



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

Architectural Review Board Staff Report

From: Planning and Development Services Director
Lead Department: Planning and Development Services

Meeting Date: August 15, 2024
Report #: 2408-3323

TITLE

Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 4, 2024

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board (ARB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Minutes of April 4, 2024

AUTHOR/TITLE:

ARB Liaison¹ & Contact Information

Jodie Gerhardt, AICP, Manager of Current Planning
(650) 329-2575

Jodie.Gerhardt@CityofPaloAlto.org

¹ Emails may be sent directly to the ARB using the following address: arb@CityofPaloAlto.org.



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: April 04, 2024
Council Chamber & Zoom
8:30 AM

Call to Order / Roll Call

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in Council Chambers and virtual teleconference at 8:33 a.m.

Present: Chair Peter Baltay, Vice Chair Kendra Rosenberg, Boardmember Yingxi Chen, Boardmember David Hirsch, Boardmember Adcock

Absent: None

Public Comment

Administrative Associate III Veronica Dao stated there were no cards submitted for Public Comment.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Senior Planner and Architectural Review Board (ARB) Liaison Claire Raybould indicated there were no Agenda changes, additions, or deletions.

City Official Reports

1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2) Tentative Future Agenda items and 3) Recently Submitted Projects

Planner Raybould stated that there were items being brought up on the April 18th and May 2nd hearing which included many new housing projects, the North Ventura coordinated area plan being brought back for another Study Session, as well as the associated ordinance that would coincide with the coordinated area plan, the pre-approved parklet's design will also be discussed with ARB, and the Bird Safe glazing and Dark Sky ordinance will be discussed further with the ARB. On April 18th, the elections had been scheduled to take place but may be moved to the May 2nd hearing as Staff wanted the Council to have chosen the new Board members before the election; the appointment interviews were to be held on April 8th and April 22nd. Upcoming ARB projects included a formal application for 640 Waverly, which was a mixed-use office space with four residential units that used the housing incentive program that increased the Floor

Area Ratio (FAR) for this project, and noted an application for 156 California had come in to Staff that included 300 hundred units, with a maximum seventeen stories, proposed under Builder Remedy and the California Avenue area, as well as a formal application for the 70 Encina project located by Town and Country Plaza.

Chair Baltay assigned Chair Baltay and Boardmember Chen as ad hoc committee for the 3980 El Camino Real project, assigned Vice Chair Rosenberg and Boardmember Hirsch as ad hoc committee to 640 Waverly, and noted that the project on 156 California Avenue had been assigned to Chair Baltay and Boardmember Adcock previously. The 70 Encina Way project was assigned to Boardmember Hirsch and Boardmember Adcock; the other unassigned projects were unnecessary for an ad hoc committee.

Action Items

2. 2501 Embarcadero Way [22PLN-00367]: Recommendation to Council for Approval of a Site and Design Application and a Design Enhancement Exception to Allow the Construction of a Local Advanced water Purification System at the Regional Water Quality Control Plant (RWQCP). A Design Enhancement Exception to Allow for a Taller Screening Wall is Also Requested. Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the City of Palo Alto Recycled Water Project Which Evaluated the Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Project. Zone District: PF (D) (Public Facility with Site and Design Combining District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner, Claire Raybould, at Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Baltay asked for any disclosures on this project.

Boardmember Adcock visited the site during the previous meeting.

Boardmember Chen commented she visited before the previous meeting.

Chair Baltay had a phone conversation with Shani Kleinhaus who explained the importance of turning off lighting at night, keeping the lights to the warmest colored tone, and had requested no more than 3,000 Kelvin was to be used for lighting in projects, as well having visited the site.

Vice Chair Rosenberg said she had not visited the site this meeting period but had done so at the previous meeting.

Boardmember Hirsch revisited the site during this meeting period.

Chair Baltay thanked the Board and asked for the Staff's presentation.

Planner Raybould stated today's project was on the 2501 Embarcadero Way advanced water purification system project. The project included construction of a reverse osmosis permeate storage tank, with a pre-engineered open air canopy building that covered a membrane filtration system, chemical storage, feed system components and other ancillary components essential to the purification system, and a small prefabricated electrical building in front of the canopy. The building had a footprint of approximately 15,544 square feet, and noted it was to reduce solidity of recycled water. When this project had been brought before the ARB in November of 2023, the key comments made by the Board focused on context of the regional water quality control plant, what was happening regarding the existing and future facilities that were planned for the area, the consistency on the project with the Baylands design guidelines and suggested modifications to be better aligned on the plan, questions that regarded the ambient and proposed equipment noise levels, and the minimization of lighting and tree removal had been discussed. Modifications had been made in response to the project plans and showed a visual of the general area of the regional water quality control plant included in the packet memo, with the restrictions to plan South for the area that had a sewer lateral and easements that restricted placement of the facility. Key modifications related to the Bayland's design guidelines and noise issues included changes to the roof structure color to the standard grey color used throughout the Baylands, better screening made of perforated metal material that could be placed on two sides of the canopy that blocked equipment from public view, the chain link fencing had been changed to include a black vinyl coating per the Bayland's design guidelines, and had a noise study provided that showed baseline noise conditions at the site and detailed the project's noise level with the distance of noise producing equipment from the property line in combination with the proposed sound wall; the reduced noise will be code compliant, maximum of forty-nine decibels. Planner Raybould noted when this project had come before the Board previously, the lighting had been proposed at 4,000 Kelvins, but it had been reduced from previous iterations from 5,000 Kelvins at the time and as stated in the disclosure the Autobahn Society had requested no more than 3,000 Kelvins, but the Staff report included a memorandum prepared by a third party that analyzed the safe lighting levels were to be 4,000 Kelvins and no less for this facility. The lighting has been focused below the canopy with additional aluminum paneling design helped shield two views on either side of the canopy to reduce light spill-over, with motion sensors and timers provided; added a colored chart showing the color difference that could be expected between 3,000 and 4,000 Kelvin. There was consideration for the trees that tied with whether the project could be moved to different locations or slightly back on the site as the new facilities planned at the regional water quality control plant could not be moved back away from Embarcadero Road to have more trees saved, but highlighted that there were numerous reiterations that happened before coming to the ARB previously, and had been brought before the Parks and Recreation Commission who commented on saving as many trees as possible as well; they updated the Arborists report with thirty-five trees to be removed, and noted most were non-native and invasive species of trees and was to be replaced with native trees, as it was outdated and did not reflect the number of trees that had fallen during the severe storms the previous year and a half. The Planning and Transportation Commission's (PTC) recommendation on this project was to ask for additional exploration

to reduce the color temperature of lighting that was consistent with similar comments that came before PTC from the Autobahn Society regarding all native species of trees were to be provided; the lighting had not been reduced from the 4,000 Kelvins as of yet, but the landscaping plan had been updated to have all native species of landscaping except for the wall climbing vines. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis that was done for this project made from a mitigation measure MM Hydro 3D from a 2015 EIR on recycled water, which required the City to consider treatment options such as reverse osmosis that reduced solidity of recycled water that made the water reusable for irrigation of salt sensitive species; in response to the mitigation measures a preliminary design was prepared, and in November of 2019 discretionary actions were taken to pursue this project that Council adopted and EIR addendum for this specific design of the project that included more site specific details of the proposed development. Staff recommended to keep the previously adopted addendum, and the ARB recommend approval of the proposed project to Council based on the provided fundings and subject to conditions of approval, which Council's final decisions would be issued on the proposed project tentatively scheduled for May of 2024.

Chair Baltay thanked Staff for the detailed presentation and asked for the applicant's presentation.

