



# Architectural Review Board

## Staff Report (ID # 12098)

---

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

**Summary Title:** Minutes of February 4, 2021

**Title:** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for February 4, 2021

**From:** Jonathan Lait

### Recommendation

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

### Background

Draft minutes from the February 4, 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 4, 2021 Draft Minutes (DOCX)



**ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**DRAFT MINUTES: February 4, 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, David Hirsch and Alexander Lew.

Absent: None.

Chair Thompson: Welcome, everybody, to the Architectural Review Board meeting on February 5, 2021. [Reading] 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 986 4526 8157. 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 986 4526 8157. 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: Thank you for the welcome and thank you for being a great Chair, Board Member Baltay, that I might follow in your steps. The next item is oral communications. The public may speak on any item not on the agenda. Do we have any raised hands?

Vinh Nguyen, Administrative Associate: No, we currently do not have any raised hands.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Thompson: Great. We will move on to agenda changes, additions, and deletions.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: No changes at this time. I believe the agenda was already changed to have the Embarcadero project go first. As long as you have that in your agenda.

**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: That's right. I have that. Great. City official reports.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, thank you. My name is Jodie Gerhardt, I am the Manager of Current Planning. Thank you to the New Chair Thompson and Vice Chair Lee. Also, thank you to our past Chair, Board Member Baltay. As far as official reports, we will remain virtual for the foreseeable future. You can still have your pajamas on the bottom. For the next hearing on February 18, we are expecting to discuss the objective standards. We do have some revisions, especially to the graphics and things. I will try and get that up on the web as early as possible so that you have a little bit of extra time. I will send you an email when that is available. The other items on the agenda would be the 650 Clark Way, which is not a retaining wall but more of a stitch pier wall to hold back the land from the creek. We also have 656 Litton Avenue, which is the subcommittee so that will just be two members of the Board. Thank you.

### Action Items

2. 1700 Embarcadero Road [20PLN-000290]: Request for Preliminary Architectural Review of a Proposed Two-Story Approximately 31,377 Square Foot Automobile Dealership. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: CS(D)(AD) (Service Commercial with Site and Design Review and Automobile Dealership Combining Districts). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at [sahsing@m-group.us](mailto:sahsing@m-group.us).

Chair Thompson: Thanks. We will move on to our first action item. This is 1700 Embarcadero Road: request for preliminary architectural review of a proposed two-story approximately 31,377 square foot automobile dealership. Environmental assessment: not a project. The formal application will be subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review. I want to ask the Board if there are any disclosures.

Board Member Baltay: I have visited the site.

Vice Chair Lee: I have as well.

Board Member Hirsch: No disclosures regarding this project.

Board Member Lew: No disclosures.

Chair Thompson: Great. I visited the material board.

Board Member Hirsch: Oh, me too.

Chair Thompson: I will hand it over to staff.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, we have Sheldon Ah Sing here to present first off.

[Setting up presentation.]

Sheldon Ah Sing: Good morning. Here we are. Some things changed and some things remain the same. Welcome to the new year. We are back with another iteration of this site. We will learn a little bit about the background here in just a moment. Great overview by the Chair. It's a preliminary review of a commercial project located on 2.5 acres. It is just at the corner property. It does not include the alley site. It is zoned CS with the site design as well as an automobile dealership district. The request from the applicant would be an Architectural Review, site and design review, as well as design enhancement exception for setbacks. We are just here to review and provide some comments to the applicant as well as to staff. This site has been the subject of many projects, as well as hearings. Sixteen public hearings to date. The site is a vacant site of a former restaurant that was closed in 2014. The site was rezoned to CS from industrial in 2009. A hotel was previously approved in 2013, but that entitlement expired in 2015. That is an image on the lower left there from the intersection. Then you have had an automobile dealership proposed in 2015 for the site. That project went all the way to the City Council, and then it was directed back to the ARB. It was deemed to be too big. It didn't fit in with the context of the baylands. The applicant withdrew the application. Another application came in in 2018, that's the one at the far right.

That one also encompassed the adjacent alley site as well. It was a bigger project but a little shorter in height. That went all the way to the Council. The zoning reached the change to add the automobile dealership combining overlay. There was an appeal earlier last year and that was upheld but when the applicant decided to withdraw and sell the site to the current owner. A little bit of site context here, it is located in an area that is predominately commercial office use. The two properties that are adjacent along Embarcadero Road are dealerships, that's the Audi and the Honda site. There are some automobile uses behind on one of the streets there. It is within the baylands area but these properties are in the private properties area. This property does not directly abut the baylands. You can see a little bit of that green in this photograph in the upper right there where this property does not touch that directly. The properties in the area are generally characterized by larger buildings with large setbacks and surface parking. The one exception really is the Audi showroom has the closest setback to Embarcadero Road. It is about 30 feet. All of the others have larger setbacks. On this property, in particular, it is 1,700. There was an 80-foot easement along East Bayshore for various utilities including the overhead transition line. That does preclude structures from being included there, especially height-wise in terms of the height limit of 15 feet for structures and that includes vegetation. The project summary for this project is just solely a Mercedes Benz brand. It includes service and sales. The total square footage is 31,000 square feet. The total FAR is .29, and that includes .25 for the dealership as well as .04 for the showroom area. The site coverage is 27 percent. Height is up to 26 feet with an architectural element that does go up to 36 feet. Then there is surface parking, there is no mechanical lifts. The only mechanical lifts are for the vehicles that are being serviced. That is very typical for a dealership but not any customer parking or inventory parking. There is also an additional setback that is proposed along East Bayshore and Embarcadero Road that is consistent with all of the other dealership applications for this site. There is also a carwash for the dealership. Some notable differences between the approved prior project and the proposed project: you can see the square footage is down by about 20,000 square feet; the FAR is down; the lot coverage is also less; the height is less; setback is also less there. It is a little greater along the Bayshore side by a few feet. The approved project had a multi-use path; this project does not propose that. The approved project proposed a removal of trees along East Bayshore and this project does not propose that at all. It does preserve those trees. A little bit more about the site plan and massing. It shows that it will follow the predominant pattern in the area with a larger setback, surface parking, and the building situated in the middle. The CS zone does require build-to setbacks. Mostly that makes sense in the El Camino Real area to try to get your building close to the pedestrian realm. This is an automobile dealership with automobile-oriented use, and then, of course, a couple lifts of the easement restraints. It does make sense to support the design enhancement exception. The height of the building would be mostly consistent with the surrounding units at 26 feet. It is a standard two-story type of building. The covered drive-through for the service is exempted from the gross floor area, and that is consistent with the automobile dealership providing this district. That area is 4,300 square feet. Showing some of the floor plans here. It breaks down the showroom there in yellow and then the dealership area in green, which includes the service area. The service drive, as I mentioned, is excluded. There is a little bit of limited second-floor space there with some offices and storage areas. Going to the elevations here -- the applicant will discuss more about the materials -- the project is, again, two-story height in some areas, but it does roughly maintain that 26-foot plate. Then you have that 36-foot architectural element which would have a future sign. Along this elevation, the building does have and the site does have a (inaudible) shape but generally here at the corner you have a showroom, which has the fenestration, and then you have some of those elements that are consistent with the brand of Mercedes which is that black colored and silver-colored metal being used there with some of that white. They are introducing some of that reclaimed wood siding as well as a landscape wall. It is more consistent with some of the features that we had in the prior project and trying to bring in the consistency with the Baylands. This is along Embarcadero Road, kind of similar features here. Again, because of the shape of the building and the shape of the lot, some of these views are similar but, again, you are continuing that silver panels mostly along Embarcadero Road. On the opposite side of Bayshore faces Audi. Here you have the silver panels closer to the street and then as you get towards the rear of the property it transitions to a stucco-type of material. Then, opposite of Embarcadero, you can see on the left side a little bit of that landscape wall terminates there and it transitions to paneling closest to the street. From there, it turns to stucco towards the rear of the building. This is the side with the carwash. Then, we just show a little bit more detail here. Obviously, this is at the preliminary stage and a little bit more conceptual. We will ask for more detail and contextual type of exhibits for the formal. The landscaping, as we expect, with a smaller footprint. The project to the left side, the prior project to the right side. Then, you have more

