



# Architectural Review Board

## Staff Report (ID # 11143)

---

**Report Type:** Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 3/5/2020

**Summary Title:** Minutes of January 16, 2020

**Title:** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for January 16, 2020

**From:** Jonathan Lait

### Recommendation

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

### Background

Draft minutes from the January 16, 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](http://bit.ly/paloaltoARB)

A hard copy of the minutes of the above referenced meeting will be made available at the ARB hearing in the Council Chambers at 8:30 am.

### Attachments:

- Attachment A: January 16, 2020 Draft Minutes (PDF)



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**DRAFT MINUTES: January 16, 2020**  
 City Hall/City Council Chambers  
 250 Hamilton Avenue  
 8:30 AM

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

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

Absent: None

Chair Baltay: Good morning. Welcome to the January 16, 2020, meeting of the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board. Can we have a roll call, please?

[Roll Call]

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

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

**Oral Communications**

Chair Baltay: Next item is oral communications. Are there any members of the public who wish to address us on any item not on our agenda? We don't have anyone for that.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Baltay: Next item is agenda changes, additions and deletions. Staff, can you go through that, please? Do you have anything? Okay.

**City Official Reports**

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

Chair Baltay: Next item is City Official Reports. Again, what do we have coming up, Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: Our next hearing would be February 6<sup>th</sup>, and we do have the objective standards, we will start that discussion. There will be, I believe three different hearings, so this will not be the last discussion, but it will be a good start for us. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: That will be at the beginning or the end of any other items?

Ms. Gerhardt: So far, it is the only item. The other thing is, we might need to start just a little bit late, around nine o'clock, so it can allow the consultants to arrive.

Chair Baltay: Okay, great, thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: Can I ask a question?

Chair Baltay: Sure.

Board Member Hirsch: Jodie, we have it in the book, you know, the documents that were submitted to us, do we have that separately, or should we bring our old book that has it bound in?

Ms. Gerhardt: You're asking about the packet, or the zoning code, or...?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, the new packet will include probably the same as what we had already. We had it in a previous...

Ms. Gerhardt: No. We will have a staff report, and we will have a fairly lengthy attachment talking about objective standards.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: Although the first hearing, we might just be talking about process, you know, how do we want to organize our way forward. We wouldn't be getting into details quite yet.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, fine. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you.

### **Action Items**

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 788 San Antonio Avenue [19PLN-00079]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of Existing 12,000 Square Feet of Commercial Space and the Construction of a Four-Story Mixed Use Building that Includes 102 Residential Units and 1,780 Square Feet of Commercial Space. Sixteen of the Residential Units Would be Below Market Rate. The Project Also Requires a Zoning Amendment to Apply the Housing Incentive Program at this Location. Environmental Assessment: An Environmental Impact Report is Being Prepared in Accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Baltay: We're going to move on to our action items. Item number 2 is a public hearing for 788 San Antonio Avenue, consideration of a Major Architectural Review to allow the demolition of existing 12,000 square feet of commercial space and the construction of a four-story mixed-use building that includes 102 residential units and 1,780 square feet of commercial space. Sixteen of the residential units would be below market rate. The project also requires a zoning amendment to apply the Housing Incentive Program at this location. Can we have a staff report, please?

Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Yes, good morning, I'm Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner, and I have a PowerPoint presentation. The applicant is also here with a presentation.

Chair Baltay: One second, Sheldon, please. I keep forgetting this. I'd like to go through any disclosures we may have. Does anyone have anything to disclose about this project? Grace?

Board Member Lee: Just simply that I visited the site.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. David?

Board Member Hirsch: Same, visited the site.

Chair Baltay: I also visited the site. Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I also visited the site.

Chair Baltay: And Alex?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Okay, Sheldon, thank you.

Mr. Sing: Okay, so, here we are with our second ARB meeting, formal, for this project. As mentioned, it's the development of a four-story mixed-use building, approximately 1,800 square feet of commercial space and 102 dwelling units on a one-acre site. The requests for the project include a major architecture review. There's also a zoning amendment, and there's a partial waiver of a retail space. No recommendations are sought at this time. Really, the purpose of this hearing is to evaluate the revisions to the project based on the prior comments from the Board, and we request that you look at this project with the lens of, that the proposed zoning amendments would be adopted. Think of it that way. It's still discretionary, but we want you to think of it in terms of, why is it before us? Well, this is accompanying a zoning amendment application. In terms of where it's located, the project site is at Leghorn and San Antonio Road. It serves as the boundary between Palo Alto and Mountain View. The surroundings include industrial buildings. The site is relatively level, some commercial in the area, as well as multi-family residential. An overview of the project. It's a 102 residential mixed-use project. We've been in discussions with the applicant about whether it's to be ownership or rental. The last time I spoke with the applicant, it was leaning toward rental because of the smaller size units of the project. There's an underground garage containing the required parking, which includes a mixture of parking lifts and surface parking, and 1,800 square feet of ground floor commercial space. That's at the corner, at Leghorn. And then, as mentioned, there's the amendments to the zoning code, which is to extend the adopted housing incentive program to the subject property, and more broadly, to the other CS zoned property adjacent to San Antonio Road, between Middlefield and Charleston. And not to really delve too much into that, but just the next couple slides about, more of the context, but this is the general area where the housing program code would apply. Some of it includes elimination of the maximum density and creates a waiver for lot coverage; allows rooftop gardens to account towards open space; excludes the first 1,500 square feet of retail, retail-like project floor area from parking requirements. These are things that are going through the process. The Planning Commission will make a recommendation on that, and that will go forward to the Council, ultimately. This slide just shows kind of what is existing, and then, what is the proposed project in general. This is a table taken from the packet already. Now, we get to sort of the crux of the debate here. At the August 2019 ARB meeting, there were a number of comments that the Board made regarding the project, and the applicant did respond and made some changes. Some of the comments that were made, was to simplify the design; the façade needed some offsets; consider adding an additional elevator, there's only one elevator in the project; and then, it needs to respond to the context of the neighborhood. The applicant's response was to break down the mass more, and the materials palette is more simplified. The corner is still generally designed the same way. It does include tower element over a retail space. The other side had a tower, the other side of that same elevation along San Antonio had a tower. That portion is eliminated and replaced with an upper floor terrace. There are a variety of... In the façade offsets and framed recesses are included in the façade. The project does include two elevators now. The materials relate more to the other buildings in the vicinity. The plaza and the courtyard area now include references to former use of the site, as well as the plaza area is extended out towards that corner more. There was a separation with landscaping. Now, you can actually walk from the corner directly into that space. The project also includes publicly-accessible bike wash area, and that's something that the applicant has proposed being a public accessible area. To continue on with more of the comments. The project did include glass corners on the towers, and the Board thought that this does not convey a residential project and design. To consider transportation network company drop-offs. These are Uber, Lyft. And then, the courtyard doesn't function well, so the glass reduced at the south corner, and the northern glass tower element was removed. There was a duck-out added along Leghorn that would have two spaces there, and that would also serve as a temporary staging area for trash pickup, as well as any loading or unloading for tenants. The courtyard area wasn't really thought out in some of the diagrams that were in the previous submittal. This time around, you have much more thought-out design. Plants are chosen to adapt to lower light levels. The interior balconies also allow some additional light, and in the plans, they show some design, and potentially there could be a water feature and other

elements that would make it more enticing. And then, the last part of the comments were to consider alternative landscaping treatment on the terrace. The last, there were these palm trees that were protruding through a roof element there. The roof terrace had no function. And then, consider alternative entry. The palm trees were eliminated. The terrace now includes some low-scale plantings that really takes advantage more of that view towards the bay. That space is still partially covered and includes some seating. The project did consider the location and entries, but decided to maintain the location of entry, the main entry into the building for the residents, and maintain the location for the retail at the corner. As I mentioned, the plaza has expanded. Then, we just had some comparisons. The applicant, in their presentation, will go through in a little more detail here, but you can see the changes that they've made. It's fairly significant. The massing is still relatively there. They still maintained 102 units, but the materials and the forms changed slightly. And then, here on Leghorn Street, you can see that that's gotten a little lighter. The same has happened, treatment for the rear elevation as well. On that corner, you can see where there's more emphasis on the corner, and pedestrians have the ability now to walk from that intersection straight into the plaza area. It's much more inviting. And then, this is the courtyard. The first drawing, I think, just wasn't really drawn all the way through, the concept, and now they have something that they've thought through more. And the roof cut, the terrace, you can see where that's changed a little bit, too. It's a little lighter in color. The project is subject to CEQA. There is a building on site at 788 San Antonio that is eligible for listing in the California registry, so demolition of that structure would constitute a significant and unavoidable impact, and necessitates the drafting of an environmental impact report. That is ongoing right now. We would expect to circulate that document in the spring. There are certain elements of the project that staff hasn't reviewed, but we're continuing to work on that. In conclusion, we do want this Board to stay focused on design of the project. There are other issues that are going on with the zoning amendment. That's something we take, those policies issues are to be taken up by the Planning Commission and the Council, typically. And we are seeking further comment on the revisions, and we do believe that the revisions are more consistent with the required architectural review findings. Some of the next steps here. We've had a number of meetings already, including this one, and the next milestone would be the public draft of the EIR in the spring. We've come back during that 45-day period to this Board with a recommendation. At the same time, it would go to the Planning Commission with a recommendation, and ultimately to the City Council. Other issue, consider the proposed project and provide feedback on the project design to staff and the applicant, and continue the item to a date uncertain. That concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Sheldon. Does anyone have any questions of staff on this project? Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: Do we have a material board?

Mr. Sing: We do have materials, yes.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions? If not, is the applicant here? Okay, you'll have 10 minutes to make a presentation, if you'd like to. If you could, please state and spell your name for the record. You'll have 10 minutes.

Sean Rinde, Studio S Squared Architecture: Good morning. My name is Sean Rinde [spells name]. I'm here representing the architectural firm, Studio S Squared Architecture. First and foremost, we'd like to thank the Board for the feedback that you provided to us at the last ARB meeting last year. There were a lot of really impactful comments that you gave us, and I think, to be quite candid and not too humble, the design is a lot more compelling this time around. We've had more time to think about a lot of critical elements, especially some elements that were sort of rushed through at the end, like that inner courtyard, of course. What I'd like to do right now is use my time to sort of run through the most impactful comments and how we've addressed them. One of the comments that we got at our last ARB hearing was that the design was a four-story building that goes straight up from the street to the roof. What we've done now is really broken up the massing, especially at the northern-most corner on San Antonio, and we've introduced a lot of these, what we are calling framed elements – the framed balconies, the framed element at the roof terrace. You can see this red line here is meant to introduce the actual roofline at the street elevation, so hopefully with this line denounced here, it becomes a little clearer that we're not going from the street straight up to the roof in an unbroken or unarticulated fashion. Here, while the red line does go up above the roof line here,

this is actually an open element, so I think it could be considered that the top of the parapet might actually read along this line here instead.

Mr. Sing: Try to expand it.

Mr. Rinde: Sorry?

Mr. Sing: Try to expand this out.

Mr. Rinde: Oh. That's a little better. Thank you. Another comment that we had last time we were here was that we should think about how we would do street drop-offs and Uber and Lyft and things like that. And what we've done now along Leghorn is create a little duck-out for two cars to be able to park here. This would be great for UPS trucks, FedEx, of course Uber, Lyft – A lot of different uses could be utilized here along Leghorn. Another comment we received was that there were too many architectural styles or too many materials in play. And I think, looking at this now, I see where you guys are coming from. It was a little bit too busy. What we've done now is significantly simplified the material palette. The main materials that are in play now are some given, such as glass. Each of these framed elements is made out of stucco, painted in different paint colors, but still just smooth stucco. The main field material would be James Hardie Artisan siding, and the shiplap siding. We have... And a couple accent materials that are used consistently throughout the building. These materials here and here, and even down here in red, are meant to be metal paneling that's laser cut. We haven't finalized the exact pattern that we're going to go with yet, but the idea is it's supposed to be a high-end material that's visually interesting and helps articulate the massing and the elevation. And then, the final material that we have is what we're terming the ribbon. There's a red ribbon that integrates with the landscape and forms the roof elements of the main entry, and the retail is made out of, it's tiled, with a metallic-looking tile from Daltile. It's a very nice-looking material and I think it's really going to tie the entire elevation along San Antonio, and it turns the corner and goes along Leghorn as well, and forms the garage entry. Basically, every entry point into the building is framed with this red tile material. We received comments that our vertical circulation needed to be rethought, and looking at the floor plan, it proved true. We did need a little more time there. We have added additional elevator shafts, we've added additional vertical circulation, to better integrate the entire plan and allow a little more flexibility for the end users. New stair towers closer to the trash chutes. New elevator shaft at the... This is the northwest corner of the building. One of the more interesting comments was that the design was a victim of its own symmetry, which at the time we thought, oh, this is looking great, it's nice and symmetrical. But hearing the comment from you guys, it did get us to look at this a bit more critically and say, well, what if we broke that symmetry as suggested? And we're really quite happy with the end result, so, thank you for that comment. As you can see, while the main sort of problematic areas might still be in the same place, i.e., the residential entry is still more or less in the central portion of the elevation here, it feels a lot less symmetrical now. We might still have the retail at the corner here, some tall, nicer apartments at the corner here, but at the far corner, we've really broken the massing down. We've incorporated a community space, a community room, at the roof terrace level. We've also got more of these framed portals to take in the views from the roof terrace. And, we're doing a different sort of balcony and unit treatment here at the corner to help prevent that symmetrical issue. We received a comment that the roof terrace had no function. We certainly had an intended function, but ran out of time to really document what we had intended. This time around, we really had a lot more thought put into the plans for review. The roof terrace is meant to have multiple different seating areas. We are considering some sort of movie viewing area, but we are, of course, aware of the concerns about light and noise being a nuisance for the neighborhood, so we want to make sure that we are thinking about that critically as we move forward into design development. This area is meant to be partially covered as well, with a community space that opens out through a series of bi-folding doors onto this open-air space that's at the northwestern corner. Sorry, I misspoke before. I got my directions wrong. This is at the northwestern corner, so looking out in this direction here, you're looking out towards the **talb-corret [phonetic]** campus, and beyond that as well, given the height that we're at on the fourth floor. I mentioned this already, that one elevator was not sufficient. That's quite true for a building of this scale, so we have now added an additional elevator shaft here at the opposite corner of the one that's serving the residential lobby. The ground floor glass at the previously very symmetrical design was overdone. We have really refined this balcony. I'm really quite happy with how this looks now, relative to the still glassy corner here above the retail corner. Palm trees

on the roof terrace weren't making sense. Fair enough. We worked with the landscape architect to come up with a more appropriate planting scheme for up there, because we still want to soften this parapet edge with some planting so that it doesn't quite feel like just your standard building wall going all the way up to a flashing cap. We want to soften that, so, I would envision that some overhanging plants here might be really nice to sort of soften this edge at the roof terrace. The bike room could not open into lobby, so we have actually really revamped the way we're treating the bike room. It's now one larger space. It is partitioned off into 20 bikes per room individually to meet the transportation code. However, this is something we'd like to reconsider and get your initial feedback on. We'd like this to be more of an open space, and given that this isn't down in a subterranean parking garage, but it's instead right at the street elevation, and it's really sort of, besides the residential entry itself, it's one of the primary elements on the San Antonio elevation, we'd like this to be a more open and more communal space. Not just somewhere where you go and meet with 20 of your neighbors, but instead, everyone can be in there together. We have a design here that complies with the 20 bikes max per room requirement, but if we can get your feedback on that, that's something that we'd like to pursue perhaps re-envisioning slightly, just to create more of a celebration of the bike. The bike room is also served by this sloped walkway leading up, and at this sort of intermediate landing... This isn't exactly a ramp. I'm hesitant to call this a landing... I'm out of time. Okay.

Chair Baltay: Thirty seconds.

Mr. Rinde: Thirty seconds, all right, let's keep going. Responding to context and site. We have more carefully studied the larger buildings within the immediate context and have tried to pull in certain elements from those, to be more appropriate to the context. And overly glassy corners, again, we've reduced that quite a bit. We still want some floor to ceiling glass, we think that's going to be a special feature, but taking into account the use here and being appropriately scaled with some solid walls to provide some privacy for those units as well, we thought was very appropriate. The inner courtyard needs development. I'm not quite sure why you guys were saying that, but okay. Fine. What we're showing now is really showing how we intend for it to be used...

Chair Baltay: We're out of time. Wrap it up. One sentence.

Mr. Rinde: Okay, sorry about that. Sure. We are, of course, eager to hear you guys' feedback on the new proposal.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Okay. Let's move on to hear if we have any comments from the public. You can sit down.

Mr. Rinde: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: We have three speaker cards. Joan Larrabee, to be followed by Pat Stewart. You'll have three minutes. Please, if you could state and spell your name for the record. Thank you.

Joan Larrabee: Good morning. My name is Joan Larrabee [spells name]. I live at 777 San Antonio Road, across the street from this proposal. I've lived there for a number of years. While we all welcome more residential property to our neighborhood, we're quite concerned about how this has just kept leapfrogging, from 20 condos, to 40-something, to 50-something, and now, it's 102 rentals, mostly studios. We're concerned that San Antonio Road is only four lanes wide. Most of the stretch in the city of Palo Alto, which is from the railroad tracks and Alma Street over to the bay shore and to the bay, only has about 100 parking places. If this has those mechanical lifts, which are very prone to break down, those people who are going to be living there are going to be having to park and walk and do something, some place. This has not been taken into account. Another comment that was made in an earlier meeting was that people who live in studios are fairly low income, and therefore, they won't have automobiles, and they'll be taking the bus. There is no bus traffic on San Antonio Road. The County took the bus traffic off years ago because it's just too congested. It's too congested to have bike lanes. There are no bike lanes, and we keep seeing all of these bike rooms. Nobody can ride a bike on San Antonio Road. I never see a bike on San Antonio Road, and I'm in and out on San Antonio Road all the time. The traffic congestion. This is going to be like a

domino, because there are more properties that will be going and turning residential. And now you've made a 50-foot program for all of San Antonio Road. We haven't seen the traffic counts. The hotel isn't open yet, with almost 300 rooms. Most of the people having to go all these different places are going to have to be making U-turns. This was not taken into account when we had traffic counts for the hotel. It was already at Middlefield at San Antonio Service Level C, which means you're waiting three traffic signal times to go. And it's just going to get worse. And you're all smart people. I don't understand why you're going along with this. I don't understand this at all. Anyway, I think it's too much, too much. But again, when it was only 20-something condos, I supported that. But I'm having a hard time with all of this. And saying that people are going to ride their bikes. They're not going to ride bikes. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Next, we have Pat Starrett, to be followed by Rita... Sorry, I can't read your name right. Pat, you'll have three minutes, if you could state and spell your name, please.

Pat Starrett: Okay, yes. The last name is Starrett [spells name]. Barrett, Garrett, Starrett. I would like to first start out with a little visual comparison. If you haven't lived in Palo Alto very long, you may not know, years ago, there was a proposal for three 10-story apartment buildings on Skyline. Now, that's what... That didn't happen, fortunately. Can you imagine? Now, one acre equals 100-plus units. Now, I have a quick question about the interior, about those elevated parking. I'd like to know who makes the decision, or what company. Did they do a lot of research? What's the safety record as far as injuries? What's the length of time it takes for someone to get there to repair it? I know that's not the outside, but I think the inside bears some thought. I've lived at the other side of town in old Palo Alto, and then I moved here. Of course, all along, I knew what was happening. Trucks, and whatever else, goes to San Antonio Road, with no thought of traffic congestion, the people that already live there. I'd like those things to be admitted to consideration. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Next, we have Rita...

Rita Vrhel: Vrhel [spells name].

Chair Baltay: And you'll be followed by Chris Brennan [sic], and you'll have three minutes to speak.

Ms. Vrhel: Okay. I live over on Channing, so this doesn't concern me, except for the fact that I do most of my shopping over on the San Antonio area. And I know that apartments can look beautiful on San Antonio. But I think there is a tipping point where it becomes a problem. I was on Middlefield Road yesterday around ten o'clock, and when I came to San Antonio, it was backed up all the way, almost up to the San Antonio shopping center. I shopped at the San Antonio shopping center and I thought, well, I'm not going to go down San Antonio Road, I'll go down Rengstorff. Rengstorff was backed up all the way to California. I think what you're seeing is what we have with the Dumbarton bridge. There are only so many ways to get to 101. And when you keep piling up apartments or businesses, or whatever, where people do have cars, you're going to run into gridlock. Now, you're talking about Lyft and Uber. A Lyft or Uber ride takes two trips, one to get there, and one to go back, so, actually, you're actually increasing the traffic by two. The second thing that I really wanted to mention is that I think residents are getting really tired of the City – i.e. taxes – paying for parking structures. When we're doing parking structures now, it's around \$65,000 a parking spot. If you bond it, it turns out to be about \$110,000. I think this building is inadequately parked. I don't care what they use, but you need more parking spaces. The City voters put together a referendum, which was then passed by the City Council, regarding limiting office space. And I would hope that the city voters didn't have to stand out in front of Safeway, etc., and get enough signatures so that there would be a referendum demanding that all private buildings be adequately parked at the cost of the landowner and/or the developer. These are my thoughts. Again, I don't live there, I don't have to look at no bus service, and honestly, I have never seen a bicycle on San Antonio Road either. I think you need to really think about what you're doing there. There will be dewatering for this building, and of course, the water level is about seven feet, so that will be taken care of hopefully by the City Council. As a founding member of SavePaloAlto'sGroundwater.org, I am concerned about the amount of groundwater that we are pulling out for private buildings. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Lastly, we have Chris Brennan [sic]. You'll have three minutes. If you could state and spell your name, please.

Chris Brosnan: Yeah, I'm Chris Brosnan [spells name]. Thanks, wow, three minutes, that's great. I'd also like to talk about the building underground here. If you'll notice, most of the buildings in the area don't build underground, or aren't underground, and that's because the water level is so low. You're basically talking about filling in the bay that you can't see. It's just kind of like a river of water that feeds into the bay, and it's really kind of concerning. I haven't really heard much about that, unfortunately, you know, in the discussion that I've heard about this topic. Another thing people talk a lot about is traffic, and obviously nobody wants to wade anywhere. You know, for me, also, the traffic is really problematic. You've got a lot of vehicles that basically are shooting out gas that is not good to breathe at all, especially when you've got cars just sitting there at the light for hours. I mean, it's really not a good situation for your health. And if you see this property on the picture here, it really doesn't fit in with the ideas that most people have in Palo Alto, about being healthy, and walking around outside. I mean, there's not very many plants, as you see. I think the problem really, for me, is, it's a fine place to develop a residential place, or whatever you really want to do there. Development is fine, but wow, five stories? I mean, there's no way you could fit this many people into this community very easily. Obviously, you see that problem with the over-parking. We're seeing that a lot with these developments, that there's just not enough parking spaces. There's really no parking spaces in the area because, you know, this has kind of been going on for a while. I just wonder, you know, five stories, underground, not a lot of trees – It's just kind of like, well... Like, I understand you want to have more houses. That seems like a good idea. But is it really worth people's health? I mean, I don't think people really understand how bad it is to breath car exhaust all day. You really need a lot of trees and plants to filter that out for you, to live a healthy life in Palo Alto and be able to walk around, which is a really nice part about this area. You can walk to the grocery store. There's a lot of things to do, really, if you could just walk there. But, yeah, that's just what I would like to see more of, is more talk about, you know, the dewatering, and underground, and also, you know, just the general health of the area. Does this really make this a better place for other people? Or is it just, you know, let's try to get as many people in here as we can, you know? I think my time is almost up, so I'll take that. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. To the applicant, you have an opportunity to rebut the public's comments if you wish. You don't need to speak. No? Very well. Thank you. Bringing this back to the Board, we'll close the public testimony. I'd like to remind my colleagues of two things. Staff has asked us to be focused not on the zoning amendment changes. This project requires changes to the zoning code, but that's not directly in our purview, and I don't think we should spend time today on that unless someone strongly feels otherwise. Secondly, I believe we had a discussion last time about the entrance to the building being in the middle of the block or the corner, and we decided that it was appropriate to leave it at the middle. Discussion otherwise is not going to help us keep on track on our time today, just so everybody is aware. With that, Grace, could you start us off, please? What do you think?

