



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: October 1, 2020
City Hall/City Council Chambers
Virtual Meeting
250 Hamilton Avenue

Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Absent: None.

Chair Baltay: Good morning. I'm Peter Baltay, Chair of the Architectural Review Board. Before starting, I'd like to read a statement. [Reading] Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, this meeting will be held by virtual teleconference only, with no physical location. Spoken comments via a computer will be accepted through the Zoom teleconference meeting. To address the Board, go to zoom.us/join. Meeting ID is 974 7551 5801. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, click on "Raise Hand." The moderator will activate and unmute speakers in turn. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted. Spoken public comments using a Smartphone will also be accepted through the Zoom mobile application. To offer comments using a regular phone, call 1-669-900-6833, and enter Meeting ID 974 7551 5801. When you wish to speak on an agenda item hit *9 on your phone so we know that you wish to speak.

[Roll Call]

Oral Communications

Chair Baltay: I'm just trying to pull up the agenda here.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: The next item would be oral communications.

Chair Baltay: Very good. Thank you, Jodie, very much. Oral communications. Do we have any members of the public who wish to speak to any item that's not on our agenda today? Vinh, do we have any hands raised?

Vinh Nguyen, Administrative Associate: We had one but they just lowered their hand. They must be here for Castilleja and not oral communications.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Everybody out there, we will be hearing testimony on the Castilleja project as we hear that project. This is just for any other items that are not on that agenda. Next item is agenda changes, deletions, and additions. Staff, do we have any changes, additions, or deletions?

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Ms. Gerhardt: I have no changes at this time.

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: Very well. Next item is City Official Reports. Jodie, do we have anything?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. Good morning, my name is Jodie Gerhardt. I'm the manager of current planning, and I think someone is bringing up this report here. We do show that we are going to be in virtual Zoom meetings for the rest of the year, at least. I show that Board Member Lee would be excused on October 15th. I don't know if there are any other vacations or absences that we're looking at. That would be good to know ahead of time. Please let me know if you have that. Then, if we go down a little bit further, you'll see on the 15th, it is the day that we are going to be discussing the objective standards. We will have more announcements about that at the end of the meeting today. Board Member Lee, potentially, if you wanted to send in some written comments that would be wonderful if you're able to do that.

Board Member Lee: I'd be happy to do that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL: 1310 Bryant Street Castilleja School Project Second ARB Hearing [19PLN-00116]: Architectural Review of Castilleja School's Phased Campus Redevelopment Proposal for Site Modifications, Demolition, Construction of a Below-grade Parking Garage and a new Classroom Building, and Minor Alterations to one Facade of a Historic Inventory Category 3 Building on Campus. Redevelopment is Associated With a Request for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment and Variance for Gross Floor Area (GFA) Replacement. Zone District: R-1(10,000). Environmental Review: A Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was Published July 29, 2020. For More Information Contact Amy French, Chief Planning Official, at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Baltay: Next item then is our action items. The first item on that list is the public hearing for 1310 Bryant Street Castilleja School Project. This is the second ARB hearing. Architectural Review of Castilleja School's phased campus redevelopment proposal for site modifications, demolition, construction of a below-grade parking garage and a new classroom building, and minor alterations to one facade of a historic inventory category 3 building on campus. Redevelopment is associated with a request for conditional use permit (CUP) amendment and variance for gross floor area (GFA) replacement. Zone district: r-1(10,000). Environmental review: a final environmental impact report (EIR) was published on July 29, 2020. With that, can we have a staff report, please? I believe Amy French will be doing that.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. I wasn't sure if there were any disclosures that had to happen before I upload the PowerPoint.

Chair Baltay: Please forgive me, Amy. I'd like to take back on that. I'm a little bit rusty today. Do we have any staff disclosures on this project? Starting with Alex Lew, any disclosures? Let's skip Alex, then. Grace -- Alex, any disclosures?

Board Member Lew: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: No disclosures from Alex. Osma, any disclosures?

Vice Chair Thompson: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: Grace Lee, any disclosures?

Board Member Lee: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: David Hirsch, any disclosures?

Board Member Hirsch: Nothing new except I want to thank Kathy Layendecker, which I didn't do last time for having taken us on a tour of the Castilleja School, which was pretty important for us. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: I will disclose that I visited the campus again and spoke to a groundskeeper who was working at the time, but I did not learn anything that's not in the public record. With that, Amy, please go ahead.

[Setting up presentation.]

Ms. French: Today's hearing with the Architectural Review Board involves this presentation that I'm giving now. This is the second Architectural Review Board hearing of this project. This is still new to the ARB. You first saw this back in August. As is typical for our second meetings, the staff report provides on packet pages 11 through 13 a brief summary of the ARB comments that are related to design and the responses. I included some links in that response table to help folks go to those materials on the webpage. There were other items that the ARB requested information. I have those today as well for discussion. We will have the applicant present the revisions they submitted back in September. We will then have ARB questions and another round of public testimony. Then, of course, the comments from the ARB. We request a continuance of the hearing after all of that to the next hearing. The applicant has committed to bringing forward a conformed plan set that will have all of the changes and all of the sheets for the project alternative. The comments that the ARB mentioned last time were focused on entries, the architecture on the two streets Kellogg and Bryant, and the materials, the Circle, the tunnel, landscaping, and a temporary campus, and requests for information as I mentioned. We will let the applicant cover most of these architectural responses. I have a brief overview. This one shows the Kellogg side drop-off entrance, which is residentially scaled, and not a lot of fanfare there. The overview of the changes that were submitted recently are shown in this brief slide. It includes removal of the second-floor area on the second side to address the comment about mass, roofline, and plate height; breaking that up. There is an enlarged landscape plan that shows some of the details and plant materials for that side close to the corner of Bryant. This is an overview. Again, the architect will go over these. This shows the big move change. The materials were posted at City Hall showing this revision here with the green tile that is the applicant's preference. The Bryant side has a new feature, which is a ground-floor gathering area, with a porch on the front side as well as on the backside. For comparison, the prior scheme had a fence and an opening right here. This shows the porch that helps the public and the ARB understand that there's an enclosed and covered area here. That's an indoor area and then there's the two outdoor areas. There's the front porch and the rear porch. There are several options for the front. There's bench seating for the third drop-off area. This shows the first floor and second-floor floor plan. An indication as to where this floor area is being removed at the second-floor areas, as well as this ground floor with porches configuration facing Bryant. This shows the secondary entry point next to the Gunn Building here where this is an open garden entrance with fencing to match the Embarcadero brick and iron fencing. It shows where this new staircase is proposed to enable egress from the second floor of the Gunn Building. This shows the garden area where this fenced and gated area leads into. Last week, we met with the HRB who did accept the final EIR responses on the cultural resources. That's the area of their purview. They also reviewed a draft finding specific to historic preservation, specifically related to the Gunn Building. They requested and will form a subcommittee to review the final detail for this exit stair. They also reviewed all of these drawings, which I'm not focusing on today for ARB. Again, this is an improvement because the Rhoades Building is being removed and a significant space is provided to let us all see the historic building without the building attachment. This is an image of what it was shown to look like in an illustration from back in the day. Again, the HRB supported this finding. This is contained in your staff report related to historic preservation. The Planning and Transportation Commission met on September 9th. That was their second meeting. They have a third meeting upcoming in October. The members that were there voted related to the EIR's sufficiency. Then, they asked staff to return with draft findings and conditions for them to consider for the CUP and the gross floor area replacement variance. We'll let the ARB know the outcome for the ARB's next

meeting. The ARB had asked last time and these were on the web pages. This shows the temporary campus layout. There were some images of the second-floor two-story modulars. I think the applicant has those images as well. We shared those with the Planning and Transportation Commission since the CUP covers use of the site for construction phasing. The applicant's CUP requests milestones and sets a request for an increase of 25-27 students per year related to these milestones of construction. Trees -- there's been some recent activity in July. The project arborist met with the City arborist on-site and we've received updates to have current day measurements of trees and to understand if there are trees that have died in the meantime, that kind of thing. This list here with the yellow reflects the project alternative, which now protects the Redwoods. These are the Redwoods that are next to Spieker Field. Again, the applicant will present their proposal for tree disposition. This is just a summary here showing that's been looked at -- which trees are being removed for which of the buildings. They are removed for driveways, and a fire road, for the pool, and for the academic building. Noise was a question. This shows the pool wall facing the neighbor. The section is showing how that works and this sound wall configuration, the kicker at the top. This faces the neighborhood on this side and the pool is down on the other side. The TDM program is complex. There are mitigation measures that would result with monitoring and reduction of the total net daily trips, which is 279 added with the project. Net daily trips would be mitigated to 114 net new trips. The number 1,477 is the total daily trips that include the existing trips plus the net new trips. That's been a point of confusion. This City staff are working on conditions that go farther than the mitigation measures. Those will be published with the Planning and Transportation Commission report that is due out soon.

Board Member Hirsch: Could I interrupt a second and a question?

Ms. French: I'm almost done. May I just finish?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, sure.

Ms. French: Okay. Then, this is my final slide related to events and obviously, we're not going to read these but the applicant has submitted the events. This is the total proposed events: 45 under 100, 40 that's 100 or more, and then five major events, which are down here that's legible, I guess. That's the proposal. I'm going to conclude here but I do have other slides for questions and if we start today discussing the architectural review findings. I'm going to try to end my show.

Chair Baltay: thank you, Amy. Thank you very much. Okay, so do we have any questions of staff from any members of the board? Dave Hirsch, I heard you start something.

Board Member Hirsch: I do.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead.

Board Member Hirsch: On the daily trips, is that throughout the day, morning, afternoon, night, pickup, delivery, et cetera? How does that play out for a particular day the 1,400 plus?

Ms. French: There are two ways that trips are measured. We have P.M. and A.M. peak trips. Those are typically analyzed in the environmental impact reports. That, in the past, has been the method to determine if there was an impact to traffic. That has changed since July of this year, but in any case, daily trips is different than A.M. and P.M. peak. I am not a traffic engineer but this has been thoroughly studied. Daily trips would be the total daily trips throughout the day, all trips.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Ms. French: That's because of the applicant's proposal for an enhanced transportation demand management program that limits the number of trips to the school.

Board Member HIRSCH: Have they been analyzed in terms of where they occur on the site? Like the amount of trips that will be into the garage or the amount of trips that are on Bryant Street during the

different hours? Also, you didn't mention this as part of the study right now but there's going to be a monitoring aspect to that, right? The actual morning and evening hours will be monitored by the school or something.

Ms. French: Monitored by the school and the City and a third party consultant. The ARB will be able to see all of these conditions that go on top of the mitigation measures that are in the EIR. You can see the mitigation measures today on the web pages. The conditions of approval that are draft for consideration of the planning commission who has the purview of the transportation, those will go farther than the mitigation measures ...

Board Member Hirsch: No, actually...

Ms. French: As far as enforcement and all that.

Board Member Hirsch: I didn't really mean that kind of monitoring. I meant that they were providing staff to move the traffic at the school in the morning and I think maybe in the evening hour. Have you had any discussion about that? I think they were going to have people at the site moving traffic and keeping it moving in some way. The school was going to provide people. Not monitoring in order to determine the amount of the traffic that's coming on any particular day but to keep the traffic moving.

Ms. French: Yes, that's part of the proposal from the applicant. The staff is guiding traffic that comes through the garage that comes into the other drop off areas in the morning. Sorry, I didn't understand at first.

Board Member Hirsch: That's fine.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Any other questions from other Board Members Grace, Alex, Osma? Then, I have two things I'd like to point out or talk about really quickly. Amy, I want to be positive. I think we talked about this last time but as I understand it, the applicant is requesting a variance for floor area. The reason we're allowing that -- I'm reading through the zoning code carefully and it says that in the R-1 Zone, variances are not allowed for limitations on FAR and size of establishment. However, the City is determining that the only limitation on size of a building applies to house size. The 6,000 square feet in table 2 in the R-1 section of the code just says house size. Is that correct that that's why we're allowing this variance to go forward?

Ms. French: It's deeper than that, or broader than that, maybe. First of all, it's a gross floor area replacement. There's two sections of the code. There's FAR and there is replacement that's regarding non-conforming or non-complying facilities. There are two areas of the code that address this situation. Size of establishment is typically used in the code to describe limitations on personal service size or office size. There are parts of the code that deal with the size of an establishment. That's really what that phrase is regarding. Yes, in the R-1, the 6,000 is a maximum house size. That doesn't apply to this project because it's not a house.

Chair Baltay: That's the fundamental statement I want to be really clear to the community for any fear of setting any precedent is being established here. We get much pressure from people wanting to go much bigger than 6,000 square feet, and that's a real ironclad limitation in Palo Alto. I would hate to see us establish a precedent other than that, but you're reassuring me that the reason that precedent does not apply here is because it's not a house. Is that correct?

Ms. French: Yes, there are many things that apply here because it's not a house. Certainly, a six-acre parcel in the R-1 is a very rare circumstance.

Chair Baltay: Absolutely. The second thing I'd like to do is I noticed we had Walter Passmore on as a panelist. After the applicant presentation, I would like to hear Walter's opinion on the impact of the garage on the Redwood trees to the west of the project. Just giving him a heads up, Walter, if we could get you promoted to give us your opinion after the applicant makes their presentation. Okay, with that, any other

questions? If not, can we have the applicant make a presentation, please? Who do we have from them speaking, Jodie?

Ms. French: We have...

Chair Baltay: Or Amy, whomever.

Ms. French: I believe we have Mindy, who is the attorney. We have the garage designer here. Pauline and Natalie are the architect team. They will have to unmute themselves. Kathy Layendecker is representing the school.

Chair Baltay: Okay, to the applicant, you have ten minutes total to present your case if you'd like to go ahead. We're all ears. Please state your name for the record, though.