Public Works Senior Engineer Tom Kapushinski, Public Works Engineer Diego Martinez-Garcia, Design Engineer with Black and Veatch Katie Gellerman, Landscape Architect with Siegfried Engineering Robert Norbutas, and Public Works Plant Manager Jamie (James) Allen all were here to present the project.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia started the presentation by showing the agenda for today's discussion. The purpose of the project was to improve the water quality produced at the plant by lowering the salt content, in doing so it would increase the number of customers and reduce the amount of recycled water used. The project was made a few years ago when the Council approved a recycled water solidity reduction policy with direction to Staff on how they moved forward with agreements and permits on reducing the salt content in recycled water. The projects' location was at the water quality control plant on the West side near Embarcadero Road, and included a new permanent storage tank, a microfiltration and reverse osmosis treatment units under a canopy structure, a blending station added to an existing building at the plant, with Landscaping, paving, and side work done around the site, and an electrical building being constructed near the plant wall. The project went through the finance committee and Council the previous year and were currently working on permitting and financial agreements including the planning entitlements and hoped to issue invitation permits in the fall of this year with construction starting in early 2025 and completed by mid-2027. He showed an illustration of the plant with a brief overview of the highlighted areas, and what was proposed to be constructed and the footprints of the site. The architectural features were pre-engineered open-air buildings with a canopy, which was updated with the grey color, and had an electrical building that housed motors and electrical equipment; it was a custom engine heavy duty modular building. An are permeate tank made of glass lined bolted steel was included in the design, and stored up to 350,000 gallons of product water from the facility, it was colored in forest green and updated the chain link security fence with a black vinyl laced coating with new pedestrian paths added to replace current sidewalks. Aluminum laser metal panels were added to the project to help shield excess lighting from the roof and provided screening from the public view; they chose a pattern that

resembled leaves to match the existing trace and future installations. The applicants were asked on the previous meeting to provide more detail and aesthetic to the exterior ten-foot concrete sound wall and they added a linear textured wood panel with color stain in a combination of colors; gave a proposed image of what it would look like, as well as an installation done in Sacramento. He finished stating the handouts given to the Board had the new updated renderings and the revised transcribe screening with the modified tree species selected based on PRC recommendations previously mentioned in the Staff report; mentioned the design also included information on all educational parts to be installed outside of the facility for public knowledge. He thanked the Board for their time.

Chair Baltay thanked the applicant for his presentation and opened the floor to Public Comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Administrative Associate Veronica Dao stated one card had been submitted.

The Conservation Coordinator for the Sierra Club Loma Prieta Chapter Dashiell Leeds talked about the joint letter his Chapter and the Santa Clara Autobahn Society had sent regarding the color temperature of lighting, and asked if the color temperature was kept below 3,000 Kelvin or below. Artificial light caused a variety of negative impacts such as distractions, disorientation, and changed key behaviors in wildlife such as pollination, foraging and migration. He discussed the Circadian Rhythm disruption of lighting, as in the Staff report they talked about why they wanted the higher correlated color temperature lighting with alertness, but the disruption was also harmful to the circadian rhythms of people; studies showed regularly disrupted circadian rhythms could lead to increased health risks of cancer, stroke, and diabetes. Mr. Leeds thanked Staff and Board for their time.

Chair Baltay thanked Mr. Leeds for his comments, closed public comment, and brought the discussion back to the Board for questions and comments; asked the applicant what they had meant when referring to the proposed future building as headworks.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia responded that it was the initial phase of the wastewater treatment at the plant, and included the pumping station, grid, and screening components of the treatment plant that protected the pumps and equipment.

Chair Baltay clarified that it was not a headquarters or administrative type facility.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia replied no that it was an industrial type of pump.

Boardmember Adcock asked what the Staff schedule was in the space that needed the lighting to understand if overnight lighting was necessary.

Mr. Kapushinski answered they had Staff on-site twenty-four hours a day, with operators and mechanics traversing the entire facility through the day; they added to the design timing sensors that allowed the light to be off when no one was in the area.

Boardmember Adcock inquired if sunset to sunrise the lights would rarely be used.

Mr. Kapushinski said that operators did rounds, but imagined after the rounds the lighting would be turned off; if a mechanic had an emergency service that needed to be provided it would be a different situation.

Boardmember Adcock referred to packet page 52, where the light level pattern was drawn over the facility, and questioned if there was additional sight lighting beyond the area not factored in the light level counts, or if only light from the canopy.

Mr. Kapushinski responded that the photometric drawing was only showing lighting for the facility.

Boardmember Adcock inquired if there was other sight lighting that needed to be factored into this project.

Mr. Kapushinski stated that was correct, and as the location implied was further from the building, it was shielded due to the facility.

Boardmember Adcock noticed looking at the left side of the drawing where the electrical building was mostly at zero, and asked for clarification if the screening would only be on one side.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia indicated there was only one screen, and that it was on the left side of the image.

Boardmember Adcock mentioned when looking past the building outside the canopy, there were light levels as high as twenty-two, and when looking at the top and bottom of the plans, the light levels were as high as twenty-seven. She asked if there were any improvements that could be added to have light not leaked outside of the canopy area.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia replied that they had not included any other provisions on that issue.

Boardmember Adcock noted that the leaked lighting outside the canopy could be problematic with the Dark Sky and bird migration issues brought forth before the Board; asked on packet page 46 if it was correct on the note saying the average elimination inside the canopy would be 157-foot candles.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia said that was a typo, and he believed it should be 15.7 as that was the average.

Vice Chair Rosenberg asked why the lighting needed to be set at 4,000 to 5,000 Kelvins, and why it could not be brought down to 3,000.

Mr. Kapushinski answered that it was up to the elimination engineering society guidelines for industrial facilities; it was recommended that 4,000 to 5,000 Kelvin for adequate management and operations around the facility.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if it was a building code requirement or recommendation for industrial buildings.

Mr. Kapushinski responded it was a recommendation.

Vice Chair Rosenberg questioned if there was anything the color temperature could negatively affect in terms of the equipment on the site or was the concern it being too dim for workers to see.

Mr. Kapushinki stated it was a safety concern for Staff at the facility working overnight.

Vice Chair Rosenberg asked how many Staff were working at the plant.

Plant Manager Jamie Allen answered there were fifty-eight people at the plant, with fourteen percent regularly assigned to the night shift, and eighty percent working part of their shift in the evening. They had half of their operators paid for night shift differentials as they were there during the evening hours as well.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired how many people would be assigned to each working area.

Mr. Allen replied that there were three to four people assigned to night shift, 6 P.M. to 6 A.M., with one person passing through during the shift for maintenance or operation management.

Vice Chair Rosenberg followed whether it was an issue needing the lighting altered to comply with concerns, or if needing to stay the same as what was proposed for safety issues.

Mr. Allen responded that the safety issue was a regular concern as they had chemical deliveries, workers who managed the chemicals, and emergencies that were to potentially occur; to which the lighting was needed within the facility to accommodate the plant worker's safety.

Vice Chair Rosenberg thanked the applicant for his explanation.

Boardmember Hirsch asked how far from the southwest wall was the water line mentioned previously.

Mr. Kapushinki answered that the water line was parked close to the facility without protruding onto the East Palo Alto sanitary easement line.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired the dimensions of the present design wall.

Mr. Kapushinki said it was a twenty-foot easement.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia indicated the easement was twenty-foot wide, and the distance would be ten-foot from the center of the pipeline to the southernmost corner of the facility.

Boardmember Hirsch questioned if the applicant had to maintain the dimensions of the twenty-foot.

Mr. Kapushinki stated it was a requirement that East Palo Alto sanitary district have the easement placed, and they had to comply to the requirements.

Planner Raybould noted sheet C10.101 showed the easement line was butted against the property line and could not be moved.

Boardmember Hirsch asked what would happen if the building was shifted in any other direction.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia replied that due to the existing and future equipment, the strength of the building was focused on the East and Northeast part of the facility, and the building was placed in a way that was feasible to accommodate the restricted easement line.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired if the new tank to be placed was thirty feet tall and if the distance from the existing tank to the future tank placement had any restrictions or regulations.

Mr. Kapushinski responded there were no restrictions or regulations placed on the tanks, but the extra space was reserved for the headworks facility; the original headworks facility had been built in 1972 with the base plant's construction, and the facility was a critical component to the plant and referred to the drawing in the packet.

Boardmember Hirsch asked which drawing Mr. Kapushinski was referring to.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia stated it was on the Staff packet page 43.

Planner Raybould brought the image onto the screen that gave a clearer picture.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia showed the orange-yellow area as the future plant headworks facility.

