



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

DRAFT MINUTES: June 16, 2016

City Hall/City Council Chambers

250 Hamilton Avenue

8:30 AM

Call to Order

Roll Call

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

Absent:

Oral Communications

None

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Gooyer announced that Item 6, the 429 University Avenue project, had been removed from the agenda and scheduled for a date uncertain. Jodie Gerhardt added that the item was removed at the applicant's request.

Ms. Gerhardt reported the July 7 hearing would be canceled, and the July 21 hearing would be canceled unless an item was continued from the current meeting to that date.

Board Member Baltay requested a future agenda item for discussion of the Mercedes Benz dealership project. Prior to receiving another application from the applicant, the ARB should discuss the City Council's reaction and request for the ARB to review the project. He wanted to give the applicant some guidance as to what would or would not be acceptable to the ARB due to the request for rezoning. Chair Gooyer inquired whether Board Member Baltay wished to discuss how the ARB wanted to handle the project. From reading the Council's response to the project, Board Member Baltay understood the Council was asking the ARB to provide guidance regarding scale and mass and allowable FAR that would be appropriate for the site, given that they were proposing to rezone the site. The ARB should provide the applicant guidance as to what might or might not be acceptable. Chair Gooyer did not wish to design the project for the applicant. Board Member Baltay meant basic parameters of site development, such as height limit and FAR. The City had been giving mixed signals regarding development of the site. The applicant was entitled to some guidance as to what might be designed before they spent more money to redesign the project again. Ms. Gerhardt advised the ARB's next hearing would be August 4. She assumed the applicant would provide revisions by that date. She suggested the ARB could hold an early hearing along the lines of a study session, but she thought staff would have revised plans to present in August. Board Member Baltay had no indication the applicant had redesigned the project. If the applicant did have a new design, then the ARB discussion was moot. The least the ARB could do was to provide some guidance. Chair Gooyer asked if the project was on the agenda for August 4. Ms. Gerhardt clarified that August 4th would be the first possible date for the ARB to discuss the project. Board Member Furth would support a study session regarding the project on August 4 if the applicant did not submit a formal request. The project was intertwined with a zoning decision. The ARB's evaluation was

based on one set of assumptions. She would find a discussion regarding the interaction of the different processes and next steps helpful. Board Member Kim was undecided. The Council and Planning Commission should decide the zoning complications and inform the ARB. As those bodies did not do that, perhaps the ARB should discuss the project. Vice Chair Lew was undecided as well. During its discussion, the Council raised several issues that he was not familiar with. Those issues would be worth discussion. Chair Gooyer was concerned about setting a precedent. The ARB had provided ample hints as to what the project should look like; yet, the applicant did not follow those hints. An ARB analysis would be a waste of time. Board Member Baltay noted the current FAR was 0.4 for the site; the applicant had increased the FAR because of rezoning for the automobile dealership. He understood the City Council did not support the increased FAR, only the change of use. The applicant needed to hear what the appropriate FAR was. Amy French advised the discussion was not an agenda item and suggested the ARB hold a retreat on July 21st for this and other topics. Board Member Baltay withdrew his request for an agenda item.

City Official Reports

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

None.

Action Items

- 3. 190 Channing Avenue [16PLN-00094]:** Request by Hayes Group Architects, on behalf of 190 Channing Avenue LLC, for Preliminary Review of demolition of an auto service use and construction of a new 8,730 square foot mixed-use building and site improvements. Environmental Assessment: Preliminary Reviews are not a Project Under the California Environmental Quality Act. Zoning District: RT-35; SOFA CAP II. For more information contact project planner Adam Petersen at APetersen@m-group.us.

Ms. Gerhardt reviewed basic details of the project and noted the 901 High Street project, located adjacent to the Channing Avenue project, would return to the ARB at a future date. The applicant provided options for surface parking and below-grade parking and two options for elevations. The project was required to provide 22 parking spaces; the applicant proposed 20 spaces, a 10 percent reduction, and lifts for some of those spaces. The project provided slightly less than the realistic capacity with respect to dwelling units. Setback requirements might need to be adjusted. Proposed elevator towers and skylights exceeded the 35-foot height limit; however, that might be allowed within mechanical allowances. Staff requested feedback regarding the three different floor plans and the two facades.

