Chair Baltay: It sore of pares out of your comment about trees in general, that perhaps some guidelines, but really just to observe to Council that big buildings and a lot of underground parking results in a loss of trees.

Chair Furth: I think it's worth talking about that the sort of perhaps unforeseen impacts of these things. If they're wrong, we should take them out. Then there was the question of just a note that the monitoring of TDM plans is important as we increasingly rely on them, which, of course, is a budget issue. And then there was some question about whether required parking is being made available for the required parking uses, but I think – Jodie, would you say that's generally a code enforcement issue? You've got adequate regulations to deal with that? I mean, I was noticing, I was looking at a surface parking lot, and it was, every space was marked, you know, only for this business, only for that business. I doubt that that's what the code required. I don't think the code said you could reserve particular spaces for particular uses.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, the code doesn't actually speak to that sort of thing, and you know, in the plans that you see were not to marking parking spaces. I mean, I suppose if we dropped it down to that level, you know, if it's sort of a strip mall with a couple different businesses, we can calculate, you know, this retail business needs five spaces and this one needs three. But usually it ends up being like 1 ½ and 2.3, so it's...

Chair Furth: I wasn't arguing that you should. I was saying that the result of this is that there are spaces that sit empty, because people honor and they go park, you know... It reduces the availability of parking on the other hand (crosstalk)

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't think we have clear language one way or the other.

Chair Furth: All right, we won't necessarily think about that. Curb management, I've got Alex's notes, but you'll do more, Alex, or not, or do you think you're done?

Board Member Lew: Well, it depends on how long a letter you want to make. I'm sort of worried that there are so many topics, that this thing could easily ramble on to be like a ten-page report and really it shouldn't be.

Chair Furth: Well, I think it needs to be short, but I think you can also reference attachments if we think that's useful. I agree it needs to be short. Its issue identifying, I think more than problem solving. And then the other issues, I'll see how it looks and you can cut it. Let me get Peter's notes. I agree that

people may not read something if it's long, but it's not inherently a bad thing, if it has narrative rhythm, right? So, I think it would be good to put in something about parking center standards, and I think Peter suggested also that we comment on the fact that the new ARB findings have been helpful.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I think that's exactly the kind of feedback a letter to Council should be. They changed the findings, how is it working out for us? It can be a one sentence thing, but just give them some feedback.

Chair Furth: Well, I think I've got what I need now that I've found it again. Osma, I look forward to getting something from you by email?

Board Member Thompson: Yeah. When do you need that by?

Chair Furth: Preferably next week sometime.

Board Member Thompson: Okay.

Chair Furth: David, are you good with what we've got? Anything you want to add?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. Sort of a general concern, a general concern that there are some large projects coming up. We don't seem to be part of the picture, really. Alex goes to meetings, but we don't really get the material at all. The two largest ones, of course, are the Ventura and the Cubberly projects. They're going to have tremendous impact on each of those neighborhoods, and I was sort of thinking when I came on the Board that having already kind of looked into those areas, that we might deal with the issues that would come, likely come up that might affect us as comments, commenters. But we would have to be a part of those projects in some integral way that we might have a private meeting, whatever they call that session when you get together and it's not official.

Chair Furth: Study session?

Board Member Hirsch: Study session.

Chair Furth: It's public.

Board Member Hirsch: ...where we as architects, urbanists here, whatever we call ourselves, have some impact on those projects as they move forward. You know, there is a presentation that was made, the Cubberly presentation was finally made and my opinion is that it's very lacking in its final conclusions, certainly in regards to planning and, of course, there's the Planning Department, but shouldn't we be involved in some way in the whole process of major developments like that.

Chair Furth: Staff?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think, I mean, the ARB would certainly be involved, you know, in the individual buildings. I think even the plans before they go forward would come to the ARB, but you know, it might be at that sort of that half-way to three-quarters point through the project. So, I can talk to Staff. I mean, these are not projects that I'm intimately familiar with, so I can go back and ask others that are and see what the plans were for that. They'll definitely come through you and I think I hear you saying that you would like to see them sooner rather than later.

Board Member Hirsch: Absolutely, sooner and to look at the conclusions and even make commentary on the side that, I don't know how we determine that commentary.

Chair Furth: Well, I think it is, I do think there's a lot of talent on the Board and I do think there's a lot of history of thinking about the City, and the ARB could be useful. I actually think, I mean, we have Alex as a representative to keep us posted, but, and we have a website, but I think it would be good to have a

stud session on Ventura so we understand early what, where it's going. I mean, I think people don't always want our comments, but I think they can be useful, and I think you often see things that are useful. You know, your experience with design lets you make comments that are, that make things better without making anything worse. So, what – and at least it would be good to have a report on what the Cubberly process is. I mean, Cubberly is a publicly-owned site and it would be unfortunate if we got it, you know, when the Master Plan had already been adopted and we said, oh my gosh, why did you put that building here, when obviously this is not the site for that. So, if we could have – that's our request. Think about it and let us know. I mean, I will at least second David's request.

