



CITY OF  
**PALO  
ALTO**

# Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 14529)

---

**Report Type:** Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 7/7/2022

**Summary Title:** Minutes of May 19, 2022

**Title:** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 19, 2022

**From:** Jonathan Lait

## Recommendation

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

## Background

Draft minutes from the May 19, 2022 Architectural Review Board (ARB) are available in Attachment A.

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

## Attachments:

- Attachment A: Minutes of May 19, 2022 (DOCX)



## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES: May 19, 2022

Council Chamber & Virtual Meeting  
8:30 AM

### **Call to Order / Roll Call**

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in Council Chamber and virtual teleconference at 8:30 a.m.

Present: Chair Osma Thompson (participating virtually), Vice Chair David Hirsch, Boardmember Peter Baltay, Boardmember Yingxi Chen, Boardmember Kendra Rosenberg

Absent: None

### **Oral Communications**

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, stated there were none.

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

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, stated there were none.

### **City Official Reports**

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

Ms. Gerhardt shared her screen with the ARB and displayed the ARB 2022 Meeting Schedule. All future meetings are currently scheduled to be held in hybrid format. The June 2, 2022 hearing has been cancelled for lack of items, so the next scheduled hearing is June 16, 2022.

### **Action Items**

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [22PLN-00028]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Board Level Architectural Review application to allow for a new storefront façade and signage for Brilliant Earth retail tenant (formerly Marimekko – Space #71, Bldg. D). Environmental Assessment: Exempt From CEQA per Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Tamara Harrison at [Tamara.Harrison@mbakerintl.com](mailto:Tamara.Harrison@mbakerintl.com)

Chair Thompson introduced the item and called for disclosures.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he visited the site and corresponded with staff regarding requesting the applicant provide more detail about the public exit on the right hand side of the façade.

Boardmember Rosenberg disclosed that she visited the site.

Vice Chair Hirsch disclosed that he previously visited the site.

Boardmember Chen disclosed that she visited the site.

Chair Thompson disclosed that she also visited the site. She called for the staff presentation.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that the consultant, Tamara Harrison, would give the presentation.

Tamara Harrison, Project Planner with Michael Baker International, stated that the item was related to the Brilliant Earth façade and signage at the Stanford Shopping Center. She displayed the site location and gave the project overview, noting that the item was continued from the May 5, 2022, ARB hearing due to Boardmember comments about the need for additional architectural detailing as well as a treatment of the common mall corridor doorway located to the right of the storefront. She showed the previous rendering and the new proposed rendering that addressed the ARB's comments. The applicant added additional champaign colored metal panels above the storefront glazing and champaign colored metal trim on the top of the parapet. The metal serves to reduce the amount of brick used on the storefront. The applicant also shifted the primary entrance to allow additional space between the primary entry and the common mall doorway. The common mall doorway would receive a full treatment with replaced trim and white paint. In response to Boardmember Baltay's comments she noted that the trim would go to the adjacent tenant wall. The recessed vestibule would also be painted white in an attempt to make it blend in. The windows will have clear glazing. At the pre ARB meeting there were questions regarding heights on the storefront, so she clarified that the light fixtures would be at 6'1" and to the top of the storefront it was 9' with the top of the metal panels at 12'. She displayed the color and material board and stated that the primary material was the thin brick veneer painted white. Signage would be in dark bronze. The project was found in conformance with the ARB Findings, the Master Tenant Façade and Signage Program (MTFS) and the City's Sign Code. Staff recommended that the ARB recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning based on the Findings and subject to staff's Conditions of Approval.

Chair Thompson called for the applicant's presentation and provided them 10 minutes.

Jason Smith, Landshark Development, thanked Ms. Harrison and the ARB and indicated Tanya Springer of Brilliant Earth and Mitch Pride from MG2 were also available. He introduced Mr. Pride to give the presentation.

Mitch Pride, MG2, thanked the ARB for its time and shared his screen. He stated that updated Sheet G002B showed the previous tenant façade and their revised proposed façade. Sheet A102B showed the proposed rendering. He noted they realigned the rendering and elevations since the ARB made comments about discrepancies at their prior hearing. The renderings and elevations are in alignment. With respect to the comments about the amount and proportion of brick as well as the attention to detail at the pedestrian level he explained a concrete beam ran across the storefront just above the glazing. They extended the visual presence of the storefront windows by adding the champaign metal panels above the glazing. They also moved the signage above the door up in order to ensure the proportions were balanced. The metal panels would be flush with the brick, and everything was detailed on Sheet A804. They wanted to stick with a minimal and understated luxury approach with the storefront. With respect to the common mall corridor they planned to replace the cased opening and paint the vestibule in a minimal way. There are sprinkler pipes and other considerations in the vestibule, so they thought the best way to address it

was to minimize it and maximize the store façade presence. A sounce was removed to help visually keep one's eye to the storefront. They also shifted the main storefront opening as much as possible away from the cased opening for a total increase of 7". He indicated that he was happy to answer questions.