Adam Woltag, Applicant: My name is Adam Woltag, design partner with WRNS Studio. I'm going to go ahead and make the presentation. I have a bunch of lifelines out to the rest of our crew here so we can ask for their input as we move forward.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, can you make sure we start a timer, please.

Adam Woltag: All right.

Mr. Nguyen: I'll keep track of time.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead, please. Make your presentation.

Adam Woltag: Thank you. The committee asked a lot of fantastic questions the last time we meet. We want to get through all of them. There are eight sections. I'm going to try to get through them as efficiently as I can, and I look forward to any questions in a Q&A if we want to focus a little bit more on some of these points. This is a slide that just shows the original project campus plan alternative four, which is what we're proposing. I'm going to be speaking to some of the modifications that Amy touched on in her presentation to alternative four. The first section is massing and setbacks. This slide illustrates the existing building footprints to be demolished in orange and proposed in green. As we look a little bit closer, it's key to note that the proposed buildings are sited over the existing classroom buildings. The Circle, which holds a deep historical meaning and memory to Castilleja, has been reduced in size and moved in plan to account for the proposed campus teaching spaces. It is also designed to address the bus drop off in an efficient and safe way. It is also important to note that the two maintenance buildings that sit along the southern property line along Emerson are being removed, increasing that setback to almost 80 feet. This slide illustrates the proposed campus access and security boundary illustrated in orange. A key to point out is the proposed campus entry is where it is today at the Gunn Building. You see it there by a very small red star, but the entrance to campus will remain the same. Now, let's move on to the Kellogg elevations and modifications. Now, since we last met the team has taken your comments and proposed some design modifications to the Kellogg massing and façade, and material strategy. This slide what we showed you the last time. Please note the drawer of the middle school clad in standing metal seam panel. Now, the revised approach. Note that the massing along Kellogg has clearly opened up at the middle school building volume. This adjustment frees up the science classroom building to the left and releases views of the sky, adding a little more visual interest to that elevation. We are also proposing replacing the metal siding with wood shingles, which is more of a historical reference to the resources on campus. That one-story stitch between the science classroom and the middle school, we are proposing be clad in ceramic tile green color. Again, another reference back to the Gunn Building and its green painted wood details. This is what it would look like with trees. You're not going to see all that much. The trees are very, very dense. This slide illustrates how the façade on both the ground floor and the second floor along the Kellogg elevation is varied with those dimensions clearly marking the various distances of the façade to the property line. Key to note that great care has been used to incorporate a varied façade that works with the planning of the interior classrooms and how they meet the building's face. Here's a comparison slide that shows before and after. Now let's move to the Bryant Street modifications. In reference to Amy's presentation, she

discussed that there are going to be some modifications to the space between the middle school building on the left and the library and arts building on the right. What you see here is what is on the current alternative, which is just an access gate between both buildings, and the revised design that replaces that gate entry with a one-story covered porch. That is what it would look like with the existing trees in place and a few new proposed trees. This is a drone view of the proposed existing entry with the gate, and then what we are proposing with the porch entry. This revision, as we've discussed, provides a covered one-story secured space between both buildings. We feel it really better defines that Bryant Street elevation in place of this secondary gate. We like this recessed porch. We think it feels more residential in scale and character, and it offer opportunity to locate the existing beautiful wood doors that are already part of that Bryant Street elevations and have been there for 40 years. Here we go a comparison between both options. Moving on to material details and craft. In this section, we wanted to present a more detailed look at our proposed building materials and how they come together. We didn't have to go very far for inspiration. The campus has wonderful architectonic elements that we can draw from and incorporate into the new buildings. Pointing out the warmth of the wood shingles of the Gunn and the Chapel Theatre Buildings., the beautiful green painted, handmade Bryant Street doors we just discussed, and of course the Circle. Really, the overall palette we feel is one that is simple, it is compressed, it is elegant, and it is natural. Our proposed palette builds from this, taking cues from the way sunlight can playoff, the texture of wood shingles, a vertical wood siding with wood batons, textured concrete, and then what we like is the craft and color of glazed tile. Here is our exterior material board. As Amy noted, it is in the reel in the lobby of City Hall. I just want to note that all of the buildings are clad in wood shingle and vertical wood siding, with accents of glazed fire clay. Aluminum windows and storefront systems will high high-performance insulated glazing units that support good acoustics and coordinate with our overall building performance strategy. Looking a bit closer at the application of these materials along the Kellogg Street façade, this is a detailed elevation and plan cut through the high school portion of the building where we see the second floor. Note here, the cut is right through a setback on the second floor where we have what we're calling a planted balcony. On the left, you see the wall section and on the right a 3-D cutaway. That illustrates how the vertical wood siding rolls under the eave toward the window and past that planter box. Even more detailed wall section that really started to illustrate how these materials are coming together. Note the concealed gutter, the concealed planter box, the painted metal spandrel panel that delineates a second-floor line. It helps scale the two-story building a lot like how the Gunn Building delineates wood siding from cement plaster. Moving north along Kellogg, a detailed elevation and plan at the revised middle school drawer formally dressed in standing metal seam, now more appropriately clad in wood shingles. Note the green tile to the left on the one-story stitch between the middle school and the science building. Here again is the second story setback of a landscaped edge. This 3-D section brings to light and illustrated one of our daylighting strategies for the lower level. There will be more on this a little bit later. And a little more detail how the wood shingles of the science building now with that second-floor opening allow those shingles to move and wrap in more toward campus. On the right, a proposed detail of how we would like to cap our shingles elevation with a clean metal hemmed edge and not the typical cap flashing. We think this approach matches the wood shingle surface and gives a nice shadow line cornice to that wall.

Mr. Nguyen: Two-minute warning.

Adam Woltag: Oh, boy. Moving ahead, we're looking at the Bryant Street elevation and more detailed sections on how that wood siding is coming together. And, again, looking at the glass skylights that bring light into that lower level. Daylighting analysis. This was a slide that we showed last time that illustrates in yellow one of the key strategies of trying to bring daylight into the lower level of these new buildings. At the high school hub, we are using skylights and full height storefront window systems that bring daylight in and we use open stairways as the way to bring daylight in. We've been studying the sun patterns around campus on the exterior and the interior, and we've done a detailed daylight analysis to test our strategies to make sure we have enough daylight and we're not bringing in too much glare. We have a full scale mock-up and Sacred Heart Schools where we've tested some of these opportunities. It's been great to see them and how successful they have been. Moving on to landscape design. This is our current landscape planting plan. Key to note the bioswales are dispersed throughout campus to help with our stormwater strategy. Our tree disposition plan shows in peach the trees that will be removed, and in dark green the trees that will be relocated. Our tree mitigation plan shows in peach where the location of the moved trees will be, and in green all the new proposed trees to the campus plan. The tree protection plan is shown

here. Key to note that red line where the Redwoods are above the below-grade parking. We've worked with an arborist and a structural engineer and we think we have a strategy that will allow us to go below-grade and not affect the health of those Redwood trees. An enlarged planting plan of the Kellogg and Bryant Street intersection illustrating the texture of our native planting palette and how they're working to really mitigate stormwater. It is part of an overall strategy where everything is coming together and working together to hit our sustainability goals.

Mr. Nguyen: Ten minutes up.

Chair Baltay: Adam, can you say how much more time do you need, please?

Adam Woltag: I could probably get through these in a minute and a half.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead. Take that much, please.

Adam Woltag: thank you very much. I appreciate it. Looking at the garage tunnel entrance you see that red box indicates where pedestrians will move from the garage up to campus. This is a section cut from the garage to that stairwell. Just as a point of reference, it's about 30 feet from stair to stair. It's an open stairway, so there will be daylight coming in. There will be an elevator and we are looking at different ways of bringing tile again and color and light into that lower level. Looking at the temporary campus when construction is going on, Amy touched on this a little bit earlier. Here is the plan for the temporary classrooms. They will be two-story in nature with exterior walkways. This is what they would look like. These are views from Embarcadero during that period when the classrooms will be over the below-grade parking. Another view from the Emerson side of Embarcadero. All right. Thank you. Looking forward to your questions.

Chair Baltay: thank you very much. Okay, we'll do a round of questions with the applicant, and then we'll open the meeting to public testimony. Do we have any questions from the Board to the applicant?

Vice Chair Thompson: I actually have a question for staff that came up.

Chair Baltay: Sure, go ahead, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: For the façade that is up against the Gunn Building... the new façade, the modified façade, are we commenting on that as well?

Ms. French: You're welcome to comment on it. I think the purview of the HRB is best suited towards secretary of interior standards evaluation there because it is a historic resource on the City's inventory. But, certainly, comments are welcome, especially if you have concerns about the finding that the HRB weighed in on related to that building.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions from other board members?

Board Member Lee: I had a question for either Amy or the applicant. I apologize if I missed it; I just wanted to make sure about that acoustical wall type one, and also the fenced type five. I'm wondering if that actually is something that was presented to us at the previous meeting of the ARB. And, if there

Ms. French: I'll say that it was part of the package that was... it's in the project plans for the project. It wasn't highlighted. We had a lot to cover at the first ARB with the EIR.

Board Member Lee: Amy, if you could just remind me, I believe that this is part of alternative four and the design has been consistent in the package presented to City and had not been modified.

Ms. French: Correct.

Board Member Lee: Okay, thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: I have a question.

Chair Baltay: One second, David. Grace, do you want the applicant to explain how they're doing that sound wall and talk about any possible alternatives?

Board Member Lee: No, I actually just wanted the history of if there was... I couldn't recall if there was another type of acoustical wall that presented to us and we were covering a lot of things at the last meeting. I just wanted to remember.

Chair Baltay: Great. Thank you, then. David, your question.

Board Member Hirsch: This is to the applicant, could you describe the number of classrooms that are in the basement area, and how the basement is really being used? There's very little description so far about what is happening on that level.

Adam Woltag: Absolutely. I don't have the exact number of classrooms but I can tell you, David, there are a number of different types of spaces in that lower level. Those range from the extension of the library and very open and flexible spaces like gathering studying spaces. There are music spaces. The loudest things that could be done there are in the basement. Choral and band spaces are down there. There are language classrooms we have there that are gathered around open, flexible informal gathering spaces. There are meeting spaces. There are some faculty offices in the lower level, as well as a lot of mechanical spaces, too. We've really tried to move a lot of the equipment from the rooftop and put those underground as well. We have service spaces down there. And the high school hub space, really important, their main living room, which goes from the ground level -- I showed that section a few minutes ago -- down to the lower level. There's a real variety of types of spaces. They're not all classrooms.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Adam. Any other questions? I would then like to have the city arborist comment on the sufficiency of the tree protection measures for the Redwood trees adjacent to the parking garage. Is that possible, staff, to have Walter Passmore comment on that, please?

Ms. French: Sure. Walter has returned to work. I provided for him the most recent... we do have some details that are on our webpage showing the soil nail wall. I could possibly pull those up and share those. Walter, are you...

Chair Baltay: I see Walter listed as a panelist. Is he not available? Yes, I think we do...

Ms. French: Oh, there he is. Okay.

Chair Baltay: Yes, I'd really like to hear from Walter Passmore if we could, please.

Ms. French: Sure.

Chair Baltay: This is on the sufficiency of the Redwood protection measures. Can you go ahead, Walter?

Walter Passmore, Arborist: Yes. I have reviewed the latest arborist report. I still need to look at some scaled drawings to verify that the measures are completely sufficient but the appearance right now is that the applicant has provided measures that would protect those Redwood Trees and allow them to remain in a similar condition to what they are right now. The applicant also provided updated measurements. We noted in our site visit that some of those trees have grown fairly significantly since the last measurement. I thank the applicant for doing that. Like I said, we need scale drawings to confirm with certainty but it appears that they have provided a design that will protect those Redwood Trees.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Arborist Passmore. With that, then, no other questions. Why don't we open the meeting up to any members of the public who wish to speak? Vinh, do we have anyone that wants to address us on this issue?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we do have about ten hands raised now and more are being raised as we speak. Let's get the speaker timer up.

Chair Baltay: Can you give me an idea of how many people we have. Is ten people what you see?

Mr. Nguyen: We have 12 people now. We'll also write down the names of everyone who has their hand raised and the order they'll be called on.

Chair Baltay: Twelve people, okay. Let's stick to our three minutes again. Do you want to call them out, Vinh, please, since you're managing the list?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes. It looks like we have 13 hands raised now. Veronica, if you could update the list after you start the timer for the first speaker. Our first speaker will be Tom Shannon.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead, Tom.

Tom Shannon: Hello, ARB. Good morning, everyone. I sent a memo to you folks yesterday. I don't know whether you had a chance to look at it but I'm just going to paraphrase some of our concerns here on Kellogg. I appreciate Adam Woltag's articulation of the Kellogg Building. I didn't realize there was so much articulation on that plan that he just put recently today. Anyway, in my memo, we wanted to just emphasize that Kellogg is pretty impacted by the school. We're trying to buffer those impacts. Sound and noise really make a difference. We have a break in the Kellogg Building right now and when there is amplified events we basically get to be, if you will, entertained by those events. Not that they're offensive but they do leak into the neighborhood. We would prefer the original design where you have a solid two-story element running down Kellogg. My second bullet was about building articulation. I see that Adam actually nicely presented that so I am going to skip that. Then we would ask the committee to maybe look at varying the architecture. I'm the first to note modern architecture doesn't handle gables and roofs and facades, but certainly, we would like to hear how you feel about these kinds of architecture up against our craftsman homes. Fourth is the solar cells and roof equipment. We just want to make sure that that's completely concealed. I've said in my memo we would welcome a variance to the roof screen just to ensure that we don't see those cells and equipment from our yards. Then, fifth and most important, is an aesthetic and acoustical fence running along that Kellogg drop-off. I mean, that will have intense drop-off and pick-ups at least twice a day. I might also point out that the Kellogg entrance is probably one of the most attractive entrances on campus because people can just park right in front of it on Kellogg and walk-in. No offense, but staff has a tendency to use Kellogg first and then the parking lots fill when there's no closer parking. I just want to highlight that to the ARB, and obviously we'll look at that with the PTC on October 14th. All that being said, I appreciate your input. There was a question about traffic and we don't know what it's going to look like but you should realize that the traffic for the school is basically what I call a merry-go-round. It can only come in on Bryant. It has to go down Kellogg, and it has to exit either on Emerson, Melville, Kellogg, or Churchill. There's really no other way to get into this neighborhood. Thanks very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Next speaker is Barbara Hazlett. You'll have three minutes. Please, go ahead.

