

1



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES

Regular Meeting
Thursday, April 2, 2015, 8:30 A.M.
Council Chambers

2
3
4
5
6

Call to Order

7
8
9

Roll Call

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

Present: Randy Popp (Chair), Robert Gooyer (Vice Chair), Alexander Lew, Kyu Kim

Absent: None.

Staff Present: Amy French, Chief Planning Official; Rebecca Atkinson, Planner; Diana Tamale, Administrative Associate III

18
19

Oral Communications: None.

20
21

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

22
23
24

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, requested the Board to move Minutes Approval to the end of the meeting due to the number of Minutes presented for review.

25
26

MOTION: Chair Popp moved, seconded by Board Member Kim, to move Approval of Minutes after the Public Hearing.

27
28

MOTION PASSED: 4-0-0-0

29
30

Public Hearing Items

31
32

1. 180 El Camino Real (15PLN-00040): Request by Ronald Zeytoonian of SPG Center, LLC, on Behalf of the Board of Trustees to the Leland Stanford Junior University, for Major Architectural Review of a Master Tenant Sign Program and Tenant Facade Design Criteria for the Stanford Shopping Center, Located in the Community Commercial (CC) Zoning District. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Section 15301. Zone District: CC

33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

Rebecca Atkinson, Planner, reported the project presented a proposed update to the current Master Tenant Façade and Sign Program at the Stanford Shopping Center. Specifically the project would integrate the four new retail buildings into the existing program and update the signage parameters allowed at the shopping center for non-anchor tenants. Currently, the sign program was relatively restrictive compared with Municipal Code sign requirements. The current Architectural Review Process for tenant facades and signs was outlined in the staff report and included the buildings involved in the program versus those that were not. Review of facades focused on width and height as predominant factors influencing whether a project was reviewed by staff or the Architectural Review Board. Proposed signs involving exceptions to the sign program were reviewed by the Architectural Review Board. The project sought Architectural Review Board (ARB) approval for the establishment of updated sign and

1 façade design parameters. Key updates would allow greater diversity in façade design. Key exceptions
2 to sign requirements would allow more overall wall sign canopy and awning signage and allow super-
3 graphics without size limits. Staff had not received any public comment. The applicant had updated the
4 Tenant Design Manual (TDM) to respond to comments received on March 19, 2015 from the Architectural
5 Review Board. Staff added draft Conditions of Approval in response to ARB comments. Staff requested
6 feedback regarding draft Conditions of Approval, specifically Numbers 8, 22, 23, and 29. With inclusion
7 of the draft Conditions of Approval as modified by the Architectural Review Board, Staff would support
8 the project and encourage the Architectural Review Board to recommend approval to the Director of
9 Planning.

10
11 Ron Zeytoonian, Simon Property Group Director of Planning and Design, incorporated into the Tenant
12 Design Manual the primary goals presented verbally in his prior presentation. For Goal Number 2, he
13 added a map outlining all areas referred to as precincts. The areas did not affect criteria or design goals
14 in terms of construction or engineering. A single-line sentence described the overall complexion of the
15 areas. Hopefully, the architects working for the various tenants would understand the intent. The
16 Glossary of Terms was repaginated and included new terms. The ARB requested clarification and
17 elaboration of Zone 5 and Zone 7. He provided additional clarification and direction for tenants included
18 in the zone. He considered Storefront Zone 7 to be grandfathered in; however, in the future this type of
19 two-dimensional painted super-graphic would not be acceptable. Page 54 had been updated to clarify
20 the maximum and minimum heights of storefronts. All new storefronts would be required to meet the
21 parapet. He added clarification and definition pertaining to porcelain tile. In order to standardize
22 identification of service doors, egress doors, and utility room doors, tenants and landlords would be
23 required to utilize circular pro font, to limit letter height to 2 inches, and to center signs on doors.
24 Language on page 61 clarified the total allowable signs that a particular tenant could have. At the ARB's
25 request, he added pages concerning the appearance of signs as interpreted from criteria. He added
26 additional descriptions of signs following suggestions of the ARB and staff. Most importantly, vinyl-
27 applied graphics were not allowed going forward.

28
29 Board Member Lew inquired about guidelines for logos within allowed sign area.

30
31 Ms. Atkinson asked if he meant the business name incorporated into or supplemental to the logo.

