



# ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD DRAFT MINUTES: March 2, 2017

City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 AM

## Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Absent:

## Oral Communications

Chair Lew: Now is the time for oral communications for items that are not on the agenda. I don't have any speaker cards and I don't see anybody here for that.

## Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Lew: Do we have any agenda changes today? No.

## City Official Reports

1. **Transmittal of the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, and Administrative Staff-Level Architectural Review Approvals**

## Action Items

2. **QUASI-JUDICIAL / PUBLIC HEARING: 855 El Camino Real [16PLN-00237]:** Request for Architectural Review of an Amendment to an existing Master Sign Program and Sign Exception for construction of a new externally illuminated post-mounted freestanding tenant sign for "Gott's Roadside" at Town & Country. Environmental Assessment: Categorically Exempt per CEQA Guideline Section 15301. Zoning District: Community Commercial (CC).

Chair Lew: I think we can move onto action items. Number 2 is a quasi-judicial item. Public hearing for 855 El Camino Real. Request for architectural review of an amendment to an existing master sign program and sign exception for construction of a new externally illuminated post-mounted freestanding tenant sign for "Gott's Roadside" at Town & Country. Environmental assessment is it's categorically exempt per CEQA. Zone District is CC. We have Rebecca Atkinson here with the Staff report. Welcome.

Ms. Rebecca Atkinson: Thank you and good morning. The proposed project is as you stated. It's a new freestanding tenant sign at Town and Country Village for Gott's Roadside. The freestanding tenant's sign employs materials that are similar to those that are used elsewhere at the property and the building architecture and in other site identification signs. According to the Master Sign Program for Town and Country Village, each tenant shall either conform to the provisions in that Master Sign Program or propose variations that would require approval via the standard architectural review process. Any new sign locations or type would then be added as an amendment to the Master Sign Programs, as any new sign location and types are generally considered as allowed to remain regardless of the tenant. In this case, the proposed project does not conform to the provisions in the Master Sign Program regarding sign

type, sign height, placement location and a number of individual tenant signs. Therefore, the project is reviewed according to the requirements in the City Sign Ordinance and the architectural review findings. The proposed location is near the intersection of El Camino Real and Embarcadero Road, right in the public seating area next to Gott's Roadside, which is right here. Here's the proposed sign as viewed at the pedestrian level. For comparison, here are the existing signs at Town and Country. The specific sign exception items are outlined on the slide. It would be a new freestanding sign on the property. There's a question in regard to the number of freestanding signs that are allowed per property frontage. Also, there's an increase in the number of signs for a tenant which speaks to the section in our Sign Ordinance regarding the combination of signs. Of course, the architectural review items that we would need to consider include the location of the sign, it's size, it's design and its illumination. There's also a policy question in regard to the approach to the Master Sign Program. The recommendation is to review the proposed project and provide direction to Staff for recommended action to the Director of Planning and Community Environment. There have been no public comments received to date since the application was turned in and there's a color and materials board available up there, for your use, as desired. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Now, it's time for applicant presentation. You have 5-minutes.

Mr. Jason Holleb: 5-minutes or 10-minutes?

Chair Lew: Do we consider signs minor projects? It's usually 5-minutes.

Ms. Atkinson: Sign exceptions are considered major.

Chair Lew: Oh, then it's 10-minutes. Sorry about that.

Mr. Holleb: Good morning again, Chairmen Lew and Members of the ARB. My name is Jason Holleb, a principle with Hayes Group Architects. I'm joined here today with Joel Gott of Gott's Roadside, as well as [Jim Ellis] of Ellis Partners, owner of Town and Country shopping center. I apologize, can I have the mouse for the presentation? Looks like it's not up actually. Thank you. Excuse us. To reiterate from a review a few weeks ago, this is an application in front of you for a particular sign for one of the center's key larger restaurant tenants; it's an anchored tenant. It's for their dedicated plaza area which is in front of their retail space, that was given to them or allowed to them by a previous CUP as well as in their lease agreement with the shopping center. We've included an excerpt from the lease showing that this was dedicated for this specific tenant. One of your comments before was to review the Master Sign Program at the center. It's included in the packets you have in front of you. To reiterate the sign program is primarily a horizontal fascia sign that's mounted to the arcade beams. As well as then a blade sign that are inside the arcades due to the store fronts being about 12-feet recess. The sign as Rebecca pointed out, is at the southern corner of the property at Gott's plaza. It's approximately 45-feet from Embarcadero property line and 38-feet or so from El Camino. Gott's restaurant is actually offset from the plaza; it's over here in the blue area. The sign itself is designed to be a portal or gateway. This is one of the original concepts of the renovation of the center years ago, where entry points were to be a marker used or created by artificial or landscape elements. They also took references or cues from California Ranch Vernacular. In this case, we're just created a simple horizontal fascia or beam that's mounted between two heavy timber posts that will sit onto of the existing stone walls at the plaza. The detailing and design for that sign are to replicate or reference the architectural key elements of the center which are always to maintain and express the post (inaudible) vernacular; again, weather exposed hardware. This is required for any renovation of the center including storefront changes. The sign portion itself is a replica or copy of the existing Gott's fascia sign. It has a die cut aluminum lettering, as well as a red accent border which is Gott's signature color. The idea for the sign was not to be too monumental or overbearing. It's really supposed to represent or reflect the horizontal datum created at the arcade area. As well as when the umbrellas are open and in use, there is a strong horizontal line that gets created and this is to again, help express an axis through the plaza space as a gateway. Here you can see the sign is over in the left-hand portion of the entry with the Gott's restaurant space to the far right. Following from the ARB hearing a few weeks ago, a couple key points to point out or mention again. This is again a

dedicated sign for a specific tenant. It's not intended to be used throughout the shopping center. Just one of the primary reasons the sign type wasn't adopted or modified to the Master Sign Program. Then perhaps again, this sign is for Gott's patrons to find their dedicated seating area as well as we mentioned last time, wayfinding. People were having trouble – you mentioned yourselves, trying to find the plaza and the restaurant. It's really for circulation within the site for pedestrians and vehicles to see the restaurant. Not necessarily to be seen or visible to drive by; it's not of the size or the proportion for that. The sign detail, there was a question about kerning and font. We did a review with our sign vendor and it will be the same as the fascia sign or master fascia sign that exists today. Then the architectural design is really pre-the Master Sign Program except that this happens to be rather than just a fascia sign on a beam, it is a freestanding sign or a beam itself. With that, I would like to invite Joel Gott up and then as well as [Jim Ellis] to make a few comments. Thank you.

Mr. Joel Gott: Good morning. I'm Joel Gott, owner/operator of Gott's Roadside. Thanks for the time today for studying this. The wayfinding for us has become an issue at the center with our guests trying to find us. We're hoping that this is the best solution that we could think of to help our guest find us as well as new guests. I don't really have much more say than that but I appreciate your time. If you have any questions, please let me know.

[Mr. Jim Ellis:] Good morning Board Chair Lew and Board Members. Jim Ellis with Ellis partners. We're the owner/developer of Town and Country Village. I've spoken to you before. I think just the one point that I'd like to reinforce is that we've worked very closely with the City of Palo Alto over – for over a decade now and when we established the sign program, which you've now had a chance to take a look at. I'm hopeful that you'll appreciate that it is a very well thought out sign program and that it is tastefully and conservatively done in terms of the size of each tenant sign and how those signs are applied to the elevations of these landmark buildings that we – in working with the City of Palo Alto, have preserved and rebuilt effectively, even though you can't really tell. The buildings were completely redone in almost every aspect to keep them looking and feeling the way they are with the signature low-slung roofs and the very horizontal nature of the center. What that does for retailers is it creates no real area -- no fascia area for the retailers to separately identify their brand and their signage. This is – we want to keep the continuity and character of the center with this sign program, however, it is challenging for anchor tenants like Gott's in the position they're in, to really have enough identity for people to notice that they are there. I think we've come up with a tasteful and carefully thought out solution in applying this sign in the seating area that they control and utilize, to help them along. We are open to any questions you have and greatly appreciate your consideration.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you very much. Are there any questions from the Board?

Board Member Baltay: I have three questions and a disclosure. I did meet with the applicant's architects late last week to have them present the project to me so I could understand what's going on as I missed the last meeting. Three questions, two for the applicant and one for Staff. For the applicant, I'd like to understand, this exterior patio, is this explicitly lease to the tenant in writing as part of their lease? Are they renting this space or is this just communal space that they put picnic tables on?

[Mr. Ellis:] They are effectively renting it. It's licensed to them for exclusive use.

Board Member Baltay: That's what that clause was that Jason put up...

[Mr. Ellis:] Yes.

Board Member Baltay: ...in the lease? The second question is regarding the super graphic "Eats" on the wall next to the restaurant which I find disturbingly in contrast to the new sign. What are your plans about that?

[Mr. Ellis:] I'm going to let Mr. Gott speak to that I think.

Mr. Gott: We have the same graphic at our store at the San Francisco Ferry building so when we built and designed the store here at Town and Country, we thought it would be good to bring that in. It really doesn't do much for wayfinding or anything so we'd love to keep it because we have it in a couple of the other stores but if it's all a distraction to be able to get this other sign, we would happily change it if need be.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. Then for Staff, Rebecca, you mentioned that if this is approved it would be considered as an amendment to the existing sign program. Can you explain what that means or – where does – I guess I'm concerned going into the future, does this mean that every tenant of this picnic table space gets this sign? How does it get treated?

Ms. Atkinson: Correct, the sign would exist regardless of tenant and that is a point of question for Staff actually, is how that would – a new name would also have—sorry, a new tenant would have to go through a new permitting – sorry, a new architectural review process but yes, the sign would remain regardless of tenants.

Board Member Baltay: It would be written in as an amendment to the existing sign program? The sign program is a public document that's been approved and this then would be added to that or is this just a one-off sign approval independent of the program?

Ms. Atkinson: It's my understanding that all signs at Town and Country are involved in a Master Sign Program including the site identification signs and all the tenant signs. This is an amendment to that existing program. The original entitlement for the Master Sign Program said that any sign that deviates from this program needs to go through the architectural review process and because there are a series of exceptions, this sign would exist in perpetuity with these exceptions and so forth. It would be an amendment to the Master Sign Program.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Sorry. Rebecca, I'm confused procedurally here because it seems to me, adopting or amending a sign program doesn't require to a making of exception findings but you're saying that this sign program says that a non-complying sign requires exception findings?

Ms. Atkinson: Correct.

Board Member Furth: Which page of the sign program is that on?

Ms. Atkinson: I'm sorry, the sign program has a wide variety of documents and formats...

Board Member Furth: I was just looking it on the material you provided to us.

Ms. Atkinson: Great so there's a condition of approval in the [O5] approval that speaks specifically to signs and it clarifies that any deviation...

Board Member Furth: Sure. I was just trying to find the reference. We can wait and I can get it later.

Ms. Atkinson: I'll find that for you and then also because it has to go through the architectural review process again and has to be reviewed against our sign ordinance, there's the trigger in our actual sign ordinance to require the project to go through the sign exception process.

Board Member Furth: My next question is that as I understand it, once this sign is up, it's part of the program. They can change the text if they get a new tenant without an additional review?

Ms. Atkinson: Correct.

Board Member Furth: They'll have a vested (crosstalk) right to the signage.

Ms. Atkinson: Through an (inaudible) level architectural review.

Board Member Furth: But it's just basically a text change and we have very limited rights vis-a-vis that so it's essentially going to happen.

Ms. Atkinson: Correct.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Ms. Atkinson: Excuse me, in regard to your first question about the Master Sign Program and the review process. It's on page 6 of 9 in the approvals 05PLN00278, so page 6, the condition of approval number 5. Where in Attachment B? (Crosstalk)

Chair Lew: Is that all Wynne or...

Board Member Furth: Yeah, I'm still confused but I think it's probably not (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Ms. Atkinson: Excuse me, it's packet page 22.

Board Member Furth: Just observe that the condition doesn't answer the question but probably practice does.

Chair Lew: I have a question for the applicant. I did go back out again to see the – your existing sign last night and I couldn't – I could only see the 'G' because of the illumination. I was wondering if you could explain the illumination of the new sign?

Mr. Holleb: All the signs there are the same lighting detail – get to it – with this mounted signing you see on the screen. It's the exact same sign that is used as the monumental sign out in front. What you might have seen maybe, is the light bulb was out potentially. They originally were all put in with an MR16s but they are currently being changed out to LEDs which this sign would be as well. There are two signs that we mounted on each of the posts or two lights that would be mounted on each of the posts. It's only actually about 12-inches that will be used projection and again, they are the exact same detail that you see on the monumental sign. Probably, if you're looking at the sign, you won't actually even notice them. Actually, if we can make one clarification point, I believe you where discussion Peter, about if this sign were to change – if the tenant were to change, will this sign remain? Will they rebrand it? Per the lease agreement, it's really the conditional use permit and the lease agreement is specifically for Gott's and I think Jim spoke to this. If they change tenants, this sign does not necessarily need to remain or be rebranded with another tenant's name.

[Mr. Ellis:] I just also wanted to add that we are requesting an exception to the sign criteria solely just for Gott's and this specific location. We are not asking for or interested in any amendment to the current sign criteria.

Chair Lew: If there are no more questions, we can go onto Board Member comments. Peter, would you start us off?

Board Member Baltay: Sure, thank you. In general, I find that this is a very well thought out sign and it seems to be quite appropriate and fitting to the site and I can see it going in there. On a design level, I find that it is tastefully designed and fits within the overall style of the Town and Country shopping center with the one exception. I find it extremely deviant to see the large "Eat" super graphic behind this sign. That's not tasteful or anywhere near within the standards for the Town and Country shopping center so

for me to approve it, I would want a condition, that other sign being removed or somehow restored – the wall of the building restored to what it was originally just by contrast. Just so my Board Members can hear my logic in feeling ok about this is that this table space out in front is a specific space that this company has leased. They are paying money for this and there's nothing in the sign program or the procedures to allow any sort of signage with that and yet, I feel it's obvious that it needs some sort of signage. It's a neat spot to sit and yet, it's really tough to identify what's going on there and the sign is really that one – and we all know that driving through that parking lot can be kind of crazy and it will just help identify this spot. It only seems fair to me that these guys are leasing this space, they ought to be allowed to have a sign over it of some kind. If this had been brought up when the sign program was first put into effect, I've got to believe that we would come up with something pretty close to this. I just don't see why we wouldn't want to allow this. My struggle has been with the fact that we're in effect, establishing a precedent. What if Pete's Coffee down the way tries to make the same argument. They've got an outdoor seating area there as well and I struggle with that and I'm not sure what the answer is and I'm eager to hear my fellow colleagues approach to that. That's why the questions about whether it's written in explicitly in the sign program or are we just allowing this but in general, I find that this is not the same as letting any restaurant with a sidewalk café table having a sign over it because this is private property. This is a property that is leased and paid for. These people own it and I feel they have the right to have a sign over their property. With that, I'm in support of it with the one condition that we remove the super graphic that's distracting behind it. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Could Staff explain the "Eats" super graphic with regards to code enforcement in the ARB's purview with regard to code enforcement.

Mr. Jonathan Lait: Yes, thank you Chair. We – I think in Rebecca's review of the application, there was an evaluation of some signs that we didn't have records for and the "Eats" super graphic is one of those signs. Now, we've had a conversation with the applicant and they seem to believe that there was some kind of approval granted and we're still waiting for some information to demonstrate that approval. In the absence of that and I don't think we're going to be waiting too much longer for that but this would be a code enforcement case. We would send a code enforcement office out there seeking that super graphic to be removed and restored to its previous conditions. Alternatively, the tenant or property owner could seek another application to allow it and that would be through an amendment to the Master Sign Program.

