



# Architectural Review Board

## Staff Report (ID # 11458)

---

**Report Type:** Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 7/2/2020

**Summary Title:** Minutes of May 21, 2020

**Title:** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 21, 2020

**From:** Jonathan Lait

### Recommendation

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

### Background

Draft minutes from the May 21, 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: May 21, 2020 Draft Minutes (DOCX)



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**DRAFT MINUTES: May 21, 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, Grace Lee and David Hirsch.

Absent: None.

Chair Baltay: Good morning. I'm Peter Baltay. Welcome to the May 21, 2020, meeting of the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board. At the start of the meeting I'd to read a statement. [Reading] Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, issued on March 17, 2020, to prevent the spread of COVID-19, this meeting will be held by virtual teleconference only, with no physical location. The meeting will be broadcast on Cable TV Channel 26 and live at Midpen Media Center at midpenmedia.org. Members of the public who wish to participate may do so by email, phone, or computer. To ensure participation in a particular item, we suggest calling in or connecting on line 15 minutes before the item you wish to speak on at Cityofpaloalto.org. Spoken comments via a computer will be accepted through the Zoom teleconference meeting. To address the Board, go to zoom.us/join. Meeting ID is 99919943549. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by name. This will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, click on "Raise Hand." The moderator will activate and unmute speakers in turn. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted. A timer will be shown on the computer to help keep track of your time. Spoken public comments using a smart phone will be accepted through the Zoom teleconference meeting. To address the Board, download the Zoom application onto your phone from the Apple App store or Google Play store and enter the Meeting ID 99919943549. Please follow the steps a through d. Spoken public comments using a phone. Call 1-669-900-6833, and enter Meeting ID 99919943549. When you wish to speak on an agenda item hit \*9 on your phone so we know that you wish to speak. You will be asked to provide your first and last name before addressing the Board. You will be advised how long you have to speak. When called, please limit your remarks to the agenda item and time limit allotted. To better facilitate public comments at the beginning of the meeting, our meeting host, Vinh Nguyen, will identify each person with a raised hand by name or last four digits of your phone number, and request that you state your name and agenda item you wish to speak on. If you wish to speak on any item not on the agenda, please state your intent to speak under oral communications. When it is your time to speak during public comment, you will be identified and provided three minutes to speak. Any callers with blocked numbers will wait until the end of the speaker's portion. The host will unmute them one at a time. All will be asked to speak.

[Roll Call]

**Oral Communications**

Chair Baltay: The next item is Oral Communications. Is there any member of the public who wishes to speak or address any item that's not on the agenda? Vinh, do we have anybody?

Vinh Nguyen, Administrative Associate: We do not have any raised hands at this time. I believe we may proceed with the agenda.

### **Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Baltay: Next item is Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions. I think we don't have any changes. Jodie, do we have any changes?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: No changes at this time.

### **City Official Reports**

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

Chair Baltay: Next item is City Official Report. Could you give us a report, please, Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: [Setting up presentation.] We're continuing on with our virtual meetings that we will have today. For the next hearing, June 4th, we don't have any action items. The only item that we have would be 380 Cambridge, which is a subcommittee review. I would just need from the chair which members would be attending that.

Chair Baltay: You would have the subcommittee even though we don't have a regular meeting?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. I have checked with the attorneys and it is fine to do it that way. We are announcing it now that we're going to have such a subcommittee. We will have agendas posted online but that's all that we need to do for subcommittees.

Chair Baltay: And the staff is happy with that inefficiency of holding just a meeting for that purpose?

Ms. Gerhardt: During these interesting times we are trying to move projects forward and we don't have anything else for the agenda.

Chair Baltay: I think the subcommittee for that should probably be composed of David and Osma if they're willing to do that as a special meeting. David, does that interest you?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, fine by me.

Chair Baltay: Osma, how do you feel about that one?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, that's fine.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Let's put those two down for the subcommittee so that's decided for you, Jodie. That way we can [distortion] middle of the week.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay, anything else on City Official Reports?

Ms. Gerhardt: No.

### **Action Items**

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3585 El Camino Real [17PLN-00305]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow The Demolition of a 800 Square Foot Commercial Building and the Construction of a New Three-Story Mixed- Use Project Including 2,400 Square Feet of

Office Space, and Three Residential Units. This is a Housing Incentive Program Project with a Variance Request to Deviate From the Parking Lot Shading Requirement. Environmental Assessment: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Zoning District: CN (Neighborhood Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at [sahsing@m-group.us](mailto:sahsing@m-group.us).

Chair Baltay: Great. Then we move on to our first action item, which is public number 2 here. 3585 El Camino Real: consideration of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of a 800 square foot commercial building and the construction of a new three-story mixed-use project including 2,400 square feet of office space, and three residential units. This is a housing incentive program with a variance request to deviate from the parking lot shading requirement. Before we start, do we have any disclosures for this project?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay, David.

Board Member Hirsch: Had a meeting at the architectural office. We're concerned mostly about the shading and the parking lot. [Phone Ringing] So that's being checked.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. I'm sorry about that. Any other disclosures?

Board Member Lee: I will also disclose that I did meet with the applicant and visited the site multiple times.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace. Anybody else?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I will disclose that I visited the site and I looked at the lighting cut sheets online because I didn't see them in the drawing set.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Osma, anything?

Vice Chair Thompson: I visited the material board at City Hall.

Chair Baltay: Okay, and I disclose I did visit the site as well, myself, to get a better understanding of the situation. Everybody, thank you for those disclosures. Before we get started, Vinh, do we have any public comments to expect for this one today so far?

Mr. Nguyen: No one has indicated that they had public comments for this ordinance.

Chair Baltay: Okay, then why don't we get started with the staff report on this, please. Is that Sheldon?

Sheldon Ah Sing: Yes, thank you. [Setting up presentation.]

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Baltay, I just want to add that Timothy Maloney just raised his hand for this item. I guess we can call him as we get to public comments.

Chair Baltay: Wonderful, thank you.

Mr. Ah Sing: Okay, thank you. I'm Sheldon Ah Sing, and just to go over what we're going to talk about, I have a project overview of what we're... first, providing a little bit about the site context and it's a small site. It's on El Camino Real. A little different context than, say, a project in the downtown area and how the housing of the program has really benefited this project. This will be, I think, one of the first projects that we use this program on. And then going into a little more detail, the El Camino Real guidelines give more detail with the project plans and also the issue mentioned of the parking lot shade canopy issue and a topic of the variance. We will display some of the materials and then we'll go through our recommendation. A little bit more about the project, it's formal review of a mixed-use project located

within the Ventura neighborhood area. It's on a small site. It's just over 6,000 square feet. To kind of put that in perspective, that's the same size lot as a typical single-family house. It is a new three-story mixed-use building. You have some offices on the first floor, office on the second floor as well as three residential units. And the project itself is community commercial, neighborhood commercial, and the project does use the Housing Incentive Program to get through some of the issues that we initially had for the project. It's also subject to the Performance Criteria Standards at [distortion] the context space design criteria standards, and those support the request for architectural review as well as the variance and this, for clarification, recommendation for approval today. We have included findings in your packet. A little bit of background, as I mentioned, this project was submitted back in 2017, and ran into some hurdles. The site required that if you wanted to include residential mixed-use you had to have a minimum of three units. There were some site constraints given the small size of the lot and since that time the City adopted the housing **CNDA Program**. That's helped alleviate some of these constraints but not all of them, as we'll go through. The project did go through the ARB formal review back in October. It's a three-story mixed-use project and at the time the Board had mentioned to demonstrate compliance South El Camino Real guidelines, provide some additional samples of materials. Also to discuss the relationship with the building that's across the alley. The site does include three sides of it that basically are streets, essentially, and there's existing two-story residential building behind. It also demonstrates some relief in the facades to also replacing the ground floor windows. Describe the pedestrian experience a little better along El Camino Real and Matadero Road. There was an issue with the perimeter parking lot landscaping and the Board wanted the project to retain that landscaping. And also it has some consideration for some signs. A bit more about the site context and... This project is also on the same agenda as another project that has a small site as well. And I think it unintentionally became, sort of, a study of micro lots. We do want to hit home, this is the current situation here along El Camino Real that it is a downtown [distortion] it sets back other site constraints, but this project also does have an alley in back, as you can see, and you have some overhead utilities that provide some additional design constraints. But the site does include the existing 800-square foot former automobile service building. The site was considered contaminated but has since been mediated and given closure by the oversight agencies. There are other two-story commercial buildings in the vicinity, as well as some vacant parcels. The Housing Incentive Program was adopted to amend the Comprehensive Plan Policies for both additional housing and production of the City. For residential mixed-use projects along El Camino Real, the director can waive the following requirement when the project is consistent with the Architectural Review findings. Those here applicable are the maximum FAR is not to exceed a total of 1.4:1. The base CN district allows 1.0:1 FAR. This project does take advantage of that. It's at 1.0:1. Then the maximum lot coverage base CN allows up to 50 percent and I think this project is up to 60 percent. The applicant did revise a response to the Board's initial comments on the following. They did reduce the office square footage. They put some of that square footage back into the residential units and in reducing the office space they were afforded to reduce the amount of parking on the site. In doing that they actually added some more landscaping in the rear. You can see that in the site plans, some permeable pavers and also two larger trees that could be accommodated in that rear parking area now. The project does formally include about 2,300/2,400 square feet of commercial space, about .38:1 FAR. That does include some shared space. The residential units totaling 4,500 square feet. It does include some shared space in its .72 FAR. The total FAR is 1.1 and the site coverage is 60 percent. Some of the notable development standards that are important to show is that in the CN District you have to -- where the other project as well is on El Camino Real show you have an effective 12-foot sidewalk and the first floor is probably being setback about 5 feet to accommodate that. There's an initial 5-foot setback for the street side on Matadero, so You wouldn't get that at a downtown area if you have a (inaudible) setback. Office space covers 35 percent and the parking lot shape canopy, we'll get to more detail about that -- the requirement's 50 percent with maturity at 15 years. In addition to these zoning requirements, you have the South El Camino Real design guidelines and for properties that are in this retail go district, 75 percent of the frontage needs to build to that setback for El Camino Real and then likewise, for the side street, 50 percent needs to be built for that setback. And those guidelines also encourage you to take access from the side street. It does mention that if you have an alley to consider that as well, and this project did look at having access of the alley and that was problematic for adding additional traffic and having sensitivity to that residential building behind. Also, the guidelines state you should have orientation of building towards El Camino Real.; this project does that. It includes the front, the building itself is frontage of El Camino Real. The back is the along the alleys where you have your parking and your other

service (inaudible). It also includes articulated base, body and roof guidelines. Some of the project comparisons from before, the left side shows you what was previously shown. The right side is what's presently shown. And at the board meeting there want really a direct direction to change necessarily the architecture of the building. It just said to consider the El Camino Real guidelines, demonstrate compliance with those. The applicant didn't change the front of the building but the rear of the site, as a result of removing some office square footage, are able to put in more landscaping. So you can notice there are a couple of trees that are on the opposite side of the driveway there. The two London Planes, those are actually street tree size type of trees. That should make a difference there. And then, here you can see in the site plan here of the changes that they made. Again, it's to, really, the rear, but since they were able to remove one of the parking spaces in the puzzle lift, now you have that extra 8 feet or so of landscaping at the end of the driveway, and that's where they can put the long-term bicycle parking spaces. They've moved that from fronting the alley, and they added the two trees there, as well. And you can see in the back where you have all the other utilities, such as the transformer pad, the [distortion], you have the trash area, you have the parking. The service parking is required; when you have mechanical lift parking, you need to have service parking. You can't put accessible parking in mechanical lifts. We'd also provide for the pathways to these accessible parking spaces and, again, as I mentioned, you have the overhead utilities there, so you're limited at the size of the trees that you put along that alley. Here you can see the project is one story taller than the adjacent properties. The first floor, or base of the building, is consistent with the neighboring building. They piggyback [distortion] the pattern. The parking lot shading is a requirement in the parking code and specifically it states that surface parking area shall include tree canopy design to result 50 percent shading of that surface area within 15 years and does specify the size of the trees you need to put in there at the time of construction. This project began, showing the areas that needs to be shaded. That's the driveway, the parking spaces there. With the revision of the project, the applicant was able to add some additional trees at the end of the driveway. These are London Plane trees, as I mentioned. They're the same as the street trees that are proposed. So they'll be really nice canopy trees and the other trees along the alley are Japanese Maples. They're very slow-growing. They're small canopy trees. Those are something that the utility department can allow underneath the power lines. The surface spaces are semi-covered spaces with vines that are growing on the structure. The applicant did look at some other alternatives here. It did look at a basement alternative in the past. You can see on the left, actually the project would take access over surface spaces along Matadero side street as well as the alley to get ramp down. And you can see with the ramp being to code, there's not really sufficient backup space to the spaces. And then, even if you look on the surface, you still don't even have 50 percent shading there on the site, so they're still problematic even when you look at the basement alternative. Probably could've pushed him in different ways here to see different configurations, but it is challenging, given that on a basement that leads to an alley, the cars coming up that ramp have their headlights into the adjacent residential -- that's pretty tough and the trash space here probably isn't sufficient on the surface here. There are a lot of challenges for having this basement alternative. And just, kind of building on what the opposite building looks like across from the alley. You can see it's a two-story residential building. There are some doors that access the alley. There's a courtyard in the middle that you don't really see here, and then the alley is 20-foot wide. You can see the utility pole in that picture. And then on the other side of the picture, the graphic, you can see, sort of, how the project puts all its massing on [distortion] consistent with the South El Camino Real guidelines. They bring the parking, stepping down to the alley, sort of having that buffer [distortion] units. This is really important if we go down the variance path. This is the first finding it's made, and because of special circumstances applicable to the subject property, including but not limited to size, shape, topography, location, or surroundings. It's not just the lot itself and maybe something that's wrong with it. Like, if you go and there's a huge row of trees or large boulders that we can't move. I mean, it's also its location and surroundings. The strict application of the requirement and regulations prescribed in this Title substantially deprives such property of privileges enjoyed by other property, and I think that's where we've tried to make those findings in your packet today, and hopefully [distortion]. Some other things about the project is that we have below-market-rate housing. The project will make an in-lieu payment of that. That number is .45 units, so it is a fractional unit, therefore it was subject to the in-lieu payment. Mechanical lift parking also has an issue regarding the operations and maintenance in case there's a breakdown. And then just pointing to some of the materials, and the applicant will probably go a little bit more into this. Hopefully, you've had a chance to look at the materials at the display case or they were available online as well. But they're using some

concrete, which (inaudible) sort of a sustainable type of concrete and there's 3form cladding. A different type of material, the glass railings, and the application of it here. There are some glass overhangs that are being used as well. The long term bicycle parking, you can see the picture on the right they're using. It's kind of a neat looking one. It looks pretty durable. This is some of the wood they're using for the trellis over the parking as well as the bench that's being provided along Matadero. And then some of the roofing material they used for the trash enclosure as well as the same material for part of the parking trellis cover. There's a rock wall that's on the side of Matadero as well going on the rear of the alley. And then some of the concrete masonry block that used for the structure of the trash enclosure and the concrete block wall. And then you have the mechanical equipment screen that's being used on the roof, as well as some of the planters that are being used along the alley portion and also along the front of El Camino Real. And then, this is the materials for, I think the 3form cladding. I believe one of the applicants wants to show that in their presentation today. And then, this is just one of the findings of the architectural review is the sustainability of the project uses concrete that has a slag, which is a sustainable material. There are solar panels on the roof. It uses steel framing, it was a renewable resource. Operable doors and windows and the 3form cladding doesn't require [distortion]. And then for CEQA we are currently in circulation with a mitigated negative declaration document being circulated from May 1<sup>st</sup> through June 1<sup>st</sup> and the impacted topics include -- they're all construction-related, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, some hazards, hazardous resources, and noise, more specifically the vibration. And all these mitigations proposed can reduce these impacts to less than significant. In conclusion, we want to conduct a public hearing. The body did respond to the ARB comments. The project is consistent with Architectural Review findings. We want to consider those variance requests by the applicant, and we want to complete the CEQA process. The recommendation is to review and consider the initial study and mitigate Negative Declaration and then recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning and Development Services based on the findings and subject to conditions of approval. That concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions. The applicant has (inaudible), which I will operate, and then we'll go ahead and get to any questions you may have.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Sheldon. Does any board member have a question for staff?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, I have one.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead, David.

