



# Architectural Review Board

## Staff Report (ID # 12097)

---

**Report Type:** Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 3/18/2021

**Summary Title:** Minutes of February 18, 2021

**Title:** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for February 18, 2021

**From:** Jonathan Lait

### Recommendation

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

### Background

Draft minutes from the February 18, 2021 Architectural Review Board (ARB) are available in Attachment A.

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

### Attachments:

- Attachment A: February 18, 2021 Draft Minutes (DOCX)



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**DRAFT MINUTES: February 18, 2021**  
 City Hall/City Council Chambers  
 250 Hamilton Avenue  
 Virtual Meeting  
 8:30 AM

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

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

Absent: None.

Chair Thompson: Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the February 18<sup>th</sup> Architectural Review Board hearing. Pursuant to the California Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, this meeting will be held by virtual teleconference only, with no physical location. Spoken comments via a computer will be accepted through the Zoom teleconference meeting. To address the Board, go to [zoom.us/join](https://zoom.us/join). Meeting ID is 961 9160 1296. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, click on "Raise Hand." The moderator will activate and unmute speakers in turn. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted. Spoken public comments using a Smartphone will also be accepted through the Zoom mobile application. To offer comments using a regular phone, call 1-669-900-6833, and enter Meeting ID 961 9160 1296. When you wish to speak on an agenda item hit \*9 on your phone so we know that you wish to speak.

[Roll Call]

**Oral Communications**

Chair Thompson: The next item is oral communications. The public may speak on any item, not on the agenda. Vinh, do we have any members of the public that would like to speak?

Vinh Nguyen, Administrative Associate: We do have two raised hands. One moment, let us get the speaker timer up.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Yes, we do have one staff member that would like to speak. Tim Wong is our Senior Planner. I call him our housing department because we have one person helping us with housing. He was with us in years past and now he is back again. We appreciate his help in all of those endeavors.

[Setting up caller.]

Tim Wong: Good morning, ARB. Thank you for giving me this time. Again, as Jodie mentioned, my name is Tim Wong. I am a Senior Planner for the Palo Alto Planning and Development Services Department. I just wanted to take this time to let you know about the Housing Element Working Group. You can see the flier on your screen. The City is looking for creative, collaborative, and energetic persons interested in housing to be part of this Housing Element Update process. Just real brief, the Housing Element is the City's strategic plan for meeting the housing needs of its current and future

residents. We are currently going through the update of the Housing Element, and as part of that, the City anticipates it will need to plan for approximately 6,000 housing units for the next update. As part of this update process, we are looking for volunteers to help serve the Working Group. This Working Group will help the City select potential housing sites and prepare housing programs and policies to accommodate these approximate 6,000 units. To serve on the Working Group you must apply. The application deadline is by 5:00 p.m. on March 5, 2021. Just to let you know, the Working Group is scheduled to meet probably one evening a month, tentatively set as the first Thursday of every month from 5:30 to 8:30. The Working Group will be meeting from May of 2021 through October 2022, approximately 15 months. If you're interested please apply. City Council will review all of the applications at its April 5, 2021, meeting and make the group selections at that meeting. For more information about the Working Group or if you are interested in applying please go to [www.cityofpaloalto.org/heupdate](http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/heupdate). On that website, you will find online applications in English and Spanish, and, hopefully, we will have a Chinese application online in the next day or so. That concludes my comments. I thank you very much for the time. I just encourage you to spread the word about the Housing Element update and also about the Working Group. We are looking for anyone interested in housing to apply. Again, the Council will make their selections at its April 5 meeting. Thank you very much.

Board Member Baltay: To the Chair, a quick question.

Chair Thompson: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: Tim, how many people do you anticipate having as members of this group? How large of a group will it be?

Mr. Wong: Great question. We have recommended 15 members with two alternates.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you very much.

Mr. Wong: Thanks.

Vice Chair Lee: Osma, if I may, I just want to ask Tim where the flier is if we did want to share that with folks in our network? Is that something on the website already?

Mr. Wong: Yes. There is a .pdf you can download on the website and I did send ARB staff a .pdf of the flier also. Either way, you can get a copy of that flier.

Vice Chair Lee: Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: I can forward the flier over to all of the Board Members.

Mr. Wong: Thank you.

Chair Thompson: All right, thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you, Tim. It looks like the other member of the public who had their hand raised has lowered their hand. That concludes oral communications.

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

Chair Thompson: Great. Let's move on to agenda changes, additions, and deletions.

Ms. Gerhardt: No changes at this time.

## City Official Reports

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

Chair Thompson: Thanks. City official reports.

Ms. Gerhardt: Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning. You have the schedule here up on the screen. We are still in virtual meetings. As I was saying earlier, for the March 4<sup>th</sup> meeting we did have some items: 486 Hamilton and 4256 El Camino. Those two items may not be quite ready, and I need to find out about the Lytton Avenue subcommittee. It may only be subcommittee happening on March 4<sup>th</sup>. I will let you know as soon as possible. I am going to have to confirm that today. March 4<sup>th</sup> is (inaudible) at the moment. Thank you. That's it.

## Study Session

2. Study Session for Architectural Review Board of Draft Objective Standards That Would Modify Title 18 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code

Chair Thompson: With that, we will move on to our first item which is the study session. This is a study session for the Architectural Review Board of draft objective standards that would modify Title 18 (Zoning Ordinance) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code. I understand that this will be the last time that we will get to do a study session on this before the next time that we meet, which will be when we can vote on it. I did want to make sure that the person that raised their hand wasn't supposed to be on the panel working on the project.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, that is Chris. We should bring Chris over.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, bringing him over right now.

Chair Thompson: I'll let staff give their report.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you, Chair, for the introduction. As you mentioned, this is sort of our last working session. At the next ARB hearing we are hoping to get a recommendation from the board so that we can move on to Planning Commission and Council, and ultimately have these objective standards in place come summertime. At that point, we could potentially be looking at some SB35 projects and we want to make sure that we have our rules in place before those projects come in. With that, I do want to introduce Jean and Chris who are greatly helping me with this project. I will let Jean Eisberg take it away with the presentation.

Jean Eisberg: Great, thank you. Good morning, Chair Thompson and members of the Board.

[Setting up presentation.]

Ms. Eisberg: I am going to give a five-minute presentation before we have a discussion. Based on our pre-meeting with Chair Thompson -- she can explain further -- we are going to give an opportunity for all of the Board Members to provide any general comments and identify sections of the draft ordinance that you want to focus on in terms of how we spend our time today. I am just going to recap where we have been, the schedule going forward and describe changes that have been made to the design standards since our two meetings in October and November where you may recall we reviewed a single draft of the draft standards over those two meetings. Then, I am going to introduce some other changes to Title 18; you may recall that we floated these ideas about a year ago when we started the project and we are going to continue working with the PTC and the Council on other changes to standards in Title 18 but just wanted to brief you on them today. Reminder for folks who may be participating from home, why we are doing this project is the City has several subjective design criteria and regulations mixed-use projects are reviewed. Our program here is to transform the context space design criteria currently in

Title 18 into objective standards, and this would actually be replacing those design criteria. This is really a fundamental change in the way that all cities in California are reviewing certain types of residential and mixed-use projects. This is the new organization of the 18.24, this new design standard section. We have purpose and applicability in the administrative section; issues around site design related to the public realm, access to the site and building orientation; and the standards relating to building design. Some of this organization is new. The current context space design criteria has some sense of organization but this is trying to create a little bit more standardization and more specificity as you move from the site design to building details. Each section is organized with an intent statement and a set of standards. The intent statement is drawn from the context space design criteria. Sometimes it is actually verbatim. The standards are objective standards and are either measurements, or ratios, or provide a menu of options. I want to be clear about the organization. We received some public comments and I just want to make sure it is clear that there are two paths towards compliance for projects going forward that are multi-family residential or mixed-use. One, there is a discretionary path that is really similar to what's happening right now. Projects can continue to go through the discretionary ARB review process, and they are going to be required to meet the intent statements, the more general design guidelines, as they are interpreted by the ARB. It is very similar to the process that you have today. Now, this new other option is for projects that are meeting objective standards either because they are SB35 eligible projects or they want coverage under the Housing Accountability Act that gives them that coverage under state law. In that case, the project must meet objective standards as we have outlined in this new design standard chapter; either the dimension standards or the menu of options, where they are available. Again, two paths towards compliance. Our schedule moving forward: we will be meeting with the Planning Commission next month for a study session. We are supposed to update them on the progress that the ARB has made over the last year and to introduce draft standards in other parts of Title 18. As Jodie indicated, we are planning to come back to you for an action item on March 18<sup>th</sup>. We will be making any changes to the design standards in the interim based on the feedback today. We will be going to the Planning Commission and Council this spring and summer to wrap up the project in anticipation of potential SB35 projects that could come down the pipeline later this year. To summarize the two meetings this fall, generally there was support of the structure of the ordinance; the idea of either meeting the intent statements or meeting the standards. We have resolved all together to clarify where the standards would apply versus where the intent statements would apply and determined that new design standards would apply to all multi-family residential and residential mixed-use project types. Regardless of the mix of commercial or residential, it wouldn't matter if it's 50 percent commercial, 50 percent residential, or just ground-floor commercial and upper-story residential. Also resolved non-residential projects would only need to comply with the intent statements. Most of these design standards are written for residential and mixed-use buildings, but the non-residential other commercial projects would need to comply with the intent statements, again, as determined by the ARB. Where more debates happened, as you may recall, were in terms of the specifics around standards in some of the design topics. We debated a number of details, ideas for the menu of options, and specific measurements and ratios for individual design topics. The other item which resulted in a lot of debate was around the graphics. We heard from you a variety of perspectives about the zoning graphics in terms of height and style, windows, things like that. As you'll see, we have tried to respond to all of those comments in this current draft. Also in the last couple of months, staff has reached out to about 30 architects, developers, and other stakeholders who regularly use the design standards in the zoning ordinance to get their feedback on the project. We received four responses including three substance responses and two that provided some detailed comments around the standard. Some of that was expressing concern about the prescriptive nature of a lot of these standards. Again, that's why we want to be really clear that, yes, there is this set of prescriptive standards but there is still this alternative compliance path that is very similar to what you have today. We have made changes in five key areas of the draft standards since you saw them this fall. I am going to go through each of these five topics. First are the ground floor residential units. You may recall at the end of our November meeting we showed this idea that Chris and his colleagues developed which expresses the relative nature between distance from the sidewalk, the setback, to the elevation of the first floor. The issue here is trying to retain privacy while also expressing a presence to the street. Basically, the further that you get from the sidewalk the lower that first-floor elevation can be. It could be screened with landscaping but you have that physical distance that reflects privacy, versus if you're right out against the street edge having that higher first-floor elevation maybe there is the stoop, allows for increased privacy and a little more

presence on the street. We made a number of changes to graphics including most of the graphics now are no more than four stories. We have done some cropping and isolating to the feature that's just being expressed by that specific standard, and some changes to the style just to be more generalized. In terms of height transitions, you may recall that we had some conversations about the existing daylight plane which appears in the district zoning standards, so in the development standards and different ways to create height transitions between higher and lower density districts. We had some standards in earlier drafts that talked about setbacks and different ways to articulate that transition. At this point, we resolved to maintain the daylight plane, which is in the existing zoning districts, and then provide some options for additional ways to soften that transition through landscape screening, through façade breaks on the butting elevation, and minimizing transparent glazing so that you have either opaque windows or fewer windows on those confronting facades. Fourth is materials; you may recall we had some examples from another project that Chris had worked on about a matrix for prohibited and allowed materials. We have developed a material list specific to Palo Alto and it is something that is described as either primary materials or secondary materials versus accent materials. Then, lastly, we added back a section on suitability and green building. This is really verbatim from the existing context space design criteria. There is only an intent statement in the proposed draft ordinance, and then it cross-references the existing sustainable design standards that are in 16.14 in the municipal code. I am going to have Chris talk to the next slide.

Chris Sensenig: Jean just asked to grab some images of projects that would meet the objective standards. I have taken a few from around the peninsula, and South Bay, and one from San Francisco. Here you can see the façade rhythm and pattern, the base, middle, and top, and also the setback and stoop conditions for the ground-floor residential, and also a corner element. Here is another part of that project that has a similar stoop configuration, base, middle, and top, change in primary and secondary materials, and corner elements. Here is a Daniel Solomon project in San Francisco that limits the overall length of façade lengths and uses the minor break, and the change in window pattern to create a base, middle, and top. I want to thank David also -- I don't think we have a slide for it here -- for sending the Wilton Court project in Palo Alto that we can also speak to later that I believe fits it. Here is another project in Oakland that has the same type of rhythm and pattern that is required in the objective standards.

