



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, September 18, 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, Clare Campbell, Senior Planner; Sheldon Ah Sing, Contract 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. None.

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: September 4, 2014

Architectural Review Board Action: Vice Chair Popp moved seconded by Board Member Malone Prichard to approve the minutes as amended by the Board.

Vote: Approval, 5-0-0-0

PUBLIC HEARING:

New Business:

Major Review:

1. **777 Welch Rd. [14PLN-00135]**: Request by Stoecker and Northway for Architectural Review of a proposal to demolish three one story medical office buildings (totaling 14,142 sq. ft. of floor area) and construct two three-story medical office buildings (at 11,550 sq. ft. and 17,220 sq. ft. of floor area) on a 1.6 acre site in the Medical Office Research (MOR) zone district. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and will be available for public review beginning September 5, 2014 through September 24, 2014.

RECOMMENDATION

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

No public comment.

Architectural Review Board Action: Vice Chair Popp moved seconded by Board Member Chair Gooyer to approve the project as presented by staff with the following items to return to the Subcommittee.

1. Evaluate bike parking location
2. Evaluate depth/dimension of first floor canopy
3. Height of first floor window
4. Interim landscaping
5. Updates to conditions of approval to maintain transition from Phase 1 to 2.

Vote: Approval, 5-0-0-0

Minor Review:

2. **3672 Middlefield Rd [14PLN-000711]:** 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.

Public Comments:

Mr. Allen, spoke that the vast majority of the people in my area actually support the Verizon application. This does represent a very strong but minority group here. The Joint Venture Silicon Valley Network did a study of this in November 2012 and I have a copy of that study. It basically says there will be no negative impact of this particular type of location of an antenna in the area.

Chuck Wilson, spoke regarding his biggest concern is safety in times of emergency that I am unable without having better coverage to provide that rely on my cell phone in times of emergency which are likely with flooding or earthquake.

Mark Weiss, mentioned that he played little league at Los Altos not here in Palo Alto.

Kristin Foss, spoke that she is the President of Palo Alto Little League. I wanted to present the position of Palo Alto Little League in this. This is Verizon's design and we support it, but really Little League's job here and what we're passionate about is providing the service of youth baseball to the community. We service over 1,000 kids over the year anything from tee ball through majors players and we have a challenger league.

Mark Priestley, spoke that he is with the Palo Alto Little League Board, the Secretary on the Board. I've had the chance to work with Verizon on this project since soon after we signed the lease, which goes back at least four years. Our intent initially was to help the community in Palo Alto with a problem which was cell coverage in South-Mid Palo Alto.

Jin Shixue, spoke that there are a handful of neighborhood who is showing concerns and opposition on this new proposal and I would like to raise one of the issues that we're facing on the existing light poles.

So there may be two issues. I'll be succinct, two issues that we're facing as the neighborhood. One is more of operational and the second one is more of a physical issue.

Ms. Liao, spoke that he will focus on the visual nuisance for the proposal of building a brand new cell tower onto the Little League ballpark in Palo Alto. So the summary is focusing on the visual nuisance and the bullet point refers to the draft staff recommendation. We challenge those recommendations.

Jason Yotopoulos, mentioned an issue relates to the historic evaluation due diligence process, but let me just say that in this process for example one of the previous designs was actually submitted by Verizon without the signature of the ballpark Board and actually published to neighbors as something that is in due process.

Mr. Jasti, spoke that he lives right across the street from ballpark, 3669 Middlefield Road. I'm probably the newest owner and I built a new house there in the last couple of years. For me the most impact I believe is probably the property value and the visual impact, property value because of the visual impact. That is my main concern.

Barbara Cooley, spoke that to clarify that the Neighborhood Association does not have a position on this tower for or against it's a separate individuals. She was happy to hear that the Board is aware of the colocation concerns that have been shared.

Jackie Yu, spoke regarding several potential hazard and the first one is noise hazard. So the emergency portable diesel generator and also the fuel power both poses potential health hazard. So the fuel cell has a potential explosion hazard. I'm a chemist so I'm particularly concerned about that potential hazard. And also the diesel generator will produce huge noise. It's way over the standard health limit even at 140 feet.

Ms. Yu, spoke about the dangerous equipment and the trucks poses a safety hazard for our children and also the tower is very close to the eucalyptus trees and that's a concern for fire hazard. And I had a fire in my home; I know how terrible it was. It was just a very difficult situation and so those are all the safety concerns we'd like the Board to consider.

Mr. Sullivan, spoke regarding the current state of wireless safety; the World Health Organization (WHO) has classified wireless radiation as possible carcinogen in 2011. This is in the same category as other toxins lead and DDT, which fall under the California Prop 65 domain.

Frank Ingle, spoke regarding a letter he sent to you yesterday; I argued that this decision is not ripe for a decision now and the reason is there is inadequate or incorrect information about fire and explosion safety concerning the storage shed as it's called. It's larger than a two car garage and taller than a two car garage, has hydrogen fuel cells inside, high power, and I have some documents to support my contention. These are from the United States (U.S.) Government. One of them is Fuel Cells for Backup Power in Telecommunication Facilities. You have a link to this, but I'll distribute the actual item.

