



# Architectural Review Board

## Staff Report (ID # 11457)

---

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

**Summary Title:** Minutes of May 7, 2020

**Title:** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 7, 2020

**From:** Jonathan Lait

### Recommendation

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

### Background

Draft minutes from the May 7, 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 7, 2020 Draft Minutes (DOCX)



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**DRAFT MINUTES: May 7, 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: Welcome to the May 7, 2020, meeting of the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board. Prior to calling role, I'd like 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 97006510481. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by name. This will be visible on line 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 97006510481. Please follow the steps a through d. Spoken public comments using a phone. Call 1-669-900-6833, and enter Meeting ID 97006510481. 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. With that, can we have a roll call, please?

[Roll Call]

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you. We have a quorum.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

## Oral Communications

Chair Baltay: With that, next item is oral communications. Is there any member of the public who wishes to speak to any item not on the agenda? Vinh, have we heard anyone who wants to address us that way?

Mr. Nguyen: We don't have anyone who wants to speak for oral communications yet. Let's give them a chance to raise their hand now if they wish to speak. Please use the "Raise Hand" feature to indicate that you have public comment. The "Raise Hand" button is located at the bottom of your Zoom screen. And if you're dialing in from a phone, you can press \*9. Does anyone have any oral communications?

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you, Vinh.

## Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Baltay: Let's move on to agenda changes, additions and deletions. Jodie, staff, do we have anything to add, change or delete?

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

Chair Baltay: Very good.

## City Official Reports

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

Chair Baltay: Next item is city official reports. Again, staff, could we have a discussion of our schedule, please? And tentative future items.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. We're having our virtual meeting today, and we'll probably continue in this fashion, at least in the near future. As far as future agendas, the next meeting would be May 21<sup>st</sup>. We do have three items on the agenda there. There we go, perfect. Thank you. We have 3585 El Camino Real, which is a mixed-use project, and actually would be our first housing incentive project, if approved. We also have the second round of the bus shelters in the Stanford Research Park. They have come up with a more modern design. And then, 486 Hamilton. This would be a first formal review for them. And then, subcommittee for a hotel on El Camino. For the subcommittee, I had in my notes that Board Member Thompson and Board Member Lew would be on that subcommittee, but Chair, if you could please confirm that for me.

Chair Baltay: Yes, I believe that's correct.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

## Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. Newell Road Bridge Replacement Project [19PLN-00130]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow for Demolition of an Existing Two-Way Bridge On Newell Road Between Woodland Avenue in East Palo Alto and Edgewood Drive in Palo Alto and Construction of a New Bridge Along the Same Alignment That Meets Caltrans Standards for Multi-Modal Access. Environmental Assessment: An Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Assessment (EA) was Circulated on May 31, 2019 for a 60 Day Comment Period That Ended on July 30, 2019 in Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The City of Palo Alto and Caltrans Published the Final EIR/EA on April 24, 2020. Zoning District: Not Applicable (Public Right-of-Way) Adjacent Single-Family Residential (R-1[10,000]). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Raybould at [Claire.Raybould@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.Raybould@cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Baltay: Okay, with that, we'll move on to our first action item. This is item number 2, Newell Road Bridge Replacement Project. Recommendation on Applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow for demolition of an existing two-way bridge on Newell Road between Woodland Avenue in East Palo Alto and Edgewood Drive in Palo Alto, and construction of a new bridge along the same alignment that meets Caltrans standards for multi-modal access. Environmental Assessment: An Environmental Impact Report (EIR)/Environmental Assessment (EA) was circulated on May 31, 2019, for a 60 day comment period that ended on July 30, 2019, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The City of Palo Alto and Caltrans published the final EIR/EA on April 24, 2020. Before we get started, do we have any disclosures on that item? I don't have anything to disclose myself. Board members, any disclosures? Alex, disclosures?

Board Member Lew: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: David, disclosures?

Board Member Hirsch: No, no disclosures.

Chair Baltay: Grace, any disclosures?

Board Member Lee: I'll just simply disclose that I visited the site.

Chair Baltay: That's exactly right, thank you very much. Osma, disclosures?

Vice Chair Thompson: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, everybody. With that, I believe we're ready for a staff report.

Claire Raybould, Project Planner: Thank you. [Setting up presentation.]

Ms. Gerhardt: Claire Raybould is a senior planner on my team, and she'll be presenting the project. We also have Michel Jeremias from Public Works, should you have any questions.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Ms. Raybould: Good morning, board members. Hold on one second. Give me one second, I'm sorry. [Setting up presentation.] Good morning, Board Members, Claire Raybould, project planner. The project before you today is the Newell Road bridge replacement. This is located along Newell Road, between Edgewood Drive and Palo Alto, and Woodland Avenue in East Palo Alto, and it spans the county line across San Francisquito Creek. You can see the location right here. Just a brief overview of the project. The project would replace an existing two-lane bridge, bi-directional bridge, with a two-lane bi-directional bridge along the same alignment. It includes sharrows, which are shared vehicle/bicycle lanes, with a four-foot shoulder for bicycles, as well as a sidewalk on each side of the bridge that would be five feet on each side. It raises the existing bridge to allow for increased flow capacity beneath, and it also raises a portion of Woodland Avenue and East Palo Alto, as well as Newell Road in both Palo Alto and East Palo Alto. It includes retaining walls in some locations to support that raised road. This is just a view of what the proposed project would look like from Palo Alto. This is a quick view of what it would look like from East Palo Alto. I just wanted to briefly discuss something that was considered as part of the final EIR in response to comments. I think we heard a lot of different comments from the Architectural Review Board, our Planning Commission, and members of the public, about bicycle lanes and bicycle safety. We did do some additional counts to obtain more information, updated information about bicycles in the area. The results of that additional analysis concluded that what was proposed was valid, that we didn't need to do additional width for dedicated Class II bicycle lanes. But we did explore a couple different options for the striping. In the end, we are proposing the original Option A, which was the five-foot-wide sidewalk, four-foot-wide striped shoulder for bicycle use, and then, 10-foot-wide sharrows for shared vehicle/bicycle use. We did consider an Option B, which was a raised nine-foot-wide shared pedestrian/bicycle path, and 10-foot wide vehicle lanes. Ultimately, both our transportation division as well as East Palo Alto's Public Works division concluded that they would

prefer Option A because it integrates better with the existing bicycle path in Palo Alto and along Newell Road in East Palo Alto, and future planned bicycle paths for East Palo Alto along Woodland Avenue. You can kind of see that on Option B, the bicycle path would end up running into the sidewalk, and there would be nowhere to go from there under Option B, so Option A is preferred and what we are recommending today. Just a brief update, responding to ARB comments. As outlined in the staff report, I think key comments that we heard last July from the Architectural Review Board was more information on the landscaping plan. We are presenting a landscaping as part of the plans today, which was not provided previously. I do just want to note, again, that these show all work in the public right-of-way and outside the creek. We do anticipate being able to do additional plantings in the creek and on private property. Those aren't presented in the landscaping plan because there are still details that will be worked out through final encroachment permits with the different water resources board and the different wildlife agencies for work in the creek, as well as with private property owners. We also heard from the Architectural Review Board that they'd like to see a plaque of some sort. We did think about a couple different options for that. We've left it open to still explore what that plaque is going to entail, but we have added a condition of approval that will add a plaque to commemorate the bridge and all the different agencies involved in this bridge, and the flood control work that this associated with this project. I spoke briefly about the pedestrian/bicycle safety. As I noted, that was a key issue that was raised early in the process. In terms of next steps following this recommendation, we would be seeking a decision from Council on the project, and certification of the Environmental Impact Report. Following that decision, we would then seek NEPA certification from Caltrans, and then, continued coordination with wildlife and water resource agencies for applicable permits. Continue coordination with East Palo Alto, Caltrans, and San Francisquito Creek joint powers authority members, and procure the final right-of-way and easements that we need for the project. We anticipate that construction would begin in 2021. The recommended motion today is to consider the final Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment included in Attachment D of the staff report, and to recommend approval of the proposed project alternative to Option A to the Council based on findings and subject to conditions of approval as outlined in the draft Record of Land Use Action in Attachment B. With that, I will turn it back to you for any questions.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Claire. Do we have any questions of staff? Any review board members with questions?

Board Member Lew: I have one question.

Chair Baltay: Okay, Alex, go ahead.

Board Member Lew: Claire, on the landscape plan, is there anything proposed, any ground cover proposed along the curb on Newell? Like, under the proposed coast live oak street trees?

Ms. Raybould: Michel, do you recall the answer to that? I believe there was going to be some under those oak trees. Let me try to pull up the plans. Hold on.

Board Member Lew: I don't need an answer immediately.

Ms. Raybould: I can look into it and get back to you.

Chair Baltay: That may be covered, Alex, when we get through the applicant's report as well. Any other questions of staff? David, did you have a question?

Board Member Hirsch: I do.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead, David.

Board Member Hirsch: Woodland Road, is there any plan for it to have a bike lane at some point? Or crossing Woodland Road? Would there be any...? Is that included in any...?

Ms. Raybould: Yes, there's planned bicycle lanes on Woodland Avenue as part of, I believe as part of East Palo Alto future planning, as part of their... I don't know if it's in their general plan. I think it's in their general plan, that they hope to have future bike lanes along that road.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Very well. Do we have a presentation from the applicant for this?

Michel Jeremias, Public Works: No, we did not present.

Chair Baltay: Okay, you're afforded 10 minutes to speak if you'd like to, but I guess you're saying that you don't want to.

Ms. Gerhardt: The City is the applicant, so Claire did that presentation.

Chair Baltay: I see, okay, it's all wrapped into one thing. Okay. Are there any other questions of the City or the applicant before we open it up to public comment from anyone? Okay, very well then. Are there any members of the public who wish to address us on this matter? Vinh, didn't we have some speakers on this?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we do have a couple speakers. First will be Hamilton, followed by Paul, then followed by Yang. If there's anyone else who wants to speak on this item whose name I did not call, please raise your hand now, and you will speak after these other people. I see Su-Ye-Shan [phonetic] just raised their hand, so I will put you down as our fourth speaker, after Yang. First, we have Hamilton.

Hamilton Hitchings: Hello, can you hear me?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can hear you. Please speak.

Mr. Hamilton: Great. My name is Hamilton Hitchings, I live in the Duveneck/St. Francis neighborhood. I am strongly in favor of moving forward with this project for the City's recommended alternative 2A. As a homeowner who experienced the 1998 flood that caused over-the-floor flooding of over 400 Palo Alto homes in my neighborhood, I've seen how much damage can be caused. The creek currently only has a 22-year flood capacity. This is because both the Newell and Chaucer bridges significantly narrow the creek flow because their design unnecessarily fills in a portion of the creek channel with concrete. For the Chaucer bridge to be replaced by the JPA, the City must first replace the downstream Newell bridge. This bridge is under the shared jurisdiction of Palo Alto and East Palo Alto. The Palo Alto staff did a good job in collaborating with East Palo Alto staff to come up with a mutually acceptable solution, Alternative 2A. Some residents have expressed concern about the potential for increased traffic. The City of Palo Alto has agreed with East Palo Alto to conduct a traffic study after completion of the bridge. I would encourage Palo Alto to do full traffic calming measures if they find a significant increase in traffic or speeds. The local proposed Alternative 2 maintains the current bridge alignment, which acts as a natural traffic-calming feature. In addition, the synchronization of the University Avenue traffic lights has increased the flow of traffic on University Avenue and reduced the cut-through traffic to Newell bridge. In addition, the traffic study for this project found that they do not anticipate an increase in traffic. I'd also like to point out that the bridge dramatically improves bicycle and pedestrian safety. This bridge would be paid 88.5% by Caltrain and 11 percent of the cost of the bridge would be paid for by the Santa Clara Valley water district. It only requires Palo Alto to provide a project manager. Thank you for your consideration, and I hope the committee will endorse the staff recommendation to our City Council. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Hamilton. Next speaker. Vinh, could you introduce them, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, our next speaker is Paul, and Paul, I believe you are calling in from a phone, last four digits 3410. I have unmuted you. You can speak now.

Paul: That's correct. Can you hear me okay?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can hear you.

Paul: My name is Paul Goomunuh [phonetic], I am an attorney for Mr. Yang Shen, who will be speaking next. He is the owner of the single-family home located at 1499 Edgewood Drive in Palo Alto. He lives there with his family in that home. It's the property nearest to the Newell bridge, and it's the property that will bear the brunt of the negative impacts from this project, which he opposes. As you may know, to accomplish the bridge removal, the City proposes to use the land immediately adjacent to his back yard as the construction site and staging area for the project. That means his property and his family will bear the brunt of the negative impacts and real harm from the project more than any other family in Palo Alto, both during and after the project is completed. He opposes the City's adoption of the DEIR as a final for the reasons stated in my email that I sent yesterday to this board. I wanted to supplement that email with the following comments. First, there's no assurance from the City that they'll take any meaningful mitigation efforts to reduce the expected level of noise, dust, soot, noxious fumes, vehicle traffic, foot traffic, lights and security projects inherent in having a heavy construction site within a few feet of this home. Literally, the staging will be within 30 to 40 feet of his home, directly in his back yard. The DEIR did not address how to keep the construction site secure, giving that this is going to attract nuisance, nor did it address what happens if the construction is begun but interrupted due to the economic impacts of the current corona virus emergency. Second, I urge the Board to carefully consider the email dated June 19, 2019, from Ben Ball. It's DEIR comment response 1-2. And the email dated July 24, 2019, from Ben Ball that's 1-3. Mr. Ball's information shows that the City's traffic estimates in the DEIR were inadequate because they underestimated the impact widening the bridge will have on thru traffic on the immediate neighborhood near the bridge. The studies that Mr. Ball cites proves that. The authors of the DEIR really need to go back to the drawing board to address that information, and in particular, our concern is, given the current corona virus emergency, is there going to be enough funding to complete the project? We fear that what will happen is the project will be begun, the construction equipment will be staged, and then, for one reason or another, whether it's lack of workers or lack of funding, the project will be stalled, and my client will be stuck with a construction site in its back yard with no completion date in site. Mr. [crosstalk] ....

Chair Baltay: Paul, thank you. We're running out of time for you, can you please wrap it up?

Paul: Yes. I would ask that you grant Mr. Yang some additional time because his comments will need to be translated.

Chair Baltay: Very well. Thank you, Paul. Vinh, could you bring us to the next speaker, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, absolutely. Our next speaker is Yang, and FYI, I do see another member of the public with a hand raised. A Xenia Hammer. You will be our last speaker on this item. Next is Mr. Yang Shen. I have unmuted you. You can speak now.

Yang Shen: Hi, this Shen Yang, Mr. Shen. [Speaking foreign language]

Translator: Again, my name is Yang Shen, and I live at 1499 Edgewood Drive. My friend, Mike, will help me with translation, which he adamantly against the expansion of this bridge, Newell Bridge. The first one is about safety. At this time period before the construction, there is already very heavy traffic due to 101 and University Avenue congestion. There is already a lot of traffic diverting through Newell and Edgewood Drive. It's also a noise nuisance. One thing that we are worried about is that even during the construction, plus after the construction, our property value will definitely diminish. And then, the other problems are, obviously the pollution, air pollution, and then, the privacy issue during construction. He's also concerned about his youngest daughter, who has very strong asthma issue, and during the construction, that's a major concern for her. And then, during our last year July meeting with the City, those questions were never answered. And then, also, currently, even without the construction or without widening the bridge, there is already a lot of traffic at nighttime going through the area, because, again, there's a lot of car screeching, a lot of high-speed. But if we widen the bridge, it's going to increase even more, because not only our family, but the surrounding neighbors. After we already spoke with them, they are also against the project because there's a lot of children and elderly on the Palo Alto side of Edgewood Street and Newell. Again, we just want to reiterate that we're strongly against this project.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Mr. Shen. Is that all?

Translator: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Vinh, we have one last person. Could you introduce them, please?

Mr. Nguyen: We actually have two more speakers. Up next – and I apologize if I mispronounce your name – Soo Ye Shen [phonetic]. I have unmuted you, and you can unmute yourself on your computer as well, and you can speak.

Soo Ye Shen: I'm [inaudible] daughter, and I'd like to speak my objection to the project. The construction project will cause great damage to our privacy as the construction will enter our back yard, cause damage to our house from air pollution, noise pollution, and light pollution, since the construction site is merely a few feet away from our bedroom. And even drive safety concern to my family during the two year long construction process. My younger sister has asthma that can be reduced by air pollution, and my father has an afternoon nap routine. Basically, our daily activity and peace of mind are all under the influence of the construction. Furthermore, the construction will also raise safety concern from the faster and denser traffic to nearby residents, which are composed of elder and children. I just want to say, from both personal and sociological standpoint, I object to the project. That's it. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Ms. Shen. Vinh, could you introduce the next speaker, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes. Our next and final speaker for this item will be Xenia Hammer. You are unmuted; you can speak. Xenia, are you there? I have unmuted you from my end, but you have to unmute yourself as well. Okay, it looks like they just left. They are no longer... Okay, they are back.

[Connecting with speaker.]

