



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: September 1, 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

Ken Horowitz referred to the closing of the Page Mill YMCA at 755 Page Mill Road. He requested the Planning Department review the Planned Community zone for the site, the permit issued to the property owner, and determine whether the property owner would allow Page Mill YMCA members to use the facility.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Gooyer moved Approval of Minutes to next on the Agenda because Board Members would likely be absent at the end of the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

June 16, 2016 and August 4, 2016

MOTION

Board Member Baltay moved, seconded by Vice Chair Lew, to approve the Minutes of June 16, 2016 as presented.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0

Vice Chair Lew suggested the Subcommittee Item of August 4 contain the action taken. Jodie Gerhardt noted the equipment malfunctioned during that meeting. Staff had an alternate recording of the meeting which they could use to revise the Minutes and present them at a later meeting.

MOTION

Board Member Kim moved, seconded by Board Member Furth, to return the Minutes of August 4, 2016 to staff for inclusion of additional details of the meeting.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0

City Official Reports

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

Action Items

- 3. 450 Bryant Street [16PLN-92]:** 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/Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared. For more information contact the planner, Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Board Member Furth recused herself from the item as she lived within 500 feet of the proposed project.

Amy French wished to hear testimony regarding the Mitigated Negative Declaration. Comments received from Caltrans were not a concern. The applicant provided two design approaches. Ms. French requested the meeting be continued to a date certain to allow the applicant to prepare a complete plan set for recommendation and action. The proposed project would be presented to the Historic Resources Board on September 8, 2016. With respect to the Mitigated Negative Declaration, aesthetics were within the ARB's purview. Staff did not suggest any mitigation measures. Staff believed the project met the findings; however, the project was not agendized for action. Ms. French reviewed plans and renderings submitted by the applicant.

Kevin Jones, Kenneth Rodrigues and Partners, considered stepping back the third floor; however, Avenidas was concerned about the loss of square footage for the classroom. Mr. Jones reviewed the evolution and details of various aspects of the project.

Martin Bernstein, Historic Resources Board Chair, provided his personal comments regarding the project. On January 22, 2016, he met with Avenidas representatives and Mr. Jones. In his opinion, the fenestration and mullions of the existing accessory unit did not meet Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation. The garage did not have such a strong historical aspect that it needed to be retained. If it were demolished, the new project could be more subordinate to the historic structure in support of the Category 2 visual impact of the main Burge Clark building.

Herb Borock was confused by the Mitigated Negative Declaration being labeled as Initial Study, because he understood those were two separate steps. In addition, he understood the applicant had to agree to implement mitigations contained within the environmental document prior to the document being publicly noticed for review. He suggested a second senior center at Cubberley Community Center would be more appropriate than the proposed expansion.

Ms. French clarified that the Mitigated Negative Declaration was labeled as draft because the Director had not approved the project. The applicant's signature on the document indicated his agreement to the mitigation measures.

Beth Bunnenberg, speaking as an individual, felt the existing garage retained sufficient integrity to be considered historic. She liked the glass hyphen, preferred the red tile, hipped roof, and suggested a flatter, more modern roof tile than the existing one. She preferred the open deck.

Sarah Hahn, Architectural Resources Group, performed the historic resources evaluation. Architectural Resources Group suggested retaining the shed/garage would maximize the number of character-defining features of a property that had been significantly altered.

Charles Chase, Architectural Resources Group, added that a lower addition, which replaced the garage and attached to the rear of the building, would compromise more historic features of the Burge Clark building.

Board Member Baltay agreed with Mr. Bernstein's comments regarding the garage. The impact of a three-story, new addition on the corner of the existing Burge Clark building was a more significant deterioration of the historic quality of the original Burge Clark building than the removal of the one-story garage. He wanted the new addition placed in the location of the existing garage, which would provide architectural solutions to many program problems. He would not agree to a three-story structure next to a park, because the trees did not completely screen the building. He preferred the building be pushed back from the park. Images from 2015 preserved the nature of the Burge Clark building. The garage was not the important or defining part of the project.