Ms. Eisberg: Thank you, Chris. I am just going to wrap up the next minute to talk about three notable changes to Title 18 that we will be working on with the Planning Commission. Again, this was presented about a year ago when we first started talking about the project. The way it is now the combining districts in the City, Workforce Housing, Affordable Housing overlays, need to be legislatively applied; they go through review by the Planning Commission and City Council. One thing to consider is whether transitions from a legislative action for these overlays, instead if there could be objective criteria that if a project meets the below-market-rate or moderate-income threshold then that overlay could automatically be applied to the site and, in that way, it incentives affordable housing and allows for the more generous development standards. This is similar to the City's recently adopted housing incentive program. Second, in Chapter 18.23 of the code, there are performance criteria or performance standards. Things like water quality, refuse storage, lighting and landscape screening. We are looking to both make sure that those standards are objective so they can be continually applied, but also to integrate and reorganize them so that they are located in sections of the code where they can more easily be found. Lastly is just a small one, but mechanical lift parking; the way it is right now this requires approval by the plane director or the City Council. We have suggested that mechanical parking lifts be allowed by right; tighten up some of those objective standards just so a project would not automatically get pushed to the director or the City Council just because it has mechanical parking. This is just an issue that is becoming more common in the Bay area in residential projects and allowing a little streamlining there. Again, these projects would continue to come to the ARB if they are going through architectural review, and the mechanical lifts could be reviewed as part of that review process. That concludes my presentation. I am happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Jean. Are there any questions of staff from the Board before we move into our own comments?

Board Member Baltay: I do, Osma.

Chair Thompson: Sure, go ahead Board Member Baltay.

Board Member Baltay: Chris, could you pull up the slide of 777 Broadway again, please? Do you mind, Osma?

Chair Thompson: Not at all. Go ahead.

Board Member Baltay: I am trying to understand how we are going to be using or interpreting these objective standards. Chris, if this comes before you as a planning staff in Palo Alto, or any of the Planning staff, would you say that this building has a base, middle, and top, and, if so, how would you define it?

Mr. Sensenig: I would say yes. It has a base, middle, and top. Through that, there are a number of distinctions that we have in the code. One is a horizontal shift, a change in floor plates that protrude or recess with a minimum dimension from the middle to the top. Also, a change in window pattern and a change in façade articulation, and a change in horizontal or vertical projections, such as shading or weather devices where the middle does not have them, the top does have them that distinguish it. It also has datum lines separating the middle from the top. The base and middle are a change in material and a variation of two of the following: façade material, material size, texture, pattern, and color. This is an example of a project that actually uses more than two of the four techniques to show variation between any of the distinct base, middle, and top sections.

Board Member Baltay: Okay, Thank you very much. I just wanted to hear your thoughts on that. Thank you, Osma.

Chair Thompson: Sure thing. Any other questions of staff before we bring it back to the Board?

Vice Chair Lee: Osma, I also have questions regarding those photos, if I may?

Chair Thompson: Sure, go ahead.

Vice Chair Lee: Thank you so much, Chris. I just wanted to ask about the Dan Solomon project in Mosaica. If you could just describe the change in... is it the change in windows that makes the top more articulated in your mind? Is that how you described it?

Mr. Sensenig: Yeah.

Vice Chair Lee: That's in San Francisco, I assume.

Mr. Sensenig: That is in San Francisco. It is in the Mission District along 19<sup>th</sup> Street. One way that it meets it is a change in window pattern and type where the base is defined by the storefront window, the middle is defined by the joint windows, and then the top is defined by breaking those joint windows into separate windows creating three different layers there. Then the top is also defined by the parapet line.

Vice Chair Lee: Okay. I am just wondering, of the examples that you have shown here in Sunnyvale and San Francisco and Oakland, are they all apartments? Are they condominiums? How many different kinds of residential building types are there? Lofts?

Mr. Sensenig: I am not sure whether they're condominiums or apartments for rent.

Vice Chair Lee: I am not sure either. Then, I just wasn't sure if these images are proposed to be included as graphics and if there were Palo Alto examples...

Mr. Sensenig: They are not proposed to be included in the document. The direction that...

Ms. Gerhardt: These photos come out of me asking if we use all of these different objective standards what is it going to look like. These are sort of helping us put all of the pieces together.

Vice Chair Lee: Okay. The other question I had, Osma, is more for Jean. I know this is going to return to us on the 18<sup>th</sup> and I wasn't sure if this is a study session and we are next going to see it as a voting item. I am just wondering if there are proposals to revise how we review that next draft and how that is incorporated into a vote. Do you have some thoughts on what the process would be?

Ms. Eisberg: Sure. Jodie, do you want to address this?

Ms. Gerhardt: Jean, you can help as well. I think mainly we are looking for all of your comments today for sure. We are hoping that we can coalesce on some conclusions so that we are able to wrap it up in the next hearing. The more information you give us the better we can make these standards.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Lew: Grace, I can answer the question on the housing. I used to work for Dan Solomon and that project on Alabama Street is affordable housing on top of what they call PDR space, it is like workshop space that used to be on the site. I think the ironworks project in Sunnyvale is also rental; they are on both sides of Evelyn Street. It was done in two phases. I think that is market-rate. It's not affordable.

Chair Thompson: Okay, thank you.

Board Member Baltay: Osma, one more question if I could.

Chair Thompson: Sure.

Board Member Baltay: To the staff, this is regarding the applicability of these standards. Can you speak to what the minimum the state law would require regarding affordability of housing units, and then what the mixed-use ratio would be as a minimum that the objective standards would have to kick into by state law? What percent is the minimum amount that requires these standards to go into effect, and is there a housing affordability component to the state law regarding objective standards.

Ms. Eisberg: A couple of things. The Housing Accountability Act requires that at least two-thirds of the project is residential, and it doesn't necessarily require affordability. That is a little bit different. The Housing Accountability Act projects need to meet objective standards.

Board Member Baltay: Okay.

Ms. Eisberg: To be eligible for SB35 streamlining, it depends on which tier or threshold a specific jurisdiction is in. At this point in time, in Palo Alto an SB35 eligible project needs to be 50 percent affordable. Now if the city doesn't meet its regional housing needs allocation prorated for that year, then it can move tiers. So some jurisdictions in the Bay area in the state are at a 10 percent threshold, meaning a project can be eligible if it has 10 percent affordable units, but at this point in time in Palo Alto the threshold is 50 percent.

Board Member Baltay: But you're saying that all housing projects have to follow objective design standards?

Ms. Eisberg: No. An application could come in in Palo Alto and it could choose to meet the intent statements and not the objective standards just as it can today. Just as it can today in terms of how the ARB reviews the projects for consistency with the context space design criteria which are a mix of objective and subjective. Projects can continue to do that they just won't have any protections under state law under the Housing Accountability Act.



Board Member Baltay: I'm sorry, but if a housing project comes in and they want to follow the objective standards we have to provide them with objective standards for any housing project in Palo Alto?

Ms. Eisberg: A project always needs to meet, for example, development standards or district regulations unless they're seeking some kind of variance waiver or exception. Just the way it is now, we are building another layer into those objective standards with a series of objective design standards. The design standards that we're proposing in 18.24 are a little bit different from development standards that are in the district regulations in that we are saying there is this out, or other option if a project for whatever reason doesn't want to meet the standard they can choose to meet the intent statement.

Board Member Baltay: I'm sorry I'm being so...

Ms. Gerhardt: Let me try as well, and Jean can correct me. Currently, we have design criteria, and those roll up into our ARB findings. We are doing it a little bit different than some cities because we are going to have this option where you can still go to the ARB and not abide by the objective standards, but what I mean by that is that we are building these intent statements that are taking the place of our current design criteria. Those intent statements will roll up to the ARB findings, so all projects will have to abide by those intent statements at a minimum. Those intent statements are still subjective. Now, the housing opportunity projects that fit into the SB35 and the SB330, those types of projects, are the ones that can take advantage of the objective standards. If they meet those objective standards then we are not able to deny them.

Board Member Baltay: Right. The question, I guess, is that projects that meet the requirements of SB35 or SB330, that's the Housing Accountability Act, is that all housing projects or is that more limited?

Ms. Gerhardt: No. I'll let you explain, Jean. It's the two-thirds housing.

Board Member Baltay: So, projects that are mixed-use up to two-thirds and then all other housing projects.

Ms. Eisberg: Residential must be at least two-thirds of the floor area, it can be supportive housing, or market-rate housing, or affordable housing.

Ms. Gerhardt: But it has to be two-thirds.

Ms. Eisberg: It has to be at least two-thirds.

Board Member Baltay: Okay. Thank you for putting up with my denseness everybody.

Ms. Eisberg: No, it's very complicated.

Ms. Gerhardt: It's okay.

Chair Thompson: It's important that we all understand what's going on. I appreciate your questions, Board Member Baltay. Any other last questions for staff before we bring it back in? Okay, not seeing any. This is a dense topic; a lot to go through. We do have another item on the agenda after this. The way that I would like for our Board to... sorry, go ahead.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have some people on the line so I don't know if we have public comments for this particular project.

Chair Thompson: Sorry, thank you for the reminder. Yes, do we have any members of the public who would like to speak?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, it looks like we do have one raised hand.

Chair Thompson: Yeah, let's hear from them.

Mr. Nguyen: Our first speaker will be Chris.

Chris Wuthmann: Good morning. Can you hear me?

Chair Thompson: Yes, if you could state and spell your name. I think it's three minutes or is it now five minutes? Okay, it's three minutes.

Mr. Wuthmann: My name is Chris Wuthmann [spells name], and I am with Stanford University Real Estate. I will be the only person from Stanford speaking. If I go slightly over three minutes if it's possible to get just a bit of distancing?

Mr. Nguyen: Chris, I am sorry. Let me cut you off for just a brief moment. Veronica, you have to exit the timer before you can change the time. Yes. I am sorry about that, Chris. Please go ahead.

Mr. Wuthmann: Okay, thanks. I have responsibility for design and construction of housing that is not for students, such as for faculty and staff. In particular, I was involved in the recent development of Mayfield Place, the 100 percent affordable housing community on El Camino and University Terrace, the new 17-acre faculty housing neighborhood on South California Avenue. While the importance of your work converting design criteria to standards for multi-family housing is naturally evident to us, we actually became aware of it only recently. The few comments we would like to offer this morning do not do justice to the breath of your discussion over the past year, and hopefully can suggest dialogue that can still be explored and prove useful. First, the question was raised back at your first study session by Board Member Lew what the relation of these standards would be to subdivisions. University Terrace is an example of this where compatibility with existing context was focused on our frontage interface with the college terrace neighborhood, which allowed the interior of the site to create a new context with the inclusion of more dense and contemporary multi-family housing. It might be worth considering whether to keep some discussion about applicable context such as currently exists within the design criteria section of the code that is being replaced, and, by implication, leave open the possibility of creating new contextual references where conditions permit. Second, we share the concerns that I think all of you expressed that the standards do not limit too much plan and design elements that may be necessary to make housing affordable. You wrestled with how to do this without having to compromise too much, which is obviously a fair concern but is also a vexing dilemma. Perhaps a solution could be an affirmative statement with an alternative compliance that demonstrable cost-saving elements, including prefabricated and modular construction, shall be legitimate consideration where the affordability of a project exceeds inclusionary requirements. Finally, we and other property managers within multi-family housing have been hearing that increased work-from-home and package and food deliveries will persist after the pandemic abates. These new ways of living will likely require adapting traditional building and site plan standards to create the necessary areas for safe workspaces outside of residents' units and drop-off areas that are not in the public right of way. We would welcome the opportunity to talk with staff about this. Thank you for the extra time here, the extra few seconds. Thank you for hearing these thoughts and for the unflagging reflection you have put into this work thus far, which I have seen reading all of the minutes, and hopefully for the opportunity to dialogue with you further in this process further. Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you, Chris.

Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: That concludes public comments for this item.

Chair Thompson: Okay, thank you. All right. Thanks for the reminder, Jodie, on the public comment. Because this is such a big item and we do have another item on the agenda, I was hoping that we could speak about this for the next hour and a little bit and maybe have a hard-stop at 10:30 where we will probably need to take a five or ten-minute break. In general, I would like to hear each Board Member's

general comments and then specific items that you would like to discuss with the Board at large as part of your feedback and review. Is there anyone that would like to start first?

Board Member Baltay: Osma, I wondered if I could make a suggestion or ask something?

Chair Thompson: Sure.

Board Member Baltay: Could we put a discussion of the applicability of this at the end of our discussion? Just carve out a few minutes after we have gone through the specifics of the thing?

Chair Thompson: The applicability of the standards at large?