Board Member Hirsch: The enclosure for the long-term parking in the back. Is that a requirement for the retail or the residential portion of the building?

Mr. Ah Sing: It's for both. They're both combined there.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions? I would like to ask one question, then, Sheldon. When you're measuring the shading as a percentage of the parking lot area are you including the area of the stacked parking that's actually underneath the building? The code seems to say you should take the area of the surface parking and shade half of that. Which area are you including when you make that measurement?

Mr. Ah Sing: We're including the driveway and the surface parking areas.

Chair Baltay: I ask this because on the applicant's drawings it seemed that they were including a much larger area for what the surface parking area was. Can you say what percentage is actually shaded with the application right now? To what extent are we asking for a variance?

Mr. Ah Sing: Yeah, I think if we look at that sheet, we're showing like 200 square feet of the parking lot being shaded. It's a very small percentage. I know they have another exhibit, but basically, that 200 square feet are in this area here. These areas are not included. These other areas are not included, so, really it's a very small area that's included.

Chair Baltay: But can you say what the percentage is? The code says they have to be 50 percent shaded. What percent shaded are they right now?

Mr. Ah Sing: Yeah, I'd have to look at that sheet and I think while the applicant's giving their presentation -- I'd just have to do the math here but, again, they're only doing -- this is the only part that's shaded. We just need to take this area here and, I mean, it's very, very small. It's not very much but I can get that for you.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thanks. Any other questions?

Board Member Hirsch: I have a question about that issue, Peter. I thought it was stated in the text somewhere that the shading is about 26 or 27 percent relative to the 50 percent requirement.

Chair Baltay: That's the number I'm looking for. Sheldon, (inaudible) would be 25 percent on this drawing in front of us.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think if you give us a minute, we can find that number for you, maybe after the applicant presents.

Chair Baltay: That's great, Jodie. Just at some point as we discuss this. With that, can we move on to the applicant presentation? Do we have the applicant here, Vinh? Could you get them on board for us, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, so I think the applicant is Pratima and Joe. [Setting up presentation.]

Board Member Hirsch: I hope they speak clear. And, Vinh, I can hardly understand you.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Chair Baltay: Welcome, Architect Pratima.

Pratima Shah: [Setting up presentation.] This is what we will do. We will continue with our presentation and during question/answer session we'll keep our camera on so we will be able to show you the markups of the material samples we made. [Setting up presentation.] Good morning, respected ARB Review Members, City Officers, and everybody who has joined us at this virtual hearing. My name is Pratima Shah, I'm the project architect. I would like to thank the officials and Sheldon Ah Sing with whom we worked closely on this project. We appreciate their detailed staff report and information --

Chair Baltay: Excuse me, could you state and spell your name for the record, please?

Ms. Shah: Yes. (Spelled Name)

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much.

Ms. Shah: We would like to thank ARB Members for (inaudible) design proposal, valuable comments and suggestions. We did appreciate them. We have reviewed and considered each and every suggestion by the Board and departments and have responded in our revised design proposal. I would like to begin my presentation with the existing site conditions. The size of the lot is 60 feet by 104 feet. That is about 6,252 square feet. It is a standard size of a lot for a single-family home and a substandard lot for a multi-family mixed-use building. The lot has been vacant for past 30 years and because the site was contaminated it had to go through the extensive process of remediation. Now the site has a clean title from County of Santa Clara. The design proposal that we are presenting today has evolved after considering different design programs and working with the consultants, City officials and (inaudible). I would like to summarize the design proposals we submitted previously. Our first formal design application was in August 2017 where we proposed three-story mixed-use building with two office spaces and two residential units. There was a conflicting requirement of the Zoning Code for this property. The

CN district only allowed multi-family residential districts. That means three or more units and the residential permitted residential density only permitted two residential units and we had proposed two. There was a conflict in the zoning requirements itself. We explored other design options for the program, like two-story office building only, but an office had more stringent setback requirements, such as 20 feet from Matadero Avenue. That's approximately one-third of the site. And we also would have the opportunity to of adding (inaudible) housing in the City. We tried the option of a basement with a ramp, a third level of mechanical lift but both options were discarded because of the mediator saw a condition and to keep the excavation to minimum. At this time we had many constraints and we were really concerned about the ecumenical feasibility of the project and that's when the housing Incentive Plan was announced by the City Council, which helped us a lot during this process. The following incentives -- like first one increase residential FAR, then reduced car parking requirement, like one car parking space for one-bedroom unit instead of 1.5 and more than 50 percent site coverage is permitted. We were able to take advantage of these incentives and propose a design which works for plans as well as City. There is no major change in the design program from the previous proposal. The proposal includes two office spaces, around 2,374 square feet, and three residential units around 4,500 square feet. In the previous proposal, a variance was requested for 5 feet perimeter landscaping along the parking lot. We have proven this requirement by adding 8-foot landscape straight at the end of the driveway along the neighboring property with two trees, shrubs, creepers on the boundary wall, and permeable pavers. This strip creates a beautiful landscape space and a visual relief in the parking area. In order to create this green oasis in the parking lot we had to reduce one car parking space from the mechanical car lift system, resulting in reduction in office square footage. The design proposal includes ten car parking spaces with mechanical vehicular lifts while three car parking spaces are on grid. On grid car parking spaces are mainly for commercial portion of the building. As David asked the question, residential will have designated parking in the car lifts. The bicycle parking has been relocated from the alley to the space in front of unused bay of the car lift system. During the previous ARB meeting there was a comment or discussion and concern expressed about the alley streetscape. Relocating bicycles at new position not only makes the bicycle parking safer but also provides a continuous landscape strip along the alley. There is a five-foot easement on the alley for overhead electrical lines. Though we have this restriction, we feel we have created a design solution which beautifies the alley: four Japanese Maple trees, remove both planters to market the boundary and beautify the alley. Thus creates a desirable (inaudible) between the alley and the parking area. Another change we are proposing for the shading of un-grayed surface parking. Our new design proposal included a continuous standing seam metal roof for the car parking area. In this proposal, we have a combination of standing seam metal roof over the parking area and (inaudible) wood trellis or pergola covered with creepers over the aisles. This combination roof will provide required shading for the parked cars. The trellis and vines, which is an interesting landscape element, will create beautiful views for the users and neighbors, as well as reduce the heat island effect. These are the pictures of the model which show the view from the alley and you will be able to see the difference this small little change we made in the alley streetscape. Now we have a continuous street of landscape. Next is the rendering which shows the corner view from Matadero Avenue and the alley. And if you have taken a drive through this alley you will agree with me that this will be one of the beautiful corners on that alley. The next couple of slides who the revisions we made to the floor plans. Since we reduced one car parking space, we had to reduce office square footage on the second floor by around 150 square feet. We have compensated this reduction in office square footage by adding more square footage to the residence on the second floor. On the third floor, we have reduced the size of the two trellises which were closer to the neighboring buildings and have increased the square footage of residence number three. We are still able to fulfill the requirement of 150 square feet of open space per residential unit and overall landscape, or open space, as we have added more landscaping on ground floor. Now I will proceed with response to the ARB comments. We have submitted a virtual material board which has pictures of the material samples, brief specifications, construction on details for a few materials, and pictures of the materials in use at our previous project. A physical material board was submitted at the previous ARB hearing and now at the Plaza. We have a mockup of 3form wall and a 3form H detail and a collection detail of steel frame and glass R-3form panel. I will show these mock ups once I connect to the camera. This is the picture of the mockup and the slacks. There was concern expressed on how building responds to its surrounding residential neighbors and location of the trash enclosure. As explained previously in the design, it has a beautiful landscape perimeter strip along the alley. The view of the parking is (inaudible) with removable planters, Japanese Maple trees and rock

walls. The standing seam metal roof and (inaudible) trellis with creepers form an interesting roof pattern. The entry of the trash location enclosure is in the front of the staircase of one of the residential building and is not right in front of the door. Trash enclosure is fully enclosed and with overhead rolling shutter. The vehicular entry and exit to the side is from Matadero Avenue, thus introduces impact on the alley traffic. As mentioned in the previous hearing by the City staff, today's ARB discussion focuses on the South El Camino Real guidelines and complies with it. One of the main concerns was about guideline 4.1.5 articulated façade base, body, and roof. As per the guidelines, the building does have an articulated façade and expresses the use of its space. For ground floor office use the building has exposed concrete column frame and a concrete slab with glass walls. This maintains the rhythm of the neighboring storefronts. The middle floor office use has an overhanging balcony with solar screening landscape elements, a vertical garden, which is a distinct feature and relates to the building next to the neighboring building. The top floor residence is cluttered with 3form and does not remove the structure existing. The residence is recessed 8 feet from El Camino Real and 16 feet in the corner to reduce the massing of the building and relate to the context. From the pedestrian view, the glass guardrail for the trellis is more visible and acts as a parapet and relates to the two-story neighboring building. The building uses singular architectural elements of the neighboring buildings, like storefront, balconies, parapets and forms a strong connection with them. As for ARB members --

Chair Baltay: Ms. Pratima, you're at ten minutes now. Could you wrap this up within a minute, please?

Ms. Shah: Yes. I am on the second to the last slide, so I will be able to finish. Thank you. As for ARB member's suggestions, we explored a couple of design solutions and we think the proposed is the best one as it satisfies the intent of the guideline and forms a strong connection with the neighboring building. The very important variance issue about the site is 50 percent parking lot with trees is a requirement for surface parking. I feel we have a unique situation where 30 of 10 cars [sic], that is 75 percent of the cars, are parked in the vehicular system and three are parked on the grayed shared driveway. The code does not address this situation. If all 13 cars were parked on the surface it would have covered 3,800 square feet and we have reduced 50 percent of surface parking area requirement. The code intends to reduce heat island effect by providing shading in the parking with trees. 75 percent of the parking is under the building and remaining is covered with landscape elements and trees. Also, it is located on the North side of the property, so part of the driveway will always be shaded as shown in the picture (inaudible). With this, I would like to conclude my presentation. We tried our best to respond to each and every comment and we are really satisfied with the proposal we have, and we hope the ARB recommends this too.

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

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: It sounded like there were some mock ups of the material that we were going to see via video. Is the Board interested in seeing that? I am.

Ms. Shah: I'll turn the video on and show it.

Chair Baltay: Can you tell me how long this video is?

Ms. Shah: It's not long I'm just going to show the mock up by camera.

Chair Baltay: Okay. At the request of Board Member Thompson, we will look at the video. Thank you.

Vice Chair Thompson: It's not a video. It's just their video, like their camera, so we can see it.

[Preparing Visual.]

Ms. Shah: This is the mock up of the wall. We have the (inaudible).

Vice Chair Thompson: Is that concrete color and that 3form brown color correct in terms of what will be used on this project?

Ms. Shah: This mock up we made with the material that was available at the workshop. Because it's a special order, a color sample of the 3form was submitted at the ARB meeting.

Vice Chair Thompson: It looks very similar to the one that I saw on the material board. The material board one maybe looks little darker.

Ms. Shah: My material sheet gives exact specifications of the color that matches with the true color if you see the virtual material sheet

Vice Chair Thompson: I went and I saw the material board.

Ms. Shah: Let me show the other mock ups, too.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm interested in seeing the corner.

Ms. Shah: (Inaudible) this is one of the ways to (inaudible) and the third mock-up is the current glass steel frame and metal plates.

Vice Chair Thompson: Can you get closer to the corner, please? Not that corner, the 3form mock up corner. Is that an edge banding of metal?

Ms. Shah: No, it's not metal its singleplex [phonetic]. It's a caulking material.

Joseph Bellomo, Architect: We've used this on several projects. I want to quickly say thank you for your time with the ARB. I served a couple terms and I understand the effort and I really appreciate that. I just wanted to interject that.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Joe Bellomo.

Mr. Bellomo: And you're familiar with the corner at University, the City parking structure?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: We're asking questions. Osma, does that answer your question?

Vice Chair Thompson: It does. I do have one more questions. A lot of my questions actually got answered by the staff report. Thank you, Sheldon, for your thorough report. I wanted to ask about the mechanical screen. I noticed on the material board there were two materials that were called mechanical screen and I just wanted to clarify why...? It was just a little confusing. I thought the sheet was the mechanical screen but there's another, sort of, thicker --

Mr. Bellomo: Pratima is showing you an example. Can you see it?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Ms. Shah: (Inaudible).

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, so is that other object just the attachment, then?

Ms. Shaw: (Inaudible).

Vice Chair Thompson: It just looked like two objects. Yeah, I can see that.

Ms. Shaw: (Inaudible).

Ms. Gerhardt: We're not able to hear Patima's voice clearly and I don't know if we have a specific question for her.

Vice Chair Thompson: I was just asking the architects, whoever can answer it.

Chair Baltay: Maybe state that again, Osma. It's not clear. I want to keep moving.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. I was just confused by the material board about the mechanic screen but if we can confirm that what we just saw will be the mechanic screen then that answers my question.

Ms. Shaw: Quick explanation, there were two screen samples submitted. The perforated stainless is for bike enclosure and aluminum sheet with big perforated hole in the middle was for the mechanical screen.

Vice Chair Thompson: I see. Okay. Thank you. That's much clearer.

Chair Baltay: Anything else?

Vice Chair Thompson: No.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions from other members of the Board? Very well. Vinh, don't we have a public comment? At this point, I'd like to open the meeting to public comments. Vinh, what speaker cards do we have, please?

Mr. Nguyen: We currently have three speakers. First will be Timothy Maloney followed by Shannon, and then followed Sorensen [phonetic]. If there's anyone else who wishes to speak please raise your hand now. Up first will be Timothy.

Chair Baltay: Welcome to our meeting. Please state and spell your name for the record. You'll have three minutes to speak. Go ahead.

Timothy Maloney: I'm Timothy J. Maloney. (Spells Name) I live on Matadero, just a few doors down from this project. I've been on Matadero for over 40 years. My only question is to the Board, I guess, about what are the plans for the City in general in the neighborhood for regulating parking? I've watched the population of cars on my street increase over 40 years and the population has gone way up. This project appears to be taking care of parking but, you know, there are going to be people visiting the property that will park in the neighborhood. The City has had to introduce signs not far away in this neighborhood restricting oversized vehicles, as you all know. And I wonder how long is it going to be before we have regulated parking limited times of, you know, residential permits and things like that. I assume that the Architectural Board knows things like this. I thought this was a good time to try to find out. I'll yield the rest of my time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Mr. Maloney. Our next speaker, Vinh, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Next speaker will be Shannon.

Shannon Marquardson: My name is Shannon Marquardson. (Spells Name) I live in the residential building just behind the alley, which is next to the proposed site. My big concern is given the noise report that was online, it seems like there will be nine to ten hours of construction six days a week for 18 months, particularly frustrating because all of us are working from home. I don't know when this project is cited to start but that would be completely prohibitive to living so close to this construction site. I know the estimates are that the alley is very narrow and that indeed is true, and so I'm just very concerned about the noise during construction, again, given that we're all home 24 hours a day. I'd love to understand

the clear mitigation for the noise impact and how we'll be able to continue to work from home if this were to start soon. And also clarify, if we can, when this project would be planned to begin so that I have advanced notice to move out if need be. And that's all I have to comment about.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Shannon. Vinh, our next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our last speaker will be Sorenson. If there's anyone else who wants to speak, please raise your hand now.

Chair Baltay: Welcome, Sorenson. If you could state and spell your name for the record, you'll have three minutes, please.

[Connecting with speaker.]

Joseph Kung: Actually, it's not Sorenson. Sorry. This is Joseph Kung. I probably have the Zoom label. I'm not familiar with Zoom. I'm actually one of the owners on the property. I don't know if I'm allowed to speak at this moment because it's a public --

Chair Baltay: Spell your name for the record.