Chair Thompson called for the public comment.

Ms. Klicheva indicated that there were no speaker cards or raised hands.

Chair Thompson called for ARB questions of the applicant.

Boardmember Baltay stated that shopping center exit door to the right of the façade had a cased opening that was currently in bad condition. He asked for documentation on what the applicant proposed to do to the opening.

Mr. Pride stated that they were working on the plan with the landlord as it was outside of their scope. As the casing was in bad shape the landlord will work with them to refinish the opening.

Boardmember Baltay asked if anything in the plan set demonstrated that they were committing to fix the shopping center door.

Mr. Pride said that they had called out the finishes but did not document it further as it was outside their scope of work and within the landlord's scope of work. He repeated that they had worked with the Shopping Center, and it was willing to update the door.

Boardmember Baltay asked if Mr. Smith represented the landlord and addressed the question to him.

Mr. Smith stated that there were not details in the drawings but offered to make a steel casement or wood painted to match a Condition of Approval.

Boardmember Baltay said that they were just in the questions portion of the hearing, and he wanted to know if Mr. Smith was aware of any documentation. He thought it sounded like there was no documentation.

Mr. Smith stated that there was no documentation in the drawing set.

Chair Thompson confirmed there were no further questions and called for ARB comments.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she held the opinion that the ARB should have approved the project at the last hearing; however, she commended the ARB and the applicant team as the façade had improved in design. She found it to be more elegant, clean, simple, and classic. She stated that the applicant team should be proud of their work, especially given that they only had a week turnaround.

Boardmember Baltay stated that he supported Boardmember Rosenberg's comments and could recommend approval for the project with the caveat that a Condition of Approval be made that the Shopping Center exit passageway have a replaced case opening made of a material other than wood. He noted that Condition could be handled by staff and that the project would not need to return to the ARB.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed with the other Boardmembers. He thought every part of the façade had improved in a major way. He forgot to ask the applicant to describe the lighting at the eye-level fixtures. He stated that he would like that question addressed. It was disappointing that they could not have more specific

information on the Shopping Center door and the Shopping Center's agreement on the materials. He noted that there was a discrepancy with how the doorway to the right was represented because G002B clearly showed that the door was far recessed. He thought the hole would be darker no matter how it was painted and needed to be properly lit in order to be acceptable in its shadow effect on the façade. He understood it was out of the applicant's control and suggested the applicant continue to work on how the doorway would be perceived in the future. The revision of the metal parapet to match was pretty. The ARB had requested they consider a variety in the brick, but the decisions made with the façade above the windows mitigated the issue. He found the proportions to be successful and the signage properly placed. He repeated that he hoped the applicant would explain how the light fixtures worked.

Chair Thompson requested the applicant answer the lighting question and noted that the ARB usually received a lighting fixture in the documentation.

Mr. Pride explained that the fixtures were accent sconces and not meant to provide a rush of light. They will provide a nice glow in the evening and illuminate the brick. The light tone would match what was coming from the interior of the store.

Vice Chair Hirsch thanked Mr. Pride.

Boardmember Chen stated that the changes and improvements looked much better proportionally than the previous design. She found the project approvable.

Chair Thompson stated that she had a question about the edge of the not in contract doorway. There was a line of brick existing, and the rendering showed that the frame would go all the way to the edge. She displayed a photograph and pointed out the existing brick. She asked if the edge would be maintained or if the trim of the door would be asymmetrical.

Mr. Pride thought the intent was not to have the brick show through and to change the opening so that there was metal that went to the wall. They would need to work through the issue with the landlord, but the idea was to keep the opening minimal and clean.

Chair Thompson shared her screen and showed a picture she had taken the day before of the current condition. She noted the tree was currently full of foliage and that would be in front of the façade. She liked the previous proposal a bit more because the campaign panels were not detailed. She had hoped to see something with more texture rather than less texture. She questioned if the brick would be lost between the panels and the foliage and stated that was her only concern. She asked if the ARB felt there should be more detail on the metal panel and suggested a subcommittee if they were. Usually the ARB had a light fixture in its drawings with a color rendering index and she asked if that could also be under the Conditions of Approval. Otherwise she could recommend approval of the project. She called for further ARB comments or a Motion.

Boardmember Baltay thought other designers could treat the metal panels and enhance the design further, but he thought the project met the standard the ARB was asked to look at, so it was not reasonable to push further on the design. The light fixture was a decorative element and is specified as such so the light rendering was not germane. The project met the standard the ARB was asked to define.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Vice Chair Hirsch, to recommend approval of the project with the following Condition of Approval added: the Shopping Center passageway and door on the right hand side of the façade and the existing casing around the opening at the façade plane should be replaced with a new painted metal casing that extends to the existing building on the right hand side. The existing doorway should be painted per the plans. The applicant should explore adding interior lighting to reduce the dark effect.