Board Member Baltay: Yeah. We have this section 18.24010 purpose and applicability, and I would like to discuss that but I would first hear everybody's thought about all of these other standards and stuff before I come to an opinion about it and I would rather discuss that at the end. Is that possible?

Chair Thompson: Sure, we can. Yeah. I think it's part of our review. We'll see if this is something others want to discuss as well, but I'll note it down.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Let's start with Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: Osma, I don't have any general comments but I do have lots of specific comments on each item.

Chair Thompson: That's great. Yeah, let's just go through what you got.

Board Member Lew: Okay. I will just do it in order.

Chair Thompson: If you flag the particular headers I can note them kind of like Board Member Baltay flagged the header 18.24.010(B).

Board Member Lew: This is general and specific. This is to 18.24.040. This is on corner buildings. We have two options; one is a corner tower or a corner plaza. I think my general comment is that we do have some projects like three-unit projects on RM20 sites that are more suburban-like, they are kind of like houses. They're technically condos but they look like houses and I don't think that either of these, an urban plaza or a corner tower, are appropriate. I would cite a project that we looked at recently was 702 Clara in midtown. It did have the requisite open space; I think they were calling out for 1,000 feet of open space, and it does have that, but it's just suburban landscape. It's not suburban and there is no communal interiors space in the project. Everything is private space. The next item is 18.24.020 on sidewalks under sidewalk width. I think the staff highlighted Park Boulevard as well as El Camino and San Antonio Road. I think on San Antonio Road I just want to note that there are different sections of the street; some parts of it have frontage roads, some parts are residential, and other parts are commercial and we might want to look at that a little more carefully to get some nuance into there. It seems like 12 feet may be fine for commercial but it may be too much on the residential areas. The next one is on ground-floor residential units. I think that is site access 18.24.030(iii). We do have some projects, like 570 Hamilton Avenue, which the Board reviewed recently which is like a courtyard building and the primary entrances are from the courtyard but they do have second entrances to private patios facing the street. It seems like those units wouldn't meet this ground-floor requirement. I think that is just something to consider. I am not opposed to what is being proposed here. The next item is under massings 18.24.050 under (B) contextual massings and the setbacks there. I do have some other examples and possible options that I'll forward to staff that don't have the setbacks but they do have some alignment issues and alignment of building elements that I have seen. I have taken photos of that so I can forward that to staff. The next item is on façade design, 18.24.060 on base, middle, and top item. That's item C, human-scaled architecture. Again, I think we do have some projects in the RM20

zone that are only two-stories high. I am thinking of maybe just excluding them altogether from this. You have one standard for three-stories and up and one standard for two-stories or less. I am thinking, maybe, of just eliminating it altogether for the two-story buildings. Then, under ground-floor character, section D of the façade design, under section B is parking. I think staff has mentioned a minimum 20-foot deep area for retail or common spaces lining the street. I just wanted to note that I looked at other projects, like at Santana Row, that that depth is actually physically more like 44 feet. I am okay with the 20 feet minimum but it seems like to get a really good building that you're actually going to need something much deeper and you would need a really deep lot. I've looked at some of the new proposed projects that have come into the Planning Department and some of them are really just showing all parking with zero-depth in there. That's just in order for them to get all of the parking to fit in the site. I think this is really important for us to try to figure out a way, or an alternate way, of making an attractive ground floor if there isn't... what if there isn't any retail or common space or if it is very limited. I just wanted to highlight that. I think that's going to be an issue to keep continuing to require full parking ratios. The next item is under 18.24.090 on materials. I did do two studies of this on approved projects in Palo Alto and I was really struggling with the 65 percent requirement for primary materials. The projects that I looked at really only got up to maybe 40. Let me get the actual numbers. I looked at 611 Cowper, which is a Hayes Group project. I also looked at the Wilson Court housing project by Pyotalk [phonetic] and they were only getting up to 40 percent. I think both projects had like four or five different materials on there. I think that we need to look at those ratios a little bit more carefully there because I think trying to get it to 65 percent would have a detrimental impact on the design of the building. I think that needs a lot of work. Then, also, too, on the materials I think we should clarify a primary façade versus a side elevation. Also under materials, I think you have the essifs [phonetic] as a band material and I just wanted to highlight that we do have the Restoration Hardware store on University Avenue which I think most people would find attractive but that's essifs, so that would not be allowed under the current standards, although that's just a commercial only project. For me, it's not necessarily the material itself; it's how it's used. Those are all of my detailed comments.

Chair Thompson: Great, thank you. I think what we'll do is still go through everybody's general comments and specific comments, and then if there are items to debate we will revisit those once we have all had a chance to give all of our comments. Okay, Board Member Hirsch.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Hirsch: I am going to take a different slant on this. I guess a more global view of the whole process.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Hirsch: A bit more global view of everything here. I think that the state has overreached in its requirement that we don't have any subjective elements at all in how we deal with new construction more that it becomes an alternative procedure and that we have to use all of the requirements that are in this new zoning. I don't think that this proposed revision to the zoning code addresses the obvious state objective which is to provide a major relaxation of the local bulk restrictions and height limitations to allow a very significant increase in affordable housing. For example, to limit the height of buildings to four-stories, when, in fact, you could get five-stories into 50-foot height limitation. Without this change, it is unlikely that the projected for new housing units will occur. I say that especially her in Palo Alto from my eight-year observation there isn't enough land to build 6,000 units of housing available without something giving, in particular bulk and height issues. Each year, the news media points out how we're falling way behind the requirements here, and 6,000 units --even though it's a reduction from the requirement of 10,000 a year ago -- is a huge number for us. It will not be achievable without major up-zoning in the regulations. Because the scope of this zoning study draft was not directed to address this issue of the increased bulk or height, Palo Alto is left with a housing conundrum unless, of course, we never intend to achieve 6,000 units. Aside from these more global issues, I believe that this draft objective standards is not a coherent, rational set of priorities based on understanding the process of design. While the intent sections are clearly written and comprehensive, the specific requirements cling to references of historic code language which does not reflect present-day principles. It requires design

elements which are simply unfounded preferences, imposes specific dimension without any reasonable justification. To illustrate these issues, I would like to use Wilton Court. Could we pull up a picture for Wilton Court? Thank you. Under the text for treatment of corner buildings, it says corner buildings greater than 40 feet in height shall include one of the following special features. The street wall shall be located at a minimum front yard setback or building-to line for a minimum aggregate length of 40-feet in length on both facades meeting at the corner, and shall include one or more of the following building features. This corner element of this building has about 40 feet on the front but it doesn't have 40 feet on the side. When it comes to specifics like this we run into some problems. Treatment of a corner building, text item number one. Then, we turn the page under corner building and it says it should have one or more of the following building features. The entry to the ground-floor retail or primary building entrance located within 20 feet within the corner of the building. The reality is that the entry to Wilton Court is more than 20 feet from the corner. A different material application and fenestration pattern from the rest of the façade; it doesn't really have a significantly different... it doesn't have a different material and the fenestration pattern is pretty much the same as the rest of the building with the exception that the windows on the corner element have a clear-story piece. It really doesn't apply because it doesn't have a different material. Under C, the change in height of at least four feet greater than less than... could you pull up the second illustration there? No, that's the second one I wanted. I wanted the straight-on elevation. There, that's good. The reality is that C, the change in height of at least four feet greater less than the height of the abutting façade... well, as you can see here the abutting façade is just about the same height, maybe a foot lower. Then, there is the section of the continuing terracotta but it is separated by a joint at that point. The materials change in the back but the front material stays the same on both elements. Really, it doesn't qualify under that piece of it at all. Then, open space. We would have to use the open space because these first pieces don't apply. On the open space, could you refer to the next drawings? That one. The open space on this building, because it is a shallow lot -- there isn't a rearing yard capable because it was filling up the property -- the open space is on a deck in the back. What are the requirements for open space? Publicly accessible open space plaza... a space used for outdoor seating for public dining. Neither of those, A or B, apply. A residential common space adjacent to common interior space is not greater than 3 feet above the adjacent sidewalk grade, fences and railings, et cetera, et cetera, 50-foot transparency. The image of open space at Wilton Court is a private deck above the parking garage at the rear of the building and is openly accessible from an interior lobby only. There is not adjacent indoor common space. Designers have chosen a large ground-floor space on El Camino as the major community room space. It faces the street where you can't really have housing, and it is a good control area because there is a reception desk there. It can be used by outside groups that would be using the building or the staff. At best, these regulations would make it difficult for a project like Wilton Court to be approved. Frankly, describing those other projects, brushing over them and say this would apply because... really, is someone is reading the specifics of all of these that wouldn't really be allowed; they wouldn't be allowed. I have a problem with the specificity of all of these details for how this whole zoning is going to, really, effectively be used. I want to note that we have had a couple of interesting responses from public architects that stated that they have a problem with the detail as well. In particular in Menlo Park, Heather Young [phonetic], in trying to make it work, was running into problems where eventually they said to her, "Well, go get another site." I think that's a problem with a code that is so detailed written as this is that you're going to just run into terrible problems along the way and interpretation of what is acceptable and what is not under the requirements of the State. I am going to finish up here. I guess, I think I am mostly done because of this example. It just seems to me it is antithetical to architectural common sense to create arbitrary vertical recesses. No, here, I have a whole bunch of other things here. Façade design on packet page 33, can we go on to that? Human-scaled architecture is exclusively for buildings with a base, middle, and top, but the actual text in the existing context space design criteria in 18.16.090 describes this as base, body, and roof, or parapet edge. That's all true in the El Camino Real design guidelines, and there is no description of these elements as if they represent specific floors as noted in this text and shown in all of the diagrams on pages 33 to 37. This building typology is not a likely prototype, so it ought not be proposed as a solution to human-scale architecture. Many other design elements create human-scale, as noted under 18.16.090 under street buildings facades, projects projecting eaves, overhangs, porches, and other architectural elements. This list should be broadened to include scale elements and larger building prototype. That prototype used exclusively to describe façade for base, middle, and top -- and please do change the titles to be appropriate to what we already have -- really isn't an appropriate description. Another one, here.

There is a required and arbitrary 600 square foot recess in any building over 100 feet in length. This creates havoc for planning the interior functions. Planning most generally happens from the inside out, not the reverse. It's really a problem here with the way all of the specifics have been addressed because they are using a lot of this exact language that says have a recess, et cetera. It is antithetical, to me, to architectural common sense to create arbitrary vertical recesses not in packet pages 77 and 79 on façade design. Just look at the Wilton Court project and you can see how recess is properly placed, and the one that is shown that separates the corner function from the remaining pieces is an example of that. Just look at that and you can see how recessed properly placed can work with organizing building functions and enhancing exterior expressions. Arbitrary recesses every 40 feet, or whatever it might be, simply aren't workable, and they don't have any relationship at all to the interior function of a building. The demand to create an objective zoning code that makes sure it is based on totally or rational mathematical principles, such as daylight plane, height factor, floor area ratios, required setbacks, open space ratio, yard dimensions, light and air requirements... this is the first step of preliminary zoning review and approval and the second is context and that exists in chapter 18 the way it is written. It is mostly appropriate, could benefit by some editing but it still the proper guide for maintaining the quality of Palo Alto-built environment. I really feel strongly about this that it is a major change in the code, but if you really want to create an objective code then we are not there in what we have been describing. I'm sorry but that's my opinion.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Hirsch. We will move on to Board Member Baltay.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Baltay: Thanks. I have three basic ideas here. One, I am profoundly bothered by the idea of objective standards as a concept, as a design principle, as Ken Hayes put it, "as form-based design." I share David's concerns. At the same time, I don't think we have a choice and it's important to be realistic here. If we stay on the high pedestal, David, like you're talking about and just say this isn't good enough -- and it probably never will be -- we're just going to get hosed. We're just going to be forced to accept design that is much less. I think what we have done is really a good effort to try to come up with something that will mitigate the potential impact on our built environment, on our design standards. I think it is incumbent upon us to just roll up our sleeves and try to do the best we can to come up with standards that will do as much as possible. While we recognize that as design professionals, I think a lot of us know that a lot of this stuff isn't going to work that well. Some of these numbers and things are just not going to work. It's going to produce pretty bad design overall, but maybe that is what we need to do in order to get more housing. With that first part off my chest, I want to just sort of step through some of this stuff and make some detailed comments, sort of like what Alex was doing. The first comment on 18.24.020, Alex suggested that 12 feet might be too wide a sidewalk in some cases along San Antonio for housing. I agree with that and think we should just check where we really want to require 12-foot sidewalks. I think the best way to do that is just to be very specific about what the widths need to be. What might be realistic is not to try to put it into code but rather to leave it to the director to just stipulate sidewalk widths and provide a table in some point in the future so that we can be sure we get it right. The second part in that section is regarding the paving materials. One member of the public brought up a comment about some of the old glass/concrete pavement on California Avenue, and I agree that that's not always the most appropriate thing to follow even if it's what's there now. I suggest that we just say that sidewalk paving materials are prescribed by the director. If they're going to be in this objective standards thing then the director of planning will tell you what the paving of the sidewalk should be. I don't see any way to otherwise write down what's an appropriate paving material and I think it's not that big of a deal. Just let the staff or planning director call that one. That's my opinion. On building orientation regarding the corner elements -- I think I brought this up last time -- I think when you have this section B treatment of corner building you're giving four options and saying you can pick any one of them. I think in order to have a successful corner you have to have all three, A plus B plus C, or you can do option two which is the open corner. In my opinion, it should say not one or more of the following, but, rather, it should say A plus B plus C or do the open corner detail. That's just my opinion about that. When you have an open corner, I think it needs to be lower to the ground. I think if it were three feet above the sidewalk grade that's too much; for it to be successful, I think it needs to be three steps maximum. Rather than define a number, just say it's

