



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES: July 2, 2020
City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Peter Baltay, Vice Chair Osma Thompson, Board Members Alexander Lew, Grace Lee and David Hirsch.

Absent: None.

Chair Baltay: Good morning everybody. I'm Peter Baltay, Chair of the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board. At the beginning of the meeting, I'd to read this statement. [Reading] Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, this meeting will be held by virtual teleconference only, with no physical location. Spoken comments via a computer will be accepted through the Zoom teleconference meeting. To address the Board, go to zoom.us/join. Meeting ID is 937 9255 2500. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, click on "Raise Hand." The moderator will activate and unmute speakers in turn. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted. Spoken public comments using a smartphone will also be accepted through the Zoom mobile application. To offer comments using a regular phone call Call 1-669-900-6833, and enter Meeting ID 937 9255 2500. When you wish to speak on an agenda item hit *9 on your phone so we know that you wish to speak.

[Roll Call]

Oral Communications

Chair Baltay: Good morning, everybody. Next item on our agenda is oral communications. If there's any member of the public who wishes to address an item not on the agenda. Do we have any speaker cards for that?

Vinh Nguyen, Administrative Associate: We currently do not have any speakers.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Baltay: Okay. We'll move on to the next item, Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions. Do we have any Changes, Additions and Deletions to our agenda, staff?

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: No changes at this time.

City Official Reports

1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, and 2) Tentative Future Agenda items and 3) Recent Project Decisions

Chair Baltay: Okay. Next item, City Official Reports, Transmittal of the Schedule, Attendance Record and Future Agenda Items and recent Project Decisions. Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, thank you for whoever is pulling this up on the screen. We have our meeting today. Our next meeting will be July 16. If we go down the screen a little bit more you'll see that on July 16 we're going to be hearing the 656 Lytton Avenue, which is a façade renovation, and I believe that is Emily's project as well. We'll just have one project for the next hearing.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Just as a notice to everybody, if you're planning to take a vacation or time off be sure to let Jodie know for scheduling purposes.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, thank you.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 4260 El Camino Real [19PLN-00142]: Consideration of a Minor Architectural Review to Allow for Façade Renovation to an Existing Structure. Scope of Work Includes Removing Existing Wood Siding and Replacing it With new Stucco and Metal Siding, new Paint and Metal Cable Railing Along all Stairways. Environmental Assessment: Exempt. Zoning District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Emily Foley at emily.foley@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Baltay: With that, we'll move on to our first action item. It is action item number two, public hearing/quasi-judicial for 4260 El Camino Real: consideration of a minor architectural review to allow for façade renovation to an existing structure. The scope of work includes removing existing wood siding and replacing it with new stucco and metal siding, new paint and metal cable railing along all the stairways. Before we start I'd like to go through disclosures. Does anyone have any disclosures to make? Let's start with David.

Board Member Hirsch: No disclosures. I visited the site, however, yesterday.

Chair Baltay: Well, that is a disclosure. Thank you, David. Osma, any disclosures?

Vice Chair Thompson: I visited the material board yesterday.

Chair Baltay: Very good. Grace?

Board Member Lee: I too visited the material board as well as the site.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And Alex.

Board Member Lew: Yes, I visited the site and looked at the materials board at City Hall.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I disclose that I also visited the site earlier this week and also looked at the materials board. Okay. With that, staff, can we have your report, please?

Emily Foley, Project Planner: Okay, I will go ahead and share my screen. As we stated, this is the façade change project for 4260 El Camino. The project is located on El Camino and the South El Camino Design Guideline District in the hotel area. It is to the left of the recently approved 4260 El Camino Real hotel project and it is a neighbor to the rear of the Palo Alto Redwoods residential area. Both of those neighbors have been notified. I did not receive any comments but they were made aware that the project was going to hearing today. As you can see this is the existing building. It is 4,854 square feet of existing office. There is no change proposed to the floor area. The building has a parking garage as the first level. The second level is the office and there are no proposed changes to the height. The existing materials include wood siding. It is brown with yellow accents and there is a shingle roof. As a part of the proposed project, they propose to use two colors of gray metal panels on the front, side, and rear facades. As well as a corrugated metal red accent in the gable and a red shingle roof. The accents in the gable area will be painted black as well as the other trim, which is consistent with the existing. There are no proposed changes to the doors or windows. The stair enclosures at the front of the

