



JOINT ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD AND HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING

DRAFT MINUTES: April 21, 2016

City Hall/City Council Chambers

Call to Order

Roll Call

Present: ARB: Chair Robert Gooyer Vice Chair Alexander Lew, Board Members Peter Baltay, Wynne Furth, Kyu Kim

Absent: None

Present: HRB: Chair Martin Bernstein, Board Members David Bower, Beth Bunnenberg, Roger Kohler

Absent: Vice Chair Margaret Wimmer, Board Members Patricia DiCicco, Michael Makinen

Oral Communications

None.

[The Board proceeded to Item Number 3.]

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

None.

City Official Reports

1. Meeting Schedule and Subcommittee Assignments
2. List of Staff-Approved (Minor) Architectural Reviews

[This item was heard following Item Number 3.]

Board Member Baltay requested an update regarding the project at El Camino and College Avenue which was last reviewed by the subcommittee. Jodie Gerhardt reported staff conducted a site visit, reviewed changes to the project, and discussed with the applicant requirements for the project to proceed. She believed the applicant decided to remain with items approved in the building permit. Board Member Baltay recalled the building as presented to the Architectural Review Board had a curved fascia trim; however, construction plans called for a chamfered piece. That was a significant change or reduction in the quality of the design. Ms. Gerhardt advised that an earlier subcommittee approval included a more angular look to the building which was approved in building permits.

Chair Gooyer inquired whether items addressed by the subcommittee were the only changes or whether there were other changes which did not receive review. Board Member Baltay believed the plans submitted to the subcommittee were different from the plans presented to the ARB. Chair Gooyer asked if the earlier subcommittee approved those changes. Ms. Gerhardt answered yes; apparently that was

not clear to the subcommittee. Board Member Kim requested all prior approvals be presented, as the majority of Board Members were new to the Board.

Ms. Gerhardt reiterated that staff did visit the site and verify those types of things. In the future, staff reports would include items subject to subcommittee review and background information regarding previous approvals.

Ms. Gerhardt requested Board Members notify her of their attendance at meetings scheduled for May 5, May 19 and June 2.

[The Board proceeded to Item Number 4.]

Action Items

The following item was heard by the Architectural Review Board and Historic Resources Board jointly.

- 3. Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Comprehensive Plan Update:** Request for Architectural Review Board, Historic Resources Board and Public Comments on a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) prepared for the Comprehensive Plan Update. The Draft Environmental Impact Report was published on February 5, 2016 for a 90-day public comment period that will end on May 5, 2016. For more information, contact Elena Lee at elena.lee@cityofpaloalto.org

[This item was heard following Oral Communications.]

Elena Lee reported the purpose of the item was to solicit feedback. The Final Environmental Impact Report would contain responses to all public comments. The Planning and Transportation Commission heard the item on April 13, 2016, and a second hearing was scheduled for May 11, 2016. The City Council was scheduled to hear the item on June 6, 2016. The comment period would end at the close of business on June 6, 2016. Ms. Lee reviewed the process for the DEIR. The City Council was the body responsible for certifying the EIR. The EIR studied long-term policies and programs; it did not set policy. Decision makers could consider revisions based on analyses and conclusions contained in the EIR. As required by CEQA, the document analyzed change from existing conditions rather than the existing Comp Plan. For each scenario, project descriptions summarized the differing impacts or results from housing, population and job projections, land use policies, transportation and infrastructure improvements, growth management strategies, Zoning Code amendments, and sustainability measures. The City Council had expressed a desire to understand all ramifications before selecting a preferred scenario. For the current document, staff prepared a range of potential scenarios. The EIR illustrated potential impacts of potential decisions and programs. The final preferred alternative could be a combination of scenarios. Once the City Council selected the final scenario, Staff would perform additional sensitivity testing to determine whether the EIR covered all topics. The four scenarios did not propose any significant land use changes. Scenario 4 proposed changing the zoning designation of the Fry's site from multifamily residential to mixed use. The first scenario was the "business as usual" or the no project scenario as required by CEQA. Scenario 2 proposed the slowest growth of all the scenarios. The third scenario, housing reconsidered, proposed slower growth but not as slow as Scenario 2. Scenario 4 was a sustainability-tested scenario. Areas of significant unavoidable impacts were greenhouse gas and transportation. Areas of less than significant impacts were biological resources, geology, soils, hazards and population and housing. All other areas were determined to have impacts that could be successfully mitigated. In terms of aesthetics, the goal was to ensure visual character was not degraded. For cultural resources, it was important to ensure historic resources were not demolished or altered. A fifth scenario would be published as a supplement to the EIR in approximately October 2016. Staff anticipated providing a Final EIR covering all five scenarios in May 2017.