Xenia Hammer: Thank you so much. I would like to speak in strong support of this project, and the urgency of it. I live on Sharon Court, close to Newell Road bridge. Also, in the flood zone of San Francisquito Creek. The creek flooded, as you know, in 1998, and the work has been in discussion since then, so this project is long overdue. The replacement of Newell Road bridge is a required part of flood control on San Francisquito Creek, and it needs to be done as soon as possible. Pope Chaucer bridge is a major, major flood hazard, and before that can be replaced, Newell Road bridge can be replaced, because it is downstream of Chaucer. The planning through this project has been detailed and extensive. The current proposal is a wonderful compromise. It meets the flood control needs on the creek, and the proposed bridge is as small as can be, meeting Caltrans requirements and transportation requirements for pedestrians and bicycles and cars. The City has taken extensive community input, and the current design incorporates that community input. This project has been scaled down as much as possible in response to the community. There are legitimate [distortion] considerations. The City will need to take care of traffic calming on the road to meet those requirements, and I think the plan addresses that. Bottom line, please, go ahead with this project as quickly as possible. There have been speakers who live next to the bridge who spoke against this project, and it is important, with all due respect to the inconvenience the construction will cause, it is, from a City perspective, you need to take the whole community's interests into account, rather than people who live right next to the bridge. Basically, please move forward with this project as soon as possible. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Ms. Hammer. With that, we will close the meeting to public comment, assuming, Vinh, we don't have anyone else.

Mr. Nguyen: That's correct. We have no more public comments.

Chair Baltay: Okay, I'll bring the item back to the Board. Perhaps Grace could start out our comments today, if that's okay.

Board Member Lee: Sure, I'm happy to do so. Thank you, Peter. I'll just begin with, thank you to all of the five public community members who spoke, as well as staff for a very complete staff presentation. I was not on the board at the time that this item came in the summer. I find the application is very complete, I [distortion]. I fully [distortion] the project. I do see it as a great improvement in terms of pedestrian and bike safety. I also appreciate the gestures that were requested, really from this board, in terms of more information regarding the landscape plane, which gives us a much better idea in terms of the context and how that project is actually going to be really an improvement on the overall site in terms of infrastructure systems, landscape, circulation, and the experience of many community members. The two speakers who spoke to the flood control and the need for this since 1998, I really appreciate the thinking from the City in terms of how we solve these problems. Perhaps they take quite a long time. This project probably will not be constructed until 2023. Thank you for everyone who has been involved in this project, has contributed to it. I did want to note that, I believe, Claire, planning staff, you know, I was [distortion], I understand why it is [distortion] regarding how it [distortion] perhaps East Palo Alto [distortion]. An improvement, I think, in this application would have been... I did some research of my own, was just in terms of the regional bike network of trails and planning by [distortion] jurisdictions. East Palo Alto [inaudible] I think my colleague, Board Member Hirsch, asked about the bikes on Woodland. How does this sit [distortion] this brief period in time, and I understand that this is part of a gesture of connecting a larger bike network, a larger regional thinking in terms of pedestrian safety, linking East Palo Alto to Palo Alto, considering just how all of those pieces play together. I guess my last comments are regarding the landscape. I understand that the City is very well staffed and will be reviewing this as it moves forward in the next years. I'm just wondering, and maybe the Board can comment in terms of moving forward, and their thoughts on the landscape and how this is all coming together, if there is a need or even a desire to have some ARB representative working with staff in collaboration, since this is, you know, this is a significant project for the community, and it will take some time moving forward, and what that kind of ushering through with some representation on our board might be, or if there's even a need. I mean, I'm happy to [distortion] to move to Council, and I thank you for the forum today.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace. David, do you want to go next, please?

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, yep, fine. Grace, that was a nice presentation. I don't want to step on your toes. You said it all nicely. I think my biggest concern at the moment is the objections that were raised by the immediate neighbors and whatever measures might be taken to mitigate those issues that they raised. Of course, you know, the staging of machinery, etc., really ought to be a part of this. I haven't really looked at our documents to see how that's going to be done. I'm sorry I didn't ask the question earlier, but perhaps, Claire, you could respond to some of that issue. Because it seems to be relatively serious. I'm not sure about the health issue, how that is addressed, but certainly the staging and where the equipment is held at the time of construction, because it will be a long period of time. Again, also I agree with Grace, an excellent presentation, and I accept your desire to use the scheme you prefer. The landscaping, I'll leave to others to talk about, but the fact that this bridge is now going to be a less solid element and have a much better feeling and openness towards the creek is going to be appreciated. In terms of traffic, I'm not sure how to answer that either [inaudible] consideration. I'm very much in favor of the project. I mention the fact that it would be nice if it were coordinated somehow with bike passage on the other side. It seems like a shame that it isn't connected in some way, or that East Palo Alto couldn't have pushed their program up to meet this. I'm sorry that's not done, because all of a sudden, you're going to get to the bridge and there's nowhere to go, as a bicyclist. But, from the point of view of the Palo Alto side, I think it's very well done, and I encourage the project to start right away, in particular because I happen to live upstream, closer to Chaucer bridge, and I'd like to see the project continue onward upstream so that the whole of the Palo Alto San Francisquito Creek is handled for future flood issues. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, David. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yes. I do support the project. I would disclose that I own property nearby, and that house flooded in 1998. For new owners, you do not understand how traumatic that was. That happened in the middle of the night and people, like my neighbors, were fleeing their house in the middle of the night to go to a hotel. It took weeks – weeks – to clean up the damage. We've been waiting over 20 years for this, and I think we're ready for it. We need it. Typically, there is a construction management plan that will

happen later. Typically, the ARB does not address the construction impact, normally. [inaudible]. Some other board members have mentioned regional bike connections, and I think [distortion] happening. You can actually see there's a new segment of, the Ravenswood [inaudible] space has a new segment of the Bay trail that's just about to open. I went over there last week, and it actually looks great. The new Newell Road bridge over 101 opened, maybe it was a few years ago, and I've been really encouraged by how much pedestrian traffic that I see going over that. I do see there are people from East Palo Alto going over, and I also see people from Palo Alto heading over there to do, like, long endurance runs along Bay Trail. I actually think that's all working pretty nicely. I have [distortion] on the project. One that I was asking about before was just the landscaping along the curb. I mean, typically, the City lets the neighbors plant and maintain that area, so, my question was, is that the plan for this? Or is the City going to plant along there. My second concern is, along Newell and Palo Alto, is, you are proposing coast live oaks. Pretty tight spacing of [distortion] on center. My only concern is that it has a very dense canopy, and it has a very low canopy, and the street lights are tall. I think they're, like, 25 foot [distortion] lights. I think it's going to create a very dark sidewalk when the trees are at medium maturity. It won't be a problem initially, and it won't be a problem when the trees get really old and the canopy thins out, but that's a long-term concern. That's all I have. Oh, one last comment. Somebody else on the board mentioned the guardrails previously. I think it was Peter. I think that there is a big difference in impact, visual impact if they're black or if they're galvanized, and I think there are maintenance issues associated with having them black. I think it's maybe up for discussion with the Board. I was also curious if we were going to bid that out maybe as options. That's all that I have. I do support the project.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Claire, did you have a comment?

Ms. Raybould: I would just ask if you'd like staff to comment on a couple of things that Board Member Lew brought up. In particular, we would be interested in your consideration of the black versus galvanized.

Chair Baltay: Let's let everybody go through this, then we'll come back.

Ms. Raybould: Okay. Okay.

Chair Baltay: There are a few things I think we want further detail. First, let's hear from Osma.

Ms. Raybould: Sounds great.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I feel pretty similarly with my other members. I also had that concern that Board Member Lew mentioned, about the tree canopy on the bridge. It might just be the picture that shows that. It does seem like it will be pretty heavily shaded. A lighter tree might be an option. It's a comment, though. I don't know if it's something that we should... I'm not sure if we should consider it to review later. The black galvanized, now I'm really thinking about this. I'd like to hear more about the maintenance issues. Obviously, we want something that will look good long term. I'm sure Claire had something to say about that, but that's okay. We'll circle back on that later. Otherwise, I'm in support of this project. I understand the sacrifice that the neighbors will have to make, and I also understand that it's important for the City long term, especially when there are natural things that happen that make it difficult to live. I will end my comments there for now, and then, we'll circle back later.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. I also am in support of this project, and I support the comments everybody else has made, and I don't want to add to them. What I would like to do, though, is have staff cover three things for us quickly, if we could. One is, could you please go through what construction logistics and regulations are required so that the neighbor's concerns can be alleviated, and hopefully mitigated. Secondly, I'd like if we could walk through what the landscaping plan is, particularly regarding the trees along Newell. And then, let's get Alex's question about the landscaping answered. Lastly, let's discuss the color of the guardrail. Claire, could you take us through those three things, please?

Ms. Raybould: Sure. Starting with the comments from the neighbor. There were quite a variety of comments. I just want to start out by saying that these are the same comments that were raised during the draft EIR comment period, and there are formal responses to comments included in, I believe it's

Appendix F of the final EIR. There are more details related to this. I'll keep my comments at a high level and speak to a few of the key things they raised. Related to, I think, air quality, the EIR did identify impacts related to NOx and identified typical mitigation measures to reduce that impact to a less-than-significant level. The EIR did not identify any significant impacts related to fugitive dust, additional dust that may be present. Standard measures are always required for every project under the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, just standardized measures to reduce dust and ensure that that's not impacting adjacent neighbors. I do want to be clear that the area adjacent [distortion] their residence is a staging area. It's not the area where all construction would occur. I do want to [distortion] as well. I [distortion] to the long-term impacts of traffic, and I just [distortion] that the analysis, the data and analysis that was completed does not [distortion] conclusion that this have an impact on traffic, or would in any way induce capacity on the roadway. This is replacing a two-lane bi-directional bridge with a two-lane bi-directional bridge, and the majority of the width that is provided is for additional bicycle safety and bicycle access and pedestrian access, encouraging multimodal transportation. A lot of the policies and the comprehensive plan that were noted in this commenter's email from earlier, all speak to the reasons why we are looking to do this project, which is to encourage multimodal transportation, and to provide better pedestrian and bicycle access, in addition to the flood control benefits as well.

Chair Baltay: Let me jump in for a second, Claire. What I'm hoping to hear from staff, from Public Works, is some of the more concrete measures that will be taken to mitigate the impact on the neighbors. What are we going to do to control the dust, the noise, security, staging? Is there anything in the plans now that they can hear and [distortion]? That's what I really want staff to address right now so we have it in the record. What are we doing?

Michel Jeremias, Public Works: Sure, no problem, thank you. Right now, the plans don't show that level of detail for construction. Typically, that is provided once we advance the project into design. Currently, we're only at the environmental stage, and due to Caltrans [distortion], we can't commence the design component. When we do commence, [distortion] is a [distortion] logistics plan, a plan that identifies where the construction fence will be located, where the trailer, if necessary for equipment, the trailer will be staged on site. It will address any [distortion] we need to dampen any noise that may be carried out. We'll also have strict measures for our consultants, our contractors, to sweep, to maintain a street clean, keep the level of dust down, making sure elements are [distortion]. One of the items I want to make clear is the construction of the bridge is only three months, but we need to do all the work around it. It's not a two-year project. It's probably going to be three months in the creek, and then, the rest of it is going to be outside of it. It's not as long-term as expected. Does that answer your question?

Chair Baltay: That does very much. David, do you have other questions about the construction logistics? You were most concerned.

Board Member Hirsch: No, I think that was well answered.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Claire, could you then switch on to the landscaping issues? What are we doing with that?

Ms. Raybould: I think the question was raised about the oak trees. Staff can certainly explore some alternative options to using oak if we feel that that's going to, at certain stages in the life cycle of the tree, maybe present maybe too dark of an area. We can definitely look into some alternative options for trees. We are looking to use only native species in this area, so we would look to some other native species. I'm using California [distortion] and Catalina ironwood, are the other planned trees in this area. I don't know, Michel, if there's anything you want to add to that, or...?

Ms. Jeremias: The landscape plan was prepared by one of our consultants, Colander [phonetic]. We discussed the plan with them, the intent. We've also talked with landscape architect [distortion] City. They have reviewed, and this is what they recommend as far as spacing. If you feel like we need to reduce the spacing for the canopy, we can. I think one of the comments we tried to address was the public's concerns regarding providing the [inaudible] exists today. We're trying to also create more shading since that's

what's out there as well, but we're open to any of your comments. We can try to address those as well as we advance the project, and then to the design.

Chair Baltay: Do you think this is going to be a committee-type thing to come back to us, or is it something we should [distortion]? Comments make sense. What's your take on it, what they're saying?

Board Member Lew: Everything I've seen so far in the landscape looks fine. It looks like they're on track to do a good job. I do support the oak trees. To me, it's really more spacing of those oak trees with the street light. In [inaudible], I would rather have, like, [distortion] scaled street lights, but I do understand that Newell doesn't have that along its length.

Ms. Jeremias: The photometric plan shows that we have probably more lights than necessary. There's more light in that area for the intended purposes.

Chair Baltay: Osma, did you have any response issue about the trees as well? You were concerned about them.

Vice Chair Thompson: I see one, because I guess we increased the spacing, then we're [distortion] some trees, and I'm sure that that's also not desired. It's fine. I think it's okay. It's one of those things where it's a concern, but it's also one of those, it's not so large of a concern. Unless Alex wanted to take it to subcommittee. I would be okay with that, if Board Member Lew wanted to. But, if Board Member Lew is not in favor, I'm also willing to let it go.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Osma. Let me [distortion] I [distortion] as possible. [distortion] to subcommittee is [distortion] further along. It's been 20 years in the making. I strongly support letting [distortion] trees, taking Alex [distortion] into account.

Ms. Gerhardt: Can I...? Is it a matter of maintenance? Maybe the trees [distortion] certain way, where it's still able...?

Chair Baltay: It would probably come up on the next question, guardrail painting, because it's something that doesn't always happen. [distortion] pointing out that very overgrown [distortion] are not maintained. The City's going to [distortion] regular [distortion]. Go over this [distortion]. Is that a choice? Something that's already been standard?

Ms. Raybould: Michel, you can speak a little bit more to that. I think both [distortion] as possible. I don't know [distortion] more maintenance for [distortion] and maybe you can [distortion] that there would be a maintenance agreement with these.

Ms. Jeremias. I think galvanized is the standard color, is a standard [distortion] Caltrans. The guardrail, the bridge railing, is standard. This is a rail that we have to use for this bridge. It's the one [distortion] test. Otherwise, if we try to use something different, we have to take it through and run [distortion] labs and test the rails. What we're trying to use is a rail that's been approved. It would [distortion] galvanized. Try to add color to it, so [distortion], and that would require [distortion] I would say every couple years' maintenance. But if that's something that the Board [distortion], we can try to go down that path. It's something that we try to provide, an option and alternative, knowing that we have [distortion] on the actual guardrail.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Okay, let's just take a straw poll. I [distortion] it's worth painting. It seems to me that's maintenance dollars not as well spent as other places. Everybody else, just on that one issue. David, how do you feel about the painting of the guardrails?

Board Member Hirsch: Agreed.

Chair Baltay: Alex?

Board Member Lew: I think using a color, somebody will want to change it. And then, it starts chipping and flaking, and so you see multiple colors on the railing. And then, I think [distortion] for the guardrails on the retaining walls, is that we have them in different cities, and the [distortion] property owners, and it seems to me that that's going to become problematic if, you know, in trying to keep it in one color. Even though it may look [distortion], a colored railing may look better than the galvanized. I think over the long haul, I think the galvanized would be better.

Chair Baltay: Grace, what's your take?

Board Member Lee: I support galvanized. I assume that actually painted was a standard for Caltrans, but I'm happy to hear we can just go with the galvanized, no need for paint.

Chair Baltay: Osma, what do you think?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm outnumbered, regardless. Galvanized is fine.

Chair Baltay: Okay good. I think the galvanized railing issue is okay. Do we have...? Anyone want to make a motion to put this through? I think we're all in support of Item 2A. Can I call for a motion?

### **MOTION**

Chair Baltay: Very well. I move that we recommend approval of this project with Option 2A, as presented by staff.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: Moved and seconded. Vinh, how do we do votes again?

Mr. Nguyen: I'll read everyone's name in alphabetic order and you can declare whether you're for or against.

Chair Baltay: The motion is made and seconded. Please have a vote, Vinh.

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

No: (0)

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

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, everybody.

Ms. Raybould: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Grace, you're going to be leaving us now – Is that right?

Board Member Lee: Yes, apologies. I will need to leave the meeting at this time. I will recuse given [distortion] with Stanford on the next items. I'm sorry I'm unable to attend for the final item.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace. Thanks for your participation today.

[Board Member Lee left the meeting.]

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3215 Porter Drive [19PLN00237]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow Construction of a new 22,029 Square Foot Office/ R&D Building. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated for Public Comment From April 10, 2020 to May 11, 2020.

Zoning District: RP (Research Park). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Garrett Sauls at garrett.sauls@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Baltay: I'd like to move on to the next one right away. Item number 3 is a public hearing, quasi-judicial, for 3215 Porter Drive Recommendation on Applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow construction of a new 22,029 square foot office/R&D building. Environmental impact is a negative, an initial study/mitigated negative declaration was circulated for public comment from April 10<sup>th</sup> to May 11, 2020. With that, do we have any disclosures for this item? I have nothing to disclose. Alex, disclosures?