building will be replaced with open railing. This is just a slightly larger view since it was a little small on the last slide. Key considerations for this project would include the appropriateness of the materials as well as that none of the doors or windows will be changing, including the garage kind of grate gate. Another item to consider is the open railing on the front. It is required to be changed from the currently enclosed to open by Transportation for visibility coming in and out of the driveway. However, along the sides, if the sides of the stair area are within ten feet of the property line, which was not information that was provided in the plans, then the sides that are parallel to the lot line will need to be fire-rated solid walls per the Building Department. The recommended motion is to approve the proposed project based on the findings and subject to conditions of approval. However, we recognize that there are items that may require additional review and we recommend that those become subcommittee items. And that's my brief presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much, Emily. Does anyone on the Board have a question for staff? Certainly, Emily, I'd like to know are there more material samples available? What I saw at City Hall... Maybe I didn't see everything but it was just one piece of metal sort of silver color.

Ms. Foley: Yes, the piece of metal was what the applicant has provided at the time of submitting the project, which, you know, at this point was some time ago. However, they have included some additional pictures of materials in the presentation that they have prepared.

Chair Baltay: One second question for you, Emily, is that this is right next to a new hotel that's going in just to the right of this building. Have you had any representations of what this building will look like next to the proposed hotel? Is it possible to look at that?

Ms. Foley: The applicant has also prepared that as a part of their presentation.

Chair Baltay: I see. We can expect to see that in a few minutes?

Ms. Foley: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Does anyone else on the Board have any questions for staff? Okay. With that, let's turn this over to the applicant if they'd like to make a presentation. They'll have ten minutes to speak.

[Setting up presentation.]

Rucha Shah: Good morning, Board Members. My name is Rucha Shah. [spells name]

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Rucha Shah: I'm the designer for the project 4260 El Camino Real. Before I start, I would like to thank all Board Members and Emily for helping us and guiding us throughout the process. This is the street view of the proposed project. The next-door building is the **NewLeaf Apartment and Hotel**. The (inaudible) building is what we are proposing. The (inaudible) existing structure as (inaudible) on each side. You can see we have made sure in the design that the (inaudible) of the building. The existing and proposed use of the building remains the same. What we are proposing here is the changes of the existing wood siding to the metal panel. The purpose of it is the existing siding is weathering off. It is deteriorating and (inaudible). That's the main purpose. For the roof upgrade and the siding upgrade. The structure occupies the entire lot. Only just a few areas in the front has the driveway and the walkway. The project fits from property line to property line. The metal panels we are using here are (inaudible) for all four sides. They are light and dark gray in color. The color palette we used here is very familiar around the neighborhood. The structure opposite to this proposed property have the same color scheme and it got approved in 2017 or '18. The metal accent in the front wall will have dark gray color, same as the siding. The siding under the accent is metal fastener panel and it is crimson red in

color. We'll keep the color scheme flooring. We are using the same colors for the shingles. The shingles are also upgrade because it needs maintenance and it has been weathered off. We are upgrading the stair rails to the metal cable railing. For the connection of the metal panel, we are going to use the same color crimson (inaudible) so it looks seamless from outside. The indoor/outdoor (inaudible) everything will have the same gray color (inaudible). The sizes of the panels will be five feet by five feet for all four sides. We are using ten foot (inaudible). The panels have (inaudible) which is (inaudible) light finish which will not at all be reflective and will not create glare to the hotel or to the passers. We have taken into consideration that it should not glare. We are repainting all the trees around the property. It is very interesting that even though the property sits on the entire site there are a lot of trees around and we are going to be doing the landscape around it. This is another view from the right side from the hotel side. This site also has some trees. This is from the left side. These are some of the features for the railing. These are (inaudible) and also because (inaudible). We are (inaudible). We are working with David [phonetic] who is the building officer from the Building Department, and he has asked us to make the side of the surface fireproof. We are fireproofing all four sides along the sides of the surface as well. These are more views with the fire hydrant (inaudible) not touching anything. They are not touching the floor area or (inaudible). That is it. Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you, Rucha.

Chair Baltay: Are we finished, Rucha? Was that your presentation completely?

Rucha Shah: Yes, yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you very much for that presentation. Do we have any members of the public who wish to address us on this matter? Vinh, do we have any speaker cards?

