



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 14738)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 9/15/2022

Summary Title: Minutes of August 18, 2022

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for August 18, 2022

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

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

Background

Draft minutes from the August 18, 2022 Architectural Review Board (ARB) are available in Attachment A.

Attachment B and C document follow-up reviews and actions of the ARB Ad Hoc Committee.

Draft and Approved Minutes are made available on the ARB webpage at bit.ly/paloaltoARB

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Minutes of August 18, 2022 (DOCX)
- Attachment B: 08.18.2022 Ad Hoc Memo 2585 E Bayshore Rd (DOCX)
- Attachment C: 08.18.2022 Ad Hoc Memo 488 University Ave (DOCX)



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES: August 18, 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 David Hirsch, Vice Chair Peter Baltay, Boardmember Osma Thompson, Boardmember Yingxi Chen, Boardmember Kendra Rosenberg

Absent: None

1. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for Architectural Review Board During Covid-19 State of Emergency

Boardmember Thompson reminded Chair Hirsch that the ARB needed to have a Motion on the Resolution.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, reminded the ARB that it needed to vote on the Resolution monthly.

Chair Hirsch called for a Motion.

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Thompson, to adopt the Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for ARB during Covid-19 State of Emergency.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that he only supported use of teleconferencing so long as it was required by State regulations for emergency ordinances, otherwise he would need to see it directed by City Council.

Boardmember Thompson stated that hybrid meetings were the way of the future and would likely be permanent.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Oral Communications

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, stated there were none.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Ms. Gerhardt stated that there were two ad hoc committees scheduled for the afternoon. The agenda listed Vice Chair Baltay and Boardmember Thompson, but it was actually being handled by Chair Hirsch and Boardmember Thompson.

Chair Hirsch thanked Ms. Klicheva for providing a tabbed book.

City Official Reports

2. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2) Tentative Future Agenda items and 3) Recently Submitted Projects

Ms. Gerhardt shared her screen and showed the ARB its upcoming meeting dates. Boardmember Thompson would not be able to attend one of the December meetings so that was noted. The September 1, 2022, meeting would hear 824 San Antonio and 250 Cambridge with 180 El Camino being heard in ad hoc following the meeting by Vice Chair Baltay and Boardmember Chen. She displayed a list including a new project and explained that ARB leadership had requested a running list of likely ARB projects which would be included in the next packet.

Chair Hirsch noted excitement about the likely project list. He asked how the ARB members could learn more about the potential projects online.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that any project that would ultimately come to an ARB hearing would have a project webpage. The webpages are posted within a few days of a project being filed with the timing being dependent on staff work levels. Any project without a specific webpage would be listed on Building Eye which was connected to the City's database.

Chair Hirsch asked about the summary of the Council screening.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested that she provide that information during the announcement section.

Chair Hirsch explained that leadership felt that a Council summary would be helpful for the ARB. Council had met the past Monday about the housing project on San Antonio Road and the summary sheet on that would be helpful. The feedback would also be useful for the ARB as it started to look at projects in advance. Later in the meeting he requested a summary of ad hoc committees.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that in the pre-meeting there was a conversation about ad hoc committees. Since those were not a public hearing they did not require meeting minutes. Because of that staff had created one page summaries. When they switched to doing ad hoc committees prior to approval letters the summary minutes dropped off, but ARB leadership had requested that return. Based on this she advised project planners that they were expected going forward.

Action Items

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 300 Pasteur Drive [22PLN00059]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Minor Board Level Architectural Review Application to Allow an Exception to the Master Sign Program at 300 Pasteur Drive. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from CEQA per Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: HD. For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Emily Foley at emily.foley@cityofpaloalto.org

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

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that Ms. Foley had a presentation.

Emily Foley, Project Planner, noted that Vice Chair Baltay had something to say.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the item required disclosures.

Chair Hirsch explained that disclosures involved more than just visiting a site and instructed Boardmembers to disclose conversations about the project as well.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the ARB needed to disclose any information learned prior to the public hearing that other Boardmembers should be aware of when they make a decision, especially if that information was not included in the staff report.

Boardmember Chen disclosed that she had visited the site.

Boardmember Thompson disclosed that she had previously visited the site.

Chair Hirsch disclosed that he had visited the site previously several times.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he had no disclosures.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she also had no disclosures.

Ms. Foley shared her screen and explained the project was a sign exception for 300 Pasteur, the Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC). The project included 9 new signs but only the proposed monument sign at the entrance required the exception. Parts of the Medical Center were being rebranded under a Cancer Center sub-brand and the signage in the project was mostly related to that. She explained the purposes of the other new signs and noted they fit into the existing sign program and regulations. Materials used were consistent with the existing signage materials which was previously approved. The monument sign also included a travertine material used on other campus signs. All materials were present on the materials board. She displayed a slide of the sign that required the exception. The sign was 41 square feet (sf) was 3 feet 9 inches tall and would therefore have a maximum size of 27 sf. Since it was a larger building monument the applicant applied for an exception to allow the larger size. She showed a slide of other signs which fit the proposed sign's orientation and materials for reference. She then showed pictures of the other signs, which were similar to previously approved signage. The new pedestrian drop off sign was 2 feet taller than similar vehicle signage. Another change was the existing vehicle directional signage had the Stanford Medical logo at the bottom, but the new signage had the Stanford Medicine Cancer Center logo at the top. She continued to show the signs that were similar to existing signs and then showed the new corner signs, which were a new sign typology. Finally, she showed the address number and explained that was outside the purview of the ARB. Staff recommended that the ARB consider the proposed project and recommend approval based on the findings. The applicant from SUMC and the designers were also available.

Chair Hirsch called for questions of staff.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the sign exception was the reason the project was before the ARB.

Ms. Foley said that was the only reason the project came before the ARB.

Vice Chair Baltay clarified that if SUMC had not requested the exemption then the ARB would not have reviewed the project.

Ms. Foley stated that was correct.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed that the sign exception was for the horizontal monument sign and due to its being horizontal and low it had limited area. He asked if the area limitation was linked to the size of the building or frontage.