Boardmember Hirsch noticed that the headworks facility would be placed over the old tank location.

Mr. Kapushinski mentioned with the limited space it was drawn up as such to allow the existing and new equipment to run.

Boardmember Chen questioned whether there was an existing status as it was a facility being built on existing property, if there were lighting studies done on the current conditions of the plant, and if any of the other structures required similar lighting requirements.

Mr. Kapushinski replied that currently the facility uses 4,000 to 5,000 Kelvins as a lighting temperature.

Boardmember Chen inquired if the entire site plan were opened other than the allotted area, would the other structures have the same required 4,000 Kelvin.

Mr. Kapushinski answered that was correct.

Boardmember Adcock asked if it was correct that the vinyl black coated fencing to be placed gave no privacy to the facility.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia stated that was correct, and that on this project, it had only a small section of the chain link fencing.

Vice Chair Rosenberg referred to the booklet page L00.004, image F on screen wall and fencing along pathways, and questioned whether the sound wall could be extended another ten feet as the chain link fencing was not aesthetically pleasing as it ran close to the public pathway.

Mr. Kapushinski responded that due to the Fire and Safety Department wanting gate access to the facility, they had to comply.

Chair Baltay questioned if the Landscaping Engineer could give a brief explanation of the landscaping design and how it was going to keep native land plantings.

Mr. Robert Norbutas introduced himself and said the Siegfried Landscape Architect group had worked on these types of projects for the last ten to fifteen years and understood the Bayland's regulations and the screening for the facility through the preserve primary plan. The planting transitions from the Baylands to Embarcadero required the plant material to be appropriate for both the influence of the Bay, as well as a material that accepted and recycled water. Studies done on plant materials and the interior of the facility

assessed the water against domestic water to show what salinity the plants tolerated, which gave the appropriate material to be used. The previous reviews requested the Group study and used a plant list from the Bayshore precise plan in Mountainview and considered during the final pallet decision; all the current plants were native to the area and had a salt tolerance. It had been requested with the limited space to create a naturally grown screen that had a safe space for the walkway corridor. They had required the plant material be planted a couple of feet back from the pathways to allow the plants to grow to their natural space and helped with less maintenance. The trees came in varied sizes and had fifteen gallon and thirty-six-inch boxes that gave a naturalized look to the notched areas along the walkway, as well as groups and clusters of shrubs throughout. There was to be an educational sign placed midway along Embarcadero for the public that pointed out what was being constructed within the facility wall and information on plant life being installed.

Chair Baltay commented on the trees with bright purple foliage within the renderings shown in the booklet and asked what kind of trees they were.

Mr. Norbutas answered they were the closest images to a strawberry tree as if was difficult to get the color renderings appropriate to the correct color and plant material; the Group wanted to show a tree with blossoms and other trees that had color to them and would not be the rich purple color as shown.

Chair Baltay inquired if image F with a large tree was an existing Eucalyptus tree, what type of screening plants were to be used, and if there were any other discrepancies within the images of the handout due to the renderings being appealing to the project; he showed concern for the inaccuracies.

Mr. Norbutas responded the tree shown in image F was a Sycamore tree screening the recycle tank.

Chair Baltay asked about the tree with yellow foliage.

Mr. Norbutas replied it was a Poplar Cottonwood tree, and they were trying to illustrate a concept of the feel of the space area and plant materials required.

Chair Baltay thanked Mr. Norbutas for the clarifications, and questioned Staff what conditions could be placed on the control systems of the lighting that ensured they would be kept off unless necessary; how did they phrase and enforce the requirement.

Planner Raybould stated that motions sensors had been proposed, so a condition of approval could be placed that motion sensors had to be installed on the lights proposed in the plan; Staff would look to have a condition on appropriate timing placed on the sensors, but the appropriate timing on when it was applicable had to be worked on with Staff to accommodate the safety and engineering recommendations.

Chair Baltay questioned if enforcement of the light issues were complaint-based or if Staff had to check on the requirements regularly.

Planner Raybould said it was complaint-based on whether Staff went to confirm the lights being on all night, as they did not have time to regularly go and check sites for compliance at night.

Boardmember Adcock asked if it was a fair assumption that with the facility being a taller building, when a light came on at night, it illuminated the whole area below.

Mr. Kapushinski replied that was most likely true, if a motion sensor light were to come on it would light an entire space.

Chair Baltay thanked the applicants and opened the floor to comments; he directed Vice Chair Rosenberg to start.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented it was a tremendous improvement since the last time it had been brought before the Board and understood the limited landscaping and lighting issues were a challenge to overcome. Being a natural area in the Bay area, it needed to be maintained with respect to the wildlife but felt setting the light limit to 4,000 Kelvin was a reasonable compromise to ensure worker safety. The wood paneling proposed went well with the natural environment but was concerned that it was only located on one side of the structure and encouraged them to consider placing them on the North facing gable façade as well. The sound walls' naturalness in the look gave an elegant feature to the outside wall and commended them on the work they had done.

Boardmember Hirsch showed concern and had wished to see all the trees kept in the plan but recognized that overcoming the challenges faced with a mechanical plant was difficult and appreciated the work accomplished within the constraints and requirements. He noted that the drawings handed in were engineering drawings and not specific sections and was displeased with the water line easement restrictions on the South side of the property line. He showed a drawing he had done regarding the trees and site, with a brief explanation of how he felt there was an allowable flexibility on the locations of where structures should be placed. He noted that the Board was not given a chance to see the future headworks facility in the set of handouts, so he hoped there was time to consider being flexible when the applicants produced the drawings to allow the landscaping team to reach the full potential. The lighting issue was important for wildlife, but the safety of employees was as well so there needed to be a common requirement for both and did not feel the Board had adequate qualifications to make the judgement. His main concern was the existing tanks' movement and removal; if moved back they could move the facility to allow every inch possible for more landscaping space.

Boardmember Adcock thanked the applicants for their presentation and was an excellent improvement from the previous iterations reviewed. The concern was the color temperature versus the light level due to the various levels of Kelvins and how it affected the foot candles and should be considered two varying choices for lighting. Light level was geared towards the safe work environment, but it was difficult to find a median as the standard was between 4,000 and 5,000 for foot candles in indoor industrial facilities. Outdoor sight lighting was kept below 3,500 Kelvin that provided a pleasant environment, as well as helped accommodate wildlife; she suggested using a warmer color temperature for the outside lighting as the lighting level was not related strongly for outdoors, and no more than 3,000 Kelvins for the light sources. She stated that on this project it would be a good example for future developments if there were a black fabric that surrounded the chain link fencing to allow reduced visibility from the public view.

Boardmember Chen appreciated the changes made since the previous review and commented that the 4,000 Kelvins with controlled lighting system was reasonable as the recommendations set for industrial

buildings were placed for worker safety. The landscape design was attractive and liked implementing the natural trees and plant life into the plan, as well as the canopy screening pattern and scale being appropriate. She thanked the applicants for their presentation and time.

Chair Baltay said the lighting levels were the biggest issue and felt 3,000 Kelvin was an appropriate color temperature as Boardmember Adcock had mentioned for exterior lighting fixtures had different effects and the standards did not work in this situation. He directed a statement to the fellow Board regarding the Bird Safe and Dark Sky upcoming issues within the town, and asked why the tone of the lighting could not be warmer as this project was in the heart of the Baylands that had a natural environment; suggested restricting the lighting to 3,000 Kelvin as a color temperature, as well as conditions placed on the timing of light only being allowed at night when necessary. He referred to Boardmember Hirsch's sketch of the movement of the tank and felt it was convincing that the building could be shifted, and asked the applicant for an explanation as to why it was not feasible to do so.

Mr. Kapushinski responded that the tank was placed to allow access from the east side of the canopy structure for maintenance and expanded the capacity of the facility for future expansions of equipment.

Chair Baltay asked what the distance was between the tank and the new enclosure proposed.

Mr. Kapushinski answered it was approximately twenty feet.

Chair Baltay referred to drawing C05102, saying it looked as if the building distance was more than twenty feet inquiring the Boards input.

