



# Architectural Review Board

## Staff Report (ID # 11210)

---

**Report Type:** Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 4/16/2020

**Summary Title:** Minutes of March 5, 2020

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

**From:** Jonathan Lait

### Recommendation

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

### Background

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

Draft and Approved Minutes are made available on the ARB webpage at [bit.ly/paloaltoARB](http://bit.ly/paloaltoARB)

### Attachments:

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



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**DRAFT MINUTES: March 5, 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: Welcome to the March 5, 2020, meeting of the Architectural Review Board. Staff, 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. Do we have any members of the public who wish to address any item not on our agenda today? Seeing no one, we'll move on to the next item.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Baltay: Agenda changes, additions and deletions. Staff, do we have any changes on our agenda? I would like to note that, I'd like to ask Osma Thompson and Alex Lew to handle our first subcommittee item today, and I will step in and handle the second one with Alex. Osma has agreed to do that. Thank you.

**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: Jodie, what do we have?

Ms. Gerhardt: On the attachments, we were showing 620 Emerson for the next meeting of March 19<sup>th</sup>. Unfortunately, that's been delayed, so, actually, the March 19<sup>th</sup> meeting will be cancelled. The Emerson project will be moved to April. We do expect that we will have two hearings in April, though.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Okay, with that, let's move on to our first Action item.

**Action Items**

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 1700 & 1730 Embarcadero Road [19PLN-00291]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Address

the Following Outstanding Issues for a Previously Approved Auto Dealership Project: Color, Landscaping, Parapets, Lighting, Transportation Demand Management Plan, County Airport Land Use Commission Review; and Floor Area Ratio. Environmental Assessment: Addendum to an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration that was Adopted for the Project on June 24, 2019. Zoning District: CS(D)(AD). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Baltay: This is a public hearing, quasi-judicial, for 1700 Embarcadero Road. Recommendation on Applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to address the following outstanding issues for a previously approved auto dealership project: Color, landscaping, parapets, lighting, transportation demand management plan, county airport land use commission review; and floor area ratio. Before we get started, I'd like to ask if we have any disclosures to make from anybody on the Board. Grace?

Board Member Lee: None.

Chair Baltay: Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I have no disclosures.

Chair Baltay: I did visit the site again earlier this week, but nothing else. Alex?

Board Member Lew: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: David?

Board Member Hirsch: Nothing.

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

Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract Planner: Yes, thank you, good morning, I'm Sheldon Ah Sing, contract planner, and I have a presentation for you. The applicant is also here with a presentation. You should have before you the materials board, as well as some larger samples that you can look at throughout. This is a project that is a 4.8 acre site. It includes two parcels. There's an existing former restaurant at 1700 Embarcadero, there at the intersection, as well as an existing Audi dealership. The request includes an architectural review. The project was subject to prior action. There was a Council meeting back in June. At that time, the Council did adopt environmental documentation. They also approved a zone change, and they approved the site and design review with conditions. At that time, the Council, they approved the site layout, the plan, the height, the massing of the project, and the building envelope, with exception of some very specific details and items that they wanted to come back to the ARB to review. Those are mentioned in the introduction, but specifically colors. There was a parapet that was towards the back of the buildings facing the Baylands. There were trees regarding along Bayshore, and there was the curved ramp at the corner that had to do with the multi path and the transition there. The green screening, which was along the back side of the building. Perimeter landscaping, specifically along the car wash building. FAR, some clarification on some of the spaces. Lighting plan, some specifics there. The Transportation Demand Management plan is mentioned. Also, the project was subject to the County Airport Land Use Commission action, so we wanted some information from them regarding that. And then, there was some missing context drawings that they wanted to be added to the plan set. So, they had to file a separate architectural review application, and the first hearing was back in December before this Board. You did review some of those issues. Most of the issues were resolved at that time. The ones that are bold are the ones that are outstanding and are demonstrated in your packet and discussed. You had the trees, again, the perimeter landscaping, the FAR, and the TDM plan. Subsequent to the meeting – actually, during the week of the meeting – the Office of Transportation did approve the TDM, so that item has kind of fallen off, but we did include it in your packet. The rest of these, we'll go into detail in this presentation. But, just to familiarize yourselves with the project, of course, and those who are watching in the audience, it's important to understand the site context, where we are. The major intersection is at Bayshore and Embarcadero. It is adjacent to the Baylands preserve; it is within the Baylands Master Plan area. The project will implement a multi pathway for bicycles and

pedestrians in front of the project. There's a wide utility easement along Bayshore that is really limiting some of the development and potential for landscaping there. There's also, the Audi building in that property is directly adjacent to Baylands and is visible from the trail in the Baylands. The closest proposed building is the car wash, just five feet away from the neighbor's property, and that has been the subject of some discussion. This is a view from the trail behind the Audi site. Getting into specific issues. Trees were an issue, and the comment was to consider an alternative to the western redbuds to include the California lilac Ray Hartman trees. In response to that, the applicant has included those Ray Hartman trees. They really limited those western redbuds to the entryway along Embarcadero. In addition, some newer trees, Chaste trees – which I think the applicant will be able to describe those more – are interspersed between the Ray Hartmans. I also do highlight here the fruitless olive shade trees that are adjacent to the building, and we'll speak more to that in a later slide. Those shade trees do help with the overall landscape theme of the Baylands side. This is just a rendering from the applicant regarding how we addressed the issue. The top slide is from the project back in December, and the bottom is the current iteration, so you can see some of the differences there. Sometimes it's hard to really capture that in the visual simulation, so I did provide a slide of what the trees actually look like. You have the western redbud, the Ray Hartman, and the Chaste trees. Both the Chaste trees and the Ray Hartmans have a purple flower, so there's going to be a lot of purple, understandably, along Baylands. Back to the olive trees, the shade trees. There was some discussion about this, but in the end, they didn't really have an issue with the type of tree, but we wanted to look closer at the tree that was proposed next to the enclosure wall. That was, again, something that the Council did approve, the layout of the site, so the enclosure wall is part of the project when it was approved. In consultation with Urban Forestry, we do propose that the tree there be relocated to the adjacent landscape, so you can see in the imagery there where that would be. There is an underground electric line proposed there, and as a condition of approval, the applicant will route that electric line so the tree can be viable there. They have agreed to that condition of approval. The car wash screening is an important aspect. The comment there from the Board last time was to provide a different screening plant along the property. That's to include the Italian buckthorn. There's only five feet between the car wash building and the property line of the adjacent neighbor. In the past, the concerns have been with noise and some aesthetics, and those issues with noise have been addressed with the conditions of approval and mitigation measures with the environmental document, and also just the way the car wash building is designed, and the operation of it. The one outstanding issue was the landscaping for the screening. Previously, coffeeberry plants were proposed, and while those were native, just given the space constraints, they would not be the objectives of screening that were really, an appropriate shrub there. They suggested the Italian buckthorn, which is not native, but those do grow up to 16 feet tall and will be appropriate there. The other issue was with the floor area ratio. At the last meeting, the applicant did propose a way to make the project compliant with the FAR and really clarify how they got there, but it didn't show the specifics in terms of how their proposal would affect the elevation. What they proposed last time were to remove a portion of the first floor service area, and that would leave that recessed, with the second story above supported by columns. You can see that in the diagrams there, and those are shown in your plans of how that's achieved. There was also some other comment about the front of the building being really superior to the back of the building, especially along the more visible areas on Bayshore. The applicant did recognize that, and they did continue some of the materials and design of the building along Bayshore. They added the louvers, they extended the metal paneling that wraps slightly around the back of the building now. These photos show what was proposed back in December, and then, the iteration currently before you. In terms of CEQA, the initial study and MND was adopted by the Council previously, as mentioned, and the project is consistent with that project description and is determined to be covered by the adopted MND. We do include an addendum, which is appropriate. It's just some minor changes to the project, and the project does not include any new significant impacts. With that, we do recommend approval to the Director of Planning based on the findings and conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Does anybody have any questions of staff? Thank you, Sheldon. Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: Could you go back to the comparison between what was proposed and what's current, for that façade with the louvers? Yeah, this one. On our packet page ZA400, that elevation looks different. It's got green screens on it.

Mr. Sing: Yeah, that is the prior iteration. That was from December.

Vice Chair Thompson: I see.

Mr. Sing: There are a few pages that are inconsistent with the printed packet. I was in conversations with the applicant earlier this week. They are going to resubmit revised drawings to show what is going to be approved, which is... Well, what they hope is going to be approved, is the current design that's before you.

Chair Baltay: Are you able to identify right now which pages are not correct?

Mr. Sing: Well, we know that the cover sheet is incorrect. There's also, I believe, ZA201. And 410 looks like another one. I mean, those are the ones that are showing some older elevations. Yeah, so, 403 is a good one to look at in terms of what's new and what they are proposing.

Chair Baltay: So, 403, Sheldon, is correct?

Mr. Sing: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think 400 and 405 are outdated.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Any other questions of staff? In that case, I have a question for you, Sheldon. I heard you say that the generator enclosure, that's the ground-level thing on the right-hand side of the Bayshore elevation, you consider that to be previously approved by City Council? Do I understand that correctly?