Mr. Kung: Joseph Kung. (Spells Name) I was a Palo Alto resident from 1984 to 1997 and I was a proud graduate from Gunn High School. I love this City, and we moved away in 1997 because my parents sold their properties. All of my parents are educators. I, myself, am an educator. I just love the City so much. Even though I'm living in Sunnyvale now I'm still involved a lot with a lot of activities in Palo Alto, including I'm a volunteer for the Boy Scout Troop 5 in Palo Alto. I also provide financial assistance for the Suicide Prevention Programs for the Palo Alto High School kids, as well as I do volunteer work for the Mitchell Park Library twice a week. I always want to get back to Palo Alto. I would like my daughter, who is ten years old now, to continue to be a Palo Alto resident and be a proud graduate from Gunn High School, as a Palo Titan. So for us, you know, it takes a long time. We own that land. Our family has owned that land since the late 1970s and I grew up from that spot. So I know how ugly the whole neighborhood was around that -- not ugly but in terms of old buildings. I'm not much of an artist. I don't understand the architect. I just like to have an opportunity to come back to the City and be able to afford the lifestyle over there. That's why I instruct Pratima to give me some commercial income and residential income -- we're not professional land developer or anything like that. We'd just like to make the use of the land and develop it into something so that we can afford to live in the area. But, of course, we have a limited budget, but I think our architects did a very good job given the very limited resources they have and a very small plot of land to create this marvel, in my opinion. And I wish that the Board -- and I heard some concerned neighbors, you know -- after the project is complete will be great neighbors and it will be the most beautiful building on the block. Please do consider it, and I thank you and yield my time. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Joseph. To staff, I'm a little bit concerned. That last speaker was the applicant, it sounded to me.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, the property owner.

Chair Baltay: That wasn't correct, I don't think. That's not a member of the public at large then.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Baltay: Regardless, applicant, you are afforded an opportunity to rebut what members of the public said if you'd care to address any of those things. I'm not sure I heard a lot to rebut but if you'd like to you do have the opportunity.

Ms. Gerhardt: Would you like staff to provide some answers initially?

Chair Baltay: Sure. I think that would be fair, as well, Jodie.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Let's see if the applicant first wants to make a statement. I mean, they're legally required to have that opportunity. So they do.

Mr. Bellomo: Quickly, this project is dear to me. I designed mixed-use building on El Camino, large shopping centers on El Camino. I grew up on El Camino, so this is just great. We also want to point out that a lot of the materials used you see are pallet. All of these materials we've used on our project -- on the University Circle, the parking structure are -- we really understand materials and the beauty they provide for concrete. Having said that, we're excited just to -- first project to get approved under Housing Incentive Plan as well. Sheldon's been super cool to work with. I'll let you speak, Pratima.

Ms. Shah: No, that's all. We will proceed with question/answer sessions and if we need to explain more to we get time at the end?

Chair Baltay: Not necessarily but here you're just afforded that opportunity to rebut anything anyone might have said about your project. I think you've done that/. Jodie, could you address the two public speakers, their concerns, briefly, if you could?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, related to the noise questions, I don't have the construction schedule. I would need the architects to help with that answer. But related to the hours of construction hours are limited 8:00 to 6:00 Monday through Friday and then 9:00 to 6:00 on Saturday. No construction on Sunday's and holidays. And I don't know if the architect has the potential construction schedule.

Ms. Shah: Potential construction will start...

Chair Baltay: I think we say we're going to meet the standards for construction. I want to keep our meeting moving along.

Ms. Gerhardt: There was just a question about when construction might start.

Chair Baltay: Sorry, yes. When will construction start?

Ms. Shah: Spring 2021.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: And then related to parking, Mr. Maloney's question, so the Office of Transportation is really in charge of those sorts of things as well as Public Works. You know, on a 20-foot alley there would not be parking allowed because that's just wide enough for two-way traffic. On the main street there is potentially room for parking, but we probably need to take that issue up later up as part of citywide question than a project question. If Mr. Maloney wanted to email me or something, I'd be happy to follow up on that.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jodie. With that we'll close the public testimony part of this meeting and we'll bring the item back to the Board. And Osma is going to start out our discussion today. Osma, the floor is yours.

Vice Chair Thompson: Now I kind of regret agreeing to that. Okay, well I appreciate all of the responses that we received from our comments before. It was a little concerning initially, that the project hadn't changed at all because, and I still feel this way, that the base, middle, and top element of the El Camino design guidelines sort of is still missing and I took a lot of time to try and understand the analysis that was given for that. And I sort of see a little better now how you are defining the base, middle, and top. I don't know. I'm trying to see how strongly I feel about this. And then the other concern that I

originally had was that the material board had this, sort of, dark color for the 3form resin and initially when I was looking at the elevations it looked like it was two colors of concrete. I realize now that it's the 3form in the concrete and that the 3form would be a lot darker and there is a lot of it. And I don't know that that color works in this area. I would ask the Board to, sort of, consider -- and I am looking at the other precedent buildings that were pointed out on University, you know, and those buildings it's sort of less prevalent, I would say, than it is in this particular design. Again, in the renderings it looks really light but the color itself is actually really dark. I'm not sure about that choice as it relates to this context. Other than that I do like the terracing and I think that is effective and so I'm going to leave it there. I think there's a lot of nice things that were done with the landscaping to, sort of, you know, deal with the some of the constraints and so I'm going to leave my comments there for now. I'm curious to hear what the rest of the Board has to say.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. David, would you like to follow up, please?

Board Member Hirsch: Who's next?

Chair Baltay: David, you're next.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm next? Okay. Yes, you know, I'm happy to respond at this point because Osma brings up the nature issue I think here. But first I'd like to say I think it's really important that we as a Board here recognize what's happening. This is a major, major project now, even tiny as it is, on El Camino. It's happening in an area where we are hoping that they'll be some development happening along with it and of the rest of the block can be significantly improved and, in fact, some of the whole area of South El Camino not particularly known and studied El Camino guidelines needs to be address. It's a very weak area of Palo Alto. I, too, went back and looked at the guidelines and really found those guidelines to be lacking because they are, kind of, caught up in something that's probably about 10-15 years old right now. Talking about buildings as base, middle, top. You know, base foundation and then the middle is the two-story middle and the top is a piece of a cornice. You know, if you look back in the examples that are given in that report, they have kind of a masonry building with a corner treatment element that projects forward. Well that absolutely wouldn't work in a place like this. And that's why I'm, kind of, totally intrigued by the way this design solves so many problems, especially on that El Camino corner. We've got narrow sidewalks and a turning issue that is difficult from Matadero into El Camino. And this building address that very directly. Some of the earlier schemes, which I really discovered for the first time, I didn't realize in our previous review having seen the proviso scheme again, the improvement from an entry in the middle of the building to a corner entry is significant and if you think about that idea of what that corner should be I think this is a prime example of what it ought to be. I think we as a Board should recognize that this is a significant project to have now, not to put it off and wait for the future. I don't mind reviewing, as Osma suggests, the colors and materials by committee but I'd like to see this project received because I'd like to see that part of El Camino have anew inviting description of what could happen to that part of the City. I've said it, pretty much, about the old guidelines. Let's have new guidelines for what buildings should be and this is a good example. There's purity about it. It even reminds me of Greek temples and the regularity and the column structure, except that it's modern with the push and the pull. It answers all of those issues that I think that we had in the beginning about articulation of facade, balconies, terrace, the importance of the corner, and entry in the second-floor overhang relating to the buildings next to it by setting the residential on the top floor further back. Those are important statements being made on El Camino. And the material palette is very, very simple. Just A few elements of that construction are being expressed here and they set off that wonderful (inaudible) of the expressed framework, like having glass against those column structures or the slab structure. It's a construction purity that I think, for me, is very important to express, without any frivolity to it, any extra pieces. It is what it is. It does what it does. It's a structural expression that's turned into a piece of architecture by the push and pull of the façade. And I hope that the rest of the board will go along with that idea. You know, when you look at our own findings I think (inaudible). I think this building, kind of, addresses all of our issues. I don't find it missing on any of it, except, of course, there is the issue of the variance. And on a tiny little lot where are you going to place another tree. It's just not possible. They've done as best they could. They've covered the parking, the outside rather well and yet light penetrates. I didn't really even look at that until just now and I think it's very

nice the way the shadow line will work from the open areas of the cover over the parking. I think they've solved a lot of the problems with the very back of this site as best they could with the limitation of the electoral lines above. The garbage is very remote from where it might be for a residential building as well but it does work there. Small walk across the parking lot, I guess, to get that (inaudible). It satisfies. They made those changes to the back of the site that I think were absolutely necessary and they made the changes relative to the planting area. I don't like the bicycle lot there. I wish it could be stuck somewhere. I'd hope that maybe it would be inside in the stairwell where you'd have plenty of extra since that long run of stairwells leaves a space below it and might be used for those bicycles. I'd like to see that end up in some way. In fact, I don't see why if you have that area back there it has to be an enclosure because that doesn't enhance that part of the parking lot at all. I'm coming down very much in favor of this project. I'm hoping that the Board will agree with me and we can get something started on El Camino. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, David. Grace, would you care to take us further, please?

Board Member Lee: Yes, I just want to thank staff, Sheldon for the complete report. It is very clear to me that this is a project that I would recommend for approval to move forward. I want to just go over a few of the comments since I didn't attend the first meeting, but I carefully reviewed what our group here had requested. I want to commend the applicant for the very careful study that has occurred for a number of years now and sharing those options with us. That was not required; however, my sense is that this is a site that has been studied very carefully. There have been multiple diagrams explored. At this last meeting what I heard was that there were some comments related to the alley adjacency and then discussion of the variance. And there was some about the materials and sight diagram. To go back to his first point, I believe this is a very high-quality application. I've sat on multiple terms with this Board and reviewed sets. I believe it's exemplary in terms of the site diagram and how it is treating a very much needed mixed-use design with housing along El Camino Boulevard, perhaps the main artery in Palo Alto. And this kind of project is very much needed. I do want to talk a little bit about the site diagram in terms of the alley adjacency. I have lived on service alleys in the past a few years back and I believe that the entry of Matadero, the treatment of the landscape, the addition of the trees, you know, they will be small in the beginning. There are Japanese Maples but the addition of those trees and a high-quality rock wall, the orientation of the trash enclosure as well as how they have actually comprised on the parking makes a lot of sense. On the variance, I do want to say that on previous terms we have had this issue of the 50 percent shading. This area of the parking lot is rather small. If you think about the parking lots exist and given the amount of shading that they are proposing and the orientation I agree that we should move forward and vote that this project progress. And the articulated base, body and roof, I think we've been calling this top, middle, bottom, and I think it is important to have a guideline for El Camino that does address articulation. I appreciate the response from the applicant and also staff in terms of recognizing that this design maintains the rhythm and pattern of the existing context. Related to the palette of materials but mostly in terms of the massing and how there is a stepping back, there is a recess on the upper floors. There's a clear storefront that marks the bottom if we want to talk about it in this way, the middle, which again changes in the materials and the massing steps back. And then finally, that large step back on the third floor to me does the job in terms of really addressing that design guideline and I think that design guideline was really talking about an unarticulated single plane that sits flat along El Camino and doesn't address what's across the street and to either side. And I think in this situation applicant has done some work and really studied. I do appreciate that. To go to the question regarding materials, I believe that the palette is highly balanced. I am not challenged by that color. I don't see it as too brown and I do appreciate also how the palette does have some translucence with the 3form and also the perforated metal in the screen. And I think when those come together -- I appreciate a color that is not so bright and will provide glare and increase the mass of a wall. Those are my comments. I just wanted to address what Osma had brought if we would like to discuss that further. But thank you for the application and I'll go ahead and pass the baton now.

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Sheldon, and also to Joe and Pratima. I think this is a really nice project. I'm generally supportive of the project but I do not think it meets several of the findings. I am just going to dive into that. I think that my biggest problem is, I think, with the parking. One of the

units is 1,300 square foot one-bedroom unit with just one parking space. I mean, typically, a one-bedroom unit is 700 to 800 square feet. A two-bedroom is typically 1,100 square feet. A two-bedroom would have two parking spaces. I think the other units are fine but I do have a problem with that one unit. I think you're short on parking. And I also think we have a comment from the public about visitor parking and I just wanted to mention that we changed the parking code I think it was last year or maybe two years ago to eliminate the visitor parking spaces. And that started at the state level and works its way down to the City level in an attempt to make housing development more feasible. If the planning director can make a reduction for mixed-use or if there is enough transit then that might be a possible fix or maybe there's a different issue of a different size unit on that second floor. I think the second finding that I can't meet is number five for native plants. I think that the landscaping plan is really completely unrealistic and it's really not even complete. You're showing, like, bamboo. There are like several hundred varieties of bamboo. Some of them are like Timber Bamboo that grows 50 feet high. You have very small planters along El Camino. It seems completely undersized for most Bamboo. You're showing Japanese Maples on the back alley, which are not native. There are lots of options there that are utility friendly that are local native plants. Off the top of my head I thought of a couple. I'm not suggesting that you use them but just as an example there's Ceanothus Ray Hartman. There's possible a **Rivese [phonetic]**, which is like a current. Possibly a Western Redbud or there's a really nice Garrya Elliptica, which is the silk-tassel tree which actually looks really nice. It looks kind of like a Wisteria. That is sort of in between a shrub and a tree. It's really not ready. It's really not approvable at all. I think it would benefit with a landscape architect in there. The third item is with regard to our sustainable finding, number six. There are a couple things in there that I think we should strike out. I do support the overall use of the modified concrete but in the staff report you're saying that steel is a renewable material and it's just not. You're using iron, or which is mined, and it is very energy intensive. If you want to include the steel I would just say it's a desirable material for recycling. That's partly because it's so energy intensive to make. Also, the staff report says that the 3form is renewable and I think that is now true. There are some specific 3forms that are better than other but typically they're using pre-consumer recycled content in there. Not post-consumer. It's not exactly meeting standards, although I will acknowledge 3form does have some sustainable practices that make it better than other materials. And I think the other thing that I would mention, too, is it was mentioned there were foldable (inaudible) up on the roof and I just wanted to caution staff about that. We've had lots of other projects that have promised that and then when I go look at aerial photos of the completed projects there's nothing on there. We've been burned in the past and so I would, sort of, prefer not to do that, if possible. And, let's see. I think those are my three things. On design, I think we should require the actual perforated metal to be specified. We've had problems in the past where architects have specified perforated metal that is too open and you can actually see right through it into the mechanical equipment, so it sort of defeats the purpose of the screen. I think, in fact, a photo that showed a very low percentage opening and I think that's fine but I didn't see that in the set and I didn't see anything specified in the drawing set. I think that does need to be followed up. That's what I have. I think the variance findings are up to the Director. I don't necessarily have any issues with that but I think the parking is a major issue for me. I do support the Housing Incentive Program and I do support reducing parking for units to make them more affordable, but this is just too much having a 1,300 square foot bedroom with one parking is too much for me. I can't recommend the project today. That's all that I have, Peter.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Thank you very much for this statement. I'd like to point out to my colleagues that our job is to enforce the codes and the guidelines as they stand and a reason for a variance is not that the application is complete or, David, that we like the building or the design. It is a beautiful design. I think all of us would agree with that, but I tend to share Alex's opinion. I think that there are some serious issues with the parking on this project. Not even getting into the parking count, which is really up to the staff and the Transportation Department, I think it's awfully tight the way you fit into the spaces. The last spot on the stackers requires you to, in a 25-foot wide space, make a complete 90 degree turn and pull into that fairly precisely with the stackers. And then to get out, I don't see how you would be juggling back and forth several times. The result is really, yeah, the parking is there. Somebody spent the money on the lift but nobody uses it. They park on the street instead, which as we heard from the community is a problem. I think the answer is that the parking really should be underground, and I think it can be done. I think we'll see in the next project a similar sized site where parking is being proposed underground. We've seen other projects where it fit. I think it really ought to

be underground. It ought to be coming in from the alley. A long ramp along the side, not as conservatively drawn as the applicant did but I sketch one out myself and I could easily fit 13 spaced at grade underground. And I've designed parking lots like this. So to my colleagues, I say that if you can imagine taking the parking taken off the surface so many of the issues that we're struggling with: the surface shading of the parking lot for example, just wouldn't be there. And it would give the building more space to fit on this site. I just think that that's an issue and I can't support it just based on the parking issue alone. And it comes back to, again, trying to fit surface parking on very small lots. I just think that that is very visible from the street and what we're doing is essentially saying that we want to protect the few people who live in that one building off the alley in the back from the headlights of cars but for that the entire City sees a surface parking area from Matadero Street, which is quite visible to everybody driving back and forth there. I just don't get it. Additionally, I had asked about the shading requirements not being met and even without a number from staff it's pretty obvious that there's very, very little landscape shading. If we go back to the purpose of these codes, which is, you know, they exist and we need to follow them, we're trying to avoid a heat island effect by giving landscape green shading on paved areas in town. And I just haven't heard anybody give me a real reason why this project should be given a variance for that purpose. What is unique and special about this property that should justify that? And even to the extent that they have. They have maybe five or ten percent shading, at best. It seems to me the applicant prefers to have a metal or a built structure to provide shading, which is fine, but that's not the intent of our code and it's not for us to find ways to get around our code. A variance has to be something unique about the property; something special about this thing. A big Oak Tree in the middle and I don't see it. It's small and tight, I grant you that but many lots in Palo Alto are small and tight. And that's not a reason for a variance. We go down a very slippery slope of we start letting variances be granted along these issues. And, Alex, the Board is asked to give an opinion on the variance. It's just not up to the Director. And staff is very much looking to us to help them for guidance on these issues. Is this is a suitable case for a variance and I emphatically say no it is not. And I have not heard any presentation from staff or the applicant or my colleagues that would justify the variance on shading, unfortunately, because I think its beautiful building, but none the less, it's just not there. I also feel as I think everyone does, it's a beautiful work of architecture. Joe Bellomo is a very talented architect. We're lucky to have him in town. He's done great buildings here but I don't see it having a base, middle, and top. I see the presentation the applicant giving us trying to stretch that as being farcical. You just put some lines on a drawing equating the top of the plane of windows and calling that a base, a middle, and a top. I think Grace's logic's perhaps the best we could come up with to try say that the top, that upper element of the building, is just set back and, therefore, the concrete frame takes over. But, again, I'm finding that, like it or not, we have this code and the effort is to make a grant urban development out of El Camino Real and we keep being pushed into trying to get away from that. If every building were like this we wouldn't have an urban environment. We all know that. If you go to any number of old cities in the world a big part of why they're successful is because they have urban development making the majority of buildings background buildings creating public spaces. This building is not doing that and we all know that and I find myself very torn but in the end I feel it's our job to enforce the standards as they exist now. It's not for us, David, to just say that we want to go beyond them because they're 15 years out of date. And I'm really struggling with that.

