



# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

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

This agenda is posted in accordance with Government Code Section 54954.2(a) or section 54956.

**Thursday, October 16, 2014, Meeting  
8:30 AM, Council Chambers**

## **Call to Order**

**Roll Call:** Chair Lee Lippert, Vice-chair Randy Popp, Board Members Alexander Lew, Clare Malone Prichard, Robert Gooyer.

**Staff:** Amy French, Chief Planning Official; Russ Reich, Senior Planner; Diana Tamale, Administrative Associate; Rebecca Atkinson, Planner

**Oral Communications:** Members of the public may speak to any item not on the agenda; three minutes per speaker. The Architectural Review Board reserves the right to limit oral communications period to 15 minutes.

*Mark Weis*, spoke regarding Old Adobe house and how we under-utilized the Ester Clark Park.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions:** The agenda may have additional items added to it up until 72 hours prior to meeting time. **None.**

**Minutes Approval:** None.

## **Public Hearing**

## **Continued Business**

1. **3672 Middlefield Rd [14PLN-00071]**: Request by Verizon Wireless for Architectural Review and a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) application for the addition of 3 panel antennas on a light pole at the Palo Alto Little League Field. The existing light pole would be replaced with a new 65' pole to accommodate the antennas on top of it; the lights would be re-installed at 60 feet above grade (the same height as the existing installation). The application also includes associated ground mounted equipment concealed within an enclosure. Zone District. R-1(8000). Environmental Assessment: Categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15061(b)(3), 15301, 15302, and 15303.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommended the Architectural Review Board (ARB) recommend conditional approval of the Architectural Review application for the project based upon the findings contained in Attachment A and conditions of approval contained in Attachment B.

*Note:* Verbatim minutes have prepared for this item.

Public Comments:

*Frank Ingle*, voiced concern about the fuel cell backing power system explosions and fire danger.

*Florinda Poggesi*, spoke about equipment building represent an attractive nuisance to playing children. There are about 1,000 children in the Little League with many times that visiting this site for games every year.

*Barbara Cooley*, spoke that she was happy to hear that it's already been raised that the eucalyptus trees in fact are not on the ballpark's property they are on the Mitchell Park side. So some of the concerns around what happens to those trees if they are taken down I've heard about that this is new information that they had an arborist look at them.

*Peter Sullivan*, spoke about the threatened lawsuit. So Verizon's lawyer has submitted a document to the City of Palo Alto threatening the shot clock, which we don't believe is actually valid so just sue the City. Our consultant cannot find a Notice of Completion.

*Willie Lai*, spoke that he opposes to the placement of this cell tower in the ballpark. I don't think it's an appropriate location for a cell tower. I would like Verizon to consider some other alternatives as Barb had mentioned either relocating or other, other areas, industrial areas I think would be more suitable for a cell tower than this location.

*Jason Yotopoulos*, spoke regarding the code any expansion in the building size or site area of an existing conditional use shall necessitate the amendment of the CUP. In this case we're expanding the building size necessitates an expansion of proceeding CUPs.

*Amy Lutz*, spoke about areas that we have not yet addressed and those are the standard application details regarding the significant construction required for this project, Policy N51 of the Natural Environment Element of the Comprehensive Plans, and the cable route of 50 feet.

*Charlene Liao*, spoke about the inconsistent and misleading information submitted by Verizon's application. So you already heard they talk about equipment enclosure instead of a building, but what they are proposing is a building that has a roof, concrete blocks, walls nine feet tall, and locked doors.

*Mark Priestley*, mentioned that he works most closely with Verizon and the neighbors. I want to be clear; we're talking about a handful of neighbors who've expressed to me concerns. I know we've seen a long list of neighbors who very eloquently expressed concerns about so many different issues, but having worked with them over the last four and a half years what I've found is having gone into this with the intent to be a good neighbor, which is something we really believe is a value is we've listened to their concerns and the concerns initially started off with concern about irradiation from the cell tower and then it turned to concerns about the value on their real estate if we put a cell tower in. And then to respond to those concerns we've gone through a number of revisions over four years, probably four different project proposals all to respond to their concerns and needs. Each time that we've done that a new set of concerns were raised and we've tried to address those.