Mr. Sing: Yes, that was part of the design that went through the process previously, and that was approved by the Council.

Chair Baltay: But if we were still expected to be looking at that elevation – *vis-a-vie* the massing changes due to the floor area ratio – certainly that could be part of that. Am I wrong in thinking that? Jodie is sighing.

Ms. Gerhardt: No, I think we just, we do want to make sure we limit our review because the Council has approved the massing of the building. I think, you know, moving that type of equipment, as you know, has other sorts of domino effects, so we would just have to be very careful about where that can and cannot go, and sort of talking that through with the applicant.

Chair Baltay: Thank you for the clarification. Any other questions of staff? Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, one more. Our packet says that we would be reviewing color, but in your presentation, Sheldon, you mentioned that, it was, like, not bolded when we were talking about that. Can we still review color?

Mr. Sing: Well, I think it's still kind of part of what the Council had initially said to review. I think to the extent that, because they made some changes to that elevation behind the stairwell... I don't know if the Board wants to go into the other aspects of the building, but I think that, at least, has changed since the last time.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, so we can review color. That's what I'm hearing.

Mr. Sing: As I said, yeah, I mean, I think it's part of the review. I just say that, what has changed since December, because in December the Board said the color was fine. The change this time around is that the elevation portion, façade, behind the stairwell, is different.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, thanks.

Chair Baltay: Okay, let's hear from the applicant. You have 10 minutes to make a presentation. I'm sure you've heard this before. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please. You'll have 10 minutes.

Lyle Hutson, Architect: Good morning, Board members. My name is Lyle Hutson [spells name]. I am the architect for the project, with YSM Design. Today is our fifth ARB hearing. We did three previous ones, and this is our second one with regards to our new application, so, much appreciated to be here. Sheldon did, I think a very thorough explanation of what the task going forward was from our last hearing, which I think we took into complete consideration on the items that we discussed. We're certainly here to answer any questions regarding other items. The project, briefly, is the, as indicated, on the corner of Bayshore and Embarcadero, and well as the Audi site, with the rear portion of the Audi site being adjacent directly to the Baylands area. In working with staff and the items from the last time, we wanted to make sure that we addressed our sensibilities and our sensitivities not only to the Baylands, but the other buildings in the area, because this is part of the business park, part of the... We have office buildings, we have commercial buildings, medical buildings, so as that mixes, we really wanted to make sure that we didn't promote this as a car dealership with a sea of cars out in front. I won't go into the sort of sensitivities of the parking system and how we're approaching that, but essentially, our parking in front is no greater than any other office parking area with limitations from the easement, the overhead easement. The first and foremost on the items that we needed to discuss from last time was our floor area ratio. We had worked significantly with staff to make sure we were under the requirements without asking for any variances or any dispensation on that. We did make a proposal last time and reduced some 940 square feet of building inside on the ground floor. I think we, in plan, delineated this, but we didn't accurately depict how this was going to be done from a visual standpoint and the massing of the building. With that, I think you'll be able to see that this is the area that has been removed on the ground floor, thus removing part of our drive aisle and two productive work stalls on the ground floor. The area in green is the slide that was presented last time, and I think this is, again, just briefly characterizes the location that the square footage and the percentage square footage that was removed from the project. The result of this is essentially the elevation, if you were to look at a flat elevation, is identical to what it was previously. We had an entry door into the shop and an area on either side that was EFIS next to either side that covered the shop service stalls. Again, from an elevation standpoint, the visual doesn't change necessarily. All the materials, the finishes, are the same. It's just the volumetric from the ground floor has been removed. We did not change the look of the entry door into the shop or the ground level colors. This slide shows the 3D view, so you can see a little more of how that was handled underneath, leaving the generator and the generator wall and screen the same. I think one thing that you'll see in some subsequent slides is this shows everything without landscape, that we've worked particularly hard with the staff and Urban Forestry to make sure that the landscaping is what everybody considers appropriate for the site, and for the visual, specifically on Bayshore. This is a view coming down the street; a view looking up Bayshore. This is our proposed view, which we understood when we presented this previously that this is an automotive facility, this is a new opportunity with the automobile storage area, and the comments were that we kind of fell down a little bit on the Bayshore elevation to the right of the stair tower. In looking at that, and looking at what was provided to us, we determined that to extend that elevation – and we use the same vernacular with the windows, the louvered windows, as well as the ribbed metal panel, and took along the rest of the elevation on Bayshore to make that elevation more in character with the front and the side. And that did encompass removing the green screens we had on that wall. Again, you can see that same view with our proposed trees. Here, you can see the revised elevation. This is our service department here, which we have windows into the service department, with the ribbed metal panel going across. We took the parapet glass, the GL2, which is the sandblasted parapet, and increased that all along the front to match what happens, not only on the corner on the other side of the stair tower, but really to give that the same appearance and utilization of the color and the light for that area. Again, you can see how the landscape and trees then begin to cover up what's seen on the building on the lower level, and that was done on purpose to screen the lower level of the building. Again, you can see without trees; with trees. At full bloom, and with these trees. We're basically cutting off most of what you'll see on the ground level from across the street. Same thing. Ghosted trees, and then, trees with the inter-mixed species this time. Another view here. You can see as the vernacular wraps around with the ribbed panel and the louvered windows, and then, again, as covered with the trees. We are maintaining our green screen. We feel that that is an appropriate transition to the back side of Mercedes and to Audi, so those maintain on those areas, so we still have the green screen

and the GL2 parapet in those locations. This was the elevation from the parking lot towards the building, at the car wash, so you can see the vegetation being proposed there. We don't anticipate any issues, either noise or site, from the car wash, but you can still see the GL2 parapet at the top and as it transitions to the Baylands. Landscape at the car wash. A blow-up here so you can see the wall and the car wash location. We have what we consider an appropriate Baylands transition from built space to the Baylands, and that's the sequence of trees, layering of trees, as determined by Urban Forestry and the City staff, so we don't have just a row of trees at the property line. We also are adding trees into the Baylands area at our expense, and irrigating those, as well as two layers of trees in that parking area by the car wash before it gets to the Audi rear elevation. I left this slide in here because we have worked with the community and with staff and with Parks regarding additional trees, regarding maintaining habitat and providing opportunity for additional habitat. In conclusion, I would say that we focused our time for this presentation with staff on making sure that we hit every point that was discussed last time and that was provided to us. I think the only thing that we still have, the Airport Commission, I don't know if Sheldon has completely followed up with that, but there was a request for an aviation agreement, which appears was already recorded previously and is part of City documents. I don't think there's any additional need for that. In conclusion, that's my presentation for this morning. Again, thank you very much for seeing us. It's early in the morning, but we like these in the morning. I'm available for questions.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Do we have any questions of the applicant before we hear from the public? Anyone? Then I would like to ask if you could come back one quick second. The new windows you've added to the Bayshore façade, it looks like on the second floor, are those windows or louvers? I don't understand what's going on. And are they on...? What's behind those windows? Is that just a parking area?

Mr. Hutson: The windows are there, and the louvers are separate. They are not an operable window. The louvers are there to provide shade and provide opportunity for screen. That area is the parking area on the second level.

Chair Baltay: I'm just trying to understand. When I look at the floor plan – that's drawing ZA104 – these louvers and windows are on that plan, I just don't see them noted here. I'm just wondering if I'm reading it right. I think I am.

Mr. Hutson: The intent is for that elevation and those windows on the plan, as well as the louver portion, to be, there be... Previously, we had glass that was a little more open, if you will, to that area. We like the natural light inside. But we've adjusted it to make it more in character with the front of the building and the commercial aspect of the building.

Chair Baltay: When you say "louver" and "window," is the glazing in the plane of the wall...

Mr. Hutson: Yes.

Chair Baltay: ... and the louver is some opaque substance angled outward...

Mr. Hutson: Correct.

Chair Baltay: ... to direct the light?

Mr. Hutson: That is correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And the louver then is an opaque thing the full height of the glazing?

Mr. Hutson: Correct.

Chair Baltay: And what material is the louver compared to the wall of the building? Is it the same, or...?

Mr. Hutson: No. The louvered portion is anticipated to be that same GL2 or the frosted glazing. You have clear glazing at the shop, and then we have a louvered or an angled panel that's, again, not transparent, but somewhat translucent.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I'm sorry to keep berating this, but, I mean...

Mr. Hutson: That's okay.

Chair Baltay: ... I'm sure the details are here, but it's a lot of drawings. At the very top, you have that, the parapet wall now is entirely glazed. Earlier, we had been concerned about having that be glowing at night. Are there light fixtures behind that glazed parapet? How is that...?

Mr. Hutson: There are light fixtures on the parapet on the other panels, but not on those panels. Those glass panels are, again, you have a sample of the glass with you. That's the transparent glass. We've gone from opaque or a solid panel to a completely transparent, which I don't think any of us want to have because of the... I mean, we could do the same thing with the bird safe glass, but I think it's more appropriate to have that panel match the upper areas of the front. That's essentially a sandblasted panel. That could transmit some light from behind, but it's not lit up from behind on purpose.