Boardmember Rosenberg cautioned the applicant not to over illuminate the inside area of the Shopping Center passageway so as to not confuse people during wayfinding.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if that could be added to the Motion.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought it was fine as stated by Boardmember Baltay.

Vice Chair Hirsch suggested they add “balanced lighting not to detract from the storefront.”

Boardmember Baltay indicated that it was fine to Amend the Motion.

**AMENDED MOTION:** Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Vice Chair Hirsch, to recommend approval of the project with the following Condition of Approval added: the Shopping Center passageway and door on the right hand side of the façade and the existing casing around the opening at the façade plane should be replaced with a new painted metal casing that extends to the existing building on the right hand side. The existing doorway should be painted per the plans. The applicant should explore adding balanced lighting that does not detract from the storefront.

Chair Thompson clarified that Vice Chair Hirsch was the seconder.

**VOTE:** 5-0-0-0

Mr. Smith thanked the ARB and staff.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 488 University Avenue [22PLN-00040]: Recommendation on Applicant’s Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow for a Sign Exception for a Projecting Sign and a Window Sign. The Project Also Includes Code Compliant Wall Signs. Environmental Assessment: Project is Exempt from CEQA in Accordance with Guidelines Section 15301 (Existing Structures) and 15311 (Accessory Structures-On Premise Signs). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Raybould at [claire.raybould@cityofpal Alto.org](mailto:claire.raybould@cityofpal Alto.org)

Chair Thompson introduced the item and called for the staff report.

Claire Raybould, Senior Planner, shared her screen with the ARB.

Chair Thompson called for disclosures.

Boardmember Rosenberg disclosed that she visited the site.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he visited the site.

Vice Chair Hirsch disclosed that he visited the site.

Boardmember Chen indicated she visited the site earlier in the week.

Chair Thompson disclosed that she also visited the site and gave the floor to Ms. Raybould.

Ms. Raybould said that the project was 488 University Avenue, which was the historic Hotel President. She displayed an aerial view of the project site in Downtown on University Avenue and Cowper. The project is a sign exception for one window sign and one projecting blade sign. The proposed projecting blade sign exceeds the maximum allowable size of 5 feet and would be located higher than 12 feet from grade. The proposed sign was 20 square feet (sf) starting at 24 feet from grade and reaching to about 34 feet from grade. The window sign exceeded the 20% maximum of the window area allowed by Code. The proposed sign would cover 43% of the window area. The project includes Code compliant wall signs on University Avenue and two compliant wall signs on the Cowper façade. She displayed a graphic displaying the proposed signs and their location and noted that they were being requested by the hotel tenant. The blade sign says "Graduate" and she showed the ARB an example of the style of the proposed sign. The proposed sign would be white acrylic set on black acrylic with a font matching the "Hotel President" historic marquee sign. She explained the example was only to provide reference for the acrylic lighting. The window sign was also for the hotel tenant and would be in front of the lobby of the hotel. It states, "Graduate Palo Alto" and covers 43% of the window when only 20% was allowed. She showed the wall signs which would read things like "restaurant," "café," and "barbershop," and would provide people with a sense of the use within. Each of the tenant spaces would have small Code compliant window signs when occupied. The building is a Category 2 Historic Structure on the local inventory. It is eligible for individual listing on the California Register of Historic Resources. The project was evaluated, and it was determined to comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of a Historic Resource. Several modifications were recommended and incorporated into the design. First, they recommended that the projecting sign be more modernized to differentiate between the new sign and the historic sign. Second, they recommended moving the sign up on the wall to give deference to the historic balcony. Staff is looking for the ARB's thoughts on the size and location of the signage as well as the proposed materials. The applicant did not submit a material board, so staff's recommendation was for the project to return to an ad hoc committee with the materials. The detailed Findings of Approval were listed in the staff report. Staff recommended approval because the building was historic and so the window sign was a better alternative to a wall sign. Staff also thought the signage was appropriate based on the relative size of the building. The recommended Motion was to recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director based on the Findings and Conditions of Approval, including a condition that the ad hoc committee review the proposed materials for the sign. She indicated that she did not know if the applicant had a presentation.

Geno Youn, ELS Architects, appeared on behalf of their client, AJ Capital Partners, and explained that they were also the architects for the building improvements that were currently under construction. He stated that he was happy to answer the ARB's questions.

Chair Thompson called for the public comment.

Ms. Klicheva indicated that there was none.

Chair Thompson called for ARB questions of the applicant.

Boardmember Rosenberg referenced Sheet A2 and the goal leaf image. She read the dimensions aloud and asked if it indicated that the script itself added up to 12 sf and the sign coverage area was a rectangular

box around the text. Specifically she wanted to clarify what was sign coverage area versus opaque sign coverage area.