Board Member Kim was leaning toward retaining the garage. The three-story mass toward the park was logical because the trees screened the building. The garage showed the transition of old and new. Subordinate did not mean smaller or lower. The new structure was subordinate in that one saw the transitions. He preferred retaining the garage/shed and the hipped roof. Stepping back the third floor provided significant relief to the massing.

Vice Chair Lew questioned whether Board Member Kim preferred Approach 1 or 2. Board Member Kim preferred the smaller version.

Vice Chair Lew noted possible future improvements to Centennial Alley and the parking lot and questioned how those improvements would affect the proposed project. The entrance on Ramona Street was important, but the proposed entrances were very different. He preferred the two or three-story glass entrance because it fit with programming of the project. He also preferred the hipped roof. Vice Chair Lew questioned whether the eave profile for a flat roof could be more narrow at the end. Mr. Jones explained that the eave and extension would be aluminum clad, a steel-frame projection that would reduce in size past the glass line. The color would be the same color as window frames. Vice Chair Lew felt a flat roof was very different in character from the existing building. The character of the overhang on a flat roof was very different from the precast concrete elements. If the garage worked with the courtyard and the addition, he could support the project. The courtyard was better with the step-back on the third floor. The narrow profile improved the proportions along the park frontage.

Chair Gooyer agreed that subordinate did not mean smaller or lower. He preferred Approach 1 with a flat roof and not demolishing the garage and constructing a two-story addition.

Board Member Baltay suggested a four-story building in place of the garage and much smaller in footprint would be subordinate to the Burge Clark building. He asked if the ARB could suggest the applicant study a building to replace the garage. Chair Gooyer added that the two buildings should be distinctive. Board Member Baltay felt a three-story building located on a corner of a park should have the third floor stepped back and the cornice detail better integrated with windows. He could not support the project without a study of replacing the garage with the addition. This was an Important project, and all aspects should be covered.

Vice Chair Lew commented that Board Member Baltay requested a study of a two-story building at the prior hearing, but one was not provided. Board Member Baltay clarified that he wanted basic site planning for a building to replace the existing garage, whether two, three or four stories.

Vice Chair Lew would defer to the HRB regarding retaining the garage. The two historic reports did not indicate the proposed scheme was not acceptable.

Ms. French advised that removing the garage would reset the environmental review process.

Chair Gooyer understood the ARB was split regarding the project. Board Member Kim was not opposed to a flat roof but wanted details of a flat roof and eave to see if the appearance could be thinner at the edge of the building. Chair Gooyer and Vice Chair Lew concurred.

Vice Chair Lew inquired about the location of mechanical equipment for both flat and hipped roofs. Mr. Jones indicated they were located on the original Burge Clark building. Vice Chair Lew asked if ducts would run between the two buildings. Mr. Jones replied water lines rather than ducts.

Board Member Kim asked about Mr. Jones' preference for a flat or hipped roof. Mr. Jones originally supported a modern concept, but the public opposed it. He was comfortable with a sloped roof in a modern way that reduced the sense of mimicry.

Vice Chair Lew remarked that people did not see the roof when it was 40 feet above ground; however, people did see the eaves, windows and downspouts. The Board should consider those details.

Chair Gooyer wanted to move away from copying the tile on a sloped roof. Vice Chair Lew suggested the Board could agree with that. Board Member Kim added that the issue was the eave profile. Chair Gooyer commented that the Board needed a detail or cross-section of the eave.

Mr. Jones understood the Architectural Review Board's goal was to create the best building and companion to the Burge Clark building as possible. He stressed Avenidas' need to provide services to the community. Mr. Jones requested a date uncertain.

Chair Gooyer noted the presence of Mr. Bernstein who could report to the Historic Resources Board regarding the Architectural Review Board's comments.

MOTION

Vice Chair Lew moved, seconded by Board Member Kim, to continue the project to a date uncertain. The Architectural Review Board appeared to prefer Approach 1 with a modified flat roof or a very low slope roof that did not utilize tile.