Board Member Lew: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: David.

Board Member Hirsch: No disclosures.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Can we have a staff report, please?

Garrett Sauls, Project Planner: [Setting up presentation.] Good morning, Board. My name is Garrett, I am the project planner for this application. The project site is 3215 Porter Drive. As mentioned before, it is a new 22,000 square foot office building in the Stanford Research Park. This is a quick overview from the previous hearing. This is a new two-story R&D office building that is providing around 70 parking spaces. We have an above-grade parking facility, as well as a below-grade parking structure, which respectively are providing 32 spaces above ground and 38 spaces below ground. They are also providing 52 bicycle spaces on the site, with 18 long-term spaces, mostly in the below-grade parking structure, and partially on the back of the property, which will be shown on the next slide, on the site plan. There are also 32 short-term spaces along the front of the property near Porter Drive. They are including around 1,100 square feet of traffic amenity space in the site, which they intend to utilize as some form of café space. They are also providing around 55 percent of canopy over the parking area, which is exceeding the 50 percent requirement that the state has. Back in the 1980's, there was a Remedial Action Order on this site that was provided to HP's Building 15. The uses that were provided at the site previously had a number of volatile organic compounds that had seeped into the ground [inaudible] a water at this location, and DTSC has been working with Stanford since then to enact this Remedial Action Order to deal with the volatile organic compounds on this site. With that, they are going to be requiring a vapor intrusion mitigation system underneath system. That will be helping to protect occupants of the site from any sort of vapors that would be protruding from the ground, as well as during construction, they would have mitigation measures to protect against those who are constructing the building. As mentioned by Board Member Baltay, we have mitigated negative declaration that has been in circulation since April 10<sup>th</sup> of this year, and is finishing the following Monday. We have not received any current comments from any member of the public as to recommended suggestions or changes to the document, and all the mitigation measures proposed to the building are in Exhibit A in the conditions of approval. With that, from the analysis we have done, we have now recognized that there will be a significant impact that could not be mitigated, but many of them are fairly standard, related to project-specific construction issues related to birds or nesting avian during construction, as well as the previously-mentioned vapor mitigation system. From the previous comments from the Board, there were about six categories dealing with landscape, architectural details, openings, windows, lighting, and other such things that we'll talk about. As noted here, the previous plans did not show the planters on the space between 3215 porter and the substation. That is actually currently now shown on the plans on the site plan, and in the rendering drawing, which you see on the cover page, as well as on page A1.7 and A1.10 within the document. They also did provide more soil volumes for the trees at the garage ramp, and that is shown on L1.15 of the plant. That was soil volume guidance that they received from the City's Urban Forestry Department previously, that they were trying to protect for those trees to have an adequate capability to grow to a mature size and not create conflict on the site. Others

were considering relocation of the oak tree along the front right side of the property. Stanford has proposed to maintain the existing condition proposal, which was it would be on the left hand side so it could still maintain a warm, opening, appealing, curbside appeal. That will be shown on the elevations as well. They also had some ground floor planters that David had commented on previously, to have those raised, and those are shown on the elevation drawings as well. The architectural details that have been talked about were for additional louver attachments and bike channel, entry awnings. Those are shown now on pages A2.13, 2.14, and L1.7. That is currently also addressed in the staff report. There is was also an ask to better integrate the rear balcony, and to have transformers be screened, and to use other additional sidings on the site. Those items have also been addressed in the staff report as well. With the window and doorframes they have shown – and I'll show in a couple slides in a second – they have brought those doorways up to the soffit for the building so that they can have a more consistent look across the site. The other items were about lighting and structural support of the façade, and the organization of the uses with the building. With the lighting, they have reduced the number of 14-foot-tall lights that they proposed, but they haven't utilized the step lighting that was suggested by the Board previously, as they found that that's been a maintenance issue for them over time. They have consulted with their structural designer to confirm that there shouldn't be any issue with changing the front façade as it was shown. Currently, they are going to be using a moment frame along the front so that it would be more able to manage what the design is showing currently. They are also looking to organize the uses more collectively along the side of the property that is facing towards Porter Drive. This was the previous site plan where they showed, you can see the mouse cursor moving around. They had their traffic mitigating amenity space along here. This is where their potted plants will be, and it will be shown on the next slide, here, where you can see the difference. They had co-located their traffic amenity space over to here, which is in combination of where they propose to have their bike repair facility, to activate this frontage space over here. Additionally, you see these landscape planters here, and you can see those on the elevation drawings on the photo renderings of the site. They are proposing to place an area resource center container, which is going to be holding a number of safety equipment, so they would be able to access the building in the event of any sort of emergency. If they were not able to get into the building, this is where that information would be stored, like walkie-talkies and first aid kits. That is a new change to the site. On the elevation drawings, you will see that they did try to highlight more, kind of this contrast between the first and the ground floor. You can also see on this rear balcony over on this left-hand side that they have changed the window paneling along here to be glass, which will call more attention to a [inaudible] in between the rear balcony and the front balcony, and they have removed this band here to showcase the stairs, which will help to identify more of the building in an angular [inaudible]. On the right-hand side, you see that with the existing, the comment related to bringing the doorways up to the underside, has been addressed by bringing the material closer up. They're showing that continuation up to the bottom side of the soffit of the second floor. Staff feels that that has been adequately addressed. One item that was brought, again, to attention was this rear balcony. You see on the left-hand side an existing condition or existing proposal, and a new proposal, which is where we have an additional use of glass paneling on the back, and we have the staircase steps being more angular in nature, pulled towards more of the east [inaudible] paneling that they're using on the site. Previously, due to the fact that we aren't able to share physically the material samples, we have been sharing the front dimensional photos of the materials that you see here. This is the curtain wall glazing. This is the balcony taper. You have the material for the wood soffit. And we have the material for the silver metal panels and mullions, accent metal, and other metals to be used on the site. With that, staff recommends that the ARB recommend approval of the project, and we would be working to, once the project has been approved, then we will be waiting until the M&D public hearing process is finished. That concludes my presentation.

Ms. Gerhardt: Garrett, do we know who from the applicant's team would be speaking, so that Vinh can let them in?

Mr. Sauls: It should be Kevin McCarthy and James Winstead, are the ones who would be presenting from Stanford. We also have David J. Powers, the City's consultant, available if there are any questions the Board has about the document.

Mr. Nguyen: I've admitted James, and I'm sorry, who else?

Mr. Sauls: Kevin McCarthy.

Jason McCarthy: It's Jason McCarthy.

Mr. Sauls: Jason McCarthy, sorry. Jason McCarthy.

Chair Baltay: Let's move into the applicant's presentation. You'll have 10 minutes to speak to us. You can go ahead any time you like. Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: Jason and James are both unmuted.

[Connecting with Jason and James.]

Jason McCarthy, Studios Architecture: Good morning. My name is Jason McCarthy with Studios Architecture. It's a pleasure to be here with you, albeit virtually this morning, but a pleasure to be back and presenting some of the updates to the project since our conversation with all of you earlier this year in January. I'll just mention, the Stanford client is also on the call, if there's any questions we need to let them address in the conversation that follows. Just to refresh, I think Garrett did an excellent job to frame the project, but just to refresh some of the early drivers of the design and what our thinking was as we approached the project. We really wanted to celebrate this very important intersection in the Research Park – Porter Drive, Hillview Avenue and Hanover Street, all coming to this intersection. Three iconic addresses in the Research Park. And then, geographically, just being located at this sort of heart of the Research Park. We wanted to address that and bring the building forward to the intersection, create an identity of welcome for the project, and really create what could become a social hub for the research park at large. Next slide please. On the site plan, I'm sure you all remember, but the project has this wonderful series of plaza spaces or outdoor amenity areas that wrap the building on three sides towards the south, east and west. As Garrett mentioned, we've been able to relocate the traffic mitigating amenity – a planned café – toward the Porter Drive façade, so that, together with the bike repair, we feel will really help frame the entrance and animate the project to the Porter Drive frontage. Next slide, please. Here is the Porter Drive image of the building. Really, that sense of welcome and identity of community that we're trying to develop with this project. The architecture is very much articulated to be pedestrian-friendly, and we wanted the building to, in a sense, engage with that intersection, engage with the pedestrian, the bicycle access and transit access, onto the property. The architecture here is articulated and has a level of detail that we think is going to help give this building a very warm and inviting feel. That's going to be attractive to the smaller technology, early-stage companies that we envision coming to work in this building as a multitenant facility. Next slide, please. Here along the entry drive, you can start to see where we begin to tailor the building a little bit in response to some of the discussion we had in the earlier hearing. As Garrett mentioned, we were able to bring the doorways and metal panel accents at the base up to that datum that wraps the building now, all the way around, in a more consistent manner. We think that's been a good improvement to the design and really helps, in a sense, simplify this façade so that you can appreciate the dynamic pattern of the windows around the building. Next slide, please. Here at the west and south plaza, you can see that we also modified the fenestration or window pattern. We made the second level windows a little less symmetrical, so it's more in keeping with that dynamic rhythm of openings along the entry drive. Again, we were able to bring ground floor openings up to that datum line on the second floor. Further, as Garrett mentioned, we did revisit the stair and balcony design here, and we propose now an all-glass guardrail with a very minimalist detail for the balcony itself, which is, again, in keeping with that front balcony design. And then, in complement with that, we decided to express the tread and riser of the stair by using an underslung structural strainer, and that added detail, we think, adds a nice complement to the simplicity and elegance of the balcony, as well. Next slide. The material palette here hasn't changed, but we have it here for reference. Still very warm and inviting. Very friendly and modern and forward looking, we think. Next slide. With that, I'll transition over to James to speak to more of the open space updates to the design. Next slide. James, please.

James Winstead, Guzzardo Partnership: Thanks, Jason. Good morning. First, thank you, Board members, for your thoughtful comments last time we presented this project. I'll take the remaining time here to walk you through changes that we've made in response to what we heard. First, while we're on this slide showing

the site plan for the project, just a reminder of some of the guiding concepts for site design of this. Again, somewhat unique to the Research Park is the really strong front door presence that this project has to Porter Drive. We use that to bring a very open, welcoming entry experience, bringing pedestrians into the project, feeling like it's an open place that you could come visit. The plaza around the south side of the building is furnished with comfortable outdoor work spaces, warm materials such as wood seating elements and the like, and there's an extremely strong indoor/outdoor relationship between that plaza and the ground floor of the building, offering a lot of interaction possibilities there. And then, lastly, this project embraced transit connections with the Research Park transit opportunities, and then, bicycle circulation, providing ample bike parking, and then, the bike amenity within the building itself. Next slide, please. The first item that we looked at based on comments was this entry stairway and the bike channels that we're providing to bring you up [distortion]. One of the changes that you can see here is that we've actually split that flight of stairs into two sections with a middle landing, which creates a little bit more of a generous, welcome, comfortable approach up into the site. And then, with the bike channel itself, we've added one, so there's one on each side, comfortable [distortion] to bring your bike up and down, or if two people are using it at the same time. And then, with those channels, we've carefully studied spacing for pedals and handlebars and things like that, that they would be easy to use in that area. We have reviewed this with Planning and Transportation staff, and they were both very happy with what we're proposing here. Next slide, please. We also have some comments about some of the planting areas in some relatively narrow spaces around the project. What we're highlighting here is the cyan color you see, is where we're proposing to use structural soil for trees and planting areas that are adjacent to paving. And then, the green highlighted raised planter at the back of the building is the built-up planter that's over the garage lid underneath, where we're proposing the oak tree. We're providing roughly 1,000 cubic feet of soil there. Both of these approaches – the soil volume in that planter and the structural soil – are consistent with recommendations we've received from urban forestry on similar projects with similar conditions, and we are working with [inaudible] Science on this project, who is a consultant, to ensure that we are providing really good growing conditions for these plants. And then, as far as the plant material itself, we reviewed what we're proposing, and we're very comfortable with the actual plant species, that they are suitable for these planting conditions. Next slide, please. The next couple of slides, we'd like to show you some of the screening approaches that we're using throughout the site. First, as Garrett mentioned, the potted trees along the north property line. We've confirmed that those are allowed. The pots themselves are fitted with forklift skids so they can be easily moved out of the way in case there needs to be any service done to utilities in that easement. Those are along that north property line. The second piece is we've introduced an architectural wood screen around the transformer, which is just off the northwest corner of the building. This is using the same Kebony wood material that we've already proposed for use on the seating elements in the plaza, so there's a cohesive material palette throughout the site where we're using that. It's a really elegant way to provide a visual buffer to that utility. The last piece on this slide is at the back of the property line where we have that screen wall for the ground treatment facility. We are proposing an evergreen hedge along there. We think that's an important feature, just to create a soft, a little warmer environment in the parking lot area. And then, we'll show a little more about lighting in a couple slides, but there was a comment. Previously, we had a parking lot pole light on that wall, and we've been able to remove that in favor of bollards. It's a little bit more of a simple expression all the way along that back property line. Next slide, please. As Garrett mentioned, the introduction of the area response center structure at the back of the site. We're using a similar, again, the architectural wood fence to provide screening there. In this case, we also have a little more space around it, so there's some really nice foreground planting leading up to. Again, it's that same Kebony wood material, so it's cohesive throughout the site. Next slide, please. Here you can see that in context. We think that's a really elegant way to provide this, sort of essential function, and it really ties into the rest of the site here. Next slide, please. This will be the final one. We took a very close look at the site lighting based on some comments we heard, with a specific look at trying to reduce the pole light fixtures where we were able to. We have been successful, as I mentioned, along the back property line. We were able to eliminate one of the parking lot lights in favor of bollards for that walkway. And then, throughout the plaza areas, taking a really close look at the photometrics and where we can use efficiency there to eliminate a picture or two, and substituting bollards in a couple of cases. We've been able to, like in the pedestrian plaza areas, we've reduced the poles by five. We're very happy with where we've ended up on the lighting design. Next slide, please. That concludes our presentation. We're all available on line, and as Jason mentioned, the Stanford team is also here, and our civil engineer is available if you guys have any questions. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. A very nice presentation. Do we have any questions of the applicant? I have three relating to materials. I wonder if you could just walk us through. Is it possible to get back to that material board you flashed on the screen? This is just unfortunate because we don't have a material board in front of us. I just want to understand better what they really are.

Mr. Sauls: Would you like the...?

Chair Baltay: The applicant showed a fairly nice put-together of materials.

Mr. Sauls: Okay.

Chair Baltay: If it's possible to get back to that. To the applicant, I'd like to have you explain to us what the metal slat, the vertical elements that make up the majority of the façade, are, if I were putting my hands on them. And then, the wood slats on the soffit, are those an actual wood? Is that the Kebony wood that you're talking about?

Mr. McCarthy: Thank you, Chair Baltay. This is Jason again. I'll start with the silver metal panel. It's a profiled metal panel that we're developing, and the image that's on the slide here is representative. It's not the actual sample. In essence, we're developing a series of varying width profiles of sort of, you could call it a board-and-batten look. They are, I think, three inch, six inch, and 12 inch width sections of profile and recess, and they're in a varying, sort of randomized, if you will, pattern, so there will be three standard panels that are repeated in a sequence that creates a random look. It's got a little deeper profile, so it has a nice depth to it. It has a sense of relief and shadow to it. We wanted it to have a texture and a sense of refinement, but also being, in a sense, a simple material, elegant and simple, but in a sense, humble as well.

Chair Baltay: Can I ask, for each individual board and bat, so to speak, are they individual pieces, or is it one larger rolled sheet?

Mr. McCarthy: They are formed metal panels, similar to the image that's on the screen. They interlock in a way that has a concealed fastening. They have sort of a lap that locks them together and keeps a very consistent profile. It's a finished project, and it's a custom, if you will, pattern. But it's a manufactured product that's designed for this interlock without any exposed fasteners.

Chair Baltay: Is it a material like zinc, or naturally finished thing that weathers, or is it a painted steel? What is the material?

Mr. McCarthy: In this case, it's a painted steel. The silver coloring that you see in the image here is, in fact, the proposed finish, so it's a high-performance metallic paint.

Chair Baltay: I guess it's impossible to answer this, but how reflective is it?

Mr. McCarthy: It has a relatively satin finish. It's not a high-gloss panel. Like a metallic, it has some amount of reflectivity to it. It has a sparkle to it, but it's not a glossy finish.

Chair Baltay: Do samples exist of this thing, or is it still in development?

Mr. McCarthy: We do have them in our office, back in quarantine-land.

Chair Baltay: That's why the questions are coming.

Mr. McCarthy: We're also going to be developing larger-scale mock-ups as we get into construction.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And the soffit, that's natural wood?

Mr. McCarthy: Yes, it's a natural wood, although we're not proposing the Kebony for the soffits because they're somewhat more protected and overhanging. We wanted a lighter color for those soffit materials, so we're proposing a cedar, which is weather resistant, but can be very handsome and a little bit lighter than [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: Those would be individual tongue-and-groove boards, or lap boards, or...?

Mr. McCarthy: Yes.

Chair Baltay: It's not a plywood sheet that's been [crosstalk].

Mr. McCarthy: Correct, correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay, great. Any other questions?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I have one. Did Garrett have...? I remember him showing material samples of the project, but it wasn't the metal panel, right? We were looking at a balcony paver. Is that right?

