



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 11822)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 12/3/2020

Summary Title: Minutes of November 5, 2020

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for November 5, 2020

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board (ARB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

Background

Draft minutes from the November 5, 2020 Architectural Review Board (ARB) are available in Attachment A.

Draft and Approved Minutes are made available on the ARB webpage at bit.ly/paloaltoARB

Attachments:

- Attachment A: November 5, 2020 Draft Minutes (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: November 5, 2020
 City Hall/City Council Chambers
 250 Hamilton Avenue
 Virtual Meeting
 8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Oral Communications

Chair Baltay: Oral communications. Are there any members of the public who wish to address any item not on this agenda? Do we have any members raising their hand, Vinh?

Vinh Nguyen, Administrative Associate: Chair Baltay, we currently do not have any members wishing to speak in oral communication.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Next item is agenda changes, additions, and deletions. Jodie Gerhardt, do we have anything for that?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: No changes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I would like to add that I have been spoken with at least one member of the Board who has requested we have an agenda discussion in the future regarding, I guess you would say, ex parte communications between Board Members and staff and the public. I would like to ask staff that we agendaize something of that nature as an informal discussion at some point this year. Would that be okay, Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, we've had the attorney's office do such a conversation before. Do you feel like you want to bring the attorneys back? Would that be helpful to...

Chair Baltay: I don't feel the need for that but I would leave that to staff's discretion. I think I would like to have the five Board Members have an opportunity to discuss amongst ourselves what we think is an appropriate process for communicating outside of meetings. I think within (inaudible) to bring up and discuss. What I am really after is to allow the Board to have a discussion amongst ourselves.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Chair Baltay: If you think the attorneys would be beneficial that's fine.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. Are you thinking for the next hearing on November 19th?

Chair Baltay: I would prefer to do it later this calendar year.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Again, whatever you think is best to fit in.

Ms. Gerhardt: December 3rd would be the next available.

Chair Baltay: Yeah. Either of those meetings and maybe it depends on what other items we have.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes.

Chair Baltay: I would think about half an hour ought to be enough to just go through all of that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. Sounds good.

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: Okay, thank you very much. City official reports, Jodie, again.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning. Thank you for my screen person. This just shows our meetings to the end of the year. We do currently have items for each of those hearings. To the best of my knowledge, all of the meetings will happen. December 15th would be installation of new or reappointments of existing members. I have heard from the Clerk's Office that the Council will be doing that in a timely fashion. We will have a full Board. The new Board would start on December 17th. We will get confirmation from Council probably around December 14th or so. We do have two items for our next hearing on November 19th. We did put down here 3585 El Camino but that is actually going to be pushed off to December 3rd likely. At the November 19th hearing we will be finishing up on the objective standards. We had started that conversation and got three-quarters of the way through. We will finish up with the last quarter or so. As we have time, we can start a second round if we so choose. The second item on that hearing is going to be 744 San Antonio Road which is a master sign program for the Marriott Hotels that are going at that location. Thank you.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL: 1310 Bryant Street Castilleja School Project Third ARB Hearing [19PLN-00116]: Recommendation to the City Council Regarding Architectural Review of Castilleja School's Phased Campus Redevelopment Proposal. Zone District: R-1(10,000). Environmental Review: A Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was Published July 29 and 30, 2020. For More Information Contact Amy French, Chief Planning Official, at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jodie. Okay. We are ready to get started on our action items. Action item number 2 public hearing/quasi-judicial: 1310 Bryant Street, the Castilleja School Project, the third ARB Hearing. Recommendation to the City Council regarding architectural review of Castilleja School's phased Campus redevelopment proposal. Zone District: R-1(10,000). Environmental Review: A final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was published on July 29 and 30, 2020. For More Information Contact Amy French. Okay, before we get started do we have any disclosures to make? Alex, disclosures?

Board Member Lew: Yes, I have a couple. I visited the site on Tuesday. I also exchanged an email with Tonya Frasco [phonetic] who wanted to discuss the sustainability provisions in the Castilleja plans but I declined to meet since we are between hearings. There is a product that the applicant is using, the Okawood and I did do additional research about that on the website. Then, I also did look at the Packard Foundation in downtown Los Altos, which is a similarly designed project as the proposed project. I was looking at façade lengths. That's it.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. David, any disclosures?

Board Member Hirsch: No. No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: No disclosures. Race, any disclosures?

Board Member Lee: Just simply that I visited the site a couple of times and also went and saw the materials board.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Osma, disclosures, please.

Vice Chair Thompson: I saw the materials board.

Chair Baltay: Wonderful. I would like to disclose that I also visited the site and possibly of interest to my colleagues is that Oak Tree number 88 is an existing tree to the north-left of the proposed swimming pool location and I found that the drip line of the tree was approximately eight to ten feet larger than what's shown on the plans. Just for your reference on that. I spent some time visiting the site earlier this week. Okay, with that we are ready to get started with a staff presentation. Amy, would you like to get started, please?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes.

[Setting up presentation.]

Ms. French: Good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. We are here at the ARB this morning to discuss the Castilleja School. Your staff report covered the submittal that the applicant provided several weeks ago now to the Architectural Review Board and on the webpage for the project. The staff report included the draft findings again as we did on October 1st. At the October 1st meeting, we did have 13 speakers and this is a continued hearing to a date uncertain with direction to modify and bring in conformed sets, which the applicant did. Last night and on October 28th, the Planning and Transportation Commission heard from the public and had some discussion late last night and continued the hearing again to November 18th to continue discussion of the CUP conditions. Today's hearing we are here to review the applicant's responses. The applicant is here to give a presentation. I can summarize the PTC hearing. I kind of just did. There was some consensus building last night regarding number of events that are subject to the CUP as well as a limitation on vehicle trips, both average daily trips and peak hour trips. There is some other stuff that happened but, again, it was continued. There is more to come. Today we will have public testimony and then the ARB may resume discussion and provide a recommendation if it so chooses. I am going to go through the applicant's responses. The applicant, of course, will go into greater detail in their presentation. The building changes and overview: there was a second break provided as requested by the Architectural Review Board, to continue breaking up the mass on Kellogg Avenue. As well, additional green tile placements on that elevation and some other responses that I'll briefly touch upon. We also had the opportunity to discover that there was a stair that needed to be relocated from the Lockey House parcel over to a different area, which the applicant did with adjusted plans for that. That move realized the retention of the Oak Tree 102, and a couple more trees as well. We will cover just briefly again the noise. There was an acoustician report that was provided with this packet. Then, landscaping, of course. There is a lot of discussion about landscaping required by the ARB. I will just quickly go through the slides for those that might be tuning in for the first time. Castilleja's request is to replace the existing building. You will see these images from Kellogg Avenue. This was a lot of discussion at the last ARB meeting. The other views here are at the corner of Bryant and Emerson and then along Emerson. These are superimposed images of the proposed building. The request that the ARB made was to show elevations with trees off and trees on. They have done that. This one shows the second break and the green tile again. Last time it was only here. This time it is marching down here and again on the other side. There have been changes here at the fascia and views of the entrances and balconies will come shortly. Again, trees on and off on Bryant Street. This shows that lobby as last time the ARB saw. Emerson trees on and trees off. These are the two entrances and the two drop-off driveways, Bryant you saw last time. This has an enlarged elevation showing this second break in the massing. This, again, is the second break view

(it is a little fuzzy). This shows the green tile use; the third location for that green tile. The applicant provided a number of sections and enlarged elevations. I am sure they will go through those in detail; this is a summary of that. The applicant provided balcony images as requested. The photo-voltaics, there's an example of the system they're looking to install. This is a school in the vicinity. The building revisions: this image indicates where the second-floor area was removed to add up to a total reduction of gross floor area from the last meeting. There are images of stairs around the property. This one is the stairs that come from the blow-grade parking, and there are two stairs. Stair one is the stair that is uncovered that is going to be moving, as shown in the images. The second stair is the one that has the roof over it; this is next to the elevator near the gym. All of this is metal; metal stairs, metal railing, and metal roof. This just shows the image of where the stair is going to from this parcel. This is tree 102. That's the latest to address some of the concerns. This is, again, the site view showing that. Then, just a quick set of fences. There is the pool fence here. This is an image I showed earlier. This is the rendering of that pool fence as it faces the neighborhood. Here are the photo-voltaics with trees on. This is a view of the landscaping and the mitigation trees that are proposed. The green trees are the ones that are proposed. The relocated trees are the ones shown in this tan color. This is a key to the frontage enhancement close up drawings of the landscaping around the entire site. Well, on three sides of the site. I am just going to quickly go through those. I have put them together to see. Here it is from Bryant, from the corner of Embarcadero all the way to Kellogg. This is the corner of Bryant and Kellogg. There are bioswales in these planting areas and the set shows the images of the plants to be used with a key to make it understandable. We go down Kellogg. Here's the Kellogg frontage. Again, the bioswale area. Then the corner of Emerson and Kellogg leading over to the Emerson Street homes where there is the garage exit and the emergency vehicle access drive. Fences, I have done a key diagram showing where these fences are. There are four types of fences on this diagram. The other fence was the pool sound wall. Here is where these are shown. If you want me to come back to this diagram later I am happy to do that to fully understand where those fences go. The same with the gates. The gates are indicated here. There are five types of gates: vehicle, pedestrian, et cetera. This had been earlier, was earlier provided, but I thought it would be worth showing again. These are the daylight illuminance patterns for the campus, as well as the sun patterns. Hopefully, these were available for the last hearing. Then, because it came up at the Planning Commission last night -- a member of the public hadn't seen what the distribution percentages would be -- I thought it would be worth showing today the Transportation Impact Analysis of the alternative four recommendation, which is included in our recommendation, is to distribute the drop-off trips to 27 percent of the vehicles coming through the garage, 43 percent going through this Bryant drop-off drive -- again only come one direction down Bryant -- and then 30 percent on this Kellogg driveway. I believe that concludes my presentation. I know the applicant is here to present as well.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Amy French. Do we have any questions from the Board for staff? No questions?

Board Member Hirsch: I do have one. Maybe about that last comment you made about the --

Chair Baltay: Please speak closer to your microphone, David. It's hard to hear you.

Board Member Hirsch: The question is of the 27 and 43 percent, whichever, do they all come from that same direction? Are they all coming off of Embarcadero?

Chair Baltay: Amy, are you able to understand his question?

Ms. French: Yes, I think I do. In order for vehicles to enter the campus on the Bryant side, they have to be driving southward, if that's the compass direction. I don't know exactly but we call that project south, I guess. They are driving down Bryant and turning right into the Bryant driveway. There is no turning left currently nor proposed from northbound Bryant left into the campus.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. All of that traffic has been a part of the Environmental Report as well? The traffic in that direction?

Ms. French: correct.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions for staff? Okay. With that, we are ready to have our applicant make a presentation. Do we have someone from the applicant team with us? Vinh, is there somebody here?

Adam Woltag, Applicant: This is Adam Woltag from WRNS Studio. I can dive right in, Vinh, if that's all right.

Chair Baltay: You'll have ten minutes, Adam. You can start whenever you're ready.

Adam Woltag: Thank you and good morning, everyone. Thank you for your time and consideration. I am looking forward to your comments and suggestions here. We have a lot to go through here today but we wanted to focus on these four key elements on building modifications, some of the material clarifications, landscaping and fencing, and some of the daylight strategies on the project. This slide illustrates our proposed site plan that incorporates the changes we have heard from you from the last time. Many of those changes were focused along the Kellogg Street elevation. Those changes were really centered on massing material, color, and texture. This slide shows our original proposed elevation from way back when when we first met with you folks. This slide shows the first run of comments with the initial break you see here just to the left of the science portion of the project. This is the new revised elevation with an added second break that Amy was referring to, and now with trees. Here is a view along Kellogg. Note the two different breaks in the massing. The initial one that goes all the way through the building and the new proposed one towards Emerson that is setback not all the way through but it does break the massing in that location. This slide illustrates the plan at the first and second floor as well as the Kellogg elevation highlighting the variety of ins and outs, or setback from the street. Note again that second break in the elevation just above the Kellogg Street entry. This is a view looking towards Emerson from that first break you see above the ceramic tile on the right. This is a view of the new proposed break in the massing above the Kellogg Street entry. Focusing a bit on that Kellogg entry, we have tried to keep it small and residential in scale and screened from the street just beneath that new porch created by that break. We have also added more green ceramic tile marking that entry. Then on the left, another view of that entry as you are walking into that space. Above it, you can see the new massing break. On the right continuing this approach turning the corner along Emerson at that recessed second-floor terrace with the proposed green tile. Now focusing on some of the material changes, and along the Kellogg we're going to cut a section here through this portion of the project. Here is a detailed, cut-away, 3-D section that illustrates those changes to the façade. We have taken our keys from the Gunn building, as you see on those little snapshots on the right, where the Gunn has a very strong datum between the first and second floor. That is what we tried to do and really amplified our approach. We have increased the number of wood battens on the second floor above that horizontal beltline, which really breaks that two-story façade into two distinct elements. We have also brought the language of the battens to that metal fascia that runs continuously all around the building now. We think that is going to be a wonderful addition adding texture and shadow to that fascia. We have also changed the color of all the metal windows and the fascia from a clear anodized to a warmer champagne anodized color. We think that is going to make the building feel much warmer. I am really, really pleased with how this is starting to come together. Here is going to be another section closer to the Bryant Street intersection. Here you can see, again, that first-floor facade clad and wood shingles. The second-floor setback behind the planted terrace and the clear windows at grade that bring daylight into the lower garden level. Here's a shot of the updated material palette with a champagne anodized aluminum sample. Now let's take a look at some of the modifications to the Bryant Street elevations. This was our original proposed design and you can see with a full break between the two building volumes and the exposed cast-in-place concrete wall on that Bryant Street elevation. Then, what we are proposing now and letting that wood façade wrap around that concrete wall and with the new proposed lobby. With trees. Moving along to Emerson Street. Here again, is the proposed elevation. You can see where that beltline is broken by that concrete wall that goes two-stories. What we are proposing now is letting that wood façade wrap around the whole building and not be broken up by those concrete share walls. Then with trees. A little bit more on the building clarifications that came up in our last meeting. There was a question about Okawood and we just wanted to show here diagramed in yellow the specific locations where we are proposing the Okawood window system. These are areas that we felt that the program behind those windows would benefit with a little more screening from the street and a little more