Barbara Hazlett: Good morning. My name is Barbara Hazlett. I'm a neighbor of Castilleja and Paly. I feel lucky to have two such incredible schools right outside my front door. It is a privilege to speak this morning in support of Castilleja as it plans for another century of educating young women to become leaders. Castilleja is a treasure and as a Palo Alto voter who strongly supports residentialist goals I feel that school, churches, libraries, and community centers are crucial civic elements and enhance our residential neighborhoods. Schools serve the public good and should not be driven away from the students they serve. Specific to this hearing, I want to speak about the temporary campus. I've looked at the structures

that Castilleja will use for their temporary campus. They bear no resemblance to the trailers we see pop up to create extra space on other campuses. They have wood finishes and colors that blend with the historical buildings on campus. In addition, the school will add a row of potted trees along Embarcadero to form a green barrier between the street and the life of the campus. Immense care and thought has been put into every detail of this process, which is not at all surprising. The school has created a plan that takes every small concern into account and mitigates impacts. At the last hearing, someone raised concerns about the temporary campus would be taken down in a timely manner. As Spieker Field is Castilleja only athletic field, I am certain all of those structures will be removed right away because the school needs that field. In fact, the school needs its classrooms and opened as soon as possible. That is why there is a detailed schedule that allows for construction of the parking facility and learning spaces to be completed in under three years, faster than many single family homes these days. The school has much more invested in finishing this project and clearing the portables away than anyone else. There's no question in my mind that this will be done in a timely manner. Once again, I want to state that I am in favor of a residentialist approach and I know that supporting excellent schools supports healthy neighborhoods. I support Castilleja and in doing so, I want to preserve the Embarcadero corridor, the vitality of my neighborhood, and ensure that inspired architecture and exceptional education continue its foundational and timeless values in Palo Alto. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Cath Garber. You'll have three minutes, please. Go ahead.

Cath Garber: Thank you for the time and care you've put into reviewing Castilleja's plans to modernize their campus. As a long time resident of Palo Alto, and as an architect myself, I'm excited to see the updates to the plans for this meeting. Castilleja is an important asset to Palo Alto. I am eager for the school to gain permission to begin this necessary and long overdue update. I've taken a look at the changes that the Castilleja architects have made to the project and I wanted to use my time to comment on the improvements that they've made to the Bryant side of the campus. The first story of the Gunn Building now has an enclosed porch space between the library and the language classrooms. This new porch connection I think nicely brings together the elements from the Gunn Administration Building, as well as the Kellogg façade into the space that joins the two sides of the campus. I like the vertical windows that recall the windows on the chapel theatre façade, and I like the suggestion that the architects are making in this presentation to repurpose the carved green doors that have opened onto the Bryant Street for decades. I think that would be a graceful nod to the past in this lighter, more updated structure. The new one-story connection between the two taller structures also echoes the modifications that is being shown on the Kellogg side of the campus. This helps to create the continuity between the Kellogg side and the Bryant Street side of the campus. The materials, and the planting along the roofline, and the recessed entry all form a more thoughtful and distinctive entry into the campus than the metal gate that was included in their previous plans. In addition, the small-enclosed space will create a more substantial buffer between the campus life and life on the sidewalk outside. In addition to lessening the noise in the neighborhood, I would think it would also provide greater security for the campus, too. Overall, I think these changes create a more cohesive and thoughtful relationship between the buildings and the neighborhood. In closing, I want to reiterate my respect for the work that has gone into this project. I'm so impressed by all of the work that Castilleja has done to respond to the feedback and improve their plans. This handsome update allows Castilleja the opportunity to modernize just as schools across Palo Alto have done in recent years. Thank you for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Our next speaker will be Trisha Suvvari. You will have three minutes. Go ahead, please.

Trisha Suvvari: Yes, good morning. Thank you to the board members for your time. As a resident of Palo Alto, I want to speak in support of Castilleja thoughtful plans for modernizing the campus. I realize that at the last ARB meeting there was some conversation about why the Circle was being maintained at the center of the campus because that may be limiting the options for updating the campus. I want to address the importance of the Circle both to the history and to the future of the school. Historically, this Circle is one of the original features of the campus. This outdoor is as much a touchstone to the past as the Gunn Administration Building built in 1907, and the Chapel Theatre. The green space that forms Castilleja Circle

is the beating heart of the campus and has been for the past 113 years. For every student, parent, or visitor who steps on campus there is an immediate recognition of the value of the Circle. It's where friendships are formed, fun and laughter ensues, study groups are held, sports are played, and, of course, countless traditions take place on the Circle. There are many things special and unique to Castilleja but the Circle is symbolic and very much a part of the school as much as the buildings. With their application, Castilleja has found a way to retain the Circle for the new campus while reducing its size in order to allow for projects like planning benefits. This change not only makes the Circle smaller, it also pulls the edges more toward the center of campus, which allows Castilleja to draw the buildings closer towards the center of campus as well as allowing for more space between the building edges and the surrounding streets. Campuses have a baseline percentage of open space and the Circle address that in a way that preserves the history of the school and the buildings, which surround the school, serve to buffer the neighborhood from the sights and sounds of daily life in and around the Circle. The Circle has been a part of Castilleja since the beginning and the modifications to the new plans to the Circle going forward benefit the neighborhood and the school. I appreciate your care in reviewing these plans and I also appreciate that your questions about how to think about improving upon the Circle has already been addressed by Castilleja. Finally, I want to commend Castilleja for taking as much care with the outdoor spaces as the indoor ones. The landscape architects on this project have enhanced the natural world around campus, preserved and added trees, and used drought-tolerant species to conserve water. The structures and the planting all serve to improve the aesthetics while minimizing impacts on the neighborhood and the environment. I appreciate your time. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Our next speaker will be Mary Sylvester. You'll have three minutes. Go ahead, please.

Mary Sylvester: Good morning, Board Members. I am Mary Sylvester, a 43-year resident of Palo Alto, and for that period of time a neighbor to Castilleja School. The focus of my comments today are on how does this project serve the best interest of Palo Alto? First of all, let's set the context. Castilleja operates in an R-1 residential neighborhood on a conditional use permit. That permit is a privilege, not an entitlement. No part of the project may be injurious to property in the vicinity, nor may it be detrimental to the public health, general welfare, or convenience of the citizenry. That's the backdrop of my comment. Neighbors in and around Castilleja School and the community largely support the modernization of the school. It's much needed and we want the students educated in a state-of-the-art manner. However, neighbors and residents want a complaint plan that is consistent across the City. No special privileges should be awarded. This is one of my concerns about the most recent staff report. It is highly beneficial to Castilleja and I don't see it as a neutral document providing for Board Members the pros and cons of the project. I would like to go into specifically what these concerns are. First of all, as to the comprehensive plans, staff cites policy L1.1 improves safety, sustainability, and programmatic space to serve students. Only 25 percent of Castilleja students are from Palo Alto. We need to have a program that is less auto-centric that allows for enforcement and accountability, which the staff has had tremendous difficulty within past years. Preservation of trees that are a value to the community. We're talking about destroying eight mature trees, and five street trees are going to be moved. Those are a public resource. They belong to the citizenry of Palo Alto. As to the floor area ratio, whatever we call a garage, it's still a garage. Let's avoid the window dressings and obfuscations and get to the heart of having an updated, compliant school that serves the entire community. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: thank you. Our next speaker will be Vania Fang. You'll have three minutes. Go ahead, please.

Vania Fang: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. As neighbors of Castilleja on Kellogg Street, we are happy to speak in support of Castilleja plans to modernize their campus. I know that at the last hearing there were some questions about the massing of the new building along Kellogg. We are happy to see the modified plans presented today respond directly to those questions by reducing the massing, varying the rooflines, and changing the materials palette. Castilleja had taken the neighbors' feedback to heart and made changes that benefit all of us who live across from the school. I see the new one-story section of the building creates a life-filled passageway between the two taller structures, significantly reducing the massing and providing variation in the rooflines. These features, along with the

addition of shingles in place of metal surfaces, change the look and feel of the building to echo the Gunn Building and the Chapel Theatre. The different setbacks break the buildings up into natural sections to mirror the neighborhood feel and scale more gracefully than the buildings that stand there now. We love this improvement and we are quite impressed by the extent of changes that Castilleja has made in these new plans. In particular, we appreciate the subtle and quiet entrance that will be hidden behind a wooden blind and gentle landscaping. For over a century, Castilleja has had only one formal entrance to the school. This has served to keep visitors focused in one place. We feel that more extensive entrance on Kellogg will require more signage and bring more activity to Kellogg Street. In addition, schools today really need to rely on one single entrance to ensure campus safety. That is why we are happy that the Kellogg entrance will be used primarily for drop-off and pick-up and will not change from current usage patterns at all. The roof height now has more variety than the previous plan. It is also lower than the current rooflines on the school building we live across from now. We recognize that there are questions about the pitch of the different roof areas. I understand that the rooflines are flat to accommodate the solar panels that will provide energy to the net-zero sustainable campus. We feel that this is a good trade-off to help the City of Palo Alto reach its ambitious sustainability goals. Thank you again for your time and attention to this important project to the City of Palo Alto, and for women's education.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Next speaker will be Rob Levitsky. You'll have three minutes. Go ahead, please.

Rob Levitsky: Hi, this is Rob Levitsky. I own the property next to the school at 1215 Emerson Street. This will not be a green project. There are 900 kilograms of CO2 released for every ton of cement that you pour. There's a tunnel that you talked about recently. That tunnel goes three feet under the Melville sewer line [distortion] 15 feet so you can have this underground -- what is it -- basement, parking structure, underground garage. Let's talk about events: 90 events is ridiculous. Other private schools, Like Stratford, have zero events and they go cold at 6:30 P.M. As far as the phased enrollment, the ARB last meeting suggested that no phased enrollment until all the buildings are done and all the temps removed. I stand by that. Trees: the staff and the EIR consultant have repeatedly misinterpreted the tree ordinance for protecting Oaks and Redwoods. Both trees 102, 140, and [distortion] for removal. [distortion]. Acceptance of removing of these will gut the tree ordinance as future builders will reference as a precedent for removing any trees [distortion].

Board Member Hirsch: I think he's cutting out here.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, we're having trouble hearing this speaker.

Mr. Nguyen: Rob, if you're there, it sounds like you might be having some...

Vice Chair Thompson: We might need to ask Rob to submit something in writing.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, if we could move to the next speaker. If you could perhaps contact Rob and ask him if he could finish his statements at the end of everyone else if he can get his connection improved.

Mr. Nguyen: Sure.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Rob. We're going to go on to the next speaker. Cindy Chen, you'll have three minutes. As soon as Vinh is ready you can go ahead. Go ahead, please, Cindy.

Cindy Chen: Good morning. Thank you for this opportunity to speak today. As a near neighbor of Castilleja, I want to share my support for their plans to modernize the campus. I realize this has been a year's long process involving multiple plan medications and the time has paid off with an excellent design. The current plans will improve the quality of life in our neighborhood with a sustainable building that is far more beautiful than an aging structure we live beside now. As a neighbor, I appreciate some learning spaces are tucked below ground but no one wants to be trapped in a dungeon. The architects have employed simple, common, and time techniques to capture natural light and carry it into the garden level. When I saw the renderings, I immediately thought of several museums that I have visited. These museums

share a similar challenge as Castilleja: limited land and the need to create inviting educational space. Castilleja accomplished this by incorporating light wells situated throughout the building and bringing light from above to those classrooms below. There are also terraces around the outside of the buildings at frequent intervals allowing natural light into the side windows in those classrooms. Finally, there are light-filled hub spaces that span the two aboveground stories and pour natural light below. Also, I appreciate Castilleja being thoughtful of noise pollution. I'm fully aware of the controversies of how the church on the corner of North California and Bryant Street is used, resulting in the movement of the new Mozart School of Music. Housing music space, meeting space, and mechanical systems underground makes a lot of sense to me. Certainly, Castilleja has been over considerate over these seven years of responding to neighbor feedback. The most recent adjustments include rendering two homes, downsizing their underground parking facility, redesigning the building to reduce massing, changing the materials, and preserving trees just to name a few. I think we have arrived at a point where a City leader should allow Castilleja to update their campus with the thoughtful plan that incorporates feedback and improves the life in my neighborhood. Thank you for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. I'll next speaker will be Carla Befera. You'll have three minutes. Go ahead, please.