opportunities for landscaping, and as I mentioned, they are saving those trees along Bayshore Road and Embarcadero Road. Some considerations here to think about, and what we are looking for some feedback from the Board on, is how the project fares against the required findings. Some of these are just relationship to the neighborhood setting and context, the transitions and scales to adjacent properties, as well as scale and mass. Then, architectural design, theme, cohesiveness, use of materials. We need to consider how the project is consistent with the Baylands Master Plan, using natural colors and choose materials and finishes that will weather well, preserve the horizon line, low horizontal elements, reduce the size of signs, and also just to design for practicality. I think we have a lot of experience on this site with the other two projects and this project tried to bring some of those features here, which we could probably hone a little bit more. Lastly, the pedestrian-oriented design. That brings us to the multi-use path, which I think is something worth considering. The city's Bicycle/Pedestrian Master Plan does indicate that there is a class two bicycle facility along this frontage, but when you actually go out there that does not exist. There is no facility such as that. The plan does not prescribe how to address a gap in that situation because it assumed that there was something there. We knew that; staff knew that so when we were having discussions with the prior applicant for their request -- their request had a legislative request for the zone change -- we negotiated to get this gap reconciled. This multi-use path is something that was proposed by the prior applicant. It did necessitate the removal of the trees there with some other planting on the site that were at 15 feet. What would be needed here is we need 12 feet. We need to have eight feet for two lanes and then we need two two-foot shoulders to make this work. There is a right-of-way now of ten feet and then there is a five-foot landscape buffer between the edge of the property and the parking lot. There is some room that we could put something there. There are tradeoffs implementing the pathway, it would be the removal of trees. There could be some other options. We would need to work this out but we want to hear some direction from the Board whether there is something we can get support to pursue. It is something that was on the previous project, and we would expect to see something here to alleviate that gap. This is an important area to have bicycle travel, especially with the Baylands. The other issue we noticed with the last project was the carwash. It is still facing the neighboring property that had the objection to the issue. With this project, we will have to have a new acoustic study that will address the noise for the site. The site does not have any backup generators. That will help a little bit but certainly, we have an updated acoustic study that will address the issues and be consistent with the municipal code. That ties into CEQA. The prior project had included an adopted mitigated negative declaration. We would propose to provide an addendum to the previous document and will include updated studies which are acoustic and traffic analysis. That will be included with the formal application. With that, we will be conducting the public hearing, provide direction on the project, and the applicant will consider those and file a formal application. Staff recommends that the ARB take the following action, which is to review and provide comments. No formal action is requested. With that, I conclude my presentation. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. I guess next we'll hear from the applicant.

Eric Iversen, Director of Real Estate Construction: Hello, this is Eric Iversen with Swickard Automotive Group. We are the applicant here today for the Mercedes of Palo Alto site. I also have my team with me. We can go through a short presentation and then we are also able to answer any questions should anybody have any questions.

[Setting up presentation.]

Chair Thompson: Thanks. You'll have ten minutes.

Mr. Iversen: Okay.

[Setting up presentation.]

Chair Thompson: Jodie, will we require applicants to state and spell their name for the record?

Ms. Gerhardt: It can be very helpful, yes, otherwise it ends up misspelled in the minutes.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Mr. Iversen, could you also state and spell your name for the record?

Mr. Iversen: Absolutely. It is right in front of you right now, but Eric Iversen [spells name]. Eric Iversen, Director of Real Estate Construction for Swickard Automotive Group.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, go ahead.

Mr. Iversen: We are here. Hopefully you can see a screen with a green Mercedes on it right now. My team is involved, our architect also on the call is Doug Van Kay. Al Shaghaghi is our civil engineer and Bryan Love is our landscape architect. Again, if there are any detail questions, they are here to answer those questions. Sheldon went through the overall perspective and overall general design of the facility. I don't want to repeat some of the things that he already touched on. I think one of the largest items here today is that we have come back with a much more scaled-down proposal than the previous Mercedes proposal. Again, we had bought this land -- and bought basically the franchise rights -- for Mercedes to go here. The prior owners couldn't put it all together and the cost of the facility was just simply too great. We came back with what I think is a much simpler and straight-forward proposal more in line with the other car dealerships on Embarcadero, the Audi and the Honda store, yet providing a, what I would call, a better design. Adding some fun elements like the reclaimed wood and the live green wall. Location, I think Sheldon went over that very well. Again, we are next to the other two car dealerships and other than that surrounded by office buildings. With Audi being the newest store, which is a very standard corporate Audi design, is immediately next door. Behind us are office buildings, as we all know. Then, of course, the Baylands is just beyond that. As we know, our biggest challenge is the high-powered transmission lines and those don't go anywhere. There is a large easement underneath them. We can't obviously build on them, and our stormwater drainage is also very limited what we can do within that easement. If you take a quick note here on this slide, you will see to the right the trees that Sheldon had mentioned that personally I am very much in love with and very much in love with the shade that they provide. I'd love to do everything possible to maintain that row of trees along East Bayshore. As I had previously mentioned, this is a picture that Sheldon didn't show but it shows the massing of the previously submittal that was approved and how significantly larger that building that was. It had multi-story service, it had car elevators; many things. They were trying to accomplish everything on this one site which ultimately made the project unbuildable and not affordable for them. Again, we came back with a much simpler straightforward, overall smaller dealership. As you can see, the dash line is just how significantly larger the previous proposal was. Again, this is the side view from East Bayshore. Again, you're starting to see some of the fun stuff, which is the reclaimed wood siding and the landscape wall to really break up that overall façade. You have the modern glass and architectural composite panels along the front going into a reclaimed wood product. If anybody has any questions, I could talk for 15 or 20 minutes just on how awesome and cool reclaimed wood is. Then, I think landscaped walls are great, especially in the climate that we have in Palo Alto. The plan itself on the inside does separate what we call the front of house and back of the house. Along Embarcadero is the front of the house with the showroom. It is the part of the car dealership that we're all familiar with, the showroom, service riders separated with a service drive that does have opening and closing doors. The weather is great maybe nine months of the year and those doors will be open during the day but closed at night for the service drive. Then, the actual service shop with 22 bays to work on cars. The carwash in this proposal as opposed to the previous one is attached to the building. It is approximately 40 feet further away from the property line as the previous proposal. The acoustic study, as Sheldon had mentioned, obviously we will get that updated. We have talked to the same acoustic engineer. I mean, common sense tells us moving that facility farther away from the property line will only reduce noise. We have brought on the same landscape architect that had worked on one of the earlier proposals and I think we have ourselves a pretty good landscape plan. Again, preserving those trees along East Bayshore is critical at least in my mind. Reclaimed wood product, like I said, I can talk for half an hour on that. It is an awesome product. The company goes around to churches, anything that is being demolished not only in the United States but around the world; they salvage it, they re-mill it, re-plane it, and then send it back out and it gets installed on a building. The green wall that we talked about is not just vines growing up the side of the building, it is actually a green wall with vertical planters. Should an area or a planter die off, they can actually be removed and rehung with a new one grown in a nursery to always have a fresh green wall appearance. Then, finally, once again my favorite trees. I don't think I am going to stop talking about my favorite trees because they provide excellent shade, they are under and adjacent to high-powered lines. It would be really hard for us to replace those with anything that is going to get much more than 8 to 12 feet tall. Here we have established trees that provide excellent shade

whether you are walking or biking on the street. That's all I have. I am able to answer any questions, as is our architect engineer and landscape architect. We are all here to chat with everyone.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Do we have any questions of the applicant? I don't see any. I guess I will open this to public comment. Do we have any members of the public that would like to comment?

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

Chair Thompson: Okay. I guess that concludes the public hearing and brings this back to the Board. Shall we start with Board Member Lew?

Board Member Lew: Sure. Thanks for your presentation. I am generally in support of the project. I have got a couple items for you. I think the first one is how much off-site parking are you going to need for inventory of cars. If I look at other similar dealerships, they have large parking garages. Even if you look at the Audi dealer next door, they have been using this property for car inventory for several years now. I guess my question is how much is there and then where are the [distortion].

Chair Thompson: Alex, you are cutting out a little bit.

Board Member Lew: Why don't you skip me and I'll try [distortion].

Chair Thompson: Okay. We will circle back to you. Board Member Baltay.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you, Osma. Thank you to the applicant for this presentation. I am generally in favor of the project presented to us. I think it is an easier pill to swallow than the large building we already approved. It is hard not to be in favor of it in principle. I would like to see if the applicant can't shift the building perhaps slightly farther away from Bayshore in order to give us both the tree and the pathway. I have argued strongly in previous projects on this site, and I really do feel that the trees should be preserved. They are mature trees under a powerline, so they cannot be replaced. It is really a shame not to have a pathway for the public at the same time. If there is any way to push the building back a bit further, perhaps, or whatever it takes to get the parking and display area they need but also to have some sort of a pathway perhaps inboard of the trees that would be really appreciated. I think it can be done, although it might impact one row of parking in the front unless you shift the building back. It would certainly be a wonderful gesture to the city if you could get all of the pedestrian, bicycle path along Bayshore and preserve those trees. That would go a long way to really smoothing your approval process on what has been a very contentious site. It is a great gesture to the city of goodwill. I would love to see you make an effort to make that happen. Other than that, the building siding is fine, I think. I am wondering if you can't modulate the massing just a little bit more. Looking straight at the elevations, the height of the building is consistently the same throughout with the exception of the Mercedes wall. It seems to me it would be a pretty easy matter to raise up or down different pieces of it to give it a little more modulation and variation. It is a fairly long façade and it would benefit from that. Again, it could just be the way you did the parapets but it would help to have that. I would like to see you consider flipping what I call the (inaudible). The reclaimed wood and the green wall and such to be on the Embarcadero side. I don't know if you followed the approval process from previous (inaudible), we had come to the idea that the building does need to conform to the Baylands design guidelines, which require muted and natural materials. We had felt that going towards the Baylands is where it was important to have these materials. Say on the Bayland side of the Mercedes fin, your design seems to do the opposite. You have the natural and muted Baylands-type materials but along Bayshore, not along Embarcadero where you're leading backward. I appreciate that the Audi dealership immediately to the left really doesn't seem to have those kinds of materials, so it does lead you to some sort of design challenge but it will be easier for this to be claimed to be in compliance with the Baylands design guideline standards if you get those materials flipped to the other side of the building. I think that would be easily done, again. You could put, say a reclaimed wood façade, on the office facility while you leave the showroom having the glass and steel look that Mercedes likes. I caution you -- or maybe you just want to check and see -- on the previous projects there was a strong design aesthetic about some kind of decorative metal poles and elements used to hold up the canopy at the front and you aren't showing any of that now. You may want to really be sure that Mercedes