privacy. We have them in the library; we have them in what you see here on the Bryant Street elevation; we have them along Kellogg where we have the science and maker spaces; then along Emerson on the second floor near conference and dining space. Now looking at a section of the building and looking at our approach to our photo-voltaic strategy where PV panels are set low on stanchions and are laid almost flat. As Amy mentioned, we have done this a couple times before. These are project examples from a campus very nearby. That very low profile that really has very little impact on the façade. Now looking at perimeter edges and landscape and fences, this is the proposed landscape plan that illustrates are internal and perimeter landscape design. It is really focused on amplifying and sustaining the existing landscape character of the area. It is also designed to work passively and slow the flow of storm water on-site and ensure the health of existing and proposed trees. As Amy mentioned earlier, here is a detailed plan of our fence strategy. This slide illustrates two of the five campus fence conditions, each of those conditions responding directly to their specific content. This slide shows a range of a more traditional brick and metal fencing along the Embarcadero and public gateways. We also transitioned to wood fences that felt a little bit more residential in scale in facing the neighborhood along Emerson. This is a specific type, type five, that is along the depressed pool seen here. This fence is doing a couple of different things. It is actually supporting a PV canopy that is trying to get our overall project net-zero target inline. It is also a detail to help increase acoustic performance of that wall. That is set behind a landscape planted buffer zone. This is a detailed vision of that here. This illustrates the richness and the variety of those native plant species and drought tolerance strategy here. A comment was brought up about public art. In response to that, we have looked at a couple of opportunities to think about where we might want to incorporate that. One location was along the existing drop-off along Kellogg. You can see here on the left a plan that shows some possible locations and some ideas and where we might want to bring some of the elements in. The intent would be that some of these elements might be specifically designed to be integrated into the landscape along the street. We wanted to show you these initial concept thoughts about how we might integrate public art along that street. Moving to daylighting and planning. There was a comment at our last meeting about what programs are in that below-grade garden level and we wanted to bring this to light. Going left to right you can see we have performing arts and digital recording. We have world languages. There is a faculty hub. There is a continuation of the library that actually does spill down into this level. There are science and maker spaces. In the upper school, the student's hub space begins at grade and spills down to that lower level, as well as building services and trash and access that is all at that lower level. The yellow indicates where we have -- through the use of skylights, clear-story windows, light wells, and open double-height spaces -- brought daylight into this garden level. That goes and begins at the roof and through the building. You can see here on the first floor the elements we are using to bring daylight into those spaces up on that second floor and how the roof also plays a part on how that daylight strategy is coming together. This is a 3-D section that illustrated how the middle school entry and hub spaces work. Students walk past a sunken garden that brings daylight into that garden level through large storefront doors into a double-height space that reaches up to the second floor. Again, through the use of skylights, interior clearstory windows, daylight really will be evident. We really are trying to get daylight evident in all aspects of the middle school spaces.

Mr. Nguyen: Time check. Ten minutes is up.

Adam Woltag: Just two slides left. This is a section diagram that shows the high school. Here this space starts at grade and drops to the garden level. Again, through the use of skylights, full-height south-facing clear-story windows, and interior clear story windows we really feel attested how daylight is going to move through this project. We feel very, very confident that these spaces will feel very inviting and very easy to flow between. That's it. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Adam, for your presentation. Do we have any questions of the applicant from the Board Members?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I do.

Chair Baltay: Osma, go ahead.

Vice Chair Thompson: Adam, would you be able to go over again the shear wall locations? I am looking at our printed plans and I do see concrete shear walls on Bryant Street and on Emerson Street. I would like some clarification on those elevations.

Chair Baltay: Which drawings are you looking at, Osma, please?

Vice Chair Thompson: AB305 and AB306 both show a texture concrete shear wall, which I was going to ask about what that texture is. But then as Mr. Woltag was going through his presentation I noticed that those elevations look a little different. I'd just like some clarification on what those elevations look like and where the shear walls are.

Adam Woltag: absolutely. I am going to point to the plan here. It's a little hard to see but I am going to show you on Bryant Street there is shear wall here. Along Kellogg there is another shear wall that was located over here and over here, so two. Then one more here along Emerson. What we are proposing to do is actually clad those in wood. Before we put a break here there was a shear wall right here. Our structural engineer is really not happy about this but we are going to get it to work. There was an exposed concrete shear wall here and there was actually another one located here along Kellogg. You won't see those concrete shear walls anymore. We're going to clad them with wood. A little bit more detailed view here. There was a wall located here and here. Those are now covered. Along Bryant Street, let's get to that one. Here we go. Along Bryant Street there is the location of that concrete shear wall. We had a break, you can see where that waistband stopped and we allowed that shear wall to make its way to the façade. We all thought that it was better, actually, to go in this direction which would be to clad that shear wall and let the wood finish and that beltline continue and not break the façade. We prefer this approach to our initial suggestions which was this one.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. Yeah, I think that this image that we're looking at is the one that's in our set. In this new one are the wood panels a certain size or are they the wood slats? I can see some seams there.

Adam Woltag: Yes, right here you're starting to see those, yes. I am going to go to a detailed view here that might help explain it. This is a pretty good view that shows our strategy throughout the whole project where we have vertical wood siding. Where you see these smoother-looking panels that are separated by these wooden battens these are on a four-foot to five-foot module. It is very regular. The battens help establish where we have solid vertical wood panels and then the openings for fenestration. It's pretty regular pattern. We have our belt line which we really like that accentuates from the Gunn Building. Then on the second floor, we have the same wood siding but we are going to increase the amount of battens on the second floor. It's the same material but a much more intense, I'm going to say, density of wood battens. You're starting to get a break now very similar in way of interpretation of the Gunn Building. We have a much different cadence of the wood battens on the first floor to the second floor. There will be more shade and shadow; there will be more density. We really like that difference between as opposed to a continuous façade of the same elements above that beltline. We are going to start to establish a different density of battens on either side of that beltline.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, thank you. Can you go over the Emerson façade. I think I cut you off before you went there.

Adam Woltag: No, it's right here. Let's see. The Emerson here you can see where that concrete shear wall used to be and it broke our beltline and really broke façade into two elements. Here it is now with a continuation of that beltline, the wood skin just rolls over it and we like that continuation of the façade. It feels much better; much more contiguous.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Adam Woltag: You're welcome.

Vice Chair Thompson: I do have one more question and it's about lighting. I wanted confirmation -- maybe this is something you might need to go and get it -- on the ZY1 pole light. The image that we have in our packet is really tiny and it's a little hard to tell what that light is.

Adam Woltag: Oh boy. I'm sorry, I don't have that packet in front of me at the moment but can we, can we get that to you and get a better...

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Adam Woltag: Get more information on that. That was Z -- which one again was that?

Vice Chair Thompson: The ZY1.

Adam Woltag: Okay.

Vice Chair Thompson: Then on the plans it says ZY1C, and I just also wanted to confirm that is the same light.

Adam Woltag: Okay. We can go ahead and get that to you.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. Those are my questions.

Chair Baltay: Before any other questions, Adam, could you clarify, then that the packet elevations and perspectives do not... or show that concrete shear wall and you're saying that's not going to be there any longer.

Adam Woltag: That's correct.

Chair Baltay: What's going on? Why are the drawings out of sync, then?

Adam Woltag: you know, this approach here with the façade treatment is a late addition. We felt it was in concert with our approach with the elevations and trying to relate this to the Gunn Building.

Chair Baltay: Amy French, are you -- excuse me, Adam. Amy, are you aware of this change?

Ms. French: I am seeing as you are.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Adam, it's important to have a complete set of plans for us and it seems like the elevations and perspectives in our packet do not show this. I am not sure how we're going to react to that but I just want to clarify that really is the case that what you're proposing is not the same as the drawings you've submitted. That's a question.

Adam Woltag: The only changes there should be would just be on the shear wall. Covering the concrete shear wall with the wood siding.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you.

Adam Woltag: That should be the only changes that may not...

Chair Baltay: Any other questions for the applicant from Members of the board? Alex, Grace, David? Then I have a question for you, Adam. You had a very nice sectional perspective entitled batten, something like -- yeah, that one is good. This is a technical type of thing but when I look at your drawings you seem to indicate a series of steel I-beams just inside the glazed curtain wall supporting the timbers lab roof. You also seem to indicate a series of drain pipes. You're showing a notch on the roof section here where the gutter would be for drainage but my understanding is that you can turn pipes laterally through a timber slab. Are these, then, going to be visible underneath? Will that change the way this looks?

Adam Woltag: Are you speaking about this detail here with the concealed...

Chair Baltay: Exactly. On that detail the drain pipe goes through the timber slab, right?

Adam Woltag: That's true. It goes through the...

Chair Baltay: And then where does it go from there?

Adam Woltag: It depends on where on the project this condition takes place.

Chair Baltay: Take the section in your perspective there. Where does it go in that section? (crosstalk)

Adam Woltag: Sure, typically it's in the body of the wall. It can be concealed within that wall and then it goes into our stormwater management area. There could be areas where it might daylight. We haven't run that all the way through but typically what we do is we conceal that within the wall where we can. There will be areas where you might see a downspout, right, that would chase all the down towards our stormwater management approach.

Chair Baltay: It is possible we will have exposed drainage pipes on the underside of that roof slab?

Adam Woltag: You might start to see it in a few locations where it makes sense to daylight, correct. You would see a downspout.

Chair Baltay: Then on the inside the structural beam, your drawing shows that as an exposed steel I-beam. Wouldn't you need some kind of fire protection? How is that going to work and look? Have you thought that through?

Adam Woltag: Are you speaking about this detail here?

Chair Baltay: No, on the inside. Looking at your perspective where the person is standing up above.

Adam Woltag: Right here, correct.

Chair Baltay: On the second floor. I'm talking about the roof. I have noticed in a number of your drawings a series of steel sections indicated which would be necessary to support the slab over the glazed openings. I was just wondering how much thought you have given to that because I think that would change dramatically how it affects how it looks.

Adam Woltag: I don't see what you're seeing right here, unfortunately, Peter. I think what we have done here in cases like this where we have CLT slab above our steel beam is that all of that would be fire protected. We could definitely get you more information when we get to that level of detail, absolutely. But we wouldn't propose anything that wasn't.

Chair Baltay: I'm looking at your detail number four on sheet AB802, which is indicating a pretty clear steel section running right underneath that small parapet wall up above.

Adam Woltag: I'm sorry. I don't have that same drawing in front of me.

Chair Baltay: To my colleagues, then, there's a steel beam that seems to be indicated there which I believe would be necessary and I am not sure you could just leave it exposed at that. I think it would be nice to know how that looks. That will be seen through the window from the exterior. That's a question to but if there's no resolution to that then that's the end of that question.

Vice Chair Thompson: The type four constriction building?

Chair Baltay: I can't hear you, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: I was just confirming is this a type four building? It's a question for Mr. Woltag.

Chair Baltay: Oh, you mean the fire rating of the building.

Vice Chair Thompson: Actually, sorry, it's type 2B.

Adam Woltag: Yeah, it's 2B.

Ms. French: Would it help -- this is Amy -- if I show it? I have that page number you reference Chair Baltay?

Chair Baltay: I don't think so because this is a question to the applicant. I don't really hear anything else about it. I don't want to drag it beyond that. Are there any other questions for the applicant?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll retract my question on the ZY1 pole. I did some further Googling and it is a timber pole it seems for the lightning fixtures. That was my question about the material.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, they do provide the specs on it in the packet but it does require some leg work to figure it out.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: I wanted to pick up on your comment, Peter, about the beam.

Chair Baltay: David, this is a question period right now. Is this a question or a comment?

Board Member Hirsch: Question.

Chair Baltay: Okay, go ahead.

Board Member Hirsch: Regarding whether you're going to have a drop ceiling or exposed lighting? How do you intend to treat the clear story aspect of those rooms that have beams below the line of the window from the slab above?

Chair Baltay: Adam, did you understand his question?

Adam Woltag: Yes, I did. Typically what we do... that beam is set back away from that clear story window by a certain distance. It could be 18 inches, 24 inches. It's not exactly entirely set. You do get a glass line coming from the bottom of the COT slab, right, all the way down to the floor slab. It's a full-height window cut. We used to call it a shadow pocket in the days of a lot of high rise construction where you have asset back. I think you remember that. But a beam is set back and what that does is sometimes it can be soffited in and so we soffit in where we have an acoustic ceiling coming in at a lower elevation and that provides a very clean and tidy way to encase the beam, fireproof it, as well as provide acoustic performance to those interior spaces.

Board Member Hirsch: So far your section doesn't really show those aspects of the interior relative to that outside wall and pocket. That's yet to come, right?

Adam Woltag: That's correct.

Chair Baltay: Adam, do I understand that the interior may have a dropped ceiling in these classrooms?

Adam Woltag: In certain classrooms, yes, where the acoustic performance is needed. Correct, yes. There will be suspended lights, ceiling fans, there's a whole interior reflected ceiling plan that we can get to you in the right amount of time that would show all those things. But, yes, there will be suspended lighting, there will be acoustic ceilings in these spaces...

Chair Baltay: And how far down would that be dropping from the structural slab do you think?

Adam Woltag: It would probably be about 24 to 30 inches. I think what we're trying to achieve in there, Peter, is a ten-foot clear space.

Chair Baltay: I see.

Adam Woltag: That is our goal is to try to get that. That is the best acoustic properties and the best daylighting properties. Where we have done that in classrooms before it has worked very, very well with lighting and acoustics.

Chair Baltay: And you're saying that the shadow pocket, the space between the dropped ceiling and the glazing perimeter, might be about 24 inches wide?

Adam Woltag: Approximately, yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you for the clarification there. Any other questions? Thank you, then. Vinh, do we have any members of the public who wish to address us? I'd like to open the meeting to comments from the members of the public now.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we do have some raised hands. I see the number of raised hands is going up as we speak.

Chair Baltay: Okay, that's good.

Mr. Nguyen: Veronica, can we get the speaker timer, please?

Chair Baltay: To the members of the public, we will be asking you to say your piece each in turn and you'll have three minutes to address us. Vinh, do we have a list of names or how do we do this?

Mr. Nguyen: Yeah, we will put the list of names on the screen.

Chair Baltay: That'd be great. Thank you. Okay.

Mr. Nguyen: I do apologize. It looks like Veronica is no longer in this meeting. Maybe she had an internet disconnection or something. Let me see if I can put that up myself. One moment, please.