Ms. Foley explained that it would be except all the buildings on the campus were so large that the allowable signage would otherwise exceed the maximum of 27 sf regardless of the size of the building.

Vice Chair Baltay understood that when the sign was less than a certain height it was limited to a maximum of 27 sf regardless of the size of the building.

Ms. Foley indicated that was correct.

Vice Chair Baltay said that if the sign were taller it could be larger.

Ms. Foley said that was also correct.

Vice Chair Baltay thanked her and asked what she meant by “new sign typology.”

Ms. Foley explained that the other signs proposed were consistent with the designs of existing signs on the property. The corner signs were not included in the existing Master Sign Program and also needed ARB approval.

Vice Chair Baltay clarified that any sign that faced two directions like a corner sign was not allowed in the Master Sign Program.

Ms. Foley said corner signs were allowed, but the proportions and background color did not currently exist anywhere else on the site.

Chair Hirsch called for further ARB questions. Hearing none he called for the applicant’s presentation and advised them they had 10 minutes.

Molly Swenson, Stanford Medicine, indicated she was joined by Ruemel Panglao of Stanford Medicine, and Nikki San Miguel and [Alan Creegle 29:40] of Clearstory. Stanford Medicine was in the middle of a multi-year facilities renewal and replacement project. Since the new hospital was completed at 500 Pasteur Dr. they proceeded with renovations on the existing hospital at 300 Pasteur Dr. The updated inpatient facilities would serve oncology patients and would be called the Stanford Medicine Cancer Center. The first phase was planned to open in Spring 2023 and the signage was essential to that opening. Additional signage would elevate the profile of the existing outpatient component of the Stanford Medicine Cancer Center.

Nikki San Miguel, Clearstory, shared her screen with the ARB. In 2019 when they got the original Master Sign Program approved many Boardmembers were not on the ARB yet, so she showed a slide containing all the signs with the ones that required sign exceptions highlighted in yellow. The reason for all the

exceptions was the zoning districts along the road. The project sought to equalize the patient experience related to signs on both sides of the street. She then displayed the approved sign family from the original program. The project brought forth two cancer centers and the signs proposed in the amendment were focused on locations to identify the two cancer centers. She displayed the existing sign family and then showed its expansion to include two additional monuments for the Cancer Center. She also displayed the other signs Ms. Foley showed. Generally they were attempting to work with the same palette and the only new material introduced was the travertine. She explained the drop off loop and that the goal was to clearly identify the separate cancer center drop off and path of travel. She showed the main entrance of Stanford Hospital and then a rendering including the signs of the Cancer Center drop off. As mentioned by Ms. Foley they increased the size of the sign to 9 foot 6 inches so that the sign was viable above queuing cars. Signs would also be placed for wayfinding along the path of travel and would match the previously approved sign family. They intentionally pursued a horizontal monument because it was more architecturally contextual and appropriate for the area and did not block pedestrian sightlines and was consistent with the language of other monuments across the campus. She displayed several other travertine signs within the vicinity of the proposed sign. Chair Hirsch had inquired about allowances for freestanding signs. She displayed the proposed monument sign next to the 27 sf allowable sign next to a person for context. If the sign were 5 foot tall it would be allowed to be 60 sf in size for reference. Despite that they still preferred the horizontal sign. She then displayed the entrance to the Cancer Center. On Blake Wilbur Drive there was a single drop-off which was split between 875 Blake Wilbur and 900 Blake Wilbur. The proposed signs clearly identified the entrances and supported the path of travel. She then displayed a series of photographs illustrating the path of travel and the location of the signs. 900 Blake Wilbur was not a Cancer Center but would contain Cancer Center services and therefore needed to be covered as part of the program. They hoped for approval on the sign exception for the main monument sign and approval of the extension of the Master Sign Program and thanked the ARB for its time.

Chair Hirsch called for ARB discussion.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if Chair Hirsch wanted to call the public comment.

Chair Hirsch called the public comment.

Ms. Klicheva indicated that there were none.

Vice Chair Baltay asked where the travertine background would be applied to the signs. He found the material beautiful.

Ms. San Miguel said that it was used on the monument sign for which they requested the exception. The travertine would be the beige face of the sign.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed it was only on the one sign.

Ms. San Miguel stated it was only used on the horizontal monument. The other signs were painted aluminum panels as the messaging changed frequently.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the travertine was used in the finish on the building or the new nursing pods or if it was unique to the sign.

Ms. Swenson explained it was not part of the building finishes, but the travertine was already on some existing site signage.

Vice Chair Baltay asked what material was used on the nursing pods.

Ms. Swenson said that it was a beige tactical panel.

Vice Chair Baltay asked what a tactical panel was.

Ms. Swenson explained it was sort of a rain screen.

Boardmember Chen said that there was currently a streetlamp at the location of the monument sign and asked if it would be relocated.

Ms. San Miguel explained the plan was to repurpose the power connections to up light the sign.

Boardmember Chen asked if there was landscaping behind the sign.

Ms. San Miguel stated they were not proposing significant modifications to the landscaping. There would be greenery behind it and up lighting on the face of the sign. Future landscaping would be low growing so as not to block visibility.

Boardmember Chen noted that there was another entrance on Page 15 with an existing corner sign. She asked if that would remain or would be updated to the new sign.

Ms. San Miguel shared the site plan and pointed out the entrance. The signage there was not proposed to be updated and she described the current signage there for a surgery center.

Chair Hirsch asked if the existing sign on the way in to 875 Blake Wilbur would remain or be replaced. He also inquired about another door that he perceived to be a staff door and where the drop off area was.

Ms. San Miguel displayed the site plan and pointed out the drop off area and path of travel. The secondary entrance to 900 Blake Wilbur was not a primary entrance and under COVID protocols all entry was funneled to the primary entrance. The existing pedestrian sign would be retained. It wrapped the corner of the wall and was visible from 900 Blake Wilbur and included messaging supporting that path of travel. Further, it contained a map graphic to support wayfinding for the global campus.

