



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 14876)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 10/20/2022

Summary Title: Minutes of September 15, 2022

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for September 15, 2022

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

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

Background

Draft minutes from the September 15, 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

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Minutes of September 15, 2022 (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
 MINUTES: September 15, 2022
 Council Chamber & Zoom
 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 Yingxi Chen, Boardmember Kendra Rosenberg

Absent: Boardmember Osma Thompson

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) Recently Submitted Projects

Ms. Gerhardt shared her screen, showed the ARB its upcoming meeting dates, and noted that currently nothing was scheduled for the October 6, 2022, ARB meeting. She stated that most likely that hearing would be cancelled and pointed out that the list of recently submitted projects was also attached.

Chair Hirsch asked if there were any additions to the recently submitted projects list since the September 1st hearing.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that if anything was added it would be at the bottom. She did not think any large projects had come in recently. She was certain there would be more added by the next hearing. Two of the ARB prescreenings went to City Council the past Monday. Additionally, the Home Key project was before the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) the night before to discuss a Comprehensive Plan change. The tip of the parcel had a conservation land designation that needed to be changed in order to utilize the site for Green Waste. 70 Encina Avenue and 4345 El Camino were the prescreenings heard by Council.

Chair Hirsch noted that the description was not included in the packet.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that 70 Encina and 4345 El Camino were on the bottom of Packet Page 9.

Chair Hirsch thanked Ms. Gerhardt.

Study Session

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 824 San Antonio Rd. [21PLN-00339]. Request for Preliminary Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of an Existing Commercial Building and Construction of a Four-Story, Approximately 30,746 Square Foot Private Residential Care Facility With 15 Independent Senior Dwelling Units, 1 Private Owner's Unit, 9 Assisted Living Units, and an 8-bed Skilled Nursing Facility, With Underground Parking and Ground-Level Resident Amenities, Plus Approximately 6,268 SF Ground-Floor Commercial Space. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: CS (Commercial Service).

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

Emily Foley, Planner, shared her screen with the ARB and explained the project was located near San Antonio and Charleston Road. Everything to the rear of the project was in the City of Mountain View. She showed a slide of the current condition, which was a boxing gym. The existing building would be demolished. Adjacent uses include Hertz Automotive and a gas station with offices across the street. She explained that this was a preliminary application which would be followed by a formal ARB application. The ARB may provide preliminary feedback relating to the Objective Design Standards, scale and mass of the building, transitions and scale to the adjacent properties, relationship to the overall neighborhood, pedestrian orientation, vehicular access, and other items related to the ARB's typical purview. She reminded the ARB that the project had the option as mixed-used housing to go through the Objective Design Standard process. As proposed the project did not meet every single objective standard so it was possible that it would use the traditional process. If it would meet the objective standards then in addition to the preliminary hearing there would be one ARB Study Session when they submitted their formal application. The project proposes to use the Housing Incentive Program (HIP) to propose a higher Floor Area Ratio (FAR) than typically allowed in the CS zone. The project intends to build a new 4-story mixed-use building including 15 independent senior units, 9 assisted living units, and an 8 bed skilled nursing facility. The skilled nursing facility was situated on the ground floor along with a small retail component. Since they are in the CS zone and using the HIP incentives she displayed the second and third floor plans. The fourth floor had the same layout as the third floor. The independent and assisted units were mixed together between the three floors. She displayed the project elevations and explained that the architect designed around and highlighted protected redwood trees. The materials include exposed concrete, stucco, and wood screens and the building stands at 50 feet. Key considerations were the floor area due to the HIP. The project did not meet the build to line requirement for the Objective Standards, but there was a special setback along San Antonio. The required setback was 24 feet, and the ground floor was set back to accommodate the drop off zone. It was possible to meet the build to line requirement by cantilevering the second floor out over the first floor. That would allow for the applicant to maintain the usability of the ground floor. The project also did not meet the contextual step back requirements since it was adjacent to one story buildings, but it was done to allow for the full residential density desired. Staff's recommendation was to consider the project and provide preliminary comments.

Chair Hirsch called for ARB questions of staff.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if it was possible to hear the architect's presentation first.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that was acceptable to the rest of the ARB and then called for the applicant's presentation.

Jennifer Kretschmer, J. Kretschmer Architect, shared her screen with the ARB and thanked them for their time. The client's goal was to provide a senior living facility that was enjoyable and include amenities. The project was very personal for the property owner. The project had approximately 52,000 square feet (sf) on a .44 acre site. The proposed lot coverage was 56% and the proposed FAR was 1.93. There was a special setback of 24 feet along San Antonio Road, 5 foot setback on the sides, and 10 foot rear setback. It was zoned CS and was part of the housing incentive program. The project included 16 independent living units, one of which was set aside for the property owner, 9 assisted living units, and a 5 room skilled nursing facility with 32 underground parking spaces. The owner also intended to provide transportation services to residents. A retail space that was open to the public and could provide resident friendly retail like sundries or a salon was included in the project. The current structure held a gym, and the adjacent uses included a gas station, two fast food restaurants, and a Hertz car rental. The project extended the pedestrian clear path along San Antonio Road by three feet and would include an easement to increase the public sidewalk area 12 feet and provide street trees. The primary entry has an exterior bench for residents to use while waiting for transportation. She showed pictures of the existing property with the proposed massing superimposed. They did not step back the building mass over the upper floors because the site was added to the HIP area, and they expected that adjacent properties would be redeveloped to maximize density. There would be 32 spaces in the underground garage which was more than the required parking for the building. there would be accessible parking, Electric Vehicle (EV) charging, and van parking with EVCS spaces. There would also be 28 long term and 6 short term bicycle parking spaces on the property. The ground floor would be composed of lobby, resident amenities including a lounge, library, and coffee bar, retail spaces, and skilled nursing units. Support spaces were also on the ground floor and primarily on the North side of the main level. Staff would manage waste collection for residents. The first level included a redwood reflection garden which preserves the site's two significant redwoods. The rear open space was primarily reserved for staff and skilled nursing. The second floor contained four independent living units and three assisted living units. The amenities included a communal dining room, resident gathering space, and warming kitchen. There was an 1,864 sf podium level garden on the level oriented to the two redwood trees to take advantage of the views and southern exposure. Additionally, each independent living unit would have a balcony. The third floor was composed primarily of independent living and assisted living units as well as a gym. The fourth floor was similar to the third floor but featured a community room for residents instead of the gym. She showed the roof plan including photovoltaic area, mechanical equipment, and mechanical screening. With the building section she highlighted that the underground parking and the ground floor would consist of larger open spaces while the upper three levels consisted of stacked housing units. The C shape design took advantage of the southern exposure and views to the mountains. Sunlight was particularly important for seniors and was taken into consideration. The building was 50 feet tall measured at the parapet. The design and material choices were intended to appeal to senior residents who lived a modern lifestyle. They planned to use green and sustainable materials and use wood and plant covered screens to provide privacy and soften hard edges. The owner wanted a strong sense of verticality in the façade to break up the typical horizontality seen in similar types of housing projects. The lobby featured a cenote sculpture which was