three steps. As defined by the building code, a step can't be more than, I think, seven-and-a-half inches, but just leave it that way. Three steps doesn't require a railing, which is, in my book, much more close, much more accessible and visually easy to get to, which is what the idea of the open corner is. I suggest that we change that to three steps maximum. On 18.24.040 section 3 ground-floor residential units A, in the case where you have a sloped site, how do you measure how high above the ground a unit is? It says here the average height of the finished floor and I wanted to know, just a clarification, if average height means the average height of the whole façade or the per individual apartment unit? I think it would be more successful if it were just per living unit. You can step the living units with the grade, otherwise, on a sloped site, you're going to find for a large building this numerical thing is very tough to work with. Again, on that one I would like to find some clarity on what we mean by average height. On building massing, that's section 050, Section (ii)(A), transition to lower density building types we are proposing 36-inch box trees every 30 feet. I think in situations where you have tight corridors are with a parking garage underneath, 36-inch box trees can be pretty big. I'd rather see us use 24-inch box trees and maybe increase the spacing every 20 feet. That's just a nitpicking detail but to my colleagues, I suggest that 24-inch box trees might be more successful and practical. On item number three on the same section, it says within 40 feet of an abutting structure, et cetera. I suggest that we change the phrasing. The last clause says, "As this will allow light to maintain privacy", I think we should say in order to allow light but maintain privacy. The code should not be assuming what the response will be. They should be explaining why, so in order to is a better term. Replace "as this will" with "in order to." Under the base, middle, and top, I am profoundly bothered by this whole thing. I think the example we were given of 777 Broadway at the beginning of our meeting today demonstrates to me that that building clearly does not have what a classically trained architect would call a base, a middle, and a top. We've got, sort of, a bastardization of this concept, which is so far from the renaissance idea of what a base, a middle, and a top, or as David put it "the bottom, a body, and a roof" would be. I don't know what to say. I don't think you can put that down in words. We're trying and trying and we are not getting very far I don't think. I think we just put it down the best we can. Two comments though: one is that the text here says on lots wider than 50 feet. We probably should say on lots 50 feet and wider. There are many lots in Palo Alto that are exactly 50 feet, and I think our intent is that this should apply to those lots. I think we should change that phrasing. I strongly agree with the comment Alex made earlier for two-stories or less. I think a two-story building is not really possible to design it with the way we're describing it, a base, a middle, and a top. I mean, in any practical sense, most residential structures have a base, middle, and top. A foundation, siding, and a roof eave, but I agree with Alex's idea for buildings two-stories or less we should just strike it altogether. I just don't see how it's going to work and I think it's a ridiculous design constraint that is a waste of effort. I am sorry; I am stepping through this whole document here. It would be helpful. Staff, if we had the sections on each page so I could see it. 18.24.060, façade design, at the very end under parking, loading and utilities, I think it is important to clarify when you're saying that you can't be more than five feet above the grade for the second-story when you have semi-submerged parking. That five feet is measured from the top of the finished surface, not the bottom of the structure. The structure could be quite thick and that would make quite a difference. Again, that clarity for item one, maximum five feet above grade is from the finished floor or the top of the structure to the grade, not the bottom. On 18.24.07 for residential entries, I question if we shouldn't have a minimum height for the stoop and the porch-style entrance. We're saying they have to be a maximum of five feet; shouldn't they also be some distance off the ground? I suppose that's governed by the residential height when we have the chart of setbacks but it seems to me it makes sense to clarify, as well, that maybe the porch should be at the same level as the residential unit so that you have some raising up of the porch off the ground. My last comments are on 18.24.090, similar to Alex, I started thinking about this percentage business; I was as much concerned about just how are we measuring the percentage? I think we need more clarity on this one or else it's going to become a disaster. If you include the entire areas of the façade, many contemporary buildings are a large percentage glass glaze walls. It could be easily 20 or 30 percent. If you're saying of the total area, which is an allowed primary material glazing, then the balance is not that hard to come up to a primary material, say a stone or a brick or something like that; however, if you exclude the windows and say the façade material is really just the solid stuff, it changes again quite a bit. I think it is really worth doing some analysis of what building facades that we have approved are and be clearer about percentages. Just how do you measure it? I could see as I thought about this, just for a few minutes even, a lot of questions start to come about how do you measure this percentage. What was included? What is not

included? That's the kind of stuff that makes or breaks the success of a project and getting it approved quickly. More clarity on that percentage would be really useful. I agree with Alex, as well, that we need to clarify what the primary facades are, again, to be very clear. For this to work, the definitions have to be crystal-clear so designers can understand and follow them. We really do need to check the percentages to make sure that they're realistic. I was channeling Joe Bellomo thinking about board-formed concrete, and I think he would argue strongly that that's a primary building material. I think making a definition of that is awfully challenging because standard poured concrete is not as attractive. I am happy just to leave that off and that would come back to the ARB or something like that, which would probably be fine. I do think that we should have a better definition of T1-11 siding or plywood here. That's a very generic term and we really want to say that that's some pattern-sawn wood veneer panels is what my definition was, but we have to be careful about what words we're using. We do allow wood veneer; it says here on the fourth item down that wood veneer is a primary allowed material. T1-11 siding is a wood veneer siding. We need to be very precise about these things. I agree with Alex that the esiffs system is not in and of itself a low-quality material, it's how it's used. We just need to be clearer about that again. It is probably better to err on the side of caution and just not leave things on the list if we think it can be used badly. Those two things are running a big risk. I would like to, Osma, come back to the items about applicability after everyone else speaks, if we could. That's what I have to say. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thanks. I think we will get a chance to go through each section one more time and talk about after hearing each other's comments. Okay, thank you, Board Member Baltay. Vice Chair Lee.

Vice Chair Lee: I will just start by thanking staff and all of the time that Osma and David put into this subcommittee item. This is not a small thing objective standards and every municipality is dealing with this. I understand the pressure given the legal impetus and also the queue that might arise in the summer. However, I don't think this is something to breeze through quickly and to push through. I really appreciate the effort from our planning staff and our consultant Chris in terms of thinking about this, reworking it, bringing it back to us, and thank you, again, Amy and Jodie and Vinh for reaching out to the community in terms stakeholders. I think that was really an important gesture in knowing that we are in shelter-in-place and not able to do this in-person and everything happening at once. I guess I will just start and say that I very much agree with everything that has been said so far largely in terms of outlook of fellow Board Members. I very much appreciate the comments that people have made not in-person, but sent to us. We did hear from Architect Ken, And Elaine [phonetic], and Heather [phonetic], and they made some very compelling points. I just wanted to touch on those, and then, also, the gentleman who did make some comments -- believe it was Chris -- and I guess I will start there. Like Board Member David, from the start and I still do have discomfort in terms of looking at an objective standards in terms of a strict, prescribed, numerical dimension or formula. I just want to approach this context because, as we know as architects and designers and planners, for every site there is a specific contextualized situation. I have just been thinking about Palo Alto in particular, the 2010 ARB Awards whenever that was... it was such a joy to participate on and really think about the environments and the buildings that we have built and were approved, and seeing age. To go back to that example of what Chris brought today -- thank you so much -- I want to start with the graphics because people so often look at graphics as examples and this manual, the objective standards, even to a seasoned consultant, the graphics do matter. I found really compelling those examples that you showed today, Chris, in terms of something in Sunnyvale, and San Francisco, and Oakland and I wasn't on the board during the Wilton Court approval process and it was really great, Board Member David, that you brought those forward. I see that there are specific conditions that we are not drafting this document for and it sits very uncomfortably with me. However, we want to do our best and try to do the right thing. This issue of compatibility to context, that Ken Hayes brought up, I think that's what we are all working towards, right, To find that compatibility and that comfort. Architect Elaine talks about... I feel strongly that we need to think about flexibility in a range of graduated dimensions and standards per the sizes of these lots in different conditions. I just began to think about it and since we have been meeting I have been thinking about San Antonio and some of its corridors, and University Avenue, and Cal Avenue, and El Camino Real, and the contrast of Ramona Historic corner, for example, that you brought up. I also just wanted to repeat what Architect Heather mentioned in terms of that important issue of making sure that we think about the big picture before we vote on this, and, having said that, I will just go to the document. If we



start with the materials -- I am going to work my way backward -- my comments from .060 to .090. Thank you so much Board Member Alex and Board Member Peter. I agree. When I first looked at this I was trying to calculate the percentage of the primary material and it is difficult. I do think it's the glazing because so much of it is glass. Do we need -- I am just going to ask a question -- the larger percentage or can we use language in terms of primary, secondary, and accent. Can we rely on consultants and our planning staff to evaluate based on those descriptors? I feel like we can, so I would remove those percentages. If we can go back to .080 and open space. My largest concern is where we are forgetting the zoning and the dimensions. You know, I hear Board Member Alex often refer to the RM20, and I am thinking of the RM40. To be frank, I am most sensitive for projects that have... sorry go back to materials. I have one more related to open space and materials; what we're not thinking of. There was a gentleman who came through... I just met with a modular company yesterday for work. Modular and prefab; we haven't even discussed modular and prefab. That is going to affect materials and I just wonder where else the language might come up where we think about the future. I think Architect Ken actually wrote about that too in terms of compatibility and styles. You know, I don't like the word style; however, the architectural language that is based on modern technology, perhaps, or unforeseen climate change. It might also be a building type that is housing that maybe is not condos or apartments or townhouses. It is something new. I just want to make sure that there is language that actually addresses prefab and modular, or when we go to open space and when we talk about deliveries and our way of adapting to outdoor living in terms of what we've seen happening with our crisis in the world, we have something in there that is the general language, and maybe it is up high under intent. Now we can go to open space. Do you mind if we just go to the open space? My worry there is just the sizes, and not so much the clear heights, I think that's fine, but when we talk about minimum square feet area -- I will just make my comments general; I don't want to be long -- in .0702 in residential entries, I know that we have patio entries, and shared entries that are not as large as what we are prescribing here, in my visual vocabulary in living in the area. I guess I am more comfortable with the five-foot by five-foot language rather than six by six and some of these larger numbers for dimensions on open space, when I am thinking about some housing proposals, in particularly affordable housing, or a mixed-use where there is a percentage. Anyways, I often think the open spaces, when I look at the dimensions, might be a little bit too large. I am sorry I didn't say that earlier in the previous meetings, but after going and looking out at examples I think that might be something to look at a little more carefully. Going back to the graphics, under the section of 1060 façade design, I think the graphics have improved immensely, but in the façade design section because all of the examples are very traditional in style I am a little bit uncomfortable. I am wondering if I can just bring up this idea of bringing in more photos. Working in other cities, I see a lot of their specific planes, for example Mountain View often includes built examples of a certain typology of building that exists within their city. It is going to be harder in Palo Alto because we haven't built a lot of housing; however, maybe we could include some photos as part of this document that we feel are compelling and might illustrate. In terms of the base, middle, and top discussion -- I really appreciate both Alex and Peter talking about the two-story -- I agree that maybe we just take that out. Board Member David mentioned this whole thing about the base, middle, and top, and I think about the projects that we have recently reviewed. I wonder if that heading of base, middle, and top under human-scaled architecture might simply be described as differentiation. Not to water-down the point, I understand that you still want to include that differentiation includes a defined base or ground-floor. Do you see that under (C)(1)(a)? Even a middle or body, but I would take out the two-story and I think we are talking about differentiation. Then, very important -- there may be disagreement with Board Members -- I feel most comfortable when there is a menu of options. On the slide, Jean, when you said ARB the intent is there and then you go down the ARB side or you can go down the side of standards and then it branches off again to a menu of options or dimensions. I feel comfortable with the menu. I feel like the menu are examples with maybe a slight change to our graphics that might show actual examples that have been built in Palo Alto, but that menu becomes really important. Maybe where there are dimensions there is a range according to different size lots and different conditions. Under the menu -- I am not sure if we are going to find agreement here -- I feel like you can choose one option; there is not a need for two or more. My feeling is with seasoned professionals and consultants who come in they can choose one. There is also city staff and maybe there is an option for city staff to pull from a subcommittee or if there is a question to go to someone on the ARB if they find that one is not enough. I believe the intent and then examples with professionals and our city team might be enough to choose one option and allow for some flexibility. I just wanted to offer