Chair Hirsch asked if the sign in the circular area would be seen but wanted to know more about what people would see if they chose to park rather than be dropped off.

Ms. San Miguel stated they were currently studying updates to messaging on the existing signs on campus. Many signs can be refreshed to show the Cancer Center as a new destination. They did not yet have the proposal ready.

Chair Hirsch called for a Motion or further discussion.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he had a number of conflicting feelings. That the project had to come to the ARB felt like overkill as he thought it could be handled at the staff level. At a high level he thought medical facilities had a cacophony of signs. The corner sign at Blake Wilbur added to this as there would be two corner signs of different colors, sizes, and heights next to a large recess in the building. Then there are

nearby stand mounted signs. The total becomes a visual mess and confusing. He wanted the signs to be consistent, smooth, and welcoming. He did not want to make a stand on what they should do, but simply tell them about his thoughts. The corner signs could be thought about differently and better integrated to the architecture. He felt the same way about the large pedestrian monument sign. The travertine was lovely but different from other signs and buildings. It did not accomplish the larger goal of being smooth and consistent. He suggested they look at the big picture to make things more visually comfortable. The ARB heard the issue because of the sign exception which he struggled with as he could not make the findings. With creative stretching he thought they could make Finding #1 work. This is a hospital on a pedestrian based part of the campus. Because it was pedestrian having a vertical sign conflicted with sightlines and would not be safe and therefore Finding #1 could be made. If the ARB accepted that the other two findings were easier to make. Therefore, if that change was made to the written Findings he could support the sign exception.

Boardmember Rosenberg fully agreed with Vice Chair Baltay about the matter coming before the ARB. As it was a closed campus medical facility and was not visible to the greater community it was a bit excessive to come to the ARB. She understood the sign exception had to come before the ARB. She thought the building was exceptional because of its size and use. Based on that the proposal was appropriate for the scale, size, and space of the location. Having spent significant time at a hospital she respectfully disagreed with Vice Chair Baltay and thought the variety of signs could be helpful and were clear. The family of signage was consistent, cohesive, and clear. The signs presented were an improvement and she appreciated the presentation.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that procedurally the SUMC had a Master Sign Program. The purpose of a Master Sign Program was to think through the site and which sort of signs were wanted on the property. The current Master Sign Program was completed a few years ago and might be out of date. If the program accommodated these signs the project would not have come to the ARB. It only came because the signs were an exception to the program.

Boardmember Thompson thanked the applicant and staff and stated that she did not mind reviewing the signs. She also thanked Boardmember Chen for going on site and noticing the lamppost. She apologized for not being able to go on another site tour personally and explained she could make the Findings to approve the sign exception for the monument sign. She also disagreed with Vice Chair Baltay and thought the travertine was an excellent choice with precedents elsewhere on campus. Since it was a pedestrian oriented location having a rich material with detail was preferable and she supported the choice. With the corner sign she had a similar thought to Vice Chair Baltay but after better understanding the purposes she was ok with the situation. If the applicant decided to change the corner sign she would be ok with that as well.

Chair Hirsch thanked the applicant for the presentation. Having visited the site and seeing the separate areas of campus he thought sign programs were essential. He agreed with the comments made about the travertine material and the orientation of the monument sign. The lower large sign was essential to indicate the importance of the building and was appropriate. He thought it was notable that the SUMC was going to continue considering the wayfinding and not close the subject. One or two signs did not necessarily fix all the outstanding wayfinding issues. The entire program was carefully considered, and he thought it would be successful. He asked if the ARB needed a Motion.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that it was an Action Item that required a Motion.

MOTION: Boardmember Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to recommend approval of the proposed project based on the Findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [22PLN-00161]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Board Level Architectural Review Application to Allow for a new Storefront Facade and Signage for Backcountry (Space #715, Bldg. E - Currently Vacant). Sign Logo may Require an Exception. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from CEQA per Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Tamara Harrison at Tamara.Harrison@mbakerintl.com

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

Boardmember Thompson suggested they do disclosures first.

Chair Hirsch called for disclosures.

Boardmember Chen disclosed that she visited the site.

Boardmember Thompson had nothing to disclose.

Chair Hirsch disclosed that he visited the site.

Vice Chair Baltay disclosed that he visited the site.

Boardmember Rosenberg disclosed that she visited the site.

Chair Hirsch called for the staff report.

Tamara Harrison, Project Planner at Michael Baker International, shared her screen with the ARB and explained they were hearing the Backcountry sign change and façade at the Stanford Shopping Center at 180 El Camino Real. The project was within Building C, Suite #650A, which was currently vacant. She showed a site plan and explained the project was subject to the Master Tenant Façade & Sign (MTFS) Program and required an ARB public hearing as the storefront was more than 35 feet and faced El Camino Real. There is a rear façade as well which is more interior to the Shopping Center. The project proposes to change the façade to accommodate Backcountry and proposes new signage. The project was conditioned to provide 5 bicycle parking spaces as well. The project does not increase the Floor Area Ratio (FAR), the height, or lot coverage of the site. It also does not change site circulation, landscape, or use of the tenant space. The new façades would consist of metal wall panels, wood siding, glazing, and aluminum signage and was consistent with the MTFS Program and the character of the center. She displayed the proposed front façade and explained the primary material was black metal panels with wood siding at the recessed entries. She then displayed the rear façade which included the same materials. The signage was subject to the municipal code. For the front façade a maximum of 110 sf of signage for wall signs was allowed. The rear façade allowed for roughly 52 sf of signage. The front façade was also subject to the El

Camino Real Design Guidelines which require signage be reduced by ½ to 2/3rds of what was allowed by the municipality. Therefore the front façade sign had an allowance of 55 to 73 sf. The MTFS allows for one primary façade wall sign. The tenant sought larger signs than what was allowed so staff requested that the ARB determine if the additional height would be allowed for the logos. The ARB's key considerations and conditions included ensuring the project was in conformance with the ARB Findings, the City's sign code, the El Camino Real Design Guidelines, and the MTFS program with the exception. Staff recommended the ARB direct staff related to the requested exception for logo height and recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning.

