



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 14971)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 12/1/2022

Summary Title: Minutes of October 20, 2022

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for October 20, 2022

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

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

Background

Draft minutes from the October 20, 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 October 20, 2022 (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
 DRAFT MINUTES: October 20, 2022
 Community Meeting Room & 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 Chambers 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:

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

Chair Hirsch introduced the item and 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 stated that he only supported the Resolution during the declared State of Emergency.

Boardmember Thompson indicated that she believed hybrid meetings would continue forever.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she enjoyed hearing those thoughts each month.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, believed the City Council would weigh in on the matter.

Chair Hirsch thought the ARB should have a discussion.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the City Council would potentially hold the discussion in February 2023. They might call an end to the State of Emergency and redefine hybrid meetings for the future. Council would also discuss whether Boardmembers could participate via teleconference as well as the public. There would likely be a limited number of times a Boardmember could appear via teleconference.

Chair Hirsch asked Ms. Gerhardt to confirm that it was not something that the ARB should discuss in general.

Ms. Gerhardt noted that the discussion should start with the City Council. The Resolution was valid for a month and Council would decide on the long term policy.

Chair Hirsch called the vote.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Oral Communications

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, stated there were none.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Ms. Gerhardt stated there were none.

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, showed the ARB its upcoming meeting dates, and noted that Boardmember Rosenberg had an upcoming planned absence. The November 3, 2023 hearing would discuss the proposed Mercedes dealership at 1700 Embarcadero and would potentially hear 3001 El Camino Real although that was not guaranteed. If Council held their hybrid meeting discussion the ARB could discuss that as well. The ARB could also host a discussion about the Fry's site, which would be discussed during the last item of the meeting. Finally, she pointed out the list of pending projects was also attached and had additions. She also added notes to the projects to help the ARB understand where they were in the process.

Vice Chair Baltay requested a status report on the project on 739 Sutter Avenue at the next ARB hearing.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that the formal application was pending and promised additional information at the next hearing.

Chair Hirsch asked if the Fry's site placed an official application with the City.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that could be discussed at the end of the hearing, but that the Fry's site had two sets of applications on file. One was the initial townhouse proposal and then the second was the new townhouse proposal that was part of the development agreement.

Chair Hirsch suggested some abbreviations on the list to indicate if a project was residential or commercial. He thanked Ms. Gerhardt again for providing the list and indicated that it was very useful to the ARB.

Action Items

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3300 El Camino Real [21PLN-00028]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Construction of a new two-Story, 50,355 sf Office/R&D Project with 40% Surface Parking & 60% Below-Grade Parking. The Proposal Includes 2,517 sf of Amenity Space. Environmental Assessment: Pending IS/MND. Zoning District: RP (Research Park). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Garrett Sauls at Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org.

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

Boardmember Thompson reminded the Chair that the ARB should make disclosures.

Chair Hirsch called for disclosures.

Boardmember Chen indicated that she visited the site and watched the video of the last meeting.

Boardmember Thompson disclosed that she had visited the site.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he visited the site.

Boardmember Rosenberg disclosed that she visited the site and drove past it daily.

Chair Hirsch stated that he also visited the site and called for the staff report.

Garrett Sauls, Project Planner, clarified that the environmental assessment was not pending. There was a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) in circulation and included in reference by the project plans attachment. He shared his screen with the ARB and explained that the project was a new two-story office building of about 50,355 square feet (sf) on a currently vacant 2.89 acre parking lot site. The applicant proposed including an amenity space into the building of about 2,517 sf. The adjacent uses were the Rivian site, an inn, and a restaurant/bar. The majority of parking was proposed underground with about 40% remaining at grade. Currently 40 trees exist on the parcel and 21 were proposed to be removed and replaced by 76 new trees. The trees were included in the packet on the landscape plans. The application had a MND and those were incorporated as Conditions of Approval and would reduce impacts to “less than significant.” At the April 7, 2023 meeting the ARB made comments which the applicant responded to and were included in the staff report. The ARB commented that an outdoor plaza was desirable, that they were interested in additional thought for the El Camino façade, that the applicant incorporate operable windows for ventilation, questioned how the interior ceiling would be designed and built and how visible it would be through the glazing, and finally they asked for the applicant to consider ground floor retail. The applicant’s written responses were in the report, but they did expand the pedestrian space and establish more benches at Hansen and El Camino and near the Creekside Inn. The applicant had a rooftop deck on the second floor in their initial submittal. Incorporating operable windows compromised the HVAC system and the applicant had a mechanical engineer present to answer questions. They studied making changes to the “W” frame on the El Camino façade and determined that would be architecturally challenging by creating some additional viewpoints. During the day the glass was opaquer and should not interfere with the visual experience along the corner of the building. with respect to providing more information on the interior ducting the applicant provided additional perspectives in the drawings to help explain areas where mechanical ducting would be proposed. Those items were usually incorporated through the building permit application rather than the planning application so those items might have to be deferred. Lastly, there were existing retail locations in the area that helped to engage El Camino Real. The applicant felt that incorporating retail into the space would not necessarily be successful. Previous ARB comments included making sure that the renderings were updated and consistent, which had been done. He pointed out several features in the photographs which were brought up at the last meeting to make sure that the ARB understood the design. Staff recommended the ARB approve the application subject to the findings and conditions in the staff report.

Chair Hirsch called for the applicant’s presentation and indicated they had 10 minutes.

James Tefend, Principal at Form4 Architecture, introduced the client and his team to the ARB. He stated that he really liked sitting at a conference table with the ARB for the presentation rather than being in the Council Chambers. He recapped that the building was two-story and all electric with 60% of the parking underground as required. Currently the site was a parking lot and he displayed context pictures of the site and neighborhood. He provided aerial views of the site as well and stated that they saw the building as a gateway to the Research Park. He pointed out that the site design was guided by a large electrical easement at the corner causing the building to be pulled back. The project was compliant with current zoning, and they were not requesting a Design Enhancement Exception (DEE). The design, material, mass, and scale were sensitive to the neighbors. The building had been stepped down to one-story toward the south side to better relate to the neighboring hotel. He provided site elevation context pictures. COVID taught architects that they needed to design office buildings to attract people. The project had a wonderful park garden for its users to experience and he provided renderings and explained how the park was sloped for privacy. The ground floor had four exterior plazas for users to work outside. The building was mass timber and very eco-friendly. The design incorporated large overhangs on all sides to shade the glass. He showed the ARB the plans by level, 2D elevations, site sections, and a rendering from El Camino to show the plazas and articulation. He continued to show elevation renderings from the different sides. The main entry was clearly visible from the street. The interior renderings were updated with lighting intent. They did not provide an HVAC solution at the time as they would rather work with the tenant on that plan. The HVAC would be minimized in order to show the wood structure. With respect to operable windows there was a real challenge with the interior climate and the building was designed for people to work outside. He displayed the trash enclosure and the transformer which were designed to complement the building. They provided the building technical sections showing the shading solution they chose. The renderings were updated and there were new ones showing the proposed articulation along the street. They debated adding more articulation but determined it would detract from their intent to show off the wood structure. They studied moving the columns to the outboard but felt it detracted from the front door experience and decided to reserve the V shape just for the main entrance. Therefore, they proposed no change there. The ARB requested they consider adding a café or food element to the project, but in speaking with the owner they felt it would detract from the single user experience that they wanted to bring to market as it was in demand. There were food options adjacent to the property. They exceeded the 120 foot recommendation from the El Camino Guidelines for the length of the parking lot, but they provided more trees and landscaping to shield that. He provided renderings to show that and the enlarged plazas along El Camino. He indicated that he was handing the presentation over to further discuss the landscaping.

Architect Gary Laymon thanked the ARB for its comments and stated that they had added value to the project. The enhancements created a great pedestrian experience for the public along El Camino and Hansen with new plantings reinforcing the existing vegetation. The plaza areas were enhanced, and the diagram was clarified for the ARB. They worked with the Water District to create a compatible planting design and had created a lot of habitat and significant shading. Sustainability goals were both met and exceeded by the plan. there were bicycle and public art amenities in the space as well.

[man off microphone -unintelligible 42:19]

Mr. Tefend indicated that concluded the presentation.

Boardmember Thompson requested clarification on the material or color of the fins on the elevation.

Mr. Tefend explained it was laminated clear glass with a small, even, milk white dot frit pattern.

Boardmember Thompson confirmed that the fins only occurred on the bottom lower elevation.

Mr. Tefend said that they were on the one-story side on the east of the building and on the west they were on the entire façade.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that the placement of the fins was based on study.

Boardmember Thompson asked if it was daylighting.

Mr. Tefend explained that it was that and the sun. There were shade diagrams included in the plan set.

Boardmember Thompson asked if they were the same fins on the entire building.

Mr. Tefend confirmed that they were the same.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the dark brown metal material was the shading element on El Camino.

Mr. Tefend showed a rendering and explained that the rooftop trellis would be that color as would the trash enclosures or any other metal trim. The wood on the board was the mass timber color.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the wood was on the east elevation as the fascia.

Mr. Tefend indicated the trim element was metal as well as the fascia. The rest of the elevation was wood.

Boardmember Thompson asked if there was depth that would happen on the sheer wall when the piece came across.

Mr. Tefend stated that it would be a little less than a foot of shelf condition.

Boardmember Thompson reserved her right to ask further questions later.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the glass beam and the light shelf.

Mr. Tefend indicated that only happened on the west side of the building and was to help control the daylight. The light shelf was metal.

Boardmember Chen stated that they opened the southeast corner and created an outdoor plaza. She asked if the space was open to the public or only for the building occupants.

Mr. Tefend said that it was open to the public.

Boardmember Chen asked about the function, specifically in light of the fact that there was no retail in the building.

Mr. Tefend explained the art plazas along El Camino were open to the public. The entrance off of El Camino was open to the public and was large enough to accommodate outdoor seating for office users.

Boardmember Chen said it was uncommon to have the primary building entrance and garage entrance on the same short façade. she asked if they considered relocating the garage entrance. Currently it was only 40 feet from the garage entrance to the primary building which was very close.

Mr. Tefend explained that as the site was rectangular and skinny the traffic engineer determined that was the best location for the garage entrance. They did not want it on the south side due to easements. There was an entrance on the north side off of El Camino for people to pull in and enter the garage.

Boardmember Chen asked if they considered shifting the ramp toward the Rivian building with the entrance facing west.

Mr. Tefend stated that the site geometry did not allow for that to happen. It was logical that the entrance be on the north side to maximize the building footprint.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the materials for the low wall.

Mr. Tefend displayed the renderings.

Boardmember Chen said that in the renderings of the main entrance the material used for the signage would be tile.

Mr. Tefend stated that the image for the sign was just a place holder. The future tenant would handle the signage.

Boardmember Chen asked about the landscaping plan on the second floor with the downlights along the wall. She asked if that only happened on the west side or if it were all the way around the building.

Mr. Tefend confirmed that it was on the west side.

Boardmember Chen asked why it was not on the entire building.

Mr. Tefend said lighting was unnecessary on the east side of the building as it would not illuminate anything. They wanted to limit the light pollution and complaints from neighbors.

Boardmember Chen thanked the applicant.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested clarification about the large W shaped timbers on the front façade. The cover sheet showed an exposed metal bracket but the A2.02 rendering showed the wood going from roof to floor. She asked which was accurate.

Mr. Tefend displayed a rendering and indicated that was the accurate drawing. The wood connected to the structure with a metal indent.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that the signage rendering was inaccurate.

Mr. Tefend stated that it was not updated.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that the project put a lot of effort into the beautiful wood ceiling. She was concerned that without basic planning for mechanics someone would just throw up the mechanics.

Mr. Tefend stated that the wood ceiling was the focal point and messing it up would result in his being fired. Sandhill would make a requirement that whatever tenant came on board would have to work with him to lay out the ductwork. Currently if they included the ductwork in the drawings it would only be a guess.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought the underside of the ceiling was beautiful and she respected the design decision. She found it interesting that although the mechanicals were not laid out they were being used as a reason to not have operable windows. That felt like it was still in conflict, and she requested additional information.

Mr. Tefend stated that the mechanical engineer was online and available to discuss the conflict. He had done operable windows in many of the Research Park projects and they were no longer used. He gave VMWare as an example. People tended to leave windows open which affected the climate control and people also fought over whether to open them or not. It was a [unintelligible 52:44] and operator issue.