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects, explained that the site was surrounded by RT-35 zoning, so there were no impacts from adjacent residentially zoned properties. The existing building was considered retail. Pursuant to the Retail Preservation Ordinance, the use needed to be replaced. He discussed context of buildings surrounding the site, the project statement and program, and a site analysis.

Vice Chair Lew noted the letters of the options in the ARB's packet did not match those in the applicant's presentation. He requested the applicant clarify the intent of the different schemes. Ms. Gerhardt referenced Sheet A0.3. Mr. Hayes clarified that Option B was Option C in the packet. Options A and B were similar, and the applicant preferred Option A because of below-grade parking and the building anchoring the corner.

Mr. Hayes provided details of the proposed project.

Vice Chair Lew requested staff comment on reducing the front setback from 15 feet to 0 with ARB review. Emerson Street appeared to have zero setback from Hamilton to Homer. Mr. Hayes indicated the Jewish Family Center had a zero setback. The edge of the planter at the street provided a couple

feet of setback for relief and to achieve the plinth. The main facade was set back to respect the medical building to the north. The planter in front of that aligned with the building to the south. The applicant attempted to mitigate the setbacks by defining the edge of the sidewalk with the planter and setting back the main facade. Vice Chair Lew noted an oak tree located close to the shared property line. Mr. Hayes advised an arborist would provide an opinion on the oak tree. Vice Chair Lew reported the oak tree was one of only two in the SOFA II area and was protected. Mr. Hayes stated the tree was not on the applicant's property. Vice Chair Lew advised the garage would impact the root structure of the tree. He understood some of the retail would need to utilize parking lifts, which they normally did not allow. Mr. Hayes commented that there was no required retail in the zone and there was no ground-floor restriction. The requirement for retail existed because of the Retail Preservation Ordinance. The applicant had to preserve the square footage of the auto service as a retail-like use. The applicant would need to consult the TDM specialist and traffic consultant to determine how that would work operationally. Retail staff could park in the lifts. The lift could always return to an open space. Vice Chair Lew explained that the lift could return to an open space, but required the use of a key; therefore, the lift was not geared toward short-term use. Parking would be an issue for retail. Mr. Hayes imagined most customers would park in one of the Downtown facilities. Providing convenient parking would contrast with the project promoting pedestrian use. Ms. Gerhardt reported staff had not put retail parking in lifts previously, so there was no precedent.

Board Member Baltay requested staff comment on the requirement that retail be preserved on the site. He asked if that was an absolute requirement, because the staff report seemed to hint that they should consider more housing on the site. Ms. French advised that the Housing Element contained certain sites as housing opportunity sites. The staff included that in the staff report for the Board's information. The Retail Preservation Ordinance was in effect. She would not expect that to change. She suspected a permanent ordinance would be enacted prior to the expiration of the urgency ordinance. Retail was required for the project site.

Chair Gooyer referenced a square on the first slide. In the site plan, the square seemed to encompass the adjacent property. He asked if that was part of the project. Mr. Hayes replied no. Chair Gooyer asked if the square was incorrectly drawn. Mr. Hayes believed the square was enlarged so as to be visible. It did not include the adjacent property.

Jeff Levinsky noted the skylights reached a height of 39 feet. He inquired whether only equipment was allowed to that height. The puzzle lift and underground parking made the situation difficult for retail. Retail at the proposed site would serve more than neighbors as Channing was a busy area. He questioned the compatibility of the proposed building with the Jewish Family Center. Watercourse Way was located in an historic building. The proposed building would be the tallest in the area.

Board Member Baltay had many small concerns regarding the proposed project. He did not see the site being a typical walk-to store as it was a bit off the beaten path. Bona fide retail was not realistic. It would be a wonderful office space. The design enhanced that. It would be perfect for a nice restaurant or a destination place. The use did not quite work. All residential would be a viable use. The SOFA Guidelines promoted preservation of trees and more greenery. The necessity for underground parking would make retaining the existing tree and landscaping very difficult. Mr. Hayes explained that the south side of the property contained a strip designed for a hedgerow of trees. Curves in the garage ramp would be an opportunity for more trees. Board Member Baltay felt that was woefully insufficient to increase greenery. Puzzle lifts were not realistic; people would prefer to park on the street. The overall parking configuration did not work. The building as designed did not have enough pedestrian street friendliness, especially on Channing Street. Two-thirds of the frontage on Channing was not pedestrian oriented. Part of the problem was the location of the stairway from the garage. The balconies seemed excessively large and excessively unmodulated; they were not private. The overall appearance and style of the building picked up some of the mid-century modern blocking and massing, but it was not terribly residential-looking. It looked like a tall and contemporary office building. Collectively these issues would not allow him to support the project at a basic level.