MOTION PASSED: 3-1

- 4. 203 Forest [14PLN-00472]:** Request by 203 Forest Avenue LLC for Architectural Review of a 4,996 sf addition to add a three-bedroom residential unit above an existing 4,626 sf commercial building. Project includes two required parking spaces for the new unit and special sidewalk base treatment to enhance landmark cork oak on Emerson frontage. Environmental Review: Categorically Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: Downtown Commercial District – Community with Pedestrian shopping Ground Floor combining district overlays (CD-C (GF)(P)). For more information contact the planner, Adam Petersen at APetersen@m-group.us.

Adam Petersen reviewed details of the proposed project, comments from the May 21, 2015 ARB meeting, and the existing built environment. The cork oak would be removed as it was not healthy. The project crossed into the required 4-foot landscape area. Parking dimensions were not consistent with the Code. Staff requested the Architectural Review Board comment regarding whether the design was compatible with the area; whether the project responded to ARB comments from May 21, 2015; and whether the height was consistent with the surrounding area. Staff recommended the ARB provide comments and continue the hearing to a date uncertain.

Vice Chair Lew inquired whether the project was a minor review. Mr. Petersen explained that changes to the building elevated the project to a major review.

David Kleiman, applicant, indicated staff did not provide him with any comments; therefore, he could not address comments in the current design. In response to ARB comments, the applicant pulled back the corner and created an outdoor seating area including a screen wall. Mr. Kleiman noted details tying the proposed building to the adjoining building. He preferred attempting to save the cork oak tree. Solar panels on both roofs would generate more electricity than the building would use.

Board Member Baltay spoke to Ken Hayes regarding authorship of the drawings. Mr. Hayes agreed to the applicant using the drawings. Board Member Baltay inquired regarding the architect of record. Mr. Kleiman responded Paula Shaviv. He and Mr. Hayes collaborated on the prior version of the design; however, Mr. Hayes did not work on any aspect of the current version. Board Member Baltay asked about the route from the garage to the residential unit. Mr. Kleiman explained that a resident could take the elevator from the garage or exit the garage and enter the building from the sidewalk. The entrance from Forest Avenue did not provide stair access to the residential unit.

Board Member Kim noted the description of two condominium units was actually one condo and one office. He asked where the new tree would be located. Mr. Kleiman replied a new tree would be placed at the parking area.

Board Member Furth referred to page A.4.1 and asked about access to the base of the stairs from the ground floor. Mr. Kleiman explained that one would walk inside from the handicap parking space and turn right. Board Member Furth inquired regarding the spaces designated as inaccessible. Mr. Kleiman indicated that those spaces were made inaccessible because they would exceed the allowed square footage if they were finished floor space. The spaces would be dry walled over. Ms. Gerhardt reported staff had concerns about that space as well. They could become a Code enforcement issue in the future. Board Member Furth asked why they did not count toward FAR. Ms. Gerhardt advised that it was not considered as part of FAR because there was no access to the space. The Code enforcement issue pertained to ensuring that space did not become accessible. Mr. Kleiman added that the inaccessible spaces were located at the mezzanine, and the ceilings were very low. Chair Gooyer asked if the space was legal. Mr. Kleiman stated none of the mezzanine space would be Code compliant with respect to height. Chair Gooyer asked if the space was grandfathered. Board Member Baltay noted Sheet A.36 showed a 10-foot floor-to-floor difference from the mezzanine to the new third floor. Chair Gooyer added that Sheet A.24 showed the existing building with an 8-foot ceiling. Mr. Kleiman clarified that the beams were 18 inches deep which reduced the effective head space. He was proposing a Code-compliant structure even though someone could theoretically alter the inaccessible space. Chair Gooyer asked if the existing structure was Code compliant. Mr. Kleiman indicated the addition was Code compliant. Chair Gooyer asked if the bottom two floors were not Code compliant. Mr. Kleiman had received a letter from the former Zoning Commissioner confirming the square footage and the mezzanine were legal. Chair Gooyer wanted to know the ceiling height if the building was legal. Mr. Kleiman advised that the height was not stated but had not changed since 1959.