Carla Befera: thank you to the Members of the ARB. In the last meeting, Chair Peter Baltay noted it's not enough for the new campus to simply be superior to the buildings constructed in the 1960s. The City, he said, should hold Castilleja to a higher standard. We must agree. As a resident across the street for over 50 years, we've too long-lived with the current unsightly jets and air design. This redesign of Castilleja seemed a golden opportunity to not only reduce the campus' considerable impacts but also to bring an architectural style consistent with the old Palo Alto neighborhood in which is situated. The housing built on the former Palo Alto Medical Foundation site came to mind. The architects have described its new buildings as being in harmony with the remaining original structures. That is the Gunn Administration Building designed by Gustav Laumeister and the Chapel designed by Birge Clark. We disagree that the proposed style is truly in keeping with those handsome buildings or with the neighborhood. The vertical planes and hard corners are nowhere to be found in the surrounding homes or indeed in the facades of the original buildings, which are graceful arts and craft shingles with articulated dormers. The industrial façade that is proposed to loom the length of Kellogg may be compatible with the business zone but is entirely out of character with this R-1 neighborhood. We also draw your attention to the outsized nature of the project. The school is proposing 195, 000 square feet of the building. For comparison, this is larger than an average Costco, which is only 145,000 square feet. It is closer to two City Halls or to two Home Depots. How is that appropriate for one small block in a residential neighborhood? We also ask you to re-review the extraordinary measures taken to refine the proposed 32,000 square foot underground garage as a basement. Albeit one that is not located under a building and in which cars are parked. The arguments made by the applicant's attorney and accepted by the PTC are a masterful example of flimflam. As a referenced under code, the school is permitted .3 FAR but is asking for a current preexisting FAR of .42. With the garage added the proposed FAR is closer to .58, almost twice the permitted FAR. There's argument that unlike for a residence, a garage should not be included in the FAR. We dispute that interpretation. CUP's are not granted to single-family homes, and the code clearly states that should CUP be granted then the area of the underground shall be counted in determining the floor area ration for the site. Chair Baltay is right to question this methodology. Staff's theory that footprint and underground garage rules only apply to residential uses would allow any non-residential use in R-1 to add a vast underground complex with none of it counting as floor area. Thank you for your consideration of these issues.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Bruce McLeod. You'll have three minutes. Go ahead, please.

Bruce McLeod: Good morning. Thank you for the time to address the ARB. I live across the street from Castilleja and have lived there for 20 years in a home that has been in my family for almost 50 years. I am very concerned about the actual design of the buildings but several other commentators have addressed those issues. What I'd like to look at primarily is a question of timing and process. There have been many comments made about Castilleja supporters regarding the extraordinary length of time this process has

taken and touting Castilleja community involvement. I was part of a small group of neighbors who met with Castilleja from the beginning on this project. We consistently brought suggestions to Castilleja only to be told, "well, we'll study that." At the end of that process, magically, there was a master plan which we had not seen that was unveiled and submitted to the city. That process had continued. Most of what you see here has not been vetted by the neighborhood before it shows up. Much of our suggestions have fallen on deaf ears, not only at Castilleja but at the City staff. Castilleja has an opportunity here. They are rebuilding over 70 percent of their campus. They can show that expansion and progress can happen without compromising what makes Palo Alto a special place. The neighbors believe that this can happen but their pleas have fallen on deaf ears. A project of this scale and impact should be held to the highest possible standards not only for how it serves the applicant's goals but also for its ability to make life better in the surrounding community. The current plans do not meet that standard. There will be more traffic, there will be more nebulous and a largely unenforceable mitigation standards, and constriction that will make the neighboring streets unlivable for several years. The surrounding neighborhoods should never be looked on as collateral damage in the service of growth. Until that is changed, this project -- and many others in this city -- should continue to be studied and revised with the active engagement of neighbors. The neighbors deserve better. Palo Alto deserves better. Thank you for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Our next speaker will be Hank Sousa. You'll have three minutes, please.

Hank Sousa: Hello, Chair Baltay, and fellow Board Members. I live at 160 Melville Avenue. My comments this morning are on the construction of a below-grade parking garage is unhealthy, unnecessary, and time-consuming. Consider this: approximately 15 months will be shaved off the construction timetable for the Castilleja school project, which is slated to take between three and five years. A nice benefit to both the applicant and nearby neighbors. The act of constructing something this large involves removing massive amounts of dirt, pouring large amounts of CO2 emitting concrete, and then returning some of the dirt. Thousands of trucks, thousands of gallons of burned diesel fuel fumes being emitted is simply not necessary. The school already has 86 at-grade parking spaces. You can recommend they continue to be used, reconfiguring the buildings, and save those spaces. Shuttle in the people who currently get dropped off one at a time. That will reduce the daily car trips by approximately 800 which responds to one of the neighbor's concerns. As you put together your recommendation, consider asking yourself this: how can we reduce the impact on the neighbors but still give the school a nice future. The answer is to keep the at-grade parking spaces in lieu of building a garage and recommend single student drop-offs be shuttled into the campus from satellite kiss-and-ride drop of spots. Consider these worthy options and skip old technology in favor of creative, green transportation. The school has several electric vans. They are on the right track there. In closing, I would like to share a brief thought about the upcoming Palo Alto City Council election. Two takeaways come to mind. One being the housing issue, and the other that residents should be empowered and listened to. Surprise us neighbors; show us that you listen to us and recommend a less impactful project. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Our next speaker will be Andie Reed. You'll have three minutes. Go ahead, please.

Andie Reed: Hi, thank you. My name is Andie Reed and I live near Castilleja School. Thanks to Chair Baltay and Board Members for keeping up with these boards and commission meetings piling up very quickly. I would like to bring up a couple of points from the staff report. Regarding the EIR, please keep in mind that alternative four has elements that were not originally studied in the draft EIR. New intense traffic patterns arise from adding four more driveways with two loops. The only mitigations offered are that the school will disperse traffic and the City will oversee and enforce. I'm sure that you are aware that this type of oversight from the City has never actually happened. Staff report packet page 13 number 8 suitability materials and packet page 36 finding number 6 are all concerned with the greenness of the project. We have learned about how the new buildings will be sustainable and environmentally cutting edge but no discussion at any of these meetings about the underground garage and how it is good for the environment. Please review packet page 14 continues the discussion about the underground garage and references the School's attorney letter. Other letters regarding this muni code issue from the public make a contrary, more direct, and logical analysis, which I hope you have had a chance to read. The idea that

this facility, which has been known as a garage for four years, is not a garage but a basement flies in the face of Palo Alto muni code. It is clearly not under the footprint of a building. The staff report mentions other examples but that are not in R-1 zones, so they are not relevant. There is one example of an R-1 zone. A synagogue on an acre-and-a-half overlooking Foothill Expressway that has zero similarity to this project. The reason this is important is because the school wants less of an increase in FAR to be considered in the variance they are seeking. Finally, it will be difficult for you to find in packet page 29 finding number 2D, that the project provides harmonious transitions in scale, mass, and character to adjacent land uses. Please refer to the Architectural Historian William Kosturas' study that I sent to you on 9/28, which gives an overview of the surrounding small older homes, and visualize, if you will, the rendering we've just seen looming across the street. Unrelenting mass and starkly modern; it would be beautiful floating in 20 acres of lawn at Menlo School. We applaud the school's education of girls and we hope that they rebuild, modernize their school within reason, compatible with the neighborhood, and compliant with muni code. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Our next speaker will be Neva Yarkin. You'll have three minutes. Go ahead, please.

Neva Yarkin: The ARB really needs to look at the traffic studies and student enrollment because adding another 125 more students, 415 to 540, will have a major impact for the neighborhood and for the City of Palo Alto. The total number of car trips for the proposed expansion is 1,477. It doesn't matter how you disperse the car trips around Castilleja, it is still 1,477 coming into the area. Seventy-five percent of Castilleja's students are coming from outside of Palo Alto. The underground parking garage entrance will be off of Embarcadero and Bryant, and the exit will be Emerson and Embarcadero. The entrance and exit of the underground parking garage should alone stop this expansion. How will any of these alleviate traffic congestion in the area of Palo Alto for the future? Is this making Palo Alto more environmentally or greenhouse friendly? Would any of you want this expansion coming near where you live? Will adding another 125 students plus parents, staff, and volunteers make Palo Alto a better place to live in or a better place to travel in? For all these traffic concerns, I'm against the expansion project. Thank you very much for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Neva. That's the end of our list of speakers; however, I would like to go back to see if Rob Levitsky would like to finish his comment. Vinh, do we have any contact with Rob?

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Baltay, unfortunately, Rob is no longer in this meeting. I suspect his internet has gone through some issues. I did send him an email asking him to submit some written comments.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Vinh. For the record, we asked and with that, we'll close the meeting to public testimony. The next is to offer the applicant a chance to rebut any of the comments that have been made if the applicant would care to do that. I'd like to suggest if Kathy Layendecker, the head of school, would like to say something; I would appreciate hearing her opinion. It's up to the applicant. You have ten minutes whomever on the applicant's team would like to speak, if at all. Do we have anyone with the applicant that would like to make a rebuttal?

Mr. Nguyen: Sorry, just real quick. Veronica, could you change the timer to ten minutes, please?

Mindie Romanowsky: Hi, this is Mindie Romanowsky with the applicant team. Good morning. Thank you for your time. We've met before. I'm the land use attorney working with Castilleja. I am just going to clarify a few of the things that I heard this morning that I think might be helpful. If there's time I may have our landscape architect answer a few questions and clarify a few things we heard about trees. First and foremost, Chair Baltay, I heard you ask the question about variances and wondering whether they would apply or could apply for the size of an establishment. I just want to make it clear -- and I do have correspondence about the findings to be made for a variance for this project. The variance language in your code does not prohibit the ability to replace the school's FAR. We're not expanding our FAR; rather, we're just asking to replace it so that we avoid a hardship or disparate treatment from other parcels in the R-1 zone. In our application, we include a few letters to support the findings to support that variance. If you take a look at those letters you'll see a map of the overall zoning. Our parcel is over six acres, one of

the biggest when you look at the map in the entire zone. When you look at the relative basis of FAR for our property versus all the other properties in the zone, our proposed FAR is actually about seven percent less than what's allowed for the other parcels in the zone. That is the reason why we have put forward our application for the variance as allowed by your code to just maintain... actually, we're going to be a little bit less than what we have right now. I would point you to that letter. It is going to go before the PTC but, if you're interested, I'm happy to forward it to his Board as well. With regard to the underground parking facility, there is no prohibition to build an underground parking facility in an R-1 zone for non-residential use. I have a letter in the record dated September 8th, which walks through all of the various code sections. I will admit, it is complex and complicated but when you look at your code, in addition to the precedent for other projects around Palo Alto, this application for an underground parking facility is worthy of approval. It certainly is supported by legal findings. The history of this parking facility was conveyed by the neighbors. We have had over 50 meetings with the neighborhood group over the last four to five years. Very early on they requested that we study an underground parking facility to reduce impacts to the neighborhood. I said this to the PTC a couple of weeks ago and it bears repeating here, I distinctly remember at looking at putting in the underground parking facility taking it to Castilleja board knowing it would be a big task to take on but really envisioning our entire plan based upon an underground parking facility. We knew that it would come with some site development strategies and we made it a priority. Parking at grade does come with impacts and that was evidenced in the EIR. This underground parking facility really serves to reduce impacts to the neighborhood headlights, cars slamming their doors, all of the things that come with parking at grade. Quickly, a couple of other things I heard with the construction timeline. Our construction timeline, as was reviewed in the EIR and put forward in the application, is three years or less. The type of construction that we are using -- it's a technical term -- but these CLT NDT structural supports go quicker. It could even be less time than three years. Certainly, you saw in your packet today examples of what our temporary campus plan would look like; very tasteful modulars. We're going to screen them and have every intention to remove them as soon as possible. We understand that no one wants to have temporary modulars there for any longer than they need to be, and we need our field back. Those will be removed as soon as humanly possible once our project is complete. Then, I have heard questions and comments today about traffic. That was studied as well and the various traffic reports in the EIR. I know it is confusing. It's very technical. You see these numbers of trips but we are an operating school right now. We already have cars coming and going. That's an existing condition and we have done a lot to reduce those impacts with our TDM programs and our shuttle systems. We're not adding a thousand trips. We are adding much less than that and we are keeping them at a constant. Even though we've requested to grow our enrollment a bit every year, our trips will remain constant. I apologize that I'm not quoting the exact number of trips. I don't have it in front of me right now but I would direct you to the various traffic reports, as I'm not a traffic engineer. I do know that we're highly committed to keeping those impacts low and not increasing those. Finally, I'd like to pass this quickly off to our landscape architect to clarify a few things that we heard today about trees if he's available. Mike, are you there?

Mike Bellinger: I'm Mike Bellinger with BFS Landscape Architects with an office in Mountain View. We've worked very closely with the architects and the project arborist to track all of the trees that are on campus. It's been very thoughtful about how to preserve as many trees as possible. Out of a total of 164 on the property, 17 trees will be removed and 53 will be planted in their replacement. In that 17 total, there are three Oaks that are going to be removed and 12 will be added back of a reasonably good size of 24-48 box trees. In addition, two street trees will be removed with changing locations for the driveways at the school, but in addition to replacing those, we will be replacing additional street trees that have been previously removed by the City. The other opportunity we have is relocating existing trees. A total of 28 will be relocated with an additional 47 trees added to mitigate the potential impact for their tree bigger by moving them around on campus. Working with the garage architect, their structural engineer, and our arborists, the garage footprint has been reduced significantly from the perimeter allowing us to save several Oaks and Redwoods. In addition to the Tree Protection Plan, there's additional mitigation to maintain irrigation and mulch and continue to keep equipment outside of those protection zones. There has been quite a bit of thought put into that and we worked closely with Walter with him pointing out things that we needed to clarify in terms of how to deal with utilities and construction. We feel that we are pretty well-mitigated from any impact of tree removal.