an organic form and would be used to bring in light. The object standards incorporated in the project included façade variation, material variation, articulated façade, green screens, wood soffits, and organic patterns. The primary entrance was clearly pronounced with a tapered overhang and articulated with a textured screen. The ground floor was tall due to the ground floor retail requirements. The retail area had transparent glazing facing San Antonio Road. The north façade was the longest and she displayed a rendering for the ARB. She thanked the ARB for its time and welcomed feedback.

Chair Hirsch thanked Ms. Kretschmer and called for ARB questions.

Boardmember Chen thanked Ms. Kretschmer for the presentation and stated she had several questions. First, she asked how people would access the bicycle room in the basement from the ground floor.

Ms. Kretschmer explained there were multiple options to reach the long term storage in the basement. It could be accessed from the stairwells, elevators, and the parking entrance. The stairwells would have access from the outside.

Boardmember Chen asked if people would take their bikes through the reflection garden and to the stairwell on the south property line.

Ms. Kretschmer said that the bicycle parking in the underground space was long term and for residents and staff. Those people could access it through the lobby of the building and did not necessarily have to come from the outside.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the trees near the rear property line that needed to be removed. She asked if that was because of the basement affecting the root systems.

Ms. Kretschmer indicated that was correct. Most of the trees were small enough that they were not considered significant or heritage.

Boardmember Chen noted that there were oaks and redwoods around there. She confirmed that the project was providing more parking than required and asked if they thought about making the basement smaller to save more trees.

Ms. Kretschmer said that they could reduce the underground parking from the front and the back and had taken that into consideration. The site's width was very narrow and in order to have the drive paths be two ways it was not feasible to go narrower.

Boardmember Chen stated that she understood. She pointed out the circular area for the potential additional utilities along the street. She asked if they had any ideas about the material and height of the screening. She indicated that it was on the site plan.

Ms. Kretschmer asked Athena Carter to answer the question.

Athena Carter, Architects FORA, stated that in the past they used plants for screening. She was unsure whether or not Palo Alto would accept that.

Boardmember Chen asked if they considered other places for the transformer location.

Ms. Kretschmer said that they had not as that was the current existing location of the transformer.

Boardmember Chen stated that her next questions were for staff. She asked about the Fire Code requirements for this type of property and if a fire lane was required.

Ms. Gerhardt explained the Fire Department reviewed all the projects. The hoses are 150 feet long so as long as they can get the hose around the building that was usually the requirement. There were other sprinkler requirements and things like that. She asked Ms. Foley if there were any other requirements from the Fire Department.

Ms. Foley said that she did not have an answer for that as this was only a preliminary review. Any formal application would be reviewed in deeper detail.

Boardmember Chen noted that the cantilevered balcony on the upper floor was only 8 inches from the property line. She asked how that would impact future development for the adjacent lot.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that would be regulated through the Building Code. Staff would look into the question.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he had several questions for staff. He asked Ms. Foley to elaborate on the build to line requirements.

Ms. Foley explained that the CS zone had a build to line requirement in its development standards.

Ms. Gerhardt said that generally it was a requirement but in this case there was a 24 foot front special setback. So the City would want the building to be right on that setback, but there are allowances to push the first floor back so long as the upper floors were still at 24 feet.

Ms. Foley said the requirement was for 50% of the frontage to be built at the setback. The property line was not exactly parallel to the building.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed that it was an objective design standard within the Zoning Code. He asked if the ARB Objective Standards would supersede or if it would be absolutely required regardless.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that it was required because it was in the same development standards table where setbacks and height limits were located. Unless there was a Design Enhancement Exception (DEE) it would not be feasible, and a DEE would be difficult for a setback.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if there was a 10 foot setback for residential uses. He understood that the staff had not done a full zoning analysis yet.

Ms. Foley said that since the project abutted other CS zoned districts the residential setback did not apply.

Vice Chair Baltay said that it was based on the zoning and not on the use.

Ms. Gerhardt referred to Packet Page 17 for setback requirements.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed that on the rear yard there was still a 10 foot setback. He thought that the drawings did not show that.

Ms. Foley explained that there was an allowance for balconies to extend up to six feet into side setbacks.

Vice Chair Baltay noted the report mentioned there were objective standards that the project would not comply with as presented. He asked what those were and indicated that staff could respond to him later if they did not have the information immediately.

Ms. Foley said that she was looking for her notes. What was included in the staff report [jump in audio/visual 45:44]

Vice Chair Baltay noticed when he visited the site that there was no on street parking in front of the property and asked if that would remain that way.

Ms. Gerhardt did not know for certain but assumed that was correct. She stated that staff would check on it.

Vice Chair Baltay understood that there was a new Tree Protection Ordinance which applied to all trees. He asked if that was correct and questioned the impact to the trees at the back of the property.

Ms. Foley explained the new Tree Ordinance went into effect after the project was submitted but before they made their formal application. The formal application would be required to comply with the new Tree Ordinance. Urban Forestry's initial review of the project also occurred prior to the new law and so it was not reflected in their review.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the new ordinance regulated all trees over a certain diameter and not just oaks and redwoods.