Board Member Lee: Thank you, Peter. I would like to thank our staff for such a complete staff report, and I'm just making sure that we know everything that has occurred on this project. And I want to thank the community members who have spoken today. I appreciate your comments. I would just like to make a few comments regarding this process and where we are. If you did want to consult, just is at the front there, if you look at the report summary, there is an Environmental Impact Report that will be ready in February. I understand this will be shared. Our purview here at the Architectural Review Board is really, we are directed by the City staff, as well as City Council, to weigh in on the architectural aspects that have been submitted to us from the applicant. I just want to tell you just briefly, if you're unaware, what happens in a draft EIR, and just that it will be public; that there is everything from all that you've raised in terms of transportation, and congestion, and water, and mitigation measures, and just the summary of the environmental aspects in terms of health of the community. I just want to let you know that. And then, to proceed to respond to the package that was submitted today. Thank you for the application, and also your presentation. I found it to be very complete. One thing that I wanted to do is just to go straight down the list of what I see here in terms of how you've responded. My comments will generally be more on, kind of the more community and public aspects of the improvements. And I want to thank our Architectural Review Board. There are four members here, and one who is not here... No, it was just the four of you, sorry, who responded, and gave these really terrific comments to the applicant. I believe the applicant has

acknowledged their impact, and I see the design is remarkably improved in many ways. I think there are more to do, as always, in design. If I just start with some of the comments from the Board regarding symmetry and design palette, kind of breaking down the scale in terms of offsets. I see dramatic improvement in terms of that front elevation. One of the things I would want to talk about, just the scale of San Antonio. I'm very familiar with this area. I've worked in this area, family has lived in this area. I think that it is something to acknowledge that San Antonio Road has very vast scale as a boulevard and as a high-traffic area that is seen from a vehicular and a pedestrian a very different way. When I look at your overall elevation, I feel like we never see that large, you never see a large front elevation when it's that big, except in the renderings. Right? You actually see pieces of the building. I'm going to talk about it in terms of the pieces, in terms of pedestrian scale, but also on the vehicular. While I appreciate the red ribbon, how it's beginning to work with the framed elements, issues of contrast in terms of material palette, I think that's something that could be refined. One of the great things working well, I think, is that the framed elements begin to create kind of this rhythm, and then, that you actually begin to break down the scale. I think when you talk about things like, again, it goes to the details in terms of a metal screen that matches a painted stucco, for example – Those are going to need to read together in terms of an element that is a volume that repeats. It would be terrific, if we see it again, with a real materials board. Because when we see things like this, and then the other pieces that are passed around, it's terrific to see the actual materials and colors, but I don't have a sense of the high contrast. I see, just in terms of how those are working together, A70 is your color materials board, but when you color xerox it, again, it would be just great to get a real materials board to us to review. There is something in the red ribbon that is really quite compelling when you see it in a rendering as a full elevation in a small set. However, I see that your red ribbon actually is a planter wall, I think, that comes down on the street, and I just want to point again to the massive scale of that, the length of that elevation. I'm not sure that it needs to be a continuous red ribbon, which is a graphic. It's really a line that's colored, that we see in renderings. But really, to think about what the red ribbon is in terms of actual architecture and space making. So, there's an entrance that has a red, it's right above my head, I see it, and it's a wayfinding, so maybe there, the ribbon becomes important. There's something that marks a corner at Leghorn, which is really the most visible place that you actually see and want to kind of participate with that kind of semi-public corner. There, the red ribbon makes sense. I just encourage you to think more about that red ribbon and what it's doing in terms of actual space making. I'm just going to keep going down the list. In terms of these excellent comments from the Board and your response, I'm so glad to see the elevator, and that you actually have thought about the glass corners. And the drop-off seems to be working well. The courtyard does not function well. I think the courtyard is now working a lot better. I believe that you can break down the scale further. I encourage you to think about the courtyard not as one space, but as a potential to be separate zones of activity or places of quiet. The interior courtyard could actually begin to incorporate some outdoor rooms, zones of planting that, I know that will be largely shaded, but there is a need for a focal point to activate the space. So often in these kind of housing developments, there is a need for quiet spaces, and more public spaces. It just looks like a very conceptual sketch at this point in my mind. I feel like maybe there could be careful thought in terms of how one person inhabits the courtyard versus a family, or two families, or four people, eight people. Does the courtyard become a place where a community member could actually, you know, take that courtyard for the afternoon, and it could actually be a meaningful place for a gathering? So glad to see that palm trees are eliminated from the roof terrace design. Thank you, Alex, and thank you, applicants. There, again, I'll just go the roof terrace. There was a comment that landscape planning needing more native species, and then, there was a comment of the roof terrace has no function, consider open space on the upper level. Previously, you had one big, it looks like a big roof element with palm trees that are piercing the element. I'm so glad that you're beginning to think how that space breaks down and have redesigned it to consider views. It's large enough space where, again, separate zones, thinking about elements of shade. Also, acoustically, just in terms of perception, sometimes roof terraces on El Camino can be uncomfortable, so how do you begin...? I mean, it's a terrific design problem for you to consider that open space a little bit more carefully, and even in terms of separate areas where it's not one large space at all times, so that you just walk around and look out and then leave, but is it a place where you can actually inhabit? Similarly, I wanted to talk about, on that corner... Maybe we'll just skip down to that, and then come back to some of the interior elements. Let's see. On the corner, there was the comment about, on Leghorn... First of all, the glass corners do not convey on residential project. I see that you reduced the amount of glass, but at the street level, at Leghorn... And also the height of that corner. I'm curious to see what the Board thinks about this corner there. Again, when you look at a

rendering in an 11 x 17 set, we see the difference there on the corner, that it's slightly higher. The corner at Leghorn and San Antonio, it's not an El Camino corner of San Antonio-El Camino, for example. However, it's an opportunity there, with the retail space, to differentiate in a way that it might... I'm not sure, I'm on the fence there, but that might need a little bit more. And perhaps it isn't actually the height of that corner of the building, but again, at the street scale. I encourage you to think about that corner a little bit more, in my mind. I also wanted to look at the, if you go to the set, I think it's on that exterior perspective you see. As you go down Leghorn, there's this large planting area, and I wonder if there's... You know, you show the café kind of seating, but I feel like Leghorn is a place of relief for the community. It's off of San Antonio. There's a very large landscape area, and maybe that's where you actually design some kind of a landscape and formal seating area, or something that gives to that community, which will largely be... That's north. That would be morning light, so it will be in shade, and will give a place of, another landscaped community, zoned for the community there. So, I encourage you to think about informal seating further down on Leghorn, not at the corner, but maybe there's a way to transition between those two landscape spaces. Okay, to go back into the building, you asked us for input regarding the bicycle room that could be more, you know, has partitioned bicycle rooms, but has potential to be more open. Look forward to hearing comments from the Board on this. My feeling is to absolutely celebrate the opportunities for community and the bike. It is true that biking along San Antonio is a challenge. I'm so happy to see that this might go to apartments or rental, and that they would provide more housing for this area. I do think that it would be unfortunate if the bike room is a place of lockers that's dark, that doesn't contribute to the ground floor lobby, and also the potential for some acknowledgment on the exterior, on San Antonio. So, I encourage you to move in that direction, and look forward to hearing comments from my colleagues here. And then, quickly, a last few things. It looks like I'm going to... I believe that you've answered it. I'm curious to hear more from the Board regarding other aspects like the trash chutes and a few other things that I've missed. But I think I'll just stop there and pass it off to the next Board member. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace. David, why don't you continue, please?

Board Member Hirsch: I was really, I'm really still disappointed with this building, with this concept, actually. I feel that buildings ought to begin with the people who are going to be in them, and scaled to residential feelings that are not here. I find that the whole scheme is kind of developed on the basis of, about 40 percent of the units are looking out on roofs. And the environment there in the back of the building and one side of the building, if it remains that way, is going to not be a very attractive place to live. Ground floor is up against a wall of another kind of a use, neighboring use. And up above, you're looking down on a roof line. You develop a scheme on the basis of how the people are going to live in it, and I don't think this is a livable building. I hope I can talk a little more to that in a minute. Everything here, to me, is overdone, out of scale, unnecessarily huge. Too far to go. The entry in the middle of this building, a big, long building, to get there, how do you get there as a pedestrian? Who is going to walk along San Antonio Road? I was asked not to talk about the Leghorn end of the building, but I still feel very strongly that more should be done, and an entry should be there. And even if it moves the store and the retail down the block further, it should be an emphasis on Leghorn because it's an area where you have access, and because it's the only crossing road here. Leghorn, again, I think is kind of the head of the building, and I have to say that because it's what I believe. And it really ought to be emphasized a lot more. I didn't really mind the glassy corner in the first scheme. I thought it was kind of the head of the building, and therefore, was defining it. But then, to have a second one at the other end, where you really can't... it isn't public access, is a wrong idea. I would have preferred an asymmetrical building where there's kind of an entry head and way to get into it, and to rise vertically in the building. But to walk along the front of this building and get to the middle of it, and then, you're at a very, very oversized entry leading to a very, very oversized courtyard in a building which everybody... a lot of people's apartments are looking out onto roofs, etc., is a misjudgment in where to put the emphasis and scale on a building like this. So, I've said it about the corner, anyhow. Who's going to use this commercial? Who is it really for? Are people going to walk across the street from the housing development and actually shop here? Is this a place for people to shop? I know this is a decision that was made at the Council level, but I think that if you think of it, that this commercial really is useful to this building, and therefore, somehow it ought to relate to the interior courtyard, which would provide a usage that could work well for the people in the building, is a better idea. And maybe there should be more than one court, which is a totally different scheme. Because if you had more courtyards, then people could be looking into them, rather than looking out of this building at these roof lines. You

know, I want to say that it follows through that the out-of-scale sense of the front of this building and the Leghorn side is demonstrated in the way in which the front is treated as well, and I just don't feel comfortable with very large, rectangular enframements of certain numbers of building, in order to use that as a foil to break up the front of the building. In some way, I think that the ground floor continuous red piece might be fun, but then, where is the scale? The scale, it's just out of scale. I'd rather not have a roof deck showing on the front of the building and bring the scale of it down to a human level. Unfortunately, nobody ever did a really good study of San Antonio Road, and we've made that comment before. And I think it really is, kind of a packaging of bedroom units to get more residential into this city that has forced this building to become out of scale and unacceptable to me. I have a few more comments. Just a minute. Well, others will speak to this, but I don't find these materials to be particularly warm and cozy and friendly. The red material is kind of muddled, and the tile material doesn't seem to relate. There's no joy in these materials. I think that people who are going to live here would be happier with a different choice of materials that were just simply more friendly materials to live in. And also, the back of the building and the side of the building, the end of the building, are... There's very little thought given to it, and it has no relationship – the sides or the back – to the front, the way the front is done. So, my comments are that I think the building is definitely out of scale. I think that the courtyard and the entry are way too large. I think access to the building isn't properly thought out. So, I would recommend that it goes back to the drawing board, and a more appropriate scheme is developed. Sorry to have to say this, but this is my feeling.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Very interesting comments from the Board members. And I'm actually, I think, somewhere in between Grace and David, to make it simple. I think my first reaction was more similar to David's. When I was looking at it more carefully, I think I understand what the architects are trying to do, and I was encouraged by the revisions you're making. Just for the record, I'm not opposed to the palm trees, and I wanted to point out a project that I like down in Los Angeles, near Los Angeles. There's the Americana in Glendale. It's kind of like a Santana Row project, and they do have high-density residential on top of ground-floor retail. And they have one section that is all planted, that's like a pool deck that's planted with palm trees, and also sort of tropical foliage that you can see from the street. And I think it looks great. It adds a lot of greenery to that, and I'm not opposed to that. I think the previous scheme just wasn't working, that particular configuration wasn't working for me. But I'm not opposed to the palm trees. I say that because palm trees are useful because they don't really require a lot of soil volume. You can look at the Canary Island palms at the Jewish Community Center. They're in relatively small planters. There's a risk when you put them in a small planter that they won't live, and some of the ones at the JCC have died and have been replaced with a crane. So, there are issues with them. But I think it is a way to get a lot of green up on the roof decks, and I think that's important for making the roof decks desirable. Okay, so, I will focus on architecture. I have a couple comments just on urban design and planning. One is, I think we have to acknowledge that this block in Palo Alto/Mountain View is a super block. It's 750 feet by about 1,200 feet. It's not downtown, it's not El Camino. It's gridlocked, even in the middle of the day. I visited the site in the middle of the day and the traffic was backed up. And if you try to go at, like, five o'clock on a Friday, it's good luck. I actually do bicycle on it. I do errands at Crossroads, and REI, and all that. I do it by bicycle. A lot of times I'll ride in the street, and then, when the traffic backed up and the cars are parked along the curb, I'll ride on the sidewalk. It's not desirable. I think we need to, if we are going to look at doing housing incentive program on San Antonio Road, I think we really need to have a heart to heart about all of that stuff. And if that happens at the PTC and Council, I think that's fine, but I think we need to really, seriously discuss all of those issues. Okay, so, on architecture. It's not really working for me yet. I think I could get there if you maybe modified the middle section of the building along San Antonio Road, where the lobby is. Maybe break that and make that almost a separate building, or just a separate design element. That will help break down the long façade. Grace was saying that you don't really see a long façade, and that's true. But all the architects that I've worked for have always worked in elevation. If you get it to work in elevation, it will work in perspective. I think you're saying, we have street trees and everything, and you don't see it. But I've always been taught you have to get that scale broken down first, then all the other things will fall into place. And I think, for me, it's not working yet. There are too many things that are sort of repeating along the length of the façade. I'm not opposed to any one of those things that you have there, but... Yeah. It's not really working for me. And when I see things like, in the staff report, it's saying, like, the bike washing thing will provide visual interest, and the bikes in the lobby will

provide interest. That does not cut it for me. I don't want to see that in the staff report. It's all about the architecture and the landscape. It's the first five feet of the building. It's all the balconies, your metal screens, the red ribbon – all of that. The street trees. That's what the visual interest is, and it's not any one little element. That's where I think the project is not really working. You're not showing all the landscape and all the trees in the rendering, so it very well could be there, but I'm not seeing it in the drawings yet. On the lobby and the bicycle room, I think some of these things are interior elements that are not the purview of the ARB. And, like, the elevator, having one or two elevators, is not really the ARB's purview. I will just point out there's a project, I don't know if I mentioned it last time, but there's a project that I do like in Berkeley, called The Parker, where they have a really nice bike room on the side street. And then, there's the main entrance on Shattuck. I think it's really well done. To me, it's livable, it's approachable. There's indoor/outdoor space. It's useable. And there are community spaces. But it's not trying to make it all one thing. And the only thing that I object to about the bikes in the lobby is security. Like, my friends have \$10,000 bikes. They're not going to leave it in an open lobby. That's just too dangerous. If you read online reviews of big apartment complexes in San Jose that have open garages and open bike rooms, there are lots of thefts, so I think we really have to be serious about it and not just try to make some pretty picture. It really just needs to work, and I think we'll let the Transportation Department sort of weigh in on what they think is appropriate. I do appreciate the effort for putting it on the ground floor. I think that's very important. I don't want to discourage you from that at all. On the facades, I won't say too much, other than, like, most of the architects that I know who work in affordable housing do tricks with proportions to make them look better, and I think you're doing that in some places – say, like at the glass corner – but you're not doing it at the bedroom windows. And I want to encourage you to sort of explore that a little bit. It really makes a difference with the windows. We're saying flush header windows going all the way up to the ceiling, or going all the way down to the floor. It causes all sorts of problems with furniture and structure and what-not. But all the architects that I've worked for who do affordable housing have done those things, and it really makes a difference, especially in small studio units. It's really critical. You're living in a little shoebox, that you get as much light and space as possible. It makes a huge difference. You can see it at the MOLA [phonetic] housing and the Jewish Community Centers. The living rooms have glass corners, floor to ceiling. It makes all the difference in the world, so, I really do want to encourage you to try to break the box a little bit on the units. I think that's all I'm going to say for now. I do want to encourage you to pursue the project. I think we have a lot of big issues to discuss. For the community, on traffic and all of that, I think we do maybe need to do a, maybe Planning could do some sort of seminar or something, but the state has required us to change how we look at traffic, and we've done that in our comp plan. We have it in our first EIR for the hotel, but it's completely different, like, how we have to process the traffic, and measuring delays at stop lights. And it's our new reality, like it or now. And I think maybe, Planning staff, maybe there's a way for us to sort of explain that better. I think it would be very useful. Maybe that's a PTC item and not an ARB item. My last comment is on the garage entrance. A lot of the projects that I see in Mountain View and Sunnydale sort of use a bright color inside the portal, the driveway frame, and lots of LED lighting, make it bright and light, so people know where it is. Also, some of the projects that I'm seeing now in Mountain View, big mixed-use apartment buildings on El Camino and Mountain View, they have figured out a way to have some retail parking behind the retail space. I know we have in our exception for El Camino sites. I think it's desirable to have some retail parking behind there, to make it viable. It also allows residential parking to be secure, and the retail parking can be open. And then, I think we have to acknowledge that some of businesses, like Starbucks on El Camino, that half of their customers are just drive-by. They're not... Some of them may be walking or something, but half of it could be drive-by, and they really need to be able to pull in and park. And we have a super block, like, on this site, it's going to make it very difficult for the business. That was all that I have. Thank you, Peter.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Osma, what's your thought?

Vice Chair Thompson: Alrighty. Well, thank you for the applicant, thank you to the members of the public for expressing your concerns, and also, thanks to the Board members, the interesting discussion that we're having. I also sort of, kind of fall into sort of a middle ground. It's true, initially, when I first saw this update, I was a little concerned that our comments hadn't really been interpreted in a way that was beneficial to the design. It is true, on closer look, there is a lot to like about the design. I think the main issue could be that in the previous proposal, there was a lot of warm colors, and a warm palette, and this palette that

we're looking at here is a lot colder in its colors. The material samples that we looked at are really inadequate, and I agree with Board Member Lee, that there's a slew of colors here on this façade, and we're only given two to really evaluate. Now, there's sort of a charcoal color, a taupe, a light blue color, beige, and then... There's just so much on this façade. And it makes sense, it's a big façade, but really, all we have is this picture, this rendering that we're looking at, to evaluate if this scheme and palette works. And unfortunately, it does not. It looks very dreary just by the colors, and that really does the architecture a disservice. Because the laser-cut panels that you have add such a richness to the façade that's very beneficial. As soon as I saw that, I was like, oh, there's actually way more to this than I realized. I really like that you guys are including that because I do think that that will add a lot of scale and relief that the building needs. Unfortunately, the north façade and the west façade seem to sort of been left behind in favor of the Leghorn façade and the San Antonio façade. But that west façade will be seen. You know, it's a tall building, and that will be seen by a lot of traffic coming from the highway, and it really, you know, for people who don't live in Palo Alto, that's a huge access road for outsiders, and for anyone that's visiting. That façade is really important, and needs to be given a bit more love. Also, the color, which I don't believe we have, of that façade, and the north façade, and the inner courtyards, are this very dark color, and it looks like it's way too dark. It almost looks like black in the drawings, which I don't believe is appropriate at all for this area. That just needs a bit more work and refinement. I appreciate that you guys responded to the glassy corners looking a little bit like office buildings. I think what you've done by adding balconies and providing a bit more relief is successful. The soffits, especially of your roof deck, are going to be very visible on the ground level, and I think a bit more material thought, having the soffits just be stucco is probably not going to be as visually appealing since a lot of people will be seeing that from the ground floor. And to the comment for the windows, you know, the way that you've done the floor-to-ceiling glass on that important corner of Leghorn, and living space, makes a lot of sense. And you have it in a lot of other areas for the living spaces, the floor-to-ceiling makes sense, especially when it's paired with a balcony. That really gives a residential feel. And it's true. The other windows could maybe use a different treatment or something, to sort of give them a bit more scale. I mean, windows are really great because those can provide relief, you can punch them in and give your façade some relief. Board Member Lew's suggestion of the middle area, potentially scaling that in, and sort of breaking up this sort of wall, is not a bad idea, actually. I think that could be really interesting, and give you some more relief as well. I mean, at this moment, really, your frames and your balconies are giving you that depth, but maybe like a step back in that lobby, which is pretty extensive, could help break down your façade a bit. And the bike room, I also agree with Board Member Lew. I bike a lot, and I would not feel comfortable keeping that open to the public. Security is really important for your bikes. I've had three stolen in Palo Alto. And I have biked down San Antonio, and it's true. Right now, at this moment, it is not a very walkable or bikeable road. But that doesn't mean it shouldn't ever be, and that doesn't mean that we shouldn't try and push for something that we want. So, I'm very much in support of having bicycle facilities here. And Baylands are just a hop, skip and a jump, and so many times I've wanted to bike to the Baylands down San Antonio. And I have in the past, but it's dodgy. But that doesn't mean that in the future, it won't be, and that it won't be really great. I do appreciate that you guys are pushing for that, and that's important. Okay. That's it for me.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. I'll chime in as well, but I share the sentiments of my colleagues here. On the site planning, however, I think you really need a drop-off along San Antonio, seeing that the Uber driver is going to turn onto Leghorn, then make a U-turn somehow to come back out again before they drop somebody off. I don't buy that. They're just going to stop on San Antonio anyway and block traffic. The question for staff, I suppose, in the same vein is that, right now on Leghorn, there's curbside parking. Is that going to be eliminated with this project, or will there be both curbside parking, and then, losing two spots for this drop-off area? The drawing implies that there's no parking and the curb drops in. Maybe we can come back to that in a second, but I think that... We all know that San Antonio has a real traffic problem, and without being real about what's happening on the ground and addressing how this building is impacted by it and how people get in and out is a real issue. I think you need to have something along San Antonio. That's where people will stop, where deliveries will be made. Especially with the traffic. Nobody wants to get out of that traffic flow. The design is improved from the initial version that we saw. I don't think it's there yet. I find that there's just too many frames moving around and not a cohesive enough sense of the design. I think a couple places where you have the large red frame, say, over the parking garage, and then there's a frame for the windows right above it, it just seems overkill. It's not integrated and thought through enough. I've noted that I think they are too monumental in feeling, still. I think Board

Member Hirsch's comments about it, to somehow seeming to start from the frames, not from the life of the people inside, just seems to be the wrong approach on a residential project like this. You'd be wiser to think about how it works as a residence, and then, try to give it some sense of larger presence on the street, rather than the other way around. It seems – to me, at least – like you've started with an idea of frames, and then, worked backwards from that into an apartment building. I've noted that they're both too monumental, too busy looking. There's just too many of them. And I find them sort of dissonant. There's no relationship between these elements that seem appropriate to a residential project. I think that the bicycle parking needs to function, obviously. What perhaps my colleagues are missing is that the bicycle room is an opportunity to enliven the street scape of the building. People are going in and out a lot, there's a lot of activity there, and that's visible from the street. And that's a good thing. We need that along San Antonio. We need that everywhere where we have these large apartment buildings. So, there's an opportunity to make the bicycle room, perhaps the front half of it, visible, open, glassed, where you see it, but then, have secure places for the bicycles themselves to be stored. It's not the bicycles that are interesting, it's the people using their bicycles. If you can find a way to do that, I think it will be successful. And just keep in mind, the idea is to enliven the street scape by putting the bicycle parking there. I'll be quick. My last thing is that I can't tell that if the materials are going to work or not because we just don't know what they are yet. I'm concerned. When I look at this strong, rust-colored red next to these gray Hardie board things, those don't work. I imagine they will, but I'd really like to see what you guys are thinking about. Put it together in a proper material board that we can really digest. I think in the action of doing that, you'll find that you give it some more thought yourselves. Right now, it feels like it just hasn't been cut through yet. These are just samples from your stock room in your office. We need to see more than that. I'm afraid it's hard to say much of anything about the materials. What I see is not enough to even make a judgment. I'm concerned that they are not... We have to make a finding that they are of high quality. I have an inherent bias against Hardie board siding as being a, not really a high-quality material for what's an intensely large, high-quality building. The burden is on you to really show me how that... What are you going to do at the corners? How does the Hardie board meet a window? Because we don't want to see these little metal trims that they push on you, or just a big caulk joint that fails after five years. It's really important to get those details right. As the architects, you need to think that stuff through. Right now, it just hasn't been done yet. I'll leave my comments at that. Maybe I can summarize what I've heard from I think most of the Board, is that the design is improved, but it's not quite there. The scale is perhaps still a bit off. What else did we have to say? Grace, can you add on to that?

Board Member Lee: Sorry, Peter, may I just jump in on your last comment? I forgot to mention – I'm so sorry – A70, there is a color materials board, and I just wanted to make a simple suggestion that, on my tired, older eyes, I have a hard time with fonts that are smaller than, you know, something on [inaudible], **civil set [phonetic]** in terms of a legend. It's just so small. And I do want to give the applicant a lot of credit. I see that you actually are painting your jet cut panels the same colors as the stucco. I mean, these things just didn't come out in the review because it's just poorly presented. I think perhaps there has been thought those materials, but unfortunately at this meeting, we didn't receive it. And then, I did want to just offer a suggestion and see what you all thought. Sometimes on these longer elevations, which, you know, this is a long building, sometimes applicants actually – and I know it's more expensive – but you do a fold-out. And you see the elevations, and just do pieces of the building, at least, on a larger scale, so that we're actually able to read it and digest it for your comments.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Grace. That's helpful.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair Baltay, if I may. Sorry, I moved locations.