Chair Lew: Just to clarify on my end, my understanding is that from the City Attorney on other projects, is that the ARB doesn't have any purview over code enforcement.

Mr. Lait: Thank you, yeah...

Chair Lew: We can't require...

Mr. Lait: Right.

Chair Lew: ...we don't have the authority to require it. (Inaudible) I think you can.

Mr. Lait: I think that's a fair representation. I would caution about conditioning the approval on the removal of that sign. We have it in the record of the Boards concern about that super graphic and we will proceed with code enforcement and follow up to use the City's police powers to address it through that mechanism as opposed through the discretionary application that's before you.

Board Member Baltay: If I could, can I clarify, though? My concern has nothing to do with whether that's an existing legal sign or not but rather, we're asked to pass architectural judgment on the compatibility of this sign and the building around it. I find that that sign is something that's not compatible with this sign and they just can't exist together. In order to make that finding, something has to change. It's nothing to do with code enforcement. I'm not even considering that much judgment of it but rather the "eats" super

graphic contrasts so strongly with this sign, they really shouldn't both be in the same place at the same time.

Mr. Lait: I guess – I'm sorry, was it – to respond to that. I think that – I understand the concern about that. The "Eats" graphic is not before the Board right now and based on our records, we believe that graphic is not permitted to be there and so in through the ordinary course of the City's work in restoring that, the way we've approached it and I appreciate that the individual Board Members may have different perspectives on that. We're kind of looking past that right now to look at the sign that's been requested. I do understand that it's certainly a distraction if you're not able to support the sign based on the existing conditions that are out there.

Board Member Baltay: That may be something the applicant wants to consider that. I'm finding it hard to make the necessary findings with both of these signs at the same time.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I'm still not – I mean, it's a very well done sign. Everything else but if the purpose of it is basically just to show that your particular restaurant has purview over that patio area. I don't think it needs to have a sign that big. I still think it's a confusing situation if you're parked on the street or driving by to take a quick look at that. I think it isn't really doing anything for you. I can't support it as it is.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for – I'm sorry, this is comments, not just questions, right?

Chair Lew: I think we – you can still ask a question.

Vice Chair Kim: I just want to make sure – thank you for coming back and it was nice to have the sign program in our packets this time around. I'm still where I was two weeks ago, I'm fine with the sign. I think it's well designed, well thought out, it makes sense to put it there. I find that the exception is warranted in this case. I had some questions about whether this is a one-off or if this is going to set a precedent. I think [Mr. Ellis] has made it clear that this is a one off. I may suggest that perhaps we make a condition that if a feature one off is to be proposed that perhaps that triggers a sign program update. Other than that, I don't have any additional comments. Again, I think it's definitely been thought out. Maybe to respond to Board Member Baltay's comment, if – I can't see the "Eats" causing this sign not to go along with everything else. I think that if the "Eats" is the problem then the existing sign – the existing Gott's sign may be a problem also. I can't see that being a case not to approve the sign but otherwise, I'm ok with it.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I agree with my colleagues that it's a well-designed sign and I agree with the applicant that it's a really good sign program. Could we see the first slide again? It's the view from the corner. Oh, and could we see the lease terms for just a second. Great, if we could see the first...

Mr. Holleb: This one or the...

Board Member Furth: This is my problem. This is beautiful and this is a beautiful shopping center and this in my view, the most congenial place to shop in Palo Alto and it's because it's so restrained, it's because it's so well integrated, it's because it's so well designed and maintained. Unfortunately, I experience this proposed sign as visual clutter and it's not compatible with that. I think – I agree with my colleague Robert, that if you trying to say that this space is to be used by people bringing out food from Gott's or being served by Gott's, the signage is too big and facing the wrong direction. Therefore, I see it as a sign that's designed to be seen by people going by. I spent a lot of time going up and down Embarcadero and

looking at this and it just reinforces my view, that I can't make the second finding. I can't make the third finding for exceptions and I can't make finding number 2 for architectural review findings. I'm not going to be able to support this sign which pains me. I also find myself in disagreement with Staff. I think that it is quite possible when your being asked to approve a new element to a Comprehensive – to a site and that new element would work if you modified another element, that's an appropriate condition for approval of the new element. Whether one wants to do that or not is another question and you certainly, wouldn't want to proceed in that way if the City Attorney told you it was an invalid condition. I don't know what the City Attorney says. I'm also concerned that – about the property rights argument. I'm not in favor of processes where a sign program generates rights to signage because of lease arrangements that the landlord makes with tenants. That's not what should be driving sign programs. It should go the other way around. With regret, because I don't like to be unable to support what people want to do, I'm going to vote no.

Chair Lew: I don't – I said I was going to support the project last time and I don't think I've changed my position on that. I think the – my only other thinking on this project is that from say the Embarcadero entrance, you have Pete's and Mayfield. They have – Pete's has the outdoor seating area on the corner. You have direct – there's a very clear direct line of sight to there from the entrance. Also, say from the two El Camino entrances, the one closest to Embarcadero. If you come in, you get a direct line of sight into the Howey's trellis and that has a sign on the trellis. Then also if you go on to the farther El Camino entrance. You come in and see Sprinkles or you would have a clear of sight to see what use to be Scott's, but this one, you don't have that. It's on that weird corner. It has a very odd angle to it – entries to the patio so I can – I've been there twice. I think you have a visibility issue from the El Camino side so I could support this. I think the sign is attractive. Did you have a comment? Quick comment, yeah.

Mr. Holleb: If we may. Just to reiterate for the "Eats" sign, I know it wasn't really part of this application or whether it was part of the discussion but as it is a concern. We do know it's possible a code enforcement item. Again, as we mentioned, they are willing to remove that in lieu of this sign. Even if you can't make that condition of approval.

Board Member Baltay: Are you changing your application to include the removal of that sign as part of this then?

Mr. Holleb: We can if that's what it takes for this approval. We just don't have anything documenting that on the application.

Board Member Furth: I think what they're saying is they are willing to not object to that as a condition.

Board Member Baltay: Jonathan said we can't include it as a condition so I'm hoping they are just willing to do it. If they offer, then it's different.

Board Member Gooyer: That I don't understand because the reality of it is if we asked for a particular in a project, a wall to be painted a different color, there wouldn't be an issue. Why is this all of a sudden different?

Mr. Lait: Yes, I've consulted with Staff and we (inaudible) if you want to put it in as a condition, that will be fine. It's helpful that the applicant is agreeing to it.

Chair Lew: I'm willing to entertain motions.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Baltay: Well, I might as well tackle this one. I move that we approve that we accept the findings presented in Attachment A and approve the sign with the finding – with the one condition that "Eats" super graphic be removed from the building behind this.

Vice Chair Kim: Maybe I can comment before we support the motion or not. I'm – we're supposed to look at this from an architectural design standpoint. Does the "Eats" sign really hurt anybody? It's just a bathroom wall. I mean, if they are going to paint it brown, does that make everything better?

Board Member Baltay: I'm sorry Kyu, I felt going out there the other day and looking around, it just jumped at me. There's nothing else in Town and Country like that anywhere and the place is so carefully designed.

Vice Chair Kim: You'd rather just see a brown wall and just be muted.

Board Member Baltay: I'd rather see what's originally approved on those things, yeah. I'm sorry but that's how I feel...(inaudible)(crosstalk)

Vice Chair Kim: No, no, that's fine (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Baltay: (Inaudible)(crosstalk) It has nothing to do with code enforcement and whether it's a sign or not. It just bugs me to see it there. It's hard to find condition – contextually appropriate.

Vice Chair Kim: I'd like to support the motion, I'm just not sure I can fully stand behind having that be a condition. I guess that's where I am. I guess I'm kind of the fence then. What do you think Chair Lew?

Chair Lew: My take on the "Eats" sign is that it's incongruous with the rest of Town and Country, just in general. I'm fine with – if the Staff wants to handle that separately for this particular sign, I'm fine with that. The "Eats" sign is a – what do I want to say? We had a – we'd had other projects downtown in the shopping center, which are considered super graphics and there's a distinguishing between a super graphic and a sign. The sign is actually their trademark logo and their branding. Then the super graphic is something else that's not related to their name, right? On Paris Baguette, there's a painted mural on the side of the building and then we also have some at Stanford shopping center at the Nike store so they are separate from signs. I just wanted to make sure that we're not – we don't blur the distinction between the – between a sign and super graphic. Then, I think our code doesn't really adequately address the super graphics issue but it's come up before on other projects. Ok, we have a motion but we don't have a second.

Vice Chair Kim: I've thought it over. I think the applicant is more concerned about having this sign go up and they're – and since they've made it – they've made a statement that they would be ok dealing with the existing "Eats" sign. I think I can support Board Member Baltay's motion and I'll second the motion.

Chair Lew: Ok, all in favor?

Chair Lew, Board Member Baltay, Vice Chair Kim: Aye.

Chair Lew: All opposed?

Board Member Furth: No.

Board Member Gooyer: Nay.

Chair Lew: That passes 3-2.

### **MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 3-2**

Chair Lew: Did you guys get it? Board Member Baltay, myself and Kyu are for and Board Member Furth and Gooyer are opposed. Thank you, guys.

**3. 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)

Chair Lew: We're ready for item number 3. Public hearing on a quasi-judicial matter for 799 El Camino -- Embarcadero Road. 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 road. Adjacent to the southeasterly edge of Rinconada Park on an 18.27-acre property. Environmental assessment is that the project is exempt from CEQA and the zone district is PF. Welcome, Amy French.

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Thank you. Happy to be here to present for the 3<sup>rd</sup> public hearing of -- for the formal project application for the fire station #3 replacement building. I have up on the screen here the history of the review, which did come back in June to this Board for a pre-limb ARB review, followed by HRB review in November, followed by December and January formal ARB reviews. The applicant heard your comments and recommendations for modifications and has come -- those are summarized in your Staff report as shown on the screen above and they have come back with some modifications that they will present to you today. We are hoping to get a recommendation today because it is the 3<sup>rd</sup> hearing. I'm just going to show you briefly the compare and contrast. We've got what you saw on January 19<sup>th</sup> with the slotted window and the taller dorm volume facing the park. Now today, with the set you're reviewing is the smaller, shorter dormitory volume facing the park with a thinner -- they call it an eyebrow beam over the balcony and this punched window as long -- long with the slightly lower Terracotta volume. Here on the screen, we have the front and rear elevations. You can see the saddle bag on the left, next to the park, is lower by 2-feet 9-inches from what the first drawing showed you. Then, of course, on the right, on the lower volume -- lower image facing the park, the lower saddlebag. These are images showing at planting and then at mature vegetation. You can here, this much thinner eyebrow beam and screening vegetation at maturity. This is what you saw in January, it had a thicker beam that came up higher. That concludes my presentation. We'll let the applicant share their -- you have a materials board as well because that was -- ok.

Chair Lew: Welcome and you'll have 10-minutes once you get the presentation up.

Mr. Alan Kawasaki: Should I begin? Ok. Again, I'm Alan Kawasaki from Shaw/Kawasaki Architects and thank you for seeing us again. We're becoming a regular here and just to also summarize in a grand scheme of things. As you know, we are fire station architects and the question of a replacement station -- this is one we have seen often here in the Bay Area because our (inaudible) stations are now 75, 70-years of age and what happens when we go back and look at optimum positioning or locations of fire stations inevitability, we find -- I would say 75% -- maybe 90% of the time, that the old stations is actually in the best location because the community has become quite developed around and so alternate sites are not available. I think this the case here in Palo Alto where you're saying, this is the best site for the station. It's one where the community is used to seeing the station and the question is with modern -- the requirements now, which include, of course, ADA, which includes now having separate dormitories for the accommodation of females, larger apparatus. An entirely different mission which is now medically related more so than firefighting. The types of equipment and the amount of equipment that must be accommodated is much greater hence, we're asking to take an existing site and put roughly twice the amount of stuff on the site. Our task is, can we do that responsibly and obviously, you have to be the judge of whether that is true or not. I'm just going to go through a couple of the slides we showed last time and then we'll talk about the things that you asked for and how we responded. So, remember from the corner and we've gone through a number of iterations on the corner and also at the entry. Those questions were related to scale also but also our response was articulation. There were questions of whether it should be sloped, whether we should be dealing with the flat roofs and we talked about how

we saw technology, for instance, being quite important and the requirement for putting PVs on the flat roof and being able to change those out over time. The highest of the three volumes – not what we're calling saddle bags but the middle volume that has the Terracotta, has a high parapet. It's got PV panels and it has condensers and other things, so those are screened but there was an opportunity to lower the saddle bags. I think Board Member Baltay brought that up in the very first meeting and I think over time we've lowered and lowered and we've got it down just as far down as we think is possible now, so we want to talk about how we did that. The view currently is a pretty much masked the existing station and I think the point made that when it initially goes in, it's not going to be so masked. It's going to be open so this is where we were last time. As has been mentioned, we've been able to take it down – you asked me the question, can we take it down some and I said yeah, probably at least 2-feet and you said, do as much as you can, that's what we did. We went back to our engineers. We were able to reengineer the system of flooring supporting the second floor, thinned that up and also look at the – it's the apparatus bay, the stuff that's in there. The overhead doors, the mechanical equipment, the exhaust systems that relieve the exhaust from the fire engines. We've taken it down – absolutely down to the tightest possible. We took the building down -- the whole building down essentially 6-inches by taking the second floor down. Then the next thing we did was we looked at the parapets. We looked at the fact that the side that's in question, has a 9-foot interior ceiling and as I mentioned, we do have residences that are 8-foot so we took a foot there, we took 6-inches off the entire building, we took the parapet down. Our net change is 2-foot 8-inches on the side facing the park. Net change to the rest of the building is 6-inches. Before and then after, so you can see the – whoops. Maybe I can use the toggles better. Here's where we were, here's where we are. We've taken that side down as about as much as we can take it and we thinned up that sort of flying beam or eyebrow. With the vegetation, obviously, this takes many years to get to this point – back to this point again. Then again, just frontally, looking at – we're looking at the right-hand side where it was, where it's at now. Looking from the side, where it was and where we're at now. Then you also asked a question about well, what happens with this material over time? Your concern was will it get darker or will it get lighter? We went to the manufactory and we can give these to you to take a look at. This is the one that we specified and these two are pre-patinaed. This is what comes of the zinc so it weathers down. What we were told is that if we pick either one of these, the natural state of zinc will become a value in between the two so the answer is that it gets lighter over time, relative to what we've chosen. You can see the – this is the original state of the one we've picked, the darker on the far left and over time, it's getting lighter. The far right, which you can only see a piece of is actually the natural state of zinc as it's weathering. Then Robert is here. We also have some questions that you raised in regards to plant materials and the shading of that. If you can come up and address that? These are his slides.

[Mr. Robert ??:] Good morning. The first question that was asked was the Arctostaphylos ground cover, Pacific Mist, to be substituted and so what we show is two varieties of plant material used in the ground cover. We have the Celosias and the Coyote Bush – Dwarf Coyote Bush, that is both California natives and will work well with the hardness and the different shade and sun situations. In general, the planting material has not changed. The vines – the Ficus vines that are the park side:37 of the wall are going to be on the segmented sections and then when we get to the portion of the wall that is part of the building, we will no longer be planting that. That way we can control the vines from taking over the building itself but still have it as a screening value for the walls. One of the other questions was to look into more native and shade tolerant plant material on the park side of the wall and we've done that. We've introduced some Mahonia and Coral Bells and other more shade tolerant situations with color varieties and plant material that matches what's going on adjacent to the park. I think generally, that's the changes that we were asked to make.

Chair Lew: Great. Thank you. Are there any Board Member questions? I had – Wynne.