will accept this design quality or this design style. We were told on previous projects that they would note. That they wanted more of that decoration that you see on other Mercedes dealerships. I think it could go either way, but you want to be sure that you have got that covered with them. The carwash, I think, is going to be fine where it is. The previous one was right on the property line and that was where the problems came from. Nonetheless, they did a detailed acoustic study and they had to actually put closing doors on their carwash to make sure that it didn't acoustically bother neighbors. The folks in the office building to your right behind you have lunch tables out in the back area there and you really don't want to disrupt that with a loud carwash. Perhaps you could just come back to us with an acoustic study showing that it doesn't do that. The fact that you're 30 feet away is a big help and I would hate to see you have to put those closing doors on this but study it and just see if you can make it work. I don't see it as a problem otherwise with that. My last comment to you is if you could be sure to supply real material samples next time so we can really understand, especially the reclaimed wood. What are you proposing? A photo of it just doesn't cut it. I understand these days it is hard to do that, but we would love to see it. That's what I think. Thank you very much.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Baltay. I want to check in with Board Member Lew to see if his audio got setup.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Lew: I just have a few items. One is any off-site car inventory and where do those get delivered to this particular project site. I would just say that I do know that we do have some issues with other car dealers in Palo Alto where they unload the cars in the traffic lanes during commute times. On the elevations, I do like the changes that you have made with the reclaimed wood and the planted façade. I am actually okay with the location. On the elevations though, I think the northeast elevation could use a little bit more work. It is very flat and you have two different materials that are coplanar with each other. I think that that one is not up at the same level as the other three elevations. On the bike path, it seems to me that a bike path would be appreciated but it does have a flaw. The southbound bicyclists using that path would then still have to crossover across East Bayshore. It's not a perfect solution. If we can get the bicyclist route to work in the street, I am actually okay with that. If there is a way for staff to look at that; if there is a way of narrowing lanes to get a bike route in there. The issue is that in the late afternoon the car traffic backups from the Dumbarton Bridge on occasion, and then the bicycles end up using the sidewalk. On the existing trees, I think that is also tied in probably to the flood elevations. The previous scheme had to raise the grade up, and that can cause issues with saving existing trees if you're re-grading the entire site. I think that we do need more information on that and how you're handling the grade. I you're going to raise the full side up similar to the previous scheme for the Audi dealer next door. I think that is all I have. I am generally in support of the project. I think the massing looks good and the material changes are well-considered. Thanks.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Lew. We will go on to Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you for the presentation. It certainly is a step down in massing and prominent of the site and the building on the site. I have similar questions about the parking as Board Member Lew. What has happened here is the previous scheme managed to keep the significant amount of the parking in the building itself, but here we are doubling up on the lanes of parking and storage for a significant element of the site here where you cut back on the building and you increase the storage on the site itself. I don't think it bothers me much on the site that faces the office building, but it is more of a problem on Bayshore. I think where more of the visible nature of this building is going to be seen daily to have a double layer of parking. Then, where does it go if you don't put it there? I don't have a good answer to that but I would've hoped that it could look a little bit more natural. I think that keeping the trees, I agree, is a good idea but somehow you have to work out the bicycle path and the issues related to a limited sidewalk. It is not a sidewalk where pedestrians will use it very much, so perhaps there is a way of compromising; take a little bit of it closer to the tree or find a way in which the trees can actually live with a drainage scheme under them that allows for an expansion of the sidewalk. It is a study that needs to be done; to expand that enough to have a bike path I think is important. To have that indicated to us all the way around the corner onto Embarcadero is also significant. In terms of parking and entry to



the building, I am somewhat discouraged by the fact that if you get out of your car, you're a visitor along there to get to the front door of this building means you have to pass the service entry area. If you're familiar with the way those usually get jammed in the early morning and there is very a really difficult pedestrian issue there. Certainly, what will happen -- from my experience -- is that that those cars will backup and align with your whole passageway into the site from the Bayshore and a lot of those parking spots will be basically parking for vehicles coming for repair. I don't know. That seems to me to be a problem relative to how you deal with the entry to the building at the same time. I noticed on the inside that there doesn't seem to be any planning for people who are going to wait in some way for their cars. I mean, that is a question I probably should have addressed to you earlier. Maybe you can come up to an answer to that at some point a little later. No waiting area, no intention of people who are going to be staying for minor car repair issues or whatever. I wonder if actually maybe the service isn't brought into the back of the building and you create more a plaza entry on this side and limit the exit the other way? That may be that that might solve that kind of issue because, after all, you could have a backup of cars waiting for service at the backside, whereas the front side does create a conflict with your front door. In terms of the material, in general, I am sort of favorable to the design. Yes, it does take away a lot of the detail, as Mr. Baltay commented on. The front, which I really rather liked, the detail that was Mercedes like but this is a different kind of canopy. Maybe something more in the detail of that will occur later on in the design here. It is a very thin element now. I don't know exactly what to suggest. The point of view is taken to see the elevations completely because it is far enough away, but if you're closer in it becomes a different elevation. You're using that to kind of link the two major forms, and, frankly, I don't quite see where the industrial feel of the Mercedes car and the detail of the part that faces Embarcadero relates to all of a sudden introducing this kind of a wood element, and then switching to a very much more natural feel of the planting. But if others think it is appropriate... I will say one thing about it is at least it turns the corner, which the planting doesn't do and I wish it would. Whether or not the building has a lower profile as seen from the Baylands or not, I don't like the idea of a material like that just ending at the corner. I think even though it is a sharp corner, I sort of feel if you're going to make a statement that you're doing a natural building and its environmental building and then all of a sudden you switch when you turn the corner; I don't see how that really works well. I would think you'd carry it around at least to the notch on the side that faces the office building. It would certainly be a nicer gesture towards the office building rather than just being the back of something functional like it is now. Other aspects of this, I think we need to see the perimeter elevation and the planting in much, much more detail. I am sure your landscape people can work on that. I do question -- so I wait to see if others on the Board also do -- this use of the wood and then the planting wall, and whether that is kind of... the way in which the forms are used in order to do that because all of a sudden, you're going to switch now from wood to metal canopy to the metal building above. It is a strange connection of paste on elements, in my opinion. Maybe it should one or the other, or maybe the planting area really turns the corner as it enters into that niche. I think my most major concern is that somehow the entry to this building, for me, doesn't function well at all, and it should be an emphasis here. The question that Alex raised I think is a very good question. What do you do with the storage of cars? Is this the best way? To be honest, one thing I really did like about the previous scheme is it got more cars off the site, and I wondered whether or not it would be possible to somehow use the roof of the maintenance area for the storage of cars. Would that make a better site plan? I could go along with it the way it is as long as there is plenty of planting and softening of the perimeter. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Hirsch. Let's move on to Board Member Lee.

Vice Chair Lee: I want to thank Sheldon for a very complete presentation, and thank the applicant for bringing this forward. This site has a long history and it is great to see that it is going to move forward. I recall the hotel discussion, which was as far back as 2011 I remember. I can be brief. I am in support of this project. I think that knowing this is a preliminary and that the project will be coming forward with more information on a greater scale I look forward to that. I will begin with this multi-use path discussion. I appreciate Sheldon's way of communicating that there is a larger plan for access in this area. This is one site; however, we do want to connect. My feeling is I did appreciate that multi-use pathway in the previously project that we saw and I don't want to tell you how to do it. I am not a huge bicyclist, not like Alex, but I don't know how to do it but I encourage you to work with the city and collaborate and see what is possible. I look forward to seeing that move forward. Maybe it is possible -- I just want to put it out