Brian Unekis, Senior Principal at ME Engineers, explained that they did not have the final HVAC layout available, but the general concept of HVAC systems was the same. To be efficient one wanted to control how fresh air came into the building and the environment within the building. Part of that would be to maintain slightly positive pressure in the building as uncontrolled outside air undermined the system. Operable windows fight the HVAC system by hitting the thermostats causing the system to either cool or overheat which was very inefficient. VMware ended up removing the operators from the windows to solve the problems. In the past few code cycles the California Energy Commission had indicated that if a window was opened then the HVAC system in the area must be shut off and then the ability to maintain comfort in the space was lost. Operable windows did not do well in commercial buildings.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the stone façade adjustment was proposed by the ARB.

Mr. Tefend explained it was not a change in material, they were just showing the correct size tile since last time they showed larger pieces.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested to see the before and after.

Mr. Tefend asked if Mr. Sauls had that ready.

Boardmember Thompson apologized and asked the applicant to repeat whether the steel pieces would be visible.

Mr. Tefend said that they would be.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that the rendering shown was more of a tile/stone façade while the previous one was larger.

Mr. Tefend said that was correct, the prior one was larger. The material did not change.

Boardmember Rosenberg explained that she had thought that it was originally metal and thanked him for the clarification.

Vice Chair Baltay requested to follow-up with the mechanical engineer. He stated that he understood that when a window opened it would turn off the HVAC system, but he did not understand why that could not

be done. The building was not too large and had a nice garden, so he asked if they could let the fresh air ventilate the building.

Mr. Unekis stated that it was required by code that if the windows were open the HVAC had to be off. The issue that creates is that people might be comfortable near the windows, but there were many places internal to the building that would be subject to what was going on outside.

Vice Chair Baltay said that Mr. Unekis said that the HVAC would have to be shut off in the area of the windows. He asked if opening one window would shut the entire building's HVAC down.

Mr. Unekis said that what would be shut down would depend on how the HVAC system was designed and zoned. The issue was that they tried to maintain comfort with HVAC and if one person wanted a window open it might affect the comfort of several people. Operable windows gave away control of the climate and caused tension amongst users. Building operators who have operable windows tend to remove the operation for that reason.

Boardmember Rosenberg argued that there was the same issue with the HVAC system on. She noted multiple occasions when she was cold in office buildings because the HVAC was set to 65 degrees. People constantly argue about temperature either way.

Mr. Unekis agreed that was true.

Chair Hirsch noted that the tenant could create a policy regarding who was allowed to open windows and when. He mentioned the wonderful air in Palo Alto and noted that he had always been a proponent of operable windows. He understood the pushback from the engineers but still did not see operable windows as unreasonable.

Mr. Tefend noted that the weather was the reason for the project's outdoor spaces. If the client asked for operable windows they would need to provide more zones for individual comfort and that would create additional ductwork which would detract from the wood ceiling. He repeated that if the ceiling were not highlighted he would be fired.

Boardmember Thompson explained that she was also currently working on a mass timber building, and it seemed to her that in order to keep a clean ceiling they needed to use underfloor ventilation. If there was underfloor ventilation then there also needed to be underfloor air intake which would interfere with the elevation. She asked if they had considered underfloor ventilation and what it would do to the elevation.

Mr. Tefend stated that they had studied it and it was an option to bring the air from the garage up, but if Rivian ended up being the tenant then trucks would be driving in on the first floor, which would not work with a raised access floor. That was why they planned to design the ductwork with the tenant precisely where it was needed. They would not raise the floor above the first floor as it would affect the elevation. Instead they would drop the podium into the ground and bring it up from below.

Chair Hirsch [off microphone 1:01:58]

Mr. Tefend said that on the second floor there would be ductwork at the roof level coming down into the space where needed. They wanted to protect the wood structure and maximize the view.

Chair Hirsch stated that the current proposal for the roof would change then because of the distribution of duct work.

Mr. Tefend explained they might need to make the roof enclosure a bit larger, but they also needed to have photovoltaics (PV) on the upper roof as well. It would need to be redesigned to fit the program.

Chair Hirsch said that it was the status of a building that was designed without a tenant.

Mr. Tefend explained that they needed a tenant in order to really scrutinize the needs.

Vice Chair Baltay said that at the last review several Boardmembers requested changes to the façade along El Camino Real. He asked Mr. Tefend to help compare Sheet A 1-11 and explain the changes to the façade.

Mr. Tefend said that the changes were minimal and that they had updated the renderings to provide better detail. They wanted to keep the façade clean so one could see into the building. Most of the changes were made on the street at the plazas and entrance to the building. The plazas were enlarged. The stone pattern on the wall was also changed.

Vice Chair Baltay thought that the changes were minimal as well. He asked for a description of the changes to the plazas, especially the one at the corner.

Mr. Tefend explained that on the south side they made the plaza entry into the building wider, they made the front plaza entry a little wider, and the size of the corner was also increased.

Vice Chair Baltay thought the plans looked to be the same size. He did not see changes to the geometry.

Mr. Tefend showed a rendering and stated the plaza was a bit larger.

Vice Chair Baltay asked how much larger they had made it.

Mr. Tefend asked if Mr. Laymon knew the amount.

Mr. Laymon said that the size of the paving area was increased, and benches were added although he did not have the square footage amount.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if they had changed the parking layout and if there was physically more space in the corner.

Mr. Tefend stated that the parking had not changed.

Vice Chair Baltay passed the plan around to the ARB for their review. The project was subject to the South El Camino Real Guidelines and three of the four Boardmembers at the prior meeting had expressed concern about compliance with the Guidelines. He did not see that mentioned in the staff report and asked staff why the South El Camino Real Guidelines were being ignored in the review.

Mr. Sauls said that the Guidelines were not ignored. They were included in an attachment as part of the staff report. Overall there was no Motion made by the ARB to require the applicant to meet the specific 120 foot distance. The Guidelines were only guidelines and not Municipal Code requirements. The existing site was an open parking lot, and the applicant did a decent job of reducing the impact or at least reducing

it compared to the current state. There was also a significant utility line running through the parcel which impacted the site plan. that was why the ARB had not seen a substantial change.

Vice Chair Baltay said that there was a discussion about the 120 foot maximum parking frontage on El Camino. He thought the ARB made it clear that they wanted change and was astonished not to see it mentioned.

Chair Hirsch wanted to know the buffer from the outdoor plazas on the west side of the building and the existing Rivian parking lot.

Mr. Tefend said that the presence of the existing tree canopy along the edge was not highlighted in the drawings but would remain. There would be immediate shading in the area, and they were also introducing shrub material to create horizontal separation between the spaces.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that the shrubs would be high enough to allow for some privacy.

Mr. Tefend agreed and said there would be a sense of enclosure and separation. That showed more on the landscape plan. in addition to the shrubs and existing trees there would be added trees to the patio area.

Chair Hirsch wanted to speak about his comments made at the original meeting about the extension of the roof and the expression of the entry to the building on the front. He asked the applicant to reinforce their comments as he thought if they had added an extension of the roof to the parking lot to create an outdoor structure it would emphasize the entry to traffic from the south. He understood the tree line issue, but he wanted to know why they could not extend it from the lobby. He asked if additional structures would have altered the aesthetic. He understood the building would be lit at night but was still concerned about the decision to have a side entry as it disagreed with the El Camino Guidelines and was not identifiable from the south.

Mr. Tefend confirmed that Chair Hirsch was asking about the V columns.

Chair Hirsch stated that was correct.

Mr. Tefend showed the rendering and said that they would have loved to add the structure; however, by putting it outside the glass it made the corner too busy. They wanted clarity from the street so that people could look in and see the wood structure. The intent was to have the glass be very clean. Having it on the El Camino side reduced the drama and detracted from the excitement which is why they reserved the detail for the short ends. They fell in love with their building and thought the addition was the wrong thing to do.

Chair Hirsch stated that he accepted that. The front rendering did not show the tree line because then they would not be able to see the building, but he understood they were there.

Mr. Sauls said he was correct.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if the ARB was still on the question section of the hearing.

Chair Hirsch indicated that he still had questions.

Ms. Gerhardt reminded the ARB that they had two additional items to hear.

Chair Hirsch noted that the project was very important, and the ARB needed to give it their full attending. With respect to the El Camino Guidelines he thought the project was one in which the guidelines could be adjusted. The site was unique as it was on the corner and required a lot of parking. Given the conditions they distributed the entry. People going south on El Camino could turn in and then circumnavigate the parking lot. there was no particular drop off for a car that would pull into that side of the building. cars should really go the other way and turn into the parking lot.

Mr. Sauls asked if that was a question or a comment.

Chair Hirsch said that was a question.

Mr. Sauls clarified that there was a loading zone along El Camino Real. He directed the ARB to A1.03.

Mr. Tefend noted that the loading zone was also visible on the current rendering that was shared with the ARB. Southbound drivers could enter into the project entry. Northbound drivers had to cross the intersection and pull into Hansen way and then turn left into the parking lot. the traffic engineer believed that the circulation worked nicely that way.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that the plan was studied by a traffic engineer.

Mr. Tefend said that was correct.

Boardmember Rosenberg pointed out the small brown area between the two lanes of traffic and asked if it was drivable.

Mr. Tefend said it was not.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that when one exited the parking structure they could not turn right, they had to go to the end and make a U-turn.

Mr. Tefend believed that was correct.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that she was looking at A1.03 and was curious about the intent of the walkway. On A1.02 there was a crosswalk which appeared drivable.

Mr. Sauls indicated that it was drivable.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that if someone were dropped off in that zone they could continue to drive forward and then go left into the parking garage.

Mr. Sauls said that was correct.

Chair Hirsch confirmed there were no further questions and brought the item back to the ARB for discussion and comments.

Vice Chair Baltay said that the building was beautifully designed for the Research Park and related to the outdoor environment. The parking circulation worked wonderfully, but it was not a building designed to be on El Camino Real. It was not an urban building for Palo Alto. The South El Camino Guidelines were ignored at the City's peril. Those were established to develop an urban boulevard and the building did not

Page 11 of 47

Architectural Review Board Meeting
Summary Minutes: 10/20/22

contribute to that. They wanted buildings to front the street and have a relationship and activity to the environment and offered amenities back to the community like plazas and shops. The building was about the occupants and the single use of the tenants. The architect made that point, and it was apparent from the design that it was all about the occupant, which was fine in the Research Park. El Camino was the grand urban boulevard of Palo Alto, but that was ignored here. The building did not front El Camino as a public, urban building. He fully agreed that the building was lovely and was an exemplary piece of architecture which would be up for awards. He congratulated the architects on the timber frame and glass but stated it was in the wrong place. The ARB needed to be more cognizant of the first finding regarding following the design standards in the City, like the South El Camino Real Guidelines. The Guidelines required a maximum of 120 linear feet of surface parking frontage on El Camino, which the project clearly violated. The reason for the standard was that the City did not want parking lots on an urban boulevard. As an example he stated that parking lots on Market Street appeared to be blighted and were a problem with the environment. He wanted to understand why the ARB would accept the parking lot and noted that the applicant was asked to provide larger plazas, enhance the landscaping, and put a café on the corner. Those were moves that would improve the public amenities and the urban aspect of the building. the ARB asked the applicant to follow the Guidelines, and no one seemed to do it. The 120 foot standard was very clearly expressed and Finding #1 was that the building met the design guidelines. Based on that he was at a loss as to how the ARB could find the project approvable on a fundamental level. He hoped his colleagues would take that to heart. There were a number of changes that the applicant was asked to make and the ARB had received reasons why they could not be done. Maybe the expressed wood V on the corner was not a good idea, but the El Camino Real elevation had not changed from the first review, and he thought it could use more articulation. The glass at the entry corner stuck out proud of the masonry element and he wanted to see it pulled back to express the wood consistently around the corner. He thought it was a matter of being consistent with the design vocabulary. It was to his dismay that the applicant did not make more changes as requested. He indicated that he wanted to go through the items discussed, the first of which was an outdoor plaza or something at the corner of the building. The landscape architect proposed enhanced amenities but did not provide a larger plaza. The façade on El Camino was already discussed. With the ventilation the ARB needed to have a discussion, but he understood that many modern buildings wanted to control the HVAC and he had not consistently voted for operable windows. The stated intention of the building was to be in a park and so it was a real shame not to have operable windows. He did not believe that they could not figure out a way to control the system and have it be as energy efficient. The building was not so large that the mechanicals had to be closed off. He also understood that they did not yet have a tenant and that the tenant might have different requirements, but the building was very striking and would be destroyed by a drop ceiling, which is what the ARB saw a lot. They needed to show the ducts on the ceiling because they would be there, the ARB needed more than the architect's word about how it would be designed. A schematic that might be adjusted was acceptable so long as the ARB had an idea of what it approved. That did not apply to every building in the City, but only to ones where people could clearly view the ceiling. It was a beautiful building in the wrong place.

