Summary Title: 799 Embarcadero Road: Fire Station #3 Replacement Project

Title: PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 799 Embarcadero Road (file PLN16-00263): Applicant’s Request for Architectural Review Approval of a Two-Story, 6,663 Square Foot Replacement Fire Station Building Located on the Northwest Corner of Embarcadero and Newell Roads Adjacent to the Southeasterly Edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27 Acre Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction of Existing Structures). Zoning District: Public Facility (PF)

From: Hillary Gitelman

Recommendation
Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board (ARB) take the following action(s):
1. Recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Community Environment based on Architectural Review approval findings and subject to conditions of approval (Attachments A and B, respectively).

Report Summary
The subject project was previously reviewed by the ARB on December 1, 2016, and January 19, 2017. Excerpt minutes of the January 19, 2017 ARB meeting are attached (Attachment F). The hearing was continued to March 2, 2017. The two prior staff reports are found online; they include extensive background information, project analysis and evaluation to city codes and policies. A copy of the January 19, 2017 report without prior attachments is available as Attachment G.

The purpose of this report is to restate the comments made by the ARB and convey the applicant’s response to those comments. The analysis section below builds upon the...
information contained in the earlier report as modified to reflect recent project changes. The draft Architectural Review approval findings are provided as Attachment A. These findings include modifications to Findings 2E and 5 offered by Chair Lew on January 19, 2017. The findings support the project.

Background
On December 1, 2016, the ARB reviewed the project. A video recording of the ARB meeting is here: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Juwv3s3KXPw&start=8&width=420&height=315](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Juwv3s3KXPw&start=8&width=420&height=315). The January 19, 2017 staff report described the December 1st ARB comments and the applicant’s responses and included the applicant’s response letter. The report is found online at: [http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/55508](http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/55508) and the video for the second ARB hearing is found here: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q66pWDs8rz8&start=3440&width=420&height=315](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q66pWDs8rz8&start=3440&width=420&height=315)

ARB Comments and Applicant Response

- The ARB noted its appreciation for the alternate Zink material, but requested the applicant consider a lighter color finish and wider spacing,
- The ARB noted the CMU fence with openings and vines was appropriate, but requested the applicant consider a warmer color for the CMU fence.
- The ARB discussed the building’s zero ‘set-back’ from the park boundary line and the height of the dormitory portion of the building, as being a potential impact upon the park. The ARB noted the woodsy setting and potential loss of ‘privacy’ for park users in the wood scape, and suggested removal of the ‘eyebrow’ over the second floor dorm balcony and lowering of the ceiling of the ‘saddlebag’ (second floor dorm component) to eight feet instead of nine feet, or if feasible, lowering it by two to four feet.

The applicant considered the ARB's comments, made changes to the plans and provided a response letter (Attachment E). The changes include a height reduction.

The above rendering of the park-facing elevation is from the January 19, 2017 plans.
The revised park-facing elevation from the February 16, 2017 plan set shows the height of the dormitory volume is lower, a standard punched opening window replaced the slotted window, and the eyebrow over the balcony is thinner. Below front and rear elevations show the park-side saddlebag was lowered as requested by the ARB.

The renderings on the next page show the smaller dorm saddlebag facing the park on the image at left, and vegetation at maturity on the image at right.

The overall height of the terracotta-clad main massing was reduced by six inches. The zinc-clad massing on the park side was reduced by an additional 2’2” (2’8” lower than the first plan set). The applicant notes that the terra cotta portion reduction “still barely allows for the minimum apparatus bay height, minimum ceiling height in the house, and minimum parapet height sufficient for mechanical screening and fall protection.” The parapet wall was removed completely on the westerly saddlebag and the bulk on this side and against the sky was further
reduced by thinning the “flying beam” at the corner from its original thickness of 2’-10” to a thickness of 1’-7”. The ARB had referred to this ‘beam’ as the “eyebrow”.

**Analysis**

The revised plans received February 16, 2017 are intended to address the ARB’s concerns. The changes appear to address the ARB’s comments to the extent feasible, given the program and site constraints. Attachment C provides a narrative of how the project meets the relevant goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

**Approval Findings**

As noted, staff revised the draft findings for approval to incorporate ARB member comments regarding Findings 2E and 5 from the last meeting. The project’s compliance with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan is set forth in the draft findings for approval (Attachment A).

**Environmental Review**

The subject project has been assessed in accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the environmental regulations of the City. Specifically, staff determined the project can be considered Exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15302. The Historic Resource Evaluation concluded the existing fire station was not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources. The HRE was reviewed by the historic preservation planner and HRB. Circulation and traffic for the replacement station were reviewed by the Transportation Division staff. Staff reviewed other CEQA checklist topic areas and will finalize the document and review findings following the ARB hearing, for the Director’s consideration.

**Public Notification, Outreach & Comments**

The Palo Alto Municipal Code requires notice of this public hearing be published in a local paper and mailed to owners and occupants of property within 600 feet of the subject property at least ten day in advance. As this project was continued to a date certain by the ARB, no additional mailed noticing was conducted.

**Alternative Actions**

In addition to the recommended action, the Architectural Review Board may:

1. Approve the project with modified findings or conditions; or
2. Recommend project denial based on revised findings.

---

1 The information provided in this section is based on analysis prepared by the report author prior to the public hearing. The Architectural Review Board in its review of the administrative record and based on public testimony may reach a different conclusion from that presented in this report and may choose to take an alternative action from the recommendation in this report.

2 Emails may be sent directly to the ARB using the following address: arb@cityofpaloalto.org
Attachments:

- Attachment A: Six ARB findings  (DOC)
- Attachment B: Draft Conditions of Approval  (DOCX)
- Attachment C: Comp Plan Policies and Programs  (DOC)
- Attachment D: Zoning Compliance Table  (DOC)
- Attachment E: Applicant's response letter February 16, 2017  (PDF)
- Attachment F: ARB minutes Fire Station 799 Embarcadero 1 19 17  (PDF)
- Attachment G: January 19, 2017 ARB Report only  (PDF)
- Attachment H: Plans  (DOCX)

(1) The design is consistent with applicable provisions of the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Code, coordinated area plans (including compatibility requirements), and any relevant design guides. *The project is consistent with Finding #1 because:*

- The project complies with the land use and development standards of the PF zone.
- The project complies with the policies and programs of the Comprehensive Plan (Plan):
  - Policy C-62, design and construct new community facilities to have flexible functions to ensure adaptability to the changing needs of the community,
  - Policy L-48, high quality design and site planning, compatible with surrounding development and public spaces,
  - Program L-49, maintain and support historic or consistent design character,
  - Policy L-50, high quality signage (existing sign to be relocated to site’s corner),
  - Policy L-62, provide comfortable seating areas and plazas with places for public art,
  - Program L-71, recognize Embarcadero Road (and other roads noted) as a scenic route (providing main access to the Baylands and secondary access to Stanford University),
  - Policy L-70, enhance the appearance of streets by expanding and maintaining street trees,
  - Policy L-72, promote and maintain public art compatible with the character and identity of the neighborhood,
  - Policy L-74, use the work of artists, landscape architects, etc. in the design and improvement of public spaces,
  - Program L-73, locate parking lots behind buildings,
  - Policy L-76, require trees and other landscaping within parking lots,
  - Program L-75, 50% shade program (zoning ordinance update implemented).

(2) The project has a unified and coherent design, that:
(2a) creates an internal sense of order and desirable environment for occupants, visitors, and the general community; *The project is consistent with Finding 2(a), given:*

- The intersection improvements will improve circulation; ingress from Newell/egress onto Embarcadero are compatible with the design concept and functions.
- The new facilities and amenities for pedestrians, bicyclists and vehicles are an improvement from the existing facilities as to safety and convenience.
(2b) preserves, respects and integrates existing natural features that contribute positively to the site and the historic character including historic resources of the area when relevant; *The project is consistent with Finding 2(b), given:*

- Existing protected trees on and off-site will be retained and protected; the natural features (mature trees) are appropriately integrated with the new plantings shown on the plans.
- The existing building was determined ineligible for listing as a state historic resource and is not being preserved, but several aspects of the new building are designed to respect the historic resources of the area, including the use of terra cotta in reference to the terra cotta courtyard walls at the nearby, historic Rinconada Library. The HRB concurred with the HRE determination the existing station was ineligibility for state registry listing.

(2c) is consistent with the context-based design criteria of the applicable zone district; *Finding 2c is not applicable since the PF zone does not impose context based design criteria.*

(2d) provides harmonious transitions in scale, mass and character to adjacent land uses and land use designations; *The project is consistent with Finding 2(d), given:*

- The project is replacing an existing one-story station with a two-story station contrasting with the primarily one-story and sloped roof character of civic buildings in the immediate vicinity; the materials and architectural forms are intended to be compatible with the mid-century architecture of the area.
- The addition will not encroach upon the adjacent park (Rinconada Park).
- The building is intended to be compatible with the character of the surrounding area which includes:
  - historical buildings on the parcel - distant from the site and obscured by mature vegetation, and nearby buildings eligible for historic register listing,
  - mature vegetation providing a backdrop for the new two-story building,
  - one- and two-story, sloped-roof residential homes across Embarcadero.
- The fire station site, over 1100 feet from the Lucie Stern Center, JMZ and Girl Scout House (Lou Henry Hoover House), is obscured by mature vegetation from views from these civic buildings; the new station would be visible from the Palo Alto Art Center.
- The project site is zoned Public Facility; the adjacent Rinconada Park is also zoned and designated for public land uses; the project, as conditioned, would not impede future park improvements currently under consideration, nor impact existing uses in the park.

(2e) enhances living conditions on the site and in adjacent residential areas; *The project is consistent with Finding 2(e), given:*

- The temporary living facilities for firefighters in the new building would provide much improved living conditions on the site.
- The proposed building would not adversely impact the nearby residential neighborhoods, located south of Embarcadero Road and North of Hopkins Avenue.
- The existing fire station is very low-key and inwardly oriented; the new station is outwardly facing and attractive to its neighbors.

(3) The design is of high aesthetic quality, using high quality, integrated materials and appropriate construction techniques, and incorporating textures, colors, and other details that
are compatible with and enhance the surrounding area; the project is consistent with Finding 3, given:

- The materials were selected for durability and reference to nearby historic resources;
- the new structure’s materials and construction techniques are appropriate for fire station use;
- Colors and textures will be compatible with nearby civic buildings and park landscaping.

(4) The design is functional, allowing for ease and safety of pedestrian and bicycle traffic and providing for elements that support the building’s necessary operations (e.g. convenient vehicle access to property and utilities, appropriate arrangement and amount of open space and integrated signage, if applicable, etc.); the project is consistent with Finding 4, given:

- The design is a code-compliant fire station providing modern amenities, equipment storage, and places the main pedestrian entry and plaza on Newell Road, the more-oriented route than the busier Embarcadero Road.
- The open space design includes a pedestrian plaza, a bicycle queuing area, and new landscaping that will serve the passersby and visitors from the neighborhood and surrounding community, as well as a second floor balcony for fire personnel to enjoy park views.

(5) The landscape design complements and enhances the building design and its surroundings, is appropriate to the site’s functions, and utilizes to the extent practical, regional indigenous drought resistant plant material capable of providing desirable habitat that can be appropriately maintained; the project is consistent with Finding 5, given:

- Existing protected trees on and off-site will be retained and protected; the planting plan will meet these findings for suitability and adaptability to the site.
- The existing oak trees are wild-life supportive as “anchor” species, to support other native shrubs (such as salvia and manzanita) that are attractive to birds, bees and butterflies.

(6) The project incorporates design principles that achieve sustainability in areas related to energy efficiency, water conservation, building materials, landscaping, and site planning; the project is consistent with Finding #6 given:

- The project plans indicate the project will follow both the LEED Silver and Calgreen Tier 2 checklists to meet City’s standards and policies for green building.
ATTACHMENT B
DRAFT CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL
799 Embarcadero Road, Fire Station #3 (File 16PLN-00263)

On January 19, 2017, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) recommended _________ of the application referenced above, and the Director of Planning and Community Environment (Director) _________ the project on __________, 2017. Project Planner: Amy French, Chief Planning Official.

GENERAL CONDITION
The plans submitted for Building Permit shall be in substantial conformance with plans dated received January 12, 2017, except as modified to incorporate these conditions of approval. These conditions of approval shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permits.