there -- that the benefits of the path outweigh the preservation of those trees. Sometimes that occurs and I don't know what is the right answer but please pursue that goal would be my advice. The overall architectural massing and the elevations the way they are presented, even at this beginning preliminary, I feel very comfortable with just how... for me, it is that terrific corner of where you see... I know there is that tower and the corner is set back quite a bit, but I love how the showroom turns and it is a very simple design. There is a brow, it wraps, and then you have this highlight which is very important. You have your sign that is ten feet larger that highlights and I am fine with the Embarcadero elevations as it turns. I did go and see the materials board at City Hall and I appreciate the diversity of materials, absolutely. I think the general placement of them make a lot of sense. One thing, though, I did want to note -- I appreciate Board Member Peter's comments -- it is true, there is an extreme horizontality here and the length of those facades, though they are setback quite far back from the property line and from the street, you really read... I just think facades on a big building like this with long lengths and a lot of surface area the overall design moves make sense. However, it is true, it is very long and I am just not sure given the length of those facades if small popups are going to make a difference. I am fine with the 26 feet to 36 feet in the way that it is sitting. If you want to show us an option that shows that it comes up and down in different areas, I think you'll still see an extreme horizontality and I'm open to reviewing that as well. The other piece that I wanted to mention was glare. The way the sun is moving around the site... I am always really hesitated and at first when I saw the material board, I wasn't sure the brow is white, right, and then you have two different tones of silver. What I find is that the light silver sometimes reads as white under extreme glare or sun. When I look at the elevation, it really is just on the East Bayshore where there is a little bit of length and it is up and it is light silver. I just want to make sure about glare issues and if maybe that's not too much. It is just something that I want to bring up. I believe that the whole screen wall, I love to see how that is going to move forward. I couldn't tell from the landscape plan. I don't know what's planted there, so it will be terrific to see what that is. The reclaimed wood, the warm color is a terrific addition to have. The issue is where you turn, though, from East Bayshore and that northeast elevation. I agree with Board Member Lew. I think that could use another round; it is rather blank. Let's see, did I cover it? There is the other piece in terms of the plants. When you show it in terms of the green screen wall, I think you're going to come back with landscape plans that are a little bit larger in scale so we can get a sense of the choices there in terms of... because it is a feature and it is kind of nice that it is on that side of the building and that we just want it to thrive. I can stop there. I will hand it back to Chair Osma.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Vice Chair Lee. Great. I share a lot of the similar opinions that have been expressed. Not all of them, so I will go in order and we will try to wrap at the end to try to come to a consensus. In general, I am also in support of the project. I appreciate how low-rise it is. I appreciate the horizon that it is kind of promoting. For the materials, the more I was looking at your elevations the more I started to notice this parti diagram where there is kind of like a sandwich where there were the tough metal materials that are overlaying on these natural materials. I am hearing some of my other Board Members' feedback and I can see pushing that a little bit more where --I like where the wood and the green walls are currently -- maybe there is an opportunity to introduce them on the Embarcadero side, the shorter side. I think also what is really lovely about reclaimed wood is being really close to it, so perhaps there is an opportunity to snake it through the interior and have it connect on the other side. There is kind of a cool experience for the customers to see that kind of relationship that you're creating between these more brand-appropriate materials and then this natural material that makes everyone feel a lot better. As it related to the Mercedes columns that are pretty typical, I don't have any love for them necessarily. I think the design as you have it now makes a lot of sense in this context. In some ways I think those other columns didn't really make much sense in this context. I think I would also even encourage pushing that natural palette even more. I think a previous iteration of those facades on that face the Baylands, that Board Member Lee and Lew mentioned, are a little blank. I think a previous iteration had just green screens in some locations where there was a little opportunity for greenery on those sides with a lot less maintenance. I think also because those sides face the Baylands there is some kind of good relationship to create there. I might even encourage a green roof. This is kind of a cool location and you're doing something really amazing with this green wall and how cool would it be to have that even creep over onto the roof? This is just some feedback for pushing your design concept but I think it is in a really good place right now. Hopefully, this feedback is helping to bring it even further. I am just going to mention that for the DEE I am okay with that DEE to not build to the line. I am also a big fan of those trees. I really would

hate to see those trees go away. I'm sort of in the camp where try to keep those trees at all costs. Try to make it work on the street side, if possible. I think I would support a proposal that keeps those trees at any cost. Let's see. I think everything has been said for the most part. All right. Is there any other discussion from other Board Members from things that they've heard others say?

Ms. Gerhardt: I was just taking some notes as well. There were some concerns about the loading spaces where off-site cars may be coming from. We talked about the bike path and the trees. Board Member Lew was also talking grade changes and how that may affect trees that are to remain. The carwash, we are aware and we will get a noise report for that. We definitely, for a formal application, will need lots more detail as far as details and elevations and landscape plans. Staff will make sure to get that. There was a question about where customers were going to wait and the path of travels internal to the site. I think those are the majors concerns or discussion items that I was picking up on. Maybe if we can ask the applicant if they had any questions before we move forward.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Iversen: This is Eric Iversen again. No specific questions. On the big general, if you would like me to answer a question on the vehicle storage, I could do that. If that's inappropriate we could wait for the future but I will keep that one really short. In the automotive industry, we go up and down with our inventory. Almost all of our facilities have short-term storage on a month-to-month basis as inventory changes over the year. The key is to not overdesign the site so that there is empty parking on-site but to find parking in an industrial area. We will have off-site vehicle storage of one kind or another. As far as the other items, I think there were a lot of great suggestions and I think we will take a look at how we can varyiate the façade and how to play around with the green walls and such stuff. It's all great ideas. We'll see what we can come up with.

Chair Thompson: Great, thank you. If there is nothing else...

Board Member Baltay: Osma, I have a question if I could?

Chair Thompson: Yeah, go ahead.

Board Member Baltay: Jodie, is the approval process now ARB to completion? We recommend approval and the Planning Department says it's okay or does it have to go to City Council again?

Ms. Gerhardt: Sorry, remind me, Sheldon, this is site and design though. Actually it would go through, PTC, ARB, and then the Council.

Board Member Baltay: This has to go back to the Council again?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, that's our standard site and design process because it is in the Baylands area and it has that D-overlay is why it needs to do that.

Board Member Baltay: Okay. The gist of my question is that I think the staff and the town as a whole is tired of keeping going over this same thing over and over again, and anything we can do to expedite this process... to the applicant, if you can find a way to really resolve that bike path issue it's going to really smooth your passage through all this regulatory stuff. To planning staff, is there just a way we can get the next application in front of us and one we can recommend approval on? Let's get the pieces together and make it go a lot smoother this time. I think everybody would really appreciate that, certainly I would. This has been quite a few times now to look at the same property.

Ms. Gerhardt: We agree and we will just make sure that we have all of those details that you expect with the materials.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. Thank you, Osma.

Chair Thompson: All right. Thank you. If there is nothing else, we will close this item and I believe Board Member Lee will be leaving.

Vice Chair Lee: Yes, thank you, Chair Osma. I will recuse myself given employment with Stanford.

Chair Thompson: Right.

Vice Chair Lee: Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [20PLN-00172]: Recommendation on Replacement of Wall Signs for Macy's that do not Comply with the Stanford Shopping Center Master Tenant Facade & Sign Program. Additionally, Consider Revisions to the Master Tenant Facade & Sign Program for Anchor Tenants. Environmental Assessment: Exempt per Guideline Section 15301. Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Vice Chair Lee: Yes, thank you, Chair Osma. I will recuse myself given employment with Stanford.

Chair Thompson: Right.

Vice Chair Lee: Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. All right. We will move on. Our next item is a public hearing/ quasi-judicial project 180 El Camino Real: recommendation of replacement of wall signs for Macy's that do not comply with the Stanford Shopping Center Master Tenant Facade & Sign Program. Additionally, considering revisions to the Master Tenant Facade & Sign Program for anchor tenants. Environmental Assessment: exempt per Guideline Section 15301. Staff? Oh, are there any disclosures? Sorry.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I visited the site.

Board Member Lew: I also visited the site and I did want to point out a couple items that I raise to staff. I saw some additional finds that aren't in our package, like new signs. I think there are like six or seven. Also, I wanted to point out to other Members of the Board, if you didn't go to the site that some of those existing wall signs are sort of like on axis and that is why they cross some of those construction joints in the brick.

Board Member Baltay: All of them, Alex.

Board Member Hirsch: David Hirsch, I visited the site and the board at City Hall, and yes, Alex, you're right. There are additional signs that were there I noticed. Some of them actually have the new graphics but they aren't apart of this presentation.

Chair Thompson: I appreciate the disclosures. I could not visit the site, I was out of town but I did visit the material board very, very late last night. All right, go ahead staff.

Samuel Gutierrez, Planner: Good morning, Board. Samuel Gutierrez, planner for this shopping center project planner here. I think this is out first, or at least my first, ARB of the year. Happy New Year!

Chair Thompson: Happy New Year.

Mr. Gutierrez: Good to see everybody virtually. We do have a presentation and I do appreciate the comment by Board Member Lew. I will be addressing those signs that he mentioned in his disclosures in the presentation.

[Setting up presentation.]