Chair Baltay: There you are, Jodie.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have our second screen up here if we want to try and summarize some of the main points.

Chair Baltay: Yes, that's what I was hoping we would try to do. I want to be sure that, to my colleagues, that we give them clear direction. This is going to be coming back a third time, it seems. I'd really like to get it nailed. How do we want to phrase our questions about scale and the overall window frames and

things? I've written down, to me, the frames of the building leave it to feel slightly too monumental, too busy, and dissonant. Anybody add on or clarify that more? David, you want to try? So we can summarize in a sentence [crosstalk].

Board Member Hirsch: No, but I want to go back a little bit, because I really think that an important statement that you made before about lay-by on San Antonio is really critical to the project here, and will affect the massing, and will potentially affect the entry. I feel it's an important addition to comments on the building as a whole. And relative to the scale issue, I think that one should also consider the possibility of a more asymmetrical building, which could be quite significant here.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so we can add "asymmetry" as another adjective.

Vice Chair Thompson: Question. It is already asymmetrical. How much more asymmetrical are you thinking? It sort of steps down from, like...

Board Member Hirsch: I think it could be then more asymmetrical.

Board Member Lee: Sorry. My concern is, you know, I think giving the applicant more specific and directional feedback would be helpful. "Asymmetry" is a large word. It's not something that I feel strongly about. I wonder if there's maybe some comments that relate to the frame, what they are describing as how the frames... We have that, right? A system of frames. I heard the words "over-scaled" or "monumental." That's not something that I feel strongly about. However, maybe we could make one or two sentences relating to the framing system, the ribbon system, and the main elevations. I think you had something on the west elevation. But that might be more productive for the applicant to be able to move forward.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I also, I also don't feel that strongly about the frames. I really think it's the color palette that is doing the building a disservice. Honestly, if this color palette went from something that, you know, to something a bit more warm, I think the frames would actually read quite positively. Like, if you can imagine the frames reading as these warm things against sort of a warm background, it may not feel as monumental or overbearing.

Board Member Lee: I agree, and I'm not sure I feel strongly about the word "asymmetry." Maybe Alex and Peter, you want to weigh in?

Board Member Lew: I don't want to weigh in on that. I would say, if David's looking to change the partee of the building – right? If I understand your previous comments correctly, then I don't necessarily agree with that. I'm okay with the courtyard scheme, corner retail, mid-block entrance on San Antonio, back door to Leghorn. And then, whatever they come up with on the façade. That's fine.

Chair Baltay: I think that's clear. We've essentially given the green light to the basic partee of this building.

Board Member Lew: If we want to do a straw vote, we can do that.

Chair Baltay: We did that at the last meeting, and we're done with that. The question now, we're talking about the appearance on the façade, if it's asymmetrical, or monumental, etc. I can say that maybe there's just one frame type too many. To me, what really caught my eye was the interaction of the frame around the entry, with the window frame, or the frame that goes up to the upstairs patio above it, the two of them just colliding with each other. And the same thing happens over the parking structure, the parking entrance. I think if you refined a little bit, and then, got your materials right, it probably would be okay. It's not that you need a total rethink of the process, but a little more refinement on the frames.

Board Member Lew: On scale, on the human scale, I would just point to the street scape elevations on Sheet AO.2B. I think that's where the frames need to work with the, the frames and the colors need to work with existing context. The context may change, but our findings require us to make it work with existing buildings. I don't think it's there yet.

Chair Baltay: Let's shift on to one comment that's been made about the side and the back of the building. The back of the building, we all agree, is right on the city line, and faces Mountain View. I think we care, but the most important one is the west elevation. I've been amazed, when I've seen the hotel going up on San Antonio, because of the curve in the road, the way you approach it, you really see the side of the building. I believe that will be the same with this building. That west elevation, Osma pointed out, will be very visible, and it needs to be carefully designed along its entire length. I believe. Does the Board support that?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Let's all chime in. Grace?

Board Member Lee: [No audible response.]

Chair Baltay: Alex, do you have any opinion about those elevations as well?

Board Member Lew: Yes. Well, this goes back to another issue, which I have not brought up, that I've mentioned before. I mentioned it before on the hotels, right? You have a 50-foot-high building and you only have shrubs, and there are no trees, and I think... But our zoning for CS is zero setback. No landscaping required in this particular configuration. The commercial next door is not low-density residential, so there's nothing required. I just throw that out there. That's my issue, is that I think there are holes in the zoning code. But I think you're saying to address it in the façade, and I will support that.

Chair Baltay: I don't know whether you'd address it with more landscaping, or more detailing, or better design of the façade, but, to me, it's sort of like the back two sides of the building haven't really been designed.

Board Member Lew: I don't disagree.

Chair Baltay: I'd like to see more effort put on that.

Board Member Lew: I will support if you want to [crosstalk]. I will support that.

Chair Baltay: The Board feels that way consistently. David, you said that you think that the drop-off on San Antonio is important. Did I understand you right? I'd like to give them clear direction again, if we think that that's essentially, or if it's just one person.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, no, I think I'll take back my comment about such an entry on Leghorn. Because I think that if you have a lay-by or drop-off area on San Antonio, the whole entry aspect of this building is vastly improved.

Chair Baltay: What do the rest of the Board think about more of a drop-off area on San Antonio, by the main entrance to the building? I'd like to give them clear direction if that's something they need to do, or not.

Board Member Lew: Could you use the word, like, "explore?"

Chair Baltay: Of course, of course.

Board Member Lew: I think we have things like Lytton Gardens in downtown Palo Alto, has a small driveway off of Lytton. I think Hamilton senior housing has a very small drop-off thing on one of the side streets. I think we can consider it. You understand, though, it's two curb cuts.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Board Member Lew: We don't allow parking in the front setback, typically. So, there are issues.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Member Lew, are you asking for a porte-cochere type of...?

Board Member Lew: No, no.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. We're just talking about a drop-off for...

Board Member Lew: It's a special setback, so they can't build anything in the special setback.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: Right? It's just a drop-off.

Ms. Gerhardt: It's just a duck-out for the Ubers and Lyfts, right.

Board Member Lew: And then, yeah, I think the other thing, too, that I've seen with apartment buildings, if it's apartments, there's usually a lot of move-ins/move-outs, at least in Mountain View. The residents have issues with moving trucks at the end of the month.

Ms. Gerhardt: So, if we make that drop-off large enough for moving trucks.

Board Member Lew: I just throw that out there for consideration.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, I don't want us to be prescribing a solution, but I want to be pointing out a problem. The problem is the traffic situation, and the problem is that there's a hundred apartments. That means there's always somebody moving in and out, there's always a Door Dash or an Uber stopping, there's always a FedEx truck. You need both curb cuts, really, but it needs to be thought about, how is it going to function, and then show us. What have I missed from the basic comments everybody has made? Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm looking at the notes that are getting noted up there. For the west elevation, do we agree that it could be west and north elevation? I'm just concerned if we don't mention the north elevation, that it will be forgotten, still.

Chair Baltay: I don't know that we have the findings when it's not visible whatsoever from Palo Alto. But, sure, all elevations of a building should be designed as well as possible. I'm okay saying west and north elevations should be more carefully designed. I don't see any harm in that. Does anybody else?

Board Member Lew: It's one of our subjective discretionary standards, that all facades have to be treated with the same level, at the same level of design.

Chair Baltay: You support including the north elevation on that?

Board Member Lew: Sure.

Chair Baltay: Sure, okay. Anybody else? Okay, so, we'd like to see both west and north elevations.

Ms. Gerhardt: Another topic we have is the courtyard. There was discussion about breaking down the scale of that. Is that a...?

Chair Baltay: Well, I had written in my notes here, and I decided not to bring it up, but I think that the planters and just the way they are relating to the apartment windows, looking out to the courtyard, needs more thought about how people live and use it. What Grace was saying about perhaps breaking down the scale and being more discreet about the areas of it. I think that could be worked on. I'm not sure I feel as strongly about that myself. Anybody else want to make a comment about the courtyards? Grace, what do you think?

Board Member Lee: I think the word "explore" would be fine, or, in terms of provide a drawing that shows how these... Maybe provide people in the drawings would also be helpful.

Chair Baltay: Okay, let's get...

Board Member Lew: I would actually argue that the courtyard is already broken up into zones.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I would like some more clarification. The courtyard does seem pretty well broken up.

Board Member Lew: In plan. Maybe not in actuality.

Board Member Lee: There might be just disagreement. I feel like the design of both the courtyard and the roof garden, as well as the areas of planting along Leghorn, could be further developed in terms of landscape design.

Chair Baltay: Yes. My concern had been mostly just, having apartments or private terraces and balconies right on the courtyard requires very careful detailing to ensure that you have privacy next to the public courtyard. And I just really didn't see how that was working exactly when I looked at the plans here. I guess I didn't feel like it was worth it for us to try to insist on some of grade separation, and then, it just has to be landscaped carefully. But I don't think it's as important as other things we're looking at. I'll put it that way. I would like to get this wrapped up, folks. Do we have any other significant comments to add to this list?

Ms. Gerhardt: We have the bike parking here, just ensuring that it is a secure area, but also maybe, you know, visible from the street to enhance that environment.

Chair Baltay: I think everybody supports that basic need for security and keeping some sort of visibility at the same time. Yes, Alex?

Board Member Lew: I think we should weigh in on the corner plaza, because I think that's a major landscape element. I don't think the Board has really weighed in on it.

Chair Baltay: Corner plaza? Which drawing are you looking at?

Vice Chair Thompson: This is the plaza that's by the retail?

Board Member Lee: A3.3H is an exterior perspective.

Chair Baltay: It's lovely if it actually comes out like that. That depends on who's running that business.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm in support of the corner plaza.

Board Member Lee: A3.3G as well. I'm in support as well.

Chair Baltay: I'd like to see resolution. If there's going to be curbside parking along Leghorn, that needs to be shown. I think that would be really critical if you have an in-and-out kind of coffee shop there, or something. Right now, it's really tough for a retail when people can't actually stop their cars to get there and it's on a busy car road. It's a nice looking image, and again, is it really going to function that way? Any other comments about it?

Board Member Lew: I agree with you, Peter.

Chair Baltay: Okay, before we make a motion, does the applicant have any questions, very quickly? Are we being clear enough for you? You're nodding your heads. Okay.

**MOTION**

Chair Baltay: Okay, I'm looking for a motion from somebody on the Board to support the comments up there. Alex?

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion that we continue the project to a date uncertain.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: Any comments about that motion? Okay, then we're going to vote on that. All those in favor? Opposed? Okay. Motion carries 5-0.

**MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 5-0.**

Chair Baltay: We have quite a crowd here for the next thing. Shall we take a five-minute break before we get started?

Board Member Lew: Sure.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Five minutes, please.

[The Board took a short break.]

3. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL: 4256 El Camino Real: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing Commercial Building for the Development of a New 51,900 Square Foot Five-Story Hotel Including 97 Guest Rooms and Below-Grade Parking. Environmental Assessment: A Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was Prepared Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and is Circulating for Public Comment Between December 20, 2019 and February 3, 2020. Zone District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Baltay: Okay, everybody, let's get started again, please. Okay, we're on air. We're going to move on to the next item, which is number 3 on our list here. This is a public hearing for 4256 El Camino Real, a recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow for the demolition of an existing commercial building for the development of a new 51,900 square foot five-story hotel, including 97 guest rooms and below-grade parking. Do we have a staff report, please? Oh, before we do that, I'd like to go through disclosures. I keep forgetting. What do we have to disclose today? Alex?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site yesterday, and I took the color board with me.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I visited the site, and also visited the neighboring Palo Alto Redwoods.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. I have also visited the site, and on past occasions, visited several apartments in the back. David?

Board Member Hirsch: I didn't visit the site this time, but I remember it very well from the previous.

Chair Baltay: And Grace?

Board Member Lee: I recently visited the site, as well as the neighboring Redwoods.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, everybody. Sam, go ahead, please.

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning to the Architectural Review Board. I am Samuel Gutierrez, the project planner for this project, located here at 4256 El Camino Real. Jumping into a bit of the project history since this project has been in file for some time with the City, and it's been a while since we've had a hearing. I want to remind people that this previously went before the Board – first formal hearing – November 15, 2018. And then, the second formal hearing took place January 19, 2019. At that time, we had an initial study and Mitigated Negative Declaration out and circulating. However, it was determined later that an EIR would be required, so the environmental study was elevated to EIR, and currently there is a draft EIR in circulation. Which is available on the City website and City libraries. Going back to the ARB comments from the last hearing back in January 2019, almost a year ago, the ARB had several comments. One pertained to shadows. The applicant had previously submitted in their plan set a shadow study that wasn't quite clear to the ARB. There were concerns about shadows being cast, you know, that would adversely impact the adjacent open space for the Palo Alto Redwoods, also known as PAR. Then, we, the City had our City environmental consultant, who was working on the initial study, the MND and now the EIR, prepare an independent study, and that is going to be presented, and also available in the staff report in an attachment. Moving on, there are details about the garage. There was concern about garage drop-off activity and how that would function. The application did revise that, and initially had removed it from the plan set, but then, they have another revised sheet that indicates that it would be located in the garage A level again. But that was a bit further around, and staff recommended a previous design to be integrated into the garage layout. There is also the stair tower. This is the stair tower on the west elevation, I believe, that was a concern around that corner of the building for the ARB throughout all of the hearings, and that's been revised in the plan set. There was also concern about the traffic signage and the porte-cochere. That was revised. There was concern about the lighting plan and the photometrics. That was also updated in the plan set that was submitted. The window details, and doing a study of the equipment screening – The plans have been revised to address those comments from the ARB. There was a comment about the design and fitment of the ceiling of the porte-cochere, but staff recommends that that would go to an ARB subcommittee since it's not that visible from the street, and it would be looking at fit and finish joints and whatever service vents or panels need to be integrated into that design. There is also a question about the clarify of the tree protection plan, which actually is a tree preservation program that we developed with the EIR, with the City consultant, under the supervision of the urban forester at the City. We do discuss that in the staff report, as well as the urban forester will present a small portion during the staff presentation. Then, there was finally a concern about the El Camino loading area or parking area, and that area between the two driveways was going to be painted red. It's a mitigation measure in the EIR, and also suggested in the technical report for the EIR as well, to paint that red for lines of sight. There would not be additional loading and blocking of driveways on El Camino, in front of the project site. Just to go over the project details, this is, again, a five-story hotel with approximately a 2.0 FAR, 97 guest rooms. Previous iterations had it up to 100. Those guest rooms were reduced by swapping out for some larger suites, so there's less guest rooms. There were some changes, as you can see in the plan set. There was kind of this orange-y tone/hue to the paneling on the façade. There was a different type of materials selected, and now there are new materials that are a darker brown color. As well as trim colors have been darkened. There was silver trim colors throughout, and now they're darker, kind of a black matte finish. There's also some rear mass changes. Again, the stairs are better integrated into the design. That's that stair tower I mentioned earlier. There is the addition of balconies, which is a new feature onto the project, and the interior garden has been revised to now include exterior seating for the restaurant/café. So, to go over the valet changes, on the left here on this projection, you can see, this is the staff recommendation – it's mentioned in the staff report – to position the valet at that location as you enter into the garage, circle down, and then, right after the accessible spaces, that's where the valet would greet you. This is the design that the consulting engineer and the City engineers found to be appropriate and to avoid queuing issues on El Camino. On the right is the design that the applicant proposed, but we did not condition to be included in the project. Going to the elevations of the project, here you can see the previous design. Again, it was this reddish-orange hue and silver accent tones throughout, along with the seafoam feature at the ground level of El Camino. Now we have this darker-brown façade with this matte black finish, moving away from the silver pieces. With the integration of this interesting paneling that's been laser cut, I believe, for the windows, to give them a bit more detail. As we move along here, here is the east elevation. That's a previous east elevation. Here, you can see the current east elevation. This is the progress of that stair tower that has been constantly commented on by the ARB. The left is the first iteration; the right is the second. And then, this is a blow-up of another submittal of that area. Here is what we currently have. The

stair tower is better integrated, staff feels, into the design now, as you see that there's three panels and that interior vertical plane of the courtyard. You have the stair tower followed by another towering feature, almost like a column, and then another one, subsequent after that. Here is the previous south elevation, the rear view, if you will, of the property. Here is the current. Again, here is the west elevation previously, and here is the current. This is the previous site plan. Most notably, you can see this wave river pattern that was the Zen garden theme that the site plan had. Here, you can see the current proposal. Still has a bit of that wave thing here, but it circles this outdoor patio area for the restaurant café. Looking at it for more of a schematic detail, you can see how the rear elevation has changed on some heights. This lower feature here has been modified to have this feature, which actually is set back a little further from the rear property, but is a bit taller. The El Camino frontage for the pedestrian experience, this was the previous experience on El Camino. There was a proposal for, as you enter from the north to the south towards this property, there will be two benches and this glass seafoam feature with some planters, and then, in between the porte-cochere, there was this feature again, but much larger, with bench seating for the public. Now, the El Camino experience has been revised in accordance with the new color palette. You'll see that the El Camino fence, for example – if I go back – there used to be this kind of oxidized metal slatted feature to kind of complement the old wood paneling that was here. Now, this is a different paneling that goes more with the color palette of the current proposal. Again, it has this organic kind of wave to it, and this would be the service gates that open for the, for utility inspectors to service the transformer that's hidden behind it, and also, the double doors for the refuse collection on the street. The other feature you'll see here – it's a little dark, I do apologize, but it is noted in the staff report – there's this slotted bench design for this first area of El Camino that you would encounter as a pedestrian. It's a wood slotted bench design, mimicking kind of this wave pattern here. Now, between the porte-cochere, there is a proposal for public art to go into this area now. This is a reference from the plan set. It is a little dark in the color plan set, but I did brighten it up a bit to make it more clear. This is just a concept. This is not what is going before the Art Commission, but I do want the ARB to note that this area has an earmark for public art there. The applicant can speak more to that, but it seems that the theme is some type of function art. Like, this would be some type of bench that could be utilized as well. As we move on, the shadow study that was prepared by the consulting environmental group that staff hired for this project. These are the images of the shadow study, which is attached to the staff report, showing the shadows cast by this project at different times of day during the December months. As you can see, in the morning, it's a bit more on this side, and then, as you go later in the evening, the shadow starts going away, waning a bit more towards the pool. And then, it moves away from that pool again at 10:00 a.m. during the December time period. And then, once you get into the afternoon, the shadows are fully cast on El Camino. Looking at another study from the more spring...excuse me, comparing December to more of the spring months, in June, towards the summer, you can see that there are different shadows being cast at different times of day. Based on the time of year, at 7:00 a.m., there are more shadows cast in this direction, here towards the Palo Alto Redwoods, but then, as we see here, at 10:00 a.m. – which is different for the 10:00 for December, where the shadows are casting towards the Palo Alto Redwoods clubhouse – here, the shadow is a bit more focused on the, actually on-site property. So, of course, with the changing seasons, the daylight positioning of the sun is different. Going into a bit of discussion about CEQA and how shadows play into it, there isn't a provision for CEQA for private open space here in Palo Alto. It is something that we look at for public open space, which is a public facility like a park, for example, or public pools. With that, the initial study does speak to that, and talks about no significant impacts per CEQA in that instance. And then, based on the shadow studies that were prepared by the City consultant, and looking at the different times of day that that outdoor facility at the adjacent condominium complex, staff feels that the design of the project minimizes the impact of shadows cast on their adjacent property. As for the tree preservation portion of this presentation, I would like to ask that Walter Passmore, the City urban forester, to come and speak on this.

Walter Passmore, Urban Forester: Good morning, Board members. Walter Passmore, urban forester for the City. I'm going to give you just a brief overview of what we have done with tree protection assessment and practices to retain trees in good condition through the construction process. We did a traditional survey assessment and preservation report to initiate evaluation of the project, and due to the number of comments that we're receiving, we advanced that with hiring a third-party arborist to provide an unbiased opinion. We also employed a sub-consultant to utilize ground penetrating radar to assess potential impacts on the root systems, due to the underground portions of the project. We found that what is being proposed

would be a less-than-significant impact, recognizing that all construction has some form of impact on existing trees. In this case, it is quite a bit less than our standard thresholds. The trees are in good condition, so we would suspect that there is going to be unobservable differences if the tree protection report and practices are followed throughout the construction process. Conditions of approval have been issued. One of those will require that the applicant submit a deposit, so that if there is any significant decline in condition, the City could correct those if the applicant fails to do so. So, a standard kind of performance bond that we collect for large projects. I think those are the highlights.

Mr. Gutierrez: Thank you, Walter. Moving on in the presentation here. We did receive a large number of comments, as has been consistent with this project, and we still continue to receive comments, some even this morning. I know that those comments have also been copied and forwarded to the ARB. It's difficult to process all comments as, you know, minutes, or even an hour before a public hearing, but staff has them as part of the record and will add them to the file. According to our review of the comments, they seem to focus on the following items: The height of the proposal in relation to the adjacent multi-family complex. They are condos, the Palo Alto Redwoods complex, also known as PAR. Again, the potential shadows cast on the open space pool area and the residential units; the proposal's overall design and compatibility with the surrounding area. There have also been comments that it doesn't meet the findings for either the El Camino design guidelines, or just the standard contextual findings. And then, the impacts of the proposal related to traffic, noise, and the adjacent redwood trees. I believe in this presentation, we've touched on some of these factors here, and also, the EIR touches on these key points with technical reports. I do want to, since it has been some time, since a lot of the comments were speaking to the adjacent context around this property, on the upper right, you can see in the highlighted rectangular figure, this is the project site. Here is an adjacent office building, an office use at 4260 El Camino. And then, here to the north of the project site, is the entry to the Palo Alto Redwoods complex, which circles the property almost entirely, except for where the 4260 parcel is located on El Camino. It goes further back to the single-family residential neighborhood that's further set back from this project site. I do want to remind people of the complex's details, and that was this breakdown here. There are a number of parcels there, and depending on how the parcels play out, these are the unit density for the parcels located here. It was developed at a time when the CS zone allowed for pure residential development, which now it currently allows mixed-use development. It was a different time. Circling back, one point that wasn't addressed here, but we do recommend for subcommittee, is the details of the ceiling of the porte-cochere. Again, that would be the fit and finish of materials and the lighting for that. Now, the recommendation that staff has for the ARB to take is: Recommend approval of the proposed project, with a requirement for subcommittee review, to the Director of Planning and Community Environment, based on findings and subject to conditions of approval. Now, I do want to note that because the EIR is still circulating, we do not have an action to take until the EIR process has been completed. The ARB would, if they feel is appropriate, if they were to recommend approval to the Director, the Director's decision would hold until the EIR process has completed. That is something that is very important to know. And there are a few things I should mention in the staff report. There are a few corrections. It has to do with the lift references. There's one in the findings. When we have the comp plan tables, it mentions puzzle lifts. That was a previous system that was going to be used in this project. They're using standard lifts. And that's also referenced in the condition of approval regarding the lifts. So, that needs to be tweaked a little to reference only standard lifts, not puzzle lifts. There are no puzzle lifts. Also, there is a condition that Walter Passmore just spoke about – the bond measure. It says 1.5 times; that's an error. It is 1.0 times per the tree technical manual. That's another condition that we will tweak. And then, there is a slight error in formatting for some of the C3 information from Public Works that needs to be amended, because the bullet points actually run into a sentence there. That's conditions in the 52 to 58, I believe. That concludes staff's presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Sam. Do we have a material board for this project? Could you bring it up?

Mr. Gutierrez: It's directly behind you.

Chair Baltay: Wonderful, thank you.

Mr. Gutierrez: I apologize, it's a little large.

Chair Baltay: Do we have any questions of staff?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Osmo, go ahead.

Vice Chair Thompson: For the recommendation to subcommittee, what items do staff recommend that we would recommend to subcommittee?

Mr. Gutierrez: It was the design of the porte-cochere ceiling. The ceiling of the porte-cochere.

Vice Chair Thompson: Ceiling. Okay. Thanks.

Chair Baltay: Sam, could you clarify for me and the general public, why is a 35-foot height limit not required on this site when it's adjacent to residential?