PLANNING AND COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENT
1. Architectural Review Approval:
   a) The project approval shall be valid for a period of one year from the original date of approval. In the event a building permit(s), if applicable, is not secured for the project within the time limit specified above, the AR approval shall expire and be of no further force or effect unless application for extension of this entitlement is submit prior to the one year expiration.

   b) The following additional conditions shall be satisfied in building permit plans:
      (1) Bird friendly glass shall be incorporated, employing one or more of the following methods:
          · Elements that preclude bird collisions without completely obscuring vision like secondary facades, netting, screens, shutters, or exterior shades.
          · UV Patterned Glass that contain UV-reflective or contrasting patterns that are visible to birds
          · Patterns on Glass designed in accordance with the 2X4 rule, which restricts horizontal spaces to less than 2" high, or vertical spaces less than 4" wide.
          · Opaque, etched, stained, frosted, and translucent glass
      (2) Outside lighting shall be appropriately shielded and minimized.
      (3) The following items shall be submitted for staff level/ARB subcommittee review to ensure project details listed herein are consistent with the approval findings, prior to the submittal of associated building permits:
         • Placeholder – ARB may have items to return for staff or subcommittee review

   c) All future signage proposed for this site and any exterior modifications to the building or property shall be subject to Architectural Review prior to installation.

   d) The stealth cell tower proposal (fake conifer concealing wireless communications facility (WCF) tower) indicated on the site plan shall be subject to separate Architectural Review and Conditional Use Permit review process. If a fake conifer WCF is not installed at the indicated location, a shade tree shall be installed to ensure the City's 50% shade by tree canopy policy/requirement is met.

2. Legal Matters/Fees:
   a) To the extent permitted by law, the applicant shall indemnify and hold harmless the City, its City Council, its officers, employees and agents (the “indemnified parties”) from and against any claim, action, or proceeding brought by a third party against the indemnified parties and the applicant to attack, set aside or void, any permit or approval authorized hereby for the Project, including (without limitation) reimbursing the City its actual attorney’s fees and costs incurred in defense of the litigation. The City may, in its sole discretion, elect to defend any such action with attorneys of its own choice.

   b) This matter is subject to the Code of Civil Procedures (CCP) Section 1094.5, and the time by which judicial review must be sought is governed by CCP Section 1094.6.

   c) Government Code Section 66020 provides that project applicant who desires to protest the fees, dedications, reservations, or other exactions imposed on a development project must initiate the protest at
the time the development project is approved or conditionally approved or within ninety (90) days after the October 27, 2016 that fees, dedications, reservations or exactions are imposed on the project. Additionally, procedural requirements for protesting these development fees, dedications, reservations and exactions are set forth in Government Code Section 66020. IF YOU FAIL TO INITIATE A PROTEST WITHIN THE 90-DAY PERIOD OR TO FOLLOW THE PROTEST PROCEDURES DESCRIBED IN GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 66020, YOU WILL BE BARRED FROM CHALLENGING THE VALIDITY OR REASONABLENESS OF THE FEES, DEDICATIONS, RESERVATIONS, AND EXACTIONS.

3. Noise: All noise producing equipment shall not exceed the allowance specified in Chapter 9.10 (Noise) of the Palo Alto Municipal Code.

PUBLIC WORKS ENGINEERING

PRIOR TO ISSUANCE OF A BUILDING PERMIT FOR DEMOLITION

1. LOGISTICS PLAN: The applicant and contractor shall prepare a construction logistics plan for the work associated with the building permit. Plan shall be submitted to Public Works Engineering and shall address all impacts to the City’s right-of-way, including, but not limited to: pedestrian control, traffic control, truck routes, material deliveries, contractor’s parking, on-site staging and storage areas, concrete pours, crane lifts, work hours, noise control, dust control, storm water pollution prevention, and contractor’s contact. The plan shall be prepared and submitted along the Grading and Excavation Permit. It shall include notes as indicated on the approved Truck Route Map for construction traffic to and from the site.

PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT OR EXCAVATION AND GRADING PERMIT ISSUANCE

2. DEMOLITION PLAN: Place the following note adjacent to an affected tree on the Site Plan and Demolition Plan: “Excavation activities associated with the proposed scope of work shall occur no closer than 10-feet from the existing street tree, or as approved by the Urban Forestry Division contact 650-496-5953. Any changes shall be approved by the same”. Also plot and label the tree protection zone.

3. GRADING PERMIT: The grading and drainage plan must include an earthworks table with the estimated cut and fill volumes. If the total is more than 100 cubic yards, a grading permit will be required. An application and plans for a grading permit are submitted to Public Works separately from the building permit plan set. The application and guidelines are available at the Development Center and on our website.

4. GRADING & DRAINAGE PLAN: Provide a separate Grading and Drainage Plan prepared by a qualified licensed engineer, surveyor or architect. Plan shall be wet-stamped and signed by the same. Plan shall include the following: existing and proposed spot elevations, earthwork volumes (cut and fill in CY). Provide drainage flow arrows to demonstrate positive drainage away from building foundations at minimum of 2% or 5% for 10-feet per 2013 CBC Section 1804.3. Label the downspouts, splash-blocks (2-feet long min) and any site drainage features such as swales, area drains, bubble-up locations. Include grate elevations, low points and grade breaks. Provide dimensions between the bidders and property lines. In no case shall drainage across property lines exceed that which existed prior to grading per 2013 CBC Section J109.4. In particular, runoff from the new garage shall not drain into neighboring property. For additional grading and drainage detail design See Grading and Drainage Plan Guidelines for Residential Development. http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/2717

The grading plan shall clearly show how all of the site’s impervious area is treated by the bio-retention area. The

5. Provide the following note on the Grading and Drainage Plan and/or Site Plan: “Contractor shall contact Public Works Engineering (PWE) Inspectors to inspect and approve the storm drain system (pipes, area drains, inlets, bidders, dry wells, etc.) associated with the project prior to backfill. Contractor shall schedule an inspection in advance (48-hours, at minimum) by calling (650) 496-6929”.

6. Public Works generally does not allow rainwater to be collected and discharged into the street gutter or connect directly to the City’s infrastructure, revise the Grading and Drainage plan to direct runoff to
landscaped and other pervious areas of the site. Flows from the proposed parking lot redesigned shall be directed to on-site pervious areas.

7. Applicant shall be aware that the project may trigger water line and meter upgrades or relocation, if upgrades or relocation are required, the building permit plan set shall plot and label utility changes. If a backflow preventer is required, it shall be located within private property and plotted on the plans. Similarly if a transformer upgrade or a grease interceptor is required it shall also be located within the private property. Plot and label these on the Utility plan. Backflow devices must be located behind the property line.

8. Based on the ARB package, it does not appear that all of the storm water from the project site will be treated. Storm water from the permeable pavement flows directly into the storm drain catch basin in the street. Revise the design so that the storm water bubbles up in the bio-retention area for treatment. Identify the overflow device and only the overflow should be connected to the catch basin in the street.

9. The ARB package shows a new driveway trench drain connecting to the existing sand oil separators. As shown, this trench drain will discharge rain runoff into the sewer system. Typically, this is not preferred by the treatment plant. Applicant shall either drain the trench drain line into the treatment area so that rain water from the driveway is treated or add a valve after the trench drain so that fire department can close the valve when it rains to limit rain runoff from going into the treatment plant.

10. The following item was not addressed with the ARB and shall be revised with the building permit plans. Typically, aside from storm drain system, all utilities shall be designed to avoid the bio-treatment areas. If in the future any utility needs to be replaced, the contractor will be responsible for rebuilding the treatment area and having it re-certified by a third party reviewer. The ARB package shows the proposed sewer line within the bio-retention area. Either relocate the sewer line to avoid the bio-retention area or revise the limits of the bio-retention area to avoid the sewer line. Alternatively if either option is not feasible, provide a detail that shows where the sewer line crosses the treatment area. The detail shall include relationship between the treatment cross-section and sanitary sewer line.

11. The ARB package also shows a French drain is proposed for the permeable pavement detail. This should probably be called out as a perforated drain line not a French drain. Please revise. Also verify that the key notes are referencing the correct the details. For example key note 14 references detail 1 on sheet C5.0. Detail 1 on C5.0 does not show the French drain or the permeable pavement.

12. STORM WATER TREATMENT: This project shall comply with the storm water regulations contained in provision C.3 of the NPDES municipal storm water discharge permit issued by the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board (and incorporated into Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 16.11). These regulations apply to land development projects that create or replace 10,000 square feet or more of impervious surface, and restaurants, retail gasoline outlets, auto service facilities, and uncovered parking lots that create and/or replace 5,000 square feet or more of impervious surface. In order to address the potential permanent impacts of the project on storm water quality, the applicant shall incorporate into the project a set of permanent site design measures, source controls, and treatment controls that serve to protect storm water quality, subject to the approval of the Public Works Department. The applicant shall identify, size, design and incorporate permanent storm water pollution prevention measures (landscape-based treatment controls such as bio-swales, filter strips, and permeable pavement) to treat the runoff from a “water quality storm” specified in PAMC Chapter 16.11 prior to discharge to the municipal storm drain system. Regulated projects, must contract with a qualified third-party reviewer during the planning application review process to certify that the proposed permanent storm water pollution prevention measures comply with the requirements of Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 16.11. The certification form, 2 copies of approved storm water treatment plan, and a description of Maintenance Task and Schedule must be received by the City from the third-party reviewer prior to approval of the planning application by the Public Works department.

13. Regulated projects with 3,000 SF or more of pervious pavement systems installed required installation inspections. The project is proposing to install permeable pavers, provide permeable pavement area for the site. The plans shall include a detail for the permeable pavement section. The material used on the
14. The following note shall be shown on the plans adjacent to the area on the Site Plan:

“Any construction within the city right-of-way must have an approved Permit for Construction in the Public Street prior to commencement of this work. THE PERFORMANCE OF THIS WORK IS NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE BUILDING PERMIT ISSUANCE BUT SHOWN ON THE BUILDING PERMIT FOR INFORMATION ONLY.”

15. Provide the following note on the Site Plan and Grading and Drainage Plan: “Contractor shall not stage, store, or stockpile any material or equipment within the public road right-of-way.” Construction phasing shall be coordinate to keep materials and equipment onsite or within private property.

16. “NO DUMPING” LOGO: The applicant is required to paint the “No Dumping/Flows to San Francisquito Creek” logo in blue color on a white background, adjacent to all onsite storm drain inlets. Stencils of the logo are available from the Public Works Environmental Compliance Division, which may be contacted at (650) 329-2598. A deposit may be required to secure the return of the stencil. Include the instruction to paint the logos on the construction grading and drainage plan. Similar medallions shall be installed near the catch basins that are proposed to be relocated. Provide notes on the plans to reference that medallions and stencils.

17. WORK IN THE RIGHT-OF-WAY: The plans must clearly indicate any work that is proposed in the public right-of-way, such as sidewalk replacement, driveway approach, or utility laterals. The plans must include notes that the work must be done per City standards and/or Caltrans standards and that the contractor performing this work must first obtain a Street Work Permit from Public Works at the Development Center and from Caltrans. If a new driveway is in a different location than the existing driveway, then the sidewalk associated with the new driveway must be replaced with a thickened (6” thick instead of the standard 4” thick) section. Additionally, curb cuts and driveway approaches for abandoned driveways must be replaced with new curb, gutter and planter strip.

18. SIDEWALK, CURB & GUTTER: As part of this project, the applicant shall replace those portions of the existing sidewalks, curbs, gutters or driveway approaches in the public right-of-way along the frontage(s) of the property that are broken, badly cracked, displaced or non-standard. Contact Public Works’ inspector at 650-496-6929 to arrange a site visit so that the inspector can discuss the extent of replacement work along the public road. The site plan submitted with the building permit plan set must show the extent of the replacement work or include a note that Public Works’ inspector has determined no work is required. The plan must note that any work in the right-of-way must be done per Public Works’ standards by a licensed contractor who must first obtain a Street Work Permit from Public Works at the Development Center.

