



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: January 18, 2018
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Wynne Furth, Vice Chair Peter Baltay, Board Member Robert Gooyer, Osma Thompson, Alexander Lew

Absent:

Chair Furth: Good morning. I'd like to call to order the regular meeting of the Architectural Review Board for January 18th, 2018. Roll call, please?

Oral Communications

Chair Furth: Thank you. Now is the time for oral communications about any matter not on the agenda. So, if you aren't here to talk about the 350 Sherman Avenue parking lot or the related EIR, now would be the time to let us know. Seeing none.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Furth: We'll go onto agenda changes, additions, and deletions. Does Staff have anything? Anybody on the Board wants any changes? Seeing none.

City Official Reports

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

Chair Furth: City official reports, the transmittal of the ARB meeting schedule and attendance record, and administrative Staff-level architectural review approvals. I'm so glad we're not reviewing tree removals, any comments or questions?

Ms. Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: Chair Furth, we do need to make sure that we have Members that are able to stay for the subcommittee.

Chair Furth: I'll get to that in a second, yes. One of the things is subcommittee assignments and we have used various approaches to assign Board Members to work with Staff and the applicant to deal with fairly fine, small details after the main decisions – main recommendation has been made by the Board. I've decided that I'd like to do this on a project basis. We have two projects today, one of them is a return of the Junior Museum and Zoo and the other is 2120 Staunton Court. Vice Chair Baltay and Board Member Lew have volunteered for that one -- those two I should say.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 350 Sherman Avenue [17PLN-00257]:

Consideration of Draft Environmental Impact Report and Review and Recommendation to Council of an Architectural Review Application for Construction of a New Four-Story, 49' Tall Parking Structure, and Photo-Voltaic Rooftop Panel Structure, With Two Below Grade Parking Levels to Provide 636 Public Parking Spaces on an Existing Public Parking Lot Within the California Avenue Business District. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Environmental Impact Report was published January 8, 2018 for Public Comments Through February 22, 2018. Zone District: PF; Public Facilities. For More Information Contact Chief Planning Official Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Furth: That brings us to the main agenda item for today which is a public hearing on a proposal at 350 Sherman Avenue for a parking garage – 40-foot tall parking garage with photovoltaics rooftop structure to provide 636 spaces to be built on an existing parking lot. It's bounded by Ash, Birch, Sherman and Jacaranda Lane. There are two items before us related to this, the first is an opportunity to comment on the draft EIR that has been prepared for a larger project. That project includes this parking garage, an adjacent Public Safety Building and an ordinance that would change the City's zoning standards for public facilities throughout the City; Staff can tell us more about that later. The documents available, it's also available online, and the public comment period on this continues until February 22nd. So, if you have thoughts after this meeting, you are welcome to send them in so that when the final EIR is prepared it can take into consideration your thoughts. The parking garage itself – the project when it came to us last time was both the parking garage and the Public Safety Building. The Public Safety Building did not meet with as much approval as the garage so the projects have been split in terms of their ARB hearings. So today we'll just be looking at the parking garage but they are – Staff plans to put them back together so that they will go to the City Council as a unit in what, late March? Early April? Is that the thought?

Mr. Matt Raschke, Senior Engineer with Public Works: As soon as the EIR is certifiable.

Chair Furth: And you get the other plan back to us for our comments. Alright, well the EIR won't be certified for a while yet. So, I have a number of public comment cards, if you want to comment and you haven't submitted a card, please do. Let's hear from Staff.

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: I'll be very brief, you did a good job of teeing up the project. With the draft EIR, the process is to receive comments and then the consultant that the City has hired will be preparing responses to those comments in writing. Collectively those will go to the City Council along with the project and the certification will be at the same time as the project. Both of the buildings – both of the sites are shared presented with Council for action on the project itself. So, just that – about the DEIR, we have been getting some comments, those were forwarded to you as we've received them and there are some folks here today perhaps to speak to that. You have a revised set of plans if anyone needs to see the prior plans I tried to, in the Staff report, provide contrasting images in the body of the report but we do – I do have an older set if anyone wants to look at that. Really, Staff has teed this up for approval, we are going to be modifying the Record of Land Use Action following the ARB's review in March is what's anticipated for the Public Safety Building. Once we receive those plans we will get those to you and then that single Record of Land Use Action would proceed to the City Council. I've prepared findings – draft findings for architectural review approval of this project and so if you could take a look at those and weigh in and provide edits as needed. I'll let the applicant provide the images and their PowerPoint presentation and Staff is ready for questions. Here's Matt Raschke to (inaudible)...

Chair Furth: First, are there any questions before Matt begins? Go ahead, if you could introduce yourself.

Mr. Raschke: Thank you, Amy. My name is Matt Raschke, I'm a Senior Engineer with Public Works and I'm the overall Project Manager for both this garage and the Public Safety Building. As you might be aware a Staff report has been published for City Council on this coming Monday night to consider removal of the lowest basement level of this garage. That – it's related to the cost and speed of construction for the overall project and it will be looking at the parking needs of the area and Council will

have to deliberate on that item but overall the – that's the only change we're looking at. We'd like to get at least Conditional Approval on the garage today if possible. The garage is a critical path for the Public Safety Building which is overall looked at as one project under CEQA. We want to get the garage built and functional before we break ground on the Public Safety Building to minimize parking impacts on California Avenue business district. I think we heard Board Member Gooyer at that the last meeting say that the – there was no reason to necessarily look at them architecturally as one project. So, we heard you on that and we're bringing back just the garage at this point because we're making some major changes to the Public Safety Building that we'll be bringing you very soon. I think – I'm hoping that you like those changes and can also then subsequently approve that project. Today we have Mallory Cusenbery from RossBrulisCusenbery Architects to give the presentation and we also have Ray Pendro from MIG. He's the environmental consultant for the EIR and we also have Michelle Wendler from Watry the parking garage specialist and I believe there's someone from (inaudible), the landscape architect to help answer any questions that you have on the project. With that, I'd like to turn it over the Mallory to present his design.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Mallory Cusenbery: Good morning.

Chair Furth: Good morning.

Mr. Cusenbery: Thank you for this opportunity to present for you and I also want to extend a great thank you to City Staff and to key members of the Palo Alto Police Department and Fire Department for the tremendous support and effort that has gone into getting the project to where it is today. As you know the City is embarking on the design of probably the largest investment in infrastructure since the construction of this very building that we're in. It's on the two lots that you see there, C-6 and C-7. As you said Chair, in the intro, currently today we're only talking about half of that project which is the garage portion on the left. We will come back to you subsequently once we redesign the Public Safety Building for an independent separate input on that. The last time we presented to you – the garage to you was in October of last year and we got detailed, extensive and very helpful feedback on the project. There – as you eluded to, there was definitely a lot of support of the direction that the garage was going. General positive feedback included that it's coming along nicely, it's a large building that will look quite nice, the Ash/Sherman elevations are quite interesting, the design is almost there, close to being something that can be recommended or approved. There was also support for the integration of the PVs, the circulation of the interior flow of vehicles, as well as the landscape approach. At the same time there was very constructive feedback that we received on areas that could use more work and those included more attention to the Birch Street stairs which was good in concept but needed to be developed. The idea of softening the look of the wall that's facing Birch Street and that it was too harsh, too massive, that the arcade on Ash was not needed, that we need to look at maximizing parking and that, as Matt eluded to, that the design of the garage and the PSB (Public Safety Building) could be treated as independent elements. They didn't necessarily need to be one overall design. We heard you, we agree with your assessments, and we believe as a result we have a better building. During the time since we last met you we have removed the arcade, we've added the parking back in that space, we've spent a lot of time coming up with a new concept for the staircase and the approach on the Birch Street side. In addition, the areas that you liked around the perimeter of the building, the exterior components, we have further refined those and developed those and making those better as well. The building is a 636-car parking structure, two-stories below grade, three-stories – four-stories above grade with a level of PV, photovoltaics, on the roof that shade the top level of parking. We all agree that it is a relatively large building but there are a lot of opportunities within the design of this building to still make it a good neighbor; still have it fit in to the neighborhood there. First of all, it's not – and it's unprecedented in its scale, there are other buildings in the immediate environment that are of a similar size, similar scale. However, there also are a lot of opportunities with the design of the building to actually work with the fabric and orientation of the historic Cal. Avenue retail district. Further, there are also a lot of opportunities to kind of build on and reinforce the more fine grain particulate pedestrian environment, both the landscape and the textual environment of the Cal. Avenue public realm. These are kind of

guiding forces that you'll see in the design that you're going to see. We limited our pallet in the design of this, focusing in fact more on things like light and shadow and how it plays in the building. Movement in pedestrian – movement of people, movement of vehicles, movement of the landscaping and the movement of the sun and how we enforce that; as well as the landscape environment itself, the organic shade, color, smells that you get from that environment. The result being that – the goal being a design that really weaves itself into the neighborhood in such a way that it feels like it belongs. It builds on the textures, the character, the quality of the colors of the area. This is looking up Birch, you can see the garage through the Eucalyptus trees, there or beyond or looking up Ash Street. There's an opportunity to reinforce and build on, for instance, the patterns and colors of the Visa building beyond but also some of the local – the smaller retail functions and office functions; such as the one on the left where you can see the continuity of the structural member as they march up the street so it's talking to both characters. Yes, we want it to be a good neighbor but at the same time it's also, we felt, it's important in this design to give the garage a character of its own, an independent character. It's not a destination per say but it is an important moment in kind of the sequence of the daily activities. One strategy we used for that is the current redesign for the Birch Street stair as a feature element. We have introduced a basket weave of terracotta scrim outboard of the stairs that – the role is to soften it, to provide color, to provide an organic material which is actual a clay material and to offer—but the concrete wall that was behind is now a smooth steel trowel plaster surface that hosts the light and shadows that's going to play off of it and adds to a brighter ambient light feel in that space. This stair is going to be an important component, you'll notice it cascades down towards Cal. Avenue so people leaving their cars come down the stair toward the retail district. There are pedestrian inflections, at the base of the stairs, the seating areas that are gracious and generous and actually are receptive and welcoming to pedestrian activities. You can sit on the stairs, if you look up at the top of the stairs there's a gentleman at the top who's very proud about having walked all the way up there. The detailed activity that you see on that side that was not unique to that side, it carries all the way around in what we consider the syncopated elevational development where a surface slide past each other. They cast shadows on each other and they start to play off each other so there's a variety—a visual variety as you move around the building with an end result that the building actually feels more (inaudible), it feels more fine grain than you would expect for a building of this scale. A couple things that I will point out is that this is a view from the corner of Ash on your left and Sherman goes off to the right. The reentrant corner that we have, obviously there's an opportunity to reduce the mass at the corners, it's a strategy we use on all four sides. We've introduced a sand color instead of the grey and then there's that – even those the arcade is gone, there's an opportunity to widen the pedestrian room right at that corner for a little bit of seating, a little more generous pedestrian zone before the sidewalk narrows again. The other thing that I will point out in this view is this is the one view where we're actually representing the possible texture that comes from the ivy growing up the terracotta basket weave. The goal of the design is that works independent of the ivy and we see the ivy as more like a value-add. That is brings a patina of time should it succeed and grow as we hope it will. This view from the corner of Birch on your right and Sherman on your left, I will point out just a couple of things from this view. One is you can see the continuity of the basket weave of the terracotta fins as they wrap around the building providing a visual variety but continuity for the garage. The other thing that I will point out is the polycarbonate canopy that's over the stairs. It serves the role as you would have a diffuser on a light. So, that even when the sun is not coming from the Birch side, when it's coming from the back side, the translucent panel picks up the light, diffuses it creating an ambient – soft ambient glow within that staircase so that there's light all day, even when the sun is on the other side of the building. This basket weave texture is something that we want to see really as an integrate to the experience of the garage, down to the experience that you have at an individual parking space and then also at night. We're proposing that there be a soft grazing light along the front text of those terracotta fins to accent the texture at night but also to provide more balance between – reduce the glare that customarily comes from inside garages when there's a lot of light inside but no light on the outside. So, this is a strategy to balance the light and soften the look at night. From a material detailing standpoint, the basket weave doesn't just change direction vertically and horizontally but it actually changes in plans. As you see on the left, parts of it are proud, parts of it are recessed and then the materials slide behind so there's a general kind of shadow boxing effect in materials. The materials themselves, I have this here which I can pass around to you, this is our materials board and I'll make that available to you. In description from left to right, we have metal reinforced terracotta which is basically brick fins, we have board formed concrete –