Board Member Bunnenberg inquired whether Board Members could submit personal comments and comments made in public. Ms. Lee replied yes. Board Member Bunnenberg asked if declaring a preference for a scenario constituted taking a position. Ms. Lee advised that Board Members could comment on both the update of the Comprehensive Plan and scenarios.

Chair Bernstein inquired whether a definition of compatible had been published and whether creative design had been identified. Ms. Lee explained that the EIR identified additional things that needed to be accomplished after adoption of the EIR. Identification of methods to implement projects would occur after adoption of the EIR.

Board Member Bunnenberg indicated the main threats to historic structures were transportation projects, large redevelopment projects and land values. She suggested the Comp Plan recognize the threats of transportation projects and redevelopment projects and include a sphere, perhaps 150 feet, of potential effect around historic properties that would allow the HRB to comment early in the process. She proposed staff submit comments from the HRB to the ARB and to the City Council. She preferred the slow or very slow growth scenarios.

Board Member Baltay wanted the EIR to address the potential impact of reducing parking requirements for some higher-density residential developments. Allowing only one parking unit per development was worth study and could have the impact of making it easier for builders and architects to develop units, which could encourage or force people to use alternate means of transportation. The EIR should study in detail the impact of changing parking requirements in a non-obvious way to promote greater densities of housing.

Board Member Bower noted San Francisco had adopted a limited parking requirement for buildings which resulted in vast amounts of cars parking on the street. Therefore, he would be hesitant to do the same. The HRB was constantly faced with destruction of historic resources without a means to stop the destruction. He hoped that would be recognized in the new Comp Plan, and that the new Comp Plan would contain better tools to deal with destruction of historic resources. The DEIR discussed potential shade and shadow impacts as it impacted open public spaces. That should be broadened to surrounding structures.

Vice Chair Lew inquired whether the EIR could evaluate proposals contained in other cities' general plans and perhaps incorporate some proposals in the new Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Lee reported some proposals were being evaluated in the Comp Plan update process. In addition, staff was following Comprehensive Plan updates in East Palo Alto and Menlo Park. The EIR studied impacts from traffic, population and greenhouse gas emissions in the cumulative analysis. Vice Chair Lew was struck by the similar numbers of the four scenarios, but the aesthetics of the four scenarios were potentially very different. He suggested the four scenarios contain illustrations of the aesthetics for each scenario. He also suggested traffic data be illustrated with graphics. He liked the shadow studies for public open space and was interested in the standards for shading impacts.

Board Member Kohler requested a list of accomplishments resulting from the Comprehensive Plan. He had reviewed several Comprehensive Plans over the years of his service on the HRB; however, conditions in the City never seemed to improve.

Board Member Furth suggested the ARB schedule a study session to discuss the Comprehensive Plan. Baseline numbers in the DEIR would be helpful to determine the percentage of change. An important point of the EIR was that it circumscribed the outer limit of possible policy changes that would not require further environmental review. However, the document did not go far enough. Small changes in vehicle miles traveled per capita meant an overall increase in vehicles mile traveled, which suggested decreased mobility. The Transportation Element seemed to have inadequate measures to address mobility. Based on her cycling experiences, onsite bicycle parking requirements did not support a more aggressive and intensive use of bicycles for short trips. That should be addressed in the Transportation Element. She suggested the document include a table of acronyms. With respect to Scenario 3, she was unsure how

focusing on working professionals and ignoring lower-income groups was admirable or consistent with federal and state housing policy. She did not feel they had adequate tools to think about that. She suggested more discussion of the environmental effects of demolition of existing buildings. In analyzing the "business as usual" scenario, staff should assume that all sites would be built to maximum FAR with underground parking. She expressed concern regarding the effects of that in terms of intensity of development and in terms of greenhouse gas and other pollution issues. It was now possible to have a light-industry software factory in any space except a retail space. Actually, it could even occur in a retail space. That issue should be addressed. She expressed concern that small professional offices were being replaced with larger uses and that urban greenery was being lost. They needed analytic tools to indicate whether redevelopment would increase greenery and to determine whether development would result in heat islands. She did not find an analysis of heat islands in the DEIR. She hoped proposed demolition regulations for historic resources and evaluation of potential historic resources were tied together. She expressed concerns regarding loss of views of the Foothills and the skyline changing from greenery to buildings. Perhaps the definition of scenic highways should be expanded.