Boardmember Thompson thanked the applicant for the presentation. She agreed that the design was very strong, and the building was beautiful. She disagreed with Vice Chair Baltay and stated that she did not mind the location. Part of the design guidelines were about keeping the standard of design high and

sometimes one had to look at the context and decide if something could be more beautiful. If an architect could make the context more beautiful, it was their job. She advocated that the project would make the context more beautiful. With respect to other things she agreed with Vice Chair Baltay. The ARB requested more articulation on the elevations. She understood the parti diagram but had recently seen jewel boxes with articulation. There were ways to make the façade more interesting as all glass was dangerous. During the day it might get opaque and monolithic and lose its engagement in some ways. The building needed to shine during the day as well as the night. She appreciated the changes to the sheer wall and thought it would have been nice to see more on the elevation. The plazas were a little better and she commended that. With respect to the 120 feet of parking Guideline she thought that if there were enough landscape buffer then that would be the public engagement. If there were something the applicant could do to make that bigger or better then she could make the Finding that it met the design guidelines. As it stood she did not know if she felt that way yet. With ventilation the ARB spent a lot of time in discussion. They understood that the building needed a tenant and perhaps they needed to return to the ARB after they confirmed one. Operable windows might add articulation to the façade and make it more interesting and beautiful. She understood that operable windows made no sense with a lab client but moving toward net zero and living buildings the buildings needed to function without electricity at some point. If the program did not allow for operable windows then she could make the Finding. There might be an interim solution where the building could have a drop ceiling that looked like wood to maintain the design intent. Overall the project was very beautiful, and she wanted to see it in the City. Some things needed work and currently she did not know if she could approve the project with items to a subcommittee or if they need another hearing.

Boardmember Chen agreed that the building was beautiful with considered proportions and well selected materials. She appreciated all the outdoor space to provide a better pedestrian experience on El Camino. Considering the zoning she thought it was a perfect location for the building. Other projects that could come forward on the parcel would still be office. With the 120 feet parking Guideline she thought the property was unique due to the utility easement and the applicant would be very challenged to meet that requirement. The site plan was reasonable, and the circulation worked perfectly. Considering the El Camino exterior façade she thought it was very good. She saw the horizontal lines that they wanted to emphasize and asked if they wanted to add more details to the elevation to create more vertical elements. With the glass elevation it was consistent from south to north and she did not think it was necessary to bring the wood structure to the exterior. She was in favor of operable windows, especially on the upper floors and agreed with Boardmember Thompson that the operable windows could add articulation to the elevations. On the south at the entry there could be more details on the elevation like something on the glass or at the bottom of the building to make it more human scale. There were restrictions on the site due to the narrow parcel and that limited what they could do with the garage entrance, but she still thought there might be safety issues as it was only 40 feet from the primary entrance. The applicant was encouraged to shift the ramp toward the long term bike storage and then turn 90 degrees to bring the corner a bit back. It was preferable to have more than 40 feet between the ramp and the entrance for pedestrian purposes.

Boardmember Rosenberg thanked the applicant for the project, thought it was beautiful and in the right location. She appreciated the exposed V shapes at entrance while the other details were behind the jewel box. It was an interesting play on the in and out of the building. Jewel boxes shone best in the right setting

and in the façade there was an extensive amount of glass. She preferred the larger swaths of material to the smaller tile as they were more cohesive with the large panes of glass. Adding another [audio jump 1:35:58]... was the one and only stripe on the building. If the material were incorporated elsewhere it might help provide articulation. She appreciated the plazas on El Camino and thought they would be successful but did not believe the public would use them due to the single tenant nature of the building. If they had a small café then the public would be invited to use the plazas. With respect to the HVAC the duct work had to be thought out to some extent. Something needed to be planned in order to get ARB support. She noted that she had a very small operable window in her office which she loved. The architect could find the right moments for small operable windows which she acknowledged might be difficult without a tenant. Basically, she asked that they allow for the possibility of ventilation in specific moments of the building. The building was beautiful, the landscape was stunning, the indoor/outdoor spaces and attention to detail were exceptional and she would like to see the project built with the appropriate tenant. She repeated that there needed to be a reason for the public to use the building as well. Without that it would be a jewel box for people to look at rather than engage with.

Chair Hirsch stated that there were some differences of opinion within the ARB but there was unanimity on operable windows and fresh air, even in commercial buildings. It seemed as though there could be more thought to the articulation of the façade. The façade was incredibly long, and the ARB saw mostly angled views. The fins worked well for articulation and created a texture to the surface. He suggested they study the articulation further. The big issue was related to the zoning and the site which were in conflict with each other. The project was uniquely sited to provide 100% parking, but if the garage were increased then the surface was open for other uses. He mentioned the Vista building on El Camino Real (interrupted)

[Boardmembers spoke at the same time off microphone 1:3:28]

Chair Hirsch stated that it had a wonderful café off to the side which was used by the public. The public was invited to come both by pedestrian amenities and the café. He thought it was reasonable to request something like a café, especially considering several of the Boardmembers voiced interest in it. It could be an opportunity for the project to relate something smaller on the site to the main building and should be considered. He suggested a connection to the Creekside if it remained in its current state. He asked what the ARB should do about the parking dimensions and noted that he was undecided. There was an opportunity to have different things happen in different parts of El Camino. Stanford was a big expanse and then there was commercial intensity. This project was almost park like coming from the Research Park and he appreciated that. With the parking entry he thought there was enough distinction and that the applicant had improved the front door. They could turn the structure the other way, but that was up to the applicant. The landscape was beautifully done. They needed to determine what would happen with the ductwork and that needed to be worked out so that it did not detract from the wood aspects of the project. He called for further comments.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he wanted to pitch an idea. He addressed the landscape architect and indicated that he had been to many linear parks and noted that they had a large swath of landscaped area between the street and the parking lot which was labeled stormwater treatment. He asked if they could make it a linear park with a pathway through it. That would allow him to find the area as a public amenity and thought it would be a lovely break on El Camino. If the frontage was a landscaped area rather than a parking lot he would feel more comfortable. He stressed that the area needed to be intended for the

public and could envision it as a parallel path to the sidewalk. If they did that and added a public café it would be positive. He told the ARB that they generally insisted on a public amenity for every project on El Camino. There was no reason why the proposed building could not provide that public amenity. If the applicant did those things he thought they would be closer to meeting the guidelines.

Chair Hirsch thanked Vice Chair Baltay for the suggestion.

Boardmember Chen stated mixed feelings about having retail on the site. She would love more retail, restaurants, or coffee shops in town but on the site with an office building she was not sure it would be viable without really great coffee or food. Without that she did not believe she would find herself in the building. The ARB wanted more activity along the street, but they also wanted the parcel to be used instead of remaining empty. If retail would not be viable then it did not make sense to include it, it would simply be a waste of space. The other functions of the building were up to the owner or the future tenant. If Rivian was the tenant a gift shop might bring the public in, but other functions not related to the office might not be successful.

Boardmember Thompson added that she agreed with Boardmember Chen on the issue. They did not want to make space for something that might fail. A good compromise might be to create a flexible space for pop ups. She appreciated Vice Chair Baltay's suggestion about enhanced green space on El Camino and thought it would be an amenity by itself.

Boardmember Rosenberg reminded the ARB that public transportation ran up and down El Camino and the zone had a bus stop so it might be convenient to grab a coffee on the property. She was not requesting a whole restaurant, but something like a Starbucks shack might work. The amenity did not need to be large, but the applicant should be encouraged to look into the possibility for a public amenity to draw people inside the building. She also liked the idea of the Rivian giftshop but noted that would be up to the tenant. The point of the ARB requesting an outside business was to pull the outside in and draw in the public. Without that the green space in front of the parking lot might go to waste. She indicated that she thought she might be in the minority though on the issue.

Ms. Gerhardt asked the Chair if they wanted to call a Motion or do straw polls.

Boardmember Thompson noted that the item had already taken two hours.

Chair Hirsch called a straw poll on Vice Chair Baltay's suggestion of opening the site to a linear park along El Camino.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the ARB was looking to increase the size of the parklet or if they just wanted it expressed more as a parklet. Based on the constraints of the parking lot the size might not change.

Chair Hirsch pointed to L1.01 for the size of the area.

Vice Chair Baltay clarified that his intent was not for the applicant to change the size of the parking lot. He was trying to find a compromise. He asked if the landscape architect could respond to the idea prior to a straw poll.

Chair Hirsch asked for the landscape architect to respond.

[no name, no company 1:57:04] thought it was an interesting idea and noted his love of New York's High Line. He explained how the train track was turned into a linear park and said he would love to design a High Line. The difficulty was that there were many things going on within the space. There was a bus stop and existing significant trees which would create islands in the potential linear park. They intended to enhance the linear pedestrian experience on El Camino with new lighting, paving, and trees which were part of the Guidelines. They increased that already by adding the parklet spaces which he argued would be more than decoration. He thought people would walk El Camino and there would be activation there which would make people appreciate the parklets and the proposed public artwork. He thought the parklets were already very engaging and would provide a real public benefit. He stressed that as other projects were developed there would be more density which would lead to more activity on the parklets. (interrupted)

Vice Chair Baltay asked if it could be designed as a linear public area and specifically requested a yes or no answer.

Chair Hirsch agreed that was the question.

[Landscape architect 1:59:35] thought the area could be developed with additional uses but would be challenged and might not be as linear as what he described.

Chair Hirsch thought that answered the question.

Boardmember Chen thought the linear park was a great idea but requested clarification if they wanted it brought around the corner on Hansen.

Chair Hirsch said that was a good question.

Vice Chair Baltay wanted the designer to look at it with few restrictions. The real intent was to make the area more public. That may mean compromising the requirements like stormwater treatment or a transformer. It was motivated by an intent to have the area be comfortable for the public. He hoped the ARB would agree to that intent and give the design team latitude to make the design decisions. Palo Alto wanted the most creative solutions.

Chair Hirsch said that it was not just for the public but also for the people working in the building. He noted that people who worked at tech companies often walked up and down sidewalks while talking on their phones. The applicant could look to create alternatives for people to use the outside space. The linear park was an idea that would add interest and complexity to the building.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if they were ready for a straw poll.

Chair Hirsch called for the straw poll.

Vice Chair Baltay, Boardmember Chen, Boardmember Thompson, Chair Hirsch, and Boardmember Rosenberg were in favor of the idea.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if they could poll the ARB on ground floor retail.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if they meant ground floor or a corner location.

Boardmember Thompson said that they were discussing ground floor.

Allison Koo, Managing Director at Sand Hill Property Company stated she appreciated the comments they had heard. She clarified that the references the ARB was making were zoned CS or CN. The zoning was very different as mentioned by Boardmember Chen earlier. The project was in the RP zone. Her research the prior week showed 35 to 40 vacancies in retail space in the vicinity along El Camino alone. That showed that the market did not have demand and it would be difficult to command and prescribe a use. She also noted that she worked in an office building on El Camino next to the Vista and the little café. Their building had activation on the street, was next to a busy café, had built in residential, and a soccer field nearby yet there were still two vacancies on their ground floor that had remained vacant since the beginning of the project. So even retail in the CS zone with activation and the other factors still had no demand. She noted that she had spoken with many different kinds of merchants, and no one wanted to move in. That was the reality of the market. Based on that retail was a difficult challenge for the project. The vacancies on El Camino were of significant length as well ranging from 11 to 53 months of vacancy. The new project did not have enough density to make people walk in to go to a small store even in a beautiful setting.

Chair Hirsch asked if the little restaurant next door was functional and making money.

Ms. Koo assumed so but that still did not help her fill the retail spaces in her office building. She stated that price did not seem to matter nor did type of business.

Chair Hirsch said that the ARB was looking for something like the little restaurant or a simpler use like ice cream. He noted Rivian was next door and they needed to look at the parklets as well.