Board Member Hirsch: Give me a chance to respond.

Chair Baltay: Absolutely. Absolutely. I just want to put out how I feel about it. I've given a lot of thought to this and I'm struggling with it because I respect the architect and I think the design is really quite good. It does so many things very nicely. I do have a small detail question about how the roof eave with zero parapets whatsoever, I'd just be very curious to see how that's built at the back of the building. I'm concerned that the back and the side facing north of the massing is just not that attractively down. It seems like a flat plane, but I can't tell if that's the presentation or the real design. I'm not going to be that firm about that. And, lastly, I agree with Alex completely. There is no landscaping plan. What I see on the drawing is a flowering Cherry Tree along the back but now we say it's Japanese Maples. I just see words like Bamboo and tiny planters. There is no landscaping plan here. It's not approvable without that being thought through. It really leaves me to question, again, whether we've really tried hard to get the shading on the parking area, and I think a landscape architect would be

a good asset to this. I'm not able to recommend approval for this today. And why don't we go back to anybody else who has anything they want to add to this. David, would you like to...

Board Member Hirsch: I would like to come back.

Chair Baltay: Please, go ahead.

Board Member Hirsch: There were some things that Alex said that I do agree with. Specifically, the landscape issues should be addressed. Probably a landscape architect could add to the teamwork there and create more appropriate plantings. It seems like it's mostly changing the type of tree and some of Alex's recommendations would be workable there. But in particular, I'd like to refer to some of the things that Grace said about the massing. Certainly the emphasis on the two-story grid of this building makes it work as a beautiful building. The set back on the third floor is very significant to emphasize that and create a context with the rest of the block to catch up at this point. I just really don't agree that we go along with penalizing this particular property for a variance which they're doing their very best to try to accommodate to. You know, the new landscape plan allows for more tree planting in the backyard as much as they possible could on this tiny little lot. To compare it with the regulation that really is meant for much larger lots where you can provide parking in between, and we've noted that successful or unsuccessful in some areas -- the shopping center. This one there's no room and they've done the very best they could. And I think if you have to weigh one thing against another, I'd rather have this building there than defeat it and submit what it is right now remaining in that lot because of a tree, because of a little bit of shading. You're not going to notice it but the building would create shadows in the parking area. You may be correct about the difficulty of that getting into or out of the parking spaces. You know, it happens all over the place. You will look at another building and it doesn't look like it's going to be any much easier there than it is here and it's a very shallow building as well. I just don't buy that argument at all. People do get into tight parking spots and I hate the thought that every time we talk about a project, we talk about parking more than we talk about people. More than we talk about pedestrians walking on El Camino Real turning into Matadero in the corner that is meant for pedestrians to turn. And, you know, we're talking about cars. Let's get away from some of this obsession with our car. There are a lot of small cars, Peter, you know. And somebody who can't get it can use a small car. We used to have a parking lot in Brooklyn, and we had limitations on the sizes of cars, and it worked. We made it work. I just don't like this focus on car, car, car all the time. Let's talk about people how they live in the City and how they can enjoy their experience of living here. I don't accept the variance issue as being significant. Forget about it. We get variances all over the place all the time. Let's not dwell on that. Osma made some points about materials and then Grace, kind of, responded to them. And I come down, kind of, on the side of Grace's comments about the material. I think it's okay. It's in the shadows. We've made appoint about the windows on the ground floor to allow visibility of what's going on in the office space there. They've accommodated that. Aesthetics I think are really important here and setting up a standard for this block with a beautiful building, that's important for us. Why not? I think we'd lost an opportunity if we don't approve this project today because it's going to sit just the way it is for years. And if you find all of these little reasons to pick at it then yes you'll be killing it and I don't like the ARB taking that role and responsibility here. We should accept a slight modification of history at this particular corner and make it work.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David.

Board Member Lee: If I may, I'll step up next.

Chair Baltay: Sure.

Board Member Lee: Osma, are you looking to speak after David?

Vice Chair Thompson: I can go after you, Grace. No worries.

Board Member Lee: Okay. Thanks so much for everybody's comments. The one that I want to speak to first is the native plants and the need for a landscape plan. This is a site where there are landscape

opportunities. I do see my colleague Alex's point regarding native plants and perhaps there might be an opportunity for the applicant to come back and actually walk through a small two-member subcommittee with the actual plants. I do see that as actually a kind of -- I would support that. Regarding the variance and the parking and the guidelines related to the articulation and then the two points about the PV and perforated metal. Let's just go through those. My feeling is, and I am not recommending the applicant's approval for this to move forward per the staff's recommendation. I agree with our planning staff because it's a beautiful building. I do have some issues with the word beautiful, for example. I think that our role is really to work with our planning staff and to present a recommendation to the Director and it would move forward. In my mind, I feel like it should. On the variance, since our planning staff has agreed that the 50 percent shading is -- it's okay for it to be less than that. I would just say we give the opportunity to the applicant to come back with some native plants or trees rather than the Maples, which, you know, I see they do quite well here but maybe in this situation and where they plant it there is a tree that might provide more shade, slight more shade. I think that the rock wall and the landscape treatment on the part of the applicant is a very positive gesture. I do think it's attainable to recommend that it move forward for review of that variance perhaps with a landscape plant that would come through the subcommittee. On the parking, again, I agree with our planning staff that the parking requirements are sufficient here. This is a mixed-use building with housing on El Camino on a 60 by 100-foot lot. To achieve -- which is so much what we need along El Camino and this is a vast improvement to this site, I feel comfortable moving forward with the parking as it has been presented. And I do acknowledge the thinking behind the 1,500 square feet in one space. You know, to achieve housing on El Camino there does need to be an acknowledgment that we need to review each case by case and, in my opinion, I'm very comfortable with the parking as presented. I also acknowledge that sometimes it's harder or slightly more challenging to move within parking lots and my feeling is this occurs in other sites, in other situations that I have seen and other sets that I've reviewed. I support the parking and the surface layout as presented. And then in terms of the PVs un-perforated metal, I think that's further down the road and I have full confidence that our City staff will be able to work with an applicant and I appreciate the acknowledgment that in the past there have been challenges. And I don't see that as a way to derail this approval or moving it forward. And then most importantly these whole guidelines of articulation and meeting that, again, I just want to maybe revisit that a little bit if we want to discuss it together. My feeling is that the storefront along the front does actually articulate a bottom. And then on the office at the second floor, there is a change in materials. There also is an in and out of the building. I think when we talk about articulation it is massing. It also has materials and how those actually work together in my mind. And then the top, I believe, is probably the most compelling, right? That there's actually a recess. But if we want to talk about just how it works together, I actually felt what the applicant presented was compelling and did actually speak to that bottom, middle, and top. If we want to maybe discuss that together we could do that. I don't know if that's the main issue. I'd love to hear from other board members. I'll go ahead and mute myself right now.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace.

Vice Chair Thompson: My turn?

Chair Baltay: Osma, why don't you speak up?

Vice Chair Thompson: I will try and go in order. With the parking notes, I'm sort of finding myself agreeing with Board Member Hirsch. It is a little frustrating to be talking about parking all the time when we really should be talking about architecture. I also think in terms of all the things that this Board looks into parking is sort of not one of the things that I like to focus on. I like to focus on materials and stuff. I do want to defer to my Board member's expertise and planning's expertise, so I'm actually going to refrain on commenting on the parking. But I think that if Board Member Lew feels like it's a problem and then doesn't feel like its problem, we'll see...I think that discussion is worth fleshing out a little bit more. It is extremely concerning about the landscape plan. That it's not approvable and for that reason I also probably will no recommend approval. I don't feel myself in a place where I could recommend approval for this project. And even the notes that Board Member Lew made on sustainability are pretty on point. I would agree with all of those changes. Going back to the parking, kind of pushing the project to park underground I think would benefit the streetscape and benefit the architecture greatly. I would support

pushing the applicant to consider that further, especially given as we'll see in the next project, that there is also a tight situation and I do think the streetscape benefits from having less parking on site. I'm going to talk about materials really quick. Can I share my screen, Chair Baltay?

Chair Baltay: Yes, that's fine. Please do that.

Vice Chair Thompson: [Preparing Screen.] I just want to point out this thing that I was talking about. This material here, this brown 3form material is what I believe makes up all of this stuff, all of this stuff and all of this stuff. I just want to point out how deceptive this rendering is. It really is going to be much more punchy rather than sandy. And I sort of disagree with Board Member Lee that the materials change from base to middle to top because these two materials are consistent the whole way. And I think it's important even in the elevations these are really showing kinds of like a light sandy color but they're not a light sandy color. And that's not to say that sandy is better. I'm not saying that. I just would like a bit more transparency in this application as to what this material is and how it will really look on the street. To go back to the base, middle and top, I do appreciate Board Member Lee's comments. It actually gave me a bit more perspective, but I do think the top, the roof is very unarticulated. And I appreciate this setback. I still really like the terracing effect. It does make the façade at El Camino seem smaller than it really is but I do think that there is some work to be done up here in terms of adding scale and articulation. I will stop there because I think that responded to all of the points that we've all been discussing.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. I have to admit I find your comment about the 3form material spot on and I'm glad we shared your screen. It's dramatic the difference from the rendering and I think you're right. We need to see something that shows that color being much browner and redder like that across the whole building will only tie the three floors together and that might be an issue. To Board Member Lee, I say that I think we have to be careful assuming staff will monitor a thing like the kind of metal perforations. I don't think they look at that too much. It says perforated metal. They've submitted perforated metal. It goes through. It's really up to us to do as Alex suggested and get a recommendation. Get a specification now that we can hang on. The staff is really looking to us for that kind of guidance. They're repeatedly just asking, and we fail in our job if we don't, at this point in a project, ask for more specificity. With that I guess, Alex, do you have anything you want to add to the conversation? I'm not looking for a motion now but I just want to make sure everybody has a chance to talk.

Board Member Lew: I don't think I have anything else to add. I would just say that on the base, middle, top issue I do think it does meet the minimum requirements of the context based criteria and the El Camino design guidelines and I would say I think there's room for improvement but I think at the end of the day if push came to shove I think that part is approvable.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex. I'd like to then chime in that I align most closely with Alex's thought and I think the base, middle, top articulation thing somehow does work on this building ultimately, maybe with a few color issues that Osma was talking about. But I think Grace's argument holds water, that there's something to that setback on the top that really makes the railing on the second level the top of the building from that urban design standpoint, probably from a pedestrian point of view. It probably does work but I'd like to again push my colleagues that building a basement parking structure is not as difficult as everybody makes it out to be. It's a deeper hole in the ground for the foundation that already needs a deep hole. It's done all over the place. Almost every project we see now does that. I don't want to be talking about parking, David. I want the parking out of sight, underground and solved. I want the politicians to decide what parking is necessary for town and applicants have to meet it so we don't have to deal with this. We're talking about it all the time because people are pushing against it all the time and it affects the architecture and in a negative way. That's unfortunate and it's really tough for us to always be put on that spot. Most likely we have codes that aren't entirely realistic. That's not for us to adjust. But in this case, I think, again, there's a solution to this parking problem, which just makes all these issues much less important and that is to put it underground. And I feel strongly that's what we should be asking for. With that, David, why don't you try to make a motion? You want this approved

today. What don't you see if you could craft something that would get you there? I want to give you the opportunity to we're all being open here.

Board Member Lee: And, Chair Baltay, may I also at some point just address some of the comments that came up?

Board Member Hirsch: I would like to also.

Chair Baltay: Okay, David, you speak first. Go ahead. I just want to be sure you have an opportunity to try to get this through today, which seems to be your strong desire.

Board Member Hirsch: Before we do that in response to this whole issue of parking it's very significant that were looking at another project that's half of a City block just about in order to get parking more level. It can't be done. In fact, I think it will ruin the ground level of this project and the way it is done on ground level if you put in a ramp down and it's not going to really happen below grade. Once again, it has a lift in the recessed parking below and the small floor plate that's you're going to be under whatever how that -- I think it's very cavalier for us to say to an architect who's been working on a project and hasn't looked at that previously to ask them to go back and look at that again. I accept Grace's comment about the way we should look at projects not because they're beautiful but because they satisfy the rules and regulations as they exist. But we should also recognize that there are areas where we should loosen up and accept the limitations that certain sites require, and this is one of them. Certainly, a variance for a small amount of shading in a parking lot isn't something that's going to ruin the nature of Palo Alto in some grand way. And in terms of materials, I think this does reasonably (inaudible) saying about choice of materials here (inaudible) I'm looking at that material and saying if this material were here I think it might even widen this façade or if it were warmer in tone after all some of that is in the shadow line, and when you put something in the shadow, it goes toward the blue. Color is very important (inaudible), but understanding in the, like in the nature that you put it in as well because that affects it quite considerably. In terms of bottom, middle, top I think that's the real issue here today and I saw the way Grace put it that it really does have a bottom, middle, top. The context relates to the two-story. It very strongly relates to the two-story aspect of the rest of the block and gives us something for the future because those buildings will definitely be changed at some point. But let's not find all the ways in which we can shoot this one down. It's reasonable to do so and I think it puts the ARB in a very bad light. I think that parking should not be the priority here. I know it can be made to work. As I said, I had an extremely ridiculously tight parking spot in a parking lot in New York and made it work. And I don't think saying that it won't work and people will park on the street is a fair way to judge it. We depend upon City planning to look at this issues. Transportation looks at these issues. They've approved it to happen; we should approve it. We shouldn't use it because we don't have a right to do that. It's really their responsibility to say that the parking will work, and they tell us the parking will work. Shading they say that's one of (inaudible) issue and, okay, then yes or no. So we accept it or not. I accept it because it's such a small lot. Nothing's going to make it miserable looking and the actual shading of the cars that are really open will have a wonderful pattern of light penetrating through them. So how can you object t it on that basis? Perhaps the only one that might be bottom, middle, top and I think at least two of us agree that it's well done. And then if it is well done then it answers the issue of El Camino Real. I really think it's important for us to approve this project today (inaudible). However, were at a limitation. Alex mentioned the fact that the City also accepts parking the way it is, Alex. It's their job to do that, not ours. I'll let Alex speak to it.