Board Member Kim agreed that illustrations and drawings and that a study session would be helpful. In addition, summaries indicating Comprehensive Plan and EIR components subject to ARB review would be helpful. They needed better definitions of high quality and creative design as they could be subjective. He asked if another draft would be reviewed after the City Council reviewed it on June 6th. Ms. Lee explained that if the EIR included all the analysis the Council felt was necessary and identified all mitigation measures, then that piece would be packaged in the form of a Final EIR. An environmental analysis of the fifth scenario would be a separate companion document to the Draft EIR. At the end of the process, both documents would be addressed in the Final EIR. If the City Council identified a new scenario or other items that had not been fully analyzed in the EIR, then staff would prepare a full analysis of that in a second supplement to the EIR, which would be subject to the full review process. Board Member Kim inquired whether a draft of the Final EIR would be reviewed or submitted to Council for certification. Ms. Lee reported the Final EIR was required to be circulated for a minimum of 10 days for public comment. If no further comments were received or changes needed, then the Final EIR would be certified by the City Council.

Chair Bernstein concurred with comments regarding a study session. The HRB was encouraging applicants to request a study session with the HRB prior to submitting an application. Perhaps the EIR could include encouragement of study sessions with the HRB. With respect to POP-4A, page 8, affordable housing should be placed on the site being considered rather than elsewhere. A study session regarding a historic resource should be required and should include review of an area of potential effect. Perhaps the DEIR could analyze a central district where cars were prohibited. Scenario 3 should include analysis of lower-income households in areas of increased housing densities.

Chair Gooyer felt the priority had been housing, which resulted in housing being placed in commercial or R&D areas. Scenario 3 was the most practical scenario. TOD was the future and the most practical approach.

The following items will be heard by the Architectural Review Board only.

- 4. 4175 Manuela Avenue [15PLN-00129]:** Request by Kevin Davies, on behalf of Congregation Kol Emeth, for Architectural Review to demolish an existing one story synagogue facility totaling approximately 11,691 square feet and construction of a new synagogue facility with approximately 23,555 sf. In addition, but not specifically subject to the Architectural Review Board's review, are requests for a Variance to exceed the maximum allowable floor area by approximately 4943 square feet for a portion of the building with a vaulted ceiling over 17 feet in height. This request is not for actual floor area, but volume space that by code is counted toward the floor area maximum and relates more toward building mass as opposed to the intensity of the proposed use. A Variance is also requested to allow the access ramp to the subterranean garage, as well as the below grade garage itself, to encroach into the special setback. Religious facilities in the residential districts are also subject to a Conditional Use

Permit. The Variance and Conditional Use Permit is not the subject of the hearing, but the public may comment on these application requests. Environmental Assessment: This project is exempt from environmental review pursuant to a CEQA Guidelines Sections 15061, 15302 and 15303. Zoning District: Single Family Residential District (R-1(20,000)). For more information, contact Ranu Aggarwal at RAggarwal@m-group.us

[The Board heard this item following Item Number 2.]

Jodie Gerhardt reviewed details of the proposed project. This was the ARB's second review of the project. Key issues were pedestrian access and circulation; the wood lattice; visual impacts of the garage ramp; and the experience of the surface connection to below-grade parking. Staff recommended the ARB recommend approval of the project to the Director based upon architectural review findings and the conditions of approval.

Stan Field, Field Architecture, shared the inspiration for and orientation of the project.

Jess Field, Field Architecture, provided details of the lattice design, examples of other uses of wood lattice, and samples of materials.

Spike Brion [phonetic] related the numbers of service attendees who parked on the street and at Aldersgate. Attendees parked on neighborhood streets before parking in the Aldersgate lot. Even with additional parking spaces in the proposed project, 30-plus cars would still park on the street. The new facility would need a second level of underground parking.

Paul Johnston was pleased with and satisfied by changes proposed to address his concerns. Staff had accepted those changes and included them in the conditions.

David Booth, Kol Emeth Rabbi, did not project actual or substantive growth of the congregation in the future. He hoped to offer communal and Jewish activities at the new facility.

Dan Siegel, attorney for applicant, noted the proposed building was shorter than the current building and significantly shorter than allowed heights for a residence on the site. The congregation wanted a modern and efficient facility. The congregation was not growing. A requested variance was before the Planning and Transportation Commission. Attendees were parking in legal spaces.

Peter Wexler indicated the Kol Emeth Board was concerned with and responsive to community concerns. He appreciated staff's engagement with the project.