Board Member Kim felt the proposed project would be a nicer experience for pedestrians than the existing auto repair shop. He concurred with Board Member Baltay's comments regarding the pedestrian streetscape, especially along Channing. There would be a dead spot along Channing because of the curb cut, the exterior courtyard wall and the egress stair. There were opportunities to enliven the Channing street front by creating a rhythm that was more inviting. He appreciated the ideas presented in the proposal; however, he did not believe a three-story building would work. The surrounding neighborhood was composed mainly of two-story buildings. The proposed building felt too boxy and too forced. Going down into the basement parking was a dangerous situation with the cars having to make a U-turn. The puzzle lift was not practical for the proposed uses. He was attempting to convince himself that retail customers would park on Emerson, Channing or Downtown and walk to the location. The applicant should accommodate situations where customers needed to park onsite. Mr. Hayes inquired whether Board Member Kim did not support puzzle lifts for the retail use. Board Member Kim did not think it was practical for all uses. Lifts could make sense for an office building or a residential building. As staff stated, the City did not have a precedent for the use of lifts with retail space. The terraces along Emerson Street were quite large. He did not see how residents would use those. He questioned whether the project provided amenities, such as landscape elements, street seating, bicycle parking, to the neighborhood. Bicycle parking was located in the basement. Mr. Hayes clarified that the long-term spaces were located in the basement. Parking would be provided on the surface. Board Member Kim requested more street sections and street elevations. They should be drafted so that the Board could get an accurate sense of neighboring building heights in comparison to the project. He inquired whether the parking reduction would be allowed because the project was a mixed-use one. Ms. Gerhardt advised reductions for shared parking were allowed, and a TDM plan would be required for the project.

Vice Chair Lew felt the site was challenging in terms of context. The SOFA II area contained many elements, but none was strong. Like Board Member Baltay, he questioned whether retail would be viable, as the project was a long way from Hamilton and University. Mr. Hayes asked if personal service would be considered retail-like. Vice Chair Lew indicated that would help and could be a fairly good fit. Mr. Hayes stated the applicant couldn't have medical office. Vice Chair Lew clarified that that type of use was located across the street. That was the range of things that could work on the site. The applicant was attempting to tie into both Channing and Emerson, which appeared to be a stretch. Mr. Hayes stated that was the reason the retail/personal service space was located on the corner. Vice Chair Lew suggested the applicant consider reducing the front setback, because most properties on Emerson had a reduced setback; although, the properties with setbacks were completely paved. That could provide more flexibility for the root zone of the oak tree. There was some opposition to using parking lifts for residential uses; however, they seemed to work fine for a residential use. He talked about the differences in lift systems. He did not understand how parking lifts would work for retail uses. Mr. Hayes noted the parking lift was a concern for the Board and asked if they could have lifts if they could adequately address the Board's concerns. Vice Chair Lew referred to Mr. Brand's concerns about a three-story building. The Code did not restrict buildings based on number of stories. The stories were shorter in the proposed project compared to the building across the street. Mr. Hayes advised the stories were 12-6 floor to floor with a concrete structure, 10 feet for the second-floor residential units and 12 feet. Vice Chair Lew estimated the Jewish Family Center was 15 feet floor to floor plus parapet resulting in an apparent height of 33-34 feet. Line elevations for the streetscape would demonstrate the massing in relation to the building across the street. He did not necessarily disagree with prior comments by Board Members regarding the building design. He may have a slight preference for Option B as it could be more compatible with the building across the street.