Board Member Furth: This is just of Staff, just to confirm that the existing building is set back how far from the park? I don't see a dimension looking at C1.

Board Member Gooyer: About 7-feet.

Board Member Furth: Ok and the proposed building is at the property line or at the edge park...

Ms. French: Not a property line.

Board Member Furth: ...at the edge of the park dedication line?

Ms. French: It's a boundary of the park.

Board Member Furth: It's a park dedication line.

Ms. French: Correct, it's a – not an (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Furth: Official (inaudible) within it.

Mr. French: Correct.

Chair Lew: I have a question. I think this is maybe for Staff and the applicant. This is something we haven't talked about I think before which is the signs. I was reading in somewhere that the existing monument sign – the (inaudible) mountain sign is going to stay but be moved up closer to the sidewalk. Then on the building signs, there's – you're showing two in the renderings but I don't see any details and so I was wondering if that's part of the application or is that a future submittal?

Mr. Kawasaki: We would like – we're applying to put the sign there. If you need more detail on that, we'd be happy to bring that back.

Chair Lew: That's for the monument but there are two things, so the wall...

Mr. Kawasaki: The monument is the existing sign being brought forward but the building sign is something that we're adding. It has a...

Chair Lew: Right.

Mr. Kawasaki: ... on the brick, right?

Chair Lew: Right, but are there aren't any – I think your showing in the renderings but I don't think...

Mr. Kawasaki: Correct.

Chair Lew: ... I didn't see any details on that.

Mr. Kawasaki: There isn't a detail on it and if we need to bring in any detail, we'll bring a detail.

Chair Lew: We can do it – I guess will Staff – I mean, it can be a separate thing and it doesn't necessarily come to the Board but I think that we – I think that Staff has conditioned it that future signs would have to go through the process. Then the – I just want to comment to that one of the signs that you're showing – like the one that's on Newell Road, it's on top of a canopy so that – we generally – that requires an exception in our code.

Ms. French: Oh, sorry. We've changed that actually.

Chair Lew: Did you change (inaudible)

Ms. French: The code was changed. I should have noted that.

Chair Lew: We've been wanting that changed for a long time.

Mr. French: Yeah, that was back in February of 2016.

Chair Lew: Excellent. That's the only question that I have. Now Board Member comments? Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I think it's a handsome building. I think it's going to serve its purposes much better than the existing building. My concern has been its impact on the adjacent park. Palo Alto has a Park Dedication Ordinance because when City's look for places to put other services whether it's utilities or public safety, nothing is cheaper than park land and the conversion of part of what downtown park to the Avenidas parking lot lead to the requirement that any un-dedication of park land be voter approved. We're not proposing to undedicated parkland here. I have one question for Staff. Is there a specific provision in the code that says do not treat park dedication boundaries as property lines or is that just something that we know because there's not a parcel line?

Ms. French: The ladder.

Board Member Furth: Ok. My concern is that the City is the only property owner who can do this kind of – have this kind of impact on that park land, right? Any other owner – there'd be an actual parcel line and it would be a setback. My concern is that this practice we have of saying not to worry, it's not an actual parcel line or lot line. While this is true, it violates the spirit of the Park Dedication Ordinance because we effectively end up with less – with more impact from adjacent development on the park than would otherwise be possible. I have – this is unimportant if the proposed project is right at the property line but for some kind of reason about the topography or the existing landscaping, it doesn't have any adverse impact on the park. I know there's disagreement among up here as to whether it does or not. Some of you who have spent a lot more time on that park than I do, don't see it as a matter of concern but I have a hard time making the findings because of the balcony that overlooks the park and because of the height and nearness of that building. I'm satisfied that that's not a problem, it's easily remediable. I'm satisfied that the applicant has tried to figure out an alternative but hasn't succeeded.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for coming back with the modifications. I think it looks great changing that one-off window on the dormitory to make it match the other one, the thinning of what you call the eyebrow. My only comment would be, what does the eyebrow really doing for the building? Is it possible to maybe get rid of it altogether but my decision to recommend approval of the project wouldn't depend on that but it was just a question.

Mr. Kawasaki: Can I go ahead an answer that now? Is that appropriate or do we have wait?

Chair Lew: No, go ahead.

Mr. Kawasaki: Ok, thanks. What happens is if you look at the second-floor plan, the way the corridor comes around there. The corridor actually comes a little bit beyond the face of what we call the Terracotta building and so there's a treatment of a butt glazing through there. In order to resolve those geometries, that is why we added the eyebrow. I know it's something in an (inaudible) thing for us but we felt that without it, it seemed a bit odd the way it jogged like that.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I think the building is a handsome building. The biggest problem I still have with it is that – I've brought it up a couple of times now. It seems to have absolutely not a relationship but all (inaudible) in my mind of form wise to the civic buildings across the street. I know you keep telling me this whole thing about the height and all the other things about a sloped roof. I still would have liked to see a sloped roof; at least some relationship. I'm not saying the thing has to be rough saw wood and

1950s Edward Durell Stone tile or I should say stone. At this point, I'll just leave it at that and I'm sort of a tossup. I'd like to see what the rest of my Board Members have to say.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. I think I can support the project now. I'd like to say I guess, that I'm very excited about the zinc material on the outside. I think that will be a truly long lasting natural material that is environmentally friendly. It's durable, it's going to last a lifetime or two and is quite handsome. I am appreciative of Robert's comments about the building not being contextually the same as the library and those older buildings but I find that this is a building of our time. It's on a tricky site which requires a more vertical building and I think this is an attractive building on that corner. I think it's going to be a real improvement for everyone coming up and down Embarcadero or turning in a Newell. I guess I'd like to comment about the process in the sense that for the issues has been what Wynne pointed out. This building is right next to the park and I believe it's very tall and very close to the park. It's 7-feet closer to the park. It's close to 15-20 feet taller than what's there now. It's a big impact on the park. I see members of our fire department in the back here. They are tall guys – they are tall guys probably because it helps them to be better firemen and we've asked them to have lower ceilings on their dormitory and to lower the ceilings where the apparatus parks and that's a compromise on their part. What I'm feeling is that through this process, we have – everyone is compromised a bit. I, the Architectural Board, we're being forced to have a building that is a little bit bigger against the park than we'd like. The firefighters have a building that's a little bit tighter in the bedrooms than they'd like and maybe that's the way it's supposed to be. That we're all coming around to something that fits because we need a new fire station and this is, as the architect pointed out, a good location for it. I can support the building and make the findings. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you for that Peter. I can support the project and I think I only have a couple nitpicky comments for Staff in that, in our conditions of approval, in findings. Let's see, under Attachment A, the architectural review findings under item 5, which is landscape. I think you – Amy, you'd revised it to add the Manzanita last time but they've taken the Manzanita out so maybe we can just delete that. Then under the Attachment B on conditions of approval, you're mentioning the set from January 12<sup>th</sup> but now we have a new set so we can update that. Then, I think under Item C about the future signage. I think we just want too – if you could just note that the signs that are shown in the building – on the building are not included as part of the approval. Ok. I think we ready to entertain a motion. Anybody? Motion, please.

Ms. French: Can I get a clarification? I think in the past with building signage, the Architectural Review Board has wanted to and it's great, to see where the signs are being located. The actual details and the sizes of the sign letters etc. would be part of a separate application but I think if the placement of those signs, in those locations, is something that the ARB could confirm or it would help Staff with their review when those come in.

Chair Lew: I think that they look fine to me. I think you would have – if the Board didn't like them, you would have heard comments. It seems like they – at least in my mind, the style fits with the mid-centuries kind of style of the building, in terms of the font and colors and the locations for that. Then really when it comes down to it is actually the just scale of lettering and the lighting and all of that is usually – is a little harder to judge at this point. I don't know if there are any other comments from the Board on the signs? No? Ok. Motion, anybody?

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Kim: I'm fine with the signs. I will move that we approve the projects with the minor modifications that Chair Lew has made of the conditions of approval.

Board Member Baltay: I'll second that motion.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Opposed?

Board Member Furth: No. Can I make a brief comment?

#### **MOTION PASSED 4-1**

Chair Lew: Yes, please.

Board Member Furth: Mine is a protest vote. If mine were the swing vote, I would be voting yes because I want this building to happen and the protest is because I think – I would argue – I would hope that when we look at the next building which is adjacent to a park, you think about the constraints that we tell the designer to work with because I'm concerned that we're increasingly building larger buildings, higher buildings, closer to parks and we're not protective enough of that open space. As common open space, it's the more precious in the City. Thank you.

Board Member Baltay: If I could second that. I strongly agree with what Board Member Furth just said. Thank you.

Chair Lew: I will chime in on that as well. Is that, I think we should consider – if we're considering a large wall facing the park, then we should also consider the other conditions on the same sight. For example, the back of the Lucie Stern Center, it has the – what do you call it? The fly space. There's this big tall – the theater thing facing the street – very close to the street and so we should -- if we're considering something like this, then we should look at the existing conditions and see what else is compatible. Yes?

Board Member Furth: I have one more thought which is that if the Fire Department is going to essentially borrow the parkland for its side yard, some of their budgets should go to its maintenance or at least the project go to its planting rather than the park budget. Thanks.

Chair Lew: Can I...

**Male:** (Inaudible)

Board Member Furth: Which is just (inaudible)

Chair Lew: This is not – yeah, don't...

Mr. Lait: I'd like to move onto the next item.

Chair Lew: Yeah, we need to move onto -- actually I think -- Wynne, I've been out to the site when they've been doing maintenance and it's the same people doing – no, it's the same people working on the park as the fire station is my understanding.

Board Member Furth: Let it go.

Chair Lew: Congratulations. Thank you, guys.

#### **4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3223 Hanover Street [16PLN-00190]:**

Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of two Existing Office / R&D Buildings and the Construction of a new two-story 110,000 Square Foot Office / R&D Building. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration was Circulated for Public Comment From February, 22, 2017 to March 13, 2017.

Zoning District: RP; RP(L). For More Information, Please Contact Graham Owen at [graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Lew: We'll move onto the next item. Ok, I think we're ready. Are we ready? Item #4 is a public hearing/ quasi-judicial matter 3223 Hanover Street. Recommendation on applicant's request for approval of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of two existing office / R&D buildings and the construction of a new two-story 110,000 square foot office / R&D building. Environmental assessment is a mitigated negative declaration was circulated for public comment on February 22, 2017, to March 13, 2017, and the zone district is Research Park. Mr. Owen, welcome.

Mr. Graham Owen: Thank you to the Board. My name is Graham Owen. I'm a Staff planner with the City of Palo Alto. I've been working with the applicant on this application. This is the second formal hearing and – on this application and we are recommending approval at this time based on findings and conditions. I am happy to provide a brief overview of the changes that have occurred since the previous hearing and I know that the applicant has a presentation as well. Just as a quick summary, this is a major architectural review application for a new two-story office/R&D building in the Research Park. It's located on Hanover Street and it's adjacent to other R&D office buildings as well as some single-family residences along the rear of the property. The building would be 109,696 square feet, which does not include 5,500 of – 5,000 square feet of exempted amenity space. Previously, the application included a request for design and enhancement exception to allow for an elevator and stair enclosures to exceed the maximum height limit in the Research Park zoning district. That request is no longer being perused at this time. Also, we have done an initial study for the project in a mitigated negative declaration that has been prepared. Here's an aerial photograph of the site showing the site context with Hanover Street as – serving as the site frontage. Office/R&D buildings on either side of the building, as well as single family residents along the rear. A couple of plan changes that have occurred since the previous hearing. Both Staff and the Board had a number of recommendations for changes to the plans that were previously presented and so those have been summarized by the applicant into a number of (inaudible). The DEE is no longer being requested as I already said. One of the bigger items was that there was an (inaudible) need for enhanced – an enhanced public entrance to the building and a drop off area. That's been included in the lower level parking deck and it's daylighted now by a light well, which I know the applicant can provide additional information on. Multi-middle connectivity was also a concern at the previous hearing so there's been a number of enhancements to the site plan, which I can show you. One of them is the side that's adjacent to the Bol Park bicycle path and there had been a path that had been connected to the drive aisle but terminated at the drive aisle previously. Now the path connects along the side of the drive aisle up to the building entrance and courtyard area. Additionally, the entrance to the lower level parking deck has been shifted down about 60-feet, which provides additional cueing area and also a new entrance to the lower level deck. There are additional sidewalks that are proposed from the garage to Hanover street and those provide additional connectivity for both bicyclist and pedestrians. Interior to the garage plan and I don't have a – the image of it here but I believe the applicant does. There's a walkway that is going to be used for bicyclists and pedestrians that connect directly to a stairwell which leads to the courtyard area. Additionally, there was a request for additional screening – excuse me, for additional trees and shrubs in the meadow area and so there's been additional plantings that are proposed. I believe 6 new trees will be planted as well as some shrubs to provide additional landscaping in that meadow area. At this time, I'm happy to take any questions you have but I know the applicant has a presentation as well.

Chair Lew: Let's do the applicant presentation. Mr. Giannini, you have 10 minutes.

Mr. Bob Giannini: 10-minutes, ok. I need my equipment. Thank you. Good morning members of the Board, Chairmen Lew, Staff. My name is Bob Giannini from Form4 Architecture and I'm very happy to be back to present this project. I think the comments that were made last time were actually great and both the owner and I are very excited to present the changes we've made. Quickly, to go through, there were four items -- I really want to address the four items that were the topics last time which was our – eliminating our request for a DEE, the garage approach. There was also an issue of sustainability and really some further study was needed to make sure that the building would be able to pass the standard

building requirements and a little bit more discussion about the lower meadow and some enhancements there. We don't talk about the DEE much, we've removed all reference from the drawing. One correction on the Staff's comments is the FAR for the – the area where we were requesting for the building was 110,000 square feet plus the amenity space. When we eliminated the elevator and the stairs that go to the roof, there were a couple of square feet there so that would bring the square footage back to the 110 plus 550 and that's what the plans actually indicate. Getting into the bigger topic of the improving site circulation. Let me quickly describe all the things we did and it all kind of relates to each other. One of the things we did was, we really need to improve the access through the garage. We had a garage that was sort of densely packed with cars, that got you to the elevator and the stair that brought you up to the courtyard. We wanted to move the entrance of the lower garage up so that it aligned on axis with that stair and elevator. Also, there was an issue of hierarchy and I thought the best comment from the last meeting was where does the Uber driver pick up? That actually was the image that let me think about all this and of course, we're also talking bikes and pedestrians. What we wanted to do was make it clear that when you come off the driveway, you go in this entrance and not this entrance. This is the one that gets you to the lower lobby. We made this entrance larger and again, put in on axis and we have another image of that coming up. We also created this new ADA path that brings you right from the existing bus stop, along with its own sideway for bicycles and pedestrians, that bring you into the garage. Then that path continues as a dedicated path to the lower lobby. Let me jump – this is a little bit of a blow up of that. This is the revised new main entry to the garage. This is the first entry you come upon. We made it larger, we made it a little taller so that you can orient yourself – you can immediately see how the site orientation works. There's the parking and then you see the light beyond into the new large light well that was created at the lower lobby. Also, we made side walls and it doesn't quite show up in the slide here for some reason but there's an opportunity for signage right at this point which would be a major wayfinding sign that would let people know that when you enter the site, this is the first entrance you come to. This is where you go to go to the building. This is the diagram of how that works. Again, we raised – well, we raised the driveway up so that we're on axis now to the new lower level lobby and you can see the sidewalk that runs along for bicycles. It goes right to the long-term bicycle parking area. There's a drop-off and we started to think of this more as a drop off at a hotel sort of arrangement where people would actually find it exciting to come to this driveway. Then following additional suggestions that were made last time, we created this open-air light well that goes right up right at the spot, to the courtyard. We kept it open so that there was a strong visual connection to the courtyard above. There would be Bamboo that would make the two levels up to the top. From this point, it's a very gracious way to drop off. Your right at the vertical circulation and then you would arrive at this pavilion. There's the top of the light well and go right into the lobby of the building which is right to the side. I'm happy to talk more about that but that's the major pieces of how we've addressed the site circulation. You still always have the grade level site circulation at the top tier, right off of Hanover but this allows an option for people who don't want to make that last little bit of climb up to the top. On sustainability, we talked last time about how the building basic strategy for sustainability was to shade itself. Since last time, what we've done is done the energy analysis on the building just as it is. It passes Palo Alto standard at 12.7% above Title 24. We do have our energy modeler here, Steven, who would be happy to go into detail about how that analysis was done. Steven is from Interface and I think the important thing here is that this is right out of the box. There's a lot of things we can do to make a building more sustainable as it goes through the design process but just taking right what's in the drawings right now, the glass, the shading, with no extra insulation. We were already exceeding Title 24 and we can talk more about that. On the lower meadow, this was the slide we showed earlier and we wanted to – what we've done is we've enhanced the lower meadow with additional planting. There were issues about what does it look like in the summer when it's brown and the winter when it's not. These are some president images of the way we see the lower meadow working. We would just some of the spoils from the site to create a little bit of topography down there and again, we have our landscape architect, Rich Sharp, who could talk more about that. Thank you very much.