Yvonne Boxerman provided comments from neighbors at meetings held regarding the proposed project. Attendees parked legally on the street on some Saturdays, not every Saturday.

Board Member Kim requested the number of people who biked to Kol Emeth. Kevin Davies reported a traffic analysis was performed and submitted. Approximately 15-17 people walked or biked to services.

Board Member Baltay asked if the greenery on the stair landing, shown on Sheet A17 was documented in the landscape plan. Mr. Davies advised that it was not, but it could be included.

Board Member Furth asked if the neighborhood had sidewalks. Ms. Gerhardt responded no. Board Member Furth requested an explanation of the relationship between proposed improvements and the property line and the City right-of-way. She inquired whether the garden was located in the right-of-way and about any treatment in place of a public sidewalk along the frontage of the building. Ms. Gerhardt advised that the project was adhering to a special 30-foot setback which allowed front landscaping. The proposed walkway would be located on private property. Board Member Furth asked if landscaping was located on the street side of the property line. Ms. Gerhardt advised the landscaping was similar to a planting strip. There was landscaping located street side. Board Member Furth asked if the walkway met

ADA requirements and would be lit for 24-hour access. Mr. Davies indicated the sidewalk would be constructed to meet accessibility requirements. Lighting had not been designed, but would meet the minimum requirements. The applicant did not want light pollution in the neighborhood. Board Member Furth asked if short-term bike areas were located adjacent to and backed into the drop-off area. Ms. Gerhardt reported bike areas should not back into a drive aisle; however, there were some tight corners around the administration building.

Board Member Kim was pleased with the refinements to the project. The majority of his concerns had been addressed and resolved. There seemed to be a lack of bicycle parking; however, it was sufficient for the number of cyclists indicated by the applicant. Mr. Davies advised the project provided 20 spaces, one more than the Code required. Board Member Kim inquired whether there was a plate backing on some lattice members going across the two buildings as shown on Sheet A16.1. Mr. Jess Field explained that additional vertical slats would be welded between wood lattice members to replace the need for columns. Those would be concealed behind wood and serve essentially as a box beam for the span. Board Member Kim asked if the plate was the same profile as the wood lattice piece and hidden behind the wood. Mr. Field answered yes. Board Member Kim disclosed that he visited Field Architecture's office to view the mockup. He was pleased with the choice of wood. He asked if the applicant choose the old-growth species rather than the newer wood. Mr. Davies felt the pieces could be interchanged if necessary in the future. Board Member Kim was pleased with Condition 19 regarding maintenance of the wood lattice. The circulation diagrams were helpful. He had minor concerns regarding pedestrians crossing vehicular entrances to the site. Mr. Davies advised that surface parking on Saturdays would be assigned and others would park below. Mr. Booth reported parking attendants directed traffic on Saturday mornings and Tuesdays. Board Member Kim noticed Condition Numbers 4 and 23 were similar; perhaps they could be combined. Board Member Kim inquired whether the applicant agreed to only eight events in a year as stated in Condition Number 16. Mr. Davies stated the applicant did agree. Analysis of events indicated only seven events with more than 300 attendees were held in a year.

Vice Chair Lew could support the project. The parking seemed reasonable. The triangular lot made everything more difficult. If the existing concrete fence was repainted, staff should review the color choice. Any lighting at the driveway entrance and signage should be approved by staff. Mr. Davies advised that signage would meet requirements.

Board Member Baltay could support the project as a whole. He expressed concern that staff supported the requested variance as it was not floor area square footage, but second-story compatibility. That was what the floor area regulations were intended to reduce. A building taller than 17 feet affected the appearance of the bulk of the building. Correspondingly, other parts of the building should be reduced in size. He could not support that type of variance finding based on that logic, especially as it was in or close to a residential neighborhood. He felt the design was compatible and would be more compatible because the project removed a large parking lot. The variance issue was not within the ARB's purview. Mr. Davies noted the proposed facility was shorter than the existing facility. Board Member Baltay was sympathetic with neighbors' concerns about parking; however, the project seemed to meet all parking requirements. A second underground parking garage was well beyond Code requirements. The wood slat design was beautiful. It would require regular maintenance. He questioned whether the ARB could require the applicant to submit a photographic record of the status of the lattice every 2 years; however, that was not entirely fair to the applicant. Condition Number 19 was open-ended. The landscaping in the stairwell was a good idea and should be included in the final project.