Chair Hirsch called for questions of staff.

Boardmember Thompson clarified that there was one logo on the façade facing El Camino that was 3 foot 6 inches. She asked if that was the item that was not compliant and if it would have to be 2 feet in order to comply.

Ms. Harrison explained that both logos on each façade were at 42 inches in height. The MTFS Program limited that to 24 inches. Both logos require the exception.

Ms. Gerhardt referred to Packet Page 52 and explained that had the outline of the MTFS Program. This project had a front and back façade which could be interpreted as a primary and secondary entrance. Staff felt that both entrances were large enough to be classified as primary entrances and were being reviewed as such.

Chair Hirsch thanked Ms. Gerhardt for the clarification.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that answered his question.

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

Garrett Thompson, shared his screen with the ARB and explained they wanted to demonstrate the difference between what a complaint sign looked like and the proposed sign. He showed a slide which had the proposed façade and sign and the compliant façade and sign. The proposed sign had been used in three other formats so far this year. Considering the façade length of over 107 linear feet the logo and wording became almost illegible if kept to the size allowed. He stated that the logo and lettering were always used in conjunction with each other, and they did not use the word Backcountry on a sign without the goat logo. He also showed the difference between the signs in a series of slides as well as the rear façade and flat elevations. He then displayed other examples of current built stores in other locations all of which featured larger signs. The Palo Alto location sign would be rear lit. A photograph was displayed of the materials for reference other than the renderings.

Chair Hirsch called for questions of the applicant.

Boardmember Thompson confirmed that the metal was aluminum composite.

Mr. Thompson indicated that was correct.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the showcase windows were inset with wood on the inside.

Mr. Thompson brought up the plan and pointed out how the wood was used on the structural line and would go back into the space. The wood bulkhead was about 4.5 feet behind the glazing. There was glazing on the side and the roof as well. They wanted to use the wood for warmth against the black façade.

Boardmember Thompson further clarified that the wood went up the side of the walls and into the soffit.

Mr. Thompson stated that was correct and showed a picture of the Seattle location, which was similar other than the glazing due to site conditions.

Boardmember Chen inquired about blade or projecting signs for the project.

Mr. Thompson said that they did not have either. They looked at a blade sign, but due to the size of their façade it was very under scale and therefore it was eliminated.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the installation and dimensions of the wood siding on the rear façade.

Mr. Thompson explained that the installation was a vertical Accoya wood slat which were spaced equally at 2 inches. They were installed over the existing structure which was painted black. He did not have the height, but guessed it was about 14 feet.

Boardmember Chen asked about the treatment at the roofline.

Mr. Thompson said that the paint went to the underside of the soffit for the tile roof.

Boardmember Chen said that she referred to the black panel.

Mr. Thompson explained it was existing wall that would be painted black. The rear had a corrugated metal panel that would wrap the side. The triangular areas would be painted.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if there was a sample of the corrugated metal on the material board.

Mr. Thompson said that they did not. He showed the material board and said it was represented by the flat metal which was flat black.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if there was an example of the texture.

Mr. Thompson said there was not but showed a picture of the material installed on the Seattle store.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed the front façade was 107 linear feet. She asked for a length on the saltbox shape.

Mr. Thompson said it was roughly 40 feet.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked how wide the rear entry façade was.

Mr. Thompson said it was approximately 25 feet.

Vice Chair Baltay noted the big windows and asked if the photometrics were done with the interior lights on or if it was done with the wall mounted exterior lights and soffit recessed lights.

Mr. Thompson deferred to Andy Neilands, Senior Project Manager at David Levy & Associates.

Mr. Neilands explained they were exterior lights only.

Vice Chair Baltay asked what would happen if the interior lights were on as well. He asked how bright it would be though the glass.

Mr. Neilands explained that he was not the lighting expert. The photometrics would have to be rerun in order to provide the numbers.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the storefront would be brightly lit in his opinion.

Mr. Neilands stated that it was subtle, and he did not believe an immense amount of light would pour out through the glazing.

Vice Chair Baltay said that the first rendering showed either a wood panel or a drop ceiling on the left and right side. He requested an explanation.

Mr. Thompson explained that the existing structure fell at 10 foot 2 inches. They chose to wrap the panel in wood to provide warmth and tie the interior and exterior treatments together.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed that the glazing stuck up over the feature.

Mr. Thompson said that was correct. The glazing went all the way up and the panel sat behind it about 4.5 feet.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if there was a specification for the exterior wall mount light fixtures and what it would look like.

Mr. Thompson said it was a simple fixture that was almost treated as a halo light. There was no logo on the light fixtures.

Mr. Neilands referred to Packet Page 5.

Mr. Thompson said that it was a wall mounted light.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if it was on Sheet S1.

Mr. Thompson said it was not. That described the lighting for the logo signs.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that completed his questions.

Boardmember Thompson stated that she had a follow-up question and requested they display the front façade. She confirmed that they were using Spandrel and asked to learn more about it.

Mr. Thompson explained it was a mirrored spandrel and they wanted to keep with the iconic shape they had developed. They did have an existing structure behind which they were trying to block in order to keep the shape and glazing. Because of that they put spandrel above the horizontal mullion.

Boardmember Thompson asked if they looked at making that wood rather than spandrel.

Mr. Thompson said that they did but preferred the simplicity of one open shape.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he had another follow-up related to the Accoya wood siding. The finish was called [maho 1:26:08] and he asked for additional information on it.

Mr. Thompson explained that [maho] was the color of the stain. Accoya was a base product that had a 50 year warranty and was the new “wonder wood.” Accoya has a yellow/greenish tint, but [maho] tended more to a warm neutral brown color when applied to the surface.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if it was a manufacture’s transparent stain.