Board Member Furth requested her comments not be part of the dialog. She asked if the performance standards regarding common, private and shared open space for the RT district, as stated in the SOFA Guidelines, applied to the project. Ms. Gerhardt responded yes. Board Member Furth did not find that the project complied with standards. The project was an 8,730-square-foot building that's driving force was the accommodation of a 3,400-square-foot residential unit. Mr. Hayes corrected the square footage to 2,700 square feet. Board Member Furth included the office space intended for the owner's use. The smaller apartments should be well designed and attractive for people to live in. She expressed concern about the 10-foot ceilings. She did not support lift parking for retail uses or retail uses at the site

necessarily. The SOFA CAP wanted to focus retail on the Whole Foods access. Retail space should be designed to be more functional than the current proposal. When thinking about a permanent ordinance, staff should consider that the SOFA CAP provided detailed preferences about the kinds of retail spaces that should be preserved. Perhaps this site was not a case for preserving retail, which would allow for more housing. Mr. Hayes indicated no retail space would help the parking issue. Board Member Furth advised that the project did not encourage bike and pedestrian travel. She wanted to see benches, shade, and visible bicycle parking on the street. The corner cutouts did work in redeveloped SOFA. Corner cutouts at other buildings made a point of trees. She requested drawings of the whole block in future submissions. The block containing the project site was a transition to Professorville, which did not have three stories or glass walls. She was concerned about the size and depth of the terraces; they seemed over-scale. She was also concerned about the courtyard aspect of the project.

Chair Gooyer agreed with prior Board comments. The site was difficult because of the scale and the SOFA CAP requirements. In his experience, customers did not utilize lifts provided for retail spaces. The perceived bulk was a concern, because the site was part of a transitional space to Professorville. He questioned whether retail was the best use of the space.

Board Member Kim asked if the skylight was intended to be included in Option A. In the elevations, it was only showing in Option B. Mr. Hayes answered yes. Board Member Kim asked if it would extend above 35 feet in Option A. Mr. Hayes responded yes.

4. ARB Review of Council-Revised Architectural Review Approval Findings. For more information contact Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Amy French reported the Council did not adopt the findings but asked staff to return with a Council item for the findings. The Council then offered modifications. The Council requested the ARB's input on the modifications. Ms. French reviewed the Council's modifications.

Board Member Furth understood the Council's major concern was that the adoption of context-based review standards did not achieve the desired results. In response, the Council added the SOFA CAP findings to Finding Number 2. It was helpful that the Mayor affirmed that a modern building located next to a much older building could be successful. The Council indicated that the ARB did not seem to think that all findings had to be made. She wondered whether the problem was the eight or nine findings and perhaps three dozen possible ways of achieving a project that met the standards. The goal of ARB comments was to communicate to property owners, neighbors and the community how a project would be judged. Verbiage should be eliminated. The ARB should consider adopting language that would inspire confidence in a review in court. She questioned whether the ARB had decision-making powers that allowed it to carry out the Council's wishes. She supported fewer standards organized around particular principles. The Council delivered a good message by saying only applicable rules mattered. The Council delivered a good message by saying the City should have coordinated area plans, but the staff messed it up by including compatibility requirements. There were two separate issues. One was whether the standards were adequate. The second was whether the ARB was applying them in a way that the Council considered to be appropriate. She recommended deleting "including Context Based Design Criteria" and "including compatibility requirements." Putting natural features and the historic character in the same subparagraph messed up the standards a bit. She was puzzled by the inclusion of "existing" natural features. Ms. French suggested it was added to clarify that it was what was there already. Board Member Furth thought the addition of "contributing positively to the site" was a good addition, because she hadn't realized trees were included as natural features. She suggested that Paragraph b end after "contributing positively to the site," and have a new Subparagraph c of "preserve, respect and integrate the historical character of the area including local historic resources, if any." She questioned deletion of the power to require that the project be compatible with adjacent land use designations. Ms. French indicated the Council deleted that language. Board Member Furth urged the Council to put it back, because the ARB dealt with many neighborhoods in transition. With respect to Finding Number 3, she supported the staff's formulation as it was clear and easy to apply. With respect to Finding Number 4, she questioned whether the language was sufficient for the ARB to address bicycle