cast in place concrete, we have the translucent polycarbonate panels, we have a smooth fiber reinforced concrete in a sand – it's call Sahara but in a sand color. It's sometimes referred to as Swiss Pearl and then on the right we have the ivy which is an integral component of the elevations as well. As they play around the building, this is looking at the Birch Street side, both the architecture and the landscape site design reinforce this idea that each elevation gets an independent identity with further helps break down the scale of the garage. On the Birch Street side there's a more generous pedestrian realm for seating, for planting, the staircase. You can see the play of light and shadow that comes from the terracotta scrim. I'll also point out, in this case, the reentrant corners on each side. The reentrant corner on the right has an interesting side benefit that that backplane, if you see on the upper right-hand drawing, that backplane lines up with the face where the mural is on the historic – on the Nut House. So, you're – specially as you come from Cal. Avenue these planes line up. Then the front of the garage steps forward and between that plane and the forward plane is where the stairs go up. Also, the stairs are doing something else interesting that we like which is that on the right-hand side it goes to the one-story height and it goes up to three-stories on the left so the stairs mitigate the scale differential in the neighborhood. Sherman continues this, the basket weave and the syncopated design.

Chair Furth: With the permission of the Board, since this is a single item and a huge project, shall we let the applicant (inaudible) continue? Thank you.

Mr. Cusenbery: I will be brief, about two more minutes. Continues the planting areas at the base there are continuous along the building. They are actually rain gardens and then there will be a row of trees out – street trees providing shade and more shadow play along Sherman. The Jacaranda side, which you're looking at here, does not have as much area for planting at the base but we do have areas where we can grow vines so that there will be an opportunity to grow vines on the back side on the Jacaranda side. Then the Birch side, you can see at the base where we've removed the arcade. The seating area at the reentrant corner is on the right and we've planted at the base there and you can see the terracotta fins in this location as well. It actually nice to look at the top because you can see the relationship of the column to the commercial building on the left and the scale to the Visa building on the right. I'm not going to go into detail on the landscape design, Zoey (inaudible) is actually here today and she can answer any more detailed questions you might have; they are our landscape architects. Also, (inaudible) to say that the plant design also reinforces these independent facades, independent zones for each of the streets, the character of each and then the site design materials are going to be a continuity of the building. So, the pre-cast seating is going to match the terracotta, the unit pavers are going to match the sand of the Swiss Pearl, the board form concrete at the planters will match the board form concrete of the building, the pedestrian landscape site elements will be an extension of the building design itself. It need be, Zoey can go into detail on these sections but this gives you an idea of a cross-section at Ash, the pedestrian cross section at Birch with a deeper seating area, and the pedestrian cross section at Sherman. This project is now -- my slideshow is frozen but in fact, that was the last slide, there's just one more. The project is currently at 100% schematic design. We are – the last slide – we are – our hope today is – well, first of all, we hope that you agree that we have heard what your comments were from the previous go around. We hope you agree that it's, in fact, an improved building and our hope is to get a recommendation for approval of this project so that we can move into design development on the project and proceed on providing the Cal. Avenue retail district with this important piece of civic infrastructure. Thank you and I can open to questions.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. Are there questions you would like to ask the applicant before we hear from the public or do you want to hear from the public next? I have four cards – I beg your pardon? Oh, did you have a question Osma? Sorry.

Board Member Thompson: Do you know what the floor to ceiling height is for the or sorry, floor to bottom of the structure height? It wasn't noted.

Mr. Cusenbery: The floor to the bottom of the structure. Michelle, do we know what that is off hand? I think the floor to floor is 11-foot 6 and the typically beam depth, do you recall? 3-feet.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Anybody else? You have 3-minutes to speak, you can speak both to the draft EIR and the project itself. The first speaker I have is Jack Morton to be followed by Christian Pease.

Mr. Jack Morton: Thank you. Jack Morton representing the California Merchant's Associations. First of all, we want to thank both Staff and the architect for hearing our concerns about the Ash and also responding to the comments of the ARB about the overall appearance of the building. We would have come with great happiness had it not been for one thing. At the last minute, we have learned that their proposal is to take away one whole level of parking, which in my mind should have a major negative impact on the Environmental Report. An under parked – the whole problem of the area is that there is relatively no parking. There are – most of the employees can't get a permit and what we had hoped to be able to do was have that extra 100 parking spaces on the second level become employee parking. From the merchant's point of view, this project now looks beautiful above ground but it's sorely underperforming what the expectation of what the community was. We have spent lots of time with Staff trying to get clear that as this area is densified, majorly densified, the issue of parking is one of the central things that impact the quality of life. Having people – I think one of the reports showed that the major need for parking is roughly between ten and six. This is an area that has very active appearances from the community to the restaurants to the businesses and shorting us on parking sort of undermines the whole point. So, while we are grateful for the external appearances, the utility of the building has been majorly impacted by this suggestion that at the last minute that we short one level. Whatever comments that the ARB can make, please keep in mind that the impact on the community is the fact that a building is underperforming its purpose and doesn't do what it should do. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Christian Pease? So, I heard that as a comment on a need for EIR revisiting in light of this proposal.

Mr. Christian Pease: Good morning. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. I'm here today to represent the Evergreen Park Parking Committee and we think this is a lovely design. One of America's great architects said form follows function. We do not believe that you should reduce this floor as Jack Morton has pointed out and we think this is a false economy. This neighborhood is going to be under extreme pressure for the next decade, Car-light Housing, new firms moving in, new office buildings are already in the pipeline, existing retail – formal retail spaces being filled with four or five times the number of employees they had before, Grand Boulevard, and the list goes on. It was a surprise to us to see in the proposal to remove this level, that it could be taken up – the lunchtime crowds could be taken up based on the efficacy of our RPP. This is wishful thinking at best, almost absurd if the consequences weren't so impactful on us. There's already a proposal for the Mayfield RPP to increase the number of employee parking permits by forty and that is going to come before the Council on the 29th. This problem is not going to go away. This is a lovely design, it's function is to create parking and over this transition period there are people hoping for autonomous cars and new transportation modalities and walkability and all of that sort of thing. Our neighborhood in this business district is going to be under intense pressure. The businesses need that extra level for their employees and their patrons and we need it to keep the pressure off of our small neighborhood. Thank you very much.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Jessica Roth to be followed by Mary Ryan.

Ms. Jessica Roth: Hi, I'm a business owner on California Avenue and also a Palo Alto resident. Three things I wanted to point out today is that I'm very, very happy with the design. This is a very large structure going into my neighborhood, I grew up on California Avenue and the impact of the size of this structure above should represent what it can do with holding as many cars as we possibly can in this space. I would love to see a second stairwell on the Ash side because it is nice for people not to have to walk a whole block over to then return to walk a whole block back if they are trying to reach retailers on the El Camino side of California Avenue. Then I also wanted to point out that a lot of the people that parked in the Evergreen neighborhood have now moved across the tracks under the underpass to the residential California Avenue – California Street side. I have many customers that are upset about this

and so we are going to have that neighborhood coming and wanting to now put limits on who can park in their neighborhood. We are going to then be scrunched again on where people can – our employees, our customers can park so if you could really stress that to Staff and City Council I would really appreciate it. I'm really happy with the design and we've been working on getting a parking garage for 15-years on California Avenue. Parking is not a new problem and it's only getting bigger and bigger down there. I mean I like seeing a change in our area, I think we're a smart City, let's plan for the future and not just try to fix an immediate problem. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you, Ms. Roth. Mary Ryan? Oh, did I get that backward?

Ms. Mary Ryan: Good morning. My condominium home fronts along Birch Street, just down the street from where the parking garage is going to be. Currently, there are two parking lots that represent 306 spaces between the two lots and there are twelve access points for those 306 spots on four different streets. Now we're going to 336 with one access point and that access point is across the street from a residential unit. I think that the access point should be down the street across from commercial instead of a residential area. I'm concerned about traffic congestion because of this one access point versus the current twelve. I am worried about air quality when cars are idling waiting to get into that parking lot because of only one access point and I'm worried about public safety because of the car congestion in that area. That's it, thank you.

Chair Furth: Thank you very much. Would the City like to respond to those points?

Ms. French: I would like to respond to the third speaker, Jessica Roth, who asked for a second staircase on Ash. In the Staff report, Packet Page 13, I mention that there is now a staircase near Ash opposite the elevator so it should be quite easy to find. You get a choice elevator or stair and you can take the stair on the Ash side.

Mr. Cusenbery: It's visible on the slide that is up there right now.

Ms. Roth: Thank you. Sorry, I didn't see that.

Ms. French: That's ok, it's hard sometimes to read plans, there's so much information in there. Let's see...

Chair Furth: The single access point and its location.

Ms. French: Right so that was a comment that we heard from other folks and we forwarded that to our environmental consultant who – and actually, that comment was anticipated in the draft EIR. There's a paragraph in there about where the access – why the access was chosen and where it was based on queuing. That was provided to those folks and I can forward that email if I can get the email of Ms. Ryan so she can see what others have seen as far as where to find this in the draft EIR. So, noted, that was a question and we have a response for that.

Chair Furth: Well, perhaps you could use a brief recap of why that was the choice that was made.

Ms. French: Yes, it had to do with queuing from the – for the eastbound traffic and allowing eastbound traffic to turn left into that location. I think it's 90-feet – I don't have the email in front of me but I can go look for it in the draft EIR.

Male: (Inaudible)

Ms. French: Perfect.

Mr. Cusenbery: I also would like to bring up Michelle from Watry Design, our parking garage specialist to answer that.