32
33 Board Member Lew indicated that was a gray area. The ARB did not have guidelines for that; however,
34 he imagined it fell under sign area. Perhaps it should be in proportion to the façade or lettering.

35
36 Ms. Atkinson suggested the ARB consider logos and all text as part of overall wall sign area. That could
37 be added to a draft Condition of Approval.

38
39 Mr. Zeytoonian stated the Tenant Design Manual could not be exhaustive. Checks and balances would
40 ultimately prohibit any unsightly sign proposals, poorly designed facades, and facades that could be
41 inappropriate. The sign review process began with the tenant coordination department at Simon
42 Property Group and then moved to him. Once he approved proposals, he submitted them to the
43 University. If the University accepted the proposal, the design package would be submitted to the ARB,
44 hearing or staff level. Medallions and logos that could be freestanding or isolated would have to follow
45 characteristics shown on page 63. Design review would ensure secondary elements were reasonable.

46
47 Ms. Atkinson clarified that logos could be considered as super-graphics. The proposed sign program
48 would exempt super-graphics from the size limitation and any other wall sign limitations. That was the
49 reason staff requested feedback for draft Condition Number 8. The alligator for Lacoste would be a good
50 example for the ARB to consider.

51
52 Board Member Lew asked if there had been discussion of pop-up stores or temporary stores. He
53 understood the City had a permit process for temporary signage.

54
55 Mr. Zeytoonian reported Simon Property Group did not allow pop-up stores or kiosks or those kinds of
56 temporary elements. They were prohibited as a frame sign.

1
2 Chair Popp did not find within the document any indication of discretionary review by the landlord or a
3 specific policy about exceptions and how those might be handled. The ARB understood that every
4 scenario could not be anticipated within the document. Zoning Regulations included language regarding
5 handling of exceptions. He requested Mr. Zeytoonian illustrate how that might be addressed.
6
7 Mr. Zeytoonian advised that restrictions and limitations could be included in a work letter, a financial
8 document, and lease restrictions. It was also verbally stated prior to negotiations of a lease.
9
10 Chair Popp asked if staff could rely on those other documents for reviewing signs.
11
12 Ms. Atkinson suggested clarifications regarding items the Architectural Review Board would want to
13 review be included in draft Condition of Approval 22. The Master Sign Program and the Tenant Façade
14 Program would be the baseline for review. Any exceptions would be presented to the Architectural
15 Review Board.
16
17 Amy French, Chief Planning Official, understood Chair Popp was seeking guidelines that staff would use
18 to present exceptions to the ARB.
19
20 Chair Popp wanted staff to handle exceptions in order to limit the amount of staff and ARB time.
21
22 Ms. French could place an exception on a consent calendar which would expedite the item.
23
24 Chair Popp asked if staff was comfortable with that course of action.
25
26 Ms. French answered yes.
27
28 Mr. Zeytoonian felt a statement that certain exceptions in design or signage were possible with landlord
29 approval would encourage tenants to reinterpret the Tenant Design Manual. By excluding that language,
30 there was a sense of stringency to the manual.
31
32 Chair Popp believed the ARB evaluated a sign as being the body that included the signage on it. The ARB
33 measured the sign as the graphics and the text rather than the material on which it was placed.
34
35 Ms. French suggested the ARB consider some language in a Condition that provided a maximum amount
36 of wall area that could be considered not part of the sign. Perhaps the ARB could provide a range.
37
38 Mr. Zeytoonian did not want to encourage or allow extremely large signs at Stanford Shopping Center.
39
40 Chair Popp explained the exception required for the Tesla sign that covered an entire wall.
41
42 Mr. Zeytoonian would interpret that as a façade integrated in the sign.
43
44 Chair Popp reported the Sign Code disagreed. He asked if staff felt that was appropriately covered.
45
46 Ms. French felt it should be stated.
47
48 Chair Popp agreed to include a statement.
49
50 The Public Hearing open and closed with no speakers.
51
52 Board Member Lew advised that pages 62 and 63 were useful and would potentially exceed the allowable
53 area for signs as stated in the Municipal Code. Most pedestrian streets facing public roads within the
54 shopping center were setback substantially; therefore, it was a different condition than the Municipal
55 Code. With respect to Condition of Approval 22, he shared Chair Popp's concerns about exceptions. A

1 reference document for Condition of Approval 23 would be good. If the shopping center did not have
2 projections, then fire sprinklers were not necessary. He asked if large canvas awnings were prohibited.