Mr. Gutierrez: This is the Stanford Shopping Center; the Macy's building. There used to be two Macy's buildings, now there's only one. This is the, I guess you would say, all-encompassing of Macy's at the Stanford Shopping Center located at 180 El Camino Real. Next slide. To provide some background and context, the Stanford Shopping Center has a Master Tenant Façade Sign Program, and the program was developed to regulate façade signage, materials, and design throughout the shopping center. It also provides the level of review that would be required based on tenant location and size. This was done to provide some consistency in the shopping center while allowing some variation; however, we did notice -- that is the second point of the recommended action -- that the anchor tenants were not specifically called out in the Master Tenant Façade Sign Program other than that they would require some type of ARB review or possible staff review. Macy's, the subject building -- also known as building K -- is a long-standard anchor tenant. It is the largest single-tenant building at the shopping center. The larger existing wall signs predate the Master Tenant Façade Program. As a result, signage does not comply with the Master Tenant Façade Program and any changes require a signage exemption, that's why we're here before you. Here's the site. Again, we can see the Macy's located here. I hope you all can see the cursor as I am hovering. These are the proposed large signs for the Macy's with their relative location pointed out. It should be noted that the signs are illuminated. The corporate Macy's star logo is internally illuminated, while the Macy's copy is halo illuminated. Here, we see that there are the other signs located at the corners at, I would say, interior mall entry at CL2 over the doorway there with the awning. Then, you see to the left on this slide the corners of the Macy's building. If you're entering from the parking lot in Sand Hill or coming from further down the way, like towards El Camino, and you go down that walkway you'll encounter these signs at the corner of the building. Again, the applicant is proposing to hang out these signs. Just a note, the brick panels that are around the façade of the building are 24 feet wide with pretty large band spacing. There is about a 5-inch separation between each of the façade panels. That is just something to note as the ARB considers the proportions of the signs and the layout on the building. The existing signage versus the proposed, again the existing signage does not comply with the Master Tenant Façade Program. It does comply with the sign code, however. If we were just to apply the Palo Alto Municipal Sign Code from Title 16, the wall signage on the building does not exceed the limitations per that code. The applicant is proposing smaller signs than what is existing. The conflict there is that if we apply the Master Tenant Façade Program limit for the signs, they would be limited to only 24 inches tall; only two feet tall. I believe the existing signs are approximately five-feet tall. That is a very dramatic change, and, again, this is one of the largest buildings in the entire shopping center. It is interesting there. This is considered a four-sided and it doesn't touch any other shopping center mass or continuous buildings with smaller tenants. It is a standalone. It does have one of the arcades over it that do kind of span between the buildings. Here is this additional signage that was brought up. The signage is displayed inside of the entries where there are concrete frames that project out. On the larger archway entries -- the one from the parking lot or the entry facing towards the Neiman Marcus building and the Apple Store, for example, in the first slide -- they are really right next to the door, as you can see here in this lower left photo. Again, this is on the lower right, this is that corner signage near the storefront to give people wayfinding abilities there. These signs are actually quite small. We liked them to secondary signage -- I will go in a bit more detail on the next slide -- in terms of the Master Tenant Façade Program, but also like wayfinding signs because if you do approach the building from the interior of the mall you will not see the large wall sign. You will see these kinds of corner or doorway signs. The signs themselves, in the doorway in particular, measure approximately six square feet. They're not very large. They are just pin-mounted flat, acrylic letters. Going here for the proposed signage to the Master Tenant Façade Program, again, the limit there is the height conflict where you are limited to 24 inches tall. Then, also, you're only limited to one primary wall sign. Again, this was considering the vast majority of tenants that really only have one wall or perhaps have a secondary wall with no entry if they're a corner tenant at some of the other buildings in the shopping center. Not a freestanding anchor tenant like the Macy's building K is. Here we can see, again, another example of the application of the Master Tenant Façade Program. We have a storefront and then we have a secondary wall where you don't see an entry for secondary signage to find your way to that store. Here, we can see that the height criteria is spelled out across the tenant's space façade. There is, of course, the 36-inch limit but that would be for stacked signs like into the north face copy, something like that where there are two lines of tenant name copy work whereas Macy's is a single line. Moving on, we have the sign exception that, again, requires findings to be made in support of the approval. This one here in

particular requests to exceed the maximum number of signage total of signs and the height per the approved Master Tenant Façade Sign Program, again the 24-inch height limit. Here, we have identified them in bullet points. Moving on. The sign exception, again, these are the required finings. There are some exceptional or extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property. That is generally not applicable to the other properties there. In considering the shopping center as its own neighborhood, if you will, because, of course, the shopping center is either surrounded by Stanford land, many forests of Redwoods, or medical buildings and then there is Ronald McDonald House on Sand Hill, and some retirement communities further down before you get to the medical center. In looking at that, if we were to apply the Master Tenant Façade Program as is to the Macy's building, it would be a little strange considering how large the Macy's building is in comparison to the standard tenant spaces, which are approximately 20 feet tall where this one is over 50 feet tall with a large façade. We are talking about a building that is over 200,000 square feet of retail space versus the standard tenant space in the shopping center varies from 1,000 to 10,000 square feet. There are some larger buildings, like the Fleming's or the Wilkes Bashford, that do have more square feet. It would just seem a little strange to apply the Master Tenant Façade Program there and we made the finding that it would be a little burdensome there and assume it would be exceptional for this to have this grant. The second finding noted here, this would preserve the ability of the Macy's building to stand out with its presence in the shopping center to have larger signage and be identified that way. It is the top anchor tenant in terms of size. Then, of course, granting an approval would not be detrimental to any health or general welfare of convenience; these are just signs, and they are not changing any land or creating any safety violations. Through this application, we found, again, that there was a flaw in the Master Tenant Façade Program. We got the consistency. I could say after years of applying this program it has created a pretty good consistency in the shopping center and efficiency; however, again, when it comes to these anchor tenants, we find this issue as identified with Macy's. Here you can see this is the guidelines in the top right from the Master Tenant Façade Program where we created a map of the different buildings in the general shopping center mass and the parameters for review are identified there. Here, you can see in this table that the Macy's building K is the largest anchor tenant at the shopping center just by square feet and sheer size when you look at it in the map of the entire shopping center. Again, when we developed the program, we didn't fully consider the context of the anchors in terms of their signage and even some other details. That is where we would seek more conversation there. Again, the intent of the program was to be adjusted over time so we could modify and change things understanding that the retail environment may change over time at the shopping center. That is where we have potentially an opening now to make some modifications. Staff does seek the guidance of the ARB on refinement suggestions of where we would go forward from this. Again, these are the parameters here for the shopping center signage in particular. We can see that this table here seems to better fit with the smaller tenants, but when looking at the limits of the signage and the size it doesn't really seem fitting for 50-foot-tall buildings with over 100,000 square feet in floor area. In the staff report, it was noted that we suggested a starting point conversation might be that the maximum signage could be considered, perhaps, 80 percent of the wall area allowed by the Palo Alto Municipal Sign Code. That is noted here in table three. In concept, if we apply that type of limitation, for example, to the Macy's signage now, that would limit the project to a maximum sign area per wall of 162 square feet rather than 203 maximum because the building is so big it actually reaches the very top maximum for wall signage. Again, just a little conversation starter there. Moving forward to the recommendation, we recommend for the ARB to recommend approval of the proposed project, the sign exception, to the Director of Planning and Development Services, based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval. Also, to provide direction to staff regarding the future application of the Master Tenant Façade Program for anchor tenants. That wraps up the presentation.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Sam. Do we have a presentation by the applicant?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

[Setting up presentation.]

Bill Comer: My name is Bill Comer, All California Signs is my company. I think Samuel presented the case.

Chair Thompson: Sorry. Could you spell your name?

Mr. Comer: [Spells name].

Chair Thompson: Thanks. You have ten minutes.

Mr. Comer: Okay. I think Samuel presented the case quite well. When they developed the Master Sign Program for the shopping center, they didn't take into account what the needs of the anchor tenants would be. What I have put here is to show that the pictures... in the sign business that is what we are doing is pictures. This one up here in the corner...

Mr. Gutierrez: You have to share your screen.

[Setting up presentation.]

Mr. Comer: What I did is I put this is what is existing and this one is what the sign program would allow, and the bottom left is what we're asking for. On this particular elevation view, what we gave to Sam crosses this architectural line here but now we have brought it back in to fit inside the two lines. Bloomingdale's was almost eight years back now and the same thing. This bottom one here would have been what was allowed by the sign program and this top view is what you gave us a variance for. As you can see, it is pretty tiny and hard to read on the bottom one. Nieman Marcus, I assume that sign has been up there quite a while. It is quite large but this is the difference in size and how it would look on the building if we went with the sign program. That's pretty much my whole presentation. I think we need a little larger sign. None of these signs are visible from the street. They all are visible only from the interior of the mall. These are three signs that we're asking for the variance on. This is the side of the building that faces the new parking lot. I guess it would be the south side of the shopping center I believe. If you stand there and look all the way to the other side of the mall you would see [distortion]. Then this one is the one we started out looking at. Other than that, I can answer any questions you have.

Chair Thompson: thank you. Does anybody on the board have any questions for staff or the applicant?

Board Member Hirsch: I do.

Chair Thompson: Go ahead, Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, in our package here on page four in the packet, the Macy's sign that faces the plaza area where the Apple Store is it shows Macy's overlapping the line on...

Mr. Comer: Let me go to that slide. You're talking about this one, correct?

Board Member Hirsch: No, facing...

Mr. Comer: This one. You're talking about this one?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Mr. Comer: Yeah, I noticed this when I got ready to do this presentation today that we had an old photo in there showing but this on here is how we want the sign to look.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Mr. Comer: We have gone through several variations sent to the mall for approval and Stanford for approval and getting it the same and back and it looks like I made a mistake in there.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Just one more here just to make sure. On page six of eight where there are lower display windows, CL3. Could you go to that one just to make sure that it is doing what I see on the drawings? Okay, that one and that one. Is that where it's going to be, the one to the right there?

Mr. Comer: I don't like the looks of it. It was put there because that just matches where the old one was but we didn't discuss it is the answer. I am sure they wouldn't be averse to moving it to one side or the other, probably to the left side of the... I would have to look at the post and stuff to see how much visual impact, you know. Are we impacted where people see coming down those long corridors leading into the mall? I would be happy to move it one way or the other.