Board Member Baltay questioned the ability to complete the proposed project without impacting the tenants. Mr. Kleiman explained that everything would be fabricated offsite such that tenants would not have to leave the building. Board Member Kim suggested the applicant could raise the mezzanine ceiling through the proposed project. Mr. Kleiman stated there were structural concerns. Board Member Kim believed the ceiling was not supporting the rest of the building. Mr. Kleiman indicated the new structure would support the new building. Chair Gooyer commented that the existing roof was not needed with construction of a new deck. The applicant could remove the existing roof and add 2 or 3 feet. He asked if the building was three or four stories. Mr. Kleiman responded four stories. The mezzanine was considered a second story with limited headroom. The new mezzanine area would be slightly taller. Chair Gooyer asked if the applicant planned to use the existing mezzanine area. Mr. Kleiman indicated it would be used by the commercial tenant. The block wall would act as part of the structure for the new building with no connection between the existing mezzanine and the new mezzanine area.

Board Member Furth requested the applicant explain the relationship between the current wall along Forest Avenue and where it would be located when the project was completed. Mr. Kleiman advised that the new stairwell from grade to the residence would be located in the planting area between the property line and the masonry wall. The continuous block wall was the original 1959 exterior of the building. There were two sets of structural masonry walls, and the distance between them formed the basis for a mezzanine that would be added as part of the addition of the residence. Board Member Furth asked if the door shown on Sheet A.24 led to the terrace. Mr. Kleiman answered yes. Board Member Furth

inquired about access to the residential staircase without going into the commercial space. Mr. Kleiman pointed to the door which was not shown open on the plans.

Chair Gooyer referred to Sheet A2.5, which showed the master bedroom separated from the closet by a long hallway. Mr. Kleiman showed that, by closing a door, the master suite was contiguous to the closet.

Doria Summa expressed concerns about massing, design, the cork oak, and the historic nature of the building. Historic review of the project was not adequate. She urged the Architectural Review Board to continue the hearing and allow staff to review the legality of the project.

Jeff Levinsky noted errors in the staff report. The existing building would require 19 parking spaces, but only 13 spaces were identified. A finding for Policy T-45, sufficient parking, could not be made. He asked staff to pursue a Code compliance investigation regarding parking.

Ms. Gerhardt reported to the best of staff's knowledge all square footage was legal, nonconforming square footage. The property retained the grandfathered status. Staff would be happy to review the issue in light of any information from the public.

Board Member Kim believed staff needed additional time to review the project. The screen wall was a good idea for a single story; however, extending it to a second story altered the proportions. There was a blank wall and a door at the elevator entrance to the residence. The entrance to the stairway being separate from the entrance to the elevator was a problem. The existing wall cut off the stair on the Forest elevation, and the stair would rarely be used. The original proposed project was three stories, but the current proposal was four stories. The fourth floor needed additional thought. He questioned whether the trash bins would be rolled to the street or a truck would have to come onsite. Pedestrian-oriented features were lacking. Other things could be added to both Emerson and Forest elevations. The Board needed more elevations of the proposed project and neighboring buildings and some site sections through Forest and Emerson. On the Forest elevation, the third floor appeared to protrude. Mr. Kleiman indicated it actually did not. Board Member Kim applauded the net zero energy use. Many of the solar panels would be in the shade, and the penthouse would cover many.

Vice Chair Lew had trouble with the compatibility findings for the Emerson Street facade. He inquired about the selection of glass in lieu of sunshades for the Forest Avenue facade. Mr. Kleiman would utilize Viracon 70 glass which had a light tint. He wanted the glazing to be the same on the three visible levels. He had added shading at both terraces on the Emerson side. Vice Chair Lew inquired about keeping everything in the same plane on the Emerson Street facade. Mr. Kleiman explained that the only way to get past the existing structure and up to a third level was to have a stairwell. Getting a stairwell to access the mezzanine and residence levels was tricky. Vice Chair Lew inquired about privacy because of the large amount of glass. Mr. Kleiman stated the residents could utilize shades. Vice Chair Lew felt most people kept blinds closed which changed the look of the building. Mr. Kleiman found a shade that operated based on solar needs. Sensors placed outdoors signaled blinds to open and close. Vice Chair Lew asked if the applicant considered bird-friendly guidelines. Mr. Kleiman had used bird patterns in glass for other projects. Those patterns were not visible from below but could be seen at eye level. Vice Chair Lew expressed concerns about findings for massing. Adjacent buildings were smaller. The application proposed some stepping, but it was not sufficient for approval. He concurred with Board Member Kim's comments regarding context.