and pedestrian access along as well as to a site. Ms. French referred to language of ease and safety. Board Member Furth suggested replacing the word access with traffic. With respect to Finding 5, she expressed concern that by referring to native or indigenous plants, they could do something undesirable. She would support staff's proposed language. She did not believe the City Codes were adequate regarding sustainability. Finding 6 could be read to mean that only meeting the Code was fine. That was not what she had in mind. Ms. French suggested objectives could capture ideals. Board Member Furth clarified that the project should be sustainable. Chair Gooyer added that the language was applicable 5-6 years ago, but now was the norm. Ms. French indicated there were green points for innovation. Chair Gooyer suggested language of meeting LEED levels. The bar should be raised from what was done 5 years ago. Board Member Furth wanted to utilize "achieves maximum feasible sustainability," but that was a tough standard. Board Member Baltay noted the City had increased sustainability standards above CALGreen. To go beyond requirements of the Municipal Code was probably duplicitous. Board Member Furth advised that new things evolved and the Code did not catch up. Vice Chair Lew explained that net zero was the new target. The State committed to doing that; therefore, he did not know if the City had to do more. He asked if Board Member Furth wanted to keep the issue as a discussion point in the findings. Board Member Furth did not want to approve a project that would not improve the environment, because there was no sustainability finding. Board Member Baltay referred Board Member Furth to the finding of "incorporates design principles that achieve sustainability." Board Member Furth suggested ending the sentence after "sustainability." Ms. French suggested eliminating green building requirements. Board Member Furth concurred. She questioned whether another finding specifically about compatibility was needed. Context Based Design Criteria and compatibility requirements should not be singled out in the first finding, because they were integral parts of the Code. Chair Gooyer would prefer not to have another finding regarding compatibility. Ms. French explained that she attempted to reduce the wording in the Council proposal for Finding 2. Board Member Furth suggested the only change in Finding 1 would be to talk about the applicable provisions rather than the applicable elements. Ms. French stated provisions would include elements, policies, and programs.

The Board agreed with changes as shown in the preamble.

In Finding 1, Board Member Furth suggested substituting "provisions" for "elements" in the second line. The Board agreed.

In Finding 2, Board Member Kim felt "internal sense of order" could be confusing. Ms. French indicated it referred to the interior of the site. Board Member Kim asked if that should be specifically stated. Board Member Furth felt it could be deleted, because the Board reviewed the whole project. Ms. French asked if the Board wanted to delete "internal" and retain "sense of order." Board Member Baltay asked if the language on the screen was the complete finding in placement of the larger paragraph. Ms. French reported it was staff's suggestion, because they placed compatibility requirements relating to coordinated area plans in Finding 1. Board Member Baltay suspected the Council would insist on adding something contextual, that word. Board Member Furth suggested "is compatible with the context of existing development." Chair Gooyer inquired whether she meant "provides compatibility in scale and character to adjacent land uses." Board Member Furth suggested a new "c" of "is compatible with its setting," "d" would be "provides harmonious transitions," and "e" would be "enhances living conditions." Vice Chair Lew noted the Board had not discussed that large sections of the City were not subject to the Compatibility Code. This would add it to the Research Park, General Manufacturing, Public Facility zones. Ms. French explained that the language acknowledged that large sites might not have the pattern that was found in an urban setting as far as building articulation, rhythm and those kinds of things. Vice Chair Lew remarked that a house in a residential district next to an office building in a commercial district triggered a daylight plane. A house in a business district did not automatically trigger a daylight plane. This would give some discretion over that. Ms. French indicated a better way would be to amend the Code. The Board agreed to changes as discussed.

In Finding 3, Chair Gooyer preferred "integrated" over "holistic." The Board agreed to changes.

In Finding 4, Board Member Kim recalled the suggestion to change "access" to "traffic." The Board agreed to changes.

In Finding 5, the Board agreed to changes.

In Finding 6, the Board agreed to changes.

Board Member Baltay inquired whether a Board Member could attend the Council discussion to represent the Board's views. Ms. French advised if discussion was needed, then an ARB Member would be invited to attend the hearing.

MOTION:

Board Member Furth moved, seconded by Board Member Baltay, to approve the Findings as discussed and agreed.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0

5. **450 Bryant Street [16PLN-00092]:** Request by Lisa Hendrickson on behalf of Avenidas, for Major Architectural Review of the proposed interior renovation of an existing historic building at 450 Bryant Street, the demolition of an existing 2,592 square foot addition and replacement with a new 10,721 square foot addition, and site improvements on City-owned property in the Public Facilities (PF) zoning district. The net increase in floor area at the property is 8,129 square feet. The project includes a request for a conditional use permit for the expansion of use. Environmental Review: An Initial Study is currently being prepared. For more information contact the project planner Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Board Member Furth recused herself from the item because her personal residence was located within 500 feet of the project.

Ms. French reported this was the first formal hearing of a formal project. Staff was preparing a document in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The project would likely return to the ARB on August 4. Staff requested comments on the project. Ms. French briefly reviewed the project.