Mindie Romanowsky: If I could just add one more thing since we do have a couple of minutes left here, I was able to pull up those trip numbers as you were speaking, Mike. Just to be clear, this project would add 279 net daily trips to the existing trips, but then we are required to mitigate that, Mitigation Measure 7A in the EIR. I know this is not your purview today, ARB, but I know questions have come up. It's very confusing about traffic. There are thousands of trips coming, I've heard that today at least once, if not many times. I just think that it bears repeating that we operate as an existing school. It's a theme that runs throughout all of these comments we've heard. We're not asking to change what we're doing. We are asking to grow our enrollment but we're keeping the impacts constant. The EIR validated that over and over again. There are no significant and unavoidable impacts. That is the purpose of that EIR. Everything that you're looking at today in your purview we feel very proud about; the sustainably, the modifications we've made to the Kellogg façade, the things we've done to bring some of the elements from the Gunn Building, the historic elements around the project to make a more cohesive plan, retaining the Circle but making it smaller allowing for increased setback. We would invite you if you have other questions about some of the things that you raised in your last meeting to ask any members of our team to address as we are here today for you. Thank you so much for your time and your service.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Mindie Romanowsky, and to the applicant. With that, we will bring the issue back to the Board and begin our discussion. Before we start discussing the issue, I'd like to just make a quick statement that I think might help us frame the issue and perhaps also the community as a whole because I think most of the Board Members actually understand this. This is a large property with an established institution use set in the middle of an established residential neighborhood. There are inherently many complicated zoning issues that will arise. The Architectural Review Board is charged to make finding, number one, that the project is compatible with the current zoning code. That's where I believe we have to step in and base our findings on some of these issues. Questions like the legitimacy of the underground parking garage, or the impact of the traffic, or the increase of the FAR, or the legitimacy of the variance on that, or the timeline for construction are issues that we inherently rely on staff to make a determination and we cooperate with the Planning And Transportation Committee to help us decide on them. I think my colleagues on the Board understand that and I hope we address our comments keeping that in mind. With that, why don't we start with Grace Lee giving us her opinion of the project so far? Grace, go ahead.

Board Member Lee: Thank you, Peter. Peter, I so appreciate your introduction to our Board's comments. You actually covered a lot and you run these meetings so well. I just want to congratulate you, Peter, but also just remind everyone who is present in terms of what are purview is. I just want to begin by extending a few gratitudes. I really appreciate the time that the community has invested in our City of Palo Alto process in spending the time and at our previous meeting with the Architectural Review Board. It is very helpful to hear your thoughts and feedback. I'd like to also thank, as always, our planning staff. Thank you so much to our chief planning official. This is a very big project and it has been so helpful to have reports that are clear. Also to hear from the City Arborist. Then, if I may, our HRB who recently deliberated on this project, voted in favor and really support our ARB findings, number two. It's terrific to hear that the subcommittee will be reviewing some details related to their process. Then to the PTC, I look forward, and I think all our Board Members do, to hearing a summary of that upcoming meeting and their discussion of issues that are so important to this project. I just wanted to highlight briefly everything that we understand from this project from the final EIR. Issues that relate to what the applicant has reminded us in terms of operations and the history of this applicant in terms of managing various aspects that relate to architecture and landscape, I look forward to hearing how that all goes in terms of managing the TDM and major events, the phasing. I do want to step back and also thank the applicants and consultants in terms of how they have sharpened their pencil several times. My comments will be addressing how they have responded to specific comments from our previous ARB meeting. With that, I will go to and begin with just some of the asks. I believe that there was some discussion of really understanding what those temporary structures and the layout would be exactly. How that occurs in site plans but also in terms of the rendering, and hearing the assurance that that, obviously, would be revisited and thought about very much in terms of the phasing moving into the actual construction schedule. The next thing I wrote down was trees. Overall, hearing from the Landscape Architect and the City Arborist, I am so encouraged to hear that there are these mitigating impacts that have been really thought about quite a bit and the assurance of the Redwoods at the garage, and overall, hopefully, the net gain in the future in terms of tree

canopy and overall replacement, as well as preservation. I think what I'll do is think about more specifically a few of the comments that relate to each edge of campus. I'll begin with Bryant Street, particularly that one-story entry porch which I believe will function as a very positive gathering place, entry node, like a fulcrum in terms of just having that. I think that the architectural expression of option number two... I'm highly in support of that. I think that in terms of that it is a porch on both sides that actually the architectural treatment blends in nicely with the overall Bryant façade elevation. I just wanted to point to that Bryant Street entry porch as one of the most positive aspects of the design that I've seen moving forward. On Kellogg Street, now we are going to learn more about materials and color. Thank you for revisiting that design in terms of breaking down... I believe we talked about the length of the facade as one mass. I'm encouraged; I think one of the community members also talked about... and it is encouraging to see that there are a variation that the applicant presented also in terms of the planes. It's not one single plane and sometimes it's hard to see that in these architectural renderings but it does come in and out. There is an attention to how to recede and come forward. I believe that the transition from steel panel to ceramic tiles is a strong move that, to me, is quite satisfying. I do think that the color, which actually is green ceramic tile, is reminiscent of the historic building on campus. I do think that the shingles and its texture, and it also brings the palette of the whole campus together. I appreciate that very much. I think it recalls the historic building but also compliments the rest of the new layer. I guess on my side, I wonder if there's an opportunity and perhaps this is not needed -- there's very mature canopy and there are very mature street trees. It creates a terrific foreground. Just a question maybe the Board could comment on, I'm not sure that the green ceramic tile could find itself again further down on Kellogg. Or maybe there is some aspect where that green tile just doesn't happen once. That it actually recedes as a highlight or as something that occurs at an upper level. I know you have the shingles that come up and hide the planter but I am just thinking of something that could perhaps show itself and have that green ceramic style be really part of the façade and not just in one place. I just wanted to throw that out. I'm not prescribing in any way. I feel very confident the applicant will come back with more details and understand their proposal even better at a future date. On Emerson, as we turn the corner, my thought is... and I know that it was presented previously, but forgive me because now I see the fence and walls. Wall type one and fence type five, and fence type four, I think that on this campus will all the landscape details I'm so grateful that the gate type A, B, C, and D and fence type one, two, and three -- well, fence type one and two -- are really these historic and you have the type that holds together very well. It's all that tube steel and it sits on top of the brick. In fence type three, you've added these other types of vertical fence. I just hesitate with the horizontality that's introduced with the acoustical wall and the fence type five and fence type four. However, I know that it only occurs in very small places. Whenever you see a fence or a wall it really is, for me, part of the landscape but it goes together landscape and architecture at a pedestrian scale. I think it's an opportunity again to think about how the whole palette is coming together in a way that's cohesive but with enough variation that it reflects this old and new. I know it's a concrete wall, and it's an acoustical wall that's going to shield the sound for the pool. I'm wondering if maybe those verticals and horizontals should be married a little bit further in terms of that fence wall type. I vote for the vertical in looking at the historical fence again and bringing that forward. By note, this is kind of a small comment, in a way, but I just want to put it out there for the rest of the Board to weigh in and for the applicant to consider for when they came back in, I believe, early November. The final comment that I had was really just in terms of the landscape that we see on Emerson Street. I guess we just don't have all the landscape quite yet in terms of when I looked at the plans. I'm curious to see what happens in terms of the final landscape plans with the fence. Also, I think that -- forgive me if I missed it -- I didn't see the landscape plans. What I see only is from the March drawings link that was sent in terms of the houses. I just want to make sure what's going to be happening with the park lawn and the houses. I think that's what we're waiting for in early November. I will pass it on. I am happy to continue this project to a date certain, I believe it was early November. I want to thank you for this application.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Grace. David, can we go to you next?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, okay. My take is fairly different from Grace's here. I think the more major concern from the last time we met was that we have an unrelenting building along Kellogg and we we're looking for some changes to that. I'd like to take a step back first and talk about how the process has worked its way through with the planning of this whole project. It really began with the removal of the art building, the reduction in the Bryant Building, opening up the space between the future Bryant Building

and the Gunn Administrative Building, and creating that porch between the Bryant Building and the Kellogg Building. There is an openness to the campus from the Bryant side that certainly is a radical improvement to the scheme. It appears that that is the major place of entry for the campus entirely, with the Kellogg entry being the rather minor portion of that. To go back to the planning once again, the planning's have created a classroom building which is really three-stories high. Two of the stories are above-grade, one of them is entirely below-grade. There have been remedial ideas as to how to bring daylight into the spaces below. But I asked the architect a question just how many classrooms there are and we never have received really, really good section to the Kellogg Building where are all of these classrooms, and private rooms, and offices, and meeting rooms, et cetera are going to be. I note that on one section, only one section of this lower level, there are high windows that allow natural light into the basement area. I'm really concerned about the way in which that is accomplished. I know there's been a tremendous effort here to create borrowed light into the basement but that's a program that's approximately one-third of the entire classroom program happening below-grade. Understandable that the functions that happen in the cellar, like the music rooms or art rooms or whatever -- music rooms in particular -- can function rather well in the cellar but where there are so many other offices and meeting rooms and socializing spaces, and classrooms, which wasn't defined for us, I'm concerned that natural light and natural ventilation isn't happening in those spaces. Normally, that is not something that we would concern ourselves about so much because it's not our responsibility and we're talking about aesthetics here, but I think it's an important aspect to this building. I am bothered by the fact that there are three feet more height potential to this building where it could be raised three feet and more natural light brought down, more natural ventilation through the use of areaways and et cetera from the perimeter so that you really aren't doing it to borrow light. I am certainly willing to look at this more to see how that borrowed light is really looking, and I wish it had been presented to us in greater detail because I really feel that's an important aspect to this project. We're concerned if we think about our normal purposes, our findings; enhancing the desirability of living conditions is one of them. I know it applies to residential mostly but in this case its sort of like residential. These are school kids that are there all day long and they need to have borrowed light, they need to have natural light. It would have to be proven to me that it is effective. That all of the aspects of borrowed light into that basement... one-third of the entire program. Then, of course, the more major concern that I still have is that despite the fact that there are these sets and breaks in the volume of the Kellogg Street façade, it is a very, very long façade. It's almost 400 feet long, or something like that. It's six or more railroad cars in length. I'm respectful for the concern that the neighbors had that they're looking at something which is one long unrelenting building form. It seems to me that having spent this much effort on the Bryant Street side to create an entry into the campus, that there would've been some way to break up the volume of the Kellogg Street side and create an entry, and perhaps, an actual breakup of that volume itself, more or less, towards the middle of the Circle so there would be an additional, kind of, way in which students could get in and out. I am not so sure that the neighbors along Kellogg are going to be interested in that but in terms of just access to the campus and access to the functions that happen on this campus, I think it's important to create as much penetration as possible. You are doing it along the Bryant Street side. Clearly, all of the vans will come in into the parking lot on the Emerson Street side, and you have then that opportunity to create a break in the volume on the Kellogg Street side and provide that as a way of things getting in. You know, if you really look at that whole length of Kellogg Street, people could park along there. They likely will park along there and that will be a significant delivery location for students, and it would be a tremendous relief for the garage as well because the garage is not an easy access to the campus. You're down a level; you go down again; you go through a tunnel; you have a staircase that's 20 feet high to get you to grade; you're still not into the campus at that point. Therefore, the Kellogg Street side... and this is obviously a PTC issue, but it's something that affects the architecture as well. I don't think it's adequately accomplished on that side of the campus. I think it could be done in such a way that it, again, sort of mirrors the entry to the Gunn Building and creates a scale to it but breaks down the scale of the building on the Kellogg Street side. I am actually pleased that the Circle has been reduced. I can understand the school's memory image of this being a very important space. I think traditions like that are, of course, significant. I think the fact that it is being retained is a nice idea. I think events that will happen there that is the space after all for the entire school but why does it have to have a vehicle circulation plan around it? Why can't vehicles be kept out and it simply a pedestrian space? I would think that the landscaping would improve significantly if it reduced the amount of circulation around the center Circle and made it more landscaping and more related to the use of pedestrians in that area. I want to go back on one item here. I think it's possible to raise the building along Kellogg Street. I'll go

back on that because if that happens I see a whole different transition into the campus. Raising it up enough to bring light down to the basement, coming through at an upper level, coming out onto areas which overlook the center in a better way, and its amore dynamic campus at this point raise dup just slightly. I don't think you would lose the formality and the scale that you're trying to achieve at the Bryant Street corner, but you would improve, definitely, the light and life of the Kellogg Street building and the Bryant Street building by providing the possibility of more direct light down to the basement area. In terms of the mass, it's very important to create a break in the 400 foot long Kellogg Street elevation. The break that is now a connection through with the green tile, et cetera... you know, let's not talk about materials until we solve the issue of really creating a connection on the campus that really makes sense. I don't see it making sense unless you raise the building to an allowable FAR, to an allowable height of the building and I think it's 33 feet. It's now 30 feet. It could be raised to 33 feet. At present, in fact, the building is 34 feet, six in height. Thirty-three feet is a reasonable raising of the building and providing more light to the cellar, and creating this upper level/lower level, and providing another major entry along Kellogg Street that will access the program of the building in an appropriate area and change the volume of the Kellogg Street facade. I have a few more items to talk about here. I appreciate all Grace's details about the fencing, about the perimeter, and about the trees. I think that the change in the parking to preserve more of the trees is a good idea. I do believe that there's an attempt to really deal with the trees of the entire lot. I really appreciate the parking garage, which I think is a tremendous value to the school. It gets the cars off the street in the perimeter. It gets them into a location where they can be unaffecting the neighborhood and get them there as efficiently as possible. I like the parking garage. I think it really works. I'm just happy with the connection through to the campus. There's an elevator and staircase immediately as you get under the utility easement. Then you come up at the corner of the campus but you're not really there yet. It interferes with an open area that connects from the Circle to the playing field. I really think it should be a tunnel all the way through to the center and connect up with a staircase that gets you right there to the center of the campus. They can keep the passageway through. This is a detail, I'll admit, but it would be possible that it'd work the way it is but it just seems more appropriate that we create a connection from the parking garage directly to the campus center for everybody. Then come up to grade at that point. Other than that, personally, I think that the swimming pool is not really solved that well here (inaudible) sunken into the ground down at a lower level. There's an attempt to create a sound barrier between the neighborhood. I don't think it is really is going to do that. I think the sound is going to bounce off the gym wall and you will hear it all over the place. I know we didn't get there today but I think that the issue of the park that you see in the site plans to date, and then the question of what happens with the Lockey House and the historical issues ought to be addressed. I personally think it's important that the campus use that area. My preference would be that this swimming pool goes there. That it can be put in a structure that hovers over it, perhaps that's also true in its present location that there could be a structure over it that really contains it. A glass structure of some sort that contains it that isn't just a wall on the perimeter. That's an important aspect to this. The neighborhood may not be aware of it but at some point, the sound penetration for all of Emerson Street isn't going to work. I don't think it's going to work. I mean, you'd have to show me that it would work, but a soundproof wall, to me, doesn't do it. Then, will the structure over the top of it, a glass enclosure... and perhaps create an area for the swimming pool that separates that function from the neighborhood. Just a couple of more things. I guess the Lockey and the sound. I guess I really covered all of mine. I want to go back a little bit here because we certainly find the neighborhood's opinions to be very useful, some of them. Questions of Kellogg Street elevation I think would be answered by even more of a breakup of the form of the building. Personally, I think there are other ways in which we could use the historical in which the Gunn Building is built with a stucco in the base and the shingles on the top so that there is a contrast between the planes that are more of a plainer quality, like the stucco proportions of the base and less of the shingle siding combination. I find that doing both of those together is pushing the envelope of natural feeling (inaudible). It isn't really at all in keeping the way the original Gunn Building is built. I like the way in which there's a stucco portion to the building and a shingle portion of that building. It strikes me that that's more in the form of an institutional building in form that has more of a residential feel to it, as well. It's a combination of institutional and residential but I think it really worked well. I think you need to have more of a contrast of materials on the outside. I would like to suggest that you work with that. I also find that the Gunn Building has a cornice that is green. I think that just a plainer wall that's green is not as effective as if you took the entire upper level of the overhanging loops and continued the idea of the green element on the perimeter of the building. That certainly would mirror the Gunn Building as well. That would carry the