Board Member Furth felt the project was difficult to think about in terms of the standards applied by the ARB. The existing facility was a conditionally permitted use in a residential neighborhood; in an atypical R-1 district; backed up to Foothill Expressway; lacked continuous sidewalks; close to Arastradero; and radically underparked for bicycles. She was concerned by the sidewalk connection with Arastradero. The project requested a significant reduction in parking; the project reduced bicycle parking as well as car parking. She could find no justification and found it undesirable to reduce parking for bicycles. She did not support a second level of car parking. The applicant should facilitate alternative methods of transport. The bike parking areas were not separated by distance or physical barriers from automobile

circulation. The project proposed alternate transportation and a TDM; however, there was no safe way for people to walk from Arastradero to the site. Condition Number 27 was not the solution. Requiring a discussion would not meaningful address a project. The City should require a design and a financial contribution towards that project at the time a project could be built. That could and should be included in a conditional use permit. That needed to be a much more serious condition.

Chair Gooyer agreed that the project had progressed. From a distance, the lattice wall would appear to be a 15-foot wood fence in front of the building. No one from the neighborhood or the public had expressed such a concern. The examples of uses of the wood lattice were institutional facilities, not the entrance to a residential area. He could agree to requiring a photograph of the wall be submitted every two years. He did not disagree with granting the variance.

MOTION: Board Member Furth moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lew, to approve the project as recommended by Staff with the following modifications: (1) the City be provided with a recorded public access easement over the walkway across the front of the property; (2) the access easement be lit to appropriate standards for a public sidewalk; (3) the bicycle parking requirement be increased to 31 spaces; (4) in June of even-numbered years for three occurrences, commencing 2 years after construction of the project, a report be filed with the City documenting the required maintenance of the wooden screen at the front of the property including photographic documentation; and (5) the location of the bicycle parking spaces and any associated landscape changes return to the subcommittee.

Chair Gooyer inquired whether landscaping should return to the subcommittee. Board Member Furth would consider bringing back the location of the bicycle parking spaces and any associated landscape changes to the subcommittee. Mr. Davies advised the site did have appropriate space for additional bike parking.

Ms. Gerhardt inquired whether documentation of the lattice wall maintenance was one-time. Board Member Furth responded no. Chair Gooyer stated after four years they would be able to determine whether maintenance was a problem. Board Member Kim did not believe maintenance documentation should be a requirement as the congregation would be responsible to maintain it as needed. The Board had not required other applicants to submit documentation to demonstrate weathering and maintenance of materials.

Board Member Furth inquired whether there had been at some point a condition requiring construction of a sidewalk to Arastradero. Ms. Gerhardt indicated Condition Number 27 was the only condition regarding a sidewalk to Foothill.

AMENDMENT: Add conditions: (6) require staff to approve the color of new paint on the fence along Foothill; (7) the applicant be required as a condition of approval to participate in funding of a new sidewalk connecting the premises to the nearest sidewalk on either Foothill or Arastradero.

Board Member Furth believed requiring the applicant to participate in funding a new sidewalk connection was reasonable in view of the requested parking reduction and the site was a place of public assembly that needed to encourage pedestrian and bicycle access. Board Member Baltay questioned the requirement due to the potential expense of the sidewalk. Chair Gooyer questioned who would be the additional participants in funding the sidewalk. Board Member Furth replied the City. The Board needed a design for the sidewalk if it wanted to include specific numbers; however, there was no design. It was not reasonable to require the applicant to fund the entire sidewalk. It was appropriate to require some funding as the proposed project would intensify use of the site. Chair Gooyer questioned whether people would walk down Foothill Expressway to reach the site. Board Member Furth clarified that it would more likely be a link to transit. Vice Chair Lew noted the County's 2040 plan included an addition of pedestrian access on Foothill. Board Member Furth stated staff was quite capable of determining the appropriate level or amount of funding.

Board Member Baltay inquired whether realistically staff could follow-up with the documentation required every 2 years. Ms. Gerhardt indicated it would have a staff impact, and she would need to determine the best way to track it. Chair Gooyer suggested one report after 3 years. Board Member Baltay explained that for the first 3 years the congregation would maintain the wall, but after 10 years the appearance could be different. He was concerned because it was a dramatic facade with wood. Board Member Furth advised that a maintenance condition already existed; the motion concerned reporting. Vice Chair Lew was more concerned that someone would decide to paint the wood wall rather than continually maintain it. Board Member Baltay suggested one review after 5 years. In 5 years, maintenance or the lack of maintenance would be obvious.