Ms. Michelle Wendler: Michelle Wendler with Watetry Design and we coordinated with the traffic consultant who was doing the traffic impact analysis to review the locations of the entries and exits. The parking lots today, part of the entries and exits are circulation and the way they circulate with the – partially within the lot to the alley. We analyzed for the number of parking spaces in this building with Van Peers and determined that one entrance location and an exit location was enough for the number of parking spaces in the building. Then the location of it was determined based on the street circulation so what was being described about the left turns and the access coming in from Birch and the distance that you have on Ash and Birch are very short. The distance from the intersections is a lot to allow access into those locations, along with the alley at that location also having circulation. The entrance being on Sherman was driven by the street circulation around the site and then the location along Sherman was based on the queuing that was analyzed as part of the traffic report.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Jonathan Lait, Assistant Director of Planning: Just the only other comment from Staff on the public comments is that the issue of the subterranean garage possibly losing a level. This is obviously a policy discussion that City Council is going to have to consider as they evaluate the project. The project that's before you with all of its level of the subterranean garage has been evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report. A lesser project or less impactful project could certainly be evaluated – is contemplated in the analysis of the impacts that are presented. They won't be any worse if the impacts – if the one level of subterranean parking is removed but...

Chair Furth: The alternative in the draft EIR is one off the top and one off the bottom, right?

Mr. Lait: Well, even if you don't take one off the top, the analysis, if a determination is made to remove one level of the subterranean garage, the impacts would not be any worse than have already been analyzed in the document. At the end of the day, it's going to be a decision for Council to decide (inaudible) (crosstalk)

Chair Furth: Thank you and they are thinking about this on Monday? Next Monday is that right? When is this going to Council?

Mr. Lait: There's a – I think there is an upcoming discussion.

Chair Furth: So, Council on Monday, thank you. Questions from my colleagues? Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Yes, I have three questions, please. Perhaps the first one is for the Public Work Department. The solar panels on the roof of the garage are definitely a part of this project or is this a possible potential future thing?

Ms. Raschke: It's definitely part of this and the base bid we plan to include the structure for the PV panels. We're still analyzing options for how the actual panels will be funded. If they will be privately owned or publicly owned and how that power generated will be used.

Vice Chair Baltay: The panels are fully intended to be part of this structure?

Ms. Raschke: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Ms. Cusenbery: I will – sorry, I will expand the answer to that and just to mention that they are also integrated with the infrastructure of the Public Safety Building providing a redundant source of power in the event of a disaster. So, they are actually seen not just – they have multiple roles.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. My second question is for the architect regarding the grand staircase coming up along Birch Street. As you're going up the stair on the right-hand side, what is the finish on that wall? I think that's the structural concrete wall.

Mr. Cusenbery: Correct, that's a structural concrete wall that we have revised so that the concrete is concealed. I'm looking for that image right now. The concrete is concealed and the surface texture is a steel trowel plaster. Sorry, I'm having a hard time finding that image, there we go. It's a smooth steel trowel plaster finish that covers all of the concrete below it and the plaster sample is on the board that we passed around.

Vice Chair Baltay: Ok and the intention is that you then get a play of light from the basket weave terracotta...

Mr. Cusenbery: That you get a play of light. It hosts the light shadows but it also adds to the brightness in that space so it would diffuse light bouncing off the translucent panel above and it bounces around in there.

Vice Chair Baltay: Then I want to – if you could clarify for me, what is the orientation of that wall?

Mr. Cusenbery: That wall is, on paper, the east side but it's actually kind of a – it's a northeast – yeah, because it's a – we're off the cardinal grid.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm looking at your site plan and it seems to show true north being more or less within 15 degrees of the orientation of that wall. Am I reading that correctly?

Mr. Cusenbery: Yeah, you're reading that correctly.

Vice Chair Baltay: So, the wall more or less is facing north?

Mr. Cusenbery: Yes.

Vice Chair Baltay: Ok, thank you. The last question was for the transportation person from Watry Consultant if we could. Is there a reason there's no access to or from the garage from Jacaranda Lane?

Ms. Wendler: Based on the review with the traffic engineer, Jacaranda is a one-way and with the other activities going on in that area, they did not believe that access from Jacaranda was going to be an appropriate connection since it mostly runs – the left turn in from Birch would be a difficult thing to accommodate in that area based on the volume. So, they determined we should not have an access in off of Jacaranda.

Vice Chair Baltay: Ok, thank you.

Mr. Cusenbery: To further elaborate on your question about the orientation. This rendering is accurate for, I believe it's 9:45 a.m. in August I believe. I forgot the month so I apologize but the idea is that there would be morning sun that comes in and that's a representative of the morning sun.

Chair Furth: Any other questions? Kyu – Alex.

Board Member Lew: It's ok. I have lots of questions so I guess maybe for Staff, the traffic report in the draft EIR had two recommendations. One was to avoid parking at the ends of the isles within the garage and the second was to add crosswalks across Jacaranda Lane. I was wondering if those are – if the – if from the Staff, I was wondering if you've – those where – should be included or does the Staff have a different response or a different way of addressing those concerns? That was I think on page 52.

Ms. French: I gave my draft EIR to...

Board Member Lew: Yeah, we can – you can circle back to me with the answer.

Ms. French: Ok, thank you.

Board Member Lew: I have other questions to if you want to – I can move on.

Ms. French: There was a moment where there were some other parking spaces that were removed. I don't know, Matt might be able to explain that.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, we took out the arcade, right. I think the arcade was taken out along Ash.

Ms. French: Right and so then there was a rejiggering of parking – oh, thank you.

Board Member Lew: It looks like in the plans those are that electric vehicle spaces.

Ms. French: So, I'm on – I now have a copy of the draft EIR or is this the – this is the parking – sorry, the...

Board Member Lew: Yeah, the traffic report is 52.

Ms. French: Traffic Impact Report page 52, it's the first bullet? No, the second bullet. I need a minute.

Board Member Lew: Ok, I have other questions. For the architect, are the different floors in the garage going to be color coded? Normally in a garage we color code it and it seems – and so the inner workings of the garage are not my major concern but it seems like things like the elevator towers are partly visible from the outside. So – I've seen a new garage at San Antonio shopping center where the color coding is part of the exterior design. It was made like a rainbow, this is a design feature that's meant to be seen from far away so there's that. Then also is the – well, why don't we – should we do it one by one maybe?

Mr. Cusenbery: Well, currently there no – we do not have a plan for color coding the floors and we definitely have not proposed any of that color coming to the exterior of the building. The thought on the building was to keep more of a limited pallet. Certainly there – we would look in greater detail and design development for wayfinding. Certainly, the signage program would allow us such an opportunity to provide a more discreet color coding so people can get oriented and find their cars but not necessarily become a major architectural element.

Board Member Lew: Ok, thank you. On lighting, I have two questions – three questions, one is you're proposing new street pole lights along Sherman.

Mr. Cusenbery: Correct.

Board Member Lew: They are different than the existing street poles which are tall cobra head light fixtures.

Mr. Cusenbery: Correct.

Board Member Lew: I was wondering if you could explain the selection there.

Mr. Cusenbery: The selection is based – I'm going to try to go to that night view right now, is to reinforce the pedestrian environment and bring the canopy of lights to a lower level. So, that the single-story component of the garage and the pedestrian realm and the canopy of the trees is reinforced not to over light that area. Then the – those are supplemented with a more subtle light on the surface of the

building. There we go, it should be up here momentarily I hope, well maybe not. Anyway, that – yes, the intent is to bring it down for the reasons of pedestrian's experience.

Board Member Lew: Ok and then there's an existing cobra head light in the parking which works to...

Mr. Cusenbery: (inaudible)

Board Member Lew: Ah, ok, good – to illuminate the alley and in the current lighting plans there's nothing shown in the alley. I was wondering if that's a conscious decision or is there something else proposed for the alley?

Mr. Cusenbery: That's a very good question and I don't have an answer to that.

Board Member Lew: Great and then my last question about lighting is there's one sconce shown in the – near Antonio's Nut House in the bicycle parking area.

Mr. Cusenbery: Correct.

Board Member Lew: I was wondering why is there only one? What is it doing and...

Mr. Cusenbery: I think if there's only one that's probably an oversight on our part. There should be more than one. The idea is that bicycle parking area should be illuminated as a continuous area and it's also a pathway that leads you to the Paseo that's mid-block. It doesn't go all the way because of structural interference but it goes most of the way there so I would qualify that as an oversight and there definitely should be more than one downlight in that area.

Board Member Lew: I think my last question – my last question is about the stairs that serve the lower levels of the garage.

Mr. Cusenbery: Yes.

Board Member Lew: So, I don't know the code – how the code works with this but can they be open staircases or do they really have to be enclosed for smoke protection?

Mr. Cusenbery: Do you want to address that? I'll have Michelle answer that.

Ms. Wendler: The stairs need to be fire rated on the inside of the basement levels and as we come up into the ground level, we've been able to keep that open since that level is open air but as you go down, there is a wall...

Board Member Lew: There's a door.

Ms. Wendler: ... in the basement levels, yeah.

Board Member Lew: It's not unlike maybe outdoor ones here in City Hall?

Ms. Wendler: Exactly, it's exactly like that.

Board Member Lew: Ok so I think – I will comment maybe on that later but thank you for the answer. Amy, did you have any follow-ups on the crosswalks (crosstalk)(inaudible).

Ms. French: Yes, I was able to read that section and it does talk about the provision of signage and/or warning systems to be installed at the entry/exit point to make sure that pedestrians will not be endangered by cars coming and going. There are no details about that but certainly, that is something

that we would look at, at a Staff level to make sure – with transportation and planning to make sure they are the minimum size needed to get the job done and be effective.

Board Member Lew: I think the warnings were for Sherman, like an audible warning or – then I think there's also one for crosswalks at Jacaranda. Anyway, these aren't like details, it seems like we could add them as Conditions of Approval if we get far today. That's all the questions that I have at the moment.

Chair Furth: Robert, any questions?

Board Member Gooyer: No.

Chair Furth: Yes, Osma.

Board Member Thompson: I tried looking for it but I kind of wanted some more information on rainwater management and harvest. If there's rainwater harvesting in the project?

Mr. Cusenbery: I'll bring Zoey Astrachan our landscape architect to answer that question.

Ms. Zoey Astrachan: Good morning. Currently, the planters along Sherman are treating all of the roof water so there'll be a network of roof water liters that let out into those individual planters and then spread it lengthwise of the planters and treat that water. So, that planting will have to be at least 30-inches deep, therefore the height of the planters and then the plant species will be selected accordingly. Is there any other questions?

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Ms. Astrachan: Is there any other questions?

Board Member Thompson: Nope, that's my only question about that but I do have two more questions. I read something about public art and that it might be – I was wondering though the statues of the public art. If it's getting moved somewhere? If there's some more information on its home in this project?