Chair Lew: Thank you. I will open up the hearing to public comments. I don't have any speaker cards but I know some of the neighbors are here. You have 5-minutes. Great.

Mr. Mike Palmer: Hi. I'm Mike Palmer. I live in – on Matadero Ave., adjacent to the site and we have a couple other neighbors here. Two main things that I wanted to say is that I wanted to revisit some of the discussion we had at the last ARB hearing. Probably Board Member Baltay remembers, he called me back up to the podium to ask a question. He didn't feel the site would – the building would be visible to the neighbors and so I want to clarify. I think there might be a misunderstanding how the berming works. So, he called me back up and asked if he – if I thought we would be able to see the building from our home. You got – you all know that it's a two-story site. The berming is only at the lower part of the site. There's no berming on the upper area. It's just foliage between the building and the neighbors. Our home – the second floor of our home is level with the building at the upper area so I answered yes, definitely we would be able to see the building because we will be looking through foliage only, no berms at the upper level, at this two-story, all-glass office building. I said yes, definitely. I just wanted to clarify so Board Member Baltay didn't think I was being unreasonable about that. Board Member Gooyer asked for a better design to visually announce the driveway entrances so—and it was nice to see that when the ARB asked Bob to do so, he could apply his creativity to find an innovated good solution to the problems he was asked to solve so that was good to see. Board Member Lew had mentioned that he was sympathetic to our concerns about the all glass building and he noted that this corner of Barron Park is one of the most rural corners of Palo Alto. He mentioned – I think you had visited Barron Park and was – said he was actually jealous of the amount of plantings there so it's quite different from – it's probably the most rural corner of Palo Alto and the all-glass office building is a pretty jarring transition. Board Member Lew had noted that the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan provides that it is part of the ARB's purview to provide a harmonious transition in scale, mass, and character to adjacent uses and land use designation. I would say that the most rural corner – one of the most rural corners of Palo Alto, very dark at night, it's a jarring transition to have this all-glass office building that will be used for tech. workers who will work at night. I would say that the current building is not a harmonies transition. The other thing that I wanted to say was to talk about wildlife impact because I've realized that it is within your purview to think about the impacts on wildlife. We've lived at our house for 10-years now and for a long time, the [Lokey] building has been this sleepy, not heavily used office building with a low percentage of glass on the façade and it was used in the day time only. That's how their research area worked with a low number of workers. We all have to admit that this is quite a big change from that current use. There will be this all-glass office building, 110,000 square feet. Modern tech. companies operate kind of at all hours. More people are during the day but a significant number of people are there at night so the lights will be on at night. That would be appropriate on Page Mill Road for example but it's different to put it next to this rural corner of Palo Alto and it will be a drastic change for the people in the neighborhood and for the wildlife in the neighborhood. Most years in the spring, in our – at our – in our backyard, we have deer appear. We were astonished to see deer actually show up in our back yard when we first arrived there. They live in the tall grass and enjoy our fruit trees. Some years, not every year but some years we have a mother deer and a fawn and they'll actually live and sleep there in the grass, right adjacent to this building site. We also see foxes, coyotes, hawks commonly. They sit in the tall redwood tree that we have in the yard. They fly over Bol Park, which is 800-feet from the site and hunt nearby and you hear owls at night. This is pretty different from the majority of Palo Alto. The light and the traffic density is much less and this building will have a big impact. It's ironic that the project is described as having a butterfly theme. It sounds like it's welcoming butterflies and wildlife to the area but it's not real butterflies. These are large, illuminated building elements and those things chase away wildlife. It's actually the opposite of what's being suggested. I would just ask the ARB to consider two things, provide a harmonious transition to the scale, mass, and character to adjacent uses and land use designation. Also, the impact on nearby wildlife of the light pollution in this corner of Palo Alto. Thank you.

Chair Lew: If you could fill out the speaker card. Great and are there any other speakers? Great, welcome, please come up and you have 5-minutes.

[Ms. Ann Marie Macray:] Hi. I'm Ann Marie Macray. I live at 910 Matadero. One of my properties is adjacent to Mike Palmer's and other neighbors I know are concerned. To some extent, I'm speaking for others as well but I agree with what Mike has said and I have also have met with the architects. I have two things that I just wanted to say. One is really a question for just clarification about the change to the parking. Have you – the garage, has that moved back toward Hanover? You said you put in place some

new cueing system –line up system and so things don't back up as much. Is the main garage now further away from the residences or nearly the residences? That's what I wasn't clear about. That was one question.

Mr. Lait: So, Chair – I'm sorry before we get to the question and answer. Since it's the public – the speakers turn. It's probably best to let her time run through and then we can answer that question.

[Ms. Macray:] Ok, so that was one point that I would like just clarified, please. The other point definitely screening, I agree with what Mike's said that light is an issue and at night, at the moment, we see its dark but I can tell you that if there is one car in that car park, we see the headlights through the foliage. I think anything that can be done to dim the lights situation and screen more and specifically on that, I think the architects and the landscapers were quite willing to try and work with us. I would ask that they perhaps revisit and come to the properties adjacent to it to actually where the light comes through and how it could be screened better because if I can see – I see one car come in, I see the headlights. It's hard to imagine the difference it's going to make when you see lights from a whole building operating at night. It's going to be a big difference to the families living around there. Many of whom have got kids and increasing its demographics, it's changing over and its families. People are trying to get to sleep so the light is the issue. Those are two points. I agree with what Mike has said and all the work that has been done and I appreciate the work that has been done to change things like the height and the height exception and so on. From my point of view and I think our immediate neighbors, if we could get clarification on trying to keep the cars – as many cars as possible away from the residents, as far back as possible. Secondly, if we could get some revisiting of what we see from our properties. So, where there are gaps and the light would come through, we can just look at how that can be screened. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you very much and if there are no other speakers, I think we can – you can have rebuttal period.

Mr. Giannini: Thank you. Maybe responding to those questions and yes, we have met with the neighbors and I think it's been a fun process. The first questions are the garage further back, closer to the residences. Yes, but it's underground. In order to split the garage to create the drive that takes you to the lower lobby and not loose cars from City minimum, we had to make the garage bigger and it did extend bigger back toward the residence because that's the only place it could extend. However, it's all underground so it's really nothing anyone would ever see. Then the other question and actually, I have the slides from the old – from the earlier presentation. Very good question about car headlights coming through the existing foliage. It's true and that's why we went with this kind of – oops. Let's see, there we go, sorry. Why went with a more bullet proof suggestion which were the hedges? Then we have the site sections up above which really study the car headlights and the way they would work on the site. Then blocking any car headlights through the use of low walls, berming and most importantly, these hedges because any kind of tree or shrub planting we put in there, at some point there might be a little vacant spot in the leaves or whatever and you might see through. This was the way to make sure that it would happen, kind of a belt and suspenders approach. In the – one last comment. In the sections, we also consider the views from the second floor and it is true that the berms and hedges don't go up two stories but the trees do. We're augmenting the trees that are already there so again, every effort that we could possibly make to make sure that we were controlling both sound and light – light spilled and vision. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Bob. Are there any Board Member questions? Peter?

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, I'm sorry guys – I'm sorry Board Members. I have a question for the energy modeling expert. This is technical but it will come to light later. I am astounded that you can get this building to comply with a 12.7% margin and I want to know if you using your computer program to model all the shades and fins and the roof over hands and things like that as well.

[Mr. Steven ??:] Yeah, we are. If I could switch back maybe to the slide. Another way? Let's see – In some ways the glass helps us and some ways we take a penalty with the amount of glass on this building

but we incorporate all the shading, all the overhangs and the geometry of the fins. If you could – it's sort of hard to see but if you look at the results that are on the screen there. It gives you a breakdown by end use, so we have heating and cooling and fans are all broken out. You can see that in the cooling category we have a small penalty against the code baseline with all the glass but in the winter time, the heating – the passive heat that's collected through the glass actually, we have a huge saving – a 40% saving against the baseline. The shading is designed in a way to reject as much of that summer time sun as it can and then in the winter time when the sun is lower in the sky, you're able to collect that passive solar gain. It's a holistic strategy with the glass and the shading devices and it results in a building that performs in a ...

Board Member Baltay: Really quickly, if you could just answer yes or no. In your opinion, if you didn't have the shading, if you didn't model that, would the building still comply?

[Mr. Steven ??:] I couldn't give a definitive opinion. I would have to rerun the analysis. I think it would still exceed the code but it may not make it all the way to 10% so I think it's probably pushing us over the 10% mark.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you.

Vice Chair Kim: A quick question while you're still up here. In your energy modeling for the winter sun, is it taking into account the site trees?

[Mr. Steven ??:] It does not.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok.

Chair Lew: Any other questions?

[Mr. Steve ??:] To that point, though, it doesn't factor it into the cooling either so you might –there'd be a little bit of a tradeoff there.

Chair Lew: Thank you. Robert, why don't you start us off?

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. I do want to say one thing. Bob, you really have to modernize your bidding system. This is – every project we get from you has these three things in it. They're really a pain in the neck. Having said that, I like the project. I think you've really increased it or done the various things we've asked. I was still a little – I don't want to say concerned but I was curious why you still have the – there's an open gap between the – you might say the vertical circulation out of the garage and then there's a gap before you get to the lobby or the building itself. I guess you've done enough of these things so you know what a client will accept as far as a distance that they are willing to travel when it's raining or something like that. I know that rain has been a vague thing over the last 5-years but obviously, this year has been a very good example as to – that's why I thought, would it be worthwhile possibly pushing that lower area a little bit closer to the actual lobby itself but again, that's – I'm guessing you're basically taking the footprint of the parking area you already have at this point – you're not excavating further into the area? Yeah, yeah, go ahead.

Mr. Giannini: Quickly, right, we don't want to push the garage further to the west because there's a large oak tree there and we're just right on the edge of that. We don't want to get any closer. We're ok where it is now.

Board Member Gooyer: I was thinking just the actual area, even if it's a walkway or some sort of a pedestrian passage that pushed you back a little closer to the lobby but it – again, that's more or less a...

Mr. Giannini: If you think of our other campuses up in the park like -- any of them, VMware or Machines Zone's or any of those, you always park in a garage. It's kind of like a college campus. These people all come from college campuses...

Board Member Gooyer: They are use to scurrying out of the garage.

Mr. Giannini: ... they are use too – if you look at VMware, you park in the central garage and you might walk the better part ... (crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, that's true. Alright, like I said...(crosstalk)

Mr. Giannini: Actually, the walk is part of the experience. The tradeoff option would be put – like a typical building, where the elevator comes up right in the building but then you have this hydraulic elevator sitting in the middle of the garage... (crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: No, you're right.

Mr. Giannini: ...(Inaudible) drops you in the middle of the bowels of the building. This is kind of a cool experience where you come up, you'd walk through this kind of – it's almost like San Francisco zoo kind of landscape there and then you walk the couple of feet to get to the lobby.

Board Member Gooyer: Thank you. Basically, I can support the project the way it is now. I think it's fulfilled the various requirements I had except for the binding.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: Thank you for coming back to the Board. I'm also finding that the changes that you've made are very much in line with the project. I like the light well that you've proposed and the revised parking scheme. I had a question that I think was answered but overall, I think it's great. You've gotten rid of the DEE and I think this would be a great addition to this area. I understand and appreciate the neighbors coming and speaking because it's actually kind of rare that we get neighbors consistently like this so I understand the concerns that you have. I think the architect has actually taken measures above and beyond to address the concerns. I think that the landscaping in conjunction with the berms and the way that the drive is working so that most people will park underground. I think these measures will take care of the concerns. If anything, maybe there's a condition of approval that we can have for some kind of shading inside the building – interior shading at the windows so that at those night time hours when perhaps there are people working, that the building does not glow quite as much. I would also like to make a comment that I think the current concerns with lighting really have to do from headlights from cars and I don't think you're going to have that problem, especially at night when people are parking underground. Then the building itself is not really a focused beam of light, it's more of a soft glow rather than again, a beam of light. Perhaps the shading at the windows can help with that but otherwise, I'm very much in favor of the building and can recommend it for approval. Thank you.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. Does Staff share the opinion that the berms and hedges will be adequate to keep people from having they're live disrupted by headlight beams, including modern, like halogen, high-intensity beam or high beams?

Mr. Owen: Yes, we do. Between -- it's all selective so you have berms in some locations and then you have a retaining wall, it's specifically right at the perpendicular with the drive aisle and then there's also the selective use of shrubs in certain locations so we do share that sentiment.

Board Member Furth: My other questions were a little bit different which was that this is not a build out of the permitted RAF on the site\, is that right?

Mr. Owen: That's correct, yes.

Board Member Furth: I'm thinking about when the other shoe drops, what happens? I mean how much of it would we lose with this landscaping in front of the building. I mean, is the remnant big enough to park itself?

Mr. Owen: I'd say it's difficult to speculate without a site plan in front of us that describes...

Board Member Furth: But you know what the RAF is and you know what the square footage is.

Mr. Owen: Of course.

Board Member Furth: So, you know what the parking requirement is?

Mr. Owen: Without knowing the design, we do know the potential RAF that would be – that could potentially be added.

Board Member Furth: How many parking spaces it would require? I realize there's extra unpacked space but I'm just asking if we did the minimum.

Mr. Owen: It would be 224 spaces. You have 386 spaces that are currently proposed and then 224 that would be added with the full development of the site if that were to happen.

Board Member Furth: I think we have to assume that it's likely to happen and it's not project splitting because if they presently have no plans to do it and the City no information about it, that's not what we handle from environmental purposes. What's concerning me is we're looking at this integrated plan with a lot of surface landscaping in front of the existing building and I'm worried that we should be thinking about this as temporary landscaping in front of the existing building.

Chair Lew: Peter.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. I'm finding myself very much on the fence with this one but maybe I can pick up where Wynne was just speaking and if possible Alex, can I ask the applicant to come up. I'm also concerned and this only occurred to me and this is the third time I've looked at this project now. There's this large landscaped area on top of the garage, which would make the perfect parking area for a new building in the meadow, which we all agree is going to happen. Can you tell us if there are any plans to do that? Are you aware of any future plans to develop that – to modify that parking area above the garage?