Chair Baltay: Take your time, Vinh. We're going to do this next. Let's get it right. It's like vote counting. You have to just do this the right way.

Vice Chair Thompson: I see that Veronica is on the call again now.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, great. And she did just message me that she has returned. I guess she must have had a disconnection of some sort. All right. Thank you so much, Veronica. Okay. While she fills in the list let me just read out the first five names so that way they can prepare. The first five speakers will be Mary Sylvester, followed by Cath Garber, followed by Vania Fang, followed by Trisha Suvari, and then followed by Jim Poppy.

Chair Baltay: Do you know how many speakers we have in total, Vinh?

Mr. Nguyen: Currently we have eleven raised hands.

Chair Baltay: Okay. That'll be fine.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay. The first speaker will be Mary.

Chair Baltay: Welcome Mary.

Mary Sylvester: Thank you Chair Baltay as well as your fellow and female Board Members. Thank you for all of you for your countless hours of time along with City staff in working on this project so diligently. I would also like to acknowledge Mr. Nguyen for his competent and very professional performance with all of us. I would like to acknowledge Chair Baltay, you, for paying attention to the vulnerability of tree 89. It is at risk and we appreciate you acknowledging its state. Secondly, I would like to ask the Board where is the garage architects? It's been great to have Adam Woltag and his team available to present to the community and the Chairs, Commissions, and Boards but we need further information about this very significant amendment to our zoning code and the implications of the neighborhood. We need to meet with the architects for the underground garage. Thank you. Now, the substance of my comments. Castilleja operates on a conditional use permit and, therefore, its operation in a single-family neighborhood is a privilege, not a right, as supporters of the school are trying to convince city officials. Consequently, it may not do anything that's harmful or injurious to the public welfare as well as adjacent property owners. The project represents a substantial intensification of use of the Castilleja site to the detriment of the neighborhood, community at large, and sensitive biological resources such as the mature and protected trees it plans to remove. This is ultimately a loss to the community and this natural heritage we have. The sustainability plan is being undermined with the underground garage. 64,000 square feet over allowable use is being reviewed and a variance is requested. This school and city are trying to explain away the intensification and inconsistencies of this project. All we ask for is a code-compliant project that pays attention to public safety, neighborhood quality of life, and the wellbeing of the community at large. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Mary. Our next speaker, please, Vinh.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next speaker is Cath. Hi, Cath, if you're there can you please unmute yourself?

Catherine Garber: Yes, hello. Thank you. My name is Catherine Garber. I often present projects to the City as an architect representing client sin Palo Alto. Today I am speaking as a Palo Alto resident who also cares deeply about how our city continues to evolve architecturally. It becomes stronger as a community. With that perspective in mind, I want to voice my support for Castilleja's designs and modifications. I am pleased to see the refinements that have been made along the Kellogg side of campus. The new breaks in the Kellogg façade parallel the look and scale of the new porches on Bryant. These changes address the goal to reduce the massive and to break up the eave. I feel it does so in a way that creates coherence along the different street views. The sections of the building along Kellogg feel more distinct from one another and connect visually with the facades on Bryant in many ways. The last I reviewed these plans I was pleased to see the porch that had been added on Bryant integrated elements from the historical Gunn Building. Specifically, it was nice to see the option to bring the green carved doors on the current entry over the new porch. Now for this presentation, the green tiles have been added to the outside of the building of the Kellogg breaks. I think this is a lovely new addition to the project, as are the touches of having the bellyband break the two floors and the added vertical battens on the second floor. With input from your commission, I feel Castilleja team has brought, in addition, attention to detail that serves to tie together the historic structures to the new (inaudible). This has been a long process for the City and the school but I truly believe we have arrived at the end of this productive road. The evolution of this project has brought important changes. It is not time to approve these plans. Modernization is desperately needed for Castilleja. The current structures are aging and do not enhance the neighborhood in the least. These new buildings and the thoughtful landscaping around them will settle in gently and create a beautiful backdrop for this with residential life in this corner of Palo Alto. Thank you for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you Cathy Garber. Next speaker, please, Vinh.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next speaker will be Vania.

Vania Fang: Hi, good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I am joining the hearing again today because I live directly across from Castilleja school on Kellogg and, therefore, I am very vested in this process.

Mr. Nguyen: Pardon me, Vania. For interrupting you. Veronica, can you reset the timer. Go ahead, sorry.

Vania Fang: Can I go now?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes.

Vania Fang: I just want to reiterate that. I am joining the hearing again today because I live directly across from Castilleja school on Kellogg and therefore I am very invested in this process. The last time I spoke I shared my gratitude to Castilleja for the thoughtful design plans for the new campus. I look forward to the new building. As I mentioned before, I especially appreciate the gentle entry on Kellogg because it is subtle and beautifully landscaped. The current drop-off patterns do not negatively impact us as direct neighbors and I want to reiterate that I happy those will be the same on the new campus. Castilleja has been a good neighbor to us in so many ways with excellent traffic monitoring, no school parking outside my home, and quiet students who we are happy to see again now that campus has reopened to small groups. During the past ARB and PTC meetings I attended, traffic and noise were often raised as concerns about Castilleja modernization project. As a direct neighbor, I honestly have never experienced any traffic or noise issues from Castilleja. We used to live near a neighborhood school prior to relocating to our current house. Every morning going to work we would be stuck behind a long queue of cars doing drop-offs as well as yielding to heavy pedestrian traffic. None of that happened at Castilleja. Traffic was always well managed and never overflowed onto the neighborhood streets. In fact, we experienced much more traffic problems as we approached the nearby Palo Alto high school but we accept that fact because we bought our home knowing it is close to schools. While I understand public schools go through a different traffic regulation process, to me as a neighbor Palo Alto High and Castilleja are both schools. Castilleja is not the source of traffic issues in this neighborhood now, and I believe this fact will remain unchanged with the new campus. Regarding noise, we rarely hear any sound from Castilleja, and remember we are almost directly across from Castilleja's pool. On the rare occasion that we do hear something it hardly qualifies as noise. It is a school after all and schools should not be silenced. I know at the last hearing as Board, you had suggested further adjustment to reduce the massing on Kellogg and now that I see the changes the architects have made I understand why that was important. I appreciate the new setbacks along the second story roofline and I think these incremental changes from the past two hearings now add up to a very different and much-improved result. I think this modernized building will be a new way that Castilleja will improve to a neighbor to me, creating a space that is beautiful and warm and scaled to match the textures and variety of our neighborhood. I am excited for this project to move forward and I thank you for your guidance and expertise in this process. I urge you to support this with a final vote today because I want to see this process start. I also want our neighborhood to be able to move forward. Thank you for your time and attention to this important project for the City of Palo Alto.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Vania. Next speaker, please, Vinh.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next speaker is Trisha.

Trisha Suvani: Good morning. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I attended your hearing for Castilleja's project in August, and in October, and I am here again today. As an observer, I appreciate the quality of the deliberation that you all have fostered in this process. As A Board, you've made thoughtful observations and asked excellent questions. Your guidance has helped to improve the project. Today we are reviewing the culmination of years of work from the school taking in feedback from neighbors, consultants, and other City leaders. This process has continued with input from all of you. I am impressed on how specific and reflective all of you have been in these recent hearings. As a result, I am also impressed with how responsive Castilleja has been making small and large adjustments to create an updated campus that will make the neighborhood more beautiful. The changes in feedback I've noted include clarity around the smaller Circle to increase setbacks, which offers up more space around the surrounding streets, two rounds of changes to the Kellogg façade to break up the massing, vary the rooflines, and modify the external materials, adjustments to the Bryant entry to include historical elements, thoughtful assessment of suitability elements, such as solar panels, and review of the best ways to enter campus and allow the school to relate to and interact with the surrounding streets. This has been a fruitful process and I sincerely hope you will vote to approve these plans as they are today. I remember that at a recent hearing as a

Board, you discussed the fact that you wanted to do more than just improve upon the current buildings, which I think we can all agree are dated and need to be replaced. But you talked about wanting to do the best you can to reach beyond that low hanging fruit to a bigger goal of creating a new campus that is beautiful on its own merits. I think you've done that here. The work that you have put into the process has made a difference and now I hope we can shift into concrete steps the school can take to begin to make these plans a reality. I thank you so much for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Trisha Suvari. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker is Rob.

Rob Levitsky: Hello. This is Rob Levitsky. Aren't those wonderful scripted speeches. Let's reach out for that low-hanging fruit. Well, guess where that low hanging fruit hangs? It hangs on trees. And without the trees, Palo Alto is nothing but a bare landscape. Initially, Castilleja came in four years ago and said oh, well, there are 168 trees here and most of them will be impacted. A lot of them we will cut down. As arborist for the City for 20 years, Dave Dockter has a motto which was you design around nature and he had a tree ordinance that supported him that in Oaks and Redwoods of a certain size in Palo Alto are protected. Well, Castilleja came in and said we will cut down any tree we really feel like. We pushed back and because of our pushback trees started reappearing on the map but it's really not enough. What's happened lately is in the EIR they have taken the position that any tree can be cut down, even protected trees, as long as you mitigate them. They play the game in saying well these Oaks are nice but we are going to plant so many of these little box oaks that we have twice as many trees. Or maybe three times as many trees, though they might only be ten feet tall and I'll be long, dead, and gone before they are even hardly over my head. Oaks and Redwoods are important to Palo Altos and we shouldn't, basically, throw away the tree ordinance like planning has done in justifying that any... in a reading of the ordinance saying that if there is a protected tree in a place where you want to put a building then the building always wins. By supporting this project, you guys on the Architectural Review Board, you would be supporting a precedent that said any Oak or any Redwood that's protected can be cut down if we want to put a building there. That's what you have done here. It is shocking. Not just buildings and not just repaired or upgrade schools, but parking garages. The trees have to die, Oaks and Redwoods have to die so you can have an underground parking garage excavating 35,000 or more cubic yards of dirt with 3,000 to 5,000 dump load trucks pouring thousands and thousands of tons of concrete where each ton of concrete emits 900 kilograms of CO₂, which is killing the Earth so that a couple more juniors and seniors can drive to school. Well, we neighbors object. So much for promoting harmonious and orderly development and enhancing the desirability of the neighborhood. I stand opposed. We neighbors stand opposed. Upgrade your school, follow the rules, don't build your underground parking garage which you can't build anyway because you don't have the square footage -- because you're looking for a variance on square footage and you pretend this --

Chair Baltay: Excuse me, Rob. We're over the time limit. Can you wrap it up, please?

Rob Levitsky: That's enough. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Rob Levitsky. Next speaker, please, Vinh.

Mr. Nguyen: next speaker is Jim.

Jim Poppy: Hi. Thank you. Thank you very much Board Chair Baltay for doing some due diligence on this project and going out and looking at the trees. Tree 89 is a magnificent Oak tree which you see visible all the way down Melville Avenue as you approach the school. By threatening its existence with the pool and the garage it's clear that that tree is in danger and it is a very important piece to softening the view of the school. As you've just seen in the plans, there are a number of fences that are going to be built right around the pool and at all angles. The removal of that tree, the killing of that tree would be a tragedy. Also, it has been mentioned earlier, why aren't you looking at the garage? This is a huge oversight and the plans make it look like cars will just magically pop out of the garage and they exit onto Emerson and there is no detailed view of the entrance on Bryant. If you look at the garage closer they have planned for

an underground tunnel that would have students walking underneath the sewer easement probably through the water table and back up into campus. I mean, this is just stunning to me that the garage has been overlooked like it's not any impact to the above-ground view. It is clearly a huge piece of this plan and is disruptive to the trees and it is a huge CO2 burn. It is so environmentally friendly. This really needs to be looked at and I hope that you can continue this hearing to address these very important and real concerns that neighbors have. As Rob said, we are not being provided scripts by the school to tell you. This is all from neighbors who are impacted. Not from parents of students. Thank you very much for your continued diligence.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jim Poppy. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker is Andie.

Andie Reed: Hi. Thank you very much. My name is Andie Reed and I live near the school. We look forward to seeing the school's spruced up new campus. The natural woods and colors and terraces and the diversity and vertical elements the architects have added makes it more interesting every time we see the drawings. As a close neighbor, however, it still feels bulky and stark. This building is based upon an enrolment increase of 30 percent more students; an enormous jump in attendees to the same small space that has served very well as a girls school for 100 years. The school has not made a case for needing to rebuild at such great extravagance. Of course, if the school wants to change its operational model and tech many more girls they have resources plenty to provide an array of options without increasing density and traffic in this small site and causing such enmity with the neighbors, which brings me to finding number one. I am glad you are all architects because this is something you are familiar with. The school is asking for a variance, and exception to Palo Alto muni code. In order to tear down five smaller buildings and build one large building, muni code says that the school needs to comply with current code. School basis their request for variance upon the size of the lot in which they claim harms them; however, they made it larger by land purchase and merging of lots over the years and getting the city to abandon the 200 block of Melville in 1992. This excludes it from consideration for an exception as the changes in size and shape were made by the owner. The variance the school is asking for is a 40 percent increase in GFA. Please see my written comments that I sent yesterday. If the underground garage is an accessory facility, which we all agree it is, and is not a basement, which we do not think it is, then this number doubles. This matters because traffic and congestion in the neighborhood is already detrimental to the public health, safety, general welfare, or convenience. This project adds more traffic from 1198 car trips to 1477 car trips. An underground garage and large modern building are incompatible with the neighborhood of smaller, older homes. Comp plan L-3.1 states new builders to ensure new or remodeled structures are compatible with the neighborhood and adjacent structures. The underground garage adds addition driveways into our narrow streets, invites traffic in instead of reducing it, and takes away the charm of tree-lined school grounds replacing it with a more institutional project which we find aesthetically harmful. I ask you to please look at not only at how the building improves the campus but also how this project looks to us who live here. We don't go to the school. Most Palo Altos don't go to the school. We see the outsides of the buildings. Please do not make this finding number one until any new expansion plans reduce impacts, not increase them and residents needs and interests are on a par equal to those of the school. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Andie Reed. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker is Alan.

Alan Cooper: Hello. Yes, I am Alan Cooper and I live directly across the street from Castilleja and I live at a point where the building now breaks. I appreciate all of the efforts of the commission and the architects of Castilleja in improving the appearance of the Kellogg side of the building. My question today is about noise screening along Kellogg. My experience has been that this noise has come through the brick and I am wondering if it is possible to add a transparent panel along this break in the building design on the inside so that it would deflect noise back into the Circle and away from the neighborhoods. I would also ask on a different topic that during the massive construction of the buildings that we add a system of real-time monitoring of air quality of particulate matters using the purpleair.com monitoring system that would

give us real-time and live control of the air position in the neighborhood. I will concede the rest of my time. Thank you for considering these requirements... these requests.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alan Cooper. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker is Hank.