character through using a plainer wall that's green because it references the Gunn Building and isn't as useful as trying to do what the Gunn Building does and use that green as a linear element at the top of the building. I think that would be more effective. I honestly think that there were a couple of different looks at the Bryant Street sides and some of the green was carried into the elevations and I liked it very much. I didn't see (inaudible). Just to recap a little bit, eliminate the (inaudible), increase the landscaping in the courtyard, break up the volume of the building along Kellogg, create two separate elements out of it somewhat, create a new entry onto Kellogg, allow the student body to enter more into the center of Kellogg and through to the courtyard, maintain the separation between and Kellogg and the courtyard where all the activity will happen. I don't think it's a problem with affecting the neighborhood if you simply have an entry into that (inaudible) activities of the courtyard should not affect the Kellogg Street residents. That's really it. I'm done.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, David. Those were very insightful comments. Alex Lew, would you care to go next, please?

Board Member Lew: First of all, I wanted to thank everybody for sending in the email comments. I did read all of the ones that arrived up until last night. I didn't read the ones that arrived this morning, though, but thank you for all of those. There were some interesting points in them. Then, thank you for the revisions to the project. I did look at those. I generally have positive feedback regarding them. I did, though, find them hard to review but I still think we're on the second hearing and we still haven't really seen a complete landscape and/or complete building plans. We are going into the third hearing, really, without all of the information that we would normally receive with an application. I find it a little bit frustrating but thank you to the staff. I think everything was clear. I think generally my comments are more similar to Board Member Lee. I do like David's comments. I think they do really raise a lot of problems. It seems to me like raising the floor height to allow more light to the lower level would typically trigger counting the basement as square footage in Palo Alto. Typically, once you go above three feet above grade then you count the basement as a whole story. I think that that's going to open up a huge can of worms. Also, there is a height limit. That's going to be another point of contention as going over the height limit. Then the building would be really a lot taller than the neighboring buildings. I think it's intriguing but it seems to me it's going to be very difficult to achieve. On the Kellogg Street façade, I do like the revisions, although I did see that the neighbors who live directly across the street do prefer the two-story continuous wall. I guess I'm leaning towards Board Member Lee's point about maybe having an additional accent wall or something. I think it could use one more visual break. It doesn't have to be a complete building break. One additional break I think would go a long way to breaking the scale. I would also consider if there is anything that you could do with modifying the overhangs or if there is some sort of very small mechanical screen for the (inaudible, and maybe there can be variation in there just to provide more variety on the Kellogg façade. The Bryant façade I think is looking really good. I think the addition of the porch works really well. I still do have concerns planting so many Oak Trees in the spaces between the buildings. I think on the Emerson Street façade I'm also thinking similarly to Board Member Lee. I am a little bit worried about the fence. I think it's fairly long. I'm looking for variations in there. The section that you showed at the pool with the landscape I think is looking good and the berm -- I think there's a new berm in there -- from what I can tell so far it looks good. I haven't really seen the whole design. I am generally in support of the parking garage. I know it is a big issue with the neighbors. I do recall why Palo Alto restricted garages in the basements of houses. My recollection is it was the house on Waverley that was one of the firsts that had the big ramp going to the garage; it was the ramp in the side yard that was really a concern from the community. I think in this particular case it can work. I think the added benefit is that the parking is underground. All of the lighting that you would have in a surface parking lot is all down below-grade. All of the noise that you get when people are doing the drop-offs is down below-grade so it will be quieter. I think there are numerous things that benefit with the garage. If there is like synthetic turf above the roof I think I would like to see that in the next hearing. I am still interested in the tree mitigation with the replacement trees and where those are located. I do want to see a full landscape plan, especially around the edges of the project along the sidewalk. The original scheme showed a very large number of shrubs, like Chokeberry and even bigger and I didn't really understand where those were. If those were along the sidewalk or of those were along the building, but it has a dramatic impact on how the neighbors would see the project. I just really just don't have any sense for where those are. Then, also, the screening; I think I just want to remind the neighbors what Palo Alto

normally does is require the structures that hold up the panels have to be within the height limit. Amy, please correct me if I'm wrong. Then, the panels themselves are less restricted. Normally in these commercial zones, you can get a little bit of extra height for mechanical screening. Maybe there is some way we can look at that or consider that on for this particular project. I did see something in the architectural section that was shown today. One last item, a minor item that I had, is the staircase at the Gunn Building. I think I recall there was a lighting metric plan in one of the sets somewhere. I didn't review it but the exterior stairs I think are nice except at nighttime because the emergency lighting that you have to use that is required can be very unattractive at night. I think we should take a look at that in the next hearing. I will go through that but I do think we should look at the cut sheets for that fixture. I think that's all I have. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex, very nice comments. Osma, your turn.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thank you. I'm also going to express my gratitude to staff and the applicant. I would concur with Board Members Lew's note that having a conformed set would really help. Disclaiming a lot of the stuff that we've reviewed is a bit hodgepodge and just having something complete and whole to look at will be really great for the next hearing. I also really appreciate all of the public comments that we received, especially the comment that really talked about the architecture and really focused on the architecture. Believe it or not, I feel like in my whole time serving on the Board I haven't really seen this level of public response as it relates specifically to the architecture. I really appreciate that. It definitely gave me -- and I'm sure a lot of my Board Members -- a bit more to chew on in terms of the perspectives. I really appreciate that. I'm going to respond to some of the things that some of my other Board Members have mentioned and then circle back. I tend to agree with Board Member Lee and Board Member Lew for the most part in terms of their commentary. I actually disagree with a lot with what Board Member Hirsch had to say on some items. Sorry, David. Specifically, like the suggestion of using stucco on the building.

Board Member Hirsch: I didn't say stucco. I didn't say that just the materials.

Vice Chair Thompson: Right. I think the materiality of the project as it is right now does appear to be very compatible while pushing the envelope. It's bringing something new to Palo Alto that is really beautiful and I think that is important. For the Kellogg façade, I do appreciate the setback that happened. I did see the comment about the concern about the acoustics with that change in massing. I do think it would be worth the applicant bringing their acoustical consultant just to explain. My understanding is if the noise is happening at a certain level and the barrier is at a certain height, even if there's a building on the other side, it should be -- in terms of the noisemaker and the noise receiver -- fine. It would be good to get confirmation from the acoustical consultant. I think also the materials chosen, the shingle and the wood, have articulation to them that it would break up the sound more than if it was a flat wall. I think in terms of the acoustic concerns... the acoustical fence that goes along Emerson, I hear the concerns of Board Member Lew and Board Member Lee on that and I don't think we have actually received very good visuals for what Emerson looks like with the new fence... not with the new fence but with the project alternative. It is possible that that could be really unrelenting, and I even have questions about fence number three in terms of its articulation if that is appropriate. Just to see that I would agree that a vertical expression might be more appropriate than a horizontal but it's hard to know without seeing the design intent. Additionally, I did notice in the materials palette the Okawood as indicated to happen in the glazing. I was planning on asking the applicant to really point out where that's happening on the facades but I think just might be better if that just happens when this comes back to us. In the renderings, it's really hard to tell where that's happening. Some clarification of how that material is used throughout the façade would be really helpful because right now in a lot of the renderings it just looks like clear glass and the wood. I do appreciate the details for the painted balconies and I appreciate on Kellogg the choice to swap out the metal with the shingles. I think that is a positive choice. I did not get to see the green tile in person. I think I probably found out about that too late but, again, I'll look forward to that at the next hearing. I think that might be most of it. I do have a question about the historical building façade. Just with that quick image that we saw on the presentation in the staff report the picture of what it looked like historically and the new doesn't look very similar. I don't know that it needs to be but it looks pretty blank right now and I'm wondering if that might be a problem. Maybe just a bit more clarification on what's happening there. I think I will leave my notes there for now.

Chair Baltay: Great, Thank you very much, Osma. Thanks to everybody for their comments. I've been struggling with this project and trying to put my finger on why. I spent some time the other day just sort of driving up and down streets a block and two blocks away approaching the school looking at it. I am finding that I just can't feel that it is compatible with the neighborhood somehow. I am beginning to think maybe it has to do with the design style. I have given a lot of thought to that and I think that while Palo Alto enjoys many distinctive contemporary residential designs their overall effect on the character of a neighborhood is modulated by the size. The R-1 zoning standard wisely limits the size of any single development whose result is an interesting and attractive eclecticism reflecting the character of the whole town; blending old and new, large and small, Birge Clark with Joseph Eichler. Unfortunately, the project before us is consistently large and different from the surrounding homes such that it overwhelms the neighborhood, disrupting the delicate balance that gives such character and charm to the community. I wrote that down but I think that's the core of what I'm thinking is that I don't mind different architectural styles -- I think Palo Alto's done great by having different architecture styles -- but we're missing the fact that when you let a single building in a residential neighborhood become this large of the same architectural style it's no longer an eclectic charm and adding character to the community. It overwhelms the community. It overwhelms the neighborhood. That was abundantly clear driving up and down Kellogg, and Bryant, and Emerson approaching the school. There is this beautiful rhythm of all different kinds of houses and I'm sure like all different kinds of people in town. Then all of a sudden this single, large building looms, and I am really bothered by that. I think the massing is too homogenous. I especially think that has to do with the roof treatment. I think the plainer modulations of the facade are nice, and I'll come to the materials in a second, but the consistent 400-foot long by 12 or 15-inch wide fascia board is just inappropriate in my mind. I'm really going to insist on seeing some kind of pitched roof forms, break in the shapes. I think breaking the mass of the building is a good thing, although it brings in some acoustical questions. I think you could do more of that, but really when you look at these facades and look at them next to the Gunn Building, or others buildings across the street, the fact that the roof is a flat, continuous plane, a single fascia of that length, I think it's the single most difficult thing to accept. I just think we need some sort of change to the way the roofs are formed in order for this to be acceptable and that it fits into the community. I find that the materials as they stands are really beautiful, and attractive, and they do harken back to the historically nature of other buildings on the campus and in the community. I didn't see the ceramic tiles in person but I can imagine they work nicely. Grace made some interesting points about incorporating that further. The architects wanting to use the old doors from the school, all of that is good stuff, but when you put 400 feet of the same good stuff and treat it exactly the same all the way down the line it's just too much. It's too much not that it wouldn't be great in a field on a 20-acre campus but it's too much for a neighborhood. It just overwhelms what's there now. People might argue that what's there now is doing the same thing and to some degree it is. It's weathered; it is staged. We're all used to it but I put it to my colleagues on the Board that that's not a standard we can aspire to just because it's what's there now. I think this is incumbent upon us to find a solution that respects the community and blends in with residential neighborhood. We see all these zoning challenges, all of these questions that come up and they are complicated. There are lawyers and planners, and planning commissions working to resolve the garage in a zoning neighborhood. How do you count FAR in an industrial building in a residential neighborhood? Well, we're architects, and the architectural issue is how do you fit a large institutional building into a dense and established residential neighbor. I think you do with a little more variety; a little more variation; a little more difference in the style. Not just one thing all the way down the line. I support other comments we've made about other things like the fences, the use of the parking garage, et cetera, but to me, the issue will hinge on the treatment of the building forms along Kellogg Street and along Bryant Street. I think in particular it involves changing the roof forms to some degree or another. I just want to be super clear that that's my position on that. I hope I can gather some support from other Board Members that I think that's what has to change. That long single linear fascia is just really ruining it for me. That's the end of my opinion comments on this but I'm concerned about the process here. We've been through two hearings already. We still haven't seen a full set of drawings of this project. Staff has explained correctly that they just haven't received them from the applicant because there's just so much feedback and people and parties that play here describing what's going on. Without a full set of drawings, we're just not able to really look into this. For example the fence on Emerson, several Board Members have very legitimate concerns about that and we don't even have a design for it. Traditionally we're stuck to three reviews of these projects. If we get back in November, which means the applicant has two weeks to respond to these comments, another package, even with a full set of drawings

and it's just not enough time to possibly address these concerns. I feel I will be compelled to then push to have the project denied rather than continued because I risk continuing a project that's already on its third go-around. I'm just being really clear with staff. I've raised this privately and to my colleagues on the Board that this project is being pushed and there is changes in the architecture that are not being addressed as seriously as I believe they need to be. We're not being given a full set of drawings and an explanation of what's really being proposed. I caution the architect and staff that we need to really understand and have presented to us what is being proposed, and I would really encourage the architect to take enough time to really feel confident that you've addressed our concerns and fully can garner our full support. Any other comments from other Board Members given what everybody else has said?