that. We will keep going on the document. I did mark up more but I also want to pass the baton to keep to our time. Building orientation and setbacks, when we go to .040 treatments of corner buildings. Thank you Board Member Alex. There are situations where I think we need to just make a change there, but I feel like I did glance over this whole... the dimensions over 40 feet here it is one of the following. This is for the length; I am talking about the lengths of the building. I guess I also am not sure about where you have the length of the building that is 100 and then you subtract such a large volume; sorry that's under building massing. Also on the corner where we see the strict dimension of 40 feet, we see that. I just wanted to point to those two that... it is on maximum façade length and those breaks where you take a chunk out of the building. I do think that might be a little bit prescriptive. Also, Board Member Hirsch mentioned -- I believe it also came up in Architect Heather's example of those continuous facades in terms of compatible rhythm and pattern when you subtract. Maybe these are examples that are offered; that these are possible ways to do it and maybe there are some photos where there are continuous facades or built examples that are greater than 100 feet in length and there is compatibility shown in the rhythm and the treatment of the building façade. I can stop there. To conclude, I do feel the pressure; I understand. There is a housing crisis and we do need to provide this route that does allow for it, I just want to make sure that there is flexibility and there is also an acknowledgment that housing is included in many different kinds of building types. I just want to end by saying in Palo Alto we also have these housing overlays, and the PD comes back and mixed-use can take very different forms; we don't want to close off avenues for quality housing. We also don't want to be too prescriptive for affordable housing in asking for too much. I'll pass it off, Osma. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thanks, Vice Chair Lee. I will get into my comments. I appreciate the thoroughness of my fellow Board Members' comments, and also I appreciate the format that everyone stuck to. I think it is really nice to hear everybody's comments from start to finish. Especially since I know in the past when we have tried to talk about this document it is really hard to get through all the way to the end. I read Architect Hayes's comments and the members of the public's comments. I am so grateful and thankful that we had those comments come in because I think they were very compelling; they all have a good point. Form based criteria won't ever really take the place of subjective criteria. In that sense, I still understand the need, similar to what Board Member Baltay said. There is a need for this and I think we are going to try to do the best we can with what we have done. I appreciate staff's responsiveness to a lot of our comments to date. I will start from the top and go down since we went the other. The note on 18.24.020 public realm about the sidewalk width that Board Member Lew and Board Member Baltay brought up, I am okay with the width as stated. If it's too large in some conditions... I mean, I understand the whole tricky thing here is sensitivity to context. There is kind of like a where possible kind of note; I would be okay with a thinner sidewalk if it made sense, but I do think that these roads are important corridors and I think uniformity is part of their identity in terms of how they evolve. I don't have an issue picking one versus sending it to staff to make an objective or subjective decision. The other note I had was on street trees, which was on that same page as (ii)(a) where it says every 30 feet sidewalks shall include at least one street tree within six feet of the sidewalk for every 30 feet of linear feet. Architect Elaine had a note to add where possible because it is true, in some cases that is not possible. I might also suggest where the context calls for something denser maybe there is an opportunity to have them every 25 feet or every 20 feet to encourage the applicant to make an argument for that. In addition, Architect Elaine had a note about the existing paving, if the paving that exists isn't safe or accessible Board Member Baltay made a note to go back to staff on that. Potentially if that is a roadblock we could have something like a caveat like if existing paving is not safe, or accessible, the applicant can propose an alternative to be reviewed. That was my note on that. For 18.24.040 in the intent statement, the last note optimized building for heat gain, I would scratch heat gain and note thermal comfort instead -- there is another location where that happens in 18.24.100 -- because thermal comfort encompasses everything that you're trying to look for when you're evaluating that. Then, similarly, the item above that, landscape or usable spaces that contain open space or hardscaped spaces, I sort of read that as asking for a lot of hardscape. I wonder if there is a way to word that where we can say there is a reasonable balance between hardscape and softscape as it makes sense. In that same section, under B, the concern about the corner lengths that has been brought up a few times that we have all mentioned/. I know Architect Elaine made a comment that 40 feet is too long. I am on board for a smaller number, as well, for that; 20 feet, 30 feet. At that point, you wonder if this criteria is even necessary; something to consider. There was also a discussion about having it be a proportion to the

building at large or at the street. Yes, I could support a lower number there. There was also a note by Architect Elaine on the open space that is just a little bit lower on this section. Architect Elaine had a comment about graduated open space depending on the size of the lot. For this item two here, maybe we could make a comment about a minimum of 20 feet, minimum area of 1,000. Maybe that 1,000 feet could modulate based on the lot size. In 18.24.50(ii)(A)(2) and (3), these are kind of the side façade. I wonder if there is fire code that covers item three in terms of the façade area being glazing that we need to consider. Maybe that item is not necessary if the code is already covering that item. Then, in (iii)(3)(b), which is the open space continuous façade, we have a lot of comments that this requirement might be onerous; it might be burdensome. I know that this is a big item of discussion. I think it depends on the lot, honestly. It is really hard to make a call but I could be open to removing this item in favor of having the buildings refer to open space requirements separately. There is a comment on 18.24.060 about non-residential ground-floor height, to consider a range between 12 and 15 instead of keeping a minimum at 14. I could support that. Then, 18.24.080 common open space, for this one under (c)(i) we have a note of a minimum size of 200 feet for common open space. I know that there are other jurisdictions that go by zone and they say a required square footage of open space by that zone and then they have a number for private and then a slightly increased number for common open space. I wonder if that might allow for that individuality and flexibility per lot. Okay, those are all of my notes. Maybe what makes sense is we go through the document -- Chris has been great about noting all of our comments -- and see if there are other items that may be conflicting and that we may need to take straw polls or provide more clarity.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair, did we want to start at the top of the document? I would like a moment to add a few comments as well just as we are going through our detailed discussion.

Chair Thompson: Sure, yeah. Yeah, let's start at the top.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think Board Member Baltay maybe wanted to talk applicability. Is now the time for that?

Chair Thompson: I think we could, if you're okay with that, Board Member Baltay, or do you want to go through all of the detailed items first and then talk about this at the end?

Board Member Baltay: What I want to do is make a case that we should limit as much as possible the applicability of this whole thing. I think it may be better to go through the details first. That's really what we need to get feedback on today. That's my suggestion to you, Chair Osma.

Chair Thompson: Okay. We will come back to this, Jodie. Let's start with 18.20. There were things like pretty minimal comments, but are there any other comments from the Board on this item or questions on staff in terms of ARB?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, if I may on the San Antonio sidewalks I can understand that the 12 feet is more applicable in a commercial type area. We did just expand the HIP to San Antonio for two blocks, and we also have the area closer to the 101 freeway is more commercial in nature. I am sorry; I am forgetting what the two blocks are. I think it's Middlefield or something. I might be saying the wrong street, but maybe if we say like East of Middlefield maybe that might give people more comfort.

Chair Thompson: There's a zoning change in there or it's just the overlay is getting applied there?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, the Housing Incentive Program is now allowed on two blocks of San Antonio.

Chair Thompson: Got you.

Board Member Baltay: Jodie, is it necessary to specify that at this point in the code? I mean, San Antonio is probably going to change as we continue to think about the planning on that street.

Ms. Gerhardt: It is but we fight about sidewalks so often that I really would like to write this down so that it is very clear to developers what is needed.

Board Member Baltay: Wouldn't it just make sense with a code? For the law to stipulate that the city shall maintain a list of required sidewalk widths and then internally you can develop what that list is overtime?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, that actually would be stronger if it was in the code itself.

Board Member Baltay: Okay. That's just my two cents is that to force that right now it may be too much and we may end up regretting the width we choose now two years from now.

Chair Thompson: Which width do we think we would feel more comfortable with, if it's not 12?

Board Member Baltay: Alex, you started this one. What do you think?

Board Member Lew: If you talk to urban designers they actually recommend 15 to 17 feet minimum; the 12 feet has always been the compromise standard that Palo Alto has used. You don't actually get everything that is in the diagrams on that sheet. It is actually hard to fit that all in, in 12 feet. It is just because we have small size lots in many places.

Chair Thompson: You think 12 feet is too small?

Ms. Gerhardt: It's a compromise.

Board Member Lew: It's a compromise. That's what we have been using for downtown and El Camino. It is something that has been widely used in Palo Alto. I think if you walk downtown you will see sidewalks that are maybe eight feet, and those are definitely too narrow.

Chair Thompson: Does it make sense to do a minimum of 12 feet, and then potentially a maximum as per allowable by the site?

Board Member Lew: I think what's written is okay.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Let's keep going, then. Do you feel all right about the accent paving notes?

Ms. Gerhardt: On the accent paving, we are trying to establish some standards downtown and Cal Avenue. The glass has been made safe. Again, it is one of those things where staff just needs that written down somewhere so that we can clearly implement it.

Chair Thompson: Okay. If it is being made safe then I don't have any issue with the way that it is written. Any other thoughts from Board Members?

Board Member Baltay: Just repeating the same argument, Jodie. Some things are best left as policies that staff provides rather than enacted as legislation and code. It is just easier to keep control of. I think things like sidewalk paving is a good one to do that way. Take that flexibility; internally establish it rather than having City Council have to approve it every time you want to change.

Board Member Lew: I have one comment on the accent paving. If you look at University Avenue it is actually a mish-mash of different sidewalks. We have had controversies on some of the projects, like some of Roxy's [phonetic] projects where he doesn't want to do the brick accent. He wanted to do interval color concrete. If you actually start walking and looking at it very carefully it is a total mixed-bag of different sidewalks and there really isn't a standard. We would like to have a standard but it is not really there yet.

Ms. Gerhardt: It was there and got eliminated in some places and we're trying to bring it back; that is the point.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, understood.

Chair Thompson: It is 10:30. We are kind of at the time where I wanted to do a hard stop. The good thing is that we got everyone's comments out. The not-good thing is that we didn't really get to debate too much. What do you think, Jodie? Do you feel like staff has enough or are there items you think we should focus on that are particularly contentious that we can spend another five or ten minutes wrapping up?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think I do have some questions. Maybe if I can breeze through some of my questions, and if Jean or Chris add into that, that would be helpful. I think on this corner element, the 40 feet gives the corner element some substantial weight. I heard some comments on the side street; it doesn't have to be the 40 feet on the side street. I also heard that if it is a smaller piece of property then maybe this can scale down in proportion. For the moment, that's the way that I would tackle that.

Mr. Sensenig: I would like to just say two clarifying points on this. One is, Alex, it only applies to buildings greater than 40 feet in height. The more house-shaped buildings and the more suburban areas would not be included; they are excluded from this. Two, to clarify that it is an aggregate of 40 feet on both sides of the building; it is not 40 feet in one direction. It is a total of 40 feet.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have room to have one side longer than the other.

Mr. Sensenig: Yes.

Board Member Baltay: I think 40 feet is the right number. We are talking about four-story or taller buildings here. Forty feet, when it is a combination of two sides, is not too small, in my opinion.

Chair Thompson: Okay, any other Board Member thoughts?

Vice Chair Lee: I am okay with 20 now that you have clarified. I was reading 40 and 40 on both sides.

Chair Thompson: I am also okay with that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you. One the next one, Chris, the entry on ground-level, Board Member Hirsch was saying that Wilton Court would not meet that. I mean, I think we still want to keep entries close to the corner. Do we maybe want to change it to 30 feet? If entries are more than that then they would come to the ARB. Is there some number that people might want to change it to?

Board Member Baltay: I think you should leave it at 20 feet and if it goes beyond that it comes to the ARB. Otherwise, it is not part of the corner; that's the idea.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. Next one, Chris.

Chair Thompson: Any other thoughts? I just want to make sure that we have a group straw poll on this. I am okay to increase it to 25 if that is helpful.

Vice Chair Lee: I could support 25.

Chair Thompson: Anybody else?

Board Member Baltay: Twenty-five is fine with me if that's the consensus.

Chair Thompson: Okay, great.