Board Member Hirsch: It is kind of a moving target, right, when we're walking this way the columns holding up the roof structure there.

Mr. Comer: Yeah, it is pretty cluttered in there.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. Okay, well, thank you.

Chair Thompson: Any more questions?

Board Member Baltay: Yes, Osma, I have a question for staff, for Sam. Sam, the Master Tenant Façade Sign Program, is that established as a bureaucratic policy or is that something legislatively approved by City Council?

Mr. Gutierrez: We approved it by staff via the ARB. We didn't go to City Council by that.

Board Member Baltay: It's different from the Town's Sign Ordinance, which is part of the Municipal Code. Is that correct?

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct. It is, in effect, an expanded master sign program. That is the more typical thing that gets presented to the Board, where in this case we did a Master Sign and Façade Program with the intention to, again, create some continuity in terms of materials and design because you might recall in past years the shopping center facades would not go all the way up to the top parapet. There would be the old mall; you would see the old corrugated concrete band at the top. This program actually kind of codified the concept moving forward of any new tenant that comes in that still has that old band has to complete their façade all of the way up. We say you have to go all the way up as noted in the façade program. Then, the signage, again, creates consistency. We don't necessarily say that there is a square foot limit, but there is a height limit and locations are called out to create that internal consistency at the shopping center.

Board Member Baltay: Okay. Then, within this sign program is there a definition of an anchor tenant? Is that some place established?

Mr. Gutierrez: No, there is not a definition of an anchor tenant in the sign program.

Board Member Baltay: Do you have one that you propose then or do you how do you propose to make that work?

Mr. Gutierrez: I believe that it would be a square footage threshold along with building type. In terms of an anchor tenant, we broached the subject before at the ARB approximately two years ago now, I believe, when we went with the sign exception for Pacific Catch, which is a larger tenant within a bigger shopping center or building and them having multiple sides. In that discussion, we found that we couldn't support the exemption because it wasn't actually an anchor tenant. Taking that conversation and applying it moving forward, a proposal would be a standalone building with square feet exceeding 30,000 square feet. That would actually identify most of the retail department stores or even the forthcoming, under construction Restoration Hardware building would be considered an anchor tenant. That would be language that we



would use moving forward, and it would be a good suggestion to incorporate that into a modification of the program.

Board Member Baltay: Okay. I had seen in your report someplace a statement along the lines of any building that is single-occupancy would essentially meet our anchor tenant building.

Mr. Gutierrez: Right.

Board Member Baltay: I am concerned about that because there are some that are very small that are obviously not anchor tenants, like Shake Shack for example.

Mr. Gutierrez: Right. Shake Shack is Building W and they are connected with the P.F. Chang's. Perhaps the Fleming's would be an example of a single-tenant building but it is not anywhere near the size of the Macy's or Neiman Marcus or Bloomingdale's.

Board Member Baltay: I am just trying to understand the legislative nature of the Master Tenant Sign Program. Aren't these generally coming from an applicant, or in this case, owner of the shopping center rather than from planning staff? It seems like you guys are writing these programs? Is that the way it is usually done?

Mr. Gutierrez: Originally, it was a collaborative effort. The shopping center via Simons [phonetic] sought to more standardized the process in the shopping center. Instead of it being a case-by-case scenario which would develop a lot of variation and inconsistencies. Also, staff seeing the shopping center and all of the turnover for some of these smaller tenants, we saw the need to develop a program to create consistency and an understanding to deal with the normal tenants that come in and out or refresh their storefronts. That became a collaborative effort between staff and the property owner.

Board Member Baltay: Is it still collaborative or is it something that you are doing now?

Mr. Gutierrez: We work with Simon regularly on it. This in particular was brought to Simon's attention. They did not object to us seeking potential modifications for the anchor tenants. The anchor tenants themselves, at least the department stores and larger buildings, don't readily change over. These are the longstanding tenants of the shopping center; they are the big tenants. Again, this does not come up very often at all.

Board Member Baltay: Okay, thanks for answering the question, Sam. That's what I wanted to know. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Any other questions for staff or the applicant? Great. Do we have any members of the public that would like to speak, Vinh?

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Thompson, we do not have any public comments for this item.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. I guess we will bring this back to the Board now. Board Member Hirsch, would you like to go first.

[Setting up screen.]

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, thank you. Where do start? I think I would do it from the numbers on the pamphlet that we received. We would start with C01, which is -- as everybody pointed out -- across from the parking lot. These new graphics are replacing these old graphics which are really on this side rather humongous. By the way, let's just start by saying it is an incredible improvement to the graphics, period. The star is terrific; I think the use of the star again rather than some other element is a nice idea for the hyphen. The scale of the Macy's letters are very nice. The propositions of them look very nice to me. It is a major improvement, so thank you for that. I am sure you worked with the Macy's people on this and however that came about, I don't know, but it is a big improvement. On this particular one, you come out

of that parking lot and I was trying to think where are these people going to see this sign. They actually come from various locations, even if the crosswalks are at a corner here. They would still see the building from different locations because the access to the parking lot is a different area. I almost feel like a second sign at the other corner just similar to this one might be a good idea, but this is certainly a nicer proportioned sign. Then you have the entry right there immediately entering. Most people I think are going to know if they are parking in that area they are going to be going to Macy's, perhaps on the way to somewhere else, but this is a big improvement. C02 over the side door facing Bloomingdale's as you pointed out is, again, much better proportioned lower down. I sort of felt as you show these graphics what would be kind of nice for us would be to see the entire wall and to see where the graphics are on the wall relative to the mass of the building all the way to the roof to the ground just as a presentation. It certainly looks fine here. My thought was that it could be a little bit lower and still look nice and proportioned to the wall, but it's not a critical comment really. C03, I really have a problem, as you do, Mr. Comer, with it crossing over the line. You are, after all, fixing up the wall where previous signs are going to be removed and putting in the new sign so I don't know why you couldn't move that sign away from the dividing line of brick break line on the outside of the building and put it over the window itself. I mean, it just doesn't work for me there at all. As we discussed, you come down the lane from the parking lot and you will see it from one location or another. It is a fine identity at some point along there that you won't miss, basically. I personally cannot accept that version. Moving on to C04, that is fine. That is a nice location. You do see it coming in and it works well with the display window. It is perfect right there. Then, the final one, thank heavens. You moved that to the next panel over and you managed to incorporate the entire larger sign, larger but not as large as the original. I think in proportion to the wall... although we can't see that drawing and maybe the next submission we'll get to see it if we don't approve these right now. The only thing I am kind of wondering about is that there is almost an opportunity to do something else on this wall and keep the wall clean because in going into the store itself that is... the way in which the outside structure works with the planting behind it growing up, the major archway with a lot of openings in it to the store... actually there is this kind of vertical grid holding up the canopy in some way that is above the door and the first part of it up to the upper windows and upper archway there is really doing nothing. The inside of the store blanks out. If it is supposed to windows that you're looking at you don't see them when you're inside the store. You almost feel like right above that major door that faces out to a major plaza wouldn't have your graphics on it to be closed off as a paneled area and coordinated with a better paint job, et cetera, all around the entry there. I mean, this is a major change, I will agree, but if I were voting on this, I would say put the sign right there in that major point of entry to the building. It is a major access inside, so why isn't the signage within that? If I were Macy's, I would want it there. Then again, of course, when you're stepping far back in that little plaza area there you do want to see it. I think, therefore, the lighting of it would have to be different for nighttime viewing. But just sticking it up on the wall there doesn't, for me, do the trick. It is not important enough, but the archway would coordinate all of the graphics into the design of this building. Other than that, I would say I approve the graphics themselves with those couple of changes I think that the scaling down of Macy's on this major store and generally speaking throughout the shopping center, as you pointed out, is a big improvement in the graphics. However, that is achieved with Sam, and the city, and the sign program it could be like a new program for the standalone large building of a certain size. Thank you.

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

Board Member Lew: Okay, thank you. I think the signs generally are looking good. I would say I have some similar comments to David. One is on sign CL3, I think that the alignment is off. The location is off. It seems to me it could be aligned with the window or it could be aligned between the columns and the sidelights, but it is not working as it is. I think that one needs to shift somehow. Sign CL4, as I looked at it on the site it is too low. If you're coming in from clarying court [phonetic] alignment there are some new planters with trees and I think the sign is hidden by the tops of the trees. I can accept it as is it, but it seems like it is not quite working as well as it could be. I am okay with the CL5 sign location. I think that is fine. On the master sign program, I pulled up my old notes from 2015. I didn't take a lot of notes on the document but I think maybe if we want more clarity on what the Board wanted before I think it was condition of approval number 23. I think that the Board wanted to see any signs if they were larger dimensions. The Board clearly understood that the anchor tenants were not going to comply with this particular document. I don't need to see 24-inch sign letters. We know that that is not going to work and

the Board knew that at the time. My recollection is that Simons- said that they were very complicated lease agreements with these anchor tenants and how much visibility they had to have, and that they couldn't just put it in one simplified master sign program. I think in that sense I am okay with keeping it as is where it just has to come back to the Board or to staff. I think we should note, too, though, that if you try to create an anchor tenant definition, I think what will happen is you're going to have things like Restoration Hardware and Anthropology say that they're anchor tenants. We already had that when the Anthropology store came in. They wanted to build their building to look like an anchor tenant and the board said we really want you to fit in with the smaller buildings. If the staff wanted to simplify it, I am actually okay with it, but I think we have to set the threshold pretty high; I would say higher than the Anthropology store. That's where I am. I don't know what the other Board Members are feeling, but I think that this should come back. It seems like there are enough inconsistencies in these drawings that we could do it one more time. If time is of the essence, then I am okay with this maybe coming back to subcommittee. Thanks.

