



# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD DRAFT MINUTES

=====MEETINGS ARE CABLECAST LIVE ON GOVERNMENT ACCESS CHANNEL 26=====

**Thursday April 7, 2011**  
**REGULAR MEETING - 8:30 AM**  
City Council Chambers, Civic Center, 1st Floor  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94301

**ROLL CALL:**

**Board members:**

Clare Malone Prichard (Chair)  
Heather Young (Vice Chair)  
Alexander Lew  
Grace Lee  
Judith Wasserman

**Staff Liaison:**

Russ Reich, Senior Planner

**Staff:**

Alicia Spotwood, Administrative Associate  
Steven Turner, Advance Planning Manager  
Clare Campbell, Planner  
Kristin Parineh, Planner  
Lata Vasudevan, Contract Planner  
Amy French, Manager of Current Planning

**PROCEDURES FOR PUBLIC HEARINGS**

*Please be advised the normal order of public hearings of agenda items is as follows:*

- *Announce agenda item*
- *Open public hearing*
- *Staff recommendation*
- *Applicant presentation – Ten (10) minutes limitation or at the discretion of the Board.*
- *Public comment – Five (5) minutes limitation per speaker or limitation to three (3) minutes depending on large number of speakers per item.*
- *Architectural Review Board questions of the applicant/staff, and comments*
- *Applicant closing comments - Three (3) minutes*
- *Close public hearing*
- *Motions/recommendations by the Board*
- *Final vote*

**ORAL COMMUNICATIONS.** Members of the public may speak to any item not on the agenda with a limitation of three (3) minutes per speaker. Those who desire to speak must complete a speaker request card available from the secretary of the Board. The Architectural Review Board reserves the right to limit the oral communications period to 15 minutes.

**John Morris, Palo Alto:** Stated his concerns regarding the AT&T proposal, and his opinion that it is big, ugly, and noisy. He also stated that the City needed responsible wireless policies.

***APPROVAL OF MINUTES.***

The minutes of March 24, 2011 were approved with correction, (4-0-1-0, Board member Malone Prichard moved, seconded by Board member Wasserman, Board member Lee abstained) to item two, Architectural Review Board Action #2 to have the Subcommittee review the material sample for all exterior site walls. Also correct the vote for item three to a motion made by Board member Malone Prichard, and a second by Board member Wasserman with all items to return to the ARB Subcommittee for review.

***AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.*** The agenda may have additional items added to it up until 72 hours prior to meeting time.

**STUDY SESSION: The following items were reviewed with the Applicant and members of the public.**

1. **2501 Embarcadero Way:** Request by the Palo Alto Regional Water Quality Control Plant for Study Session Review of the conceptual design of the new master landscape plan for the interior areas and exterior perimeter of the water plant.

**Public Testimony:**

**Emily Renzil, Palo Alto,** Stated her concerns regarding the removal of landscaping and the impact it would have on the wildlife. She also supported the project.

2. **2501 Embarcadero Way:** Request by the Palo Alto Public Works Department for Study Session review of the preliminary plans for a new Recycling and Household Hazardous Waste Drop-Off Facility in an undeveloped area along Embarcadero Way

**Public Testimony:**

**Emily Renzil, Palo Alto,** Stated her concerns regarding the gray fox den area and the recycling center expansion. She also supported the project.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

3. **1095 Channing [10PLN-00337]:** Request by NSA Wireless, on behalf of Roman Catholic Welfare Corp. of San Jose, for Architectural Review of a 50 foot tall tower to house a telecommunications facility (nine panel wireless antennas and associated equipment) on the St. Albert the Great Church property. A Conditional Use Permit (CUP) to allow the building-mounted telecommunications facility was tentatively approved on March 25, 2011. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act per Section 15301. Zone District: R-1 (Single Family Residential).

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) recommend the Director of Planning and Community Environment approve the proposed project based upon the Architectural Review Findings (Attachment B) and subject to the conditions of approval (Attachment A).

**Public Testimony:**

**Stephen Stuart, Palo Alto:** Stated his concerns regarding process, loss of property value, Channing as a boulevard with 24' setbacks, and request for the Board to reject the project.

**Tru Love, Palo Alto:** Stated her objection of the project and potential for change in home buying.

**John Morris, Palo Alto:** Stated his concern that AT&T may have taken advantage of the church and its parishioners, that the residents are against this project and that the community meetings have been short noticed and asked that AT&T rethink the project.