Chair Baltay: But is there illumination, are there lighting fixtures behind that?

Mr. Hutson: No. Let me be clear. There are light fixtures for the parking deck there, but they are not directly behind these panels to light up these panels.

Chair Baltay: How far back from...?

Mr. Hutson: They'd be on, for surfaces that are solid, so you can look at the... Our lighting plan shows the location of the horizontal light fixtures. There are no pole fixtures on that third deck, so everything is lit from the 4-foot-high parapet to minimum illumination levels as described and prescribed by City staff.

Chair Baltay: Great. Thanks for the explanation.

Mr. Hutson: You're welcome. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions? David.

Board Member Hirsch: On bicycle parking?

Chair Baltay: To the applicant, if we could ask you one more question, please?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. I just noticed on the bicycle parking, there's space for five bikes adjacent to the showroom area. I think that it indicates there's supposed to be 15 bikes overall. Is there another location where you have bikes on the plan?

Mr. Hutson: Yes, there is more bicycle parking on the site plan over by the, to the right-hand side of the stair tower, and there's also bicycle parking on the Audi portion. We do have the prescribed number of bicycle parking and lockers.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Thank you.

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry, one more question about the louvers. You said the louvers were like a glazed pane that's framed.

Mr. Hutson: Correct.

Vice Chair Thompson: Is it GL2?



Mr. Hutson: Correct.

Vice Chair Thompson: And that's the frosted one that David just held up?

Mr. Hutson: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. And is that on top of a window that is also GL2?

Mr. Hutson: No. The window is our standard bird safe glass, fixed panel glass, non-operable. The louver is the same material as the parapet above. It provides a little bit of transition, but not transparency at that point.

Vice Chair Thompson: And we're seeing, like, a white frame, like a metal white frame...?

Mr. Hutson: The anticipated frame would have been a silver...

Vice Chair Thompson: A silver to match the...?

Mr. Hutson: ... silver, right, to match the metal.

Vice Chair Thompson: The **centria** [phonetic]?

Mr. Hutson: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Hutson: That's why that color is there.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. With that, let's open the meeting to public testimony. We have one speaker card, from Jeff Levinsky. You'll have three minutes. If you could state and spell your name for the record, please.

Jeff Levinsky: [spells name]. Good morning, Board members and staff. It's good to see new plans that we can use to check if the FAR discrepancies have been cleared up, as the Council directed, but there still seems to be a major problem. The Council and staff agreed last June that the stackers should count once as floor area. Here's an easy way to think about it. As the slide shows, if the vertical section of the stacker starts on the first floor, it should be counted in the first floor's floor area, and the area above it on the second floor doesn't count as floor area, and thus it's white. If, instead, the stacker starts on the second floor, then you would count its floor area in that of the second floor, and there's something else below it on the first. Since it's a two-story building, either the stacker should be on the first floor or on the second floor. Very simple. But here's what the latest plans show. This is the second floor, and you'll see there's a large white area in the middle, and that's the stacker. White means it's not counted in the second floor's floor area, so that's where it should start on the first floor. You'd expect to see stacker there. Let's see if this works. This is a cutaway showing you what's on the first floor below the white area on the second floor. And what you can see, a lot of it is stacker, and that's good, but the pink areas are showroom. In other words, you've got showroom on the first floor, and stacker on the second floor, but the stacker on the second floor's floor area isn't getting counted in the floor area for the building. There's another problem area. Up here at the top are two offices. If you were in those offices and you look up, there's a ceiling, and above that is the second floor, and that's where the stacker starts. But again, it was white up there on the second floor, so that area wasn't being counted in the floor area either. Here's what the fixed plan should look like. I put in pale purple the extra areas that are, on the first floor, not stacker, and the stacker starts on the second floor. That adds up to about 1,800 square feet. A little more by my calculation. I'm going to help you out. I'm going to pass out a very low-tech version of this. There's the second floor – sorry – and you open the little tab, and there's the first floor below. And I do want to say that these plans are an improvement since last year. Last year, there was even more white stacker area on the second floor, but now, some of that is purple. That was done precisely because the stacker area starts on the second floor in those areas, and there were showroom beneath. If you just did that for all these other areas, then the

plans would be right. But you will have another about 1,800-plus square feet of floor area that puts the building over its legal limit. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. With that, we do offer the... We have no other speaker cards. We do offer the applicant a chance to rebut what was presented, if you're interested. We're just trying to be balanced here.

Mr. Hutson: Good morning, Lyle Hutson [spells name], representing the applicant. Appreciative to Mr. Levinsky for taking the time and effort to attempt to try and completely understand how this project works and what we're doing. There were numerous iterations as it relates to the, what is considered part of our parking area, what is part of showroom, what is part of neither one. Without going into numerous discussions about the lifts and the aisle that we have down the center that's not used for any storage at all, yet we are counting that as stacker area, so no cars are parked in that area. It's purely a transition aisle for the car lifts. They don't live in that location, and they're not there, and that's a vertical open space all the way up the entire time. In understanding this... And the numbers have been very closely vetted with staff, not only prior to City Council, but also afterwards, as they wanted us to clarify those areas. But I think if you look at all of those areas... Also, the comment about the storage above the second floor, we are counting that as square footage on the second floor as it relates, and not where it's not on the ground floor. Again, thorough, but just not entirely accurate on the numbers.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. I'd like to ask staff to chime in on this FAR issue as well. It seems to be significant if it's the case, but it's very hard for us to tell. We're counting on you to give us a fair assessment. Does this meet FAR, or not?

Ms. Gerhardt: Staff believes that it does meet FAR. We have gone through this project with a fine-toothed comb, and we have looked at, specifically, there is one row towards the front of the building of the stacker that does sort of overhang the showroom. We have counted that. Up on the second floor, you'll see, on page ZA104, you'll see where that change was made and the FAR was added. We did handle that. As far as on Sheet ZA102, you do see there's sort of two pink areas. This is where the cars come out of the stacker. That space is already counted, so we don't believe that that space need to be counted twice where the cars are coming out of the stacker.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jodie. Okay. Let's begin our deliberations on this. Grace, do you want to tell us what you're thinking?

Board Member Lee: I want to thank the staff and our planning consultant, as well as the applicant, for bringing this forward, especially since there have been five ARB meetings. And thank you, Jodie, staff, regarding the FAR clarification. I do not have significant comments. However, I do want to just walk through our previous comments. This is the second time that I'm seeing this project. And then, from this very clear report, in terms of our previous ARB comments, and then, the response of the applicant. I appreciate, I think it was a board member on our side who made the suggestion for the ramness [phonetic], and that seems to be working well, as well as the... And I appreciate the applicant's thinking about those trees again. I believe the lilac and Chaste are fine. See [inaudible] improvement. The elevations depicting lower level change, that also seems straightforward to me, as well as the TDM. In terms of the updates, I understand that it is approved. Where I did want to make some comments was the Bayshore Road elevation. At the previous hearing, I did not have comments on that Bayshore Road elevation. I felt like it would be something that I would feel, moving forward, as it was presented. However, my colleagues did have comments. Now, with this new elevation, one of the things that... And I think that it's fine given the setback, and especially the trees that would be seen from that Bayshore Road, screening that elevation. It's a very long façade. I appreciate, if you're facing that stair on the left side, you have always shown kind of this ribbed panel. I guess it's opaque glass and then the louvers. That's about 50 feet in length. And then, when you look to the right of the stair, I think we have another 90 feet of something similar. While I appreciate that there absolutely is more continuity, that ribbed panel does very briefly turn the corner, perhaps you were addressing, just thinking about how to improve, per comments of a few of us on the Board... I'm not sure that's an improvement, to have that long, ribbed, horizontal, lightly-colored revision, where it seems now that side of the building has more weight, rather than receding in your previous. I do apologize. Sometimes on the board you hear from the five of us and three say one thing and two the other. My feeling