Board Member Lew: Can I be the contrarian for a minute? You know, we have the Sunrise housing on El Camino, and it has a corner element but the main building entrance is on the side street. It is senior housing, so it has porte cochere and a drop-off there. The corner element isn't really an entrance. Maybe there is an exception for certain kinds of housing. If it's senior housing where they really are using the automobile drop-off...

Ms. Gerhardt: But I wonder if such a project, too, could have a secondary entrance at the corner and still abide by this.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. On the senior housing, they really try to control the entrance just for security and to keep tabs on the residents for the ones who have Alzheimer's and who can wander off the campus. Yeah, I don't know that we need to make a big deal about it. I just wanted to point out that I think that there may be other ways; there might be another option.

Vice Chair Lee: I do concur with Alex there. I see that right now we are saying either or, right? In a situation for Sunrise they would need to, right? Isn't this a menu option?

Mr. Sensenig: Yeah. This is a menu of options that you can have A, B, or C. Mr. Baltay wanted all of them to be part of it in his comments, but you do have an option here of how to meet this. There is also always the ARB route. The direction that we took from the ARB earlier in this process is, when possible, be stricter. That kind of goes through this whole document that, yes, we understand that we are not providing every building type to fit these standards, but, you know, these are a tighter set of standards and then if you want to deviate from them you go to the ARB.

Vice Chair Lee: Thank you, Chris. If I may, I do think the menu option is compelling and to have one as a possibility. In the case of Sunrise I just know -- thank you, Alex, for that reminder -- it wouldn't be possible for them to have an entry on the corner and then space is very precious and they have actually saved that space for open space further along the block. I don't know. I think in that situation it makes sense to have the options and choose one.

Chair Thompson: I would agree with Vice Chair Lee that I don't think they should all be required. I think the menu is important and having that flexibility is important.

Board Member Hirsch: Under B, it has to be a change of material? A different material application and fenestration pattern.

Ms. Gerhardt: That's one of the options you could choose.

Board Member Hirsch: I'm sorry; I demonstrated I think on Wilton Court the use of the same material worked very well in the corner, so why does it have to be a separate material?

Mr. Sensenig: David, thank you for your comments. Wilton Court would meet these standards with the increase to 25 feet here. Concerning your comment on C, I think you made a really good point that it is not clear what the overall height that needs to be four feet greater or less than. That can be clarified that since Wilton Court has a part of the façade that's punched out and then the part back, that it is actually greater than the average primary façade for each façade. I am proposed, kind of, rewriting this with a little bit more clarity that what Wilton Court is doing is acceptable because it's essentially, through its design, having a change in height. But, you're right; this wasn't written clear enough to allow that.

Chair Thompson: That makes sense. I can support that.

Board Member Baltay: That's all fine with me if you're waiting for that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair Thompson, maybe silence means you're okay with it.

Chair Thompson: From here on out, silence means you're okay with it.

Board Member Baltay: I don't agree but I yield to the consensus of the Board.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, silence means you're okay enough.

Chair Thompson: We yield to the silence.

Ms. Gerhardt: What did we pass, Chris?

Mr. Sensenig: I think the other one...

Ms. Gerhardt: The 100 feet?

Mr. Sensenig: Yeah. Going back to some of the examples shown and some of the examples given by the subcommittee in the past, I agree that this is an onerous standard and one that is going far in requiring breaking up of buildings. There are two possible ways, I think, to change this. One, is to increase that its building is greater than, like, 140 feet or 150 feet. If that's what Palo Alto feels appropriate before there is a major break. Or, as Osma recommended, potentially removing this item and relying on the façade rhythm and pattern standards.

Ms. Gerhardt: I am hoping Board Member Lew might be able to speak to this because I am assuming that the Olive Garden-type building that was the whole length of the block is what we are trying to get to here.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I think a lot of the new buildings are 200, 300, 400 feet long. I think that once you get over 200 feet I think you do need something. I don't think it has to be 600 square feet. It could be, maybe, 300 or 400 square feet. If you just walk down Hamilton Avenue you'll see a lot of 100 by 100-foot buildings, and then there is a 25-foot alley in between them. That seems to work pretty well. The Olive Garden project, my recollection of it had one six by six notch in the building and that was it. I think if you look at the Mayfield housing and College Terra Centre both had something much larger, approximately 20 by 20 feet. I have all of those drawn in AutoCAD, so I can forward staff the dimensions of all of those projects if you want.

Vice Chair Lee: I will just say that I appreciate Chris' suggestion; I think 100 feet is not that long. I think it needs to go longer to increase that length and maybe it is a proportion. Also, this diagram implies open space the way it is shown. I think connotes that. I just want to make that comment.

Board Member Baltay: I think 600 square feet may be a little bit too much. Maybe more like 400 is a more realistic target.

Board Member Hirsch: Can I suggest something here? Many of the examples we were shown -- I agree with Grace's comment that we should be seeing some photos of buildings that exist and samples of what are appropriate -- have recesses, bays, and one would count the face of the building when there is a bay as a recess. You might have a series that define a building's façade. We certainly saw that in the example I showed at Wilton Court where the recesses are effective in creating the exterior volumes scale of a building. Why do we have to incorporate that in a single recess? The actual fact of a long building if you had a recess like this it would kind of be meaningless, but when I converted into something that can, in plan, be turned into bays or part of a unit I think it is very useful. We are talking about modulating the exterior face of a building. That is the way to do it.

Chair Thompson: I was just also going to put in my two cents. I am okay with creating a higher number than 100, so 150 or even 200, and then, if necessary, making the break smaller in size from 600.

Mr. Sensenig: Just for reference, the Wilton Court project is about 150 to 160 feet in length. That is actually a good one to look at and say would you be okay with that building being 50 percent longer without a break?

Chair Thompson: I think that would be too much.

Vice Chair Lee: I also just want to point out the language here says at least one vertical façade break. You know, maybe if we are rethinking the language we are talking about overall length and we are also talking about a prescribed break. I also look at the graphics and I think of it as a C-shaped building like

Alphabet City and Steven Holl and that is not what we are asking for. I just want to be clear that we present it and write it specific and not specific.

Mr. Sensenig: Osmar, is it okay to do a straw poll on 150 feet and 400 square feet?

Chair Thompson: Yeah, let's do that. Straw poll to changing it to 150 feet in length and 400 square feet, like Chris said. Sorry, Board Member Baltay?

Board Member Baltay: Yes.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Board Member Lew?

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Lew: I can support that, and I could also go maybe up to 200.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Board Member Hirsch?

Board Member Hirsch: I am not in favor of a single one.

Chair Thompson: Not in favor of changing it to 150?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, in favor of changing it to 150, but I am not in favor of a single break that is on a dimension like this.

Chair Thompson: The verbiage is at least one. The applicant could choose to do more than one. Okay, Board Member Lee?

Vice Chair Lee: I am fine with that; it's better. I think 200 is possible as well.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I am in support of 150 with a minimum area moving down to 400. Keep going?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah. What are the next sections, Chris?

Mr. Sensenig: There's the base, middle, and top excluding two stories.

Chair Thompson: Yeah, should we take a quick straw poll on that? I think I heard three people in support of that, at least. Go ahead, Vice Chair Lee.

Vice Chair Lee: That sounds good.

Chair Thompson: Okay, I am also in support of that.

Mr. Sensenig: Okay. I think that was the main question here other than its appropriateness or changing its name to base, body, and roof parapet edge.

Chair Thompson: Let's talk about that. Are there any other Board Members that have a response to Board Member Hirsch's suggestion?

Board Member Baltay: Actually, I think Grace had her finger on it best. It is no longer base, middle, and top. It is rather differentiation that we're talking about.

Vice Chair Lee: I would support it. My feeling is, I don't want to repeat, but I just feel like we don't use the word differentiation as a heading. We use the word articulation and modulation if we are calling those out separately. I would be comfortable with that.



Chair Thompson: I am sorry; is the suggestion to change it to differentiation from base, middle, and top?

Vice Chair Lee: Yes, and I would retain the language of differentiating in the paragraph using the language base, middle, and top pointing to the example.

Chair Thompson: I see. Okay.

Mr. Sensenig: Would it be a vertical differentiation or just differentiation period?

Vice Chair Lee: I could go either way. I think it relates to massing.

Mr. Sensenig: Okay.

Chair Thompson: let's do a straw poll just for differentiation. Board Member Lee. Anybody else? Board Member Lew?

[Adjusting Audio.]

Chair Thompson: I am in support of changing it.

Board Member Hirsch: Are we calling this human-scale architecture?

Board Member Baltay: Sure, it sounds fine. I feel like I am sort of just making big changes to architectural history with this kind of verbiage, but, yes, it's a more accurate description so I support it.

Chair Thompson: I think I heard Board Member Hirsch asking if we would still keep human-scaled architecture as item C. I think we still would, we are just changing the letter (I) from base, middle, and top to differentiation.

Board Member Hirsch: I pointed out that the actual code indicates other elements of human-scaled architecture. I don't find it to be appropriate. I don't have a substitute right now but maybe Grace could come up with something. Human-scaled architecture when it's a small building is one thing; when it's a very large building, which we are likely be seeing, is something very different.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Hirsch: There are so many different kinds of elements, like canopies over the front door, or the plantings, or the trees in the front yard, or the size of the windows, or different sizes of windows. Some of that is in your diagrams, Chris, but to call this specific design human-scaled architecture doesn't seem appropriate to me.

Chair Thompson: Board Member Hirsch, you're suggesting changing the term human-scaled architecture to something else? Is there any support from anyone else on the Board to do that?

Board Member Baltay: No, I don't support that. I think human-scaled is an important concept.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I saw Board Member Lew shake his head.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I don't support that at all. I am actually reading the Jan Gehl book Cities and People, and I think the human-scale is actually the most important thing. If we do nothing else, that is what we should focus on.

Vice Chair Lee: I agree.

Board Member Lew: I think he would argue that the base is the most important thing. The top is not as important as you get taller buildings because you don't really see the roof. I am actually more in support of the base, middle, and top than articulation because articulation sort of gets everything equivalency. You are differentiating but the top is doing something different than the bottom. You see in so many of the new apartment buildings it is all kind of the same, like the 777 Broadway project in Oakland. There are better projects in Berkley that do base, middle, and top in more of the classical architectural thinking and I think that is where we should focus our attention. I will go with the majority on the board.

Chair Thompson: I think you have a really good point, Board Member Lew. I think as much as this is a classical thing that we're discussing it is also a very human-experience thing. A human-experience is the base when they are right next to the building but they experience the top when they see it from down the street, and then they experience the middle somewhere in between there. I sort of see these at the three different distances at which a building is perceived by a human in a city, and they all have a very important role to play. The silhouette of a building can be so iconic and that only happens if you do something to the top. Certainly, in older style, a lot of detail is put there and it is fun for the eye to be able to look at those things. I am with you; I think human-scaled architecture is important to stay. I think the discussion we are having is very relevant. I think differentiation is a very modern way of talking about it but I think it is still referencing the same concept. Any other comments from the Board?

Board Member Baltay: I guess I will support what Osma and Alex just said. Maybe we should keep the term base, middle, and top for now at least. That is referring back to our human-scaled concept here.

Chair Thompson: Wait, we just did a straw poll to change it to differentiation.

Board Member Baltay: I know, but Alex made a good point, and only after he speaks can I think about what he is going to say.

Chair Thompson: For reference, we are keeping the term in the description. It is still saying defined base or ground-floor, middle or body, and top or cornice in the verbiage.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, but I think the problem is that the actual mechanism we are giving to make a base, middle, and top isn't really doing what we're thinking about. We are just talking about semantics here, and I don't think it is possible to really define it that way. We probably should just move on, Osma.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I guess we won't redo the straw poll.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Hirsch: In reference to Alex's comment, I agree with whoever he is reading there that human-scale elements are critically important, and he pointed out, actually those usually occur on the ground floor -- it seems that the book you're reading also points that out -- so that the base, middle, and top is another experience as you move away from the building. The organization is quite different and I am concerned saying human-scaled architecture from that point of view ought to be building articulation or composition... articulation and composition. But when you get close to the building then it becomes human-scaled architecture. It is how you read a building when you get close into it that it really becomes important that it is of a human scale.

Chair Thompson: Okay. We have a few suggestions.

Board Member Hirsch: It's made as a suggestion.

Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: building articulation instead of using human-scaled architecture because it refers to everything about the building and being human-scale which it really is not, especially if it's a bigger building.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Do we want to think about this a little bit more? For a change of this scale, we could still do this at the next hearing as well.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I think that sounds good. Let's keep going.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chris, do we have another section or anything? Do we need to talk about materials at all or is there anything before that?