**Jon Meisner, Palo Alto:** Stated his concerns regarding his proximity to the project and his opposition to the project; requested denial of the variance due to lack of valid findings.

**Rita Vehel, Palo Alto:** Stated her concerns regarding her proximity to the church; noted she was not told why the applicant needed 9 panels during the outreach meeting; stated the 1996 telecommunication act prevents the denial of a project based on health, the U.S. doesn't have a lot of studies regarding this and her opinion about the church receiving compensation for the project.

**Dave Lanfermar, Palo Alto** (Attorney for Mr. Stuart and Mrs. Love): Stated concern about review process, concern about the design and variance request to exceed height limit, which he commented should be no higher than 30 feet for the tower building.

**Carolyn Reese, Palo Alto:** Noted her concern about the tower's massiveness, proximity to single story homes, distance from the rectory windows, design and materials and concern about potential lighting on the tower; suggested the massing be reduced and the same material should be used to match the existing structure if the tower does get built.

**Nancy Marty, Palo Alto:** Noted her opposition along with other Church members, and concern about potential health impacts that aren't recognized by the US safety regulations. Noted she has been told to stay away from this project, that she is against allowing a business to come in to the neighborhood, and suggested AT&T needs to figure out a different way to get their product out.

**Mona He, Palo Alto:** Noted her opposition to the project, and relayed her questions regarding collocation with other carriers.

**Herb Borock, Palo Alto:** Noted the ARB should not hear the project and the project should be rejected on CEQA grounds as it is non essential to the neighborhood and the AT&T coverage project is being piecemealed; expressed concern that project notification was given without a complete description and should come back after a complete project is submitted.

**Debbie Joseph, Palo Alto:** Noted her opposition due to health issues and concern about the massiveness of the tower; displayed a data port offered by AT&T.

**Architectural Review Board Action:**

The Board continued the project to a date uncertain, (4-0-0-0, Board member Malone Prichard moved, seconded by Board member Young).

3. **559 Lytton Avenue [11PLN-00076]:** Request by California Communities on behalf of Lytton Park, LP for Preliminary Architectural Review of a new development consisting of four attached townhomes. Zone – RM-30.

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff recommends that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) conduct a preliminary architectural review of the proposed project called “Lytton Park” and provide comments on the design to staff and the applicant. No formal action may be made at a preliminary architectural review public hearing. Comments made at a preliminary architectural review public hearing are neither binding on the City nor the applicant.

**Public Testimony:**

**Sandra Belfatti, Palo Alto,** Stated her concerns regarding privacy.

**Architectural Review Board Action:**

As this was a preliminary review no action was taken.

- 5A. **211 Quarry Road- Stanford University Medical Center Project, Hoover Projects [10PLN-00398]:** Request by Stanford Hospital and Clinics on behalf of The Board of Trustees for the Leland Stanford Junior University for Architectural Review of a new 60,000 square foot medical office building and parking structure containing 1,088 parking spaces. These projects are components of the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project. Existing Zone District: PF (Public Facilities).

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff requests that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) review the development plans, architectural review findings (Attachment A), draft conditions of approval (Attachment B) and recommend that the City Council approve the expansion to the Hoover Pavilion site adding the new medical office building and parking structure.

**Architectural Review Board Action:**

The approval is separated into two parts, 1) landscaping, MOB, and site planning and 2) garage.

- 1) The board recommended approval (4-0-0-1, Board member Wasserman moved, seconded by Board member Malone Prichard, Board member Lee abstained) with the and additional condition that the following items be reviewed by staff:
  - a) trash enclosure details
  - b) final hardscape plan (center spine paving)
  - c) Bruce Fukuji recommendations be considered
- 2) The Board recommended approval of the garage, ( 3-1-0-1, Board member Malone Prichard moved, seconded by Board member Lew, Board member Wasserman opposed, and Board member Lee abstained).

- 5B. **Stanford University Medical Center – Renovation of the Hoover Pavilion [10PLN-00398]:** Request by Stanford University School of Medicine on behalf of The Board of Trustees for the Leland Stanford Junior University for Final Architectural Review of the renovation of the

Hoover Pavilion. This project is a component of the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project. Existing Zone District: PF (Public Facility).

**Staff Recommendation:**

Staff requests that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) review the renovation plans, architectural review findings (Attachment A), the draft conditions of approval (Attachment B) and recommend that the City Council approve the renovation of the Hoover Pavilion.