Board Member Lee: Peter, if I may, I'd love to just address some of MY fellow Board Member's...

Chair Baltay: Please, go ahead.

Board Member Lee: ...comments and also this issue of incomplete, and just clarify some of my comments. I actually really appreciate the Board's comments. I feel like there is a consensus between us. There is a commonality that we do feel there are a few things missing. If we talk about what's missing and know that the applicant has provided quite a bit of information but it seems like we are reacting, from what I heard, is to the missing landscape plan, right, and something that we can digest that really understands the edge on Emerson, Kellogg, and Bryant. Given that our task is to continue this item, I think there is consensus that we all want to continue to a date certain early November. My feeling is that the applicant could come forward with what is asked. Then, I just wanted to go back to Peter's comments, and also to David's. Thank you so much. I don't agree and respectfully disagree in terms of the amount of change that is needed. In my comments in the past two meetings, just to reiterate -- or maybe it just didn't come through -- my feeling is that the biggest concern was really that Kellogg Street elevation. The change that has been made in terms of a break that is now one-story with a railing and a change in material, color, and depth, to me, is very much in line with what I was hoping that the applicant might come forward with. I do not feel like there's an issue in terms of neighborhood compatibility. I am very happy to make the finding that the overall project is very much compatible with the neighborhood. I so appreciate your comments, Peter, in terms of really looking at the neighborhood. I have myself spent a lot of time walking in this neighborhood and driving. I appreciate the mix of historic, and modern, and contemporary. My feeling is what the applicant has proposed -- and I am sorry it didn't come out more clearly in my previous comments and today -- is that they've actually presented something that is not large, that is not different, and that respects of what was there before. It is actually smaller in scale in many of the edges than what is there now. I do not feel like it disrupts or overwhelms the neighborhood. I actually feel like it is very quiet. Castilleja has been a gem. It's modest in scale and it blends in. I do understand your comment regarding the roof and fascia; however, from a pedestrian and vehicular perspective, I believe there is enough variation and plane. Then the drops where it significantly drops from multiple stories down to a one-story with a railing, for example on that longest façade, I do feel that there is relief on Emerson as well as Bryant with the entry porch along Bryant Street. Then on Emerson, I do want to revisit my comments. I do believe that maybe there is something to be done to that acoustical wall, which is really a small pedestrian scale wall that I believe this applicant could achieve something great in varying the treatment of that wall and just an overall fence... how does it all come together? My comments were related more to even something that could go to a subcommittee. Sometimes we approve projects where there are small things that come back to a subcommittee that are at the level of a fence detail or something that has changed. I want to go back to Board Member Osma's comments in terms of the materiality. It does, for me also, seem very compatible to the neighborhood. I feel that the template of materials -- I don't feel strongly about the roof being overwhelming or too much -- and the fact that it is varied on what is existing and historic is very positive. It is something that I just wanted to revisit. I would love to hear from other Board Members.

Chair Baltay: I think this is great, Osma, that we're having this discussion. This is exactly what the ARB should be looking at. I fundamentally disagree with you that the roof is great at the height it is. I think you're correct, the massing of this building is fine. It easily masses in with the rest of the neighborhood. The materials are becoming really quite wonderful. It's going to be great. There is a lot of thought and a lot of things fitting together, but to me, it's just the continuous warm contemporary style and the continuous

flat roof doesn't work. What does everybody else think? Do we have any more discussions? This is the crutch of the matter, I think.

Vice Chair Thompson: I can jump in, or, actually, why don't you jump in, Alex, and I can jump in after you.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Vice Chair Thompson: After hearing everybody's perspectives, I would say that I agree mostly with Board Member Lee. I think that the massing was responded to. I don't know about pitched or slanted roofs. I don't know that that's appropriate for this building at all. In terms of massing, I think the applicant appropriately responded to what we asked for. I do think that the small scale articulation... I don't see a problem with that across the length of the street because it does actually change. It's not the same thing the whole way. If you look at the Kellogg elevation the design isn't stamped across the whole way. There are modulations and changes across the whole façade. Maybe there is an opportunity for a little roof break but honestly, I can make the finding with the design as it is and with the materials as chosen, assuming that the green tile works. I think it probably will but I would still like to see it. I would say I would disagree with the notion that the massing needs to change. Alex, is your microphone working now?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, great.

Board Member Lew: Historically, I have voted no on projects that had very long facades even if they had a lot of modulation and articulation. I've looked at those buildings now that they have been completed now, right, and I still feel the same way about most of those, especially when they are over 350 to 400 feet like 195 Page Mill Road, which is on Park Boulevard. I think that is a really good example. It just doesn't really fit in well with the neighborhood, despite all of their best intentions. I am always looking for more variation and visual breaks. It doesn't have to be a complete break in the building. I think I am in the middle from what I have heard from the other Board Members. I am right in the middle of trying to figure out if its compatible or not. I really need to see the landscape with the building. It doesn't have to be in perspective. I can read plans. Say, for example, many of the large houses in old Palo Alto have hedges right at the back of the sidewalk and you really don't see very much of the buildings at all and this could be the case in this particular project or not. I haven't really seen much. We've just seen little flashes of perspectives in the presentations but nothing is in the packet. I really can't make any determination whatsoever based on the very limited information that we have.

Board Member Hirsch: That leaves me. I don't agree that we should try to look more like the neighborhood. My feeling is just the opposite. We should look more like a school, which it is. In terms of the massing, the breakdown in scale to a one-story piece that disconnects the area that the part of the building that is on Bryant and really around the corner doesn't do enough for me. Again, I really feel something else could happen in the middle of the building. Something different happens from one end to the other quite well with the module of a 12-foot height glazed areas and (inaudible) in the middle. The overhang that happens at the top of both ends is really rather successful. Where it falls apart is in the middle, in my opinion. There should be something, I think, that connects it to the middle of the campus in the middle of the building here which would change the scale and break up the monotony of the rest of the 250 or 300 feet to the left of the one-story building. I am looking at that elevation right now. I just think that is a missing element; some piece of the building that just (inaudible) or something that's happening beyond this modulated wall that's really significant on the inside and breaks up that volume. It breaks up that volume to create an entry point. I think the modern idiom here is pretty good. I like the (inaudible) the windows can flow along the outside based on functionality. But I think you could change that with an element in the middle that would connect you to the center. None of my fellow Board Members here agree with this but I would love to see it tried in some way. You would then have a major piece that (inaudible) that maybe realize that you're entering there into something that is really in the middle of the building. It's a very causal entry on Bryant Street. Then it causally comes around and connects in with that recess. I don't think that's perfecting or I don't think it's... I think you could go back up to the full height somehow

with one element to break up the middle of the rest of the building here and have a better formal relationship as a project. That would be enough for me because I think the rest of the idioms are fine. Material wise I kind of like the original piece. The original elevations (inaudible) of the balcony element there. I don't quite know why it couldn't come a little bit further forward even (inaudible) next to it. (inaudible) n the inside. Why isn't that really moving (inaudible) visual planting area. (Inaudible) you can use it as a balcony. In sum, I think I would like to see -- I don't think any other Board Member agrees with me --something that happens that really breaks the volume in that. I think that's important. As to the linearity and the casualness in which the window is actually following the functions of the inside somehow, I think that's quite successful, especially from the middle of the building to the far left (inaudible) to the corner of Emerson.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, David. I think what I'm hearing is there's not a whole lot of support from my comment about the roof changing. I can appreciate that. I hear a strong sense that the material selections themselves seem to be going on the right direction. Then, I don't hear much support for David's idea of breaking the buildings completely for a second entrance along Kellogg. If I am misstating and anyone else thinks that's really a positive change that we should push for I should hear that because otherwise what I am hearing is some consensus or middle ground with more changes to the Kellogg elevation could be helpful. Alex, you stated you thought you were in the middle. Are you able to perhaps put words to that? I want to be sure we give the applicant good feedback that as a Board we can support so we don't redo this discussion again. Grace and Osma seem happy with the way it is, more or less, but, Alex, how would you counsel the applicant to make changes that might get them through do you think? Can you answer that?

Board Member Lew: I would say that I think in my mind that the amount of change that happened between this meeting and the last meeting, in my mind, it needs one more level of change. That increment of change, and, for me, it could be in the roof, as well. Although, Peter, I think part of their issue is the height limit. I would support modifying the overhang and fascia to provide variation. I don't think...

(crosstalk)

Board Member Lew: ...Osma's or Grace's, it's just that I think it's really important, to me, breaking up the façade and its really critical.

Chair Baltay: Should there be another break in the second-story of the building the way they added one someplace down the line? Sort of halfway what David is suggesting?

Board Member Lew: I don't want to [distortion]. It may just be a material change or change in plane having -- I don't know what they're doing about public artwork -- some sort of visual element that provides a break in the façade.

Vice Chair Thompson: May I jump in?

Chair Baltay: Of course. Please, don't ask.

Vice Chair Thompson: I can understand breaking up the façade a little bit more. I agree with Board Member Lew's comment that maybe the level of change that happened between now and then could happen between now and the next meeting. For David's comment on connecting in the center, I could see myself supporting that if it was done well. I can kind of see how that might break up the façade. I don't know if there's a security issue necessarily about controlling entries and exits around the school but I can see one thing when I'm looking at the updated Kellogg elevation is just that it doesn't have a lot of connectivity, right? It's just a wall that has windows but there is no actual pedestrian in and out it seems on the Kellogg side. I can see adding that somewhere. I think Board Member Lew's comment about adding public art or something a bit more visually interesting, there is currently an updated Kellogg elevation. There is one part of the elevation that is just the shingle wall that goes all the way and that could potentially become really blank and really difficult to look at. I would encourage the applicant on the choice of the green tile is good. Given that we are repurposing the historic doors that has even a smaller

level of detail, I might encourage the applicant to choose a tile that has an even finer detail than the one that we've seen so far just to keep with that. I think it would also add more visual interest along Kellogg. In summary, I think I could support massing changes to break it up along with David's comment to put something in the middle. Like Board Member Lew, I don't really want to dictate exactly where that should go but perhaps another change would be preferable and more visually interesting on this façade.

Chair Baltay: Can we bring the architect on board here to get their opinion on what they might suggest even? I know it just expands this discussion but it's so important that we give them clear feedback. Vinh, is it possible for the project architect to come on board and comment on what he's heard?

Mr. Nguyen: What's his name?

Ms. French: Adam is available right here.

Chair Baltay: I've said to my colleagues I think that'd be a good idea to have Adam respond to our concerns about the elevation along Kellogg Street. Is it possible to make another round of changes similar in magnitude to what you just did?

Adam Woltag: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: This is a really informal conversation at this point. I'd really like to just hear what you think.

Adam Woltag: As an architect, these are the conversations you live for when you get a chance to talk about a design that you've been working on for years and taking all the input and putting it out for others to digest and also respond to, and I will note, make better. I think specifically to touch on what you said, Alex, I appreciate that and also how about we have made these changes since the last meeting. I think they are appropriate and we've really tried to respond to the committee's request. About the Kellogg Street elevation, it has always been our design intent that the elevational strategy of this building is defabric and wraps this campus in a very, I'm going to say, appropriate language. It's not a figural elevational strategy. We're not trying to create figure along that elevation, especially behind that incredibly mature and beautiful trees that really set the character of Kellogg. It's a quieter elevational approach, which I think might be interpreted as lacking figure, and that's exactly what we've been trying to do from the very beginning. To create something that we think modulates daylight in a way that creates interest and beauty; applying a material palette that is warm and that will age really nicely, we think. It won't have to be painted every year but something that has a natural experience that reflects the neighborhood as well as historic resources on the campus. That elevational fabric is really about modulating a few things. It's about trying to bring great daylight into these teaching spaces for students and faculty. It's about bringing in air. I appreciate some of the comments about natural ventilation. I remember Hirsch you were bringing that up and I just want to let everybody know we are focused on all of these windows being operable to help allow...

Chair Baltay: Adam, we are trying to have a discussion about what we were talking about which is the massing and potential modulation and potential changes. I don't want you to spin us on what's good about the building. We can see that but we have a very finite amount of time that we can put into this. Can you help us with that discussion, please?

Adam Woltag: Absolutely.

Board Member Hirsch: The direction you're going I think we'll get there eventually. Personally, I think I'd like to hear it out because it is after all your design and you're talking about it to the extent that you can maybe abbreviate it (inaudible).

Adam Woltag: I'll go point by point. I think raising the building is something that we don't feel comfortable about. We're trying to keep the elevation low to respect the neighborhood.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Adam Woltag: I think creating another entrance along Kellogg in an effort to break up the elevation provides challenges to security, and, also, I think we're trying to create a hierarchy of entrances. I think the Bryant Street elevation is the entrance. We want to focus visitors around that. In creating a larger more celebrated one we're not that comfortable with. I think we feel the one on Bryant is most appropriate. Adding pitched roofs, to us, just doesn't feel appropriate to the architectural character and style. The roof here is about creating energy and I think we have photovoltaics up there and we're trying to hide them and reduce the impact of those photovoltaics on the neighborhood. We think a flat roof that conceals those things appropriately gives the school the most flexibility around that. Creating more porosity through to the center of the campus, that's going to start to really put some pressure on the acoustics. That is why that wall is very important. We feel it is doing exactly what it needs to do. Creating more breaks actually breaks up the interior functions of the building. There's a flow that the school wants, right, between the middle school, between the science, and between the high school. Students move through those in a very, very, very choreographed way. If we start punching holes through that wall just to create porosity, we start to break that flow. There's an interior life to this campus that ties into education and experience of education and how they want to deliver education. That continuity is very, very important to the school. That reflects, obviously, on how we're letting daylight in which we have spent a lot of time talking about. I'll pause right there, Peter, if there's anything else you think I've missed.