Ms. Raybould stated that Boardmember Rosenberg was correct in her assessment. The Code defines that a sign had to be viewed in a square area, but staff wanted to make it clear that the sign allowed views through.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that she wanted to confirm she had the proper understanding and that the blade sign was placed high because of a recommendation from the Historic Review Board (HRB).

Ms. Raybould indicated that the historic architect, Page & Turnbull, reviewed the project and determined that was necessary, not the HRB.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if they specified a height for the blade sign.

Ms. Raybould said the sign was previously at about 22 feet and just above the balcony. They suggested moving it a few feet to give deference to the historic balcony. No exact amount was specified.

Boardmember Chen asked if the wall signs were backlit or if it was even allowable to back light signs since the property was historic.

Mr. Youn said that the code compliant wall signs were not illuminated.

Boardmember Chen inquired if the [unintelligible 39:44] were clear glass or tinted.

Mr. Youn confirmed that the storefronts had clear glass.

Boardmember Baltay asked the applicant about the use behind the façade with the large “Graduate” sign.

Mr. Youn explained that when one entered under the marquee the lobby and registration desk would be to the right. The first bay with the “Graduate” gold leaf sign was the lobby/lounge area.

Boardmember Baltay asked if the activity would be visible through the window to the street.

Mr. Youn stated that it would be.

Boardmember Baltay confirmed that the projecting sign had white letters outlined with a neon lit tube.

Mr. Youn explained that it was similar to the “Oracle Park” sign shown by Ms. Raybould. It was a reverse channel letter made of aluminum with neon or LED tube lighting exposed within the channel. The back surface of the sign would be white acrylic.

Ms. Raybould displayed the “Oracle Park” sign again.

Boardmember Baltay asked if there were other improvements or changes being made to the Cowper façade. During his site visit he found the façade to feel secondary despite it sitting on a prominent corner.

Mr. Youn said that would be the arrival point for valet cars so the side door would also lead to the lobby and registration. As it was a historic building no major changes were proposed. The door would be relocated.

Boardmember Baltay confirmed there were no proposed canopies or anything else.

Mr. Youn said there was not.

Boardmember Baltay confirmed that staff had the project reviewed by Page & Turnbull and asked if the HRB or City had reviewed the project.

Ms. Raybould explained the City had not reviewed the signage project because the Code recommended it go to the ARB for a sign exception. The City reviewed all other modifications as part of a previous application for a seismic upgrade.

Boardmember Baltay confirmed they did not review the blade sign on the corner.

Ms. Raybould stated they did not.

Boardmember Baltay asked why staff sent the project through Page & Turnbull if it did not require historic review.

Ms. Raybould noted that any change to a historic building required compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, due to that, minor exterior modifications of Downtown buildings were always sent to Page & Turnbull. Code did not require review by the HRB.

Chair Thompson said staff mentioned the attachment to the building was changed to be less historic looking. She did not see anything in the packet indicating what the attachment looked like, so she requested clarification.

Mr. Youn said that the prior iteration had decorative scrolls mimicking the scrollwork on the marquee. The Secretary of the Interior's recommendations were not to try to mimic the historic fabric of a building and to contrast it with contemporary details. The actual historic building needed to be distinct from anything added to it. The blade sign was their interpretation of the rules. The scrollwork was removed from the bracket where the sign attached to the building.

Chair Thompson asked if there was an example of what the scroll work looked like.

Mr. Youn referred her to the marquee below for an example.

Boardmember Baltay indicated that he noticed during his site visit there was an earlier rendering of the sign on the public notification. That showed the scroll bracketing she was interested in.

Ms. Raybould indicated she would attempt to pull up the old plans.

Chair Thompson suggested they hold a round of ARB comments while Ms. Raybould was looking.

Ms. Gerhardt said that Page & Turnbull requested the scrolls be removed because they made the new sign appear older and historic and there needed to be a difference between the two.

Mr. Youn agreed with Ms. Gerhardt's statement.

Ms. Raybould displayed the image.

Chair Thompson thanked her and stated that was helpful. She called for a round of comments.

Boardmember Chen thought the design was successful and appreciated how the applicant applied the color from the door and marquee to the storefront and behind the signs. She thought it was nice that the retail signs were smaller than the hotel sign. Generally, the project evoked an older feel and was approvable.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that generally he was favorable toward the design. He had questions that he believed to be beyond the scope of the ARB. He suggested one might want to light the channel with the lettering to bring out the lettering above the doors for the individual retail signs. There might be lighting issues there as mentioned by Boardmember Chen. He did not know if that could be considered or if it would change the historic quality of the area. Beyond the scope of the project, he also noted we don't know what they're going to do with the transom details as a background to the color. He felt there was a grid idea with the windows which was confusing and noted the size of the windows to the left. He asked why there could not be a single pane of glass where the lobby was and questioned if that would be too much of a modernization. The lettering would read better from a single pane of glass.

Ms. Raybould explained that per the historic reports the windows were designed as a return to the historic form. The storefronts had been modified at some point, so the design approved by Council actually brought the windows back to the original design of the building.