*Kim Amsbaugh*, spoke that she is in charge of sponsorships and from the Little League Board's perspective the opposition has taken its efforts to the next level with this manifesto of 69 pages and aggressive claims against the League all coming from someone who only yesterday was trying to get our site deemed historical because of his love of the park and the meaning of it to the community. This group isn't interested in working with us to build a project that makes everyone happy. They blast us for the numerous iterations of the plan, but yet the reason for these iterations is because we're trying to collaborate with them, to cooperate with them, to listen to their needs. This Not In My Back Yard (NIMBY) close-minded no cell tower approach they aren't thinking about the greater good, the fact that the neighborhood will enjoy better cell service, and that the League potentially can use funds from this project to pay for capital improvements that will make Middlefield Ball Park an even more amazing place.

*Don Amsbaugh*, spoke in favor of the cellular antenna and as a League we're a group of volunteers working year round to provide a safe and enjoyable experience for roughly 1,100 children a year. The proposal with Verizon represents an opportunity for our League to have a small but steady income to ensure we can continue to service the community in the future. We are acting not on our behalf, but on behalf of the community.

*Kristin Foss*, mentioned what you are seeing today is their latest attempt to do that. They've been talking a lot about due process and slowing down the decision, but this isn't about due process, this is about obstruction. It's obstruction when we get 70 pages of erroneous report two days before this meeting.

*Ken Allen*, spoke that he supports the project.

*Mark Weiss*, noted he hoped for a resolution, noting corporations are not people.

**Architectural Review Board Action:** Board Member Malone Prichard moved, seconded by Board Member Gooyer to recommend approval of the project with the following conditions:

1. Modify Attachment A, to cite Comprehensive Plan Element B13; B13 is specific to supporting the development of communication infrastructure.
2. Allowing the applicant to the option to either do the hydrogen fuel cell or a diesel generator, that the finish of the light pole will be acid wash, and that the approval be amended to specify that it is Hardie plank not wood siding.
3. The first condition regarding the red gum eucalyptus trees at Mitchell Park to achieve perpetual 25 foot foliage clearance with strategic structural pruning through the following measures: A) the entire row of historic red gum along the Mitchell Park property line shall be perpetually maintained in a consistent line with 25 feet clearance from the antenna for the life of the project; and B) each pruning event shall be approved subject to a public tree care pruning permit from Urban Forestry.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED (3-1-0-1, Chair Lippert opposed, Vice-Chair Popp recused)

### **New Business**

2. **2555 Park Boulevard [13PLN-00381]**: Request by FGY Architects on behalf of Campbell Avenue Portfolio, LLC for Architectural Review of the construction of a new three story, 24,466 square foot office building replacing a 10,800 sq.ft. mid-century modern office building in the Community Commercial (CC(2)) zone district. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) has been prepared and circulated for public review and the comment period runs from September 5, 2014 through October 20, 2014.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommended the Architectural Review Board (ARB) to recommend approval to the City Council on both the Architectural Review, including the Design Enhancement Exception (DEE) for height, and the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), based on the Findings in Attachment A and the Conditions of Approval contained within Attachment B.

Public Comments:

*Judith Fields*, spoke regarding the EIR that added additional traffic at Grant Avenue, noting that coming out of Grant Avenue, you can't see both sides of the street.

*Peter Lockhart*, spoke in support of the project.

*Mark Weiss*, spoke in favor of investment

**Architectural Review Board Action:** Vice Chair Popp moved, seconded by Board Member Gooyer to recommend approval of the project with the following conditions to come back to subcommittee review of:

1. A more details ? landscape plan
2. Reconsideration of reduction of the canopy structure by a third
3. Reconsider DEE ?
4. Details of the rapping back of the balcony (vertical pickets)
5. A Photometric plan
6. Reconsider floor to ceiling glass

VOTE: MOTION PASSED (4-0-0-1, Vice-Chair Popp recused)

3. **180 El Camino Real [14PLN-00247]**: Request by Simon Property Group, Inc. on behalf of the Board of Trustees to the Leland Stanford Junior University for Architectural Review of Phase III of the Stanford Shopping Center redevelopment, including four new retail buildings in the location of the former Bloomingdales. The four new retail buildings have gross floor area of 131,105 square feet and net floor area of 119,799 square feet. The project includes associated site improvements and a redesign of the center's entrance drive from El Camino Real. Zone: Community Commercial (CC). Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Sections 15302 and 15304.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommended the Architectural Review Board (ARB) review the proposed project, receive any public testimony, and continue the project review to a date certain.