19. PAVEMENT: This portion of Embarcadero Road was resurfaced in 2015 as such any cutting into the pavement will trigger additional pavement requirements. Add the following note to the Site Plan adjacent to the public right-of-way: “Applicant and contractor will be responsible for resurfacing Embarcadero Road and Newell Road, based the roadway surface condition after project completion and limits of trench work. At a minimum pavement resurfacing of the full street width along the project frontage may be required.” Plot and label the area to be resurfaced as hatched on the site plan.

20. STORM WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION: The City’s full-sized “Pollution Prevention - It’s Part of the Plan” sheet must be included in the plan set. The sheet is available here: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/2732. The ARB package shows the outdated Pollution Prevention sheet. The exhibit was modified in 2015 and the ARB package should use the most current exhibit.

21. IMPERVIOUS SURFACE AREA: If the project will be creating or replacing 500 square feet or more of impervious surface. Accordingly, the applicant shall provide calculations of the existing and proposed impervious surface areas with the building permit application. The Impervious Area Worksheet for Land Developments form and instructions are available at the Development Center or on our website.

PRIOR TO BUILDING PERMIT FINAL
22. STORMWATER MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT: The applicant shall designate a party to maintain the control measures for the life of the improvements and must enter into a maintenance agreement with the City to guarantee the ongoing maintenance of the permanent C.3 storm water discharge compliance measures. The maintenance agreement shall be executed prior to the first building occupancy sign-off. The City will inspect the treatment measures yearly and charge an inspection fee. There is currently a $551 C.3 (2017FY) plan check fee that will be collected upon submittal for a grading or building permit.

23. STORM WATER TREATMENT: At the time of installation of the required storm water treatment measures and prior to the issuance of any occupancy permit, a third-party reviewer shall also submit to the City a certification for approval that the project’s permanent measures were constructed and installed in accordance to the approved permit drawings.

PUBLIC WORKS – WATERSHED PROTECTION
The following comments are required to be addressed prior to any future related permit application such as a Building Permit, Excavation and Grading Permit, Certificate of Compliance, Street Work Permit, Encroachment Permit, etc. These comments are provided as a courtesy and are not required to be addressed prior to the Planning entitlement approval:

1. PAMC 16.09.055 Unpolluted Water
   Unpolluted water shall not be discharged through direct or indirect connection to the sanitary sewer system, and

   PAMC 16.09.175 (b) General prohibitions and practices
   Exterior (outdoor) drains may be connected to the sanitary sewer system only if the area in which the drain is located is covered or protected from rainwater run-on by berms and/or grading, and appropriate wastewater treatment approved by the Superintendent is provided. For additional information regarding loading docks, see section 16.09.175(k)

2. PAMC 16.09.225(b)(9) Vehicle Washing Operations
   No person shall discharge wastewater from vehicle washing operations or wash racks to the storm drain system or onto the ground. A drain shall be installed to capture all vehicle wash waters and shall be connected to an oil/water separator prior to discharge to the sanitary sewer system. The oil/water separator shall be cleaned at a frequency of at least once every six months or more frequently if recommended by the manufacturer or the Superintendent. Oil/water separators shall have a minimum capacity of 100 gallons. The area shall be graded or bermed, and be equipped with a shut-off drain valve to prevent the discharge of storm water to the sanitary sewer system.

3. PAMC 16.09.180(b)(14) Architectural Copper
   On and after January 1, 2003, copper metal roofing, copper metal gutters, copper metal down spouts, and copper granule containing asphalt shingles shall not be permitted for use on any residential, commercial or industrial building for which a building permit is required. Copper flashing for use under tiles or slates and small copper ornaments are exempt from this prohibition. Replacement roofing, gutters and downspouts on historic structures are exempt, provided that the roofing material used shall be prepatinated at the factory. For the purposes of this exemption, the definition of “historic” shall be limited to structures designated as Category 1 or Category 2 buildings in the current edition of the Palo Alto Historical and Architectural Resources Report and Inventory.

5. PAMC 16.09.180(b)(5) Condensate from HVAC
   Condensate lines shall not be connected or allowed to drain to the storm drain system.

6. PAMC 16.09.180(b)(b) Copper Piping
   Copper, copper alloys, lead and lead alloys, including brass, shall not be used in sewer lines, connectors, or seals coming in contact with sewage except for domestic waste sink traps and short lengths of associated connecting pipes where alternate materials are not practical. The plans must specify that copper piping will not be used for wastewater plumbing.

7. 16.09.180(12) Mercury Switches
Mercury switches shall not be installed in sewer or storm drain sumps.

8. PAMC 16.09.165(h) Storm Drain Labeling

Storm drain inlets shall be clearly marked with the words "No dumping - Flows to Bay," or equivalent.

**PUBLIC WORKS - RECYCLING**

The location of the trash enclosure will require staff to move the carts to the curb. The hauler can pick up the carts in the enclosure, but this will incur a significant "pull-out" charge.

Zero Waste strongly recommends removing the public litter can from the outdoor entry area off of Newell Road. If public litter cans are placed at that location, two can - one for garbage and one for recycling - should be at that location. The Fire Department should also verify with CSD and PWD as to who is expected to maintain the public litter can(s).

**UTILITIES – ELECTRICAL**

B 1. Industrial and large commercial customers must allow sufficient lead-time for Electric Utility Engineering and Operations (typically 8-12 weeks after advance engineering fees have been paid) to design and construct the electric service requested.

B 2. A completed Utility Service Application and a full set of plans must be included with all applications involving electrical work. The Application must be included with the preliminary submittal.

B 3. The applicant shall submit a request to disconnect all existing utility services and/or meters including a signed affidavit of vacancy, on the form provided by the Building Inspection Division. Utilities will be disconnected or removed within 10 working days after receipt of request. The demolition permit will be issued after all utility services and/or meters have been disconnected and removed.

B 4. All utility meters, lines, transformers, backflow preventers, and any other required equipment shall be shown on the landscape and irrigation plans and shall show that no conflict will occur between the utilities and landscape materials. In addition, all aboveground equipment shall be screened in a manner that is consistent with the building design and setback requirements.

B 5. Contractors and developers shall obtain permit from the Department of Public Works before digging in the street right-of-way. This includes sidewalks, driveways and planter strips.

B 6. At least 48 hours prior to starting any excavation, the customer must call Underground Service Alert (USA) at 1-800-227-2600 to have existing underground utilities located and marked. The areas to be checked for underground facility marking shall be delineated with white paint. All USA markings shall be removed by the customer or contractor when construction is complete.

B 7. The customer is responsible for installing all on-site substructures (conduits, boxes and pads) required for the electric service. No more than 270 degrees of bends are allowed in a secondary conduit run. All conduits must be sized according to California Electric Code requirements and no 1/2 – inch size conduits are permitted. All off-site substructure work will be constructed by the City at the customer’s expense. Where mutually agreed upon by the City and the Applicant, all or part of the off-site substructure work may be constructed by the Applicant.

B 8. All primary electric conduits shall be concrete encased with the top of the encasement at the depth of 30 inches. No more than 180 degrees of bends are allowed in a primary conduit run. Conduit runs over 500 feet in length require additional pull boxes.

B 9. All new underground conduits and substructures shall be installed per City standards and shall be inspected by the Electrical Underground Inspector before backfilling.

B 10. For services larger than 1600 amps, a transition cabinet as the interconnection point between the utility’s padmount transformer and the customer’s main switchgear may be required. See City of Palo
Alto Utilities Standard Drawing SR-XF-E-1020. The cabinet design drawings must be submitted to the Electric Utility Engineering Division for review and approval.

B 11. For underground services, no more than four (4) 750 MCM conductors per phase can be connected to the transformer secondary terminals; otherwise, bus duct or x-flex cable must be used for connections to padmount transformers. If customer installs a bus duct directly between the transformer secondary terminals and the main switchgear, the installation of a transition cabinet will not be required.

B 12. The customer is responsible for installing all underground electric service conductors, bus duct, transition cabinets, and other required equipment. The installation shall meet the California Electric Code and the City Standards.

B 13. Meter and switchboard requirements shall be in accordance with Electric Utility Service Equipment Requirements Committee (EUSERC) drawings accepted by Utility and CPA standards for meter installations.

B 14. Shop/factory drawings for switchboards (400A and greater) and associated hardware must be submitted for review and approval prior to installing the switchgear to:

Gopal Jagannath, P.E.
Supervising Electric Project Engineer
Utilities Engineering (Electrical)
1007 Elwell Court
Palo Alto, CA 94303

B 15. For 400A switchboards only, catalog cut sheets may be substituted in place of factory drawings.

B 16. All new underground electric services shall be inspected and approved by both the Building Inspection Division and the Electrical Underground Inspector before energizing.

B 17. The customer shall provide as-built drawings showing the location of all switchboards, conduits (number and size), conductors (number and size), splice boxes, vaults and switch/transformer pads.

B 18. The follow must be completed before Utilities will make the connection to the utility system and energize the service:

- All fees must be paid.
- All required inspections have been completed and approved by both the Building Inspection Division and the Electrical Underground Inspector.
- All Special Facilities contracts or other agreements need to be signed by the City and applicant.
- Easement documents must be completed.

**UTILITIES – WATER GAS WASTEWATER**

1. Prior to Demolition Permit Issuance
   a) The applicant shall submit the existing water/wastewater fixture unit loads (and building as-built plans to verify the existing loads) to determine the capacity fee credit for the existing load. If the applicant does not submit loads and plans they may not receive credit for the existing water/wastewater fixtures.

   b) The applicant shall submit a request to disconnect all utility services and/or meters including a signed affidavit of vacancy. Utilities will be disconnected or removed within 10 working days after receipt of request. The demolition permit will be issued by the building inspection division after all utility services and/or meters have been disconnected and removed (existing building).

2. Plan Requirements
   a) The applicant shall submit improvement plans for utility construction. The plans must show the size and location of all underground utilities within the development and the public right of way including meters, backflow preventers, fire service requirements, sewer mains, sewer cleanouts, sewer lift stations and any other required utilities.
b) The applicant must show on the site plan the existence of any auxiliary water supply, (i.e. water well, gray water, recycled water, rain catchment, water storage tank, etc).

c) The applicant shall be responsible for installing and upgrading the existing utility mains and/or services as necessary to handle anticipated peak loads. This responsibility includes all costs associated with the design and construction for the installation/upgrade of the utility mains and/or services (if required).

d) An approved reduced pressure principle assembly (RPPA backflow preventer device) is required for all existing and new water connections from Palo Alto Utilities to comply with requirements of California administrative code, title 17, sections 7583 through 7605 inclusive. The RPPA shall be installed on the owner’s property and directly behind the water meter within 5 feet of the property line. RPPA’s for domestic service shall be lead free. Show the location of the RPPA on the plans.

e) An approved reduced pressure detector assembly is required for the existing or new water connection for the fire system to comply with requirements of California administrative code, title 17, sections 7583 through 7605 inclusive (a double detector assembly may be allowed for existing fire sprinkler systems upon the CPAU’s approval). Reduced pressure detector assemblies shall be installed on the owner’s property adjacent to the property line, within 5’ of the property line. Show the location of the reduced pressure detector assembly on the plans.

f) Existing wastewater laterals that are not plastic (ABS, PVC, or PE) shall be replaced at the applicant’s expense.

g) Existing water services that are not a currently standard material shall be replaced at the applicant’s expense.

h) The applicant shall pay the capacity fees and connection fees associated with new utility service/s or added demand on existing services. The approved relocation of services, meters, hydrants, or other facilities will be performed at the cost of the person/entity requesting the relocation.

i) Each unit or place of business shall have its own water and gas meter shown on the plans. Each parcel shall have its own water service, gas service and sewer lateral connection shown on the plans.

j) A separate water meter and backflow preventer is required to irrigate the approved landscape plan (≥ 1000 SQFT lawn area). Show the location of the irrigation meter on the plans. This meter shall be designated as an irrigation account an no other water service will be billed on the account. The irrigation and landscape plans submitted with the application for a grading or building permit shall conform to the City of Palo Alto water efficiency standards.