Hank Sousa: Good morning Board Members. I live at 160 Melville Avenue, about 185 feet from the planned underground garage exit. I noticed with interest that you have listened to the public and along with your input have influenced the school's architects to submit new drawings for the proposed Kellogg Avenue building. My hope is you will also hear the neighbors of the school who don't want the proposed underground parking garage. It is unhealthy in several ways including its excavation and construction. If it is allowed to be constructed it will continue to pollute and would likely be in place for a great many years. If it is built, the net gain is only 22 parking spaces. All of the thousands of dump truck loads of dirt to be removed and the hundred of cement misers lined up to pour the concrete, plus the dismay of many of the close by neighbors who will witness the commercialization of the neighborhood for 22 additional parking spaces. We don't think it is worth it. Shuttling in the students who currently arrive singly by car is a greener technology. It is unlikely you Board Members would welcome construction like this next door or across the street from your house. We feel the same way. The campus already has 86 parking spaces at grade and they can continue to be used with the new buildings being slightly reconfigured. The 86 spaces allow for an enrollment of 450, which is an eight percent increase over the current cap. That is the percent increase that was given when the current CUP went into effect in 2000. Please see your way to recommending the plan going forward without an underground garage. Help preserve our neighborhood quality of life. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Hank Sousa. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker is Randy.

Randy Popp: Good morning. My name is Randy Popp. I am a resident of Palo Alto. I have been an architect here for 32 years and I have been involved on both sides of the table at the ARB. As I do with many projects, I have closely followed the progress of this project through the City process. I want to thank the members of the Board for their thoughtful and insightful review of this project. I am not affiliated with Castilleja School in any way but as a resident who cares deeply about the City, I appreciate the way your guidance has influenced the project. More specifically, I would like to voice my support of your suggestions regarding adjustments to the massing and refinement of the materials on Kellogg. With the revision before you, I feel the massing is not visibly reduced from the prior concept and I am pleased with the way the building is broken into smaller sections. I would suggest that any further breaks or changes might only become chaotic and I am hopeful you will feel the same way. I would like to commend WRNS Studio for their design and emphasize my feeling that the most recent adjustment strikes a good balance creating a pleasant façade that is not overpowering to its context. The design now nicely bridges to the scale of the surrounding homes and the over fabric of the neighborhood aesthetic. In regard to the trees, I see that they intend to remove three damaged Oaks. I would urge you not to resist this. I understand this is being done for a number of reasons, but if they were my client I would coach them out of an abundance of caution to proceed with this. Based on my read, those trees will need to be removed with or without improved new learning spaces. Tending to student and employee safety should be a paramount concern and now is your opportunity to balance the removal with replacement. At this point, I believe the applicant has satisfied your request for suggested changes. More than that, they have created an elegant replacement for an aging set of outdated and absolute buildings. I believe you can successfully satisfy the findings today and move this project forward. This is a great project which has improved nicely through the ARB process and I urge you to register your approval consistent with staff's recommendation. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Randy Popp. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker is Jessica.

Jessica Resmini: Thank you. As many others, I have been following the collaboration efforts of staff, community, and Castilleja. I would like to commend the tremendous effort to balance many perspectives. My name is Jessica Resmini and I am not affiliated with the project but I am joining this discussion as a resident of Palo Alto and a practicing architect. I also have experience with working with PAUSD on the bond project related to measure Z and modernizing learning spaces for students across Palo Alto. In both my personal and professional life, I support thoughtful progress and improvements to our education facilities. As we think about the future of our City it is important to remember that 100 years ago the neighborhood around Castilleja was farmland. The City we love was built by pioneers and visionaries. Leland Stanford opening a university here intended for agricultural studies that has now become one of the preeminent research institutions in the world. Birge Clark and Robert Eichler both became icons in architecture leading the way for movements and design right here on the streets of Palo Alto. Lucie Stern partnered with Clark and the City to leave a legacy to support the first children's library in our country. Palo Alto is a City that has been shaped by visionaries in the service of education, including Mary Locket who founded Castilleja School in a novel effort to prepare young women to succeed and Stanford. The change before you in Castilleja's modernized campus with underground is another important legacy in architecture and education in Palo Alto. The existing buildings are outdated and the new structures are sustainable and elegant. The materials draw from historic buildings on campus, settle gently into the fabric of the surroundings homes, and improve light and landscaping at the street level. The improvements suggested have improved the final product creating a cadence along Kellogg while maintaining a façade that feels cohesive and unified. Palo Alto is celebrated around the world for its innovators and visionaries, and Castilleja is an essential part of that fabric with its flexible learning spaces, sustainable architecture, and beautiful aesthetics, WRNS has designed a building that will enable generations of young women to be educated as our future leaders. I hope you will approve these plans. I firmly believe Castilleja has arrived at an excellent compromise and I eagerly look forward to this new legacy for students in our community. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jessica Resmini. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker is Neva.

Neva Yarkin: Good morning ARB Commissioners. My name is Neva Yarkin. I live on Churchill Avenue. I live two blocks away from Castilleja. My family has owned this property on Churchill for over 60 years when Castilleja was a boarding school. A new development in the City regarding traffic issues is that six-and-a-half weeks ago on September 21st, the XCAP Committee presented to City Council in a 6 to 3 vote to close Churchill Avenue for the train crossings. A new train coring will happen sometime to enable Paley students to get to school. Nowhere in any of the documents is it mentioned about train crossings which will have a major impact on traffic flow in Palo Alto. It needs to be added to this conversation. It was mentioned last night at the PTC meeting that there are construction management codes. If that is the case, I would like to find out where that is listed because I have real concerns about safety issues during the construction period. Students, pedestrians, and bikers should not be in a construction zone while attending school in temporary buildings. When Stanford was rebuilding housing, their construction zones were closed off to everyone. Enrollment should not be increased beyond 415 until all of the construction is finished. The ARB commission has an opportunity to make Palo Alto a more livable and innovative place to live. Looking at the Palo Alto Comp Plan 2030, we need to have new ideas and be creative rather than archaic as to how Palo Alto's future will be shaped. I believe environmental issues are Palo Alto's top priorities. Castilleja should take bold steps to be a leader for the Bay Area on environmental issues. This could really happen with a satellite shuttling service for all Castilleja students to alleviate traffic congestion and parking problems in this section of town. If satellite shuttling happens, a parking garage which is not environmentally friendly, would not be needed at all. This would make Palo Alto a role model and a better place for the neighbors and citizens to live in. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Neva Yarkin. And our next and last speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next speaker is Becky.

Becky Sanders: Good morning. I am Becky Sanders over here in Ventura, 1.6 miles from the school. Why am I watching today? Well, I want to track how the City's Boards and Commissions approach the overarching demands of privileged institutions to expand beyond legally allowed parameters. In Ventura, we are looking forward of the redevelopment of the Fry's site and to welcoming new neighbors but we are aghast at how the concerns of a significant number of Castilleja's neighbors are being marginalized and ignored. Concerns such as density, massing, and an underground parking garage that is not even included as floor area, green gas emissions, as well as the removal of heritage trees. An organization of privilege appears to be able to bend rules to the breaking point because it suits them to do so. I mean, I know your job is to check the plans but despite the claims of the applicant, I think the plans are still flawed. Plus, the applicant is in such a hurry that they show one set of plans in their presentation and a different set of plans in the packet. What is that about? Thank you for noticing that the plans didn't match. I know that's your job; that's what you do. But I point out that rushing through this process invited mistakes that will have lasting repercussions throughout the entire City. My primary concern is solving the mystery of the garage, but I also align myself with Andie Reed's comments about the inconsistencies between the plan designs and the law of the City. Yes, the design is attractive and has been greatly improved over the course of this process. I just wish it could be built on a site suitable and consistent with this grand design. This design doesn't belong at this site. Don't you see it that way? I mean, if friends in North Palo Alto can't get a square deal how can we in modest Ventura get a fair share? I would hope that you stop allowing equivocation for best evidence as pertains to the designation of the garage rather than on the City code. Thank you very much for hearing me today and thank you for your service to our fair City.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Becky Sanders. Vinh, do we have any other speakers?

Mr. Nguyen: We do not have any more speakers for this item.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you very much to the members of the public for your comments. You've all been fully heard. We would now like to ask the applicant if they would like to make a rebuttal to the public comments. They have ten minutes available. Is there anyone on the applicant team that would like to address or respond to these comments?

Mindie Romanowsky: Yes, if you can hear me this is Mindie Romanowsky.

Chair Baltay: Yes, good morning, Mindie. If you'd like to respond you'll have ten minutes. Vinh, can you start a timer, please?

[Setting up presentation.]

Mindie Romanowsky: I may at the end lend some of my time to some other people on our team.

Chair Baltay: All right. Ten minutes total.

Mindie Romanowsky: Thank you. I want to respond in no particular order to a number of the things we have heard this morning and in the narrative out there. There has been a narrative that Castilleja is getting a grant of special privileges and they are intensifying the use. I would tell you that this is simply untrue. To the contrary, our request to maintain the above grade FAR is the request to maintain the status quo that we have by right. Our campus predated zoning and due to our current permits which vest our square footage, those run with the land. Our application is simply asking to rebuild and replace a bit less FAR than we have right now. As our in the materials, when you compare the size of our parcel which is over six acres, to the other lots in our same zone on a relative basis our FAR is 7.2 percent less than what's allowed for other parcels in the zone when you do the math. This is all in the letters in the record. Next, I want to address the parking facility. With due respect, the comments we have heard today that our garage has not been looked at are simply untrue. The full set of plans show the garage details and our garage architect is here for questions. I would invite any of you to ask those of him. As we have shared over the years, this parking facility was conceived of by neighbors to reduce impacts after a multitude of facilitated meetings between the school, the neighbors, and our architecture team. We did this for over three years with professional facilitators and mediators. Those meetings were opportunities to share ideas, obtain

feedback, and then arrive at a plan. Indeed, the garage was what informed our site plan and was really a gating issue for how we moved forward with the design before you today. As we know, the EIR confirmed there are no impacts that come with this parking garage. We know that your comp plan and the municipal code supports this facility as an accessory facility to a use permit. It's also important that the professional analysis be considered and that we cut through some of the lay person's opinions that we've heard about whether it is safe to excavate, or whether we are hitting a water table because if you look at the reports we see that the professionals have determined it is safe to excavate and that this project does not impact a water table. Moving on, the tree comments we've heard, you know, this has been asked and answered many times. We are very proud of the trees on our campus. We have no goal to get rid of any tree that is not, you know, right needed to build a few buildings and that we have informed our site planning based on the tree locations. Our plans in the record show detailed locations of how we comply with the tree ordinance and how we are not even saving the mature Redwood Trees. We have changed our garage footprint, as you know, and then as recently as the last few weeks, we have even saved a few other trees that were flagged by members of the public throughout this public hearing process. Specifically tree 102, and tree 94 and 95. Our landscape architect is here and we also have feedback in the record from our arborist. I would invite everyone to see those materials. Chair Baltay, you did ask this morning about the steel beam and while we were listening to the comments I was able to confirm with our team that given the building rating, we believe we don't need to fire rate those beams but we will provide that to you in writing if you're interested. We also heard questions today about noise. I want to just let you know our noise consultants are here if there are questions specifically and the Commissioners want to hear from them. Before I pass it over to any other members of our team that want to speak, I just want to, in conclusion, say that the emphasis needs to be on the journey that has gotten us here whereby our project has been driven by open communication, input from neighbors, input from City staff, analysis by professionals, including CEQA experts, noise consultants, traffic engineers, arborists. All of this was to ensure that not only we bring a project without significant impact from a CEQA standpoint, which is very technical, but also to address the perceived impacts and the impacts that are felt in the neighborhood that don't always show up in a CEQA document. Things like how can we save more houses, how can we save more trees? That goal was balanced with the other goal of educating more young women on a sustainable campus that complies with Palo Alto's very respectable sustainability plan and is an amazing goal that all of Palo Alto's should feel very proud about. This campus does that in a very aesthetically compatible way, as you saw with the designs today. In conclusion, I would implore you not to let the voices of the few who do not always base their comments on data in the record and analysis by professionals to diminish the voices of the many supporters you have heard both in writing and in public comment. I would implore you to base your decision on real information that is proved with analysis. With that, I want to just remind you that we have a team here for questions today. Our garage architect, our noise consultant, our landscape architects, our traffic consultant, and even those some of these questions we heard today are not in your purview, things like the variance, if you have questions and you need clarification we are all here to answer those for you. I am going to stop my video and if anyone from our team wants to chime in you can do so now.

Mike Bellinger: This is Mike Bellinger, Landscape Architect. I don't know if you can hear me.

Chair Baltay: We can hear you fine, Mike. The purpose of this ten minute period is to rebut comments from the neighbors. If you'd like to add to that please go ahead.

Mike Bellinger: I just wanted to clarify a comment about tree 89. In July, the project arborist met with the City arborist and they agreed to do a complete re-inventory update of all of the trees on campus, canopy, diameter, and health condition. The current plans show the updated canopy that was established in July. I will clarify that with the arborist but he had it at 50 feet and that is what is shown on the plans. We will go check on that.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Mike. If there's nothing else from the applicant we will close the meeting to public testimony. Is that right, Mindie? There is no one in your gang who has anything else to add.

Mindie Romanowsky: If you would like we do have our acoustic consultant. We did hear some questions about noise. Phil are you able to just respond to that? I don't know if you're able to at the moment but please do if you can.

Phil: Yeah, the specific question I heard was about the noise coming through the opening in the existing building from the inside Circle across Kellogg Avenue. The new building will close off that gap at grade so there will already be a noise barrier there. We actually did do an analysis to see whether an additional barrier on the second floor would make much of a difference and what we found was that the difference would be imperceptible, less than a decibel for adding an additional barrier on the second level.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you very much. Why don't we close the meeting to public testimony and bring it back to the Board? I'd like to then start our Board discussion of this project with David Hirsch. Whenever you're ready, David, you can go ahead.