Vice Chair Baltay said that they needed to determine what they would do for Palo Alto since they were putting a large business there. If people were coming into work, what would the project do to make them comfortable in town. It was not simply a matter of what might make her money, Palo Alto needed to accommodate the workers. Sand Hill needed to contribute more to the community with its projects. The ARB wanted creative solutions and not statistics on vacancies. Palo Alto wanted landlords to help activate the street and grow El Camino. He noted that Palo Alto would continue to grow and pointed to the Fry's site as an example. People needed coffee shops and other amenities. The project had to come up with something that would give back to the community. The ARB did not want to prescribe the tenant but wanted the project to give back.

Chair Hirsch added that the café neighboring Ms. Koo's office was incredible. He said that the ARB needed to wind up the topic and called a straw poll on some form of commercial use in the area.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought the argument was persuasive but was still of the opinion that something should be attempted. She asked how many people would be inside the building on a daily basis or if that was not available since there was no tenant.

Vice Chair Baltay supported asking for retail.

Boardmember Thompson indicated she was not in favor of requiring retail.

Boardmember Chen said that she was also not in favor of requiring retail.

Boardmember Thompson stated that the project had not requested any Design Enhancement Exceptions (DEE) and requiring retail might be asking them to go against zoning. That requires extra fees (interrupted)

Ms. Gerhardt clarified that a restaurant could go in with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). It was more of a process but was easy enough to navigate.

Boardmember Thompson indicated that she still had not changed her mind.

Vice Chair Baltay wished it did not have to be so prescriptive and that the applicant would return with a proposed solution that worked for them and for the City.

Chair Hirsch asked if it was conditional on them returning and saying what they could do.

Vice Chair Baltay said that a straw poll was a yes or no question.

Chair Hirsch said that the straw poll was for a small commercial use on the property.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that the ARB was 50/50 without Chair Hirsch's vote.

Chair Hirsch wanted to qualify his response and said that he could be in favor unless the applicant found there was no possibility of success for the facility commercially.

Mr. Sauls thought the applicant provided some information and indicated that it would help staff to know what they should ask the applicant to provide as proof.

Ms. Gerhardt said that it was a larger analysis and perhaps they would have to look at all of El Camino to determine the answer.

Chair Hirsch indicated that he wanted to see some effort made toward commercial usage of some small part of the project for the community. He asked if the ARB wanted to say where the use should be, such as the corner.

Boardmember Thompson wanted to leave it to the applicant.

Vice Chair Baltay said that the use did not have to be commercial. It just needed to draw the public in and be open to everyone. That could be a non-profit or even public artwork.

Boardmember Thompson thought there was already artwork in the corner.

[Speaking off microphone 2:14:01]

Vice Chair Baltay said that it would be in the building, not just landscaping.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the poll was for inside or outside of the building.

Vice Chair Baltay envisioned 200 sf in the corner of the building, possibly on the south side. He wanted the applicant to provide a solution rather than the ARB being "stiff armed" like they were in the first round. He repeated that the activity needed to be for the community and not necessarily commercial.

Boardmember Thompson clarified that it was a request for some of the square footage inside the building to be allocated to something other than Research and Development (R&D).

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that was correct.

Mr. Sauls wanted additional clarification.

Chair Hirsch thought that was a different kind of vote.

Mr. Sauls noted that one of Vice Chair Baltay's suggestions was for public art. So it was not necessarily that part of the building would go away from office, it would just have to bring visual interest into the building. the applicant had proposed some form of art and he thought it was at that corner of the building. That would be exterior and within the landscaping.

Boardmember Thompson suggested the art could be considered in a subcommittee.

Boardmember Rosenberg did not want to hinge the approval on the applicant saying yes or no, but rather that they were open to the possibility and would seriously consider it. She agreed the matter could be looked at further in subcommittee. She agreed with Vice Chair Baltay that it felt like the applicant provided a hard no instead of a creative solution. The parklets were supposed to engage the public, but the public had no reason to go to them. The ARB wanted consideration.

Chair Hirsch thought they were trying to decouple that from the approval of the project. He suggested a straw poll on whether it should be a subcommittee item that did not stop the ARB from approving the project.

Boardmember Chen had a question of staff. She asked if the proposed use would be non-profit or art gallery if it would still require a CUP.

Mr. Sauls said that it would depend on size. Personal Service would be similar to a retail CUP. He directed the ARB to L1.03 for the information on public art.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about the red dot.

Mr. Sauls explained that was the placeholder. He indicated that the applicant wanted to speak to several items.

Ms. Gerhardt clarified that personal service was not a permitted use, but retail and restaurant/café functions would be a CUP.

Ms. Koo explained that they had a willingness to include food service and that they could have a tenant that wanted to include it. The use of the facility was user specific and demand specific. In the Research Park there were several cafés that many people did not realize were open to the public. If that was the intent and approach they would be happy to encourage and works towards that goal without a strict requirement to get the project permitted or approved.

Ms. Gerhardt added that the project had approximately 2,500 sf of amenity space. A cafeteria for office workers does not require parking, but if it were a public restaurant then there might need to be additional parking. The Stanford Research Park had a good Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program so it was possible that the parking would not be required.

Chair Hirsch [unintelligible 2:22:37]... they needed to define the space as it would require future construction. He called for a Motion.

Boardmember Thompson asked if they could hold another straw poll on the façade articulation.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that a lot hinged on the tenant occupancy of the building. the ARB should consider a subcommittee for when the tenant was selected. She wanted to see the project move forward and urged the ARB to find a way for that to happen. She did not know if that was possible.

Boardmember Thompson thought that the ARB's purview was the architecture. she repeated that she wanted to take a straw poll on the elevation. The ARB needed to find the architecture appropriate for the location no matter the eventual tenant.

Chair Hirsch explained that he wanted to decouple it from the approval, but it was an issue on the table.

Boardmember Thompson thought it would only come before the ARB if it had enough of a physical impact.

Chair Hirsch asked if Boardmember Rosenberg could phase a Motion.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she wanted to hold Boardmember Thompson's straw poll first.

Chair Hirsch asked Boardmember Thompson to discuss the straw poll.

Boardmember Thompson said a couple of Boardmembers mentioned that they wanted more articulation on the façade and that the fins were good. There was a comment about the sheer wall treatment. The straw poll was to add more texture and articulation to the façade along El Camino.

Boardmember Rosenberg held a slight preference to the larger panels on the sheer wall. Otherwise the façade was beautifully done, and she did not want to impose her preferences on the architect.

Boardmember Chen was in favor of the current elevation, but it would be better with operable windows on the upper floor.

Vice Chair Baltay did not believe the ARB should proscribe further changes to the façade. He thought it could use some work but trusted the architect. There were other things that he wanted to push harder for, and he noted operable windows were a separate discussion.

Boardmember Thompson indicated that operable windows would affect the façade.

Vice Chair Baltay agreed that it could. He wanted the architect to hear that that façade could use another round. He did not want to tell them to move the structural V inside.

Boardmember Thompson said that they were not asking them to move the structural V. Everyone was happy with where the glass was. The issue was about adding more fins or a treatment that might relate to operable windows that would make the façade appear less monolithic.

Chair Hirsch indicated that it was a straw poll.

Vice Chair Baltay said he could support Boardmember Thomson's points. The building could use more work to reduce the two story glass façade. He supported the straw poll.

Boardmember Thompson stated that she was in support and that it sounded like there were two Boardmembers not in support leaving Chair Hirsch as the swing vote.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that they were only speaking about operable windows and not fins.

Boardmember Thompson stated that it was about fins as well. It was about adding texture.

Chair Hirsch was in favor of adding additional texture. He stated that the ARB needed to move forward.

Mr. Sauls suggested that they straw poll on operable windows, which he believed the majority of the ARB wanted.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that the ARB needed to see more design of the mechanical system including an allowance for operable windows and a finish design.

Ms. Gerhardt thought that was an item for a subcommittee which could be added to a Motion.

Vice Chair Baltay thought that was a straw poll item but that everyone agreed with him.

MOTION: Boardmember Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to approve the project subject to the terms and conditions in the report and for the applicant to return to subcommittee with 1) an updated landscape design for the strip along El Camino and Hansen Way which would intentionally bolster pedestrian experience along the corridor, 2) a study of additional texture on the El Camino façade, 3) a further developed mechanical system with provisions for alternates moving forward, 4) a study of operable windows, and 5) a consideration of an activation element along the ground floor.

Boardmember Rosenberg clarified that the Motion contained four subcommittees.

Boardmember Thompson identified five.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1: Vice Chair Baltay offered a Friendly Amendment that the applicant add operable windows rather than study them.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that the applicant already studied the operable window issue.

Chair Hirsch asked if Boardmember Thompson agreed to the Friendly Amendment.

Boardmember Thompson did not believe that the ARB had seen any study.

Vice Chair Baltay was not interested in discussing the matter further with the mechanical engineer. He wanted ventilation in the building.

Boardmember Thompson accepted the Friendly Amendment.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she would still second the Motion.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1 ACCEPTED

Vice Chair Baltay asked how Boardmember Thompson phrased the public amenity.

Boardmember Thompson repeated that she said, “study an activation element on the ground floor.”

Chair Hirsch asked if it would be in interior space.

Boardmember Thompson wanted to leave it open and broad as the ground floor or plane. It might be something floating on the landscape.

Chair Hirsch thought the language inferred that it would be inside.

Ms. Gerhardt clarified that ground floor would mean the first floor of the building.

Boardmember Thompson said that the ground floor or elsewhere on the ground plane.

Vice Chair Baltay asked for staff's opinion.

Mr. Sauls asked if they wanted a potential tenant or simply something that activated the space such as artwork. That was discussed and the project already included some art. the question was did the ARB want more profound or significant art in lieu of a coffee stand or something like that. He requested clear direction so that when the item returned to subcommittee they were not asked again for a coffee stand or similar.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #2: Vice Chair Baltay offered a Friendly Amendment that the applicant be required to have 200 sf of retail space on the ground floor.

Boardmember Thompson did not accept Friendly Amendment #2.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #2 REJECTED

UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Vice Chair Baltay offered an Unfriendly Amendment that the applicant be required to have 200 sf of retail space on the ground floor.

Chair Hirsch called for a second and asked if Boardmember Rosenberg would do so.

Boardmember Rosenberg wished to leave the item more open ended. She thought that a coffee cart would be acceptable. To require 200 sf inside the building was too restrictive.

UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT FAILED FOR LACK OF SECOND

Boardmember Thompson thought that the subcommittee would want a ground floor plan with a highlight on where the activation would happen and what it would be.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed and noted that she appreciated Vice Chair Baltay's intent. The ARB wanted the applicant to leave the meeting with clear direction. They wanted something given back to the City and engagement with the public in the space. She hesitated to create anything more formal or restrictive as she wanted the applicant to have flexibility.

Mr. Sauls restated what had been included in the Motion so far: that the applicant should consider an activation element on ground floor or elsewhere on site, which may not be attached to the building.

Chair Hirsch thought that was accurate.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested the Motion be read back.

Mr. Sauls said that there were five subcommittee items: 1) enhancing the landscape strip along El Camino Real.

Boardmember Thompson thought that needed to be specifically related to the El Camino Guidelines as the ARB had to make the finding.

Mr. Sauls stated that 2) asked the applicant to consider additional textures or modifications to the El Camino Real façade, 3) to develop preliminary details on mechanical systems or alternates in order to understand how the interior space would look.

Boardmember Thompson thought that if there were no tenant then the applicant would need to provide alternates in order to show flexibility for prospective tenants.

Mr. Sauls stated that 4) was to add operable windows. He asked if that was for the first or second floor or both.

Boardmember Thompson indicated that she did not want to be prescriptive.

Mr. Sauls said that 5) was to consider an activation element on the ground floor or elsewhere on site that may not be attached to the building.

Boardmember Thompson asked if they were ready to vote.

Chair Hirsch called for the vote.

VOTE: 4-1-0-0 (Vice Chair Baltay, Nay)

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the Chair would appoint the subcommittee.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if Vice Chair Baltay wanted to speak to his no vote.

Vice Chair Baltay did not find that necessary.

Chair Hirsch asked if Boardmembers Rosenberg and Thompson would serve on the subcommittee.

Boardmember Thompson accepted the assignment.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if they would handle all five issues.

Chair Hirsch said that it was one subcommittee.