3. For Building Permit

a) The applicant shall submit a completed water-gas-wastewater service connection application - load sheet for City of Palo Alto Utilities. The applicant must provide all the information requested for utility service demands (water in fixture units/g.p.m., gas in b.t.u.p.h, and sewer in fixture units/g.p.d.). The applicant shall provide the existing (prior) loads, the new loads, and the combined/total loads (the new loads plus any existing loads to remain).

b) The applicant’s engineer may require to submit flow calculations and system capacity study showing that the on-site and off-site water and sanitary sewer mains (existing 5.4” PE sewer main) and services will provide the domestic, irrigation, fire flows, and wastewater capacity needed to service the development and adjacent properties during anticipated peak flow demands. Field testing may be required to determined current flows and water pressures on existing water main. Calculations must be signed and stamped by a registered civil engineer. The applicant is required to perform, at his/her expense, a flow monitoring study of the existing sewer main to determine the remaining capacity. The report must include existing peak flows or depth of flow based on a minimum monitoring period of seven continuous days or as determined by the senior wastewater engineer. The study shall meet the requirements and the approval of the WGW engineering section. No downstream overloading of existing sewer main will be permitted.
c) All backflow preventer devices shall be approved by the WGW engineering division. Inspection by the utilities cross connection inspector is required for the supply pipe between the meter and the assembly.

d) If a new water service line installation for domestic usage is required. For service connections of 4-inch through 8-inch sizes, the applicant’s contractor must provide and install a concrete vault with meter reading lid covers for water meter and other required control equipment in accordance with the utilities standard detail. Show the location of the new water service and meter on the plans.

e) If a new water service line installation for fire system usage is required. Show the location of the new water service on the plans. The applicant shall provide to the engineering department a copy of the plans for fire system including all fire department’s requirements. Please see a fire/domestic combination service connection for your project - see City of Palo Alto standard WD-11.

f) If a new gas service line installation is required. Show the new gas meter location on the plans. The gas meter location must conform to utilities standard details. Gas meter to be installed above ground.

g) A new sewer lateral installation per lot is required. Show the location of the new sewer lateral on the plans.

h) All existing water and wastewater services that will not be reused shall be abandoned at the main per WGW utilities procedures.

i) Utility vaults, transformers, utility cabinets, concrete bases, or other structures cannot be placed over existing water, gas or wastewater mains/services. Maintain 1’ horizontal clear separation from the vault/cabinet/concrete base to existing utilities as found in the field. If there is a conflict with existing utilities, Cabinets/vaults/bases shall be relocated from the plan location as needed to meet field conditions. Trees may not be planted within 10 feet of existing water, gas or wastewater mains/services or meters. New water, gas or wastewater services/meters may not be installed within 10’ of existing trees. Maintain 10’ between new trees and new water, gas and wastewater services/mains/meters.

j) To install new gas service by directional boring, the applicant is required to have a sewer cleanout at the front of the building. This cleanout is required so the sewer lateral can be videoed for verification of no damage after the gas service is installed by directional boring.

k) All utility installations shall be in accordance with the City of Palo Alto utility standards for water, gas & wastewater.

PUBLIC ART
The applicant intends to incorporate art into the project and has been working with public art program staff to meet with the Public Art Commission. The final review with the Public Art Commission must be completed and the project artist and artwork approved prior to the issuance of a building permit. The artwork must be installed as approved prior to the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy. If the applicant chooses to instead pay to the public art fund in lieu of commissioning art on site, the funds must be received prior to the issuance of a building permit.

URBAN FORESTRY

1. Tree Protection Report (TPR): The TPR submitted with the Building Permit shall include protection and water monitoring for any trees to be retained on the site and adjacent trees that overhang the project site.

2. Building Permit: The Building Permit shall include:
   a. A Tree Disposition Sheet showing all existing conditions of the site, curb cuts, utilities and trees to be retained, removed, and relocated.
b. Grading and drainage plan that includes existing and proposed contours @ 2-foot intervals, shows any excavation proposed in the tree protection zone of any regulated trees including parking lot trees overhanging the site. Drainage shall be directed away from any oak.

c. Plan notes for any excavation or activity proposed in the TPZ any regulated tree. Indicate on plans the area and details for removal of existing concrete, grading, and irrigation system over tree roots with the dripline area, consistent with TTM, Sec.2.40.

d. Accurate locations for TPZ fencing placement, specifying ‘Type I’ around the protected trees and public street trees, as noted in the tree survey or tree preservation report.

e. All existing and proposed utility, telecommunication, driveway construction, transformer and pad size, above and below ground locations within the dripline of any regulated tree. Avoid any reference to utilities within 10 feet of public trees on either side of the sidewalk.

f. 3. During Construction:
   a. TREE PROTECTION VERIFICATION. Prior to any site work a written verification from the contractor that the required protective fencing is in place shall be submitted to the Urban Forestry Section (derek.sproat@cityofpaloalto.org). The fencing shall contain required warning sign and remain in place until final inspection of the project.
   b. EXCAVATION RESTRICTIONS APPLY (TTM, Sec. 2.20 C & D). Any approved grading, digging or trenching beneath a tree canopy shall be performed using ‘air-spade’ method as a preference, with manual hand shovel as a backup. For utility trenching, including sewer line, roots exposed with diameter of 1.5 inches and greater shall remain intact and not be damaged. If directional boring method is used to tunnel beneath roots, then Table 2-1, Trenching and Tunneling Distance, shall be printed on the final plans to be implemented by Contractor.
   c. PLAN CHANGES. Revisions and/or changes to plans before or during construction shall be reviewed and responded to by the (a) project site arborist, (name of certified arborist of record and phone #), or (b) landscape architect with written letter of acceptance before submitting the revision to the Building Department for review by Planning, PW or Urban Forestry.
   d. CONDITIONS. All Planning Department conditions of approval for the project shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit.
   e. TREE PROTECTION COMPLIANCE. The owner and contractor shall implement all protection and inspection schedule measures, design recommendations and construction scheduling as stated in the TPR & Sheet T-1, and is subject to code compliance action pursuant to PAMC 8.10.080. The required protective fencing shall remain in place until final landscaping and inspection of the project. Project arborist approval must be obtained and documented in the monthly activity report sent to the City. The mandatory Contractor and Arborist Monthly Tree Activity Report shall be sent monthly to the City (pwps@cityofpaloalto.org) beginning with the initial verification approval, using the template in the Tree Technical Manual, Addendum 11.
   f. TREE DAMAGE. Tree Damage, Injury Mitigation and Inspections apply to Contractor. Reporting, injury mitigation measures and arborist inspection schedule (1-5) apply pursuant to TTM, Section 2.20-2.30. Contractor shall be responsible for the repair or replacement of any publicly owned or protected trees that are damaged during the course of construction, pursuant to Title 8 of the Palo Alto Municipal Code, and city Tree Technical Manual, Section 2.25.
   g. GENERAL. The following general tree preservation measures apply to all trees to be retained: No storage of material, topsoil, vehicles or equipment shall be permitted within the tree enclosure area. The ground under and around the tree canopy area shall not be altered. Trees to be retained shall be irrigated, aerated and maintained as necessary to ensure survival.

4. Prior to Occupancy:
   a. URBAN FORESTRY DIGITAL FILE & INSPECTION. The applicant or architect shall provide a digital file of the landscape plan, including new off-site trees in the publicly owned right-of-way. A USB Flash Drive, with CAD or other files that show species, size and exact scaled location of each tree on public property, shall be delivered to Urban Forestry at a tree and landscape inspection scheduled by Urban Forestry (650-496-5953).
   b. LANDSCAPE CERTIFICATION LETTER. The Planning Department shall be in receipt of a verification letter that the Landscape Architect has inspected all trees, shrubs, planting and irrigation and that they are installed and functioning as specified in the approved plans.
   c. PROJECT ARBORIST CERTIFICATION LETTER. Prior to written request for temporary or final occupancy, the contractor shall provide to the Planning Department and property owner a final inspection letter by the Project Arborist. The inspection shall evaluate the success or needs of
Regulated tree protection, including new landscape trees, as indicated on the approved plans. The written acceptance of successful tree preservation shall include a photograph record and/or recommendations for the health, welfare, mitigation remedies for injuries (if any). The final report may be used to navigate any outstanding issues, concerns or security guarantee return process, when applicable.

d. PLANNING INSPECTION. Prior to final sign off, contractor or owner shall contact the city planner (650-329-2441) to inspect and verify Special Conditions relating to the conditions for structures, fixtures, colors and site plan accessories.

5. Post Construction: All landscape and trees shall be maintained, watered, fertilized, and pruned according to Best Management Practices-Pruning (ANSI A300-2008 or current version) and the City Tree Technical Manual, Section 5.00. Any vegetation that dies shall be replaced or failed automatic irrigation repaired by the current property owner within 30 days of discovery.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal C-1: Effective and efficient delivery of community services</th>
<th>A new code-compliant, modern, safe station will allow for more effective and efficient emergency services and related activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal C-4: Attractive, well-maintained community facilities that serve residents</td>
<td>The proposed station will be attractive and allow for easier maintenance in the long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy C-24: Reinvest in aging facilities to improve their usefulness and appearance. Avoid deferred maintenance</td>
<td>The aging facility does not meet today’s needs for a modern fire station providing adequate storage, service areas and resident amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy C-62: Design and construct new community facilities to have flexible functions to ensure adaptability to the changing needs of the community.</td>
<td>Dormitories, office and utility space are on the 2nd floor; apparatus bays and public functions are on the 1st floor. The community will always need a fire station in this part of the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program L-49: Maintain and support historic or consistent design character in areas with such character</td>
<td>The design respects the surrounding mid-century institutional character but does not replicate the character; project uses materials in a way that is compatible with mid-century design concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-50: Encourage high quality signage that is attractive, appropriate for the location and balances visibility needs with aesthetic needs</td>
<td>The existing wood monument sign will be relocated to the corner of the site; an above-canopy sign is indicated facing Newell Rd; a window sign is indicated facing Embarcadero Rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-58: Promote adaptive reuse of old buildings</td>
<td>The project is to demolish rather than reuse the old building, given the safety and other needs of the community, and to meet code requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-48: Promote high quality, creative design and site planning that is compatible with surrounding development and public spaces.</td>
<td>The selected architectural style will be compatible with mid-century institutional buildings in the area. The proposal would not impact adjacent public park (Rinconada) trees or uses (with additional landscaping to soften the precast concrete wall). High quality materials are proposed throughout the project. An uncovered, 2nd floor ‘residential’ terrace would face the park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-49: Design buildings to revitalize streets and public spaces and to enhance a sense of community and personal safety. Provide an ordered variety of entries, porches, windows, bays and balconies along public ways where it is consistent with neighborhood character; avoid blank</td>
<td>The new building and site improvements provide architectural and pedestrian interest at the street level; pedestrian entry plaza on Newell and at corner. Solid and fairly blank walls are part of the design due to the uses within the building; however glass garage doors face Embarcadero, and glass is proposed at the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-66:</td>
<td>Maintain an aesthetically pleasing street network that helps frame and define the community while meeting the needs of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-70:</td>
<td>Enhance the appearance of streets and other public spaces by expanding and maintaining Palo Alto’s street tree system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program L-71:</td>
<td>Recognize Embarcadero Road (and other roads noted) as a scenic route (providing main access to the Baylands and secondary access to Stanford University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-72:</td>
<td>Promote and maintain public art compatible with the character and identity of the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-62:</td>
<td>Provide comfortable seating areas and plazas with places for public art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-74:</td>
<td>Use the work of artists, landscape architects, etc. in the design and improvement of public spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-75:</td>
<td>Minimize the negative physical impacts of parking lots. Locate parking behind buildings or underground wherever possible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy T-1:</td>
<td>Make land use decisions that encourage walking, bicycling, and public transit use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy T-19:</td>
<td>Improve and add attractive, secure, bicycle parking...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy L-76:</td>
<td>Require trees and other landscaping within parking lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program L-75:</td>
<td>Program for implementing codes requiring trees capable of providing 50% shade in parking lots within 15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy N-17:</td>
<td>Preserve and protect heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>trees, including native oaks and other significant trees on public and private property.</strong></td>
<td><strong>redwood will be preserved in place. Several significant and protected trees nearby on the adjacent Rinconada Park will be preserved and protected.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policy N-22:</strong> Limit the amount of impervious surface in new development or public improvement projects to reduce urban runoff into storm drains, creeks, and the San Francisco Bay</td>
<td><strong>Pervious parking space pavement, C3 swales and permeable landscaping are features of the project.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ATTACHMENT D
## ZONING COMPLIANCE TABLE
### 799 Embarcadero Road/Fire Station #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS FOR PF Public Facilities ZONE DISTRICT</th>
<th>ZONE DISTRICT STANDARD</th>
<th>EXISTING/PROPOSED PROJECT</th>
<th>CONFORMANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses Allowed</td>
<td>Allowable use, Fire Station</td>
<td>Fire Station</td>
<td>conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Building setback</td>
<td>Equal to setback required in most restrictive abutting district – no interior yard less than 10 feet</td>
<td>PF</td>
<td>conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front Yard (Embarcadero)</td>
<td>24 feet special setback</td>
<td>51 feet (existing) 35 feet (proposed)</td>
<td>conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rear Yard (Hopkins)</td>
<td>20 feet</td>
<td>Minor increase in setback from existing</td>
<td>conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior Side Yard (Park)</td>
<td>10 feet</td>
<td>No change; Parkland boundary is not a lot line</td>
<td>conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Side Yard (Newell Road)</td>
<td>24 feet special setback</td>
<td>27 feet</td>
<td>conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Site Coverage (building footprint)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Proposed: 17.2%</td>
<td>Conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Height</td>
<td>35’ within 150’ of residential zone</td>
<td>15 feet, existing height; 33’5”, proposed height top of parapet center structure; 30’ top of parapet of wings</td>
<td>conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum Floor Area Ratio (FAR)</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>Less than 0.17:1</td>
<td>conforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Requirement</td>
<td>Specific to use</td>
<td>5 existing vehicle spaces; 9 proposed including ADA and 2 EV capable spaces; 8 bike parking spaces proposed</td>
<td>Conforms per 18.52.070 C(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16 February 2017

Amy French
City of Palo Alto Planning Division
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94310

**Re: Palo Alto Fire Station No. 3**

Dear Ms. French,

We would like to thank you and the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board in taking the time to review our submittal for the Palo Alto Fire Station No. 3 project.