Mr. Gutierrez: That requirement in the zoning code that pertains to the CS zone is for properties that are zoned residential low-density. That would be single-family residential, or RM-20 now – the code changed; it used to be RM-15 – and RM-30. But the adjacent residential complex is zoned CS, which is the same zoning that this site is, so it doesn't have that protection. If it were to be zoned some multi-family zoning, it would actually exceed our current highest zoning of RM-40 because of the unit density there. It would have to be some type of different zoning. It wouldn't impact the... It wouldn't restrict the height of this development, is what that gets to.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Okay, to the applicant... Oh, one more question.

Board Member Lew: I have a question for you, Sam. The EIR looked at alternatives, and Alternative 2 is no exterior balconies or outdoor restaurant seating, or exterior balconies along the rear of the project site. And it says that Alternative 2 is determined to be environmentally superior, to be the superior alternative. Is the project plans, is that what we're looking at now? Is that Alternative 2, or is it the original one?

Mr. Gutierrez: No, that is not Alternative 2.

Board Member Lew: What's before the Board is what? Like, this set of plans, this is not Alternative 2? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Gutierrez: This proposal includes balconies, but there was another proposal with more balconies facing, more intensely.

Board Member Lew: Is it balconies just on the rear of most facing? Because there are rear facing parts on the main building, right? Say, like...

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes.

Board Member Lew: ... on the five-story part of the building, and then there's the two-story part of the [crosstalk].

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Board Member Lew: And what about the outdoor restaurant seating? Because I see restaurant patio seating, I guess, in the courtyard.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes. In the draft EIR, there is a discussion about the sound mitigation. It goes into that design, and the alternative that that mentions doesn't go into that discussion. So, if you look at the project as analyzed, we found that with the sound walls that were added, it's within the thresholds to be acceptable.

Board Member Lew: About the mitigations, and distance...

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Board Member Lew: ... to that? Okay. Thank you.

Vice Chair Thompson: [off-microphone] This is Alternative 2?

Board Member Lew: This is not Alternative 2, right?

Chair Baltay: Any other questions of staff? Then, to the applicant, you'll have 10 minutes to make a presentation, if you care to. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please.

Randy Popp: Hello. My name is Randy Popp [spells name]. I am the owner's representative on this project. I am here today with my fantastic design team: From Greenwood & Black, Rebecca and Ron; I've got David from MPA Design; and from Aaronson, Dickerson, Cohn & Lanzone, Camas Steinmetz is here as part of our legal advisory team. Katherine, our client, unfortunately is not able to attend. I think she is watching from Hong Kong today. Thank you for taking the time to look at this again. I appreciate you all doing this building on the staff report. Our goal today is really to just review the changes since our last hearing, discuss any things that you feel need more explanation, help evaluate any areas that might need further study, hopefully going to subcommittee, and advance the project according to the staff recommendation. I want to just briefly touch on the timeline because, I think Sam has done a great job in his report here today, but it actually goes back to an initial study session that was August 2017. That's taken us to this point. And as Sam mentioned, you know, the year of delay since January was really due to converting the MND to a full EIR, to really fully study the project. I wanted to share with you, having sat in your seats, that I think that this is a great example of a project that has benefitted from the ARB process. The change that's occurred in this project over the course of those years has been pretty dramatic, both in terms of site partee and organization of the massing, the design of the building overall, and even the amenities that are part of it. We had a very deeply u-shaped building directly facing the neighbors that had a pool and a very active courtyard. Today, as you've seen, the project is quite a bit different. Sam has already run through all of these items, but I'll touch on these as I progress through the presentation. I wanted to start by giving you an illustration that's in your packet that shows you really how little the massing has changed for this project since the last time you saw it. Sam had a good description in a couple of sections that he blew up, but really, the overall shape and scale of this building has not changed since the last time you saw it, in a significant way. What we've done is we've retooled the design of the exterior. I won't read this whole thing, but what we're shooting for here in terms of our alignment with brands and a potential flag for this hotel is that it be a boutique. It's really characterized by good design, idiosyncratic, something that's based on a motif. Our thought for a brand for this particular hotel, a style for this hotel, is aligned with the term analog. It's something that is very human, very organic, and it's the way we all experience life. We've used that as a touchstone for the design. Our goal here was to really simplify the material palette. We've organized the pattern of windows to calm and balance the building. We've added details around the windows to create elegance and interest, and the analog wave is used as a design motif throughout. We've tried to create a very consistent treatment of the surfaces, the underside of the roof, eave, metal accents, wall areas, balcony panels. We've created operable windows and doors to promote good indoor air quality. As was mentioned in the staff report, we really did redesign what we call the north stair tower, with a vertical application of a compressed analog wave, articulating the movement it screens. The courtyard has been redesigned with a change to the building layout that creates a more enclosed and controlled environment, further protecting the neighbors from sound and activity that will occur there during the limited hours of use. And more specifically, what we've done is we've rotated the two-story rooms that are at the back of the building to extend them further towards the neighbors' outdoor recreation area and create more protection along that edge, both visually and acoustically. While we have the exact same number of outdoor seats, we've gathered them closer to our lobby and farther from the neighbors. Through conversation with representatives, we know we cannot reduce this further in proportion to room count. Large umbrellas will create a containment area for sound, and at the same time, provide protection from mid and late-day sun. Seating is arranged behind a sculptural living wall and fountain feature, blocking and masking noise, and creating a limit point for activity. Quieter seating and walking paths will occur on the other side. Wooden

decks, thoughtful decorative and native drought-resistant planting materials will be placed throughout, with particular attention to the redwood under canopy areas. Activity including background music or events will be limited to very specific hours. This is not a place for large gatherings or major outdoor functions. It's an amenity for the enjoyment of the guests, and we believe a significant aesthetic over the existing parking lot that occurs there now. We have lowered the height of the roof screen to be at the minimum needed to enclose the equipment we have conceptually evaluated. And as I mentioned, consistent application of materials has been a focus. We will have natural appearance for the underside of the soffits, wherever they occur, and you can see again how organized and consistent the window pattern has become as a result of the careful coordination with the interior. At the rear elevation, we've limited the windows to a minimum to enhance privacy for both our guests and our neighbors nearby. The shortest distance between our windows and the closest on the neighboring property is more than 37 feet. This is approximately 10 feet more than a typical multi-family design would require. We worked hard over the past two years to adjust the building massing and design to be respectful of the adjacent neighbors, while maintaining the necessary efficiency and coordination our building needs to be functional. At this point, we believe we've reached the best balance that can be achieved. In response to staff comments, and with direction from **soft brand [phonetic]** representatives we've shared the design with, we've added balconies where feasible. Functional space that expands the area of the guest room and allows access to the outdoors is a benefit we feel adds great value and character to the building. We've carefully studied the placement of these, and the shortest distance from balcony to neighbor's window is more than 58 feet. We are consistent with zoning regulations for height, and these sections further illustrate the terraced nature of the building. We've included details in your packet to help explain how we intend to apply the exterior materials and transition between elements. Happy to discuss that further. We have physical material samples in front of you, and I'm happy to have my team help with any follow-up discussion you would like to have about the character or the design. The City has studied the shade and shadow and confirm the information we showed earlier. Our diagrams go just a bit further and represent the impact the existing trees have on the neighbor's site, in addition to the shadows our building will create. Other than the extreme points of the seasons, as stated, our new construction is shown to have no significant impact. In the EIR, at pages 4.5 through 11, explains the estimated project trips will only be 31 during the 7:00 to 9:00 a.m. peak hour, and 32 inbound trips during the 4:00 to 6:00 p.m. peak hour. That means we're only seeing a car about every four minutes. We believe that the stacking is not going to be an issue. Valets move cars along at about a pace of three minutes each. The goal is just to scoot them right down into the garage quickly. And the constraint that staff is suggesting we believe is overly conservative and onerous, and will not serve our hotel well. So, we would like to potentially have some discussion about that. We can go through how the circulation works a little bit more, but we do have enough room in our circulation under the porte-cochere to allow for an SU 30 truck, in addition to three cars, stacked at any time. In regard to the lighting details, you had asked for some additional information, and staff has been supportive of the gentle and controlled approach we've submitted. And although you can't read it in this slide, in your packet hopefully you can see that the photometric levels dwindle to nothing at the property lines. Along El Camino, trying to activate that frontage, you know, we've talked quite a bit about the Grand boulevard and how this project associates with that. But there was definitely some concern about some of the elements that were out there. This playful fencing illustrates a motif and character that we've added to create interest. Again, something staff was supportive of. We'd like to hear your thoughts about the current porte-cochere concept. We feel it's complete and capable, but staff had some reservations. Circulation space. Illuminated well, maintaining a focus on the interior and the entry sequence. Decorative, but not overworked. Plenty of other interest in the vicinity of this, and a goal of leading your eye and motion to the interior. Walter was quite capable in his explanation of the tree protection zone, so I won't go into that. I'll just end here briefly by saying that the art is something that we're definitely focused on. It will be a great amenity and add to this project, and we will be discussing that further with the Palo Alto Art Committee. We've been in touch with Elise about that quite a bit. To end, I want to just state that our goal here today is to respond to your questions and discuss any areas you feel need further explanation; assist you in evaluating anything that might need to go to the subcommittee; and close today's hearing with a Board recommendation for the project to be approved by the Director. Thank you for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Does anyone have a question of the applicant?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, hi. I had a question about the material application on the building. Is the soffit the same material as the siding?

Mr. Popp: It's not. We're hoping to find some type of a wood material, wood-look material, that's consistent with that, but we haven't decided exactly what that material would be.

Vice Chair Thompson: The intention would be to match the color?

Mr. Popp: Very consistent.

Vice Chair Thompson: And then, in the back courtyard, there's sort of a black applique for some parts of the façade. Is that the soft black metal element?

Mr. Popp: It is.

Vice Chair Thompson: And that takes the whole wall...?

Mr. Popp: It is.

Vice Chair Thompson: And the soft metal black elements, is that also the railing?

Mr. Popp: Correct.

Vice Chair Thompson: I see. Okay.

Mr. Popp: Thank you.

Vice Chair Thompson: Those are my questions.

Board Member Lee: I had a quick follow-up to Osma's question on the materials board. Just saw that for the first time today. I'm wondering if the soft black relates to that gate then, with the undulating wave. Is that the color for that gate?

Mr. Popp: It does. You know, Grace, what happened in the last hearing – and I appreciate that you're here today – we had a lot of comment about too many materials, too many different things going on, too busy, intersections that were difficult. So, one of the ways we've addressed that is to and just quiet all of that down. We have a very limited material palette. We're trying to use just a very small selection of colors and apply them carefully. Our goal here really was to have a lot of consistency across this building, and to create some decoration around the windows and other places, but use a really limited palette to do that.

Board Member Lee: I appreciate that. And then, I believe I can see it in the drawings, and estimating 15 to 20 feet, but could you, for the whole room, describe what the setback is in terms of that screening of the chiller, boiler, that's eight-foot-two-inch high? How far is that set back from the edge of the building?

Mr. Popp: Give me one second and I'll get an answer for you on that.

Board Member Lee: I think it's 15 to 20 feet, but I thought that might be helpful, to pull out what that dimension is.

Mr. Popp: You're asking how far the roof screen is set back from the frontage on El Camino?

Board Member Lee: That's right. Oh, sorry, from the building perimeter wall along the adjacent neighbors.

Mr. Popp: Okay.

[Short pause while applicant looks for answer.]

Mr. Popp: From the property line, not the neighbor's building, but from the property line, it's about 35 feet, we believe.

Board Member Lee: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Alex, you said you had one follow-up question as well?

Board Member Lew: A dimensional question. Randy, I don't need an answer immediately, I'll let you look at the drawings. But for the two-story portion of the building, I'm seeing different dimensions in your plans and sections. I'm seeing 16 feet, and I'm also seeing 20 feet. That's in Section A6.1, or in the plans, on A3.0, something-16 feet. If you could get back to me later about the dimension from the rear-most portion of the building to the fence, to the Palo Alto Redwoods.

Mr. Popp: Great. When I come back up for other questions, I'll be happy to address that.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you very much. With that, we'd like to open the hearing to any public testimony. We have quite a few speaker cards here. We'll still stick to three minutes each, but we'd appreciate as much efficiency as we can. We're going to start with Josephine Shuster, to be followed by Julie Baskind. You'll have...

Sharlene Carlson: [off-microphone] May I make a request?

Chair Baltay: You may.

Ms. Carlson: I'm Sharlene Carlson, and I'm a board member for the Palo Alto Redwoods. We have had a request that we have three board members make a 15-minute or less presentation and have others cede time, and that we could begin with that.

Chair Baltay: That's reasonable. Can you tell me which people are ceding their time to you? We'd like to get this organized.

Ms. Carlson: Can people raise hands who are ceding their time? Angel Rocha, Anna Rubin, Doug Schwan, Mary Sylvester...

Chair Baltay: Go slower, please.

Ms. Carlson: Angel Rocha. Evangeline Rocha.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And who else?

Ms. Carlson: Anna Rubin. Did you sign a card, Anna? Mary Sylvester. Jean Kvasnica.

Chair Baltay: Okay, fine. Let's get you started here.

Ms. Carlson: Thank you. I am Sharlene Carlson [spells name]. Julie, would you mind coming up and scrolling this for me, because I don't know how to do this. I'm Sharlene Carlson [spells name], and I am president of Palo Alto Redwoods Home Owners Association. I have here with me letters from 120-plus residents, and I think you've probably seen many of these. And they are all opposing this project. And we have residents in the chamber today who are also opposing, and I'm going to ask them if they'd raise their hands. They don't have to necessarily stand up... Just get a sense that there is a lot of opposition from our community. We are a multi-family residential condominium community of 117 units, most in buildings three stories tall. We have approximately 275 residents living in a 2 2/3 acre property next to and behind the proposed site. Even though PAR – we sometimes reference ourselves as PAR, Sam said – is zoned commercial CS, it is critical to note that we have been a residential neighborhood since this was built around 1982, and we should be afforded the priority protections and considerations required by the Comprehensive Plan. For the past three years, at two preliminary hearings and two formal ARB hearings, Palo Alto Redwoods has

provided written and oral comments, and basically, of the various design changes, and they basically have objected to the massive height and density, we feel is out of character with neighboring properties. The risk of damage to our redwood trees and to the structures of our buildings and infrastructures. And, the possible reductions in light and views of sky, noise increases, traffic safety, risks of parking challenges, environmental and public health impacts, just to name a few things. We have repeatedly urged the developer, City, and the ARB to hear our appeals for reasonableness, and little has changed. This project has been through multiple revisions. We count 10 different submissions, each with a transformed concept and associated goals. It started with a 69-room boutique hotel plus eight townhouses, plus one level of underground stacked parking. It is now a 97-room high-end boutique hotel with large glass patio doors and balconies, and a bar-restaurant patio abutting our property, with amplified music, plus two levels of underground parking. And I should say that a year ago, it was to be a Zen courtyard. We have gone from Zen to bar, from meditation to libation, from bad to worse, in our opinion. Two things throughout all of the changes that have been made to this project have remained, and one is that the developer has tried to make it as massive as possible on a small parcel. The second is the Palo Alto Redwoods has objected to that massiveness. Remember, all hotels are not built to ordinance maximums of 2.0 FAR. The two hotels recently built on El Camino are four stories tall with a FAR of about 1.75. They are on much larger parcels. A lower FAR is more appropriate for the hotel on this rather small site. The current design adds large sliding glass patio doors, which are kind of the full height and width of the rooms, and balconies; an outdoor restaurant/patio with a firepit and a proposed patio facing our property; amplified music, which will be allowed from one hour after sunrise until 10 p.m. This moves the entire structure closer to our property with these balconies, increases noise, and decreases privacy. Hotel guests sitting on patios will look into PAR residents' homes, down on the clubhouse and pool area. Our beautiful trees and property will become the hotel's free view. Interior lights from the literal walls of glass windows may be on at all hours of the day and night, and the intrusiveness in the latest design is in so many ways worse than previous designs. The draft Environmental Impact Report notes that the proposed design is not the environmentally superior option, which member Lew mentioned previously. It is not. The staff report does not mention the negative impacts on neighbors detailed in the DEIR, but instead claims that accommodations were made to protect neighbors' privacy, and this is inaccurate and needs to be changed. Does the City really need more hotels for any reason but for hotel tax? Recent reports indicate that hotel occupancy has declined in Palo Alto, while the City has a desperate need for housing. And more hotels are under construction, including expansion of the Parmani Hotel on El Camino, and the two Marriotts that are being built down on San Antonio. Don't forget the Su Hong parcel is designated as a housing inventory site in the Palo Alto housing element of the recent Comprehensive Plan. The staff report needs to note this and state what other site is identified as a swap so the hotel can be considered. Particularly since the Fry site no longer seems to be available as an option for housing. We do not believe the ARB can find that the project has a unified and coherent design that meets the requirements of Finding 2, specifically that it provides harmonious transitions in scale, mass and character to adjacent land uses and land use designations, or that it enhances living conditions on the site if it includes residential uses, and in adjacent residential areas. The hotel will not provide harmonious transitions in scale as it will tower over the properties around it and appear many times larger than adjacent structures. The tall but narrow street façade will be unprecedented in the area and will appear out of proportion to buildings around it in aspect ratio. The hotel does not enhance living conditions on our residential community, and it does not meet any of the criteria for harmonious co-existence with the adjacent residential neighborhood. Palo Alto Redwoods has revised the DEIR and staff report and its appendices and finds a number of irregularities. We will provide detailed written comments before the end of the DEIR comment period, but we do want to highlight a few things. Some proposed conditions in the staff report are problematic or incomplete, including but not limited to: The tree protection and preservation plan only protects trees on the 4256 side and not on the PAR side. This needs to be changed to include trees in PAR. Noise from amplified music is allowed between one hour after sunrise to 10 p.m., and this should not be allowed. And there are no protections of PAR property from excavation or over-excavation, and this needs to be added. Again, I said we will be submitting comments. In conclusion, based on all these salient points, we urge the ARB to reject the proposal outright. I will now turn it over to board member Peter Mills, who will make a few comments.

[light applause]

Chair Baltay: Please, please, let's hold the applause. If you could state and spell your name.

Peter Mills: Good morning, my name is Peter Mills [spells name]. I'm a Palo Alto resident, Palo Alto Redwoods homeowner, and member of the board of the home owners association. I'd like to make four comments. First, the DEIR is incomplete, and I believe we should have a more thorough daylight study, which is missing from the report. The current study seems to cherry pick times of day and doesn't reveal the extent of the lost direct sunlight and lost views of the sky. Second, the project does not respect our privacy and quiet enjoyment. The second, third and fourth floors of PAR look out at sky now. If this project is completed, it will look directly into a building that is 62 feet tall. The outdoor Zen garden has become an outdoor bar and restaurant. We all know restaurants and bars are not quiet. The noise will be a permanent blight for our residents. We request to move the bar and restaurant indoors and have it open onto the Grand boulevard in the front, rather than in the back, which would make it truly a grand boulevard. The privacy invasion is extreme and unfair. The current design means 56 windows of PAR residents will face an expanse of 70 windows and sliding glass doors, making it look like a Manhattan building. And we don't want to live in Manhattan. We should also have accurate measurements and resulting renderings of the views looking at the hotel rooms that will result from having such a massive building next door. The project will likely damage our property. There's tree damage that we expect based on digging and draining of the water table. The trees will lose morning sunlight, and that combination of less water and less sun, we believe will be very damaging. The architectural submissions misrepresent the scale and mass of the project. Some of the renderings that you saw this morning exclude trees and show instead big brown walls, which are not visible and don't exist, and thus, those renderings misrepresent the scale and impact and real size of the project. I'd like to turn it over now to Neil Murphy, another resident of the Redwoods, who will discuss the traffic problems that will be generated by the current project design. The hotel's primary business is loading and unloading people in and out of their facility 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The current plan must not be built because it pushes their primary business off of their private property and into the public street, and does not accommodate peak loads. We have pictures of this exact activity of private business being transacted on public property at the Hilton Hotel just up the street, to the detriments of the residents of Palo Alto and people driving on El Camino. The grand boulevard vision will instead become an unsafe grand traffic jam reality. I'll turn it over to Neil Murphy.

Chair Baltay: If you could state and spell your name as well, please. You have about four minutes left on your time allotment.

Neil Murphy: Thank you. My name is Neil Murphy [spells name]. Good morning. Your recommendations here should be fully informed. For this reason, I've sent you links to 188 photos illustrating the exact problems this project is going to install immediately in front of our driveway. Based on that evidence, the DEIR finding that this project will have no significant impact is demonstrably wrong. Please consider. You now have evidence – I don't know if you've had a chance to take a look at it, but I sent you the links – you have evidence that vehicles existing the hotel will have less than 100 feet to cross three lanes of traffic to make this U-turn. This is a significant impact. You have evidence that rideshares park illegally wherever it's most convenient, and they jut into traffic in a valley, and making a toothless suggestion to please move is not going to stop them. That's a significant impact. This project is intentionally under-parked by 15 percent. No hotel parking is allocated for employees, who then have to park on ECR or at the cabana. Foisting responsibility for this load onto the public or neighboring properties is a significant impact. If the justification is under-parking is a projected increase in rideshares, shouldn't the porte-cochere be larger to accommodate this increase? You have evidence that porte-cocheres back up onto ECR and block traffic. This is a significant impact. What exactly is supposed to happen in the porte-cochere when a UPS and FedEx truck arrive at the same time? These accommodations are inadequate. You have evidence of the problem of buses. There. This is the Su Hong site. You have evidence of the problem of buses, for which this project makes zero accommodation. The only place the buses can park is where they will park – immediately next to our driveway, blocking visibility of pedestrians, like our children walking to school, and obstructing traffic, despite a red curb. This is also exactly where the garbage truck is supposed to park for this plan. You have evidence that red curbs are ineffective as a deterrent to illegal parking. In fact, the City staff report takes the position that we, the neighbors, will have to assume the obligation of initiating police enforcement, for whom this is not a priority. We haven't asked for this obligation, and we don't want it. Calling the policy doesn't work. We have, and they don't come. Speaking with drivers directly doesn't work. This is a significant impact. This over-massed project is a square peg and the plot is a round hole. These traffic and parking issues are symptoms of bad design. A project should be self-contained, not dependent

on consumption of public resources like curb space to compensate for its shortcomings. A project should not depend on free, involuntary labor from the neighbors to compensate for design flaws. It's wrong to force the public to assume responsibility for the negative impacts of a problem which is too massive for the site and cannot make adequate accommodations. Clearly, this is the antithesis of enhancing living conditions in adjacent residential areas, one of the findings you must make, which does not include caveats. The permanent problems this project will install for us are self-evident. For these reasons, we strongly urge you to consider rejecting this proposal. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much.

[light applause]

Chair Baltay: Please, please, we want to get through all of this. We have a few more speaker cards here. Irene Kane, to be followed by Humul Richine...? I'm sorry, I can't read the writing here. Irene Kane, if you could state and spell your name, please, for the record.

Irene Kane: Hi, my name is Irene Kane [spells name]. I've been a Palo Alto resident for decades now. I have a good friend who lives in the Redwoods, and when she first told me that they were going to tear down the restaurant and build a five-story hotel, I was stunned. I was like, what are you talking about? That parcel is tiny. How can they build a giant hotel there? When they explained that they were going to dig down two stories for underground parking, I was like, wow, that's really going to affect your trees, your landscaping, and everything else. She said the original proposal didn't have balconies; now it does have balconies. Balconies are a horrible idea for the people who live around there, because once people are outside, they think they can talk much louder, which they do; the sound carries much farther outdoors, and especially at night. The restaurant obviously doesn't operate 24 hours, it's only open until a certain time, and then they had their nights free. Well, now that's not going to happen. Traffic there is already terrible, trying to get in and out of that area is just... It's not great now, and it's going to be way, way worse with this. Also, redwoods are extremely hard to plant anything underneath them. I have a redwood tree right next door to me. It's ginormous, and almost nothing grows under there. So, if they think they're going to have this great landscaping around, if it's near those redwoods, that's not going to happen. I think this project is just way too massive for the area. In general, overall, I think this under parking, of all these massive places that you want to build, it's just horrible. People can't easily walk around here, and they can't easily bike. I'm sorry, but you need to stop this under parking of buildings. Sorry. You're dreaming if you think it's going to force more people out of their cars. That would be wonderful, but sorry, that is a joke. It's just not going to happen. This area is not that walkable. It's just too big, places are too far away. People are not going to give up their cars. The whole Bay area just does not have enough public transportation, they don't have safe bike areas. Walking around El Camino, I never see anybody walking El Camino. I never see people crossing El Camino. It's dangerous. It doesn't happen. It's unpleasant. This project is too big. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Next, we have Humul... I'm sorry, I just can't read your name here.

Vice Chair Thompson: HHR initials?