Vice Chair Lee: Before we leave that, did we want to talk about the menu of choosing two? I wasn't sure if there was any consensus in choosing a menu of one through the use of two or more of the following techniques. I think it is important to allow for some flexibility to say use of one or more.

Chair Thompson: What do the other Board Members think? Let's do a straw poll to change it back to one.

Vice Chair Lee: If I may, I just want to point out that I forget to say that the examples I saw with Broadway, and Mosaica and Ironworks I would describe their base, middle, and top in fulfilling this requirement differently, I think. I think we all would slightly differently. I do think a professional could choose one.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chris, can you walk through how this menu works?

Mr. Sensenig: Yes. The reason for two is that they kind of work in conjunction and we separated different things out. There are also menus within menus, right? There are four things that you have to choose two between. One is variation and building modulation. There are three options in that. The second one is variation and façade articulation; having bays, or not having bays, or a change in vertical projections or adding datum lines, or a change in fenestration, size and proportions. Oops, that's number three. It is hard on a small screen like this. We had a slide that previously showed this. If I just go to the high-level ones, it is variation in building modulation, variation in façade articulation, variation in fenestration, size, proportion, and pattern, and variation in façade material and pattern or color. It is two of those four and then within some of them, there are multiple options.

Chair Thompson: Okay, thanks. Let's just do a quick straw poll on if we think it's worthwhile to change it to one or more instead of two or more. This is proposed by Board Member Lee. Do we have any concurrence from the Board? Board Member Lew?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I don't have an opinion yet. I would prefer to do some studies before (inaudible) meeting.

Chair Thompson: All right. Board Member Baltay?

Board Member Baltay: I think we should stick with what staff has worked at. It sounds like they've really thought a lot about this and I don't want to, on the fly, try to undo their work. It is a complex thing they are trying to accomplish. I support what's currently in front of us.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Board Member Hirsch?

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Hirsch: My biggest problem with this is the image of the building itself in each one of these. We went pretty far, Osma...

Chair Thompson: Sorry, Board Member Hirsch, I was just asking if you are in concurrence of changing the menu as part of the straw poll.

Board Member Hirsch: Good point. I haven't got an opinion about that at the moment, but I do have an opinion about the actual prototype building that is expressed here as a sample that I would like to be brought up as an issue to discuss.

Chair Thompson: Okay. For the straw poll, I am in favor of keeping it the way that it's written. It's 11:00 right now. We are completely out of time. I know you have a note on the imagery, Board Member Hirsch. I think you did mention it as part of your initial commentary.

Board Member Hirsch: I did.

Chair Thompson: I think it is noted by staff. Let's talk about materials really quick because I think there were some items on there that maybe not all of the Board Members had a chance to put input on, and then we will wrap up with the purpose and applicability, and then take a ten-minute break.

Ms. Gerhardt: On the materials, I heard a lot of comments that it would be hard to meet the 65 percent. I am wondering if we included glass and a second material, and counted those two things as the primary material would that better make it work out?

Chair Thompson: There is glass on this list. It's the fourth item from the bottom. I wanted to make sure that the Board Members that brought up the issue about glazing were aware of that.

Board Member Baltay: I think it is more a matter of how you're defining all this. Almost every building is going to have a lot of glass, a lot of windows. Is that a primary building material or is that just a de facto part of the building?

Ms. Gerhardt: That's the other way, too. We could just not calculate the glass. When you were running your numbers, I don't know how you were running them, but if you took out the glass from the percentages would that make it work better?

Board Member Baltay: Jodie, are you terribly uncomfortable with Grace's idea of leaving primary as a staff judgment? A know it when you see it kind of thing.

Ms. Gerhardt: That would be subjective.

Chair Thompson: It would be.

Ms. Gerhardt: That means anything gets through.

Board Member Baltay: I mean, sort of, but you might say any reasonable person might conclude that.

Ms. Gerhardt: We need to have a bare minimum objective standard. We need to set a bottom bar, kind of thing.

Vice Chair Lee: I am glad you asked the question about comfort level of staff because ultimately they are going to be reviewing it. I appreciate your remarks, Jodie. I just want to mention, also, that there are service areas and there are areas that are not so public to the primary corridor, vehicular or pedestrian, and that is a calculation and if we get to those percentages it can be misleading in terms of the percentage and what actually is seen as a primary material. That's why I am more comfortable with the words primary and secondary and accent.

Chair Thompson: That's a good point.

Vice Chair Lee: Other cities do this, right, in design. Don't you feel like we have seen primary, secondary, and accent, and then staff review and not percentages in other design guidelines?

Ms. Gerhardt: If there are any examples you could send us that would be wonderful.

Chair Thompson: If we did remove item (B)(I) there is an inherent implication that the primary material would be everything else because it says secondary is not allowed more than 35, accents not allowed more than five. So, there is an inherent implication that everything else would be the primary. Potentially, that could solve our problem for us so that you're only checking for secondary and accent.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, that is actually a great solution.

Board Member Baltay: That sounds like a good idea.

Chair Thompson: Any other concurrence from the Board?

Board Member Hirsch: On one material, glass block. There are other forms of glass materials that are similar to a glass block. It should be a broader description than just glass block.

Ms. Gerhardt: Are you talking about any sort of frosted or obscure glazing?

Board Member Hirsch: No, with glass but there are other forms of glass besides block.

Chair Thompson: Like what, David?

Board Member Hirsch: Double layer of glazing that intersects itself. I can't recall what it's called but it is being used commonly.

Chair Thompson: Maybe there is a caveat that materials not listed can be brought to subcommittee or something like that. Could that solve, potentially, the item for unmentioned materials here?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, I think...

Board Member Baltay: I am sorry; is it a crazy idea just to say that staff shall maintain a list of materials and keep it updated from time to time or even establish a process for that? Again, just let the code say that this exists and let the details of it be something that we can professionally adjust as time goes on. You just can't get it right right now and put it in this log I don't think.

Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Member Baltay, I think that's a great idea, especially when it comes to materials that it is going to be changing on a regular basis. We want the ability to change that without going back to Council.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah. Maybe just say that with the consent of the ARB, this list will be updated every three years or something.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I think that sounds good. Let's wrap this up and we will talk about the purpose and applicability really quick. Board Member Baltay.

Board Member Baltay: Yes. I would like to propose that I think this should only apply in the most stringent case. I would like to say that a unit has to be two-thirds mixed-use, not just all possible things. Somebody could come in with one apartment in a large building and call it mixed-use because it is and all of this would apply. I don't think that's a good idea. Secondly, I don't think we should even reference non-residential projects in there. I want to be really clear that we are doing this because we have to, not because we think it is a great way to do urban planning. We should focus this as tightly as possible on what we are required to focus it on, which is, as I understand it, residential projects and mixed-use projects with more than two-thirds housing. I would like to state that in here. I feel pretty strong about that, actually. I think it might also be worth putting in a clear statement that... it says here, as I read it, "It may include a recommendation by the Architectural Review Board depending on review required by Chapter 18.76." I think it is better to say that it needs to follow the requirements of 18.76. It is not

always discretionary to the director to send it to ARB. Again, I would like to see the language tightened up so that it really focuses this whole thing.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think -- Jean can help me with this -- on the non-residential projects we say in Section C here that they would need to meet the intent statements. They are encouraged to meet the objective standards, but they have to meet the intent statements because those will still continue to be reviewed by the ARB in our standard fashion. What we are doing with this code change is we are taking away all of those design criteria that we currently have and so we need a replacement for those, but we made it fairly high-level in just applying the intent statements to commercial projects.

Board Member Baltay: I guess that's fine, Jodie, it just seems not so clear to me. If I were designing just an office building I might say why should I have to look at this whole bunch of stuff if it's only voluntary; it just muddies the water. But my real concern is about the mixed-use percentages. I really think we want to limit this to buildings with at least two-thirds residential.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, meaning that you want the objectives... you're suggesting that the objective standards only apply to the SB35 and the SB330 type projects.

Board Member Baltay: Absolutely, yes. That is the core of what I am saying. That is the core of, I think, the feedback that we have received from the community.

Ms. Eisberg: We will need to check with the City Attorney. Part of this is that our standards need to be generally applicable according to state law, so just making sure that that meets that threshold. We will check in with the attorneys.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think the minimum that we could do... I mean, again because we're replacing the design criteria we would still want to have all housing projects meet the intent because those roll-up to the findings.

Board Member Baltay: The intent is fine. It really comes down to, I think, the percentage of mixed-use, and my fear is that an office building with one penthouse apartment could be called mixed-use housing.

Ms. Gerhardt: It cannot. It would have to have three apartments to be multi-family, but yes, three apartments and a big office would be mixed-use.

Board Member Baltay: That really concerns me greatly, and this is something I feel very strongly about.

Chair Thompson: If I may, I agree with Peter, and my computer is at three percent. I might have to run and get a cord. Thank you, Peter; I agree with your comments there.

Board Member Hirsch: I would agree with that, too.

Chair Thompson: Board Member Lew?

Board Member Lew: I can go along with the Board. I actually think a little differently, though. I was hoping we could get to a place where there are cookie-cutter buildings, but a good cookie-cutter. Let's say like House Minoterrace [phonetic] or all of the bay-windowed buildings in San Francisco. I think you have generic housing buildings that are following a pattern and they create really nice neighborhoods. I hope that we can get there someday. I think it is going to be a long way off, though.

Chair Thompson: thank you. In terms of my feedback, the item about the non-residential uses I think is pretty clear in there that it only needs to meet the intent statement. There is a sentence afterward about being encouraged to meet the objective standards, and I am okay to strike that if that makes it even clearer that it is really only meant to meet the intent statement. For the majority of housing, I am not sure I fully understand the issue, but it seems like a square footage proportion percentage thing. A certain percentage of the square footage... three units is actually three percent of the whole -- this is a

gigantic lot or something -- but there might be something to be wary of in that case. In most of the cases we've seen, the housing -- even if it's three units -- tends to take up most of the lot anyway. I will leave it at that. Are there any other final comments from staff? Anybody? Thank you so much. Let's take a ten-minute break. We will reconvene at 11:30.

Ms. Gerhardt: I believe Board Member Lee needs to recuse herself for the next item, and is on three percent battery so maybe we let her go now.

Board Member Baltay: (Inaudible).

Vice Chair Lee: See you next time.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you.

Chair Thompson: We will see everyone at 11:27/11:30.

[The Board took a short break.]

### **Action Items**

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 650 Clark Way [20PLN00134]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to allow in-channel creek bank stabilization of the Children's Health Council property. The proposed project will install a live log crib wall with a rock toe within San Francisquito Creek to prevent future erosion impacts. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) was circulated from February 5, 2021 to March 7, 2021 in accordance with CEQA. Zoning District: PF (Public Facilities). For more information contact the Project Planner at [Claire.raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Thompson: Our next item is a public hearing/quasi-judicial. 650 Clark Way: recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow in-channel creek bank stabilization of the Children's Health Council property. The proposed project will install a live log crib wall with a rock toe within San Francisquito Creek to prevent future erosion impacts. Staff.

Claire Raybould: Good morning. Claire Raybould, Senior Planner with the City of Palo Alto.

[Setting up presentation.]

Board Member Lew: Osma, we should do disclosures, as well.

Ms. Raybould: Yes.

Chair Thompson: Okay, sure. Are there any disclosures?

Board Member Baltay: I have nothing to disclose.

Chair Thompson: Board Member Lew?

Board Member Lew: I went to the site on Tuesday.

Chair Thompson: Board Member Hirsch?

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Hirsch: I went to the site yesterday.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. I have nothing to disclose. Go ahead, Claire.

[Setting up presentation.]