Mr. McCarthy: That's right. That was also in the... He had an image of the metal, again, the sample that was provided on the board was more for the finish of metal, rather than the actual profile of the metal panel. That was shown in Garrett's earlier slides as well.

Mr. Sauls: I can show that right now. Hold on.

Vice Chair Thompson: That would be great.

Mr. Sauls: This is the one you were talking about, Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah. Okay, so, this is just a... Okay, I see. It's just an example of the finish.

Mr. Sauls: Yes.

Board Member Hirsch: I have a question, too. What's the material of the fascia of the balcony in the back? I think it's more than one area that has it.

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, you can see that in the image here, the white accent metal. We have a number of elements of the design that are actually going to be painted white, and that includes those balcony fascia, as well as the exposed steel columns along the front façade, where we've got the ground floor colonnade expressed.

Mr. Sauls: This one right here.

Mr. McCarthy: And then, the dark gray accents are for the window reveals, if you will, the trim around the window punches, as well as those ground-floor metal panel openings and doors.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you very much for that quick discussion about the materials. I think it points out, at least in my mind, that it's really hard to make a real evaluation without seeing these things. But, let's keep moving forward.

Board Member Lew: I have one question.

Chair Baltay: Sure, go ahead, Alex.

Board Member Lew: I have a question about the, there's an existing stair and pathway to the Hewlett-Packard site. I think I've seen in the drawings, you mention that there could be a future connection, and I was wondering what the status is of that.

Mr. Sauls: Sure. Are you talking about the side that is closer to the substation, or the 3181 Porter Drive location?

Board Member Lew: Oh, I'm not sure. I just, I saw it when I was visiting the site.

Chair Baltay: It's next to the substation, on the right as you're facing...

Board Member Lew: On the right side, yeah, near the substation.

Mr. Sauls: Okay. Currently, there isn't a proposal to maintain any sort of connection between the spaces, so that would be, there's that kind of off-road/dirt road that's up along this side that you're talking about?

Board Member Lew: Right.

Mr. Sauls: Right. Currently, there isn't a proposal to maintain that as a vehicle passageway between the site, and I spoke with the fire department and there's no requirement for it to be maintained. Effectively, it would be cut off at this point and become unusable in terms of having a vehicle passing through the space. We could obviously have one do so anyway and drive over whatever curbs may be there, and over this kind of [inaudible] bike pathway that they've got going on along the back here. But there isn't any expectation that that would be kept.

Chair Baltay: I believe there's also a pedestrian staircase that...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I recall a staircase, but...

Chair Baltay: ...somebody put a lot of effort into it at one point. There's even a small landscaped area, maybe 20, 50 feet up from the property line. It may be worth having the applicant consider how they're going to incorporate that because people will use it.

Mr. McCarthy: Currently, it's not maintained. As I understand it, that's on the HP parcel and we couldn't force them to upgrade all of that to what we would like it to be. To become an accessible pathway, it would be quite an investment, so I don't know what the long-term prospects are for them improving that side of the berm there.

Chair Baltay: It might just be a matter of putting a pathway for you branching to that, so at least people could [crosstalk]...

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, we sort of expect that could connect in here over time if they were to update their side of the fence. I think Stanford would welcome that, to increase the pedestrian friendliness of the Research Park.

Chair Baltay: If we move on, do we have any public comments on this project, Vinh? I'd like to open it to public comment if we have anything.

Mr. Nguyen: We do not have any public comments for this item.

Chair Baltay: Okay, is there anyone out there who wishes to address us on this item? Okay, I don't see, hear, nobody has their digital hand raised up.

Mr. Sauls: Sorry, one last little thing on that. There is a pedestrian pathway connecting 3181 Porter Drive and 3215. It's a little more difficult to see because of this overcast in the tree, but there is a proposal to have an allowance to connect – you see the mouse moving through – from one site to the next, with this proposal. It's not on the HP side, it's connecting towards 3181 Porter.

Chair Baltay: Great. Thank you, Garrett. Why don't we go back to the street view of this building? It's very nice looking. David, why don't you start us off with your comments?

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, thank you. Well, there are some significant improvements here that I think that you've made on the design, both of the building and of the site. I appreciate in particular the lighting changes that were made because I felt that, certainly the poles seemed a lot higher and interrupted the building, and certainly you see it, in this case, that the lighting is brought down to a more pedestrian level. I think it's a significant improvement in the project on the lighting side. Of course, the little details were we, it's wonderful, the fact that, you know, the way the bicycle can be brought up to the plaza level there on the side. Never seen that before. I think it's a wonderful idea. One other plus... It would be good if we could switch to the site plan. The fact that you've found a way to keep those trees alive as a creative order to the ramp going downstairs, and the other parking on that level, by expanding the amount of open paving area where they can be watered properly, so we know they're going to live. I think that allows us to agree that it's possible to have trees on that perimeter. I am assuming that you really looked at that in enough detail, you know, that those trees would last in our dry season here. Because it's an issue – Are they going to be watered? I suppose that would work, expect that there is such a drought that you can't water. I would hope that you could answer a question as to what would be done. Will those trees really last? Or do they need to be, especially on the ramp level, does it need some other kind of planting? It would be nice to have the trees, but I'm not sure they're going to make it. Your choice as to how you make sure that will stay just as it has been drawn. Personally, I love that back wall. I think that somebody spent a lot of time in it, and I sort of hate to see us kind of gussy it up with planting in front of it. I expressed that before. I think the bollards actually add something to it, but I would wish that there were almost no planting in front of that piece because it's sort of an art piece of its own. And maybe lower planting rather than more planting, which is what you seem to have done here. You know, a building like this is really, it's one of those buildings that [inaudible] in the detail. I maybe didn't look at the detail; it's so hard when you don't have the drawings in front of you, to really ask yourself the question, how is this handled, that handled? Digital set in order to see it all. And I didn't do that. Metal paneling, I happen to know a little bit about this because I have a house that's made out of zinc. The detail of how you end a vertical piece when it comes down to the bottom, and how does it turn in under, and how does it turn into the window – all of those kind of details are really quite critical, and I don't think I've seen enough of that detail yet. I sort of trust that the quality of everything that's been here is really quite nice. Elevation and perspectives are beautiful. But sometimes the extra detail is really necessary when you're dealing with materials like that. The corrugated metal, you know, what happens with it underneath as you need another surface? What creates the joint at that point? How does water flow off of that? I sort of expect Osma will get into this more than I would, but I'm a little concerned with the fascia materials on that deck. I think the rear deck in particular. I think that is a big improvement over what was shown before, in reaction to some of the comments that were made. And yet, I still am not too sure about the detail of the face metal material, how that's going to work relative to the paving above, and how the water gets off of that deck. I'm not sure if I looked at the front deck and whether it has a similar problem, but the rear one sort of sticks out to me as an issue of detailing, once again. But from the beginning, the landscape and the idea of an inside/outside building like this, it's quite wonderful. The whole building, its casualness, and in a setting of, kind of rigid, industrial look to the rest of the whole Research Park, this is a pleasant relief from those [inaudible] to a building that is quite friendly, and the landscaping, which is really wonderful, all around it. It's sort of too bad that it has to be pots on the other side, but it's better to have the trees than not to have the trees. In a sense, that's all my comments. The step lighting, which I did suggest, I think it's reasonable to say that it's more difficult to maintain than what you've shown, so I accept that point of view. Other than that, I would say that if this were to have to go to committee at all, it would be because of the detailing of the materials on the outside, more than anything else that I would comment on here today. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Alex, do you want to pick it up from there, please?

Board Member Lew: Sure. I actually don't have very many comments. I do support the project. I think the community center-like design, the indoor/outdoor design, the low height light fixtures, native plants, and the structural soil, are all really well designed, and I can support the project. I do understand David's comments about all the joints and details on the metal panels. I did not review those. If you want that to come back to subcommittee, I will support that. I will say that Studios has done several buildings in the

Research Park and they've all turned out really well, so I do trust that they can do the job on this project as well. That's all that I have.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Osma, what are your thoughts?

Vice Chair Thompson: I can support this project. It's very, very handsome, and I think the improvements are mostly good. Really appreciate the bike stair channel. I think that's a huge benefit to the project. I am very concerned about the metal panel. Throughout the course of this meeting, I thought I knew what it was, and then it became very evident I did not know at all what it was. And the fact that, I guess the material sample isn't really what it really will be, I'm sort of strongly in favor of going to subcommittee just to review that material specifically. Not that I don't trust the applicant at all; it's really just that, you know, the color sample really isn't enough to understand exactly what's going on with that wall. I do see some of the details that you provided, but they're very minimal. It's not enough to really know what this whole thing is getting cladded in. So, I would like to see that go to subcommittee. But the design of the back stair, the exit stair that goes up to the second floor on the back side of the building, I've been struggling with that a little bit. Seeing the before and after, initially I sort of preferred seeing that stringer on the sides. To understand the design intent, is to go for something minimal, sort of looking at it. It seems like there's a glass guardrail that sort of extends, become a wire guardrail, sort of a wire infill guardrail. I'm a little nervous about the detailing of that. I didn't see any details of that stair in the drawing set to really kind of understand, like, are we going for a floating stair kind of thing? I'm struggling with the stair design a little bit. Otherwise, it's nothing that would stop me from improving the project. It would basically be a subcommittee item. Those are my comments.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. I share my colleagues' sentiments. In general, I'm ready to support this building. I think it's an excellent design. They've done a lot of good things. A lot of thought has gone into this, and almost everything they've described and explained what they've been thinking, I've been impressed with, from the bike channel, to the wood covering of the transformer, to the landscaping, to the light fixtures. My sole concern – and I think this should come back to subcommittee because of this – is the materials. Unfortunately, I just think that without a material board in front of us, it's really tough to know what it's really going to be like. That metal paneling is, in particular, important to me. If that's a very rounded edge where they've formed those board and bats, it won't look like that. It will look like a corrugated metal piece that they screwed up the spacing on. If it's too reflective, it will just be awful. It will be really shiny and bright. Those are both things you just have to see firsthand. It's not that I don't have confidence. These guys are really good architects and they've done some great buildings, but I think it's incumbent upon us to be careful, and to see that kind of stuff. I don't really have anything else to add to the discussion, but I would like to see us in some way come back and review the material samples as real samples, and perhaps see a few details of things like the stairs, as Osma mentioned, and the edge of the balcony railings, the fascia, how that drainage is handled. I'm sure that they're going to come up with great solutions, but we just don't see it now. It's just too hard to dive into that level of detail on the screen. With that, are there any other comments from anybody else?

Mr. Sauls: Yeah, if I may, I would like to share the details that we all are talking about on the screen. Stanford did provide these items based on you guys' request previously, so I wouldn't want it to seem as though they haven't tried to address the comments. Here, we have detailing of the inside corner of the balcony, and your other connection details, how this material is coming together. Jason, I think will be able to talk in more detail about these, and I can sift through the two or three different details that you guys are looking at. There's information about the balcony as well.

Mr. McCarthy: Thank you, Garrett. If you could go back to that plan view, the detail of the metal panel. Before I try and respond, I just want to say we are totally in agreement of the importance of the detailing on this project, and the simplicity, and a sense of the diagram puts more pressure on all of the detailing being really well thought through. It's what we're working on right now in developing the package for permit submission. A lot of the details that you pointed out in terms of how we transition at the datum line where the building steps back, the detail at the window inset, the detailing of these stairs, and so forth, these are all... We totally agree and appreciate the importance of them, and to some degree, that's our favorite part of the project, is making sure those look good. I appreciate everyone's comments and concerns

on those, and if we do need to go to subcommittee, happy to help reassure all of you of that further. As far as the metal panel goes, I was trying to see if I have... We have photos of those. They're not really great photos of the samples that are in the office, but we probably have enough samples that we could ship one to each of you for your, you know look and feel over. But if you'd just zoom in on that plan detail of the corner there, Garrett, for a moment, you can see essentially the profile, which is a deeper leg return. It is a relatively crisp corner, Peter, to your comment. Sorry, Chair member Baltay. And it's a system that is developed by Centreea [phonetic], and they...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: [inaudible]

Mr. McCarthy: ...metal panel buildings with the concealed fastening. We're pretty comfortable with the profile, but agree that the transitions to other surfaces are going to be critical.

Chair Baltay: The detail of the edge of the balcony as water rolls off, or doesn't. Do you have that...?

Mr. McCarthy: It's not a very large-scale detail. If you could go back, Garrett, to the section through the balcony. There you go. Back up on. That's the overview, but if you back up one. Other way, sorry. There's the detail, if you zoom in on that. There's actually going to be a glass shoe, you know, that's concealed in the metal panel fascia. The wood plank soffit is trimmed on the underside of that balcony. The pedestal system will conceal the drainage that's happening below, so we're not running any water over the edge of the balcony. We're trying to treat this as elegantly and minimally as possible. There will be some reveals to the metal panels that aren't really evident in the renderings, that there is a, you know, occasional reveal. We're treating all of that and considering all of that carefully. But we've been, again, just trying to reassure all of you, we're trying to develop these details as consistently as we can with the rendering and the intent, which is to keep this a very simple and elegant façade at the balcony edge. That's one example to illustrate there, but there's more detail to be developed, but hopefully that gives you a sense of the assembly that's involved.

Chair Baltay: David, what's your take? This looks like a pretty good [crosstalk].

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, this is significant information for us.

Mr. McCarthy: And actually, if I could go back to Board Member Hirsch's earlier comments about the question on the trees on the soil on the plaza, just to... I'm not sure if James mentioned this in his presentation, but we are working with Hort Science as part of our design team, and have a pretty robust team in terms of trying to make sure we've got the health of the species cared for, and the irrigation design to support all of that. I think we're bringing the best minds to all of these components as these projects are very much a labor of love and pride for all of us.

Mr. Winstead: Thanks, Jason. That's right, we are [crosstalk]...

Board Member Hirsch: [Laughing]

Mr. Winstead: ... plans for the project. There's a substantial amount of natives, and even the ones that are non-native are all selected for drought tolerance and good water efficiency for the irrigation system. Those are totally valid concerns, but we have taken that into account in our design.

Chair Baltay: That's great. Thank you, guys, for the comments about the trees. Can we back up a sec? Do you have similar details about the staircase, especially the one in the back? Osma had some concerns about that. It might be reassuring if you have the same thing.

Mr. McCarthy: I don't know if we included the section detail here. I think the rendering, if you go back to that view, Garrett, maybe where you compare the two in your presentation.

Chair Baltay: I think we all have in our mind the difference between the stringer and the steps. Showing the edge of the [crosstalk].

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, I don't think we included the railing detail in the stair, to answer your question.

Chair Baltay: Osma, you're feeling like you'd like to see that at a subcommittee level, that kind of detail for the rails and the stairs?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, it just took a little bit of digging to really figure out... It sounds like it's a cable wire rail, a cable wire guardrail for the stair.

Mr. McCarthy: We're actually proposing that as a rod on the exterior. We've had issues where the cable tends to create rust over time where it penetrates the stanchions, and no matter how good a job you do painting it, eventually the wire abrades and there's some kind of corrosion that happens. We've transitioned our thinking for that stair to be a thinner rod element instead of a wire, so it would be, you know, a half-inch diameter rod.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. The drawing on page 23 says wire infill.

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, I think we, you know, that's an update since we submitted this package to you.

Mr. Sauls: Let me just show... We do have some information on it; maybe not enough. On this section of the plan, we do have some more...

Mr. McCarthy: Yeah, if you could zoom in on that a little bit further, Garrett, I think that's helpful. There's more detail to be developed than what's demonstrated by this drawing, in terms of how those stanchions will connect back to the structure. Again, these are pieces of the project that we're still developing further in detail for constructability purposes. Again, we're passionate about getting it right and making it look wonderful. We think we've got a good start on it, but again, we'd be happy to present further development on that with all of you. Or in committee.

Chair Baltay: Thanks for those explanations, guys. That's helpful. I'm feeling like the detailing is probably going to come into place pretty nicely. They seem to know what they're doing, and what we're seeing... Everything we see looks good, and it's pretty reasonable that it's taking time to do all of this. I'm still concerned, though, that the materials themselves, especially that metal panel, what is it going to look like? It's really unfortunate for you that you just can't show us the panel. It might be that in the next month or two, we're able to have a formal meeting together where we can see it. Do I have any consensus with the rest of the Board that we still want to see some of these things back on subcommittee, or should we just let this go? Other people, what do you think? Alex, you haven't spoken.

Board Member Lew: If the rest of the Board wants to see the metal panel at subcommittee, I will support that. I'm generally okay with all of the details as far as they've been developed so far.

Chair Baltay: Osma, how do you feel about the panels and the detailing so far?

Vice Chair Thompson: Certainly, I think I would definitely support seeing the material board at subcommittee. And I would also like to see how the stair progresses and how that detail evolves as well. Is the Board okay with reviewing that as well?

Board Member Hirsch: David, are you in the same frame of mind?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, I'm much encouraged by the other details that I've seen. I should have maybe looked a little further into it. It seems like some are missing, but that their capability to do them properly is here. I'm right down the middle. I could let this one go and trust in the designers to put it together.

Chair Baltay: Let's get Jodie, help us out here. Are we likely to be able to see physical samples in the next month or two? And to the applicant, what timeline is it that it becomes an issue for you if we want to see back the details as you're evolving them, but also see real samples? How can we work with you and still want to see this?

Ms. Gerhardt: At this moment, we're not anticipating physical meetings in the near future, but I think we could ask the applicant, you know, somehow we could figure out how to mail those to you, especially if it's a subcommittee that's two members, so it's not too many samples.

Board Member Hirsch: The other thing you might consider is just asking the samples be kept at City Planning and we go visit them ourselves.

Chair Baltay: I'm not sure there's anybody there, David.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, City Hall isn't open, but we can certainly figure out a common location if that's needed, as well...

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah. I think also – going back to the stair thing – just the fact that the drawing [distortion] wire infill and it's evolving to cable rods, like, I think, given that that design isn't complete, it would be worth... I'm going to encourage the Board to consider that it would be worth seeing at subcommittee.

Chair Baltay: Okay, and to the applicant, does this hurt your timeline, if we want to see one more go-around at a subcommittee level? What's your timeframe?

Mr. McCarthy: Well, we're trying to wrap up our detailing so that we can submit drawings for permit near the end of this month. Early June, actually. I don't know what timeframe or how quickly you'd be able to reconvene to present... I mean, I think we'd be ready to do that relatively immediately. In terms of getting samples to you, we could probably get that done relatively shortly. If it can be scheduled in short order, I think that's better for our scheduling impacts.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, and to be clear, I mean, you can submit for building permits before subcommittee.

Mr. McCarthy: Oh, okay. Then it shouldn't really matter. If for some reason you were to not like our railing design and we had submitted drawings for permit, and you said, oh, we really want you to go back to a cable infill, then we have to revise drawings. It does have some impact to us, Jodie, but it's possible, sure.

Chair Baltay: It sounds like you're moving along fairly quickly, though.

Mr. McCarthy: Yes. That's the intent.

Chair Baltay: Then, to the Board, I think we can put this on a subcommittee, but let's identify who that committee is now, and let's just let them get these things by mail worked out. Does anyone want to try and make a motion?

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah. I'll move that we approve the project subject to the conditions, with two items going to subcommittee. One is a review of materials, and another is to look at the details of the exit stair.

Chair Baltay: Are there any other details you want to see? We might as well just be clear with them what we wanted to see. David, you had some thoughts.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, nobody has picked up on my thought about the back wall there, that's a piece of artwork by itself.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, we're trying to make a motion on subcommittee items, so I think that one...

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Chair Baltay: I'll second that motion. Do we have any friendly amendments on the details? Other details you'd like to see.

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

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I have a friendly amendment. I'd like to see less planting at the back wall.

Chair Baltay: Do we have a second on that friendly amendment? Okay, the motion fails for lack of a second. David, I'm sorry. I'm trying to be formal here.

#### **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT MOTION FAILS FOR LACK OF SECOND**

Chair Baltay: The other details for the building. For example, the edge of the metal panels at top and bottom. Did you want to see that kind of thing?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I do.

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

Chair Baltay: Okay, so, I'd like to make a friendly amendment to add the detailing to the top and the bottom panels. Although I'm the seconder anyway.

Vice Chair Thompson: I accept that.

Chair Baltay: You accept that. Anything else?

Board Member Hirsch: I didn't see quite enough of the fascia versus the window connecting elements of the projecting metal screening either.

Chair Baltay: Can you clarify that and make it into an amendment?

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

Board Member Hirsch: I propose that see more details of the way in which the recesses and the connections of materials, other materials, are shown.

Chair Baltay: That's a friendly amendment. Osma, what do you think?

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry, I didn't follow. Where is this detail?

Board Member Hirsch: As the recess of the projecting elements as they meet window bays and flat material behind the projections.

Vice Chair Thompson: The louvers?

Board Member Hirsch: I don't think we've seen enough there yet.

Vice Chair Thompson: I just want to be clear.

Board Member Hirsch: They're in progress, but they're not there yet.

Ms. Gerhardt: Are we talking about joints where two different materials come together?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, correct.

Ms. Gerhardt: Just seeing all those details where the two materials come together.

Board Member Hirsch: Mm-hmm.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. I'm fine with that.

Chair Baltay: Okay. It's moved and seconded, and there's been some amendments that have been accepted, and as the seconder, I accept them as well. Are we ready for a vote? Vinh, could we have a vote, please?

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

No: (0)

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

Chair Baltay: Okay, the motion carries. Before we finish that, I'd like to appoint Osma and David to that subcommittee, right up front so it's clear to staff and the applicant. I think you two have been very focused on this, so it would be good to have you handle the subcommittee, unless there's an issue with that.

Vice Chair Thompson: That's fine.

Chair Baltay: Okay. With that, we're done with item 3. Jodie, typically we would take a break at some point. Is that something we can do right now?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, that would be perfect. We can take a five minute break, or something.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, can you give us a time that we can re-adjourn exactly, so we're all on the same level here? We're going to take a five or 10 minute break. What's a good round number?

Mr. Nguyen: How about we return at 10:45?

Chair Baltay: Sounds perfect.

[The Board took a short break.]

Chair Baltay: Let's re-adjourn. It's now 10:45. We're back in session, everybody. I'd like to shift our agenda, Jodie, if that's allowed, and do the subcommittee appointment for objective standards after 411 Lytton. Is that permitted, to do that?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, at the pleasure of the Chair.

Chair Baltay: I think that's better for the applicant's, to do that.

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

5. 411 Lytton Avenue [19PLN-00348]: Request for Preliminary Architectural Review of an Addition to an Existing Category 2 Historic Single-Family Residence. The Project Also Proposes the Expansion of an Existing Partial Basement to Construct two new Units and the Renovation and Rehabilitation of the Historic Structure. Zoning District: Downtown Commercial With Pedestrian Combining District (CD-C(P)). Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. For More Information Please Contact the Project Planner: Sheldon S. Ah Sing at [sahsing@mgroup.us](mailto:sahsing@mgroup.us).

Chair Baltay: With that, we're going to move on to our study session item, a preliminary review. Item number 5 is 411 Lytton A, request for preliminary architectural review of an addition to an existing Category 2 historic single-family residence. The project also proposes the expansion of an existing partial basement to construct two new units and the renovation and rehabilitation of the historic structure. We don't need to do disclosures because this is a study session. I have invited the chair of the Historic Resources Board, Dave Bower, to join us and discuss. The HRB has already reviewed this project as well. Maybe we'll have the staff presentation, and then, David, you can talk to us. Does that work?

David Bower, Chair, Historic Resources Board: Works for me, but I'd be happy to... It might be more useful for you to go through your presentation – I've seen it – and then, I can talk to you about it. Up to you.

Chair Baltay: With my colleagues' consent, I'd like to just have the HRB feel pretty represented on this. I think this is going to hinge on the historic nature of this building, so that's why he's here. With that, let's start a staff presentation. Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. I'm taking over this project for Sheldon Ah Sing, as we're trying to ramp down our use of consultants during this time period. I'm sorry if I don't have all the answers, but I'm happy to see that Chair Bower is here to help with some of the historic questions. I believe you're seeing the first slide here. The second slide, just explaining the project. This is a preliminary review, so we are not making any decisions at this point. This is more conversation with the applicant to see how they can improve their project before they do submit a formal application. The current project is to rehabilitate the existing structure to add approximately 200 square feet to the rear of the structure, and also add two units in a basement level. To do that, they will need a major ARB, which, again, will come back to the Board. They are also requesting off-site parking, and then, a bonus for doing the historic rehab. There are bonuses in the code allowed for that. The site currently includes the 854 square foot single-family home, which is a Category 2 that the HRB did recently review. They are proposing interior/exterior remodels of that structure, the addition to the back, as I said, and the two units underneath. There was a historic report conducted in 2012. It's been peer reviewed more recently, and then, also reviewed by the HRB. It does discuss the character-defining features and the rehabilitation work that is going to be done. We can talk further about that. This just goes into a little bit about the rehab work, that it would include a structural engineer assessment to ensure that the foundation and the front porch are stable. Replacing that foundation, removal of any non-historic items, being some of the stairs, and then, rehabilitating the character-defining features. The new construction is located in the rear, and then, we do have the two units proposed below. This is some diagrams showing the view when you come down the stairs. There would be a below-grade patio to get to the entrance to the two units. This just shows you an overview of the project. We have a cross-section, again, just showing you the basement there and the addition. The HRB did take a look at this on April 9<sup>th</sup>. There were some differing opinions that I hope Chair Bower can speak to. This goes a little bit into the HRB compliance evaluation, and maybe I can go back to these slides in a minute. As far as the parking, they are required to have four parking spaces on site, and some of them need to be covered. The current proposal is to have three off-site spaces at the adjacent property, and also to do a director's adjustment for one parking space. Regarding the floor area bonus, the project would be eligible for a bonus in the amount of \$2,500 square feet, after they complete the rehabilitation work. It's our understanding that the owner does not intend to use this on site, but it would be later transferred. Once they file a formal application and move forward with this project, the project would need to be found in conformance with the architectural review findings, the context-based design criteria, performance standards, and the Downtown Urban Design Guide. In conclusion, they are proposing rehabilitation of the existing structure and the two additional basement units. They are proposing to be consistent with Secretary of Interior standards, and we are just seeking direction from the Board to help them further their formal application. Chair Bower with the HRB, I can go back to some of these historic slides if that's helpful.

Chair Baltay: Okay, Jodie, that's your staff report?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, sorry, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so, we will hear from David. I wonder also, do we have the applicant on line to talk, to address this?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, I believe Ken Hayes is here. My view right now, I can't see.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, do we have Ken Hayes on the line as well?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we do have Ken Hayes on the line. Would you like me to unmute him?

Chair Baltay: Yes, please do. Hi, Ken, can you hear as, as well?

Ken Hayes: Can you hear me?

Chair Baltay: Hi, Ken, this is Peter Baltay. I'm not asking you to start your presentation now, but I'd like you to be aware that I've asked Dave Bower from the HRB to step in, and just chime in on how the meeting went with the HRB as well, so we have some background on all of this.

Mr. Hayes: Great, thank you.

Chair Baltay: I want to get your take, if you think... Would you rather we hear from David first, or hear your presentation? I'm trying to keep this...

[crosstalk]

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, whatever makes sense for you. I'm prepared either way. I was going to briefly summarize the comments that I heard from HRB, but if David is here to do that, that's fine.

Chair Baltay: David, why don't you carry us through this first, then. What went down at the meeting? Is that okay?

Mr. Bower: Fine. Thank you, Peter.

Chair Baltay: Please leave Ken on the line so he can hear and participate as well. Go ahead.

Mr. Bower: Sure. Thanks for including me in your review. As you know, the HRB reviewed this project on April 9<sup>th</sup>, and I think, if you, in your enormous packet, have the HRB minutes, on pages 12 through 14 is the relevant discussion of the project by HRB board members. Let me start, if you will indulge me for a minute, just reviewing how the HRB does a review of a project like this. We use the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation. They were first published in 1978 and revised in 1983. They are 10 different standards that describe how a board like ours will approach an evaluation of a project like this. Only three of those standards apply specifically to this project. Let me just read them, and I'll describe how the board reacted to each of them. Under number 2, it says that the historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved, and in number 9, it says new additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with massing, size, scale and architectural features to protect the historical integrity of the property and its environment. Standard number 10 says new additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property in its environment would be unimpaired. Let me start with standard number 2. Well, I should say, I looked up, as we always do as board members, compatibility and differentiation are our major focuses here, and if you look up the definition of "compatibility," it's existing or living in harmony. This is the online Merriam-Webster definition. And to "differentiate" is to make different by modification or change in character. Standard number 2 was discussed, and the board had widespread agreement that this project meets that standard. The character-defining features of the existing building are by and large retained, except for the small space on the rear of the building where the addition is going to be constructed. And those same features will be upgraded with maintenance and improvements to their character. In standard number 9, which was the focus of most of our discussion, board members were concerned about the top of profile and orientation of the siding on the addition, the flat roof form that's proposed, and the aluminum window material on the rear at-grade portion of the addition. In general, the board felt these features of the project were generally not

compatible with the existing building, and too differentiated to meet the Secretary of Interior standards. We didn't talk about colors, and in all fairness, Ken, his firm will produce materials and color board when this comes back to, I assume both boards, for formal review. But it was suggested by one board member that maybe the color of the rendering made the addition seem more stark or different than it actually will be in its final form. Finally, standard 10 is less significant because you could, in theory, remove the first floor addition from the back of the building and replace the shingles, thus not damage existing material beyond repair. Although that's extraordinarily unlikely it will ever be done, that's a standard that we have to look at. I wanted to just make one more comment. This differentiation and compatibility issue is always difficult, and there are lots of different ways to achieve those two goals. An example that I think is a very good combination of compatibility and differentiation is the Peninsula art league building on the corner of Ramona Street and Forest Avenue. The original building has a heavy dash plaster finish on the outside, it has a gable roof, and it has somewhat unique divided light windows. The addition has the same cement plaster finish, but it's a smooth finish. They have a modified gabled form on that addition, and the divided light windows on the addition are similar, but they are not identical. It's the similarity identity issue that we always struggle with. At any rate, it's a very good example of how you can achieve an addition that is both differentiated and compatible. I'd be happy to answer any other questions. That's basically the, a very brief overview of our meeting.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. That's very helpful, to have that. Unless my colleagues on the Board think otherwise, I'd like to hear what the applicant has to say. Are there any questions, or any ideas otherwise?

Mr. Hayes: Questions from the applicant?

Chair Baltay: No, from the Board. From other Board members. I don't want them to think I'm running roughshod over everybody here.

Vice Chair Thompson: I kind of want to wait, to hear from the applicant before asking.

Chair Baltay: Okay, Ken, why don't you take it away. You have 10 minutes. Thank you.

Mr. Hayes: Great. Good morning, everyone. I hope you've all been well and out of harm's way, and thank you for continuing the work of the City here. It's important that we continue to move forward, I think. My name is Ken Hayes with Hayes Group Architects. I'll be making a presentation on behalf of our client, Brad Ehikian with the Ehikian Company. Brad should be on the call. I can't see who the attendees are, but I'm pretty sure Brad is on the call, listening. I'm also joined this morning by our landscape architect, Laura Gerard [phonetic], and BKF Civil Engineers are here in case there's questions about the excavation, and maybe water management, that sort of thing. Isaac Comtroski [phonetic] and Monica Cartehenus Bardo [phonetic] is also with us. Jodie, thank you for stepping in for Sheldon. I'm going to ask you to advance to the first slide, please. The next slide, rather. The site, as we know, is a mid-block site. It's about 2,800 square feet. It's a very small site. Next slide. There it is in yellow. It is surrounded on three sides by the CDC (P) pedestrian overlay, commercial district, and to the rear, the RMD, which is kind of a multi-family low-density district. Next slide. This is the existing view of the house. I think we're all familiar with it if we've spent any time downtown. It is Category 2 Historic. We actually elevated it to that stature in 2014. It was built in 1901. It's a great example of a square cottage. There's actually a matching, a sister building to it, right around the corner on Waverly. They both used to occupy a single piece of property that has since been subdivided. It actually was part of the first residential subdivision of Palo Alto, so that was also part of the historic heritage of the property. As Chair Bower described, the proceedings at the HRB, I felt like they were generally in support of the concept. I wasn't overly surprised. I knew there'd be discussion about differentiation and compatibility. They specifically took note of the vertical siding and wondered why the addition had vertical siding when the cottage itself has the horizontal shingles. You can go ahead and advance the next slide, too, while I'm talking. That's the back of the building. That back porch was part of the character-defining features, but it's on this secondary elevation. That will be removed, along with the window and the door to the left. Or the window to the left and the door at the porch itself. Next slide. These are just some shots of the neighborhood. This project at one point was part of a larger project, which included this corner parcel at 437. This is to the right of the property. This is the parking lot where we would be able to provide the parking. The two properties are under common ownership, meaning this

property and the subject property of today's meeting. Next slide. This is the corner property. It's a little retail shop. Next slide. It kind of shows the whole block in perspective. Next slide. This gives an idea of what the program is. I'm sorry about the formatting there; it looked fine on mine. Five key points. Add two living units to increase the number of units to three, thus transforming this building into a permitted use in the CDC zoning district because they don't allow a single-family use in that zoning district. As a conforming use then, we'd be able to expand the existing house by adding one bedroom, which the owner has wanted to do for the last seven years, and develop two studios in the basement. Number three would be to create some outdoor landscaped areas so the new living units have a place outside that's immediately adjacent to their space. Make it feel like it's not in a basement. And, obviously, respect the historic integrity and comply with the Secretary of Interior standards, and the three that David had just outlined. M-Group had a historic review done of our application, and the historic consultant found that it was, in their opinion, in conformance with the Secretary of Interior standards. But I understand that we need to work with Palo Alto's HRB and find a mutually beneficial and appropriate design. And then, provide parking. Right now, there's a covered carport on the property where they park a car. We'd like to get rid of that. It's a temporary, tent-type structure. And because of the co-ownership or the common ownership with the property next door, we would combine or use the parking lot there, which is a commercial office/bank, and hopefully get some synergy to be able to provide our parking during off hours and weekends at that property. I have a letter of agreement and a lease modification. Obviously, this would have to be codified and recorded, but that's the intent, is to provide all the parking for this project next door. We would try to reduce the required number from four spaces using some of the director-approved parking accommodations, and have that reduced by 20 percent. So, we would have three spaces formally provided. Next slide shows some imagery. On the left, that's kind of what we're thinking in terms of vertical siding. Not sure about the color, but we thought that that clearly differentiated the addition. The slide in the middle is the underground living, or below-grade living, if you will. That's the inside view. On the right-hand side is the exterior view of that same unit. We like the idea of sort of this inside/outside flowing of space to make the units feel bigger. Next slide gives us some material palette here. We have the shingles on the right-hand side, representing the existing. We have a lot of board form concrete that wouldn't have been out of character for a period home like this, but that essentially defines everything below grade, foundation and down. We have some Corten metal panels on that picture, second from the left, and again, the vertical and, in this case, I guess that's a cedar siding. Next slide. Next slide. This represents the existing home. The next slide should kind of give you a shading of that. It's 853 square feet. Oh, we went the wrong way. Oh, okay, we skipped this one. This is some imagery for the landscape, the below-grade and at-grade areas. We're thinking native grasses, pavers, ways for water to be able to infiltrate the soil below, and then, this sort of inside/outside living on the right-hand slide. I think it would be just a wonderful place to live and get the benefits of being downtown. Next slide shows the footprint of the existing house. It's two bedroom, has a little living room, a kitchen and a bath, and not a whole lot else. It has the front porch that's going to be rehabilitated. Next slide gives you kind of an idea... It should come up with the floor plan shaded. Jodie, if you could advance it to the next slide.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, the computer is struggling a little.

Mr. Hayes: Yeah. It looks like it loaded more than the next slide. There's a 10-foot setback. There's no setback required because we're in the CDC, except where you abut residential properties. So, there's a 10-foot setback at the rear. Next slide. On this left-hand side of the building, there will be great solar exposure. It's kind of south-southwestern exposure, so we think that will be a nice place to live, essentially. Next slide gives you an idea at the bottom. We're providing three different ways to get into the site: Traditional access to the front porch in the center; and then, on the right-hand side, you can go down that pathway, it will be helpful for maintenance of the plants and so on, but also provide identity for one of the units that's downstairs. Perhaps there. On the left-hand side, we would provide access there, across some pavers. There's some outdoor space for the tenants to enjoy. That would provide access to the other unit that's downstairs. Next slide. The parking would be provided in this lot on the adjacent property. Like I said, it would be kind of a joint use parking facility, where the existing tenant would use it during the daytime for their operations, but after five o'clock – or whatever time is agreed to – it becomes the residential parking. We'd have a gate in the fence there. We would actually move the fence and try to bifurcate this landscape strip and get landscape on both sides of the fence, but have a gate through – if you go to the next slide – it shows the addition in the back of the building with a, it's a single 223 square foot, kind of a master

bedroom with a deck off the back. Next slide. Open space down below, and then, you see the arrows on the two stairs. There's a stair on the left and a stair at the top of the drawing. Those would be two individual stairs that would lead down to the sunken outdoor space. Next slide. Outdoor space is kind of highlighted there in the front of the building, so that would either be for all the tenants, or maybe for the tenant that occupies the existing house. But, of course, they have a private space in back on their deck, as well. Next slide. This just highlights where we proposed... There is no trash and recycling facility now on site, so we would, on the left-hand side there, provide an area for refuse. And I believe that's where we're using the Corten steel to kind of conceal that area on the left side of the building. The next slide I think shows the unit plans. This is down at the courtyard level. There are two unit plans. They are both studios, primarily because there's really no, you know, we don't want to have a rescue window and ladder out the front of the building because of the impacts that would have on the historic building. There are two studios. One is less than 500 square feet on the left-hand side, and the one on the right is, like 699 square feet. They both have separate toilet facilities. The back, kind of a dressing area, and then, sort of a common living/kitchen area on the unit on the left, and a little larger one on the unit on the right. Thinking that sliding glass doors would open up and the units could then live to be outside, and try to use the landscaping to create some private space for each of them. One thing that is important to us is we're trying to get some ventilation through these units, so there's a window provided at the bottom of the page there. You see what looks like a... It is a light well, essentially, next to the porch at the front of the building. That light well would have a window that someone could actually walk through at the studio level, so opening that window and opening up your sliding doors would get cross ventilation, we believe, through those units, which would make them a little more habitable, as well as then introducing light in the back area of the building. Next slide. I think there's some elevations. This is the elevation on the top, the west. This is a cross-section through the stair itself, and you can see how we've kind of established this horizontal line for the foundation. Everything below that would be the board formed concrete. And then, at the back left-hand side would be a wood structure, not unlike the historic building, built on top of the board formed concrete, but using a vertical siding, still wood. Could indeed be the same color as the historic home, but we felt like the vertical siding gave us that differentiation. We actually had a pitched roof on this building before, in the 2014 application for the larger mixed-use project. We, in the end, felt that was character defining... This is called a square cottage, and what's really character-defining is the simple square hip roof, so we felt that the flat roof was the least impactful to the simplicity of that square hip roof. We felt that that was the appropriate direction to take, to respect that, but also be compatible with the rest of the building. Front of the building, there's really no change. You do have the light wells on either side, but we'd be restoring the porch and the columns, and all the windows are going to be refurbished, etc. Next slide. Shows the east elevation, which is the parking lot side of the building next door. Again, refurbishing the existing historic building, and we've offset the addition at the back so that the addition on the right-hand side of that top elevation is set back about a foot. It's not coplanar. Again, a move to help differentiate the new and the old. And then, you can see the bottom view there is a section through the other stair that goes, if you were to come in from the parking lot side of the building, that would take you down to the courtyard. The next slides I think are just some sections, pretty self-explanatory. We're not changing the elevation of the historic building itself. It's elevated about three feet above grade, which helps minimize some of the excavation at the back of the building. You will step down into the bedroom addition in order to get all of that built below the plate line of the existing square cottage. Next slide gives you some 3D views. We're probably thinking that we would like to use a darker paint color, not too terribly dark, but something that might have deep grays with kind of green undertone to it. Wood horizontal fencing that would surround three sides of the property. Next slide. A view of the front. Now, I'm now showing landscaping in this, but there is a conceptual plan in your packet that we can talk about. I just realized I did not include that in the presentation. Maybe it's at the end. Next slide. Again, this is from the sideways side. You can see where we're starting to introduce some Corten steel panels that take you kind of into the site, and then, they begin to screen the trash enclosure, which is off to the right. Next slide. By the way, the picket fence is not historic, so we've elected to take the picket fence out to open the yard up a little bit more. Just a vertical, kind of an axon, so you can see what the composition looks like and the relationships, how the flat roof is below the iconic square hip, offset from the wall of the building and differentiated. Like I said earlier, there could be this move to actually, maybe use the same paint color, and that would help to integrate. I think color is one of the most important things, actually, in terms of compatibility, almost more than anything. And it shows the gate where the parking would be provided here in the foreground, and that gate does down to the unit below. This back balcony, we kind of like the idea that the upper

tenant can actually be on that balcony and overlook the space below, so that they could kind of have a community, so that they're not trying to be completely isolated from one another. That was an amenity that I think I wanted to highlight. Next slide. This might be a view down in the courtyard, looking into the larger unit. Next slide. You can see the board formed concrete, all the way around. This is the stair that goes out towards Lytton, and it gives you an idea of how those Corten steel panels would be introduced to provide a lighter way of screening the trash. We really want to stop this sort of datum or reference line of the board formed concrete where we're showing it at grade. And then, anything above that becomes a different material. Next slide. This is just the view from the opposite side, kind of axon. You see how the planters step down on the right-hand side for that entrance, and this gives you an overview of what the yard is below. The yard is about nine feet down from the existing grade, and the fence would probably be a six-foot fence, so we're trying to get vines and vegetation that would grow on that. I know Heeta [phonetic], a neighbor that lives kind of right behind the property, was on the call earlier, and she had some concerns over noise. I mean, I think that this is pretty low impact usage with two studios below grade, and being that the yard is depressed nine feet down, I doubt if there would be any impact acoustically. The mechanical units are intended to be at the front of the building in those light wells. We'd have, like, little compressors in there for the residential units, and we're still trying to figure out how we would handle it for the main unit itself. But no noise-generating equipment that we're aware of yet, at the back of the building. I think this was the last slide. Jodie, I always put slides behind my logo slide that are supporting slides. If you wanted to see the landscape, I think it's loaded in there somewhere. Unless everyone has the landscape plans in front of them.

Chair Baltay: Ken, I think you've probably exceeded your 10 minutes.

Mr. Hayes: I know, I know.

Chair Baltay: [crosstalk] of your presentation, but let's move on.

Mr. Hayes: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Do we have any questions of the applicant, or the HRB, or anything, from architecture board members.

Vice Chair Thompson: I have a question.

Chair Baltay: Yes, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: The front porch design, is that going to be one of the additions that will not try to look different?

Mr. Hayes: Board Member Thompson, the front porch is character defining, so we're going to be rehabilitating and restoring the porch itself, and the columns. And it actually has a painted wood, probably redwood, T&G decking. There was some discussion about the stairs, and then, the pipe rail. The pipe hand rails, there's been really no discussion about those in the historic report. I frankly don't know when they were added, but we would like to propose new metal railings in place of the pipe fitted railings. And the brick steps are planned to be replaced because I believe they're also failing, along with the porch. I want to look at the building around the corner that was the sister building to this, and I believe I said at the HRB that we would look at that building for understanding maybe how that porch, how those steps were built, maybe originally. I went and looked at that building and it actually has brick steps as well, so we may well be putting back brick steps at the front because it could be something that was part of the original, although I really felt that they were not. We wanted to put back wood steps, which you would find on many homes of this vintage.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions?

Board Member Hirsch: Question. Are the windows in the original house, are they going to be replaced? Are there any examples of windows? Were they replaced?

Mr. Hayes: Board Member Hirsch, no, the originals are original, and, boy, I wish I could buy windows today that would last 120 years. We're going to rehabilitate the windows. We have not inspected all of them. They're not in terrible shape from a rot standpoint, but most likely the counterweights and so on are all going to have to be replaced and rehabilitated. But the idea is that we would keep those windows. We were actually using aluminum sash windows in the addition that would be painted. They would not be anodized, but they would be painted. And there was some discussion at the HRB about whether that was compatible or not. I thought that it was, especially if they were painted.

Chair Baltay: Ken, can you confirm for me, there's a single tree on the left side of the house. That has to go, I can see, right?

Mr. Hayes: The avocado tree goes, yeah.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And then, on your light wells in the front, are you going to need a railing around those?

Mr. Hayes: No, actually, what we're proposing is a metal grate, so you just walk on top of it. The idea is that... It's not an escape/rescue situation. It's ventilation, and obviously we don't want a railing because that would just destroy the existing home. It's a metal grate that you can walk on top of.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. Any other questions?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah. On the access to the parking, it shows a parking spot there on the neighboring property. Is there a way to get out, into a car directly?

Mr. Hayes: So that I'm clear to your question, we're going to be capturing three existing parking spaces on the property next door, and then, providing a gate and a walkway, so that you would walk from the car towards the landscaped area, where we would make provisions for pavers or something, to be able to then maneuver to the gate and go in the gate.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Mr. Hayes: They are existing spaces, but we need to acknowledge the fact that someone is not going to walk towards the office building, but walk towards the gate to go into the residential project.

Chair Baltay: Great. With that, do we have any public comments of any kind, Vinh? Has anybody asked to speak? Is there anyone out there who would like to address us?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we do have a couple public comments for this item.

Chair Baltay: Let's open this up to public comment at this point. Can you tell us the first person, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes. Our first speaker will be Geetha, followed by Neilson, followed by Jeff. If there's anyone else who wants to speak whose name I did not call, please raise your hand now. So, first would be Geetha. And Geetha, since you are using an older version of Zoom, I cannot unmute you. Instead, I will promote you to panelist so you can speak.

Chair Baltay: Welcome Geetha. Go ahead, please.

Geetha: Thank you for the time to speak. I think maybe I, since I live at 385 Waverly, which is on the adjoining property along the slatted fence that you see in the property line, and the rear straight line. My main concerns I think were about sound and light, and also about the density is going to increase with the addition of two units, right? Just want to see how the landscaping will help to mitigate any extra sound, light, and things like that. And one more concern I have is about security, just because of the location of our property close to the 7/11. I have many times seen people just wander over, especially late at night since the 7/11 is open all night, and hang out near the property [inaudible] gate. Just want to see how that will be mitigated. It's a concern for both the 411 property as well as mine. That's my second point. The

other point is just a correction in the drawings I saw in L.1. There is indication of screening on the side of 401 [distortion], but I think that doesn't exist. I do have plants along the shared fence between 385 Waverly and 411. Just wanted to correct that. Those are my main concerns. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Vinh, could we have the next speaker, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes. Our next speaker will be Neilson. Neilson, I have unmuted you, and if you can please unmute yourself as well, you can speak. Your unmute button should be at the bottom of your screen, towards the left.

Neilson: Thank you. I live at 155 Bryant. Appreciate [inaudible] comment on several issues, but I only have time to talk about parking. I appreciate getting the alert in the staff report. In the future, I'd like to see more analysis accompany the alert, on what the impacts will be. Let me briefly enumerate. The parking impact is twofold. It will be in the neighborhoods, and the neighborhood streets, and it will also be within the commercial zone area. And particularly if the plan is to allow parking in the adjacent property, which happens to be owned by the same person, that there's a massive displacement process that goes on. I'd like to work with the Office of Transportation, who should be present at these presentations to talk about the impact, and scarce parking the neighborhoods and the commercial zone. The idea of using adjacent property is the most concerning to me, and I will enumerate that in an email to you, and to Philip Kamhi. I think City policy is lacking on the cascading effect of parking such as this. The most important thing is to get the Office of Transportation to participate in sessions like this. Thank you very much for the opportunity to address this, and I will be able to try to get some analysis done by an amateur parking expert in the neighborhood, who have got now almost 10 years of experience. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Nielson. Vinh, could you introduce the next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next speaker is Jeff. Jeff, I have unmuted you. You have to unmute yourself as well to speak.

Jeff: Okay, can you hear me?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we can hear you.

Jeff: Excellent. Good morning, Board members and staff, and thank you for holding this session. I do have a few comments and questions about the parking situation as well. Specifically, for parking to be moved to a different site, the staff report references the law 18.18.09 OC, and that law governs commercial uses in the downtown assessment district. This property, however, is residential, and it's not in the downtown assessment district, so I don't think the report is citing the right law. And then there's a problem about adding three parking spaces, or using three parking spaces on the next property. That property appears currently to have 24 parking spaces, but the building, when it's occupied as it currently is, needs 29 parking spaces. So, there's already a shortfall of five spaces. If this comes back for another review, I think it would be good to have a good analysis of how that other site is parked and what its requirements are for that. I did try to find out what's happening over there by looking for the use and occupancy permits for that building. For the upstairs tenant, I couldn't find any occupancy permit at all, and for the downstairs tenant – that's Alvin Bank – they have a permit, but it states the wrong sizes for the building. That's also worrisome. Finally, if there's going to be some kind of... If it turns out there's going to have to be something to accommodate the parking issues, then it would be good to see all that, even though it's on the [distortion] because that could have impact on the historic renovation and such for the house. That's it. Thank you, all.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jeff. Vinh, could you introduce the next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Jeff is our last speaker, so we may proceed with the agenda.

Chair Baltay: Great. Okay, then we're going to close this meeting to public comment and bring it back to the Board for discussion. Why don't we have... Alex, do you want to start us off with some thoughts, please?

Board Member Lew: Sure. I do want to disclose that I did watch the HRB meeting yesterday, and I also, I did some separate research, looking at the [distortion] Sanborn fire insurance maps, to see how this property developed over time with the sister house that Ken has mentioned on Waverly, and the corner building next door [inaudible]. Generally, I'm supportive of the project. I do think there are a whole host of issues that have to be resolved. I think that Nielson and Jeff and have mentioned the parking. Also, I have some cautions for you, Ken. I vaguely recall that you can't have sliding doors be the only door in a unit, and I don't remember exactly where that is in the building code. I just want to caution you on that.

Mr. Hayes: If there's 10 occupants.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I thought there was something for houses as well. Anyway, it's been a while since I've looked at the code. Just a heads up on that one. I've done a lot of three- and four-unit buildings on very small lots, and usually I have issues with getting all the meters in place. I think it helps if your project is all electric and you only have to deal with electric meters and not the gas meters, that that could help a lot. The other thing, too, if it were one ownership, I've done it where you have, like, third party sub meters in there, so you don't have to follow all the City regulations for meters. That's another option. On other multi-family units downtown, the City has required roofed trash enclosures, so I think that could be an issue there. I think we recently looked at a project in downtown north where the City didn't require that. Also, bike storage, bike lockers. For the plants and the trees in the subterranean, in the basement patios, I'd just be concerned about the soil quality and soil volume, because it's not topsoil. That's something you're digging down deep. I'm curious to see what you can do there. Also, in all the basements that I've done, there's been, like, sewage pumps in the basement. And I think that's maybe not the ARB's purview, but I didn't see anything in there. On color, I've done research on my own house, which is of the same vintage, and gray-green colors were actually very popular at that time, and it was actually monochrome, you know? It was not like the San Francisco Painted Ladies in the 60's. The gray-green is really popular, and if you actually go to the Haas-Lilienthal house in San Francisco, they've restored it to its original gray-green color. That might be...

Mr. Hayes: Okay.

Board Member Lew: And they actually did the real, like, historic, the true historic research in that because those original paint colors can fade or change over time. So, there are ways, if you want to match what was existing there, the existing paint color, there are ways for specialists to figure out the actual color. But I do support the project because we did make the change to get rid of the penthouses, so we do have this tricky new rule for multi-family units. I think you've done a crafty job of trying to get three units in there. I myself wouldn't really want to live in the basement units, but I think that there's a need for smaller units. I think we do need to allow for some flexibility with parking standards on historic properties because, otherwise, we're just going to, they're going to get torn down. We have to allow some flexibility in there. I think that's all of my comments. I'm curious to see what my other board members have to say.

Mr. Hayes: Great. Thank you, Alex.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex. Who wants to go next? David?

Board Member Hirsch: I'll wait till Osma goes.

Chair Baltay: Osma, why don't you take your turn.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I really appreciate the presentation. It actually helped a lot to understand all the things that are happening here. I appreciate the attention to detail. I'm actually a fan of the approach that you presented, where it is quite different, you know, this addition, but it's nice. It sort of has... It has that thing that I like that they do in Europe, where you'll have something old, and then you'll have something modern that's really beautiful that connects to it. Really, kudos on that. There are some questions. I notice the light well on the front with the metal grating. I'm a little concerned that, while that seems really necessary for the units at the bottom, it sort of would distract, I think, a little bit from the historical nature up above. Not really sure. I know you mentioned you're not landscaping it too much, so

it's sort of a tricky one on that one. I'm not sure how I feel about those light grates. I appreciate on the back addition to the top level, that there is this sort of pinch-in. I was a little concerned it looked quite massive in the elevation, and that's... In the elevation, it's actually hard to tell that it is [inaudible] comes out and you look at the plans closer, and the renderings. I wonder if there's a way to sort of reduce the massiveness. I was thinking in elevation, you know, potentially. I don't know if there is a way to... Are we allowed to share screen or...? I'm not sure how to describe this. There might be an option to sort of, the roofline having some sort of differentiation there, so that an elevation there looks like there's a separation. And you have a closet there, so there might be a... I'm not sure how [inaudible] internally. Yeah, I mean, there's like, sort of these so interesting things to focus on in such a small site. In general, I think it's a nice idea. There is definitely more to unpack here, but conceptually, I'm on board with how this project is working.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. David, what are your thoughts?

Board Member Hirsch: Not sure. I think that my cohorts have covered an awful lot of ground here on this one. I think it's kind of amazing to be able to fit this much housing into this teeny little site. I guess we're supposed to consider it from a historical point of view, but I accept the historical comments that have been made prior to. The comments of the neighbors are kind of interesting in that the question of security of the stairways that go down to the lower levels really impacts a bit the history. If you're to provide some kind of a gate, it could then be at the front of the building there. I mean, how would that be coordinated?

Mr. Hayes: There is a gate, yes.

Board Member Hirsch: [crosstalk] issue. It's amazing. I guess what I'm concerned most about is how you build all of that underneath the house there. By structural means, how is this done? How do you support the house above? Whether you tear out in the process of building that, all the foundation all around the whole perimeter of the house is gone. You know, it's very tricky in terms of its construction. Holding up the house so you don't lose it in the process of building is going to be probably the biggest issue in this whole construction. As well as the comments that Alex made about mechanical requirements that are not yet shown. The ejector pumps, all those kind of things that you need. Plumbing under grade, you know, that is down below, where there was nothing before. How do you deal with all that? I mean, the planning is clever as can be. The privacy issues, I think have been nicely addressed, so that you get these two dwellings in there, separate from each other enough so that you can use that, kind of minimal outdoor space. But leave it with the issue that, my concern is that let's not lose the house for the increased value here.

Mr. Hayes: Right.

Board Member Hirsch: Make sure that we find a good way to retain it, and make sure that your engineers actually provide assurance that everything will be retained above. That's my biggest concern.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, David. I'd like to chime in with a couple of things, but at a high level, first, I think it's wonderful that someone is trying to build small housing downtown. It's a good thing to do, and we should be supportive of that, especially if it's preserving an older part of our architectural history. I share strongly, then, Alex's sentiment that we should be flexible regarding parking issues. It's really a challenge to put that much parking. You just can't fit it on that property and do everything else they need to do, and it's a reasonable request, I believe, to give them some latitude to make the rest of this come together. I just want to put that out there.

Ms. Gerhardt: I'm sorry, I had to walk away for a minute. This is the dangers from working from home, but I can answer some parking questions if need be.

Chair Baltay: I'm not sure if we need to. My feeling, at least, is on the Board, this is really a staff, a Planning Department issue, to make a judgment call, and ultimately a Director's decision on this kind of thing. I'm

just giving you my opinion. Find a way to make it work if you can. We need the housing there, and they can't do it if they have to add as much as parking as the code would require on site.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, and we will certainly get the appropriate reports and work with Transportation on that as part of a formal application.

Chair Baltay: What I would like to do is talk about two things. One, just that below-grade patio out in the back, and how important it is for that to really be a successful space for this project to work. Whenever I've done, what I call basement houses, we try to put in large light wells, and we almost always try to step that tall wall at the back into two or even three pieces, with some kind of landscaping in between it. And I would encourage the architect Hayes to consider if there's a way to do that. Rather than a single nine-foot-tall concrete wall, break it up, put some plants in there. And it looks like you might be able to, especially given the shoring requirements at grade or lower, but you could step it into two pieces somehow. We find even a foot of dirt in there can grow some vines or something, and it just softens it so much. Honestly, think about that nine-foot-tall concrete wall. I know it's board formed concrete and architects love it. Well, not everybody does. A lot of people will just think it's concrete, you know, when it's wet.

Mr. Hayes: The HRB loved it.

Chair Baltay: I'm just throwing it out there. To me, it's the quality of that space. And then, I don't know if your consultant can address or not, but we found that there's a free board requirement of about nine inches when you step out of a basement house into what's a light well. Obviously, your patio wants to be same grade as the rest of the house, but I don't quite know how all that plays out. It's become a significant issue on other projects.

Mr. Hayes: Yes, if I may...?

Chair Baltay: Yes, please, go ahead.

Mr. Hayes: We've had discussions about that, and both landscape and BKF are on the line, but the concept that we're thinking about employing right now is some kind of pedestal concrete paver system, so that we can get the free board, but yet provide the paved surface at the floor line. Not unlike you might do a, you know, a roof pedestal paver. We're looking for a paver system that is more robust and has longer spans, so bigger pavers.

Chair Baltay: But you really want some landscaping in there, too, don't you?

Mr. Hayes: Absolutely.

Chair Baltay: Like, some grass and stuff. That's going to be harder to keep in there. I think, as Alex mentioned, there's a myriad of technical issues you have to solve. That's one, I've noticed that a lot, the landscaping down in those light wells, and if you can break up the walls, it really helps make them more palatable. The second thing, and I want to cycle back on this with Chair Bower, is it seems to me the question comes down to one of, what is the right amount of differentiation? And I find the new building attractive and clearly differentiated from the old one. I'm trying to understand, you know, is it possible to be too differentiated? You seemed to imply, David, that you want it to be different, but not too different. It's okay to have divided lights on your windows, but they shouldn't be quite the same pattern. I've always understood it that you really want to be significantly different, so that it's really clearly understood that this is new versus old. Can you comment on that? Because I think that's what a lot of this is going to hinge on, ultimately.

Mr. Bower: Yeah, it's the focus of many, many seminars I've been to in the last 13 years as a board member. We're required, as you may know, to go have inside training, like architects are required to have. And it's a very, very difficult decision or architectural feature to be different, but you don't want to be so different that you become some place example of exactly the wrong kind of differentiation. One of the really poor differentiation designs was at the Presidio. The Disney Museum is a glass and steel box on the

back of the [distortion] year-old buildings. And every single seminar, those are pointed to as being inappropriately differentiated. The board felt that maybe horizontal siding would be appropriate. It was the verticality, I think, that several board members described. And there are many ways to do this. Ken does a lot of this, and this project is – as you pointed out - [distortion] he has done a huge and incredible job in trying to fit [distortion] make all of the details we're talking about work on this little tiny space. It could be horizontal siding would work. We didn't really have any details – because this is a study session – of what that siding is going to look like, and that would make a difference. Often in a building like this, in a residential space, you would put shingles on that new addition, but you would put a different pattern in the shingles. I don't know if that answers your question, but if it gets too far away from what's already there, it ceases to be compatible. And it's an individual judgment decision, basically.

Chair Baltay: I guess I'm just thinking of, I don't know, the Pyramid at the Louvre in Paris. Couldn't be more different, and yet, that's a classic example of historic addition to a building. Just doing it so differently that it's clear.

Mr. Bower: You're right, but it's also, my recollection is that's a very, very small piece of that huge building. It's in a big courtyard...

Chair Baltay: Visually, pretty important. Let's not debate what your seminars do. I'm thinking we want to be sure to give the architect clear direction here on where to go. Jodie, the process for this is that it has to clear HRB, you need a formal recommendation from them, ultimately?

Ms. Gerhardt: This is a preliminary review. The HRB has looked at it, and now, the ARB is doing that. This preliminary process will be done after this meeting. And then, the applicant can decide to apply for a formal application.

Chair Baltay: If they go forward, does the HRB, will look at it formally, right?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay. The HRB then makes a recommendation to the director, or they are part of the ARB process? How does the ARB evaluate the historic compatibility part of this?

Ms. Gerhardt: The HRB hearing would be first so that the ARB would have that information to use in their recommendation.

Chair Baltay: I see. Our job is to listen to what they're suggesting, and then, take it from there.

Mr. Bower: Jodie, if I could chime in here. I think the HRB has to approve the project in order for the transfer and development rights to kick into this. Am I wrong about that?

Ms. Gerhardt: There is the bonus, and we need to make sure that they are rehabilitating the building to a significant standard before that bonus is accepted. There's a few other pieces to the bonus because they really don't give the bonus until the very end, after the rehab has been done.

Mr. Bower: Yeah, it's my understanding that the HRB has to approve the remediation and rehabilitation in order for the development rights to be available to the developer. Which is pretty important to this particular project, as I understand it.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, which would happen after the rehab.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so, I'm just trying to get a sense of how we can give the applicant feedback on what's going to be considered a, ultimately a compatible amount of differentiation. For lack of a better way to put it. Ken, are you feeling like you're getting good input from us?

Mr. Hayes: Thank you for the opportunity, Chair Baltay. You know, I think that we can clearly work with the cladding, you know, the siding material on the building, but, you know, I felt pretty strongly that the flat roof and making that, you know, subservient to the hip roof on the building was the way to go, just because this square cottage was known for the simple shape hip roof. The previous project that we had proposed had a hip roof on the addition out the back, and I go back, and I look at it and I think, What was I thinking? It starts to consume the beautiful, simple hip roof. I would really like consensus on the flat roof. I think I can work with other stuff, but it's kind of where I was...

Chair Baltay: You have my support on that. I think your logic is good. What does everybody else think? Who wants to take it up?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll go next. I think the flat roof is fine. I think my issue is just how it connects to the main building. Is it okay if I share my screen? Is that weird?

Chair Baltay: Can that be done?

[Thompson sharing screen.]

Vice Chair Thompson: I just want to point out this connection here. I think the flat roof... I'm okay with the flat roof. I just think the way that it's connecting is a little too much. It almost seems like it needs to be separated so that there is some kind of break, so that there is that hierarchy. Actually, while we're here, I had a question. And I think I might have missed it. I remember Board Member Lew talking about color. Is the color of this building changing to gray?

Mr. Hayes: That is not representative of the color, but we will be changing the color of the building, yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Do you know what color you're changing it to?

Mr. Hayes: There's been discussion about some kind of a darker gray-green color. Probably not that dark that we're showing here. And one thing that I mention is that we could use that same color on the addition, and that would begin to pull that into the composition.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. Yeah, because it's, like, it's yellow right now, right?

Mr. Hayes: That was just natural wood. Although the existing house is yellow, correct.

Vice Chair Thompson: The existing house is yellow, yeah. I mean, I think this foil is... Sorry, I know we're not talking about colors and siding anymore. Maybe when there is a proposal for this. I think this foil is interesting to explore. I like that it's different. But if the building stays yellow, or [distortion]. Those are my comments.

Chair Baltay: Anybody else want to comment on the question of what's a compatible form, per se? Alex or David?

Board Member Hirsch: I'd like to jump in on the color change there.

Chair Baltay: Okay, or the color.

Board Member Lew: Can we stay on the roof?

Chair Baltay: We're trying to give them clear guidance on big things, like is the roof okay, and...?

Board Member Lew: And there are no colors proposed. Right.

Chair Baltay: Let's focus on that and see if we can get guidance on it. Alex, what's your thought about the flat roof and the massing?

Board Member Lew: I can support the flat roof. It seems to me that hip roofs have ventilation issues, given the code-required ventilation, requires adding more things on top of the roof. And then, another factor I think is if there's any desire for photovoltaics, it seems to me that putting it on the flat roof would be much less.... You would much better screen than trying to fit it on a hip roof.

Mr. Hayes: On the historic roof.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, on the historic hip roof. If you have a flat roof, you can fit in roof relief vents on the flat part of the roof. It seems to me to have some advantages.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex. Dave Hirsch, do you have an opinion on that?

Board Member Hirsch: I think that the, although it's a different style completely than the front of the building, that it doesn't really have to look that different [inaudible] back to the perspective aerial, perspective drawing. I don't really know why it has to stand out substantially from the main building.

Chair Baltay: So you're saying you think a hip or a gabled...

Board Member Hirsch: No, no, I'm for the flat roof.

Chair Baltay: Oh, you are for the flat roof.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. Just color change. It seems like a start addition to the building.

Chair Baltay: We'll come back to the color in a second. David Bower, can you give us your take on what you think your HRB is going to land on this issue. Do you think you'll be persuaded that the flat roof form will work?

Mr. Bower: Speaking for the board and the comments, almost every board member commented about the roof, the starkness of the flat roof against the gable roof. I suspect that's going to be a relatively significant issue here. One thing that you should know as ARB members is that we generally, in the HRB, don't weigh in on color. Color is not part of the Secretary of Interior standards if you go with the color, as Alex suggested, that is reminiscent or appropriate for a building of that age. Color would pretty much be on you. But I think the board would probably feel that the whole building ought to be the same color.

Chair Baltay: Okay, that's clear advice to the applicant. Shall we have a round of comments on the color, too? Are we beating this to death? Ken Hayes, are you feeling like we're giving you guidance here?

Mr. Hayes: Yeah, well, the most important, I think, is the roof form itself. I think I can work with the HRB's comments and your Board's comments regarding the other elements. I actually like what Osma was talking about. We had a study like that, where we kind of created a separation joint between the new and the old, and also allow a better transition to horizontal siding. Because one of the concerns we have with horizontal siding is it is never going to line up with the contours of the shingles, so, how do you negate that kind of awkward juxtaposition? And maybe some kind of a notch would do that. Notch in the wall, notch in the roof, and as kind of wraps around. And maybe at that point, it would even make the hip a little bit more stand-alone and not look so crowded by the flat roof. I could get HRB support at that point, perhaps.

Chair Baltay: Okay, I think you've heard that the ARB is generally supportive of the flat roof concept, but HRB doesn't seem to be. That's about as much as we can say on that for you. Any closing comments from any other Board members? I think we should wrap this up. No? Okay. I think we'll finish that off and move on to the next item. Thank you very much, Ken Hayes and staff. Let's get this meeting over. We're going to move on to...

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you, Chair Bower.

Mr. Bower: Thank you. I appreciate your listening to comments, and I will see you when this comes back.

Chair Baltay: Great. Thank you. Thank you, David.

4. Appoint Subcommittee for Objective Standards.

Chair Baltay: We're going to jump backwards to agenda item number 4, appoint subcommittee for objective standards. Jodie, could you tell us what that's about, please?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, just one second, I need to find where I put that.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I didn't realize it's already noon. We need to wrap up.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. I'm going to run without... I was just going to show you the staff reports. For the objective standards, you know, we've had the two meetings beforehand, the one in December and the one in January, where we've started the discussion of objective standards. As we move forward, we're starting to dig further into the details, and this is where staff and the consultant could use some help from two of the Board members, to just sort of narrow down from the hundreds of options that we could come up with, you know, to a handful of options, that then the full board could weigh in on. We are looking for the Chair to appoint two people. We need some people who have a little bit of time to review all of this detailed information. We also need someone who is familiar with the code because we are talking about picking up pieces of the existing code and rearranging that, and thinking through the best way to do that. With that, I'll turn it back.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Jodie, that makes sense. How much time commitment do think is involved? Are you able to assess?

Ms. Gerhardt: We were not able to pin that down. I mean, there is a document, though, that is a good 30-some-odd pages long of all these objective standards that need to be converted. Forty-two pages, actually. You know, it is a little bit of a time commitment to read through the pages, to think through what the best options may be. There might be a meeting every one or two weeks that you could attend to with the consultants to discuss this as we go along, and then, some research ahead of that.