No public comment.

**Architectural Review Board Action:** Vice Chair Popp moved, seconded by Board Member Lew to recommend continue the project to a date certain on November 6, 2014 with the following direction to provide:

1. Clarification regarding area calculation
2. Address blank wall area
3. Coordinated landscape and pavement
4. Placement of bicycles and consideration of bicycles reserve

VOTE: MOTION PASSED (4-0-1-0, (Malone Prichard recused)

**Board/Staff Announcements, Updates, Reports, and Comments:** Members of the public may not speak to the item(s).

### **Adjournment**

**Subcommittee Members:** Lee Lippert and Alex Lew (subbing for Clare Malone Prichard as conflicted)

### **SUBCOMMITTEE:**

5. **180 El Camino Real [14000-01714]**: Simon Property Group, Inc. request for ARB Subcommittee review to discuss staff's determination regarding architectural and streetscape features partially visible from the right of way.

The ARB Subcommittee confirmed staff's determination regarding the geographic locations of the architectural and streetscape features at Stanford Shopping Center that are partially visible from the right of way.

**STAFF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW.**

*Project Description: Installation of one non-illuminated freestanding sign up to 5' tall*  
*Applicant: 535 Arastradero Road [14PLN-00292]*  
*Address: Collie McVicker*  
*Approval Date: 9/30/14*  
*Request for hearing deadline: 10/14/14*

*Project Description: Façade improvements and new signage for a Category 2 historic resource*  
*Applicant: Christopher Preovolos*  
*Address: 448 University Avenue [14PLN-00225]*  
*Approval Date: 10/1/14*  
*Request for hearing deadline: 10/14/14*

*Project Description: Landscape modifications, including a new tree planting plan to the office building*  
*Applicant: Renault and Handley*  
*Address: 855 W. California Avenue [14PLN-00310]*  
*Approval Date: 10/3/14*  
*Request for hearing deadline: 10/16/14*

*Project Description: Minor parking lot modifications to the existing fire lane*  
*Applicant: Mr. Toeniskoetter*  
*Address: 650 Page Mill Road [13PLN-00305]*  
*Approval Date: 10/6/14*  
*Request for hearing deadline: 10/20/20*

*Project Description: Replace existing furniture with new outdoor seating consisting of six table, six umbrellas and twenty four chairs*  
*Applicant: Michael Amy*  
*Address: 365 California Avenue [14PLN-00242]*  
*Approval Date: 10/7/14*  
*Request for hearing deadline: 10/20/14*

**Sub-Committee Members:**

Robert Gooyer  
Clare Malone Prichard  
Lee Lippert  
Randy Popp

**Terms:**

May 1, 2014 to August 21, 2014  
June 5, 2014 to October 16, 2014  
September 4, 2014 to October 16, 2014  
November 6, 2014 to March 19, 2015

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.

AMERICANS WITH DISABILITY ACT (ADA). The City of Palo Alto does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. To request an accommodation for this meeting or an alternative format for any related printed materials, please contact the City's ADA Coordinator at 650.329.2550 (voice) or by e-mailing [ada@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:ada@cityofpaloalto.org).

PUBLIC COMMENT. Members of the Public are entitled to directly address the Architectural Review Board concerning any item that is described in the notice of this meeting, before or during consideration of that item. If you wish to address the Board on any issue that is on the agenda, please complete a speaker request card located on the table at the entrance to the Council Chambers, and deliver it to the Board Secretary prior to discussion of the item. You are not required to give your name on the speaker card in order to speak to the Board, but it is very helpful.

RECORDINGS. A DVD of the proceedings may be reviewed by contacting the City Clerk's Office at (650) 329-2571.

LATE RECEIVED MATERIALS. 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 Department on the 5<sup>th</sup> floor, City Hall, 250

Hamilton Avenue during normal business hours. During the 9/80 Friday closure, materials will be available at the Development Center, 285 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto. Please call 329-2603 to reserve a copy.

All correspondence relating to any of the agenda items or non-agenda items, which were not received by the 2:00 PM deadline for inclusion into Board packets on the Thursday preceding the meeting date, need to be received before 3:00 PM on the date of the meeting for distribution to staff and Board members.