Boardmember Rosenberg accepted the assignment and thanked the applicant.

Chair Hirsch thanked everyone and called for a 10 minute break.

The ARB took a break

4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 901 South California Avenue [22PLN-00142]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow Demolition of a two-Story Office Building (54,930 sf) and Construction of a new two-Story Approximately 55,583 Square Foot Office Building with a 2,709 Square Foot Amenity Space.

Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of CEQA per Section 15302. Zoning District: RP(L) (Research Park).

Chair Hirsch called the meeting back to order and introduced the item.

Vice Chair Baltay disclosed that he visited the site.

Boardmember Chen disclosed that she visited the site.

Boardmember Thompson disclosed that she visited the site.

Boardmember Rosenberg disclosed that she visited the site.

Chair Hirsch also disclosed that he visited the site and called for the applicant's presentation.

Mr. Sauls explained that he was the Project Planner for 901 South California Avenue. The application had a preliminary ARB application in March 2022 and had returned with response to comments. He recapped that the project was a Major Architectural Review application to replace an existing building on a 3.19 acre site. A new two-story office building was planned, and the City found the application exempt from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as a replacement building. The building was proposed to be 58,000 sf, but the applicant would utilize 2,709 sf of amenity space. Since the last hearing they updated their canopy coverage, added a driveway along California Avenue, and had increased the number of species to incorporate more native landscaping. Parking was placed at the rear of the site so that the building was experienced from California Avenue. The ARB had inquired about underground parking or a garage in order to increase the landscaping, adding operable windows to the building, and suggested the amenity space be moved closer to the entrance of the building. The ARB also wanted additional treatment at the back, which was consistent with the design of the front, for the applicant to consider softening the relationship with the red building, and for the applicant to provide an existing or exposed impermeable coverage for the site. They were further asked to soften the front façade and to try to integrate the façades. The applicant increased the landscaping by adding a barbeque area, which was shown in the drawings. Additional landscaping was also planned for the front of the building. Previously the application included a DEE to request some added height, but the ARB did not support that DEE. Accordingly, the applicant reduced the height of the tower element to comply with the current height requirement. The applicant retained the horizontal accordion door to help activate the second floor areas and bring in natural air ventilation. The amenity space had been potentially located to the back of the property and could be moved around if necessary. He shared the rear façade of the building and its updated design which was reminiscent of the front façade. He then provided an aerial view of the additional amenity space and the canopy cover over the parking area. It was planned to have a cover of almost 68%. That exceeded the City's 50% requirement. Most Research Park projects were closer to 50% and the applicant was doing a much better job in that respect. Staff recommended that the ARB approve the application subject to the findings and conditions of approval.

[Chair Hirsch off microphone 2:58:02]

Vice Chair Baltay wanted to hear from the applicant.

Boardmember Thompson agreed.

Stan Lew, RMW Architecture, explained that this was the second hearing before the ARB. The ARB offered a number of comments which they responded to and he would address in his presentation. He shared his screen and displayed renderings of the additional landscape on California Avenue. They were also maintaining specific trees in the landscape and had the project landscape architect present to explain. With respect to the architecture they had simplified the building's palette and removed the wood look metal panel in favor of the red and grey terra cotta. The geometry of the building was responsive to the context of the neighborhood. He showed the site plan which was largely unchanged. They added an outdoor amenity to the back of the site in direct response to ARB comments. He showed images of existing context and then renderings of the building, including an evening view. The site plan showed the amenity space towards the middle of the building which he highlighted with his cursor. The main entry was in the center of the building and comprised of a glass element adjacent to the second story. In the first round they heard comments leading to the terrace at the back of the building. the new façade was proposed to integrate the design and be more consistent. It was also a benefit for the tenants to have access to outside space at the rear of the building. He provided additional views of the building and the proposed plant materials.

Emily Rylander, Principal of Andrea Cochran Landscape Architecture, Inc., explained that they had made many improvements to the landscape since the previous hearing. She stated that she would walk the ARB through the slide show and discuss the thinking in depth. The site was across the street from a residential community, and they sought to be respectful. Additionally, they worked hard to preserve the large existing trees. The space was planned as a series of garden rooms. On the California side there were several large Magnolia trees they were looking to preserve. A berm was proposed so that from California it would berm toward the building. the exterior would not have a lot of interaction with the workers, so the exterior was more of a residential garden feel with lush planting and mature trees. The main pedestrian entrance was flanked with trees and a mix of native and ornamental plants. The perimeter of the site contained mature trees they planned to save and enhance for shade and screening. There were significant amenity spaces towards the rear of the site for the tenants including a private upper terrace and a new garden space which could be used for outdoor events or breaks during the day. She provided renderings of views from the back garden spaces which provided filtered views towards the parking lot. With the parking lot they proposed augmenting the existing trees with new trees.

Mr. Lew indicated that they had completed their presentation.

Ms. Gerhardt reminded the ARB to take public comment.

Chair Hirsch called for the public comment.

Ms. Klicheva indicated that there was none.

Chair Hirsch called for ARB questions.

Boardmember Thompson explained that they had asked the applicant to consider adding more operable windows and asked if that was considered.

Mr. Lew said that there was a lot of discussion related to operable windows but given the nature of the program for the building and its being a laboratory that required air pressurization, safety, and energy considerations they did not plan operable windows. He stressed that was mostly due to programming.

Chair Hirsch asked if there was comment on that.

Vice Chair Baltay noted that they were in the question phase.

Chair Hirsch asked how the large door which opened onto the terrace affected the laboratory.

Tanita Choudhury explained that she designed laboratories for her company. The building ran on 100% outside air with no recirculation. The laboratories because of the pressurization could not be open. The only areas which could were amenity spaces where people would take lunch. Where they could make windows operable they did and what Chair Hirsch mentioned was an example. The laboratories would be closed from the amenity space.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that they were physically closed off.

Ms. Choudhury confirmed that they would be closed, and the terrace area would be its own mechanical zone and would function separately.

Vice Chair Baltay said that from California Avenue there were three or four mature palm trees on the edge of the property. He asked for assurance that they would remain.

Ms. Rylander indicated that she could give that assurance.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the low wall on the site plan behind the building. She thought it appeared to be 6 feet high in the rendering. Additionally it looked like there were bushes surrounding the barbeque area. She asked if it was the intention to create a more enclosed space for that area.

Ms. Rylander displayed the rendering and pointed out the wall and the hedge which were to help screen the parking lot.

Boardmember Chen asked about the 2nd floor rear outdoor terrace fire access ladder and its exact location.

Ms. Choudhury stated that she had worked with the Fire Department, and they requested the ladder. The sunshade would go away in that area. It would be removed because with the overhang it was made redundant and interfered with the stairs.

Mr. Lew indicated that was done in response to Fire Department comments.

Boardmember Chen pointed out that the rendering of the rear façade and the site plans did not match. She requested clarification as to which was correct. The floor plan was on Sheet A2.2 and the landscape planting was closer to the staircase.

Mr. Lew explained that the landscape planting plan called out zones and were ideas of where the plantings would be. The rendering was an earlier idea. They would not have landscape planting blocking the stair.

Boardmember Chen asked if there was glass on the skylight parapet wall on the tower.

Mr. Lew confirmed that Boardmember Chen was looking at the rendering he had on the screen.

Boardmember Chen indicated that she was. She asked if the second floor had a wood ceiling.

Mr. Lew stated that the drop ceiling in the rendering was made of wood inside the lobby. On the exterior it was a metal panel behind the structure which wrapped the top.

Boardmember Chen confirmed the finish would be the same as on the material board.

Mr. Lew indicated it would be similar.

Boardmember Chen asked what type of glass was used on the parapet and how they expected it to remain as clear as it was on the rendering.

Mr. Lew stated that as it was a two-story building it would be serviced from the ground with regular cleaning and maintenance from a lift.

Vice Chair Baltay asked the architect about the limestone and terra cotta panels. He confirmed that they were precast concrete in limestone and terra cotta colors.

Mr. Lew stated that the samples were on the material board.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if they had considered using actual terra cotta clay.

Mr. Lew explained that the colors were limestone and red, but they were both terra cotta samples.

Boardmember Rosenberg [off microphone 3:15:30]

Mr. Lew indicated that was correct.

Chair Hirsch called for further questions but heard none. He called for ARB discussion.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she had comments. It was interesting that this project came to the ARB after the last one, although she did not want to compare projects. There were a few notable successes with the project. Even though the building was a laboratory and needed to remain sealed they still had an air intake plan and where possible they were utilizing ventilation. The front façade with the garden landscaping felt inviting. The back barbecue area tied into the parking lot and both spaces were successful. The terra cotta was not to her personal preference, but she appreciated the aesthetic. The building was interesting, compelling, and well thought out.

Vice Chair Baltay agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg. The site planning was exceptional, and the landscaping was improved since the last ARB hearing. It was a convincing presentation driven by a convincing design. He agreed that the amenities could go wherever the tenant wanted to put them. The bicycles needed to be stored close to the entrance. Previously it was toward the back of the building and the ARB requested it be close to the entrance and they still needed to complete that. That was not a tenant improvement situation and needed to be handled during the planning process of the project. The tower element was no longer a tower, but a corner. He found the change unfortunate and suggested the architect treat it like a corner or project it from the building. He understood that the tower was removed but the design only went halfway, and he suggested another round of thought. Lastly, something about the terra cotta material did not feel as rich as he would like. Initially he thought it was a concrete product

and he feared that one would be able to see the edge of the panel and reveal that it was not completely terra cotta. He requested a subcommittee review the issue and the applicant give the material another thought. Currently the red was flat, and the limestone color lacked richness. He stated that he could support the project overall.

Boardmember Thompson agreed with many of the previous comments. She appreciated the adjustment which resulted in the DEE being withdrawn. The way the corner was treated at the parapet was nice. She agreed with Vice Chair Baltay that more could be done to modulate the façade. There was a monolithic feeling to the glass. The fins on the prior back façade looked really great and she was sad that they were gone. However, the activation of the space was great. The California façade was really great, but the other three struggled with monolithic feelings. She suggested that more could be done to add texture to the façades so that they were more interactive. She enjoyed the red color but felt that the grey was lackluster. She suggested a material that might shine more. Further, they could bring the angles from the California façade to the other parts of the building. The landscape was lovely, and she appreciated the work done there.

Boardmember Chen thanked the applicant for the project. She liked the site plan and thought the landscaping and outdoor space was lovely. She agreed that the materials did not seem rich enough, especially the grey color. She asked to see how the terra cotta material would be used at the corners. With the tower she did not think that it needed to be emphasized more. She thought it looked nice and it was consistent with how the glass connected to the terra cotta tile and was fine with the current design as shown.

Chair Hirsch thanked the ARB for the discussion. he thought the comments were simple as the building was pretty successful. He noted that the façade was ornamental and not functional as with other laboratory buildings. It would have been interesting if it could have been functional and related to the use of the building, but it did not. He asked if the ARB would accept that approach. Several issues were raised including bicycle storage. It was not unreasonable to be kept where proposed so long as people used a different entrance. He asked if there was an area inside for bicycle repair and apologized for not asking the question in the prior round. It was reasonable that the inside storage in the area could be for that use. He agreed that the lobby height was fine as materials were related to each other on the same plane. He had been in favor of a high tower, but the element looked good as it was, and he appreciated how it related one material to another. The issue with the richness and color of the materials could have been mitigated if the applicant had provided more detailed drawings of the corners. They would need to be mitered.

Mr. Lew indicated that they planned to miter the corners so there would be no exposed edges on the terra cotta. They were working closely with the fabricator on the details and did not want the materials to be less than quality.

Chair Hirsch noted that the ARB had to consider how different colors would come together at corners. He suggested that they consider the details more and called for further ARB discussion.

Mr. Lew explained that was why they had spent so much time working with the manufacturers and fabricators on the tolerances of the terra cotta materials. He explained that they moved away from the wood look panel meeting the terra cotta so that they could meet the terra cotta to terra cotta.

Chair Hirsch said that matched textures as well.

Mr. Lew agreed that was the case.

Chair Hirsch stressed that the idea had to work.

Mr. Sauls directed the ARB to A5.1, A5.2, and A5.3. They showed wall standards and could be useful in showing how the material connected to itself or disparate materials.

Mr. Lew indicated that they did not show the mitered joints.

Boardmember Thompson directed everyone to A5.3.