Chair Baltay: HR? Okay, we'll go on to Stephanie Tramz, to be followed by James Waskey. Stephanie, please. You'll have three minutes. If you could state and spell your name.

Stephanie Tramz: Stephanie Tramz [spells name]. I am an owner and resident at Palo Alto Redwoods condominiums. I'm glad that it's now clear that these are condominiums because I've been at the prior hearings before the ARB and City staff referred to our units as apartments. They are not apartments. They are very valuable condominiums, \$1 million-plus each market value, so we have over \$117 million worth of residential real property surrounding this proposed hotel. I think that there has to be some concern about our well-being. We are substantial tax payers and residents in the city of Palo Alto, and I think this project, which maxes out every idiosyncrasy of the zoning laws... I belatedly found out that due to some historical irony, our residential condominiums are zoned as some sort of a commercial. Therefore, we don't benefit from the City of Palo Alto plain [phonetic] for light and air. That pertains to residential areas,

generally. But there is no question that if this project is built out, it is going to severely, negatively impact the lives of our 117 condominium units, way to our detriment. It will plunge our units into darkness. Also, due to its excessive height, it will interfere with the free movement of air. It will make our units hot and dark. And I want to say something about the five-story height. It's not just five stories. I just looked at the drawings out in the hallway. There is a sixth story which is surrounded by some sort of metallic shield because there's going to be a whole bunch of equipment on the top of the building. So, in terms of interfering with light and air, that will be even more severe than depicted on the drawings. I'm just chagrined that this project has been foisted on us, and I am concerned about the fact that the architect for this project is a prior member of this board, as I understand it. I myself feel that there is an appearance of impropriety in that close relationship. We are asking, please, to reject approval of this project. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. James Wang, to be followed by Josephine Shuster. James Wang? James Wang is up next, please.

?: [off-microphone] [inaudible]

Chair Baltay: Not yet. James, have a seat. Let's let Josephine go first.

[Determining next speaker.]

Chair Baltay: Please address us.

James Wang: My name is James Wang [spells name]. I agree with all my neighbors and the president's presentation. I emphasize the massive things. I just want to emphasize. I'm the resident in unit [inaudible]. You notice [inaudible]...

Chair Baltay: Please speak into the microphone.

Mr. Wang: Yeah, this angles, okay? It's angle. So, my unit and this angle, the approximate distance is very, very close to the proposed hotel. I just notice. They still view the very high, at least the four stories, actually the height is five stories, immediately in front of my unit. I'm already 64 years old. I'm going to retire and spend the rest of my time in this [inaudible].... My wife and my children is [inaudible] So, suddenly, a wall in front of your windows. Two windows [inaudible]. It's completely broke our views and the light. The morning, we wake up. Instead of the beautiful redwood trees with the sun shining, what we see is a big wall, like in a jail. And also, I noticed, when the back corner at the rear, they built high, and also, it's a stairs. Stare at the window. Everyone at the public can walk in there [inaudible] to look [inaudible] privacy. My children is minors, okay? It's affecting our whole lives and the privacy. I really urge you to [inaudible] reject that. It's suffering our interests [inaudible] for their profit. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Josephine Shuster, to be followed by Rita Vrhel.

Josephine Shuster: [spells last name]. I assume you know how to spell Josephine. Anyway, I'm the oldest thing in that building. I'll be 90 years old in September, and I really do not want to live out my last days in a dark, gloomy place. I live on the fourth floor, and I will be impacted. I can't imagine how the three floors below me are going to feel, having no light and no air, because that's exactly what will happen. The project is simply too massive for the property, and as I've said before, I will not be living in the black hole of Calcutta; I'll be living in the black hole of Palo Alto.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Rita... I'm sorry, I can't read your last name. To be followed by Julie Baskind.

Rita Vrhel: [spells name]. Again, I live on Channing Avenue. I've got no dog in this fight, except that the Redwoods is a really beautiful community. It was planned with extreme care. I think there is redwood tree planted for each unit, if I'm correct. Now, you have the choice of putting profit over long-term residents. The lot is very small. I spoke to this Board several weeks ago on the **Castaley [phonetic]** DEIR. We know

that the City right now seems to be putting out what I would consider – and what other people consider – really crummy DEIRs that seem to modify or minimize traffic and noise, both of which you are going to have with this project. I would ask you to really look, and for everyone here to make comments on those two issues. I think one of the things that the City needs to do – and you as a board – is to not degrade existing buildings or communities in Palo Alto as you are approving new projects. The Redwoods are extremely important, and even though Mr. Passmore said that a bond will be put in place, we all know from the Edgewood project that it's very easy for a developer – like Sand Hill Properties – to tear down one of the most important parts of the Edgewood project, meaning the Eichler building, and say, "Whoops, okay, we'll pay that \$75,000 fine." Money right now is not an issue for any of the developers. I think the project is way too massive. It could be cut back. I'm not saying don't build anything, but build something that is more appropriate. And how it looks from the street really is the least amount of problem with this project. No balconies. Set back way far from the residents. Do not degrade the Palo Alto Redwoods. One last comment. I don't know if you've gone into any of the units at the Palo Alto Redwoods that would be degraded by this project. I would really encourage Sharlene and you to work that out. The last question is, would you want to live here, in the Palo Alto Redwoods after this project is built? And if you can say no problem, then I probably have somebody in that unit who will sell you their unit, because it's going to be horrible. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Julie Baskind, to be followed by Jeff Levinsky.

Julie Baskind: My name is Julie Baskind [spells name]. I've been a homeowner at the Redwoods since 1988. Sam, he has pictures from the second floor inside unit, which, to Rita's point. So, as I get started, you can see what it looks like now, today. In preparing my remarks, I reviewed the official minutes from January of 2019 hearing, and concluded that the ARB members' comments are way more persuasive than anything I could have written. So, with brevity, here it goes. Skeptical sun study. Concerns over circulation and parking. Stair tower looks taller over the pool. Concerns about street and sidewalk elevation. Massing. Needs better relationship to nature. Skeptical shadow study. Blocks skylight. Still too many issues. Too tall and vertical. More than Homewood Suites and the Hilton. A FAR of 1.75, better than 2.0. It's too close to the Redwoods. Tree protection concerns. Not confident of a light study. The restaurant should be available to the public. Are we designing projects that meet the reality of the situation? Separately, this is a general quote by an ARB member that was made to the Palo Alto Weekly, but not specific to this project: *"The content of developers' presentations must demonstrate and emphasize sun angle studies, massing considerations, perspective street views, neighborhood context modeling, and pedestrian impact. Well before façade designs, unit plans and construction materials are presented. This feasibility study is when the 50-foot height limitation is either justifiable or not."* Another ARB member recently, in the Weekly, not specific to 4256: *"There are numerous instances cited where garages interfered with the root systems of the trees and at times requiring the board to recommend revisions. While the reduction of surface parking is generally a positive change, less space is available on site for large trees to grow and mature."* In concluding, it's worth pointing out that the current design differs from earlier ones only in the marginal details. It retains all the mass and the scale, with trivial cosmetic changes. It's certainly darker and more somber, which only emphasizes its bulk and density. This proposed hotel project blocks virtually all daylight from homes on that side, including mine, as well as the 12 BMR units, which is why we keep asking for that daylight study. I agree with the concerns expressly quoted by you, the members of the ARB, and request using your own criteria and objections, the proposal be rejected today. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Jeff Levinsky, to be followed by Douglas Schwandt.

Jeff Levinsky: Good morning, Board members and staff. It's Jeff Levinsky [spells name]. I'm not a resident of the Palo Alto Redwoods. Rather, I am part of the community organization PAN, which stands for Palo Alto Neighborhood. We are concerned about the deterioration of our town's quality of life due to development. As you may now, the City's scientific annual survey shows a year after year decline in public opinion of the quality of the city development, and overall resident satisfaction. Our organization's own survey shows a similar decline. Today's hearing is a perfect example of why Palo Alto residents and their attorneys sent the City a letter on February 6, 2019, detailing how this project does not comply with various laws, including the Municipal Code and the Comprehensive Plan. For example, that letter lists six absolutely relevant Comprehensive Plan policies. Not a single one of those is in the staff report before you. One of

those policies is L-1.1, which says: *Maintain and prioritize Palo Alto's varied residential neighborhoods while sustaining the vitality of its commercial areas and public facilities.* "The hotel project does not maintain the Palo Alto Redwoods' residential neighborhood. It instead undermines that neighborhood by creating deep shadows and a massive loss of privacy. The policy says to prioritize residential neighborhoods, so when there is a conflict between what might be best for a commercial development and an adjoining residential neighborhood, you are to give the neighborhood the priority. Where is that policy mentioned in your staff report? Nowhere. At the very beginning of the Comprehensive Plan, there's an overriding principle intended to guide you. It states that the Comprehensive Plan, *"...encourages commercial enterprise, but not at the expense of the City's residential neighborhoods."* Everyone here knows that commercial development being proposed will be at the expense of a residential neighborhood. It is, thus, not consistent with the plan. But where is that principle in your staff report? Nowhere. I hope this explains while residents feel our development process is getting worse. Dozens volunteered long hours over multiple years to create that new Comprehensive Plan that balances interests between its residents and development. It was a Herculean effort. For their hard work to be selectively omitted from the staff report is tragic. It sends a terrible message. Please, please, look at those policies that were in that letter and include those when you think about your findings. Thank you.

[light applause]

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Please, please, hold the applause. Douglas Schwandt, to be followed by Anna...

?: [inaudible] [off-microphone]

Chair Baltay: Very well. The next person there is Anna...?

?: [inaudible] [off-microphone]

Chair Baltay: Very well. With that, we'll close the public testimony. The applicant has an opportunity to rebut what's been stated, if you wish. You'll have 10 minutes.

Mr. Popp: Thank you. Thank you for allowing us to come back up and speak to some of the comments you've heard. I want to start by just saying that gathering supporters for a project like this, to come and speak to you about the benefits of a hotel, is difficult. Right? People are at work. They are entertaining the guests that would be using these hotels. They are businesses that are seeking places for interviewees. They are families that are looking for places to have guests come and stay with them. And locating those people and having them come and speak in force is not something that is realistic. But I can tell you that the benefits of this hotel are numerous, and it doesn't stop with the enormous amount of TOT that this project generates, somewhere in the neighborhood of close to \$1.5 to \$1.8 million worth of tax revenue for the city each year, which goes directly to helping to fund housing projects and other city amenities. There are so many benefits to building a project like this. It's really difficult for me to stand up here and not say this to you. It's a fully compliant project. This use was intended for this site by the Comprehensive Plan, and the people who bought units next to this site knew the zoning at the time. I don't mean to sound abrupt about that, or flip about it in any way. But the fact is, everybody knew what this site was capable of being developed as. That has not changed. I want to just run through a couple of the items that we've talked about. First of all, in regard to the impact to the redwood trees, you heard from the urban forester for the City of Palo Alto, chief arborist for the City of Palo Alto. This project preserves all four of the redwoods on site. The garage boundary was carefully adjusted to avoid impacts to the tree roots. The conditions of approval, 59 through 70, ensure that these trees will be protected during the construction and hotel operation, and we're committed to that. This is confirmed by the extensive root survey and the EIR. The adverse impacts on the traffic, safety, noise, air quality, etc., the EIR confirms that all of these impacts will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The construction process will be managed to mitigate noise and impacts to the neighbors. The EIR confirms that these impacts would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. The bulk of the buildings do not cast shadows upon the Palo Alto Redwoods homes or the pool area. The City commissioned its own shadow study, confirming what the project team had done, that shows that this project is designed to limit shadows cast on neighboring residential properties and recreational spaces. The shadows will only be cast during very limited times, and they are

not significant. We have minimized the massing in respect to the privacy of the Palo Alto Redwoods homes. We've reduced the number and size of rear windows significantly. The changes to the project have been made over time, and you've watched all of that evolve. The reduction from 100 to 97 rooms, terracing the building, reorganization of the overall plan to move massing toward El Camino and farther from Palo Alto Redwoods, and special room plans designed to limit window interaction. We are consistent with all provisions of the zoning code, and specifically height. The project fully conforms to all of the requirements. The hotel is a permitted use on this site, and the only discretionary approval for this project that's required is yours. We are consistent with the comp plan. We have assurances that noise from the HVAC and outdoor spaces will not be heard. This has been studied in the EIR, which concluded that those will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. In regard to draining and run-off or flooding of the Palo Alto Redwoods area, the conditions all ensure that the project will have adequate drainage to avoid that. And, in consideration of converting the project to mixed use or housing, I'll just say that, again, hotels are a permitted use here. This applicant considered other uses on the site and determined that the hotel is the highest and best use. Specifically addressing Mr. Murphy's comments, the Hilton that he's showing you so many pictures of has room for 800 people to come and meet in that hotel. The balconies are a standard amenity that people expect with a hotel of this character and this style. It's something that we heard clearly from the soft brands that we have been addressing. Same is true of the courtyard. As a full-service hotel, they expect to have some outdoor seating and outdoor dining area in this climate. The parking is fully climate at a 1.0. We know from studies that we've been doing... I think you're all aware that I'm involved in the Marriott hotels that are on San Antonio Road, and we've evaluated this pretty carefully. In this local area, there are recent studies that show that the correct parking for a hotel of this scale and this style is .65. We are overparked, dramatically. In terms of circulation and drop-off, the EIR shows that we are fully contained in the project site, that there is no expected spill-over, and this should not be a problem. We have a full-time valet to deal with it. The other point that'd like to bring up really quickly is, I think, Alex, you had asked what the dimensions were. That two-story portion that's in the rear of the property is 16 feet from the property, where there is currently a non-conforming 12-foot-high wall at the rear. The closest dimension from that building to a Palo Alto Redwoods building is 38-foot-seven in one direction, and 42-foot-eight in the other direction. So, significant space behind a tall wall. I'll just close by saying that the floor area ratio for this site, at a 2.0, makes sense. It's a small site. Hotels need to be 100 rooms to be successful. It's a constant across the nation. We backed that down to 97 because of a need to add some amenity spaces and some other things that we just couldn't fit in without dropping some rooms. And part of that was in response to the neighbors, who were asking us to try and minimize the size. But we just don't have flexibility to reduce this further. We've crafted the shape of the building, we've organized the spaces in a way we feel is responsive and respectful, but, at this point, we'd like you to consider the project that's before you. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. With that, we're going to move on to Board comments, but I would like to thank the community for coming out. Your comments have been heard, and speaking for all of us here, we appreciate that you make the effort to come tell us what you think. With that, Alex, Lew is going to start us off on our discussion today.

Board Member Lew: Sure. Thank you for all the members of the public who spoke. This is the third hearing, so the Board has to make a recommendation today. It is only a recommendation to the Planning Director, who will make the decision, and then, that decision can be appealed to the Council if an appeal is filed. And then, it does take... Does it still take three council members to pull an appeal on consent, now that we have a smaller council?

Mr. Gutierrez: I believe it's the same number as before.

Board Member Lew: Same number as before.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes.

Mr. Gutierrez: Thank you to the design team for the revised project. I think there are several improvements, particularly the materials. I think the railings really do add a lot of character to the project. I have a couple concerns, and I hate to have to do this at the third hearing, but I do have some issues with the massing.

It seems like it's inconsistent, to me, on the back. When I was looking at the dimensions and I was looking at the site, it seemed like the rear-most portion of the project is very, very close to the Palo Alto Redwoods. And I do acknowledge that the zoning doesn't have any requirements, specific requirements for that. And then, also, too, it seems like you've changed the massing, the stepping, and I think I would prefer us to go back to the previous stepping, unless there's a persuasive argument. I think Peter was actually pretty adamant about the stepping of the massing, and I think it was actually working better. I don't know. We'll see how he feels about the current one.

Chair Baltay: Alex, let me interrupt you. Could you show us on the drawing where you're talking about the massing? Just so we all have a clear understanding of that.

Board Member Lew: Sure.

Chair Baltay: Which elevation drawing? Let's put a line on it.

Board Member Lew: Well, I think probably the most useful one is the, I think he has the axon...? Let me get the page... With the highlighted changes – 3.16. Okay, so, the rear most portion of the building, which is the little two-story thing, I had not ever noticed it until yesterday, but it seems... I sort of paced the site and looked at where that was with relation to the Palo Alto Redwoods, and it seems like really close to the fence. That's minor, though. I think it's the fourth and fifth floor stepping, in blue, which is shown on the right. I think it's adding massing, and my take on it is they're trying to maximize the floor area up to the full 2.0. And I think the Board worked very hard to get the lower massing, and I'm not sure that we should go back to that, to go back up with regard to the stepping. On the findings, I do want to remind the Board we do have to meet all of the findings, and in the case of previous appeals, that we really have to address the context-based criteria. That's really what the Council, they're really looking at. They really want to make sure that the project fits into the neighborhood. And it's a challenge because the hotel, we allow hotels to be twice as large as a mixed-use project. The Council had the opportunity to, and they debated lowering the floor area during the comp plan and zoning updates, and they had put that on the plate, and then, the Council changed, and they removed that floor area reduction, so it is 2.0. If you look at the context-based criteria, we do allow larger buildings to sit next to smaller buildings if they make design linkages. I think that's really important. We don't necessarily require that a new project meet the same height as the neighbors. They are allowed to step up. I actually think the other principle of the zoning is that it really has to be fair and equitable to all the property owners, and it's sort of unfortunate in Palo Alto that, you know, hotel developers are more equal than others, but that's the way the code is written. I would argue that the project meets the context-based criteria. Materials, I think the siding is a big upgrade from the previously proposed material. I did take the color board out to the site and photographed it against the neighboring buildings. I think it actually looks good. The color seems a little off to me. I wish it were a little bit more redwood-y, but I do understand the redwood color of that material is probably too red. It's probably, like, too much. I think you've enhanced the window designs with additional molding. I think my previous concerns about the gates and metal works, I think have been addressed. I think that the sun study and the tree study have been done well. I don't really have anything to contradict those. That leaves me with a couple items. One, as I mentioned, is massing. Two is the street trees, and I think there's condition of approval number 63. The plans are saying that the London planes are going to be moved, which I think is unrealistic. I do think that the City staff has put in there a requirement for a suspended pavement system, so that the new trees would have more soil volume. But I think the plans are sort of contradicting each other at the moment. Right? The plans are showing something different than the conditions of approval. Two is the... Hold on a second. Oh, yeah, I previously mentioned, I had concerns about the balconies. It seems like the architect is going two things. One, it seems like you have actual balconies, and then, some of it you have, like, Romeo and Juliet balconies, like balconettes. They're not actually balconies, but they look like balconies. I'm concerned about that. That seems to me to be a huge loss. It seems to me that's going to be a real struggle with the neighbors. The Board has previously wanted them, like on Hotel Parmani, facing the street, and our zoning code does sort of argue for that as being, adding human scale, and adding eyes on the street. I will support those on the front of the building. I do have concerns about those on the rear and courtyard facing units. That being said, when I look at hotels, I usually pick older, like the older Marriott Courtyard hotels that have balconies. That's my first choice when I'm looking for a

hotel, typically, so I do understand the desire to put them in. Okay, so, I think that's all I have at the moment.

Mr. Popp: Alex, can I respond to you?

Board Member Lew: Yes. Thank you, Randy. If it's quick.

Mr. Popp: It will be very quick, yeah. I wanted to just address your question about the massing and why we made the change at the rear, and I wanted to just...

Chair Baltay: Excuse me, guys. I don't want you to come up now.

Mr. Popp: Okay.

Chair Baltay: I'd like to hear everybody's comments first. Alex, please.

Mr. Popp: Okay. I'd love an opportunity to just explain [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: You will have an opportunity. Let's get the Board going through this first. I'm sorry, Alex. Anything else from...?

Board Member Lew: That's it for now.

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

Board Member Hirsch: I believe pretty much with everything Alex has just said. I think that the rear of the building would be better if the stepping was a previous one. I also wish that somehow the presentation was made so that we could see exactly where the section through the building to the neighboring housing, so you get a sense of exactly what that relationship is. Unfortunately, I don't see that in any of the drawings here. Just giving a distance dimension from a point on the building to the neighboring buildings really doesn't give us a clear idea what the perspective is going to be, and I'm afraid this is for the future, this comment. In terms of the back of the building, I think the idea of the way it steps down and creates an inner court is a good idea. I'm concern, as some of the community mentioned, that the areas under redwoods don't really allow for much growth as all. I have a redwood two doors from my house and it's a mess underneath. I would say that an alternate to that would be ground-level landscaping that doesn't include planting particularly, but is attractive to the people in the building next door. Did I say the Romeo and Juliette balconies are...? I don't see them as that. I think they are a larger dimension, and probably big enough for this project. And also that they face in a direction where I don't think they'll really impact by noise the neighborhood at all. It's unfortunate that the lower portions of the building in the back yard have a kind of blank wall towards to the neighbors. I wish it would be more exciting, but I guess the way the planning works, you really have beds on certain walls. But you might consider, you know, I know there's the question the community will ask, about light pollution towards their buildings, but I think that the actual look of that wall is also important, the back wall towards the residential neighborhood. And that's the consideration of the back of the building. I think there's a vast increase in the quality of the landscaping, and that kind of firepit I think is a really nice idea. I think that kind of looking from the neighborhood towards that kind of activity, as long as it's not too late in the night, isn't a bad thing. The areas that sort of concern me a little bit more are the front of the building. I've always really liked the way in which the window bay and the opening at the bottom there, the way the building sets back, and there's kind of an outdoor bar – I'm not quite sure what happens out there. People waiting for people pick-up, or whatever, in there, or just outdoor coffee, or whatever, is a nice way of treating that volume and opening it towards the space in the middle of the building. And it seems it spans all the way across. I don't see the sense in putting those kinds of, if that's exactly what's going to happen here, putting these chairs on the outside and dividing that into a two-part opening. The benches there kind of pick up the shape of the undulating wall. I understand that's what it is, but it seems like pretty much on the street, and not a place where people would likely, really sit, off to the point where it's so much closer to the sidewalk. I think that just a bar with perhaps a continuation of the undulation as a part of that would be a better way of treating that

as a single opening for whatever happens there. I mean, I think that the roof lines are significantly better than they were on the front of the building. But my concern is that the smaller section here is really so nice, and you place the name of the hotel, and it chokes off the space to the first windows, and the texture of the whole front of the building, and yet, you have an opening below it. This is sort of a detail, but I think that somehow if the letters could be hung in the open space below, it would be even more effective. And then, the building would have simply a nicer look in that section. I've always had a problem, and the community certainly raised this, with the fact that it's such a narrow site and you have to squeeze so much transportation into that area. I could see it clogging the street, causing a problem, traffic issue, especially when a bus arrives, or a van arrives. Or a van sits in the middle space there. I don't know what you do. I think it's been zoned as a hotel. We've looked at other hotels which there is much better treatment for vehicles entering and getting to the garage. Mention the Parmani, which has a side entry into the parking entry, and actually entry into the hotel itself. And then, the front is turned into something that is very community-oriented, with some dining and canopies and, you know, very attractive area in the front. I guess it's not possible here, but I find it unfortunate that it's not. You had a traffic study, but I'm sorry that, you know, those issues don't get addressed. But if they did, what would happen is the whole hotel would have to move back, and there's absolutely no room to do that. Going to the other side of the building, the proportions are not nearly as nice. The base of the window structures are right on top of a piece of steel structure that runs across. I would wish somehow that there were some space under the windows in proportion to the front. There is no large elevation that shows me what that's going to look like. I really think it's so tight up to the bottom of the window that the structure is in that section. This is a kind of aesthetic that, you know...

Chair Baltay: Which elevation? Which other side of the building are you talking about?

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, the wider...

Chair Baltay: So, looking from El Camino, it's the piece on the left.

Board Member Hirsch: On the left.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Board Member Hirsch: I would have liked to have seen some of the masonry carried below that window line. Thank you. Somehow that would be more consistent left to right. And I think it's possible, even if the area where the driveway comes through to go down to the... yes?

Mr. Popp: [off-microphone] I can't tell what you're talking about. Can you be more descriptive about what portion of the building [inaudible]?