Ms. Gerhardt wanted staff to take a second look, but it appeared there were 7 trees that the City was concerned about when it used to just be oaks and redwoods. The trees still needed to be around 11.5 inches in diameter. Redwoods had to be 18 inches. There were also designated trees. Any tree on an ARB project could be a designated tree and they could request that it remain.

Vice Chair Baltay said that the survey indicated a stand of trees at the back of the property, some of which were 15 or 16 inches. He indicated that completed his questions of staff and asked if Boardmember Rosenberg had anything for staff first.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that she had questions of staff. With the balconies she heard that they could protrude into the side yard setback up to 6 feet. That confused her since this project only had 5 foot setbacks. An 8 inch offset from the property line was minimal and she asked staff if they saw any issues with that.

Ms. Foley stated that the applicant would need to meet building code since planning requirements were more relaxed.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if balconies would accomplish the build to front line.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that all balconies would not accomplish that, but they could have some ins and outs. The City wanted the feeling of the building to be on the build to line. A combination of some solid walls, some balconies, and a recessed ground floor could work. Since balconies are only a portion of the façade they would not meet the 50% requirement by themselves.

Boardmember Rosenberg wondered if the radius of the front drive needed to comply with a fire engine being able to access the space or if the fire engine would remain by the curb on San Antonio.

Ms. Foley thought that would depend on the overall length of the building. The Fire Department did not make any comments on that.

Boardmember Rosenberg explained that she was questioning whether there needed to be a recess in the front for access. She indicated that concluded her questions of staff.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if he could ask questions of the applicant.

Chair Hirsch indicated that he could.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that he was not an architect of this type of building but when he had seen them there was greater attention paid to the separation between assisted living units and independent living units. This concept had them lined up in a corridor with no separation. He asked if that was intentional according to the client's desires.

Ms. Kretschmer explained that the client's initial desire for skilled nursing was so the tenants did not have to go elsewhere to seek skilled nursing healthcare. The separation was that it was put to the back and there would be doors and walls to that area. The main corridor in that area was not (interrupted)

Vice Chair Baltay apologized for the interruption and explained that he was asking more about the units on the upper floors where they mixed assisted living and independent living.

Ms. Kretschmer apologized for the mistake.

Vice Chair Baltay understood that assisted living was a more substantial level of assistance and was usually in its own wing. He asked if it was intentional to mix them.

Ms. Kretschmer said that the mix was intentional. They initially had designs where the assisted living was together. There was a structural thought about stacking the units, so they checked with the owner and on the requirements for assisted living. They did not find anything that said there would be a problem with assisted living and independent living together since the staff was going to be in the same building.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired about the owner of the property and if that person would also be operating the facility.

Ms. Kretschmer said that was correct and that the owner was seeking the assistance of some providers.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that was wonderful news. He asked for further information on the cenote sculpture.

Ms. Kretschmer explained that it would come from the roof garden area on the second floor and would bring in light to the lobby like an oculus. The sculptural element would be seen in the dining room and bar area located on the second floor. It would hopefully provide joy and something unique for the residents.

Boardmember Rosenberg remembered her last question for staff. She asked if the applicant would be required to follow the angle or if a stepping that touched would qualify in regard to the front setback line.

Ms. Gerhardt thought given the odd angle a stepping would be acceptable. It would depend on how much and the ARB could assist with that.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that she had several detailed questions of the applicant. She asked if the skilled nursing facility was more of a hospital or pseudo hospital setting and requested clarification.

Ms. Kretschmer said that it was not intended to be long term health care. It was more of rehabilitation area or for residents to move into as their health changes. The owner currently works hands on in senior care and the project was one of passion for her; she wanted the facility to operate such that someone could move in when healthy and would not have to move out when their health changed. Memory care was not planned for the facility so that would be one limitation. The general idea was that residents would not be rehoused. The skilled nursing was more support for residents who needed healthcare.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the area could be utilized post-surgery and things like that. She heard the mention of memory care, which was going to be a follow-up question. She summarized that residents would go from independent living to assisted living to skilled nursing and then at some point they would need to move out if their health deteriorated beyond that point.

Ms. Kretschmer confirmed that was accurate and also that rehabilitation was something that skilled nursing would manage.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked about the skilled nursing rooms and if each had a restroom.

Ms. Kretschmer said that was correct.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted that the laundry facility was off of the nurses' station and assumed that was just for the skilled nursing area. She asked about the laundry for the rest of the units.

Ms. Kretschmer explained that the owner wished to provide laundry service to all residents.

Boardmember Rosenberg brought up that the outdoor area in the rear was predominantly for the skilled nursing section. She asked where the access would be.

Ms. Kretschmer stated the plans were very preliminary and they were working on it and discussing it with the team. It would also be a space for staff apart from residents for a break area.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that the central area designated by SN #2 seemed like a nice area that could be more indoor/outdoor.

Ms. Kretschmer asked if she could address the questions about the balconies on the side yards.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that she was interested in hearing the response.

Ms. Kretschmer said that they understand the rules for balconies, but they chose to set them back two feet from the setback. So it was not 8 inches, the balconies on the side yards would be two feet from the property line.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that on RPA 6.3, 6.4, and 6.5 it showed them designated and labeled as 8 inches from the property line. With the entryway, exterior materials, and main façade she appreciated

the red wood reflection garden. She loved the upstairs balcony and the commercial spaces. She asked if the commercial spaces would be accessible to the general public.

Ms. Kretschmer said that it was the owner's intention that the commercial space would serve the residents and would be open to the public.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that the articulation of the entrance on the front façade felt underwhelming. She could not tell where the entrance for the facility was versus the commercial entrance and suggested they celebrate the entrance.

Chair Hirsch thought the biggest obstacle was the front setback. The way the plan currently worked there was a staircase there. He asked if the applicant had thoughts on how they would answer the issue or if they would press for the design exception.

Ms. Kretschmer suggested they start with the driveway aisle. They wanted a driveway space and received comments from the Fire Department. The Fire Department made no comment about the driveway aisle. On other projects they had added things like a wharf fire hydrant. The front entry with the driveway aisle was meant to have a drop off zone for residents and the owner wanted to provide transportation to the residents. There would be a seating area to accommodate that as well. A lot of the design of the project came from her own experience in caring for her parents and uncle.