Board Member Furth spoke to Dave Dockter who stated he and the Urban Forester did not support trying to save the cork oak, even though they acknowledged its historic importance as a cork oak. They recommended replacing it with a new cork oak. Board Member Furth questioned whether the applicant could realistically implement the program of maxing the square footage for office and residential space while keeping the legal, nonconforming use. She looked forward to staff's comments regarding the mezzanine space and excluding it from calculations for the parking assessment district. She had reviewed the South of Forest Commercial District Urban Design Observations. The street had a beautiful set of rhythms set up by narrow, single-story commercial buildings. The proposed project obliterated the

rhythm. She could not make the finding that the project was compatible with the area. The pedestrian overlay district forbade driveways under most circumstances; yet, the site had two driveways. The location of the handicap parking space was not good. Several aspects of the garage were problematic. She did not support the tandem parking. The seating area should be oriented to the sidewalk rather than the building. The project did not have a human scale, particularly along Emerson. More street trees were needed. A garage door, an elevator tower, and a glass panel 5 feet from a block wall was not pedestrian friendly and did not provide recommended recesses, seating areas, or lively windows. The project needed overhangs that protected pedestrians from sun and rain. She requested staff provide square footage including all space. She did not support proposed parking or intrusion into the backyard setback with a terrace. She did not understand the value of the fourth floor glass atrium. She expressed concern about floor-to-ceiling glass in a residential building and would not support it where windows were visible to the floor from the public right-of-way. She was concerned about the use of natural gas. She could not make the findings for approval, because the project did not conform to Code. The project was much larger than it needed to be.

Board Member Baltay concurred with Board Member Furth's comments regarding the pedestrian-nature of the site. The proposed project did not enhance the pedestrian experience. The project did not fit the neighborhood context of smaller, two-story, older commercial buildings. The concrete screening was not appropriate to a downtown, urban environment. Parking for the building would not work. Access to the property and circulation thereon was not safe and convenient. Staff should review the inclusion of the mezzanine area in the parking assessment district. The proposed project did not provide proper parking. He was having difficulty with Finding Number 3 and Number 15. The building appeared to be or could be converted to an office building. The floor plan did not work, certainly not for a residential function. Two walls of glass were not sensitive to energy usage. It would be a disservice to continue the hearing in hopes the applicant could improve the project. He suggested the Board deny the project.

Chair Gooyer felt it was a strange project. He did not understand the addition of the fourth floor. The building was large before adding the fourth floor. A glass wall in an urban environment was not logical. It was difficult to make any of the findings for approval. The mezzanine, ceiling heights, and dropping a new building on top of the existing building made no sense. Parking did not work.

Board Member Furth suggested the Board request staff provide draft findings of denial at the next regular meeting. Chair Gooyer indicated the Board should deny the project if the applicant made only minor changes. Ms. Gerhardt requested the applicant state for the record that he chose not to make major changes to the project.

Mr. Kleiman appreciated the Board's review of the project. Several comments were based on either incorrect information from the public or an inadequate staff report. He would have considered reasonable modification requests from staff; however, he had not received and did not expect to receive any staff comments. He preferred the Board deny the application, because he did not believe staff would provide him any meaningful feedback.

Ms. Gerhardt reported staff had communicated with the applicant. Staff was willing to speak with the applicant about changes to the project to make it better and compliant with the Code. She wanted to understand the applicant's proposal to maintain the existing structure, if the applicant agreed.

MOTION

Board Member Furth moved, seconded by Board Member Kim, to continue the matter to October 6, 2016, with staff to provide in the Board's packet a draft recommendation for denial of the project based on the current discussion.