(Crosstalk – tank placement and scaling of the sound wall compared to existing tank and future tanks)

Vice Chair Rosenberg said on drawing C10-101 the easement lines are noted at twenty-feet apart, but the tank looked closer to twenty-five to twenty-eight feet in distance.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia responded a further explanation on the larger space in the equipment access area near the tank was the fire department had reviewed the facility due to the chemicals used, and wanted four entrance access points but were only allotted three so they had to input an entrance large enough to allow trucks to come on to the site.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if it was related to the chemical truck unloading area attached to the main structure.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia replied that was for chemical deliveries, but the fire department was concerned about the storage of chemicals and wanted easy access in case of emergencies.

Chair Baltay questioned if the building were shifted to the right laterally, closer to the old storage tank, it would not have changed the distance clearance to the new building but would impact the future plans for the headworks facility.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia answered that was correct.

Chair Baltay commented there were many points of focus regarding the project from an engineering and safety standpoint, and asked if it would be possible to have one more review session with the tank moved slightly, or if it was the only location the applicant's felt was feasible.

Planner Raybould stated that if ARB were to give directions on what ideas to explore, they could look at the different components on what they were trying to design and what possibilities there were to have the building moved in different directions and the exact distances needed as this was going before City Council.

Vice Chair Rosenberg questioned if moving the building was something they could issue as a condition of approval as there was a better analysis of what clearances were required, and if they had the permission to move one foot down and over would they be allowed to do so.

Planner Raybould replied that was possible to do.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay suggested that the project be reviewed once more as it benefitted the community to have the tank shifted further from the public's view. He felt unsure of implementing a restricted condition that it needed to be moved or have a limited dimension; when he looked at the landscaping site plan L00005 regarding the permeate tank, half was shielded by the concrete sound wall but the half that was not had a top chain link fenced area that turned upward to the fire gate, and asked why the wall could not be extended the additional length to cover more of the tanks view.

(Crosstalk – Planner Raybould projected image of the site plan)

Mr. Martinez-Garcia stated that they originally needed access for the fire department and kept one gate without changing the chain link design and would have it looked into changing it to a wall if no reason for the access gate.

Chair Baltay wished to see it changed to a concrete wall as a condition of approval, and requested the applicants consult with members of the design team to shift the permeate tank further from the sound wall.

Boardmember Adcock referred to L00011 and suggested the light tree density area surrounding the tank have the pathways moved closer to the street to allow extra trees to be placed.

Chair Baltay made two conditions of approval regarding better screening placed around the permeate tank by it being shifted further from the street, extending the sound wall, and having the landscaping screening increased.

Vice Chair Rosenberg mentioned her previous suggestion of having more paneling added to the gable face that helped reduce light spill out from the front, and inquired if that was necessary to be added.

Chair Baltay replied if any members of Staff wanted to explain more on the item as it was a possibility.

Boardmember Adcock said looking at the photometric diagram on the third to last page of the packet, if modeled accurately, the perforated screen on the left side of the page showed the light leakage was blocked beyond the canopy on the East and Northeast side where there was less equipment stored, but on the North and South plan that had manned equipment there was no screen to block the light spillage. She suggested improving the screening for that area, and that with the two extra bands wrapped around the fencing it helped to reduce the light concerns.

Chair Baltay noted the rendering showed the metal screening went along the non-gable end of the eve edge and would be easy to have the paneling attached to the header, but if placed across the gable end it could have additional structural added to the project; it was not detailed in the drawing how it was built, and asked the applicant if it was feasible to have the gables installed on two sides of the building.

Mr. Kapushinski stated that if added to the North side of the facility it needed modified structural members to have the gables supported as the header was exceedingly long.

Chair Baltay inquired if it was a feasible request to have implemented.

Mr. Kapushinski responded they would investigate what could be done.

Boardmember Adcock with a butler frame added to the end, it seemed like a reasonable request that miscellaneous framing was added to support the screening.

Chair Baltay asked if Ms. Gellerman was a member of the design team and if she would like to have the question addressed.

Mr. Martinez-Garcia introduced Katie Gellerman to respond to the question.

Ms. Gellerman clarified that the Eastern and Western side did not have the panels on the walls due to the large equipment that would need to be accessed and moved in the future. The paneling could not impede overhead in the space as the equipment had to enter with forklifts, cranes, or upkeep required for machinery, and needed to have the open canopy space on both ends.

Boardmember Adcock asked if it was for future replacements of one or two parts of equipment or if for regular daily maintenance.

Ms. Gellerman answered there would be regular maintenance that happened along both sides that needed to be accessed, but the addition added in the future underneath the canopy would also as well.

Chair Baltay questioned what vertical clearance was required for the overall design clearance for the internal part of the structure.

Ms. Gellerman replied that it had been measured in a way that allowed the installation of the reverse osmosis treatment units to the side and was unsure of the actual height.

Boardmember Adcock asked if the clearance needed was higher than the twenty-four feet the lights were hung at, and if the lights needed to be moved to get the access required.

Ms. Gellerman stated for the potential future construction being proposed it would.

Chair Baltay inquired if the structure needed a large amount of structural work redone to support the panels or was it feasible to have them suspended from the gable beam.

Ms. Gellerman responded a structural engineer needed to be consulted to confirm if horizontal beams needed to be added in addition to what was already in place.

Chair Baltay asked if the proposed panels going between the bends had been checked by a structural engineer currently.

Ms. Gellmer said the Northern side had no requirements applied so modifications to the structure could be possible from the structural engineers' assessment.

Chair Baltay thanked Ms. Gellerman, and addressed the Board that the light spillage was a prominent issue, screening panels that could be unbolted to allow equipment access could be implemented, (Interrupted)

Mr. Martinez-Garcia noted that the height they were allowed to lower to would not be known until the beginning of actual construction as the equipment to be used was selected at that time; they would also have the light screening height elevated looked at as well.

Planner Raybould commented that could be added as a condition of approval to have explored before applying for the building permit.

Boardmember Adcock mentioned on the photometric diagram it showed that the twenty-four feet on lighting based on the light level quoted previously, the section S00008 stated the bottom of the hinge point on the butler frame was also twenty-four feet, but it was not how the light had been drawn, and asked for clarification on what the height of the frame or lighting was; it seemed to be more structure added but was designed to be removable and was not convinced future equipment justified having an open visible space, and suggested a bolted type connection that could be removed as it was an important issue.

Chair Baltay and Boardmember Hirsch supported what Boardmember Adcock had commented for the record.

Boardmember Hirsch added it was consistent with the materials used surrounding the building as an exterior view of the building and should be shaped to match the roof line as well.

Chair Baltay looked at the current proposed screening panel and saw the bottom panel being approximately twenty feet above ground of the building; a twenty-four-foot plate height with a four-foot panel and thought a second condition of approval should be the two sides of the building screening panel had to be placed at twenty-feet going up, and left how to mount and bolt the screen to the engineers. He brought the discussion back to the color temperature and the control systems of the lights and mentioned the Boardmembers stances on whether 3,000 or 4,000 Kelvin was appropriate; stating it was to go before City Council in two months and knew there would be complaints from the Autobahn Society regarding the lights being too bright for the birds, but wanted a unanimous decision from the ARB to aid Council in making a decision.

Boardmember Hirsch commented to help with a decision he would go with lowering the light level to 3,000 Kelvin or had a restriction on lights during the evening hours to vary the Kelvin temperature based on operations in the facility.

Boardmember Adcock stated that would be a large request for industrial typed lighting based on the purchase of particular foot candles, which made it hard to adjust in the plan, and thought if the 3,000 Kelvin was purchased and settled for the light levels proposed in the photometrics seemed appropriate.

Chair Baltay and Boardmember Hirsch supported Boardmember Adcock's statement. Chair Baltay asked Vice Chair Rosenberg for input on her stance with the lighting issue.