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Baltay, we still do not have any public speakers at this time.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Very well

Ms. Gerhardt: Vinh, we have one attendee, Kyle [phonetic]. Do we know...?

Mr. Nguyen: Yeah, but we don't have any raised hands. Kyle, if you want to speak can you indicate so by raising your hand. There should be a raised hand at the bottom of your screen and if you're calling in you can raise your hand by pressing *9.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Well, it seems like we have no speaker comments on this. Let's bring it back to the Board. Who would like to address this project first? Maybe David? How are you feeling about this?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, okay.

Chair Baltay: Let's hear what your thoughts are.

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you to the applicant. I think it's a nice presentation and clarified much of it. The drawings that we have of it are a little bit premature in some ways although I think the project will mature well mostly because, actually, the original building is quite nice, I think, the way it's put together. The original materials certainly haven't held up very well and I think that the idea of the metal paneling and the inserts and color scheme brings me to the conclusion of what it should have been in the first place. I think the decisions about the two-tone metal panels on the outside look much better than the ones that I was looking at earlier than the white element that I'm looking at now here on the drawing because it certainly will be toned done. The exciting part about this building, of course, is really the façade and the way the solid form with the industrial-looking ends of this building. I think that the elements that have been added to it enclosing the staircases -- which are a little confusing to me. Looking at something that is covering up the base of the stair and then opening (inaudible) at the top. I'm not clear as to what that all is. How that inhabitants the other work. Although I tried to look at the drawing I didn't see enough detail to make any kind of statement about it. Some of the areas that I

think need work are certainly the way in which the planting is taken. The building isn't falling apart at the moment. Nobody seems to be worrying or anything. I think it will be fine. But there are levels of planting. Is the ground level is it going to be in the ground the way it's shown? Is it going to have a curved element to it that's really going to define? Is it going to sit the way it is? What kind of planting is proposed for the perimeter of the building? Are the remaining trees that are there able to remain? I'm curious to whether the trees are healthy to remain. I'd like to talk about the variety of tree, you know, whether it's appropriate or not. I think it's an issue that still needs work. The railing drawings looked a little confusing but I guess I'm clear about it now. These plans are a little bit better. They show the cable rail. The stucco at the front of the building, it showed stucco in the front. Isn't that really an aerated setback (inaudible) behind the tree and you don't show where th... In the original drawing it said stucco and (inaudible) doesn't appear to be stucco looking. I'm not sure as to how it cultivates to the drawing in the front that really works with the staircases on either side and what is stucco and what is not. And the electrical box that is exposed in the front I tend to feel that there is a kind of industrial look to the building and so in some way you could accept that but I think it needs to be dealt with in some way. You could maybe paint color the box itself or some kind of enclosure, if that's possible. I'm not opposed to the idea of having some sort of a paint color. One of the elements that actually isn't dealt with here is the front lighting. I didn't see anything significant but this building ought to be lit (inaudible) somehow. Now it's an exciting building to look at so it would be nice if it could be lit rather dramatically. I think that would add over to the three-dimensionality of the building and (inaudible). I don't see anything as to that effect at all. (Inaudible) where the lighting comes (inaudible). I felt that the shingle roofing, that somehow or another ought to have a metal roof but (inaudible) shingle type of roof there. However, no doubt the red color will make a difference and certainly the (inaudible). Let's see. In terms of the planting and as you go up the staircase and get to the top of it and you're looking at it what is it at the top? Is that going to be another planter? It would be nice if it was. It is somehow I think the intention of it to be (inaudible) right now of course it's not well cared for and needs to be dealt with. In some detail it really ought to show it up even if it becomes a metal enclosure that has some planting in it, you know what I mean. Probably treated but not properly described so far. I think it's an opportunity on that one staircase on the right-hand side to do something with that area that will make it a lot more pleasant, leading up the stairs and leading to that landing and soften the effect of the entry into the building. I like the idea of the way in which it's squared off in the front and the lower, whatever, staircase to kind of make it separate. I'm not understanding exactly what the transportation issue is here in terms of openness of the staircase. I think that is should really be squared off the way it's shown with some kind of transparency to the railing as you go up the staircase and to the landing and get a (inaudible). The building which is closing itself off from this side yard and it is interesting the way it is shown right now. Is our hotel building is really that far away?