Mr. Lewis, spoke regarding an issue with all the lights in the ball park in order so that they aren't abused and people aren't turning them on when they shouldn't be are on a timer that no one in Little League except has control of. There are three people with a key to the shed that can turn on manually or off. We keep that very isolated to only a number of people so that people aren't going in there and turning them on when they want to and violating the use.

Chris Melvin, spoke he played on the ballpark when he was a child in the seventies and am now a member of the board and he's in charge of the fields. He stated the field is old and has been in use for a long time and there have been a lot of people of note who have been there, some of the representations were not particularly accurate. Ty Cobb was not the president at the time. He was just happened to be a resident nearby and was asked to come throw out the first pitch. Lots of people do that kind of thing, doesn't necessarily associate them with a historic landmark.

Rod Greason, spoke that he lives on Middlefield across from the ballpark as well. He mentioned a study that puts into record here was primarily focused on San Jose, which is a completely different market than Palo Alto. Cell tower impacts neighborhood values and not in a positive way.

Architectural Review Board Action: Chair Lippert moved seconded by Board Member Malone Prichard to continue the item to date certain of October 16, 2014 ARB meeting after the Historic Resources Board (HRB) has had the opportunity to hear the item with the following items to return to the Board:

1. Material board;
2. Further details of the equipment enclosure;
3. Options for pole finish;
4. Revised drawings and other application materials that consistently indicate an 18 inch pole;
5. Photometric study of the replaced lighting.

Vote: Approval of continuance to date certain of October 16, 2014, 5-0-0-0

STUDY SESSION:

3. **1313 Newell Road [Art Center]**: Request by City of Palo Alto Public Works for Study Session to present design concepts for a new corner free standing sign for the Art Center and Rinconada Library facility; the formal project will require a Sign Exception application to exceed the number of free standing signs allowed on the project site.

Public comment:

Catherine Ballantyne, spoke that she travels by the Main Library daily, she doesn't support the proposals.

As a study session item, no action was taken.

CONTINUED BUSINESS:

4. **Build-to Standard Ordinance:** Review of Draft Modifications to the Build To Line Requirements in Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 18.16. *This item was discussed by the ARB in a public hearing on September 4, 2014 and continued to this date for further discussion. This item was reviewed by the Planning and Transportation Commission on July 30, 2014 and continued to a date uncertain.*

Public Comments:

Ken Wang, spoke that the new buildings are coming to El Camino Real are creating tunnels and the sidewalks are public right of way.

Ben Cintz, spoke regarding the Comprehensive Plans and urged the Board to not treat El Camino Real different from other parts of the City.

Architectural Review Board Action: Chair Lippert moved seconded by Vice Chair Popp to continue the item to the October 2, 2014 ARB meeting.

Vote: Approval, 4-0-0-1 (Gooyer absent)

NOTE: Although the 441 Page Mill Road project was continued to 9/18/14, the applicant has requested postponement to a future hearing date, so the item will be re-advertised.

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

Adjournment

Subcommittee Members: Clare Malone Prichard and Lee Lippert

SUBCOMMITTEE:

5. **250 Hamilton Avenue [14PLN-00228]:** Petra Solar ARB subcommittee review of neighbor outreach signs on the street light poles.

STAFF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW.

Project Description: Removal of one non-illuminated monument sign and the installation of one non-illuminated monument sign

Applicant: Jason Frith

Address: 1051 East Meadow Circle [14PLN-00270]

Approval Date: 9/5/14

Request for hearing deadline: 9/18/14

Project Description: Removal of one non-illuminated monument sign and the installation of one non-illuminated monument sign

Applicant: Jason Frith

Address: 1035 East Meadow Circle [14PLN-00269]

Approval Date: 9/5/14

Request for hearing deadline: 9/18/14

Project Description: Removal of one non-illuminated monument sign and the installation of one non-illuminated monument sign

Applicant: Jason Frith

Address: 1052 East Meadow Circle [14PLN-00268]

Approval Date: 9/5/14

Request for hearing deadline: 9/18/14

Project Description: Removal of one non-illuminated monument sign and the installation of one non-illuminated monument sign

Applicant: Jason Frith

Address: 1066 East Meadow Circle [14PLN-00271]

Approval Date: 9/5/14

Request for hearing deadline: 9/18/14

Project Description: A minor exterior improvements, which include door replacement, new side entry and windows, and new paint throughout

Applicant: Andy Pluess

Address: 744 High Street [14PLN-00096]

Approval Date: 9/5/14

Request for hearing deadline: 9/18/14

Project Description: Two DAS (Distributed Antenna System) installations comprised of pole-mounted wireless communication antennas and associated equipment boxes on existing light poles within city right-of-ways adjacent to 1299 Page Mill Road (light pole# P2N55A) and across the street from 1661 Page Mill Road (light pole #P2N54A)

Applicant: AT&T

Address: 1661 & 1299 Page Mill Road [14PLN-00183]

Approval Date: 9/8/14

Request for hearing deadline: 9/22/14

Project Description: A new externally illuminated monument sign

Applicant: David Ford
Address: 3000 Hanover Street [14PLN-00304]
Approval Date: 9/11/14
Request for hearing deadline: 9/24/14

Sub-Committee Members:

Alexander Lew
Robert Gooyer
Clare Malone Prichard
Lee Lippert
Randy Popp

Terms:

January 9, 2014 to May 15, 2014
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, 5th 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.

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 5th 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.