Ms. Carter indicated that they had provided a seat near the front.

Chair Hirsch asked if they had given thought to the plan and the zoning issues.

Ms. Kretschmer confirmed that he meant that the upper floors would meet the front setback.

Chair Hirsch said that was correct.

Ms. Kretschmer explained that the client had a vision of the building being a place of joy and also like going on a cruise. The initial design ideas were very cruise ship looking. They would definitely look at incorporating the setback and creating a more exciting front façade. she saw no issue with making the changes. The current plan was more informed by structural components and how things stacked to reduce construction cost. Cantilevering really adds cost to projects.

Ms. Carter noted that the entry was tapered and did project forward.

Ms. Kretschmer wished they had the side view renderings because the fins came out and protruded and were not completely vertical. Very few things on the building were vertical. It did not render well on the elevations.

Ms. Carter directed the ARB to PA 10.1.

Chair Hirsch said that he had noticed that the balconies did that on each side. He asked if the vertical wood slats were also not completely vertical.

Ms. Kretschmer explained the vertical wood slats were not completely vertical. The wood was twisted slightly and would appear thin then thick.

Chair Hirsch asked how the public would access the commercial spaces and where they would park.

Ms. Kretschmer indicated that the extra parking in the garage was for commercial use.

Chair Hirsch inquired if they had considered a bike path on San Antonio Road.

Ms. Kretschmer explained that they would love a bike path, but it would be in the public right of way. She repeated that they had bicycle parking and ways for people to bring bicycles onto the property.

Chair Hirsch called for further ARB comments or questions.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that there was a member of the public that wished to speak.

Chair Hirsch called for the public comment.

Ms. Klicheva introduced Humberto Nava.

Humberto Nava thanked the ARB for hearing his comment and explained he was a representative of Nor Cal Carpenters. He wanted to know if there would be a labor centers attached to the project. It was great that there would be something to take care of the seniors, but he asked if anyone would take care of the workers. He suggested they think about what kind of labor [unintelligible 1:11:52] they would have on the project.

Chair Hirsch was unsure of how to answer the question.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that it was not for the ARB to respond, but more for the applicant if they chose to answer.

Chair Hirsch asked if the applicant had a comment.

Ms. Kretschmer stated that it would be discussed with the owner.

Ms. Foley advised that the ARB had received a written comment via email which was printed out and at places. It appeared to be about traffic during construction and the interface between the construction project and the public streets would be taken into consideration.

Chair Hirsch said that was not in the ARB purview.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that Public Works would create a logistics plan for construction. There was a lot of construction on San Antonio and staff would bring that to the attention of Public Works and try to foster coordination.

Chair Hirsch suggested the ARB make its final comments.

Vice Chair Baltay had a list of items for the applicant whom he thanked for the exciting project which he was pleased about. As the applicant was in a preliminary stage he requested they view his comments as similarly preliminary. On the site planning he wondered if they were overdoing saving the redwoods on the righthand side of the property possibly at the expense of the trees at the back. Frequently the trees did not survive construction so they would need to demonstrate that the tree would survive or come with another proposal. The underground parking was essential and excellent. The front drop off was a necessary feature, but he was concerned that the building was pushed too far from the street. They needed to find some way to bring the building forward more with some sort of cantilever or overhang. He

did not believe the retail would work as there was no way for the public to come to the facility. There was not street parking nor realistic parking underground. It would be difficult to get from the garage to the shops without entering the facility. He also questioned the location for retail. Lacking a larger vision from the City on the development of San Antonio he suggested they look into a coffee shop or restaurant type facility. When they returned with the full application he wanted to see more thought about the use of that space. The open space at the back was problematic because it was locked behind the skilled nursing area and felt like an afterthought. He suggested they pull the building forward more and create a space for staff or residents. The bicycle parking did not work as it was buried in the back of the garage and really one would have to walk the ramp to get their bicycle in and out. Senior citizens need easier access so the bike parking should be near the front door and easy to use. If the intention was for staff parking then the bottom of the garage might be fine, but it was a large amount of space that was not likely to be used. He doubted residents would have multiple bicycles in storage and recommended they work closely with staff to meet the real bicycle requirements for their users. The same thing applied to the location of the trash bins which would be difficult for the City to service. It was also located in such a way that the kitchen trash needed to be carried through the lobby of the building. He encouraged more thought around the issues and suggested they look into putting the trash in the basement. The kitchen location was problematic as it was a prime street facing location. It would be nicer to have the dining room along the frontage with the kitchen to the backside of the dining area. He questioned the decision to mix assisted living and independent living units and suggested they give it more thought. The market demanded both types of units and also that they be kept separate. Currently the assisted living units seemed to be the least desirable with limited light and poor access with no balconies. That was not an ARB issue, but he wanted to bring attention to it. The foundation should follow the structure above it and currently where the wall was round the foundation was square. That would affect the layout of the basement. He questioned if the elevator size would be functional, especially near the nursing stations. They could also consider pushing the stair tower back, perhaps next to the kitchen. He loved the second story courtyard and wondered if it could be wrapped around to the front of the building somehow. With respect to the massing he understood the structural desire to keep it stacked floors, but the City wanted the building to be more stepped. It was currently a box with applied elements, and it needed more in an out. Neighborhood compatibility was an issue the ARB struggled with on San Antonio. Council had yet to provide clear guidance on how the street should be developed. Generally buildings are asked to step down on the sides and the Objective Standards required the same thing. However, he believed the street would be redeveloped to hold mostly four and five story buildings. The applicant also had a narrow lot, so stepping the building did not really work well. He did not have an answer for it, but the standards required the ARB to consider compatibility and being compatible with a one story building was difficult. The Objective Standards made things more difficult for the applicant. He did not understand the proposed fins and screening elements. They seemed interesting but fussy and complicated and should be more integrated into the structure and form. Full floor to ceiling glass on the street was often problematic in living units. The north elevation of the building was visible coming up San Antonio from 101 and should be looked at. He promised the applicant he would look at the issue as they provided more complete drawings. Since they were surrounded by one story buildings the elevations were tremendously visible. With the material selections he did not totally understand the proposal, but the basic feeling was interesting and possibly attractive. He questioned the fundamental statement that it was a building for seniors who had lived a modern lifestyle. Assisted care buildings should be more comforting and comfortable rather than cutting