Ms. Gerhardt: No, that's actually not the case. I think this is, you know, they had to sort of force in a 2-D image into this plan set. We have the porte-cochère of the hotel. There is an opening underneath but that third floor closest to this subject building is pulled pretty much all the way forward.

Board Member Hirsch: All the way to this building.

Ms. Gerhardt: Pulled forward to the street, yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: Forward to the street?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah. There is maybe a ten-foot setback to the hotel. Between the buildings, there's about a ten-foot separation but the third floor is pulled all the way to the street.

Board Member Hirsch: What I'm concerned about is where is the hotel? Is there a side yard between this building and the hotel? What we're looking at is a pretty big space there.

Ms. Gerhardt: There is the side separation, yes, just not as much front separation as you're seeing in this drawing.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, prospectively. What would be the distance, you know, approximately between -- is there a walkway that's possible on that side yard or no?

Ms. Gerhardt: That side yard is all hotel property.

Board Member Hirsch: I thought so. But is it open like that? I mean, is a piece of it going to be open? I think we need to see that somehow to understand that. It is kind of a missing piece there. We're looking at something with a tree in the back, you know, looking all the way to the back of the building with a tree back there. I think we couldn't really see back there at all. Yes, of course, we're at a high viewpoint. Okay. It's just not a realistic view from this perspective at this time.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, I can pull up the hotel plans if need be.

Rucha Shah: Can I speak?

Chair Baltay: David, does that conclude your comments?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I think, you know...

Chair Baltay: For now, at least. Just to get started on this. Alex, do you want to take us the next step? What do you think?

Board Member Lew: Sure. Rucha, thank you for the presentation. I think the presentation drawings were a lot better than the submitted packet of drawings. Based solely on the drawings I was thinking this was not ready to be approved and many of the issues have been resolved in your current presentation, which is that you had two panel sizes shown. The front and the side façades had different panel sizes. The color board was not complete. There were a lot of building elements where no color or material was shown. There were multiple different types of railings shown. There was a wood railing detail, a cable detail. I think there's an existing metal pipe rail show on the side facing the Cabana Hotel. I was unclear as what the red roof was in terms of materials on the drawings. Then, also, too, the stucco that was show on the drawings had like a horizontal texture but it wasn't really clear what that was. I think the final element, which was unresolved to me, was the rear façade. I did look at that onsite and it seems to have a trellis element that's similar to what's on the existing front stairs. The detail for that was showing that there's an alternate material of T1-11 plywood siding shown as an alternate. I think that we need to look at that more carefully, the rear façade, and how it faces the Palo Alto Redwoods Condominium project. I think that the T1-11 siding is not acceptable under any circumstances in my book. For durability it's even worse than the existing wood siding. I have concerns about the metal siding. I think that it may not be capability with the existing wood fence and the Palo Alto Redwoods shingle style. That's where I am on this one. I think coming into the meeting I was thinking this needed to come back to the full Board. I think the current drawings shows that it's much improved. I think I'm comfortable with this coming back to subcommittee. That's all I've got. Thanks Peter.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Alex. Thanks for those comments. Grace, how would you like to go next, please?

Board Member Lee: Sure, happy to do so. Thank you to the applicant for sharing this with us and thank you to planning staff for, kind of, ushering in. My comments will be brief because they're very similar to my colleague Alex who just spoke. First off, I really appreciate the iterations. I saw the first iteration that came through months ago and then this one and just going to that existing building one of the strengths I think, though, it does need maintenance and the wood siding doesn't last forever. I'm a big fan. I think Board Member Hirsch also mentioned that the building has really grown on me over the years, and one of the things that I think is a strength is that it holds together as a building so well. There are pieces to this building in different planes, and what is really great about that existing building, perhaps even that dark brown color, for me, is that it holds together so well and it doesn't step forward in a way. It actually sits back. I understand the need for change and for maintenance concerns and this