Board Member Hirsch: If we're going to go on from that, or Peter you want to talk about that issue, fine. Because I have another one.

Chair Hirsch: What's your other one, David?

Board Member Hirsch: The other one?

Chair Hirsch: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: Peter was commenting.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could I finish?

Chair Furth: Sure, go ahead.

Vice Chair Baltay: I wanted to comment that it seems to me that Alex is our representative on the North Ventura Plan process, which you're very interested in, David. And you can, of course, go to those meetings but...

Board Member Hirsch: I did.

Vice Chair Baltay: Alex is a member of that Board to put commentary and stuff, but it seems to me that Alex is there because of his role on the ARB.

Chair Furth: Right.

Vice Chair Baltay: And it's reasonable to say, Alex should be coming back to the Board reporting, which he is, and he should be taking feedback from the Board back to that public body. So, we do have a role in that process. I think we just haven't done very much with it, but maybe Alex can correct me if my thinking isn't right, but that's how I see the situation. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, so this is new for the Board. I think in the past we haven't had representatives on other projects. But we have commented on other Master Plans, so I'm thinking of, there was Mitchell Park Master Plan that didn't, I think in the end I'm not sure that one went anywhere. There was the Rinconada Park Master Plan and we did comment on that, and changes were made based on that. So, I don't think there's any reason why something couldn't come to the Board. And then with regard to the North Ventura Plan though, is that I think, I've looked through the schedule of meeting the Planning Director has put out, and there is no plan to come to the ARB at the moment. So, if you want it to come, then I think you should ask for it. It's on a very right timeline and they've factored in a lot of meetings with the Council and the Planning Commission, but not the ARB.

Vice Chair Baltay: I was just saying, Alex, that it doesn't need to come to the ARB as a body, but rather through you as a representative. If we discuss it at a meeting when you report to us and take feedback.

Board Member Lew: Well, that was the Council's idea.

Vice Chair Baltay: I think we are taking part (crosstalk)

Chair Furth: But, in fact, we aren't, or at least I'm not. Alex says they had a meeting or they didn't have a meeting. So, he tells us about the process and he refers us to the website, which I have not studied. And I think if it were on, I mean, I don't know what state it's in. I mean, are there drawings, are there plans, are there maps, are there principals. All these things I could learn. But if it's just a report on them and it's not scheduled for more extensive, you know, if there's not something, some short Staff Report that at least says, go look at this, then I don't think we are as a body doing this.

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I'm assuming that's because there is nothing of substance to bring back to the Board yet, from Alex.

Board Member Lew: They're just, they just started developing the two alternatives. But it's going to move very fast over the summer. But there's nothing to present to the Board at this time.

Chair Furth: Okay.

Board Member Lew: I mean, they're collecting information on the context.

Chair Furth: So, maybe the thing to do, but I'm not going to be here probably, so I will leave it to you all, but I will be here in July. It seems to me it would be useful to have it as an agenda item a little more formally, at least in our own heads, that we'll commit to see what's out there so that we can, if we have anything we want to get back, we will channel it through Alex?

Vice Chair Baltay: I would expect Alex to bring to the Board when he thinks it's appropriate some process or progress or some kind of commentary, if Board Members are interested and Alex thinks there's something of substance there, yes absolutely.

Board Member Hirsch: The other issue is the wireless issues, you know, with the Board. The Council came to a final decision Jodie forwarded. Actually, Jodie you forwarded it to everybody?

Chair Furth: Yes, she did.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, okay. So, you note that we were kind of left out of the final part of that, Peter. We didn't...

Chair Furth: I don't think the final part of that has happened yet. I think that the (crosstalk)

Vice Chair Baltay: David, on that account I think the issues was clearly that the ARB's opinion was clearly heard by the Council, and the Council made a decision what they wanted to do. So, our commenting on it further, I think, is redundant.

Chair Furth: And Peter, you were there, right?

Vice Chair Baltay: David and I were both at that particular meeting.

Chair Furth: I think that one's perhaps done for the moment.

Board Member Hirsch: Planning was supposed to go back and reexamine the standards, and they were to do that in about a year's time. I personally am still unclear as to what the planning's standards really are. Peter, are you satisfied?

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I won't say I'm satisfied with the decision, but I think the Board, the Council made a clear decision. One of the decisions, one part of it was to not include the ARB in the review process. And based on the wisdom of the Council, that's what they decided.

Chair Furth: And I realize we're, actually what we're supposed to be discussing here is our report, and we're probably getting (crosstalk). It's good to raise the issue, but we shouldn't (crosstalk).

Vice Chair Baltay: That's why I think it doesn't belong in our report.

Chair Furth: Yeah. And I'm happy to talk with you about it later. And with respect to Cubberly, Jodie, if you could find out what the state of play is, you know, sometimes going to look at two hours of tape or something isn't a very efficient way to learn. So, with that I will put together a draft. I will hear from Osma and you can rip it to shreds next time. Alex, anything more? Okay, Staff, Jodie, thank you. We're done.

Adjournment