Ms. Raschke: Yes. Matt Raschke, Public Works, the Community Services Department was unable to draft or come to an agreement with the Paul Knox studios who was the selected artist from the selection panel. They – because we were so far along, they basically have kind of passed on bringing in an artist for this project. They currently are in the process of selecting artists for the – in the Public Safety Building and once that artist is on board, they are going to look at supplemental opportunities for art on this structure. The runner-up in the garage artist selection panel was subsequently selected as the artist for the downtown garage on Lot D up on Hamilton and Waverly. They didn't want to bring in the runner-up for this project and have them working on two garages in town.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you. Then my last question is if there's any – in more recent parking garages – maybe this is a question for the parking consultant, is stall availability indicators and parking space availability systems.

Ms. Wendler: Hi, yes, parking guidance systems are included in the project as part of an overall City objective so they will be included in this project; as well as being incorporated into other projects.

Board Member Thompson: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Excuse me, while you're still there or almost, so I always consider the pinnacle of this the Portland Airport garage which tells me exactly what's going on before I get there. How will this work? There will be an external availability and then internal guides and green and red lights? What's it going to be?

Ms. Wendler: Yes, we haven't heard the exact selection from transportation about the exact system because we're trying to match what's going to be installed in the rest of the town. The idea is that there are signs at the entry and then signs as you go up so you know. In this case, because of the circulation pattern, you pretty much drive by each space as you go up the building because there are only two parking bays on the ramp. There will be an indicator at the ground whether there are parking spaces on level two, three, four, to help you adjust to where you need to go for the parking; especially if it's full so you don't go in.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Any other questions before we start with comments? I'd like to begin with comments on the draft EIR, anybody have some? Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Sure, I'll address my comments here just on the EIR report as it is directed towards both the buildings. I find that there are two items that potentially need a little more addressing as far as the potential mitigation and one is on the tree removal. The report does mention that there's a eleven heritages and protected trees being removed but it—as I read it, it just seems to say that the City ordinance says they will be replaced and that's sufficient mitigation. I think that the report should go into a bit more detail about why that's the case. On any private development, you wouldn't be allowed to move those trees so just saying that following the code I think is not adequate. It's a significant amount of trees being removed and I think we should address it in more detail. The second thing and I suspect there will be others on the Board supporting this is that when you do this much groundwater pumping to build two-stories underground because it's below the water table, it's bound to have an effect on the environment and I don't see any mention of that in the report. So, again, some impact or some effect – some discussion about how we're going to mitigate the impact of the groundwater pumping should be included in the report. Lastly, I have a comment and I can support it with a dozen or so quotations here but when I'm looking at Chapter Four which is regarding the aesthetic impact on the building. It seems to me that it doesn't really mention the fact that the Board was not terribly pleased with the design of the Public Safety Building and by saying that essentially the aesthetic impact will be mitigated because the Board will approve the design isn't really sufficient. So, if I could just start throwing out a bunch of sections perhaps that should be addressed. On Page 4.6, I have one, two, three – the fourth paragraph down, there's a quote – there's a line that says the secondary two-way ramp will be located on Birch Street etc. It's regarding where the police cars come out onto the street. If I remember right, the Board had quite a bit of concern about that particular ramp and to leave it in the report as a given, I think is not correct. The next – first paragraph on Page 4.7 says the monopole will visually relate to the pattern of verticals in the PSB's exterior design and mounting on the building to improve its overall visual integration. I don't think that was the Board's statement on that and I think that shouldn't be in the EIR in that way. Three paragraphs down it say the PSB etc. carefully focusing on appropriate site planning and following that it references three concepts that the ARB is going to choose between. I think we were quite clear that none of those were adequate concepts. Rather than waste everybody's time going through it, as I go through this section there just seems to be repeated references to a design that we didn't really think was going in the right direction. We should be more careful to be factual and maybe get more references to the design that's going to be built as we go through this. I'm curious to hear what everybody else thinks but as I look at the report, just Chapter Four there seems to be missing the mark a little bit. Thank you.

Chair Furth: Any other comments?

Board Member Gooyer: No but I did want to indicate that I agree. It seemed like we weren't really happy with the design and it – based on what's written here, we basically were and you are just going to do some fine tuning to get it to work. I have to agree with pretty much every point that was mentioned.

Chair Furth: Alex?

Board Member Lew: On – I guess I have two comments, one is on – in the traffic – well, I have an overall comment. One is I think it was the draft EIR was done really well; like with all of the explanations in there were done really well compared to other EIRs that I've looked at recently. I mean they explain

things like relatively new things like vehicle miles traveled and I think that was done really well. The – I did see that there's something out of date in the transportation impacts section on bike shares. I think that's all changed since last November, that the Council shifted directions so that's out of date. On the aesthetic mitigations, my recollection is that in the past, say like on a big – on big projects like the Stanford Hospital. That we just said that the ARB process was the mitigation, that once you get through the process, then that is it. So, when the report itself doesn't necessarily have to spell out exactly what the ARB is going to decide and so maybe we can sort of separate it out a little bit. That's all that I have on this one.

Chair Furth: Thank you. My comment on the EIR – draft EIR, first I agree with the serious problem with the aesthetics. It has a lot of judgments about the design which sort of preempted anybody else's analysis and I don't know what the CEQA solution is but it certainly contradicts the opinions expressed by the body charged with advising the City on design. That needs to be reworked in some way because the statements it makes about the careful thinking of mass and whatnot – careful site plans I don't believe are true. I mean they may have done a great deal of thinking but the result is not acceptable as it presently is there. The other thing is this would be an opportunity to update the description of the parking structure which has changed in many, I would say good ways since this document was prepared. I also think that the discussion of groundwater management is inadequate. I had a question which doesn't need to be answered now and it may be answered somewhere in the document but there is a test for whether there's too much shading from a new project. The shading has to do with the light on spaces other than streets between 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. during – from September 21 to March 21st, from equinox to equinox. I'm just curious as to the source of the test and I'm also curious as to why we're excluding streets? If this is a Citywide standard, I think there's a problem. California Avenue, University Avenue, and I'm sure other streets function as important public spaces. I mean their – this is a horrible inversion but they are the equivalent of malls. I mean these are outdoor integrated across the street neighborhoods, it's what we cherish, and the availability of some public light is what makes them places that are attractive to pedestrians. This is one of our two most pedestrian-oriented, pedestrian-focused areas so I'm concerned both about the test and curious as to where it comes from. I'm also concerned about the tree mitigation, it's – we're removing trees we wouldn't ordinarily allow to be removed. I think they are mostly – are a number of them oaks because they are protected trees, right? I want to know where they are going to be mitigated, I think it needs to be close, not something planted far, far away. Basically, are we going to have a net increase in the canopy, I think so but we need a better discussion of that. In terms of construction noise, I was wondering if those hours are adequate for the neighborhood but then I recalled that the farmers market is Sunday but again, this is an important commercial neighborhood. It's busy on Saturday, do we think that's ok? My biggest noise concern is on Impact 13-3, operational noise, I think I read both this and the Conditions of Approval to say that 78.2 decibels are acceptable for the operation of this facility and that doesn't seem right and shouldn't be right if it is. I just would note also in the project itself, on Page 21, there are no – in the Staff report, there are no urban forestry conditions when I was trying to track this through. So, I think it would be good to revise the project description to reflect the improvements in this particular part of the project and then address the other issues raised by Board Members. Is that it for the draft EIR? Let's get on to the more fun part, comments on the garage itself, please. Who would like to start? Osma.

Board Member Thompson: Just kind of coming into this for the first time. It's true, the first thing that I noticed was this beautiful render of the shadow of the trellis on that wall and then occurred to me that because of the orientation of the building, it was very questionable. It didn't seem right so even if it was 9 a.m. in August, that might be the only time when that actually happens. It might be nice to integrate that more in the South and West facades where the public can actually enjoy that effect that you're going for. Another thing I noticed was there are, inevitably in many parking structures, there is a large swath of sheer walls that are these grand open spaces and actually, that's kind of where the public art ideas sort of came to my mind. I was like oh, these could be really nice public art opportunities that could actually enliven the structure. So, I don't know if that was considered but it might actually make these large expansive of blank be really culturally appropriate to Palo Alto and give the residents more ownership of the space. Another thing – actually, maybe this should have been a question but in analyzing the floor plan, I noticed that with the accessible stalls there isn't a real clear path of travel for the accessible cars

to get to the street. Typically, there's sort of a hatched isle that shows the path of travel and that's absent in your floor plan right now so unless you want to point that out, I couldn't see it.

Mr. Cusenbery: There's direct access to the street. There's actually breaks in the planting seat wall that provides direct access to the street.

Board Member Thompson: Ok, great, thank you so much.

Mr. Cusenbery: Yeah so you don't actually have to circulate through the garage.

Board Member Thompson: Ok because I was like oh no, where is everyone going?

Mr. Cusenbery: I wanted to briefly just step back to the public art just to add a couple of layers from the history of this. Originally the large wall that's facing Birch, we had proposed that that be a full height public art site and that was the original intent and that was one of the sites that were given to the public artist. Obviously, they would finally choose but we put that as a preferred site in part because there's – its visibility from across the street would be profound too. When the public art component fell through, that was no longer an option and there is a remaining sheer wall on Sherman. One of the things – we had actually proposed public art – extensive public art on the Sherman Street side but one of the factors to consider in that location is there is a public art installation on the Visa building right across the street. Some of the comments we received on some of our initial – because we actually had a long art location on Sherman, was that you're going to have two public art locations shouting at each other across Sherman. So, as we – and to the extent that we are able to bring in public art in subsequent roles, we would probably stir it towards the Birch Street side based on some of those comments. We, in principle, agree with what you're saying, absolutely.

Board Member Thompson: Yeah and potentially if you guys decide to reconfigure to do the light and shadow thing on the other sides, that potentially could work with that. I think otherwise, the basket weave is aesthetically – it's a good choice. That's all my comments for now.

Ms. French: Could I mention something in response to the path of travel? If you look at the site plan, ARB O-2.01 it's ten pages into the set, you can see that there are pedestrian paths of travel that go from the ADA accessible pathways to Sherman. There's four of those, there's a fifth one that is not indicated to have that feature so we'll take a look at that but at least the pedestrians who are parking in those spaces have a path to Sherman sidewalk.

Board Member Thompson: I actually didn't notice that break before so that's helpful, thank you.

Chair Furth: Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: Thank you. Yes, overall, I find the building to be handsome and very supportable. In fact, I'd like to comment that I hope you can apply some of this same thinking you've done here regarding neighborhood scale and granularity and pedestrian friendliness to the PS Building. I think that was missing on that structure and it's wonderful to hear the way – just your thought process in describing the building and the enthusiasm behind it is 180 degrees different than what we heard last time. I find it appealing and I think the building is going to look wonderful. I find especially removing the arcade was a good move and I think the grand staircase was a wonderful idea. It will just make it so much more accessible going in and out and it will be friendly and then the offsetting of the walls by the Nut House is a very clever way to do it. I'd like to suggest two things I think the Board might be able to ask you to improve on. So, one of them has – is regarding the staircase again, while the idea of a play of light on that wall is fine, I don't think that's going to happen. Your orientation doesn't let that be the case and it seems to me there might be some way you could treat that large concrete wall more than just a smooth textured plaster. That's a very tall wall with just a plain finish that would at best just have sort of a row of handprints on it where people touch it. There must be some way we could just liven that up and make it better and somehow perhaps relating to the idea of this play of light or what would the shadows

be like, something like that. Secondly, the same – I wonder if you could come back to the perspective showing that staircase from across Birch Street. No, not that one. I'm concerned the basket weave patterns, as they follow along the stair – right there. They seem to sort of have an arbitrary stepping up at the end of the staircase and I'm wondering if you couldn't just improve that just a little bit more. It's a refinement, it's a small detail but...