edge and dramatic. He suggested they think about the design vocabulary or make sure that the client really understands what they were trying to do. From a compatibility point of view the proposed architectural vocabulary worked but he was not sure it functioned with their usage. When they returned he requested that the plans be more consistent and that they be provided with more 3-dimensional imagery, especially from San Antonio Road. The renderings did not need to be photorealistic, but accurate 3-dimensional images would be great. Overall he felt that they had small ideas of how they wanted to develop the project. The cenote sculpture required more thought. The large scale parti of the project was missing and it was currently a stacked box with basic apartments. The program and site were challenging with zoning restrictions. They possibly had significant code issues to deal with and work through. Lastly, he said to the City that the project reinforced the need for a more comprehensive plan for development along San Antonio Road. This was the third or so project the ARB had seen and there were more in the pipeline, and they had no consistent guideline to give applicants or the public. It was unfortunate to have to work reactively rather than proactively.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed with Vice Chair Baltay on many of his points. She thanked the applicant for the project and stated that the City needed these facilities and passion projects. The overall parti was more of a decorated box than anything else. The cenote idea could be utilized to a greater extent for the overall parti of the building versus the c-shaped cutout on the side. She suggested that a central courtyard might be more successful than a side courtyard and would appreciate a better connection to the side yard. Ageing populations needed movement and a walking path or other connection was critical. The front drop off needed to move forward and she encouraged looking to hotels for inspiration. Coverage above the drop off area for weather was also strongly recommended. She disagreed with Vice Chair Baltay and thought retail was a good idea that would revitalize the area. It was a hard site to access unless one was parking and coming up but there were other examples of that in the City. There were solutions that needed to be creatively considered. The use of the commercial spaces was critically important to whether or not the public would come. A café or restaurant might be a great idea. A salon for the residents also made sense, but other uses might not be successful and that needed careful consideration. With the palette she struggled with the overall color choices. The dark gray and blacks were kind of depressing and heavy and this type of building wanted for joy and warmth. She further recommended less glass in the living areas. In regard to the neighborhood compatibility and the stepping she did not have a good answer either. Part of her thought they should build for what is there as the next parcels might not be redeveloped for 20 or 30 years. However, she could also envision the street being maxed out in that time so there was no strong answer. Maybe the answer was somewhere in the middle and the building was neither a straight box nor completely stepped. She thanked the applicant again for the project.

Boardmember Chen believed her colleagues covered most points. She saw the contemporary trend for senior living in the project, thought it was nice, and stated it could be a trend in the future. She also liked the reflective garden, the green wall, the wood material on the façade and hoped those would remain. She agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg about color and thought the palette was too dark for senior living. A study she read on senior living stated that to seniors' colors appear grayer. Based on that she hoped lighter colors and more wood material or green walls would be used on the front façade to make it more human scale and welcoming.

Chair Hirsch stated that he wanted to summarize the comments. The ARB was concerned about the rear property line, the trees, and the usage of the space and asked the applicant to give more thought to those issues. The idea of a walkway through the property was nice and he did not think it would be a problem to mix with staff in the rear. Fire access could be handled by the Fire Department but a fire truck ought to be able to be pulled into the front of the building. The balcony along the north elevation creates privacy issues with the neighbors so the applicant needed to ensure that met the code. With the build to line and DEE the applicant seemed on the way to another solution. He agreed with Boardmember Chen that utilizing friendlier colors and materials was a better bet for the building. The applicant needed to consider the Objective Standards as they were applicable to the project and work with staff on them and tree preservation. The assisted/independent living issues were programmatic and between the applicant and its clients. He agreed with everything said about the commercial use; in order for it to work they needed to get people into the building which might be simply unworkable. Vice Chair Baltay made good points about the need to plan the neighborhood to determine how to satisfy the needs of the community. The commercial uses might be a better bet in an area where other commercial facilities existed. The commercial space was questionable and might be better used by the tenants. There were good questions raised about bicycle parking and he hoped that people would be able to access their bikes closer to the perimeter of the site. Overall the service areas required more study for convenience. He understood that was difficult due to the small site. The building had obviously been designed from the inside out and it was time to do it the other way around. Textures and colors would become more important with the official application. The internal program was incredible for seniors and clearly drove the project but the aesthetic issues at the perimeter were not yet solved. He repeated that the program was very exciting and noted that the country tended to warehouse seniors in unattractive buildings with less possibilities. The scale was small and would feel personal to the residents and he praised the owner for bringing the project.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the ARB could give the applicant clear guidance on two issues. First, the extent to which they should comply with the build to setback in the front. That required major design changes and he thought they should be told what the standard would be. The same question applied to the side stepping of the building from the side property lines. In order to answer those questions he asked the staff about if the Objective Standards required the side stepping. He thought there was no option around that. If the applicant chose the conventional design review process then the side stepping would be up to the judgement of the ARB.

Ms. Gerhardt confirmed that was correct.

Vice Chair Baltay thought that this kind of project should be allowed to go straight up at the sides. He preferred to see the project meet the front setback and articulation on front façade. the ARB owed it to the applicant to let them know how the Board would treat the project if they came back though the standard architectural review process. He asked Chair Hirsch if the applicant could have a clear answer on the questions.

Chair Hirsch thought the applicant had the option to decide how to proceed.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the project was in a preliminary stage. They talked about wanting to provide clear direction to projects earlier in the process as it was more difficult to make changes further into the process. The more direction the ARB could provide the applicant the better the project would be.

Boardmember Rosenberg appreciated the clarity Vice Chair Baltay was trying to provide the applicant. Personally, she thought it should be allowed to go straight up but she was not impressed with the balconies protruding into the side yards. If the building were allowed to be straight it should respect the setbacks top to bottom.