Chair Hirsch noted that the drawing needed to be bigger for him to understand what it would feel like. He agreed that the landscaping was terrific and was glad that the amenity space was enclosed to block out the view of the vehicles. He thought it was a gutsy building and he appreciated its depth. It did not speak to the function of the building, but he appreciated the structural quality of the building which brought the scale down to something more residential. He called for follow-up comments.

Boardmember Thompson suggested a straw poll about the texture on the façade. she thought the glass and terra cotta as aligned felt monolithic. She asked how the ARB felt about more texture or ins and outs and pointed out that the California façade had all of that. Pedestrians would just see a flat wall along the side of the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg mentioned A6.2 and asked if the glass stretches within the brownish box should be recessed. She asked if that was the intent of Boardmember Thompson's thoughts.

Boardmember Thompson said that something like that would work as would further use of canted texture. Punching the window might not work. The parti of the building was a solid red box that was carved into to show the white and silver. The parti lost steam along the back of the building.

Mr. Lew appreciated the comment and noted that with the California elevation they were deliberately working to the scale of the neighborhood across the street. That was the reason there was less glass on that side.

Boardmember Thompson thought the ARB all really liked the California elevation. The public would not see the back of the building but would see the sides. Therefore, her concerns were really about the sides.

Chair Hirsch [off microphone 3:36:37]... noted the trees would overlap a lot and block the view of the façade. The cut out for the side entry was a major change in dimension and made the rest of the façade reasonable.

Boardmember Thompson liked the recessed entry and was fine with the massing. She thought there was an extra level of scale and dimension that could be pushed further. In some ways the design was too blocky.

Vice Chair Baltay directed Boardmember Thompson to A6.6 which was a more realistic view of the façade. He asked if she meant that the tower should be differentiated from the limestone terra cotta.

Boardmember Thompson said no. she liked the glass entry as it was but had an issue with the two masses on either side of it framed by the terra cotta.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if recessing the windows to showcase the thickness would work.

Boardmember Thompson said they could be pushed, canted, given textured, finned. She wanted something that would make it more than a rectangle. It needed another level of detail or refinement to make the entry shine.

Mr. Lew asked how the ARB felt about a shadow box around the glazing in the two grey masses to frame it for enhanced detail and articulation. They could study the issue and return to a committee or staff.

Ms. Koo indicated that they would be open to recessing it and stated that she liked the idea.

Boardmember Thompson repeated that it could be recessed, canted, or otherwise for more dimension. She suggested they think about how they wanted to approach the entrance.

Mr. Lew said that they would look at it.

Chair Hirsch thought it became a question of forward and backward.

Mr. Lew agreed.

Chair Hirsch stated that he was also concerned about places where materials met and noted that happened all over the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted that her opinion differed, and she loved the colors coming together and the knife edge created by the miter. The concerns about construction notwithstanding she thought it was an interesting use of the material.

Boardmember Thompson seconded Boardmember Rosenberg's opinion.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that he was still thinking about Boardmember Thompson's question of the texturality of the whole façade. He thought A6.6 met the findings but could support another look at it.

[Ms. Koo off microphone 3:42:07]

Vice Chair Baltay suggested that if he were the architect he would take an additional pass at it.

Boardmember Thompson noted that it was the human scale design mandate she was concerned with. everyone would see the façade as it was along the boulevard entry.

Boardmember Chen noted that the same detail happened around the entire building with the glass flush with the terra cotta tile. She pointed to A7.0 and noted how it contained the same treatment. She asked if the ARB wanted that to change as well.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that was the reason he was uncomfortable telling the architect to surround it with a shadow box.

Boardmember Chen pointed out that the south side was still the same.

Boardmember Thompson asked the ARB to consider asking the architect to work with a subcommittee on the detailed connection between the glass and the terra cotta and consider adding more texture, variation, and types of shadow. She spoke about the Google buildings near the Baylands as reference.

Chair Hirsch thought that if it could be done that way it would be great. He assumed that they had looked at the details.

Mr. Lew stated that was correct.

Chair Hirsch wanted to give the applicant approval because he did not think they needed to return with a lot of details. They could provide the details to the subcommittee and show the ARB how it would be done. Everything was in the detail, but he thought it should remain as a box.

Boardmember Thompson suggested a straw poll as she disagreed with Chair Hirsch. She thought it needed to be more than a box, it needed to have texture and dimension.

Chair Hirsch called for the straw poll.

Boardmember Thompson clarified that it was being in favor of the side façades where the glass appeared flush with the terra cotta to ask the designer to add more texture and modulation along the façade.

Vice Chair Baltay suggested they “consider adding”.

Boardmember Thompson said that would occur in a subcommittee.

Boardmember Chen stated that considering the other façade she would say no.

Boardmember Thompson was in favor.

Vice Chair Baltay was in favor of asking for additional consideration.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that she would ask for consideration but would not make it a requirement.

Boardmember Thompson agreed that it was consideration.

Chair Hirsch indicated that he was not the deciding vote, but he agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg and would ask for consideration but not for a requirement.

Boardmember Thompson stated that the ARB could recommend approval but have the item returned to subcommittee.

Vice Chair Baltay asked about the added rain screen and if there was a way to make it interior space.

Chair Hirsch looked at the construction (interrupted)

Boardmember Thompson indicated that the detail was on 5.3.

Vice Chair Baltay said that they detailed it as a rain screen. He wanted to know if it was possible.

Mr. Sauls confirmed that he was talking about how it moved in and out.

Vice Chair Baltay said he was.

Mr. Sauls said that there were discussions about it being square footage.

Vice Chair Baltay indicated that there was a note on the plan showing that it was already counted that way. He was asking from a constructability and useful function. (interrupted)

Chair Hirsch [unintelligible 3:48:40]... recess into the space would be useful.

[Ms. Choudhury off microphone 3:48:49]

Vice Chair Baltay asked what they thought of that.

Chair Hirsch [unintelligible 3:48:55]

Mr. Lew explained that they looked into it with staff and could explore the technical feasibility of it although it was not how the cubbies were originally conceived.

Vice Chair Baltay asked staff if it was included in the area calculations or if they would suffer an additional area penalty.

Mr. Sauls directed the ARB to A0.4 which had the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) calculation table and explained what was included.

Vice Chair Baltay said the issue was one of constructability and practicality. He thought from the exterior he would prefer that they be functional parts of the building. He was uncomfortable mandating that though.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought it made no difference to the exterior of the building whether or not the spaces were used. Every square inch of the City was worth money. If it was already counted then the applicant might want to consider its use for something.

Ms. Koo thought it was easier for them for space planning with the laboratory function to have things straight than indented. She preferred having the depth and dimension on the outside (interrupted)

Chair Hirsch said that the applicant was not being asked to change that. They were just asking if the applicant could use the interior space where there was no structure.

Mr. Lew said that it was conceivable to use the space although they were not counting on it. It was not efficient for the planning of laboratories.

Vice Chair Baltay suggested Mr. Lew take the comparison to [Lewy Con 3:51:17] as flattering.

Boardmember Thompson asked if anyone wanted to make a Motion.

MOTION: Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve the project as presented with a subcommittee for the modulation of the window façade where they meet the terra cotta.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1: Vice Chair Baltay offered a Friendly Amendment for the bicycle parking area to be more proximate to the entrance/center of the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg did not believe that was necessary and thought the location of the bicycle parking was reasonable.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #1 REJECTED

Boardmember Thompson asked where Vice Chair Baltay suggested it be moved.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that it needed to be closer to the center of the building near the bathrooms and elevators.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that they would want the bikes to come straight in from the outside and straight into the space.

Vice Chair Baltay stated they could go on the backside and into the lobby.

Boardmember Thompson said that she did not use bicycle storage. She brought her bicycle in and put it next to her desk. Bicycle storage was always in a forgotten closet in the far back. She would second a request for the applicant to reconsider the bicycle location.

Vice Chair Baltay told Boardmember Thompson that had already been asked and the applicant would not reconsider differently.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the ARB had asked for that at the last hearing.

Vice Chair Baltay stated they had.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #2: Vice Chair Baltay offered a Friendly Amendment for the ARB to request to see the terra cotta and limestone material samples and more details in subcommittee.

Boardmember Rosenberg accepted Friendly Amendment #2.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #2 ACCEPTED

[cross talk, but appeared Boardmember Chen accepted Friendly Amendment #2 3:53:55]

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #3: Boardmember Thompson offered a Friendly Amendment to ask the designer to consider a stronger material instead of the grey...

Vice Chair Baltay asked if she would phrase it as richer materials for both colors.

Boardmember Thompson stated she was more concerned about the grey.

Boardmember Rosenberg was more concerned about the red.

Boardmember Thompson stated that they could do both.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested a second look at the material color palette. She repeated the Motion was to approve the project as presented with a subcommittee for the modulation of the glass within the terra cotta elements and with two Friendly Amendments, one being a terra cotta sample detail, possibly a physical sample and the second being for a richer material selection.

Boardmember Chen stated that she would still second the Motion.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT #3 ACCEPTED

Mr. Lew said that they had already planned a mockup with the actual materials, so that would help.

Ms. Koo asked if they were proposing different colors of the original material or requesting a new material.

Boardmember Thompson thought they were requesting a variation. She and Vice Chair Baltay saw the color and it looked silver and shiny, but the physical material was a dull, dark grey. She suggested something that was in tune with the design intent.

Vice Chair Baltay cited 626 Waverly, a building with a terra cotta paneled façade, as an example of a rich terra cotta. He did not believe the current material would look as good on that project.

Mr. Sauls restated the Motion as follows:

RESTATED MOTION: Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve the project as submitted with the following items to return to subcommittee: 1) study the modulation along the window façade where the glass met the terra cotta, 2) detail of the terra cotta materials and how they would be joined, 3) consider richer material and/or color for both terra cotta elements.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Boardmember Rosenberg congratulated the applicant.

The ARB took a break

5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 414 California Avenue [22PLN-00207]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Minor Board-Level Architectural Review to Allow the Removal and Replacement of Existing Stucco with new Tenant Colors, Rooftop Mechanical Equipment, two Parking lot Trees, Front Breeze-Block Screen Wall and Façade, new Landscaping, and new Signage. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of CEQA per Section 15301. Zoning District: CC(2)(R)(P) (Community Commercial).

Chair Hirsch introduced the project and called for disclosures.

Vice Chair Baltay disclosed that he visited the site.

Boardmember Chen disclosed that she had previously visited the site and been there many times.

Boardmember Thompson disclosed that she had also previously visited the site and been there many times.

Boardmember Rosenberg disclosed that she had visited the site the prior week.

Chair Hirsch disclosed that he visited the site the day before. He called for the staff report.

Mr. Sauls explained he was the Project Planner, and that the application was for a refresh of an existing building. The stucco had deteriorated over the years and the applicant was looking to remove it and the breeze-block system located on the front of the building. The existing site was a bank building and had been one since 1958 when the building was originally constructed. The site was .37 acres, and he displayed an aerial view of the project and its neighborhood. The project sought to refresh the building by removing

Page 34 of 47

Architectural Review Board Meeting
Summary Minutes: 10/20/22

the stucco and painting to a new grey/blue color scheme. The material board was available for the ARB's review. The project also sought to install a horizontal grey metal panel on the front of the building underneath the overhang roof structure and new tenant signage. New mechanical screening would be installed on the roof to buffer views of the mechanical equipment from the street on both sides. The additional ground cover landscaping was proposed as majority native species. He displayed a picture of the building as originally designed and explained that due to the breeze-block system staff brought on Page & Turnbull as consultants to evaluate the property as a historic resource. He directed the ARB to Attachment E for more specific information. Some components of the building could have helped qualify for the California Register of Historic Resources, but those components were modified over the years such that the historic integrity was diminished. The building was not eligible to be listed. The application requested to remove two trees in the parking lot, but the site currently exceeded the parking lot shading coverage requirements of 50%. He showed several elevations from the plan set. The existing glazing on the building was proposed to remain. The work primarily focused on removing the breeze-block system and the existing stucco. He displayed images of the signage and noted that they confirmed to the sign code allowances. The building would retain the stucco material similar to buildings in the surrounding context. The removal of the breeze-block system did not impact any historic resource and would make the building more structurally sound and safe. The proposed design would open the façade of the building and make it more visually attractive to pedestrians. Staff recommended the ARB approve the application based on the findings and conditions of approval in the staff report.