Board Member Furth stated the applicant was welcome to submit other written materials as part of the packet.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0

Study Session

5. **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. Environmental Assessment: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Zoning District: Downtown Commercial (CD-C (GF)(P)) District. For more information contact the planner, Adam Petersen at APetersen@m-group.us.

Board Member Furth recused herself from the item as the applicant believed Board Member Furth was biased against the applicant.

Board Member Baltay recused himself as well.

Ms. Gerhardt reported the applicant met with the Director and her to discuss changes that could obtain approval of the project. The applicant removed approximately 3,000 square feet from the fourth floor. Staff scheduled a study session to allow the Board and applicant to discuss potential changes that might obtain approval of the project. The project would return to the ARB at a subsequent time for a final recommendation.

Mr. Petersen provided an overview of the site and surrounding uses and reviewed changes to the project.

Pratima Shah, Joseph Bellomo Architects, hoped revisions to the project would receive Board Members' support. She reviewed the project, design strategies, and revisions. The major change was elimination of the residential area from the fourth floor. The number of residential units was reduced from four to three. The proposed FAR was 2.58, where 3.0 was permitted.

Michael Harbour, appellant, reviewed the Council's direction and changes to the proposed project. From the perspective of Kipling Street, massing did not appear to have changed. The square footage of the second floor did not change. The square footage of the first and third floors were within 1 percent of the previous square footage. The square footage of the fourth floor was reduced from 5,173 square feet to 2,476 square feet. Overall the square footage reduction was 9 percent. The fourth floor had been replaced with HVAC equipment and solar panels, which in his opinion mitigated the reduction in square footage. The building remained a colossal building on the narrowest street in Downtown Palo Alto and overshadowed the first-floor neighbors. Traffic and parking issues remained. The site had no loading zone.

Jeff Levinsky noted staff had not required off-street loading areas for buildings; however, the Council in the 411 Lytton project raised the issue of loading areas. The site required one off-street loading area measuring 12 feet by 45 feet. Locating the loading zone in the alley was not legal and would impact access to the building.

Doria Summa concurred with Mr. Levinsky's comments regarding locating the loading zone in the alley. The plans did not show the changes to the building. Pulling back the fourth floor was not sufficient.

Sam Arsan reiterated his comments from the August 4, 2016 meeting regarding short-term tenants in the building. A retailer in the same block of University Avenue indicated his business had been impacted by the lack of activity on the block. The proposed project was attractive and would be a welcome addition to University Avenue.

Herb Borock stated the agenda item and public notice for the item was to consider an appeal of the project. Four weeks ago the Board requested staff prepare findings approving and denying the project

so that the Board could act at the next meeting. The Board could consider the revisions, make a decision based upon findings, and then direct staff to return with those findings for the Board to act.

Vice Chair Lew provided a site plan of Downtown and reviewed Downtown projects similar to the 429 University Avenue project. Because Kipling Street was 50 feet wide, he suggested the Board emphasize the two-story nature of the project and a stepping back of the third floor by 8-15 feet. The alley was narrow and difficult to traverse. The City should have regulations for alley setbacks and daylight planes. More recesses in the facade along Kipling would be better. Existing buildings in Downtown had notched corners, planters, canopies, and outdoor tables. The drawings for the proposed project did not contain that level of detail or design linkages to nearby buildings. The building could contain more square footage, and people would not notice the increased square footage if the design were better.

Board Member Kim felt the latest rendition of the project was better; however, the drawings still lacked a great deal of information. The elevations should include line weights, step backs, details of the metal fins, door swings, etc. The Board had not received a full site section through University Avenue. The applicant seemed to be trying to address public comments, but those changes were not visible in submissions. The column on the corner of University and Kipling was a problem. The project needed bike parking at ground level. The residential spaces were better but could be improved more. He appreciated the honesty of proposed materials; however, a level of complexity or difference could be added to the project, whether a different shade of concrete or a different board form. There was a way to differentiate the third floor so that it did not read as the same material throughout. He questioned whether the retail doors on the ground floor could blend in with the darker metal used throughout the building.