Mr. Cusenbery: Noted.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...the way it is isn't quite right. It goes without saying that the way you build that terracotta slats is critical, you don't want them to be so frail that they break.

Mr. Cusenbery: No.

Vice Chair Baltay: These buildings receive really no maintenance and terracotta is a brittle material but they look great. My other comment has to do with this circulation in the garage and I just don't see why you couldn't put a secondary entrance or exit off of Jacaranda Lane, back – at the opposite corner from where you drive in and out. It seems to me at the expense of one parking stall, maybe two, you could substantially improve the circulation through it. We did comment on this at the last meeting, that having just one entrance to a 600-car garage. I understand that the transportation guy says it's going to work but in my experience in life, it just takes one person getting confused about direction whether they're coming or going, something like that and that really clogs things up. Almost all the other garages in town that I'm aware of have two at least entrances and exits and it just seems like it's an easy thing to do.

Mr. Cusenbery: Well and if I could just respond in brief?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'd rather just go through the Chair.

Mr. Cusenbery: Ok, I'm sorry, I apologize.

Vice Chair Baltay: So, those are comments. I can support the project, I'd like to see us make those two small shifts. Thank you.

Mr. Cusenbery: Thank you.

Chair Furth: Alex.

Board Member Lew: Great, thank you. I am also generally supportive of the project. I agree with Peter generally about having a second entry/exit and even if we don't do it today or initially, it seems to me that we should – it should be future approved. So, that at the very least you have a clear span and you don't have columns coming all the way down to the ground so that we could open it up at a future time if it's needed. Things change over the life of the City and if we imagine this is going to be here for 100-years, some things can change and it seems to me that we should have that option. On – I also agree with Peter on the stair wall, I think it's looking good. I do – I think the plaster is better than having concrete and then again, I just worry about graffiti and dirt and repainting it and what not. I think I also agree with Osma's comment on the sheer wall; at least on the one on Sherman. What I've seen on some other – on older garages is that they'll do little openings, like a fortress opening, like a castle opening and I was wondering if that is – if something like that is possible. I'd also say that I was looking at several other public garages and they have more stuff and I'm saying like tile base, awnings, little-punched openings and whatever. In a lot of garages its just – it can look – it can add a lot of clutter and it seems counter to what you're proposing to do today but in a way, it does add pedestrian amenities. It seems to me in this particular case, since you have the planters along Sherman, that may be enough but I haven't – we don't have the landscaping plans so I couldn't tell you for sure today and we do have a finding about that, a landscape finding. On the stairs that go down to the garage – to the lower levels of the garage, I think my recommendation is if you can do it, is to have them more open at the ground level. I mean to me going into some little dark staircase is just – it's not desirable so in any way you can have it

more open and more open to the sidewalk, it will feel safer and it will seem – it will appear lighter and more open and more welcoming. I think we should address the recommendations in the traffic report about the parking at the isles and the crosswalks and the audible warning or some sort of warnings at the driveway entrance and exits. We don't have any landscape plans and we do have findings for that so I think that has to come back to the Board in some way. Then on the lighting, I think we do need to have something along Jacaranda Lane. I'm generally in support of the massing, I think you've done a great job on the material selection with the terracotta and the board formed concrete. I guess I would – on some of the materials like say you're proposing like a cement board – like a Swiss Pearl.

Mr. Cusenbery: A Swiss Pearl, exactly.

Board Member Lew: Some of these things I – in the back of mind, I was wondering – been wondering, are you proposing an integral color and then what happens over time? Are we – would we paint it and I guess I would say the same thing with the board formed concrete. You know if there is graffiti coding? Are we just going to let it be and paint over it as needed?

Mr. Cusenbery: In the context that we have it set up, the board formed concrete is more vulnerable than the Swiss Pearl. The Swiss Pearl is pretty much inaccessible, the outer surfaces are.

Board Member Lew: You know you see like highway overpasses...

Mr. Cusenbery: Yeah, I know.

Board Member Lew: ...and somehow some people...

Mr. Cusenbery: If you're motivated there's a way.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, if there's a will there's a way and we do have graffiti in town. Usually, it gets cleaned up immediately but it does happen. So anyway, I don't know if we need to go into nitty gritty details about that but I do have concerns about that because I think it's going to happen someday. I did want to agree with the previous comments about the tree mitigation and it seems we're – for City projects, we want to lead by example and we're removing all the trees. We don't really know what the mitigation – where they're being replaced so it doesn't seem to me like we're doing a great job on that.

Chair Furth: Robert.

Board Member Gooyer: I have to go along with the other Members that I think it's a big improvement over what we've seen. I guess I also have – the only area of concern or at least I think it's worth commenting is that whole idea of the grand stairway and that the adjacent wall. I agree based on the orientation that I don't know if you're going to get the play of light that you're looking for and to me, it's almost – it's going the wrong way; in that, a building like this is very large and bulky, to begin with. Then what you're doing basically is you've got what looks to be an 8-foot or so stairway coming out and then you're creating a trellis in front of it which adds to the overall bulk of the building. I guess part of that is also to give more character to the wall behind it. I would almost be tempted to – I'd like to see the trellis go away and actually make more interest in the actual stair itself. The stair right at the moment is sort of – blends into the wall adjacent to it. If the stair became the terracotta element for instances, that climbs up the wall, then you're basically bisecting that large wall and a lot of the concern about this massive wall goes away. It also then allows you to cut the roof back somewhat and the overall bulk of the building, on that side, gets reduced greatly and really, you're not changing the function because – I understand the overhang or the canopy but if you're doing it for rain, a canopy that's 40-feet up in the air isn't really going to keep rain off your head all that drastically. I don't know if that's the intent of it but I think what it will do is – like I said in this case, there's nothing really spectacular about the look of the stair as it relates to the rest of the building. It's not an accent point, it's not, you know like I said, the reddish terracotta stair right there so you could actually point it out. I think you're missing something and also adding to the bulk because of it. I agree with the tree removal or that sort of thing, especially setting a

bad example and overall, this wouldn't be a breaker for me but I'd love to see a little bit more effort considering people are calling it the grand stair and all this. To me there's nothing grand about this stair, you're basically putting a trellis in front of it than hiding it so to me that gets away from the concept of a grand stair. I pretty much agree with most of the other Members, I think I'll leave it at that.

Chair Furth: Thank you and thank you for this revised plan. There is so much about it that I really like and I think that it's clear from the public comment that you've addressed concerns of the neighborhood and the merchants and the people who frequent it and of the Board. You know somebody at some point today said it wasn't a destination but of course it is, this is the Union Station of that part of town. This is where those people who use cars, and that's a lot of people, enter the neighborhood and so I think we're going for a similar kind of experience. You know in the 60's peninsula towns put a ballot measure on and adopted them, banning parking structures because they were seen as a symbol – an emblem of overcrowding and urban danger and just generally bad things. I think with a lot of effort we've managed to transform that experience in many parts of town and I hope this continues that project. I like the fact very much that – this is an odd thing to say about a huge parking garage but that it kind of flies its sustainability flag. I like the rain gardens, I like the highly visible photovoltaics, those are all good things. I like the fact that we're going to have intelligent wayfinding, I also feel kind of deprived when we don't have it. I'm concerned about how safe it's going to feel to be in the subterranean levels but I don't really know how you address that. If that is going to be employee parking, it's going to present an interesting issue for employees getting their cars late at night. One of the things that I really like is the way that I think it now looks like a building that's supposed to be in the California Avenue, both commercial and to the South. What do we call that? District, that it integrates both with the office and residential buildings and with Cal. Ave itself, I think that's great. With respect to the sheer wall on – well, we do need a landscape plan, I think before we can approve this. With respect, for example, to the sheer wall on Sherman, whether it works and how it works is going to depend a lot about what's planted there and what kind of tree shadows we get. I don't think there's much that's lovelier than the pattern of light and shade from a tree on a wall but I don't know what we're going to have there and how it's going to look. I'm not – I like your overall design so I'm not particularly interested in additional detailing at this point but I'm open to the thoughts of my colleagues on this and a view. It is a problem that that lovely light that we see on the grand staircase is a rare phenomenon and I think that means that needs further thought. I don't know if you provide a painted version of that or you do something different. It certainly is true that there are lots of things one can do with a staircase, what I like about what you have is that this is a huge building. It's – and the scale of the element is good, it's big so I'm open to further thoughts about that but it's close. I actually do like the idea of a light diffusing screen up above on both sunny and dark days. I do notice that the Staff conditions are not complete and we don't have a full set of plans. When I look at what seems to be the critical path here, I know it's a while before we can take this to Council and I would be inclined to ask this to come back one more time but what are my colleague's thoughts? Does somebody want to make a motion or just chat?

Vice Chair Baltay: I have a question about the process if I could? The reason we're pushing to get this approved now is so they can get into a more of a construction drawing phase and get a jump on constructing this or is it just to sort of get one more thing out of the way?

Mr. Raschke: Correct, we want to actually break ground on this in October. So yeah, we want to fast-track construction documents and get them out to bid because the escalation that we're still seeing in the market is extreme. So, every month this -- that the Public Safety Building is delayed with what the cost estimates that we're seeing right now, it's probably \$100,000 to \$200,000 a month that we're escalating the project as it drags on.

Vice Chair Baltay: So, addressing my colleagues then, I understand the Public Safety Building will be coming back to us sometime in March and I'd say there's a chance we're going to continue that to another hearing. If we tie this building to that, they're not going to start in October and so, in reality, we're cost quite a bit more by delaying it. I think the comments I've heard are all things that could be addressed...

Board Member Gooyer: Well, the other way to look at it is – I mean we all take chances. You could start construction documents basically with the way this Board feels about the existing project and get 85% of those done and some minor modifications that you leave purposely vague like the stair or whatever; the wall; something like that. You could do a whole lot of construction and that isn't going to waster 3-months' worth of time while it's just sitting there so I think we should bring it back because there are some modifications. I'm not happy with like I said that one thing, I guess I feel a little bit stronger about it than the rest of the Board so that's fine but I think there needs to be some redesign on that grand stairway. I don't think that alone is going to like I said, will allow you to do 85% to 90% of the construction documents, even if that's vague at the moment. I don't – I wouldn't think – I'd also – because this is a public building, I don't want to get hung up in that hey, come on, we're in a hurry. You guys have to approve it now because we're on a time schedule.

Board Member Lew: I have a follow up for Staff on Robert's point. How does this work? The Council needs to authorize the next phase typically like on the bicycle bridge they authorized design development up to whatever, 65% of DD. Is that going -- is that the same process for the garage? I mean the Council needs to approve...