Chair Baltay: We'll summarize for you, Randy, as we get closer to that. Thank you. Keep going, David.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. I feel that that would be a masonry base under the windows on that level, on the left-hand side of the building. The problem with is it that, of course, you can't use a pier the same way as you have the piers on the right. What I would prefer to see, something similar to that, even if the pier was in a vertical direction towards the parking. In terms of massing, I think it will just look better. And then, I think you could carry that around the corner to the front of the setback area of the building. And in that area, I don't see why you need to have a full height, full height wooden partition, breaking up the... Why couldn't that be similar to the undulating front fence? Why couldn't that kind of connect across? There, you have a more reasonable place for your furniture. It's set into the area, and seating seems reasonable there. You know, in response to the community's big concern of the mass of the building, it's a zoning issue. I can't see how we can question that at all. It's just one of those things the Council and so on has [inaudible] zoning, and this is what it is. I think that, to the sense that you have designed this building to respect that as best you could, by stepping it down in the back, it a tremendous plus here. If you went back to, as Alex suggested, the massing, the way it was in the original scheme, I think that would be an improvement in the back. I would hope that the community would also recognize that if this is done well enough, with care about material colors – which I haven't mentioned yet, others probably will – that this

is kind of an improvement over a big asphalt field in front of a one-story building, and they are looking at a roof. It's not such a negative, really. Could be better. The lighting will be better. The planting will be better. I think the interesting thing is that it sort of, the redwoods will be seen over the top of the lower structures in the back yard. There's some plusses here, from both the hotel side and community side. I don't accept all of what either of you say, but it's close. I would vote to approve it. As I said, I think it's important to find something in the back yards there that... One other thought. And this is really off-base, I'm sure. Wouldn't it be nice if somehow the redwoods had a stair down and could use the space of the dining room themselves? I'm sure there's some way in which you could give them capability of using the dining, despite the fact that you're [laughing]. Okay. Whatever. I just think it should be more of a feeling of an openness between the two of you as neighbors. That's my comment.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Grace?

Board Member Lee: I want to thank the staff for the complete staff report, and also the applicant for the presentation. But I really want to thank these community members who have spent the time to sit with us today. I also thank community members who have invited ARB members even to see from the Redwoods' perspective. I did really appreciate being able to see from within the property, in terms of across the property lines. And I guess I just want to go back. I wholeheartedly agree with one comment that my colleague, Board Member Hirsch, just mentioned, regarding zoning. Given that this is an ARB application, this is the third, I unfortunately was not able to attend the first two, but I did want to just make some comments. This is a project, and its address, and its APN number, its zoning classification, really governs all the design standards, as you know, that are attached to this. Everything from the construction type, how many stories, the building height; even how high the screening of the equipment, how high it can be; lot coverage; the floor area ratio. These are all things that are constraints. We have a City zoning code. It is very much binding, and guides our approach in how we evaluate applications, how not only our board does... Which actually, all of these things, I just want to point out, are not in our purview so much. We are actually working under the constraints of a zoning code, and we have these able-bodied staff members. We also have a city council and consultants who are trying to work within those constraints. Parking is difficult, congestion is difficult, change is quite difficult. So, I'm going to speak to comments and recognize that our purview for the ARB is to respond to packages that are provided to us with an applicant, and know that we have a city process, and that this draft, the EIR, and the comments from the community, and that being under consultation by our City Council, is going to be very important for the planning director. Given that, let's just jump into the comments. You know, one of the things that I saw in the staff report – and I really appreciated – that is missing, and I'm not sure... I just wanted to make sure. The materials board, did you all review that in the last meeting? Because I feel like it's changed. Yes. I just want to point that out, that, you know, in the summary, that is the one thing that I saw that was missing. Materials and sample boards and the palette has changed. I'll leave that comment to the end, but I wanted to just go through what the City has provided us here. One of the things that the city of Palo Alto has done, and I really appreciate it, is that you actually have thought about some of these challenges, and some of the communications, and that there was an ask to a third party for the shadow study. In addition, there was the report from our city arborist today, and also, just that effort in terms of going to the consultant to actually, I mean, to really think about the trees. I am going by this report, and what I see is that there are limited shadows during the morning hours. The shadow study does show that over the course of the year, the shadows are a little bit longer, but in, you know, I am seeing that there is a limited time period when it is on the adjacent property. I also, when I look at, in terms of the trees, I really appreciate this extra effort that is given to make sure about the health of those trees. What I see is that there is actually, in addition, conditions of approval where a term of five years after the certification of occupancy. To me, those extra controls are reassuring, and because we take our trees very seriously. I just want to acknowledge those two things, that the City has worked with the applicant. Those were concerns of mine after speaking with a few people. Also, walking the site myself, and knowing that adjacent site. The other piece I wanted to mention is just in terms of the efforts, in terms of lighting. I see that there's been efforts on those. Those are kind of the main things that I wanted to look at first. And then, these asks in terms of access, and the edges. It sounds like there's been an effort, and there will be a return to staff in terms of conditioning this whole garage valet area, that they will provide updated plan sheets. I see that as a positive. I also see there is an ask in terms of the ceiling of the porte-cochere, and how it be detailed. There, I am curious what my colleagues think on that side. When I see the renderings and the lighting and

the signage, I don't think that there's a need for more detail. However, perhaps that is something that was asked in a comment made by an ARB member in a previous meeting, or... Maybe we can talk about that together in terms of that ceiling of the porte-cochere. The other piece that I saw was the red curbs. That all seems to sit well. In terms of the edges, also, let's talk about the stair tower. Well, that's kind of inside, but I feel like overall... I'm not sure about the use of... Well, there's been a dramatic change, so I just wanted to go through that, because when I look at my packet, and it's pages 81, 2, 3, 4, 5... I know this is just palette and materials. I understand, and I defer to my colleagues in terms of this more subdued palette. But I guess my concern is that, previously there was an effort in terms of the redwoods, and something along the El Camino façade. That was a little bit more celebratory in nature, in terms of that front pedestrian experience. Now, it's very dark, and I do find the set to be printed very dark, so maybe it's not full justice. But I look at the materials board and it also is very dark, and I'm concerned about the black color that is at the gate, and also the trim, and maybe this is something that my colleagues feel strongly it needs to move in that direction. The other pieces, I appreciate the Public Art Commission is going to be weighing in on some kind of functional bench. And then, the effort on the gate and the bench. But I do feel like those two need to speak together, so maybe that's something that will occur with the Public Art Commission's weigh-in on what is approved here. The stair tower, when I compare the two, maybe there was some issue regarding the design just in terms of its massing, or its weight, and how that held together. I guess I could go either way on that. When I look at the courtyard perspective and think about that stair tower, overall, I can be in agreement with the City that the stair tower is improved. The Board, I'd like to hear comments from Board members on that. Board Member Lew talked about the revised stepping. That is best seen... And I just want to point to the site section, so, on our packet, page 87, if you look at the east section view, that was previous, and then the current, on my side the stepping is probably something that occurred per programmatic design. The setback is 36 feet, it looks like, in both proposals. Maybe this is something that we'll discuss as a group. I don't have strong feelings regarding an ask to revisit the massing at this stage, given that the setback is significant. To go back to the perspective of the edges, one thing to consider are the setbacks. I feel like dimensions are very important when we evaluate this application, and when I heard that there's 37 feet between window to window, 58 feet from a balcony to a neighbor, and that there's a setback of that, you know, the building height is 50, but there's actually a setback of the screen on the mechanical equipment of 35 feet to the property line, in addition from that property line to the neighboring wall. To me, that's significant. I just want to pull out the dimensions that are related to how we evaluate this project. The signage seems like a proposal that I have seen, and that has been approved by the City. I do not see any issues on that end. And there was one other piece that Board Member Lew mentioned in terms of a tree that was related in our context-based criteria. And I'm just not clear on that, so maybe we can discuss that a little bit further. With that, I'll pass on the baton.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace. Osma, what do you think?

Vice Chair Thompson: All right. Well, thanks again to the community, thank you to the applicant, staff, for helping break this all down for us. I'll just jump right in. We'll start with the mass because a lot of people have been talking about that. I would agree that it does still feel blocky. I do agree that this change that happened between this last application and the one that we're seeing in front of us is not for the better. In general – and I think I remember mentioning this when we first saw this, not last hearing, but the hearing before – was that a relationship with nature is extremely important to your neighbors, the Palo Alto Redwoods, and it's important to Palo Alto as well, And I remember encouraging the designer to integrate nature as part of the partee for the building. And in some ways, I would say that's happened, and in other ways, I would say it has not happened. For example, the palette, choosing a wood material is actually, I think it's a huge benefit to the project. I agree with Board Member Lew. The color is, it would be better if it could be more reddish, and a warmer color. At this moment, this sort of wood and black sort of feel like a tarantula on a block of wood. It's very dark, and somber. And there was something kind of warmer about the previous choice, which was almost too red. It didn't even look like wood in the previous. I don't even remember if it was wood. It wasn't, right? Wood is definitely something better to look at. It's more complex. It has a lot of texture. That choice for cladding is in tune with including nature, but in terms of the actual mass of the building, I don't see that happening. One thing that was nice about visiting Palo Alto Redwoods was to see how nature is integrated in the architecture. You're walking around, there's wells for trees, and circulation, and it really feels like it is designed about nature, and around nature, and the mass of this does not have that, to its detriment. I think there could be a really beautiful building here that has that, and has

some of the elements that you have in here, where you have some wood siding. I think the black laser-cut panels are nice and rich. Sparingly. The big massive walls of black that we're looking at here is too much. It's too dark, a little scary. And I would encourage... I'm not sure how it's going to happen today, but I would encourage not to choose that. The palette would need to be updated. So, yeah, in terms of massing, there's a lot of work to do, and I'm not sure the project is there. I don't know how it could get there without some considerable redesign. The Juliette balconies are very nice. They sort of create nice relief, so I am a fan of the Juliette balconies. Again, the black is okay, sparingly. In general, the packet that we see in front of us presentation-wise has a lot of problems. A lot of the images are very dark, the elevations are very dark. And to note, there wasn't a very comprehensive, like, there's stucco here, and there's Hardie board here, and all of that stuff that... It took a lot of guessing. And the renderings also, I think, were just very dark. In some of these, it almost look like you put them on shadow on purpose. I'm sure you didn't, but it made it a little hard to imagine what this could be when there's sunlight on it. Which I'm sure there is, in some ways. As far as the courtyard design goes, just looking at the before application and the one we see before us, the courtyard perspective in the application previously had a nice organization, and I think the one we see in front of us today is a bit scattered. I don't see why you couldn't have a bar and still have that organization that was there before. For the stair tower, I like that it had greenery and nature integrated into it. The one that we see in front of us doesn't have that, so I'm not sure why that was deleted. As for the ceiling on the porte-cochere, we don't really have much information about what that even looks like. I'm happy to look at it in subcommittee, but I don't have much to comment on, other than those light fixtures. Which are fine, but I guess, really, the material of the ceiling soffit is really what matters, and I don't know what that is. A lot of holes here, and a lot of problems here. I'm not sure I can recommend approval.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. I'd like to make a few quick comments, but then I'd like to give the applicant to address this question of massing we've all been talking about. I'd also like to be sure that all the Board members have chimed in on this issue regarding the valet parking at the front, and what happens when you drive down into the basement level. There's been requests for us to put feedback on that from both the applicant and the staff. I find myself in agreement with Alex regarding the massing at the back. Or, he said he finds himself in agreement with me, but either way, I think the change is for the worse, and it was better to have the building stepped further at the back. It just minimizes the impact on the buildings behind, and I think that's an important element. Otherwise, though, I think the building's massing and basic partee is acceptable. I think it actually does a good job of balancing the residential facility at the back of the building and our desire to create a grand boulevard along the front, along El Camino. That's a challenging design prospect, and I think they do a good job of pulling that together. I had been very critical about the shadow study in the past. I find it very helpful that the City commissioned an independent third-party shadow study, and it shows me that there's no significant shading after about 10:30 in the morning on the swimming pool area, which has been my big concern. I believe that shadow study, and I think the community should feel reassured, that beyond about 10:30 in the morning, you should not have shadows in your swimming pool area from this building. I think that's a good thing. They've made a lot of effort to position the building and pull it back so it doesn't cast shadows there, and I think that's good. This is the best tree report study I've ever seen in Palo Alto. They've gone to extraordinary lengths to document, protect, study and demonstrate, at least for me, that these trees will be protected and preserved. I believe that to be the case. The building really does step back from the trees. If any of us remember, the buildings were originally much closer to those redwoods. I commend Walter Passmore and the City staff for really being aggressive and firm about this, and I believe that the trees will be preserved if these reports are followed. Okay, so, with that, I want to ask Randy Popp if he'd like to address our concern about why we should not be requesting you to remove the massing you've just added. We worked hard to get you guys to change it, and now, you've put it back in at the last minute. Why is that okay? I'll give you three minutes, Randy.

Mr. Popp: Thank you. It will be very brief. I want to just describe that the architectural plans that we submitted in the last hearing were not coordinated with the elevations in the way that they needed to be, and through the process that Rebecca and Ron have gone through and coordinated room types and layout within the building, we found that there was a pretty serious error at that back corner of the building. We did drop from 100 to 97 rooms, but we did need to make a correction in the massing in order to allow the rooms to stack the way they need to for efficiency. And I regret that there was an inaccuracy in that

previous presentation, but we felt that the small – as we see it – change that we’ve made to the rear of the building is far enough away from the most adjacent residence that it is, in our minds, not problematic in regard to their views. The other thing I’ll offer, it’s associated with this, but separate, if you’d like to see it. We actually flew a drone. We have views from some of the balconies and some of the window locations, so, if you’d like to see that, I can show you some of those. I’ll come back up if you’d like to be aware of that. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thanks, Randy. We’ll come back to that in a second. Let’s quickly dive into this issue of whether... The current proposal is essentially saying that they’re going to do valet parking from the street level all the time. Staff has commented and said that they don’t believe that’s appropriate because it will cause backup onto El Camino. Therefore, they’ll change the design downstairs to have something of an entry lobby that functions. When I look at that, I believe that the proposed floor plan change does function properly if they make that change. I guess I just feel it’s not my purview from the ARB to decide whether or not traffic will be backed up. That’s what we have professional planners and traffic consultants for. But that’s an issue they’ve asked us to chime in on. Grace?

Board Member Lee: I’ll just say I concur. I do not think that that’s something to come back to ARB. Perhaps that is something to come back to staff.

Chair Baltay: Who else?

Vice Chair Thompson: I’ll concur with what Board Member Lee said.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I do not have expertise to weigh in on that. I think we could look at, just for comparison, look at the Garden Court hotel, as well as the Clement [phonetic]. Those are urban hotels with valet parking. Look at that. And they’re also relatively small. It’s not like a Hilton Garden Inn, or the two Marriott hotels on San Antonio Road. They’re much smaller.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board members, if I may, just to clarify for the residents. Our transportation department and our consulting engineer, traffic engineer, does not believe that having the valet at the surface level, under the porte-cochere, is advisable, because that would create backing up onto El Camino, and that’s obviously not good for anyone. Therefore, the valet does need to be located in the basement level. Sam has drafted up some ideas of how that could be done, and we’re, as staff members, we’re happy to take on the details of that. Also, too, the porte-cochere will be a good drop-off point for Ubers and Lyfts and other vehicles of that nature.

Chair Baltay: I think you put it just right, Jodie, and what you’ve heard from the Board is that we won’t want to weigh in on that any further. We’ll accept the staff’s opinion, and the professionals within our department. The applicant asked us to address that; I believe that’s where we stand with that. I’d like us to, maybe just do a straw poll. I think the building should be, the massing in the back should be reverted to what it was in the previous application. It might lose another room or two, but I believe that’s the better solution. Do we have anybody else supporting that position?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I did, I do. I think it’s important to give the applicant a chance to show us in section, in model form, or whatever, whether or not we’re making the right decision, however. If that’s possible.

Chair Baltay: Well, what I’m hoping for is to get this thing approved – or recommended approval – today. We don’t have time for more studies on it, then. Furthermore, honestly, David, they’ve had their chances. They’ve come back to us many times. We’ve been talking about this, over the past two years, quite a bit.

Board Member Hirsch: Fine.

Chair Baltay: Who else can support that?

Board Member Lew: I will support that.

Vice Chair Thompson: I would support that, but also with the caveat that I don't know that that fixes everything. So, yes, but also, there is more to be done, and I don't know that the current design can get there. Also, David, on Sheet A6.1, there is a section that goes through the building and shows the trees for the neighborhood on the far right. If that's helpful.

Board Member Lew: Right, but that's always where I think there are some dimensional discrepancy in plan and section. That's labeling as 20 feet, but the plan is showing it as 16 feet. I think we need to look at that again.

Chair Baltay: Let me be really clear, that we're talking, on Sheet A3.16, Drawing #2, the two large elements shaded in blue at the right hand corner of that drawing, are the massing pieces we're talking about. It's not all the other blue elements there, but just those two large ones. It looks to me like it's two hotel rooms that have been added in.

Board Member Lee: I would just look in our packet, page 87, there's an east section view, previous and proposed, that is dimensioned to the property line and shows the massing that has been advised.

Chair Baltay: I'm sorry, Grace. You're talking page 87. Those are building cross-sections.

Board Member Lee: That's right. What I say is east section view – previous, and east section view – current. And I think that the stepping occurs in the previous, which is what...

Chair Baltay: That's correct.

Board Member Lee: Right. That is the drawing we should look at. And did everybody agree? I'm just confused now. It sounds like you, Peter, are advocating for, and Alex is in agreement, and Osma is saying there's other massing issues in other parts of the building, or specifically this drawing?

Chair Baltay: Well, I'm just trying to get consensus on this one particular issue, that we're reverting back, as you say, on page 87, that upper, previous cross-section, I believe is the same thing as what is shown in the axon in metric view.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, it is.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I'd like to get the Board to at least, if we agree on that, let's say so clearly, so that there's no debate later. I've heard four members. I haven't heard you support that, Grace. What is your feeling?

Board Member Lee: I don't have a strong opinion on that.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

Board Member Lee: I could go either way. It could go previous, but it also could go as proposed. Because the setback is the same.

Chair Baltay: That's there, at least with four members supporting that. I've heard... Osma, you had, I think, perhaps the strongest reaction against the building. Is there anything we can do to get you to come on board?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm sure the application... Well, I guess... I guess I'd like to ask the other Board members how they feel about the massing as a whole, as it relates to the neighbors. One of the neighbors said, you know, can you imagine yourself living on that other side, looking out here, and being proud of what you see? And as the massing stands, as the design stands, I could not say yes to that.

Chair Baltay: Let me tackle that for you, because I can comfortably say yes. I believe the massing of the building does two things very well. On the El Camino side, it's really a good urban building on the edge of

our grand boulevard. I believe that this really does complement and support our design intentions along the El Camino façade. Okay. On the back of the building, it steps back a lot from the Redwood buildings. It's a long way away from the property line. It's much farther from the boundary line than their buildings are, and it steps quite a bit. There's no balconies actually facing their units. All the balconies are pulled in from that. And I believe it's a very reasonable response to compromise. We're trying to fit new buildings into old buildings. We've gone through, I would think of as a lot of design revisions, getting the applicant to pull the building further away from the back property line, to step it down significantly more than the code requires. Significantly more than we required other hotels to do. Randy Popp could tell you on the Hilton buildings over on San Antonio. We jammed it up tight against the back. Here, we had to really respond to residences in the back, and as much as we may not all be in agreement in the community, I believe that architecturally, we have worked hard to get the massing of the building to step away from the Redwoods in the back, to do as much as they can to mitigate the impact. The same thing applies for the area where the swimming pool is. We've worked really hard to minimize the shadow and pull it away so there's not some hotel room looking into that swimming pool area. And if you remember earlier, it wasn't always that way. So, yes, Osma, I think the massing is a good balance the way it is. I don't know if I'm persuading you, but that's what I think.

Vice Chair Thompson: What do my other board members think?

Board Member Lew: The drawing set is missing a really important drawing, which is a 3-D axon, or just a really good site plan. The site plan that they're showing is really more of a floor plan with the Palo Alto Redwoods just barely drawn in. It's very difficult to read, and it doesn't really distinguish between balconies and rooms. And then, the context aerial photos don't really show the building. It shows the neighbors, but the proposed massing of the project isn't shown. I think we can infer, but I'm not sure it's really shown properly. And say this goes to the Council; I think they're going to have an even harder time understanding what the massing looks like. It may not be ready to go today.

Board Member Lee: If I may, I was absent at the January 17<sup>th</sup> meeting, and I believe the applicant presented today that the massing has not changed significantly since the second and third. I'm curious why the Board did not ask for massing revisions at that time.

Vice Chair Thompson: I believe we did, at the time. I think it's in the notes.

Chair Baltay: We have been pressing all along for changes to the massing at the back of the building, and I think at that point, they had stepped it sufficiently that the majority of us felt that it was close, it was getting there. And I believe it would be if we erased the changes they've just proposed, which is sort of a step in the wrong direction.

Board Member Lee: Okay, that's helpful. It sounds like your feedback and the report as summarized is accurate from staff in terms of, there is a note regarding massing. There have been significant changes in this package. The one small ask now is regarding that step on the back, which we're discussing. That helps me to have a greater context since, when we say "massing," that's a big word. In terms of the project, it might be productive to actually talk about where and how and the changes since the second and third.

Vice Chair Thompson: Another example is the stair tower got bigger, and I don't remember us asking for that. Yeah, there's kind of... That's another example, perhaps, of a massing issue. I think like I said before, there are things that are improved in this new design, specifically the choice of using wood. But in terms of massing, the previous design was definitely closer. That said, the balconies and the courtyard of the new design seem to give that façade a little bit of a nicer relief.

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may, we do have on the screen right now, showing the differences between the second and third design as far as the massing on the rear. Some portions of the building have not necessarily gotten closer, but they've gotten taller.

Vice Chair Thompson: That's right, yep.

Chair Baltay: You mean the stair tower, by that?

Ms. Gerhardt: The stair tower I don't believe has changed in size, but we could ask the applicant.

?: [off-microphone] It's the same.

Chair Baltay: I thought the building was still 50 feet all along. The building hasn't gotten taller.

Ms. Gerhardt: No, the building hasn't gotten taller, but just the, the rear kind of stair steps, so, the steps have changed.

Chair Baltay: But that's what we're proposing to push back on.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. I'm just making clear that there has been a change between the second and third design.

Chair Baltay: Let me shift gears then for us, onto the materials, because at first, I was quite taken aback at how dark it looks. Looking at the material board and thinking about it, I really think this is more an issue of a less-than-perfect presentation, more than it is a design problem. I think the wood paneling will actually be a lot lighter in appearance, and I think a lot of this is just shadows, and then, poor Xerox technology here. It's unfortunate, to the applicant, that you chose to present drawings that just don't help your case. I'm still up here, thinking that we should... It will be okay. But [crosstalk] support that.

Board Member Hirsch: Just a... I think that the comments that you've made concerning materials is appropriate. I didn't speak up before about materials, but I think on the whole, they are all a little bit too dark. But we should see a sample board of a better quality than the one we have here. Because that's what we're judging by, at this point.

Board Member Lew: What is wrong with the sample board that's right here?

Board Member Hirsch: The wood tone, I think is darker, not as... The comment was made, was darker, not enough reddishness in it.

Chair Baltay: I've heard comments about the colors needing to be redder to match the redwood siding, perhaps, but my comment I just made is that I believe this color will actually look reasonably light. It's a medium tone. It's not a dark tone. And I think it will contrast well with these other matches.

Board Member Lew: That product only comes in five colors.

Chair Baltay: That's right.

Board Member Lew: I presume that the designers are talented enough to pick the best of the colors. Architects are usually good at that. Not always, but usually.

Vice Chair Thompson: The product manufacturer's [inaudible]. How does the rest of the Board feel about the expanses of black in the courtyard area?

Chair Baltay: I just don't know that there's that many expanses of black. I think there are expanses of shadow. Show me where it's black, Osma.

Board Member Lee: It sounds like there's consensus that the actual drawings, the colors that show up in the drawings, appear darker because the renderings are shown in shadow. But the actual materials board is correct, right? These are the materials. And I guess I share Osma's comment regarding the black gate and the use of black as being heavy. However, perhaps, would we all feel comfortable if the color and materials discussion goes to a subcommittee? Which is a portion of our board, to weigh in with staff?

Chair Baltay: Okay, so, I'm not sure I'm hearing strong enough consensus, Grace, that this is ready for a subcommittee. What I've heard Osma saying is she's uncomfortable with some elements of massing, and I don't hear a consensus the color is okay. I've been advocating for that, and what I hear everybody saying is it's still too dark. I think that it is really important that, when this gets in front of the City Council, they don't have the discussion we've just had. If we're going to put our stamp on this, it better be a good presentation, as well as a good design. Because I want to be standing in front of the Council actively supporting this project, if we think it's good enough to be supported. I can't do it with these presentations. Maybe it will have to come back again.

Board Member Lee: Maybe the choices could be outlined in terms of which direction... What are our options, given that this is the third hearing? Maybe that's something we could talk about as a group.