Mr. Youn stated that was correct. Where the historic storefront could be rehabilitated it would be and where modern storefronts were inserted they are being replaced with the historic style, material, and profile of the older storefronts.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed that it would be a modernization and withdrew the comment. The blade sign was an exciting piece of work and questioned by the brackets could not also be embellished but noted it was not worth arguing with Page & Turnbull on it. Generally he found the project to look like a Birge Clark building, which was as it should.

Boardmember Baltay explained that he was not comfortable with the project. The historic nature of the building pointed out to him that the projecting sign on the corner was halfway historic. There was finial on top, the detailing was similar, and the font was the same, but they could not have the scroll elements on the attachment. He thought most people would think the scroll elements would make the sign look better and more like the old building. He understood that they did not want to mimic the past. He was uncomfortable that the HRB had not reviewed the project and made the determination about how to handle the sign on building. There was a "Garage" sign there originally. The sign exception findings could be made and that is the part the ARB had to review. Whether or not the design was historically correct was an issue for the HRB or if staff was averse to that another review by Page & Turnbull. Currently there was a hybrid historic solution on a very important historic building in the City. He did not find the current sign to be the best solution and thought the ARB may not be the body to make that decision. Based on that he was uncomfortable approving the project without further historic review by the HRB. Related to the sign exceptions there were three findings the ARB had to make. For the projecting/blade sign there was exceptional circumstance, and all the criteria was met. He was unable to make the finding for the large storefront sign. The lettering proposed was much bigger than anything else allowed on the Avenue despite the storefront situation being similar to the rest of the buildings. Therefore, he did not want to allow for the precedent of the larger sign. The hotel already had a canopy, and it was easy to tell what

was occurring in the space. Accordingly, he was unable to make Findings #1 and #2 relative to the oversized window sign. He noted that was independent from his feelings on the aesthetics and stated that the ARB needed to consider its Findings.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she was in partial agreement with Boardmember Baltay. The ARB's purpose was to consider the sign exception, not to discuss the historical elements. However, she also thought the sign was a strange hybrid that required more attention. She was reluctant to require an additional review and waiting period over scrolls on a bracket and asked if there could be a Condition of Approval that required a cursory review by the HRB. She repeated that the sign was not quite historical and not quite modern so someone should review it. She was also reluctant to support red neon lighting as it felt alarming and asked if there was another color option. She noted that she did understand the historic nature of the red on the building. there was no issue with the blade sign height or the storefronts. She understood Boardmember Baltay's concern about the size of the lettering, but if the actual sign coverage was 12 sf then she was persuaded that the amount of opacity was not excessive. She agreed that the sign would set an interesting precedent. She wished the gold leaf lettering was smaller but overall she thought the project was interesting, nicely done, and she had no problem approving the sign exception.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated she wanted to speak on the City's historic review process. Signage is viewed as a smaller item added to buildings and is often approved over the counter. In this case staff took the extra step of having Page & Turnbull, the Chief Planning Official, and others review the plans to meet the Secretary of the Interior Standards. Because the project met the standards it is not required to go to the HRB for review. Staff wanted to keep the lesser process as much as possible.

Ms. Raybould added that she could go back to Page & Turnbull, but anything that was added to a building that could easily be removed had more flexibility in the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Page & Turnbull provided recommendations, but generally felt the design was fine. Their recommendations were to improve compliance with the Standards but did not feel very strongly that those attachments needed to be refined. If the applicant returned to an ad hoc committee staff could explore the issue further with Page & Turnbull and possibly come up with a revised design.

Chair Thompson thanked staff. She commented that she could approve the project as it stood but thought a subcommittee to review the scrolls was a good idea. The United States treats its historic structures differently than other parts of the world. She did not want to compromise on a design element that could enhance the project. If the scrolls were acceptable she would support their inclusion. With respect to Boardmember Rosenberg's note about the red lighting she indicated she was okay with red because it was easier on the eyes at night. Related to the precedent setting window lettering she felt the project was a special situation as it was historic. During the site visit she saw decal signs on the windows which yielded a historic feel. Based on that she had no issues with the window sign and did not believe the ARB was setting a precedent except for historic buildings that had signs in the windows. She repeated she could approve the project with potentially adding an ad hoc committee to review the scrolls. She called for further discussion or a Motion.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she had a question but deferred to Vice Chair Hirsch.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that he wanted to comment on the larger “Graduate” sign on University. It was a disservice to the sign and its size to not show the entire building. The sign represented the use of the entire building as a hotel. It was appropriate to have it near the front door, especially considering the historic “Hotel President” sign would remain on three sides. The name of the building had to be announced somehow and the “Graduate” sign was appropriate given the size of the building. He agreed with Chair Thompson on the color red and noted it also fit with the size of the building and its placement. He did not feel strongly about the brackets and suggested that the applicant follow Page & Turnbull’s advice. It was not necessary for an ad hoc committee to spend time on such a small item. He thought they could approve the project with no further meetings necessary.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she had another question. She confirmed Page & Turnbull recommended removing the decorative bracket scrolling but did not require it.