Mr. Thompson said that it was produced by the manufacturer and the sales representative. All Accoya is milled by project and has become a name brand, but it was sold by smaller distributors. [Maho] was a color that was unique to one of the distributors.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if there was a shine or sheen to it or if it would be a matte clear finish.

Mr. Thompson indicated that it was matte.

Chair Hirsch called for the public comment.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that there was no public comment.

Ms. Klicheva confirmed that there were no speaker cards.

Chair Hirsch called for ARB discussion.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she was partial to the design and thought it was clean and simple. She appreciated the warmth of the wood, and the use of the mirrored spandrel glass was clever. With the signage exception she was having a difficult time determining why the rear façade should receive the exception since it was only 25 feet in length. The allowable size seemed an appropriate fit for the rear façade. With respect to the 107 foot linear façade and how it lined up with the saltbox she liked how the logo was off to the side and she appreciated that the proportion looked better there. She was eager to hear her colleague’s thoughts.

Vice Chair Baltay agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg that the design was lovely and fit in nicely. He was on the ARB when they reviewed the previous tenant’s façade which was all white. In the end the all white seemed ok and now he felt the all black would be ok. His reservations were related to the sign size both on the front and back façade. The purpose of the regulations was to make things less visible from El Camino so a large sign to be seen from El Camino did not fly. He also did not know what findings the ARB could make and asked what was exceptional about the storefront that should allow for a larger logo. He understood the applicant’s point about the proportions of their sign but felt it was a design issue and did not justify an exception to the sign rules. The sign was fine at 2 feet high, and he could not make the findings to go beyond that and grant the sign exception.

Boardmember Chen thanked the applicant and said that she liked the elevation design, materials, and wood siding on both the front and back side of the project. With the sign exception she agreed with her colleagues and suggested the applicant separate the logo sign from the text so that the logo sign could meet the 2 feet requirement. On the rear façade it made sense for the sign to be smaller as the width of the building was narrower.

Boardmember Thompson [audio/video skip 1:33:11] thanked the applicant for the renderings that showed both the proposed and compliant signs. The rear looked very nice with the complaint sign and made the façade feel intimate. She explained that to make the sign exception the ARB needed to find an extenuating circumstance and she agreed with Vice Chair Baltay that she could not find something extenuating. If they were trying to capture the interest of drivers on El Camino there would be trees blocking the way anyway. She did not love the spandrel because up close it was dishonest and did not provide the silhouette at night. Based on that she recommended wood which would make the façade nicer and could be lit at night to provide the shape. With the smaller sign they also might want to use a blade sign to attract pedestrians.

Chair Hirsch said that the larger façade sign was a matter of proportion to the entire building. He thought making it smaller would diminish the entire façade. Based on that he agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg that it was important to keep the larger size on the front but only allow for the compliant sign in the rear. There were exceptions within the shopping center already and this particular store was larger, so it was important to have the sign relate to the size of the store itself. He found no problem with the spandrel glass issue. The scale of the light fixtures was also appropriate. He appreciated the façade as it was and would prefer the signage on the interior be changed. He noted that the ARB had some differences and asked what they could do to move to consensus.

Boardmember Thompson said that she took Chair Hirsch's point about the large façade. She asked the ARB what they thought about the wood and referred to the nighttime rendering. As shown the boxes popped because of the wood in the back, but the middle fell apart.

Boardmember Chen thought a different lighting design might help, such as LED strips in the middle to enhance the geometry.

Vice Chair Baltay asked Chair Hirsch if the applicant would address the issue by modifying the spandrel somehow. He thought the point was good but wanted to know what it would take to change it.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that she liked the spandrel and thought it was beautiful in the daytime when most visitors would be there. She did appreciate Boardmember Chen's lighting ideas but disagreed with the idea of wood. The images of the previously built stores were not as visually striking as the proposed design.

Vice Chair Baltay said that he would prefer to see all glass to the ceiling so they could see deep into the building.

Boardmember Thompson said that it would not be all glass because it would be solid. It was deceptive.

Vice Chair Baltay wanted to know if they could change the building inside so that it would go deeper but did not know if that was realistic.

Chair Hirsch noted that he saw shaking heads. He agreed with Boardmember Chen's comments about how to light the material and also that the wood was a wonderful natural looking material. The illustrations did not represent what the lighting might be, so he encouraged further thought into the area.

Ms. Gerhardt thought there were a variety of opinions on the project. There were also different parts to the project: 1) the façade itself; and 2) the signs. She suggested straw polling to see where the ARB was as a whole. Following that the applicant could explain which changes might be possible.

Chair Hirsch suggested they start with the lighting. He called for a straw poll for improved lighting on the front of the building.

Boardmember Thompson asked if they could be more specific.

Chair Hirsch called for suggestions.

Vice Chair Baltay supposed the spandrel issue could be addressed with lighting if it was lit so that at night the full salt box shape was emphasized or brought out it would address the ARB's concern.

Boardmember Thompson thought it was a separate issue. Her issue with the spandrel was that it looked like glass until one got up close and then realized that it wasn't glass. Dirt collected on it. The lighting idea was separate.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he was confused. The two rectangular windows had spandrel panels with an Accoya wood finish edge of the drop ceiling which would be lit in a way that the whole (interrupted)

[interruption of the Zoom to Mr. Levy for a moment 1:44:17]

Vice Chair Baltay (continued) on the salt box shape the glazing above the horizontal ceiling had not cavity behind it. It was a surface spandrel panel.

Boardmember Thompson said that was correct and that she was suggesting it be treated similarly (interrupted)

Vice Chair Baltay asked why it couldn't be treated similarly to the side windows. He thought that made more sense.

Boardmember Thompson thought that should be the straw poll.

Vice Chair Baltay said that there were two different treatments on the windows. The rectangular windows had glazing clearly expressed as glazing whereas the salt box was not.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested they ask the applicant. She understood that the glazing on the left and right side sat proud of where the structural element was. There was space between the glazing and the dropped header to illuminate it and have breathing room. She believed the salt box shape was more pressed up closer to it. They might not be able to do it without moving the glazing façade out.