Chair Baltay: I think you are making very good points. Those are quite legitimate what you're saying and I think all of us sense that some of these things are a bigger deal than we want to push on. You haven't really said well this is what I can do to address what seems to be a majority of the Board's concern. The facade is just too long at the same mass and scale. What can you do? Is there some sort of modulation or change of material or a little bit of height change you can do to break some of it up? Is there anything else you can think of? I know you have to think about this more but...

Adam Woltag: This is not a small question. It is something to think about. I will say I thought the comments from Member Lee about bringing more craft -- I think, Osma, you were saying the same thing -- and color, and detail to the ground level on the first floor where people are walking by is going to help break up where there has been a lot of comments about the massiveness, or the imposing nature of this elevation, which we don't feel at all by the way. I think bringing more material and color could help. It's something we could study a little bit more. Is there anything else we can do to try to reduce that impact around there? Those are things I think are very appropriate and we'd love to study.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you, Adam. That's all for Adam. Thank you, Vinh. You can turn him off again so we can keep with the Board here. Do we have any comments from the board? We need to give some conclusion to this on where we want them to go. Are we satisfied with his comments about not being able to put additional breaks in the building?

Board Member Lee: Thank you, Peter, for allowing the applicant to respond. To be productive, I really appreciated the applicant's comments in terms of understanding their constraints and just what would be sacrificed and some of the motivations behind decisions. Our rule here is really to give comments and continue to early November. There is some disagreement and I think that they've taken note of our comments and we spent three hours, and I feel like we should move forward and allow the applicant to digest those comments. Asking the applicant to respond on the spot is asking a lot. I think we should move on.

Chair Baltay: Okay, everybody else feel the same? Alex, you're nodding your head. Yeah?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I've heard this issue of massing that we've talked a lot about. I've heard real concern from almost everybody regarding the Emerson Street set of detail and stuff, and we just want to see more information about that. David had brought up two items. I want to be sure we're not trying to push further on. One is regarding the connection from the parking garage into the campus, whether we should push them harder to change that. I don't hear a lot of appetite, David, from anybody else about that issue. It's not that I don't think it has merit but (inaudible) to my concerns.

Board Member Hirsch: May I speak to that a little bit because I'll take a close look at the elevator staircase coming up and what it does to the space that connects the campus to the playing field there. It's a fairly wide-open space now but it can be a very constricted area there. I guess I could live with this in terms of that connection as the only open connection in the whole campus right now. One gets a sense that if it were connected through to the court at the center Circle area somehow, it doesn't have to be at the center of the Circle but to the perimeter there it would remain open to the field, and then it's possible you could have a gallery connection, or art, whatever, skylight feel but it would say as an open... this is a big school and now it's getting to be a bigger school. A lot of people will be moving through that area to the playing field. Not just where the people will be using it as a sports field but there will be some form of actual connection that people will use that open field as a play area. It needs to be kept as open as possible for a larger population of 500 plus in the school. I think that's worth looking at in a bit more detail in order to see if there's an alternative in that area where the staircase is right now.

Chair Baltay: I think, David, that comment has been noted. They've heard it and I just don't know if we have enough support on the Board to push more firmly for something like that right now. It's a big change to them. The other comment you've made repeatedly is regarding the concerns about daylighting in the basement. I think, at least I feel, they've addressed the daylighting pretty well. Those are going to be pretty nicely made spaces. I think it's going to work. Does anybody else on the Board share David's concern regarding a basement lighting strategy?

Vice Chair Thompson: I do not. I agree that those spaces will probably be adequately lit.

(crosstalk)

Chair Baltay: I just want to be sure we're talking about whatever everybody thinks.

Board Member Hirsch: There's a lighting diagram in the set and what it shows is that the amount of lighting that you have into that basement area is pretty limited. It's a daylight analysis plan, and it is very extensive, of course, in the upper level but it is limited to the corners where there's (inaudible) in just a few areas but there's an awful lot of classrooms that don't have any light. There's a tremendous number of spaces that are completely submerged. The whole Emerson end of the building has almost no natural light. The whole Bryant end of the building, except for one side that has clear story outside windows, it has next to no light for a whole lot of classrooms there.

Chair Baltay: Okay, I've heard your arguments, David. I appreciate what you're saying and that's not untrue. It's a matter weighing, I think, the various factors involved. Amy French, have we provided, do you think, sufficient feedback for staff and the applicant?

Ms. French: I do think that's true, that you've collectively expressed your thoughts and suggestions. I don't know that I can summarize them. I think you were trying to do that just now and you got two things that were consensus: the Kellogg massing, having some variation there, and the Emerson fencing. Of course, we want to see the conformed plans with landscaping and maybe some enhanced or enlarged landscape details, especially along the right-of-ways on all three of the streets where changes are occurring. We definitely need a motion to continue. It does not have to be to a date certain. It can be to a date uncertain.

MOTION

Chair Baltay: Okay, then I will move that we continue this to a date uncertain. Do I have a second?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: Okay, made, and seconded. Any other comments? If not, can we have a roll call vote, please, Vinh?

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lee, Lew, Thompson (5)

No:

Absent:

MOTION TO CONTINUE PASSES 5-0-0.

Ms. French: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, everyone, for indulging me. I know I seem to go on and on with this discussion. It is very hard remotely, I get it.

Board Member Hirsch: We all do.

Approval of Minutes

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for August 20, 2020

Chair Baltay: It's so hard on the architects not knowing where to go and I want to be sure we give them and staff good feedback on it. Let's just race through the rest of this and be done. Next item on our agenda is the approval of minutes. We have the Architectural Review Board meeting agenda from August 20, 2020. Any comments on those minutes? If not, can I..

Board Member Lew: I have...

Chair Baltay: Go ahead, Alex.

Board Member Lew: I have two comments. On packet page 73, it says Catherine Cowper was speaking and the minutes say Caper and it should be Cowper (Street), C-O-W-P-E-R.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex.

Board Member Lew: The second one is on package page 77, Sonali Singh had mentioned an Instagram account which is BIPOCATCASTI. It's an acronym for Black Indigenous People Of Color At Castilleja. It's spelled BIPOCATCASTI. That's it.

Chair Baltay: Would you care, Alex, to make a motion for us including your comments?

MOTION

Board Member Lew: Sure, I will move that we approve the minutes for... what's the date on those? I forgot the date?

Chair Baltay: August 20th. August 20th.

Board Member Lew: August 20th, 2020, with those two corrections.

Chair Baltay: I will second that. Can we have a vote, please, Vinh?

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lee, Lew, Thompson (5)

No:

Absent:

MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 5-0-0.

Board Members Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Baltay: Thank you. The next item is Board Member questions, comments, or announcements. Alex, do we have any progress on the North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan project?

Board Member Lew: Sure. The next meeting is going to be next week on Thursday, October 8th at 5:30. There are also projects that are happening in the plan area. These are going to go to Council for prescreening. One is a target at the Fry's building at 340 Portage. There's also a mixed-use project at 2951 El Camino, which is a five-story building. That is also going to go to the Council. They are looking to use the new planned community zone for housing. That is coming to the Council soon. I apologize I don't... oh, here. I think that's on October 5th. That's next Monday.

Chair Baltay: What am I missing, Alex? Are those related to the coordinated plan that you guys are working?

Board Member Lew: The Council resurrected the planned community zone for housing. The PC (Planned Community), sort of, circumvents a regular zoning, and then the North Ventura Plan has not been adopted or finished.

Chair Baltay: Right.

Board Member Lew: But these would be happening. Well, they haven't been committed yet, right? They're just going for prescreening but in theory, they may happen before.

Chair Baltay: Is this doing an end-run around the work of your community then over there?

Board Member Lew: Not necessarily. I think they've been following the (inaudible) all along. You could consider it end run or you could say that they're taking... they've been following it and trying to understand the spirit of the law or the spirit of the plan. It doesn't necessarily preclude future projects from happening elsewhere on the site. You guys might want to pay attention to the Council meeting next Monday. I don't know if we mentioned this before but there is also a new housing project proposed across the Street on Stanford Lands. That's not in the plan area, and that's also for the planned community zoning for housing.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex. Lastly, I would hoping that either Osma or David could give us a heads-up on the next meeting regarding the objective design standards for the zoning code.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Is there anything we should be doing to prepare ourselves for that meeting?

Ms. Gerhardt: Peter, if you don't mind I can give an intro to this and Let Osma and David take it from there.

Chair Baltay: Okay, let's keep the whole thing in less than five minutes, though, because...

Ms. Gerhardt: Yup. I have some slides prepared. We all know that given the changes in the state law we are working to strengthen our design standards to be objective standards. We have had a few public hearings with the ARB and the PTC. Staff has been working with the subcommittee, being Board Member Thompson and Board Member Hirsch. We've met with them several times over the summer to go over some draft standards. We have built a website. I have a short URL here so that you can easily get to that website. On the website, we currently have the list of guidelines to transform. Those are the existing design criteria that we're looking to transform from being subjective to objective. We hope to have out the draft new standards by early next week so that you have an extra minute to look at those. Then, of course, the staff report comes out the week before the hearing because this will be discussed at our next hearing on the 15th. We're just doing announcements today. From the subcommittee, they had suggested several topics. The full Board may want to discuss further; those could be things that you research ahead

of time. Those being base, middle, and top, that whole idea. Alex, earlier in the hearing had talked about façade length. That's something to think about. Also, height transitions; when a new building is next to an R-1 single-family or anything else what do we want those transitions to look like? There are also articulation and massing strategies. How would we maintain a nice massing, and then materials? How do we want to regulate those or not would be the question. With that, if there are other announcements but we haven't agendized this for discussion necessarily.

Chair Baltay: The question is just how can we prepare for this meeting, not to discuss the topic itself. Osma or David, do you have any other suggestions on how we could prepare for this?

Board Member Hirsch: Osma, you want to go first?

Vice Chair Thompson: Sure, yeah. I think Jodie outlines the big ones that have been major points of discussion when we have met separately. I would familiarize yourself with the findings that we have now and really ask yourself if you feel like the objective version to that sticks true to the intent. I think that's the main thing. It's also a lot of work. It's a lot of stuff to do. I would set aside a Saturday or something, a full day...

Chair Baltay: Wow.

Vice Chair Thompson: Give yourself some breaks. Maybe spread it out over two days just because it's a lot to go through. I also think it's a tricky question. There's a lot of stuff in our codes right now that are very subjective and making them objective is a tricky thing just because they are subjective. Just fair warning when you prepare for this just give yourself a lot of time. I think the document that Jodie is going to direct us to references another document with the text that is the current subjective standards. Just know that you're going to have to flip between those.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Osma.

Board Member Hirsch: I wanted to make a few comments. I wrote a summary letter and my sense is that there were some areas that are being described somewhat overly descriptive. We will have to take a look at them to see if the way in which they are described actually makes sense for the future. Where various details are given specific dimensions and those would be either to meet them or see them in some way. There were questions of how terminology and how do things get described within the format of the zoning because strong, compatible, human scale, modulation... I think that there needs to be some form of glossary or definitions. There are questions as to who makes the decision and as to when there are areas that are questionable and who should make the decision. Its mentioned that the planning director makes the decision. I suggested that perhaps the planning director and the Chairman of the HRB... us the ARB meet together to see where items... the general description of what this is all about is a two-prong direction. One of them is that the applicant would put these particular regulations and now ultimately have to come in front of the Board itself. That's a big question as to how that occurs and whether what is being described by the applicant who would put in something that doesn't come to us... how does that fit in with the context of Palo Alto? There's (inaudible). I don't know what that one's about. The planning and transportation (inaudible). They joined in the discussion. They are very concerned that we are responsible for a lot of the decision and want to keep it pretty much that way as the way I read the minutes of their meeting. They mention us a lot in them. They also mentioned the fact they thought there might be other people who historically have been important to the ARB and the design of Palo Alto, you know, Garber et cetera, who might join in this effort. I tend to agree with them. They have been around a long time and they should have an opportunity to be part of the review even if they aren't officially (inaudible). Of course, the idea here is to shorten the time of approval. It's a question as to how that is done and maybe that would be discussed in more detail when we (inaudible) because the idea here would be that these are all objective and there is no question as to what could be done or should be done so that we'd shorten the timeframe, which I guess...

Chair Baltay: David, I just wanted your opinion as to how we can prepare. You're starting to verge into stuff that we have to agendize first.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: I think that's great feedback. That's great advice, Osma and David.

Board Member Hirsch: Let me finish up. There's minor editing of all of those aspects of it and some of it may require some revision. I noted some areas where simply, technically the diagrams are not appropriate. Osama's list does deal with many of these. There's a very interesting issue here and that is that there is a question of what is a height limitation because I think that's going to be a part of all of this. As these projects come forward, clearly they're going to need to be taller to be useful. The question of how that fits in with the timing of all of us is a question that we will have to consider.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, and I do want to be clear that we're not looking to change development standards or things of that nature. We're looking to make the existing criteria that we have loaded up on the website objective. As Osma said, ultimately when you get that second document you'll have the old standards and the new standards. You'll want to have them side by side so you can look at them and see what it used to be and what's drafted right now. Also, keep in mind that in the new standards we're creating an intent statement of generally how we want projects to go as far as massing and facades and things like that. Then, we build the objective standards underneath. We had talked earlier that we are creating this medium-sized box where most projects can hopefully fit into those objective standards, not all projects. Then, if a project cannot fit into the standards, then they have the option of adhering to the intent statement and having the ARB review that to ensure that they adhere to that intent statement. There are options for how people can go with the objective standards or talk to the ARB and have more of a discretionary process. That's the framework of how we're trying to build this so that there are lots of options.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Chair Baltay: Thank you, everybody. We are adjourned.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you, everyone. We'll see you on the 15th, and I'll send you some emails with information before then.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thanks.

Ms. Gerhardt: Take care.

Adjournment