Ms. Raybould recalled that it was a recommendation to better comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. She stated she needed clarification from them on whether they still felt the standard could be met with the brackets.

Boardmember Baltay said that the ARB was there to get the best possible design. He found the original scroll brackets to be the better design, but the ARB could not determine if that was more or less compliant with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. If staff and the City followed due process then the ARB should push for the better design and request the scroll brackets.

Chair Thompson asked how the ARB felt about the item going to an ad hoc committee as part of the Conditions of Approval.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that if the ARB was in favor of the scroll then there was no need for an ad hoc committee. She suggested a straw poll.

Chair Thompson said that the only reason would be to allow for more coordination with Page & Turnbull or with the Secretary of the Interior.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that Ms. Gerhardt was nodding her head.

Ms. Gerhardt thought staff would want a chance to discuss the matter with Page & Turnbull further. She reminded the ARB that they did not have a color and materials board and wanted that item to return to an ad hoc committee.

Chair Thompson noted that there would be an ad hoc committee.

Boardmember Baltay asked staff if they were certain they did not want to involve the HRB. He noted that they already reviewed the building and gave it a lot of thought. He asked why they would not take part in an important element like signage.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the City could always do more process and that she would speak with the Chief Planning Official. The ARB could make a recommendation, but ultimately the Director would decide the process. Staff would need additional time to think about it.

Boardmember Baltay advised the ARB that there were not many Birge Clark buildings in town. Putting a 35 foot high wall sign on one was a big deal. The Birge Clark on Hamilton had a large clock mounted to it and required a lot of discussion. He did not believe the sign was any different than the clock.

Chair Thompson requested to see the scroll image again since it was not in the ARB packet. In response to Boardmember Baltay she stated that she did not feel as strongly about the HRB review. Many historic experts seem to have reviewed the signs already. The applicant could discuss the scrolls with Page & Turnbull and perhaps choose to go to the HRB for its feedback, but that might be up to the applicant rather than a requirement.

Boardmember Baltay stated that the image on the screen was a better design and if the ARB had that as a standard then the scroll detailing and other thoughts were more successful. If the ARB was not tasked with looking at historic things then it should recommend that sign design.

Chair Thompson called a straw poll on asking the applicant to [unintelligible 1:12:46] scrolls as a subcommittee.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested Chair Thompson clarify the straw poll.

Chair Thompson asked if the applicant should be instructed to consider including the scroll work as part of the design and returning to the ad hoc committee.

Boardmember Baltay asked if the ARB could see if they could approve the project as it was without an ad hoc committee.

Chair Thompson stated that the Conditions of Approval already included an ad hoc committee for proposed materials.

Boardmember Baltay said that if the ARB did not agree with that then the applicant could move forward.

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Baltay thought the ARB should review the sign materials.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he was confident the sign would look as described. He did not see why the ARB would need to look at it and was okay with the red neon lighting. Staff could check the building permit drawings against the renderings. He repeated that the real issue was the historic one. If the ARB planned to punt on that issue then the design shown was appropriate and documented enough.

Ms. Gerhardt said that there would not be any HRB hearings in June so in order to hear the project they would need to do May 26<sup>th</sup> which was a tight turnaround. Therefore, they would most likely only be able to do a subcommittee of the HRB or they would have to wait for the July 14<sup>th</sup> hearing.

Boardmember Baltay stated that as the ARB he wanted to look at the project on its architectural merits and on those grounds the project was fine. He repeated that the ARB should start with a straw poll to pass the project as is. If not then they could discuss the details on the brackets.

Chair Thompson said that before she conducted the straw poll she wanted to state that it was not acceptable to her to forgo a review of the materials and color samples as that was an important function of the ARB. She asked Boardmember Baltay how he wanted to word the straw poll.

Boardmember Baltay respected the Chair's statement and could agree that the project needed to return for a material review. Therefore he no longer thought they should do a straw poll to approve the project as it stood.

Chair Thompson thanked Boardmember Baltay.

Boardmember Rosenberg added there was a difference between the packets the ARB received, and the images presented on the screen. She found the "Oracle" sign to be clear and to provide sufficient information. If that was not sufficient for Chair Thompson she could support that and have the applicant return with the materials.

Chair Thompson said that the picture was not what the applicant was beholden to.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed.

**MOTION:** Chair Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to recommend approval of the proposed project based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval, including a Condition that an ad hoc committee review the proposed materials for the projecting sign and review any additional scrolls added to the bracket based on the applicant's further study.

Chair Thompson asked if anyone wanted to speak to the Motion.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated that he changed his mind and thought the scrolls were a reasonable addition to the projecting sign, especially relative to the "Hotel President" sign. A person on the street would look at the sign and find it compatible with the building. He thought the scrolls added to the way the sign connected to the wall in a beautiful way. With respect to the color and material palette he thought there was enough information provided to make a recommendation. He would vote for the Motion but thought they could simplify it to request the scrolls as shown.