Board Member Gooyer: What you're saying is can they start construction documents...

Chair Furth: What do you need in order to start construction documents?

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Board Member Lew: You need some Council approval I would imagine. Yes.

Chair Furth: Yes, thank you.

Board Member Lew: Welcome.

Mr. Brad Eggleston, Assistant Director of Public Works: Good morning, I'm Brad Eggleston, the Assistant Director of Public Works, these projects are structured a little bit differently than the bike bridge was. I think what you're recalling with that project is that we had to actually take a contract amendment to the Council to authorize the next phase of design. With these projects we have the full design authorized in the current design contract – right so there is – as we've said – as Matt and Mallory have said, we're really wanting to forge ahead with a design with an eye to that October breaking ground date. There is a checkpoint with the Council where we would ask them to authorize the EIR and approve the Record of Land Use for the project. I'm not sure what that would mean in terms of at any point that we would pause with the construction documents process before getting to Council.

Chair Furth: With respect, I don't think we've been dragging the project here. The public comment period on the draft EIR doesn't even end till February 22nd. I think the consensus here is that we think it's a good building, we think it needs a little more work and I definitely think we need some more careful looking at the conditions which I do not think are not ready to go. I'm concerned that this is a very big project and I don't want to miss something because we're trying to amend conditions or add conditions on the fly. So, what would you suggest as a procedure? You, you're good at this.

Mr. Lait: Well, so I think that just taking a step back, I think the Board has had this sort of informal interest in wanting to move City projects forward at two meetings. This is your second meeting and I've heard a number of comments, a lot of it is positive though maybe perhaps not unanimously positive about the project. The things that I have heard I think could easily be addressed here after this point without subcommittee and then some points with the subcommittee. The grand stair and I understand that there's maybe some objection to the term but that stairway is not going to move. There are treatments and elements that may be modified to enhance the lighting effect that the Board has talked about. I think that's something that can be addressed in subcommittee. I think that wall – the large plaster wall is something that may benefit from a little bit more discussion today and if we can give some

clear direction to it for subcommittee members to explore that, that could be helpful. The landscaping, we don't try to – landscaping is an element of the design. We don't want to hide the building with landscaping – landscaping shouldn't be the reason why a building gets approved or doesn't get approved. It's supposed to enhance and improve the design but it's not the reason why. I mean I think that's something that we can come back in subcommittee or even later to the Board and have a discussion about landscaping. I think there's – and as far as the conditions go, I think we're probably 98% there and the reason we added that in the Staff report is because I think we're fine-tuning a few things related to the environmental analysis; which is frankly going to change even if you continue this over time as we get closer to the City Council. I think all things considered, from a Staff perspective, we are very mindful of the cost not only to other applicants that have to go through the process. We want to streamline and be efficient in our review but the City also has an expense that it's accruing and that has potentially broader implications from other – as we spend more money to building the parking structure. There are less funds available for other capital improvements that we want to advance so our interest is to move it forward.

Chair Furth: I think we all share the view that it's important to do what we can to expedite this. What I'm trying to figure out is I don't think we – well, we'll just check and see but I don't think we have – we have no landscape plans for example. How are we to make our findings in the absent of those plans?

Board Member Lew: You condition it to come back. I mean you can condition the landscape plans to come back. That's not – this is a...

Chair Furth: So, this is an approval subject to further review by the ARB?

Mr. Lait: You're approving – you would be recommending approval of the project with the condition that the landscape plans return to the Board.

Chair Furth: Ok, thank you, that was my question.

Ms. French: Could I just mention that there is a landscape concept that shows where trees are to be located, where shrubs are to be located and specify the tree species. I think the – what's missing is the smaller level plantings, the smaller plants.

Chair Furth: Colleagues, what – first of all, are you – are we generally supportive of the idea of trying to put together a motion that approves this project subject to further review by us?

Board Member Gooyer: What does that mean?

Board Member Lew: Let's just be more specific, let's – I'm willing to approve the project today with all of the items that have been previously mentioned coming back to subcommittee. I'm actually ok with the staircase, I think I disagree with Robert but I'm fine with if we want to tinker with it. I think I'm – I would be willing to have that – how do we say – consider revising the staircase but it seems to me that the grand staircase issue had – there were safety issues regarding the police station. So, I imagine that there's – that they're going to want some sort of screen wall there. Anyway, let's – I – it seems to me all of these things to me are – could be addressed in subcommittee.

Board Member Thompson: I think – oh I was going to say my major – I mean I agree mostly with the Board Members. I think regarding the stair, it's true, I did feel that it was missing some design thought. Part of it could be mitigated and in many ways, I understand there's something wrong with public art integration but that doesn't mean that the architect or the designer can't take some initiative and improve the view from the ground in some way that you kind of have a basket weave fractal skin. That couldn't somehow integrate either texturally or paint or something to improve it. As it stands right now, it's true that right now it is missing that and so it would be worth seeing again.

Board Member Gooyer: The way I see it is that we're – as you said we're almost there. I would prefer to see it come back to a date certain and that way you can determine how that fits into the schedule and limit it to just those items that we've talked about; the stair, a couple of other items and if it could be done fairly quickly and I don't think that that's going to interfere with the overall scheme of things. Like I said, the stair is going to stay where it is so from a structural standpoint or a construction document standpoint, that's not going to change. It's going to be how it's addressed and I think it's a fairly big element of that corner and I think we need to do something other than subcommittee.

Vice Chair Baltay: I agree with Robert on that.

Chair Furth: I agree too so that's three votes for that process. Let's see if we can focus down tight on what it is that we'd like to have further work on. So, I have that we need a landscaping plan, I would like further details on what the actual operational noise level that the City is willing to commit to is. The one that we have seems oddly high. What would you say – let's see, Peter I've forgotten what you're points where? There in my notes here somewhere. What else did you want to add? Oh, somebody wanted crosswalks indicated on Jacaranda, is that right?

Board Member Gooyer: That's fairly minor (inaudible).

Board Member Lew: No...

Chair Furth: Do you want any additional work on lighting?

Board Member Lew: ... it was only – actually the – I wanted the Staff to respond to the recommendations in the traffic report.

Chair Furth: So, but at the same time we could get additional completed detailing on lighting, that was a gap.

Board Member Lew: No, I think their lighting is...

Chair Furth: It's ok?

Board Member Lew: ...there but that the...

Chair Furth: There are gaps in the plan?

Board Member Lew: Well, there's no – there's nothing addressing lighting Jacaranda Lane.

Chair Furth: Right. I'm just trying to avoid further referrals to subcommittee.

Board Member Gooyer: I basically think the grand stair, the trellis and the concrete wall behind it need to be – needs some further clarifications or refinement.

Chair Furth: Well, before we talk about that, anything else I've left of this list?

Vice Chair Baltay: At least two of us asked about a secondary exit onto Jacaranda Lane (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Chair Furth: Ok, planning for a possible future exit.

Vice Chair Baltay: Or creating one right now.

Chair Furth: Exit on Jacaranda Lane. What else?

Board Member Thompson: More information on the tree removal.

Chair Furth: Yeah, landscaping plan, more tree. I will tell you if this is part of the landscaping plan, I'm going to be looking for benches that people who don't have great muscle tone can (inaudible). In other words, armrests, something that lets people lever themselves up from benches – from the seating. Anything else? Is that it? I have such illegible notes here. We're happy with the rainwater harvesting. I think we – could we get more of a – more statements of consensus on the grand staircase. Robert's presented the view that it needs significant change. What's the view of the rest of you? Alex.

Board Member Lew: I don't think I agree.

Chair Furth: Ok, do you want anything or are you good?

Board Member Lew: No, I think previously have stated my concern. It was mostly just keeping the plaster wall...

Chair Furth: So, sturdy materials?

Board Member Lew: ...clean. So, like hard trowel plaster typically shows cracks. I'm not sure if you were proposing to paint it or not. Often times the paint is used to hide the cracks and public buildings and garages usually get pretty grungy and they don't – they're not spic and span, nice and clean and so those are my general concerns about the plaster wall.

Chair Furth: Peter. Ok, sorry, Peter?

Vice Chair Baltay: I think I stated my concern, that wall absent the play of light is going to be a big blank wall that's getting dirty and so I'd rather not tell the architect how to resolve that issue but I think it needs resolution or refinement maybe.

Chair Furth: So, the issue is that accept at 8:30 in the morning it's going to be too big and too blank and too vulnerable?

Vice Chair Baltay: Yeah, it's in shade 90% of the day, 90% of the year...

Chair Furth: Ok, I think that's probably pretty clear.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...and then I also felt that the detailing of the basket weave terracotta below the stair needed further thought. I think the architect would agree that it needs further thought and just giving them some space to do that. Those are my two issues on the staircase.

Chair Furth: Anything else?

Board Member Thompson: I think I would agree with Peter and Robert on that, that yeah, it's kind of – it could need more thought. It's true that it won't look like that and so it would be good to just know more about the design intent. It's a nice effect so it would be nice to see if it could be incorporated somewhere where it could happen and also just more thought on the big blank walls as well. That's sort of my things.

Chair Furth: Thanks, so I'm not in favor of relocating the lattice particularly. I think this approach but I do understand that it's not going to work as shown and that we need to figure out or the architect needs to tell us how to address that. I've got landscaping, more good information about how the tree loss is going to be really well mitigated, assurances that the operational noise is going to be at some level that's attractive to people in the neighborhood walking by, perhaps some corrections of omissions on the lighting plan and a plan for lighting on Jacaranda Lane, either an exit or a plan for a possible future exit on Jacaranda Lane, and some -- what's the word? Refinements – some further thinking on how to make

the grand staircase wall study and as interesting as it appears in this elevation. Would somebody like to make a motion to – oh, is there a date that this could come back to us?

Mr. Lait: Yeah, we'll look at a date but can I offer...

Chair Furth: Sure.

Mr. Lait: ... just another Staff perspective based on the motion and I don't want to be argumentative about this but I just want to be clear about what the motion is and what we're doing. As I hear the comments that we're being asked to come back, there is the landscape plan which this Board has routinely conditioned as a condition for return. I don't see a problem with the landscape plan not being fully developed at this point. There's the operational noise level issue that's been addressed, you know we don't believe that this is going to operate any differently than any other parking structure that we have in the City but moreover, that's an environmental point. We've heard the comment, it's going to be addressed in the Environmental Impact Report and if there's additional mitigation that are required, we would address that. The tree removal, the trees are going to be removed and I understand that there's concern about the mitigation about how that might be addressed. That too is an EIR point, we've heard the comment, we're going to study it, we'll respond to it in the final Environmental Impact Report. I don't know why the project would have to be continued on that point alone. I heard a comment about the rainwater harvesting, that's a technical detail that we can be – that can be worked out. It sounds like the plan has – the applicant has a plan for addressing that. Lighting plan on Jacaranda Lane, again a detail that the Board consistently has moved to a subcommittee to discuss lighting. That seems like a very discreet element related to one aspect of the project. There was a comment about the exit on Jacaranda Lane. Staff believes that this is infeasible for the project design due to the interior ramping of the project so we don't feel like we're going to be able to come back with any changes to that feature. The – there was a detailing about the basket weave and the terracotta. This is – we've heard some comments about that and I think this is a detail that was expressed as something that could be easily addressed. It sounds like the architect has an idea about how to address that and the final component has to do with the refinement of the staircase where we've heard ranging views from I don't like it to it's good, how's the plaster going to work? I think that's the one area that we could probably benefit from some further Board discussion and if the Board can't come to a perspective of how to address that, then I don't know what continuing that is going to do. If there are some specific comments that can be given to the applicant so that we can come back to a subcommittee to address that wall, then I think we should do that. Of all the comments or the reason that I've heard for continuing this item and coming back, I don't think anyone of them rises to that level of a need to return to the Board. So, I just want to offer that in the interest of all the things that have been said before.