Kevin Jones, Kenneth Rodrigues and Partners, reviewed revisions made in response to prior comments.

David Hirsch had submitted a review of the building from an independent standpoint. The Board should consider an alternative proposal if the importance of the garage was questioned and removed. The original building could be enhanced by removing the garage and incorporating the new facility behind the building.

Jeff Levinsky stated the project required a CUP because of zoning and use of the property. He questioned whether parking required by the building could be satisfied by the substantial in-lieu parking payment. The 2014 study of the building was based on a 5,000-square-foot addition of program space. He wondered if that matched the current proposal, which might generate more parking and traffic needs. If the extra parking required by the project was matched by the actual generation of parking spaces, then community concerns and CUP needs would be met.

Martin Bernstein, Historic Resources Board Chair, reported the HRB generally felt the current proposal was heading in the right direction. Modification of the project helped reduce the perceived mass of the building. The ARB could consider a landscape screen for the City parking lot. If his cornice detail were 22-24 inches, it would help the building be perceived as a two-story mass. The cornice detail could be considered compatible with neighboring buildings.

Ms. French added that comments also addressed the all-glass frieze, windows, balcony railings, the floating glass and the top of the roof.

Board Member Baltay requested Mr. Bernstein address the one-story garage building with respect to removing or altering it. Ms. French advised that the garage was the same era as the original building. The project considered removing the garage, but it was presented with the garage in place. Board Member Baltay thought public comments regarding the garage were logical, but wanted to have more context. He asked if the HRB recommended the one-story garage remain. Mr. Bernstein indicated that was the recommendation because of the age and its original use. Board Member Baltay inquired whether retaining the garage was absolutely necessary if the applicant demonstrated that removing or altering it would change the rest of the project in a beneficial way. Mr. Bernstein indicated historic preservation was guidelines and principles. The structure did have history.

Vice Chair Lew asked Mr. Bernstein to explain thinking around compatibility of the new building to the old with respect to materials, window color and other details. Mr. Bernstein referred to page A4.9. The HRB suggested reducing the visibility of the decorative glass panels. The HRB suggested making the eave line, gutter line and fascia thinner to reduce the perceived mass. The colors were compatible. Vice Chair Lew asked if the HRB discussed the gutter and downspout profiles and the copper-colored wrought iron. Mr. Bernstein explained the HRB was more concerned about the massing. Colors and materials were somewhat similar and without high contrast.

Board Member Kim believed the new design was much more in line with the Birge Clark expression. He favored the connector element. The building could have more possibilities if the garage was removed. The choice of materials was consistent with the existing structure. He appreciated attempts to make the perceived mass less. He questioned the metal paneling, how it related to the existing structure, where the design came from and if it could be reduced in height. The way it was used on the glass facade in the rear entry versus the use on the northwest elevation was a different expression. He wondered whether that was appropriate. The overall size of the elevations was difficult. He asked if the height restriction for the site was 50 feet. Ms. French replied correct. He questioned whether the roof pitch could align with the existing roof pitches. He inquired about parking during construction. The cornice detail was a great addition. He questioned whether it could be even taller. Overall he was pleased with the latest design; however, more revisions could be made.

Vice Chair Lew generally supported the project. The historic report and the peer review supported the project as is. They did note the building would be better if it were lower. The three-story addition touched the building in a place that had been altered previously and minimized blocking of views of the back of the building. The courtyard was desirable. He wondered if there was a way to pull back the third floor to reduce the three-story mass facing the courtyard. He suspected that would be better, but it would impact the program. He expressed concern regarding the size of the concrete moldings with the downspouts. That was a critical element. The exterior design did not seem quite right, but he could not name the problem. He wanted to see the details of the metalwork for the balcony railings. He did not find lighting fixtures or photometrics in the submission. With respect to landscape, the hedge along the park and courtyard might be too big and would require frequent pruning. He questioned the rationale for screening the historic building from the park. Other points of concern were gutter profile and eave details. The building could be slightly more contemporary and remain compatible, but it was a fine line.

Board Member Baltay did not find the project compatible. Three stories were too tall against a Birge Clark building and too big against the park. The building was not designed in any way to mitigate its impact on the park. Opening the corner at the park and pushing the building against the alley should be explored. The new building did not respect the proportions of the Birge Clark building. The building did not need more decorative detailing to make a three-story building look like a two-story building. It should downplay its relation to the Birge Clark building. The lobby was too small; the dining area was smaller and less attractive than the current dining room. There were many reasons for redesigning the project.