Chair Thompson: Thanks, Board Member Lew. Board Member Baltay.

Board Member Baltay: Thanks, Osma. Thanks, everybody. I am okay with the signs as presented as long as sign CL3 gets shifted left or right as Board Members Hirsch and Lew have commented. I will also comment that I think sign CL3 and sign CL4 should probably be at the same elevation. Alex may well be correct that CL4 is too low but I believe those two are seen along the same façade with the same relationship to the decorative windowfront underneath. I am perfectly fine letting the applicant make decisions on how those are placed in detail, as long as CL3 is shifted so it is not going across the brick pattern. We can leave it to staff to make that final evaluation; this is an internal shopping center thing. I am okay with the sign exception allowing the larger signs. If anything, CL1 should be bigger, although then it wouldn't fit with the brick patterning on the wall, so I am perfectly fine with the way it is there. To me, the bigger issue is whether we try to sort of put all of this into the sign program. I agree completely with what Alex just said. I think that coming up with a definition of an anchor tenant is going to be problematic, and because they are so rare that we have this issue anyway I think it is much better to bring it to the review board when you have a case of the sign being larger than what the program calls for. I think, Sam, you have an excellent idea of what is likely to be approved and such and you can advise tenants of that. You have clearly established this four-foot-four-inches seems to be about the right size for these larger buildings. I think you will find that if you try to actually write it down and put it into code it gets complicated and you really just opened yourself up to odd questions and arguments, which you don't have. I have to say, I am a little bit uncomfortable that you're spending city money and time coming up with what really should be an applicant's responsibility. This is Simon Properties shopping mall and they should be coming to you with a request for a sign program that we can approve. It just struck me. I thought this was something that the City Council had voted on and that we really need to go through them. On the flip side of all of that, I have to say that, Jodie, you and your staff have done an excellent job managing this shopping center. Sam has been really focused and wonderful. It is fantastic to have one person, one very capable planner looking this over. Sam is absolutely right, that the consistency of signage and design as a whole, consistency of the approval process has really improved and it is something that you want to keep going and keep and keep working on. I give you latitude that way and maybe if you really feel you need to improve the sign program, fine, put time into it but work with the applicant. You've got to come up with a better definition of anchor tenants. I will caution you; I don't think you can do it but you've done a great job so far so I don't want to handicap you on what you're doing. I think right what we have is working. The few times where we have a big sign, we are happy to look at it. As you can tell from our comments, we are focused and caring enough about it that you don't need to legislate every piece of it. I think what is before us today is otherwise quite approvable. To that effect, I have made a few changes to some of the findings, but why don't we finish with Osma's comments, and then if she wants us to we can get into that. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Sure, thank you. All right. I will kind of repeat and add to it. CL1 appears to be good across the board. CL2 is also okay. Agree with my fellow Board Members that CL3 should be adjusted. I did have a note that I think it should be aligned right-justified with the window edge so that it is still close to its original location but justified on the right side to maximize visibility. CL4 I agree that it should be maintained at the same height. If it is too low because of the trees, that might be an issue and it might

not be the right location. I will trust Board Member Lew's note on that because I did not see that. For CL5, I do appreciate Board Member Hirsch's suggestion for CL5 being within the arch. I was kind of struggling with that a little bit as well because we all noticed that it was straddling the line, and I understand the applicant shoes to put it on the right side but that arch has some depth and if you are standing right where the arch is then potentially the arch would obscure that sign if it is on the right side. I had a thought maybe it might be better to put it on the left side. Then Board Member Hirsch came up with the idea of putting it in the middle of the arch. I do think in the middle of the arch it would be the most straightforward place to put because that's where you're entering. I think CL5 potentially needs a little bit more discussion. I did hear Board Member Baltay and Lew say that they are okay with that location, but maybe we should do a straw poll on that in a minute. We are getting rid of these big signs and I have a huge concern that they are going to leave shadow marks behind them against the façade. I don't know if there is something in the conditions to make sure that when we get rid of that that there is some sort of way to clean it or something. I am not sure how you clean something that is cleaner than everything else around it but some way to blend it in. Then, for the sign exception program, for the anchor tenant issue I am really less-fussed with that. It is really more about how this sign relates to the wall. I actually think it is more about the architecture that it is being put against rather than how much money this potential tenant is bringing in, which is kind of how I understand an anchor tenant. You know, really, I think the reason these changes make sense is because this is a bigger building and the shopping center has a lot of smaller-scale stuff which calls for smaller-scale signs. This is a bigger-scale building and therefore it calls for bigger-scale signs. I think proportion is really more what I think needs to be considered over whether it is an anchor tenant or not. That is all of my notes. I wrote we should potentially do a straw poll for the height of CL4, and then a straw poll for CL5 in terms of how we feel about the location of that. Let's start with CL4. Do we feel like it is too low where it is? Let's start with Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: I thought that -- actually Alex could clarify this -- he was really talking about CL2 when he talked about the height of the signs because the signs that are above those windows should match up because the two of them are on the same façade. CL4 and...

Chair Thompson: And CL3.

Board Member Hirsch: CL3, yeah. The height of those should be similar above the display window. Alex was mentioning -- I think, so he should clarify for us -- CL2 and the height of that which I thought would be a little lower. He mentioned the trees further along that alleyway, I believe that is what the discussion was, so that that particular Macy's, he thought, should be higher. I also mentioned the fact that it isn't being shown with a full wall elevation. It is a little hard to tell proportionately. The whole idea of presenting signs should be something that is done almost with different perspective angles, your step backs, and the alleyway that's in front with the open plaza in front. Then you get closer to it relative to the canopy and where the canopy's perspective might interrupt the proportion above. That would make it easier to see, but, first of all, are we talking about CL2 or are we talking about CL4, Alex.

Chair Thompson: Yeah, why don't you clarify Board Member Lew.

Ms. Gerhardt: I believe you were doing a straw poll on CL4, correct?

Chair Thompson: I was. I was doing a straw poll on the height of CL4.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I would think it is hard for us to do a poll if there isn't any information to see the issue. I could send you guys a photo at the moment that I took yesterday but maybe it is better just to either have it come back or we just approve it with whatever minor adjustments.

Board Member Baltay: How about if we just say that CL3 and CL have to align, Alex, and then they can decide what height exactly with the planning staff.

Chair Thompson: We would have to ask them to consider the height if that's what we want to do for both of them.

Ms. Gerhardt: The applicant just needs some general direction. If we want to bring this back to subcommittee, if we want to bring to staff, just who to bring it back to would be the question.

Board Member Baltay: I am okay with it going to staff, as long as they are the same height; I think the applicant and staff can figure it out. That is my straw poll vote.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Lew: I will agree with that.

Board Member Hirsch: I would agree with that.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I think it should come to subcommittee, but this is a democracy.

Board Member Hirsch: I agree with that, too.

Board Member Baltay: I think, Osmo, we have so many things we're trying to do with the planning staff right now. This is just not high on the list.

Chair Thompson: There are other things too. Let's talk about CL5; Board Member Hirsch had a suggestion for a different location. I would be open to that, and also even whether it is on the left side or the right side of that joint. Can I hear some opinions on CL5?

Board Member Baltay: I am okay with it where it is proposed on the façade. I think it is crossing the joint but it seems to me still that it works. I think it would be fine in the middle of the arch, but I don't want to be designing this for the applicant. If they wanted it there, they should propose it there. It is a big change from how the sign will function and I am not comfortable just mandating that.

Chair Thompson: To clarify, the applicant showed today that it is no longer straddling that joint. The applicant showed it on the right side of the joint today, which I understand is the...

Board Member Baltay: I am fine with that, too.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Board Member Lew.

Board Member Lew: You know, I actually have fond memories of looking out that window, as well as the other big arch window. You used to be able to see out. My recollection is it was floor-to-ceiling glass, and so I think I am okay with the wall sign. It seems to me if you do try to fit a halo-lit sign there then it is going to look completely different than the other signs, right, because the lighting is internal and it is bouncing off of the brick. It seems to me that that would be a different animal altogether. If you're trying to do that, I would think that you're actually trying to do an awning sign, perhaps, or something like a canopy sign. I think I am not supporting moving that one.

Chair Thompson: Do you have an opinion on whether it is on the left side of the construction joint or the right side?

Board Member Lew: I think what the applicant showed today in the presentation is better than the drawing set.

Chair Thompson: Sorry, that wasn't my question. It was a question of whether the sign should be entirely on the right side or entirely on the left side of the joint. The applicant showed today on the right side and I had mentioned that might get obscured by the architecture.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, but I haven't seen the other option, right?

Chair Thompson: Okay. I'll note you down as okay with it.

Board Member Lew: (Inaudible) better setting back farther, like the photo simulations would be actually better showing more of the context.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Board Member Hirsch, on CL5?