is the length of 90 feet, of continuing that ribbed, strong, horizontal, lightly-colored Bayshore elevation is not an improvement. However, at the same time, I understand what the applicant was trying to do to accommodate. I'd love to hear from my colleagues on that. Thank you for this materials board. It's very complete. I'm happy to approve this moving forward, though I don't think this Bayshore elevation has improved, in my mind. Thanks.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace. David, would you like to go next?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I repeat what Grace said, and thank the applicant for coming here five times, as well. As the staff efforts, dealing with this complicated building, it's really kind of another kind of a building that's pretty new out in the world here, I think, with the stacker idea, technology of the stacker, and what it does to clean up a site, which is never really the greatest with automobile buildings like this, where you have to store cars somehow. The stacker changes the use substantially, allowing the cars to be inside. I'm very pleased by that technological change. In terms of Grace's comment about the back side of the building, I'd say, I guess I'm the one that brought it up first, the thought that somehow it should be very different since it's the service area. But I'd take a step back on that one and say that I think that in this case, having changed to have it relate to the other element on that façade, I think it's a big success, and that the end of the building that way is broken by the stair, which, in the first place, is a good division. Secondly, I just think it now carries the whole building around to the back. I'm pleased with that change. I don't find it to be excessive in its length. The building is that wide that way on that side, so it's certainly successful. All of the landscape improvements I think have met our Board's concerns about visibility, where it's good and where it isn't. I'm pleased with all of that. I think there was a recognition that our board members have some sense of where those should be, and I think you've adapted to their suggestions very successfully. In looking at this, I felt that these five meetings were very, very successful. In particular, I really like what's happened to the back of the building now, with the plantings on the back wall. I just think they're simple and direct and appropriate. I don't really have anything more to say. I think it should be approved. I look forward to that.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Thank you for the revisions. I can recommend approval of the project today. I have two comments. One is regarding the Bayshore elevation. I think the revised design actually fits better with the neighboring building. I think the cantilever, and also the louvers, actually make it, I would argue, more compatible with the neighbor, with the adjacent building, than the previous design. I can support that. Second, just a general comment about the black and white color scheme. I won't make a big deal about this, but I would just say, actually, over the Christmas holidays, I actually circled around the entire bay, along the bay trail, and I was looking at a lot warehouses in the East Bay, and I actually think it's just better to have them all one color. Just have everything white. The ones where I see where they try to do, like, a black and white or navy blue and white color scheme, to try to make the bulk smaller, it doesn't really work. Because when you're actually out on the bay, it's a different scale. Like, something big out there is like Hangar 1 at Moffett Fields. That's big. All these other little one and two story buildings, they look like nothing out there, at that level. In this particular location... And you're trying to work around all the facades, and it's more of an urban location, and I think it's fine, and I can recommend approval. I can also recommend the jet black, as long as it's an integral color, EFIS or stucco. If it was painted, I would recommend "no" on this particular project. That's all that I have.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex. Osma, your thoughts.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah. Thanks to the applicant and staff and my fellow board members. It seems like we've all been picking up on some of the similar stuff. Interestingly, the façade on the stairway, I think it's funny; we seem to potentially be a little split. I think I kind of agree with Board Member Lee, that the previous elevation, which broke up that façade a bit more, I think I... I remember having issues with it as well because it did seem not well detailed. But it's true that this length of façade after the stairway seems a lot. The image above just seems a lot more pleasant to look at. I'd be curious to hear what Board Member Baltay thinks because it might be potentially the splitting vote on that. And then, as far as the colors, I still have issue with the black color. I think I've said this every single time that we've reviewed this. The black

color is quite dark. I do appreciate that it is a lot less than what it used to be, but in general, I'm still not a fan of it. That said, otherwise, everything else, the massing seems fine. And I'll leave it there.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Osma. Okay, well, I, too, can support recommending approval of this project. I think it's come a long way, and certainly appreciate all the effort you've made. I remember being very excited when we first saw the stackers, and I'm pleased that they are still there, and we're going to pull this off. I do want to comment on the comments made by Jeff Levinsky from the public, about the floor area ratio. It's extremely complicated, but I would like to ask if staff is willing to at least sit down with him once more and make sure we understand, if you haven't already. He was the one who pointed out the first time that we had a discrepancy, and I think we owe it to the public to be sure we're right on this. Council was clear that the building must meet FAR regulations. I, for one, don't want to get involved in how you calculate that. It's extremely complicated, and I understand that you've been really working hard on it. And I think I speak for the Board when I say that we don't want to be doing that math up here, but it's critical that it be done correctly. I'm just pointing that out. He's taken a lot of effort to point this out, and he was right the first time, so we owe him the benefit of the doubt. That said, I think most of the things that have been done have been very successful. The car wash, I believe will work well. The landscaping is a big improvement. On the colors, I find that I like the black, and I like especially the way the black and the rest of the material board manages to mix the new Mercedes-Benz branding, which is important to them. But also has a softness to it that, I don't know how, but it really does pull in a sum sensibility of the Baylands. I think it's to do with the creamy white color. I know we've all struggled a long time on that, but I'm mentioning that because I'd like to see us talk about that in the findings. It's important that this relate to the Baylands, and I think the colors do that, and I think we should mention why. On the Bayshore elevation, I have an issue, but not with the windows. I think the louvered windows are an improvement, and I suppose if it were my pencil drawing, I would have made fewer of them, but I don't want to design that from up here. I think having the louvers in the windows is an improvement over not, as Board Member Hirsch said. It just continues the façade into one coherent piece. I'm concerned, however, and I'll point my colleagues to drawing ZA411, which shows the generator enclosure. It's a large black chunk at the ground level, below the Bayshore elevation. It just seems to me that it's a pretty big piece that takes away from the cantilevered aspect of the building. In a sense, it makes a mockery of the fact that we're trying to reduce the FAR, and yet we put this large block there that, by all appearances, is part of the building, and yet it's an outdoor enclosure of some kind. It's for a backup generator, as I understand it. I'm just hard pressed to believe that couldn't be located someplace else. That said, I've heard no one else on the Board bring that up, so I suppose if there's no more traction than that, then that's the way it is. But to my colleagues, I find that unfortunate. My other comments have to do with the findings themselves. In numerous places, when I read through the proposed findings, I want us to say more clearly why we think this meets the Bayshore Design Guidelines. I think it has to do with how the colors are softened a little bit from the crispness that you usually see with the Mercedes-Benz projects. I think it's important to somehow mention that, and justify it. We're setting a standard for future projects in this area, and the Council asked us to look at color, so I'd like to see us somehow modify that a little bit. That's the sum of my comments, and I can recommend approval. Any other...?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I'd like to respond to what you just said about the colors as it relates to the Bayshore. I'd like to hear what other members of the Board feel about this. I disagree that the current palette is appropriate for the Bayshore. I mean, I agree that the lighter colors, like the creamy, ACM-1, STU-1, I think even STU-2, works, but the black I don't think does. In this case, I feel like we're making an exception because this is Mercedes' brand, and we've also asked them to try other things, and it hasn't come out. I don't feel comfortable at all supporting that these colors are appropriate for the Bayshore. I think if we approve this, I would say it's an exception. I would like to hear what the other members of the Board think.

Chair Baltay: Grace, your thoughts?

Board Member Lee: Happy to weigh in. I actually think the colors are fine for the Baylands. I don't feel strongly about that, but what I do feel strongly, and I wonder if this is something that is nuanced, or just in line with what Osma is thinking, is the contrast with the dark black and the lighter color. With our California sun and that long elevation, I just want to point it out. And to be clear, I definitely want to

approve this project. I see it moving forward, and it's a terrific addition to our city. The screening of the trees, for example, and the use of, you know, the citrus and evergreen, with purple blossoms – that's great. Our street scape. But please do look, board members, at ZA059, and just know that cars do come up on Bayshore, and the length of that elevation – that is going to be glaring white with the contrast of that black stair tower, and the length of that elevation is long, horizontal – to me is just very striking, as something that is not as comfortable for me in comparison to the previous proposed Bayshore elevation. Having said that, happy to vote for this project moving forward, given the screening and the setback of the building from the actual curb line and experience of pedestrians and vehicular drivers. However, it does strike me, and maybe that's something, Osma, you're referring to when you talk about appropriate for the Baylands, is the contrast of the black and white. But as far as colors, I think they are appropriate, and I'm happy to move the project forward.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I've been bothered by the problem of the Baylands being described as a requirement of this project somehow. I mean, I think this represents a building that is very much like the zone of all of the other buildings that are at that end of Embarcadero. There's a consistent number of office buildings of this nature in that quadrant of what is, I guess, the Baylands in some way. But I don't see the relationship. I think this building is sort of a stand-alone building on a corner, a very prominent corner, and it should express what it is, and what it does. And the kind of a car that is the product of this generation of cars, until we move onto something else, is one of the more beautiful pieces of manufacturing that you can see on the road. The building looks similar to the car, and I think that's an important relationship. I like the contrast very much. I like the black and white contrast. I think if it were a very light building and tended to disappear... It's too big for that. It needs to be broken down in scale, and I think the black and white manages to do that. And I think that is the effect it has on the Bayshore elevation as well, where the staircase is, where it ought to be, and very prominent, and sort of separates the front and the back, and that you have decided to relate the, in a smaller scale... In fact, it sets down, which I think is something that we should be looking at. In elevation ZA203, you see it, the service area has a lower area, so it isn't as massive as if it were the full height of the front of the building. Therefore, the materials also are broken in that respect as well. They step down, and the glass steps down, and the parapet steps down, and the metal panel is stepping down at that point. Well, it isn't stepping from the lineup, but it steps from that point up, the metal panel up. I'm quite happy with that end of the building. I think you're coming off, you know, where you see that, it's fairly deep in the site. You're coming up to the building, so if you look at it from the point of view of someone driving, because there aren't a lot of pedestrians, certainly, on that street. It's kind of a progression that will take you around the corner. Again, I just wanted to say that I think it's a well-done building, and of its type, it's quite an interesting building at that.