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you. Thank you, Adam. I really appreciate the further work on the details of the façade and I agree with a lot of the comments that it is a major improvement of the project. I reviewed the set of drawings. The drawings themselves, unfortunately, are not up to the same completeness as your presentation today. Next time around I hope you can come in -- or to other clients -- with a more up-to-date set of drawings that allows us to see where the project is going. It is a little difficult to not have those on hand and to get a project piecemeal like that. I am really happy to have a set of physical plans rather than just a Zoom set of plans because it is easier for us as architects to review a project in detail going back and forth through the plans, the elevations, the sections, the material, illustrations. Thank you for the updated plans when we did receive them a week ago now. Major concerns from the previous meeting were the unremitting length of the Kellogg elevation. In the new detailing of the one-story closer to Emerson side of Kellogg is a really significant improvement. The break in the entire volume, the interruption of the roofline, creating three discreet façade elements along Kellogg; it is what I was hoping for in the beginning would be a way of reducing the scale of the Kellogg elevation and making it certainly fit the street and the residential neighborhood. The accent tile is also an improvement and that use on the Emerson end of the building as another entry point really works quite well. I really wonder why it couldn't have been used or actually I wonder why the break where it was first used closer to Bryant isn't also an entry or an exit or in some way related to that kind of function. Then, I asked the question, well it seems to be serving a purpose. It is describing an entry as well as a reference to the Gunn Building and the fascia of the Gunn. Why not consider it symbolically in these other areas? This is a suggestion, but it appears that this is the direction you're going in so I'd like you to take a look at that. Unfortunately, we don't have elevations of the interior of the Courtyard. At a similar scale as the Kellogg façade, I don't think it's appropriate to approve a project unless we can see the whole project. As you are improving the rest of the view of this building, why not give us the interior views as well. Who knows, we may have some comments to make but it is certainly significant that the building is one building and we need to look at the whole building. We always get that in any proposal to us. My most significant concern is really the limitation of this site to properly expand the program. As it is located in R-1 residential district surrounded by private dwellings, the program simply does not fit the site unless one-third of the space is located below grade. I don't see it is our role to question the planning Department's acceptance of the FAR calculation, except as it affects the review of the ARB findings. We have to also be cognizant of the history of this school as a significant educational institute with an important role to play in the education of women beyond Palo Alto's borders, too. Going back in the history of the project, I was intrigued to see the earlier schematic design concept where the entire center courtyard was excavated so that the basement level, this questionable educational level below grade, is a sunken public space. The Kellogg side was exposed to daylight and the inside basement level was, of course, exposed to that sunken courtyard. I was disheartened to see that that bold idea had died. It would have been an amazing amphitheater space for the performance of Greek tragedies, women's rights, lectures, ballet performances, and many public events, but it is no longer. You'll have to imagine present-day functions serving those purposes. But most importantly, it would have been a source of natural light for many classrooms and teacher spaces of the basement program. Now with these spaces entirely below grade, natural light and air has become the scarcest commodity. The Kellogg site, walkable glass skylights serves only four of the twenty or nineteen below-grade classrooms. The lobby staircase draws light from limited skylight areas two floors away. Clear stories windows into the three basement classrooms on a rendering perspective -- that's in your drawing

number 802 -- showed up in an elevation or perspective drawing of the Kellogg façade but weren't included in the section. You showed another picture of them today and they are there. They are there because the landscape on the perimeter has provided a recess that allows the basement wall to be revealed and clearstory windows to be placed in those below grade classrooms. You have a method for bringing light inside of the building and I think you overstated it, frankly, -- specifically Adam -- its function in it providing appropriate light in that basement area. I would suggest that you use your skylight idea, your perimeter walking light wells to provide light almost in the entire perimeter of the school so that you can really legitimately say that you have answered that issue of bringing natural light to the basement. There would be other ways of doing it, as well, and, of course, you know you could look into that. The light wells or whatever else you would like to do but if you could do more of what is there and bring natural light down to the classroom areas I think it would be a great service to this building and basically to the education of these young women to not be held off from that opportunity. I want to go on to something else here, and that is it seems to me there is another opportunity here. You have a 600 or 700 square foot stair enclosure that connects the Kellogg building to the library and to the art department there. That skylight, that element, could simply project through the roof creating a skylight and bringing much more light down to the basement area. I would like to ask you to look at that. I think it's an opportunity that you shouldn't give up on that you can make light well out of that that will provide much stronger light to the basement area. As you can see, that's my major concern here is the light. I would've liked to have seen an illustration or put up an illustration of GOO6. If that were possible for the temporary campus plan, as well. Is that possible for you to do that?

Chair Baltay: Vinh or any member of the applicant team, do we have the possibility to put up certain pages of the presentation?

Mr. Nguyen: I'm sorry, which presentation did you want to be on the screen?

Board Member Hirsch: GOO6.

Chair Baltay: One of the pages of the applicants drawing set. I'm not sure they can pull that up at the last minute, David.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Ms. French: I have the web set open. I can look for that sheet. What is it? GOO?

Board Member Hirsch: Six.

Ms. French: GOO6.

Board Member Hirsch: And the temporary plan. I'm not sure where that is (inaudible).

Ms. French: It will take me a while.

Chair Baltay: Do you want to go on to something else, David?

Board Member Hirsch: I am just going to continue, then, Peter.

Chair Baltay: Please do that. Let's keep moving.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Castilleja has probably considered alternates to the phased construction but I wonder whether they've ever considered moving the program off-site so that the entire project could be built in one phase. Certainly this would benefit the neighborhood residences and be a better answer to our finding concerning promoting the orderly and harmonious development of this City. I note that based on some recent experience, that Cubberley is one reasonable place where it is possible to relocate temporarily to construct the temporary classrooms without unduly disturbing existing community program. Utilize the availability of the gyms, the pavilion, the auditorium, and the playing field that are all there.

There is plenty of parking space and the ability to make a much better campus while the present campus is being renovated. I mean, I suggest this because of my concern that this is just... have you really concerned and analyzed the traffic entering the campus on a normal day and the need for this parking garage, and the number of vehicles including the cars that go to the railroad station to pick up other students from other communities and bring them here. These are all going to be coming to this campus while it is in construction. There are workmen who need to arrive as well. There are trucks and trucks of dirt being hauled away and construction equipment coming onto the site and very loud demolition going on at the same time. I want to just read from a critique from packet number 22 that we received today. It says "as other construction projects in Palo Alto have shown, construction vehicles block traffic lanes restricting streets and sidewalk's access throughout the area to concurrently allow a school to bring hundreds of students to the area with drop-offs, pick-ups, and parking. Adjacent streets will severely exasperate what neighbors see as an excruciating process of noise, disruption, et cetera. The idea of allowing unmonitored Access and parking during the process defies logic." In any case, you know, I think it falls on us to comment about this because it could be a very serious problem with trying so hard to keep this school on the site at the same time as all of this construction, I state this with a lot of experience in construction where it is such a mess. There is no way of reducing it. The dirt flies all over. You put construction fences around a property and they don't really sufficiently make it a useful place to have a school at the same time and to reside, since it is a residential community. I bring it to your attention because I think it is serious enough to deal with it now rather than wait for the disaster to happen later on. I also want to point out that there are benefits, of course, to moving the school temporarily. One of them is you can do the whole project and that is really significant because it is a three-year, which is I think a conservative estimate of time. Maybe it is a four-year project by the time you're finished with it. That is a hell of a long time for a disturbance to a whole community. If you could cut that in half by asking the school to relocate temporarily I think it would be a benefit to all concerned. I haven't really focused on the aesthetics because I really am concerned that this is more serious and Palo Alto should think carefully about this. To end on a good note, I think it is going to be a beautiful school. I am absolutely impressed through the roof with comments that were made by the architects today. The detail is beautiful and it solved the Kellogg Street side. You haven't solved the lightning in my estimation and you can do more of a job on that but I look forward to his school and the way it fits into the residential community and the scale of it and the detail of it. With those comments, I will end. Thank you.

Ms. French: Did you want me to put up that sheet you asked for GOO6?

Board Member Hirsch: I guess so.

Chair Baltay: Is that yes, David?

Board Member Hirsch: Actually, to be honest, if the temporary campus plan was available that would be useful today as well.

Ms. French: Okay. I have that handy in my slide but did you not want the GOO6 then?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I'd rather have the temporary plan at this point.

Ms. French: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Why don't we continue on with other Board Member and come back to that as you get that ready.

Ms. French: I have it ready.

Chair Baltay: You have the temporary plan ready?

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Go ahead, put that up, please. Okay, David. What's your...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Let's see. This is actually a new temporary plan.

Ms. French: No, this is the same one.

Board Member Hirsch: You know what's different about it is... it's new to me. It's not in our set. It now is a redoing of it. I can see that one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight... okay. Originally, the plan extended into the Lockey property and there were two classroom elements in that plan. This is one module less than the plan that's in our drawing. There were 20 classrooms in that one and there are only 18 here. Yeah, there are only 18 classrooms here. And what else is missing? There was a missing circle to imitated or bring back for the time being the Circle into this particular scheme and now that has been eliminated. This is an awful lot of construction in a very limited area, with an awful lot of kids in a construction zone. Not so much that they would be affected by the construction of the Kellogg end of the site, imagine what it would really be with all of the cars coming to this area. With all of the students being delivered to the area. With all of the trucks coming at the same time. With the workers coming early in the morning and trying to find places to park in the neighborhood. I think just reinforces what I am concerned about here. That really does go back to our concern as a Board about the effect on the neighborhood as a whole here. I ask you to consider that. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay, David, thanks for pointing all of that out about the temporary and the impact of construction. Are we ready to move on? If so, I'd like to see if Alex Lew would like to go next. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Sure. First of all, thank the architect for the revisions. I think they were all done very well all considered. Also, thank you to Amy French and all of the planning staff on the project. I think that the staff report was done really well and everything was clear and easy to understand. I am in support of the project. I can recommend approval today, I believe. I do have comments but I think that those can all be addressed either by staff or by subcommittee. I think the first one I will go into is findings. For staff, on package page 23 where you're referencing comp plan policies, there is a policy about the streetscape neighborhood amenity and the draft language (inaudible) bike racks. As I was walking around the site this week, I think that there has been a dramatic improvement in the landscape. The landscape plans show a variety of plants at a very small scale and it provides a lot of visual interests for pedestrians. I would say that landscaping improvement is on Bryant, Kellogg, and Emerson. There is some proposed language for a public art piece along Kellogg. That would be a visual interest element there. I think also on Kellogg we are removing the existing maintenance building and trash areas. Those are pretty unsightly at the moment, so putting those underground makes a dramatic improvement to Kellogg. Also on Emerson, there is an existing fence covered with Ivy right at the back of the sidewalk, and in the new proposed project that fence is being moved back substantially and there is a large amount of landscape in front of that. I think that that actually makes Kellogg pedestrian experience a lot nicer. Also as I walk around the site, there are a lot of gaps in the existing street canopy and the proposed plans are showing that all of those gaps are being filled in. I think that it also makes it substantially nicer. Okay. On the new street trees, I did have a comment for staff that I think if you haven't already reviewed it with the urban forestry is that there are utility lines above Kellogg and you're proposing large Coast Live Oaks on there. I am just asking if that was considered and if the City is able to prune the trees around the existing utility lines. Also, along Kellogg the proposed plans are showing new Manzanitas along the curb, like in between the curb and the sidewalk. As I was reviewing it, I think that there are several existing Magnolia trees. The Magnolia trees in Palo Alto typically have very shallow roots and they're really at the surface. Usually the soil is hard as a rock. I think if staff could review that perhaps on-site as part of the tree monitoring. I would really look at that carefully. I don't want the surface roots of the Magnolias to be removed for new plants because it will kill the trees. Also, on Kellogg I think it was in our staff report about the sound impact at the building breaks. As I understood, it was less than one decibel for things that are happening the Circle. If there are seminars up at the second-floor terraces, if there was a solid railing you could reduce the sound by five decibels and I think that is what the neighbors were asking. I think maybe we should consider that in there as a condition of approval. Okay. My last item, which I really hate to go around in circles about, is on the Kellogg façade pull out drawer where you used to have where there was standing seam metal siding I think maybe we should consider putting that back in. I was looking at the details of the shingle and the parapet cap and I am not so crazy about that. I can agree with the project as is but I think we should maybe think about that. Typically, shingles tie into something more substantial than just sheet metal

flashing. Otherwise, I can recommend approval of the project today; I think David has a fair point about construction staging and also having a temporary campus on-site and all of the construction worker parking. It seems like if the temporary campus was off-site it would give the construction crews a lot more flexibility and it would reintensify the use. I think that's a good idea but I don't think that would affect the way I vote on this particular project because we haven't typically voted on construction impacts in the past. I know that sort of changed with the current comp plans but we haven't historically done that. That's all I have. Thanks, Peter.

Chair Baltay: Alex, you were talking about going back to a metal finish. Can you show us which elevation that was on?

Board Member Lew: That's on the Kellogg elevation and it is on the one-story element on a drawer pull. If you want a sheet number...

Chair Baltay: Yeah, what's the sheet number so I can see it?

Vice Chair Thompson: I can share my screen. I have it open, I think.

Chair Baltay: That'd be great if you could, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: Is this it, Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: You're suggesting, Alex....

Board Member Lew: I think it looks fine...

(crosstalk)

Board Member Lew: I'm sorry?

Chair Baltay: Make your pitch again on what you think that should be. I didn't understand you the first time.

Board Member Lew: The original plan had some sort of metal, perhaps, standing seam. I am just saying and throwing out to the Board to just consider that. It is really mostly looking when I look at the detail of the parapet cap and the shingles. Typically, you would hide...

(crosstalk)

Board Member Lew: I don't have it in front of me but typically you would hide the top course of shingles. You would tuck it in under something, you know?

Chair Baltay: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Here it is just a profile of metal.

Chair Baltay: But are you suggesting increased detailing or just changing the material altogether?

Board Member Lew: Perhaps it could be either.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I just wanted to be sure we understand what you're saying here, which I do now. Thanks for sharing your screen.

Board Member Lew: Okay. That's all that I have.

Chair Baltay: Great. Thank you, Alex. Grace, your turn next if you don't mind.