Mr. Giannini: Right. There are no future plans to develop – there are no plans. We don't have a tenant at this point that is asking us to provide the additional RAF so, at this point, the application is just for replacement square footage. However, we've thought about how it's going to work obviously because we do want to make sure it works. We've seriously have thought about it so for example, in the upper tier, the garage is being designed so that it can handle the weight of another building and this is a possible option. If you were going to do it, you could have a small campus where you have two buildings with a courtyard in the center. The court – some of the landscaping on the top could conceivably go away however, there would be a lot of landscaping left as you would see that in a new application, which you could deny. I think the challenge for us would be to show you that when we do increase the RAF from 25% to 40%, that the project doesn't suffer in any way but yes, it would be – yes, we can't create space out of nothing. The building would either – the building could go on the lower meadow or it could go on the upper terrace. We honestly don't know that yet. We don't know if things will change before that happens. Maybe cars aren't as important anymore and some – a lot of the landscaping can stay. If there was a scenario where the building went on top of the garage, which would make a lot of sense, we would park the lower meadow but it would need to be parked in a way that was a very attractive parking lot that was very well landscaped. Again, I think we've said this all along that we are designing the site to

work well in the future. The site does have a FAR of 40% allowed. I think the challenge we would have would be to show you how we could do that on the site and not destroy the concept that we've already come up with.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you. I think my opinion of your project would change dramatically if the area on top of the garage where more parking. The building is designed, it seems to me, to be seen from a foliated area.

Mr. Giannini: If I could indulge one more time. I think it's fairly certain that we would not put more parking on top of the -- I mean, I can't show you that till we actually make an application but there's no glimmer of thought that we put more parking up on top of the podium.

Board Member Baltay: I see. There is no -- you don't think there's a plan to put parking on top of the current...

Mr. Giannini: It would -- the way this is conceived is that the most logical way to expand the site would be to put another building -- the other building would be considerably smaller than this building so it would stay up at Hanover at the 50-foot setback on Hanover and it would probably go -- and it would go back on the site but it wouldn't go back anywhere near as far as the existing building because the existing building is 110,000-feet and the new building is only 60 something feet -- 60,000-feet. If car where still in the cards when this expands, the car would go down on the meadow most likely. We would most likely try and see if the building could go up on the top with a large courtyard in the middle which would still have habitat. We would have to convince you of that and that's most likely how the sight would proceed but there is no tenant pushing the extra building right at this moment.

Board Member Baltay: Alright thank you and I do acknowledge that that's not part of your application and it's extra to be talking about it but it is something that concerned me. I have three things I'm thinking through on the project. The most important to me is still just your overall site access and I know we pushed you to get a better access to the garage and it's ingenious what you guys have come up with. I'm not entire convinced that it's really going to work but maybe, I'm willing to give you the benefit of the doubt. You've done a building like this but then I -- on a small level, you have a bike path coming in from Bol Park and that seems to take you nowhere near where you need to be to park your bicycle. It's sort of retroactively seems to be getting -- to get there, you'd want that bike path to get you to that main entrance as well as everything else. I'm just throwing that out as a comment. That doesn't overall effect things for me. I'm concerned that the building just seems to me, to be energy sufficient, looking at it. You guys are the experts. You've run a bunch of computer models and I'll grant you that but I guess I'd like Staff to be aware that if the building ends up needing to be modified on the exterior like different shading or roof overhangs, that effects, at least for me, my opinion of the aesthetics of the building. I don't think it's acceptable for them to just say, we need to make some changes to meet Title 24. You know how tough the code is. We've been asking them now about it being tough and I'd like to say this is the building we're approving. Then lastly, I do remain concerned about the neighbors' concerns of seeing this brightly lit building from their property and from what I can tell from the application, the landscaping will be adequate to prevent headlights from coming through and hopefully some sort of shading conditions or enough landscaping to prevent the building from really being seen from Mr. Palmer's house and things like that. I don't -- I think it's ok given the plans I have here but we've seen so many projects where it turns out not to be and I guess I wonder if my fellow Board Members have any idea of how we can condition something so that that doesn't happen. It could be incredibly annoying to have a headlight flashing into your living room every so often. I think if we can resolve the neighbors' concerns and then be focused on the shading, I can support the project.

Chair Lew: Thank you, Peter. I brought -- just to continue the thoughts of -- on the light impacts. I brought two photos and I think -- yeah, great. If you could open the -- yes, I think open files, my Lexar documents, -- middle, right. Then it is -- which one is it? I think it's ARB. Great. Yeah and those two photos. Great and go to the other one first, that would be great. Great, thank you. This is the Blooming Dales -- our new Blooming Dales at Stanford shopping center and I photographed it last night. We're

about 200-feet away from the building on the El Camino sidewalk. There's a low hedge, maybe like 4-feet and that's actually – I'm looking through –you're actually looking through 4 rows of trees, right? They are parking lot trees but it's winter time and so they are deciduous. Right next to the hedge, in the foreground, there's a -- or under the canopy of an oak tree and there are also London plane trees which are the street trees. I think what the neighbors are afraid of is this. This is like a 50-story – 50-foot high building, right? The proposed building is a lot – is shorter than that. I think the proposed plantings and the existing trees are mostly coast live oaks, it seems like? I don't have an exact planting plan. I think we just have a conceptual planting plan. In theory, conceptually, I think that there would be more screening than this, what I'm showing – that what's showing in this – in the photo but I think there could still be an issue with the amount of glass and lighting. There could a glow from the building onto the neighbors. It's a concern that I have and then we go to the next project. This is the new Visa building near the California Avenue – street. It's actually on Ash and Sherman and I took this again, last night. There's a park in the foreground. This is the back of the building. There are four units on the left-hand side that don't appear to be occupied at the moment and the light that you see are the back of the office building. I think – I don't – my camera is reading the light that's there. It's reading brighter than it actually was in real life but I share this particular picture because the – it has – the condition of approval was for all automatic nightshades and so the shades are down at a certain period of time in the day time and that – it was meant to provide more privacy to the adjacent condominium complex, which you can't see because all the lights are off on the right-hand side of the screen. That's one option that we've done before on previous projects. I think -- I've talked to the neighbors after one of the hearings and I think that they wanted more architectural – more of an architectural solution than interior window treatment solution. I think also on this particular project, the Board had requested less glass so here, it's just punched openings, it's not a window wall system. Again, this particular project is 3-stories and not like the proposed project, which is two-stories. The – also, on this particular project at Visa is the – I think all the existing trees had to come out and had to be replaced because there's a big parking garage underground. I guess, in my mind, those are a couple of options. One is to reduce the amount of glass and I think you didn't – Bob, you have it in the plans that you've reduced the amount of glass below the desk height? You didn't mention that in your description but it's on one of your sheets here and I didn't see it carried through into all of the drawings. One is – the other options is we – the Board could look at a final landscaping plan because we only have a conceptual now that doesn't really show all the plants. We don't have the hedge species outlined in the – itemized in the drawing or I don't – it's not at that level of detail yet. Then the other option is for a requirement for automatic night shades on the building, as I see it. I think all the other improvements that you've made are good, Bob. I think the only other comment I have is that the – I'm not seeing the landscape – I think you had mentioned the Bamboo in the light well and I'm not seeing that in the landscape plans yet. That's a fairly minor item. I will return to the Board for comments. I think that Wynne, you were concerned about the head lights and the building.

Board Member Furth: Yeah, I am.

Chair Lew: I am too.

Board Member Furth: First of all, it was very helpful to have the response on the thought that's gone into the build out. I find that reassuring that it's going to be possible to do something that will be attractive and it will retain features of the site development that I like. I'm very interested in the possibility of nightshades. I think there are two issues that most – it seems to me, the most serious one and the one that we ought to be able to address 100% essentially is the head lights issue. Whether it involves closing off the upper driveway at night or whatever. It sorts of like a performance standard – a continuing performance standard which says they will not be visible from the adjacent properties or any of the properties over there. I'm also interested in reducing the night time glow. They do have a relatively dark sky out there which is a rare amenity. I know it's not completely dark but we require – I mean, we have very strict standards on parking lot lighting and external lighting and trying to reduce night time glow and glare. It would be good when we're having a glass-walled building like this or even any building with large expanses of glass, that is that people keep pointing out, are occupied late into the night. Office buildings some time ago cease to be daytime uses. They're not anymore and so I would be very interested in having automatic motorized shades. I don't know what the downside would be. Cost?

Chair Lew: The downside is that you've got a – over time you've got different tenants coming in and they may change things. Also, it's sometimes can be difficult to synchronize all of the shades all at once. Sometimes it doesn't always work. Then it's kind of left – if something happens, it's left to the neighbors to contact code enforcement and that doesn't always happen.

Board Member Furth: But here the landlord is Stanford, in its industrial park, which I believe has the capability to police and manage this kind of thing.

Board Member Baltay: If I could chime in, I'm a bit concerned about the interior shades just because of the geometry of the building and the fact that it's almost all glass on the facades. It's going to be really tough to get automatic shades coming down of a sloped ceiling. I could see it being really difficult to do. Secondly, in the building like this, your kind of want to be looking out at these trees. That's sort of the design of it so that the occupants may well be quite inspired to lift these back up again. I'm just not sure – it's not a series of punched openings where you can really have window shades that will be used. That may not be a viable long term solution.

Chair Lew: Could we maybe ask the landscape architect to review the – to show us exactly which plants are there at that corner of the building, facing the neighbors? I think – I was looking at it yesterday and it seemed like you had olive trees and there are oak trees and it seems like you might have four layers of landscaping at that – yeah, please come up. Great.

Mr. Rich Sharp: Good morning. Rich Sharp, Studio 5 Landscape Architects. Yeah, I've been sort of chomping at the bit to address this here because I do think this whole edge is heavily landscaped. Not only the existing landscape but what we're adding to that edge. As Bob mentioned, on the west edge of the property, it's fully hedged where we can. It comes down to the closest point of the building. There are – most of the trees there are existing coast live oak so all evergreen, predominantly. The infill between those trees and the building that you're seeing – do you want me to – I guess we lost the keyboard here. The infill layers of trees – I can point to them here. Let me get to the landscape plan. The opposite way or this way? I'm trying to find the (inaudible) one, it will be easier. Save the best for last, right? Ok, let me see if – I don't know if the cursor is working here. Is that working or not? Well, you can see in the lower left-hand corner of the screen there, the lowest canopy that's running along the property line – the dark green is the hedge and we have it as English Laurel. We have it as – I can check the plan but either 15 (inaudible) or 24-inch box with the intent that it would go in at a minimum 8-foot tall. We've put in 24-inch box hedges, 12-foot tall on day one. We do a lot of high-end residential and I'm familiar with all the sizes. Easy fix to get that in at 12-feet and that sitting under existing canopy and that's why we chose the limits of it to work with the drip lines of the trees there and not be digging into heritage oak root structure. When you get east of that hedgerow, we still have the existing canopy and that – the canopy isn't as deep heading towards the building so that's where you see the introduction of a lot of new oaks. Just to clarify the point on the mounding, at this point where the building gets close to the property line, which is still about 90-feet away. Up at the building pad, we do have a 5 1/2-foot to – we have a 4 to 1 slope, we can go up to 6 1/2-7-foot of mounting there that those new trees will sit on. That mounting is viewed from a lower perspective of a resident. We'll cover the first floor with the shrubs on top of it for sure. The tree, with the evergreen canopy, will cover the upper floors of that building. We've strategically marched along this edge and looked at the opportunities. When you move further east to where the drive aisle comes in, that's where we've introduced the retaining wall that's high enough to block the head lights and then the mound climbing up behind that. There's a positive grade above that wall so we don't have to do a really tall wall because that's unattractive. We want the wall for sound and headlights. The mound climbs from there and we show that in the sections and then it drops back down quickly so we don't interrupt the existing tree roots again, in that area. Then as you climb up that driveway, the wall holds that edge all the way up that driveway to small podium parking lot. Again, there's screening all the way. Then as you come down to the meadow, that's where we have pretty much the deepest section of the existing canopy and then you'll see in the meadow, based on comments, we've used sight spoils to some contouring so it's not just a big flat meadow but it has a contour. We've added some additional strawberry (inaudible) – Arbutus Trees that are the first trees into that meadow, which

are an evergreen. What we call an understory canopy so a lower canopy for that bike path access coming in. That plus the mounding will shut down – would really shut down the full view of the meadow from the residents but if there is a future parking lot, it would also shut down that future parking lot, so we're trying to take that into account as part of this initial build out.

Chair Lew: I think you're showing two existing oak trees to be transplanted up on the upper level.

Mr. Sharp: Correct.

Chair Lew: What size are those?

Mr. Sharp: Those are – I don't have the specs. They are at least an 18-inch caliper tree, which puts them at about a 30-foot canopy size in day one. That tree that's sitting by itself at the end of the building there, closest to the residents. That is that transplant tree so we're putting a giant canopy on that short façade of the building and then that cluster of four trees in that – what we're calling the art court there, those would be evergreen trees as well. We're trying to just – that's the end of the building that's closest to the residences, it's a short façade and we're trying to fill it with canopy as much as possible.

Chair Lew: OK, thank you very much.

Mr. Sharp: You're welcome.

Chair Lew: I'll bring it back to the Board for a motion. Don't jump all at once.

Board Member Baltay: I'm still concerned that the landscaping may or may not be adequate. I'm struggling with what I'm seeing him – hearing him say is that there's a row of hedge underneath those oak trees. I've been out to the site a couple of times and you go around to that beat-up parking lot at the back and you can trod through the leaves under those trees and look over the fence. What I'm seeing is that's where they are going to put a 12-foot hedge and I'm having a hard time believing that can happen. Those trees are pretty mature and I think that's not – I'm not a landscape architect but I don't know if you can put a 12-foot hedge underneath a grove of mature oak trees like that. I do think that there's a tremendous amount of space from the property line to the new building and it ought to be possible to get landscaping in there that really does provide genuine screening. I'm not sure that I'm buying this landscape plan, I guess that's what I'm saying.

Chair Lew: Let's see, Wynne?

Board Member Furth: Lighting is still my concern and when I'm looking at A-4.2 and I heard that the ground floor would be quite thoroughly screened. I didn't know if the statement was also the second-floor windows would be fully screened or obscured or hidden? I was trying to follow the presentation but I didn't hear that. Would the southeast second-floor windows also be screened from the residents – adjacent resident – from the residential area over on the side?

Chair Lew: Please.

Mr. Giannini: I'd like to say a couple things about the lighting. One, on night lighting, this building should do better than most buildings because of the big overhanging roofs. Just like the way you have low cut off parking lot lightings and we're well aware of the night – no night lighting ordinances. The buildings are following that same pattern so night lighting shouldn't be an issue. Again, just to run through how the – definitely the berms, the hedges, the shrubs, the low walls screen the ground floor but they can't screen the upper floor. That's where we have all the existing trees and the augmented trees.

Board Member Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Giannini: That's how that would work.

Board Member Furth: One more question while you are here if I could? When I look at those elevations, it doesn't look to me at those you have a lot of complicated roof lines. When I look at the shade catalogs, they all tell me they can deal with these things but aren't these horizontal?

Mr. Giannini: Actually, it's easier than that because actually where the windows are, it's straight across.

Board Member Furth: That's what I thought.

Mr. Giannini: The notion of putting in automatic shades – we were just chatting, is a fine one. I think we would be willing to do that and also, we were just chatting because how do you make sure that it stays in perpetuity, it can be in the lease ...

Board Member Furth: You put it in the lease.

Mr. Giannini: It's in the lease and then there are lots of things in the lease. For example, all the green stuff is in the lease. There are certain things the tenant has to do so that could just be another one of them. The notion of doing that on that side of the building – where ever appropriate, is ok and very doable.