Boardmember Chen agreed.

Chair Hirsch also agreed.

Ms. Gerhardt clarified there was no side setback in the zone.

Boardmember Rosenberg explained the drawings showed a 5 foot setback. She asked if that was inaccurate.

Ms. Gerhardt stated it might be something they were trying to address because the City requested perimeter landscaping and other things of that nature. The project showed 5 feet but that was not a requirement. [audio/visual skip at 1:46:40]

Boardmember Rosenberg [audio/visual skip at 1:46:40]... not a required setback respecting some type of allowance for future daylight between the buildings was a very good idea. She strongly encouraged respecting a 5 foot setback.

Vice Chair Baltay asked staff what the setback was in the Objective Standards.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated she needed to look that up.

Chair Hirsch said that there was a significant number of units facing that side and without a setback of at least 5 feet light and air circulation would be a problem. He understood the point of being respectful to the neighbor but noted they had no idea who or what the neighbor would be. It was very likely that the area would be developed soon. He thought it was always nice to have a balcony and noted it was hard for the ARB to comment on the matter at this point.

Vice Chair Baltay explained he was trying to get to a point where they could stipulate the setbacks required. If the applicant came back through the conventional ARB process and had the building analyzed under CS zoning there was no setback. However, if they wanted to get an approval from the ARB they most likely needed a setback of some kind. He asked Boardmembers to imagine trying to design a building when they did not know what the setback would be. That seemed unfair. He asked again if there was a setback in the Objective Standards.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that she had not found anything and did not believe there was.

Vice Chair Baltay thought it was crazy for the applicant to design a building not knowing what the setback would be. The ARB needed to decide on something and provide the applicant guidelines. He suggested 5 feet and said that there could not be a residential building without a setback.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that at the residential elements it needed to be 5 feet. That was all she would stipulate and her personal opinion.

Chair Hirsch reminded the ARB that there were trees all along the north side of the property. They do not know if the trees had to be retained and that would affect the next project designed along the property. That would create light, air, and a nice view.

Vice Chair Baltay noted the applicant would not be able to keep the trees with the basement. It was impossible to keep both.

Chair Hirsch said that the trees were on the adjacent property.

Vice Chair Baltay said that there were a few in the survey. He also remembered other trees on the neighbor's driveway. He did not want the ARB to design the project, he was just advocating for clear guidance. If the ARB wanted to be involved in projects earlier the only way to do that was to provide concrete guidance. It was uncomfortable but there was no code governing the issue. He asked what the setback should be and if they should save the trees. He voted for a five foot setback and was willing to lose trees to let the building go forward. If they had to preserve all the trees he did not believe the project would work.

Chair Hirsch asked for consensus and turned to Boardmember Chen who seemed to agree off camera and microphone.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she agreed.

Chair Hirsch agreed as well.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed the clear direction was to respect a 5 foot setback on the sides and the ARB was okay with the loss of trees based on the fact that it was necessary to provide significant underground parking.

Vice Chair Baltay pointed out that the landscaping would be replaced with something else. He asked Ms. Gerhardt if what the ARB was trying to do made sense.

Ms. Gerhardt heard a 5 foot relief for the residential portion of the building. She asked if the ARB wanted perimeter landscaping which would be 5 feet for the entire building.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that ideally a 5 foot perimeter was best. If there were a significant reason for something other than residential to be closer she would consider it. The 5 foot perimeter with the landscaping was ideal.

Ms. Gerhardt stated for the applicant's benefit that it was not a 5 foot required setback but a design standard the ARB applied to a specific project. It was a soft 5 feet. If the applicant made a case for something different the ARB would listen to it.

Chair Hirsch stated that was well put and everyone could agree.

Vice Chair Baltay noted that everything was an exchange. If the applicant went through the Objective Standards then they would have to step the building back on the sides. The ARB was ok with letting the

building going up more or less straight with attention to the balconies and some relief on the north elevation so long as it was 5 feet back. That was the direction for the applicant to use when it designed the foundation.

Chair Hirsch thought they were pretty clear. He also thought the applicant understood the issues with the front of the building and knew there would be significant changes there.

Ms. Gerhardt said that with the front of the building the development standard was a hard line. They had to meet the 50% build to line.

Vice Chair Baltay heard no one on the ARB express a willingness to move around that. He asked if there was anything staff thought would benefit from more clear direction.

Ms. Gerhardt summarized they heard that an arborist report was needed on the trees to prove that they could be maintained. There was extra parking provided at the location which the applicant could use to make a case that the retail was more viable. If the applicant would provide shuttle service there could be a reduction in parking so they might want to investigate a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program to reduce parking on the residential side. Staff would ensure that Fire and Building reviewed the plans. The balconies, setbacks and build to line were discussed. The ARB was also concerned about the viability of the retail so the applicant would look at that. Bicycle parking was brought up and seniors needed to be able to access the spaces. It was possible that seniors would ride three wheel bikes so wider spaces might be necessary.

Ms. Foley assured the ARB that she had notes related to the materials.

Chair Hirsch said that was what was missing from the previous discussion.

Ms. Gerhardt said that there was a discussion about using warmer and more inviting colors.

Chair Hirsch thought the program was incredible and the ARB looked forward to reviewing it again.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if Chair Hirsch wanted to ask the applicant if they had questions of the ARB.

Chair Hirsch said that was a good idea.

Ms. Kretschmer thanked the ARB for the opportunity to ask questions. With the setback they asked if the side setback should go to the balconies or if the balconies could protrude in any way into the setback. The balconies were only located on the 2nd through 4th floors. From grade the balconies would be 20 to 25 feet high. She asked if Ms. Carter had any questions of the Board.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought the issue was not that the building touched the ground it was that they were allowing for light to pass by. The fact that a balcony was 25 feet in the air did not change the fact that it would prohibit light from entering below. The further that was pulled back from the setback the more light would flow down the sides of the building.

Boardmember Chen agreed and thought that a 5 foot setback with no projection was the minimum.

Vice Chair Baltay also agreed.

Chair Hirsch said that he was fine with that. All the projections that were planned were not discussed and whether or not they were a good aesthetic idea was something the ARB could discuss.