Vice Chair Rosenberg said it was a delicate balance between the safety of the workers and the impacts of the environmental surroundings, and placed the safety of workers as a priority; being in the heart of the Baylands there were many disruptions in the area already, and understood the importance of protecting the area, but with the site already designated at 4,000 to 5,000 Kelvin it was difficult to try and force a regulation on this particular area with the other part of the site uncompliant. If costly sensor monitors and adjustable lighting fixtures were forced on a project such as this, it would be unreasonable; the lumens and foot candles were separated from the color temperature, so was convinced pushing the color temperature should be considered if maintained light levels were needed for the illuminations, and felt 3,000 Kelvins was reasonable to ask for as this being an outdoor lighting issue and impacted the Bayland area.

Chair Baltay inquired if Boardmember Chen had any comments on the lighting issue.

Boardmember Chen was in agreement with Vice Chair Rosenberg as the site was located close to the Baylands, but when the overall context was looked at there was an airport and other facilities with higher color temperatures in the same area, and after Boardmember Adcock's statement on the color temperature and foot candle being separate issues, it was suggested that more studies be done on how lowering to 3,000 Kelvins impacted the safety of workers and birds during the evening.

Vice Chair Rosenberg summarized that when the future of the city was looked at, with all the buildings and infrastructures that will be built, lowering the color temperature in this project could be valuable for the environment in future.

Boardmember Adcock commented that it was a small issue within the project, but there were future projects that this issue helped resolve when plans were made.

Boardmember Hirsch wanted to address the view of the pathway along the fencing and solid wall that had the fire department access, and asked if the solid wall could be continued to both side of the fencing with an emergency access inserted.

(Planner Raybould brought up the previous diagram on to the screen)

(Crosstalk)

Mr. Martinez-Garcia noted that the fire department planned to have access to the site through the existing front gate, and the one on the chain link fencing was a pedestrian not a truck fire access; the fire department had requested a new fire hydrant be placed outside the facility near the sidewalk that allowed firefighters to bring the hoses through the gate.

(Crosstalk)

Vice Chair Rosenberg argued that the chain link fence should be farther off the pathway as the sound barrier fencing was more aesthetically pleasing than the chain fencing.

(Crosstalk – discussed the fencing areas on the diagram)

Chair Baltay asked Boardmember Hirsch if it was suggested to move the access gate to the middle of the sound wall, closer to the street.

Boardmember Hirsch answered that was correct.

Fellow Board members showed disagreement with the suggestion.

Chair Baltay felt a five-foot break being added to the sound wall was not preferable.

Vice Chair Rosenberg agreed and thought it was better placed off the street and felt the sound wall had been well designed.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay asked Vice Chair Rosenberg to continue the motion.

Motion of Approval

Vice Chair Rosenberg motioned to approve with the following conditions:

1. Light fixtures were to be changed to 3,000 Kelvins.
2. Screens were added to Northeast, Northwest, and Southwest sides of the building with a height of no greater than twenty feet above the finished floor.
3. Requirements be placed on motion sensors to reduce lighting on site and set a maximum time limit on the sensors.
4. The sound proofing wall needed to be extended to meet with the existing chain link fencing end corner.
5. Explore the potential of the relocation of the reverse osmosis permeate tank to the inward portion of the property's site.
6. The proposed planting be increased on the reverse osmosis permeate tank side of the soundwall.

MOTION: Vice Chair Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Adcock.

Boardmember Adcock requested a friendly amendment that the tree planting be increased, not the lower planting.

Chair Baltay asked the First and Seconder that an additional phrase was to be added to the third condition regarding the lighting set amount with a maximum time limit on the sensors that they were only on at night when necessary for safety or operational needs.

Vice Chair Rosenberg agreed, Boardmember Adcock seconded.

Chair Baltay inquired if Public Works wanted to give feedback on the conditions proposed before taking a vote.

Jamie Allen stated that points two to six were agreeable, but the first condition was difficult as the engineer needed to ask the electrical designer if they would go against the recommendations of safety by the Illumination Engineering Society on an industrial facility; they had records of injury to workers on the night shift. They had motion sensors on existing lights that turned off if an employee was wiring a panel and needed to move in front of the sensors to turn back on. The maximum time limit in condition three needed flexibility as the lighting had to be adjustable for high frequency areas as workers spent longer time in certain areas. The fencing and surrounding sound wall helped to lower the expected number of mammals wandering onto the site; he gave the example of the streetlights and airport having overnight usage and encouraged the lighting stay at the recommended 4,000 to 5,000 Kelvin as the motion sensors would be off when an area was unused.

Chair Baltay thanked Mr. Allen for the input, and suggested they modified condition number three to remove the maximum time on the motion sensors and leave the Staff in charge of how the sensors would operate.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that condition three did not have a set maximum time limit and could be implemented by facility Staff, and felt it was appropriate to keep the condition.

Boardmember Hirsch noted that the words when in operation and for safety need stated in the condition allowed for appropriate control of the request.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay asked if all members of the Board were in agreement to keep the condition as stated.

All members of the Board agreed.

Chair Baltay said the Board had come to a balance between bird safety and the Baylands but felt condition one on light temperature was a recommendation to the planning director, and the decision should be left to them; he felt strongly to leave the condition as it was.

(Crosstalk)

Boardmember Adcock said that every condition could not be met due to her knowledge of the technical memorandum she had studies and found the color temperature section seemed to focus on the productivity of the workers, not the safety; light levels were concerned about the workers safety, and the color temperature was not. In interior environments the lighting was warmer for hospitality type businesses and higher temperatures were used for industrial spaces, and as this project was an outdoor industrial space it needed to have a balance of both issues.

Vice Chair Rosenberg countered that if the Kelvin was set at a warmer color temperature, was it potentially induce fatigue in workers and cause an unsafe environment; she wanted to be attentive to the location of this project, but the key focus was worker safety in a night environment.

(Crosstalk)

Vice Chair Rosenberg proceeded with the motion as it was written.

Vote: 3-2-0, Boardmember Chen and Boardmember Hirsch voted no.

Planner Raybould asked if the Board members who voted no could explain further the reasoning for the decision.

Chair Baltay allowed the explanations.

Boardmember Chen stated that the knowledge on how it impacted the safety of the facility workers or birds to lower the Kelvin lighting to 3,000 was lacking in the decision, and felt it was appropriate to leave the decision to the applicant rather than have it required.

Boardmember Hirsch wanted to add a minimum of five feet that extended the tank interior to the site as an additional setback.

Planner Raybould thanked the Board members for the explanations.

The ARB took a 10-minute break and resumed with all members present.

Chair Baltay called the next Item and noted that Planner Raybould had left for a training session.

Action Items

3. Architectural Review Board's (ARB) Draft Annual Report and Work Plan

Chair Baltay asked Senior Planner Jodie Gerhardt to present the Item.

Senior Planner Jodie Gerhardt stated there was no presentation but shared the document on the screen. The two parts of what would be discussed was the Council's work plan that looked at future projects, and the ARB's version of an annual report that discussed what had occurred in the last year.

Chair Baltay addressed the Board and summarized the ARB was tasked by Council to have a work plan made for the following year, which was shown in the document, and have an annual report drafted for City Council and the Planning and Transportation Department. The objective was to keep focused on a group of items for both the work plan and report, and felt it was best to track the future and past items at the same time. The first item was the review of ongoing projects, the quasi-judicial review and recommendation process, and had asked Staff to have a list made of the notable projects reviewed over the last year and wanted to provide images to City Council and the Planning and Transportation

Department of the changes the ARB's recommendations had benefited towards the projects. In packet page 73, the application review section of the annual report, listed the projects that had been reviewed and made recommendations on, and wanted to have the list divided into five groupings with the each Board member, assisted with Staff, locating the proper images that represented the before and after stages of the project, or a final image with comments on the result of the changes made recommended by the ARB; it helped Staff if each Board member took three of the projects as they were knowledgeable on the changes made to each plan. If images on a certain project had not been shown visibly, bullet points showing the areas where ARB's recommendations positively affected the planning should be added. The list consisted of fifteen projects, and asked for volunteers to pick which projects they wished to select.

Vice Chair Rosenberg clarified in packet pages 76 and 77, and provided were before and after project images that did not show the impact of ARB's contribution to the projects planning, which was why the suggestion to have Board members work creating bullet points on changes made to the projects added to the images. She referred to packet page 73 and inquired if two of the projects were still in progress and if they were to be included in the list.