Chair Baltay: Have you finished, David? I don't want to cut you off, but Grace, did you want to chime in once more?

Board Member Lee: Thank you. I don't want to make this a longer meeting than it is, I just want to be productive and offer comments to the applicant that is productive. And also acknowledge the staff's efforts in working for a while with this applicant. And I just want to say a couple of things, thank you for your discussion. I do think when I mentioned the perforated, absolutely. We should comment on these materials. I just simply wanted to note that there's a materials board in the City. We'll go back to the materials board and I believe there are samples that they've already shown in a few sets. My confidence

was there but I do not want to say in any way that board members should not actually specify and point out the materials and be that detailed oriented, just to clarify. The other piece is on the parking I'm very uncomfortable in laying out and designing underground parking for this applicant. I also just want to make sure because when I saw responses to ARB comments and reviewed the last meeting, I did not hear a lot of comments to the applicant to go back to an underground parking solution. And, so, I'm just wondering if that's correct and are we a little bit unfair as a group now actually asking the applicant to go back to underground parking when that wasn't what I saw from the notes and staff, I don't believe, has directed or presented that. Just noting that this is not the first meeting, this is the second meeting, I believe and just how we actually offer feedback to an applicant there does need to be some consistency, right, in terms of layered comments to actually provide critical feedback where an applicant might improve their application per the review of the City staff. Are we comfortable just in terms of how this process has been in terms of our communication to the applicant with comments related to parking? And also just having said that maybe this isn't our purview as much. I mean, it is in that we hear a lot about the comments on parking but I think we need to evaluate each application on what is presented and also acknowledge that City has standards that the staff has reviewed and discussed with the applicant. I'll just leave it there. I'm not sure where we are in terms of a motion today.

Chair Baltay: What I'd like to do is give David an opportunity to craft a motion that allows this building to go through today. See if you can get a second and get the vote on it, David, before we go the way I think it's going to go. Does that seem fair to you?

Board Member Hirsch: Mm-hmm.

Chair Baltay: You feel strong about it. Here's your chance to put something together. Hearing what everybody said, what do you think will be a passing motion?

#### **MOTION**

Board Member Hirsch: I would like to make a motion to approve the project with the following items to be handled through committee: a landscape plan for the building from the consultant; a new materials board for consideration based on comments by the Board. That's the motion.

Chair Baltay: Let's repeat. The motion is to approve the building today with a landscape plan coming back to subcommittee and a revised material board coming back to subcommittee. That's what I heard you say, right? Do we have a second for that motion?

Board Member Lee: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: The motion has been made and seconded. Does anybody want to address that motion

#### **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO MOTION**

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm going to make a friendly amendment to accurately depict the building's colors in the drawing set, and to accurately identify which perforated metal material goes where in the drawings; and to update the sustainability findings per Board Member Lew's comments. That is my friendly amendment.

Chair Baltay: David, is that amendment acceptable to you?

Board Member Hirsch: Absolutely acceptable.

Chair Baltay: Grace, how about you?

Board Member Lee: Yes, acceptable.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Anybody else care to address that motion before we vote on it? Let's do a roll call. Vinh, could you hold a roll call to vote motion, please.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think staff will have some questions just on details and we want to make sure the architect understands what we're asking for at the end, but we'll let the motion go through first.

Chair Baltay: I would like everybody to understand that I'm trying hard to get this through. I am very sensitive to the statements made about let's get these buildings through. Let's not overdo it. I'm afraid I just can't support it myself, obviously, but I hope that everybody recognizes that this is in the interest of moving forward. Let's go ahead with the vote. Vinh, please call a roll call vote.

Aye: Hirsch, Lee (2)

No: Baltay, Lew, Thompson (3)

### **MOTION TO APPROVE FAILS 2-3.**

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Osma. Okay. So we're back to work then, right. The motion fails on a 3-2 vote. Let's try to break out what issues are necessary to get this thing approved. I think we all agree it needs a landscape plan. Let's do some straw poll votes and let's make this quick. Who agrees we need a full landscape plan to come back to the Board? Don't raise your hand, just speak. What do we need to do to make that articulation on the façade better? Anybody want to add things to that? The applicant needs to know from us what to do. This is our chance to be clear. As Grace said we want to be moving forward.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think the Board might be split on this. I think I mentioned most of the elements in the friendly amendment but to accurately render the building per the material board or the desired design intent, whatever that is, whether it is the sandy color or the punchy color. I do think that the upper top roof needs a little bit more articulation.

Chair Baltay: We're hearing we want to see the materials better and perhaps make some adjustments as to what they are, the color or the perforations, but then you're also saying some architectural building changes, especially on the third floor. Who else is in agreement or opposed to that? I find myself in agreement with that statement. David?

Board Member Hirsch: I'm actually in agreement with that as well.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Grace and Alex, how do you feel?

Board Member Hirsch: What it is, I'm not sure.

Chair Baltay: Well that we leave to the architects. Grace?

Board Member Lee: I'm opposing because I'm not sure what we're asking the applicant to do there.

Chair Baltay: Osma, can you be more clear?

Vice Chair Thompson: It's lacking a scale. At this time it reads like a flat plane on that upper level. I'm asking the applicant to add some scale and architectural refinement to the third level.

Chair Baltay: Adding scale and architectural refinement. Grace, does that answer your question?

Board Member Lee: It's open-ended there. I'm going to mute and listen for a while. Go ahead. Not the time to leave your microphones off so we can all speak. Alex, what do you think?

Board Member Lew: I will support that. I think we've gone over this before on other projects...

Chair Baltay: We have.

Board Member Lew: ...regarding cornices.

Chair Baltay: We have. There's a track record of all of this and so we're not breaking new ground here to the applicants that care to look at other developments along El Camino. At least we have four and a half people behind that. That's where we're going with it. The next issue and probably the most contentious is the parking. Let me put it out there, I would like to see the applicants, at the very least, give a serious proposal of possible underground parking. Doesn't say it has to be that way but I'd like to see it studied more carefully. Do I have any support from anybody else on the Board asking them to do that?

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry, can you repeat that.

Chair Baltay: I would like to see a detailed plan for what underground parking might look like even with the idea of getting a variance for a narrower ramp or steeper ramp, perhaps, to make the parking the place where we grant the variance because the lot is small. I think you can justify that, as we'll see on the next application. But I think the answer lies in redoing the parking altogether.

Board Member Lee: And, to be clear, was this asked at the previous review and just note in the notes. I'm not sure why (crosstalk).

Chair Baltay: Grace, we had quite a bit of issue with the surface parking and I remember distinctly saying you should bring it in off the alley; you should look for other solutions. We didn't give them answers and I'm reluctant to even be saying put it underground. But what we're saying is the surface parking isn't really working.

Board Member Lee: To be clear, there was no asking for an underground parking study at the previous...

Chair Baltay: It's very hard to be doing that. We're looking for applicants to come up with the solution.

Board Member Lee: I'm going to pass on agreeing with this advice of the second review since it wasn't discussed at the first review and the design was very similar.

Chair Baltay: Fair enough. How about the rest of the Board members?

Board Member Hirsch: I'm going to pass on that as well.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Alex and Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll support it.

Chair Baltay: Osma would be in favor of a look, at least, of underground parking. Remember were just giving the applicant's guidance. They're ultimately in charge of their project and they're going to come back with whatever they want to do. Grace is asking us correctly that we should be clear. That's pretty clear.

Board Member Lew: I will support that, Peter. It seems to me it's in the comp plan. It's very clear in the comp plan about that. I will support that and I'm also open to any other alternatives they have for solving the parking ratio.

Chair Baltay: That's three of us out of five, 3-2 supporting at least a stronger look at the underground parking. I think that's the best guidance, Jodie, were going to be able to give you on that issue. We're a split Board on it and that's where we stand. Can we do a quick poll on the variance? The variance is essential. The Director is looking for us to give them an up or down on that. How do we feel about the

justifications behind the shading variance right now? I don't see it. I can't recommend it on that ground. How about the rest of you?

Board Member Lee: I'm comfortable.

Chair Baltay: Grace is comfortable with it.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm comfortable.

Chair Baltay: David is comfortable with it. Osma and Alex?

Board Member Lew: I think I'm comfortable with it. I think we should note that even though it may not meet the requirements of the parking lot shading, I mean, the project potentially has five Sycamore Trees around the street which is a substantial amount of shade. That's all on City property. I don't think that there is a bigger picture -- I don't think there's an issue. I think we're just trying to meet the technicalities of the code.

Chair Baltay: Yes, that's right.

Vice Chair Thompson: I have trouble with it. I have trouble with the variance just because the heat island effect is a real thing and I'm sure that code is in that place for that reason.

Chair Baltay: Jodie, you're hearing a split Board on that. This time it's 3-2 in favor of the variance. But I think if the applicant could come back with a better rationalization perhaps, something along the lines of what Alex just mentioned or maybe a little more landscaping and less trees maybe a better presentation that really showed us what the percentage really is you might have a chance of getting that one through if that's where we end up going. What else are we missing here before we continue this? Jodie, do you have anything that we haven't given you a straw poll on?

Ms. Gerhardt: I see us coming back with landscape drawings. There were some questions about the materials. Just being more specific about the materials and the colors, which plays into the guidelines about base, middle, top. We want to make sure what those colors are. It sounds like for the base, middle, top guideline we're focused on the top level and that it's reading a little flat right now. It needs some more scale to it. There was conversations about a cornice, but I don't know if cornice sort of fits in with this style.

Vice Chair Thompson: I didn't want to include that word in this necessarily.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think it's really just about adding scale.

Chair Baltay: I think Osma was talking about modifications to the third-floor element, the stepped back piece. To somehow make that work better within the overall articulation of the façade. I don't think any of us want to see some cornice stuck on the second floor in spite or whatever that would (crosstalk).

Vice Chair Thompson: And there's no issue with the step back. I think we all kind of like that.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, the overall fastening is fine.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. And then for the underground parking, there were at least three members in support of at least having a better study of that showing you the analysis that the architects have gone through because it would be the preference to have underground parking. So we'll make a concerted effort towards that. Sustainability: Board Member Lew had some comments about that that we will incorporate. And then on the variance, we had at least three members in support of the variance and we'll see how we can better craft some findings around that and give you some better numbers.

Chair Baltay: If it's necessary.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think that's most of it. I do know that Pratima, you know, maybe if the architect has any quick questions because I do want to make sure that they have clear direction going forward.

Chair Baltay: Let's hear from the architect.

Ms. Gerhardt: And, also, too, we do have Ellison has a hand raised. I think we've closed the public comment period.

Chair Baltay: I think we've made ourselves very clear on this, Jodie. To the architect, do you have any questions about what we're putting out here, and if so ask them now, please?

Ms. Shah: One important thing I want to clarify is the 3form sample. There is no deviation in the color. The main sample was submitted at the ARB hearing and the material board is at the City Hall. We had to make a new one when this meeting and the mock ups are from our previous samples we had here. The mock ups, color, and the new color does not match. We have given the specification and color sample to you in the previous meeting and you had no concern about the color in the previous meeting. Second thing about basement parking, the main reason we didn't go for basement parking is the...

Chair Baltay: Pratima, we asked if you had any questions about our motions. We don't want to reargue the case now. I'll ask you once more, do you have any questions about what we're saying?

Ms. Shah: The main question about the basement I just wanted to mention we cannot proceed with that option because the side is remediated and below 15 feet it is contaminated so we wanted to keep excavation to minimum.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think we'll study that.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Okay. Let's leave the applicant muted again, please.

Vice Chair Thompson: Also, just to clarify about the material, it's more about the representation in the drawings that it doesn't match the material board.

## **MOTION**

Chair Baltay: I move that we continue this to a date on certain subject to straw poll comments that we've made previously. Can I have a second, please?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Board Member Lew: I second.

Chair Baltay: Motion is moved and seconded. Can we have a roll call vote on that please, Vinh?

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

No: Lee, (1)

## **MOTION TO CONTINUE PASSES 4-1.**

Chair Baltay: So the motion carries 4-1. Thank you very much to the applicant and to everybody. Let's take a ten-minute break. We'll come back to session at 10:55. Thank you, everybody.

[The Board took a short break.]

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 486 Hamilton Avenue [19PLN-00347]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of a 2,500 Square Foot Commercial Building and the Construction of a New Three-Story Mixed- Use Project Including 2,500 Square Feet of Retail Space, 2,500 Square Feet of Office Space, and Four Residential Units. Environmental Assessment: Pending. Zoning District: CD-C(P) (Downtown Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [samuel.gutierrez@Cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:samuel.gutierrez@Cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Baltay: Okay. So the Architectural Review Board is back in session. We're going to move to action item number 3. This is a Quasi-Judicial hearing on 486 Hamilton Avenue: consideration of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of a 2,500 square foot commercial building and the construction of a new three-story mixed-use project including 2,500 square feet of retail space, 2,500 square feet of office space, and four residential units. Before we get started, I'll ask if we have any disclosures to make. I visited the site myself earlier this week, anybody else?

Board Member Lew: I visited the site yesterday and I looked at the colors and material board at City Hall.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Any other disclosures? No other disclosures from Grace, Osma, or David. Then we're ready for a staff presentation. Sam, is that you?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, that's me. I'm Samuel Gutierrez, the project planner for this project coming before you at 486 Hamilton Avenue. This is actually just down the street from City Hall, not very far. It is in the downtown context. [Setting up presentation.] Once again, this is 486 Hamilton Avenue. This is a photo of the proposed project. The project is before you for a formal review. In the past, this did come to you as a preliminary application but currently it is a mixed-use project located on 0.12 acres of land. On the corner there you can see the Google Map of Hamilton and Cowper in downtown Palo Alto. It is a new three-story mixed-use building, zoned CDC with a pedestrian combining district. And the application before you today is kind of a first run at formal. So we do request the Architectural Review Board to provide some feedback. There's some discussion about design enhancement and I'll go a little into the parking. And, again, we're not looking for a recommendation at this time because this was a preliminary application. We want to see if they addressed the comments during the prelim to this formal before going further down in greater detail in reviewing the application. Just to show you the zoning in greater detail, here's an overlay of the zoning district around it. Again, it's a CDC with a P overlay in there. You can see the property identified. There is one of the downtown lots located nearby and there is a TC just down the street. A bit of background, as I mentioned before, this application, or this project, came before you as a preliminary application on August 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019. At that time it was a four-story mixed-use project and the ARB comments were to eliminate the fourth floor, reduce the height of the building, provide more landscaping, to address the blank walls that the preliminary application had presented. The details for mall scale needed to be provided and it needed a more residential feel. The ARB felt at the time that it was a bit more commercial. So that was where that comment was sourced. Here we have the proposed project. Once again, it's a three-story mixed-use building. So they did eliminate one floor. They added basement parking because in the preliminary application there was surface-level parking that was accessed off of Hamilton. And then they did provide more landscaping through vines and potted plants. They added balconies and the upper floors appear more residential with better connection to the street. Here we can see a comparison between the preliminary application on the left and then what's proposed before you today on the right. We can see the differences there on the left versus the right for this application. Here, again, we have the elevation views as opposed to the rendering. You can see some of the changes on the projects. Hamilton elevation, again, left to right and the Cowper Street on elevation left to right; the left being the preliminary and the right the proposed project. The project breakdown, again we have a three-story building. One story offset from the adjacent building on Cowper. The two-story offset from the adjacent building on Hamilton. If we go back here, you can see the Hamilton building is that small parasol building and then on the Cowper you can kind of see it on the upper right there's the Victorian-style structure there. And that could be noticed here on the left. The ground floor has retail because the existing building does have retail space. The ground floor's proposed to have 2,466 square feet in retail. The second-floor office space is proposed at about 2,538 and all four residential units averaging about 982 square feet on the second and third floors. The total FAR is 2.0:1.