3
4 Mr. Zeytoonian replied yes.

5
6 Board Member Lew would accept the sign program.

7
8 Board Member Kim was happy with revision of the TDM. He inquired about the type of document
9 referenced in Condition of Approval 23. It seemed to be a text document that referred to drawings.

10
11 Ms. Atkinson reported master program documents and façade program documents were common. The
12 TDM was focused to a particular audience; therefore, it was not as clear to members of the public and
13 line staff. A reference document would contain all approved requirements in both text and graphics.

14
15 Board Member Kim questioned whether a separate document would be beneficial in that it could conflict
16 with the TDM. He asked if the reference document would be easier for staff and the public to understand
17 in order to interpret signs.

18
19 Ms. Atkinson responded yes. The TDM was oriented towards the present time. A Tenant Façade
20 Program approved in 2005 was still in place. The TDM for Stanford Shopping Center could be updated
21 when many elements were implemented. The reference document would contain a set of clear
22 requirements while allowing the TDM to evolve.

23
24 Vice Chair Gooyer agreed to placing exceptions on a consent calendar.

25
26 Chair Popp noticed wood siding was a disallowed material. He inquired whether the wood bleachers on
27 the Nike store would be permitted.

28
29 Mr. Zeytoonian explained that the statement was focused on facades constructed entirely of wood. As an
30 accent material, wood was acceptable.

31
32 Chair Popp noted that there were no public speakers. Based on that, he did not feel there was a reason
33 for many sign issues to be presented to the ARB, if staff was comfortable reviewing and approving. The
34 maximum allowable sign area for wall signs should include language regarding signage and graphics
35 versus the panel on which they were mounted. That would provide flexibility in evaluating that. Note 22
36 stated clearly that it did not pertain certain portions of Stanford Shopping Center in Topic A. He asked if
37 that meant the Standard Sign Code and the standard process applied to those specific portions of the
38 shopping center or those specific portions did not have design criteria but the process applied to how the
39 tenant would handle it. There should be a distinction.

40
41 Ms. French understood Chair Popp was questioning the process if one business replaced another.
42 Because the former guidelines for the shopping center had public right-of-way facing signs, staff would
43 refer that to the ARB.

44
45 Chair Popp wanted that to be presented to the ARB in the context of the tenant design criteria rather
46 than the Palo Alto sign criteria.

47
48 Ms. Atkinson asked if the question pertained to a particular building.

49
50 Chair Popp referred to 22A, the master tenant and tenant façade program did not pertain to certain
51 portions of Stanford Shopping Center. Only Palo Alto sign regulations applied to those portions of the
52 shopping center.

53
54 Ms. Atkinson advised that was correct. The ARB could change that.

55
56 Board Member Lew asked if signs on department stores were larger than 24 inches high.

1
2 Mr. Zeytoonian indicated page 16 clearly illustrated the storefronts that fell in the purview of the TDM.
3 He hoped any of those storefronts would be submitted for staff review as often as possible. Typically he
4 did not write tenant design criteria for outparcel anchors. To produce specific façade criteria and signage
5 criteria would require another volume of the Tenant Design Manual. In some cases, an outparcel anchor
6 could be submitted to the ARB as an exception.
7

8 Chair Popp asked if Mr. Zeytoonian preferred exceptions be handled in that manner.
9

10 Mr. Zeytoonian would prefer that.
11

12 Chair Popp referred to Condition 23 and inquired whether evolution of the TDM would be presented to
13 the ARB if it contained dramatic changes.
14

15 Ms. Atkinson reported the reference document would carry requirements forward. Staff would continue
16 to review according to the reference document.
17

18 Chair Popp asked if Mr. Zeytoonian would accept language of "other than dimensional changes."
19

20 Mr. Zeytoonian answered yes.
21

22 Chair Popp noted a typographical error on page 61, an extra "a." The language regarding vinyl graphics
23 and the evaluation of the occurrence at the Wilkes Bashford store was consistent with his concerns.
24