Chair Furth: Thank you. One of the things that are perplexing me is that the issues that you've described as environmental carry over to the Conditions of approval of the project.

Mr. Lait: We acknowledge that. If there are any mitigations that need to be incorporated, those will necessarily be a part of our Conditions of Approval. I mean I view this more as an administrative component for us to address in how we frame and address the conditions. In fact, we noted in the Staff report that even if the board were to approve it today or continue it, we still may be modifying some of these Conditions of Approval as the project moves forward to the City Council.

Board Member Lew: Well, and Planning Commission too. Right?

Mr. Lait: Planning Commission is going to be looking at the Environmental Impact Report but also the texted amendment that is associated with the project but they're not going to be looking at the details of the project.

Chair Furth: Thank you. So, you're asking us – so, explain to me what 78.2 decibels sounds like?

Ms. Gerhardt: I just want to be clear and I can grab the page, I don't have it in front of me but...

Chair Furth: It's Page 14.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yesterday when we were discussing this, the operational numbers are closer to 52 so we'll grab the page and find that answer for you.

Chair Furth: Great because as it stands, we're supposed to be approving noise up to that level which I wouldn't be able to do. I wouldn't summarize our concerns quite the way that Staff has but I understand their view. We could satisfy the operational noise problem by changing that condition to something more suitable. We still don't have any transportation conditions and we still don't have any – that's on Page 15 and we still don't have any Public Works Urban Forestry Conditions on Page 21.

Ms. French: Can I clarify something there?

Chair Furth: Sure.

Ms. French: The transportation Staff member has been intimately involved with the redesigns that have been coming through and they have no conditions at this point. We do – we can add a condition about that – come back and let's see the signs for the – the signage that's going to be coming forward related to the safety at the entrance.

Chair Furth: I'll see if anybody wants that, thank you. So, we'll just put none rather than to be determined.

Ms. French: Sure, we were – I was hoping I would get something this week but then the other was the Urban Forestry Mitigation Measure 6.2 I think it is, does have some specificity as to what the Urban Forestry folks want back. Dave Doctor retired, we don't have any conditions from Urban Forestry at this time. We do have a mitigation measure that's fairly specific.

Chair Furth: Thank you. Out of our list of five items, we could change that operational noise condition down to a lower level?

Ms. Gerhardt: If you'd like we...

Mr. Ray Pendro: Hello.

Ms. Gerhardt: ... do have the environmental consultant here.

Mr. Pendro: Yes, my name is Ray Pendro from MIG. We've worked on the EIR with City Staff.

Chair Furth: Thank you.

Mr. Pendro: The operational noise standards are based on the City Municipal Code and the number you're quoting is the sound of the ventilation fan at the north end of the parking garage. I will give a very brief summary just by reading two sentences from Page 13-29 of the EIR. The paragraph in the middle to just – I hope this helps a little bit, it's of course, just the summary of a whole chapter. It says the results of the calculation indicate the parking garage would result in noise levels of 52.8 decibels at a distance of 58 – of a distance of 50-feet from the building which is approximately 10 decibels lower than the existing noise on that street which is approximately 63 decibels. The operation of the parking garage at 50-feet from the fan, the exhaust fans for the basement would actually be 10 decibels less than the decibel level of the street traffic driving by the garage.

Chair Furth: This is good. Remind me where they are?

Mr. Pendro: Page 13-2...

Chair Furth: No, I'm no Page 13, where they are in the building?

Mr. Pendro: Oh, they are on the north edge of the parking garage near Jacaranda Lane.

Chair Furth: Near Jacaranda and what level vertically?

Mr. Pendro: I don't have the design of that but it's for the garages so it would be near the alley.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Pendro: It's for the basement level.

Chair Furth: Right and so where does it exhaust?

Mr. Pendro: Well, the fan – I'm not designing a parking garage. Michelle?

Chair Furth: I'm sure somebody knows.

Board Member Lew: It's near the...

Mr. Pendro: It is in the alley behind the (crosstalk) (inaudible).

Ms. Wendler: The exhaust shafts are adjacent to the elevator towers and they go all the way to the top.

Chair Furth: Ok so this is nice to know. I did read the code and I did read the new Noise Element and then I read our Condition of Approval which was not reassuring so can we change that? Why doesn't Staff suggest some language?

Ms. French: Are you talking about Noise Mitigation 13.1 that's on Page 30.

Chair Furth: I am talking about – well there's that and then I don't know that we can't – we can't exactly rewrite the mitigation measure for a document that we're not – I figured that's what it says in the EIR but when we have our own Conditions of Approval it would be a lower noise level that we would be tolerating. Where ever you want to put it is fine with me.

Ms. French: So, add the noise condition to the planning conditions.

Chair Furth: Which essentially says that the noise level of the equipment will not exceed whatever you're willing to commit to.

Mr. Lait: Well, I think we just need to say that the project shall operate in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance. I mean that's ultimately what we're looking for and we believe that can be achieved.

Chair Furth: Not when you tell me that it's 78.2 decibels. I mean is there a problem that I'm not seeing here? I mean I know there are a lot of rhythmic scales and all that but is there any problem with committing to a slightly lower level? This is a part of the City that doesn't show up on any noise contours. This is a relatively quiet part of the City.

Mr. Lait: Ok but as I'm understanding it, you're not asking for it to operate lower than the City's noise level, right? You're asking it to be in compliance with the City's Noise Ordinance?

Chair Furth: I'm asking it to operate in a way that's consistent with people being comfortable walking around it.

Mr. Lait: But I mean the standard is the City's Noise Ordinance. I mean that should be the standard for review and so if – we're saying that the project will meet the City's Noise Ordinance.

Chair Furth: My question is, is there a lower number that we can commit to?

Mr. Lait: We can study that and get – send the Board a comment on that but it's unprecedented for us to...

Chair Furth: We don't – when we review buildings, we don't say you comply with the quantitative standards of the City and therefore you're approved. We wouldn't exist if that was one of the things that we did and I confess that part of my problem is just confusion that we would say in our ordinance that that decibel level was acceptable. It seems very high to me. I am willing to let this point go if I have no agreement from my colleagues.

Mr. Pendro: I'll just point out that I believe where the number comes from, it's Mitigation 13-3, operational noise, it's the second bullet and in combination with the information that I gave earlier, 78.2 decibels is the decibel at the location of the ventilation fans. It's Page 13-32, the second bullet so that noise level disperses over distance.

Chair Furth: If we were a private project as opposed to a public project, we'd be held to a stricter standard under our ordinance?

Mr. Lait: No, the same standard applies for both projects.

Chair Furth: Because I when I was looking at the exceptions, it appeared to say they got 15 decibels and we got more.

Vice Chair Baltay: Wynne, it seems to me...

Chair Furth: I'll let it go.

Vice Chair Baltay: ... if we just eliminated that last clause which says which is estimated to be, just strike that from the Condition of Approval, we'd all be happy with this.

Chair Furth: Alright, we'll do that. That's Page 14, it's the second full paragraph after the first – after the second bullet. That takes care of that one, that leaves the landscaping plan – oh, let's take the next – so, with respect to either building or planning for an exit on Jacaranda Lane. Staff believes that's something they would say no to, is that right? It can't be done?

Board Member Lew: From my point of view it – I was thinking it would be a second exit somewhere else. It wouldn't have to be on Jacaranda Lane. There are other – there are City garages in – off of Castro Street in Mountain View that have exits onto the alley – one-way alleys and they work. I don't think that the – it seems to me the traffic study indicates that people are coming from all directions and they would not necessarily be coming from the opposite lane on Birch making a left turn into the garage. They could easily – you could circle around the block around California, turn right on Birch and so right into the alley so it seems to me that we should have some flexibility.

Chair Furth: So, then would it – what we are asking to see is a secondary entrance or exit – and/or exit?

Board Member Lew: In my mind – well, so – I'll let Peter speak to his but my own is just that it would not necessarily have to be implemented initially.

Vice Chair Baltay: I agree with what Alex is saying. If we just ask them to eliminate that one post, then time will prove out whether the exit is necessary.

Chair Furth: So, revise the design to make possible future exit or entrance?

Vice Chair Baltay: Well, I suppose we should verify with the architect if that can be done but I've got to believe that it's possible but I really think we want to move this along and not keep negotiating these small things.

Chair Furth: If we do this discussion and get this hammered out today, it will perhaps advance the project.

Ms. Wendler: Subject to not actually being a traffic engineer but a parking designer, where you're talking about is coming down the ramp to the right of the elevator and there's a – the elevator vent shaft and there's a column and then there's a second column. For a single exit only, lane and not having an entrance, the space between the two columns would be wide enough without actually removing the column to allow for a potential future right-hand turn lane onto Jacaranda. Assuming that it would be consistent in the traffic impact analysis which I can't speak too.

Vice Chair Baltay: With all respect, the Staff already mentioned they're concerned about is being proximate to the top of the ramp and I'd prefer to see us have more latitude with a larger space so that we don't create a dangerous situation. It seems to me again that if it's possible to remove one column at the lower corner there, then we all sorts of future possibilities at really no cost.

Ms. Wendler: It's not impossible to remove a column. We can evaluate the column spacing and see how we can make that and do the turning diagrams to show how that would work.

Mr. Lait: So...

Vice Chair Baltay: If that's what it...

Mr. Lait: Sorry.

Vice Chair Baltay: ...takes to get you approved today is that a fair deal?

Ms. Wendler: I –

Mr. Lait: So, Board...

Ms. Wendler: If Staff is supportive.

Mr. Lait: Board, if I may? It sounds like – so there's interest in wanting to have an – having an additional egress, only right? Egress or ingress or egress?

Board Member Lew: Look I've seen enough – I've seen several garages in San Jose where they've had – like at Santana Row and also downtown near the Martin Luther King Library and they have – there are issues. There's – basically what happens is in this type of garage, if some space opens up close to the entrance and one car stops, it blocks all other traffic. That person could take 5-minutes to get out of the car and it's been a problem in other garages and they've had to restripe the on in San Jose – on Santana Row. So, to me, it's an issue and it seems to me it's just – I'm only arguing for flexibility for something to be changed...

Mr. Lait: I'm trying to get...

Board Member Lew: ... in the future.