**Public Testimony**

Beth Bunnenberg, Palo Alto: Spoke as a representative of the Historic Resources Board (HRB), regarding the stunning art deco design of the building and recommended the finial be added.

**Martin Burnstein, Palo Alto:** Stated the recommendation from the HRB for the replacement of the Finial was unanimous.

**Architectural Review Board Action:**

The Board recommended approval of the project, (3-0-0-2, Board member Wasserman moved, seconded by Board member Lew, Board members Lee and Young were absent) with an additional condition that the finial be built as described in the drawing with whatever material is appropriate.

**BOARD MEMBER BUSINESS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

**REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS.**

**SUBCOMMITTEE:**

6. **300 Homer Avenue [10PLN-00174]:** Request by Garavaglia Architecture on behalf of Palo Alto History Museum for sub-committee review of modifications and building additions to the historic Roth Building previously approved with conditions by the Director of Planning and Community Environment following review by the HRB and ARB at public hearings held on 2/16/11 and 2/17/11, respectively. The following items for Sub-committee review are:
  - a. Landscape plans showing plantings in access area to the public restroom and in the area of access to the café adjacent to Bryant Street. The plans shall also show graphic representations/concept sketches of all signage.
  - b. Details of all doors, windows, trellises and railings.
  - c. Revised design of the east elevation wall (near the rear façade) such that the parapet is lowered to expose the edge of the existing tile roof.
  - d. Cut sheets for outdoor café seating and other furnishings, with layouts of all seating shown on the landscape plan.
  - e. Locations of condensers or any other exterior mechanical equipment on the site plan.

**Subcommittee Action:**

- a) The items were reviewed and approved as shown on drawings in the file, labeled as 'Sub-Committee Submittals.' However, it was noted that a follow up by the planning staff shall be made with the City's Parks Dept. regarding the pathway to proposed, required public restroom.

- b) The items were reviewed and approved as shown on drawings in the file, labeled as ‘Sub-Committee Submittals’ with the exception that Detail #5 on Sheet A-8.10 shall have NO metal rail cap at the balconies. A “clean” edge was the accepted design treatment for this detail. The café window awning in black color Sunbrella model as shown on Detail 18 is acceptable, as depicted on Sheet A-8.11. Café signage is not approved as separate signage approval is a requirement under Architectural Review condition of approval #7.
- c) The Sub-Committee has determined that the parapet **shall** be removed.
- d) The items were reviewed and approved as shown on drawings in the file, labeled as ‘Sub-Committee Submittals’ with the provisions that no plastic furnishings are accepted, and that the ‘Woodard Bistro Table’ and the ‘Woodard Metro Stackable’ chairs or equivalent dark metal style models are acceptable. Real or faux wood café furnishings were not approved due to maintenance issues.
- e) The items were reviewed and approved as shown on drawings in the file, labeled as ‘Sub-Committee Submittals.’
- f) Sign locations were established.

**STAFF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW:**

*Project Description: Glass canopy over existing stairs (PLN)  
 Applicant: Carrasco and Associates  
 Address: 325 Lytton Avenue  
 Approval Date: March 23, 2012  
 Request for hearing deadline: April 5, 2011*

*Project Description: Wall sign for First Tech Credit Union (PLN)  
 Applicant: True North Signs & Graphics  
 Address: 3000 El Camino Real  
 Approval Date: March 28, 2011  
 Request for hearing deadline: April 11, 2011*

*Project Description: Wall sign for The Workshop restaurant (10PLN-443)  
 Applicant: David Le  
 Address: 233 University Avenue  
 Approval Date: March 23, 2011  
 Request for hearing deadline: April 5, 2011*

*ADA. The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request accommodations to access City facilities, services or programs, to participate at public meetings, or to learn more about the City’s compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), please contact the City’s ADA Coordinator at 650.329.2550 (voice) or by e-mailing [ada@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:ada@cityofpaloalto.org).*

*Posting of agenda. This agenda is posted in accordance with government code section 54954.2(a) or section 54956. Recordings. An audiotape of the proceedings may be obtained/reviewed by contacting the Planning Division at (650) 329-2440. A videotape of the proceedings can be obtained/reviewed by contacting the City Clerk’s Office at (650) 329-2571.*

Materials related to an item on this agenda submitted to the **Architectural Review Board** after distribution of the agenda packet are available for public inspection in the **Planning and**

**Community Environment Department at 250 Hamilton Avenue, 5<sup>th</sup> floor, Palo Alto, CA. 94301** during normal business hours.