Boardmember Baltay asked if Vice Chair Hirsch was suggesting a Friendly Amendment.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that it was a simplified Friendly Amendment eliminating the need to look further into the color or material palette.

Boardmember Baltay asked if that was separate from the use of the scrolls. Chair Thompson's recommendation does not include a recommendation regarding the scrolls.

Chair Thompson clarified that it did.

Boardmember Baltay asked if she was recommending they include or not include the scrolls.

Chair Thompson said that it recommended the applicant look into including the scrolls.

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:** the ARB recommends the applicant include the scrolls.

Chair Thompson asked what happened if the ARB recommending the scrolls brought the project into opposition with the Secretary of the Interior or any other historic expert recommending otherwise.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that it was the ARB's recommendation.

Ms. Raybould stated that it was fine if the ARB made a recommendation. The applicant was open to the scrolls as it was their original design. It was changed based on Page & Turnbull's recommendation. The applicant could discuss the matter with Page & Turnbull further and if they felt it was possible with the Secretary of the Interior's Standard they could use the old design or another similar design.

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT ACCEPTED:** Chair Thompson said that she accepted the Friendly Amendment to change the wording to ask the applicant to include the scrolls. She asked if Boardmember Chen agreed.

Boardmember Chen indicated she still seconded the Motion.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that Vice Chair Hirsch had mentioned removing the need to review the materials, but Chair Thompson wanted to review the materials. She asked if that was a Friendly Amendment or a comment.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that it was an either/or. The ARB could review the materials or not. He believed the materials would be confirmed.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that staff required color and materials for all projects. it would set a poor precedent to not require that in this project.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that he gave up on the point.

Chair Thompson said that she would not have accepted that as a Friendly Amendment. She called the vote.

**VOTE:** 5-0-0-0

Chair Thompson thanked the applicant and staff.

### **Approval of Minutes**

#### 4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 21, 2022

Chair Thompson called for a Motion.

Boardmember Baltay stated concern about Page 54. Former Mayor Holman spoke, and the sixth line down contains "Autobahn," and it should be "Audubon." Secondly, Packet Page 71 in the second major paragraph the applicant interrupted Chair Thompson and made a statement regarding the approval process. He thought the applicant was stronger in his statement, but the minutes read "the project would end up in court." He asked what the ARB remembered about the exchange and to comment on if the minutes were accurate.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she also felt the applicants' words were stronger in person. She recalled that Boardmember Baltay had a strong reaction at the time that mirrored her feelings. She recalled that he felt threatened and that should be commented on.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed that he shared their feelings.

Boardmember Baltay asked if staff could review the recording to see if it was verbatim accurate or rephrase it so that it captured the feeling they remembered.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that the minutes were summary and not verbatim. They wanted the summary to be accurate so they would review the minutes.

Boardmember Baltay read "Mr. Hickey stated that staff" but indicated that Mr. Hickey had interrupted the Chair to make the statement. That was what he wanted captured in the minutes.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that any time there was something that hinted at litigation the minutes should be verbatim. The specific conversation should be documented verbatim.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed that the section should be quoted so that it was clear.

Chair Thompson asked if they should hold off on approval and ask staff to return with the minutes. Otherwise they could have an ad hoc committee for the minutes.

Boardmember Baltay understood the minutes were not released to the public until they were approved. He wanted the minutes out sooner rather than later.

Ms. Gerhardt noted that the draft minutes were in the packet.

Boardmember Baltay stated that then the minutes should return to the ARB.

Chair Thompson agreed.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed. Further she noted that the newspaper reported on the meeting the next day and while "loud and clear" it was also a bit softer than it should have been. She supported a second review of the minutes.

**MOTION:** Chair Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Baltay, to defer approval of the minutes of March 10, 2022 to the next ARB hearing.

Vice Chair Hirsch wanted to be specific that it was moved to make corrections to the minutes that absolutely represent what was said in the meeting.

**RESTATED MOTION:** Chair Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Baltay, to defer approval of the minutes of March 10, 2022 to the next ARB hearing and to take the Item on Packet Page 71 and replace them with verbatim conversation.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested she state, "amend and add in the verbatim conversation."

Chair Thompson said that they wanted rewriting as well.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed.

Chair Thompson asked if she needed to edit the Motion.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that staff was clear on what was needed.

**VOTE:** 5-0-0-0

**Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Ms. Gerhardt reminded Chair Thompson that she had announcements on committees.