Chair Baltay stated that if they were still being constructed then they did not apply to the list and asked Planner Gerhardt if they were still in the process of completion.

Planner Gerhardt responded that they were still in the process and uncompleted projects.

(Crosstalk regarding the NVCAP and the eight hundred San Antonio project being discussed that day)

Chair Baltay removed the NVCAP and 660 San Antonio project that were still in the process stage from the list and left eight hundred San Antonio on the list as it was counted completed following the meeting today.

Chair Baltay asked for volunteers or by the end of the day had a list of members made.

Boardmember Adcock questioned if allowed to pick her own projects as she had only been with the ARB a limited time and had knowledge on only a few; 739 Stutter, 2501 Embarcadero, and eight hundred San Antonio.

Chair Baltay agreed to all projects selected and inquired if any fellow members wanted to choose.

Vice Chair Rosenberg picked the three projects located in the Stanford Shopping Center: The OurHouse, Sushi Roku, and Restoration Hardware.

Boardmember Chen inquired what was expected of the Board to add with the images.

Chair Baltay replied to depict the changes ARB had recommended that showed the contributions to standard reductions, such as SB9.

Boardmember Hirsch questioned if they were to add the bullet point to the list or just the images.

Chair Baltay responded the idea was to assist Planner Raybould with creating a gallery of images with projects before and after completion with highlighted bullet points with clarity on what had been ARB's recommendations and examples for City Council and the Planning and Transportation Department to review.

(Crosstalk on the images shown and what Chair Baltay wished to see on the reports.)

Vice Chair Rosenberg brought up the OurHouse project that ARB's ad hoc committee had a major influence on the oversight of the change being approved and what had been proposed, and the how it benefited from being brought back for rereview before approval.

Boardmember Chen asked how detailed and defined the bullet points needed to be on the changes and recommendations made.

Chair Baltay answered depending on the images provided, between three to ten bullet points with key changes should be added. He questioned Boardmember Chen if she would work on the 3100 El Camino and 3200 Park Boulevard projects.

Boardmember Chen agreed.

Chair Baltay assigned the 420 Acacia and 123 Sherman projects to Boardmember Hirsch.

Boardmember Hirsch agreed.

Chair Baltay selected the Fire Department and SB9 projects and opened the floor to Public Comment on the Item.

Administrative Associate Veronica Dao stated there was no comment card submitted.

Boardmember Adcock corrected that packet page 69 was misprinted with the year as it said 2023-2024 instead of 2024-2025, as well as her status being added to the current Board member list.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay said they were to have a round of questions and comments with the goal that in a month there was a unanimous supported idea of ARB's work handed over to City Council. The second goal regarded the Objective Standards and how they were to move forward, as well as what had been done in the past; asked for any Board questions or comments on the standards.

Boardmember Hirsch mentioned that SB9 should be added to the Objective Standard as it had been brought to his attention by Planner Gerhardt previously.

Planner Gerhardt responded that the note was referring to Objective Standards chapter 1824 on the multi-family projects, not the SB9 project because it was a separate standard.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he had made many comments addressed to the Board previously that were not discussed, but he had them written and asked for a common review of the SB9 should be incorporated into the standards.

Chair Baltay responded that SB9 had been looked at for the objective design standards relative to SB9 projects, and the concerns on SB9 standards were appropriate to be added to Section one, objective design standard refinements category.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay clarified that Boardmember Hirsch wanted to have added to the work plan for Council the opening back up the SB9 Objective Standard discussion as a Board, and questioned if there was anything to add on the past year discussions of the SB9 standards previously reviewed and approved.

Planner Gerhardt noted that goal number two was regarding the future plans for City Council.

(Crosstalk)

Planner Gerhardt asked Chair Baltay what packet page was being used to clarify the SB9 discussion with Boardmember Hirsch.

Chair Baltay responded packet page seventy-four and said they had looked at the objective standards and found how some standards were not appropriate to town home developments, and felt the standards needed to be revisited on regular basis; he asked Boardmember Hirsch if he wanted the comments on SB9 made be added to this section.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that the reasoning behind Boardmember Chen and his hesitance of recommendations on townhomes were because they wanted to receive the minutes from the previous meetings before they could properly add their comments on the issue.

Chair Baltay moved to packet page seventy and stated the goal was to assist the city as it considered modifications to objective standards, provide feedback on research as they progressed forward, and suggest better ways to have different housing typologies defined.

Boardmember Hirsch said if they listed the objective standards for the following.

Chair Baltay questioned Planner Gerhardt about the list in the objective standards chapter 1824.

Planner Gerhardt responded that was only for multi-family housing; she suggested removing that chapter and just having it called the Objective Standards.

Chair Baltay asked if that incorporated the SB9's standards as well.

Planner Gerhardt encouraged that if it were a lower priority item or later in the year project being proposed, she would suggest they worded the standards to that effect.

Chair Baltay said the Board wanted to be able to bring before the City Council what the ARB had found standards within the Objective Standards needed to be adjusted given the projects brought before the Board and asked for Planner Gerhardt's recommendation on appropriate phrasing to be written.

Planner Gerhardt stated there were more specifics in the high and low priority columns that allowed space for detail to be added, and in the high priority column the first bullet point should have addressed the modifications to the objective standards in 1824, based on reviews from a number of projects done previously with a separate line item for the SB9 objective standards.

(Crosstalk on previous meetings regarding the SB9)

Planner Gerhardt recommended the SB9 standard be added later in the year as it had just been changed this year.

Chair Baltay said if it were feasible that they added under the high priority column modifications that addressed objective standards in chapter 1824, and under lower priority add modifications that addressed objective standards regarding SB9.

(Crosstalk)

All members of the Board agreed to the addition to the priority column of lists.

Planner Gerhardt noted that she was adding to the 1824 first bullet under high priority and use the same language to have the changed SB9 under the low priority column.

Chair Baltay brought up project goal number three regarding coordinated area plans within the city and hinged from recommendation number two. He referred to the San Antonio Avenue Corridor lacked large scaled urban planning and was the reason for the need of the coordinated area plans. The downtown area needed a specific plan to increase housing, which members of the Board had discussed previously on how to have it implemented, as well as the benefit of enlarging the scale of Encina Avenue which had been currently brought to ARB's attention. The three projects listed were in the high and low priority columns, and the projects listed under high priority were San Antonio and downtown, with Encina Avenue under the low priority; asked Board if any other projects should be considered as a recommendation to Council regarding specific studies and what order of priority the projects should be listed as.

Boardmember Adcock commented that the 156 California Avenue project was coming before the Board soon, and with relevance to that project, and asked if there was a California Avenue coordinated area plan placed that she had not been aware of.

Planner Gerhardt responded there was not.

Boardmember Adcock stated that the Encina project had brought the attention to what the coordinated area plan for the California Avenue area was supposed to be, as there was many new developments being considered in the location, and felt it was best to learn from City Council what future developments were proposed before ARB reacted to the projects.

Boardmember Hirsch questioned why both California and University downtown areas were not being taken into consideration at the same time as they both were categorized under the same subject matters such as potential housing.

Boardmember Adcock inquired if California Avenue was being considered for major housing other than the Molly Stone site previously reviewed.

Planner Gerhardt replied she needed to look up the information as they had gone through a whole housing element housing process and housing element sites were chosen but did not believe it was on California Avenue; the Molly Stones construction was a Builder's Remedy project and did not adhere to the housing element. She informed the Board that Council had moved forward with plans on San Antonio and the main downtown area, and if ARB had any input or details, they wanted added to the projects were appreciated; there had been no plans to implement a coordinated area plan for California Avenue and Encina that she was aware of.

Boardmember Hirsch felt both locations should be condensed together for a study done that aided the ARB in their feedback, and California Street should be added to the high priority list as there was significant sites that were still available for development. The City Council had approved a consultant contract that had been studied over the past few years, which was passed a couple of weeks ago, and the ARB needed to describe the street as an ongoing project that they had information regarding.

Chair Baltay asked Staff for information regarding the approved contract from City Council.