Board Member Furth: It would make – I would feel better about it because I'm concerned not – I appreciate that the overhangs are going to help with the upward glow but I also think just looking at me in my office working late is not a treat if you live nearby.

Mr. Giannini: I'm certainly sure that you won't be able to see it because right now, you go well, you went out there but there are a lot of existing trees. However, this would again be a belt and suspenders approach that we would be...

Board Member Furth: I would appreciate that.

Mr. Giannini: ... would be very appropriate. Thanks.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Gooyer: I'll make a motion that we recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Community Environment based on the findings subject to conditions of approval and possible add the or I should say – and add the requirement for auto-shading for the building, mainly on the second floor or I guess we could do it everywhere but the second floor... (crosstalk) (inaudible)

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) floor on those, on the frontage. I mean, I don't really care what it does shooting down towards the Research Park. It's the frontage towards the residents – frontages.

Board Member Gooyer: If we want, we could have the landscape plan once it's been fully developed, come back to the subcommittee for final approval.

Board Member Baltay: I can second that motion.

Board Member Furth: Could we add a finding and Staff could tell us where that headlights will be fully – one of the reasons we can approve this is because the headlights will be fully screened – I don't know how you say this. There will be no – headlights will not be visible from the adjacent residential areas.

Board Member Gooyer: I have one thing about headlights. I live on a normal residential street and I get – when somebody makes the turn – I happen to live on a corner. I get headlights that go into my house. I mean, it's like I'm sorry but that just the reality of life.

Board Member Furth: I don't think it's necessary. I agree (inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: The other way to look at it is and I hate to be the ogre here but this is not like a development where they tore down 200 residential units in the back of these properties and all of sudden put a high-tech building in here. The high-tech building was there probably before most of the neighbors moved in. They understand that there may be something in the future. I'm not saying that we shouldn't do the most we can but the reality of life is that they knew there was something back there on a commercial level. There has to be a certain amount – I think if we take a lot of effort – I don't think we ought to be able to say well, from now on, you can only build a one-story concrete bunker there and that sort of thing and the lights have to be turned off before you go into the parking lot. I think that's overkill so I think the reality of it is, with the proper screening which we can really do a great deal of enhancing with the subcommittee, I think the lighting is just a reality of life or I should say the headlights.

Board Member Baltay: I can second the motion.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

Mr. Owen: Wait, wait, wait, wait.

Chair Lew: Oh...

Mr. Owen: Sorry, I just wanted to ask for a little clarification on where exactly on the building you would like to see the shades and also, whether or not it would be on just the second story or also on the first story?

Chair Lew: As I took the notes, the motion was to have it only on the second floor and that was the maker of the motion. Then there was a comment of having it residential facing, right, but that was Wynne. That wasn't the maker of the motion.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree. I don't think it's necessary around the whole building but I don't know. What would you say, maybe from the apex towards the residential? Something like that or even just – ok, I can agree with Peter that it's just on the – what would that be? Just the west or I should say the east elevation and the little bit of the south elevation that faces the – basically here and there. Ok, I think we're all in agreement that in those...

Mr. Lait: Ok, that's great that you guys are but you're looking at a diagram, we're not.

Board Member Gooyer: Ok, well look right there. (Crosstalk) It would be the east elevation and the direct south elevation, right? There you go, right there, that and that. (Crosstalk) That's a very long-winded way of doing it but I think everybody understands.

Ms. Gerhardt: Board Members, if I may, is this also something that maybe could come back to the subcommittee with the details for the shading?

Chair Lew: Sure.

Board Member Gooyer: Sure. I agree. Those have become fairly common now a day but it probably wouldn't hurt if we're going to bring it back for the landscaping anyway.

Board Member Furth: Alex?

Chair Lew: What?

Board Member Furth: Did you have a – you mentioned something about reduced glass at the – below knee height – below desk height, on some elevation and not others?

Chair Lew: Well, no. That appears on sheet – where is it? Early in the set of drawings. Sheet A-1.2, there's a note that says windows on the short end of the building will have spandrel glass in the lower 30-inches to avoid floor to ceiling glass.

Board Member Gooyer: You ok with that?

Mr. Giannini: If I could just clarify that. I think what the -- I think it's – at least what our intention is that actually, the lower 30-inches of glass all the way around the building will be fritted glass so you can see through it but it will be a polka dot frit, that's to control clutter more than anything else. After we had done everything else on the building on the residential side, we thought we – doing anything more on the lower 30-inches probably wouldn't be necessary so it's a semantic issue probably. We're calling the fritted glass spandrel glass but more appropriately, it should be called fritted glass and it would be around the whole building on both floors.

Chair Lew: Ok, thank you for that clarification.

Mr. Lait: Then Chair, just as you're concluding your deliberation, I just want to pass along that there's interest among the adjacent residents to offer a comment. I think it has to do with the level of the auto control curtains being at both levels instead of just the second level but it's up to you to consider whether you want to allow for that input.

Chair Lew: Why don't we – since – I think the motion is for the this – the automatic shades to come back to subcommittee. Why don't we – if this is ok with the motion – the maker of the motion, why don't we just say open it for the first and second floors and then we'll see what they bring back to the subcommittee. Does that make sense? (Inaudible)

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible) (Crosstalk) I don't think it's necessary for the first floor, I just don't. It – based on all the cross section we see, I don't see that being an issue. It's the -- especially with all the landscaping that they are looking at. The second floor is the concern.

Chair Lew: Ok. I think that's...

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible) a question.

Chair Lew: Ok, we'll do the procedural question (crosstalk) and then we can (inaudible).

Board Member Furth: If it's true, for example, that an element of the landscape plan that we're relying on in our approval, turns out not to be possible. If it's correct that unfortunately, you can't get a dense hedge under oak – near that close to oak trees, what happens?

Chair Lew: I think there's a fence there in that location. There's a solid fence in that particular – not on the whole property line but on that particular corner, I saw a tall fence there so there's that. That may be only 7 or 8-feet high. It's not as tall as an actual – the 12-hedge.

Board Member Baltay: The landscaping plan can include things like fences if that's necessary.

Board Member Furth: I was just asking procedurally essentially if it's impossible then does it come back to us, does it – is it an amendment to the approval? What is it?

Chair Lew: (Inaudible) (Crosstalk)

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may, you're already bringing back the landscaping and the shades to the subcommittee so if there where changes like that, the subcommittee could address those.

Chair Lew: I think the motion as it stands is for second flood shades on to – on portions of the east and that south end and for the final landscape plan to come back to the subcommittee. Then -- (crosstalk) I'm just saying – I think there have been a lot of comments but the actual motion was just those two items and not the (inaudible)...(crosstalk)

Board Member Gooyer: Yes, that's the actual motion at this point.

Chair Lew: Headlights are not included at the moment but you could propose an amendment or not.

Board Member Furth: I was just going to suggest in that this is going to base on the plans submitted, today right? Then on sheet A-1.2, where it says windows on the short end of the building will have spandrel glass on the lower 30-inches, it would instead be revised to say windows will have fretted glass on the lower 30-inches to avoid whatever.

Mr. Lait: Chair, if there is an opportunity I'd like to have (inaudible) for a comment?

Chair Lew: Yes, please.

Mr. Lait: Thank you. One of the – I had an opportunity to speak with the applicant and I'll just note that they find that this design scheme with the auto shades on the first and second floor are acceptable to them as a condition. I would note that our subcommittee reviews are usually for these fine tuning of details and we've heard through the dialog here today and the testimony that this is obviously, a very significant concern for the area residents and I think closer on this issue at this meeting would be helpful because they don't get the same notice for the project as they do for the subcommittee. If they are interested in that dialog, I'm concerned that they might miss that opportunity. If the Board were willing, I would encourage a recommendation for the condition to include that there be shades on the first and second floor and not to come back for the subcommittee on that issue.

#### **MOTION AMENDED**

Board Member Gooyer: Fine, if the applicant is willing to do the first and second floor, I'll modify my amendment or my motion for that.

Board Member Baltay: Ok, I'll second it, sure.

Chair Lew: Ok, let's a vote on the motion. All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Opposed? No. That passes 5-0. Thank you, Bob.

#### **MOTION PASSED 5-0**

- 5. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 1545 Alma Street [16PLN-00283]:** Consideration of an Architectural Review Application to Allow an Addition to an Existing Single-Family Residence and the Construction of two Additional Units on a 10,000 Square Foot lot. The Project Also Requests a Design Enhancement Exception for Driveway Width and Distance From the Adjacent Property. Environmental Assessment: The Project is Exempt from CEQA per Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction) Zoning District: RM-15

Chair Lew: Well, we're going to take a 5-minute break before the next item but I think we do have one Board Member recused on the next item so why don't we do the disclosure right now.

Board Member Furth: Peter, you have to announce it.

Chair Lew: Yeah, you have to just say that you're recused.

Board Member Baltay: I'm recusing myself from the next agenda item #5. I don't need to give a reason, do I? I have a previous financial relationship with the applicant.

Male: Thank you.

Chair Lew: Let's move onto item #5. It's a public hearing on a quasi-judicial matter at 1545 Alma Street. Consideration of an architectural review application to allow an addition to an existing single-family residence and the construction of two additional units on a 10,000-square foot lot. The project also requests a DEE for a driveway width and distance from the adjacent property. Environmental Assessment is the project is exempt from CEQA per guideline section 15303 and the zone district: RM-15 and we have our project planner, welcome Sheldon.

Mr. Sheldon Ah Sing, Project Planner: Yes, good morning. I do have power point presentation. The applicant is here as well with their presentation and thank you for the introduction. As mentioned, the request includes an architectural review as well as a design enhancement exception. There are findings and conditions of approval are included in your packet. The key issues are the architectural design and context of this infill development and also an exception to the driveway standard, which we will go into. Just going over the site plan briefly. It's a deep and narrow lot, it's 50-feet wide by 200-feet deep. There is an existing single-story, a single-family residence that's near the front of the property. There are an existing driveway and curb cut there already as well. The proposal is to keep the main house at the front, to renovate that house to include a new covered garage, where there is no covered space now and include a second-story addition. In doing that, there's actually less square footage for that unit. Then also to add two new two-story units towards the rear of the property and include new landscaping to provide some landscaping – some privacy, excuse me. Parking is provided in both covered, as well as uncovered. You have some perpendicular, as well as some parallel spaces. I did want to include here that there was a condition of approval by the – by Staff because of the privacy concern, the City's third party architect did review and wanted to see another [Rismen] Boxtree on the right side between the two that are proposed, so there would be a third tree that. This shows the elevations; the architect will describe a little bit more in detail about the materials and the design intent. I think it's definitely within the purview of the Board to provide feedback and direction on the colors and design. Some of the key issues would be adding the two units to the property. Right now, it's considered a single-family use although, it's a multi-family zoned property. By adding the two additional units, it now becomes a multi-family use property and that therefore, the driveway, which is existing, is completely conforming when you have a single-family use but becomes non-conforming because there needs to be a distance of 5-feet between the edge of that driveway and the adjacent property line. As well as now the width of the driveway needs to be 16-feet, where I believe now the closest point because of the existing house is 9-feet. The other issue is that you are maintaining that house in the front. A single family does transition to a two-story in the rear so that's also something that should be considered when you're looking at – especially, the privacy concerns on this next slide. The applicant does provide those pictures. I think at least one of the Board Members did go on the site to see that. I did want to have a photo of the driveway so you can see some of the constraints there and why the Design Enhancement exception is supported. The intent of that – that standard to have separation is for exiting for multi-family properties because you have a high density, more dwelling units, not traffic that comes out of it. Here you have three units and in order to provide the standard of 5-feet, you have to renovate that house that is existing. You have to shave off a part of that house, so to speak. There's also a mature street tree that has to be removed and you have a utility pole in support that would have to be adjusted somehow, so there are some constraints on the site. The traffic division did look at that and determined based upon the low amount of traffic that would be coming in and out of that property and the adjacent property, there wouldn't be a safety issue or concern there. Therefore, the Design Enhancement exception could be supported. With the environmental, this is new construction, it does allow up to two units with this exemption. There are no impacts of cultural resources although the existing house is – was built in 1924. It's not – it wasn't – it's deemed to not be eligible for listing on any historic list so therefore, there are no cultural impacts there and also no hazards. We, to date, have not received any public comment on this project and we do

recommend approval of the project – the residential project based on the findings subject to the (inaudible) approval. That concludes the presentation. I'd be happy to answer any question and again, the applicant is here as well.

Chair Lew: We'll do the applicant presentation and if we have a public speaker, we'll do that after the presentation.

Board Member Furth: I should disclose that prior to this hearing, I did call up the applicant's architect and asked for permission to go view the site, which I did. I also went through the shading diagram with the applicant's architect but there's no additional information beyond that already in the record.

Mr. Kelvin Chua: Good morning. My name is Kelvin Chua and I'm from Topos Architects and I'm the lead architect on the project at 1545 Alma Street. I'm representing my client Manish Baldua, who is here. We are also joined with our landscape architect, Dakota Birch. I'd like to thank the Board for taking the time to review this project. Let's get started. First of all, I'd like to talk about the zoning, which Sheldon has already brought up. I just want to reiterate some of these points. The RM-15 lot with the 10,000-square-foot lot size doesn't allow us to develop a single-family unit, it's not permitted. Neither is a two-family unit per zoning and so the only development allowed on this site is a three unit, multi-family condominium. It does not qualify for (inaudible) residential because of the size of the lot as well. Parking is very restrictive on this site. It's a large element of this project. Each unit is required to have the covered and uncovered parking space for each Unit A, B, and C; A being the existing unit. With the addition to the existing unit A, is in direct response to trying to meet that parking – cover parking space requirement. Once again, the – as you mention before, the Design Enhancement Exception is requested for the driveway width and the distance from the adjacent property due to the following factors. The narrow lot which is the 50-foot width, the removal of the street tree that we want to keep, which is – we also want to retain the existing driveway approach and we also want to retain – without having to demolish the existing house, which is this front portion, which would have to go. In the design of the project, we desire to keep the existing home. The existing home is in good condition and we would rather reuse the house, rather than to demolish it and rebuild it. The other issue is that we wanted to preserve the existing street elevation and keeping within the neighborhood context and minimizing any impacts of the view from Alma. The other reason is project economics. The client does not want to have to rebuild the existing house. These are some pictures of the existing house as it currently is. The other portion of the design is that we have to build two-story units on this property due to the site coverage and the FAR constraints. The site coverage is 35% for the 10,000-square-foot lot so we have maximized the footprint on the 10,000-square-foot lot. The FAR for the project is 50% so it's 5,000-square-feet so the only way to build is up. We still have relatively small units, they are 1,700-square-feet about for each one. As far as context goes, the existing home is a Mediterranean style, it's nothing to dearly hold on to but it's something that we want to keep. We feel that the residential zone is very eclectic. There's different esthetics for all the homes in the area so our intent was to keep a visual interest with staying within the context and contrasting that – the old Mediterranean style with a more modern form. We also felt that the modern – well, the more vertical elements that we're putting on there is going to break up the massing of the building itself. We are also introducing bold, more vibrant uses of color with the plaster and these modern elements. A huge factor for the design is also the privacy. We want to minimize the impacts on the neighbors. For the windows that are facing towards the neighbors, they are more punched openings – smaller openings that are still at heights that are set higher; about 4-foot in height. The balconies are more small decorative elements and they are important for the visual and spatial relief for these small homes and none of them are directly facing into any of the neighbor's property. We're in the condition that we've spoken to planning about, was that some of the view – even from these balconies, had a side view into neighbor's properties and with the help of our landscape architect, we've designed these metal screenings that could also – they are also kind of garden walls that can provide more privacy and blockage of these views. We did do a neighborhood outreach in terms of sending out notices and so that neighbors could contact us with just their concerns. We had an opportunity to meet one of the neighbors directly, to address his concerns in terms of his views of this property. We were in email contact with the rest of the neighbors and offered to meet with them so some of them we spoke to directly as well. We have engaged in a landscape architect who is here, who has helped us with

developing privacy – in better developing the landscape plan. This is an image of those higher windows that are facing into the neighbor's properties that are set high. This is an image of the balcony with the privacy screening on the side of it. The balcony depths are about 4-feet or so. Not really big enough to have a big table where as a patio but like I said, it provides special and visual relief for these small homes. The materials for the roof is a lightweight concrete roof tile to match what the existing clay tile of the existing building. We have samples of that here if you want to take a look. Then the flat roof for the larger vertical elements is a dark gray roof membrane. The pigmented plaster is going to be a smooth pigmented plaster to match the existing building for the older Mediterranean style elements and the more contemporary elements are more vibrant hues of – vibrant colors used on the larger elements. Wood windows for the more older Mediterranean style portions of the design and then aluminum windows and – wood doors with aluminum frames for the rest of the contemporary portions. This is a bird's eye view of the property above from (inaudible). This is with it without the trees. There – this is, on the left, the photo of the existing property. On the right is the proposed elevation. Maintaining that front façade, there's not much change and you can slightly see the proposed addition for Unit A, kind of peeking on the left side of that roof ridge. The purpose of the photo is just to show you that it has very minimal impacts in terms of the view from Alma. Here's another photo from the corner side and it shows the same thing. You can start to see some of the larger elements from the Units B and C but once again, it's very set back and is very minimal in terms of the view from Alma street. This steps in closer and is kind of progressing down the driveway. One step closer as well and this unit, the blue one, for unit A is the addition. This is a photo of the covered parking – the garage and then the bedroom upstairs. This is just a closer photo of the Units B and C, which are the new proposed units. In closing, the complete – the building is completely code compliant. It meets all the daylight plane, height restriction, setbacks and the project has gone through the individual review as Sheldon has mentioned, addressing all their comments. We've done all we can to address the third parties architect comments. This has been a long review process for our client in terms of waiting 6-months to get this hearing and we request that the ARB recommend for approval.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you for your presentation and I will open the hearing to public comments. If you would come and also fill out a speaker card when you are done, please. You have 5-minutes.