The basement parking as configured does allow for 13 spaces. It's a mixture of mechanical lift parking and standard parking, which is non-mechanical lift parking for this purpose. Some of the issues that we do have is that the setback for the stairwell and the elevator shaft they encroach into that setback, as proposed. And the parking dimensions for the garage are unusual but functional. The Office of Transportation did review, of course, with planning staff and the parking does work but it is a little irregular and I will go into greater detail. And then, of course, the articulation along the elevations, before the ARB in the preliminary had mentioned it looked a little commercially and to add more residential feel so perhaps the articulation as presented might present further issues. Going into the setback discussion the South elevation has a stairwell, an elevator shaft that leads to the basement and the required setback is 10 feet for residential uses in the building, where the stairwell has a zero foot setback. And the elevator has a 5.5 setback. That's where, perhaps, a DEE or a project revision would be needed to address that issue there. Also, the project the reduced the height from previous iterations, however, it just creates this massing issue for that stairwell and the elevator is a consequence of trying to address some of the ARBs previous comments. Going into the parking it has nine spaces and two mechanical lifts. We could see here a quick section view. It's a three-stacker. This isn't a puzzled lift as the Board has seen before in other projects. This is a full three-stacker fixed system that moves vertically up and down. And then there's a center channel where the vehicle would come out as the proper vehicle that needs to come with a load up or exit. There are four standard spaces, again standard means non-mechanical lift spaces, proposed and you can see that here in the right corner layout of the parking. And the basement space does include parking for all the uses. There would be a shared parking situation going on to accommodate all of the different uses. Here's the blowup of that basement layout and the design. Here you could see it is a ramp that comes down and it is not the standard size per required per the typical circulation but in reviewing with the Office of Transportation it does work. It has this bottleneck feature that you see. The driveway has a wider opening towards the Cowper side and then it narrows as you get into the garage and that allows for vehicle to pass each other as they enter and exit. It allows room to maneuver and the Office of Transportation did feel that this was acceptable. Also, the backup clearances for all the parking spaces and the turning radiances are pretty tight. There are some minor details that we do need to confirm would work, such as the type of EVSE equipment that would installed because if anything shifts here it would not make things pencil out as far as circulation. Those are some fine details but before we got into those details we just wanted to get the ABRs feedback on the overall project. Again, if things shift and move, then that would impact the design of the basement. We do want to know what the ARBs thoughts are before we get into those nitty-gritty details, but as is the project does work in terms of the parking. Elevation articulation. The Hamilton façade used additional balconies to convey residential use on the upper floors. Again, you could see here the comparison between the two proposals; the left being previous and then the right being the current. And then you can see that the project is also subject to public art requirements. One of the comments the ARB did have was, again, to reduce the blank walls of the project and there could be an opportunity on some of those blank walls for public art. But again, before we get into that discussion, we wanted to see what the ARBs thoughts and feedback was on this iteration of the project before we go down that road more. Here is the provided cross-section of the project. You can see how this would work. Again, on the longitude side you can see the parking stackers there and the driveway ramp and how that cuts down into the garage. And here you can clearly see how the parking stackers would go down another level for the lower parked car and then would go up a little higher for the top stacked car. And then the cross-section 2 would be the other side of the building just seeing the cross-section to the garage. The project does have a landscaping plan, but it is very preliminary. We didn't go into deep discussion about it but that is something that we want some feedback from the ARB on. Of course, it is part of the ARB findings for landscaping. I did want to just briefly touch on some of the conceptual proposals the applicant has put forward for landscaping for this project. Again, it's a little limited because they are building to the edges of the property. Something to be mindful of that if landscaping does go onto the building it would need to physically go onto the building rather than on the site or there would have to be some cut outs or planter boxes in there but it still limits where the landscaping can be. Again, this is a preliminary plant list that they're looking at. You'll notice that there aren't very many native plants but moving forward we can make adjustments and changes. The next steps is to incorporate the suggestions and direction from the ARB, complete the CEQA evaluation, which would also include a full evaluation and the historic status of the building and return to the ARB for a future hearing to integrate all those changes and provide all of the fine details. The recommendation before the ARB is for the ARB to

consider the proposed project and provide feedback on the project design to staff and the applicant and then to continue the public hearing to a date uncertain to enable the applicant to submit landscape plans and staff to review the project in accordance with CEQA. And this concludes staff's presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Sam. Do we have any questions of the staff from the Board? No one, very well. We'll move on to the applicant presentation. Vinh, could you ask the applicant if they'd care to make a presentation, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Sam, who's the applicant for this?

Mr. Gutierrez: Today I believe it would be Kim presenting.

Mr. Nguyen: I see a Kim Tren [phonetic]. Is that right?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: We have a phone user who raised their hand. Perhaps this might be one of the applicants.

[Connecting with speaker.]

Khoi Le: My name is Khoi Le, I'm the architect for 486 Hamilton Avenue.

Chair Baltay: If you could hold on one second. Sam, is this the applicant?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, they're a part of the applicant team.

Chair Baltay: I just want to be sure. Last time we had somebody sneak in. I want to be sure we're hearing the applicant.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, we are the applicant, yes.

Chair Baltay: You'll have ten minutes. Go ahead.

Mr. Le: Good morning, Board members, planners, and City officials. My name is Khoi Le (spells name) and we are the applicants for 486 Hamilton Avenue. Before we get started, I just want to thank the Board members and the planners, Samuel and Jodie, for helping us and guiding us through this project here and giving us awesome comments here, which we incorporated into the plans as you'll see shortly. Samuel, do you mind showing your screen?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, I'm going to share the applicant's presentation with everyone.

Mr. Le: Okay, thank you. [Setting up presentation.] What you see before you, as Samuel has stated before, this is a perspective view of the proposed project at the corner of Cowper and Hamilton. I just want to talk to you folks about the site itself. It's a wonderful site in a wonderful City. It's a pretty interesting site but a very challenging site. If you notice it's only 43 feet wide and I believe about 125 feet long here. It is very challenging to fit any sort of parking or anything like that or a garage in here. As you noted, Samuel, previously, the lot size is roughly about 5,300 square feet and there's an existing one-story structure. I believe there's about four retail establishments in there, which occupies roughly half of the property and the other half is just on-grade parking. I believe there are about 8 stalls there. And then in the lower left-hand corner you can see that image there of what is existing. What we propose here is a three-story mixed-use project and the ground floor being roughly about 2,100 square feet. We had roughly about 1,700 square feet of office space, which is located on the second floor. And then the remaining usable square feet goes to four three-bedroom residential units here. The total gross floor area is roughly 10,750 square feet. Again, this is just a view of the proposed project there at the corner of Cowper and Hamilton and in our initial preliminary presentation I guess we showed our renderings at the very last moment and one of your first comments was "hey, show it in the beginning."

Get us excited about it.” So, here we are. Many of the comments that came from that preliminary meeting were that I think Chairman Peter you stated it was a little bit too tall. You could not recommend for it to be passed if it was four-stories tall. We took a look at that. We dropped it one floor. And then Board Member David, you also mentioned that you don’t want to see the parking or the garage parking entrance along Hamilton. That should be for retail or some other commercial activity there. We took that into account, and what we did was we moved the parking and the parking entrance onto Cowper, and then you’ll see on the right hand side the entry to the parking garage is right at the corner of Cowper and Hamilton. We did have to move a tree to make that happen but if you look at this perspective here, the comparison on the left hand side was existing. It was what we presented maybe almost a year ago and then the right hand side is what is proposed. Do you see how much larger it was? We just reduced the scale quite a bit here; the three-story verse the four-story product. What you see here is a view from the west of the property here looking down Hamilton. We broke up the façade quite a bit. On the next slide you see a comparison between what we had about a year ago on the left-hand side there. You see how the parking garage is there which dominated the Hamilton elevations and façade there. The whole experience was interrupted with that garage entry and whatnot there, so we went back to the drawing board and revised everything. Actually it was pretty fun doing all this stuff. And then we put the garage entrance, as I mention, along Cowper and put the building entrance along Hamilton there. And if you notice along the right-hand side you see how we stepped everything and made everything a little bit more residential scale there. What you see in front of you is a comparison before the old plan and the new plan. The proposed plan, which we’re proposing today, is on the bottom and the previous plan is up top there. As I mentioned before, previously there was parking along Hamilton Avenue and the garage entrance was on Hamilton Avenue. That was a huge experience as you walk past you can see just a garage and car entrance. What we did, per your advice, is we took the entrance and the garage and came off of Cowper, which is on the right-hand side and went down into a basement. One of the other comments I believe by Board Member David is you didn’t want to see all the trash and recycle as you walk along Hamilton Avenue. And if you look at the previous one that’s where we had it, along Hamilton Avenue and then you had the entrance to the parking garage. We took all that stuff and then we put it downstairs. It’s much more pleasant experience. As you walk along Hamilton what you find now is that you’re going to walk passed a nice little garden and then the entry to the building and then the retail there. We managed to fit all the retail on one level. In the previous plan, it was split on two levels. It wasn’t a continuous retail experience. Right now the retail occupies pretty much 90 percent of the Hamilton walking experience here. And one of the things in our minds that we wanted to do was we wanted to open up Hamilton and Cowper as much as we can. In the original plan, it shows a lot more where we just opened up the corner with bi-fold doors and handle doors, a lot of landscaping, and whatnot. It just leads you right into that retail experience. We still have a hint of that on our proposed plans there. We have beautiful landscape stairs coming up into the retail experience. The rail has two entrances: one from the left-hand side and one from the right-hand side at the corner, which we think is really important. On the second level previously we had two-story retail and also a unit on one side and then an open void space for the parking lift system and whatnot. As you saw in the previous slides it just dominated the elevation and it was slightly unsightly. Again, we revised it and right now we have all office spaces on the second floor and a residential unit also on that same floor there too. And throughout the whole floor plans you also have planters and balconies just to soften the building a little bit. On the third level previously we had office space up here and one residential unit but in this current plan we have is three residential units. Again, we broke it up quite a bit in the previous plans it was quite monolithic and the faced was pretty straight. I think Board Member Osma made a comment about how we should chop it up a little bit and add more reveals and whatnot, so we did a lot of ins and outs into the facades. Within those ins and outs we have these outdoor balconies on all these three units there. In the corner of Hamilton and Cowper there’s a nice big balcony for that resident. In the middle there’s a nice balcony for them too and then the third on the left-hand side you see another nice balcony there. In the current plan this level would just be roof but the previous plan we had two residential units here but on this plan, as you can see, on the current plan we just have the roof plan here. We took the whole building down roughly, I believe, 11 feet. The previous building height was 50 feet. I think we’re down to about 39’ 10”. As you can see the comparison, the previous section on the left-hand side and on the right-hand side you see the proposed section here and you see how we took the garage and we made that subterranean and then all the residential is on the third level and the second level I think is 50 feet for the previous project and then our current one is 39’10”, I believe. Here is the comparison between

the previous view and the current view. And, again, we're along Hamilton. We're looking east here. We took one of your comments about trying to climate a lot of those blank walls and whatnot, so we did that. We chopped it up quite a bit right at the entry next to that existing retail building there.

Mr. Nguyen: We're starting to approach ten minutes.

Mr. Le: I'm almost done. Again, this is another view from Cowper here showing you the differences between what we are proposing right now and what we had previously. And notice how much smaller it is. This is just some elevations of what we are currently proposing, and you see all the ins and outs of this building now. On the left-hand side, the middle, and the right-hand side. Again, this is a view from Cowper here. And this shows you the materials that we're planning to use here. We're thinking about some stucco here and also we want to add some eyebrows, aluminum arbors, and whatnot so we hang a lot of greenery along there just to soften up the building a little bit there. And then I think Board Member Osma, you mentioned before that our railing system looked a little bit too cheap. I think it was a grid system of mesh. We changed it out to a more stainless steel railing system. And I believe this is the last slide here.

Chair Baltay: We're running over 12 minutes now. Can you wrap it up in the next 20 second, please?

Mr. Le: Perfect. This is the last slide. This shows you the car lift system which Samuel went over already and this concludes our presentation here.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Wonderful. With that, do we have any questions of the applicant from the Board? Could you clarify for me then, please, the height of the third floor, the residential floor, and the second floor? When I look at the renderings it looks like the third floor is taller but on your sectional drawing its showing both as having a 12-foot floor to floor or floor to ceiling height. Is that correct? What are the relative heights of those two floors, please?

Mr. Gutierrez: Chairman Peter, you're absolutely correct. They're 12 feet each. Maybe it's the perspective that the model builder built this at. It makes the top-level look a little bit taller but you're absolutely correct. Its 12 feet.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you very much. Okay. Vinh, do we have any public comments for this? I'll open the meeting to public comments right now.

Mr. Nguyen: We do have a member who just raised their hand, Jeff Levinsky. If there's anyone else who wishes to speak on this item please raise your hand now. Otherwise, Jeff will be the final speaker.

Jeff Levinsky: This is Jeff Levinsky (spells name). Good morning, Board members and staff. Several of us neighborhood people sent in a letter pointing out some concerns that we had about the project. One of those is that the calculations for parking appear to have been done not including the shared commercial space and I heard different numbers even in the presentation and staff's numbers for the size of some of the spaces that differ from what's shown in the plans. When this comes back we hope that that would be considered. We also pointed out some concerns that aren't addressed about how the parking will be assigned between the different uses because that has an impact on the floor area of the building. A point that was not in the letter and is not addressed in the study done by hexagon is that the parking for this building, and, in fact, the demand for parking for this building, is being reduced by the City's -- the amount of parking the building has to provide is being reduced thanks to a 1,500 square feet reduction through a special provision of the City Code. But it doesn't reduce the number of cars that will be looking to park. It's simply a reduction of how much parking the building is required to provide. This neighborhood is heavily over parked. It is the source of enormous contention and has created huge, long City Council meetings over what to do about all of that. The mixed-use parking study that Hexagon presents does not take into account the higher demand for parking that will exist at this site. Roughly speaking, there will be 40 percent more cars trying to park than the study considered if you look at what the 1,500 square feet allowance generates. The study from Hexagon doesn't explain how they determined which type of mixed-use building statistics to use. In other studies that have been presented

to the City, it is very explicit about well we used this kind of building, and the statistics were taken from this particular time and so forth. Because it would be good for us to understand whether or not when you're trying to fit these different uses in if you're considering buildings that are in heavily parked areas or under parked areas and then this building having its additional unique problems with under parking because of the extra 40 percent that's not being handled by the underground parking. Those are my comments. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Mr. Levinsky. Do we have any other public comments? Vinh, anything else?

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Baltay, we have no further public comments for this item.

Chair Baltay: Okay. To the applicant, you have an opportunity to rebut the public comments that were made. Would you care to do so?

Mr. Le: Thank you, Jeff, for your concern about the parking and the parking requirements. We did do a study, as you mention, via Hexagon and whatnot and we're asking for a 30 percent reduction and that is due to the fact that we're close to a lot of the public transportations and also the train station. And we were just hoping that we would get that reduction there based on those conditions there and the parking study.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. With that we'll close the meeting to public testimony and bring the item back to the Board. Grace, you're going to lead us off. You could go ahead, please, whenever you're ready. Thank you.

Board Member Lee: Thank you. I just want to extend a thank you to our staff as well as out applicant in terms of this presentation and working with the ARB. I will start with the applicant's presentation. Thank you for going through each of the comments that my fellow Board members had given and really showing us the changes that have been made since your preliminary. I think you're defiantly headed in the right direction and I'm happy to provide some additional comments for moving forward. I am very happy to see the three-story kind of response and particularly how the massing has changed on the corner I think is working quite well. There was a comment regarding blank walls and I think there's still some room for improvement in terms of decreasing the blank length with some variation that I think was described previously as smaller-scale detail. Maybe if there's a way to look at three areas, I just wanted to point out, in terms of a finer grain or even a large grain, medium grain, and a fine grain. I leave that to you as the applicant in terms of how you might interpret that architecturally. I'm looking at the ground floor area that is rather long. I don't have the exact dimension. That is kind of that blank wall office space that does not change. The rhythm kind of continues. As well as on the second floor I believe there's still some room also just to address the blank wall that is facing Hamilton Avenue. The other place that I saw that could be a place to kind of further refine your design is looking east at that very large stair. And, you know, again the adjacent parcel might change and we don't know what's going to happen in the future but when I'm walking down Hamilton towards Cowper I find that kind of great expanse of stucco to be a change in scale that's a little bit drawing. And so maybe there is something to do there in terms of some design attention. What has worked quite well is your addition of balconies which introduces that, kind of, medium grain or finer grain. As you move forward it would be wonderful if the Board is able to review some kind of a sunshade study that really looks at how those balconies are shading and creating comfort for the users and also just the larger massing and how the sun is going to move around this building. The other piece that I just saw in terms of your set I always like to have north arrows and then also when you go to the materials board -- before I go there I just want to also talk about the public comment regarding neighborhood concerns on parking and also I believe Sam talked about the parking garage and the basement because that was a big change that you made. On the parking it would be wonderful -- I know that you're working with staff and they will be reviewing in terms of what those clearances are and how that parking garage is meeting the counts, and also in terms of how it works really in terms of service and clearances. I hope they spend a lot of attention to working with staff and hearing the comments of neighborhood concerns. And I think right now I'm not able to review it. I know that it's in transition and you're moving forward. I just want to make sure that the

parking flow and the clearances actually work given how tight those dimensions are. I think it's ambitious and I applaud you and I think this is needed. Some really terrific solution to the parking; so just keep going. The other piece that I wanted to mention was the DEE in terms of the 6 foot on that third floor. I am comfortable in terms of the way that it is treated and moving that forward I look forward to hearing other colleagues here on the Board speak about that but I will leave it at that. The other piece that we should talk about is the landscape plan. In terms of drought tolerance and native plants I think there's probably another design iteration to go there as well and overall it seems like the right direction but again sunshade study, understanding just how as you refine the design that will affect your pant palette. Please do pay some attention there. And now we'll go to the colors and the materials board. I did have a chance to go over to City Hall and review the display case. First off, there's a lot of Milano cotton and I think that's that cream color that is the stucco color and my feeling is that it may want to be revisited in terms of glare and tone and perhaps there's another color in the palette that is added or another material as you begin to refine the design and introduce a fine medium, kind of, large scale grain treatment to the blank walls as well as the eastern stair. I think that covers everything that I wrote down. I'll go ahead and pass it over, Peter, to who is going to speak next.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace, very thoughtful comments. Alex, would you care to go next?