AMENDMENT: Change (4) to: in June, 5 years after construction of the project, a report be filed with the City documenting the required maintenance of the wooden screen at the front of the property including photographic documentation.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0-0-0

Mr. Davies inquired whether the easement dedication was a recommendation or a condition. Board Member Furth indicated it was a recommended condition. The applicant had a choice of providing one in the public right-of-way, which was undesirable, or having a lighted PAE that provided the applicant could relocate it or shut it off.

5. **355 University Avenue [15PLN-00237]:** Request by Hayes Group Architects, on behalf of Palo Alto Masonic Temple Association, for Major Architectural Review, Historic Review, and Seismic Rehabilitation Floor Area Bonus for a new façade and signage, new second story with outdoor rooftop patio area, and interior modifications at 355 University Avenue, and a new façade and site improvements to the ground floor and adjacent public alley at 461 Florence Street for Design Within Reach. The project requests approval of a seismic rehabilitation floor area bonus for the addition of the new second story. Environmental Assessment: Categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per CEQA Guideline Section 15301 Existing Facilities, Section 15304 Minor Alterations to Land, and Section 15311 Accessory Structures. Zoning District: Downtown Commercial (CD-C(GF)(P)). For more information, contact Rebecca Atkinson at rebecca.atkinson@cityofpaloalto.org

Rebecca Atkinson reported the applicant had updated the project plan set since March 10, 2016 and responded to feedback from the ARB, HRB and staff. She provided full-sized sheets of selected aspects of the plan set. The applicant had compiled a series of options for the different elevations. The arrangement of planters did not allow for much pedestrian waiting in the recessed area; therefore, Staff included a condition of approval to remove some planters. Staff requested feedback regarding the wood siding on the University Avenue facade in relation to the metal louvers on the Florence Street side. She reviewed details of the options for the ground-floor area. The Director determined the project represented a correct use of the seismic rehabilitation floor area bonus; the proposed changes in building height, length and envelope were minor and pedestrian oriented; and there was no floor area bonus remainder. Staff recommended the ARB recommend approval to the Director based on the draft findings and conditions of approval. The applicant requested discussion of Condition of Approval Numbers 12 and 28. With respect to Condition Number 28, there was some question regarding whether the findings in regard to pedestrian orientation could be made with or without the curb in place. The applicant requested discussion of the timing of the project returning to the subcommittee. The applicant provided samples of new materials.

Board Member Furth noted Condition Number 12 concerned a public access easement. Ms. Atkinson indicated the easement would cover those features the ARB might include in the ground-floor area in order to make findings.

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects, had revised the design to address comments from both the ARB and HRB and provided alternatives to discuss.

Laith Sayigh, DFA Architects, explained changes to and options for the design.

Chair Gooyer was disappointed with the applicant providing options for the ARB to select. The applicant should provide the design on which the ARB would comment. Ms. Gerhardt indicated staff requested the applicant provide options for use of the Florence area.

Board Member Baltay requested the width of the white portal frame on the original application and as currently proposed. Mr. Sayigh indicated the width increased from 5 feet to more than 6 feet. Ms. Atkinson added that the dimension change was included in the staff report. The current width was 6 feet 7 inches.

Board Member Baltay felt the increased width of the portal frame was an improvement, but still not the proportions he wanted to see. The planters detracted from the usefulness of walking nearby, and they would not weather well. The lattice work in front of the structural glazing also detracted from the quality of the design. The idea of wood veneer inside would be better. The concept was handsome overall. He appreciated the space planning idea of the basement. He could support the facade. He was very concerned about the Florence Street facade. The owner was requesting a large approval and extra square footage; however, the architect was not doing much to the facade. The facade needed more vitality and life, perhaps some windows or other changes. The site was challenging with the alley, parking, and upper facade. Mr. Sayigh explained that the applicant was not renting that part of the building. It was very tricky for the applicant to do anything to that part of the building that affected the functionality of the building. The applicant attempted to provide a design that cleaned up the facade without changing the usage of the space; yet, the Board continued to request changes. Mr. Hayes clarified that the site contained two distinct buildings. The building receiving the seismic upgrade faced University Avenue. The applicant did not have any right to do anything to the second building. Chair Gooyer asked why the applicant presented the second building. If the applicant had no control over the building, then the applicant should not have shown it. Ms. Gerhardt advised all buildings were on the same legal parcel. Chair Gooyer asked if there was one owner for both buildings. Mr. Hayes assumed the lodge owned both buildings. Design Within Reach was leasing the space from the Masonic Lodge. Design Within Reach originally leased the ground floor of the building, but the space was illegal. From the City's standpoint, the space did not exist, and Design Within Reach could not use it. Because the ground floor was originally leased by Design Within Reach, it was shown to the ARB. Board Member Baltay viewed the situation as one property owner who needed to upgrade the property as a whole. The property owner was receiving benefit from the tenant's improvements. Palo Alto had a long history of public murals. He suggested a mural or a trompe l'oeil on the facade. Painting it white or adding a large louver were not acceptable ideas. A public gathering spot or a place for transients to congregate was not needed. Perhaps the ground-floor space could be a public bicycle parking space along the alley. An empty space was not a positive improvement.