The following table enumerates as our response to the ARB comments made during the discussion at the ARB meeting on January 19th, 2017:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>ARB COMMENT</strong></th>
<th><strong>SKA RESPONSE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There were some concerns that the elevation facing the park was still too large. It was asked if there was any way to further reduce the massing on the park.</td>
<td>By lowering the second floor by 6 inches, we were able to achieve an overall height reduction of the entire building. This reduction was accomplished by adding additional steel framing above the apparatus bay. On the zinc clad massing closest to the park, the height was reduced even further; this mass was lowered by an additional 2'-2&quot; for a total of 2'-8&quot; lower than was previously presented. We achieved this by removing the parapet wall completely at this location and changing the second floor ceiling height from 9' - 0&quot; to 8' - 0&quot;. To further reduce the bulk on this side and against the sky, we also thinned the &quot;flying beam&quot; at the corner from its original thickness of 2'-10&quot; to a thickness of 1'-7&quot;. Finally, the park side &quot;slot&quot; window which echoed the &quot;slot&quot; window above the entry has been changed back to a simple punched opening due to constructability issues when the parapet was removed in this location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Landscaping and plant palette on the park side of the wall was discussed.</td>
<td>Plant palette will be native, drought-tolerant, shade-tolerant, and low maintenance. A substitution to the Pacific Mist will be made due to the discussion of a local failure rate of that species. More than one groundcover species will be incorporated in case of failure of any one species.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
February 16, 2017

We look forward to meeting with you again on March 2nd to discuss the project further. In the meantime, please feel free to contact me should you have any questions or additional comments. My direct phone line is 510-379-2261. You can also reach me at akawasaki@skarc.com.

Sincerely,

Alan Kawasaki, AIA, LEED BD+C
Principal
Shah Kawasaki Architect
Present: Chair Alexander Lew, Vice Chair Kyu Kim, Board Members Wynne Furth, Robert Gooyer, Peter Baltay

Action Items

PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 799 Embarcadero Road (file PLN16-00123): Applicant’s Request for Architectural Review Approval of a Two-Story, 6,663 Square Foot Replacement Fire Station Building Located on the Northwest Corner of Embarcadero and Newell Roads Adjacent to the Southeasterly Edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27 Acre Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Section 15302 Southeasterly Edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27 Acre Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction of Existing Structures). Zoning District: Public Facility (PF)

Chair Lew: Ok, so the next item is item 3. It’s a public hearing/quasi-judicial for 799 Embarcadero Road. Applicant’s request for architectural review approval of a new two-story, 6,663 square foot replacement fire station located on the Northwest corner of Embarcadero and Newell Roads which is adjacent to the southeasterly edge of Rinconada Park; which is an 18.27-acre property. An Environmental Assessment is that the project is exempt from CEQA, pursuant to section 15302 and the zoning is public facility. So, Staff?

Ms. French: Yes, thank you, Amy French, again. I wanted to just start off by reminding the Board that this was last before you on December 1st and we did try to capture in the Staff report the various comments that were made and how the applicant has returned. The applicant did provide an updated chart that’s attached to the plans that were sent out. We got them the day of the packet so – it’s just slightly different. It has a few more statements there. Again, here is the existing first station. You saw these images last time. I just wanted to let you know, over the weekend I had a chat with the former firefighter who said that the firefighters are interested in that original sign because some of them, including the one that I spoke to, started work at that station and has some sentimental attachment to this original sign. He said, you know, even if it was salvaged and placed inside in the lounge where they hang out, that would be nice; so, I just thought I would bring that up. Again, the HRB had seen this before and had asked for consideration for a pitched roof. The ARB, some members brought that up last time as well and then, also there was a suggestion for outreach to the Community and I’ll have to say, they really knocked it out of the park. The fire Chief and the Staff here and Public Works met – Matt Raschke to my left and Bridget, and the architects held an event over at the Art Center in the former City Council Chambers there, and we did have one attendee, but it was very interesting because her father had been the one to design the Terra Cotta wall over at the Rinconada Park – I’m sorry, over at the Rinconada Library. So, it was very interesting having a conversation with her. The revised plans, just to get to it; Zinc panels here and I’ll let the architect go a bit more into the choices there, but there was a concern by the ARB about the life span of the material. Then, the park facing the wall, there was another concern there so, there have been changes there. The other note was about the corner, your noticing
that there can be a bit more generous paved area for the bicyclists that come to that corner. I have the revised materials here, just quickly; again, the architect will cover these in more detail, but CMU wall with recurring slates and openings facing the park with some additional vegetation; the wood soffit going into the inside to supplement the wood door. Then, of course, these are two images that you have in your plans that have the see thru fence option and then the CMU wall with the breaks and the additional vine plantings. Then here, on one of your later pages in the packet shows a study for a pitched roof. So, this would be increasing the massing and that’s what the architect looked at. Again, here’s the existing and proposed layout, and so, that’s it. I’ll just leave this out. Again, we’re asking for the Architectural Review Board to [Technical difficulties] So, we’re asking for architectural review recommendation to the Director today. We’ve teed it up that way with the findings and conditions so we’re hopeful that the ARB can come to a recommendation today, and Matt, did you want to add anything as the project manager?

Mr. Matt Raschke: No, I would just like to introduce Alan Kawasaki from Shah Kawasaki Architects and have him present the latest design.

Chair Lew: Well, welcome back and you have 10 minutes.

Mr. Alan Kawasaki: Yes. Thank you for seeing us again and we also joined by the Fire Department with your questions as well as our landscape architect if there are any questions in that direction. Just to summarize, I think we all have recognized that the surrounding has a mid-century modern vocabulary and we’ve been trying to respect that and as we know, modernism is not necessarily fixed in time but it’s about reflecting our own time but being respectful of course to existing conditions. As we talked about previously, you know, our constraint is that we’re essentially trying to put twice as much program into the same footprint in the same sight so, that’s a challenge. We’re trying to get more in and how do we do that has generally been through a two-story, rather than a one-story building. I’m going to show a little bit of backtrack only to show the progression because I know that not all of us have attended every single one of the past – this is the third meeting so -- Board Member Furth?

Board Member Furth: I should say that I was unable to attend it but I have read the minutes carefully and they’re practically revamped.

Mr. Kawasaki: Right. So, this was actually where we were in November and I think we first talked to you in June but November we were here and we were - actually, we had also talked to HRB; had a presentation. This reflects where we were with them and also with some preliminary with you and I think what we’ve been seeking to do is get more articulation and scale to the building. So, as we’ve progressed, we’ve added more window openings, more variations to the facades but it has remained --in our recommendation, it has been for a flat two-story building rather than sloped. Just to recall also, part of the reason was of course, if we sloped it, we believe that many of the elements will exceed the 35-foot height limit, if we had sloped elements. The other is that our belief is that we are now required – as architects, we know that we have CALGreen and we know that we have PV requirements and so, we also know that technology changes over time so, we felt that rather than having PVs on a sloped roof, that having on our high section – as you know, we increased that center bay above the apparatus and made the saddle bags lower but we made the center part taller. That center part is where being PV panels are and are ballasted so they could be changed out over time. This was the first iteration. More articulation and I know this was not necessarily what we came for today to talk about, really, we came about this slide. Same thing though, rather boxy to begin with, more articulation and I think the last comments we had on this slide or questions that we had to address, where the materials. The question was on our specified materials, which is a fluoropolymer or Kynar aluminum finish. Is there something that could be designed to have a longer durability? One question was asked, “what is the durability of Kynar or fluoropolymer?” and, as we all know, it is the material, state of the art, high risers are cladded in it so it is the best in terms of finished materials. What we said was, “how about we have natural materials?” What we are coming to you today is to say, as an option or recommendation, we like – we’re recommending Rheinzink, which is a Zinc material so there is no paint on it. It weathers to this color. Actually, we’re having it pre-weathered and the panels are a little different, it’s more of a thinner panel as you see and vertical which we think is fine because we’ll have the metal panels vertical. We’ll have the
Terra Cotta horizontal just to keep them different, keep them broken up. The other thing we did was – I think there was a comment on the elevation. You liked the wood door as we do and just to note, our interiors of our front entry, the ceilings are wood and so we thought, let's bring more of this wood. So, what we're proposing to do is on the soffits, the underside - I hope this works - yeah -- so the undersides, we're actually putting a wood slate and we like that idea because you know, weathering wood is also an issue over time and so this becomes protected. As we're entering the building, we have a nice human scale and pick up on the door which is wood and then the wood panels that are in the ceilings beyond. The other comment was on this elevation in particular, but I think in general it was the idea of a sloped roof. We did look at that again but we still feel that – essentially, what we've done is our saddle bag portion or the metal portion of the building are pretty much -- the roof is just at or slightly above - the parapet is almost a gravel stop and so anything that we add in terms of sloping to that, will increase the height of the building. Then, if we did that, this shows at the high point 35-foot and at the low point right down to the lowest portion of the gravel stop so technically, we can slope and if we were to slope, we like the idea of Asymmetry in the building rather than symmetry but still, our recommendation is not to go this direction. As you can imagine as I have already stated – and we were just looking at this element so, if we were to make this low and make this high at 35-feet – but imagine taking this from the low point and raising at the same slope to that point, we would exceed significantly the height limits. Again, we think that the idea of having a flat zone here with interchangeable PV panels is probably the best. We have a tree here of course so, this location also gets us mostly the best orientation – southern exposure, probably this is not a great location but we think this as a flat roof predominantly over the main bay is the way to go. We think that by bringing more articulation to the building, we've accomplished many of the concerns I think that we heard about massing and scale. This is our recommendation. I think some of the other points that were a concern last time were the concrete wall along the park and there were concerns about both the massing, but also, is there a way to kind of have a little bit transparency, rather than – well, what we did was photographed the building as it exists. We take relatively the same angle -- I think you pointed out that there is a picnic bench of course, which exists there and then there's a little barbeque place there. Right now, you cannot see or see it just a tiny bit of the existing building right here and yes, a two-story building will be seen from here but is obscured by the current trees and as we know, when we rebuild a wall, a lot of these existing trees with be affected. Our proposal - this is the first one which is the idea of transparency. This proposal is one where I think as suggested that some sort of gate that we have at the - sliding entry gate to the parking would be replicated on this side and yes, you would see through but I think -- just bear in mind what you're going to be seeing is parked firefighter vehicles. There are storage vehicles back there also for emergency and of course we have the generator and other things. We can do it, it's not our favorite solution so we're thinking if the transparency was desired maybe an idea of slots in the wall makes a bit more sense. So, we would have these - yes, these sort of metal pickets as where shown here but really in kind of isolated places and that's what's shown here. You wouldn't really see until you got up and if you really wanted to look in there, you could look in there but not so much. This is sort of at construction and you can see some smaller indications of 15-gallon trees being placed back here. The other thing that we did – I know it's not what you asked for but what we did was we said let's replant all those bushes and trees and vegetation that's there that is actually screening the existing building. We think in sort of 15-years, it's going to look like this. We think in 20-years, maybe you won't see any of the building on that side so, a combination of what do we have in the beginning which is sort of a peek a boo – I think someone said peek a boo look into parking and then over time, all that would grow through. The vines would cover probably those fences and the trees would probably obscure that elevation in its entirety. Then, the following are just simply our resubmitted boards. Our previous board or previous elevation, the Rheinzink boards also with the bird glass, right? Safety glass and - we can take that over there. This is also -- Board Member Lew, this is the block so rather than poured in place concrete, we have to be mindful of our budget also so what we did was we offset – you know concrete block is less than poured in place. We thought, well ok, we get some scale but we made a nice block which is machined faced block and that's what we're proposing. We think that works well with the metal panels; again, concrete walls changing to block walls; Rheinzink, the new glass. These are just for record, right? The concrete with slits and a site plan with more vegetation along that edge. We did widen out along – as much as we could. The problem that we had was that right here; there is telephone pole with guide-wires going out so we weren't able to actually put the paving in here. We were worried about people hitting the guild
wires but we did increase as much as we could the paving area. That’s our response to your thoughts. Thanks very much.