new future. My concern really was the set in terms of the size of the panels, not understanding really what the colors were and how they were outlined. Like Board Member Lew, I agree that it could come back. I think we could approve it if it came back to a subcommittee with another iteration based on comments today. In terms of the metal panel, I really appreciate that now the panel size is consistent. One of the things that I saw was that you have the two-tones of the light gray and the what you call dark in the set. I see it outlined here. The open railing, for example, that sits kind of further towards the sidewalk and towards the El Camino I think is fine. Then as you move back towards the building and that gable roof mass, one of the things I'm seeing and what's right here on screen is I'm a little concerned about that light gray color in the large panel size on all sides of the building and how that really disconnects from the gable piece. It's quite light and I'm worried about glare or that feeling that this building isn't holding together as a whole. I wonder if maybe if there's -- and the board I'd love to hear your thoughts and maybe it is just the way the rendering is and, you know, it is not true. It is only now in the presentation we see with its existing context but when I look at this rendering I'm a little concerned about how that mass, that light gray is gleaming white. I guess that was my concern when I saw the panel at City Hall in the exhibit that it's a light gray and there's a lot of it. A lot of it on that side elevation and on the front all in one plane. There's a contrast to what sits behind it, which is really this terrific gable roof and that mass of glass on the front. I don't know, maybe there's another iteration where the tonal gradation or the scale of gray is actually revisited so that it is maybe thought out a little bit more in terms of that color template of gray tones. Then, also, taking cues from what's around it a little more; the new building that's going in next-door and just looking along the context of El Camino. I know that it's not white and that's not what you're proposing, but that's what I'm seeing here in this presentation. I'm just reacting to that. The other piece, I just want to make sure, it sounds like you're going to just re-landscape, is what I heard in your presentation, and not introduce new plants. If you are introducing new plants, I didn't see that in the set. That could be discussed at the subcommittee. I do have some concerns about the side but, you know, the proximity of the existing of the building next door on either side and just future growth maybe it's not such a concern that it is a long blank wall but the rear, I do agree with Board Member Lew, that perhaps there can be some thought given to that rear elevation. I'll leave it there. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Grace. Very insightful. Osma, would you care to go next?

Vice Chair Thompson: Thank you. Thanks to the applicant, thanks to staff. Thanks to my Board members for starting a good conversation. I'm perhaps a little less forgiving of, sort of, of all the discrepancies that I ended up seeing in the drawing set. I think I saw two different designs, three different designs for the stair rails in different parts of the drawing package, which is pretty confusing. I think that is a problem that that design is not well defined. On A2.4 we see that the screen actually has a chamfer in it. The rendering in front of us we see that it's full size, like a big square. Then in the details there's no actual detail of which part of which design is actually being manifested here. And I think that is a problem. I would say the treatment of the stair is not defined in the drawings enough for me to comment on whether it is appropriate for this area just because I'm not sure quite what it is. Then I'll move to the colors and the siding because I think that is also another big problem. I should have mentioned I have been to the site and when we were reviewing the project adjacent to this we had a chance to go into one of the units. We saw the backside of what this building looks like from one of those units and there is a trellis there, and I think there is so much greenery, so many trees. This choice of palette is not compatible with the context at all. We spent a lot of time on the hotel adjacent to make it much more warm and compatible with the area. There's a building across the street that has warm wood tones. This building I understand it needs maintenance, it always does, but this change in design for the façade I think is completely incompatible with the context. I can't make finding, I think it's finding number two on this project. I think even finding number three, the material choice. I'm also concerned about glare. Also, the five by five rhythm of the panel, if that is what it is, is not very human-scaled. What's nice about the current building is that we have siding at a pretty tiny scale, and so even though that wall that goes along is really long it's got this scale to it that makes it really palatable and really nice. That will completely be lost if we go with the scheme in front of us. I'd really encourage the applicant to consider that human scale is really important on the street level. I don't think that these things are light enough that they could come back to subcommittee. This is the whole project, basically. I am definitely not ready to approve it. I think there is a lot of rethinking that needs to be done here. It is true, the

renderings look like that upper color is white, but we saw the material sample; it's not white. It's a gray color. I am wondering if that was actually supposed to be the bottom color or the top color. Lack of clarity is concerning. I agree with Board Member Hirsch that a lighting plan would be really helpful here. We've asked other applicants to do that. Yes, lots of problems, I'm afraid. I'll end my review there.