[Mr. Jason Metloft:] 5-minutes, ok. Whoops. My name is Jason [phonetics][Metloft] and I'm also representing David [Chen] who was here but he had to go because he had another appointment but we're both the neighbors who are directly effected in the back – well, this is part of the problem. I guess the northwest side of the house, which turns out, unfortunately, even though it's the side yard, it turns out to be the back yard of all three homes – well, the two new homes. The first home is oriented the right way, the other two – second and third homes are oriented perpendicular or the perpendicular orientation as you'd expect. The big important thing for – I'd like you to please consider is these homes -- these two new homes that are going to sit directly behind my backyard and my friend David [Chen] who was here sitting next to me. Their backyards are oriented – even though it's a side yard offset or whatever you call it in your terms, it's really a backyard. We're seeing what is the back of their homes, the back-master bedrooms, the back offices, the back patios of these homes, even though they only have a 6-foot offset. It's very much infringing – I have a small yard. I have a less than 20-foot back yard. This 25-foot home and its windows from its bedrooms are going to be looking 6-feet away, directly into my back yard. It is a huge impingement or whatever the right term is to personal space. My two daughters, whose windows will be looked – they will be looking directly into my daughter's bedrooms, not to mention my back yard. I have some specific things – by the way, I'm a little perturbed that the description of no public comment, that is absolutely not true. I have emails to someone who is no longer with the Staff here, Victoria Hernandez, dating all the way back to August and that wasn't noted in the notes, any comments etc. I've made my opposition very clear for almost 6-months now; as has David. I've also met with the architect at Topos and I appreciate that they were very kind at recognizing the concerns we have. I'd like to go through them very briefly. The first is daylight planning, I think that might have been taken into account but previously it was very – worse than it is now. The second is the windows. The windows, I've requested that they be clearly glazed in the window, not just a covering so that no tenants can rip them off, the coverings on the outside. So, that someone can't be looking from the second floor into my daughter's windows. The third thing is the balcony that they described. While

there is a – I see its revised again, I requested this but it's only the part that's facing – it's like 2-feet wide so there's 10-feet wide with a full range of view, that will be looking directly into my back yard.

Board Member Furth: What's your address?

[Mr. Metloft:] Ok, I'm sorry, it's 118. I can maybe show you the pictures that where it's very clearly showing that. 118 is the one in the middle so it's affected by the – it's behind building B in this drawing. It's the building C balcony that's looking directly into my yard. You can – I don't know how to get to the right slide but you can see the building C is looking directly – there it is. Sorry, go back. You can see building C, which is on the left side here, my house is in the middle; 118 Churchill. There's a balcony and it's not shown in this picture but yes, it's facing the other house but with – beyond the screen that's only 2-feet, they can see directly from the second floor, directly into my house; it's only 6-feet away. It's just not appropriate for a residential neighborhood. That's related to the fact that this – these homes are in the orientation that they are and that is being perpendicular to normal setbacks from back inside. The last two things I'll briefly say for efficient of time here is the colors. There's a 23-foot wall, bright red and then bright blue, right there in my back yard; 23-feet high. It's closer than I am to you. I requested that those colors not be used and something more muted like the yellow if they want to use color but I mean, it's so close to my yard. The last thing is, there's no description of the shrubs. We talked in one of the meetings with the architect, the shrubs that are being built, I've requested that they be high enough to cover those windows, which would be 14-feet I guess. I'm just guessing somewhere in that range and there's no description of the plan. Just to summarize the things that I think aren't addressed are the window glazing in the glass, the removal of the balcony because it's just looking directly into my backyard, the colors and then the size of the trees when they are planting. Yeah, they can put in trees but if it takes them 10-years to reach the size to create the screen, that's not ok. Thank you for your time and attention.

Chair Lew: Great, thank you for coming today. Do we have any Board Member questions?

Vice Chair Kim: I have a question. Does the total – I guess first for the applicant, does the total FAR include the garage areas?

Male: Yes.

Vice Chair Kim: Ok, thank you.

Chair Lew: There's a – is it 230 square feet per unit, is exempted.

Male: If we asked the...(crosstalk)

Chair Lew: A required (crosstalk) (inaudible) required parking so if you did extra parking, then it would count. Where if you made an extra-large garage, that extra square footage would count towards floor area.

Vice Chair Kim: Would you like to clarify?

Mr. Chua: Yes, you are correct. It doesn't count as the FAR, I was thinking of the site coverage in terms of how that was laid out. Yes, so that 230-square feet for the covered parking is not counted towards the...

Vice Chair Kim: Are you subtracting the 230-square feet or just the area of the garage for each unit? Am I confused?

Chair Lew: You're on the first page?

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, I was just looking over the floor areas on the first page, under project information and the garage area was listed separately but I couldn't tell whether that was also included on the main floor or not. I think overall, it sounds like 230-square feet is exempted from each unit anyways, so I don't think that's a problem. Chair Lew, the 230-square feet is to make an exception for the garage? The covered parking? Why is that 230-square-feet exempted?

Chair Lew: Yes, it's in the multi-family code and it's always been there. Yeah, I don't know (inaudible). That's always been there.

Mr. Lait: I'll take a look but is the question – is it up to 230-square feet or an automatic 230-square foot, is that the question that we're ultimately getting at?

Vice Chair Kim: Yes.

Mr. Lait: Let me take a look at the code and find out.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: I had a question about open space calculation. There's common open space, there's private open space and as I recall, you can swing some of it back and forth but I couldn't quite figure out – there's some part of the front – what I think of as the front lawn of Unit A is designated as common open space, so I was trying to understand what the code requirements were and how this project complied with them. If you're looking at A-11.

Mr. Owen: Right, I think the intent of the applicant is to create a condominium map so that would describe the areas that would be private and common areas.

Board Member Furth: (Inaudible)

Mr. Lait: Let's take a look at that and see if the front yard can count as a required open space.

Board Member Furth: I know there's a complicated formula about common and individual open space and what you have to provide. If you could explain to me what that is, I would appreciate it?

Mr. Lait: We'll work on that but in the meantime, I can answer the other question. The provision is in [section 18.13.040] and the footnote to the table reads that covered parking is not included as floor area in multi-family develop, up to a maximum of 230-square feet per required parking space that is covered. Covered parking spaces next to the required parking in the area is counted as floor area. I would say it's up to 230 and not a guaranteed 230.

Vice Chair Kim: Understood and then I have more question. Just out of curiosity, it was said that single family dwellings and two family units are not allowed in the multi-family zoning but could there be two separate dwelling units?

Board Member Furth: No.

Vice Chair Kim: No, that's counts as a two-family dwelling unit?

Mr. Lait: Yeah, two separate single family residences would be two units on the lot and...

Vice Chair Kim: That's not allowed in the RM-15 zone?

Mr. Lait: Yeah, there is a – I had to look that up myself and I was reviewing the report. There is a footnote to the land use table – this is RM-15 I believe, right? It says that single family and two families are permitted but then you have to go to the footnote, which says that it's only permitted on lots less

than 8,500-square feet in size. The result then is the only residential units that are permitted here is a multi-family use, which is a minimum of three units by our code.

Vice Chair Kim: Got it. Thank you.

Board Member Furth: So, it's a minimum of density requirement? To use our residential land for residences.

Chair Lew: Any other questions? No?

Board Member Furth: I did have one question which was, I know Alma busy street and the train tracks are nearby too. What's the noise contour for that front yard?

Mr. Lait: We'll take a look at that in the plan here, one second.

Board Member Furth: I think we have that data somewhere. From another project, maybe?

Mr. Lait: We'll come back to that one.

Chair Lew: Robert, would you start us off in comments?

Board Member Gooyer: Sure. Well, I understand the desire to use the – as much of the site as possible so I guess it's one of these things you pretty much have to do to the three units but one of the problems I'm – first of all, I agree with one of the neighbors, I'm not a real big fan of the bright red and then bright blue. Also, from the way I understand this, you're going to retain the Mediterranean style of the front house and then add sort of 2 ½ modern units on the back. That's the part I have a problem with. I mean, there are plenty of good looking modern residences in Palo Alto. To me either this thing needs to be all modern or all Mediterranean. Now, maybe the idea is you make all three of them Mediterranean, I don't know. It is trying to shoehorn as much as you can. I can understand the neighbors' concerns that 118 Churchill, where you've got this two-story building 6-feet away or 7-feet away from your back fence and his backyard isn't that big. I would not be a fan of a two-story building – building B located where it is based on his desire. Then looking at the front here, you mentioned the front – the building you show on the left with the smaller windows, I just don't like this look. I mean, you tell me you're doing it for – to make it easier so people don't – you're not looking down at something but to me, that's not doing anything for the design and the reality of it is, that's the furthest part away from another resident. This building is basically or these buildings are big monolithic stucco blocks that are with multi-color with very small windows. I really don't have anything I like about them at the moment.

Chair Lew: Kyu.

Vice Chair Kim: I think this is an interesting project. I like that we're increasing the density and creating two additional dwelling units. I think there's a lot of information that I would still like to see before making any kind of a recommendation. I think it would be important to see at least a couple site sections. Maybe through the side yards, both in the driveway and also on the back so we can see what that overall elevation will look like from, let's say 118 Churchill. Also, a site section – cross section through the buildings themselves so that we can also see how the buildings on this lot relate to one another. I appreciate the neighbor's concerns. I was looking at the window schedule. It does look like you've added privacy glass to those second story windows that are facing the neighbor's property. I'd also like to see some construction details. There are some areas that I think – I just don't quite understand yet, like the areas with the color cement plaster. The flat roofed areas, is there a parapet? How does that skylight relate to the roof? Just a minor note, on sheet A-2.2, for the Unit A elevations, elevations 3 and 4 all say Unit C. Those are all Unit A elevations, I believe. As far as the DEE goes, I'm ok with the DEE desire. I think the driveway, because of the current situation, I think that's fine. It's a narrow lot and I can see that an exception can be granted there. I noticed on the civil site plan that you're showing the drainage and you're showing some down spouts but I didn't see them on the building

elevation and so it would be good to show them on the building elevations next time to see if they are a certain color, whether they match the -- which stucco they match or how they relate back to the roofs. Other than that, I think it's kind of a tricky problem. It sounds like you're forced to build two additional dwelling units on the lot but at the same time, it is a small lot and it's unfortunate that it's 8,500-square-feet as opposed to 10,000- square-feet. I think I'll leave my comments at that for now. I'm not ready to recommend any kind of a motion at this moment but I think you're definitely putting a lot of thought into this and I'd like to see it developed a little bit more and brought back to the Board. I think the overall concept can be interesting. Maybe adding onto Board Member Gooyer comments about keeping that Mediterranean feel on the new buildings as well. I don't know if that's still something that could be rethought or if that's kind of set. I realize that they are two brand new buildings and I'm just not sure that you have to try to co-mingle both the very contemporary and the more traditional Mediterranean in two brand new units or it's not something that you have to deal with as is. Other than that, thank you for your presentation and I look forward to seeing additional details.

Chair Lew: Wynne.

Board Member Furth: Thank you and thank you for the presentation. This is a really interesting neighbor and block because High Street is missing, so we have these incredibly deep lots and when you look at the lotting pattern around you, this is not R-1 development. If you look at those parcel maps, you've got parcels with no access to streets, which means you essentially have flag lots and if you walk -- when I walked along, one of the interesting things is there's no parking on Alma and there's no parking on that face of Churchill so I got to walk the neighborhood a bit to get there. This is a neighborhood that's really transformed itself. It's armored itself against Churchill traffic so where we use to have front lawns, we have paved parking courts. Sometimes they double as basketball courts. You've got screened walls, you've got very additions in front of houses where it was probably originally front yards. You've got second units behind houses, I don't know what the zoning is but they are there. This is a very mixed neighborhood. I think it's also a really lovely neighborhood because it has wonderful trees, it's got sort of a riot of architectural detail and real gardens, not industrial style gardens. I do think that between the next meeting, it would be helpful if people had the opportunity to go walk that back yard because it's a huge area and you get a really interesting understanding of the neighbor's situations. 185 Churchill, is the one with the huge oak tree? 118, sorry. Great big sort of Shelly style, big oak tree and then next to it, going down Churchill towards the Bay, is a house which has had a very large second story addition, with a second story balcony right on this property. No regard for the privacy of this property, it's just -- there we go. The other thing that is interesting is there is a lot -- unlike a number of situations, where we see there's a lot of screening landscaping that people have around some of the perimeters. Even though what they are screening themselves from is 150-feet of the back yard. This is one of the biggest valley ball courts I've ever seen in Palo Alto. As to the -- it's interesting to be because what I'm most -- I'm concerned about neighborhood privacy, neighborhood visual impact, and adequate outdoor -- useable outdoor living space. I think the DEE I wouldn't have difficulty approving. I live in a house of a similar size and on a similar lot size in downtown north. The difference is, is that we don't have any driveways on our parcels and so that puts a big additional constraint on what you're doing and I see nothing to be gained by widening that. I think we could find the existing house and tree and maybe even the utility pole, is a compelling reason to provide a DEE. It does seem to me that this is designed to get every possible square foot of FAR and I think there are something like 10 or 11 bedrooms depending on how you count this, in these developments. While it's delightful to see houses that aren't two bedrooms because we have a shortage of multiple bedroom houses. I'm a little concerned and it would be interesting to hear from you all about whether the nominal outdoor spaces work. I measured -- I was particular concerned about the backyard of Unit C because it's up -- it faces sort of east and it's going to be two stories and it's up against a fence. It's up against somebody else low out building. I guess it's about 13-feet wide, is it? I got up and measured my yard and it's 13-feet wide and that's useable but you wouldn't want to go any narrower. The only reason it's 13-feet wide is because the ARB made the applicant take out a unit so we would actually have functional yards. I'm interested in hearing what you and the landscape architect think about usable outdoor space, particularly for Unit A and if we need to shrink these units a little bit to accommodate a better outdoor space, I would be interested in that. We have a spectacular climate here and it's a very sad thing not to be able to sit outside and enjoy it. As to

the design, I don't consider Unit a Mediterranean except for that it's got a red tile roof. I mean, if it's Mediterranean, it's via north India. It's got a lot of different design elements. I don't consider the round windows centered on a pitched roof a typical Mediterranean element. I don't consider the front porch and banister treatment – in other words, I don't think we have a strong design statement here that it would be important too – it's important to acknowledge it but I don't think it's very valuable to replicate it. On the other – I actually like the bright colors though maybe I'd prefer it came (inaudible) but I appreciate the fact that I may like this bright colors, is less important that what is visible from neighboring properties so that may need further thinking. As to the relatively squared off design, I guess when I saw it I thought, this is Mediterranean by way of (inaudible). I mean, it's a different aspect of Mediterranean design. It would have a lot to do with how you treated the windows and whether they were set in with curved detailing but the squared off elements don't offend my sensibilities as long as in the fine detailing, they reflect the things that make real Mediterranean, Mediterranean. I mean, what I think of as finishing and fenestration details so those are my thoughts at the moment.