Board Member Lee: Yes, thank you. I'll start also with some thank you's. I see that we have come on this journey and I do very much appreciate the process the City of Palo Alto upholds in terms of our multiple Boards and their various purviews. I wanted to first, though, thank the community for your attendance, attention, your careful listening, your communication of (inaudible) on the project. I also want to thank the City staff and our fellow Board Members at the HRB as well as the PTC and of course the Council as this is a joint effort. Our purview is really to make those findings and I do want to say that I am very impressed. Thank you to the applicant for being very thoughtful and layered in your approach and always trying to do better in terms of planning for sustainability. I feel like this project is building a future. As we know, the site is beloved as ever site in Palo Alto, but particularly this site for its history, and for the history of the use that has been at this site. Its integration with the neighborhood and how that related to our findings. I do want to say that I feel that the sets we have seen, and it is a lot of information -- thanks to the City staff and Amy, Jodie, and Ben -- in terms of providing so much data. The data is important because all of this adds up to how we interpret. I guess in an ideal world, I love how our Board -- and thank you fellow ARB Board Member in terms of looking at the sets very carefully, listening to each other -- I think that the applicant generally tends to hear what's loudest in terms of our volume and comments that are repeated. We try to come to a consensus and sometimes we don't. Sometimes there are things that are slightly off and then sometimes we are aligned but I feel like the applicant here has done quite well and has been in-depth and versatile in sharpening their pencils and bringing forth responses, for example, to our comments from the previous two meetings. I am just going to go down this list where some of the comments I voiced and that others voiced a little bit more loudly. First, the findings that we are asked to uphold and hopefully we get to a vote today. I am very much feeling that the findings are definitely being met by this project in many different ways. I wanted to go back to my colleague Board Member Lew's comments on some of the findings but first I will just start with what we have been discussing the most and focusing our comments on has been that Kellogg Street exterior elevation and important edge to this project. Thank you, applicant, because I do see that that has come forward. My comments were really related to the materials and color and it is so wonderful to see that there has been careful attention, again going back to the Gunn building -- which is part of our findings in terms of seeing how we are preserving, and respecting, and adapting -- here you have taken those keys very well and you have looked and seen the shingles; you've seen the green and the tile. Also, the real rich and textural approach. I very much appreciate how the green tile is being repeated on the Kellogg Street elevation. The battens definitely are reminiscent, I think, of a previous time and preserved and integrate into this new façade harmoniously. There also is this material of the shingles. I can just talk about it right now in terms of this thought that perhaps, and Board Member Lew brings up, there might be a little bit need for -- I didn't put it in my notes but I could see it -- making sure about the detailing about that cap. Perhaps that is something that could return to a subcommittee. Because the shingles are reminiscent and part of the Gunn Building it is so much a part of the overall materials template as we walk around the complete campus on the exterior. My preference is that the shingles would remain as presented in the set we are reviewing today. I also wanted to go to the comment regarding the shear wall and how it is showed in our set and the perspectives. I do see that vertical shear wall and the intent of the applicant to do even better in terms of integrating this -- I don't like the word -- bellyband. It is a separation between the first and second-floor which decreases the mass. I am in support of that. I also would like to hear from Board Members just on their thoughts in terms of how it is shown in our set and then how it was shown in the presentation. I do feel that is a change that didn't show up in our set; however, it is very easy to digest and understand it because you are proposing that material choice of the bellyband separating that first and second floor around the building in the current elevations. If that did want to go back to a subcommittee and just looking at that detail that would be one way to take a second look. I would like to hear from the others on that. In regard to the Kellogg elevation, I think members of the public and our Board Members have said it, for me, that one break that was presented at the second hearing was very much appropriate and appreciated. I think that the embellishment with materials and a finer grain and a further depth in how that façade comes in and out and recedes worked very well. I thank my fellow Board Members in asking for more in terms of even decreasing the mass further. I think you have achieved it very well and I appreciate the use of the tile that is in two planes. In terms of how it begins to model or define the porch, it is very positive. The other things that we discussed were a couple of other pieces that I discussed and other Board Members discussed was the landscape proposal. Thank you; the enlarged landscape plans are very clear. I teach a bit and I

would show that landscape set as a teaching set. It is very clear. It outlines the approach. It describes the sustainability of bioswales and plant species. The very minor comment that I had, and this is perhaps something about maintenance is that I love the ferns and the grasses and I am looking at the Calamagrostis, the feather reed grass, that actually grows quite large and the grasses can be unsightly if not maintained properly. I just want to make sure that there is proper maintenance, there is cutback when the weather turns, and how that actually... that feathery grass and because you show it also in your photos it can dominate in terms of its light brown color. It will decrease. I have mixed thoughts on that choice but I think it would be fine just make sure on how it layers with the other grasses and ferns particularly on the Kellogg Street façade. I saw that it actually is on three sides of the campus. On the enlarged landscape plans, it is wonderful to see that the landscape on all sides of the site and the proposals are terrific and there has been such a strong focus on how to preserve trees, how to relocate, and how to plan for the canopy and the shade. I have full confidence in our City staff in terms of arborists and who has been talking to whom. It is a lot of data and there may be some places where you need to go back and make sure... I do think our City staff and our arborists and the applicants that they... I do feel that that will go forward in a positive way. I will leave it at that. The other piece that I wanted to talk about was -- and is part of my mind the landscape proposal -- this family of fences and walls and gates. Thank you, Amy, for showing that in your presentation, and to the applicant for making a small change to that acoustical wall in terms of a template now. There's just a family of fences and walls that begin, for me, to speak to the historic nature of the fences and walls and gates that exist on all sides. I think that the traditional and contemporary approach work together quite well. Now, let's talk a little bit more about something new. Oh, in the materials I also did want to just mention that the champagne anodized color, which is arm, and also the additions a slight change from last. I am in full support of that in terms of the overall palette. Again, part of this landscape proposal the public that was just shown as some ideas right now I encourage that that might move forward. I know that would be at a future date and it might involve City staff and perhaps even a presentation to the Public Art Commission or some kind of putting heads together. I think that that with the landscape, if it is integrated well, could be a terrific addition. Thank you Board Member Lew in terms of going to the findings and finding where that public art price might show up in the language if we move forward to approve. Also, calling out that I fully agree with removing the unsightly maintenance building, fences moving back, and also landscape improvements on the three streets would be, I think, welcome additions for me and to the findings. In terms of acoustics, my feeling is there is a report; the consultant is here, and City staff has been working well. I don't feel the need for that additional remediation on the second level. However, I also would like to hear from other Board Members regarding that acoustical improvement that was suggested by Board Member Lew. It might be something that could come back to a subcommittee. In closing, I think I have covered all of my comments. I do want to just thank my fellow Board Members, City staff and I look forward to a further discussion with some of our Board Members today before making a motion.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace, very thoughtful comments. Osma, it's your turn if you'd like to go next.

Vice Chair Thompson: Sure, thank you. I will try to keep this brief because I feel like a lot of what I wanted to say has been said in some way or another. I will start with saying that I do appreciate the updates to the Kellogg façade. I appreciate the comments from the Board encouraging those changes and I appreciate the applicant responding to those changes. This façade is looking better than it has ever looked, I think, since we have seen it. I would not support changing that part of the material to standing seam but I would support looking at the detailing of how that parapet meets the planter as part of the subcommittee, assuming that that detail will be visible on the façade. I think the shingles make sense but it is true that there is a treatment that needs to happen to that parapet that will be visible once it is further developed that is not currently visible. Let me cross these out while I write these out. It is interesting; when I was looking at the elevations I flagged those concrete shear walls as question marks. While it is too bad that that change didn't get into our set I appreciate the applicant having the foresight to know that that is unsightly and the change that was made that we say in the presentation is an improvement. That would have been a comment that I would have suggested the applicant come back and do something else with those walls. I appreciate the change and I appreciate that we can see that here today. I do think that those are improvements to the façade and I don't know if as part of the conditions that we make that note as well. One issue that I would like more detail on is the tile patterning. The tile sample that we saw in the materials board was quite tiny and it is a little unclear, especially with the renderings that we are

seeing, how that tiny tile is being applied across that whole surface. More detail needs to happen, I think, for that. That could go to a subcommittee, I think. I do think that is really important because what we are seeing in the renderings are kind of a multi-color tile that looks vertically aligned and the tile that I saw looked like it might be more of a subway tile, which are two very different feels. I want to make sure that the tile ends up getting to the feel that we're seeing here in the rendering, which is sort of a light and glossy accent. Board Member Hirsch's suggestion about adding more light around the periphery I think is a good one. I would be in support of that suggestion. I think the efforts that have been made currently in the drawings and per the application's presentation that show all of the different ways that light makes it into the building through the skylights and through the walkable light wells. I would say having more of that wouldn't be a bad thing at all. I appreciate how much there is and I think urging the applicant to consider more of that is a good thing. I really appreciate the other sustainability measures that are incorporated in this building. I don't mind the solar panel on the roof. I think aesthetically having a little bit of visibility on there is fine. I kind of actually like that accent in some ways. I agree with Board Member Lew's notes on the landscape. For the railing on the second-floor terraces, I have seen clear glass sound barriers that could be used there. I hesitate to require that unless I knew how frequently those terraces would be used. I don't know if classes are being conducted up there or the noise level that is expended of those terraces. From the appearance it might be minimal. Potentially, I could be open to seeing something there if it makes sense but only if it makes sense programmatically, which would require further discussion with the applicant. Maybe that could be a subcommittee thing. I appreciate the mullion color champagne. That's the majority of my notes. Overall, I can feel that I meet the findings with a few items going to subcommittee. This project is really good looking at it will be a really good project if it is executed the way it is present. Thanks.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Osma. It's my turn now. Before I start, I want to say that I am impressed that it really seems to me that we are really listening to each other. I like to hear our comments coalescing together. The building is improving and it feels good. That said, I am still having trouble with the overall compatibility; how well the building fits into the neighborhood it's in. I would like to just put for the record the three reasons why I think it really isn't compatible. One is that the building has an 18-inch high metal finish façade which is 120 feet plus 76 feet along Bryant, 128 plus 55 plus 100 feet along Kellogg, and then another 160 feet along Emerson. I just feel that that size and that continuous length of element is too much to fit into the neighborhood that it's in. That is compounded by the fact that it is exactly the same height, the same elevation, everywhere. It just reinforces that consistent size of the building. I believe that is inappropriate in a residential neighborhood. The other issue that I have is that the basic design motif is one of 12 8-foot tall curtain wall glazing panels facing out into the residential neighborhood. I am concerned. That is big pieces of glass that will need some sort of sun shading, especially on Kellogg. Even yesterday the sun was very bright out there. It will need some sort of privacy screen even on the second floor. Those classrooms will be very open to the street for wondering students' eyes in or out. Then at night, anytime a classroom is occupied at night that is a large bit of night pollution for a quiet residential neighborhood. For those reasons, I am just really concerned that it doesn't fit into the neighborhood. All of that said and having listened to all of the testimony today, I am not sure my concerns rise to the level of not meeting the required findings. I do not think they will prevent me from being able to support the project but I want to state that for the record. I am just concerned about that. I have a different set of concerns regarding the swimming pool and it has more to do with what I see as an incomplete presentation of what's going on. Again, as I stood there yesterday for quite a while trying to understand how this was going to fit in and it really is a 15-foot deep in the ground concrete wall box with a swimming pool in it and at places the concrete, as best I can tell, is only a few feet from the edge of the pool. We don't have any real details or elevations of how that is going to be treated or finished, how that is going to relate to the sound wall which will make it closer to 20-something feet tall. There is a very large Oak Tree, a beautiful Live Oak on the left-hand side as you're standing on Emerson which the drip line extends, I'd say, almost ten feet beyond the edge of where the retaining wall will be. I would like to have staff check and investigate that but I just can't see how a tree at that stature could survive this much construction. A 15-foot cut 10 feet into the drip line of an old Live Oak Tree, and a really beautiful one, I think will be the end for that tree. I think it just needs to be addressed how they plan to do it. Additionally, the swimming pool has, what I say, the right side as you're standing on Emerson again, it seems to be a series of functional spaces. Perhaps a locker room or some mechanical stuff and on top of that is some sort of a roof element, which just hasn't been described anywhere. I am just curious as to

what that is or how that's going to be treated. As well as next to that again is that service ramp in which cuts into the ground there. Again, there is no detailing on how the fencing around that is going to be treated. That's next to the main drive-in to the Circle and I believe that will be quite visible from the campus and from the center of the Circle. How that railing, which is a very important because it's a big safety issue, is treated is critical and yet there is zero evidence of that. Additionally, there is a beautiful Live Oak tree; again, at what is basically the end of that service ramp right at the edge of the Circle. That's tree number 155. Again, that tree is slated to be removed and I wonder if again thinking more about how that ramp works maybe you could save the tree which would help mitigate the impact visually from the center of the campus. But to me, the pool is really just a whole bunch of questions about how it is really going to work, what these spaces are going to be like inside around the pool, and how that is going to integrate with the campus. What is that structure to the right of it? I just don't think we have enough information here, honestly. That really concerns me. I am hopeful that we can protect tree 89 so it really will survive and I am hopeful that we can get the applicant to revisit tree 155 to try to keep that one. I am concerned about some of the proposed exterior lighting. Osma brought this up. Fixture ZY1 A, B, and C are 16-foot tall some sort of uplights as I can tell proposed to be -- at least as I can tell, again -- along Kellogg Avenue and those don't seem appropriate to me in that location. Again, at night they will be quite bright and certainly, we do not have much information; just a very small cut sheet of what they're supposed to be like and how they fit into the project. Then my last concern, really, is coming around again. I just think again in spite of the improvement having a package of drawings it is still incomplete and it's inadequate. To be honest, gang, we are getting 1/32 scale of elevations drawings of this project, which is tiny. I get that we have to be able to read plans but the native drawing of these is 1/16 scale, which is already pretty small. When was the last time we had a project of this magnitude where we accepted elevations at this scale? The floor plans are at one inch equals twenty. It is also a tiny scale reduced by half of what we're looking at. It's just not possible to understand and really warranty some of these details. David raises good questions, very legitimate questions about the daylighting. With these plans, I am really just unable to figure out what is actually happening and it is hard to pass judgment on it. It seems to me that it is not an unreasonable ask to get plans at a larger scale with more detail. I am also distressed to find that the elevations are inconsistent. This morning with the shear walls I get, but if you look at page A320 or 302 maybe. On 302 is their elevation sheet and elevation two, the west elevation, is intended to be the interior courtyard of the long building except on the left it is just not correct. The building is connecting to another building there and it's just not shown properly. On the right, that's where the building has an L; it comes back at you and it is just not a suitable drawing to explain what's happening. I am sorry but I don't think these are complete or descriptive enough drawings to really justify what we're about to approve. I really would like to see drawings that have a finer scale that have been completely updated. I can appreciate and I agree with Osma's comments that the shear elimination is an improvement but what we are approving becomes a record and I think it really is a mistake to just leave it to staff to figure out what was said at a series of public hearings to take a few perspective sketches from the architect, which seems to change constantly, as the record. The record needs to be a full set of detailed drawings that are accurate and correct. I am having a tough time with that. I am also struggling with some of the more technical details that I have pointed out. If there are going to be drain pipes dropping down from the projecting eaves of the building I would really like to see how and where that is done. It's not that I don't have confidence that it can't be done or that it will be done nicely, these architects seem very capable. But not to be figuring that out upfront it just seems inappropriate to be approving it at this stage when that is the case. If the ceilings inside the classrooms really do have a 24-inch or even 30-inch dropped ceiling there how that is reflected on the facade seems important to me. I would like to see what they are really thinking about that. There is a number of these kinds of questions that I just don't think have been fully resolved. My goal will be to overall support the project but I would like to see it come back to us with a lot of these questions answered, as well as a number of questions that the rest of the Board Members have brought up. I do not support approving this and sending it to subcommittee. I just think there are too many things to go on that. That's how I feel. Do we have any other feedback now that everybody has said their piece?