Chair Thompson stated that the ad hoc committees for the parklets and California Avenue had been assigned. She announced the ad hoc committee for the parklets was Boardmember Chen and Boardmember Baltay. The ad hoc committee for California Avenue was Boardmember Baltay and herself. The ad hoc committees could be revisited in six months to a year depending on the progress of the items. She called for other questions, comments, or announcements.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that he wanted to discuss the Monday morning meetings he had with Chair Thompson, Ms. Gerhardt, and staff. Previous Chair Baltay thought the ARB should review projects at an earlier point in order to clarify the extent of the review. The Bayshore project was not just housing, materials, and a general façade look. It was very complex in terms of site planning. He understood Zoning determined site plan, but there ought to be flexibility within that law to allow for different forms of housing on a site. The earlier the ARB got a project like the Bayshore project the better. The process could be changed for larger projects that require more environmental or site plan study. Boardmembers visit sites but for that kind of project should be involved in a broader way. He outlined an idea where the Chair and Vice Chair would meet with Planning and review the scope of a project to determine if it should have a site planning zoning preliminary review by the ARB.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he supported Vice Chair Hirsch's thoughts.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that originally he thought an applicant should provide preliminary schematics to the Chair and Vice Chair, but he had changed his mind and Planning staff should describe the project at its earliest stage with a unit count, the block elevations, and site plan concepts. Then the Chair and Vice Chair could determine if the submission was sufficient at that stage for the ARB to review. Then the full ARB would be notified to visit the site and Planning would prepare a list of similar projects for the ARB to visit. He explained that when reviewing Bayshore he found it important to review other housing projects in the City. It was important for the ARB to be familiar with the different prototypes of multiple dwelling housing. Following the preliminary presentation the ARB would visit the projects and get initial impressions. If there were significant differences between the Chair and Vice Chair then staff would work with the applicant to provide more advanced documents. He was concerned that when they reviewed drawings [Unintelligible 1:38:37] incredible amount of work that cost the applicant a lot of money. He was pleased with the ARB's decision on Bayshore but was concerned about applicants being very upset over the amount of work they had put in by that stage of development. The ARB must ensure that its response was clearly thought out, so he wanted to raise the issue and hear the ARB's opinions.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that the hearing was in the announcement phase so Vice Chair Hirsch was welcome to bring the topic up but before it could be discussed further it needed to be agendaized. She stated that she could put the topic on the agenda for the next hearing.

Chair Thompson indicated that she wanted to suggest that as well.

Boardmember Baltay asked if they could agendize the discussion for June 2<sup>nd</sup> rather than cancelling the hearing. They could also discuss the Bylaws.

Vice Chair Hirsch noted they also needed to discuss the ARB Awards.

Chair Thompson stated that needed ARB attention as well. She had a conflict on June 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Boardmember Baltay requested they schedule it for another time.

Chair Thompson asked if he meant a retreat.

Boardmember Baltay said that it just needed to be a meeting at a time that suited the Boardmembers.

Chair Thompson stated that she would think about it.

Boardmember Baltay suggested she speak with staff. The ARB felt there were a number of unresolved items, so it was inappropriate to not meet. He reassured staff that they did not need elaborate staff reports, they just needed time for discussions. The more the ARB exerted its independence the better. He recommended the Chair schedule something.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that the HRB was not meeting in June. Therefore, June 9<sup>th</sup> was appropriate for a special meeting.

Chair Thompson said that June 9<sup>th</sup> was difficult, but that the afternoon of either the 2<sup>nd</sup> or the 9<sup>th</sup> could work.

Ms. Gerhardt said staff was looking at June 9<sup>th</sup> and asked the Board to review their calendars.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if June 2<sup>nd</sup> worked in the afternoon.

Chair Thompson stated that it probably would.

Ms. Gerhardt noted that they did not have the chambers for June 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Boardmember Baltay stated that they did not have to meet in the room. the meeting only needed to be agendized and publicly accessible.

Chair Thompson said she was open on Friday, June 3<sup>rd</sup> in the morning. She noted that the meeting was kind of like a retreat since they were speaking about bylaws and internal operations and procedures. She asked if they could hold the meeting that way so they would not need the recording infrastructure.

Ms. Gerhardt said that Chair Thompson was right about the recording and asked the ARB to wait a moment while she spoke with staff. She noted that Ms. Klicheva found that they were unable to meet on

June 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> because of insufficient noticing. The following week was a possibility. She suggested they work to schedule the meeting offline.

Chair Thompson agreed and stated that she would look into the matter. She called for further comments, questions, or announcements.

Boardmember Baltay asked staff about the status of the Bayshore project that the ARB recommended denial of about a month prior.

Ms. Gerhardt said that it was going to the Planning Commission the following week and the Council on either June 20<sup>th</sup> or the 21<sup>st</sup>.

Boardmember Baltay asked if the Director took action on the project.

Ms. Gerhardt explained the Director was taking the project to Council.

Chair Thompson called for other questions, comments, or announcements, but there were none. She indicated that the ad hoc committee of Boardmembers Baltay and Rosenberg would stay on to speak with the applicant who was attending virtually.

### **Adjournment**

Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting.