



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
EXCERPT DRAFT MINUTES: August 20, 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

Action Item 2

2. PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION ITEM 1310 Bryant Street, 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street [19PLN-00116]: Architectural Review of Castilleja School's Phased Campus Redevelopment Proposal for Site Modifications, Demolition, Construction of a Below Grade Parking Garage and a new Classroom Building, and Minor Alterations to one Facade of a Historic Inventory Category 3 Building on Campus. Redevelopment is Associated With a Request for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment and Variance for Gross Floor Area (GFA) Replacement. The Primary Project Also Includes Requests for a Tentative map With Exception and a Variance for Below-grade Setback Encroachment Into the Embarcadero Road Special Setback (the Alternate Project Does not Include These Requests). Zone District: R-1(10,000). Environmental Review: A Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was Published July 29, 2020. For More Information Contact Amy Contact Amy French, Chief Planning Official, at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Jodie. Moving on then to our action items. We're going to start with action item number two, which is the public hearing for action item 1310 Bryant Street, 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street: architectural review of Castilleja School's phased campus redevelopment proposal for site modifications, demolition, construction of a below grade parking garage and a new classroom building, and minor alterations to one facade of a historic inventory category 3 building on campus. Redevelopment is associated with a request for conditional use permit (CUP) amendment and variance for gross floor area (GFA) replacement. The primary project also includes requests for a tentative map with exception and a variance for below-grade setback encroachment into the Embarcadero Road special setback (the alternate project does not include these requests). Zone district: R-1(10,000). Environmental review: a final environmental impact report (EIR) was published July 29, 2020. Before we get started on that, I'd like to go through any disclosures we may have. Does anyone have anything to disclose? David, do you want to start? Do you have anything to disclose?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I visited the school, given by a vice principal there, to see the buildings on-site, and the open area of the playground, and generally through the school. As well as to see the materials board at City Hall.

Chair Baltay: Any other disclosures? David, did you meet with any neighbors?

Chair Baltay: Yes, thank you for the reminder. Previously met with a neighbor's group who requested -- Peter and I met with them this past weekend and listened to their concerns. It was a small group of about six people with us in a backyard.

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

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes, I went to see the materials board and I visited the site.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. Grace, any disclosures?

Board Member Lee: Yes, I also visited the site over the years. I went and saw the materials board. I did want to note that I did sit on the Board back in 2006, I believe, when the gym/fitness building came to the Board. I have been in contact with the applicant, and I have reviewed community member's... what they have shared.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Alex, any disclosures?

Board Member Lew: Yes, I do have five items here. In November of 2019, I talked to David Bower [phonetic] from the HRB. He said that he would like to see the new stair at the Gunn Building come back to the HRB. I think that that is in our staff report. There's no new information there. I downloaded two aerial photos; one from 1941 and one from 1965. Photos from that era were mentioned in the historic evaluation but I didn't see them in the report. I wanted to actually see the photos and I was looking for the relationship of the school to the neighboring houses over time. I did exchange emails with Mary Sylvester regarding meeting with the neighborhood group that I declined. I did visit the site yesterday, and I also regularly pass by the site weekly over the past ten years. I visited the materials board at City Hall yesterday. That's it.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. I would like to disclose that I have met with a neighborhood group led by Mary Sylvester at their home near the property. I didn't really learn anything that's not in the public record. I also met the Assistant Head of School, I believe, Kathy Layendecker. She toured the campus with me and David Hirsch. The only thing I learned that was perhaps not so clear in the public record is that the alternate design proposes to not have all the students enter through the underground garage. It would rather be distributed around the campus. That wasn't clear to me from looking at the drawings. I've also spoken with several other neighbors in the community who have mixed support. Some are very strongly in favor of this school and some opposed to the project. Okay, with that can we have a staff report, please?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, I would like to share my screen. I've been trying to get that permission but still unable.

[Setting up presentation.]

Jonathan Lait, Planning and Development Services Director: While Amy gets that set up maybe, Chair, if you don't mind, I'd like to just preface her presentation with a few remarks. I'm Jonathan Lait. I'm the Director for Planning and Development Services. I want to acknowledge that the City's been processing this application over the past several years as it has evolved. As you noted, Chair, a moment ago, there clearly are a lot of strong opinions about this project from those who support it and those who are in opposition to the project. While there's been a number of meetings with residents and the applicant team, we've had some public meetings regarding the historic resources and the environmental analysis. The meeting this morning is really the first opportunity for the applicant to present the project and for the public to really engage in sharing their comments on some of the specific aspects of the application itself. Because of the very number of applications that are involved in this project, there will be hearings before this Body, the Architectural Review Board, the Historic Resources Board, the Planning and Transportation Commission. Once we have gone through all of those Boards and Commissions with their recommendations, the project will ultimately be presented to the City Council. That Body will take final action on the project. For today, you'll likely hear a lot of comments that range across the spectrum of areas where these different boards and commissions have interest or focus. We'll try to identify in our staff report and in our presentation that Amy's about to present the area where the ARB's focus will be

most helpful. We do know that there are a lot of aspects of the project that the community is interested in discussing related to enrollment, activities, and things of that nature. Some of those will be addressed by the PTC and fall outside of the role of the Architectural Review Board. For staff's part in this, as you know, we receive applications and it is our job to objectively review those applications and process them to the various boards and commissions and make recommendations based on findings that are set forth in the City's Municipal Code. To that end, I want to thank Amy French with her 21 plus years of experience with the City of Palo Alto, her deep knowledge of the code and the City's processes, for her stewardship of managing this project and getting it to a place where we can begin these public meetings. Amy has made herself available to community members and has done an amazing job putting a lot of data on the City's website. Thank you, Amy. Appreciative of your efforts and with that I welcome you to start your presentation. Thank you, Chair.

Ms. French: Thank you. Good morning, all. I'm Amy French. I am the Chief Planning Official and the steward of this process. I'm happy to be here today in this clean air giving you the presentation. This is really the first time that the applicants are going to present their proposal in a public hearing setting. It's a first hearing after the final EIR was published a few weeks ago at the end of July. This is the first ARB hearing on the project. This is our order of the presentation today with staff. We're going to cover the brief history. We're going to give a project overview, and the required applications to get through this process, and the final Environmental Impact Report. I'm supported by Katherine Waugh of Dudek. Then we'll get to the applicant's presentation, and the ARB will have questions for staff and the applicant. Then, we'll launch into community comments and the ARB comments. As noted, we are asking for a continuance of the hearing. This is the site. This is Castilleja School. All of these properties but one are Castilleja owned. We have a property on the corner here under separate ownership. Now for some history. Castilleja School started in Professorville at this location, 1121 Bryant, for several years before moving to their current location. They had about 68 students and it was kindergarten through twelfth grade. They moved to 1310 Bryant in 1910, starting with several buildings as you see here. You'll see the Recitation Hall is still on campus. This is the Gunn Administration Building that is a historic resource on the City's inventory. By 1924, they had quite a few more buildings. Again, you see the Gunn Administration Building is still here. None of the other buildings pictured here still exist. Ten years later, we have the Recitation Hall existing still, and now we have a Birge Clark Building, the Chapel. Lots of changes; tennis courts came, etc. You'll see the historic building here, the Gunn Administration Building. It's attached to a 1960's building called the Rhodes Hall. Then we have the Birge Clark Chapel. Here is the view from Bryant Street of that building that does attach to the historic building. Here on the other side at Emerson we are seeing the two houses owned by Castilleja, and this third property that's a residential home on this side of Emerson. Here's a view of those homes. Here's a view of the property as it exists today and the buildings that are there today. Now for a project overview. Castilleja is seeking to change the campus and upgrade the buildings and relocate the pool to below grade. They submitted a master plan with their conditional use permit for phased development. They want to rebuild the above grade floor area, and expand the basement to create the capacity for a student enrollment increase up to a new cap of 540 students with the phased development that's subject to architectural review. Here in this image are buildings to be demolished with this proposal. There are five buildings in total. This is the original project submitted in 2016, and later updated with the architectural review application in 2019. Plans have been updated over the several years we have been at this. This is the current version of the original project. It shows the new building, which is the Academic Building here, the new Library -- these are also connected -- the pool below grade, removal of two Emerson homes, and other changes. This is the project alternative that came in this year in February, and updated. This shows retention of those two homes. It also shows a different circulation pattern called the dispersed circulation. Below here is a reduced garage size. A garage that doesn't encroach into the Embarcadero setback. You'll hear about student enrollment. This is the thing that has been of concern and a code enforcement case. The original use permit allowed for 415 students. Today's enrollment is 426 students. The proposed enrollment is 540 students, as I mentioned phased over time. This just documents here the case that the City handled in 2013 with a penalty payment, transportation demand management implementation, annual enrollment reductions, and leading to this conditional use permit application. I have this very wordy table showing the changes in gross floor area. We can come back to this but basically demolition on this side. They're going to demolish 84,572 square feet in these buildings, above-grade gross floor area, and they're putting a proposal in that replaces that 84,572 square feet with

slightly less above grade. Then the alternative project also replaces slightly less than the existing above grade. There is some below grade expansion. That will handle additional classrooms that are needed for the additional students and other functions. I will come back to this later because it is a lot of detail, as needed. This is the project components. Again, the five buildings to be demolished, replacement in the new academic building with expanded below grade area. We have subterranean garage access from the Bryant Street parking lot and exiting over onto Emerson, opposite Melville Avenue. The proposal is to complete the garage and begin student enrollment increases after that. There is a pedestrian passage that goes from the garage below grade over to the campus buildings for students that would be dropped off. There is a proposal to demolish the pool and reconstruct it with a sound wall. Then, there are deliveries and enclosures for those types of functions that are near the Circle and under the academic building, and, of course, the landscaping. This shows an image that came with the original project showing the park or open space landscape area that would replace the homes on Emerson Street. With this project, the garage did extend under these homes under the park area and into the setback on Embarcadero. All drop-offs were to occur inside the garage and then the cars would exit on to Emerson and all turn right and this caused an impact. The project alternative has a garage exit at the same location onto Emerson. In this project alternative, the cars are not all leaving and turning right because of the dispersed circulation proposal. This is an image showing the original garage here encroaching under the Embarcadero setback, and encroaching under these two homes. The reduced garage alternative is this configuration retaining homes, retaining these trees, and not encroaching. Again, another image showing parking spaces. The parking spaces in the project alternative meet the code rather than exceeding the code, which is what the project included. The project alternative was submitted by the applicant to address several community concerns, remove the significant and avoidable CEQA impact, and it enables the withdraw of the tentative map and variance for the Embarcadero Road encroachment. It reduces the ground floor level of the Academic Building but this is offset in the basement with additional floor area. I believe this is a typo. I think they are retaining 11 more trees than the proposed project. Retaining I said, not removing. The main thing with this project alternative is that it would not require a statement of overriding considerations by the Council if the Council were to approve the project alternative. Now, we get to the discretionary review and the required applications. We are here at the ARB because of the Architectural Review application. We're looking at all these things. We're looking at potential hearing dates. We've published that September 17 is the next ARB date but that's a flexible situation. We have other potential dates in October as needed to come back with some tailored architectural findings and plan refinements as needed. The Planning Commission meets next Wednesday, August 26. They have quite a few applications in front of them. The top two are CUP and Variance for floor area replacement. Those are the two associated with the project alternative. The project has all four of these applications associated. Again, we have published September 30 as our second Planning Commission meeting on the project. The HRB met last September to discuss the draft EIR, which had a cultural resources section looking at the historic buildings on site and the neighborhood adjacent the historic building. The image here on the screen is the preferred option between the two that the HRB saw back in September. Then, of course, City Council I have a November/December target after all of the other boards and commissions have had several meetings. What the Council would be doing is certifying the final EIR. They would be approving a record of land use action that addresses the mitigation monitoring and reporting program, and those applications we discussed: architectural review, conditional use permit, and variance. Now, in the staff report, I noted seven topics that relate to architectural review findings. These are the seven topics, packet pages 18 to 32. Again, these relate to findings that the ARB would eventually have to discuss and come to an agreement on. These are the findings, of course. We have several findings. We have the proposal for phased construction. This is through the architectural review process. Up to five years are enabled through the architectural review process. The applicant requests three years of construction, the first phase being the garage; subsequent phases noted in the staff report. Then the final EIR. There's been quite a history. As I noted, our consultant Katherine will be presenting on the final EIR but we've been through a few years of preparation, publication, comments, responses to comments, and here we are now after the final EIR was published. We have a vehicle and circulation parking design. This is a topic that is an ARB topic because we have various parking lots around the campus. There are three surface lots now. They are going to two surface lots plus the underground garage. They are proposing the use of tandem spaces but we don't count those tandem spaces toward the parking requirements. They are, as noted earlier, putting some service functions under the Academic Building and the buses would use

the Circle perimeter driveway. The underground circulation uses a double row of one-way drive through. This does enable if there is an emergency necessitated through this morning drop-off situation there's a second drive. There's also this pedestrian tunnel, as noted earlier, going from the garage to the campus in both project and the project alternatives. Noting that this pedestrian tunnel has been studied and looked at through the City Staff for compliance. It would be a permanent encroachment within that 25-foot public easement. We have bike parking around the campus increasing to 140 spaces in both long-term and rack spaces. Then the compatibility. Of course, the applicant has a long presentation to get to so I'll leave it to them to show their studies for compatibility and architectural treatments there. As noted, the materials board is on display at City Hall. Again, the ARB has a finding related to historic preservation which, you know, for this campus we have this historic building that will be separated by 50 feet from the new academic building that's proposed, and there will be some landscaping there. These are the materials. Then we have sustainability. This is, the goal is a LEED building, and these are some of the things that Castilleja is proposing. They've cited the benefits of achieving these goals and some strategies. I'll turn it over in a minute. This is what Katherine will be presenting. These are the five categories that are most related to the architectural review purview regarding the final EIR. I'm going to now, I think, share Katherine's screen. Let me check with her.

Katherine Waugh, Senior Project Manager: Good morning. Thank you, Chair, and Board Members. As Amy mentioned, my name's Katherine Waugh. I am a Senior Project Manager with Dudek, and we are the City's environmental consultant for preparing this EIR. This slide outlines what the required contents of a draft and a final EIR. The draft EIR was released for public review last summer starting in July, and it includes a detailed project description. In the environmental analysis, a really important component of CEQA is that we start with what exists currently. We look at the baseline conditions of the existing setting and we compare the effects of a project to those existing conditions. The analysis is based on a defined threshold of significance and those come out of City Code, the City Comprehensive Plan, other planning and regulatory documents that the City has adopted, as well as any applicable State or Federal criteria depending on the resources we're looking at. We then determine whether an impact would occur and whether it would be significant or remain below any particular thresholds, in which case we would find it to be less than significant. Where there is a significant impact, CEQA allows, or requires, that we provide mitigation measures that can reduce or avoid or provide compensation for that impact. These mitigations measures need to be commensurate with the level of the impact so that there is a nexus between the impact and the mitigation measure, a direct nexus, and that they are comparable in scope to the level of that impact. Another really important component of a draft EIR is to look at project alternatives. In the final EIR, we expanded that alternatives analysis based on some of the public comments, and as Amy mentioned, based on the project alternative that Castilleja School has proposed. In that final EIR, we have a series of master responses. There is a large volume of comments that were received on the project and the EIR. We wanted to be able to provide comprehensive responses to those issues in a complete way rather than in little bite-sized bits, directly responding to individual comments. We took the whole body of comments and tried to distill them down into the major topic areas that were addressed. This slide just lists the topics that were covered in the master responses. I am happy to answer questions on them but I didn't want to bog things down by trying to get into the details of each one. As Amy highlighted, it is really important to understand the differences between the proposed project here and the project alternative that Castilleja has suggested, which we call the dispersed circulation reduced garage alternative. I'll go through this quickly since Amy's already done a really good overview as well. I just wanted to present it in a slightly different way in terms of what elements are common to both project versions and then how those two differ from each other. You can see easily it is the same enrollment level, the same amount of special event activities. There are no changes in how the pool would be designed or operated. They both provide a very similar pedestrian and bicycle circulation plan showing how students and faculty could move throughout the site and how they would access the site if they're not coming in a single-occupancy vehicle. Under the proposed project, as Amy pointed out, the project would demolish the residential structures on Emerson Street and replace that area with a landscaped open area, whereas the dispersed circulation reduced garage alternative would retain those existing structures and the other features on those two parcels. Amy did a really good explanation of how the garage would differ between the two alternatives. Obviously, it's a little bit smaller under the dispersed circulation alternative. Then there would be a drop-off lane added to Kellogg Avenue in generally the same location where there is one currently. Then there would also be drop-off and pick up

and the Bryant Street/Luke Driveway, closer to the Kellogg side of that frontage. Then the building size; the Academic Building would be nearly the same size under the two alternatives. As Amy pointed out, there is a slight change in the above grade square footage because of adding the Kellogg Avenue drop-off lane. Then that is made up for with below grade space. I just have a few more slides where I wanted to highlight the findings of the EIR related to those five topics that Amy pointed out as being most relevant to the ARB purview. The first one is the land use impacts. We broke this down at different components of the project. As Amy noted, there is a significant and unavoidable impact under the proposed project that's related to traffic volume. Specifically, it was the TIRE index analysis, which stands for the traffic infusion on residential streets or in residential environments. We found that there would be a significant increase in the number of trips of cars on Emerson Street between Melville and Embarcadero on a daily basis. That impact would be reduced somewhat by implantation of an enhanced TDM Plan, as required under Mitigation Measure 7a, but that that would not be sufficient to bring that traffic volume down to a less than significant level based on the TIRE index thresholds. In the final EIR, we added some text to Mitigation Measure 7a to clarify some of the monitoring and enforcement provisions, and strengthen the performance standard. The City has a set of metrics to evaluate how well Castilleja would be attaining the standards set forth in the that TDM plan and allow for a process of adaptive management so that that TDM plan can be modified. The specific strategies that are implemented each year can be modified to reflect changing conditions in where students are coming from as well as background conditions and what specific strategies are more feasible and more effective as those conditions change. We also looked at impacts associated with noise. We found that specific to the pool there is a lot of [distortion] the alternative proposed to place that pool below grade so that that provides a lot of noise attenuation. Then there would also be a sound wall constructed along the projects Emerson Street frontage. The wall would be set back 20 feet from the public right of way, and the wall height relative to the street elevation would be consistent with the City's codes at six feet. There would be a kicker, which is an angled wall facing in towards the pool area to further reduce sound levels without adding height to the perceived height of that wall. The one mitigation measure require under noise related to land use compatible is the Mitigation Measure 8a, which requires further analysis of the loudspeaker system and where those speakers are set and faced to ensure that noise levels remain acceptable. We also looked at activities associated with special events. Again, we looked to what the existing condition is and how many events are currently being held each year. This Mitigation Measure 4a would slightly reduce that and define a set cap on the number of special events that the school would be allowed to have in any given year. There are also requirements related to providing floor circulation and parking plans. We also found a potentially significant impact under land use related to whether the project would be consistent with the City's tree preservation and management regulations. The project plans and the project alternative plans include tree protection measures and landscaping plans that did demonstrate consistency with the Tree Preservation and Management Regulations, but we required Mitigation Measure 4b to further give the City the tools to be able to monitor that and do additional plan review as the individual construction phases are proposed. We also, in that Mitigation Measure 4b, added a little bit more stringent of a requirement than the City's codes in terms of monitoring the trees that are on site. Even the ones that are retained, which is not typically required, but to have the monitoring program for five years after each construction phase that's proximate to those trees that are retained to ensure that their health is not compromised by the construction process. Finally, we concluded that impacts related to aesthetics would be less than significant and the next slide goes into a little bit more detail on that one. We had to address it both under the land use chapter but it had its own chapter as well under aesthetics. There's much more detail in that second chapter. This finding, again, was less than significant with mitigation and the only mitigation measures you see on that final bullet is related to lighting plans and making sure that those plans meet the City's standards related to light spillover. The other issues we looked at were comparing the proposed building against the existing buildings in terms of their scale and massing and materials and colors. In the final EIR, we added some exhibits that provide photographic stimulations of the view from Emerson Street. Amy included a couple of those in her presentation as well. Again, the pool sound wall was something that we spent a lot of time on because there was concern about its height and whether it would conform to the City standards and how it would appear from Emerson Street. As I mentioned, it would be set back 20 feet with landscaping between the sidewalk and the wall. Again, we looked at the tree removals and relocations and replacement and because the site plans do demonstrate consistency with the City's regulations and Tree Technical Manual, from an aesthetic standpoint we concluded that that impact would be less than significant. As I

mentioned in the land use context, we looked at noise, as well in a more detailed way. Some of the things I didn't mention earlier were that the building orientation... the configuration of the new academic building would actually provide some additional attenuation from noise that happens when there are special events held on the Circle. We found that there were some houses for which that noise level could increase slightly but in all instances the noise levels would not exceed the City Code or would not exceed the increase above ambient level that's allowed under the City Code. Again, we talked about the effects of the pool reconfiguration and relocation on sounds and we have the mitigation measure related to the loudspeaker design standards. There is also a mitigation measure related to construction noise levels but that's a very standard process of developing specific noise reduction strategies for each individual construction phase. Finally, the impact analysis related to cultural resources. As Amy reviewed, the project would modify the eastern façade of the Administration Building, which is a historic resource. Those proposed plans are consistent with the Secretary of Interior standards and, therefore, that would not be a significant impact. There are no other historic resources within the project site. Mitigation Measure 6a requires protection for both for the Administration Building and the neighboring historic resource building during construction to ensure there is no inadvertent damage during those processes. I believe that is my last slide. Thank you, Amy. I did want to keep my presentation really short because I know we have a lot to get through this morning but I am happy to answer questions on any of these topics as well as anything else that's addressed in the EIR.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Director Waugh and Amy French, for the EIR presentation. I'd like to ask if we have any questions from the members of the Board for the Staff but I'd like to try to keep it at a high level. We want to hear from the public as much possible and the applicant. Are there any questions from other Board Members? Okay, then.

Board Member Hirsch: I do have one. Just to emphasize this. The garage will or will not be used as a drop-off location, then? Has that been eliminated from the program?

Ms. French: I can answer that. In the project alternative that is to be presented, the drop-offs occur around the site as they do today. The new drop-off in the garage would be another place for drop-off but not the only place. The applicant can share what their plan is for that.

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you for that question, David. Anything else from the Board? Vinh, do we have the applicant keyed up? Could they give their presentation, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Amy, who's the applicant?

Ms. French: It's Adam Woltag.

Mr. Nguyen: It looks like Adam Woltag is in the meeting as a panelist.

Adam Woltag, Applicant: Good morning, this is Adam.

Chair Baltay: Good morning, Adam. We'll give you ten minutes to speak and then you'll have a chance to rebut community comments. Please do let me know if you think that's not adequate though. Go ahead.

Adam Woltag: We'll try to get through this in ten minutes.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, if you could time that, please.

Adam Woltag: Great. I am going to share my screen.

Chair Baltay: Adam, if you could please spell your name for the record.

Adam Woltag: Sure. It's Adam, A-D-A-M. Last name is Woltag, W-O-L-T-A-G.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Go ahead.

Adam Woltag: Well, good morning, everyone. Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to your comments and questions. I'd like to open up by saying that this project is designed to respond to many things. It's a combination of buildings and landscapes and spaces that help frame the experience of this really beautiful place. This project is designed to respond to the educational advancement of our next generation, and is also designed to be sensitive to the surrounding neighborhood. In so doing, our overall sustainable approach responds to and reflects the City's sustainable guidelines. Let's start with a view of the existing campus looking southeast. The red contiguous roof of the two and three-story classroom building that joins with the historic Guinn Building, and wraps the edge of the campus along Bryant and Kellogg. This is a site plan of the proposed design. This page shows three diagrams that compare the existing and proposed footprint as well as height. On the upper left the orange existing and the gray proposed. Note that the overlaps of what we're proposing and what is there is roughly the same. Regarding height, the diagram on the lower right illustrates that our proposed roofline is lower than the existing condition. In fact, we're actually not taking advantage of the full City's allowable mechanical roof equipment. We think that's actually a really good thing to try to keep this as low as we can. Our original submitted campus plan on the left received comments which we have responded to in the alternative number four campus plan. Amy touched on this a little earlier. There are a few key things I'd like to touch on as we move through here. One is illustrated in blue, the reduced garage footprint, which has allowed us to preserve the two houses both owned by the school along Emerson. As well as reduce the impact to existing on-site trees. With some subtle shifts in the massing and some interior re-planning, the introduction of an additional campus pedestrian entry along Kellogg has allowed us to maintain the existing Kellogg drop-off that supports an overall distributed drop-off strategy. Now traffic engineers have studied the impact of this model and concluded that this distributed approach, which is the current practice, is superior to a consolidated model where all traffic is funneled through the garage. This approach mitigates the traffic impacts identified in the DEIR. This approach has minimized curb impact along the streets with vehicular ingress and egress. It results in few curb cuts that are now thoughtfully organized around use and flow. Really key to this is how service, trash, loading, and deliveries have been moved inboard to campus away from the neighborhood and moved below grade. We think that's an excellent way to mitigate those impacts on the surrounding neighborhood. As noted earlier, this project's sustainable goals are aligned with the City's sustainability and climate action plan, focused on resource efficiency, the use of healthy materials, and a commitment to eliminating fossil fuels. It has really guided our design approach of three floors of academic program, one below grade and two above, that are connected together through day-lit teaching and gatherings spaces, and landscaped elements to ensure an experience of comfort, health, and delight. Skylights cover teaching patios, sunken gardens, and the use of clear stories will help ensure good daylight penetration at every floor in an effort to create a welcoming environment and reduce energy needs. Windows and exterior covered walkways and teaching spaces bring the outdoors in connecting teachers, students, and staff to nature. For example, looking at the below grade garden level, which benefits from generous open double-height stair spaces, those are opportunities to bring in daylight into those public spaces that are below grade. Light-colored wall finishes and interior classroom clearstories will allow that light to flow into hallways and teaching spaces. This is a section through the upper school hub space. This is the upper school's living room. This illustrates how we are approaching maximizing daylight penetration through glass curtain walls and skylights to get light into that garden. For the middle school hub space, that space bends upward to the second-floor classrooms and a central sky-lit hallway. This slide graphically illustrates our sustainability approach, which is summarized. There are a lot of icons here. It is really summarized to say that everything is working together to achieve our goals. Building elements, like walls, roofs, floors structural systems, our NEP systems, material site, and landscape design all has a purpose and has to if we're going to achieve our ambitious goals. As do the edges of the campus that face a neighborhood where they address entry, acoustics and safety, security, service access, storm water, and we hope beauty. As an example, our roof design highlights day-lighting opportunities in yellow and energy generation which you see highlighted in blue. It is reflective of our design and our goal toward net-zero energy. Now in response to neighborhood and contexts, we began this process by walking the campus and taking in the neighborhood that surrounds this campus. We

looked closely at the street elevations across the street from our campus. We studied the relationships and textures of solid and void, of building surface to open space, of accents and elements of the houses across the street, the cadence of glazing, and the roof height and roofline, and the overall comprehensive texture of that street. We began to layer this into how we might approach each campus street edge, not as a singular gesture but taken into account how landscape and the existing street trees comprise the whole experience. Now, I'll walk through some of the proposed building elevations in perspective and follow up with some more conventional flat elevations and some photo-montage images to show how the proposed design works in the existing context. I will also show you images that have the trees on and off. The Bryant Street view, trees on. Emerson Avenue view, trees on. The Kellogg Avenue view, trees on. I'd like to pause here and point out our approach at the sidewalk edge. We really tried to focus on scale and the fine grain patterning of the surfaces. The very eave edge that goes from Bryant to Emerson, and the cadence of windows and the depth of the façade and how it will play with shade and shadow. A view highlighting the distribution of the various materials across the elevation, and I'll touch on this more a little bit later in the presentation. Also, our approach to designing the new quiet entry off of the Kellogg Drop-off that we feel is trying to be sensitive to that activity along Kellogg. A view of the corner of Emerson and Kellogg, and the deep express roof eave of the second floor recessed planter at that corner entry. Now to help respond to the scale and the existing context, we have photo montage six street-level views of the proposed design, two views of the proposed Bryant and Emerson garage entry and exits. The Bryant Street existing; you can see the Gunn Building and the existing classroom building that are joined together, and the proposed design. Bryant Street and Kellogg intersection, existing. Now the proposed. The Kellogg Avenue looking toward Emerson elevation, existing, and proposed. Then Kellogg Avenue looking toward Bryant, existing, and proposed. Emerson Street corner, existing, and proposed. Then about midway down Emerson Street, existing, and proposed. Now off that intersection of Bryant and Embarcadero, this is a view of the existing entry parking before and after the incorporation of the garage entry. Then moving to the other side of the site to Emerson. This is the exit right now off of Emerson, and this is the proposed. Moving on to some more conventional flat building elevations, what you'll see is on the upper portion of each of these drawings is the elevation without trees and then the elevation below with trees. This is the Emerson Street elevations. The Kellogg Avenue elevation. I am going to pause here for a moment just to show a perspective diagram with some hash marks where we've stitched in areas where we really tried to shift the massing of the building elevation to highlight where we've broken the plane of that side. This is a building cross-section that illustrates, along with the program richness of this project, the various day lighting strategies we are applying to bring natural light into every possible space. It also helps to describe our use of dowel laminated timber system, or DLT, which is a wood structural decking system that has a very low carbon footprint and allows for greater spans, reduced structural members that in turn results in faster assembly, a lower impact on construction time, and eventually lower impact on the surrounding neighborhood. We feel that it has many benefits and we also think it's beautiful when exposed and there is lots of opportunities in the project to do that. These are a few wall section elevations to show how we are using wood as an exterior material. Here, as vertical [distortion] siding as well as shingles that we think hark back to some of the historical resources on campus as well as some of the residential resources within the neighborhood. Now, this is a view of our material palette. This is what we think pulls from the campus and we believe it is a warm and natural palette. It's a durable palette and one that has taken views from history and also reflects some of the texture of the surrounding residential neighborhood. We really feel it provides the right frame for the experience of the campus center. This is a view from the center of campus, the Circle, looking towards the middle school entry. As noted earlier, we have...