Planner Gerhardt stated there were no details at her disposal currently, but by the next scheduled hearing she would bring information for the ARB to look over.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired if there was a study being done over the next two years, how would they implement the Boards recommendations as it slowed the process with the downtown's development periods; gave the open question as to whether they continued moving forward with the consideration of the special study or not.

Chair Baltay mentioned that the Council had been notified that the downtown housing plan was important and a high priority to the ARB, but it was up to Council to decide how the city resources was allocated to have the goals set accomplished. The question left for ARB was if other areas were to be added or removed from the lists, as it was the ARB's responsibility to point out issues on development before they reached City Council.

Boardmember Adcock questioned if the housing element sites were to be layered into the goals for this discussion and gave an example of San Antonio being a large portion of the housing element, construction site, and zoning areas; the housing element plan did not include significant portions of California Avenue plan, so was unsure of how readily available development was going to be implemented unlike San Antonio. She asked if the housing element map needed to be reviewed and be ahead of the planning of projects to push for a coordinated area plan for California Avenue to ensure the same comments were not mentioned repeatedly.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay pointed out a sentence on the bottom of the ARB recommendations and reported that the comments over the year were centered on the increased importance of housing projects within the city; he indicated to the Board that if in consensus with the statement, which of the coordinated area plans were likely to be selected for the issue of increasing the housing in the area. He gave an example of Encina Avenue being categorized as a low priority project area as it was not sufficient enough to accommodate the needed number of housings required, but the San Antonio area had enough space in the area to provide the required amount of housing, so it was categorized as a high priority project area.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that if California Avenue were included in the list, it would be a high priority area as well, even if the housing element had not been brought in discussion previously. Cambridge Avenue and Molly Stones had been reviewed by him for housing projects before was also now under consideration for the housing elements as well.

Chair Baltay questioned if California Avenue had the same potential of increased housing as San Antonio.

Boardmember Hirsch thought it had significant potential for increased housing and gave the example of Cambridge having sixty percent of one side of the street being a parking lot, with three functional uses on the site.

Planner Gerhardt noted there were three sites on Cambridge that were part of the housing element but were small four and five units that were to be constructed.

Boardmember Hirsch recalled the units were to be built on the North side of the street.

Planner Gerhardt stated that there was potential for California Avenue to add future developments as new regulations regarding no parking being required, which would open many opportunities for the area.

Chair Baltay questioned if California Avenue should be added to the list of low priority projects or adding with the downtown high priority list.

Vice Chair Rosenberg indicated that some areas looked at in the projects proposed were high density versus low density buildings that were condensed to downtown, midtown, and California Avenue areas for retail areas adding housing density in the nodules, however there were too many restraints that prevented the developments from being too high and too large in mass, such as lot sizes were smaller and the zoning areas were less useful for large unit complexes as it was too constrained. San Antonio had more freedom on projects as there were larger lots available, it ran on a well driven street, and the added large-scaled developments constructed with a number of residential housings affected future development; she felt San Antonio was the first high priority area that dramatically impacted the area, second priority was downtown, third being California Avenue, and four if achievable, midtown. Encina Avenue was not a high priority area in her opinion as it had too many restraints to accommodate the necessary increased housing required.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay clarified that Encina Avenue was not on Vice Chair Rosenberg's list of priorities due to the limitations and regulations restricting construction of potential housing.

Vice Chair Rosenberg responded it was not as high of a priority as the previously mentioned areas.

Boardmember Adcock asked if there were any current areas located near Encina that were part of the housing element.

(Crosstalk)

Planner Gerhardt answered that there were four to eight smaller units proposed on three to four sites of the properties located on Encina.

Boardmember Hirsch questioned Planner Gerhardt as to why locations like Encina would not have been potential parking for the Town and Country instead of a Planned Housing Zone (PHZ) development.

Planner Gerhardt stated that if a developer were to bring a PHZ application before the Staff it would be considered, but Town and Country were adamant about the usage of their parking lot and structured parking needed to be implemented which had not been discussed as of yet.

Boardmember Hirsch and Planner Gerhardt discussed the Hamilton area and the parking being separated and accessible to the University and stated areas similar were perfect for future development but recommended that California Avenue be considered for housing but also that there were parking requirements for the street itself.

Boardmember Chen clarified that from what was understood, the coordinated area plan was only for future projects that projects under review or had been completed would not be affected by the plan.

Planner Gerhardt answered that if the project was farther along in the process and was pending, Staff tried to collaborate the projects as best they could but was not required until the plan had been approved.

Boardmember Chen commented it would help if the housing element plan were overlayed to show where the current project stages were at currently and felt that locations that had the higher potential for housing elements should be the higher priority.

Boardmember Hirsch agreed with Boardmember Chen's comment.

Chair Baltay stated that all members of the Board were in agreement that San Antonio was the first on the high priority list and downtown would be second.

All Board members agreed.

Chair Baltay said there had been no consensus on how they were to move forward, and referenced to the review process that had high density housing within close proximity to single family housing as there were many concerns from the community about privacy, and stated it would be easier to have the projects approved if moved to more opened proximity locations such as San Antonio and downtown.

(Crosstalk between Boardmember Hirsch and Chair Baltay regarding the parking and increased housing in certain areas of Palo Alto)

Boardmember Hirsch commented that long-term planning and the urban design impact of was the focus of the ARB recommendations and they needed to have that in consideration when decisions were made on locations for parking and housing elements.

Chair Baltay asked if there was a consensus that California Avenue as the third priority on the coordinated area plan list.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay noted that California Avenue was added as a third high priority study area, and asked if midtown was to be added to the list as well.

Vice Chair Rosenberg noted that California Avenue should be lower on the priority list as the urgency for development was not as prominent as San Antonio and the downtown area were.

Chair Baltay questioned what the Encina Avenue site was to be categorized as.

Boardmember Chen commented that it should be added to the end of the high priority list.

Boardmember Hirsch agreed.

Chair Baltay asked Vice Chair Rosenberg if it was all right to remove the midtown area as a potential study area or if it was to be classified in the lower priority area.

Vice Chair Rosenberg felt comfortable with midtown being categorized on the lower priority list as there were SB330 projects that were expected for development and was a collision zone with residential and commercial buildings in the area; it was not an immediate concern, but it should be added to the list as a potential area.

Chair Baltay questioned the Board for further support on adding midtown to the lower priority future work study list.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay stated there was a consensus on California Avenue as a high priority area to be added to the future work study list. He said there was a statement in the annual plan that regarded what had been observed in each area, and a statement regarding California Avenue needed to be included; gave Boardmember Adcock the opportunity to express her questions or comments on San Antonio.

Boardmember Adcock clarified the focus for the San Antonio area were the services, fire access, and pedestrian and vehicular circulation through the area, and inquired what the area boundary was as the housing element map showed an area close to Charleston in the Meadow Circle area, which was a high density planning for the housing element; wanted to have a study with City Council to discuss the boundary and the overlay of the housing element so to not have repeated discussions regarding the issue.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired if it was to be placed within the San Antonio study or if would be categorized by itself.

Boardmember Adcock replied that the housing element maps were all connected by the GM and RM zoning areas but had more projects on San Antonio that were coming before Staff, and thought the area studied should be a wider dimension so the development options were not restricted.

Chair Baltay commented the wording be phrased to say San Antonio Avenue, extending from the bay to El Camino Real to have the entire area included. If how far inland to extend the property was discussed, one side of the street was property owned by Mountain View, and the other side needed to have explicit regulations on what was allowed for development; and example was to consider extending the area as far as the Coverly Community Center and did not support that idea.

Boardmember Hirsch mentioned that areas looked at should consider the long-term issues with future development and high-density housing element possibilities and referred to the Fabian design projects.

Planner Gerhardt stated that as the housing element, the Fabian east-middle circle area had re-zoning implemented on the area, same as El Camino and Page Mill. The zoning standards were already placed on what was regulated within certain areas; the coordinated area plan had the details for each site. She commented that the Home Key project was underway, and felt it was unnecessary to extend the area to the Bay.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay referred to Boardmember Adcock's comment that regarded defining the areas to be added in the future work study list.