Board Member Lee: I am happy to chime in with a few thoughts. Thank you everyone for comments. Peter, on yours I did want to make some remarks in terms of just having seen a lot of sets, all of us, on this Board over the years. On a project of this size often the elevations are of a smaller scale. There is an effort on the applicant in terms of enlarged elevation, multiple sheets, and also large perspectives that are

very well done in terms of showing materials without trees. I believe we didn't ask for anything enlarged and beyond what they have... they have, in my mind, given us a lot of material but I understand your comment regarding the area we all see in terms of where the shear walls were shown. I did just want to go back to our group and see if there is consensus that that is where a portion of our Board may review it again. When I was taking notes of what all of us were saying, it seemed like that was one of the comments in terms of where we see a shear wall in the elevation and that that would come back. I would feel comfortable with a subcommittee to see that with the bellyband in that location. The other piece that I just wanted to bring up was in terms of this exterior landscape light, if there is enough of us on the Board that would like to see that come back that seems like it could be a large-scale cut sheet with the photo and an actual key plan and to show that at a subcommittee level. On the acoustical rating, that could be a discussion that is shown as well. I don't feel strongly about that but if we were to craft a motion for this project to have a few subcommittee items... I did want to go back to what Osma said, the tile pattern is easily something that is seen at the subcommittee level in terms of what is that pattern -- we have a sample -- and the cap shingle. Those are the things that I wrote down and I would love to hear from others on comments now that have gone around the table.

Chair Baltay: I have got six things in my quick jotted list here that I have heard people say that could take some more work. Grace, to me, that's just getting to beyond where it's an inappropriate thing for a subcommittee do deal with, they're not individually huge, although some of them could be. This is an important project and I believe we should really be getting a complete and thorough package that we can all agree on. The subcommittee's approvals tend to be much less rigorous in my experience. Shall I go through this then and we can all chime in and see if there are other items? At least we are working at either a subcommittee list or giving the applicant instructions.

Board Member Lee: That would be great.

Chair Baltay: The shingled wall on Kellogg Avenue, what I have heard a majority of the Board say is we want to see more detail on how the top of that wall is finished off. Alex, I'm afraid I haven't heard any support for changing it back to metal. I think the shingles are what the Board seems to be singling in on but I, myself, think it's a legitimate that the detailing isn't quite right. The second thing is to see some sort of tile patterning installation and patterning details for the green decorative tile. Is that about right, Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes, how the time is implemented and the size.

Chair Baltay: Okay. The third issue that I heard Grace mention -- I didn't hear anybody else but it seems reasonable to me -- was a question about the feather grass and if that's an appropriate choice for the landscaping. Grace, do you want to elaborate on what that really is.

Board Member Lee: I should say that my comment is about maintenance. Just that there is an eye on how that is maintained so it doesn't get too unruly since that it is a very versatile plant. They can do very well and create more of a dominant effect and I did see it both in the furmand [phonetic] and in the middle layer. It's a minor comment that relates to making sure about maintenance.

Chair Baltay: You're just asking the applicant to consider that choice once more.

Board Member Lee: absolutely. No need for further review unless other people...

Chair Baltay: Okay. That's a minor thing. Do other members of the Board concur or feel that's not appropriate? I'll take silence as yes. David has asked strongly to consider additional means of getting daylight to the lower level classrooms. I heard Osma support that and I support that. That's a bigger deal. David, do you want to make a pitch for explaining for that really is and whether that could be subcommittee item or if it needs more design work?

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, no, it is a very significant issue here. We have to make that basement work as a school building and it has to have as much natural light as is possible. I think that has to be explored in detail on the courtyard side as well because there are a lot of classrooms in the basement that face the courtyard, and that affects circulation on the ground floor. It affects the landscaping on the ground floor, et cetera. It really is a significant piece. The railings and whatever...

Chair Baltay: What I'm trying to do, David, is come up with a sentence or two that we can give to the applicant. What are we asking them to do regarding the daylight?

Board Member Hirsch: Explore expanding daylight methodology throughout the project.

Chair Baltay: Throughout the project to the lower level classrooms?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, to the lower level classrooms but I also suggested they consider taking the significant node between the art building and the main building and bringing in daylight from the top of it. It's about a 600 or 700 square foot square that is circulation throughout the building. It could be a skylight element; it could go to the full height that's allowable to this building. I think it's a broader exploration... the broadest possible exploration of bringing light to the basement.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I'm not sure you're going to keep Osma with you on that one. Osma, what's your take?

Vice Chair Thompson: Well based on the applicant's presentation I thought I did see a skylight that went to that circulation space that meets that request. My support of this was really more about... the applicant currently has some walkable glass that brings light down to the lower levels.

Chair Baltay: That's right.

Vice Chair Thompson: I was in support of adding more of those conditions around the building because I did only see two conditions, which I think is a minor request and in subcommittee you can see they've added... it's not something that is visible on the street so it's not going to really affect the aesthetics of the project as it relates to the environment. It's really more about adding more light to the lower levels and making more space, perhaps, between the building and the landscape to provide for that.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Grace and Alex, do you want to chime in at all? Is there any more support for this idea?

Board Member Lee: I will say I don't feel strongly. It's not a comment that I have made in the past two other hearings. I feel like daylight is a strength that they have brought to the project and...

Chair Baltay: Okay. You're satisfied as it is then?

(crosstalk)

Board Member Lee: If the majority of the Board feels like it would want for further study and review it at a subcommittee level I am open to it.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Alex, do you want to comment or do you stand with what you've already said?

Board Member Lew: I am with Grace on this one.

Chair Baltay: Okay, fine. I support what Osma says. I think a small level of additional studies could be appropriate. I am sorry, David. I don't think it's necessary to do a wholesale re-envisioning of the daylighting in all of the building at this point in the process.

Board Member Hirsch: I have one more that I did raise, Peter, and that is we haven't seen a single large scale elevations of the courtyard façade.

Chair Baltay: We're going to come to that in a second, David. It's on the list here. We've heard from the public and then I heard Alex and Osma discuss the possibility of having a sound barrier of some kind at the breaks between the building facing Kellogg. Is support again, in concept, doing that. I support, I think, what Osma said which is you'd like to make sure that its programmatically necessary first before asking an applicant to do that. David and Grace, where do you stand on that issue?

Board Member Hirsch: Frankly, I have a comment about that. I was really surprised to see that as an open area and not a through connection. It's sort of an internal connection. It is set back, of course. The corridor is set back from the facade and as it would be on the other Emerson end, which is also all the way up and is on the second level, it is an interior connection, I am surprised it isn't (inaudible). It's a whole other subject matter and no one has really talked about it today.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, the point I am trying to bring up is one several Board Members discussed which was asking the applicant to put some sort of transparent sound mitigation barrier.

Board Member Hirsch: I don't see it as a major issue to have a sound barrier.

Chair Baltay: You don't think it's necessary or you don't oppose having it asked to do that?

Board Member Hirsch: I think the use of that could be monitored by the school.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Grace, I didn't hear your opinion on that one.

Board Member Lee: I don't feel strongly. I didn't bring it to the table and I don't see a need; however, I guess I am confused. I am not sure if the majority of the Board is in support of having that come back for review.

Chair Baltay: Well, I think we have... Alex mentioned it, Osma supported it and I support it in concept, although maybe, Alex, could you explain more carefully what you're thinking?

Board Member Lew: I think the issue is sort of clear that there is a potential for noise if you have an outdoor terrace facing the neighbors. The neighbors are concerned about it. It seems like a small ask by the neighbors. I think that we should consider it. The acoustical consultant has weighed in. There is a 5-decibel reduction if we do some sort of solid railing. It seems like a small ask from my point of view.

Chair Baltay: I support what you're saying that we're asking them to essentially consider, right, or to study or find a way to potentially put a barrier there? I mean are we asking them...

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I mean, I think that's the right... yeah, consider it.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I don't see any harm. I support that.

Vice Chair Thompson: If you look at... oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Chair Baltay: Are you in support of it as well, Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I am, yeah. If you look at the floor plan AV101 which floors the floor level I would say it is a bit more important on plan -- is it plan north -- opening north. The opening plan south looks like it's more of a balcony. It's not really like a potential circulation space but the space plan north looks like it could be a potential circulation space. Potentially something transparent there makes sense.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Look, I support what Alex said, and I think you do too, Osma. I think that would be on a list of wither revisions to come back or subcommittee items.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I think it's a subcommittee item.

Chair Baltay: We have had David repeatedly ask, and I've strongly asked, that the elevations get corrected. I haven't heard from Alex, Grace, or Osma a definitive statement regarding whether you support that or not. Are the elevations sufficient as they are presented now?

Vice Chair Thompson: I think in my comments I said that the change that was presented today with the shear wall is what I would like to approve but that would be the only change to the elevations.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

Vice Chair Thompson: I don't think that warrants reprinting everything.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

Board Member Lee: I concur with Osma's comment there.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Well, look, David, there are only two people supporting what we are saying so...

Board Member Hirsch: Yup (inaudible).

Chair Baltay: ... that's the way to is.

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry, did we hear from Board Member Lew? I didn't hear him say.

Chair Baltay: Well, it sup to Alex to speak up if he wants to put into these things. I mean, Alex likes to keep his counsel, so what do you think, Alex.

Board Member Lew: I am in agreement with Osma and Grace. I don't really see a lot of... I am not sure I see the added value of having a complete set of drawings come back to a full Board.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Well, we are even talking to a subcommittee now. Is this something we want to make them represent the correct set of elevations or are we happy with what we have right now?

Vice Chair Thompson: A subcommittee...

Board Member Lew: We do (inaudible) set of drawings and I think it could go to the subcommittee.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I have three items but I'm the only one who brought them up, so lacking any more support I don't know what to say. I was concerned about the swimming pool, about two of the trees, and the finishing on the service ramp. Does anyone else support that?

Vice Chair Thompson: Let's go one by one, Peter.

Chair Baltay: Okay, I think the swimming pool is still poorly designed or poorly defined and the building next to it especially. We don't even know what's going on there and how the roof of that is being treated or what it is really going to look like. I think they need to present to us what the full design is on the swimming pool area.

Vice Chair Thompson: Which building are you talking about? The fitness and athletics center?

Chair Baltay: Let me find it in the plan for you.

Vice Chair Thompson: It's an existing building I think, the fitness.

Chair Baltay: No, it's new. Sorry, I am still trying to figure out where it is.

Board Member Hirsch: AB100.

Chair Baltay: AB100, David?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: Yes, AB100 drawing number two. With that showing let me explain that more carefully, I guess. The swimming pool itself, starting on the left-hand side when you stand in that parking lot that tree 89 is just to the left of the swimming pool here and the drip line extends well into the perimeter of the existing building. That's how you can tell that it's almost over the edge of the swimming pool itself. On the right-hand side there are some functional elements inside the building with a curved upper right corner to it and the top of that has some sort of a flat roof structure closer to grade, I gather. I just don't know anywhere what that's going to be. Then this surface ramp as it goes down doesn't have any explanation of how it's treated at the top level, again closest to the campus. Those are my issues with this whole thing. I don't know that the design is bad; I just don't know what here. I would like to see more detail and thought and make sure that tree 89, especially, is going to be okay.

Vice Chair Thompson: Would be okay to ask the applicant? When I look at the south elevation on AB302, I don't see anything that goes above that perimeter fence.

Chair Baltay: Sure, if you want to ask the applicant back I am all for that. You're the one with the tight time constraint, I believe, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: I do. I have to leave here soon. I think it would be good to get clarity on what... I didn't read that as a building. It would be good to find out what that is.

Chair Baltay: Looking at the 1 in 40 plan, there are clearly a bunch of doors into rooms. That's where I would put a locker room of some kind.

Vice Chair Thompson: It says below grade pool equipment storage.

Chair Baltay: Is the applicant still with us? Can we ask the applicant for clarity? Vinh, is it possible to unmute them

Ms. French: Adam is unmuted.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Chair Baltay: Adam, can you explain to us plan number two on sheet AB100, please?

Adam Woltag: I am actually looking back up at... it is also important to look at AS101 just to get a sense of what's at grade and what's not.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

Adam Woltag: Peter, you picked out something really critical there. It is true that there is a ramp that drops down below grade that takes care of service and access to the project but the plan you're looking at that calls out all of that equipment is below grade. There is no building on top of it. It is literally going to be at grade. There is no structure there that you would see from the street. There is a retaining wall on the ramp side that basically holds grade. All of that storage equipment is at the level of the pool. It's at the below grade level.

Chair Baltay: Is there a roof over all of that equipment?

Adam Woltag: There's a structured roof there and the intent is to landscape that. There's no roof as in a first-floor roof. It would literally be at grade.

Chair Baltay: Yes, so it's a roof at grade. The entire building is below grade.

Adam Woltag: That's correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay. What is the building to the left that says heat pump on our drawing here? What is the structure to the left of that? The long, narrow rooms there?

Adam Woltag: On the other side of the pool? One second, let me get to the same...

Chair Baltay: Drawing number two floor plan pool.

Vice Chair Thompson: Can you share that view, again, Amy?

Adam Woltag: Yeah, could we pull that up so we're all looking at the same thing?