Vice Chair Baltay repeated that less than 5 feet for a residential building was too close. If someone built next door and also used projecting balconies then neighbors could touch each other.

Chair Hirsch thought the ARB all agreed.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the applicant had further questions.

Ms. Kretschmer asked if they could provide sunshade angles to show that sunlight was still allowed if that would change anyone's opinion.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that they could provide whatever they felt was best and the ARB would provide guidance. She thought they were being clear that they would respect and expect 5 feet but if the applicant had a design that would change their minds then it could be presented. There was no guarantee the ARB would change its mind.

Chair Hirsch said that was correct.

Ms. Carter asked if the neighboring properties would also have a required 5 foot setback.

Vice Chair Baltay thought that was a question for City Council and he would appreciate the applicant asking them that.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the Code was written for El Camino and allowed a mix of uses. If San Antonio needed design guidelines was a different question.

Vice Chair Baltay thought it was 10 feet along El Camino for residential. He thought it was more substantial.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that staff would look into it.

Vice Chair Baltay apologized to Ms. Carter for not being able to answer the question.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested the applicant look at the South El Camino Guidelines and related Code.

Boardmember Rosenberg reiterated to the applicant that if they went by the standard design guidelines there would be a stepping requirement. To avoid that and have a vertical façade they were requesting it be pulled in a little bit. It was an attempt to meet in the middle.

Chair Hirsch indicated that it was a residential use in the CS zone. That had to be treated differently and he thought they were clear on the 5 foot minimum. He indicated that no Motion was required and thanked the applicant for the project.

Ms. Kretschmer thanked the ARB.

The ARB took a break

Action Items

3. Review and Approve Changes to the Architectural Review Board's (ARB) By-Laws to Better Align With Council's BCC Handbook.

Chair Hirsch called the meeting back to order, introduced the item, and called for the staff report.

Ms. Gerhardt shared her screen with the ARB and displayed Packet Page 56. She explained this was the second hearing related to the By-Laws. Boardmember Thompson was absent but offline she had no major questions or concerns. Section 3.1 defined the Chair and Vice Chair positions as starting in April of each year with added language from the City Attorney. Section 3.2 contained an updated department name and was revised to have more inclusive language. Section 3.31 discussed how the Chair was responsible for the annual report/workplan to be completed by the end of term on March 31st.

Chair Hirsch clarified that the annual report and workplan were combined.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that was correct. The Chair had to drive the process. Section 3.32 updated pronouns. Section 3.33 said that the Secretary, which was her, would provide the ARB with early notification of pending projects that would require review. That was what she had placed in the City Official Reports. On Packet Page 58 they inserted the language about the ARB premeeting with the Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary. That meeting did not need to be noticed to the public. She noted that she needed to fill in the dates and other than that she was available for questions or a vote on the By-Laws changes.

Chair Hirsch called for a vote.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he had a procedural change on Section 6.1 regarding the ARB premeeting. He requested they strike "a few days" and say that the "Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary shall meet ahead of each public hearing."

Ms. Gerhardt thought it was pretty obvious when the meeting had to happen as it was between the packet printing and the hearing. She thought the wording change was fine.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that Ms. Gerhardt would make the change.

Vice Chair Baltay said that a broader discussion had taken place about whether to include in the By-Laws a greater level of requirement or involvement for the ARB. He had hoped to have that discussion with Boardmember Thompson present as well. Unless someone wanted to hold the discussion he was prepared to move forward with the approval.

Chair Hirsch indicated that he had discussed it with Vice Chair Baltay over the past few months and they were in agreement. He asked if anyone else wanted to discuss it or if it would go into this part of the regulation. He thought it could be a scope of work that could be included in the Findings.

Vice Chair Baltay said that it was not clear that the By-Laws were the place to incorporate that kind of thing. The Findings were encapsulated in a City ordinance and were not easily changed. Because he did not know where it should go he was not eager to push the matter further. Currently the only change they made was asking staff to provide the list of pending projects. He thought that was progress.

Chair Hirsch thought they cleaned up the document and where to put the other idea was something to work on.

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to approve the ARB By-Law changes as presented except for Section 6.1, where “a few days” was stricken and replaced with “Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary shall meet ahead of each public hearing.”

VOTE: 4-0-0-1

Approval of Minutes

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for August 18, 2022

Chair Hirsch called for comments or changes to the minutes.

Vice Chair Baltay noted that on Page 95 he made a Motion with two conditions and then listed three. He thought that was accurate and had no changes. He asked if anyone else remembered otherwise.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that was fine.

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve the minutes of August 18, 2022 as presented.

VOTE: 4-0-0-1

Chair Hirsch confirmed that Ms. Gerhardt did not need anything further on the changes.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that was correct.

Chair Hirsch noted that under ARB Procedures and Rules that a 2/3rds vote was required for several things. He directed the ARB to review Packet Page 67 and noted that with 5 people the math did not work out.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted that technically 3/5ths were less than 2/3rds.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that the math also depended on the quorum.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if it should be changed to a majority vote.

Vice Chair Baltay explained that the guidelines came directly from *Robert's Rules of Order* which were modified for the whole City. He did not think they should look into them in more detail as the idea was to protect the minority.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that she would get clarification from the City Attorney's Office.

Chair Hirsch asked if they should have a discussion about whether the Findings should be changed in some way and then make the proposal that it change. The ARB had been asked to study the Objective which meant that they were involved in zoning. The Findings do not say that they were to be involved in zoning. It did say that the PTC was to be involved. The PTC Findings and requirements had overlap and it was conceivable that they could request further discussion. He asked what Ms. Gerhardt thought.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if they were talking about the preliminary reviews.

Vice Chair Baltay explained that he had asked if they wanted to consider putting stronger language in the By-Laws regarding the desire to be more involved in reviewing projects earlier on. He did not believe the Board had consensus and it was a rocky issue.

Ms. Gerhardt said that they had a formal process for preliminary reviews, which was what the ARB heard earlier in the hearing. The preliminary process was optional. The formal process was required. She asked if they were talking about the first hearing of a formal process.