Vice Chair Baltay said the applicant could be asked, but he thought they really should just do that.

Chair Hirsch asked them to imagine the possibility of extending the shape of the salt box into the building.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that was what he said at first. There was a structural element going through.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that the applicant had their hand raised if Chair Hirsch wanted them to address the questions.

Chair Hirsch said that he would as all the Boardmembers had different intentions.

David Levy, David Levy & Associates, explained that the façade was developed because there was a moment frame completely across the building. underneath that was the original concrete façade of the building. Then inside the building was a solid masonry wall dropped down from concrete spandrel that was there which created the moment frame for the whole center. The landlord took a section of the moment frame out and put in a new moment frame behind the entrance. The existing concrete remained and could not be taken out. The wood Accoya seen in the windows wraps over the pieces of exposed concrete and the glass was put over it. They could not remove anymore of the frame and open it any further due to the remaining moment frame. The spandrel was used instead of wood as they tried the wood and it looked too similar with their Seattle project which they were not satisfied with. This façade was developed knowing most customers would see it in the daylight hours and they did not think anyone would recognize the spandrel glass was reflective above the doors, which were very tall. He was convinced that it was a cleaner application than using wood. He welcomed any questions.

Chair Hirsch said it was not clear where the line of the ceiling was on the inside. He asked if it was at the line of the spandrel glass at the salt box entry.

Mr. Levy said that it was behind the glass. The concrete dropped down about 4 feet behind the glass and that was wrapped with wood.

Chair Hirsch asked if that was clear to the ARB.

Mr. Levy asked Andy if he had a section available.

Mr. Neilands asked Mr. Thompson to pull up the packet.

Boardmember Thompson suggested they look at Sheet A500.

Chair Hirsch thanked the applicant in response to being shown a drawing.

Boardmember Thompson [unintelligible off microphone 1:51:21].

Boardmember Rosenberg clarified that she understood the drawing. In theory they could pull the door, façade, and spandrel glass forward 8 inches and wrap the back portion with wood. She disagreed with that, but it was a possibility. She liked the way it was.

Chair Hirsch said that the drawing clarified the section through the façade better.

Vice Chair Baltay said that now that he understood it better he was concerned that the side windows were flush with the black. He thought they were deeply recessed into the façade. he did not think it was as good and thought there should be more of a physical reveal on the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg argued that if they pushed the glazing back they might be accentuated in a way that looked like entrances. Having them up front it was clear they were a window, and she liked the difference.

Boardmember Thompson agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg and thought the inset entry made sense.

Chair Hirsch also agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg.

Vice Chair Baltay stated they need a physical reveal there of at least 6 to 12 inches.

Mr. Thompson said that there was no recess, but there was a frame around the outer display windows of 6 inches that goes up and around from the panels.

Vice Chair Baltay appreciated the construction details.

Mr. Levy added that the display windows were just as they were in the previous store. They were in the exact same plane but had a masonry wall behind. The landlord's work allowed them to open up those walls and see into the store.

Vice Chair Baltay understood that but thought the design would be stronger if it were recessed even 6 inches. He did not think it affected his ability to accept the façade under the standards, therefore, it depended on what his colleagues thought. The biggest issue was the sign exception. The design was strong either way and the ARB loved to dive into details. He thought it would be stronger to have the side windows recessed 6 inches or so. He also thought the spandrel was not as good. He asked if they could view the storefront in Seattle again.

Chair Hirsch agreed.

Vice Chair Baltay asked the applicant to show the Seattle store. He confirmed that it was shown in the upper left corner of the slide.

Mr. Thompson said that the existing building had limited structural capacity to entertain windows across. They would have preferred something closer to the Palo Alto design but due to lead times, agreements with the landlord, and the pandemic they were limited to the shown opening.

Boardmember Rosenberg appreciated the Palo Alto placement of the sign in relation to the salt box slope of the roof.

Mr. Thompson agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg.

Boardmember Thompson suggested a straw poll.

Chair Hirsch suggested they separate the sign issue from the salt box and side windows. He asked who would like to vote.

Boardmember Thompson asked if they would do the front façade sign differently from the rear.

Chair Hirsch said that they would do both signs separately.

Boardmember Thompson asked where they were starting.

Chair Hirsch suggested they start with the front façade without the sign.

Ms. Gerhardt said that they should do a straw poll on the front façade itself not including the sign.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he was ok with leaving the façade as it was or if the designer chose to change anything based on ARB comments.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed with Vice Chair Baltay. She liked the façade as it was and noted that she would be distressed if the lights changed significantly since the ARB was not provided a spec sheet on the lighting fixtures. Based on that she requested they adhere to the renderings as close as possible.

Boardmember Chen agreed and noted that lighting could be used to enhance the geometry of the entrance.

Boardmember Thompson said that she was in the minority. The applicant could consider the suggestions, but she could still approve the project unchanged.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he would support Boardmember Thompson if she had a concrete idea.

Boardmember Thompson stated that they did not know the details of the structure, so she was ok.

Chair Hirsch was in agreement that the front façade shape was nice and should be kept. The designers have completed the other projects well so he was confident that the store would be beautiful. He suggested the ARB focus on the signs and called for a straw poll on that.

Vice Chair Baltay thought the rear sign should be compliant.

Boardmember Thompson agreed.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed.

Boardmember Chen agreed.

Chair Hirsch agreed.

Vice Chair Baltay understood Chair Hirsch's argument about the front façade sign being proportional to the building and agreed. He asked which findings the ARB could use to justify the decision.

Chair Hirsch thought using the shopping center's... (did not finish thought)

Ms. Gerhardt said that the sign was a similar situation to the Medical Center they just discussed. The store was not in conformance with the master sign program but were in conformance with the sign code and El Camino Guidelines.

Chair Hirsch thought that was enough to accept the front proportions.

Vice Chair Baltay asked Ms. Gerhardt if a sign exception required three findings in the code. If it was an exception to the MTFs program then was there not a different procedure? He was concerned about opening the door for every tenant facing El Camino to use the same justification.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that was a valid concern and the decision should not be taken lightly. That said, this store had the longest façade by far on the row.