Chair Baltay: Let me see if I can crystalize the two things I think we're going around on. One is on the Bayshore elevation. I'm hearing two Board members say they prefer the previous elevation to the one that's now proposed in front of us. Is that just flat-out...? A summary that we can say?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes. I mean, so far, I've heard two members in favor of the image below and two members in favor of the image above. And then, just to clarify what Board Member Lee was saying about page ZA059, the rendering that's in there is the old proposal that sort of shows that façade broken up, so you kind of have to use your imagination that all of that would not be broken up per the image below on our screen.

Chair Baltay: I don't feel that strong about it, honestly. I think that the louvered windows are a long expanse, and when Grace points out that it's a large, white façade, it will be fairly pronounced from that Bayshore side. You do look into the building there. That said, I agreed with David's original comments, that the building on the right seemed, just not designed. That upper part was just a black wall that wrapped the corner. And I don't want to send this back to the drawing board again. We've got to come to resolution. Alex, what's your thinking on this? Talking about the Bayshore elevation.

Board Member Lew: I think I already said everything that I can say on it. I mean, I think it's approvable. I would just say, I think I would disagree with David on the Baylands Master Plan. You argue that on other parts of the city, that we haven't done a master plan. We actually have done the master plan. It's about this thick. And this is part of the Baylands. The project across the street was part of the Baylands, and that

set the standard for what we want, and not the buildings that were done in the 50's. So, I will leave it at that.

Chair Baltay: Okay, well, I prefer the newest elevation to the previous ones. I'm sorry, Grace. I just think we have to say one or the other. I think the new one will be better than the old one. Do you want to try to persuade us otherwise once more, Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I was going to suggest maybe we consider adding an item to subcommittee, where we sort of keep what is at the bottom, but add some green screen elements that are at the top that breaks it up a little bit more. Kind of keep the bones of the bottom that includes the windows and the facades, but instead of having the expanse of white, that that could get broken down a bit more, and have that be a subcommittee item.

Chair Baltay: Are we really prescribing what...? Are you saying they need to add a green screen there, or just come back to us with another design of that façade? I'm uncomfortable telling them what to do. I think all of us would be.

Board Member Lee: I just want to add that... I'm sorry, this discussion has gone so long. I'm happy to approve the project as presented today. However, I feel, as an ARB, to approve an elevation that is, just that area is 150 feet, and it's the same horizontal plane, and it's a false front, is not great design. However, the applicant has done a terrific job in a very complicated program in accommodating the City in every way, so I'm happy to approve it. I hesitate at the subcommittee in terms of further design, especially since this is a false front. There's no opportunity to actually have landscape on that green screen. That is completely false. I'm happy to approve the project as is. I think as an ARB we should make comments on 300, 400 feet elevations and how it has been designed. That's why I brought that point forward.

Board Member Lew: I don't think it's at the same plane, right? You're saying that the two louvered areas, they're on different planes.

Board Member Lee: Sorry. I'm just talking about the length of...

Board Member Lew: Just that one...

Board Member Lee: Just that area, yeah. The view from Bayshore...

Board Member Lew: And how long is it?

Board Member Lee: ...of driving or walking.

Board Member Lew: How long is it? I mean, you're talking about 300 or 400 feet, but that section is not 300...

Board Member Lee: That piece is about 50, plus 90, plus... You know. I think it's 160 feet. This is not something that, I'm going to approve the project if we have a motion to approve the project, but I do feel like, in our comments, if there's a revision in an applicant's package, the ARB is given the task to make comments on that package.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think the only reason I suggested green screen is because that's what's in the previous proposal, and given that... I don't know. I mean, is there a better way to phrase something that could sort of make this be better design in your eyes, that the subcommittee could...? You know, this project could still be approved and move forward, but have a way of breaking down that false façade?

Board Member Lee: I'm happy to approve the project. I think that when we move to subcommittee, those items should be... This is a big one, right? To redesign the whole elevation? I mean, that's a big part of the elevation, so I guess I agree with Peter, that that is too much at the subcommittee level. I do want to move the project forward.

Chair Baltay: Okay, let's jump to the second thing I feel fairly strongly, David, in spite of your statement about it being a corner building. We do have to make Finding #1, that it is compatible with the various relevant design guidelines, which is the Bayshore Design Guidelines, so when I look at the findings, Policy L6.6, our finding says.... I'm looking at staff report packet page 17, Policy L6.6. We say in our findings, basically, what's going to go out in the record: [reading] *The design of the buildings are sensitive to..., etc., ... and are consistent with the Baylands ... design guidelines.* I'm asking us to say, how is it consistent? I think it's important for us to state in the record how we find this to be consistent with the guidelines. And I just don't, anywhere in here, I just keep seeing, say it's consistent, but not say why or how it's consistent. And we worked really hard to come to that conclusion, that it is somehow consistent. I think, David, with all respect, we do have to make that finding. If it's not consistent, we can't make the finding. It's required to be consistent. How can we say that? Or can we just send it back to staff and ask them to find a way to say it? Anybody have any advice or input on that? I had proposed, I think it's consistent because of the colors, but there's not consensus on that.

Board Member Lew: They've stepped the massing. There's the curved wall and overhangs that bring down the scale. There's a curve on the building across the street, as well. The black and white, we may disagree on the black and white, but I think we can agree that it emphasizes the horizontal and not the vertical.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I would say the ways in which it does work is the massing and the horizontality.

Board Member Lee: I agree, horizontality. I wasn't here for the massing so much, but it sounds like that discussion. I hesitate on comparing buildings across the street with a curve, though. That, to me, seems not appropriate here.

Board Member Lew: It's not appropriate normally, but this is the CS zone, and if you actually look at the CS zone, it actually is about facades. It's weird, I know. In theory, there shouldn't be... It's a CS zone, right?

Chair Baltay: Okay, well, do we have consensus then, that we can ask staff to include the term, "stepped massing, curved walls, large overhangs, and horizontality of the design," someplace in the findings that are necessary? It seems like we're coalescing around the words "stepped massing," "curved walls," "large overhangs," and "horizontality," as being adjectives that describe why the building meets the Baylands Design Guidelines. And we don't seem to have consensus about the color, I gather.

Board Member Lew: I want to add something else. In Finding 2.b., it talks about natural features. That's mostly about landscaping. Most of the landscaping is being removed from the site because of the grading. Right? But they are adding a lot of native landscaping to increase.

Chair Baltay: And substantial new landscaping?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I would say substantial new native planting that will integrate it into the Baylands.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

## **MOTION**

Chair Baltay: In the interest of moving this along, I will move that we recommend approval of this project, subject to conditions... The second one you typed. The Bayshore elevation, I think take off. My motion is just that we amend the findings to include the stepped massing, etc., up there. Anybody second that?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Baltay: Okay. All those in favor?

Board Member Hirsch: Aye.

Board Member Lee: Aye.

Board Member Lew: Aye.

Chair Baltay: Opposed?

Vice Chair Thompson: Nay.

Chair Baltay: Okay, the motion carries 4-1.

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

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much for your application.

Mr. Hutson: May I speak for a moment?

Chair Baltay: We're...

Mr. Hutson: You're finished. I was always never to come back in, but...

Chair Baltay: No, I think we're done.

Mr. Hutson: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Let's take a five-minute break, and then we'll come on to the second project.

Board Member Lee: I just want to note, I will recuse myself on the second item.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace.

[The Board took a short break.]

[Board Member Lee is not present.]

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [20PLN-0003]: Consideration of an Application for Major Architectural Review to Allow the Construction of a Two-Story Retail Building of 28,714 Square Feet Located in the Stanford Shopping Center. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org)

Chair Baltay: ... back in session here. The next item is item number 3. It's a public hearing, quasi-judicial, for 180 El Camino Real. Consideration of an application for major architectural review to allow the construction of a two-story retail building of 28,714 square feet located in the Stanford Shopping Center. Staff report? Oh, first, disclosures. David, any disclosures?

Board Member Hirsch: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: Alex.

Board Member Lew: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: I did visit the site earlier this week, but I have nothing else to disclose? Osma?



Vice Chair Thompson: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Staff report, please.