Chair Gooyer felt the current proposal tended to be more compatible with the existing building with respect to the proportion of some windows, the texture of the skin. However, it still went too far in mimicking the Birge Clark building. Perhaps the cornice could be enhanced on the top of the second floor, and the building could have a flat roof. He liked the patio in the back with the garage. He preferred to keep the garage and do something with the front building. Shifting the volume around the sides and lowering the third floor would not have the same perceived bulk. More design was needed for the ARB to approve the project.

Vice Chair Lew asked if the Director would make the final decision. Ms. French responded yes. An appeal of the Director's decision could be made to the Council, and the CUP could be reviewed by the Planning and Transportation Commission. Vice Chair Lew inquired whether a 2-2 ARB vote could be sent to the Director. Ms. French advised a non-recommendation was not desirable.

Vice Chair Lew suggested the ARB work on reaching three votes for approval of the project. Board Member Baltay asked if Board Members could agree to ask for studies or considerations regarding his comments. Chair Gooyer asked if he meant a study session. Board Member Baltay felt the project had not been fully vetted. Chair Gooyer noted Board Member Baltay seemed to be more opposed to a three-story building than other Board Members. Board Member Baltay thought the Historic Resources Board did not do its job when considering the relationship of the addition to the Birge Clark building. He wanted further review of the garage, because the design could be much better if the garage could be removed. Vice Chair Lew recalled the applicant previously had provided programmatic-level massing, which received a negative reaction. The Board wanted more of the mass facing the park. A two-story option around the back was not considered. Chair Gooyer thought wrapping a two-story L-shaped building around the back did not enhance the Birge Clark building. Board Member Baltay could envision a design that was lower and smaller. The building was too tall at the edge of the park. Board Member Kim inquired about the view of the building from the park. He could see the parking structure and the trees but not too much of the building. A three-story mass at the garage location made it seem much bulkier. Chair Gooyer clarified that Board Member Baltay meant a two-story building in the back. Chair Gooyer liked the variety of the current one-story, two-story and three-story buildings. Board Member Kim noted a 50-foot height limit. Board Member Baltay stated they were trying to match context. Board Member Kim thought they were trying to be compatible to context. Chair Gooyer preferred to worry about compatibility with a landmark than compatibility with a five-story garage across the street. Board Member Baltay was considering compatibility with the park.

Chair Gooyer advised the applicant had more work to do. Three Board Members had voiced concerns, and the fourth was not happy with the project as a whole. Vice Chair Lew was willing to accept a three-story scheme facing the park if the courtyard was compelling. He suspected the building was too high and encroached too much on the courtyard to make the courtyard a great space. Chair Gooyer suggested an alternative was to make the lower two floors larger and trim the third floor.

Vice Chair Lew advised that parking was an important piece of the project. The existing parking lot was deficient in landscaping and really needed improvement. Existing trees did screen the building from the park, but it was really very open. The alley was lined with visible trash cans and should be improved.

Mr. Jones requested the project be continued to a date uncertain so that he could work with staff regarding revisions to the design.

MOTION:

Vice Chair Lew moved, seconded by Board Member Baltay, to continue the item to a date uncertain.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0 Furth recused

6. 429 University Avenue [14PLN-00222]: To Consider an Appeal of the Director of Planning and Community Environment's Architectural Review Approval of a 31,407 Square-Foot, Four Story,

Mixed Use Building With parking Facilities on Two Subterranean Levels on an 11,000 Square-Foot Site. Zoning District: Downtown Commercial (CD-C (GF)(P)) District. Environmental Assessment: Mitigated Negative Declaration. For more information contact project planner Adam Peterson at Adam Peterson at APetersen@m-group.us.

Study Session

None.

Approval of Minutes

7. June 2, 2016

Vice Chair Lew reported in approval of minutes, page 6, that "Vice Chair Lew understood Chair Gooyer appreciated the quality of the drawings rather than the renderings" should be "Chair Gooyer appreciated the quality of the drawing elevations rather than the building design."

MOTION:

Vice Chair Lew moved, seconded by Board Member Baltay, to approve the minutes for the June 2, 2016 meeting as noted.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0 Furth absent, Gooyer abstaining

Subcommittee Items

None.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

None.

Adjournment