Vice Chair Baltay said that was not quite what they were discussing. He thought they voted on the issue and were done with the conversation. He asked if they could continue the discussion.

Ms. Gerhardt said that they needed to be careful not to make any decisions and not go on a tangent that was not on the agenda. They were fine if they were describing a project that would be on a later agenda.

Vice Chair Baltay said that one of the purposes of the premeeting was to look at projects that were not yet deemed complete but were coming to the ARB for preliminary procedural feedback on completeness of the application. He thought that would be a good idea, but he was not sure he had the support of the Board. Based on that he did not want to push harder. Boardmember Thompson strongly expressed a desire not to do that.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that the reason they started the list was so the full Board would have it. If there were questions then it was better to bring that up during the City Official Report. That way the entire Board and public would hear the question. It would be a one way conversation, but staff would receive the message.

Vice Chair Baltay said that was the consensus they reached during the last discussion.

Chair Hirsch thought the summary spurred an interesting discussion with the Mayor and Vice Mayor.

Vice Chair Baltay [off microphone 2:29:26].

Chair Hirsch said that the list was for projects so the ARB could look towards the future. He gave an example of San Antonio Road and the increased density of the area decided on by Council. That was significant for the City and was something the ARB could participate in to a greater degree. The ARB and PTC should be very involved in the San Antonio Guidelines and the two bodies would have to coordinate. That was what he was pushing for when he suggested the list of pending projects to begin with. The question and the next step were how to get it to happen.

Vice Chair Baltay thought that was well said but the By-Laws had been voted on and so it was best not to continue discussing the issue.

Ms. Gerhardt said that with respect to the San Antonio issue the Director had responded that Council was aware of the issue and had directed staff to work on it. Staff was currently reviewing staffing levels and workload to determine when it could be done. She hoped they would continue to push the idea with staff and Council. The ARB would be included in the work.

Chair Hirsch suggested that they find a way to make a presentation to Planning that they were interested and wanted to participate in the process.

Vice Chair Baltay said that they were interested and wanted to be involved in the process. He was getting increasingly uncomfortable that the discussion was not agendized.

Chair Hirsch stated that they could move to the Minutes.

Subcommittee Items

Vice Chair Baltay reported that the Mayor and Vice Mayor held a meeting for the leadership of the various Boards and Commissions. As Chair Hirsch was out of town Vice Chair Baltay attended in his place. To begin Mayor Burt outlined various major items the Council had done or was working on this year. The first item was the business tax, which has been placed on the ballot. The tax might not yield as much income as the City would like but was more likely to pass. City Council directed that the funds be used for a low income housing fund, transportation for grade separation projects, and a third item that he was unable to capture. The City Council approved and endorsed the Life Moves transitional shelter to be built at the end of San Antonio Road. The City received the \$26 million grant to build the shelter. A gas transfer tax is being proposed for the ballot and would bring in an estimated \$4 million per year. Vice Mayor Kou and Council Member DuBois negotiated on the Fry's site and reached an informal agreement which would allow a housing project on Park Boulevard that would be dense and include family housing. There was no response given to his question about the density. The existing building that housed Fry's would remain in place and repurposed for commercial use. Palo Alto would receive a grant of 3.5 acres of land, 2.5 acres of which would be for a new park and 1 acre for housing. Vice Mayor Kou indicated that acre would be developed as deeper affordable income housing. Lastly, Vice Mayor Kou said that there would be a coffee shop to memorialize the original use of the warehouse building as a cannery. Catholic Charities bought the Mike's Bike Shop site on El Camino and intended to use it for very, very low income housing. Vice Mayor Kou also stated that the public had indicated that family housing was a need. They also presented the Climate Plan updates and explained there was a community group working on it. The plan called for Palo Alto to have an 80% reduction of greenhouse gas emissions by the year 2030. Palo Alto was 100% carbon free in the electric production that it used and 2/3rds the cost of PG&E. They discussed the increased electrification in the town and how the utilities were handling it. The utility grid was highly stressed but not because of the increased load of electrification on buildings but rather Electric Vehicle (EV) charging. The Mayor suggested that one solution was slower charging but that would probably not be popular. Finally, they mentioned that there was a new Police Chief and City Council was happy about that. The meeting concluded with Board and Commission members speaking about what they had done. Utilities spoke of increasing demands on the electric grid, the fiber communication system, and the effects of sea level rise. The Chair of the Historic Resources Board (HRB) expressed concern about staffing levels. The Stormwater Management Chair made a strong statement that the stormwater fund was properly used. Parks and Recreation reported that the Mayfield North Field would be repaired, Cubberley Gym was out of service, and Mitchell Park Dog Park would be expanded. On behalf of the ARB he presented four things of interest. First, he reinforced that they had asked for a better long term plan for San Antonio Road. The Mayor acknowledged that was needed but noted that South of Forest was a contentious process, and the City needed a better process. Second, he mentioned that the new Objective Standards were in place, but the consensus of the ARB was that it was unclear how they would work. The standards should be reviewed in a formal way annually. He also mentioned the upcoming ARB Award Ceremony and asked the Council Members to attend. Finally, he mentioned the list of upcoming projects and that was positively received by the Mayor, City Council, and other review bodies. The other Boards all wanted

copies of the list. He thought it was a good wake up call for staff, people wanted to know what was forthcoming. Planning and the HRB really wanted to see the list. It was a positive meeting, and he was pleased to report on it to the ARB.

Chair Hirsch stated that he had wrote something for the meeting and it paralleled what Vice Chair Baltay said. He was also concerned about San Antonio Road and another item that he could not recall. He and Boardmember Chen were working on the Objective Standards and needed to decide how to bring it back to the ARB. Because they found the Bayshore project to be an issue he developed a scheme and would discuss it further with Ms. Gerhardt. That kind of development was larger than materiality and needed to be discussed.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Boardmember Rosenberg reminded the ARB that September 21st was the ARB Award Ceremony. She asked the Boardmembers to complete their comments on projects by the next day and send them to Ms. Gerhardt and Amy French.

Adjournment

Chair Hirsch adjourned the meeting.