Chair Baltay: We can say what we think, Grace. If we think it needs a fourth hearing, we'll put it forward. We have no control ultimately over how the Planning Director acts on our recommendation. It's a recommendation. I think that they want to work with us, and I think that everybody shared the goal that this be a strong design when it gets in front of City Council. So, yes, we can push... [crosstalk]

Board Member Lee: In terms of direction... [crosstalk]

Chair Baltay: I think a fourth hearing would be fine if that's where we want to go.

Board Member Lee: ... four a fourth hearing, then I do think we need to have some clear direction for the applicant in terms of massing. And then, in terms of the color and materials board, can we discuss, should those colors and materials go back to the previously submitted? Or are we all advocating together to continue with this muted, neutral tones and the black?

Chair Baltay: On the materials, I've heard everybody thinking it's too dark. I haven't heard anybody say they should revert back completely to the design. I think this design is actually better organized. It's more coherent. If they've done all the things they said, it is a better design. Maybe it's a little bit too dark. If we're going to be pushing that we're going to continue this one more time...

Ms. Gerhardt: Board members, if I may. It is unusual to have a fourth hearing for a project. I would need to clear that with the Director. However, I believe, if we were able to limit to certain aspects, it's possible that that would be a doable situation, because we do want to be able to have a good discussion about these items.

Board Member Lew: Excuse me. I did want to also add that, you know, the Council, like, Councilmember DuBois has asked us to weigh in at the third hearing, so I think we should take votes or straw votes. If the fourth hearing happens, fine, but I think we have to be on the record today on these major items.

Chair Baltay: What do you mean by "on the record," Alex? That we should...?

Board Member Lew: We vote, straw votes, on particular items. It has to be very clear. The Council has made it clear what they want. They want us to weigh in.

?: [off-microphone] May I say something?

Chair Baltay: No, I'm sorry, please. We're having enough trouble without additional input here. Thank you. Very well. I'm of the opinion that we could put this forward and have the materials covered in the subcommittee, and require that the massing be changed, point-blank. Do I have support to put that forward as a, not a continuation, but rather a conditional approval?

Board Member Lee: I would support that.

Board Member Lew: I would support that.

Board Member Hirsch: I would support it.

Vice Chair Thompson: I would not support that.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so it is 4 to 1. Osma, can you give me a reason, or what would you recommend we do instead? Looking for unanimity here.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think perhaps a fourth hearing would be helpful if the presentation was much more clear about what materials go where. I think, you know, we both interpreted this elevation differently. You thought this whole thing was in shadow, and I believe the whole thing is painted in black. I still think I'm right. I think this is painted in black. But I think having that will be very helpful, just to know exactly what we are approving. I think that's my main issue with the project that is in front of us here, that there is a lack of clarity in the design as it stands. I mentioned before, there are good things about this, but the lack of clarity is what gives me pause, and that's probably why I can't [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: If one of the conditions for the subcommittee was to see a series of very good-quality renderings, not only it showed the materials being slightly lighter and revised, but also presented in a very positive way, and you were on that subcommittee, can we earn your vote?

Vice Chair Thompson: The only issue with that is I don't know how I'll feel once I see them, is the thing. The renderings would inform my decision whether I'm in support or not in support. So, I could not recommend approval... I mean, yeah, sure, that would be great, you know, if this happens anyway – which it seems like it might – that would be great. But I can't... I hope you understand my opinion. The renderings are not going to fix everything. They're going to inform me whether the design is [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: Well, I'm suggesting we do two things. One is we send it back to subcommittee with a request for the materials to be made lighter. To reconsider the look a little bit. I think that's the consensus on the Board. The second thing is for the subcommittee to approve both the materials and the renderings of it, to be of a high enough quality that we feel it represents what we're approving. You could reject it at the subcommittee level just because the renderings weren't good enough. Even if you thought the design was good, you could still make them come back again with good renderings. Would that be...?

Vice Chair Thompson: And if the materials are unsatisfactory?

Chair Baltay: You reject it again at subcommittee. That's what you do. You're supposed to do that at subcommittee, right?

Vice Chair Thompson: Sure, yeah.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, yeah. Yeah. Three hearings, this has come a long way. It's pretty darn close. I think the issue of massing, we've gone around on it a lot. The materials are close. The parking issue seems to be something we're sending back to staff. We're being fairly tough here. Who wants to make a motion?

Vice Chair Thompson: Wait, can I add one more thing?

Chair Baltay: Yes, of course you can.

Vice Chair Thompson: To this list here, for the stair tower enclosure, I'm convinced it also got bigger for [inaudible] axon, the back of A3.16.

Board Member Lee: Osma, as you look at, just to give you one perspective, if you look at packet page 83, I see that the courtyard perspective is taken at two different angles, so, when you do that, it does appear to look taller between those two renderings. I did take a second look, but I think that the actual angle of that perspective is higher, almost like a bird in the sky, versus lower, so the stair tower does appear to be higher, but it is, again, it is a graphic, unfortunate direction. Just simply in those two renderings. I don't know if there's an actual dimension, just an elevation that you could refer to.

Chair Baltay: Can we just put in a condition that the stair tower be as low as reasonably possible, and that the subcommittee take a look at it?

Vice Chair Thompson: [inaudible].

Chair Baltay: Can we put that in there, Jodie? The height of the screening on the stair tower be made as low as reasonably possible.

Vice Chair Thompson: How does the Board feel about the courtyard design?

Chair Baltay: Any comments on the courtyard? Well, I guess that's your answer, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay.

Chair Baltay: There's no more feedback on that.

Vice Chair Thompson: I've made a note that the previous design had a better organization. But if no one else feels that way, that's okay.

Chair Baltay: Who can make a motion for us on this project?

Board Member Lew: I will make a motion, but I think that we should, I think there are some things on the findings that maybe we should pay attention to. There were things that you had mentioned that are not in here. Say, like, grand boulevard, massing, top/middle/base, are not in here. It just says it meets... What does it say? It says the proposed project will substantially increase the existing massing.

Chair Baltay: Be specific. Say...

Board Member Lew: Well, I think it should be, we have to advocate for the project. Like, what are the elements that are good in the massing? Say, for example, in the front façade, that is broken up into three pieces. It's not a long, continuous... Right? It's broken up. And there are recesses and projections and overhangs. Lighting, and screens, and seating. And then, I think for massing, for the whole, I think I've seen previous sets, drawings in previous sets that showed the proposed project and the Palo Alto Redwoods, and my recollection is that the drawings showed that they were very similar. And I don't really see that drawing in this particular set. I think that would be very important for the Council, to see that the sites are treated similarly with regard to setbacks.

Chair Baltay: Would you like to have the findings also come back to us on subcommittee, to make a final review? Why not?

Board Member Lew: Sure. I would say, I think there are some things in here, like, the findings reference dark wood panels, and they are not. It's medium-colored cement board, simulated wood. I think there are a lot of [inaudible]. I would give some of those to the staff between now and the subcommittee.

Chair Baltay: Well, the subcommittee can be the final arbiter of that, just [inaudible] happy with it.

Vice Chair Thompson: And then, I think on the subcommittee list, we wanted to add that ceiling for the porte-cochere, or staff wanted to add the ceiling. I'm also going to ask one last question before we do the vote. Seeing the list of things that are going to subcommittee, do we feel comfortable that this is still a subcommittee level of stuff to decide things on? Just going to put it out there.

Board Member Lew: Historically, massing has not been a subcommittee item. Typically we would leave it for more minor details. But I think you need to be on the record now of why something is not meeting... Like, for example, for massing and the stair tower, put out all your arguments now, and let the Planning Director weigh in on it. Then you'll see, the Planning Director agrees, and the project owner agrees, then you might get a fourth hearing. But I think you have to put everything out now. The strongest arguments

need to be made now. The subcommittee is going to be... Yeah. I think you just have to assume, once it goes to subcommittee, that something is going to get approved.

Board Member Lee: I agree, Alex. I think, you know, if we all agree that this should go to a subcommittee, it is a portion of our board that represents our board, right? It's just a smaller number. It sounds like there is a clear directive to return to the massing that was presented previously. When I look down this list, there are actually pretty clear directives, and if the applicant is open to making those revisions, a subcommittee would be the part of the ARB to review.

Chair Baltay: Yes, I believe that, we're not asking for a redesign of the massing of the building, which would be inappropriate for the subcommittee. We're asking them to return to something we've already seen, and that's just a very simple, check it off, brought back to where it was. That, I think a subcommittee can handle. I'm still looking for one of you to make a motion. Alex? Please?

## **MOTION**

Board Member Lew: Okay. I will make a motion that we recommend approval of the project to the Planning Director, with the following items to come back to the subcommittee: One is an improved drawing set with accurate renderings; two, reconsider the materials for a lighter color palette; three, return the massing to the previous scheme. And I have a set of drawings that was dated... This one may be older. I have a January 8, 2008 [sic] set. I think there's one more recent than that. That the porte-cochere ceiling return to the subcommittee. I think that's it, right? Oh, yes, and the stair tower. We're trying to reduce the height of the stair tower, as low as feasibly possible.

Ms. Gerhardt: And the findings?

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I think we direct staff to review the findings. There are some inaccuracies with regard to the wood. Dark-colored siding. I think we want to add the South El Camino Design Guidelines massing for boulevard buildings in there. And then, I think we're looking for some sort of statement about how the massing of the project is related to the existing massing of the Palo Alto Redwoods.

Chair Baltay: [off-microphone] [inaudible]

Board Member Lew: Well, I think that's in the drawing set, right? I would lump everything in the first set. Like, a really good site plan. Proofing of the colors, of the printing. I understand. You sent a set of drawings, and every different printer, it will come out differently. It depends what kind of paper you use, if you turn the shadows on and off. I understand how complicated it is, but this is not presentable to the Council.

Chair Baltay: Okay, the motion is made.

Board Member Lee: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: And seconded. Do either of you want to address your motion? No? Okay, are we ready to vote? All those in favor, aye? All opposed? Motion carries 4-1. Thank you very much, everybody.

## **MOTION PASSES 4-1, WITH VICE CHAIR THOMPSON VOTING IN OPPOSITION TO THE MOTION.**

Chair Baltay: With that, I think we'll take a short break. Do we want to take a longer break? Grace, are we going to lose you after this, or...?

[Discuss length of break.]

Chair Baltay: Let's take until 1:15. Take a quick break, shall we? Thank you very much. I'm sorry for the next applicant, to make you wait even more. We've been at this all morning. We'll be adjourned until 1:15. Thank you very much.

[The Board took a short break.]

[Board Member Lee is not present.]

4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3215 Porter Drive [19PLN00237]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Construction of a new 21,933 Square Foot Office/ R&D Building. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study is Being Prepared in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: RP (Research Park). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Garrett Sauls at garrett.sauls@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Baltay: ...3215 Porter Drive, consideration of a major architectural review to allow the construction of a new 21,933 square foot office/research and development building. Do we have any disclosures from anybody? Alex?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site twice.

Vice Chair Thompson: I have nothing to disclose.

Chair Baltay: I visited the site once. David?

Board Member Hirsch: Also once.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. With that, do we have a staff report, please?

Ms. Gerhardt: Just to confirm that Board Member Lee has left, as she is recused from Stanford items, I believe.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jodie.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

Garrett Sauls, Associate Planner: Thank you. My name is Garrett Sauls, I'm an associate planner with the current planning team. This project is a new commercial building within the Stanford Research Park. It is part of second phase to the 3181 Porter project that resulted in the demolition of the existing building that used to be on this lot in 2016. Currently, the lot is vacant. As I said before, this is a new two-story R&D office building within the Research Park. It is about 22,000 square feet in size. They are proposing to include an 1,100 square foot traffic amenity space, which would be some sort of either café or recreational area, which would effectively not require any sort of parking, per code. Additionally, there is an at-grade and below-grade parking structure. The at-grade parking space includes 32 parking spaces and 38 below-grade parking spaces. They also include 52 bike spaces. Eighteen of them are long-term bike storage facilities, and 32 of them are short-term bicycle parking facilities. Like I said before, the building that previously existed there was the HP building 15. The Department of Toxic Substances Control – DTSC – board had required a remedial action to clean up volatile organic compounds back in 1989, which has been continuing on this site since then. One of the things that the DTSC would be requiring most likely would be a vapor intrusion mitigation system, as that continued cleanup is ongoing with the site. Lastly there is an initial study that is being prepared by our consultant, David J. Powers, for this project. The anticipation is that it be a mitigated negative declaration. They are currently in the process of preparing that document, and it would be available and provided at the second hearing, along with findings and conditions for approval of the project, or continuation. If you look at the presentation, there is also a site plan provided that shows where the building is to be located, which is closer to the front of the property, just beyond the 50-foot front yard setback that this site has. There is a special setback along this area that requires this 50-foot setback. They also have a ground water extraction and treatment facility that is on the very back of the site, which was also part of the requirement from DTSC to help with their cleanup efforts for the site, for the plume that is underneath it. One of the things that would be included in the project is a modification to the driveway entrance and the intersection that is right there. They would be extending the intersection where it currently is, which is just past the site, northwards of this image, where there is the

city substation adjacent to the site. This intersection now will be coming up and meeting, as you see on the plans, on the site plan, meeting up where this driveway is. It would be extended partially beyond where the current driveway is for the substation. There are also, you see in the presentation elevation drawings, which show the materials, they are using a material siding, rain screen siding along the building. They also have a substantial amount of glass along the front side, and portions of the left-hand side of the building. The inclusion of a large pedestrian area within the front of the space tries to activate the street and make it more of an interesting and inviting space. One of the other things that they are including within their project is a small area that they are looking to create a bike shop for maintenance area, within the building. This isn't written on the plans explicitly, but it is one of the things that has been communicated to staff by Stanford. With the inclusion of the bike path that they have along the northern side of the property, as you see in the image on the presentation, this would be creating an upgrade space between the bike lane towards this area, where you see the loading space is currently being proposed. That would provide a little bit more of a direct connection to that area and make it easier for bicyclists who travel to the site to access their bike facility area. Some key considerations for the project is that, with the site, they are proposing to remove 10 trees that are currently on the site. None of them are regulated oak or redwood trees. They are proposing to place 33 trees on the site, and with this, they would be bringing the site up to providing more than 50 percent canopy coverage of the parking area, which is required by the City zoning code. The majority of the species in the landscape narrative is also native, so that is also helping to meet future findings for this project, that they are including more native species in this proposal. Three other things that staff is looking for the Board to provide feedback on: Previous architectural review boards had suggested that they were more interested in having long-term bike storage spaces closer to the front of the building. Currently, the long-term bike storage spaces are along the rear back of the property, and also in the garage. There is also a number of short-term spaces closer to the front. We're looking to have some input as to whether or not you would be feeling that it should, that you should have the long-term bike storage spaces to the front, or if what they have shown in the plans is acceptable. Others are the treatment of the building with a mostly gray color, is one of the things that we wanted you to provide input on. Along the right and rear sides of the building, there are a substantial amount of metal material, metal siding, that isn't broken up by the windows as you see on the front and the left-hand side. We're also looking to get your input on that. Lastly, there is a transformer proposed on the site plan next to the four accessible parking spaces at the very back of the building. Typically, we would be wanting to see these types of transformers either put into an enclosure or screened significantly by landscaping. This is within the rear half of the property, but we are wanting to see if there are any strong opinions on how that should be placed for the site. Currently, we are not proposing to approve the project as we are still outstanding for the environmental documents, so we are looking to continue, get a recommendation to continue this project to a date uncertain. With that, I conclude my presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Garrett. Do we have any questions of staff? Very well. The applicant has a chance to...

Vice Chair Thompson: Alex.

Chair Baltay: Alex, go ahead.

Board Member Lew: Yes. Why are there so many short-term bike parking spaces proposed for the project? Like, in far excess of what is required.

Mr. Sauls: The applicant can give a little more information about that, but what we've seen and what we've talked about with them is, what they're trying to do with this bike facility, this bike maintenance facility, is trying to activate that space a little bit more. One of the things that this can at least provide a benefit to is for those individuals who are passing through the site, or passing by, will be able to pull off, park their vehicle, park their parks, in [inaudible] spaces, and give them a little more flexibility, and not have to hold onto it and move it around with them.

Board Member Lew: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay. To the applicant, you have a chance to address us, if you'd like. You'll have 10 minutes. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please.

Tiffany Griego, Managing Director, Stanford Research Park: Great. Good afternoon. Hope you're full after a good lunch. My name is Tiffany Griego, managing director of Stanford Research Park. [spells name]. We are excited to present a new office building at 3215 Porter, and in particular, to share our goals for you, for how we plan to use this very small vacant site, located truly in the heart of the Research Park. The project has been designed with a community-oriented human scale, welcoming intention. The reason for that is we are planning to use a portion of this building to accommodate small start-ups that otherwise struggle to find space in the Research Park. We also want to use a portion of this building for the headquarters location for the Stanford Research Park Transportation Management Association. And from this building, we will facilitate and oversee the SRPGO transportation programs that we discussed with you last December, which have helped result in a 10 percentage point reduction in SOVs since four years ago. Anyway, 3215 Porter is an ideal location for pursuing these very specific goals. The site is currently served by eight public long-distance transit routes, three last-mile shuttles that serve the Research Park from the two different Palo Alto Caltrain stations, and this site falls within walking distance of currently 8,000 employees who work in the area. I'm going to turn it over to Jason McCarty from Studios Architecture to walk through our presentation, but I encourage you to invite me up if you have any questions.

Chair Baltay: Welcome, Jason. If you could state and spell your name, please.

Jason McCarthy, Studios Architecture: Thank you. Jason McCarthy [spells name]. Continuing on with Tiffany's comments, we really do appreciate the significance of this site. It's a very exciting opportunity, we feel, at an important crossroads, really at the heart of this precinct in the Research Park. Certainly three iconic street names coming through – Hanover, Hillview, and Porter Drive – coming to this focal point that this intersection fronts onto our site. Our first instinct really was to bring the building forward, as Garrett mentioned, really wanting to engage the architecture with that intersection, and connect to transportation and pedestrians in this part of the site, of the park. Bringing the building forward also had a very important benefit, which was that we could really enjoy the benefits of views across this really lovely glade that was developed as a part of the 3181 Porter project just to the south. And then, the tertiary benefit, of course, is that pulling the building forward helps to screen somewhat the Hanover substation, which is fairly prominent at the intersection today. A little bit more focused on the site itself. We're trying to feature wayfinding very simply and clearly, both in the planning and in the architecture. We've developed a front entry plaza, as well as significant amenity space or ground-level plaza on the south and west sides of the building. These significant open spaces are really made possible by the first move, which is to push the parking toward the rear of the site, and the majority of the parking below the building in a one-level, below-grade parking structure. The footprint of that garage actually extends beyond the footprint of the building, so we've gone to some lengths to really try and get as much of the parking out of sight as possible, and leave ourselves room for some of these outdoor amenities that go along with those. The character of the building, as Tiffany was mentioning, we really wanted to express a notion of engagement and welcoming, and speak to a sense of community within the Research Park. Obviously, this is a continuation of Stanford's modernization of the Research Park, and as a building that is servicing in a multitenant scenario, particularly trying to draw early stage innovation companies and really create a sort of hub or an incubator for those sorts of companies, it needed to have this feeling of community. So, we're trying to tailor the architecture to be particularly welcoming, very clear for wayfinding, and then, also, celebrating these shared amenity spaces – outdoor balconies, shared lobbies, and obviously the significant plaza area around the site. As you enter the site, this is a view from the entry drive. You can see the silver metallic profiled metal panel siding. We're trying to develop a siding **patternation** [phonetic] that's varied widths of panel, very sophisticated window fenestration pattern, as well as just composing an elevation that helps to break down the scale of the building and create interest. As you head towards the back of the site, you can see again the significant plaza areas, outdoor space, available also on the second floor, and an elevated deck. Again, all of these sort of architectural amenities are made better by the fact that we don't have so much parking on grade to contend with, obviously. The materials proposed, again, the silver metal is the primary silver metal profiled panel system as the primary cladding. And then, significant amount of highly transparent glass, so we're using a very high visual light transmittance, low-reflectivity glass, in order to really make this building feel welcoming and open. And we want this to have a bright and fresh feeling, so there are complementing

accents in white metal at the balcony fronts, and exposed structural elements. And then, a darker gray metal accent is used where we have deeper recesses for window punched openings. And then, warmer elements such as the wood at the underside of the roof canopy overhangs, and then, obviously, in the landscape, there are other natural as well as bench elements that help to complement this more silver-colored building. And then, again, back to the view to the front and the south plaza area. We really wanted this building to be very articulated. We've used a lot of the elements of the design to help give the building scale, but really, this is demonstration of our sustainability in the project as well. Some obvious elements here in view are the deep roof overhangs and the horizontal sun shading elements, which help to create the facade design, but also really help our energy model and performance of the project overall. We're using higher than minimums on all of our insulation, so we have a continuous out-sulation in the metal panel wall. We're using a rock fiber metal wool for that out-sulation, and at the roof, we're using an R-36 roof, so again, well above the minimum. And our most recent energy model, we're close to 18 percent above Title 24. We're very proud of the energy performance of the design, and all of the features architecturally are helping in that regard. Obviously, treating the sunlight helps us have a very open and bright interior, while still also mitigating for glare and enjoying those views out. More detail on the roof, which isn't visible in this view, but we are proposing a standing seam metal roof, which would again be in that silver metallic finish. We've spent some time to condense all of the mechanical equipment on the roof into a smaller mechanical area, which we were able to organize towards the north of the building, such that this south slope of the roof could be reserved entirely for a photovoltaic array. Again, another significant measure that we're very proud of, and that's made all the more important for this project as we're also pursuing this as an all-electric design. That includes the small cooking kitchen that's anticipated with the café that's proposed ultimately. With that, I'm going to pass the mic over to James Winstead with the Guzzardo Partnership, to speak just a couple minutes about the landscape and plaza design.

Chair Baltay: Welcome. If you could state and spell your name. You've got less than two minutes.

James Winstead, Guzzardo Partnership: Okay. That should be find. James Winstead [spells name]. Just to speak a little bit about the site plan while we have this slide on the page. As Jason mentioned, this project has been somewhat unique within the Research Park in the fact that we've been able to bring the building up to the front of the site, making the front door very prominent. And then, in the landscape, using wide stairs to bring the site down to the public sidewalk and provide very strong connections to pedestrian and bicycle circulation, as well as the variety of transit that serves this site. And given the site's location on the intersection of Porter and Hanover there, it really is a prominent front door. And then, with the transparent ground floor and the prominent front, the openness of the site is very intentional, and we're really trying to make this feel like it is the hub that we think it can be for the surrounding community. To speak a little bit about bicycle parking. Again, we brought visitor racks up front and center to that arrival area, making them, again, very convenient to the transit in the area, and as an amenity, connected to the bike repair service that we're anticipating in the building. Secure bicycle lockers are provided both at grade near the entry of the building and in the garage, both of which are in excess of what is the requirement for this site. We think it more than satisfies the employee demand for secure bike parking, and then, we have the additional bike parking up front as a very open, welcoming move to try to bring people in here from the surrounding Research Park. To speak a little bit here about sustainability for the project. Stormwater treatment, we've brought up that to the front of the site as well and integrated it into the sort of terraced landscape that brings you up from the sidewalk into the site. Stormwater treatment planting would be part of the native drought-tolerant palette we have for the site. Also using a lot of habitat-friendly plant material. Again, it's built into the site plan from the very beginning. It's been part of our intentional approach to this project. For the amenity areas, we've brought them to the south and east side of the site there, so taking advantage of sun exposure there, offering a variety of sun and shade for people that would use this space. Scale-wise, at the front of the site, we've kept it very open, with a large accent focal tree, to tie it into that open glade at the adjacent site to the south. And then, as you transition a little bit deeper into the site, we transition into more of a screening approach at the property line as you start to have the office windows of the neighbor looking down on you. So, you're a little more tucked in there.

Chair Baltay: I'm afraid your time is about up. If you could wrap it up in another sentence.

Mr. Winstead: Thirty more seconds should be...

Chair Baltay: One more sentence.

Mr. Winstead: Okay, thank you. I guess just the closing thought there would be that the plaza is designed for comfort, and then, a very strong indoor/outdoor connection to the ground floor, including outdoor collaboration and work spaces for the building.

Chair Baltay: Very nice sentence. Thank you very much.

Mr. Winstead: We're very happy to answer questions. Thank you, guys, very much.

Chair Baltay: Okay, any questions from...? Alex, yes?

Board Member Lew: I have a question about landscape. I was wondering if you could explain the constraints regarding the utility substation and the easement and the potted trees and the loading zone, and what's possible and what's not possible.