Ms. Gerhardt said Boardmember Rosenberg gave her answer.

Boardmember Thompson requested to see what was previously shared a moment before on the screen.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if Ms. Gerhardt had specific language to share.

Ms. Gerhardt did not find sign exception findings, which were normally drafted up. She had the ARB Findings. As Boardmember Rosenberg and Vice Chair Baltay said they needed to be careful about setting a precedent. She did think it was a larger façade and there were justifications that could be made.

Vice Chair Baltay pulled the Sign Exception Findings from the previous project and read Finding #1 aloud. He asked the ARB what the exceptional or extraordinary circumstances were.

Ms. Gerhardt said that in this case they would discuss the circumstances that were different from tenant to tenant.

Vice Chair Baltay said that the exceptional circumstance would be the longer façade.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that was correct.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if someone had twice as large a frontage if they could get twice as large a sign again. There were reasons that things were capped in the code.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed but cited Sheet A300. In theory it could be three separate projects with three notable signs. The applicant was not even proposing a blade sign, it just wanted one sign to speak to the entire façade which was appreciated design wise. The round portion was 3 foot 6 inches, and the text was only 2 feet tall. So the exception is almost only applicable to the goat logo which was a circle. Because the façade was so long and could have been three separate tenants with three separate signs having one simplified design was acceptable. She also appreciated that they were not cluttering the façade with a blade sign.

Boardmember Chen agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg and suggested the applicant think about separating the logo and the text. The text looked good at 2 foot high and only the round shape then exceeded the requirements.

Chair Hirsch suggested they look at the logo on the [unintelligible 2:05:07] piece there is a separation. On the image of the building it looked closer due to the perspective and angle. The proportion on the page was good.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if they finished the straw poll on the front sign.

Vice Chair Baltay said that it was not that easy because the decision hinged on the making of the findings. The ARB was struggling with the findings.

Boardmember Thompson indicated that she was also having a hard time with the findings.

Ms. Gerhardt explained staff had advised the applicant that they could keep the lettering at 2 feet and minimized the logo but even to her eye that looked awkward and that was a big part of why they brought it to the ARB.

Chair Hirsch suggested they try to wind up the discussion.

Boardmember Rosenberg mentioned that stacked signs could be taller at 36 inches. If the logo was viewed as a stacked sign it would be a very minor exception.

Vice Chair Baltay asked Ms. Gerhardt if that could be the answer.

Ms. Gerhardt said that was true. Stacked signs generally meant two rows of lettering, but potentially the ARB could use the 36 inches as limit for the logo.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if that would be acceptable to the applicant as a compromise.

Boardmember Thompson said that was in between.

Chair Hirsch asked the applicant if 36 inches were acceptable.

Mr. Thompson explained that Backcountry was hitting new markets and was only an online retailer until about a year and a half prior. All marketing contains the logo lockup like that. They were trying to build recognition and the word Backcountry without the logo was not as identifiable. The most important thing to the applicant was the branding and it was important to keep them together.

Boardmember Thompson said that they were not suggesting separating them, they were suggesting making it all smaller by 6 inches.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted that the text measurement of 2 feet ignored the dropdown of the letter y. Taking the entire logo and word and shrinking it so the exterior measured 36 inches could be a good compromise.

Vice Chair Baltay said that was provided staff put in the report that it was being considered a stacked sign because there were two unaligned elements so 36 inches was acceptable. Without that he could not support the exception.

Ms. Gerhardt did not know that staff could call it a stacked sign because that was meant to be two words on top of each other. However, if the company had a longer title they would be allowed 36 inches. So for setting a precedent that would be reasonable.

Chair Hirsch said that he would give the applicant one last chance to respond.

Mr. Levy said that they would have to present it to Backcountry for its approval. The scale of the logo and wording was sacred to the company. They needed to study the sign to see how it would look on the façade. Accordingly, he asked if they could get approval on the façade and sign in the back and then come back with a study of how the 36 inches worked on the storefront.

Chair Hirsch asked if he was assuming that they would reduce the sign in the back.

Mr. Levy said that they would.

Chair Hirsch suggested that they say that the front sign would return to the ARB.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the Motion would be to a date uncertain.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if it could be handled by an ad hoc committee.

Chair Hirsch suggested a straw poll.

Ms. Gerhardt thought the ARB as a whole needed to vote on the size they could make the findings for so if the ARB agreed 36 inches was correct then the details could go to an ad hoc committee or staff. If there was no agreement on the size then they needed to return to the full ARB.

Chair Hirsch asked for a Motion.

Boardmember Thompson said that the applicant wanted to study the idea. She asked if they studied it and did not want to do it if the approval would fall flat.

Ms. Gerhardt thought the ARB could say 36 inches and if the applicant wanted something different they could come back. That would at least give them 36 inches approved.

Mr. Levy said that they would please accept that.

Vice Chair Baltay wanted the ARB to make a decision so the applicant could move forward. He suggested they say 36 inches maximum.

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Thompson, to recommend approval of the project as presented with two conditions: 1) the front signage be no larger than 36 inches tall, 2) the light fixtures be clearly documented in the drawings to represent what was currently shown on the plans, and 3) the rear signage needed to be code complaint.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Approval of Minutes

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for July 7, 2022

Chair Hirsch announced the ARB minutes for July 7, 2022.

MOTION: Boardmember Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve the minutes of July 7, 2022.

Vice Chair Baltay said that he did not know if it was the July 7th or the July 21st meeting that included an ad hoc meeting.

Ms. Gerhardt said that it was the 21st.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he would hold his thoughts and had no comment on the July 7th minutes.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for July 21, 2022

Chair Hirsch announced the ARB minutes for July 21, 2022.

Vice Chair Baltay understood that following the July 21st meeting there was an ad hoc meeting on Castilleja School. The meeting was rather involved and had a site meeting and discussion. He thought that should be included in the minutes for the record and did not believe the minutes should be approved without it.