Chair Baltay: Very good. Thank you, Osma. Well, I'm going to chime in as well then. I think I feel perhaps even more strongly than Osma that this project is far from ready to be approved. I think the application is just incomplete. There are just too many missing holes, missing parts. I'll list a couple but the detailing is incomplete and really not specific to this building. Those are standard details which don't apply to how the panels might join or meet the roof in particular. The stair railings are all over the place. We don't really know what's going on. The materials are extremely incomplete. We don't have a material board. This bright red roofing I doubt meets CALGreen standards for cool roof materials. We'd be faced with the substitution in midstream. That's a dramatic difference even if the red were acceptable, which I question. I think on the second level the building is really not compatible. It doesn't seem to have any sense of taking design cues from its neighbors and that's unfortunate, especially as we've pushed this hotel to be very compatible and to be very cognizant in that. I think Grace's comments about the building are quite spot-on about how there is some character quality to that building that is quite attractive. I think Osma was pointing out a part of it might have to do with that horizontal wood siding at a human scale. Certainly, there's something that's just being lost with the application of these metal panels. That doesn't work for me very well either. I need to see how the hotel relates to this building. The rendering provided is grossly inaccurate and there's two or three different heights and how close is it really to this building. We just don't have enough information. It's really just not ready for review, to be honest, in my opinion. I would strongly encourage the applicant to consider something else than the metal panels. They're tricky to put on in the best of times. You have to really design it carefully when you have variety of different sizes, as you'll be forced to do on this building. It's going to be really tough to make it work. It's really important to detail out how the corners, the roof eaves, the openings, interaction with the stairs, all those things come together. Metal panels are not forgiving. You've can't just figure that out in the field. It looks really hacked on when you do that. The back elevation is critically important. That's really staring right at the apartment complex behind it and the glare from this light-colored panel will be significant in the sun. It'll be probably more than significant. We'll be getting letters about it. It's just inappropriate to have something that reflective right next to the hotel and the apartment building behind it. It seems to me that it really hasn't been considered yet what happens with that. The back elevations also just not accurate; that's not what's there now. We need to see that. For those reason and variety of things like that I cannot support recommending approval at this time for this project. Does anybody else have anything to chime in on after we've all spoken about this?

Board Member Lee: I can chime in briefly.

Chair Baltay: Sure.

Board Member Lee: I really appreciate everyone's comments. I just wanted to advise, you know, hopefully when this project comes back again, and I think I agree with everyone who has spoken here to a large extent, it would be wonderful and perhaps you could work with the staff planner Emily in terms of the actual set being very much consistent with a full material sample board with colors. The presentation needs to be consistent as well so there aren't new things that come into the presentation. It's difficult for our Board to digest it in this forum. We review the materials, we go see the materials board and when there are missing pieces and consistencies, I just wanted to note like Osma, I wrote down in my notes all these pages numbers on your set where there was a question marked and circled where I just could connect the dots. We want to encourage applicants, however, all the pieces -- if you could just be consistent for the date of the hearing that would be great.

Board Member Hirsch: Since you're asking, I wouldn't mind jumping in as well. I agree pretty much with what everybody has been saying, but I'd like to add that I think the way in which the building reads so well is with the block elements that create the frontal surround within the building sits on behind it need to be defined, but certainly not the way they look here. It's the strength of this building that it has those

elements that pull forward, the staircases and the way of getting in which I think is such a successful piece there. I disagree a bit with the idea of looking for it to fit in with the context because it's just never going to be able to do that. But I do think in terms of tone and texture and material it needs a lot of work. Certainly, the detail wasn't there in all the drawings. I had a problem reading it all. I think the concept is there but the materials aren't there. You really do need to tone down the whole element of the blocking piece of it that support the structure behind it. But in a sense, those are the strengths of this building and so I don't think we should be looking to see anything other than the shape of this building the way it's done and the material detail of it. I agree that the rendition of the metal parts needs to be designed and it hasn't really been thought through yet. What Chair Baltay was saying is correct. Metal isn't an answer unless it's detailed properly. The scale of it is a question because it is intended to support the shape of these blocky elements. How you do that and the scale of how it breaks down from that point is very critical. It maybe should be redone a little bit more in a blocky way the way the building really is and some smaller scale on the surface. It won't detract from the mass idea of the building supporting the structure behind the (inaudible). I agree that this presentation isn't ready yet and I agree with everybody commenting on that. We need to see the detail of it and we need to look the (inaudible). And then look at the back of the building carefully enough to (inaudible). It sounds to me the like the comments are correct. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Before we try to move on this can we quickly cover what level of landscaping we'd liked to see them come back with? What kind of a landscape plan? I forget who made the comments about whether the plants are in the ground or not but I do think that it'd be nice to what kind of landscaping should be done. What does everybody else think? I'm just trying to think. We want to give them clear direction. Any other comments about the landscaping?