Mr. Winstead: Sure, we explored screening as much as possible along that property line. There's really two elements at play there. On our property, there's existing utility easements pulling from the property line, I think about 15 feet into our site, that prevent planting in the ground and things like that. And then, on the other side, for the substation, Palo Alto Utilities is following a Homeland Security directive for open, clear transparency into the substation, to have eyes on potential bad guys and things like that. We've explored options for screening that, and I believe there's still some possibility that we may be able to come to a negotiated settlement there.

Mr. Sauls: I can speak a little bit more to that. In previous direction from other utilities groups before this meeting, have been that they wouldn't be able to have any sort of screening between the site. When I spoke with them just yesterday, all three different groups of stormwater, electric and water/gas/wastewater, they said that they were fine with putting moveable planter pots as a screening objective between those two sites, provided that there is a condition that obviously said, you know, they would need to be moved whenever maintenance would be needed. And obviously, we would require also that they be repaired if they are going to be a part of this project. You do see in the, on the front page of your plans, that they do actually show a planter pot on there. That, I think, was actually removed from these plans as a result of directives from the utilities before they ended up submitting this, so that will be in the next submittal. That was confirmed yesterday that it would still be okay for them to have those, provided that they were moveable.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions? No? With that, we'll open the meeting to any public testimony. I don't see any speaker cards. Is there anyone who would like to address us? Okay, seeing no one, we'll close the meeting to public testimony, and then begin our deliberations. Osmā, you're turn.

Vice Chair Thompson: I get to start? All right. Well, thank you so much for this application. You know, upon first look, it's just kind of a joy to look at. It's very well designed. It has a really nice feel to it. I like how simple it is, I like that the material palette works really well with the warmth of the wood. I like that there is sustainability kind of written all over this, with a deep overhang and the louvers. That's so important for future buildings in Palo Alto, so thank you so much for thinking for thoughtfully about your site. In a design like this, the details are everything. I don't really have too many comments, other than details I'd like to see for the next go-around. The transition that you have with the entry awning and your metal – it's not this image, it's the front image – there's a bit of a jog between the entry awning and the metal, the corrugated metal. I think that detail will be important. The detail for the louvers that cover in front of the glass, you know, those attachments are going to be important to hide. And then, even just the standing seam siding, those attachment details, sometimes you can see all the hardware and... yeah. I'm talking about that corner at that entry as it touches the metal siding. That's going to be important. Also, the design of the bicycle channel as it goes up, so I guess that's more of a landscape note. As you have it now, I've tried riding my bike up channels like these, and they're not very pleasant. A raised channel with kind of like a curb so the tire doesn't hit the stair tread is important. I would encourage you to look at that for the next time around. Actually, I did have a question of the applicant that I forgot to ask. Does this rendering that

we're looking at, does that show the mechanical screening and the solar panel array? I'm wondering if you see those at this level, or are they hidden from this rendering?

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, they're hidden. You wouldn't see them. I'm sorry, they're not hidden from the rendering, but in this view, you'd have to get quite a bit further back before you'd start to see the mechanical screening. And the photovoltaic itself, we're planning a system that would clip directly to the standing seam ribs, so it's actually very low profile. That would also be set back some distance from the edge of the roof, so it won't be really visible except from very distance views or second level of adjacent property.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. I appreciate that you guys put a lot of thought into that. I would ask, the next time you guys come, to find that view that you can see it in, so that we just know what that looks like. It's probably down the street, or something. But at this time, I don't think we have a material for the mechanical screening. That's the only reason I ask. Otherwise, very well done. Good job. It looks good. That's all I got.

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

Board Member Hirsch: Sure. You know, I want to say the same thank-yous, and also, I think... You've already covered so much of it, didn't leave much for me to talk about here. Because it's a delightful building. Sort of a little bit like an Eichler blown big. Yeah. But it has its own character, and for an office building the way it is presented, it's going to be quite a pleasing experience to work in this. And what might have been missing is the amount of socializing space that you have on the outside of it. Tremendous thought as to how these people can enjoy themselves, both inside and outside this building. Just a few, because, you know, they answered the question about looking at the planters on the other side of the street, which don't appear in the plans, and now I know why. I hope you get the opportunity to put those there. Looking at the drawings, I have a few questions. I guess one of my major thoughts is, you have the aluminum siding or... It is aluminum, I guess, on the outside? It's aluminum?

Mr. McCarthy: It's a bent metal, a bent steel panel that's painted. It's not a [crosstalk]...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Mr. McCarthy: ... kind of a composite. And this sample that Garrett is bringing over is not the actual profile that's proposed. That's more for the color. We're still developing the particulars on the width of the panel.

Board Member Hirsch: You're showing this, you know, on both the upper level and the lower level, and along all of the – oh, it's going to be hard for me to figure – the entry façade, which direction is that from, looking at the...? West, or...?

Mr. McCarthy: The entry is southeast. The entrance is on the southeast.

Board Member Hirsch: Southeast, okay. So, along the whole of the south side, and then, turning into the east side, glass turns the corner. And then, going the opposite way, on the west side, it comes around, and there's a nice projection of the upper floor with the deep recesses in the black reveal. And all of that looks really terrific. But I don't feel that the east side as you go beyond the door there, that operable door for the bicycle area, I don't think that recessing the metal at that point is the best answer, at least not from my standpoint. Other board members can comment. Because of the fact that the window line goes all the way up, wouldn't it be nicer to see some solid element different from the metal on the lower level.

Ms. Gerhardt: Can we ask what page you're taking a look at?

Board Member Hirsch: I'm sorry?

Ms. Gerhardt: What plan sheet are you looking at? Where is this comment directed to?

Board Member Hirsch: I'm sorry, I can't really hear. What was that?

Chair Baltay: Whereabouts in the drawings are you?

Board Member Hirsch: Where? Okay. Which ones. It's A1.14. Starting on that. And then, the next one... Let's see...

Vice Chair Thompson: Are you talking about the recessed between the ground floor and second floor?

Board Member Hirsch: Between the ground floor, the recess. Yeah.

Vice Chair Thompson: A little, sort of like a pop-out, the second floor pops out?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. Yeah, the second floor pops out consistently all the way along, and then there are the recesses of the windows above. On that particular façade, actually you're showing on A1.14, you're showing a darker gray metal, and then it breaks to a darker gray. Which I assume is a stucco surface, or...?

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, that's a metal panel.

Board Member Hirsch: That's another doorway, which isn't defined as a door in the rendering. But that looks better to me somehow, that material, so that you're not using the same material just set back a little bit from the face. I think it would emphasize the upper floor portion of the building better than presently where it's shown. If you did a different material like a stucco, if that's possible. Looking all the way along, and then you get to the opposite side, the northwest. And there... And we were asked to comment about the elevations here. There, I also feel that what you're kind of missing is the possibility of the openings in there going all the way up to the soffit, all the way to the underside. Just the way they really do on the rest of the glassed areas around the building. With the proportions, you know, your front proportion of the large three-piece window and then a one-piece is a very elegant, wonderful break-up, but in the back of the building, you have two kind of equal windows next to the... And then there's the door in the middle, which goes all the way up, and then you have more windows on the other side, which don't look so bad on that side. I think proportionately, you could study that face a bit more. And what is happening down below, the glass comes all the way around that corner where the little shop is going to be, but then it stops, and then, the next door doesn't go all the way up to the soffit. And the ones further along don't do it, either. It seems to me you could be consistent and have them go all the way up. And then, consider changing that material below, because I'm not sure you want to really have the same material at the lower level as you have above. It certainly isn't going to emphasize the way in which you've done the face of the building and the way you turn the west side of it. Other than those comments, my thought is that there's some issues with some of the landscaping areas. Let's see if I can find the landscape plan. Of course I like the planters in the containers. That would really make, certainly a more elegant way up than what's there now. That's just going to be an improvement. You know, there's this wonderful wall in the back. It's kind of surprising, right? The wall with those punctures in it. And I really like the look of that wall just the way it is, so I wouldn't think you're helping it by putting something at the bottom, planters along the bottom. My opinion is the way is great the way it is. I wouldn't want to detract from that. But more importantly, actually, you're putting some trees in the perimeter, a very narrow perimeter around the parking ramp to the cellar, to the basement. Do you expect that you can get trees...? A question, but maybe you want to answer it later. Do you expect to get trees to really grow in that very narrow area where the wall of the parking, going all the way down? I really don't think that's going to work. I was quite concerned about that. Of course, in the open areas where you have the parking divided there, and you have an island in the middle, there's room for that. But I don't see that the trees are really going to work. The one big tree, you have, kind of like the one in the front, you know, you have a major tree in that area. That's an area that you probably can do that with. I'm hoping. Even there, you're just above the parking below. It's not much of a place for having a significant tree, it seems to me, so you'll have to give some thought to that. Other than that... Well, I just thought, at the base of the corner where you have the store, and then adjacent to it, again, there's a very narrow area of planting up against the building. Almost seems insignificant, and you wonder, will it be trampled in that area? What's the real reason for that? You know, otherwise, the landscape around there is just wonderful. I mean, the thought of the way in which people can come out and have little committee meetings outside, you know, and use the outside-inside, almost interchangeably, is fantastic, in my mind. One other general comment, and that is that there's an awful lot of lighting fixtures,

it seems to me. There are areas where I was... Let me see if I can get the lighting plan. I was wondering if you couldn't put in some more step lights in the major step coming up. And perhaps look to not have quite as many... I don't know if you've given us a study of the lumen output on the property. Is that yet to come?

?: [off-microphone] [inaudible]

Board Member Hirsch: Is it... Oh, it is here.

Mr. Sauls: There is one...

Board Member Hirsch: I see it. Okay. But it just seemed to me that there's an awful lot of sort of pink light fixtures shown on the site. I wonder if they are all necessary. They look small enough when you look at them in elevation. They're about the most minimal kind of fixture that you can get. You don't see it in the elevation. It doesn't interrupt it very much at all. Just looks like a huge number of light fixtures overall. And in fact, there's one on the parking lot area against the concrete wall there. I don't like that one at all because it really breaks up the... Yeah, it just breaks up that wall. And the wall is a piece of artwork that somebody really spent some time on, I think. Proportions in the opening, and you look through, and you see the tank in there. Something not to be meddled with, I think. Those are really all my comments. The planting along that wall. My comments. And congratulations. I think it's just going to be a great building. I love it.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, David. Alex.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. Before, you had mentioned the startups and the TMA headquarters. Before I even knew anything about that, what struck me was that it seemed like the community center, before knowing anything about the drawing, I just said that this looks like a community center, not like a standard office building in the Research Park. So, I think you guys have met your objectives with the design on this one. I think my main concern is the entrance, and then, like, the removal of the trees on your property, as well as the substation property. If they're going to be replaced with things in pots, my question is, would it make sense, does it make any sense, to have, like, a specimen valley oak on that side of the property instead of the, where you have it now on the...? I don't know. The southern, or left side of the property. That's just a what-if. Just to give it scale. Because I think that the Canary Island palm, pine trees, look great there, and they look to be healthy. I'm just really sorry to see those go, and I would like to see something of a similar scale, if it's possible. I understand that there's a stop light, and you want a large tree interfering with the sight lines into a stop light, and what-not. On the architecture, I support that. On some landscape details, I just had a couple cautionary notes for you. One is the clematis **bosseyantha** [phonetic]. I have one, and some of my friends have them, too. It goes dormant, like July to December. It holds onto the leaves, and they're brown, so it looks like it's dead. I see that you've mixed it in with another vine, so maybe that's fine, that will work, but in my mind, it's not a great plant to try to cover a green screen. It's very stringy. It's not like a full vine that will cover a mesh panel. And then, too, I do have some concerns about the valley oak above the garage driveway. I think maybe staff can weigh in just on the amount of soil volume and minimum dimensions necessary for such a large tree. We don't normally see valley oaks on any of our plans, just because it's such a big tree. And then, staff had asked us to weigh in on the color of the siding. I don't really have an opinion. I think what's being proposed is fine. And I think staff had asked about the long-term bike locker locations, and I don't really have an opinion. I mean, my recollection is that our code, at least it used to, asks that it be as close to the elevator as possible. And I don't know if it's still that way. I know that in a lot of our housing projects, we've allowed them to be in the corners of the parking garage, just because that's space that's not used that well, that much, for other things. But I would just say, usually the ramps are steep, so people would ideally prefer to use the elevator to get up and down with the bicycle. And also, staff had asked about the transformer. Maybe if there's a detail that could be provided...? Because I think when we looked at some transformers in the shopping center, it seemed like there were tall ones and short ones, and different screening requirements for those. I guess I would just like to see what it is. I think it's fine to have it in the back. I think you guys are off to a very good start. Do we need to make a...? Oh, Peter, you need to speak. Yes.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex. Okay. Yeah, I look at perspective on A1.12, and I'm very impressed. It's a genuinely handsome, contemporary, sustainable, dramatic building. It will be a real nice addition to campus and town, so I think it's all very positive. I confess that my first notes on this were sort of a big question mark. Why make it look so residential? Hearing the building's use, looking at it more carefully, really thinking about the scale and such, it's not residential, but it has a feeling that's different than other buildings in the Research Park, and I think that's appropriate given the use you're thinking about. And I think you've done a great job of anticipating and hopefully incorporating a lot of activity outside the building. In walking around there the other day, and other times, it really is the case, that there is a lot of people coming out for lunch, talking, riding bikes on the path. I think it will be very successful that way. But allow me to throw a few thoughts at you, just on my notes here. You seem to have this very dramatic corner with the architecture here, and there's a lot of traffic walking past this corner on Sheet A1.2. But the café is put at the back corner of the building, and then the bicycle repair is on the right-hand corner of the building. It seems to me that you might be better to try to concentrate those things in one place. It's very ambitious to think that three corners of this building are all going to be visibly populated all the time. But just a thought, that whatever that amenity space is might be better off up on the front. When I look at the staircase coming up from the basement, that's seen again on this A1.12. Somehow, to my eye, that's not integrated into the design. You lost an opportunity to do something better with it. It's just sort of placed there in the middle of the plaza. Maybe it should be over where the bike repair area is, and you could integrate it somehow into the corner of the building more. Maybe if you take some of David's comments about the way you're treating the materials at the step of the building, it's an opportunity to do that. I don't have answers; I'm just shooting at it, looking at this. More strongly that, the staircase going up on the back of the building – that's seen on rendering 1.13 – I think is not of the same caliber as the rest of the design. It could be improved, just how you choose to make that stair work. I'll leave the comment at that. I think the transformer would be better if you could locate it further to the back of the property or in the garage, if that's possible. Those are big, and you can hide them with plants, but not always successfully. It is out of sight of the front of the property and it's not... I don't know. That big of an Architectural Review Board issue. But certainly it's advisable, if you can do something better with it. I did share David's comments when he went around the building and looked with a finer eye about the way the windows meet the roof on the second floor, the way some of the materials step on Sheet A1.14. Having the corrugated siding step back just a little bit over the doors seems to me a lost opportunity to try to introduce a different material, or bring it out and not make everything step. Again, you seem to be very capable designers, and I'm sure you'll, as you refine this, pick up things like that. My last thought was just that you have a beautiful looking façade of the building, but it's just all glass on that first floor. I'd encourage you to consult with your structural engineers and make sure you're not going to wind up with some big steel braces in the middle of that. Or, if you are, anticipate it, and be sure you're controlling it. Don't let the engineers at the last minute throw a big sheer wall at you, because that won't look very good. But overall, a very attractive building. A pleasure to look at. I can wholly support this as we go forward. Any other comments about this?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, the way these...

Vice Chair Thompson: I have a question...

Board Member Hirsch: ...hearings work is that you listen to your cohorts here and learn a little bit about it, you know? You see other opportunities to emphasize, that you agree with them, or disagree with them. But in this case, I think studying that lower level with the metal all the way out is definitely a reasonable thought. And I agree about the staircase in the back, that there certainly could be much more detailing in that, as well. Of course, the issue about structure, which we all face at some point in the project, so you will obviously come up with that one at some point. Just to add to those notes that I agree, that those ought to be studied in the manner suggested. As to the stair from downstairs, I'm not as bothered by that location. It seems that you have the elevator, other than that, coming out on the other side, in the building. So, in terms of the relationship of that restaurant, or whatever it is, you know, the other corner, is on the plaza side, whereas the bike repair I think is appropriately towards the front of the building. That's where I disagree with Peter on this one. But certainly you could study it. But I think it's okay, from my opinion, where it's located. Thank you.

Vice Chair Thompson: Just a couple things after listening to everyone give their feedback. For the material, initially when I saw it, I was a little worried it was a little too dull, but then I looked at it up against the window, and it has a really nice quality against the sunlight. So, I actually like the color that's chosen over there. As for the bottom half, I don't know. I think as they have it actually works pretty well for me. I'm not opposed if the applicant wants to study another option. I do like that it steps back. It kind of has a nice partee across the whole thing. I did want to express that. A quick question about site planning. Those trees that Alex mentioned that are going to be removed, can we get a little more clarity on if they're healthy, and well? It seems like the site plan is pretty symmetrical. Why wouldn't we flip it so that we could keep them and then have the driveway on the other side? That's kind of a question for staff, if you have an answer to that.

Ms. Gerhardt: You have a tree disposition plan, L1.21, showing which trees are coming out and which are to remain. And actually, this is showing new tree planting that was part of the 3181 project, also.

Mr. Sauls: Furthermore, on L1.23, you do have an arborist report, which calls out a good bit of the trees that exist on the site are in a fair or good condition. But as a result of the development they are proposing, that is a result of them removing the trees that are shared or nearby the Porter substation. That is the 3350 Porter substation. Or Hanover. To echo a little bit of what Jason was saying earlier, there is also a separate application for those substations, that one as well as 950 Hanson, that is proposing to remove a number of trees around the edges of the property. The utility department had a study done by Homeland Security that had recommended them to increase the height of the fences, as well as remove a substantial amount of trees around the perimeter to make it more visible.

Vice Chair Thompson: I see, so it's the other application that's sort of directing the removal of these trees?

Mr. Sauls: The ones that are on the shared property line that is on the Hanover substation, yes. That is part of it, yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Any other comments, thoughts? We're...

Mr. Sauls: If I may provide a bit of clarification from earlier comments, for Board Members Thompson and Lew. To Board Member Thompson's comments about the material for the roof screen, if you look on at Sheet A2.6, there is a call-out for the material roof screen on the elevation drawings, that showed that as P2. Which, when you look at the materials board, the one that's sitting underneath the metal panel calls that out, or shows you which material is going to be used for that roof screen.

Vice Chair Thompson: [inaudible].

Mr. Sauls: Okay. It's actually, then it is on A2.14, where it does call that out as a silver metal accent and mullion.

Board Member Hirsch: Yep.

Mr. Sauls: And then, in addition to that, if you look on Sheet A1.10, you will see a rendering that shows a further-out image, like what you were asking for. That shows a little top-notch corner of the roof screen, but that's taken across the street from the site. And then, if you flip to the next pages, you will see it along kind of that side angle, as well. On the driveway.

Vice Chair Thompson: That's very helpful. Thank you.

Mr. Sauls: And then, to Board Member Lew's comments about placing the long-term bicycle lockers in the garage, the code still is what it is before, like you were saying, in that we want to have it placed closer towards the elevator that they have. Which they have done. It was just previous direction that staff had received is that we wanted to have those a little closer to the front. If that's changed, then that's something

we would take into consideration. And you should be able to see that on A2.1, which shows the basement area, and it shows the long-term spaces nearby the elevator.

Chair Baltay: Okay. With that, do we have any other comments? I think, staff, we're saying that we cannot approve this today, regardless.

Mr. Sauls: Correct, because we don't have the environmental document prepared yet, and presented.

Chair Baltay: Okay, well, that's unfortunate for the applicant because we could otherwise, I think, push this along. We'll need to make a motion to continue per the staff recommendation. Does the applicant have any questions of us? Do you understand? You're okay. I just want to be sure.

## **MOTION**

Chair Baltay: I move that we continue this to a date uncertain, based on the comments that we've proposed.

Board Member Lew: I'll second. And David.

Chair Baltay: Okay, we have a second, and a third.

Board Member Hirsch: [inaudible].

Chair Baltay: David seconded. Any comments? Okay, all those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries 4-0.

## **MOTION TO CONTINUE PASSES 4-0.**

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Good luck with your project.

## **Approval of Minutes**

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 5, 2019.

Chair Baltay: We have item number 5, is the minutes from the meeting of December 5, 2019. Do we have any comments on those?

Board Member Lew: Those minutes were delayed, so we only received the minutes for December 19<sup>th</sup>.

Chair Baltay: I'm sorry. I'm looking at agenda item 5, Alex.

Board Member Lew: Oh. We got an email saying that we were going to do it by email, the draft minutes.

Ms. Gerhardt: We have stopped doing minutes by email. There was too much confusion with that method. We are now printing all minutes in the packet so that you have everything in one place.

Board Member Lew: Well, we were doing... I've been on the Board [inaudible]. We did it email first, and then they were printing them in the packet for a long time, right? I just reviewed the last, like, I reviewed the minutes for the 19<sup>th</sup> by email. Right?

Ms. Gerhardt: Not that I'm aware of.

Board Member Lew: Well, I sent them my corrections previously.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah. In your packet...

Board Member Lew: His email said that the minutes for the 5<sup>th</sup> were delayed, so I didn't look in the packet.

Chair Baltay: Would you like to push this off to next time?

Board Member Lew: No, I'll abstain. I will abstain from both.

Chair Baltay: Well, what's important I think on the minutes from the 5<sup>th</sup> is that there's two subcommittee items, and we've been pushing hard that those get included and checked. Do you want to take a glance at them now so we're making sure? I didn't have any other...

Vice Chair Thompson: It doesn't look like the subcommittee has the disposition on there.

Chair Baltay: [inaudible].

Board Member Lew: Jodie's added the sheets at the end.

Vice Chair Thompson: I see them now.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, so, at the very end, there's the conclusion memos.

Board Member Lew: Okay. I think those look correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Any other comments on the minutes from December 5, 2019? I'll move that we approve those minutes.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries 4-0.

**MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 4-0.**

6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 19, 2019.

Chair Baltay: Item number 6 is the minutes from December 19<sup>th</sup>. Any comments on those?

Board Member Lew: I previously sent comments directly to staff.

Ms. Gerhardt: Were those just clerical error type corrections?

Board Member Lew: Material names, product names. I have it written down somewhere.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, I will work with support staff to make those changes.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, there's one... I don't have the notes in front of me, but it was like a Kebony, K-E-B-0-N-Y.

Chair Baltay: Alex, would you like to send those...

Board Member Lew: I've already sent them.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I move that we approve these minutes with the notes Alex has sent to staff being included.

[no audible second.]

Chair Baltay: All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries 4-0.

Ms. Gerhardt: Who was second?

Chair Baltay: David.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Chair Baltay: With that, the meeting is adjourned. We have a subcommittee item following this with Board Members Hirsch and Lew. Thank you everybody.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

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

North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) Working Group Updates – Board Member Lew – not addressed.

### **Adjournment**

### **Subcommittee Items**

Board member Hirsch and Board member Lew

7. 180 El Camino Real [19PLN-00129]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project that was Conditioned to Return with Project Changes Related to the Landscape Plan, Corner Markers for Outdoor Market/Seating Areas, Site-Plan Circulation Shown to Maintain 8 Foot Clearances, Facade Wooden Slats Details, Bicycle Rack Specifications, and Bollard Details. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org)



# Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Review

---

TO: Jason Smith, 122 N Harbor Blvd Ste 204, Fullerton, CA 92832  
 SUBJECT: 180 El Camino Real [19PLN-00129] Market Plaza  
 DATE: January 24, 2019  
 FROM: Samuel Gutierrez, Planner

---

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE:

---

The application, and plans and material samples dated received on November 21, 2019, was reviewed by the ARB Subcommittee on January 16, 2019, in accordance with condition of approval #3 as stated below. The ARB Subcommittee comprised of Board members Alex Lew and David Hirsch.

ARB SUBCOMMITTEE: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall return to the ARB subcommittee for approval of the following items, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Community Environment:

- a. The landscape plan for the project area.
- b. Corner markers for the outdoor market/seating areas that are artfully installed within the Market Plaza.
- c. The site-plan circulation shown to maintain an eight-foot clearance is maintained within the Market Plaza area walkways.
- d. The wooden slats details for the facades.
- e. Bicycle rack specifications and details.
- f. Bollard details and photometrics if illuminated.

At the meeting, the Subcommittee reviewed the following revisions presented by the applicant.

- The updated plans note the landscape plan, required clearance for circulation and corner markers, bicycle rack details, and bollard details as requested.
- Details for the wood slates were also provided by the applicant for the subcommittee to review.

The Subcommittee agreed with these changes as presented. The applicant shall ensure these changes are incorporated into the design and this Subcommittee Review letter shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s).