Ms. French: Sure.

Adam Woltag: Thanks, Amy.

Chair Baltay: On this drawing to the right of the swimming pool...

Adam Woltag: Correct.

Chair Baltay: ...is a large narrow set of rooms, one bigger than the other with what looks like doors coming in from the swimming pool area. What is that? What are those spaces?

Vice Chair Thompson: You're talking about this one and this one?

Chair Baltay: Yes, exactly.

Adam Woltag: It's a series of stargaze spaces and mechanical spaces, pool equipment, heat pump; those are all the things that are servicing the pool.

Chair Baltay: I see, okay. That, then, has a roof that's at grade and landscaped somehow.

Adam Woltag: That's correct. That is correct.

Chair Baltay: Is there any detailing on how that's done and what the landscaping is like?

Adam Woltag: We don't have it here but we can definitely get that to you, Peter. Not a problem.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you, Adam. I think that, Osma, explains what we're talking about. That goes back to what I'm asking for which is to have just a better description of how all this is working. Is there more support on the Board to make that ask or is that something we're comfortable with?

Board Member Hirsch: You have my support, yes. I think it's a significant area and the landscaping should be part of the packet as well. And the study of the tree, as you've mentioned. That's all part of the same package.

Chair Baltay: I don't hear anyone else, David. I think that's where we leave that. Look, it's now up to somebody making a motion. I do not support putting this to a subcommittee but if somebody else wants to make that motion now is the time to speak.

MOTION

Board Member Lee: I'll move that we approve this project as presented with a list of, I believe, four or five items that might return to a subcommittee for review. Would that be a complete motion?

Chair Baltay: Why don't you itemize what's on that list, Grace? You can just say the subject of it.

Board Member Lee: The items that would come back to subcommittee review would include green tile pattern, cap of the shingles along the lower massed elevations element on Kellogg, a cut sheet of the exterior landscape light, and I believe that's on Kellogg street as well.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Was there anything else that anybody wants to make sure that's the complete list that you want to put in your motion? Okay. It's been moved. Do we have a second on that motion?

Board Member Lew: Sure, I will second.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Do either of you want to speak to your motion? No, okay, well then...

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Vice Chair Thompson: Is it possible to make a friendly amendment?

Chair Baltay: Yes, please do.

Board Member Lee: Absolutely.

Chair Baltay: It's not complete to what we just talked about. You folks should know that.

Vice Chair Thompson: Could we add that the applicant look at an acoustic barrier on the second level?

Board Member Lee: Sure, so that would be a sketch of... consider or please study the possibility of an addition...

Vice Chair Thompson: Correct.

Board Member Lee: ...to the terrace at the terrace level an acoustical panel and describe the reduction in decibel projected remediation that would occur with that addition.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes. Yes.

Board Member Lee: I am happy to add that to the motion.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Board Member Hirsch: I'd like another friendly amendment...

Board Member Lew: I will...

Board Member Hirsch: ...or do we vote on the first on?

Chair Baltay: You're welcome to make a friendly, David. Propose something.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think Board Member Lew has to second the friendly amendment.

Chair Baltay: Oh, I am sorry, yes. Alex, are you okay with Osma's amendment?

Board Member Lew: Yes, I seconded it.

Chair Baltay: Okay. David, you were going to propose something.

Board Member Hirsch: yes, I propose that the applicant explore the use of the light paths around the perimeter to expand natural lighting into the basement rooms.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Is that acceptable to you, Grace?

Board Member Lee: I think the language that -- maybe you can just clarify -- I believe that there was discussion about just some kind of, what is it -- to let in light in the way that has been shown already in one situation that is...

(crosstalk)

Vice Chair Thompson: It's the walkable...

Board Member Hirsch: Walkable light path.

Board Member Lee: Is that what we're agreeing on as the friendly amendment?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, the walkable skylight.

Board Member Lee: That would be the word, walkable skylight.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Board Member Lee: I am open to adding that language as a friendly amendment.

Chair Baltay: Alex?

Board Member Lew: What is the exact requirement? Is it to study it or are you actually requiring it to be included at all...

(crosstalk)

Vice Chair Thompson: I think it's a study.

Board Member Lew: I will accept study. I would not accept requiring every classroom to have skylights.

Board Member Lee: I too agree with further study.

Chair Baltay: Okay. The amendment is to ask for further study of skylights at the lower level classrooms?

Board Member Lee: I'll accept.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Board Member Hirsch: One other friendly amendment and that would be to present the committee with more full-scale elevations of the courtyard façade.

Chair Baltay: Okay. The amendment has been proposed, Grace?

Board Member Lee: Which amendment are we talking about? The walkable skylight first?

Chair Baltay: David is asking for an amendment asking full scale or larger scale elevation drawings of the courtyard faced. I think we already beat this one to death, David, but Grace it's your...

Board Member Hirsch: let's find out. Let's find out. It's an amendment.

Board Member Lee: Yeah, that wasn't on my list and I just want to make sure we second the walkable skylight.

Chair Baltay: Alex said that was okay, I think.

Board Member Lee: Okay, great.

Chair Baltay: Alex, did I misspeak?

Board Member Lee: I didn't have the -- oh, sorry, Alex, you go ahead.

Board Member Lew: No, I am fine with that.

Chair Baltay: Alex, are you in support of studying additional walkable skylights?

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. David has now proposed requesting larger scale elevation drawings of the interior courtyard elevations of the building. Grace, what was your response to that?

Board Member Lee: That one didn't seem like we had a majority agreeing on that.

Chair Baltay: Okay. You do not accept that amendment. David, you have the option of making an unfriendly amendment and try to gather votes for it.

UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Let's change the word.

Chair Baltay: That's the territory we're in now on this, unfortunately, but do you want to do that. I don't think you have the votes for it.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I'll do it anyhow and they can vote it down.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Jodie, can you correct me? Are we doing this the right way now?

Ms. Gerhardt: I am looking that up as we speak. We don't do that very often. We're usually a very friendly Board.

Chair Baltay: I don't think this is unfriendly. I think we have people who feel strongly about things and we want to make sure that we are doing it through the proper mechanism.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have Albert here if need be but I am also looking this up as we speak.

Chair Baltay: Alex, do you have any guidance for us? You've been through this, perhaps.

Ms. French: I have some ideas too.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, Amy's been here longer, too.

Ms. French: Certainly when building permits... well, assuming... not assuming anything but any building permit is going to have to show elevations on all sides of the building and what it's going to look like. That's always an opportunity.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think we are looking for guidance on unfriendly amendments.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, if there is an unfriendly amendment not accepted it would occur with the main motion but Chair has discretion to bifurcate the issue.

Chair Baltay: So, it's up to the Chair's discretion?

Vice Chair Thompson: To do an unfriendly amendment?

Ms. Gerhardt: I am just reading the rules.

Mr. Albert Yang, Assistant City Attorney: I'm just jumping in here. The rule should allow for an amendment, which is by definition unfriendly amendment. It's a secondary motion that can be made while the main motion is pending as long as it has a maker and a seconder. Then you would vote on that amendment before you would go back to the main motion.

Chair Baltay: Right. That's what I thought. Okay. David is making a secondary motion that we request full scale or larger scale elevation drawings of the building elevations. Is that right, David?

Board Member Hirsch: That's correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I'll second that and then we'll have a vote on it. Let's have a vote on that issue, Vinh.

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry, I have a quick question. That's not contrary to the motion that's happening, right? The request is part of the subcommittee request?

Ms. Gerhardt: It's a separate motion.

Chair Baltay: Yes, this is something that would then be made as part of the main motion. Is that right?

Ms. Gerhardt: If it gets approved then it would be incorporated into the main motion.

Chair Baltay: Right. It's still not fully approved as to the package of what we're saying but we're sort of forcing Grace's hand on the motion.

Board Member Lee: To be clear, I want to make sure about what is the new motion. Is it for full-scale elevations that your back is to the courtyard and you're looking at interior elevations...

Chair Baltay: Okay, David?

Board Member Lee: ...to return to the subcommittee for review?

Board Member Hirsch: No, just the interior façade of the courtyard.

Chair Baltay: Be more clear, David. Let's really be precise here. What are we looking for them to do?

Board Member Hirsch: Larger scale drawings of the façade...

Chair Baltay: What's the scale? What scale do you want to see, 1/8 inch?

Board Member Hirsch: I am just saying as they did on the perimeter (inaudible).

Chair Baltay: Well the drawings now are at 1/16th inch scale. Is that what we're asking for?

Vice Chair Thompson: And it's just for the inner courtyard.

Chair Baltay: These drawings are sort of here. It's just they're not correct.

Board Member Hirsch: They're 1/16th right now. That's the scale of the drawing (inaudible) and we were looking at 1/32nd. I would say if they're going to be produced at this scale they should be two-times the scale.

Chair Baltay: I didn't understand you, David.

Board Member Hirsch: Two-times the scale that is shown on the drawing.

Chair Baltay: Okay. We want to see 1/16th scale drawings of...

Board Member Hirsch: They are 1/16th right now, Peter. The drawings that are shown on our set are 1/16th.

Chair Baltay: Yeah but they're reduced...

Board Member Hirsch: But they're half-sized. They're half-sized.

Chair Baltay: That's not the applicant's issue. That's just the size drawing we get. So, we want to see 1/16th inch scale drawings of the elevations of the building?

Board Member Hirsch: That's what we have as present. If they're going to make them into half-scale (inaudible).

Ms. Gerhardt: Do you want 1/8th on reduced size paper?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. We are asking for 1/8th scale drawings.

Vice Chair Thompson: Are you asking for all elevations of the building or just the interior courtyard elevations?

Board Member Hirsch: That would be the three interior courtyard elevations. Basically, the classroom building, and the art building, and the dining room (inaudible).

Chair Baltay: Okay. We are asking for 1/8th scale, which is twice as big as they are now elevations. David, just make it of the buildings.

Board Member Hirsch: Make it which? I'm sorry.

Vice Chair Thompson: Of all the buildings.

Chair Baltay: We want 1/8th scale of all the buildings.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, fine.

Chair Baltay: That's the motion. I second the motion. Any other comments on it before we vote if that becomes included?

Vice Chair Thompson: Can we also add that the change to the façade that we saw today is incorporated in this?

Chair Baltay: Yes, of course. That should be completed 1/8th inch scale elevations.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Lee: To be reviewed by the subcommittee is what I understand.

Chair Baltay: That would go into the motion as a subcommittee item, that's right.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: Let's have a vote on that. Vinh, can you call a vote?

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Thompson (3)

No: Lee, Lew (2)

Absent:

MOTION TO APPROVE UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT PASSES 3-2-0.

Chair Baltay: Okay. To be clear, that's been added to Grace's motion.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Let me try one more friendly amendment. I want to be quick. Grace, can we ask them to study the health of tree number 89. That's the one I think is impacted.

Board Member Lee: Yes, I'll accept that as a friendly amendment.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. Alex, are you okay with that?

Board Member Lew: Yes, but I think, Peter, that's already being addressed in the last meeting. I think they talked about reconfiguring the staircase there and changing the paving to DG but if you want to revisit it I will...

Chair Baltay: Yeah, Alex, this is important to me that the tree gets saved. I just don't have confidence that it has been studied yet. By this, at least, it gets...

(crosstalk)

Board Member Lew: ...revisit it again.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I am asking that to go back to, it looks like, a subcommittee. Okay. With that, we have a motion...

Vice Chair Thompson: Question. Sorry, one more. It's a question for you, Peter. Did you also want to study the impact on Oak Tree 22?

Chair Baltay: I didn't mention that. Which tree is that?

Vice Chair Thompson: I thought that was the one that you noticed that the diameter was bigger.

Chair Baltay: That's Oak Tree number 89.

Vice Chair Thompson: Oh, sorry. Okay. I guess I wrote down the wrong number

Chair Baltay: The other tree I mentioned was tree number 55 but I don't want to go there right now. It's too much, I think.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, never mind.

Chair Baltay: You guys are going to agree with me and I don't want to push it.

Vice Chair Thompson: All right. I don't have anything to add.

Chair Baltay: Anything else to our motion, gang? Okay. With that, we have a motion that's been made and seconded. Let's have a vote on that, Vinh.

Aye: Hirsch, Lee, Lew, Thompson (4)

No: Baltay (1)

MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 4-1-0.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you very much, everybody. I appreciate the hard work and consideration and I hope none of us take this personally. It's all about trying to do what we think is the best thing to do. With that, congratulations to the applicant, your motion has carried. Let's see, can we quickly go through the rest of our agenda here? Osma, how much time do you have left?

Vice Chair Thompson: I have five minutes.

Approval of Minutes

3. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for October 1, 2020

Chair Baltay: Okay. Next item is approval of minutes. Do we have any comments on the round of minutes here?

Board Member Lew: Peter, I have comments. They're all very minor like typos and things that I can send directly to staff. I don't think we have to discuss them.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I'll move that we approve the minutes subject to the comments that we haven't seen yet from Alex, which he is going to send. Talk about a vote of confidence, Alex.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: Okay. It's moved and seconded. Let's have a vote, Vinh.

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

No:

Absent:

MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 5-0-0.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Baltay: Okay. Alex, next item is subcommittee report. Do we have anything for North Ventura?

Board Member Lew: Yes, there is a meeting tonight. It's a joint meeting with the Parks and Recs Commission. I think it's at 6:00 tonight to review the feasibility study of naturalizing Matadero Creek.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Are you suggesting we should all go to that meeting?

Board Member Lew: No because we don't want to have a quorum there.

Chair Baltay: Okay. We are counting on you to report back then from your attendance at the meeting, right?

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Anything else, Alex?

Board Member Lew: No, I think the only other thing I think we should mention is the City Clerk's Office extended the deadline for ARB applications but I don't have the exact date. I would think it's sometime soon.

Board Members Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Baltay: Okay. That comes into Board Member comments or announcements. Yes, I haven't gotten a clear answer on whether the actual recruitment period has been extended for the ARV. Jodie, do you know what the status is?

Ms. Gerhardt: I hadn't heard officially but there was some possibility of extending the application period but then I have also heard from the Clerk's Office that they will still make a decision by December 14th. So, any extension is not going to go past that. We will have new Board Members at the appropriate time.

Chair Baltay: great. That's what's of interest to us. Anything else? Okay, then we are adjourned. Thank you very much, everybody. Thank you, staff -- Amy, Jodie, and everybody. Thank you to the applicant. Have a great day everybody.

Adjournment