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning to the Board, Samuel Gutierrez, project planner for this project, located in Stanford Shopping Center. Moving into the project, I do want to do a brief overview of the history because it's a little different than most projects, in the sense of this was originally a part of the Macy's Men's redevelopment, the greater project for this corner of the shopping center, located at the Sand Hill and El Camino portion of the shopping center. As is here on the slide, this was previously reviewed by the ARB on December 5, 2019. There were two options presented to the ARB. One included the Wilkes Bashford building, which is located at the corner of Pistache and El Camino. One did not. Instead, it included a building pad, kind of a land reserve for a building to come in later, under a separate application. Ultimately, the ARB approved Option 1 without the Wilkes Bashford building, thus approving a building pad, the land reserve. We're here today with the development of said pad. This is a map indicating the location of the building pad, located here. And then, of course, the rest of the redevelopment, the parking lot, the drive aiseways, landscaping, and the surrounding area, the El Camino sidewalk, this new drive aisle, and these new buildings here, were all already approved under separate application. We will be focusing on this section here. To give you an overview of the new building proposed, it's a new development of a partial two-story building within that building pad that was approved. It's approximately 28,000 square feet for the new Wilkes Bashford tenant space. There are no parking lot changes associated with this. Again, it's focusing on that pad. Here is a comparison of what the Board had previously seen. We can see that there was less articulation in some parts of the building, and the new proposal has more articulation in these corners of the building. There was some concern that this interior portion was not articulating the massing enough. It was too plain, too boxy. We go through the elevation changes, this is the previous. Again, we're looking towards the interior of the shopping center, facing El Camino. The arrow indicates where we're looking. This is the previous, and here is the proposed. The façade got a little taller. There's a bit more articulation on these corners, they are a bit more pronounced. Here, we can see it from a side view, going down the Pistache drive aisle towards El Camino. Again, this is that corner previously, and now we can see that that massing is broken up. We have more prominent corners again. This is towards the El Camino side. Here, there's more subtle changes. There's more use of brick material in this location. The parapet was brought down slightly, and so was the masonry. This is the El Camino frontage, and again, the parapet and masonry was dropped a bit, and some of the actual glass mullion slightly changed. We're wrapping around the corner now. The large heritage oak would be off to this side, so we're looking from the parking lot. As we continue, we can see the previous, and here is the proposed. Again, there is shorter parapet and masonry. These lines here did get slightly shorter. Now we're going towards the shopping center side, facing the parking lot. Again, this is the previous, and we see again this breaking of the massing, and the taller parapet here to give, kind of the third section of the building. You have the El Camino side, then there's a middle that's mostly even, and then, now, you have this corner that projects higher, so the building is kind of sectioned in three pieces. To highlight that, you can see here in the perspective rendering, again, there's a more even parapet. This division between the corner isn't as pronounced, and now, you can see that it's broken up, and you have this corner that's far more pronounced than it was before. The other concerns that the ARB had was the location, the site planning relative to the oaks along El Camino, starting from the El Camino corner at Pistache, heading towards the large heritage oak, Tree 39. Previously, the building was much closer, and there was concerns that it was intruding too much into the canopy spread. Not so much the TPZ, but the canopy, and there would be possibly too much pruning that could damage that oak. So, the design was revised and the building was set back further from that, to further minimize any need for additional pruning of that canopy. As a result, the building also was pushed back further from the corner trees – Tree 70 through 72 – at the El Camino/Pistache intersection. These changes to the building footprint, after being reviewed by staff, we do feel that these are sufficient changes, that we feel that the proposal would be very minimal impacts to any of the trees in those locations. Staff recommends that the ARB take the following action: Approve the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Development Services based on the findings in Attachment B, and subject to conditions of approval in Attachment C. That concludes staff's presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Sam. Do we have any questions of staff? Alex.

Board Member Lew: I just have one comment for staff. On tree terminology, I think we should be careful. I've been corrected by the city attorney on this once before. Like, for heritage oaks, in Palo Alto, that's really something that is a cultural designation made by the Council. We have protected trees, say, like oak trees and redwood trees, and then we have the regulated trees through the ARB. Like, El Palo Alto is a heritage tree. This is just a protected oak tree.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex.

Mr. Gutierrez: Understood.

Chair Baltay: Okay. The applicant will have an opportunity to present your project. You will have 10 minutes. If you could please state and spell your name for the record. Thank you.

Matt Klinzing, Simon Property Group: Good morning. My name is Matt Klinzing, with Simon Property Group. [spells name]. I believe Samuel gave you hard copies of this as well, and it just goes into more detail of what he just discussed. I'd like to walk you through some more detailed specifics on what we have and have not changed in this presentation. The front sheet here, the bold red line indicates where the final approval came down, just so we're all clear. Everything outside of that final approval was a part of the project one, or the approved ARB, everything within where our reserve building pad was not. That's what we're here to discuss today. How do I get to the next page? Samuel? Oh, okay. This sheet, we spent a lot of time putting together. There was a lot of discussion last time about clearances, what was appropriate, what we needed to have. We were outside of the TPZ's, but there was concern about canopies, so we did the following. We went out and surveyed the previously-documented corner of the building on the site. Then, we flew a drone overhead to take actual down views of the canopy, as well as those markers. Then, we had our civil engineer take that survey and overlay it on our site plan with the aerial photograph. Resulting from that, as you can see, we bumped the building back an additional five feet at this point. We then sat down with Urban Forestry, sat down with our arborist we have here today, and talked about all of the issues related with that, and if they felt comfortable. And overwhelmingly, they did. We have more information today if you'd like to discuss that further with them. But we thought this would be a helpful graphic so everybody understood where we kind of stood on site. And then here, of course, is the document that Samuel already showed you, which is our tree disposition plan that indicates where those are in proximity to the building. Of course, Samuel documented the distance from the TPZ, as well as from the actual tree trunk itself. Looking at building design now. When we were here last time, we heard some comments that were from, "Yes, it's good, I'd approve it," to "I'd approve it, but I want to see some things changed," to "Here's where we think you need to adjust." I'd like to walk you through those specifics today, and I've provided these elevations side by side so we can do that, similar to what Samuel had provided. On the top is what we proposed in December, and on the bottom is what we're here discussing today. When we came back in December, prior to that, we had heard there needed to be more ins-and-outs to the building, more depth, more plane change, so we provided that in the previous iteration. Then, at that meeting, when reviewing that, the consistent comment was there has to be more change in parapet height. We did the following, in an effort not to make the building so discordant, but to provide that. We noticed that primarily on the east side of the building is where you had this continuous parapet line that carried over to the internal road. What we have done now is actually created an area of stucco that bumps higher, that breaks that plane. And then, the masonry, we had similar here on the top elevation, is still there, embedded within that stucco, but we break the line. Then, so we don't get too crazy with all kinds of different materials, we took this darker masonry, the gray that we have that's on the material boards, that is in a Norman shape, or close to Roman shape, as opposed to a standard modular, because we wanted to see something a little different, and we carried that to the actual parapet line. The result is that we have more of a stair-stepped parapet and, we think, a more simpler design, as compared to what we already had on the west side. The masonry here with three openings are similarly echoed to the masonry here with three openings, but they are of different brick colors and different brick shapes to provide some variety. In addition to this subtly that you see as we get into it, is we refined the trellis a little bit as well. Not in material; materials have all stayed the same because we heard the materials were good, but we refined a little bit the details surrounding that. Here now is a blowup. There was some concern last time that we were having a hard time seeing what the design of the building was with trees, so we provided a smaller inset without the trees, and then, a larger inset, obviously that has the trees. And you see the details that

I'm talking about here. We've changed with the bump in the parapet, the higher stucco, the masonry, and then, this Roman masonry back here. As we get closer to the building, this is where you can see in a little more detail the changes to the trellis. Previously, we had had a number of members. We thought it would do better with just a cleaner profile, so these are integral in line, and now, these not-wood, prefabricated trellis pieces are within the same plane as the beams that we have here as well. Now, if we move to the southern elevation, this is the one that's facing Pistache. Again, on the top, it's very similar to the north, but mirrored. We had heard – again, previous to the prior presentation – that we needed more in-and-out, so this had accomplished that. But then, again, there was the comment about the parapet, so we undertook the following. We increased the height of our Prodeema wood in the center here, as you can see somewhat, to give a little more variety of change. Again, on the left, we echoed what we had done on the northwest corner. We increased the height of the stucco, the masonry, and then, we simplified this by having one wall of this masonry in the Roman shape, in the darker color. As Samuel pointed out, we also had a field of brick, and then a break of stucco. We thought to simplify this, we would have a field of brick here. One thing I want to point out is don't get caught up in concern that this one area of elevation be plainer. As you can see in the renderings I'm about to show you, the intent is always to have – although you can't see it so well in this – cypress trees that line there. That is in our planning plan. As you might remember, one of the original philosophies was to kind of morph and blend the idea of landscape and how it works with the building. Hence our green walls, hence the integrated bio retention pieces, and the trellises, and all the green, so that further sticks with that idea. As we look at a detailed shot, this would be this courtyard area as you walk along the southern sidewalk, and again, you see the streamlined trellis that we have here, bio retention, that Roman-sized brick that we have in this area. Next, we go to the west elevation. This is the one that faces the interior of the project, or over to the direction for where Restoration Hardware would be. Originally, there was some concern about the prominence of this western entrance, so when we came back in December, we introduced this masonry break and some other masonry areas to make this more clearly defined as an entrance. This, everybody felt, did not need to change. However, because we made the other parapet changes on the north and south elevations, the result is we had to tweak this somewhat. The parapet has gotten larger here, but we've also bumped up the parapet to the main entrance piece so as to not lose that accentuation of that entrance. Other than that, it's still the same layout, same materials. Nothing else has changed or altered since the previously preferred elevation that we had in December. And then, again, you see a detailed elevation rendering. To remind you, this crosswalk that comes over to the southwest corner is a raised crosswalk. We were concerned about having a clean pedestrian flow, so that still remains as is in the previously-approved site approval. Lastly, we get to the east elevation, and quite honestly, this one, we had a little bit of consternation with. Two meetings ago, people liked it. Last meeting ago, there was, again, some concern that needed to be tweaked. We looked at a whole bunch of options and how to adjust it. At the end of the day, none of those seemed to be as effective as the current elevation, with exception. In the previous submission, these top windows here were actually going to be spandrel glazed, and there was some concern about amount of transparency on the corner. What we have done now is we have actually made those all transparent. We have achieved that by having an interior bulkhead bump-out. Since we have stairs that are pocketed in these corners on the interior plane, you would have a step back from the elevation, you would have lights in the ceiling, you would have drywall come down, and then, it steps back into the storefront. The result, at the end of the day, is you're not looking at a break between solid and clear. You have one clear statement on that corner, we think is an improvement. But we still retain the other issues, which is we have the integrated green wall and... Yeah. In general. And then, here again are some views, very similar to what we had last time, but now you see this clear glazing that carries up to the second level, and again on the southwest corner. If you can see a little change here in the top, that's not, you know, spandrel; that's actually where that bulkhead drops, and then, would push back in. Just so you clearly understand how that would look at the end of the day. We are still integrating green walls, and it's probably a misnomer. They're live walls, and we spent a little more time digging into this since last time. Just so you're aware, this is a continual, updated and curated product, and what it is, it's a series of pans in which we have the plants in. It's continually irrigated, it's continually drained, and these do need to be changed out from month to month, year to year. This would be in every evolving kind of landscape that we see as part of the building façade. Lastly, the materials. We have not adjusted these because they were, like last time, everything as we had it prior, just on the elevations and the way that we have shown. We're happy to entertain any questions or comments you have.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Do we have any questions of the applicant?