25 **MOTION:** Chair Popp moved, seconded by Vice Chair Gooyer, to accept the application as proposed and
26 as conditioned by the staff report with the inclusion of a statement in Condition 23 for some limitation of
27 future changes to the TDM coming back to the ARB if those changes included dimensional adjustment to
28 the allowable sign size or area.
29

30 Ms. French asked if Chair Popp wished to limit the statement to signs specifically.
31

32 Chair Popp replied yes. His goal was for staff to handle much of the work. If staff accepted adjustments
33 to parapets and other things, then the ARB would agree.
34

35 **MOTION PASSED:** 4-0-0-0
36

37 2. 2015 ARB Awards: Initial Discussion of the Process, Timeline and Potential Award Categories for
38 ARB-Recommended, Constructed Development Projects Completed from 2010 through mid-2015.
39

40 Amy French, Chief Planning Official, advised that she prepared the report rather than the City Manager.
41 She hoped to utilize the televisions in the lobby to reflect the winning entries. Past and present Board
42 Members could adjudicate entries. She could arrange a retreat for that purpose. She requested the ARB
43 consider a means for the public to provide input. She provided at-places a list of projects she was
44 researching. Parameters were projects constructed since the last design awards in 2010 through the
45 present and projects recommended by the ARB. Traditionally five projects received awards; however, in
46 2010, five projects received awards and five projects received honorable mentions. Board Members and
47 past Board Members wrote descriptions as to why projects were selected. Some older projects were
48 eligible because they had not been constructed prior to the 2010 awards. She noted projects that were
49 additions to historic buildings. She encouraged the ARB to consider a category for those projects. In
50 2010, Board Members assisted staff by photographing projects and conducting site visits. The ARB
51 should focus on process, timeline, and categories.
52

53 Vice Chair Gooyer asked if Set 3 projects were not be eligible.
54

55 Ms. French answered yes.
56

1 Vice Chair Gooyer would have to review the projects as he had served only a short time on the ARB. He
2 would be flexible with regard to timeline. The public should be allowed to nominate projects whether or
3 not the projects were eligible.
4
5 Ms. French advised that single-family homes were not eligible, because that involved the Individual
6 Review (IR) process.
7
8 Vice Chair Gooyer did not wish to dissuade public participation.
9
10 Ms. French suggested use of a web page comprised of projects the ARB had selected as finalists. From
11 those projects, the public could offer input.
12
13 Vice Chair Gooyer asked if the ARB would prepare a short list of 10-15 projects and have everyone vote
14 on those projects or if the public would prepare the short list.
15
16 Ms. French felt public input on all projects would be unwieldy. Selection of projects occurred over several
17 meetings, one of which was a retreat. The retreat would be a public meeting.
18
19 Vice Chair Gooyer inquired whether the ARB would review each individual project at the retreat or the
20 public would review projects online and prepare short lists.
21
22 Chair Popp clarified that the ARB was inventing the process. He wanted to hear proposals for the process
23 from Board Members.
24
25 Vice Chair Gooyer had no proposals for a process.
26
27 Board Member Kim liked the AIA New York program held in October. However, an October deadline
28 would constrain the ARB. Projects could be divided into categories of new construction, remodel, and
29 reuse. Board Members could nominate three projects per category.
30
31 Vice Chair Gooyer would rather select five, six or eight of the best projects. Six projects in one category
32 would be acceptable.
33
34 Board Member Lew indicated that had been the past process. In 2010 the ARB wanted to recognize
35 parts of projects; therefore, they awarded honorable mention.
36
37 Vice Chair Gooyer suggested a category for a specific aspect of a project rather than awarding an
38 honorable mention.
39
40 Board Member Lew felt the ARB in 2010 wanted to recognize that design was more than just the
41 building. He urged Board Members to consider current design issues and that the awards were an
42 opportunity to address those design issues.
43
44 Board Member Kim agreed with Vice Chair Gooyer not to award honorable mention. He questioned
45 whether one small component of a project elevated the whole project to the level of receiving an award.
46
47 Chair Popp advised that the ARB could provide merit awards for projects that overall deserved
48 recognition. Projects that were close to that and should be recognized overall could receive an honorable
49 mention. Special awards could be given for specific aspects of a project.
50
51 Vice Chair Gooyer agreed. He did not want to give an award to a mediocre building with magnificent
52 lighting.
53
54 Chair Popp stated that building could be given a special award for lighting.
55
56 Vice Chair Gooyer believed that was the difference compared to the 2010 competition.