**Chair Lew:** Great. Thank you very much for your presentation. I don’t have any speaker cards. We can move onto the Board Member questions. Anybody? No. Comments? Then why don’t we start with Kyu?

**Vice Chair Kim:** Alright, thank you for coming back with the refinements that you’ve made. I guess I do have a couple quick questions, just to start perhaps. I was not so much against the previous metal panel but I think the Rheinzink is also a fine choice. Is that the only proportion that it comes in? Could you find a wider panel perhaps or is that just the natural dimension of that panel?

**Mr. Kawasaki:** We’re actually trying to look and see. This is what we’ve found thus far. We’re actually - we’re going to talk to our manufacturers of our prior panel which is currently only available in, to see if fluoropolymer they could do this but we don’t have an answer.

**Vice Chair Kim:** Ok and then also, I wanted to get a clarification then, what is your preference for the fencing? Is it to go with (Inaudible) or is it...

**Mr. Kawasaki:** I think the Fire Department can best explain this but you know, we've done 24 fire stations and every single one of those, there is this balance that you have to take between what the public sees and what is kept private. In general, from a functional standpoint, you don’t have those back aprons visible. Then the question usually is, do we make that sliding gate opaque or picketed? In this case, we said picketed. We’ve never had a comment before to open up the backsides of an apron. It usually can be pretty messy back there and if you – the Fire Department is here, they can explain that I’m sure.

**Vice Chair Kim:** Ok, understood. I mean, I think for me, the project was near approvable last time and I think the further refinements that you’ve made - I stand very comfortable in recommending approval of the project. Thank you for staying with us and addressing our comments. I was perhaps just slightly a little disappointed that that water fountain never got moved to the corner but it’s not a deal breaker by any means. I think the choice in materials, again, is very handsome and very thought out. I appreciate the section details of some of those material corners of the building. I think my preference for the fence - my question was actually not so much whether to go picketed or CMU but I think the original fence that was presented in the poured in place concrete was perhaps a little bit nicer but I do understand the cost implication and I would be fine with a CMU fence as well. The comment that I have is really regarding the park facing elevation. It does seem like you’ve tried to make an attempt at changing one of the dormitory windows. It looks like it’s been set further back than the other window and goes to the roof. To me, it seems a little bit like a one off. I can see how at the fire station entrance way, you have a similar window condition where it does go up to the roof but I don’t know if it’s necessarily worth doing that change but in either case, I think over all the fire station has come out very well and I’m appreciative of the process that you’ve undertaken to get here and thank you very much for your presentation.

**Chair Lew:** Robert.

**Board Member Gooyer:** Ok, first of all just a couple of things. I always frown a little bit when an architect sits here and says, don’t worry, in 20-years we’ll put trees there and it will hide the whole things. It just really - that bothers me a little bit but I do like the improvements that you - definitely like the improvements you’ve done with the materials and everything else. I’m still not a big fan of the big cubes. I mean, I do appreciate also the Staff report that says, note that with the proposed installation of solar voltaic – photovoltaic panels will provide a visibly sloped element to serve as a reference to a sloped roof residential oriented civic architecture. If we have to use the solar voltaic panels to get the sloping roof I want, I think we’re really pushing the envelope. This thing has a 5-foot parapet on it and I still don’t see why we can’t get some - and I agree with you, I’m not a big fan of the symmetry; I agree with that. I would prefer an A-symmetrical but I would have liked to see something more of the slope to represent that. I like the change in materials that you’ve done, definitely. The only thing I fear a little bit is the new metal may end up on a not so sunny day, end up being a very, huge black cube sitting there and that
bothers me a little bit. That may detract from the rest of the building. I guess that’s all I have – I’d like to hear what the rest of my fellow Board Members say before I give you a sort of up or down on it.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. Thank you for working through the design process. I think the building has indeed gotten better, gotten closer to something that we can approve every step of the way. Contrary to what Robert said, I liked the elevation, the cube from Newell. I think it’s a handsome building of our time and support that part of it quite well. I also think the use of the natural Zinc panels is a very good change and I want to be clear that we want to – I will want to see that definitely put on the building. I do agree with Roberts comment that your choice of finish might be a little bit dark and I would support having perhaps you take one more look at whether that is the right color. You don’t want it to just be a black box and I have worked with this material and it does on a cold wet day, have a very dampening effect. It’s very non-reflective, very natural looking and you want it to look sort of interesting and crispy and the dark color may not do that. I’d like to bring my comments though back to the Board that I remain quite concerned about the height of the building against the park. I’ve struggled with this quite a bit. I went out yet again, to the park and took a long walk through the whole park from the Lucie Stern Center through the trees and I’m sorry but I think that that part of the park is not just a tucked away piece of one picnic table but rather sort of the end of Rinconada Park, which is heavily used. Those Redwood groves back near this building are, I think, quite heavily used with people sitting, recreating in there. I think your renderings, taking it off from one angle, don’t fully get the way that this will appear through the trees, I grant you. I was unable to convince myself that it didn’t matter, that it was ok. So, back to my Board Members then, this building is 7-feet closer to the property line. It is twice as tall; literally, 30-feet against the boundary. No place else in town do we let a development go that close. What they’re really proposing to do is take another 10-foot buffer zone of the park and let that become the landscape zone. Well, that’s what a setback is and why do we let this building of all buildings push another 10-feet into the park, which is really what they’re doing in order to properly mitigate the impact of the height of this building and the mass of it. Again, 7-feet closer to the property line, twice as tall...

Chair Lew: Can I make a correct, that it is not a property line. There’s a park boundary line but it is one parcel.

Board Member Baltay: Absolutely. I’d like to be clear. I understand that this is one parcel. What I’m referring to is what the public perceives as a boundary line and I think that’s important to see. Anybody else developing in town would think of this as a boundary, a termination and setbacks are designed for purposes to mitigate the effect on the neighboring – I won’t use the word property but the neighboring use. When I look at the design of the building, then I say to myself, what can be done about it because I understand it’s a complex program, it’s on a tight site but if I could pull our attention to section A3.12. I wonder if it’s possible to even pull that up on the screen?

Mr. Kawasaki: I don’t have that on...

Board Member Baltay: Is that possible to...

Mr. Kawasaki: I don’t have it here. No, this is from last time probably or from the hard copy that you...

Board Member Baltay: Well, I’m just looking at the drawing that was given to me. If I get my Board Members to even take a look at section A3.12.

Mr. Kawasaki: If you could just go - show me what that is because we’ll know which one you’re talking about.

Board Member Baltay: It’s a building section through the residential - through the firemen dormitories...

Mr. Kawasaki: Right.
**Board Member Baltay:** ... what I'm looking at is a 10 ½-foot plate to roof area for the dormitories. It's about a 9 ½-foot ceiling for the firemen's dormitories. Then, I'm looking at – it's not dimensioned here - several feet of mechanical space over some other functional space - this is the part of the building that is against the park and I just don't understand why you can't do something to lower the height of that piece of the building. So, in my opinion, for me to feel that I can make a finding that this is contextually appropriate, I think it needs to come down at least 4 or 5-feet against the park somehow, just to mitigate the apparent height. So, that's my push to my fellow Board Members that we seriously consider what's otherwise a very handsome building but seen from this angle of Rinconada Park less so. Thank you.

**Chair Lew:** Wynne.

**Board Member Furth:** Thank you. Could we go back to the image of the view from the park now upon competition? The photo simulation.

**Mr. Kawasaki:** Yes. This one or this one?

**Board Member Furth:** That one. Thank you and just - so, I understand that this is a single parcel of land but we're not here to decide whether something is compliant with the quantitative aspects of the code. We're thinking about does it meet the design standards of the City? Treating the use line, the park boundary as a property line, what the setback of this building from that property line?

**Mr. Kawasaki:** If it were a property line, it's against the property line.

**Board Member Furth:** From that line, there is zero setback?

**Mr. Kawasaki:** Right.

**Board Member Furth:** I think it's our responsibility to look at this not as if where a computing device that can't think about a larger context and is calculating literal compliance with the quantitative code but to understand the intention of these rules. It comes up in the research part to and applies them accordingly. First of all, I think it's great to have a new building. I like the way the building looks from Newell. I like the way it looks from both those street frontages. I think it will be lovely to have a building that looks new, adequately fun and update, solid, unlikely to come down in an earthquake and also is civically inviting on those frontages. I think that is all terrific. I'm very struck by the adverse impact on the park. It does two things. One is, you see it from quite a distance and it's a handsome building but what's special and delightful about Rinconada Park is that it's a wood. Particularly, in the vicinity of this building but not unfortunately in front of it and with this building, we lose two things. We lose the sense of being away from urban hardscape and we lose any sense of privacy. This becomes an overlooked – not in the sense of the neglected but prevailed site. I've got two questions for Staff here because this is a project of course. I'd like to approve – I recommended approval for – one is, are we confident that the shadow line that this building will throw in the park will not adversely affect having plantings there, heavy plantings? I know we have shade diagrams but I don't know what that means in terms of the health of growing plants.

**Ms. French:** Well, I'll try to answer that. I guess the existing plants are mature vegetation and when we say growing plants - I mean, all plants grow but...

**Board Member Furth:** Well, no, in my garden, a lot of them die because of inadequate light.

**Ms. French:** Well, plants tend to continue to grow as long as the circumstances allow for it. The brand-new planting that is proposed in this project include vine plantings along this wall, as shown on the screen image, and I guess potentially transplants of trees. Looking at sheet A108, which is basically, December at 9 AM, you know, there's not going to be much growing going on at that time.
Board Member Furth: I’m basically asking you if it’s going to become all mossy? The answer I’m getting is we don’t know but we think it will work.

Ms. French: I think if you consider where the – where South is, we will have sun coming into it just not at the times – not at 9 AM, you know, in the winter. I think yes, they’ll have enough – Oh, is he? Oh, the landscape architect is here.

Board Member Furth: Great.

Mr. Kawasaki: Would you like – ok. This is Bob…

Board Member Furth: Cool. That’s wonderful.

Mr. Kawasaki: ...Norbutious?

Mr. Bob Norbutious: Hi. Maybe I can help a little bit with that. So, in this situation with the very large trees, regardless of orientation, we’re looking at understory planting design. Along the walls, with the use of vines, we will be able to create that green screen and the interface with the park setting. The planting material is going to be low water use plants that will tolerate the shade, part shade.

Board Member Furth: For example?

Mr. Norbutious: We have Celosia and Salvia on the edges that will still grow thin but will still be a nice rich color. It won’t be a deciduous look so, it will always have that nice green interface with the park itself. Final selection definitely has to consider the shade value of the tree that are above it.

Board Member Furth: If one of the concerns is higher landscaping so that the overlooking of this area by the deck, for example, on the second story is through tree filtered –is through foliage rather than as it presently is, is that possible and how many years would that take? Do we have funding for that part of the design?