Board Member Hirsch: Just, on the very cover sheet that we're looking at here, you're noting... I'm not quite understanding on the El Camino side what the green or blue stand for, around the trees there. Is that solid...? What happens there?

Mr. Klinzing: If we could actually bring up the landscape plan as part of the submission, it shows the detail. To be quite honest, it's been a couple months since I looked at that, so I need to reference the drawings again. But that has not altered from the previous proposal, so I believe it's an area of lawn, and then, we get closer to the trees, it's decomposed gravel to make sure that they are preserved. But I can reference that specific plan if you want me to, Samuel.

Chair Baltay: That's drawing LS100, David. In your packet.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. I'll look at that.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions?

Mr. Klinzing: We actually have our landscape architect here.

Board Member Hirsch: Would you like to address the question to him?

Board Member Hirsch: That's fine.

Board Member Lew: These are shrubs.

Board Member Hirsch: Shrubs, okay.

Mr. Klinzing: If you look at the color coding, we have an area of shrubs, and then, an area of ground cover, and then, of course, the trees.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Mr. Klinzing: And then, we have bio retention that's to the north as well.

Board Member Hirsch: Got it.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions? With that, we'll open the meeting to public comments. We don't have any speaker cards. Does anyone wish to address this project? If not, we'll close the meeting to public comments and begin our deliberations. David, would you like to start us off?

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Well, first, I want to thank our Chairman for bringing up the question in the first place, of the oak trees on the El Camino side, and the fact that you recognize that as a problem, and seemingly solved it pretty well, I think, with the latest setback. That's an important consideration. I think the last time, I didn't think so much of it, but I'm very glad that our Chairman brought it up because it's now resolved. You know, looking at these sheets now, the area that concerned me the most was actually facing the shopping center, and that it didn't have scale equivalent to what it ought to have, relative to the shopping center, where you're going to see it most importantly. I think you've solved that very, very well now. The scale is nice, the material changes are good. The whole building, to me, the interesting thing about it is it's relation somehow to Bloomingdale's, which is one big element, whereas this is broken down into very humanistic kind of a building. It should be a joy to walk against the planes, you know, along the sidewalk. I hope that people will walk along Pistache Place because there's a lot going on there, as there is on the opposite side. I like the symmetry of the ends versus the very casual, kind of open feeling of the sides as the planes move back and forth, and that you have a trellis that sort of unites the bottom piece. It's really quite a successful concept. Aesthetically, I think the building is a tremendous addition to the whole shopping center in that it sort of deals with a humanistic scale of what a building could be. I've never seen a building, quite that many planes on the outside as this one has, and every one a different material. I think there's an opportunity in this kind of a building to do just that, so I'm very, very pleased with the

way those elements work. At one point, I didn't think brick was a great material, and I thought it should be a different scale brick, but I find it works very well now the way it's described. I think at the other end – if I can get back to the site plan – the parking is a little funny in that you have access off of Pistache Place into the area there, and then you could continue going along into the parking lot. It just strikes me as a strange situation there, where you have kind of a distinct area of parking on that particular side, different from the larger parking. It's almost as if you couldn't make up your mind exactly how to treat all of the parking.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Member Hirsch, just to clarify that the parking lot has been approved already. It's just the pad location that we're discussing today.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. I'm not really questioning its use. It just is two different kind of parking areas there, and it seems a little bit strange to me. I guess, you know, what seems the most strange is actually that there is access to the parking off Pistache, whereas if you turned the corner and went into it on the opposite side, it could be a, kind of a cul-de-sac parking area on that side. Meaning that it would relate more to the other side, the major piece of the parking. That's just, kind of a... Well, it actually could be a working comment, you know? I'll leave it out there for others to comment on. You know, the fact that you have a line of trees down Pistache Place, and yes, in the summertime, they're going to sort of cover up a very nice elevation. I guess we have to wait for wintertime to see that elevation more clearly. Which is okay because it's there permanently, so it will be well seen during the months where there isn't any other planting; the leaves are off the tree. I'm in favor of approving this project today. I think that the materials are well chosen, the design is excellent, and I'm waiting to see the building in place.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Alex, your thoughts?

Board Member Lew: I have no new comments that I have not previously stated on previous reviews.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: All right. Thank you so much for the application. Very much appreciate the changes that you've made. I do think they benefit the design of the building greatly. Initially had some questions about Paint 1, because I think from a distance, Paint 1 sort of blended into Brick 1, which sort of blended into Brick 2, but I'm looking at the materials board and they are very different. I think it's probably just the lighting in the rendering. I'm pretty impressed with the changes that were made, impressed with the drone study that you did on the pad. I think the building is better for it, so appreciate that. Yep. I was going to say more but I feel like... She did have a... No, no. That's good. Sorry. Some of these elevations, I got confused when there was a brick one or stone one, but I think it's just because I was turned around. The stone is next to the green wall, and the brick is against the shopping center. Very well done. I can approve this project.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma.

Board Member Hirsch: [inaudible] [off-microphone]

Chair Baltay: Sure, go ahead, David.

Board Member Hirsch: I noted in the lighting drawing that the wood treatments have lights within them. I wonder if you could tell us how that works.

Mr. Klinzing: Sure. It's an embedded LED that works within the panel system. During the day, it doesn't have a significance presence, you don't notice it's there, but at night, what it is, it's a linear light, so it's meant to be a subtle accent as you're going by, to try to give it some pop.

Board Member Hirsch: What happens with the wood in the area where you have the LED?

Mr. Klinzing: Well, you design the panel in such a way that the two work within the same system. Basically, if you can picture a panelized system, and then you have one two-inch-high strip that actually fits cleanly within that façade. And then, at night, that's what comes on.

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. I share my colleagues' sensibilities toward this project and can approve it, can recommend approval today. I think it's going to be handsome addition to the shopping center. I greatly appreciate your taking the effort to study and adjust the building further away from the trees. I think it's going to keep the trees alive and thriving, and I feel that's one of the most important things we can do along El Camino. I'm in support of this project. I would like to say that I also have no new comments. I still feel that the parking system situation just doesn't work. We're essentially adding more square footage than what's there now, taking away parking, and it's already under-parked. Just putting it out there again. Sooner or later, we have to address that issue with the shopping center. It's not working right now. Nonetheless, it's not within the purview of this application. I can support recommending approval. Anyone want to make a motion on this, then?

### **MOTION**

Board Member Hirsch: I recommend that we approve this project today. Anybody second that?

Chair Baltay: I second that motion. Anyone wish to discuss it? If not, all those in favor, aye? Opposed? Very well, the motion carries 4-0.

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

Chair Baltay: With that, we will move on to the next item on our agenda.

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

Chair Baltay: Let's see, study session. Is that about the North Ventura Project, Alex? I see a study session listed on our agenda. Preliminary Review. Jodie, is there something....?

Ms. Gerhardt: No, that's just a header that's always there. So, no, that isn't anything.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

### **Approval of Minutes**

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for January 16, 2020.

Chair Baltay: Approval of minutes is the next item. We have two sets of minutes. January 16<sup>th</sup>. Does anyone have any comments?

Board Member Lew: I have comments which I submitted to staff a couple days ago. But staff said to read the comments now. This is for January 16<sup>th</sup>. Packet Page 84, there's a reference to the "talb-corret," Taube Koret [spells]. Like, the Jewish Community Center. Packet Page 91, there's a reference to MOLDAW, which is the senior housing. Packet Page 95, there's a mention of "shrugs," which should be "shrubs." And Packet Page 135, there's a reference to a Clematis vine. It should be Lasiantha [spells]. On Packet Page 166, which is subcommittee of the Marriott.... Oh, that's the next set of minutes. I'll hold off then.