Board Member Furth believed the University Avenue frontage and use would be a great addition to the street. She liked the open, accessible, visible aspects and the roof terrace. With respect to the frontage, the Code allowed the ARB to select among 18-inch setbacks for pedestrian usage, landscaping, and a third option she couldn't remember. The ARB had discretion on that point. The alley was not supposed to be a place for trash storage. Without the trash bins, the alley could be a successful space within the City. The Zoning Code and the Urban Design Guidelines stated to avoid blank walls. She could forego fenestration on the Florence blank wall. A Byzantine mosaic or a living wall would be fine. She wanted assurance that the building frontages facing the alley would be cleaned and painted. That should be a condition, if it wasn't already. She strongly supported converting the ground-floor space to bicycle parking, including space for bicycles with trailers. Trash storage in the remaining space would be a good long-term solution, but that was within the landlord's discretion. She favored an approach that was well lit, well landscaped, and contained some seating. Bicycle parking should be available, if not 24 hours a day at least until other businesses closed. With respect to the curb, she did not know of a good design. She preferred bollards over curbs.

Board Member Kim believed the planters could work on the University side, but they needed a relationship to the storefront mullions. Fewer planters would allow space for people to congregate. He preferred the wood paneling over the metal louvers; however, the wood grain would be lost at that height and distance. Making the storefront appear smaller by surrounding it in a dark color was handsome and a nice solution. For the Florence Street facade and space, he preferred the full open space option. The rollup doors would have to close for security reasons. The proportions of the main entrance on University Avenue were slightly awkward. The double doors should be double the width of the storefront mullions; that might be the reason for the awkwardness.

Vice Chair Lew preferred the wood veneer option for the University Avenue side. He agreed with comments regarding the planters; fewer would be better. He could support the wider doorway. He was not happy with the proposal for the Florence Street facade and space. He preferred using the space for public art. The space was not appropriate for public gatherings. He would not expect to find bike parking at this location. He supported some sort of space for employees to gather in the alleyway. He preferred murals for the blank facade. He did not like metal louvers on the white wall. He inquired whether the University and Florence buildings could be separated for possible approval. Ms. Gerhardt explained the buildings were located on one legal parcel and should be kept together. The City Art Department was interested in the empty space; however, there was no funding or plan for the space. If the Board approved using the space for public art, a backup plan would be needed for the space. Ms. Atkinson clarified that Staff suggested adjusting the location of shutters so that the space could be opened and programmed by the Public Art Department. She added that other entities could be interested in the space.

Chair Gooyer noted revisions to the University facade were based on two comments. Neither the wood veneer nor the metal louver was a solution to the question asked. The door was awkward in the overall proportion. The mesh seemed arbitrary in that it stopped two-thirds of the way to the door. The facade needed rethinking. The planters did not add to the architecture. He did not like either option for the Florence Street facade. The empty space was just an invitation for people to congregate.

Board Member Kim did not want the Florence Street building to hold up approval of the University Avenue building. Chair Gooyer stated that was the project. The design was focused on the interior, and the facades did not match the quality of the interior. Ms. Gerhardt advised that changes could be returned to the subcommittee, if the Board felt the changes were minor. Board Member Baltay felt changes were not appropriate for referral to the subcommittee. He asked if the project could be conditioned such that the applicant could apply for a building permit for the University building, but the permit could not be issued until the ARB cleared the entire project. Ms. Gerhardt reported the applicant could apply for concurrent building permits at their own risk. Board Member Baltay wished to find a way for the applicant to tell the property owner that the property owner needed to address the rest of the property before the owner could lease to the applicant. Mr. Hayes wanted to find a way to bifurcate the two elements. He suggested tying the occupancy permit for the store with approval of the Florence Street building, so that construction on the store could begin while they continued addressing the Florence Street building. Mr. Sayigh clarified that the applicant was paying rent on the space it would donate to the City as a space for bike parking or public art. Chair Gooyer stated the applicant's deal with the landlord was not within the purview of the ARB.