Chair Gooyer appreciated the reduction of square footage; however, perception remained a problem. The building was missing a distinction between the first two floors or the retail and the third and fourth floors. The project would be better with moving some square footage from the third to the fourth floor. When materials were the same, the step back tended to disappear. He did not favor the mesh screen; it was not compatible with the character of the area. Along the rear, the first two stories should relate to the adjacent one-story building and the other story should be stepped back. The ideal place for the highest point of the building would be the middle of the building on the western side. From his reading of the plans, one would access the restroom from the fourth floor office space by going outside or taking the elevator or stairs. Perhaps the office space should be located on the third floor and an apartment located on the fourth floor. The drawings were unacceptable; elevations were flat. To provide honest opinions, the Board needed details of treatments.

Vice Chair Lew felt the third floor needed to step back more on the alley side and possibly on the University side. He was undecided about the Kipling side. With a greater setback, the applicant could show landscaping. He recommended a full structural bay if possible. The Board seemed to have more issues with the Kipling Street facade. There was not a good hierarchy of elements. The glass stair tower was an improvement. The portal for the office space, the small recess for the retail frontage, the screen, and the eyebrow were not sufficiently differentiated and looked the same. He did not believe the mesh screen was necessary for sun screening. A retail tenant would likely want some sort of portal or something for signage, lighting or branding. The stair tower could be beautiful at night if properly illuminated. There could be more people-oriented recesses; however, a solution was needed to prevent people from sleeping in them. He requested the applicant submit a landscape plan.

Board Member Kim noted Chair Gooyer's comments regarding shifting third-floor massing to the rear corner of the fourth floor. He requested building sections and clearer dimensions. The Board needed to see shade and shadow studies for the new massing, lighting, photometrics, sections, and dimensions for step backs.

Chair Gooyer stated the eyebrow made the third floor look larger than it was and should be eliminated.

Ms. Wong advised that the building was designed not to look like other buildings Downtown. Recesses on University Avenue did not work. The building had at least as much square footage in recesses as the building at 278 University. It was an injustice to ask the architect to copy other buildings. Other architects had reviewed the plans for the building and provided positive comments. The applicant had provided the best rendition of the project and could provide the Board with more details. In response to Vice Chair Lew's request for recesses along Kipling, the applicant placed them in the back. The project would have street lighting at the ground level to enhance the entire building.

Chair Gooyer clarified that the Board wanted to approve a project that also satisfied neighbors. The Board was providing opinions on elements that seemed to work in the neighborhood. It was impossible to find compatibility between a four-story building and an adjacent one-story building.

Ms. Wong wanted the Board to judge the building on its architectural merit. The appellant would never accept the building.

Chair Gooyer reiterated that the building could not look like a monolith and receive approval.

Ms. Shah advised that the appellant showed a streetscape that did not include the four-story building on Kipling. The proposed building was located in the commercial district, not the transition district. A 50-foot height was allowed at University Avenue. They had set back the building as much as possible.

Chair Gooyer suggested following the Board's comments would increase the likelihood of the Board approving the project. The Board was also following the Council's mandate. If the applicant felt the building had to be addressed on its merits, then the applicant needed to develop an argument to convince the City Council.

Vice Chair Lew did not advocate that the building look like 278 University Avenue. There was a middle ground that the applicant refused to consider.

Chair Gooyer explained that the Board was attempting to provide the applicant with some guidelines. The item would return for a formal application at a date uncertain.

Subcommittee Item

701 Welch Road [16PLN-00135]: Request by Michele Charles, on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University, for Minor Architectural Review of changes to the approved Lucile Packard Children's Hospital (LPCH) project design regarding landscaping changes to address tree loss due to the drought, monument sign and wall signage changes, and design adjustments to site improvements in the Hospital (HD) zoning district. For more information contact the planner, Rebecca Atkinson at rebecca.atkinson@cityofpaloalto.org.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

[The board did not take up this item because of time constraints.]

Adjournment