Mr. Lait: I'm trying to get the Board there so as – just to be clear, you're saying ingress/ egress from Jacaranda or anywhere?

Board Member Lew: No, I'm just saying if – anywhere. It would be either egress or...

Mr. Lait: Ok so then the condition that the Board could consider is that you recommend that the City Council consider an additional ingress or egress opportunity either now or plan for a future ingress opportunity. Then in the interim, the architect and Staff could explore where those possibilities exist, present those to the City Council and the Council could say yes, we think that's a good idea. Let's either do it now or let's plan for it. At least you're teeing up that you're interested across in the recommendation to the Council, Staff is doing the work in the meantime, Council makes the decision as to what to do with it.

Vice Chair Baltay: With all respect Jonathan, that's too much detail for the Council to get into. That's why we're here, is to give them a firmer direction; it should be there or it shouldn't and I feel very uncomfortable just leaving that to Council. They generally don't – that's just too much detail for them to get into whether to have a column or not.

Mr. Lait: I'm just responding to what the Board had -- I heard a plan for it, I heard...

Chair Furth: I think we're asking that plan be made now in a revision to this plan before us.

Mr. Lait: Ok so Staff shall plan for an additional ingress or egress opportunity.

Chair Furth: I think the – the motion that I have in the back of my head is that we recommend approval subject to the following conditions. One, that the plans be revised to show a potential ingress/egress in addition to the existing one. Any other conditions that we want? I think that the landscape plan be prepared and reviewed by the Board for approval. That revised materials – revised – somebody phrased these – the grand staircase request for me.

Board Member Lew: I don't think we're in agreement on the staircase.

Chair Furth: Well, let's see, give me your point of view. Somebody gives me their point of view.

Board Member Thompson: Perhaps just further design development on the skin and the staircase.

Board Member Lew: I think we should be more – I think at this point if we're – this is already our second hearing on this, that we should be fairly specific. I think Peter has been specific that it's below the staircase.

Chair Furth: Maybe we could go backward so Robert has suggested removing the screen and taking a different approach. Does anybody else support that approach?

Board Member Lew: I do not support that.

Vice Chair Baltay: No, I don't support that, I'm sorry Robert.

Board Member Thompson: I do not support that.

Chair Furth: So, that one is off the table so we're talking about something else. Peter.

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm just still trying to get my head around. Robert made, what I thought, was a convincing argument why we should just continue this project. We were about to do that and then the Staff made an argument why we should move forward with it. I guess I want to hear if Robert is convinced by Staff's argument that we should be looking for a way to just get this out today rather than just continuing it.

Board Member Gooyer: I guess my – I mean I'm willing to just say fine, I'll vote against it. I mean that's very simple. No, I mean if we want to be realistic about this, I feel like we're being bulldozed to make a decision today and the reality of it is I don't see that if this comes back to a date certain, that it's going to modify the schedule of the project. You can keep going with the construction documents even if you change the way I want the stair or you don't do that, that's not going to change the construction documents. That's going to be the biggest time frame and all these other things that need to be done are going to happen while they are doing the construction documents and if they come back to – other than well, we can't get it done for 3-months to get the redesign done. A lot of it's going to be on the design team on how quickly they can respond. So, like I said, the easiest solution would just be – I'm unhappy with the design – why is this thing – well, I'm unhappy with the design of the stair. I think it's trying to do something and it's not very successful. Obviously, I'm in the minority on that so that's fine. These projects don't have to go five zero.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I agree, I'm having a hard time understanding why this is a critical path but whether we bring it back not having voted yes or we bring it back having voted yes with conditions, we still need to define what we want from the designer. I'm asking for a consensus – a majority consensus, not (inaudible) on what you'd like to see back from the designer – from the architect on the staircase?

Mr. Cusenbery: For the sake of for a motion on this, may I offer my interpretation of what I've heard and you can see if this sounds good?

Chair Furth: Certainly.

Mr. Cusenbery: The removal of the basket weave aside because I see that as a standalone piece, the parts that I understood which – and fully support, is the design development of two key components. One the wall behind the stair and two the experience when the sun isn't cascading in from that side of the building. It will appear like this sometimes but there are the majority of the times that it will not. So, the few components that I heard that need design development are Board Member Lew mentioned durability and cleaning and what it's like down at the level. Board Member Thompson mentioned the specularity, the light, the fact that is has during a certain time of day a beautiful specularity but then when the sun goes away it becomes flatter. Are there ways that you can do that? Board Member Baltay mentioned about well, can you simulate what the light might be doing during the times the light isn't actually there? That you actually kind of have a continuity of experience even though you don't have continuity of light. From our perspective, that would mean – that would translate to a surface development in durability and specularity of that wall. Get some design interest so that it's interesting even when the light is directly not on it. I actually have a question that I'd like to pose to the Board related to that. Is there an openness to using artificial lighting in the evenings in such a way that we're using on scrim on the Sherman side whereby there could be shadows that are recreated on the walls in the evening? That's a question for discussion but the bigger picture is, we not only, I think understand the need to design develop that portion further but are enthusiastic about it. I think there are all sorts of great things that we can do that are relatively simple, just need more development.

Vice Chair Baltay: Could you get them done in time to return on March 1st?

Mr. Cusenbery: I don't want to influence necessarily the direction. We will proceed at whatever pace that is required for how everybody approves.

Vice Chair Baltay: February 15th, is that too soon?

Mr. Cusenbery: I mean I can offer thoughts right now that immediately come to mind that...

Chair Furth: (inaudible)...

Mr. Cusenbery: Alright.

Chair Furth: ...go that far but thank you, this is helpful. Can I have a straw vote, who would like to continue this? Just raise your hand if you want to continue it for another meeting. I'm going to suggest that we – Staff can tell me whether this is a feasible motion or not. That we recommend – our recommendation on this one is to the City Council, not the Director, is that right? So, I mean actually, the big design issue is whether or how many floors you're going to have underground right? That's the big design question that's up in the air?

Vice Chair Baltay: It's not a design questions.

Chair Furth: No, I mean not for us but I mean in terms of construction drawings. That...

Mr. Lait: I wouldn't even have that conversation, it's not relevant to the Board's...

Chair Furth: It has nothing to do with the critical path because we would prefer, I think, to continue this whole thing and see it one more time. You have strongly urged that we not do that, it's been suggested that this would interfere with the moving forward of the construction drawings, there's a certain amount of skepticism about that comment or point of view so that leaves us in a funny place. Alex, you have a good history of the Board, do we make motions to recommend approval subject to bringing it back to the Board as a whole for further consideration of certain aspects of the project?

Board Member Lew: Say that again? I – you're saying to approve (crosstalk) (inaudible)

Chair Furth: (Inaudible) (crosstalk) to referral to subcommittee but I don't want this to go to subcommittee.

Board Member Lew: You want it to come back to the full Board?

Chair Furth: I think these issues are important.

Board Member Lew: Well, then it needs – let's....

Chair Furth: Let's just continue it.

Board Member Lew: Well, then it just has to come back to the Board. I mean...

Chair Furth: Fine.

Board Member Lew: I think you just have to bite – I think the majority needs to bite the bullet then.

Board Member Gooyer: I agree, you either approve it and bring it back to subcommittee or you bring it back to the full Board.

Chair Furth: Got it.

Board Member Gooyer: It's one of those two options.

Chair Furth: Alright.

Board Member Lew: Or you can also condition it for Staff to follow up on items.

Chair Furth: Right. Well, I would entertain a motion to continue this matter and if nobody wants to make that motion, I will make it.

Vice Chair Baltay: Then you make it.

MOTION

Chair Furth: I move that this matter be continued and return to us with a plan revised to show a possible second entrance or exit that could be designed – that could be implemented in the future. That it includes design development with respect to the grand staircase leaving in place the screen on the top of the screen in front of the building but that the – learn a new word every meeting, with further development to consider specularly and in particular the durability of these materials in light of the fact that the shadow interest will only be available in very limited times and with a full landscape plan. Is there a second?

Board Member Thompson: Can I add something to that?

Chair Furth: Well, not unless there's a second.

Board Member Thompson: I second.

Chair Furth: Ok. Would anybody like to make an amendment?

UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Board Member Thompson: Can I make an amendment that the next time this project is presented that multiple times of day are shown on a single view to see how the sun changes over time.

Chair Furth: You're thinking just for the...

Board Member Thompson: For the elevation.

Chair Furth: ...staircase face or all of them?

Board Member Thompson: I'll leave that up to the architect but definitely on the staircase but other elevations are encouraged.

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

Vice Chair Baltay: (Inaudible)

Vice Chair Baltay: Oh, I would have to accept it. I don't accept it, thanks.

Vice Chair Baltay: (Inaudible)

Chair Furth: Is there a second?

AMENDMENT FAILED WITH THE LACK OF A SECOND

Chair Furth: Any comment before we vote?

Mr. Lait: I have one.

Chair Furth: Yes.

Mr. Lait: You had also wanted the condition change for the decibel levels.

Chair Furth: Right.

Mr. Lait: So, is that part of your motion as well?

Chair Furth: Well, my motion is that it would come back but I would – yeah, that was the deletion of the estimated 78.2 decibels on Page 14 and I would also expect completion of the omitted findings.

Mr. Lait: Thanks, and just can I have one second to meet with Staff to talk about dates because right now it's not continued to a date certain?

Chair Furth: Sure.

AMENDMENT

Mr. Lait: If we could make the motion to – if this motion is passed, we would ask that it be continued to a date certain of March 1st.

Chair Furth: I am willing to accept that, is the seconder?

Board Member Thompson: Yes, I am.

Chair Furth: Any further comment before we vote? All those in favor say aye. Opposed? Motion passes.

MOTION PASSES WITH UNANIMOUS VOTE 5-0.

Chair Furth: Thank you. I know this is difficult, I know that it's a complicated project but I think we think it's going to be great and enormous progress has been made. Sorry, we couldn't give you everything you wanted but we'll get there.

Approval of Minutes

Chair Furth: There is no study session. We don't have any minutes, do we? No minutes to approve.

Subcommittee Item

Chair Furth: We have two subcommittee items and they are 1451 Middlefield, the Junior Museum and Zoo and 2120 Staunton Court. The subcommittee will be Vice Chair Baltay and Board Member Lew.

3. **1451 Middlefield Junior Museum and Zoo [17PLN-00147]:** ARB Subcommittee Review of Resolution of the Gable End at Main Entry Per Approval Condition #9
4. **2120 Staunton Court [16PLN-00419]:** Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Project Changes Related to a Second Story Bay Window. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: RMD(NP). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Adam Petersen at apetersen@m-group.us

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Furth: Anything else before we adjourn? Board Member questions, comments or announcements?

Vice Chair Baltay: I'm afraid I'm going to miss the February 15th meeting, I'm sorry.

Chair Furth: Going to have a really big Valentine's Day, are you? I just wanted to say that the revised Comprehensive Plan is not available online. We got a notice about the link and if you want a physical copy, speak to Staff. Thanks. We have the draft, yes but it's probably pretty close. Thank you, meeting is adjourned.

Adjournment