Board Member Lew: Okay, sure. I just want to say to the architect I think you're very crafty and I think you come up with a very ingenious scheme. I think you've made a number of huge improvements to the project. I am generally in support of the project. The issues that I have flagged here is I think on the exiting street trees. I think there's one that's labeled as an existing pair on Cowper and that's actually the Liquidambar, I believe. And then, I think the larger point though is that if on this very small site, I mean, you're digging a basement that we're really not going to be able to save... I'm doubtful that we're going to be able to save any of the trees, so I think we actually need to look at how that all get replanted after construction of the building. I think we need to see something that's realistic there. On the native plant finding, I think that this particular project has a lot of very unusual and very difficult circumstances. I think it's fine to consider alternate plants, like non-native plants, that will actually work in very difficult situations. On the materials board I saw that you had the Starphire glass, like the low iron glass, and we do have that on some of our buildings downtown. It's usually only the first floor because it doesn't really meet the California Energy Code and there are ways to work around the code or work with the code, but it is pretty unusual just to see that on all floors of the building. I mention that because I think the Hamilton Avenue, at least that ground floor, is relatively flat. I guess I just want to see what you're thinking about there. If you're thinking about two different kinds of glass and then how do we break the building if it has two different kinds of glass on the façade. Regarding how it is compatible with the old house, which is actually an office building. What is the address? At 610 Cowper, I think you've made a lot of improvements by having some recessed areas on the first and second floor to make it a little bit more open to the neighbors and I think that's all good. You are showing some cable screens right at the property line and I think we what to look at that very carefully to see how compatible it is with the old Victorian-era house and maybe there are ways of using a different material that's a little more sympathetic with the old house next door. I consort the DEE. I think the narrow ramp can work. We've done it on one other project. I think the 636 Waverly project had a one aisle, or whatever you call it. One car width wide driveway, and I don't know of any problems. Maybe staff can review that if there have been problems on that project. That's all I have. I am generally in support of the project. It is going in the right direction and I look forward to seeing the next submission.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Alex. David, your turn.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, thank you. Thank you for the presentation. It is a significant improvement.

Chair Baltay: David, it's a bit quiet. If you could speak up or louder.

Board Member Hirsch: I'll try to. My voice seems to be going here. [Adjusts Audio.] Can we put up the perspective elevations from Hamilton?

Mr. Gutierrez: One moment, Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: There's one that shows both directions.

Mr. Gutierrez: Is this the elevation you're looking for, sir?

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, well that's good enough for now. Certainly, this is an incredible improvement for Hamilton's elevation.

Mr. Gutierrez: Is this the elevation you're looking for, sir?

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, well, that's good enough for now. Well, certainly, this is an incredible improvement for (inaudible). But on the parking – and Alex brings up a very good point – I think that the parking in the (inaudible) area there could use more work. I know it will affect things upstairs, but I still think that [distortion] straight down, and you have the recessed area for the lift on the other side of the building, or the other end of the building. You might come up with a better scheme. I think you need some additional work on the parking in the basement area. One particular reason is that you're down in the cellar and now the parking can go further down, and it affects the structure of the neighboring house, the historic house. I would be concerned about that impact. Once you dig a foundation, I think there will be problems with the foundation of the neighboring building. At least you have to study that piece. But the fact that it also isn't going straight down to the cellar really affects the plan of the commercial first floor and its entry there [distortion]. And kind of interrupts the commercial (inaudible) looking for further study about how it works. But it certainly is a significant improvement over what we saw in the first place. Reducing the level as we recommended was excellent. You know, one of my main concerns is the way in which garbage was collected in the previous scheme. Now, we have some of the garbage way to the other end of the cellar, way too far away. I don't know why it isn't possible to have that located somewhere off of a lobby, even if it steals a little space from commercial. But my biggest concern here, the mix of the second floor, if it's a commercial space and a residential space. It really kind of bothers me, that it would be so much better if it were all residential. (inaudible.... (inaudible)....) I think the garbage removal needs to be studied somehow. The other aspect of it is this mix of commercial on the second floor. Access to it is through the main lobby, off the elevator, down a very long corridor. I think either you eliminate it as residential in that floor, following the plan on the top floor, or you find some way, flexing commercial on the ground floor so it works with upstairs. Using a larger single-use user. In some way, I find that to be a really confusing idea, is to have people getting to the commercial on the second floor via the residential [distortion]. You know, it's true of the last building we looked at. And I would have had that same comment there as well. But this is for (inaudible) think about. You know, this elevation here that's showing, the proposed scheme is (inaudible) better than what was there before. And then, if you flip back to the opposite [distortion]... Anyhow, what you're looking at here is no differentiation between a commercial storefront look and a residential area. I find that to be a problem, that the scale... And that's what we've talked about, I thought, the last time. The scale should change at some point, changing the use of the floor. (inaudible...) That seems to me [distortion]....

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry, David, that last bit is hard to understand.

Board Member Hirsch: Can you hear?

Vice Chair Thompson: I think if you lean forward, you're closer to your microphone. A little easier to hear you.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. There really should be quite a change in scale, I think. You know, I notice the building that's on the corner of, next to City Hall, the new one on the corner. The whole of the top floor residential, quite substantially different than the commercial down below. I find that there's ought to be a change in scale based on the change in use, significant change in use. But what it is, is exactly the same all the way through this building. That's, to me, to make it monotonous. It would be so much more interesting if it were a change in scale. But there is a conflict on the second floor between commercial and residential, and they look exactly the same. I'm really bothered by that. Color. I'll mention the color.

It certainly is a bright building. Perhaps overly bright, at least from neighborhoods. You have a brick building on one side, and then, a more muted (inaudible) building across the street. I think the color stands out too much, and there could be more variation [distortion] bases of the building that are one use (inaudible) core of the building, the stair tower, etc. Modulation in that respect. That's the back of the building. I (inaudible) find that elevation of the area interesting. There is a lot of openness towards (inaudible). The amount of parking lots in the back (inaudible). Pretty much my concern is that especially... I question why it is that you have a second commercial with accessible (inaudible) elevator to a rear passageway that leads down a long passage to get to the entry of that building. Is that really going to work? Wouldn't it be better to create a staircase (inaudible) upper floor, right from the street level, and keep the elevator only for the handicapped accessible...? I think there is a dichotomy here of uses that doesn't function that well. That's my, really my major concern. That and the scale of the residential versus commercial. Thanks.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, David. Very thoughtful comments. Osma, your turn.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thanks. Thank you to the applicant and staff for the presentation, which gave us a really nice comparison of what was there before and what is now. I do agree with a lot of what the other board members have mentioned. I do think that what we're seeing today is an improvement from what we had seen before. However, I do also agree with Board Member Lee, that there is still a little ways to go. Particularly, it's on a few items that were mentioned last time, which were the blank walls, the small scale, and the residential feel. I mean, the addition of the balconies has helped a lot with the relief of the façade. But I concur with Board Member Hirsch, that the residential architectural style and the commercial architectural style blur very much. There's a little bit over... I forget how big this parcel is. It's, like, almost 100 feet long. At the bottom, there's 85 feet of glass, and there can be more to be done to sort of add a bit more visual interest. I would encourage the architect to push a little bit more in terms of relief of the facade, and small scale. I do think having this differentiation and program actually adds to the reason why you can change up the scale a bit as you go up the building. I think the next time we see this, it would be really nice to get a better understanding of the building's relationship with the adjacent house that Board Member Lew is referring to. Though the one view that we did see in the presentation is not very close up in detail. You know, there is actually a lot of that façade that's going to be visible to the public that's pretty blank, and I agree that the mesh wire gate might not be the best choice to interface with the adjacent building. A view from Cowper, sort of understanding that relationship between the building, sort of the two buildings, would be good. I also concur that the view from Hamilton still has a blank wall where the stair is. That needs to be worked on. So, yeah, I'll just reiterate, it still needs a lot more articulation and smaller scale, and there's still more to be done to sort of give that a residential feel and, differentiate from the commercial feel. As for the color, yeah, I did also look at the City Hall display case. Actually, the color looked a lot brighter than what I'm seeing on my screen. It looked a lot closer to a white, and what we're seeing is that sandy beige. It's definitely something to consider. Might consider having a bit more variety to the color palette. Right now, this is just kind of two materials, and the project might benefit from the... You know, added scale might come, potentially, with some more diversity in materials. I'll leave it there.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Osma. I'm not going to belabor the point more. I think very similarly to my colleagues on the Board. You've made tremendous improvements. The building, I believe, can be approved at some point, but it's not there yet. I agree completely with almost everything everyone said. I think Grace put it very nicely, talking about the sense of scale. It's lacking. It doesn't seem to have quite a refinement, and that's a nice way to think about how to get that. I think David and Osma are correct, talking about the need to express residential versus commercial uses, and that's probably where the answer lies in your design, is to study that. What I'd like to do is throw out to you that I think the problem lies perhaps with your basic partee of arrangements for the circulation, the vertical circulation. It's the two stair towers that create a difficult parking situation downstairs. It's the one stair tower on the east side that creates the need for the design enhancement exception. The stair tower has created a single-loaded hallway situation on the second and third floors, which creates some very uncomfortable bedrooms in the apartments. In apartment 1 and 2, and then, apartment number 3 in particular, has a bedroom with the only window looking out on a hallway. That's even fronted on a piece of wall on the other side. It's worse than a typical motel. That's just not high-quality design. I think the answer lies in

rethinking how you integrate that vertical and horizontal circulation. That will also bring you around to the way you have the second floor horizontal circulation shared between commercial and residential. What it looks like now, honestly, is that that is going to be all office spaces. That whole second floor really is a commercial layout right now, and it's very easy to make it that way in the future. We're asking you to design sort of with integrity all the way through, that residential spaces are truly residential in a mixed-use building. I can understand how frustrating it is to hear that, and how challenging it is. It is truly a challenging design problem [distortion] worked out. But that's mixed use on a tight lot. We're asking you to make the mixed use genuinely mixed. Mix it up. I think that the answer, again, lies in how you reconfigure your circulation, and if you do that, you'll get there even better, I believe. My last comment will be to do with the materials. I think the colors are going to be too bright. They are also just too monotonous right now, just that one plaster color. Finally, I would say that that acrylic plaster is not, in my book, what I call a really high-quality material. It's sort of a basic building material you put on the back of a large building facing something that's not important. And you're using it an awful lot on the front, where I prefer to see some sort of panelized stone material, or tile, or something that's a little bit more deftness/craftness to it. Just express more the nature of the building somehow. This just seems like it's almost a paint color applied to everything. I'm having a hard time with that. That doesn't work for me. I think also your green landscaping on the sunshades up on the second and third floors is something you can add in the computer, but I don't quite see how you get that to actually grow. It gets awfully hot and dry in that environment, and I don't think those will work the way you've got them. I'm not sure they actually help you any, either. No more need for me to belabor the point, though. I think what we've said is fairly consistent and accurate all around. Does anybody else have any further comments? If not, can someone make a motion for us, please?

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Thompson: I move that we continue the project to a date uncertain.

Chair Baltay: Subject to the comments we've made?

Vice Chair Thompson: Subjects to the comments that we've made and that are in the planning staff report.

Chair Baltay: Do I have a second for that?

Board Member Hirsch: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: David, you're seconding that?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Anyone want to address that motion? Any questions from staff or the applicant? Jodie, are we clear enough?

Ms. Gerhardt: I know that Board Member Thompson needs to leave soon, but I did want to ask the applicant if they have any questions. Again, not a rebuttal, but just questions.

Chair Baltay: I'm open to that, if the applicant would care to address it. Vinh, could you unmute them? Any questions from the applicant, please?

Mr. Le: No, I think you folks are very clear on the points that you folks have made, so no questions on our part.

Chair Baltay: Thank you for the hard work and the changes you've made. It's going in the right direction, and we very much look forward to this being a successful project.

Mr. Le: No worries. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, could we have a roll call, please?

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

No: (0)

**MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 5-0.**

Chair Baltay: Okay, we're five in favor, none against. The motion carries. We're going to move on to the next item. Before we do that, I believe Board Member Lee is going to excuse herself.

Board Member Lee: Yes, I will excuse myself from this item and the rest of the meeting. Thank you, all.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much for your help today, Grace.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thanks, Grace. Chair Baltay?

Chair Baltay: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: I have to go. I think we had all sort of budgeted this meeting to go till noon, and it has gone over. I have prior obligations I can't get out of. I'm wondering if subcommittee could be postponed to another time.

Chair Baltay: Let me understand this. We have the bus stop to do, and then we have the minutes of something, and then a subcommittee? Do we have a subcommittee?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Baltay: Who are the subcommittee members right now? Can we just change the assignment?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I'm on [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: Alex?

Vice Chair Thompson: It's me and Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: It's the hotel on El Camino.

Chair Baltay: Oh, that one, right. No, I don't think we should do that, Osma. I'll step in your place instead, if necessary.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Because I think you can, you can sign off. That's fine. As long as we have a quorum, we'll be okay. Alex and I will handle the subcommittee. Thanks, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. Thank you. I'll excuse myself from the rest of the meeting.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

[Vice Chair Thompson and Board Member Lee left the meeting.]

4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 250 Hamilton Avenue [19PLN-00220]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Minor Board Level Architectural Review of Three New Bus Stops in the

Public Rights-of-Way Located at 3380 Coyote Hill Road, 3223 Hanover Street and 1501 Page Mill Road. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15311. Zoning District: PF (Public Facility). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Garrett Sauls at garrett.sauls@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Baltay: We're going to move on to action item number 4. This is a public hearing, quasi-judicial, for 250 Hamilton Avenue. Recommendation on applicant's request of minor board level architectural review of three new bus stops in the public rights-of-way located at 3380 Coyote Hill Road, 3223 Hanover Street and 1501 Page Mill Road. Can we have a staff report...? Do we have any disclosures to make? I will disclose that I went out and visited one of these sites. I can't remember which, but I did one. Alex? Board Member Lew: Yeah, I visited the bus shelter on Quarry Road, and I looked at the trash cans at Palo Alto Square.

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

Board Member Hirsch: None, no.

Chair Baltay: Okay. With that, can we have a staff report, please?