1
2 Board Member Lew did not believe there was a difference. All the honorable mentions were good
3 projects.
4
5 Chair Popp noted the 2010 ARB had specific criteria for awarding the honorable mention.
6
7 Vice Chair Gooyer explained that a person unfamiliar with the project would not know the aspect that
8 was awarded.
9
10 Chair Popp requested Board Members focus on the upcoming competition.
11
12 Board Member Lew stated the important thing was the ARB's statement about design. The categories
13 would make it work. He was not concerned about the number of awards but preferred as few as
14 possible. He suggested displaying projects at Mitchell Park Library in order to reach a wide variety of
15 people.
16
17 Chair Popp preferred a few specific categories limited to three projects within each category. The ARB
18 could choose to give special awards for aspects of projects. He questioned the amount of time the ARB
19 and staff could dedicate. He asked if funds were available for additional assistance. He wanted to create
20 a website so that the public could provide input. This would act as a survey of public opinion regarding
21 architecture.
22
23 Ms. French reported staff had not allocated funds for assistance. In the past interns had assisted.
24 Perhaps project architects could provide professional photographs of their projects.
25
26 Chair Popp asked if the ARB should narrow the list of projects before soliciting public input.
27
28 Ms. French suggested segregating projects into types such as housing, adaptive reuse and remodel, and
29 commercial; not that the types would be the same as the categories. Board Members could select
30 projects from each type, and those would be placed on a website. The public could then select their
31 favorites from those types.
32
33 Chair Popp believed this was an opportunity for the public to provide their opinions. He did not want to
34 eliminate projects too early. Perhaps the Council would also select its preferences.
35
36 Ms. French stated the ARB could implement a special category for projects with ridiculous constraints. In
37 that way, the public could understand the difficulties constraints imposed on projects. Perhaps the ARB
38 could select the first pool of projects for the competition. Other projects which the public heavily
39 supported could be another pool.
40
41 Board Member Kim would rather have the full list of projects open to the public. The public could vote
42 from the master list, and then the ARB could select from those projects or revive projects the public did
43 not favor.
44
45 Vice Chair Gooyer agreed.
46
47 Board Member Lew felt allowing the public to select projects first would not tell the ARB's story.
48
49 Chair Popp suggested the ARB organize projects into categories of housing and commercial and adaptive
50 reuse and select the best from the categories.
51
52 Board Member Lew asked if it would be a people's choice award.
53
54 Board Member Kim liked the idea of a people's choice award.
55
56 Board Member Lew believed it was critical for the ARB to utilize focused categories.

1
2 Vice Chair Gooyer inquired whether the ARB would in effect vote when it passed projects.
3
4 Chair Popp answered no. Many projects received approval but were not great designs. The ARB was
5 searching for projects that were exceptional.
6
7 Board Member Kim felt the wording should clearly indicate that projects were not necessarily the best
8 designs but were projects approved by the ARB.
9
10 Chair Popp concurred with the concept of a people's choice award. Perhaps there could be a Council's
11 choice award.
12
13 Vice Chair Gooyer noted the public would have the final vote for a people's choice award, even though
14 the ARB might not agree with the final selection.
15
16 Chair Popp felt the ARB was searching for a sense of the public's appreciation for architecture.
17
18 Vice Chair Gooyer stated the ARB was drifting away from the concept of a design award. The public
19 could select a project that was not the best architecturally conceived project.
20
21 Chair Popp clarified that the ARB would decide which projects were the best. By obtaining ARB approval,
22 projects had achieved a certain level of quality and character. Next, the ARB would select projects that
23 deserved a merit award for doing something exceptional, other projects that deserved an honorable
24 mention, and other projects with aspects that should be highlighted. Beyond that, he wanted to know
25 which projects the public felt were the best projects.
26
27 Vice Chair Gooyer suggested it could be a different category.
28
29 Chair Popp stated public opinion would not influence the ARB's selections.
30
31 Vice Chair Gooyer reiterated that a people's choice award would be a category rather than the overall
32 scheme of the entire competition.
33
34 Chair Popp agreed that the public would not drive the process. The people's choice award and the
35 Council's choice award could be secondary awards.
36
37 Vice Chair Gooyer added that it would give the ARB an idea of what the public felt was important.
38
39 Ms. French could confer with the City's Public Information Officer regarding ideas. There could be an
40 opportunity for the public to comment qualitatively on projects selected by the ARB.
41
42 Chair Popp believed the number of people who could attend such a meeting would be limited.
43
44 Ms. French indicated Staff would explore possibilities with Information Technology (IT) staff.
45
46 Chair Popp felt the overall goal was valid. If Board Members did not object, he would like to explore that
47 process.
48
49 Board Member Lew was not clear about categories. He liked to read critic's reviews and public reviews
50 even though they were often split.
51
52 Vice Chair Gooyer did not want the public's selections to compete with the ARB's selections. The people's
53 choice award could be a single project, or first, second, and third projects.
54