Chair Baltay: Any other comments regarding the minutes of January 16<sup>th</sup>? I'd like to point out, on page 95, we had a straw poll vote of sorts at the time, and it's recorded that Grace Lee's comments were no audible response. I believe I recollect her saying "yes" at the time. Does anybody share that? This is regarding a discussion of the symmetry of the façade and whether we were essentially satisfied with it. If we don't have a strong recollection, we should leave it as it is. Grace is not here.

Vice Chair Thompson: I don't remember.

Ms. Gerhardt: I can check with Board Member Lee and verify that. And Board Member Lew, you said you emailed? Was that to myself or to Vin?

Board Member Lew: To Vin.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: I would like to, if Grace did respond affirmatively, I'd like to have that in the minutes. Any other comments regarding these minutes? Okay, then, can I have a motion, please?

Board Member Lew: I will move that we approve the minutes for January 16, 2020, with the previously-mentioned revisions.

Chair Baltay: I second that motion. All those in favor? Opposed? The motion carries 4-0.

**MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 4-0.**

6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for February 6, 2020.

Chair Baltay: Let's go on to the next one, minutes of February 6<sup>th</sup>. Do we have any comments regarding those? Alex.

Board Member Lew: Under the subcommittee item, under the header, it mentions that the Marriott Courtyard is being changed to...?

Ms. Gerhardt: To Tribute?

Board Member Lew: Tribute. But my recollection is that Randy showed us some Marriott addition. Was it Tribute? Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, there's two Marriott brands on the same property.

Board Member Lew: I do understand that, but I thought he was showing us something else. Okay. I will stand corrected then.

Chair Baltay: Any other comments? If not, can we have a motion on that one, please?

Vice Chair Thompson: I move we approve these minutes.

Chair Baltay: I second that motion.

Board Member Hirsch: Second.

Board Member Hirsch: David seconds that motion. All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries 4-0.

**MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 4-0.**

**Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Chair Baltay: Let's see, what else do we have on our agenda today? Board Member questions, comments or announcements. Alex, do you have anything to report on North Ventura?

Board Member Lew: There was a community meeting... when was it? Was it Tuesday? Was it this week or last week? Last Tuesday. Which was at Gunn High School, and it was actually well attended, and it was a

diverse group of residents, from kids to seniors, and everybody in between. It was well represented, and there were a lot of comments. Staff did a really good job on organizing it. The next meeting is this month, right?

Vice Chair Thompson: It was, like, a discussion about what's going to happen?

Board Member Lew: There are three alternate schemes. One is to retain Fry's, and then, there is a middle scheme where just a piece of Fry's is retained, and then there's a third scheme where the entire building is replaced. The format of the community meeting was actually just for people, mostly for them to record comments, not to get into the nitty-gritty about each scheme. They were just trying to listen and record what people were interested in. And then, there was also alternate plans presented for the expansion and renovation of Boulware Park, which is next door to Fry's. That's a separate project that is on a similar timeline.

Chair Baltay: Any questions of Alex? I'm sorry, Alex, are you complete?

Board Member Lew: I just wanted, that it is scheduled to come to the ARB for comments.

Vice Chair Thompson: All three of the schemes, or just the one that they end up picking?

Board Member Lew: Well, it's tentatively set for all three schemes to come for comments from the Board, so we'll see what happens.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. David, you have a question?

Board Member Hirsch: Just a few additional comments. Part of the scheme seems to be to take apart the Cloudera building. And there was a thought of putting housing on part of that site. Could you comment on that, Alex, just what you saw there?

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, it's a master plan, right? Nothing is proposed to be demolished. In the, early on, when the committee was working on the project? I think the staff was sort of holding back on proposing anything for the Cloudera site, and one of the comments from the working group was that we should actually think about that, so that has been incorporated into most of the schemes.

Board Member Hirsch: Just to sort of clarify what seems to be coming from this study, from what I see, is that the owner in this case, Sobrato, really wants to, as much as possible, to keep the Fry's, because it's financially a good idea for them, I guess. Would you agree that that seems to be the push at this point?

Board Member Lew: Sure, but the master plan lasts for much longer than the, in the short term horizon. Right? I mean, what they decide to do in the near term is fine. They're private property owners, they can do that. If we change the zoning, this is, like, a long-term thing. Say, like downtown. We expanded the downtown zone, and now, it's been, like, 80 years later, and we're just getting around to putting new downtown buildings on some of the old residential sites. It's a long-term zoning change.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm sort of unsatisfied with that, personally, because I won't be around to see any of it.

Chair Baltay: David, we just want to get the report from Alex, because we've got a lot of people waiting for us.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, okay. Oh, are they related to us?

Chair Baltay: Well, we want to finish the meeting.



Board Member Lew: We have subcommittee items.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Okay. I mean, I think that part of the plan for the site was to, in some way, think about housing for the site, and it turns out that the housing, as it's proposed, in the long term, actually will require lots of streets and amazing changes to the area that will be very, very expensive to do. There is no part of this study so far that studies the economics of that aspect of that part of the scheme, and I think it would be important for us to inform the committees that there should be an economic study of the future uses. The other aspect that bothers me personally is that, it seems to me that the committees have come up with their own desire to have more green space, and what has been proposed is a very urban scheme, which really has very little green space and ought to be re-studied in some way. There ought to be some other scheme that has more green space and connects to Boulware Park.

Chair Baltay: David, this is going to come before us an item. Those are the kind of comments that we can address in great length then.

Board Member Hirsch: We can do it then.

Chair Baltay: Let's try to get that stuff at that point. Is that okay?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. With that, we are adjourned. We have two subcommittee items to follow. Thank you.

## **Adjournment**

### **Subcommittee Items**

6. 180 El Camino Real [19PLN-00110]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project that was Conditioned to Return with a Tree Replacement Plan and Details for the Location of New Bicycle Parking. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org).
7. 400 Channing Avenue [16PLN-00381]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That is Requesting Review of Facade Modifications Made in the Field. The Subject Site is Lot One and has a new Address of 909 Waverley Street. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in accordance with Guideline Section 15303 (new construction). Zoning District: DHS District in the SOFA I CAP. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Danielle Condit at [danielle.condit@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:danielle.condit@cityofpaloalto.org)



## Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Review

---

TO: Mike Mowery, Kimley-Horn 4637 Chabot Drive Ste. 300, Pleasanton CA 94588  
 SUBJECT: 180 El Camino Real [19PLN-00110] Macy's Men's Redevelopment  
 DATE: March 19, 2020  
 FROM: Samuel Gutierrez, Planner

---

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE

The application, and plans and material samples dated received on February 26, 2020, were reviewed by the ARB Subcommittee on March 5, 2020, in accordance with condition of approval #4 as stated below. The ARB Subcommittee comprised of Board members Alex Lew and Osma Thompson.

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 final location of all bicycle parking (including 70 new spaces) shall be in conformance with the revised occupancy study, to the satisfaction of the Chief Transportation Official, along with the final design for the cargo bicycle parking stalls.
- b. To ensure a no net loss of canopy, the project is required to plant 249 trees throughout the site and/or make an in-lieu payment. Staff will work with the applicant to find suitable locations for these trees on-site and adjacent to the site. The applicant will provide the ARB subcommittee with an updated tree map, showing the location of all "no net loss" trees to be planted and shall make an in-lieu payment for any trees that are not able to be placed on-site, per Condition #75.

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

- The updated site plan noted the location of the new bicycle parking and relocated bicycle parking, along with the final design for the cargo bicycle parking stalls.
- The updated tree disposition site plan which includes the updated totals for tree planting replacement and the on-site site locations of the tree replacements.

The Subcommittee agreed with the changes involving trees and required that one cargo bicycle parking stall be moved from the area near Bldg BB to South West portion of the Shopping Center near The Container Store Entrance. 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).



## Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Review

---

TO: Jing Quan, WEC & Associates 2625 Middlefield Road #658 PALO ALTO, CA 94306  
 SUBJECT: 400 Channing Ave [16PLN-00381]  
 DATE: March 5, 2020  
 FROM: Danielle Condit, Associate Planner

---

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE *Danielle Condit*

---

The application and plans dated received on February 26, 2020, was reviewed by the ARB Subcommittee on March 5, 2020. The ARB Subcommittee comprised of Board members Peter Baltay (Chair) and Alex Lew (Boardmember).

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

1. Entry Door
2. Exterior Light Fixture
3. Vehicular Gate at Driveway
4. Eave Detailing and Color Changes (Soffit trim and Up-curl eave at Living Room and Right Building Corner)
5. Wall Vent at Living Room and Wall Trim Under Gables
6. Window Recess and Detailing Change on Front Façade
7. Bay Window Trim Color
8. Placement and number of corbels under bay window
9. Window Grid Changes and no grids at bay window
10. Chimney Shroud Style

The Subcommittee agreed with these changes as presented with the condition that landscape screening be provided for two street facing tankless water heaters at 905 Waverley Street. The landscaping will be provided to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Community Environment. The applicant shall ensure these changes are incorporated into the design and this Subcommittee Review letter shall be included in the digital file of the building permit.