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, the point you raise is a good one, I think, whether to the right or to the left of that particular joint. In other examples here, it is kept on the right-hand side. No, I am sorry. Excuse me, it is kept on the end of the building. It is too bad we couldn't see it in that location and the proportioned... I don't know if by putting it there -- because both of those panels seem to be approximately the same size -- it would feel cramped at the end wall but I think, Osma, you raise the issue and it is too bad... we should really ask to see it. That pushes us a little bit more into the committee versus us not seeing it again. Alex mentioned a couple of reasons why; I just think Macy's should be part of the discussion of the door and signage and in changing scope because I am not denying that it isn't a major scope change to put it in the arch, but it is not a bad idea in terms of what would be possible, even if it led to them building a background for the sign to be against that simply took up the space of all of the non-usable windows. Inside those ceilings have been dropped and you can't see out that, and Alex's memory of having light behind him coming through isn't there anymore. It just isn't inside, so the outside, which is not exactly pretty structural element, could very well be done differently where we would create a background for the sign within the arch. All of that said, I admit, it is a much more major change in how this is done. It involves more than just putting a sign on the side of the building. If this is a suggestion that others would agree is worth studying while we, let's say, discuss this other major sign on the side of this building, then why not suggest it? That's why I did because I think it is a much better location if it were in the arch. If this word could get back to Macy's and to Simons, if it were considered, I think it would be a benefit to the whole shopping center to make that kind of improvement.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Baltay: Osma, I'll defer; if you as Chair would like this to go to subcommittee, I can easily support that.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I am going to really quickly share my screen to show at least what Google Earth shows on the street view. This is the sign in question and we are discussing... can you guys see? Okay. I feel like it is a good time to make a motion.

Board Member Baltay: Osma, I would like to modify some of the findings, perhaps, because I am concerned about them supporting a change to the whole program if it's okay.

Chair Thompson: Sure, go ahead.

Board Member Baltay: Finding one, this is the ARB findings on page 19 of our packet here. Finding here, the sixth line down there is a break in the sentence. It says "signage are either 43.75 or 66 square feet in area." I believe all of the text after that should just be struck from the rationale. I think all of that is just supporting a change to the program rather than the sign that we are approving. Similarly, down in the second, the project is consistent with finding two because... let's see. Really, we should just strike to where it is the very last two words on this page "the proposed signage is of a consistent design and illumination on each façade, creating a sense of order." I think that is sufficient rationale for approving it again, striking the first three-and-a-half lines. Then, I would like to strike the last sentence of the rationale for line three, which is that "while the reverse halo illuminate provides a modern look and sleek appearance at night..." I would like to strike that from the rationale for a finding. I don't think that's something we want to necessarily support. With the indulgence of my colleagues, I recommend those changes to the findings.

Chair Thompson: I am okay with that. Do Board Members Lew or Hirsch have any comment?

Board Member Hirsch: No.

Board Member Baltay: If you would like, Osma, I can make a motion based on that.

Chair Thompson: Sure.

Board Member Baltay: Alex, are you okay with that?

Chair Thompson: I saw Alex nod. Alex, we can't hear you.

### **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: I will move that we recommend approval of this project with the following items to come back to subcommittee: 1) sign CL3 be shifted left or right to avoid the break in the building façade; and 2) sign CL5 be properly shown at the location desired, and also that the applicant consider placing the sign instead under the archway; 3) would be that the findings be changed as I previously mentioned. That is my motion.

Chair Thompson: Do we have a second?

### **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT**

Board Member Hirsch: I suggest an amendment that CL5...

Chair Thompson: Wait, sorry. I didn't hear a second. Was that Board Member Lew?

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Motion by Baltay, seconded by Lew. Did you want to add a friendly amendment?

Board Member Hirsch: Friendly amendment. I would suggest that CL5 be considered on the left-hand brick panel as an alternate to go along with the rest of them.

Board Member Baltay: You're saying, David, we should just tell them to put it on the left-hand panel when they put it up on the wall?

Board Member Hirsch: If it is on the wall it should be considered on the left-hand panel, which we haven't seen.

Board Member Baltay: That's fine with me. Alex?

Board Member Lew: Sure. What is the exact language? Consider?

Chair Thompson: It's consider.

Board Member Lew: Or are you dictating?

Chair Thompson: It's consider.

Board Member Lew: (Inaudible) consider.

### **FRIENDLY AMENDMENT**

Chair Thompson: Okay, consider. Can I also add a friendly amendment?

Board Member Baltay: You can try, Osma.

Chair Thompson: That we ask the applicant to consider aligning CL3 and CL4 to the same height.

Board Member Baltay: Absolutely, I forgot about that. Yes, thank you. I support that completely.

Board Member Lew: Okay, I am fine with that.

Chair Thompson: Okay. If there is nothing else, motion by Baltay and seconded by Lew. Can we have a roll call vote?

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

No: (0)

Absent: Lee (1)

**MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 4-0-1.**

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair Thompson, do we want to go ahead and nominate the subcommittee members at this time?

Chair Thompson: Sure. Board Member Baltay looks like he just stepped away but I'll suggest Board Member Baltay and Board Member Hirsch.

Ms. Gerhardt: See, when you walk away you get assignments, right?

**Approval of Minutes**

- 4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 3, 2020

Chair Thompson: Okay to move on? Great. Next item is approval of minutes. We have the draft Architectural Review Board meeting minutes of December 3<sup>rd</sup>. I am going to wait for Board Member Baltay to come back to approve these because I was absent for them. We probably need more than two people to vote on the minutes. Or do we?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, we do need a quorum. Actually, he is back. There we go.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Baltay: I am here. We are going to approve the draft meeting minutes for December 3<sup>rd</sup>. I will abstain because I was not present. Does someone have a motion?

**MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: Sure. I will move to approve the minutes from December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2020.

Board Member Hirsch: Second.

Chair Thompson: Motion by Baltay, seconded by Hirsch. Can we get a vote?

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lew (3)

No: (0)

Abstain: Thompson (1)

Absent: Lee (1)

**MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 3-0-1-1.**



5. Draft Architectural Board Meeting Minutes for December 17, 2020

**MOTION**

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Next item is the draft Architectural Review Board meeting minutes from December 17, 2020. I move that we approve these meeting minutes.

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Chair Thompson: Motion by Thompson, seconded by Baltay. Can we get 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. Okay, our next item is board member comments, questions or announcements. Alex, do we have any update on the NVCAP item?

Board Member Lew: Sure. The NVCAP went to the Planning Commission on January 13th for a second hearing. I think the Planning Commission gave a lot of good comments about modifying the three alternatives to make them more financially feasible. Also, there was a prescreening for 2951 El Camino. It was actually a second prescreening at the City Council, and that is within the NVCAP project area.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, the project at 2951 El Camino is a prescreening right now. We have heard from the applicant that it will come back as a formal application, then it would come to the Board at that time. This would be for a PHZ, planned community rezoning. It could go through all, the PTC, ARB, and City Council ultimately.

Board Member Lew: Right. Also, just in the news if you guys have been following it, one of the property owners in the NVCAP area is proposing an office overlay for their properties. That's going to the City Council on March 1<sup>st</sup>. Everybody is looking out for their own interest there it sounds like, so stay tuned.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah. I think with 3045 Park -- thank you for these reminders, Alex -- is zoned GM as are a bunch of those other buildings right there. Some of the other buildings have grandfathered office uses but because this building is brand new it doesn't have that grandfathering. They are allowed to do research and development but they have not been able to find such a tenant. So, they are proposing additional office uses, and, as you said, that will be reviewed by Council.

Board Member Lew: Also, that Park project technically is not within the official NVCAP boundaries.

Ms. Gerhardt: It's just on the other side of the street. Is that correct?

Board Member Lew: Some of the planning staff have been thinking about adding that to the boundaries and to consider the housing over on those sites as well. Also, the developer owns the old HP Cloudera site as well.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, Cloudera and also 2747. They own three properties right there.

Chair Thompson: Thank you for that update. We all got the reminder earlier that the objective standards will be presented at our next meeting. Just a reminder to the public to send any comment sin on that. Any other comments before we adjourn?

Board Member Lew: I've got a couple more.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Lew: In January, William Riggs on the Planning Commission had to resign. There are three vacancies, and the Council is scheduled to meet on February 8th to do the PTC as well as the HRB appointments. Also, there are a whole bunch of other housing projects coming in. It sounds like there are quite a few projects coming in. We really need to get to work on the objective standards. I think it is really critical that we really focus on that. I think that is going to be the biggest thing that the Board has ever had to tackle.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you, Alex. We did over Christmas and the New Year receive a bunch of new housing projects, which we are excited about, but, yes, we also need to make sure we have the proper regulations in place. I do appreciate all of the work that has gone into those objective standards. It is our goal to finish those in the summer, but to get them through the ARB before then because we need to go to Council in the summer. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: All right. Thank you. Thanks, everyone. Happy New Year. The meeting is adjourned.

Board Member Hirsch: Congratulations on your first.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, first meeting.

Board Member Baltay: (Inaudible).

Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: Take care, everyone.

Chair Thompson: All right. Take care.

### **Adjournment**