Board Member Furth did not believe the building could be approved because the Florence frontage did not comply with the Code or the Urban Design Guidelines. Perhaps the ARB could agree on a condition that sent that aspect of the project to the subcommittee. Both Chair Gooyer and Board Member Baltay did not feel that issue was appropriate for the subcommittee. Board Member Furth suggested the Board reach consensus on a direction for the facade. Ms. Gerhardt suggested the Board attempt consensus on each aspect of the project.

Board Member Baltay could support the University Avenue facade with the wood if the planters were removed. Vice Chair Lew preferred the wood and agreed with the reduction of two planters. Board Member Furth preferred the wood and had no opinion about the planters. Board Member Kim preferred

the wood and reducing the number of planters. Chair Gooyer felt the whole proportion of the front elevation was off. He could not accept the University Avenue elevation.

Ms. Atkinson reported the alley facade would be painted white. Project plans showed that the 461 Florence Street building would be cleaned and repainted the existing color. The security gate and new stairway would be gray. Board Member Furth inquired about changes to the barred windows. Ms. Atkinson indicated no changes were proposed for the windows on the 461 building. Mr. Hayes added that there would be lighting in the alley.

Board Member Baltay suggested continuing the item to a date certain to allow the applicant to return with minor changes to the University facade. Chair Gooyer understood four Board Members had stated they could approve the University facade. Board Member Baltay wanted the applicant to reconsider the proportions. In addition the applicant could work with staff to determine a process to separate the two buildings and have proposals for use of the empty space. Mr. Hayes wished to bifurcate the two buildings such that the University building could proceed while they worked out the Florence building. Chair Gooyer asked how that would help the applicant. Mr. Hayes explained construction of the main store could proceed. They had applied for building permits. Chair Gooyer inquired whether the applicant hoped to receive a building permit for the University building without approval of the Florence building. Mr. Hayes answered yes. Chair Gooyer did not believe that was feasible. Ms. Gerhardt advised that they could say no issuance of TCO for the retail space until the Florence issue was resolved. Board Member Furth was very concerned about effectively tying the two buildings together. Mr. Sayigh advised that the project would likely fail without approval at today's meeting. Board Member Baltay reiterated his suggestion to continue the item for 2 or 4 weeks.

MOTION: Board Member Baltay moved, seconded by Board Member Kim, to continue the item to a date certain of May 19, 2016, at which time the applicant would return with final revisions to the University Avenue facade and, after working with Staff, proposals to address Florence Street modifications.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0-0-0

Chair Gooyer inquired whether staff would discuss a plan for the project. Ms. Gerhard would discuss the issue with the Director and the City Attorney.

Minutes Approval:

None.

Subcommittee Item

None.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Board Member Furth requested a study session regarding the Draft EIR for the Comprehensive Plan. Vice Chair Lew felt there were two items: the DEIR and the Comprehensive Plan. Board Member Furth wished to discuss the aesthetics section. It seemed to omit some important elements. If Board Members agreed that the ARB wasn't or couldn't evaluate aspects of projects, then shaping mitigation measures in the Comprehensive Plan EIR was a good way to make that happen. Chair Gooyer inquired whether Board Member Furth was interested in a discussion or having someone present to review the finer points. Board Member Furth was more interested in Board Members' views. The criteria for aesthetic evaluation and proposed mitigation measures and level of significance drove what happened in the Comp Plan. Public comments regarding neglected aesthetic aspects were interesting. If it was properly mitigated, the City would be better looking in the future. Board Member Baltay would support scheduling a study session if the goal was for the Board to speak as a unified voice and impact the process. Board Member Furth concurred. Board Member Baltay stated it would be appropriate for the Chair to appoint a

subcommittee to develop a plan. Board Member Furth wished to consider the important as well as the urgent.

Board Member Furth was willing to serve on a subcommittee. Chair Gooyer requested a second Board Member volunteer for the subcommittee. Vice Chair Lew did so. Board Member Baltay suggested all Board Members submit written comments. Board Member Furth stated that would violate the Brown Act.

MOTION: Board Member Furth moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lew, to form a subcommittee to review the Comprehensive Plan DEIR.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0-0-0

Vice Chair Lew attended the Council meeting concerning revisions to architectural review findings. The Council proposed many revisions and referred the item back to the ARB for comment. Chair Gooyer asked if staff would present an item to the ARB. Ms. Gerhardt responded yes.

Adjournment