Chair Hirsch called for questions of the staff.

Vice Chair Baltay said that in the earlier meeting Mr. Sauls indicated that there was an engineering report on why the breeze-block needed to be removed. He asked where that was.

Mr. Sauls directed the ARB to Page A1.45.

Vice Chair Baltay requested that he summarize the report.

Mr. Sauls explained they identified the existing structural conditions were safe and that it would survive a minor to moderate earthquake. They had difficulty being able to access some structural elements of the concrete breeze-block in order to determine how capable it would be to withstand earthquakes. Retaining the material came with a risk of it potentially falling. It was concrete and might cause more damage than other materials.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if there was a definitive statement on if the breeze-block was dangerous. He read that it "may" pose a substantial risk in case of a seismic event. They recommended an investigation, not removal.

Boardmember Thompson noted that it said to either strengthen the attachments or replace the grills with lighter ones.

Vice Chair Baltay thanked her for that answer.

Chair Hirsch asked if it contained a history of the impact of previous earthquakes on the site.

Mr. Sauls indicated that it did not say much about that. He asked the applicant if the structural engineer was still present.

[man 4:20:37] explained the structural engineer was unable stay due to the timing of the meeting. The engineer could be emailed questions for clarification.

Mr. Sauls asked if the Chair would (interrupted)

Chair Hirsch [off microphone 4:20:51 to 4:21:06]

Boardmember Chen asked if the applicant had a presentation.

Chair Hirsch said that they would and explained they were hearing questions of staff. He then called for the applicant's presentation.

Ben Kracke, Studios Architecture, introduced Lauren Patrick and Kevin Lieberman and shared his screen with the ARB. He explained the project was located on California Avenue and that the recent rejuvenation of the streetscape was incredible. The project was in the center of the Uplift Local Pedestrian Streetscape Campaign and the applicant was excited to renovate and reactivate the vacant storefront. The building had an independent and third party review for historical significance and none was found with the breeze-block. They did not know the mural was there as a previous tenant punched an ATM and a night deposit box through the wall and stuccoed over it. The structural engineer was not at the hearing but had provided commentary on the building. the building is structurally sound, but the breeze-block was flagged as a potential concern. It was technically a light frame structure, and the existing blocks were relatively heavy. Technically there was no sheer wall underneath the blocks. Substantial code revisions penalized heavy concrete walls attached to light structure so the building would not be allowed under modern code. When removed the proportions of the building felt lighter, brighter, and more friendly. The old façade was heavy and dark and created a barrier between the active streetscape and the building. the two-story glazing was maintained and would be accentuated. New downlighting in the soffit would create light at the pedestrian scale. Two-thirds of the building would be glass and then they introduced a metal panel for some scale, texture, and signage. The landscape was proposed to be expanded to further soften the barrier between the streetscape and the interior of the building. all stucco would be torn off and replaced as it was badly worn. The ARB had the material board which included the colors. He then showed slides of the neighboring properties for context before showing a rendering of the new elevation in context. The mechanical screen was 54 feet back from the façade and was not really a design element. It would be painted the same color as the façade. He pointed out an existing drive through teller window and explained that was not allowed per the planning code and would be removed in the renovation. The area would most likely be used as an employee break area and they wanted to maintain natural light to it. With the signage they were in compliance with the sign codes. The signs combined took over 17 sf, where up to 70 sf was allowed. The company name and logo were on the eyebrow and then the logo was under the overhang on the metal panels. He provided an aerial site plan with the public entrance on the front and the employee entrance to the rear. The landscaping plan proposed to remove the two small cherry trees which would most likely be compromised during the renovation but maintain the other existing trees and expand the landscape. California Avenue might stay pedestrian and if that happened they would have the ability to further extend and connect the greenways to provide additional barriers between the

pedestrians and the parking. Finally he displayed the color choices and directed the ARB to the material samples. He thanked the ARB for its time and comments.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that concluded the presentation and called for ARB questions of the applicant.

Boardmember Thompson confirmed that there would not be a two tone treatment with the colors.

Mr. Kracke [off microphone 4:30:31]

Boardmember Thompson confirmed the placement of the other colors and inquired about the materials.

Mr. Kracke [off microphone 4:30:52]

Boardmember Thompson asked if there were floating panels or if there would be a smooth soffit.

Mr. Kracke stated that they were adding some articulation under the stucco and explained there would be a six inch reveal and the existing overhang.

Boardmember Chen asked if there would be a live strip around the floating panel.

Mr. Kracke stated that there would not.

Boardmember Chen asked for the dimensions of the metal panel on the front façade.

Mr. Kracke indicated that they were proposed to gradiate from larger to smaller.

Boardmember Chen asked if each panel was a different height.

Mr. Kracke stated that each panel was a different height and there would be a fully finished reveal.

Boardmember Thompson [off microphone 4:32:25]

Mr. Kracke said that was correct.

Boardmember Chen asked if it was a requirement to have the screen above the roof.

Mr. Kracke stated that it was his understanding it was required.

Mr. Sauls explained that the City did that for many projects. when new mechanical equipment was being placed it was screened from public view.

Vice Chair Baltay thanked the applicant for the application and asked if they explored the possibility of preserving or restoring the mosaic sculpture or tile on the left of the front façade.

Mr. Kracke said that they had not looked into that since such large portions were removed. They also had not touched the stucco and did not know what further damage was done. Page & Turnbull were able to provide a few pictures, but the area had been refinished multiple times, so they were not sure what was under there and did not have documentation to recreate the artist's vision.

Vice Chair Baltay called attention to the large eucalyptus trees to the rear of the building. he asked if they would affect the building's foundation.

Mr. Kracke explained that while close the arborist thought they were far enough away to do the work.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if there was any intention to return to request the removal of the eucalyptus.

Mr. Kracke said there was not. The trees would be maintained and protected, and they would follow the requirements.

Vice Chair Baltay asked staff about the historic determination and whether the Historic Resources Board (HRB) should review and consider the project. There was architectural precedence for the design style around the City.

Mr. Sauls explained that the Page & Turnbull report identified that the breeze-block was not historic. If the report had identified other elements that contributed to the building potentially being historic then the project would have gone to the HRB. Since the report stated that it was not staff did not find that necessary.

Vice Chair Baltay thought that if the mosaic still existed it would be historic.

Mr. Sauls said that it was potentially historic but was not a clear cut case. Many things are deemed significant or not significant based on who created them. Other items related to the building would have also factored into that determination. Collectively the relevant items did not raise the building to a historic status.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed that there was no process to bring the HRB in until that process had been determined.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that internal staff including Chief Planning Official Amy French had reviewed the application. It was not deemed necessary to get the HRB involved.

Boardmember Thompson made several inquiries about the lights in the RPP.

Mr. Kracke indicated they were circles. The color temperature would probably be 3,500 although the final selection had not been made. All exterior lights would be the same color temperature.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the doors would be retained on the front façade.

Mr. Kracke explained the doors would be replaced by new glass doors and hardware.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that the “floating panels” on the ceiling were blocked down 6 inches to allow space for the housing of the lighting units.

Mr. Kracke said that was correct.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that everything was completely wrapped.

Mr. Kracke said the color change would happen at the inside corner.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if there would be a J channel or molding break between the two colors.

Mr. Kracke indicated that they had not figured out that detail. There might need to be some movement to allow for a cleaner transition.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that the mechanical screening would be painted.

Mr. Kracke said that it would match the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the employee window on the side of the building would be operable.

Mr. Kracke said it would not.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested clarification on which proposed parking situation was correct.

Mr. Kracke explained that the 90 degree parking was the current proposal so that they could avoid cars making 9 point turns.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that the parking was not correct in the packet.

Mr. Kracke said that it was developed after the packet was completed.

Mr. Sauls said that the application did not include the changes and would have to go through a different architectural review.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired about bicycle parking.

Mr. Kracke stated that there were four existing bike parking spots on the public right of way shown on Sheet A1.8. Those would be maintained and hopefully heavily used.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if they planned to propose an ATM.

Mr. Kracke indicated that they did not.

Mr. Sauls directed the ARB to A1.35 and A1.34 for details on the recessed lights.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that the cut sheet showed circles and squares which was the reason she asked.

Chair Hirsch had noticed that the paving around the site was a mixture of things. There was no detailed drawing of the concrete work needed in front of the building or any sense of color changes. That was a missing piece of the presentation, and he did not know how to make a final decision without that detail.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the ARB's scope was the building and not the site work.

Mr. Sauls said that was correct. The extent of the changes was minor groundcover landscaping in the front area.

Ms. Gerhardt explained staff looked at the entire site and they needed to make sure that any site changes required were in proportion to the renovations.

Chair Hirsch agreed that they had to relate.

Ms. Gerhardt said that a lot of California Avenue had glass sidewalks, but that would not happen in this project.

Mr. Sauls said that underneath the façade was the applicant's property.

Chair Hirsch asked if applicants were usually required to replace sidewalks if they were not in proper condition.

Ms. Gerhardt said that there was a standard condition that if the sidewalks needed to be replaced it would be enforced by Public Works.

Chair Hirsch asked if they would make a presentation to Public Works with the design of the paving.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that Public Works would handle all of the review.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that there was no concrete sample provided and asked if they had thought about it.

Mr. Kracke said that they had thought about it, but he understood the interior was not part of the project.

Chair Hirsch explained he was speaking about the area from the column to the building itself.

Mr. Kracke stated that there was no plan to replace that, just to extend the planting. In the parking lot there were Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA) issues to be addressed. There was no concrete sample.

Chair Hirsch questioned whether the current step off at the side met ADA standards.

Mr. Kracke stated that the current condition did not meet ADA standards. the proposed parking with the 90 degree spaces would meet all requirements.

Chair Hirsch confirmed that included the level of the passageway.

Mr. Kracke said that the grades would be resolved.

Chair Hirsch held up the materials board and asked if that would be added to the face of the building.

Mr. Kracke said it would.

Chair Hirsch asked what would happen when the material met the corner.

Mr. Kracke explained that the material had an end panel so it would return on itself and have a hairline joint. It did not touch the corner of the building. The building was in plane with the rear of the panel. He stressed that there was a finished end panel.

Boardmember Thompson said that the system appeared to have panels that cascaded in width and asked where that was elaborated on.

Mr. Kracke said that it was not detailed in the submission but explained the arrangement.

Boardmember Thompson asked if there would be duplicate panels or if they would all be of different sizes.

Mr. Kracke thought it might end in two duplicate panels. It was intended to get smaller as it went up.

Chair Hirsch noted that the doors were presently 7 feet 6 inches tall and asked if that would be increased. He asked if they thought about how that would work.

Mr. Kracke said they were maintaining the existing fixed glazing around the opening. They were just changing out the doors and adding modern hardware and security. The opening was not being expanded.

Chair Hirsch asked if the client was in favor of removing the breeze-block.

Mr. Kracke explained they had been asked to look at it.

Chair Hirsch asked if they wanted it removed.

Mr. Kracke said yes because of the cost to maintain it along with the liability of maintaining it.

Chair Hirsch assumed that they could add something to make it structurally sound. He asked if that had been considered by the structural engineer.

Mr. Kracke said that was not looked at beyond the theoretical.

Boardmember Thompson asked about the design intent in the choice of the blue/grey color.

Mr. Kracke explained they wanted to freshen up the building. the cooler temperature worked well along the block and accentuated the client's logo. It was not a branded color but did work as a nice backdrop to the client's colors.

Boardmember Thompson [unintelligible 4:48:31]

Mr. Kracke said yes.

Chair Hirsch thanked the applicant for answering the ARB's questions. He called for ARB discussion.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if there was public comment.

Chair Hirsch called for the public comment.

Mr. Sauls and Ms. Gerhardt indicated that there was none.

Boardmember Chen thanked the applicant for the application. The building looked good and had nice materials. Proportionally it was nice but considering the context along the street she thought the front elevation was out of scale. Removing the breeze-block made the building appear taller so she suggested they add design elements to bring the building to human scale. That could be done with planters, extra seating, more decorative lighting at the lower level, or perhaps another screen at the same location.