Mr. Lait: If I can comment because the Board Member had some questions about the open space. There isn't actually – I'm not finding anyways, a provision that says one could not use the front yard for required open space. However, there is some language there that the Board might be interested in which says, usable open space shall be located and protected from activates of commercial areas and adjacent public streets and provide noise buffering from surround uses where feasible. I think that might speak to some of the concerns you had regarding that and I wanted to get that there if you wanted to see if there are an additional comment you wanted to make on it.

Board Member Furth: Thank you. I am concerned – again, I'm not clear on what the code requirements are but just functionally, figuring out where I go outside to sit with my newspaper, for Unit A. I don't – my experience of standing by that front yard is that that's not a feasible place without sound protection. I'm interested in the possibility of or maybe it already exists, of an actual useable, defined space that's not going to have cars creeping into it for that Unit A.

Chair Lew: Ok, are you done, Wynne? You can comment later if you have more comments.

Board Member Furth: You know, I could go on forever but yes.

Chair Lew: Thank you for the – for your presentation and I would say that I do support in general, the concept of the project. Of having put in three units on a skinny sight and I did want to acknowledge that we have a couple other projects that have been built in Palo Alto that are on the same size lots. There's one on 639 Homer and that was by David [phonetics][Sulneck]. There's one right next store to it, which is 649 Homer by a different architect and 145 Hawthorne by Chris Spalding and that was a local developer. I think those are all pretty nice projects. I think those are working. They have – most of them have had the DEE issue with regard to the driveway and the minimum landscaping and we worked through that. As long as – you can plant along the fence and get screening so I'm fairly comfortable with that. The – I think I'm in agreement with most of the comments that have been made. I think Kyu had mentioned more drawings and I think that I do – would recommend that. I brought the sets from the projects that I just mentioned and they show other drawings that can better show – better communicate your project. Also, I think on your site plan, which is – you have a couple good site plans actually, but like A -0.4 and then you also have one further back in the set. I would recommend trying to include a little bit more if you can on this 132 and 136 Churchill. They are a little bit cut off from the page and the 132 and 136 are my understanding, two units on one lot, right? Then I think also, I'm interested in – I'm sorry, I forgot your name. The 118 Churchill, I that is also technically two units – it's been converted to one, ok so it was -- I was looking at it. There was a unit in the back and the front, ok. I would be interested in the exact placement of the oak tree as well. I don't know if the oak tree in our drawings is correct or not.

**Male:** It is not.

Chair Lew: That was my – I was looking at photos and it didn't seem like it was correctly located.

Male: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: That's fine. Then also, I think to – I would encourage you to maybe show some of the front yards of the neighbors because I think, my observations which are the same as Wynne's, is that all the neighbors have done turn – backup spaces and extra parking in their front yards. Just to mitigate the lack of parking on Alma and Churchill. I think also, you're showing -- on the site plan, you're showing the air conditioning units in the setback, which we don't allow noise producing equipment in the setbacks. I think that's all I have on the site plans. The – oh, one other thing too. The a – on 118 Churchill, I think it's labeled as a two-story resident. Most if it seems to be predominantly one-story and there is a portion at the highest point of the ridge that's two-story so maybe if you were to – maybe if there's a way of just dotting that in so that we can see where there are privacy issues. I think I do want to – the other site plan that you have in the back of the set, which is – let's see. Do we have a sheet? Yeah, A-3.5 is great and so then I would say – is that the ground floor? That's the second floor, that's great so maybe I would just dot in on that particular one – for the 118 Churchill sight, where the neighbors mention the bedrooms and the privacy issue so that we can see the – any privacy issues there. Also, with the one 132 Churchill, I would just – I'd be curious to know which rooms are facing your – facing the proposed project. Are those like bedrooms or those – is that the living room facing your project so we have an idea of that privacy issues there. I'm in agreement with I think, the comments about – a lot of the comments about the style, even though we have contradictory comments about the style. I think the mix of the two is a little strange. I do want to support having individual entrances – like you have the different colors and the sort of tower elements. Our Comp. Plan, I think does suggest that all units have some sort of prominence facing the street so I think that that's important. It's not clear to me that you need to continue that all the way through the building because then it's sort of affecting the neighbors. I would say for the red and yellow elements, that's fine facing the street and the driveway and then maybe not do or have some sort of transition where it's facing the neighbors on Churchill. With regard to style, I think that there's enough architectural history in here to navigate something that's better than what you have. If it's Ricardo LeGorreta or Lewy [phonetics][Bariguone] or Irving Gill, I think there's enough room to maneuver in a one to two-story stucco Mediterranean, modern. I think there is enough room to do it. This particular project though is a little strange to me to have aluminum windows and wood windows and it's not just that, it's stained wood windows and glass. It's a very odd mixture.

Board Member Gooyer: The classic one was where the front one is Mediterranean yet, you have to take part of the chimney and then have a metal floor. I don't see too many metal floors associated with Mediterranean. It's that sort of thing that is either do it one or the other or pick something that's ...

Chair Lew: You know, I'm thinking that you can do an in between but it has to be – but not this.

Board Member Gooyer: Modern and Mediterranean to me just...

Chair Lew: Have you seen, there's a really nice Mark – some of Mark Max's early work did that fine line between contemporary and Mediterranean. I think there is a way of doing it, with the right – it takes the right touch.

Board Member Gooyer: (Inaudible)

Chair Lew: There's a way but I don't think this is – I don't think this is working yet. I think most of the problems that I am having is that I think you're trying to put two-stories right at the 6-foot setback line and it's causing you to do a very low plate height because of the daylight plane. All the other projects that I mentioned today on Homer and Hawthorne and stuff. They do the 6-foot first floor but they've set back the second floor 10-feet and it breaks up the massing and it seems to me that those projects work better. I would encourage you to take a look at that to see if that actually is useful to you or not. I do want to acknowledge that you've – I think you've been trying to be responsive to the privacy concerns like the small windows and the glass and all of that and landscape screening. I think I would just push back that I still need architecture and I don't really see it yet. Particularly in Unit B and then in Unit A, the addition to Unit A is fairly strange in my mind and I would say that's on the sheet A-2. – which one is it?

A-2.3 or no, A – 2.2, the front elevation, where you're matching the slopes of the daylight plane to the existing slope of the house. I mean, that is very strange and maybe there is a way of doing it and maybe if it doesn't look good in elevation, maybe it looks better in 3-D but it's kind of an odd assemblage at the moment. Yeah, so I can't – at the moment I can't support that. On parking, when you have three unit – a three-unit project, you don't have to have – the code doesn't require you to have a visitor's space. My hunch is that the project may be better with one even though it's not required because there's no parking on Alma or on the closet section on Churchill. Normally, that required parking isn't allowed in setbacks and we do have a special setback right on Alma but I'm just asking as a what if, I'm not requiring it but I'm saying what if there is something – some extra space somewhere. Then the other thing that I'm not quite comfortable with is you have the two (inaudible) – you have one – two required spaces for Unit A. One is in the garage and then the one – the other one is an outdoor space which is right next to the garden or the open space for Unit B and that's not so ideal, in my mind. I think on the other projects that I mentioned, they figured out other ways of getting in an extra space. I think those other projects didn't have the special setback on Alma, though, so they had a little bit more room to fit in an extra car but that's not the most – to me, that's not the most ideal situation. Just aesthetically or just even practically so I would ask if there are other ways of doing it. That's where I am at on this one. I'm not prepared to – I don't think it's ready to be approved today. I think it has to come back. Is there a – yes, Staff? Johnathan.

Mr. Lait: Thank you. Just a couple things, one I wanted to – I want to apologize to the public speaker Jason, we looked at the project file and in fact, there are email correspondence noting his concern early on so I apologize for that. We're getting some contour information back and it looks like it's at least 70 decibels sort of mid-way through the property and may be a little bit more toward the front near Alma. We'll consider that when we return with the open space and how that's all addressed. We've heard a lot of comments and I don't – not many of them were contradictory I don't think and so, what we'd like to do is get a summation of the Board and I don't know that we need to do that here. I think we'll listen to the tape again and document all these individual issues and ask the applicant – it just seems like there is a lot to work on here. Unless the Board thought there was a way to summarize the key – there's so much to – if there is a way to summarize the key issues, great. Then we can head in that direction but I'm hearing comments from – that affect many layers of the design consideration.

Board Member Gooyer: Let me just ask, will the possibility of – I noticed all three of these are 1,600-square-feet; something like that. The thought of maybe shrinking the building or the residences down a little bit and that will allow you the ability to do some setbacks or even squeeze in an extra parking space or whatever, that sort of thing. I've lived very comfortably in a 1,350-square-foot house for years and raised a family there so I mean, it's not like you have to have 1,600-square-feet. The other question I was just – I find that so bizarre that there is no way you can say you want to put two residences in there and ask for an exemption?

Mr. Lait: We didn't explore that. I could – we could look at what our various entitlements such as various and things of that nature allow for deviation from the code in that regard.

Board Member Gooyer: Especially, in this situation with the no parking on the – to me, this site would be a lot better for two residences that – almost like a flag lot type layout but it could be condominiumized but it seems to make more sense in this than trying to squeeze three in. I know they are doing what the code says they have to do but I don't think it's to the betterment of the neighborhood.

Chair Lew: Yes.

Board Member Furth: I share Robert's question about whether slightly smaller units would work better. I live in a much smaller house – I live in a small house and I've lived there with a number of people and it's very comfortable and I'm very happy to see houses with more than two bedrooms but depending on what you count as a bedroom. I was counting them as if it were a bedroom tax, a door that closes and has access to a bathroom and I come up with 11 bedrooms and 10 baths, that's a lot for three units. I believe that three units is a good use of this site but I'm not use Unit – sometimes this project seems to

be designed to the code and not to the property. It's every square foot and that is not getting us the result we need because we're not just saying, do you meet the numerical standards? We're saying, how does this work as a place to live, both indoors and out and how do we do this in a way that doesn't have negative effects on the neighbors other than the unavoidable ones? They've benefitted from this big open space for years and that's going to go away but there are other things that can be reduced to an acceptable level. This is not an un-intensively developed neighborhood. Is it 118? They have a spectacular tree but it's also intensely developed and its Churchill frontage is designed to deal with a heavily traveled street. This is not a neighborhood where people have these little houses surrounded by big open spaces. I think this density could be fine but I think the units may be a little too big.

## **MOTION**

Chair Lew: Ok, so do we – motion? Continue to a date uncertain?

Vice Chair Kim: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: All in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Opposed? None. So, that's 4-0

## **MOTION PASSED 4-0 WITH BALTAY RECUSED**

Chair Lew: Thank you. We look forward to seeing this next time around and yes, you can a follow-up.

Mr. Chua: We did meet with the Zoning Department about the factor that we tried to ask if there will be – we would have to ask for a variance basically, to get – whether we wanted to design something for a two-family unit or even a larger single family unit and that's what we are dealing with the code. They said well until the code changes, that's your situation is. We're designed to those perimeters and I understand that the buildings are large and we are trying to fit a lot of things on there but – beside the point, the aesthetic wise, talking about the – if – we're proposing to keep the existing family unit and we're coming back with the redesign. The comments I'm getting from this hybrid of the aesthetics in terms of it, if the owner still want to – the clients still wanted to hold onto the existing unit, are you guys proposing that we could separate and develop the two other units in a completely different aesthetic than the front building or that's – are you guys leaning – you know what I mean? I'm trying to understand what you guys are looking for in terms of...

Board Member Gooyer: I would personally prefer all three of them to be the same whatever it is so they end up – but that would be the minimum to not have the first building a combination of each but I would think I would prefer to have the whole thing work as a group.

Mr. Chua: Right, but then that confines us to the aesthetic about what you're saying about this Mediterranean style which really isn't a Mediterranean style in terms of (inaudible)(crosstalk)...

Board Member Gooyer: Yeah, sometimes you get a masterpiece – some magnificent bungalow or something in there that you want to keep. That's no architectural masterpiece that there's right now so I mean, I don't see that you need to keep that – maybe you modify that to something else or I don't care if you turn it into a ranch style of whatever the case is. I just think it ought to work a little bit more harmoniously than it does now or like I said, you turn all three of them into modern. I mean there have been plenty of modern residential units that have been approved thru the Board here and are located in the City. That would be fine with me.

Vice Chair Kim: I don't necessarily disagree but I think there could be a way that you transition the back of the existing single family home into something more contemporary and then the two new units maybe

go along with that contemporary style. I don't think all three necessarily have to be – look and feel the same style but I think there are ways that – perhaps you can study a little bit further and the new units are new units. I don't see a reason why they have to be Mediterranean but again, there should be some kind of a sensible transition perhaps in the back of the existing single family house to transition to that style.

Mr. Chua: Thank you.

Board Member Gooyer: It looks like you have plenty of flexibility.

Chair Lew: Ok, so that's it for today.

### **Approval of Minutes:**

#### **6. February 2, 2017, Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes**

Chair Lew: Oh, we have meeting minutes for February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017. I think there were 33 pages long. You have comments? You have comments? OK, I started but I think I only made it to page 5.

Board Member Furth: I only read the part that was me. On page 13, packet page 203. It says conventions in place. That should be covenants.

Mr. Lait: I would suggest that if there's word typos or things of that nature...

Board Member Furth: There's only two.

Mr. Lait: You can just hand those to us. You don't have to spend the time here (inaudible).

Board Member Furth: Just the one I really like where it says expressions to individual preferences which leads to so jawing. Actually, that was jarring transitions.

Chair Lew: Ok, we have a motion to – do we have a motion?

### **MOTION**

Vice Chair Kim: Yeah, so I think for the purpose of the meeting minutes. They are obviously taken verbatim and there are some miss hear words but I think, for the most part, the minutes are fine and I'll move that we approve the minutes from the meeting of February 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2017.

Board Member Gooyer: I'll second that.

Chair Lew: Ok, all in favor?

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

Chair Lew: Opposed? None. That's 4-0-1 with Board Member Baltay absent.

### **MOTION PASSED 4-0-1 WITH BALTAY ABSENT**

Chair Lew: Thank you, Jonathan.

### **Subcommittee Item**

### **Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements**

## Adjournment