1 Chair Popp would not mind if the public did not agree with the ARB's selections. The public might not
2 have the level of architectural experience of Board Members, but they might have a certain reaction to
3 the types of projects being built. This was an opportunity to receive feedback from the public.
4

5 Vice Chair Gooyer did not want the people's choice award to have the same categories as the ARB's
6 awards.
7

8 Chair Popp indicated the public could select their favorite projects from each category of projects. That
9 would create a body of information that the ARB could consider. The ARB would select the outstanding
10 projects from all projects, regardless of category.
11

12 Ms. French suggested she return in May with possibilities for outreach, for sorting projects into
13 categories, and for displaying projects.
14

15 Vice Chair Gooyer recommended staff contact owners and architects to obtain photographs.
16

17 Chair Popp did not agree. The website could have amateur photos or Google street views of projects for
18 fairness. After the ARB had narrowed the list of projects, then staff could request photos.
19

20 Ms. French suggested displaying the approved drawing alongside photos of the built project to
21 demonstrate the evolution of the project.
22

23 Chair Popp added that evolution of the project could also include its progress through the ARB's process.
24

25 **Minutes Approval**

26

27 Chair Popp suggested Board Members first offer comments regarding any of the Minutes. He requested
28 Minutes prior to November 20, 2014 be approved in one Motion, and Minutes after November 20, 2014
29 be approved in a separate Motion.
30

31 Board Member Lew noted two sets of Minutes were added at places.
32

33 Amy French, Chief Planning Official, explained they were included in the agenda, so they could be
34 considered. If Board Members had not reviewed them, they could be deferred to the next meeting.
35

36 Chair Popp announced the ARB would take a break to review the Minutes provided at places.
37

38 Chair Popp reported the ARB had one vacant position and Board Member Kim was not a member of the
39 ARB for a portion of the Minutes. The ARB was in a position of not having sufficient Board Members to
40 constitute a quorum.
41

42 Ms. French advised that those Minutes would be deferred and noted as not having a quorum in the
43 current meeting to approve them. The Midpeninsula Community Media Center captured the meetings in
44 their entirety; therefore, the public could review meetings through that source. Staff had contracted
45 preparation of Minutes, so that they would be presented in a timely manner in the future.
46

47 Chair Popp indicated Board Members could comment on Minutes to enhance accuracy of the Minutes.
48

49 Ms. French clarified that the ARB could comment but not vote on the Minutes.
50

51 Chair Popp stated the October 16, 2014 Minutes, Item Number 2 contained question marks in the action.
52 Number 1 was "a more detailed landscape plant." Item 3 was to reconsider the DEE. The Motion passed
53 with Claire Malone-Prichard recused.
54

1 Board Member Lew stated the November 6, 2014 Minutes, subcommittee members should be himself and
2 Board Member Malone-Prichard. He asked if staff would provide verbatim Minutes of the appeal of 429
3 University on January 15, 2015.
4

5 Ms. Frenchman noted verbatim Minutes for all three meetings were available on the City's website.
6

7 Board Member Lew indicated the title should be changed from Agenda to Minutes for the February 5,
8 2015 Minutes.
9

10 Board Member Kim noted the City of Palo Alto logo had been resized at the beginning of 2015.
11

12 **MOTION:** Chair Popp moved, seconded by Board Member Lew, to accept the Minutes as amended for
13 the period between September 18, 2014 and November 6, 2014 with the exception of September 18,
14 2014. Minutes of the September 18, 2014 meeting were excluded due to a lack of a quorum present at
15 that meeting and capable of voting in the current meeting.
16