Chair Hirsch asked Ms. Gerhardt about the write up for the ad hoc.

Ms. Gerhardt believed that staff was in the process of creating the write up. The item could be continued until that was ready.

Chair Hirsch suggested they continue the item.

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to continue approval of the minutes of June 16, 2022 to a date uncertain.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Ms. Gerhardt stated that she had announcements.

Boardmember Thompson indicated that she also had an announcement. The ARB Awards Ceremony was scheduled for September 21st. All Boardmembers should have received an evite and are asked to RSVP. Any questions could be directed to herself or Boardmember Rosenberg as they were on the ad hoc committee.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that they had examples of the award certificates which could be viewed by the ARB. She suggested they place a checkmark on the certificate they liked best as an informal way of voting on the design.

Chair Hirsch asked if they had contacted the person about the lobby board.

Boardmember Thompson said that they were and that physical boards were requested by the winners which would be presented on the night and displayed in the lobby for a month. The projects will be celebrated publicly for a month at City Hall.

Chair Hirsch asked if they had received any responses from winners.

Boardmember Thompson explained that the emails to winners had only been sent the previous day. All materials were due the next week.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that they had received confirmation that the winners were aware of their awards.

Vice Chair Baltay thanked Boardmembers Rosenberg and Thompson.

Boardmember Thompson reminded the other Boardmembers that they each had to do a project write up. The winners were also providing narratives on the projects. The ARB write ups were due in two weeks.

Chair Hirsch asked if individual Boardmembers would introduce the projects.

Boardmember Thompson said that was correct. There was an agenda for the evening which would be hosted by herself and Boardmember Rosenberg. Each Boardmember would be asked to introduce a project.

Boardmember Rosenberg clarified that the introductions did not need to be long.

Boardmember Thompson said they should mention the reasons the projects were selected as winners.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested a two to three minute time limit since the architects would also speak.

Chair Hirsch agreed.

Boardmember Chen asked if the winners were providing presentations.

Boardmember Thompson explained that they would give more of an acceptance speech.

Chair Hirsch inquired about the dress code.

Boardmember Thompson asked everyone to dress nicely. She suggested cocktail attire.

Ms. Gerhardt appreciated the work on the ARB Awards and thanked Amy French for her involvement as well. As requested she discussed what was covered at the latest City Council meeting including the pre-screening of 800 San Antonio. She quickly displayed and summarized the slideshow presented to Council by the Project Planner. Generally Council was in favor of the project. The next Council item was a pre-screening of 616 Ramona. She quickly displayed and summarized the slideshow presented to Council by the Project Planner. In order to modernize the structure the project seeks to go outside the building envelope. Council was not 100% in favor of the idea but will have further discussions. The final item heard was related to the execution of agreements with Home Key. The project is moving forward and will come to the ARB for project design shortly.

Chair Hirsch thought that the ARB had already looked at that item.

Ms. Gerhardt said that she was working on the fly. Staff was working on Home Key a lot and the ARB had already reviewed the design. The architectural review was not done so she would return to the ARB with further information. She thought the formal review remained.

Adjournment

Chair Hirsch adjourned the meeting.



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

Architectural Review Board Ad Hoc Committee Review

TO: Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects, 2653 Spring Street, Redwood City, CA
94063

SUBJECT: 2585 E Bayshore Road [21PLN-00121]

DATE: August 18, 2022

FROM: Claire Raybould, AICP, Senior Planner

The application, and plans dated June 28, 2022, were reviewed by the ARB Ad Hoc Committee on July 7, 2022 in accordance with condition of approval #6(a-b), as stated below. The ARB Ad Hoc committee was comprised of Board members Thompson and Hirsch.

5. ARB AD HOC COMMITTEE: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall return to the ARB for Ad hoc review approval of the following items, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services:
 - a. Provide clarification regarding the trees along the frontage to confirm they would not conflict with the PG&E utility easement. If the proposed trees are found to conflict with the easement, provide alternative trees and an updated landscape plan.
 - b. Provide alternative materials/colors that are of a warmer color scheme.

At the meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee agreed with the revisions presented for landscaping within the PG&E utility easement. However, the Ad hoc committee requested that the applicant return to the Ad Hoc Committee to provide further clarification on the weathering of the Shou Sugi Ban Wood siding and to provide a lighter color for the pilasters and concrete (reflected as C1 on the materials board and plans).

On August 18, 2022 the applicant returned to the ARB Ad Hoc Committee. The ARB Ad Hoc Committee reviewed plans dated July 26, 2022 in accordance with Condition of approval #6b. The ARB Ad Hoc Committee was comprised of Board members Thompson and Hirsch. The ARB Ad Hoc Committee agreed with the materials and recommended approval of the proposed colors, as revised. They also recommended that the M1 Mechanical screen color be revised to the C2 (Burnt Ember) color as it is a less reflective color in keeping with the Baylands Design Guidelines.

The applicant shall ensure the changes presented in the subcommittee are reflected in the plans submitted for building permit(s). In addition, this Ad Hoc Committee Review letter shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s).



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

Architectural Review Board Ad Hoc Committee Review

TO: Geno Yun, ELS Architecture and Urban Design, 2040 Addison Street,
Berkeley, CA 94704

SUBJECT: 488 University Avenue [22PLN-00040]

DATE: August 18, 2022

FROM: Claire Raybould, AICP, Senior Planner

The application, and plans dated April 29, 2022, were reviewed by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) at their regular meeting on May 19, 2022. The ARB recommended approval of the proposed project with a requirement to return to the Ad Hoc Committee in order to present samples of the proposed materials, particularly a sample of the tube lighting for the projecting sign, and to add the decorative scrolls to the sign if the Historic Architect determined that the scrolls would be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

On August 18, 2022 the ARB Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the revised plans and the materials board, dated August 4, 2022. The ARB Ad Hoc committee comprised of Board members Thompson and Hirsch. At the meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee found the materials acceptable and agreed with the revisions presented without conditions.