Chair Baltay: If I could break in for a second. You're now at twelve-and-a-half minutes. How much more time do you need, please?

Adam Woltag: A minute-and-a-half. I'll get through it very quickly.

Chair Baltay: Go ahead.

Adam Woltag: Great. Real quickly, we've met with the HRB. We've received comments and we're looking forward to going back and meeting with them. I'll touch really quickly on landscape. It's very important because our landscape design has been developed to ensure perimeter edges of the campus

gather rain water and storm water to help with infiltration and help reduce the impact on the City's infrastructure. This is the same strategy we've been using for the interior of the campus where bioswales and flow-through planters help reinforce place making and gathering spaces. The topography along the perimeters are also designed to help screen the campus but also provide opportunities to help highlight our storm water strategy. Our palette is pulled from native and drought-tolerant plants, and brings nature into the over campus experience. This approach provides an opportunity to use landscape as an educational and infrastructural tool, and tells a valuable story about this place, our climate, and is central to the core values of Castilleja. Thank you. Sorry for running over time there.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Adam. Very nice presentation and I especially appreciate your before and after photo montages. They make it very clear. Vinh, I believe we have some public comments. I'd like to open the meeting up to public comments at this point. Can you tell me how many people we have to speak? What should we anticipate, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, it looks like the number is quickly rising. Let's give everyone 30 seconds to a minute to raise their hand. If you want to speak on this item, please raise your hand now. If you're using the Zoom app, there should be a raised hand button at the bottom of your screen. If you're calling in from a phone you have to dial *9 in order to raise your hand. We do have a couple groups who will be pulling their time together. If you are part of that group where you're going to be donating your time, please raise your hand as well. Let's give everyone maybe 30 seconds or so.

Chair Baltay: To the public, I would like very much for everyone to have an opportunity to speak and I'd like to maintain it at the full three minutes that we typically allot. I would hope that everyone could recognize that that might be a lot of time and while this is a very important project it would be great if you could limit your time to less than or try not to repeat what someone else is saying. We'll listen to everyone's comments, however, and we very much want to hear every member of the public who has something to say. Vinh, as soon as you could I'd like to get a count of approximately how many people we have.

Mr. Nguyen: It looks like we have topped at 31 speakers.

Chair Baltay: At three minutes each that's a lot. Okay. I think we should get started then.

Vice Chair Thompson: Board Member Baltay?

Chair Baltay: Yes, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: Will we ask questions of the applicant after public comment?

Chair Baltay: Do any of the Board Members have questions? Would you like to ask something, Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I just have a quick question. It's about the material choice for the shingle. I just wanted to confirm that it's a straight-edge and not a scattered or shake.

Adam Woltag: Yes, it is. We're really looking at that shingle to match the same profile that's on the historic Gunn Building. We're looking for that continuity. We think that'll be a wonderful response, right, to the historic resources.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, thank you. Sorry, I have one more question. I noticed that you had a corrugated metal siding but when I looked at the material palette I didn't see it. Where does that occur, the corrugated metal siding?

Adam Woltag: The metal siding is one of the options we were looking at at the Kellogg elevation. There's kind of a drawer that's pulled out of the building that creates a second-floor planter box. We felt it was a nice contrast to the overall wood elevation. If you look at the Kellogg elevation, you'll see a call out for a metal panel system. We are right now considering standing metal seams. There will be some texture to

those metal panels. We think that will help really accentuate the shadows across that facade, especially on that part of the project.

Vice Chair Thompson: And does that use the MT1 anodized aluminum finish?

Adam Woltag: No. We're looking at a couple different options. I think the one we've settled on we were looking at a zinc or a zincalume or something that really doesn't need a lot of paint. Something that doesn't have high reflectivity but still has a nice robust feel to it.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. Are there any other Board questions? I'd like to get started.

Board Member Lee: I had a quick question if it's allowed at this time.

Chair Baltay: Absolutely, Grace. Go ahead.

Board Member Lee: My question is about the modular classrooms. I just didn't see anything in the applicant's project materials regarding how many, what kind, and perhaps this is forthcoming at the continued meeting but I just wanted to put it out there for the applicant.

Chair Baltay: I believe, Grace, I saw a drawing of the proposed modular layout and whatnot. Would it be acceptable to you, Grace, if the staff or the applicant could find that drawing and bring it back when we have comments from you directly?

Board Member Lee: Absolutely. (crosstalk)

Chair Baltay: I'm eager to get to public speakers.

Amy French: It's available on the webpage, so I can bring that up during the comments.

Board Member Lee: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Are there any other Board Members have any other questions for the staff or the applicant? Then let's get back to our public hearing meetings. Vinh, do we have the first speaker, and is it possible to get a list of some kind or something, Vinh?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, if you click on the participant's tab at the bottom it will bring up the list of speakers. You should see that there is 31 raised hands.

Chair Baltay: Great, okay. Well, I'll count on you, Vinh. Please announce each person in turn. Give the next person a heads up. To each speaker, please state and spell your name and you'll have three minutes. Let's get started, Vinh. Announce the first person, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay. I'll go ahead and announce the next five people so that way they can know who is coming up next. First would be Cath Garber, and I do apologize if I mispronounce anyone's name. After that will be Rebecca Eisenberg, followed by Nancy Tuck, followed by Tom Shannon, and then Rebecca S. Up first would be Cath Garber. If you could please unmute yourself on your computer you may speak.

Cath Garber: Hello. My name is Cath Garber, C-A-T-H, last name Garber, G-A-R-B-E-R. I'd like to share my thoughts regarding the final EIR for Castilleja. I'm a Principal at Fergus Garber Architects and have been practicing architecture in Palo Alto since the mid-90's. I designed a number of new homes in the neighborhood. One each on Kellogg, Emerson, and Waverly, and two on Kapper. I am currently working on two historic remodels across the street on Embarcadero. I live next to Green Middle School, and my children, both boys, attended Palo Alto Schools. My strongest relationship with Castilleja is that I ride my bike right on my way to the office near Town and Country. In all of my years, I have never witnessed

anything other than calm and courteous parents, staff, and students getting dropped off. I feel very safe as I ride by on my bike. As with other interested community members and as a curious architect, I've looked at the proposal. I like the overall design and its attention to the surrounding neighborhood. I was pleased to see that the historic Gunn Building will remain. I think the new construction is complementary. The new buildings are quite and the materials nicely complimented the historic building. Being lower in height and having recesses in balconies, incorporating the variation in materials, and the scale and massing feels right on the new construction. I agree with the EIR, which states the project improves the neighborhood aesthetics. I also wanted to comment on the landscaping. I think that the gates and the fencing are handsome. They are better detailed than you see on most commercial projects. I was also impressed with the plant and tree selection. I think the landscaping looks dense and is as attractive as found on most of the residential projects found in the neighborhood. In summary, I wanted to commend the school for proposing this alternative that they are today. It saves the homes, preserves trees, reduces the scale of the garage, and eliminates erratic impacts associated with the original proposal. I think this is evidence of Castilleja's responsiveness to the input from the DEIR and from the neighbors. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Vinh, next person, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next person will be Rebecca Eisenberg. If you could please unmute yourself you may speak.

Rebecca Eisenberg: Hello. Thank you so much for your time and for allowing me to speak. I greatly respect and recognize the amount of time and the many years that this commission, as well as the other commissions and departments of Palo Alto, have spent on this issue.

Chair Baltay: Excuse me, Rebecca. Please spell your name for the record.

Rebecca Eisenberg: Certainly, sure. It's R-E-B-E-C-C-A, last name, E-I-S-E-N-B-E-R-G.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Rebecca Eisenberg: Yeah. I am calling because it is extremely clear that this very hearing is in violation of Palo Alto's Municipal Code, Chapter 18, Section 7-6. As well as California State Government Code Chapter 8700, and the various provisions held within it. The City and this Commission have absolutely no legal right, and Castilleja has even less legal right to be presenting an EIR at his time. In particular, because of the way that it is misrepresenting the purpose of this project. The purpose of this project and the purpose of these hearings is to determine specifically, not whether or not Castilleja has mitigated its recognized extremely large impact that it would have on the community, should it be allowed to build this school according to its amended CUP. But rather, the purpose is to ask and evaluate whether Castilleja School, a private entity that offers zero public interest and shares zero of its facilities with the public in any way, has the right to take 55 residential lots and destroy everything in them and convert them to a private school that would offer zero benefits to the public. Also as admitted, it would actually provide a great deal of harm. To ask to be at the state where [distortion] is illegal stage in this hearing. I'm not blaming you. I am just pointing out that this is where it is. Now, just to explain a little bit of the background of this, given the proposed use of this six-acre parcel that some value at as much as one billion dollars by the applicant that pays zero in any property taxes into the City, as it now needs to be taken is whether or not Castilleja has a right to build anything on these residential lots other than 55 residences. Castilleja only has the right to use those residential lots for purposes other than residential if the City of Palo Alto were to grant Castilleja those rights. The City of Palo Alto doesn't have the right to grant Castilleja any variance whatsoever because of an agreement that Castilleja signed with the City in 2013, where Castilleja agreed that if it did not comply with the schedule to reduce its enrollment to 415 students by the year 2018, and if it didn't reduce its traffic to 365 cars by 2018, Castilleja signed an agreement that would be happening here is a revocation hearing of its permit. I'd like that to happen according to the law and contract. Thank you.

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

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker will be Nancy Tuck. Nancy, if you could please spell your name for the record, and then you may speak. Hi, Nancy, if you're there please unmute yourself.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Nancy Tuck: My name is Nancy Tuck, N-A-N-C-Y, last name is T, as in Tom, U-C-K, and I've lived on my home on Melville Avenue, a couple hundred yards from the school, for the past nine years. I'm also a parent of a 2017 Castilleja graduate. I haven't had any contact with the members of the ARB. You can add me to your list a strong supporter of this project. I've attended countless outreach meetings graciously hosted by Castilleja over the years. As someone who has been directly involved in the conversation and collaboration over these many years, I can attest to Castilleja commitment to transparency and meaningful dialogue with its neighbors. Even more important, the plan itself speaks to the steps Castilleja has taken to listen and respond with solutions that address neighbor's concerns. Castilleja's proposal to significantly decrease their garage size and maintain multiple or distributive drop-off and pick-up locations are key examples of this. So was the meeting they held with neighbors whom we could provide direct feedback to the architects on design elements. Now, Castilleja has a plan with no significant impacts and a beautiful design, which is a win-win for everyone in the neighborhood, the school, and the City. As a neighboring property owner, I find the proposed upgrades to be far more aesthetically pleasing than the current structures. I appreciate that there is no increase in the building height, the modern architecture, the proposed landscaping, as well as the environmental benefits of the reduced carbon emissions. I am also pleased with the amended traffic plan, with the additional drop-off and pick-up spots, as well as the options for disbursement direction for autos leaving the proposed garage. At various times over the years, my support for this project had made relations hard for me in the neighborhood, but I stand by my conviction because I see how hard Castilleja has worked to make the design changes to respond to input. Castilleja is an excellent and considerate neighbor. I feel lucky to own a home nearby. The administration and the Castilleja community always work to be mindful of neighbor's needs and requests. In recent months, I have especially appreciated how Castilleja has delivered to neighbor's doors detailed information about their new project alternative. We've been informed of the progress and the updates to the plans at every step along the way. This smaller less-impactful project is the result of a successful collaboration toward shared goals to improve the neighborhood and the campus. The renderings on the Castilleja website are significantly more attractive than the dated buildings that we look at today and would greatly enhance our community. Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you, Nancy.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Vinh?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next speaker will be Tom Shannon and Tom I believe you have a presentation for us. Yesterday you had indicated that you might have a neighbor who is going to be donating some time. Can you confirm that's still happening?

Tom Shannon: The neighbor was Allen Cooper [phonetic], but we weren't sure that the Chair was going to allow that.

Chair Baltay: That'll be fine, Tom. How much time do you need to make this presentation?

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair Baltay, if I may?

Chair Baltay: Sure.

Ms. Gerhardt: In order to combine speaker times, we need a group of five or more people to combine speaker time.

Tom Shannon: That's what I heard, yes.

Chair Baltay: I would like to make an exception to that and allow -- you want to combine with one person, Tom?

Tom Shannon: Yes, my neighbor's named Allen Cooper. My presentation shouldn't take more than three-plus minutes. It just rolls over slightly.

Chair Baltay: Okay, go ahead, please. Let's see what happens. Thank you.

Tom Shannon: Okay. Good morning, Architectural Review Board. My name is Tom Shannon, T-O-M, S-H-A-N-N-O-N. I am a 40-year resident of Palo Alto, 31 years directly across the street from Castilleja. I am also one of the four creators of the neighbor's alternative plan in your staff report, but there's no time to talk about that this morning. The picture on your screen shows two simulation models. The top picture depicts Castilleja's drop-off traffic pattern for the draft EIR published in July of 2019. The bottom picture is Castilleja's proposed drop-off traffic pattern for the final EIR published on, what I heard was, July 29th. We got it July 30th of 2020. Note the significant difference. The top one was made available for public comment though. The bottom one had no public comment. That's a significant problem, we find, with the final EIR. Not to mention a public relations credibility problem for the City. Notice that the bottom diagram depicts a powerful visual of the native impacts Castilleja traffic pattern would have on all the surrounding neighborhood streets, including the Bryant Street Bike Boulevard. Now, what's the ARB's role in this? I would ask them to look at the context. Study how the applicant's proposal will interface and affect our surrounding neighborhood. We cannot understand how the City concludes that this traffic plan is compliant with the Code, quoting the code "the proposal shall not be detrimental to property and improvements in the vicinity, and will not be detrimental to the general welfare of the surrounding communities." In granting a conditional use permit, reasonable conditions or restrictions may be imposed to assure the conditional use is compatible with the existing adjoining properties in the general vicinity. I would believe that our neighborhood is "in that general vicinity." We have to ask ourselves why does the City continue to give greater priority to the needs of Castilleja, a private education foundation business, over the neighborhood and communities needs aimed to preservation of one Palo Alto's historic residential neighborhoods? Let's talk architecture. We all acknowledge that mistakes were made in the past. How a three-story dormitory got built on Kellogg Avenue in the 1960's across the street from seven craftsman-like homes leaves one to question that approval. Now Castilleja proposes an industrial-sized horizontal high-rise with little articulation to replace this dormitory and classroom building. The proposed building would stretch nearly the entire length of Kellogg Avenue, equivalent in size to Palo Alto's City Hall, situated directly across from seven early 20th century craftsman homes. We would ask the ARB to study this building in scale and carefully decide if it's consistent without neighborhood's architecture and does it deserve to be called compatible. We have an opportunity to correct past mistakes and reestablish preservation of our neighborhood. Let's jump on it. Here is a six-point plan for the ARB to consider implementing. Send the plan back to staff and ask for a revised plan that's in keeping of the scale, design, and architecture of the neighborhood; two, correct past architectural mistakes by recapturing the residential feel of the neighborhood; three, design a creative compatible campus that mirrors the surrounding historical context; four, eliminate traffic impacts. If we can't get an Embarcadero entrance, require the school to shuttle all students to campus. Per the EIR, this could reduce traffic on some residential street by over 1,400 trips per day. Five, hold a community meeting, or hold as many as you have to. The public deserves a right to comment. Six, be transparent. Correct a flawed EIR process. If you want to stand behind the so-called mislabeled final EIR, schedule a comment period. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Tom. Vinh, could we line up the next speaker, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker will be Rebecca S. Then the five speakers after that will be Nanci Kauffman, followed by Gary Paladin, followed by Barbara Hazlett, followed by Sonali, and then followed by Jeff Levinsky.

Rebecca Sanders: Yeah, my name is Rebecca Sanders, spelled R-E-B-E-C-C-A, S-A-N-D-E-R-S. I have arranged to yield my time to the Lawyer Leila Moncharsh. I just want to go on record I will stay online until she is able to speak.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: To be clear, she is using your time, Rebecca, and speaking on your behalf?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, that's correct and they actually had emailed beforehand. Our next speak will be Nanci Kaufman. Nanci, if you could unmute yourself, identify yourself and you may speak.

Nanci Kauffman: Good morning, everyone. This is Nancy Kaufman, N-A-N-C-I, K-A-U-F-F-M-A-N. I am a Castilleja neighbor and homeowner for more than 20 years. I am also the head of Castilleja School for the last ten years. I want to start just by thanking all of you, the members of the Architectural Review Board, the staff and all the consultants for the time and attention you've given to revealing Castilleja's master plan, and especially for studying the new project alternative. As you know, Castilleja is over a 100-year-old institution. Our classrooms buildings are over 50 years old. We must modernize our facilities to meet the needs of our students, and to update our systems to enhance our sustainability. We're fortunate to be working with a team of architects who understand how to design with the community in mind. You've seen the stunning architecture that Adam has shown you, but beneath that there is a real programmatic rationale for our new campus. Every aspect of the new building is there for a reason, contributing to learning, minimizing environmental impacts, and enhancing the neighborhood. Over the past five years, we have participated in over 50 meetings with our neighbors to gather feedback to incorporate into our campus plan. Whether it was a large group setting or some of the intimate smaller ones the goal was always the same: to find a way to modernize our campus in a way that improves the neighborhood and reduces our impact. Many of the key elements of a modernization were driven by neighborhood feedback. The garage to move cars off of the neighborhood streets, the below grade pool and deliveries to minimize noise, and the commitment to preserving trees and housing to protect the residential feel. The proposed alternative is the most recent evolution of our project as we've gradually scaled back and refined our design to do more with less. We are very proud that the final EIR report found our proposed alternative to be the environmental superior project alternative due to the robust transportation mitigations, and the preservation of trees and housing. For all of these reasons, we would like to proceed with project alternative number four as our project. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair Baltay, if I may, I just want to be clear to the applicant that anyone speaking for the applicant should stay within the ten-minute presentation window. I believe the last speaker is also a neighbor but anyone speaking for the application should not be presenting using this public review.

Chair Baltay: That's a fair statement, Jodie. Let's try to keep an eye on that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, next public speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker will be Barbara Hazlett. Barbara, if you could unmute yourself, identify yourself, and you may speak.

Barbara Hazlett: Good morning, Commissioners, and everyone. My name is Barbara Hazlett spelled B-A-R-B-A-R-A, last name H-A-Z-L-E-T-T. I have lived very near Castilleja School just across Embarcadero for over 40 years. I feel very fortunate to live near this important institution. We all need to be reminded that much like Stanford, Castilleja is a nationally ranked school. How lucky are we to have these kinds of educational institutions in our backyard. Specific to this hearing, I wanted to speak today about the building design and how pleased I am with the proposed plans. The schools' architects have carefully studied the surrounding homes to select materials that mirror them. The new rooflines are at the same height, or lower, than the current structures reducing the overall size and allowing for more sunlight. I've looked at the renderings Castilleja has shared on their website and the landscaping, including all of the trees, blends the buildings beautifully into the surrounding neighborhood. Without increasing any floor area ratio, Castilleja modernization greatly improves on the current aging structures we see on campus

now. All of us as immediate neighbors will benefit greatly from this design. In conclusion, the school is an excellent neighbor. The school predates all of the neighbors having been at this location since 1910. Castilleja should have the opportunity to modernize as have Ohlone, Paly, Addison Elementary and Stanford. I look forward to seeing this plan come to fruition because I know it will quickly become part of the architectural fabric of our residential streets. Castilleja's always been a gem in Palo Alto and I hope they can finally modernize their aging campus. Please support the school's plans, and ensure that inspired architecture and exceptional educations continue its foundational and timeless values in Palo Alto. Thank you.

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

Mr. Nguyen: The next speaker will be Sonali.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Sonali Simgh: I just wanted to note I'm a community member. I'm also an alumni of an all-girls school and a Stanford grad. I have personal friends who are Castilleja grads. I support girl's education and I support intentional community building.

Chair Baltay: Excuse me, Sonali. Can you spell your name for the record.

Sonali Simgh: What? I'm sorry. Spell my name?

Chair Baltay: Spell your name.

Sonali Simgh: Sure. My name is S-O-N-A-L-I, last name S-I-M-G-H. I'm a community member. I'm also an alumni of an all-girls school and a Stanford grad. I have personal friends who are Castilleja grads. I support girl's education and I support intentional community building.

Male: Can you start the timer?

Sonali Simgh: Should I start again? Okay, I'm a community member. I'm also an alumni of an all-girls school and a Stanford grad. I have personal friends who are Castilleja grads. I support girl's education and I support intentional community building. It is absolutely absurd that you think you need to build a parking lot to expand girl's education. There are many ways to do this; expanding enrollment that doesn't include spending an unnecessary amount of time and money and creating significant community disturbance for a parking lot. With your clear financial surplus, you could be extending by ensuring scholarships for girls from East Palo Alto. You could be using charter buses for students and faculty who live close by, and allocating existing parking permits based upon distance. Again, I went to an all-girls school and I do support girl's education. I don't support dishonesty about the impact to the environment around it. I don't support the disregard for disadvantaged girls in this community who are separated from us by only a highway. I believe that given Instagram accounts that have amplified personal testimonials racism at Castilleja, including by poc [phonetic] at Casti, Castilleja could use rethinking and self reflection about where your funds go. What are you really doing to desegregate your school? What are you doing to increase enrollment for disadvantaged students who are in our community? What are you doing to address institutional racism at your school. If you're building a parking lot instead of answering those questions, you certainly cannot use the excuse of not having the funds to resolve the more important issues at hand during our community public health and public crisis. This pandemic, the devastating effects of climate change we're seeing, and rampant institutional racism. None of this needs to involve building a parking lot. That picture that Adam denoted of historic Castilleja is hardly anything to hold up. It shows exclusively what its students -- it denotes a time in which the school embraced racist harmful segregation policies. Make no mistake, there are people of color out here that Castilleja refused to admit into its school. These dynamics still exist in the community. I'm not sure why we're so focused on the appearance and exteriors when we're not talking about the alternate ways that Castilleja could be achieving the same goal that cost the same amount but involves less disturbance and do not involve spending money on a parking lot. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you Sonali. Vinh, if we could move to the next speak, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker will be Jeff Levinsky and then the five speakers after him will be Nelson NG, Sonali Simgh, Cathy Layendecker [phonetic], David Yee [phonetic], and then Angie [phonetic]. Jeff, can you please identify yourself, unmute yourself and you may speak.

Jeff Levinsky: Okay, this is Jeff Levinsky, J-E-F-F, L-E-V-I-N-S-K-Y. I'd like to share a screen. Is that possible or not?

Mr. Nguyen: Unfortunately, that's not possible at this time.

Jeff Levinsky: Okay. All right.

Mr. Nguyen: If you would have submitted it before the meeting we could put it up for you.

Jeff Levinsky: Okay, I asked about this in the EIR but the EIR did not address the specific question that I asked, which is about the laws governing whether Castilleja's proposed underground garage should count as floor area. The ARB members are familiar with this topic in general and they are being asked in their finding number one to certify that the project complies with the Palo Alto zoning laws, and it appears that there is a problem. In four separate places, our zoning laws say that a garage in the R-1 zone, in which Castilleja sits, does count as floor area. I'll just briefly rattle off what those are. They're in the definition section 65. It says in the R-1 single-family residence districts as that gross floor area includes "covered parking." Further on, it goes on to say "garages shall be included in gross floor area." Then in the site development standards for R-1 it says that gross floor area includes "covered parking." Further on down there's a table, table three, which is in the letter I sent in yesterday. It shows specifically garages and carports and there is a star to say included in the gross floor area. The only argument that the EIR made in opposition to this is that it was a basement. That the garage is somehow also a basement and basements are or can be excluded from floor area. There is an explicit law that says that basements may not extend beyond the building footprint. The garage that's proposed is under a playing field, not under any building footprint, so it cannot be considered as a basement. One last point, by the City's not counting the garage as floor area, I calculate that the City will be losing almost a million dollars in impact fees, most of which would go for affordable housing. This problem is not only a violation of the law, it appears, but is also something that will harm the community beyond. I'd like to see it addressed in the EIR, which it wasn't, and corrected. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jeff. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, our next speaker is Nelson Ng. And Nelson I see you have two accounts in this hearing and both of them have a hand raised. Can you confirm if it's the same person or if they are two different individuals?

Nelson Ng: It is two different individuals. One is my wife Kimberley Wong. This is me. She's going to be speaking as well but she is on the iPad and I am on the...

Mr. Nguyen: Understood. Okay, go ahead.

Nelson Ng: My name is Nelson N-E-L-S-O-N, N-G is the last name. I have been living in Palo Alto across from Castilleja on Emerson Street for over 24 years. In the next three minutes, I will just cover two issues of the incomplete study of the impact and providing inaccurate information of this EIR. I am asking the commission to reject it until these are corrected. First issue, from page 44 of the appendix E Traffic Impact Study, they stated after revealing the (inaudible) data between March 2015 and March 2018, only found one single non-injury collision occurred along the studied segment during this time. The finding concluded given the lack of crashes involving bikes along Bryant and Embarcadero and I quote, "a safety concern involving bicycles along the study segment has not been demonstrated." Therefore, the study is not focusing on it. However, there was indeed an accident of a bicyclist and pedestrian on a scooter struck by a car going westbound on Embarcadero at the intersection of Bryant

and Embarcadero on February 13, 2018, at around 5:00 p.m. That accident shut down both sides of Embarcadero for over an hour. You can find the details of that accident on the weekly articles titled Two Injured on Embarcadero Road Collision. The next issue is about the proposed project found that the results is significant and an unavoidable impact even with mitigation because the garage would direct an increase of 80 percent of new trips coming off bound on Emerson to eastbound Embarcadero to make a right. That will increase it from 842 trips to 1,521 daily trips. In order to address that, the new alternative proposal was that without any study in the EIR validating assumption. It just says that the alternative assumed that only 10 percent of the traffic will go into Bryant Street into the garage. Therefore, by further splitting up the garage's traffic coming out they've reached that goal by reducing the traffic by 21 percent to only 51. Their assumption is just not correct. This is just like with our studies. If the student got an F minus they should not be retested to pass the class because they are assuming that the student is getting better. What I am asking the commission to do is basically to restudy all the incomplete findings and inaccurate issues. Then asking them to come back to them to present the EIR. Thank you.

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

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, next speaker will be Kimberly Wong. Kimberley, I believe you sent me a presentation yesterday. We'll get that up for you. If you can please unmute yourself, identify yourself, and then you may speak.

Kimberly Wong: Hi how are you?

Mr. Nguyen: Good, thank you.

Kimberly Wong: My name is Kimberly Wong, K-I-M-B-E-R-L-E-Y, W-O-N-G. I've lived across from the Lockey House for 24 years. With the construction of the gym in 2007, we were affected by the noise, dust, and dewatering of the construction. The project Castilleja is now proposing is monstrous in comparison. The Palo Alto Municipal Code requires that a project enhances the living conditions on the site and in the adjacent residential area. It also says that a project should promote visual environments, which are of high aesthetic quality. This project does not take into consideration neighborhood livability as residents need to bear the brunt of traffic and noise brought on by this massive project. Cars traveling in and out of the garage and around campus will compete with bicyclists on the Bike Safety Boulevard and neighboring streets causing unsafe conditions. I suggest that a no garage option be returned to the table and studied to provide a safe and a more aesthetically appealing alternative within a single family neighborhood. Here's slide one. The proposed three-fourth block long building on Kellogg also fails to blend in with the classic Spanish tutors, craftsman colonial revival homes around the campus. This goes against the mixed-use area L6 to avoid drastic changes between residential and non-residential areas. For slide two, please. To illustrate the size and massing of this building. To the left is Target, which is 600 feet long and Castilleja, which is currently 200 feet long. Though there are different sizes, the relative building length to the street is just the same and as much of an eye sore. Adding a row of trees in the front of this does not change that fact. The new structure should be broken up and redesigned with more pass through views of greenery and open space, and be more compatible to the administration and Chapel Building in a manner with Gustav Laumeister first envisioned when he created the campus for Ms. Mary Lockey more than 100 years ago. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Kimberly. Next speak, Vinh, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker is Sonali, who I believe will be donating your time to Rob Levitsky. Can you please confirm if that's correct?

Vice Chair Thompson: Didn't we just hear from Sonali?

Sonali Simgh: This is donating my time to Rob Levitsky. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, did we already hear from her or is this...

Mr. Nguyen: I do not think we have heard from Sonali yet.

Vice Chair Thompson: The person who was on Zoom who had written her name as Sona, when she spelled her name for the record she spelled Sonali Singh.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay. Sonali, can you confirm if you're the same Sonali speaking from earlier?

Sonali Simgh: Hi, yes this is the same person.

Mr. Nguyen: Since you already spoke you won't be able to donate your time to Rob Levitsky as well.

Sonali Simgh: Okay. Sorry about that.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Rob, you have three minutes. Please state and spell your name for the record.

Mr. Nguyen: Rob has a couple of other speakers as well but he is down on the list. The next person will be David Ye [phonetic]. David if you could please identify yourself and you have three minutes to speak.

David Ye: Yes, this is David. I would also like to donate my time to Rob Levitsky.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Vinh, please keep track of all this. Let's find the next speaker.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker will be Angie, who I believe might also be donating time to Rob as well. Can you please confirm?

Angie: Yes, I would like to donate my time to Rob. Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, sure. After that will be Ruben [phonetic] who I believe will also be donating his time to Rob. Can you please confirm? Ruben, if you're there can you please unmute yourself and confirm.

Ruben: Yes, sorry. The window to unmute just showed up. Yes, donating time to Rob Levitsky.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, thank you. Our next speaker will be Bruce McCloud. Bruce, can you please unmute yourself and identify yourself and you have three minutes to speak. Bruce, if you're there can you please unmute yourself on your computer?

[Adjusting Audio.]

Bruce McCloud: My name is Bruce McCloud, B-R-U-C-E, M-C-L-O-U-D. I've lived and worked in Palo Alto [distortion]. The ARB's charge includes promoting visual environments, which are of high aesthetic quality, and variety [distortion]. I've worked with WRNS Studio on other projects and the aesthetics for the proposed buildings for Castilleja [distortion]. Kellogg Street façade is devoid of any variation along the 400-foot roofline and includes only [distortion]. At a public meeting the school's representative stated that the neighbors would not notice once the landscaping is in place. [Distortion]. As for neighborhood considerations, I have admired many of the modern homes that have been built around the City. When [distortion] they have been welcome additions to the diverse fabrics of our neighborhoods. This design has been allotted by Castilleja [distortion] overbearing 1960's era monstrosity. That is a low bar. Castilleja has an opportunity here [distortion] something that is compatible with the neighborhood and compliments the surrounding houses. The Palo [distortion] with no increase in floor area. Castilleja circumvents the spirit and [distortion] floor area below grade plus another 30,000 square feet of garage space. I ask that the ARB [distortion] Palo Alto neighborhoods from overreaching development; however, well-intentioned by rejecting plans that in any way increase

the floor area of this [distortion]. Finally, in April of this year, eight months after the DEIR public comment period of the proposal [distortion] triggered additional studies, especially traffic flow, and a public comment period. It did not. [Distortion] is legally defensible avoiding additional public comment for the revised plans is a betrayal of the public [distortion] responsible to the community at large. The ARB should correct this lack of oversight and refuse to consider any development [distortion] plans are subjected to public comments and review. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Mr. McCloud. Next one, Vinh, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next person will be Netta [phonetic], who I believe is also donating time to Rob Levitsky. Netta, can you please confirm if that's true?

Netta: Yes, that's true.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, thank you.

Chair Baltay: Okay, next person, Vinh, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker will be Hank Sousa, who we have a presentation for. We'll pull up your presentation for you in one second. Okay, Hank. Please unmute yourself, identify yourself and you may speak.

Hank Sousa: Yes, Hank Sousa, H-A-N-K, S-O-U-S-A. Hello, Board Chair Baltay and fellow Board Members. PNQL stands from the beginning with no garage, no demo of the schools two Emerson Street homes, and preservation of protected trees. The schools' no garage alternative calls for the demo of the two homes, substantially altering the community character leaving one private residence on the corner of Emerson and Embarcadero. What we would like to see happen is the preservation of the 86 parking spaces on the current campus. That would require some redesign of the proposed new building but the no garage alternative already calls for a reduction in classroom space and lower student enrollment. This idea is in the revised DEIR Section 13.8, alternative five, pages 13-30 and 13-31. This reconfiguring of the buildings utilizing tucked under parking. To go a bit further with that logic, use the existing footprints of the current buildings. An enrollment of 450 would most likely to be more palatable to nearby residents. Let's assume the 86 spaces on campus are assigned to workers and staff. The school would continue to use off-site parking for some of the staff. Next, let's address the single-car drop-offs. If the school were to establish east and west side kiss-and-ride drop-off spots where busses picked up the students, there would be virtually no traffic issues associated with the school except when large events occur. The school could continue to park vehicles on a playing field for large events, which we would like to see reduced to 20 per year. The school has yet to show a willingness to embrace an authentic shuttling program. The newly planned buildings have state-of-the-art environmental features. Building an underground garage is incongruous. There is no need to reinvent the wheel. Use the current parking on the campus, reconfigure the buildings, save the two Emerson Street residences, shuttle in the students, and continue to provide a high-quality education to a student population that fits comfortably within the site. We'd like to see you recommend new buildings that are less massive than the one planned for Kellogg, no underground garage, and the embrace of authentic shuttling from drop-off spots. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Mr. Sousa. Vinh, if we could move on to the next applicant, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker will be Carla Befera and I believe we also have a presentation for you as well. I believe you will be sharing the same presentation as Tom Shannon. Carla, if you can please unmute yourself, identify yourself and you may speak.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Carla Befera: My name is Carla Befera, the name is spelled C-A-R-L-A, last name B-E-F-E-R-A. I'd like to address some specific issues related to this project. A 4,000-page FEIR was released on July 29th. In

order for the stakeholders to review this information, they had to read 200 pages per day to be well informed for this meeting, a scant 20 days later. First question is why the rush? This project is listed as an action item on your calendar. I respectfully request that this project be referred back to the City staff for further review, and more importantly, to establish a comment period on the latest plan, which is most definitely revised since the one submitted for the DEIR last July. Some nine months after the initial comment period expired, Castilleja submitted a revised plan. Why was there no public comment period for the revised plan? Surely this is not acceptable. I submit that approving or even reviewing this revised plan without a public comment period is in violation of the spirit, if not the specific requirements of CEQA, and makes for a troubling view of the inner workings of our City staff. The revised plan has been trumpeted as mitigating some of the variances the project required but it also establishes new concerns. A particular note the revised plan completely alters the suggested traffic pattern, yet no additional traffic studies were made. Instead of cars arriving and exiting adjacent to Embarcadero as you can see, the new plan has cars dropping off and picking up on all three sides of the school facing the neighborhood in addition to the garage entrance on the Bryant Street Bike Boulevard. According to table MR5-2 in the FEIR, the school anticipates 1,477 car trips per day driving through all adjacent intersections of this residential neighborhood. One of the most significantly impacted intersections, Bryant and Kellogg, was not studied at all during this process. You can see by the illustrations the differential under Castilleja's revised plan, cars will travel not just around the school but will impact all the neighboring streets. The impact is significant on the Bike Street Bike Boulevard, as well as on Kellogg Street, which is currently being explored for new bike access. The plan traffic -- let me repeat, we're talking about 1,477 car trips per day not including traffic related to the 95 events -- will impact bikes, cars, and pedestrians trying to commute to several neighboring public schools. Just another reminder that 75 percent of this school's attendees come from outside of Palo Alto. These are untamable impacts incorporable for a quiet residential neighborhood particularly when compared to alternatives, such as the alternative plan to be found in your packet which was suggested by neighbors with all ingress and egress via signal on Embarcadero. I believe one of your directives is to preserve quality of life, which this plan I'm afraid does not do. Because both of these significant lapses and the lack of review of viable alternatives we request that you deny approval of this plan at this time and rehear the project back to City staff to establish a comment period on the revised EIR. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Carla. Next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next speaker will be Rob Levitsky who we have a presentation for. And, Rob, you have a group of five people. You will be given 15 minutes to speak. I think you previously indicated you have more people to donate time but 15 minutes is the maximum, so even if you have more people available to donate time you will not be given any additional time. Rob, if you could please unmute yourself, identify yourself and you may speak.

Rob Levitsky: My name is Rob Levitsky, that's R-O-B, L-E-V-I-T-S-K-Y. Owner at 1215 Emerson, which is adjacent to the school. A sixty-three year resident of Palo Alto and 30 year neighbor of Castilleja. I am looking at the architectural review goals and purposes and trying to see how this project fits in with that. Castilleja completely took us, neighbors, by surprise on June 30th, 2016, with their slide in a presentation showing an underground garage, removal of two nice houses on Emerson replaced with an underground garage, an unwanted private park, and the parking garage. Just about everything in this picture was to be removed in this plan: the six Redwoods, a bunch of the Oaks, the houses. All would just vanish. Cars would be parked 16 feet below grade, in some cases right up to my property line. My house is in the corner with the redline around it and you can see the first iteration of the parking garage had cars basically touching the property line 16 feet below grade. Nearly all 168 trees, including protected Oaks and 120-foot Redwoods, would be subject to being killed or maimed. This is quoting from the April 2016 inventory of trees report by Arborist Michael Bench. Among the 168 trees, there are 122 trees on the Castilleja campus. There are 42 street trees and 4 trees located on my neighboring property. All of the 168 trees are expected to be impacted by proposed construction. That's architectural review goal number one, promote orderly and harmonious development in the City. This surprise on the neighborhood and just whacking all the trees and houses is not exactly fitting into my definition of harmonious development. Purpose number two of the ARB: enhance the desirability of residents or investment in the City. There's no way that the extra traffic, loss of protected trees and canopy,

underground parking garage, loss of two of the three houses on the block, three to five years -- who knows how much construction -- and 5,000 truckloads of excavated dirt was going to enhance the desirability. In fact, we had several people move away because of the conflict, and houses pulled off the market because of scared buyers. One Sunday afternoon after seeing Castilleja misrepresentation of neighbors about the garage, we collected signatures from 47 neighboring households against the garage. All of the lighted addresses are people who signed petition against the underground garage. Purpose number three in the ARB: encourage the attainment of the most desirable use of land and improvements. But at what costs to the neighbors who never were showed the plans? We never objected to a compliant project but they came at us with a list of demanded variances violating the setbacks on Embarcadero, on Emerson, on Bryant, merging two house lots on Emerson, and tearing down the perfectly good houses. Shifting the Melville public utility easement and building a pedestrian tunnel two feet under the Melville sewer line. This is a permanent encroachment of the public utility easement. This is not normal. None has been granted in the last ten years. This is showing the underground tunnel, and just above it, below the red line, is the Melville sewer line that services the whole neighborhood, two feet between the sewer line and the underground tunnel. Not to mention destroying two of the three houses on the east side of the 1200 block of Emerson. The school tried to buy my house. When I said no, it was in further discussions that they had -- I know they tried to discuss anyway -- trying to get my house by eminent domain. Real friendly, huh? Then there's the variance required for floor area ratio. They cry hardship in their variance requests blaming the lot shape as an excuse. But Castilleja didn't complain about the shape of the lot when the City of Palo Alto gave them Melville Street in 1992. Now they want, out of havoc, to follow the FRA rules for lot coverage. They also want to get planning to allow an underground garage where, as Jeff Levinsky has explained, is not allowed and not count 35,000 to 50,000 square feet in the FAR calculation. Purpose number four ARB: enhance the desirability of living conditions upon the immediate site or in adjacent areas. There is no way that cutting down the standing 100 to 120-foot Redwoods and large Oak canopies enhances the desirability. Nor does slicing and dicing through the roots of other protected trees for various pipes, walls, equipment faults. Perhaps some of you noticed the extreme interest in preserving the 300-year-old Oak in the 2300 block of Webster at the City Council meeting on Monday night. Over 30 residents spoke in favor of not violating the Tree Protection Zone. No one spoke in favor of the supposed property rights of the builder. Palo Alto's cared deeply about trees, especially Oaks and Redwoods, and believed that the rule protecting trees would be even tighter than what is in the tree manual. Here's an example of interfering with the tree protection zone of a protected tree. The arrow points to a little dot you'll see in the center, which is the center of a tree. There's a Tree Protection Zone around it but you would never know it. There's a large electrical transformer, the sidewall of a swimming pool, a set of stairs, a fire access road which cuts into the canopy, bicycle parking, and, of course, the school's trash dumpsters. That's how they value tree number 89. This may be a 70 or 80 percent of the TPZ being violated versus the 17 percent which caused all the uproar at the City Council over the Oak on Webster Street. There are many other trees in this design subject to similar TPZ encroachment. The desirability is another question. The desirability of imposing an ugly and dangerous underground parking garage entrance along the Bryant Street bike route. Others have talked about this. The people would be diving into the underground parking lot and there would be a risk of a bicycle accident. Or a parking garage exit on Emerson aimed at Nelson's house at 1260 Emerson? Talk about bad feng shui. Is that what neighbors should be doing to each other? Having hundreds of car lights shining in your doors and windows along with the attendant buzzers, lights, engine noise, and toxic auto exhausts? And then there are the same cars queuing up on Emerson blocking access to the driveways. Purpose number five on the ARB: promote vital environments which are high aesthetic quality and variety, and which, at the same time, are considerate of each other. This is our block. Beautiful trees. You can see that there's stands of Oaks, Liquidambars, the Redwoods are to the right, and a couple of houses. All of these would be demolished. Somebody thinks they're going to improve on this 100-year-old aesthetic of trees and houses with some bulldozed mess, private park... who knows what they actually want put there. The planning department has chosen to call a dozen or more protected trees "less than significant." So these trees would not be listed in the biological resources section of the EIR. The trees could be removed and replaced by mitigation 4B: planting something else somewhere else. This is the game they play. We're mitigating. We're buying some trees; we're buying some canopy; we'll try to put it on the side if we have room otherwise we'll just plant some trees somewhere else. Done. Nice slight of hand, planning department. Not to mention the 120-foot Redwood that was cut down in 2016, based on an inaccurate arborist report. This tree just so

happened to be in path of the garage exit. This 120-foot Double Struck Tree looks perfectly health and was perfectly healthy. But they ran in and said oh its danger, danger, danger. There's the but cut of this tree. It's almost solid wood, maybe 85 percent wood. You need about 30 percent to hold a tree up. The tree was really in no danger. It was a bogus report and just happen to be in the path of the exit of the proposed parking garage. Our neighborhood of 100-year-old houses and trees would be salvaged and cleared by their first proposal, replaced by an underground parking garage. No thanks. We like our neighborhood how it is with trees, houses, and no underground garage. We are more interested in houses and trees than in the number of curb cuts, the cadence of the windows, or the shape of the shingles. So far the school has grudgingly accepted the neighbors have made good points. Why else would they come back with a proposal that now saves more of the Redwoods, but not all, spares the two houses, and avoids the 24-foot setback on Embarcadero? I might add that none of these changes were suggested by the City planners who seemed to have shown no interest in comments made by the neighbors. The next step is to lose this unnecessary parking garage and give up on 540 students. The neighborhood has already lives with 448 students, and we are willing to accommodate a few more as well with a zoning compliant no-garage option. Castilleja should have the right to modernize but follow the zoning rules like everyone else, but the scattershot design shown here have been very abusive to the neighborhood and is nowhere near ready for a favorable recommendation. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Mr. Levitsky. Vinh, could we move on to the next speaker, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we have eight speakers left and the order will be Chase Lambert [phonetic], followed by Jim Poppy, followed by Leila Moncharsh, followed by Gwen Whitlwer [phonetic], followed by Andie Reed, followed by Gary Paladin, followed by Lorraine Brown, and then last but not least, our last speaker will be Neva Yarkin. Up next will be Chase Lambert. Will you please unmute yourself, identify yourself, and you have three minutes to speak. Seeing there is no response, in the interest of time we'll come back to Chase at the end. Up next would be Jim Poppy. Jim, can you unmute yourself, and you may speak.

Jim Poppey: I am donating my time to the next speaker Leila Moncharsh.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, sure. Hi, Leila, can you please unmute yourself, identify yourself, and you will have six minutes to speak.

Leila Moncharsh: Good morning, [distortion]. I am L-E-I-L-A, Last name [distortion]. I represent PNQL land use attorney and I have been since 1993, and I have a Master's degree in [distortion]. I am also a former vice president and a continuing board member of the Berkeley Heritage Association for about ten years now. My office is in Oakland. I help neighborhoods with land use issues throughout the greater Bay Area. I want to make a couple of comments first of all, on the Gunn Administration Building just to preface what I have to say in substance for the rest of it. First of all, the speakers are correct. Legally this [distortion] the final will need to be recirculated. The law is very clear on that. I will be citing the code sections in my letter about the EIR. The changes to the wall on the Administration Building need to be part of that recirculation. Also, [distortion] that there's more than the stairs that need to be looked at. I am glad this is going to the Architectural Review Board. My topic mainly is about repurposing. One of the problems with this project that I see is it has been left out of the discussion here in terms of what you're going to be able to do with this property long-term. First of all, I want to thank Amy French for being responsive to requests but it is one thing that for some reason staff has really never addressed, so let's talk about it today. First of all, much of my practice deals with conflicts between [distortion] and neighborhoods. I have seen a lot over the years and I've learned a lot about private schools and how they operate. They have an enormous number of [distortion] to their business. They have very large endowments but those are very [distortion], and most of them run on shoestrings, to be frank about it. The best, kind of, sweet spot for them in California has been the 350 to 450 enrollment level or less. You can look at the Department of Education and you're going to see that. They have incredible competition challenges in the Bay Area, especially for parents who can pay full tuition. There's a great demand among the private schools. Now they've got another challenge in this: the pandemic. Lately, around the Bay Area we're finding that religious private schools are closing permanently. That wasn't totally unexpected but because of changes in how people look at religion and how they proactive religion. We

had another one that was consistent with Castilleja and that was Palmer School in Walnut Creek. Three hundred and eighty-five students, kindergarten to eight, came along; they closed permanently after 82 years. Politics, besides funding sources, are challenges. Sonali brought up some of that and we see it around us. What we're looking at here is when the project would be completed you'd have 224,500 square feet of developed property. What are you going to do with it if in the future either Castilleja is extremely successfully but this square feet is used up, and they can't continue to build on it indefinitely so they move? What you've got is 224,500 square feet. You might say, well, there's always a housing need. We can demolish there and rebuild. No, because demolition costs are extremely high. So, what are you going to put there? If we say housing still, well, so, what are you going to do? Put a high-rise housing development there? Condos? No, because you're restricted by the zoning. What happens to these things with private schools and other institutions, it's not limited to them, is they end up just sitting there and there isn't any good repurposing. When you look at this garage you look at the type of buildings [distortion]. What are they consistent with? In my looking at them you could put a lot of walls into the new building that you see that's very long and the neighbors are criticizing. Using like SRO's there, but there are no services around there. That's not going to work. They appear to be office. They're very consistent with what we see in large office complexes but it's not zoned for that. What are you going to do with it? Does Palo Alto need empty school campuses? [Distortion]. I would suggest that a lot of the mess that you see with trying to do things, like move parents around and figure out how you're going to get all of them into the property and such. A lot of this would dissipate if you reduce this overall project by a lot. Also recognizing, as much as we love Palmer in Walnut Creek and we love Castilleja in Palo Alto, these private schools move and they close in one day's notice. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much. Next speaker.

Mr. Nguyen: The next speaker will be Gwen. Gwen, if you could please unmute yourself, and identify yourself, and you may speak.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Mr. Nguyen: I am not sure if Gwen is having technical difficulties or not. We will come back to her at the end. Up next will be Andie Reed. Andie, if you could please unmute yourself and you may speak.

Andie Reed: Thank you, Vinh. Andy Reid, A-N-D-I-E, R-E-E-D. Thank you and hello to the Architectural Review Board. We appreciate your hard work on this project. To provide context, Castilleja operates in an R1 zone under a conditional use permit. These conditions include a number of students to be enrolled and number of events that can be held on campus. The school has exceeded their conditions on both of these over the past many years, and yet this project that you are currently reviewing asks for more students and more events. You have the difficult job of deciding whether the City should bend new conditions around the school's latest business model or instead acquire that the private tax-exempt school adjust its goals to fit the needs and interests of the residents of Palo Alto. There is a variance being requested for an increase of 33 percent in floor area ratio. Code allows 86,800 square feet above grade floor area and the school is asking for 116,000 square feet -- although if you include if you include the underground garage, which code appears to require, the increase is more like 70 percent. The proposed modern style building will loom large and is not compatible architecturally with the surrounding small older homes. What is also important to note is another square footage increase that's not other apparent. Page G..001 of the current plans specifies that the total floor area above and below grade combined currently existing is 160,000 square feet. Proposed is 192,000 square feet. The school is asking for an increase of 20 percent square feet of usable space on the same six acre lot where they have successfully educated girls for many decades. That increase doubles when you consider the underground garage as active usable space. No matter how you look at it, all of these increases in square footage are to accommodate 30 percent more students, parents, staff, faculty, supporters, and volunteers so Castilleja can achieve a new operational model. Unless it can be shown how this benefits Palo Alto, the boards and commissions reviewing this project should request that the school dramatically reduce its demands. I have a couple seconds here. I am going to ask where is the discussion around the underground garage? Where is the architect that's building the underground garage? What is its environmental impact? Does the gate clang closed? How does that tunnel work? We would like to see

renderings and understand this better but we have not been able to get the school to let us speak with the underground garage architects. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Andie. Vinh, if you could line up the next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker will be Gary Paladin, followed by Lorraine Brown, followed by Neva Yarkin, followed by Mary and then we'll go back to Gwen at the end and see if her computer's working again. Gary, if you can please unmute yourself, identify yourself and you may speak.

Gary Paladin: Hi, good morning. My name is Gary Paladin, G-A-R-Y, P-A-L-A-D-I-N. I believe Castilleja deserves some recognition for the effort its put into developing a master plan for its campus. This plan aims to reduce the school's environmental footprint in our community and establishes a benchmark of sustainability that other institutions, I believe, will want to model. Castilleja's plan aims to meet or surpass both California's and Palo Alto's aggressive sustainability goals. Its innovative solutions for a clean and sustainable future. For starters, outdated campus structures will be disassembled, rather than raised to maximize recycling and utilization of existing building materials. In new construction, it will incorporate only non-hazardous responsibly sourced green building materials. The future campus is designed to be completely self-sustainable, reliant upon on-site generated energy from solar panels on building rooftops and heat recovery systems. With the exception of its science labs, the campus will be entirely fossil fuel free. Planned installation of high-efficiency recycled water infrastructure and drought-resistant landscaping, along with efforts to preserve existing trees on campus, will also contribute to the schools self-sustainability. Castilleja's plan demonstrates commitment not only to the environment but also to the community. The plan to build environmental education into its curriculum demonstrates commitment to educating young women to become environmental stewards and leaders for our future. Thank you for considering my comments.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Mr. Paladin. Vinh, if you could line up the next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: The next speaker will be Lorraine Brown. Lorraine, if you could please unmute yourself on your computer, identify yourself and you may speak.

Lorraine Brown: Good morning. I am Lorraine Brown. My name is spelled L-O-R-R-A-I-N-E, B-R-O-W-N. Thank you for this opportunity to speak with you today. I grew up in Palo Alto and I raised my family here since the 1990's. I also work at Castilleja. I know traffic has been a concern for our neighbors. I want to comment on how traffic demand management, or TDM, has become embedded in the culture at Castilleja. As a long time Palo Alto, I appreciate concerns about traffic in our city, so I'd like to share my perspective on the school's commitment to managing traffic and parking and being the best neighbor that we can be. When Castilleja embarked on the master planning and CUP process years ago, we kept an eye toward reducing impacts in everything from noise to traffic. The project alternative number four, it's in the final EIR, specifically features a smaller garage and distributed drop-off for this very reason. In the seven years since we developed our robust TDM plan, our traffic levels have been consistently 25 to 30 percent below where we started. Accomplished at a time when traffic has been relentlessly increasing in the Bay Area. Over this time, TDM has become part of our culture. It is not just what we do, but it's who we are. Through parents, student, and employee education, frequent reminders, and strict rules for parking and traffic, everyone in our community has come to appreciate their role in making a difference, and they do. To support their efforts, we have added bus routes, shuttle service between Caltrain and the school, and employee reimbursements for non-car commuting. All employees are required to come to campus at least three days a week by some means other than single-occupancy vehicles or participate in traffic duty to help manage flow during drop-off and pick-up. The results have been astonishing with fewer than 50 percent of our students arriving on campus in single-occupancy vehicles. With this successful track record and a depth of experience, we are poised to continue to reduce our car trips per student as we grow enrollment, resulting in no net new trips while making this unique education available to more girls from a diversity of backgrounds. We will be held accountable through carefully documented mitigations and conditions of approval with penalties to ensure our compliance. To ensure compliance within our community, we have at least seven monitors who help with daily and special event traffic and parking. They also patrol neighborhood streets to ensure that Castilleja community members are only

parking in designated areas. We have shifted event-related parking to our athletic field, and our attendants promote compliance and efficiency. We intend to further reduce our parking impacts with the underground garage designed to relocate parking on the perimeter of campus below ground. I also want to note that a proposal from the community to enter and exit campus on Embarcadero was studied at the City's request before we filed our CUP application. After study by traffic consultants, the City determined that it would cause an adverse impact. I'm telling you all of this...

Chair Baltay: Excuse me, Lorraine. If I could interrupt you, please. It sounds to me like your speaking as the applicant not as a member of the public. That's fine but I will then credit that against the time the applicant is granted to rebut comments from the neighbors. I would like to stop you at this point, however, and continue with public comments. To anyone else in the public who intends to speak as the applicant, please hold off on doing that now. Vinh, could we go on to the next public member, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, the next speaker will be Neva Yarkin. It looks like she just lowered her hand. Okay, it looks like our next speaker will be Mary Sylvester. Mary, you can unmute yourself, identify yourself, and you may speak.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Mary Sylvester: Thank you, Chair Baltay and Board Members, as well as City staff for the opportunity to speak today. I am Mary Sylvester, and that's M-A-R-Y, S-Y-L-V-E-S-T-E-R. I am a 43 year resident of Palo Alto and I to have raised my two children at this home on Melville Avenue, one-half block from Castilleja School. For the last 20 years, I have professionally worked with children and teens, and frankly enjoyed the presence of Castilleja in the neighborhood. I've loved the sound of children and young people's voices and it brings energy and vibrancy to the neighborhood. I have never made a complaint against the school; however, when the school submitted its expansion plan on June 30th of 2016 and had their underground garage exiting at the front door of one of my friends on the corner I decided it was time to make a statement and intervene. The thrust of my comments today will focus on how does this project serve the best interests of Palo Alto. Not just the neighborhood, but this could be a groundbreaking project for the community as a whole, opening flood gates that we may not want to see. First of all, let's set the context. Castilleja operates in a residential neighborhood on a conditional use permit. That's in the Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 18, Section 76. They're on a CUP because given the nature of their operations, their size, their scope, and the impact on the surrounding neighborhood. They do not readily fit into the residential neighborhood context. This is a privilege to operate in this neighborhood. Not an entitlement. Whether they've been here 100 years or 110 years, that is not the issue. The City regulates zoning. Consequently, the holder of such a privilege may not do anything that will be injurious to property in the vicinity and will be not detrimental to public health, general welfare or convenience of the citizenry. To accomplish the goals of the ARB, there are findings that I believe you must make. Finding one, the design is consistent with the applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, the zoning code, the coordinated area plan, and any relevant design codes. Something's up with my timer her but is this plan consistent with -- hello? Is this project consistent with...

Chair Baltay: Mary, I'll give you 30 seconds more if you could, please.

Mary Sylvester: Something happened to the timer here. Okay. I contend that this project is not consistent with a comprehensive plan, the zoning code or our sustainability plan. On balance, I contend that the cost to Palo Alto with Castilleja's current plans as a whole do not justify the benefits to a small portion of Palo Alto residents. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Mary. Vinh, if we could move to the next speaker, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, our next speaker will be Gwen. Gwen, if you could please unmute yourself, identify yourself, and you may speak. Gwen, if you're there could you please unmute yourself? Okay, seeing as how there is no response and Gwen is the last hand raised, Chair Baltay, would you like to give her some more time or would you like to close public comments.

Chair Baltay: No, I think we will now close the meeting from public comments. Thank you everyone for speaking.

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Baltay, sorry to interrupt, it looks like one person just raised their hand. I would like to call this person if that's okay with you.

Chair Baltay: Sure, Go ahead.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, Neva Yarkin. She had her hand raised earlier...

Chair Baltay: Fair enough. Fair enough. Let's let this person speak, please.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay. Neva, can you please unmute yourself and you may speak.

Neva Yarkin: My name is Neva Yarkin. Its spelled N-E-V-A, the last name is Yarkin, Y-A-R-K-I-N. I live on Churchill two blocks from Castilleja. My family has owned this property for over 60 years. Traffic in Palo Alto has continued to increase for years. Castilleja's expansion adding another 125 more women will continue this increase on the congested roadways in Palo Alto. If this expansion is approved it is not just a neighborhood problem, but will affect the whole city with traffic flow. I am not a fan of parking garages for the following reason: if I had a daughter at the school I would not get stuck in a parking garage or the traffic surrounding the school. I would drop my daughter off one block north of Embarcadero or one block south of Churchill so I could rush off to work. I am sure others would do the same. Our lives have also changed with COVID added to the picture. Would any of you let your daughters take the train to school now with COVID in the air? Private cars might be the only option left, which means more traffic. Construction will take five years. Hundreds of big cement trucks will have to follow the construction route in Palo Alto, which is taking Alma, Kingsley and Embarcadero, or taking other side streets close to the construction site. One outcome for the big construction project would be lane closures. An example of lane closures due to construction is at Oregon Expressway. One lane of Oregon Expressway is closed during the day, which has lasted for months. Traffic is a nightmare. Could this happen on Embarcadero? Another disturbing aspect of this project is that Castilleja will continue to teach classes in modular buildings while construction is going on. This could be a safety problem with students, cars, trucks, bikes together. Future plans for this area, which was not addressed in the FEIR, train crossings at Churchill. It should be looked at. Thank you for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Ms. Yarkin. With this, I'd like to close the meeting to public comment and give the applicant a chance to rebut comments that have been made. The applicant will have ten minutes. However, I'm going to credit back against that three from Lorraine Brown's comments, which I interpreted as an applicant rebuttal in advance. Would the applicant care to rebut for the remaining seven minutes of their time? I know we say Mary Leaddecker's name on our list at first and she removed it, I believe, because she is one of the applicants. But it's up to the applicant to decide if they'd like to speak. And if so, they have seven minutes.

Mr. Nguyen: Yeah, I see Mindy Romanowsky has raised her hand. You can just unmute yourself and speak if you're speaking on behalf of the applicant.

Mindy Romanowsky: Good morning members of the ARB and members of staff. My name is Mindy Romanowsky. I am a land-use attorney and I represent Castilleja School in this very long-awaited project that we are very proud to have come before the ARB this morning. As we know, we are embarking on the first of many important public hearings. We really look forward to hearing the comments from the ARB. We know that you are tasked with making findings ultimately not today, but findings based upon the seven itemized municipal code requirements and we do look forward to hearing that feedback and getting to that feedback. Today we did here many constructive comments that we will take to heart as we have done over the last five to seven years of meeting with neighbors. As the head of school communicated, it has been 50 plus meetings with neighbors that have given us the ability to arrive at this moment with this application. I want to make it very clear, however, that today we heard a number of inaccuracies both in fact and in the law. Misquoted legal provisions and misquoted facts in the

neighborhood that have been identified. I do plan to submit a letter both to correct the record on the facts and to provide the correct legal citations which support our project. I will include items like the legality of the underground parking garage in an R1 zone when you're operating as a non-residential use. I will include items that address the legality of the final EIR, and whether it needed to be recirculated when a project alternative was identified as having fewer impacts, and ultimately arrived at a conclusion where there would be no significant or unavoidable impacts, amongst other things. I just want to clarify that while I cannot correct the record on all of the items I heard within the last hour or so, we will do that. I want to thank you for your time and get your very important and constructive feedback so that we know where to go from here. We hear the direction and we can iterate appropriately. Thank you so much for your time.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Ms. Romanowsky. Do we have anything else from the applicant? If not, then I'd like to bring this back to the Board. What I'd like to propose is that we ask any questions we have now of staff or the applicant. Then we'll take a short five-minute break and then we'll get into some Board comments if we could. Do we have any questions for the applicant from any member of the Board? I would like to start, then, and ask the staff to please explain how the floor area is calculated for the new building. These would be the current requirements. Is there any merit to the question about whether garages are allowed underground not under a building? And isn't there a 6,000 square foot maximum floor area in R1 zone regardless of lot area? Could you please address those comments?

[Setting Up Presentation.]

Ms. French: This is the table I showed earlier. We have analyzed the situation with what is floor area and what is not. The code is clear about whether it is a single-family residence. That's different from a non-single family residence in an R1 zone. There's precedent for this and we analyzed it. The garage is not considered gross floor area. It is square footage and usable. Parking is garages and carports, not a below grade facility for a non-residential use. I don't have the code sections in front of me but this is showing on the screen what I prepared for this meeting to share what was going on with floor area. This is not subject to the maximum house size. It's not a house. I think you asked that question, Peter. Was there another question you had?

Chair Baltay: What is the allowed floor area for this lot?

Ms. French: The allowed floor area is what has been allowed in the past through the conditional use permit. After floor area ratio was instituted for residential back in 1998 this property became a non-complying facility with regard to the floor area ratio that was instituted at that time. This has been out of compliance with the 1998 floor area ratio regulations since that time. I don't have the...

Chair Baltay: Amy, if the lot had never been built on what would be allowable square footage for a non-residential use on this lot?

Ms. French: I don't have the number that corresponds in this chart. It's the floor area ratio for the lot size. I don't have it on this screen. I don't want to just rattle off a number.

Chair Baltay: I understand. It's basically 30 percent of the lot area though in R1, isn't it on a very large lot.

Ms. French: It's a formula that starts with a different ratio and then adds another ratio later. It's not precisely 30 percent. There's lot coverage and then there's floor area ratio. Those are different.

Chair Baltay: Okay, I was just trying to get a sense of how much bigger they are proposing than what would normally be allowed on a property of this size.

Ms. French: They are proposing less gross floor area than what is on the property now in both the project and project alternative, as you can see at the top.

Chair Baltay: Okay, very good. Thank you, Amy. Do we have any other questions for the Board for applicants or the staff? No, I see none. Okay. I'd like to take a five minute break. When we return we'll ask Dave Hirsch to start us off on our discussions. I now see 11:11. Let's say 11:16 we'll start up again. Let's to be precise on that. Thank you everybody. Five minute break.

[Recess.]

Chair Baltay: Okay, are we able to get started again, Vinh?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, of course. If all Board Members could confirm that you're all here.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: it looks like we have a full house. Yes, we can.

Chair Baltay: David, I've asked you to start a discussion if you don't mind. You can go ahead whenever you're ready. Unmute yourself, though.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you all for the variety of presentations, pro and con. They are really very impressive and have brought to our attention, I think, a lot of the significant issues. Starting with some of the plus sides on this project, I am impressed with the fact that finally the 1950's building will be moved away from the historic building. I can't imagine how that was done in the first place but it was a different time, I guess. Now that's split the Gunn Building and the Administration Building is separate. It's a significant improvement and also it provides additional location for access to the campus center. I am happy about that and I think that it's an improvement that the Art Building is going to be demolished and create a greater open space and a place where moving the maintenance down below in an appropriate location. The garage and the issue of the garage, which of course will be a PTC issue as well, is really probably more appropriately handled by that agency. However, it seems to be to be a sensible idea from the beginning except for the fact that it maintained a significant amount of drop-off for student body. I don't think it's an attractive way in which students can come to this building or to the site, and I hope that it can be minimized. I emphasize that above grade could be easily more attractive on... let's see. It's on Kellogg Street. Kellogg is, I guess for me, the biggest issue of the project. It's an incredibly long building and it is unrelenting. Even with nice textures and the varying window spacing, it's unrelenting. It really has no major... even though it has a drop-off at the building at that point that that decision was made the building itself does not lend itself the way it is right now to entering the campus or to become a major entry to the campus. I think that's a very, very big mistake. If I go back for a minute, it seems to me that there are two absolutes on this campus. One of them is the easement and the utility easement which is a problem as was pointed out in section since you have to get under it in order to get through to the campus. The other one is the Circle. The Circle will not be broken. It seems that the Circle represents something to all Castilleja graduates. It has this incredible, kind of, nostalgic value and it was obviously off-limits for the designers to touch it. It doesn't represent anything specifically architectural as far as I can see. It isn't contemporary in its look and its usefulness to the campus, but it is very limiting to the way the whole campus has been developed now. Combining the fact that the Circle is enviable and the campus building along Kellogg is so tremendously long are two irresolvable problems in this whole scheme. I just don't see that that six railroad car scheme of a building, more than six, actually, is viable. I think the Kellogg building really has to be split and something more profound made out of the entry to the courtyard from the Kellogg Street side. It isn't there now. The other aspect to this that bothers me a lot in the whole scheme of it is since the limitations are so strong here, the Circle and the perimeter -- which, by the way, is used as a drop-off point as well I'm told and car traffic can actually enter it, and I think the vans deliver students and faculty to the inside of that space -- that function isn't really serving the school as it could. I really see there's an opportunity to do something. I imagine the landscape designer was told you can't do anything there and I think if we gave them another chance they could do something much, much better than that Circle by itself. In the very least, you could reduce the Circle. It doesn't have to stay exactly enviably that size.

That's part of my concern; half of it. The other part is that the program now increasing 100 students causes you to go down to a cellar to make up for all of the additional space you'll need for this expanded educational usage. It cannot be that you're bringing in enough light and it's not natural light in any case. Its borrowed light to make those spaces look as nice as what the drawing showed. By the way, it would have been nice for us to see those drawings really presented in a way where we could understand how it possible could work. But to me, at this point, the drawings that we saw today, which we didn't really get in the packet, they certainly were not emphasized appropriately. It is clearly something that we would have to study further to see how it is possible to get enough light, enough borrowed light to make those spaces below feel comfortable. Furthermore, you're putting spaces which are in a building that has solved all the environmental problems but they have no natural ventilation. It certainly would be possible if you were to have a smaller Circle to have a stretched out building in a way that it could grab some natural light somehow from the outside. The cellar does not do sufficiently in my estimation. Another issue that I have is that you're coming through a deep tunnel from the parking structure to go to what? You're coming up and you're actually bottleneaking the possible connection through to the athletic field. It's much tighter now. There's a staircase up at that location where the garage is. There's an elevator up in the space between the administration building and the gym, which is a sufficient space for the kids to go to the ball field and watch a game. It is now being really terribly restricted. Should that tunnel have been carried all the way through to the center and the center you go down and then you connect through directly to the garage. It would've made a real connection to the center of the campus both for the kids who are coming and for the kids who are going back to be picked up, or for people simply going to get to their car and leave the campus. In terms of the TBM's, I think that's terrific that it is so active and that the school is so successful in arranging that. I find that's pretty impressive if it satisfies the community. It's clearly going to be better now that there is a garage. I am not convinced that the swimming pool will absolutely solve the sound problem. It's placed down low next to the gym, next to a solid wall in the gym and I can't imagine that the sound doesn't project out in all directions from... but that's a study which I think you'd have to prove to the community otherwise. If it doesn't work it's going to be an annoyance and add to the complexity of the relationship to the community. In sum, I personally can't accept the building as a single building. I think it needs to be broken. The Kellogg face needs to be broken, with possibilities of actually stretching the building out. Even on the second floor keeping the entry at the Emerson Street corner underneath it and stretch the building closer to Emerson and pull the building apart and create something dynamic as sort of a symbol of the school. All of the other entries you're kind of sliding in from the outside, whereas this would be a very important entry direct into the middle of the courtyard. I request that the school reconsider what they consider such an important historic piece of the campus, the Circle in itself. Let the landscape designers provide something that is more appropriate for school use. I think about the Stanford entry with a church and the front of the Romanesque building. I think how wonderful that space is and it's a great big space and there are no cars. It is full paved in a very simple, wonderful way. It works for potentially large gatherings as well. I think it's possible to find a design for the center that is appropriate for today's usage, and not specifically a memory from the past. I'll end with that.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, David. Why don't we hear from Vice Chair Thompson next? Osma, go ahead.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thanks. Thank you to the applicant and thank you to all the members of the public that gave us their feedback. I'm going to keep this quick because I know we're probably going to continue this and see this again, and we have another item on the agenda after this. In general, as far as the architecture of the building I'll respond to something Board Member Hirsch mentioned about the façade along Kellogg. This was from a few other comments from the public as well. On first glance when I visited the site, the existing façade along Kellogg is pretty unrelenting and pretty strong. When I was comparing it with what we had in the packet, from I could make out at least at the time, it seemed like an improvement. If you were going to have that massing, which already exists, the proposal here is an improvement over what's existing. I will say the renderings that were provided to us on page 9 through page 12 were really hard to use as a way of understanding what the building is actually doing. It took a bit of gymnastics going between the elevation and the other little tidbits of axons that we had to really understand what the façade of this building is actually doing. I think the presentation that we received today from the applicant was a lot more helpful because I think in our packet we don't have any

renderings where the trees are off. I will say that even in the presentation today when the trees were off there was still this like ghost of trees, which is a little distracting. I think we really need to see what that façade is for what it is when there are no trees because that will be what comes out. I think, also, the other views that were chosen along the streets also didn't really accurately depict how a person would experience it. Like on Bryant Street, the view that was chosen was a little skewed to the point where it was a little hard to understand. If the view had been a bit more straightforward we could actually see how the façade changes. When we see this again I think I would like a bit more clarity on the design in terms of the graphics. I can see a lot of work went into this on the site planning and things like that but I think we are all here to judge what the building looks like in terms of aesthetics. I think a bit more clarity on that would've been helpful. That said, from what I saw and what I can make out and even after this presentation, I really think that the design is an improvement to the area. I like that there are notes taken from the existing context. I like the parti diagram that you showed about looking at the rhythm of the neighborhood and using the patterning of the façade to, sort of, respond to that. In terms of the design, I'm actually all very much in favor of the aesthetic direction and the material choices, the façade. Again, I was actually okay with the façade on Kellogg being flat just because that is what exists right now. The proposal is an improvement over what exists right now. Could it break up a little bit? Sure. I could see that being an improvement to connect to that Circle in the back. There's kind of a nice differentiation because this isn't a residential building it shouldn't look so much like a residential building. I think right now that massing helps a little bit with that. I could go either way on that. A little bit of improvement but in terms of what we have right now I think it is a really solid design. I'll leave it there. Generally in favor of the architecture of the façade on Kellogg. I could be open to seeing that change a little bit. I didn't really walk through the middle of the campus so I am not quite sure about the Circle in the middle and if that wants to change or not. I will refrain from commenting on that. In general, it seems like more expanded space might be better but it depends. Okay, I will leave it there. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Osma, very intelligent words. Alex, how about you go next. Alex Lew.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for everybody's presentations. They were actually very well done today. I will get to the preferred alternative but I do want to say that I opposed to the original scheme building in the special setback along Embarcadero. I won't go into all of the reasons but I think that I would not support that. Regarding zoning, I guess I would like for staff to follow up with Jeff Levinsky's comments and letter. I did review the zoning codes last night. I would like clarity on that. I would also add that the comp plan policy T-56 does strongly encourage below grade garages for all new developments. I think we should all factor that in as well as to the actual language in the zoning code. On the site plans, I too was troubled with the traffic circulation with the original scheme. I would like more information on the preferred alternative. I just didn't see enough information about how that would all work. It does seem like it does have some benefits with regard to like trash pick-up being below grade. I think the distributed drop-off has some sense too. I think that makes some logic. On landscape, I am a little bit troubled with the tree mitigation. It seems like there is a huge number of newly proposed Coast Live Oaks that are required for mitigation. They are located really close together. They are located really close to the building. I don't think that that's a viable option. I do understand that those are required but I think we need to get actually get something that's viable. They are really much too close together. Also, I was concerned about tree protection for existing trees that would be saved. It would be like 84, 85, and 87 which are next to the proposed pool. As well as tree 89 which is an Oak Tree at the electrical transformer that was mentioned previously. Also, I would like more information on the proposed retention of Redwood trees 115 to 120, which are in back of the Emerson Street houses because they are so close to the garage. On the landscape design, I think the presentation today looked good but based on the packet I did not have enough information to understand what all of the perimeter planting would actually look like. I think that's really critical to see if the modern architecture is compatible with the more traditional neighbors. I think that the native plant palette proposed would meet our findings but I really did not understand the actual design intents and how the plants would be placed all along the perimeter. I also did notice that there is no planting proposal on the curb in the City ride-way planting strips. I would like more information on that. Under architecture, I guess I would like some clarity from staff about ARB findings for the R1 contact space criteria. We usually use standards for other zones. We don't usually use the R1 because we don't typically review houses. I guess I will say I haven't decided on

that yet. I would say that the architect has a good track record of combining modern architecture with historic and traditional materials and proportions. They've done new buildings at the Hoover Pavilion as well as some medical buildings at Welch Road at Stanford. They also did work on the Baldwin Building with another architect on University Avenue. I think that they are very capable in coming up with innovative solutions that are both modern and contextual at the same time. Again, for me it seems like the building are a little more modern than I would like. For me, I guess my judgment on it would really hinge on the landscaping. Maybe it would work possibly, maybe, changing the metal siding. I do understand that's its only an accent piece and I can't really fault you if it's just an accent piece there. But when I was walking the site yesterday it did strike me that the buildings were a little bit more modern than the neighborhood. But they are sustainable designs. I do have a question for the architects about using a lot of clear wood or clear stained wood. It seems to me high-maintenance and you do need to use a lot of chemicals to clean that. Also, I would like more details on the rain screen cedar shingles and how you handle all of the edges of those, like all of the jambs and sills. Also, under the photo-voltaics design, I am interested in the foldable PV structures on the roof. I do want all of the support structures to be screened if possible, especially if they are tilted up. I do understand we have limits by the California Solar Act but I would like to get more information on the foldable structures. On the construction phasing, I guess I would like some comments from staff maybe at the next meeting. If I read the report correctly, they want to increase enrollment midway through construction in trailers or in portables on top of the new garage. That seems highly unusual to me. It seems to me for ARB for projects, the finished product is the thing that is expanded and they are trying to get an enrollment increase before they actually finish the building. I would like more information on that. It seems to me that we run the risk of having permanent trailers on Embarcadero Road. It has happened on quite a few public and private schools in Palo Alto. I think that would be very undesirable. I think my last comment is on construction impacts. As a bicyclist in Palo Alto and in Mountain View, my personal experience is not good with those big earthmoving trucks. I've had quite a few close calls with that. Several bicyclists have been run over and killed in neighboring cities. I think what we have to do whatever measures are necessary and whatever detours are necessary to prevent collision. Collisions that I am aware of are trucks turning right in to the path of bicyclists who is trying to go straight. I think I really worry about kids not understanding how trucks are moving, and how much clearance they need, and the blind spots. I think that's really critical. That is all that I have for today. Thank you, Peter.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex, wonderful. Grace, you're next.

Board Member Lee: Thank you, Peter. I'll just begin by a few appreciations. I just wanted to thank all of the community members who are present at this meeting who've drafted communications to our Board and shared it with us, as well as to City Staff who has really taken the time to walk us through this very long historic project now since 2016. Also, I just want to shout out a thank you to our PTC and our HRB and our Council. It is so wonderful that the city has this process of really going through with several folks who will weigh in and hear from the community again and make their comments. I am going to now proceed to just also thank the applicant for all that the applicant has done over the years, and for providing the alternative. It is wonderful to have this opportunity to review the final EIR. City Staff has been terrific in terms of focusing their staff report on how we might as a Board really focus our comments on physical modifications to the site. To step back, I have been in the area since the 1990's and before that. It is wonderful. This site in particular and this neighborhood is quite dear. I really appreciate what we have seen just in terms of the materials and the comments and understanding the importance of so many things: mature landscape, applicant or users and additions to the community over time. In terms of really focusing -- and I saw this in the application today -- on sustainability as a guide. Master plans are long in years and in implementation, and I appreciate how there is careful thought in terms of planning for change but also not forgetting where we started. Thank you, Amy French, for bringing some of that history not the presentation at this site. Having said that, I just want to switch over now and talk about some of the edges. If we begin on the Embarcadero side, I had asked about the modular and I understand this is a first showing and there is going to be more meetings but staff had asked us to comment on the modulars. I did see the sheets from Modtech and the diagram in terms of that site plan. Knowing the phases that are ahead I look forward to discussing this further and understanding the findings in a more careful way in our next September meeting. With that schedule of 15 months, two months overlap, 15 months, and 20 months and then the ask in terms of how

operationally this all proceeds, it would be wonderful to... and I saw the setbacks are going to be respected on Embarcadero but this question of just how do those modular classrooms during that period of time... what is the site during that time. I'd love to know a little bit more and perhaps that will help other bodies that the City has to evaluate the project. When we talk about that whole Embarcadero side I just want to make the comment that when I look at the site plan and the master planning and the thought that have gone into it, my first thought when I received the documents was exactly the third or fourth slide that the applicant provided. It was, you know, where are the buildings? Where are the setbacks? How do these buildings sit on the site? What are the edges? Where are the points of public and private meeting? I am very happy to say that the buildings that are removed and the buildings that are introduced really respect the setbacks. They are lower in scale. They actually provide entry points that make a lot of sense. I also see that building underground is a terrific direction to move for this site. I believe that that garage as well as the pool make a lot of sense in terms of design and reacting to the program here, and just planning for the future. Having said that, as you turn and let's say you go to the Bryant Street entry I am very happy to see that there is an 80-foot setback, and there is landscape there. Then as you turn the corner towards Bryant, we just want to make sure... and maybe that's something that shows itself in our future meetings in terms of where those points of entry occur. It would be great to have an enlarged site plan so we understand the landscape, the dimensions. There are very important points... they are nodes. They are vehicular, pedestrian and it would be wonderful to have those enlarged plans I think, where those entry points occur on Bryant and also on Emerson. As we move around the site a little bit further I just wanted to talk about where this keys into how the school operates and this wonderful TDM that has been in place over the years. How the applicant and how we understand that is going to be managed becomes important. Just what is the flow in terms of the dispersed pick-up and drop-off. We understand there's multiple and how many people are entering and at which peaks times. For me, its how does that translate into the physical manifestation on this site? Is there a thought in terms of comfort of the users in terms of that waiting time? That might translate to a landscape solution. That might translate to some kind of a shade structure or seating even, so that we understand where are those disperse points and how are they treated with landscape and architecture. Coming around to the Kellogg, I really appreciate how my colleagues here on the Board have talked about that longer elevation. It is the most talked about right there perhaps architecturally. Again, it is so positive to see that the setbacks are maintained, the landscape is very mature. I thought it was very compelling when the applicant actually showed the elevations with the slight trees and with the really mature canopies that exist on the site. I appreciate and I wish it had been presented to us earlier. Typically we receive a week beforehand. Some of that study of the closed and open, light and void... just some of the concepts that you are working with from a very sustainable point of view how it is so important to understand how the sun is moving around the building so they can design the photovoltaic and where the shifts in the building occur. A few things: there are terrific opportunities on that Kellogg side. I see that there is a drop-off point and there is an effort at some kind of a shade or a break in the building there. There is also something with metal panels there. I would love to learn more in terms of the choice of that metal panel. I am squinting and I am trying to understand how that palette comes together and begins to be defined by the opens and voids, and be guided by the sustainability goals but also doesn't feel like one long plane. I think that in between meetings we will understand that better. One of the queues that you might want to take a look at -- and I think that you probably have and it just didn't come across the presentation more -- is that wonderful Gunn Administration Building. When we look at that building, what I saw is there are some darker colors in the palette. There's a dark green and darker in tone and whatever it may be it tends to recede. There's a little bit more depth. Maybe when you come back there might be an effort to actually have enlarged elevations, they don't have to be huge pullouts, but maybe in specific places along Kellogg. This way we understand when one material changes and another begins and just what is the view from the sidewalk. What is it from across the street? What is the pedestrian view? I just think for right now the scale of the elevation is just too dichromatic for me to have a strong opinion in terms of how best to break it up. I do hope you give some careful attention to the Kellogg Street elevation. That's the east elevation. On the west elevation, which is on the courtyard side, there is a little bit more. I think there is probably a lighter tone shingle, and then the vertical siding, and with the railings and the balcony it is just... somehow I wish the east elevation began to take some queues from the west elevation. I wanted to make some comments on the landscape and this importance of the Circle. I appreciate Board Member Hirsch's comments. Just having been in this neighborhood and walked through the neighborhood and had the terrific opportunity to see

what's inside I think that history is so important. I hope that the Circle is retained and celebrated. I even saw that it might even show up in your phased plan. That there's actually some place for the students where that Circle is remembered. I know that you're working with very... the dimensions are... and the constraints; however, to think about the history of this place and also its future I actually really appreciate the application here and the design because it does retain the history and builds upon it in a way that thinks about the future with specific eyes on sustainability. I think that is a big gift to the City Palo Alto and commitment. I just want to applaud you in that way. Moving forward I would love to see more of that come through perhaps in graphics that are enlarged and more detailed so that we may be able to comment in a more effective way. I'll pass it on now.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you very much, Grace. Thank you, everybody. I am going to run through a couple of comments. I find myself in agreement with much of what many of us have said. At the start, I agree with Alex that the initial proposal is something I could not support. I could not support it because I think that having a drop-off for a school underground in the way they had presented was just not a tenable solution. I think it was just such an unpleasant way to enter into such a beautiful campus. It just wouldn't be suitable. Additionally, the way it would concentrate the traffic would be really hard to work with. I am very pleased to see an alternate proposal put out there. I am not saying it's perfect right now but it is certainly something that might be able to gather my support. On a large scale when I look at the circulation parking question, what I see as an architect, as somebody who knows the neighborhood and who lives around here and passed by all the time, there's a question to me of where is the front door? Where is the entrance? Where does this institution present itself to the public and what I see is a whole series of small little places you sneak into the campus? A couple of entries maybe along Bryant but it really seems to me to be lacking a way that you go in. It seems to me that this project is an opportunity to do that. It seems to me that along Kellogg Street you might try to improve the architecture by breaking up the massing of the buildings and maybe also put an entrance into the school there. Or you have the opportunity on the other side to reinstitute the Melville right of way and put a passage way through there where the kids then come in between the Chapel and the gym buildings into the Circle. I'm just disappointed to see nothing. To see a continuation of what I call ad hoc educational architecture. I think there's an opportunity to do a lot more than that. I am hopeful that a little more thought might be given to just where is the symbolic front door of the school. Where is the face you want to march in and out of on the ceremony? I am disappointed that so far I don't see that at all on the plan. Then my next comment is regarding the building design. I have real issues with the way façade along Kellogg Street is handled. I have been trying to put my finger on what it is because clearly the building is set back, as Grace said, from the street. There is some mature landscaping there. It is even less high than what's there now. I don't think the height of the mass of it is the problem but I think there is something to the 400-foot-long façade that does feel unrelenting, as several people have used that term. It might be that it has this continuous plate height in the middle and then a roof line that's exactly the same along 400 feet. It might be that as much as we like this, what I call warm contemporary architecture... I think that is perfect appropriate I almost every neighborhood in town. That's when you're putting in one house amongst many. This is so much of this strong contemporary architecture that it overwhelms the neighborhood. I think it's actually inappropriate to let this building basically redefine the character of the neighborhood, which is what I think it will do. As Grace pointed out, very accurately, the existing Gunn Administration Building has a real character to it somehow that to me defines what I think of as Castilleja. That and the Birge Clark Building. I don't see that much of a queue in the new buildings. There is something about the texture and the sloped roof and the way the shingles are integrated on the old building and the other buildings in the neighborhood that just seems to be missing on the new structure. I think what David was saying about having the building broken into two or three buildings or pieces so you have either a passageway through or a sightline through is important. If you're going to have a drop-off or an entrance on one façade I think you need a door or an entry at the drop-off. You have to carry these architectural thoughts through to completion. It seems to me like the drop-off was added after the long façade of the building was designed. Again, as Grace said, I don't have proposals how to fix that problem but I cannot support a single long façade on Kellogg as is presented to us. I will acknowledge, as Osma said, that the new proposal is better than the old. I think it is. The old building is 1960's concrete dormitory. It wasn't even designed to be a school. It's a tad too tall but I think, Osma, we can hold a higher standard in that. It's not enough to just do better than before. Castilleja has been around a long time, and they are a valuable member of our community. We

want them to do right by us. To really make this something that the next 100 years are going to look back on and really feel good about, the way we do on some buildings on this campus and the way we do with other institutions in town. It is reasonable to hold them to a higher standard than just make it a little bit better than it was. I think that's what we need to hold for. I would really like to see the architects take a stab at rethinking the way that building is massed. Rethinking the way the roofline goes up and down some, and maybe rethinking the style of it a little bit. I share Alex's concern about the landscaping. I just don't think we have a complete enough package to really understand what's being proposed. I am concerned that the Redwood trees behind the existing houses are very close to those garages and we all know that a 16-foot concrete is tough to build right next to a Redwood tree. It is important to save those trees. I believe that stuff can be mitigated and dealt with but we'd like to see more information about how that's done. I just don't see it in the package right now. I think we'd like to see a better landscape design -- or more complete, perhaps, is a better way to put it. I'll pick up on Alex's comments about the phased construction. I had been thinking about it from a point of view of the impact on the neighborhood and the faster the better, obviously. It's a big impact on the community there but I think you he is spot-on when he says that these temporary structures have a way of becoming permanent. I think we need to be very vigilant about that. That is the last thing we want to see is a series of buildings stuck next to Embarcadero Road for ten years because the project has been delayed, changed, modified; all these things can happen. It seems to be sensible just to say that the increase in enrollment should be hinged on the project being completed. It is obviously not our call but certainly that's an opinion we can offer. On the environmental impact report, I can accept most of the findings in there just fine. I think the traffic studies are very thorough and they did point out correctly the issue on Emerson with the earlier design. I believe that will be mitigated with the distributed drop-offs. I do think they are correct in pointing out that the swimming pool noise is significant and will need to be studied carefully and made sure that it is not an impact on the neighborhood. A swimming pool with girls playing water polo makes a lot of noise. Solid concrete walls echo and reverberate that sound. It is possible it could become quite an annoyance to the community. It seems to me, however, that's something that can be studied and mitigated and managed. It's not a big, big issue but it needs to be thought through. Lastly, I will commend the applicant on their historic preservation moves just by separating away from the Gunn Admin building and by preserving that Chapel you are doing wonderful things. It is really the best way that they can help that other building by removing the one next to it so it's separated out. Those are my comments on seven comments that I felt were important. I think we're fairly consistent as Board actually what we've been saying. Does anybody else want to add anything?

Vice Chair Thompson: I just had a quick thing that I wanted to add.

Chair Baltay: Sure, go ahead, Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think I didn't mention it but I would also echo what you and Board Member Lew mentioned about being more in favor of the alternate option for the schemes. I also wanted to make a note to the applicant that I think one of the reasons that a lot of us are commenting on the Kellogg façade is because I think there is a lack of clarity on what's happening in each part along the façade. I think because it is a little bit vague. I think the metal accent façade... Board Member Lew mentioned that maybe that is not appropriate. Even in my brain I'm not quite sure how long that is, how much of an impact, is it really an accent or does it take up a considerable amount of space? I think those kinds of things will help better make judgment. Lack of understanding sort of makes us make assumptions for what that actually is and it doesn't help us understand your design intent for that location.

Chair Baltay: It is true, to the applicant and staff, the drawings in the presentation that was initially given to us was difficult to follow. I've heard from every Board Member how challenging it was to figure it out. It is a challenging project, everybody. There's a lot of information here. There are a lot of parts. The applicant can work on that. We've got to keep working on it. We'll get there. Any other thoughts from anybody? Comments additionally? I would like to chime in that I forget to mention that I do support David's comments about the underground building, the classrooms below grade. It is imperative that those have good day lighting and we all know that's possible. It needs to be designed and thought through. I didn't see anything in this package of drawings that convinced me that that had been accomplished. I'm positive it can be done and we would like to... I think David is correct. Those spaces

need to be wonderfully light-filled spaces, even though they're down a level. We'd like to see evidence of how that's done. I'd like to then shift us on to process. The staff would like us to continue this to a date certain of about a month from now. I will say that I am uncomfortable with that because I don't see how an applicant could respond quickly enough to the comments we've made to do that.

MOTION

Chair Baltay: I would like to make a motion that we continue this subject to comments made to a date uncertain and leave it to the applicant and staff to decide when they think they're ready to come back to us. I am going to make that motion. I'll put it out there for a second, unless we have any other comments.

Board Member Hirsch: I second that.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I have movement and a second. Does anybody want to address that? Amy French, do you want to tell us is that okay with you?

Ms. French: That's fine. I think the extent of the comments, which we've taken good notes on, would lead a person to believe, and I'm imagining the architects are thinking the same thing, that they would like additional time to prepare for the next meeting.

Chair Baltay: Yes, I would really like to be sure that we have ample time for everybody to study, to understand, to digest. This is a very important project. While all want to be efficient with our reviews and approvals, and staff time, it's important to get this one right. So far we're doing the right things. With that, the motion's been made and seconded. Vinh, can we have a roll call vote, please?

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

MOTION TO CONTINUE PASSES 5-0-0.

Chair Baltay: Wonderful.

Ms. French: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you to everybody, the public as well, for their comments and for being with this long process.