Mr. Norbutious: One of the problems of bringing in trees to an existing situation, other than looking at the arborist report and the health of the trees today, you’re looking at a generational planting. That if you were to put in more Redwoods or more groves of trees for future growth as these starts to die, that would be one approach to take. That has been taken before but right now we’re in a situation where it’s understory trees that will be able to grow to their maximum 15 to 20-foot height and not grow irregularly based on what’s above them.

Board Member Furth: So, you couldn’t get a 25-foot tree in there or 30-foot?

Mr. Norbutious: No, that would be with the expectation…

Board Member Furth: I’m not expecting you to do violence to the park design.

Mr. Norbutious: Right. What it would expect is that these trees have a life span that those Redwoods and Oak would eventually come out which generally, looks like they don’t have that ability. If you bring in Redwoods, they’re going to be thin. They would fill in but they would fight with the existing trees.

Board Member Furth: Even though it looks like that there is a fairly large open space here actually, roots are busily occupying that land?

Mr. Norbutious: Right, right.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Well, I find myself in a dilemma here because I think the building is - partly is because I’m mindful that Palo Alto population has residents that have often felt that the City has
not adequately protected its park land. That's why we have a park improvement ordinance that lets them reframe any park improvement. That's why we have a park dedication chart provision that says that the City can't un-dedicate used parkland for non-park uses without the consent of the voters. Looking at these photo simulations, which are not looking at the real building, it seems to me that this does have an adverse impact on that park and I would love to hear from my colleagues that I'm wrong and it will be fine.

Board Member Gooyer: Can I make one thing – what made me think about this is that one of the big issues, when we talked about the University property, is the whole concept of an eyebrow makes it even look bigger than – and that is a terrace. I mean, would there be some consideration of getting rid of that eyebrow which would make that corner a lot smaller?

Bard Member Baltay: Absolutely. That would be an improvement in my opinion.

Board Member Gooyer: That's a fairly simple...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: ...right, exactly. That seems to be the biggest concern that we have is the impact on the park. If possibly, as you said, you take that back second-story area, get rid of the eyebrow. Possibly drop the – just in that area, the ceiling height to 8-feet instead of 9, that would begin to – do a big chunk -- I mean I understand, in the central area you don't want to lose 4-feet out of your space but that would go a long way towards making it seem smaller and also just the whole concept of the shadow study.

Board Member Furth: Somehow, when you take that eyebrow off. It seems like this engages with the park instead of looming over it.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) (Crosstalk)

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) Ok, excellent. I think that is a very interesting suggestion and I - maybe I have a question for the applicant. Board Member Baltay was talking about lowering the height of the building but if you could maybe just refresh our memory about the – you went through the height – I think the first hearing of why the ceiling heights went up and maybe if you just review – you have a cross section through the whole building that shows how the different cubes align with each other.

Mr. Kawasaki: So, the governing elevation setting for the second floor is obviously over the top of the apparatus bay and so, we would want that to be continuous. We would not want to have a staircase going down to the saddle bag so, we take those across. If there some room on that second floor to take it down a bit? Yeah, I would say, currently they are set at 17 if I’m not mistaken. We have, under circumstances, for instance, when the ARB has said we need to take it down, we can push it down a bit. I can't – I’d have to work with the construction engineer and see what we can do. See what happens is you got that fire apparatus that has to come out a 14-foot door and then above that, you have coiling doors on the backside so that there's height. There's also, I think we talked about the (Inaudible), these are the vents – there are hoses that go from the back of the truck. They are on a slider so, those also take the room. The front of the building has the 4-fold doors. They do not have such a requirement however, they have greater depth. If we – we can't really push the building back because of the turning diameter. We can take another look to see if we can get 4-fold doors back in the back. There is a higher cost. They are about 35k per door versus 5-10; they're pretty expensive. They're great doors but that will add considerable cost to the project. I think that we can push the engineering to see if we can drop the floor down somehow if - I think I hear what you're saying. Now, as far as the dormitories, 9-feet; that is a standard firehouse – let's call it program requirement. I will say there are also, similarly, when we have concerns with height. We took down (Inaudible) Fire Department down to 8-foot, which is a residential level in the dorms. Many of our houses are at 8-feet, right? Again, that can be done. We're maybe talking 8-foot on the dorm, maybe a foot on the At. Bay, that's 2-feet. I think what I'm hearing from you is do
everything you can to bring that elevation down and so, that would be something that you could direct us
to do. We would need to see if our department can accept that because it is a programmatic requirement
at this point. Typical fire station has a 9-foot ceiling; typically 17-foot floor to floor. I could, with some
additional engineering see if we can pull that down so, yes, you could direct us to take another look at
that and talk back with our department and see if we can pull that elevation along that side down
slightly. I don't think we're talking 4-feet but maybe a couple feet and I think the suggestion about the
terrace there is a good one. Yeah, we can pull that back and see what we can do there to reduce the
massing; all good comments and things that we can come back to you with.

Chair Lew: OK, thank you.

Board Member Furth: One more question.

Chair Lew: Sure. Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Trying to remember back to our previous discussions. Remind again why this
building couldn’t be back 10-feet from the changed use from the parking boundary? Was it to do with the
turning radius?

Mr. Kawasaki: From the park boundary, it has to do just with getting things to fit. Maybe...

Board Member Furth: Because we’re not built all the way up to the street setback line.

Mr. Kawasaki: No. We can’t be because what happens is if you look at – maybe – let me see if I can get
to the site plan. It was way up front, right? All the way up.

Board Member Furth: C2?

Mr. Kawasaki: I don’t – here. Going back to some of the other diagrams. We are pushing the turning
diameter for a truck to get into these back doors right now.

Board Member Furth: Right.

Mr. Kawasaki: So, that’s at that door. Then we have constraints regarding the historic or the cultural
assets which are the Oaks and the Redwoods. We cannot get into those areas – stay clear of the canopy
because we know the roots are at least that far. Pretty much, if you looked at this footprint, it is pretty
much the same as the existing building footprint with the exception of, as you stated, this area – I think
it's about 7-feet or so. So, we are now encroaching into this area and that is both on the ground floor
and the second floor. That has to do with putting in support and putting in stairs. By support I mean,
(Inaudible) when we do a fire station, there’s more cleaning and safety things that we do. There's more
stuff that we have to do to support an apparatus. The other thing that happens on the upper floor as you
notice is that – you know, we have private bathrooms, private dorm rooms...

Board Member Furth: I know, the introduction of women just made it so much harder.

Mr. Kawasaki: It made it better for everyone. So, yes, we have those issues as well.

Chair Lew: Is that it Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Yes.


Vice Chair Kim: I have one more question. Looking at the perspective that you had on the screen before
and even the west elevation; if the building is up against that park dedication line, currently it's showing
the CMU fence wall with the Rheinzink above, is that what you're planning? It almost looks like there is a
double wall there but it's really on the same plane, is it not?

**Mr. Kawasaki:** This is currently on the same plane so, as you said if this was a property line - that zero-
lot line - block wall on the property line and then the face of the Rheinzink is also directly in alignment
with the concrete block wall.

**Vice Chair Kim:** Ok, thank you.

**Chair Lew:** Ok. I have a couple of over comments that are different than the other Board Members. Part
of this relates towards a revised finding and I think that some of these are issues that we haven't really
discussed in previous hearings. One is that we have a – in our landscape finding, we're trying to create
habitat and so, we are trying to encourage more native plantings. We have that in - I think the Staff has
put in some draft findings for that, which is finding number 5. I think I did want to sort of revise that to
say - let me get the exact wording. I think the Staff has written it as the existing protected trees on and
off site will be retained and protected and I think we just want it to say something more positive which is
that the existing Oak trees are wildlife beneficial and are considered an anchor species for habitat. Then,
there are other native, smaller shrubs, right? Like the Salvia, Spothesea, and the Manzanita are also very
attractive to birds, bees, and butterflies. I think the idea is that in creating a habitat, you actually want
trees and shrubs together. You don't want an Oak tree and a lawn because the wildlife actually wants
both in proximity to each other; is my understanding on it. Then, I guess a question for the landscape
architect, is that the Manzanita that you're specifying for the ground cover. I think you had a lot of it. My
understanding was that that was used along Palm Drive at Stanford when they reconstructed the road in
the 90's. Then, they took it all out because it wasn't performing well and they replaced it with a non-
native plant. I was just - I don't know all the details about it but I was just wondering your thoughts on
how you selected this and then if you're aware of any issues with that variety of Manzanita?

**Mr. Norbutious:** Do you know the actual variety of Manzanita?

**Chair Lew:** It was that Pacific Mist... (Crosstalk)

**Mr. Norbutious:** It was the Pacific Mist? (Crosstalk)

**Chair Lew:** ...Yeah, and they've used it else ware but in this particular one, it was sort of a high-profile
failure. It just didn't really fill in - it was along the curb, right? You know on the planting strips.

**Mr. Norbutious:** Ok. So, as far as plant material, we do like to use it but we have found lately that
working with nurseries and different varieties, we've done some work at the Bay Lands and El Camino
Park. Same kind of situations where it's hit or miss that they do very well and then we've also had some
situations where whether it's recycled water or the orientation that they aren't doing as well. I think we
need to look at some more of the different varieties we could choose from if we want to still stick with
the Arcaste and keep that kind of ground plane or bring in a secondary ground covers so that we do have
the benefit of variety. Not too busy up the landscape but to look at different massing especially, for
health and quality. The healthy plant will dominate the areas. The Arcaste may not thrive as well.

**Chair Lew:** Ok, thank you. Then, I think my second item is on finding or new findings which are 2E
which is on - that the project enhancing living conditions on the site and in residential areas. I think the
Staff; your draft says the temporary living facilities for firefighters in the new building would provide
much-improved living conditions on the site and the proposed building would not adversely impact the
nearby residential neighborhoods located at the south of Embarcadero Road and north of Hopkins
Avenue. I think that those are fine and I think I was thinking about adding an additional comment which
is that the existing fire station is very low key and very inwardly oriented and that the new stations is
actually fairly outwardly...

**Board Member Gooyer:** In your face.
Chair Lew: ... well, in your face. I would say - well, I would say it's welcoming but the plaza, the porch, the entrances, the balconies are all - and the glass doors and the wood pedestrian entrance doors is all very desirable and attractive to the neighbors. On the fence options, I want to thank you for this sample. I was a little worried that this was going to be to gray. I think you picked it to go with the Zinc. You know, I was worried it was too gray - to dark compared to the pool house or the pool facility. So, we'll see. I don't know. If there was a way to use a warmer color I would welcome it. I realize that it's - you're proposing to cover with Creeping Fig, which will sort of - yeah, it will. Yeah, and the Creeping Fig will pretty quickly cover up all the block. Regarding the fencing, I think I had a preference for the CMU over the metal. I have seen metal fences or at least metal gates that have more privacy than I think the way you've detailed it. It seems to me that the block is a safer design choice at this point than going with the open gate and primary fencing around the back. Especially, because you have the garbage and the generator and potentially a cell tower - station in the corner. So, it seems like the block is a safer design choice. Regarding the comments about the sloped roof and the massing - the three-story massing on the park; I think my take on it was that the building is only 40-feet long facing the park; horizontally. It's not like some of our buildings in town. We have 300-foot long, three-story facades without windows so, this is not anywhere near close to that. We do have other parks. I think there's a Heritage Park downtown that has three-story condominiums facing the park with no buffer at all. My take on it, I think it's – my take on it is I was thinking that's it's approvable today but – yes.

Board Member Furth: That park actually followed and was created by that same development so that's an Ab Initio arrangement.

Chair Lew: I know you worked on the (Inaudible). Thank you, Wynne. It seems to me – I think Robert’s idea of cutting off the eyebrow could be a huge – possibly be a huge improvement so I am - I think that's worth studying. Then, my question is for staff. I think we're on our third hearing. I think we have to - No? Because you're not counting the preliminary?

Ms. French: This is the second formal hearing.

Chair Lew: But we normally count the - what is (Inaudible) (Crosstalk)

Ms. French: (Inaudible) You have three hearings...

Chair Lew: So, you're not considering...

Ms. French: Yeah, so if you felt you needed to continue it to see something additional, that is your right to do so, or privileges as a Board to do so.