17 **MOTION PASSED:** 3-0-1-0 Kim abstaining
18

19 Chair Popp indicated the vote for the third item in the Minutes of March 5, 2015 should be 3-0-1-0.
20

21 Board Member Lew stated the vote for Item 1 in the Minutes of February 19, 2015 should be 4-0-0-1.
22

23 **MOTION:** Chair Popp moved, seconded by Vice Chair Gooyer, to approve the Minutes as amended for
24 the period between November 20, 2014 and March 19, 2015 with the exception of March 5, 2015.
25

26 **MOTION PASSED:** 4-0-0-0
27

28 **MOTION:** Chair Popp moved, seconded by Vice Chair Gooyer, to accept the December 18, 2014 Minutes
29 as amended.
30

31 **MOTION PASSED:** 4-0-1-0 Kim abstaining
32

33 **Board/Staff Announcements, Updates, Reports, and Comments** 34

35 Amy French, Chief Planning Official, announced the 429 University Project was appealed and would
36 appear on the Council's consent calendar on April 6, 2015. Should the Council remove the item from the
37 consent calendar and schedule it as an action item at a future date, the target date was May 4, 2015.
38

39 Chair Popp volunteered to be the liaison for that item and asked if he should attend the Council meeting
40 on April 6.
41

42 Ms. French answered yes, if the Council heard the item on April 6.
43

44 Chair Popp could offer the Council an explanation of the Board's actions.
45

46 Board Member Lew indicated the Council seemed to feel compelled to comment on appeals of signage.
47 Many community members wanted to speak to those signs. He was expecting the Council to remove the
48 appeals from the consent calendar.
49

50 Ms. French reported staff prepared full reports for items on the consent calendar. The public felt
51 constrained by not being allowed to address the Council. By its nature, the Council could not conduct a
52 de novo hearing at the time of the meeting.
53

54 Chair Popp would not be available for the Council meeting on April 6. He would contact Mayor Holman
55 and request her opinion of whether the Council would hear the appeal at the meeting on April 6, if it was
56 removed from the consent calendar.

1
2 Ms. French would contact Chair Popp if she received information regarding the appeal.
3

4 **Adjournment**
5

6 **Subcommittee Members:** Randy Popp and Kyu Kim
7

8 **SUBCOMMITTEE ITEMS:**
9

- 10 3. 420 Ramona (15PLN-00041): Request by Brendan Canning on Behalf of Leheng Cheng for a
11 Façade Remodel and Tenant Improvements to Establish a New Restaurant within the Former
12 "Mandarin Gourmet" Restaurant Space in the CD-C(P) Zone District.
13

14 Subcommittee Item #3 was continued to the next meeting on May 21, 2015.
15

16 **STAFF ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW**
17

18 *Project Description: Removal of a tree and planter at the area of the building and the addition of tree*
19 *bollards to prevent damage to an existing transformer*

20 *Applicant: Robert Zontos*

21 *Address: 550 Waverley Street (14PLN-00483)*

22 *Approval Date: 3/16/15*

23 *Request for hearing deadline: 3/30/15*
24

25 *Project Description: Construction of a minor addition enclosing a 450 square foot recessed area within*
26 *the existing building footprint*

27 *Applicant: Scott Walker*

28 *Address: 4085 El Camino Real (15PLN00033)*

29 *Approval Date: 3/16/15*

30 *Request for hearing deadline: 3/30/15*
31

32 *Project Description: Modifications to an existing landscape plan including removal and replacement of*
33 *existing trees*

34 *Applicant: Neil Woolner*

35 *Address: 3175 Hanover Street (14PLN-00497)*

36 *Approval Date: 3/16/15*

37 *Request for hearing deadline: 3/30/15*
38

39 *Project Description: Historic Review for façade improvements including new signage, an awning, paint*
40 *colors, heaters, illuminated menu boxes, and sidewalk tables and chairs*

41 *Applicant: Reza Javandel*

42 *Address: 271 University Avenue (14PLN-00473)*

43 *Approval Date: 3/19/15*

44 *Request for hearing deadline: 4/1/15*
45