Boardmember Adcock commented that it was to define the areas in which to study surrounding San Antonio Avenue that were potential future higher density development.

Vice Chair Rosenberg said the first bullet point defined what the area encompassed, once defined the second point focused on the commercial areas and how they would be replaced, neighborhood parks, transportation, and sewage lines.

Boardmember Adcock clarified it was issues that were above grade to be defined as well.

Vice Chair Rosenberg agreed and felt it appropriate to have the defined areas of what was to be planned in the future for San Antonio.

Chair Baltay questioned if phrased to say what the San Antonio area was to experience, would that be accurate.

All Board members agreed.

Chair Baltay mentioned that comment regarding the last sentence on the coordinated area plan would allow consideration for Transportation Park's integration with Mountain View, and asked if the description should be changed.

Boardmember Adcock stated that Transportation neighborhood parks, City services, and pedestrian and bicycle pathways be added.

Boardmember Hirsch added that commercial should be added as well as it was a higher population density in that area.

Chair Baltay asked if to phrase it as retail commerce and was the integration of nearby developments in Mountain View to be removed.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that sounded reasonable.

Chair Baltay moved to the next item regarding downtown, and it stated the increased standards while increasing vibrancy sentence and did not feel anything needed to be added to the phrasing. He asked Boardmember Hirsch to draft a paragraph regarding the addition of California Avenue to the future work plan list.

Boardmember Hirsch agreed.

Chair Baltay questioned if any changes or thoughts needed to be made to the Encina Avenue section.

Boardmember Hirsch mentioned he had spoken with owners of properties on Encina Avenue that had said there were areas available for potential development, and that Town and Country had separate ownership to their property. The land area by the railroad was a prime area for future development as well as the parking that would be needed but felt Encina should be seen as a singular project.

Chair Baltay inquired if there was a better way to phrase the wording, but there were three and four sentences that stated the site had potential for higher density housing, it acknowledged the importance of Town and Country, the parking had to be a large portion of what was to be constructed, and the coordination area plan was the way to have the project implemented.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay stated the phrasing was to be left as is. There was a consensus there were four projects, three of which were higher priority, and one was not; the text had been defined, so he moved to the fourth goal. It was Item three in the annual study that related to the bird safe glazing in Dark Sky.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay continued that goal number four was new guidelines, ordinances, and streetscape that included, but was not limited to, bird safe glazing, Dark Sky, parklet designs, and University Avenues streetscape, and asked if any changes needed to be made.

Vice Chair Rosenberg noted that it had impact on current projects that had come before the ARB board, so it was an item that needed to be discussed, but how it was written was sufficient.

Boardmember Adcock inquired how the University streetscape section differed from the downtown housing plan, and asked if it was considered an overlap on goal number three and four.

Chair Baltay said as he thought on the issue, it should be stated University Avenue and California Avenue streetscapes, as it was tasked to ARB by Council in previous projects to be involved in the California Avenue redesign, and asked if it should be left as a potential discussion to participate in.

Planner Gerhardt commented that it could be phrased generically on streetscape designs, not necessarily on University Avenue.

All the Board agreed.

Boardmember Hirsch questioned how the Board was to look at the El Camino area on how to review the new zoning and how it was to be applied, as the general objective standards did not allow higher than four and five storied buildings, but seven and eight storied buildings were being proposed in the areas.

Chair Baltay responded El Camino had not been placed on the list due to the design standards on zoning that were applied and had not seen projects failing due to lack of standards.

(Crosstalk)

Planner Gerhardt stated that there were several projects proposed along El Camino that were pending and had objective standards that many of the projects would use; there were South El Camino guidelines that had been in place for a lengthy period of time.

Boardmember Hirsch asked how the objective standards would be used within those types of projects.

Planner Gerhardt replied that projects were reviewed against all the different guidelines and zoning standards.

Chair Baltay asked if that was where the twelve-foot width and build of the sidewalk standard was placed.

Planner Gerhardt believed that was where the twelve-foot guideline had been placed, but it was also within the zoning code.

(Crosstalk)

Boardmember Hirsch questioned where the mass of the building's standard would be placed.

Planner Gerhardt answered that step backs were discussed in the objective design standards, and if a project came in as discretionary, it was used as a starting point.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired if a height limitation was implemented as well.

Planner Gerhardt replied it was, and that the Page Mill and El Camino area had been rezoned to allow taller buildings, but it had a maximum limit regulation.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay brought the discussion back to goal number four concerning the bird glazing, and asked if there was anything to be added to the annual plan list, as it stated the ARB was to provide feedback to planning Staff, Council, etc. regarding upcoming bird safe glazing in Dark Sky.

All the Board agreed it was fine left as written.

Chair Baltay moved to Item number four on the lack of communication between other Board, Commissions, and Council, and ideally, he felt there should be a liaison that relayed the information between each party; had no issue on how it was done, but more on the politics that were to be defined.

Boardmember Adcock supported the Item but was unsure how to move forward and having the recommendation implemented.

Chair Baltay said three to four years prior, Council made a Board and Commissions handbook that studied and debated the issue at length and had not addressed the particular issue as it was not an important discussion at the time, and asked if it should be removed from the work plan list.

Vice Chair Rosenberg noted that it was important to address when a concern of lacking communication between Boards.

(Crosstalk)

Boardmember Adcock felt that from project to project it was important for the Board to know how each of the committees were progressing, but outside the projects she questioned what the main objective was, and how to achieve the goal.

Boardmember Hirsch added a third if the communication helped be constructive in the planning process.

Chair Baltay stated a liaison from the Planning Commission had explained in better detail their discussions on color temperature of lights, and if the ARB had been given the information prior, it would have been helpful on current projects; the description could be worded to say a system of liaison between various Board and Council needed to be created, and noted it was to be added as an Action Item.

(Crosstalk)

Planner Gerhardt commented that what the liaison responsibilities were to be needed better detail that helped Council understand what was expected.

Chair Baltay took the responsibility to write in the sentence regarding the addition of a liaison between Boards.

(Crosstalk)

Chair Baltay asked if any other Items not discussed would like to be commented on.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated a fifth goal to be added was roof terraces as an important issue to discuss in terms of how it was to be planned, and suggested it be written that the ARB should provide feedback and possible guidelines to Staff and City Council regarding roof terraces and if it was allowed, where they were allowed, and what were the regulations to be placed; many SB330 building were starting to be proposed with roof terraces, and felt the ARB did not have a consistent and comprehensive guideline on how the issues were approached.

Planner Gerhardt responded that roof terraces were allowed, and there was some code language in place, but was open to ARB's feedback on the issue to refine the standard.

Chair Baltay questioned if it was added under project goal number four, as it was intended to address bird safe glazing.

Vice Chair Rosenberg felt it was a separate issue than the bird safety issue.

Boardmember Adcock mentioned that it would be better placed in the goal number two on modifications to objective standards.

(Crosstalk)

Planner Gerhardt said that there were code standards on roof terraces, and in goal number four the guidelines and ordinances were already placed; it could be changed to say the existing ordinances as well.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that it could be placed in goal number four as A. bird glazing and Dark sky, and B. roof terraces.

Chair Baltay questioned the Board if roof terraces should be added to the list.

All the Board members agreed.

Chair Baltay stated that a written description of how it was to fit from the annual plan to the work plan.

Vice Chair Rosenberg volunteered to assist in having the drafts made.

(Crosstalk between Chair Baltay and Vice Chair Rosenberg on how they were to word the added phrasing)

Chair Baltay asked if there were any concluding thoughts on the discussion.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if there was a specific due date when the image and bullet points for the projects were to be finished.

Planner Gerhardt noted that the packet was released a week ahead of the meeting, and they were a month out from the next meeting, so two weeks would be feasible to allow Staff to add it to the packet.

Vice Chair Rosenberg said that by the next ARB meeting on April 18th they should be done.

Chair Baltay reiterated the date the information was expected to be done by, and asked if there were any questions, comments, or announcements from the Board.

Planner Gerhardt stated that there was none.

Adjournment

Chair Baltay adjourned the meeting at 12:24 p.m.