Chair Lew: Ok. Why don't we - does anybody want to take a stab at a motion?

MOTION

Board Member Baltay: Sure. I'll move that we continue this project to a date uncertain with the request that...

Male: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: Let him try the motion and we'll see where... (Crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: (Inaudible) I just wanted to put it out there - with the request of the applicant to the lower the height of the saddle bag - to use the term of the architect - between 2 and 4-feet adjacent to the park boundary. With all other findings as set forth in the Staff report and with - oh, on the last thing would be to have the actual finish on the Zinc panels come back to us for consent review - subcommittee review. I don't think - was there any other? (Crosstalk) I would leave it to the architect's
discretion how to reduce the apparent mass. I think the suggestion is a good one but I’m very uncomfortable with us actually designing from the podium here. I think these architects especially - was there any other landscaping questions Alex that you were concerned about, though? I can’t remember.

**Chair Lew:** I think they’re aware that there is an issue so, I think that that's...

**Board Member Baltay:** Ok, well, that’s my motion.

**Chair Lew:** Anybody going to second?

**Board Member Gooyer:** Second.

**Chair Lew:** Ok, seconded by Robert.

**Mr. Raschke:** Can I just make a point of clarification? So, the motion is to continue it to a date uncertain but then you asked for the Zinc panels to come back on consent. Would those be coming back for consideration with everything else?

**Board Member Baltay:** Very good. Let's just take that off altogether at the moment.

**Mr. Raschke:** Ok, thank you.

**Mr. Kawasaki:** I think – can I add one other point? We asked - we presented two options in terms of the block wall versus the picket fence and if there’s a preference that you have, we would like to continue on your preference or if the Fire Department has any issues then, they would want to weigh in.

**Board Member Baltay:** I would like to then add to the motion that we keep the concrete block wall preference if that's ok with the secondary?

**Board Member Gooyer:** (Inaudible)

**Board Member Furth:** Is there a date certain that the applicant would like and staff would agree to?

**Ms. Jodie Gerhardt:** If you wanted to talk about a date certain for a March 2nd hearing, we would need to have revised plans at the beginning of February. For a March 16th hearing, we would need to have revised plans in the middle of February.

**Mr. Kawasaki:** We can make the beginning. Staff may shoot me but we’ll make the beginning.

**Ms. Gerhardt:** The beginning of February would be a – for revised plans would then be a March 2nd hearing.

**Board Member Baltay:** Very well. Let's change the motion to a date certain of March 2nd.

**Board Member Gooyer:** I’ll keep my second on that.

**Chair Lew:** Ok. So, all in favor?

**Chair Lew, Vice Chair Kim, Board Member Furth, Board Member Gooyer, Board Member Baltay:** Aye.

**Chair Lew:** Ok, so that’s 5-0. We will see you back in March. We are going to take a 5-minute break before we hear item #4.

**MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**
Architectural Review Board
Staff Report (ID # 7577)

Report Type: Action Items  Meeting Date: 1/19/2017

Summary Title: 799 Embarcadero Road: Fire Station #3 Replacement Project Second ARB

Title: PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 799 Embarcadero Road (file PLN16-00123): Applicant’s Request for Architectural Review Approval of a Two-Story, 6,663 Square Foot Replacement Fire Station Building Located on the Northwest Corner of Embarcadero and Newell Roads Adjacent to the Southeasterly Edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27 Acre Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt From the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Pursuant to Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction of Existing Structures). Zoning District: Public Facility (PF)

From: Hillary Gitelman

Recommendation
Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board (ARB) take the following action(s):

1. Recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Community Environment based on Architectural Review approval findings and subject to conditions of approval (Attachments A and B, respectively).

Report Summary
The subject project was previously reviewed by the ARB on December 1, 2016, and continued to a date certain, January 19, 2017. An earlier staff report includes extensive background information, project analysis and evaluation to city codes and policies; that report is available online: http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/54890. A copy of the report without prior attachments is available as Attachment G.

The purpose of this report is to restate the comments made by the ARB and convey the applicant’s response to those comments. The analysis section below builds upon the information contained in the earlier report as modified to reflect recent project changes.
The City Council adopted new Architectural Review approval findings that became effective in January 2017; these are provided as Attachment A for the ARB’s consideration. The findings support the project.

**Background**

On December 1, 2016, the ARB reviewed the project. A video recording of the ARB meeting is here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Juwv3s3KXPw&start=8&width=420&height=315. The ARB comments at the hearing and the applicant’s responses are summarized below and on the following page. The applicant also provided a response letter (Attachment F). The applicant considered the ARB’s comments and made three significant changes to the plans:

1. Adjusted the park-facing elevation (shown in below image) similar to the approach used on the Newell-facing elevation; a dormitory window is extended upward through the roof plane to break up the mass.

![Park-facing elevation](image1)

2. Provided two alternatives to the concrete wall formerly proposed around the parking lot, to provide greater transparency and supplemental vegetation. The above image shows a concrete masonry unit (CMU) wall option, with recurring slots or openings; landscaping additions for both options, and additional images for this CMU wall option will be provided in hardcopy plans to show the wall’s running-bond pattern and detail for the openings. The below image shows the second option, to extend the see-through metal fence around the north and west sides of the parking lot; however, this option provides less privacy for the firefighters.

![Concrete masonry unit wall](image2)

3. Proposed a zinc panel, Rheinzink, exterior material with a 20-year warrante and with a 200-year life expectancy. The zinc panels (shown excerpted in below left image with the proposed CMU wall) would have a narrower vertical pattern than the previously proposed Alucobond panels, which also have a 20-year warranty.
A summary of ARB comments on December 1, 2016, and the applicant’s responses thereto and related images are provided in the table on the following page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ARB Comments/Direction on December 1</th>
<th>Applicant Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider placing generator at back corner.</td>
<td>The generator is in the same location. The potential wireless site shifted westward away from parking space #4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="image">October 11, 2016 Site Plan</a></td>
<td><a href="image">January 5, 2017 Site Plan</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widen the paved corner near crosswalk to be more generous on the Newell side.</td>
<td>Because of guy wires and anchors, the paved corner cannot be extended toward Newell, but it has been expanded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nearby pool building is warmer with wood trellis; substation’s wood screen fence is more open; consider making parking lot wall more open and enhancing the park-side planting.

Consider not having two-story gray metal panel wall next to park - metal may not be durable/the right solution – make the view from the park more pleasant.

Consider more texture (eg De Young Museum)

Darker metal is better than lighter metal; consider making siding more residential-looking but still using a modern material

Consider using more wood at entry to make more warm/inviting

Consider using a sloped roof

Consider gate materials go around parking lot

Consider placing fountain near corner

Shadow concern from new building

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change #2 as noted above replaces the solid-concrete parking lot wall with more open wall options and additional plantings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Due to the site constraints/programmatic needs and requests, floor plan is unchanged. Changes #1 and #3 noted above are proposed to address this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes #1 and #3 introduce more texture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change #3 as noted introduces vertical siding look using a Zinc material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional wood at entry is shown in revised plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect determined flat roof is best for solar PV array; with sloped roof, building would be taller near park due to PV array and program’s height requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change #2 option addresses this comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect stated on 12/1, ‘Will look at fountain’, but it remains in the same spot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarified on 12/1: ‘Shadow is not from building; it’s from wall’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

The draft, incomplete plans received January 5, 2017 capture the three changes noted in the above report section. The hard copy plans, to be submitted January 12, 2017, may provide additional detail regarding landscaping, at a minimum. The changes to the parking lot perimeter wall, west-facing elevation and landscaping, and metal siding (reflect a more residentially-oriented application pattern or texture) appear to address the ARB’s comments to the extent feasible, given the program and site constraints. Attachment C provides a narrative of how the project meets the relevant goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

---

1 The information provided in this section is based on analysis prepared by the report author prior to the public hearing. The Architectural Review Board in its review of the administrative record and based on public testimony may reach a different conclusion from that presented in this report and may choose to take an alternative action from the recommendation in this report.
**Key Issues:** The only key issues remaining with this project, based upon the December 1, 2016 discussion, may be as follows:

A. a flat roof is still proposed, contrary to some HRB and ARB members’ preferences,
B. no additional wood detailing is proposed at the entry facing Newell Road, and
C. despite the permeable element of the revised parking lot wall, and additional landscaping, the interface of the fire station site with the park edge may not be as “pleasant” as some ARB members prefer (i.e. the revised plans do not include the prior suggestion of placing a mural along the wall facing the park, because the proposed public art is a mechanical piece for plaza).

Staff suggests that these issues could be resolved (or considered resolved) if the ARB were to:

A. note that, with the proposed installation of solar photovoltaic panels will provide a visible sloped element to serve as a reference to sloped roof, residentially-oriented, civic architecture,
B. add an approval condition to require a return to the subcommittee or staff review of additional wood entry details, and
C. add an approval condition to require further modifications to the park-facing parking lot wall (e.g. variable heights, additional permeability, color, materials) and/or additional or different plant materials within the park near the wall.

**Bird-Friendly Design:** The architect has noted that a new plan sheet (A-603) will describe the glass selection to ensure the project reflects ‘bird-friendly design’. The glass selected is ArnoldGlas lSolar Ornilux insulated glazing; this glass has a UV-reflective film on it. The sample board to be presented to the ARB will include a sample of this product.

**Approval Findings:** Staff has prepared draft findings for approval to indicate the project is approvable in accordance with these findings. The project’s compliance with the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan is set forth in the draft findings for approval (Attachment A). If the ARB believes additional, significant modifications are needed to better meet the approval findings, the applicant can be directed to return for a final hearing. If the ARB recommends project approval subject to submittal of additional details for staff or ARB subcommittee review prior to Building Permit submittal, the ARB can add such an approval condition.

**Environmental Review**
The subject project has been assessed in accordance with the authority and criteria contained in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the State CEQA Guidelines, and the environmental regulations of the City. Specifically, staff determined the project can be considered Exempt under CEQA Guidelines Section 15302. The Historic Resource Evaluation concluded the existing fire station was not eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources. The HRE was reviewed by the historic preservation planner and HRB. Circulation and traffic for the replacement station were reviewed by the Transportation Division
staff. Staff reviewed other CEQA checklist topic areas and will finalize the document and review findings following the ARB hearing, for the Director’s consideration.

Public Notification, Outreach & Comments
The Palo Alto Municipal Code requires notice of this public hearing be published in a local paper and mailed to owners and occupants of property within 600 feet of the subject property at least ten day in advance. As this project was continued to a date certain by the ARB, no additional mailed noticing was conducted.

An open house was held at the Art Center on December 14, 2016. The meeting was attended by Fire Chief, Chief Planning Official, Public Works Engineering team, project architect, and the Senior Program Manager for Arts and Sciences, and one member of the public. As of the writing of this report, no project-related, public comments were received following the outreach meeting.

Alternative Actions
In addition to the recommended action, the Architectural Review Board may:
1. Approve the project with modified findings or conditions;
2. Continue the project to a date (un)certain; or
3. Recommend project denial based on revised findings.

It is important to note that this project is the first of the significant Council Infrastructure Plans to come before the Architectural Review Board. Construction of the project is scheduled to begin in August 2017. A continuation or denial of the project would lead to a delay in the project schedule.

Consistency with Application Findings
Staff has prepared draft findings for approval using the Council approved revised AR findings that became effective January 12, 2017.

Report Author & Contact Information
Amy French, AICP, Chief Planning Official
(650) 329-2336
Amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

ARB Liaison & Contact Information
Jodie Gerhardt, AICP, Planning Manager
(650) 329-2575
jodie.gerhardt@cityofpaloalto.org

Attachments:
- Attachment A: Six ARB findings (DOC)
- Attachment B: Draft Conditions of Approval (DOCX)
- Attachment C: Comp Plan Policies and Programs (DOC)
- Attachment D: Zoning Compliance Table (DOC)
- Attachment E: 12-01-2016 ARB Minutes Excerpt (DOCX)

2 Emails may be sent directly to the ARB using the following address: arb@cityofpaloalto.org
- Attachment F: Applicant's response letter (DOCX)
- Attachment G: Staff report December 1, 2016 w/o attachments (PDF)
- Attachment H: Project Plans (DOCX)
ATTACHMENT H

Hardcopies to ARB Members and Libraries only

Project plans can be reviewed at