Garrett Sauls, Project Planner: Good morning, board members. My name is Garrett Sauls, and I am the project planner for the Stanford Research Park Bus Shelter Program. This project came back to the Board today after receiving comments back in December of last year. To give a quick overview of the project, basically what it is, is Stanford is looking to establish bus shelters within the Research Park that would be providing a universal design that could be approved, kind of similar to a master sign program. There's quite a number of stops that currently do not have either a bus shelter, or the structure is dilapidated or in poorer form, that they would like to upgrade for the community, you know, the workers within the Research Park. Each site within this proposal, each site would be upgraded to meet ADA and Public Works standards for clearance requirements and other sort of accessibility needs. Each site would include photovoltaic panels on the roof and include waste containment facilities. Just as an overview, there are over 60 stops – bus sites – within the Stanford Research Park, again, with varied levels of shelter service. With this approval, we would be looking at something that may be more like an over-the-counter review of a future bus shelter, or potentially a staff-level application if there were modifications needed to the site that would not conform with the designs that have been presented in the staff report. Here you see a summary of the comments of what were provided in December. Primarily, you'll see that the concern was about maintaining sidewalks adjacent to the bus shelters, and that they would still be able to provide enough spacing for pedestrians to pass through the space. Public Works and Transportation have reviewed this and they have provided conditions of approval that will be protective of those measures. There was concern with the use of the IPE wood material on the trash enclosure structure, and that could have some weathering over time. That has now been replaced with a polyethylene or plastic material, so that overall has helped to make that change in the project. The bus shelter, the bigger comment that the Board had provided was that the bus shelter should try to complement and integrate its structure design into what some of the newer buildings or the type of modern or futuristic-looking buildings that we have within the Research Park, and we'll have a comparison of the previous design and the new design later on. There was less concern about the color, which staff had raised previously. You'll see in the plans that those have been addressed, those have been changed to be more of an aluminum silver metal panel color. The other significant comment the Board provided was that the structure before was a little darker and heavier, and they wanted to see more glass and transparency and light brought into the structure. Those will be shown shortly. Lastly, there's some clarification that was needed about who will be maintaining these structures. Stanford has a third-party agreement with VTA Real Estate to be maintaining and installing these structures over the life of them. That is reflected in the conditions of approval, that that would be maintained, so you should be able to see that in the staff report as well. For the three sites that we're talking about today, they are 3380 Coyote Hill Road, 3223 Hanover, and 1501 Page Mill. Thirty-three eighty Coyote Hill is the number one star that you see down; 3223 is number two; and 1501 Page Mill is number three. You can see here some of the older structures that are present out at the site right now on Coyote Hill. You can also see that there are other sites that either just have a

bench, or there are other additional sites within the Research Park that don't have any sort of covering at all, or any sort of bench either. This shelter would instead serve to replace all of those and make the accommodations for bus travelers more inviting and welcoming and comfortable. Some key considerations for the design. This design will help inform staff in searching for or creating a consistent design to go throughout the city. Transportation has been working with VTA to figure out what are the opportunities within the city that this kind of design or concept could be implemented, so that we could have some updated shelters, because we do see a number of bus shelters within the city limits, outside of the Research Park, that are also in fairly similar conditions. As was mentioned before, the sites – all of them – would be upgraded ADA upgrades, photovoltaic panels, and include waste collection facilities, and would be maintained by Stanford so that there aren't waste collecting in the area, or any sort of damage or graffiti or anything finding itself at these sites. Overall, the materials used are of high-quality and long-lasting nature. There's a reduction in the IPE wood material and an increase in the glass used on the site to help make that structure more apparent. Since the original design was brought to the board, Stanford changed it so that there would be a silver aluminum metal material. Staff doesn't have any concern about the color choice that has been presented. Our motion is that we'd recommend approval of the proposed project to the director, based on the findings and conditions of approval that are in the staff report. Here are a couple slides to show, some other structures that are out there currently in the world. On the left hand side you see more the standard VTA bus shelter that has been around in the area. On the right hand side we see what is called the landscape form 1.0 version, the bus shelter that you'll be seeing in the second that isn't available anymore, but was used along Quarry Road and near the hospital previously. With this design, you can see, on the left hand side was the previous design that the shelters include – and I'll scroll in a little bit so it's a little more apparent – on the left hand side you see these structural beams that are coming here, and this wood panel underneath. On the right hand side, you'll see now that the structure presented is much more open. There's a greater [distortion] amount of glass on each of the sides and on the roof material, to allow for more light and transparency, as the Board had asked for previously. We can also see a photo simulation of what the structures would be looking like at nighttime, as well. That concludes my presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Garrett. Any questions? Do we have a staff presentation, or was that the applicant presentation as well?

Mr. Sauls: The applicant will be presenting as well. Vinh, if you could enable Jason McCarthy and Jamie Jarvis to present, and have their audio visible.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay. If those two could unmute their microphone, you can speak.

Chair Baltay: Welcome. Please state and spell your name for the record. You'll have 10 minutes. Thank you.

Jamie Jarvis: Hi, this is Jamie Jarvis, just confirming that you can hear me.

Chair Baltay: Yes, we can hear you.

Ms. Jarvis: All right. I hope I'm sharing my screen. Oh, Jason has his screen on, so that will work. Thank you for having us here today, and Garrett, thank you for that introduction. My name is Jamie Jarvis. Jason, if you could advance to the next screen. [spells name] I'm the Director of sustainable transportation programs for the Research Park. I've developed and managed the commuter transportation program for the Research Park the past four years, and would like to spend just a few minutes reacquainting you with the context for a bus shelter project. And then, Jason McCarthy will present our new shelter design. Next slide, Jason. The Stanford Research Park Transportation Program is known as SRPGO and provides comprehensive commuter transportation service to 140 companies and approximately 29,000 employees in the Research Park. To support transit use, Stanford and our tenant companies purchased discounted smart passes that provide free fair on all VTA and Dumbarton express buses. We also provide free shuttles from the Palo Alto and California Avenue Caltrans stations, and we fill gap in public transit service with SRPGO long distance commute buses. Next slide, Jason. Our efforts have reduced solo driving by 10 percentage points over three years, and nearly double transit use, from

6 percent to 11 percent. We're very proud of these accomplishments and are committed to further increasing the use of alternatives. However, we feel the current state of the bus stops throughout the Research Park limits our ability to increase transit use. Next slide. We currently have a mishmash of aging and unattractive shelters, and some of our most well-used transit stops have no shelter at all. Next slide. We believe attractive, functional bus shelters are key to attracting new transit riders, and for this reason, we propose to install new high-quality bus shelters at three locations along interior roads in the Research Park. When we first presented this project to you last December, you were supportive of having new bus shelters in the Research Park, but weren't thrilled with our custom design, and specifically asked for a lighter and more modern shelter. The shelter we're proposing to you today is a landscape forms design that we believe reflects your guidance. The shelter is already installed in two locations in Palo Alto along Quarry Road, and has also been specified as a condition of approval for the 3223 Hanover project. We envision that this shelter will become the preferred option for future shelter replacements and additions in Stanford Research Park. I appreciate you allowing me to provide the context for our shelter project, and at this time, I'd like to introduce Jason McCarthy, Principal at Studios Architecture, to present the design.

Jason McCarthy, Studios Architecture: Thank you, Jamie. It's a pleasure to be with you and present this on behalf of Stanford. We've been working carefully with Stanford on the development of the design and essentially exploring options, following up on the conversation and the discussion that was held in the first hearing. What we're coming forward with today we think addresses all of Stanford's goals for the project in terms of the transportation goals that Jamie has outlined, and we think also really helps address all of the important topics that were raised in the initial hearing. Principally, what we think we're proposing is a very light structure, something that is very elegant in design and engineering, very contemporary in feel, that's a complement to the other buildings in the Research Park, or the buildings in the Research Park, in the sense that it's appropriate to the context, and also, the material sensibility that you find in adjacent structures nearby. The structure itself is an aluminum frame, which is very thin design, very elegant, and that supports a glass surround and a glass canopy, which we think will really allow for a lot of light, a lot of transparency. A very welcoming design that we think ultimately will support and attract greater ridership in the Research Park, and ultimately, create a great addition to the street scape on the sites that are proposed here. A little bit more about the design that's proposed. We are including a small photovoltaic array on the roof of the canopy, if you will, and that photovoltaic helps this shelter operate off-grid, so the lighting that's integrated into the structure will be energized by this photovoltaic array. Very low energy consumption system, and very high sustainability in keeping with what we think are the goals of Palo Alto, and Stanford more broadly. Again, the glass surround is very transparent glazing with distraction dots for safety. We think that high transparency allows for a lot of natural light, but also provides safety from a visibility standpoint. We think it's very functional in terms of ease of maintenance. The glass of the canopy has a translucency to it, so that provides a good amount of shade while still bringing a lot of natural light through, creating a comfort for the rider who is waiting for their bus. The materials proposed, again, are very simple and elegant, we think. Very forward-looking palette. The silver metallic frame and other metal components of the shelter is sort of a primary material, which we feel is timeless and consistent with the feel of the Research Park in general, and these sites. That metallic framing element is accented by the IPE that you see on the wood bench, and then, the black plastic trash and recycling containers in that receptacle design. There's a couple of additional images we have of... This is the landscape 2.0 shelter design that we're proposing, and the silver metallic frame. Just wanted to share these images to give you a better sense of the refined engineering that we find. We were just really drawn to this shelter design and felt that it was going to be a great addition to the Research Park. The materials that are proposed, the IPE gives a warmth to the overall design, making it very attractive and welcoming, but again, it's a very durable material that can be maintained relatively simply. And then, further images reflecting the overall quality of the engineering behind these products and their specification. We hope that all of this is in keeping with the level of quality that you see more broadly in the Research Park, and ultimately, we hope that you'll agree that what we've proposed is a very elegant solution for an important function in the Research Park, and beyond. With that, that concludes our presentation. We're happy to address any questions that you may have. I'll stop at that point. I'll stop sharing, I suppose, so the staff can take back over.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Jason. Any questions of the applicant from the Board members? No? Okay. Do we have any public comments? I'll open the meeting to public comment. Vinh, anything?

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Baltay, we do not have any public comment at this time?

Chair Baltay: If anyone wishes to address us, now is the time. Okay, I'll close the meeting to public comment and bring it back to the Board. Alex, why don't you take us along, if we have to. I'm envisioning we can approve this fairly quickly, but go ahead, Alex.

## MOTION

Board Member Lew: I'll move that we recommend approval to the Director of Planning.

Chair Baltay: Anyone care to second that?

Board Member Hirsch: No comment, you mean, or what?

Chair Baltay: That's basically what he said, yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I want to just congratulate the team on what they presented before we vote it in.

Chair Baltay: Why don't you second the motion, and then, comment on it?

Board Member Hirsch: All right, I'll second the motion.

Chair Baltay: Would you care to address the motion you just seconded?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I would.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I'm kind of thrilled by this one. (inaudible) the qualities that (inaudible). The detail of that shelter is really amazing (inaudible). I'm really concerned about the IPE and the structure (inaudible) if it's in use, I'm okay with it. The glass panel isn't really shown as being as transparent as it was shown in the rendering. Will it be more transparent in some (inaudible) than others? I don't understand that. (inaudible) could respond (inaudible)....

Mr. McCarthy: The renderings that we shared, the computer renderings, you know, it's a tricky thing to get the computer to show glass accurately sometimes, but it is a fairly transparent glass. The photos that we shared today I think are more representative. The renderings actually suggest something more translucent rather than clear. We just wanted you to know there is glass there, because if you make it go too clear on the computer, it kind of disappears from view. We may have over-tweaked the glass. The photos are a better representation.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. It's just a very good choice. (inaudible....) One question (inaudible). It looks like that's a very steep site... (inaudible) ...In which case it would look a little different than it does (inaudible). Can you answer that one, Jason?

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, it is a sloping site, and in each of these sites, there's some slope to the hillside, as you find throughout the Research Park. But for each of these sites, we're able to create a leveling, if you will, by addressing a little bit up hill and a little bit downhill. We're able to create a level area for the shelter itself that allows us to meet the accessibility requirements and so forth.

Board Member Hirsch: What happens with the supports that are around the perimeter (inaudible)?

Mr. McCarthy: They're generally within that leveled portion, so the area of the shelter and the surrounding sidewalk will be at a minimal cross-slope for drainage, for accessibility compliance. Is that answering your question?

Board Member Hirsch: Inside (inaudible) size, basically you take (inaudible) accommodate the slope, is there some way to adjust the size of the slope?

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, there's a detail for the footing that will allow them to level this in the field. I don't think we have that detail shown, but I think they anticipate that there's a certain amount of finessing this to fit to the contours of the slope.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. (inaudible) explore that (inaudible). Okay. I'm fine with it.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. The motion has been made and seconded. Vinh, could we have a roll call vote, please?

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lew (3)

No: (0)

### **MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 3-0.**

Chair Baltay: Motion carries 3-0. Thank you very much. Congratulations. It's a great design.

Mr. McCarthy: Thank you.

### **Study session/Preliminary review**

Chair Baltay: Okay, let's move on to study session/preliminary review. I don't think we have anything, do we, Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: No. We have the minutes, which would be next.

### **Approval of Minutes**

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 16, 2020

Chair Baltay: Okay, next is approval of minutes. Does anyone have any comments about the minutes from the meeting of April 16<sup>th</sup> of this year? Alex, you must have something.

Board Member Lew: I've looked at the minutes, I have no comments.

Chair Baltay: I have no comments.

Board Member Hirsch: David, anything else?

Board Member Hirsch: No comments.

Chair Baltay: David, make us a motion.

### **MOTION**

Board Member Hirsch: I make a motion that we adjourn.

Chair Baltay: Your motion...?

Board Member Hirsch: You want me to motion that we accept the minutes. (inaudible)

Chair Baltay: I think I heard you say you move that we accept the minutes. I second that motion. Vinh, call the vote, please.

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lew (3)

No: (0)

**MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 3-0.**

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you very much.

**Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Chair Baltay: The North Ventura Plan, anything for us, Alex?

Board Member Lew: The next meeting is on May 26<sup>th</sup>, this Tuesday, at 5:30. It will be via Zoom, and the agenda is available at PaloaltoNVCAP.org.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so there's nothing new. We're waiting for that meeting to take place.

Board Member Lew: Nothing has happened since the last ARB meeting.

Chair Baltay: Great. Okay. Then we're all set. The meeting is adjourned. We're going to move to a subcommittee meeting. Thank you very much everybody.

**Adjournment**

**Subcommittee Items**

6. 4256 El Camino Real [18PLN-00096]: Subcommittee Review of a Project Previously Recommended for Approval, with a Recommendation that the Following Items Return: Enhanced Renderings, Consider a Lighter Color Palette, Provide Ceiling Details for the Porte-Cochere, Reduce the Stair Tower Height to the Lowest Feasible Point. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at [samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org).



## Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Review Memo

TO: Randy Popp/Randolph Popp ARCHITECT, 904 High Street, Palo Alto, CA 94301  
 SUBJECT: 4256 El Camino Real [18PLN-00096] New Hotel  
 DATE: May 28, 2020  
 FROM: Samuel Gutierrez, Planner

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE

On January 16, 2020, the ARB recommended approval to the Director of Planning & Development Services for the subject project while conditioning that certain project elements return for review by a subcommittee of the ARB. Rather than waiting to respond to a potential condition of approval, the applicant submitted certain project elements for ARB subcommittee review prior to Director's decision on the application. On May 21, 2020, ARB Subcommittee comprised of Board Chair Peter Balty and Board Member Alex Lew, reviewed the plans and material samples dated received on May 1, 2020, in accordance with ARB conditioned items below that were to return to the ARB Subcommittee:

- A. Provide updated renderings that more clearly indicate the color and materials for the project, while showing the required rear massing change.
- B. Revise the stair tower to be as low as possible (west elevation).
- C. Ceiling details for the Porte-Cochere design.

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

- A. The applicant has updated the plans (Sheet A5.4) to include photographs of similar projects using the materials that have been proposed. The applicant maintained the color and materials selection previously review by the ARB on January 16, 2020, as the updated plan set renderings better portrayed said color and materials selection, believe this would address the ARB concerns. The updated ARB subcommittee plans included rear massing change per the ARB's recommendation of approval and the project now shows 96 rooms total.
- B. The applicant studied the stair tower, which is at the lowest height possible without visually exposing the stair and railings. The Subcommittee plans have been updated to included information about height on sheet A4.1.
- C. The Porte Cochere ceiling is illustrated in more detail within the Subcommittee on sheet A5.3 where reference to materials, lighting, and a diagrammatic detail are shown.

The Subcommittee recommended approval of the changes and revision as presented by the applicant to the Director. The applicant shall ensure these changes are incorporated into the final construction design and this Subcommittee Review Memo shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s) along with the approval letter for the project.