Ms. Raybould: Claire Raybould, Senior Planner with the City of Palo Alto. The project before you today is the Children's Health Council Streambank Stabilization project. Before we start, I just wanted to explain why this is in front of you today because I know it is a bit of a unique project in that there is very little architecture to comment on. The way that our code is written, and we do require for any exterior improvements, including things like landscaping, architectural review. If a project is subject to a CEQA document it is not exempt from CEQA then it is required to come before the Architectural Review Board. Part of that is providing an opportunity for the public to comment during the circulation period of the mitigated negative declaration for the project. I just wanted to kind of explain that to you guys before we get started today. With that, the project location is 650 Clark Way. As you can see, the work would be located along the creek bank at this property within San Francisquito Creek. Just for a bit of background, this project really did occur in two phases. Back in 2018, the Children's Health Council and WRA came to the City with concerns because there was an imminent threat of landslide at this property. In the 2016 to 2017 rainy season, there was significant loss of property, approximately 20 horizontal feet of the creek bank and 7,500 square feet of the outdoor learning area was lost. You can see in this picture where the creek bank was previously and where the current fence line and see where that property was lost. There was this imminent concern for the safety of children that are using that outdoor area there needed to be some immediate protection of that creek bank. The project that came before the City in 2018 was all outside of the creek and it was exempt from CEQA; therefore, it did not come before the Architectural Review Board. That just included a sheer-pin wall behind the top of bank, all buried underground to provide that immediate protection. Unfortunately, though, that sheer-pin did not provide long-term erosion protection at all. The creek bank continues to undermine the bank in this location at the toe of the bank. The purpose of this project is really to provide that long-term solution for erosion along this property. Just a quick overview of the project, the project includes construction of a log-crib wall with a rock toe foundation along a 275 foot long, 50-foot wide linear portion of the campus bordering the creek. The crib wall would be built using stacked layers of logs and rootwads installs at a 1:1 slope. As I noted previously, this project is subject to CEQA and the City, as the lead agency, circulated a mitigated negative declaration for this project on February 5<sup>th</sup>, so we are still in the 30-day circulation period which ends on March 7, 2021. Mitigation has been incorporated into the project to address specific concerns, particularly related to biology, air quality, archeological and tribal cultural resources, and hydrology. In terms of next steps, following the ARB's recommendation and the close of the MND circulation the City would evaluate any comments they receive on the MND and publish a final mitigated declaration. The Director, following that, would issue a decision on the proposed project. If approves, the applicant would continue to pursue applicable permits and approvals from other state, regional, and federal agencies, which there are quite a few. A lot of those are already in process right now but require the CEQA to be complete before they can have them move forward and issue those permits. The applicant really hopes to complete work in a single dry season, ideally this dry season coming up this summer. Staff recommendation is that the Architectural Review Board takes the following actions: consider the Mitigate Negative Declaration and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan; and recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Development Services based on findings and conditions of approval, which have been included in the packet. With that, I will turn it back to you and recommend that you hear from the applicant briefly.

Chair Thompson: Sure. Let's hear from the applicant.

[Setting up presentation.]

Bianca Clarke: Good morning, everyone. It is nice to see you guys. Thanks for this opportunity to bring this project in front of you. My name is Bianca Clarke [spells name]. I am with WRA, INC., and we are the biological firm that has contracted with CHC to do the design of this project and also to secure all of the regulatory permits that will be required for it, as Claire had previously mentioned. I have my colleague here also, Brian Bartell. He is our lead restoration designer for this project. We are both very



heavily involved in it but we come at it from two different expertises. We also do have the applicant's representative Terry Boyle [phonetic] of CHC on the call, I believe.

Male: Thanks, Bianca.

Ms. Clarke: Are we okay if I start?

Chair Thompson: Yes, please.

Ms. Clarke: Okay wonderful. As Claire was mentioning, we are dealing with a very steep creek bank that is really right at the edge of the Children's Health Council campus. In this picture that you're seeing here is pretty much its current condition where you see a bank that is completely slumped in on itself as a result of several years of extreme rains, heavy flow events, and overall exposure to the elements has compromised the integrity of the creek bank. This is a little bit of a different overview of where it is, but as Claire had mentioned, it is 650 Clark Way and it really is at the edge of the outdoor playground of the school. Because there was this phase one work that was put forth, we wanted to really demonstrate that, yes, that was some emergency work that needed to happen to immediately protect the playground but it was not the end all be all. At the end of the day, we still need to provide long-term protection of the bank so that it did not erode any further and also protected the sheer-pins that are in place. At this point, this is what we are proposing is this living crib wall to be installed. The sheer design of it is meant for long-term protection. We can get into specifics in later slides, but at the end of the day, that is the real purpose and need of putting this second-phase of work forward. A little bit of history of what CHC is and what they do for the community, they are an educational and clinical services facility that aids children and teens with learning differences. They deal with autism, ADHD, anxiety, and depression, and individuals with those types of challenges are very susceptible to their environment. The outdoor learning area serves as a very critical component to being able to service these individuals. It isn't just a playground for kids to go out there and swing, it really is their sanctuary for when they are for dealing with challenging or stressful situations this helps calm them. Again, it really is a critical component for the children. It is composed of two on-site schools and a therapy center. They do some clinics that also help underserved families, and they also provide an education center so that they host a myriad of workshops -- right now everything is virtual but assuming we all get back to normal -- and families come and utilize their services for workshops and classes on how to help their own children. On average, I think that they serve about 150 students daily. It is not a small feat what they are doing and they are really out there trying to provide a sanctuary and help for families in these situations. That's a little history of CHC. Let me take you to 2016 when this bank decided to take a dive into the creek. When Claire was talking about the lateral extent of land that they lost, that equated to about 7,500 square feet of their outdoor schoolyard; it is not an insignificant amount that caved in. As I mentioned, WRA assisted with this, but sheer pins were installed to immediately protect it and now we have this phase two where we need to do this long-term protection. In total, we installed 19 sheer pins and, as I mentioned, it is for the immediate protection for the bank. In the approval process with the City, it was conditioned that we have to do this more long-term protection. It is kind of a two-fold effort but, yes, the City allowed the first-phase to move forward but did condition it, but it was also a good idea to have this long-term protection as well; it is serving two purposes here. Here are some images of the sheer pin work that was installed. It was very intricate. I am going to let Brian jump in and tell you a little bit about what the sheer pins do and what that all entailed.

Brian Bartell: Thanks, Bianca. The immediate need was to make sure that no more land was lost. Du Technical Consulting Firm [phonetic] was contracted by CHC, and we worked with them and CHC to come up with this design. Basically, what you see here, with these circles, are the forms, the rebar, that go inside these sheer pins, and they are essentially concrete cylinders that are about two-and-a-half feet to three feet around circular and they extend about 50 feet into the ground. They have a space of about two or three feet between. What this does is prevents that slumping motion because what the creek is undermining and then slumping in. This was put in as phase one to prevent any more land from being lost. Basically, everything that is on the creek side could be lost; everything that is on the school side is there to stay. The concern is that if the creek does get to the wall and starts to erode then you're in a bad situation when you have to do something right away. The City predicated the approval of phase

one, which was the sheer pin wall, on coming and doing some kind of stabilization within the creek. Phase two is this living crib wall design. We selected this design because we have got a lot of constraints. This is something that we called a vegetated crib wall. These are rootwads at the bottom, which are basically trees that have been pulled from the ground, they are about 10 to 20 feet long, and the trees extend into the bank. Then, ovetop, you have logs and they are stacked kind of like Lincoln Logs, and in between you have a mix of rock and soil. In the voids you plant Willows and other species, mainly Willows that will grow in wet environments, and overtime as the roots take hold other plants come in and start to take hold. As the wall begins to decay -- over a long time because we use Redwood logs - - it remains stable. What this does is it protects the bank from the erosive forces of the actual channel during high flows. Another reason why we selected this is because it has been used successfully on San Francisquito Creek upstream in a couple of locations in recent years. It is something that is favored by the agencies, it's fish-friendly, and it provides that long-term stability. This is just a quick overview of the design. As you can see, we've got a rock base that extends down below the base of the channel to account for scour; these are the rootwads at the bottom layer; these are the logs stacked back into the bank parallel with the flow that goes up. Above the ten-year flow, we just slop back at 1:1, and, of course, like I said, this area will be planted with native riparian trees and shrubs.

Ms. Clarke: One thing I want to also point out is this image here showing the plantings right here. This is what it'll look like immediately post-construction and within the first couple of years. The intent is, over the long-term, is these plants would grow and become much more robust and provide a very thick riparian canopy over the creek bed, which, in turn, adds to the benefits of this particular design because the more shade that you have the better it is for the water and the better it is for fish. Just some added detail there. Speaking of fish, this creek is known for being critical habitat for Steelhead, and it is a very heavily regulated creek, first and foremost. By putting in these rootwads, it actually helps create refugia habitat for fish because they tend to overhang just a little bit. When you're getting a flow event -- keep in mind that these rocks are below-grade -- fish will be able to actually get refuge underneath these logs. In turn, it has that added benefit of really being an ecological benefit for Steelhead. They are able to hide from predators, and the rootwads, in nature, will actually also provide nutrients and food production for the fish. Then, as I had mentioned, the planted vegetation, as it continues to grow and get bigger and more robust, will help shade the creek bed and add for cooler water, which is a benefit for fish as well.

Chair Thompson: Bianca, you're ten minutes are up. If you could wrap it up that would be great.

Ms. Clarke: Okay, I'm sorry. Yeah. These are some other pictures of what you can expect to see for the rootwad. These are not what's happening in our particular creek; these are just representative photographs and then just more information on the diversity of the habitat it will provide. Long story short, ecological benefit as a result of this design. Ultimately, we will stabilize the sheer pin wall, we will stabilize the bank long-term, and the plants will become the long-term stabilizer. The last thing I wanted to mention is that it is a very heavily regulated design because of the type of system we are working in. We have a number of regulatory agencies that are overseeing this. This is how many people we have to coordinate with. It is being done under the utmost scrutiny. I will leave it at that.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Do we have any questions of the applicant from the Board? Not hearing any, do we have any members of the public that would like to comment?

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

Chair Thompson: Okay. I guess we can bring it back to the Board. Board Member Hirsch?

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. It really is a fascinating new thing to look at here for an architect. We don't have many opportunities to see such an interesting treatment to our natural issues around us. I happen to live right on the creek quite a bit further down and it is about 30 feet down in this area as well. Should it all fall in, I would be very happy to have this work done close to where I am living because it looks to me like it is a great solution for stability, as well as answering all of the issues necessary for natural habitat. I look at the area I'm in and I wonder, "What the heck is holding it all up

here?" There are trees that grow into the slope and probably not by choice, more by what seeds have fallen there and managed to grow. I really can't think of any reason to ask questions. I note that the sections in the drawings I see where the wall is now that you tied back to the playing fields where they are now. It's somewhat distant from the part that you're going to be adding to down below. It just seems like a neat idea to use the base of the tree at the bottom, and the Willows in between. I am assuming that the round elements that are shown in the section drawing are going to be round continuous pieces that will connect to each other in that direction and then be pinned to the ones that are more like deadened into the ground. What can you say? It looks like a beautiful thing; I'd love to see when it is complete. I have taken a look at the hazardous present condition and I think that the engineers are really doing something very clever and aesthetically appropriate. That's about all I would say.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Hirsch. Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: Thank you for your presentation. I can recommend approval today. My only comments are for staff in the findings; I think you could enhance finding number five with what was described in the presentation today, which is that the Redwood logs will protect the Steelhead trout, and also that eventually the Willow canopy will provide shade to the creek bed, which will benefit the trout as well. It looks good, thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Lew. Board Member Baltay.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you very much. I can make the findings to recommend approval of this project. I have no further comments. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. I am hoping to ask a question to the applicant briefly. Where is the wood that you are using being sourced from? Is there any thought that has been put to that yet?

Mr. Bartell: We do not have a source yet, and that is because it is kind of a fluid market. If we need to find wood, it's usually up to the contractor that we hire to find a good source. The agencies that give us permits, mostly notably CDFW and Regional Water Quality Control Board, are very explicit that they have to be taken from either a logging operation that has approval or a site that has the approval to remove the trees. It is always a challenge when we build something with logs like this; finding a good source for the logs.

Chair Thompson: Yeah, I imagine. Thank you for answering my question there. I mean, the solution seems appropriate. I would just encourage the applicant to source their material from a place that has the lowest impact possible in terms of... I learned a lot about logging, weirdly enough, in the last couple of weeks and there is definitely a wide variety out there and a sustainable force has many different meanings. I would just encourage the applicant to try and pay attention to that since that's the most important building element here. I really appreciate the applicant's presentation and I can recommend approval. Any other discussion or should we go for a motion? Does anybody want to do a motion?

**MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: I will move that we recommend approval of this project as presented.

Board Member Hirsch: Second that.

Chair Thompson: Motion by Baltay, seconded by Hirsch. Any comments? Vinh, can we have a vote?

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

No: (0)

Absent: Lee (1)

**MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 4-0-1.****Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Good luck, guys. Our next item is Board Member comments, questions, or announcements. We have the NVCAP update by Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: There is nothing to update in the last two weeks.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I appreciate the update of no update. I know that happens. I think we are good to go unless there is anything else.

Ms. Gerhardt: I did just want to confirm that the major items for March 4<sup>th</sup> have dropped off. There is potentially a subcommittee item with Board Member Hirsch and Board Member Lee. I will let them know if that is going to continue, but it would just be the two Board Members at most. Otherwise, we will see everyone on March 18<sup>th</sup>. Thank you very much.

Chair Thompson: All right. Thank you, everybody. This meeting is adjourned.

**Adjournment**