Board Member Hirsch: I did originally, and I think it needs a landscape plan and we need a lighting plan.

Chair Baltay: Yes, and a lighting plan as well. Jodie, have we given clear enough guidance? Do we need to reiterate all of this or is this pretty well heard do you think? Can we just make a motion to continue?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, I do think if the applicant maybe has one or two questions of classification that might be helpful. I think it sounds like we need a lot more details on the metal panels if we're going to stay with that material.

Chair Baltay: Absolutely.

Ms. Gerhardt: We also need a good color and materials board with all of the colors and materials that we can put in the display case so you can see that. The stair railing, we need to figure out if that's within the ten feet; if it needs to be solid or not. We need to finalize that question. Then I hear, you know, a landscape and lighting plan.

Chair Baltay: All right.

Ms. Gerhardt: I believe those are the main things.

Chair Baltay: Yes, the rear elevation needs to be considered.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Several comments were made about the glare, the lightness of the material as far as it reflects towards the neighbors.

Board Member Lee: I would just add a drawing in the set that actually shows the adjacent building or a partial elevation of the existing building so we see the full streetscape.

Chair Baltay: I think it's fair to say, Grace, we need a complete application and the standards require showing adjacent properties.

Board Member Lee: And I want to be sensitive and understand that the applicant is working with planning staff on a minor application submittal and those requirements are probably not the same as what we're used to in a major. I would direct the applicant to just work closely with staff and...

Chair Baltay: Yeah, that sounds good. Would you care to make our motion today, Grace? Do you think you could do that?

MOTION

Board Member Lee: Sure. I move that we continue this application to -- should I say a future hearing or a date that's ...

Chair Baltay: A date uncertain.

Board Member Lee: A date uncertain.

Chair Baltay: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: I second that.

Vice Chair Thompson: I second.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so it's moved and seconded. I wonder if we can now ask the applicant if they have any questions of us. We have a motion on the table. Vinh, could you check and see if the applicant has any comments, please?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think she's here already.

Rucha Shah: I'm here. Thank you so much for all the comments. I just wanted to add that for the landscaping these are all existing trees. We are not proposing anything new. We are just going to (inaudible) everything because it was very small. We just changed the siding and nothing more but we are still upgrading. On the floor plans we have mentioned the lighting is just for the exterior. Nothing interior. Not for the façade but for the planters and the focus on (inaudible) upgraded. About the electric box, which is in the front, it sits on the concrete so there -- to cover it or to plant something -- a hedging around it is actually not possible because it is very close to the neighbor's property line and the sidewalk and its concrete. We actually decided not to disturb that portion by the planters but just leave it and that's fine. About the railing, the drawing which I think you have was the previous submission where we were applying for the wooden railing but now we have two inches and no stucco. There is no stucco in the scope of work. Everything is metal panels and only cable railing, not the wood one.

Chair Baltay: Okay. To the applicant, please, if you could we were asking if you have any questions about the decision we're passing for you on this. Do you have any questions?

Rucha Shah: No.

Chair Baltay: No, okay. With that let's take a vote on that. Vinh, could we have a roll call vote, please?

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lee, Lew, Thompson (5)

No: (0)

MOTION TO CONTINUE PASSES 5-0.

Study session/Preliminary review

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much to the applicant and the staff. Let's move right along then.

Rucha Shah: Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Next item is a study session. Do we have a study session, Jodie?

Ms. Gerhardt: Actually, we should have our minutes first, I believe.

Chair Baltay: I'm just reading from the list here but we can go to the minutes if that's...

Ms. Gerhardt: There is no study session. We are on to minutes.

Approval of Minutes

3. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 7, 2020

Chair Baltay: Okay, approval of the minutes. The first one is Draft Architectural Review Board Minutes for May 7, 2020. Do we have any comments on those?

Vice Chair Thompson: I noticed that there was a lot of distortion. There was a lot of distortion. I think a lot of the messages were not well transcribed.