Boardmember Thompson agreed with Boardmember Chen. It was hard for her to support the current design because the breeze-block added a smaller scale refinement, articulation, and texture. Along California Avenue it was very small scale and as the design guidelines developed the street wanted to be pedestrian friendly. The current design did not provide any of that. The feature wall was just a blank wall. The small scale work happened so far away from the human eye that it did not engage with pedestrians. She encouraged the applicant to consider perforated metal to bring delight and beauty to the different arches. The City wanted to create character on California Avenue that was really specific, and the building could fit anywhere. The building was iconic within the City, and it was a bold choice to remove it. If they had to take it away they needed to give something back. California Avenue overall had a very warm palette with green accents from the landscape and she had a huge issue with the building's color palette as it

stood. It stood out too much and did not feel as though it belonged in Palo Alto. She could not support the project as it stood. Since the façade facing the parking lot was exposed there was a responsibility to make the façade something other than a monolithic wall.

Vice Chair Baltay thanked the applicant for the application and supported his colleagues' comments. The breeze-block was historic to him, and he noted that the library was screened over the same kind of breeze-block. It was a shame to lose it since there was so little history in Palo Alto. He felt the same way about the mosaic mural; it was certainly not in good shape but could be restored. If the owner were interested in maintaining it that was the kind of touch that would bring them kudos around town. He understood what staff had said and noted the ARB would not require it, but it would be great if the applicant took the idea to heart. The building faced strong afternoon sunlight and would get very hot in the afternoon sun and the applicant needed to ensure that the HVAC could handle that. He thought that they could add a third street tree and that would make the front less barren. He asked Mr. Sauls if that could be required or requested.

Mr. Sauls asked if he was talking about the area near the bicycle parking.

Vice Chair Baltay said that he was.

Mr. Sauls noted that Public Works might become an issue as they wanted an 8 foot wide sidewalk.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that the sidewalk was very wide there and already held two street trees. There was a drive alley to the right of the bank which could have its visibility impacted by a street tree. In 2013 there were no street trees. California Avenue had a history with street trees and several people had lost their jobs over that history. If there were no cars coming from the drive alley then the street tree would be a positive improvement. He also called the ARB's attention to Drawing A1.5 which showed a landscaped area on the front lefthand corner of the parking area. He asked if they could add additional pedestrian amenities to the area such as a bench. The more benches and landscaped areas the better due to the pedestrian nature of the street.

Mr. Sauls showed a photograph and confirmed that was where Vice Chair Baltay envisioned a bench.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that it was and asked to see the area where he suggested a third street tree could go.

Mr. Sauls showed the photograph.

Vice Chair Baltay pointed out where a third street tree could be placed in line with the other two.

Boardmember Rosenberg thanked the applicant for their presentation. She viewed the project more favorably than her colleagues due to her love of minimalism. The blue color made sense with the bank's modern slant. However, she thought the overall application lacked depth of thought and the project needed another level of refinement. She agreed that the project could use nods to the historic nature of the property. The history did not need to be preserved, but it needed to be remembered. She suggested they install a new mosaic that referenced the history of the building. she was concerned that some of the details were not thought out and wanted to better understand the thinking in the area on the ground

level between the columns and the building. The view from the parking lot could be improved with plantings along or vines on the building.

Mr. Kracke indicated that there was planting planned for the strip it was just not on the rendering.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that what the ARB had on the proposed landscape plan showed the parking lot in its existing configuration versus what the applicant had shown on the screen. She understood that there were proposed plantings, but they were not shown in the packet. The ARB wanted another level of depth before it could grant a confident approval. She repeated that she appreciated minimalist architecture but agreed that the scale of the building after the removal of the breeze-block was much taller than the neighboring buildings. That was not necessarily a bad thing as when the mosaic was displayed the front of the building was open.

Mr. Sauls stated that slide was in his presentation.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that there was no breeze-block.

Mr. Sauls explained that was not a picture of the actual building and was only an example.

Boardmember Rosenberg thanked him for the clarification. When the building was looked at in scale next to the neighboring buildings it looked tall and imposing by comparison. She suggested the applicant consider metal fins or a laser cut panel to add something more evocative of the history of the building. Overall the design was clean and a clever way to refresh a building. She asked if the driveway on the right was part of the scope of the project.

Mr. Kracke indicated it was not.

Chair Hirsch thanked the applicant for the presentation. He was intrigued by the shadow lines inside the building created by the breeze-block on Page 106. The breeze-block modulated sunlight and created a texture indoors. That made one think about what was happening outside. Based on that he agreed with Boardmember Chen's comments regarding scale. The portico area was very shallow but very tall and intimidating. It was unlike anything else on the street. He was happy they changed the doorway as that was a problem on the face of the building. The problem was the tremendous height in the portico, and he thought something needed to be brought down to human scale. He and his wife ate dinner across the street from the property the prior week and they enjoyed the breeze-block and therefore he was sorry to hear that it was not maintainable. He suggested that they could keep the two sides but stated he was not sure if that would be dangerous in an earthquake. Even if it was a structural problem he thought that there would be some way to ensure that they were structurally sound in the future. In Palo Alto they had the library and several major Stanford buildings which featured stone blocks. Boardmember Chen's comment about something being brought lower was worth considering. He was concerned about the paving issues and requested that the applicant differentiate the outside paving from the doorway paving. That area was part of the building and not the sidewalk so consideration there was important. If they planned to get rid of the breeze-block something had to occur in the openings. He suggested perforated metal or another system to replace the breeze-block. With respect to the graphics he did not believe there was enough room at the top and thought they should be brought down. Other buildings on California Avenue have larger graphics. California Avenue was a low scale community, and the building was quite

different. In order to relate to the rest of the community the scale needed to come down. He questioned whether it was a good idea to have seating within the bank area but thought that area needed something, and furniture might be reasonable. Boardmember Thompson's comments about the side wall applied to both side walls. The window on the side of the building was too small and could be opened up. They did not need to be governed by the existing hole in the wall, getting light and air into the room was more important. The grid structure could use more creativity and might help to bring the scale down. He shared his colleague's opinion that the project was not ready yet. He called for further thoughts.

Boardmember Thompson was reminded of a project the ARB reviewed where they were asked to look at the side of a building as the rest of the building had been previously approved. The side wall was blank, and the ARB was requested to review it as such. Her point was that they had been asked to review lower priority walls for blankness. The wall might be very exposed and was an opportunity for something like a mosaic, mural, or architecture work. Both side walls were visible from the street and required thought.

Chair Hirsch wanted emphasis on the columns as the building was very grided. The drawing on the cover showed the mechanical system on the roof and he did not believe it would be visible from that viewpoint. Based on that they could remove the "thing from the roof" [mechanical screening? 5:15:36] before the ARB discussed it.

Ms. Gerhardt reminded the ARB that the meeting had a hard stop at 2:00 p.m. and asked if there was a Motion.

MOTION: Boardmember Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to continue the project to a date uncertain.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Ms. Gerhardt asked if the applicant had questions.

Mr. Kracke said that they had investigated a mural although it was not part of the application. It would take over the stucco portion of the front façade and wrap to the side of the building. No artist had been identified yet. That was an element of the façade they wanted to enliven. He noticed the sketches of additional joint lines and thanked the ARB for its comments.

Approval of Minutes

6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for September 1, 2022

Chair Hirsch introduced the item and called for comments or changes to the minutes.

MOTION: Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Vice Chair Baltay, to approve the minutes of September 1, 2022 as presented.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

7. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for September 15, 2022

Chair Hirsch introduced the item and called for comments or changes to the minutes.

MOTION: Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Vice Chair Baltay, to approve the minutes of September 15, 2022 as presented.

Boardmember Thompson indicated that she would abstain as she was absent from the meeting.

VOTE: 5-0-1-0

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

8. Informational Item on Several Applications Currently on File for the Frys Site at 200-340 Portage and 3400 Park Blvd

Ms. Gerhardt explained that the formal hearings on the project were likely to happen in December. The item was placed on this agenda to put the matter on the ARB's radar. There were two versions of the Fry's townhome project discussed on Packet Page 160. The 91 townhome project was older and was an SB 330 project which limited discussion to 5 hearings. That project was put on hold and the City was now reviewing the 3200 Park Boulevard project, which was at the same location at a different address. This had a development agreement that provided for 3.25 acres of dedicated land and \$5 million in funding for affordable housing. That project would reach the ARB soon and the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) staff report was attached for ARB reference.

Chair Hirsch asked if the entire ARB received the link to the drawings.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that both projects had websites and she would make sure the Boardmembers had the information.

Chair Hirsch stated that the project was significant.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the ARB could collaborate with the PTC on the project. The preliminary plans have a gap as they are focused on a legal issue. The ARB was focused on design and the site plan was the middle ground. He did not think anyone was thinking about physical planning and design. The PTC did not want to engage with design, but by the time the project would come to the ARB in December it would be too late as the site planning decisions would have been made. The ARB had seen this happen before. He asked if there could be a joint meeting of the PTC/ARB or if the Chairs could speak to get more integration of the Boards. The sooner they could collaborate the better although he acknowledged the burden to the staff.

Ms. Gerhardt explained the PTC continued its hearing to October 26th. Nothing prevented the ARB from sending a representative to the meeting and nothing prevented Boardmembers from attending as individuals or speaking with PTC Commissioners as an individual. They needed to keep in mind that the project was highly negotiated between the developers and City Council.

Vice Chair Baltay thought that what he was requesting was within those parameters. He did not want to question the result of the negotiations, rather he intended to find middle ground on the design that was

not part of the negotiation. It seemed as though the developer's initial presentation would be carried out without any real planning behind it. He asked if Ms. Gerhardt could ask the PTC if they wanted ARB input in a formal way. He suggested the ARB have a committee to attend the PTC hearings.

Chair Hirsch thought it would be a good idea to have an ARB Study Session on the project. They could identify priorities to be addressed and have an agenda to take to the PTC. It was a misnomer to call them the PTC because Planning should be a broad look at a project.

Ms. Gerhardt explained the PTC looked at some physical planning but that was mostly related to the legislative aspects of the project.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the ARB wanted to create a subcommittee to look at the physical planning aspects of the project and attend PTC meetings to provide input or feedback.

Chair Hirsch suggested that the ARB look at the presentation and then meet for a Study Session to discuss the project.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if a closed meeting of the ARB to discuss a project was allowed.

Chair Hirsch noted that it would be a Study Session. He understood that it was an official application and maybe the City Attorney needed to determine if they could host the Study Session.

Ms. Gerhardt thought site planning was more related to Objective Standards and was a different conversation. They needed to be careful because they could not discuss pending projects without adhering to the Brown Act.

Chair Hirsch suggested that there would need to be a subcommittee of 2 people to study it. He thought that could be a problem as well.

Vice Chair Baltay wanted a seat at the table and thought a subcommittee could appropriately work.

Ms. Gerhardt confirmed that there was a pending application. It was a rezoning that included architectural review.

Vice Chair Baltay asked to get involved earlier at a high level to have impact on the physical planning of the development.

Ms. Gerhardt heard that and understood the precedence of the Bayshore project. This project was different as it was a negotiated development agreement with Council. She agreed that it would be helpful to have a straw poll to see if the ARB wanted to get involved.

Vice Chair Baltay said that he wanted to know where everyone stood.

Chair Hirsch said that they should discuss the possibility.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed that it was a very important project on a massive site in the middle of the City. That said, she wanted to be careful to respect the ARB's purview. She liked the idea of having a subcommittee to keep an eye on it and report back but did not believe the whole ARB should be involved in PTC matters. As a newer Boardmember she acknowledged that she did not understand the legalities involved.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that she was mostly concerned about time. She provided the report so the ARB would understand the project was coming and could do some homework. They could ask her questions and point out potential problems. Staff was open to those emails and now was the time they should send them. That might be the better way to handle things.

Boardmember Chen thought it was a big important project that might affect a lot of things such as the Objective Standards in the coming years. It was good for the ARB to be involved in the early planning phase and to discuss more about the design possibilities. She did not know what format that should be done in. She apologized and indicated that she had to leave the meeting at that point.

Boardmember Thompson thought that Ms. Gerhardt made a good point about Boardmembers attending PTC meetings and speaking. She thought it was a good idea to encourage that. She could be open to a subcommittee that reported to the ARB but was concerned that two people might not be able to speak for all 5 members. She was also concerned that the ARB not overstep its purview. Empowering the ARB to go to the PTC and make input on the public record was a good thing.

Ms. Gerhardt noted that the item was informational and did not require any action like a vote. The ARB could discuss the ad hoc committee at a later date.

Adjournment

Chair Hirsch adjourned the meeting.