Chair Baltay: Do any Board members have an expressed interest in doing this? Osma Thompson approached me that she would be willing to do this work. David and Alex, do you have a feeling? [crosstalk] already working on the Ventura project. David, this is dealing with local zoning that you may not be as familiar...

Board Member Hirsch: I'm not... I'm very interested in this. I think it affects the city in a very big way. It affects our role in the city in an extremely big way as well. I'm quite concerned with turning back a process that is a part of us. We are involved in subjective comments all the time. I'm concerned that the wording of our zoning, if it's changed to only objective, and somebody else is telling us now to do our work, I'm really quite concerned about how that is, how that is objectified.

Chair Baltay: Do you feel you have the time to do this kind of thing, David?

Board Member Hirsch: I do, yeah.

Chair Baltay: I think it's going to be somewhat time-intensive. Osma, how about you? Do you feel confident you can put in the time to do this?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes. I have a full-time job, but yes.

Board Member Hirsch: You know, if I may say, I think it's important to keep Alex in this one because, you know, I often depend upon Alex to correct me when I don't know enough. And he's very knowledgeable about, certainly all of the code. I do believe that Alex is important. Why does it need to be just two people?

Chair Baltay: Well, we have this Brown Act issue, that three of us constitutes a...[crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: Oh, yeah.

Chair Baltay: ... can do it. Only two of us can [crosstalk].

Board Member Hirsch: Is it really representing the Board when it's done that way?

Ms. Gerhardt: This is just to get the process started. It absolutely would come back to the full Board to make any final decisions. And the subcommittee can help us decide when that time period is also.

Chair Baltay: Alex, I haven't heard from you on this. You're obviously experienced and knowledgeable of the local code, but are you willing? And do you have time?

Board Member Lew: I am interested. I would say, though, I don't have time in the next month. On the North Ventura, we've had multiple delays, so we're looking at having three meetings in the next, like, six weeks. And the number of alternates that we've been studying has gone from three to eight. So, I'm quite swamped at the moment. And I do understand that the objective standards is on a tight timeline, too, because of the state. I'll be happy to help as much as I can, but it may be limited, just in the near term.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Alex. Jodie, what I'd like to do, if we could, is not decide right now, but rather, talk to Grace Lee, who is not here with us now. And also, talk with you off line. We'll have an answer by the end of the week. Would that work out okay?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. I'll just need to confirm with the attorneys. I mean, they did want to make sure that we had agendized the item, but I don't know if we have any comments from the public. But I think, ultimately, it is the Chair appointing two people, so I believe that will be okay. But I will double-check.

Vice Chair Thompson: I also wanted to just also... I mean, ask you, Chair Baltay, if you're also interested in this as well. Just so that, you know, the whole Board... You wanted to hear from the whole Board, but we didn't hear from you.

Chair Baltay: Well, I'm interested, of course, but I'm also very busy. I always feel if there's other warm bodies willing to do the work, I need to stay a level back. I'm hearing that David and Osma are very interested, and I don't know what Grace is thinking. And I'd like to speak to Jodie off line and get some feedback. I think this is something that will be fairly technical and detailed, and you want somebody who can really roll up their sleeves and work with the Planning Department to try to nail all this together.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Unless anybody has any other issues, I'd rather leave it not deciding right now. If anybody wants to talk to me off line, that's fine, too. Are we all okay with that? Everybody is shaking their heads yes. Let's leave it at that. We'll have an answer by the end of the week for staff.

## 6. Discuss Procedures for Virtual Hearings.

Chair Baltay: We're going to move on to agenda item number 6, discuss procedures for virtual hearings. This is something that I put out there last meeting, and I think today, our meeting where we had the material board, pointed out, at least to me, the issue we're facing, which is that without real samples, it's awfully tough to make a final determination on some of these projects. Do we have any other opinions or ideas? What shall be do? Everybody turn on your microphone. Don't be polite, just talk.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, the material sample issue isn't such a difficult one. I mean, the consultants can bring the samples to some place where we could get to see them. I can't imagine that we can't find some kind of a safe area. Maybe in the lobby of City Hall? That must still be open. Some area like that.

Chair Baltay: That's one idea, deposit the samples someplace where we can all go to them. What we ended up with today is just assigning it to a subcommittee. It's a small enough group, they can send that many samples out. Any other ideas or thoughts? How important is this, really?

Vice Chair Thompson: I think it's really important. I'd be willing to go somewhere and, you know, if it's a location where the material samples can be viewed, just to see them, touch them, and then, wash my hands afterwards. I think it's important.

Chair Baltay: What's your take, Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, it's important. I was thinking maybe we could punt it. In the past, sometimes we've had, we've asked, or we've added a condition of approval, like a subcommittee could go out on site later, when construction is farther down the road, to approve colors and textures. Like textures of stucco, or mock-ups of cast concrete. And then you don't get hung up now, before a contractor is selected and before the project has been bid. That's one option.

Chair Baltay: Okay. It sounds like we're all in agreement that that's an issue. Jodie, is there a way the City can put samples someplace where we can go look at them at some point? Is that something that's viable? The lobby at City Hall?

Ms. Gerhardt: Everything is sort of locked down at City Hall right now. There's one or two people going into the building. I mean, it's something where I could possibly go into the building, but I'd have to let you into the building. We would just have to have a set time period, or something like that.

Chair Baltay: If I just used my office around the corner and find a way for people to access it there? Is that legitimate, or is that crossing the line?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think if we, you would probably have to let the public into your office, would be the only thing. If someone wanted to stop by and see them. I mean, the same thing would be for City Hall.

Chair Baltay: Well, the office is closed as well, but we have a shaded area in the back where somebody could go. But the idea of the general public being told to do there is probably not smart.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: How can it be that, on one hand, we can't have the samples, and the other hand, everybody has to be able to see them uniformly.

Ms. Gerhardt: Well, we're presenting them on the screen, so everyone is able to see them in that fashion. Usually we would have them at the public hearing, where we're passing them around, so the public could touch them and see them there if they wanted to. It's just, how do we emulate that same sort of thing?

Chair Baltay: I'm willing to take my conference room and put a passcode on the lock so any board member can go in there any time and look at them. We can just leave them there. The office isn't open, but they could be left there without any trouble. That's right downtown. I don't want to put that to the general public.

Ms. Gerhardt: Let me speak with the attorneys, if us showing us the materials on the screen during the actual hearing, if that's sufficient for the public's view, but then, the ARB could go to your office and be able to touch and feel the samples. I'll just need to confirm that.

Chair Baltay: Okay, why don't you look into that? Any other thoughts about materials? Or anything else about having these meetings remotely? How else are we doing? Do we feel that we're able to communicate well enough together?

Vice Chair Thompson: I have a question. When I was sharing my screen just a little bit ago, on the last item, I had this, like, itch to sketch over the drawing...

Chair Baltay: I know you did.

[crosstalk]

Vice Chair Thompson: Am I allowed to do that?

Chair Baltay: You can do anything you like, Osma. You're [crosstalk]. Be careful.

Board Member Hirsch: You don't want to wreck your screen.

Chair Baltay: Alex, explain [inaudible].

Ms. Gerhardt: I think it's just, you know, it's being recorded, it's out to the public, so you just have to keep that in mind.

Board Member Hirsch: I have a question about how it's being presented to us. Because if we get all of the... If there is a presentation, we don't quite know what's new and... When you get a drawing, you know, you can compare it with what has gone before. But in this last case, on the last project, not the last one here, but the one... In the park...

Ms. Gerhardt: Porter, on Porter Drive? The Research Park?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, Porter Drive. There were all of these versions of what was presented. How do you know which one is the very latest one? To get all the material that you really want to see, and what's been changed since the last one.

Ms. Gerhardt: You're wanting to be able to compare plan sets from the first version to the second?

Board Member Hirsch: Quickly, yes. Quickly. Yeah, yeah. I find that to be a problem, not to be able to really see that immediately.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have the project web pages that should have all of the different versions of the plan sets there, especially the versions that went to the Board. There is that web page. I don't really want to offer this, but there is the potential to go back to paper. We as a department are actually trying to get away from paper. I mean, this is a great opportunity to save some trees. We do have our new online permitting system that we have to use right this minute, but we are going to continue to use into the future. That will reduce a lot of paper. But if it's easier to review that way, we certainly could... I could talk to supporting staff.

Board Member Hirsch: No, I'm not really suggesting back to paper. I'm just saying, how can you tell us which is the very latest without having to look through all the material on line?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, so, probably that project web page would be the best. In the staff reports, usually the very last attachment is the links to the project plans, and it links into the project web page as well. Maybe we can just better note that somehow. There's also, in our emails to the Board, when we're now sending you this electronic packet, maybe we can have some more direct links in there as well.

Chair Baltay: Yeah, I felt today, again, during the Porter Drive building, it was clear, at least to me, that I hadn't really reviewed those details as much as I should have. Honestly, the digital package was just more intimidating somehow to crack into. Just to figure out what I needed to see on paper, somehow I'm used to figuring out where it is. I think I'm not alone on that one.

Board Member Hirsch: You're not.

Chair Baltay: I suspect that's a matter of just changing process. Not saying we have to go back to paper, though. Any other thoughts on this subject?

Board Member Lew: Peter, I have one concern. For example, at the next meeting, we've got that controversial hotel project coming to the subcommittee. In the past, in past meetings, it's attracted a large number of neighbors from the Palo Alto Redwoods. I have some concern, if they are so interested in the project, that we don't really have a process set up for subcommittee to handle a large number of [inaudible].

Chair Baltay: Do we have the option, Jodie, to re-escalate something back to the full board instead of the subcommittee? Doesn't the subcommittee have the option to send it back to the Board?

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't think we've done that in many, many years.

Chair Baltay: I think that's the answer, Alex. If you think there's a lot of people who are still speaking and you feel there's more testimony that needs to be heard, or you can't make the subcommittee decision.

Board Member Lew: I don't know if the neighbors are planning to come or not. Maybe we could find out.

Ms. Gerhardt: The neighbors are still involved. I don't know exactly if they're wanting to come to the subcommittee. But that may be the ultimate answer, is that we have that subcommittee meeting, and if we're not able to make decisions, we could send it back to the full board. Let me think about that a little bit more. But you're right, if there's a large interest... But there's nothing that prevents, I mean, the subcommittee happens on the same Zoom channel, so they could still be attendees to that type of meeting.

Vice Chair Thompson: They could raise their hand, potentially.

Chair Baltay: Is your question, Alex, the logistics of having people involved in a subcommittee? Or is it whether it should stay a subcommittee? Did I understand you right?

Board Member Lew: No, it's mostly just a logistics, of trying to review it with a large number of people.

Chair Baltay: Jodie, will Vinh be there for the subcommittee hearings? Do they have that support?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, I think Vinh gets to be here with us all the time. Just to help in the background. We appreciate that. And Medina, as well.

Chair Baltay: I would expect a subcommittee would take testimony from any interested members of the public, if they feel they want to chime in. It's usually less formal. I think that's the way it should work.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, we have not usually had comments on subcommittees, but, I mean, it's certainly open for the public to attend.

Board Member Lew: I'll just give you, one example was the Lockheed site in the Stanford Research Park that was next to some of the neighbors in Barron Park.

Chair Baltay: Yes, I remember that.

Board Member Lew: And they came to the subcommittee, and it was a fairly heated debate there. It's unusual, but it does happen, and I'm thinking that this project would be more likely than not to attract people.

Chair Baltay: I wasn't aware that was the case. To me, that means that we failed at putting something to subcommittee. If it's still that controversial, it shouldn't be at the subcommittee level. Subcommittee is supposed to be doing technical evaluation based on their understanding of the Board.

Board Member Lew: My understanding is that this project is going to be appealed. I just want to make sure that everything is done properly.

Chair Baltay: Absolutely. Jodie, could you check if there's any way to bring this back to the Board instead, if Alex is concerned? Or what the process should be, so that the subcommittee has guidance? We don't want to screw things up either.

Ms. Gerhardt: I [crosstalk] the attorney right now, yes.

Chair Baltay: That's off the question of virtual hearings, which is what we were discussing. Is there anything else while we're doing this, on virtual hearings? Okay, I just received a message from the City Attorney that we have to come back to the subcommittee. First, I'd like to work through the other two items on the agenda.

### **Approval of Minutes**

Chair Baltay: Next one is approval of minutes. Do we have minutes to approve, Jodie? In our packet, is that right?

Mr. Nguyen: We actually don't have any minutes to approve because our early April meeting was cancelled.

Chair Baltay: And the last meeting we had on line, we don't have those minutes yet?

Mr. Nguyen: We usually approve the minutes two meetings later, instead of the next meeting.

Chair Baltay: I see, okay, so the minutes aren't ready yet from the last meeting. Very well.

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

#### 7. North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan Working Group Updates

Chair Baltay: I'm eager to hear if Alex has anything to report about the Ventura committee.

Board Member Lew: Sure. The last meeting was cancelled, but there is going to be a Zoom meeting on May 26<sup>th</sup>, from 5:30 to 7:30. We've tentatively scheduled two more meetings in June, which would be June 9<sup>th</sup> and June 23<sup>rd</sup>, but those dates are still tentative.

Chair Baltay: Okay, nothing more than that, though.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, and I had mentioned briefly that the consultants did three alternative schemes, but members of the commission have done five additional alternates on their own. Those additional five schemes are going to be discussed at the next meeting.

Chair Baltay: Okay, great. Thank you. That covers all of our agenda items. Let's come back to agenda item number.... Okay, Jodie, yes?

Ms. Gerhardt: Hi. I'm having conversations with the attorney as we speak. On the subcommittee item, we were being more specific about one project, but if people did want to speak on a subcommittee item, it is not subject to the Brown Act, but we would, of course, let them informally comment, within reason. And then, also, back on the subcommittee for the objective standards, I really would appreciate if we could do those appointments now. The attorney says that we need to do that during a public hearing, and if at all possible, I don't want to wait until the next hearing.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so we're going to pick that up before we end. Here's my thought on this. Alex, you're currently on the Ventura committee. David, you've always been very interested in being on the Ventura committee. Alex, you would be great on this subcommittee for design standards. Are you willing to switch

it over? Change committees, Alex, so the City can benefit from you on the zoning instead. I don't think you can do both.

Board Member Lew: I think it's possible to switch. The City Council only requires somebody from the ARB. It doesn't have to be me. It's not like they appointed me to be on it.

Chair Baltay: David, what are your thoughts?

Board Member Hirsch: Then [inaudible] to me. I'm not so interested in Ventura anymore.

Chair Baltay: Oh, you're not interested in Ventura.

Board Member Hirsch: No, no. Frankly, I think it's a dead horse.

Chair Baltay: I thought I was trying to marshal our [crosstalk].

Board Member Hirsch: No, no, it doesn't work. I think [inaudible] sort of really, for me, it sort of killed it now.

Chair Baltay: Are you sure, David? I mean, it's well suited to what your interests are.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, no.

Chair Baltay: The zoning thing is going to require a lot of detailed knowledge of the code.

Board Member Hirsch: I agree with that. Yep.

Chair Baltay: I'm not sure you have that. You've only been in town a year or two.

Board Member Hirsch: That's correct. That is correct. I'm lacking in...

Chair Baltay: You and Alex switch. Then we would have better resource allocation, I think.

Board Member Hirsch: You're pushing, Peter. You're pushing.

Chair Baltay: I'm pushing, that's right. I want you guys to do what I think is best for Palo Alto.

Board Member Hirsch: I really have no, no longer any interest in Ventura. I really don't think it's going anywhere for about 30 years.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Well, then, Jodie, we'll have to appoint David and Osma to the new subjective standards and leave Alex where he is. I don't want to rock the boat beyond that. And Grace is just not here, so I can't hear her input, and that's all there is to it.

Board Member Hirsch: Osma, do you feel good about all the zoning information? Where I'm weak?

Vice Chair Thompson: I can't claim Board Member Lew's status in knowledge, but I've lived here a long time.

Vice Chair Thompson: Are you interested, Osma, in switching with Alex? No, I think it's fine. Leave it the way it is. Okay.

Vice Chair Thompson: I do regret that Board Member Lee is not here. I wonder if she would have been interested.

Chair Baltay: I just don't think it's fair to appoint her without asking her, right?

Vice Chair Thompson: True. Yeah.

Chair Baltay: And if we have to decide now, what can we do? Right?

Amy French: I should mention that the Planning and Transportation Commission will be talking about the objective standards next Wednesday night, so anyone who is interested or appointed should tune into that. I know Grace Lee was involved in the El Camino Real guidelines, which was partly the context-based design criteria in our code. Kind of mirror the El Camino guidelines in many ways, so that would be a consideration if Grace was interested. But certainly up to you.

Vice Chair Thompson: Can we get her back on the call? Maybe she's free now? I don't know.

Chair Baltay: No, the decision is made. Osma and David will be on the subjective standards committee, Alex will remain on the Ventura committee. I think that lets us adjourn. Are we all done? Have I missed anything? No subcommittee today, right? Thank you all for volunteering.

Board Member Lew: Thank you, Peter.

Chair Baltay: We'll see you.

### **Adjournment**