Ms. Gerhardt: There was distortion in the video you mean?

Vice Chair Thompson: No, in the transcript. On page 36 I noticed that we can't really tell what Chair Baltay is saying because every other word says distortion.

Ms. Gerhardt: Oh.

Vice Chair Thompson: Did you guys notice that there's a lot of -- I feel like a lot of the intent of somebody saying something is lost because of that. I'm not sure how to fix that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Well, I'll take a look. I think the transcriber's doing that somehow if the video's shaking or something they're wanting to record that but as long as the... When you read the sentence without that, does it...? Is that what people said?

Vice Chair Thompson: Maybe, but I feel like the complete thought is gone because I think the distortion is supposed to be maybe like an audio distortion.

Ms. Gerhardt: But I think there are some missing words. That's what I'm wondering.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. We need to see if we can fill in some of the missing words.

Chair Baltay: Jodie, do you guys subcontract out to a service to do these minutes. Is that how it works?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Baltay: And in the past, we've not had problems with the technical part of it and they've been doing it from some sort of recording as well. Is this is a different recording they're using now that we're online?

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't believe so because there's still the Midpen Media recording our sessions. It's the same sort of service as far as the video goes. We'll just have to see. I mean, I haven't seen this in other minutes. I wonder if it's specific to this hearing and maybe there really was some distortion on the video

and there really were words missing. I'll have to just go back to the video and see and maybe if we want to... maybe we need to put this off for one hearing. We can talk about it next time.

Chair Baltay: Anybody else have any opinion about this issue?

Board Member Hirsch: I'm really bothered by it because it didn't (inaudible) the meeting and a lot of what was said.

Chair Baltay: I think I'm for trying to reduce the workload on staff at these times and not try to push too hard unless we really feel it's just not capturing the intent of what we were saying. But Osma's bringing up a very good point. I mean, we do want to have a record of what we said. That's what the point of these things are. Any other comments on the Review Board Minutes from May 7? Osma, do you feel you want to make a motion to continue this or to approve it? It's your choice. You make a motion.

Vice Chair Thompson: In all fairness, I mean, some of it is my text but most of it is actually your text.

MOTION

Chair Baltay: I'll move that we approve the minutes for May 7.

Board Member Hirsch: I'll second that.

Chair Baltay: It's been moved and seconded. All those in favor. Vinh, can we have a roll call vote, please?

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lee, Lew, Thompson (5)

No: (0)

MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 5-0.

Chair Baltay: Motion carries four and a half to zero. Okay, fine.

Ms. Gerhardt: Four-and-a-half, I love it.

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 21, 2020

Chair Baltay: Okay. We're going to move on to the next item which is Draft Architectural Review Board Minutes for May 21, 2020. Any comments on those?

Board Member Lew: Peter, I have three phonetic spellings. I don't know if you want to do those now or I can send them by email to staff.

Chair Baltay: Why don't you quickly say what they are, Alex, if it's only three.

Board Member Lew: On package page 78 Sheldon was speaking and there's something in there about CMDA. I don't know what he said but I think the intent was the CN zone, like neighborhood commercial zone and Housing Incentive Program. Sometimes we call it the HIP.

Chair Baltay: That needs to be clarified, certainly. What else?

Board Member Lew: Yeah. On packet page 84 this was Ms. Shah from Belomo's office was mentioning a caulking called singleplex and I think that's a brand name which is Sikaflex, which is S-I-K-A-F-L-E-X.

Chair Baltay: Good catch, Alex. Yes.

Board Member Lew: Packet page 90, I was speaking and I was talking about a plant and it's transcribed as Rivese and I was intending to say Ribes, R-I-B-E-S. It's a native plant.

Chair Baltay: Fair enough. Any other comments on these minutes? Alex, why don't you make a motion for us?

MOTION

Board Member Lew: I will move that we approve the minutes for May 21, 2020.

Chair Baltay: Subject to the comments you just made.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Baltay: I'll second. Vinh, roll call vote, please.

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lee, Lew, Thompson (5)

No: (0)

MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 5-0.

Mr. Nguyen: Alex, if you could email me those changes after the meeting that would be much appreciated.

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Meeting Minutes for June 4, 2020

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Next item is number 5, Draft Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Meeting Minutes for June 4. What do we have on that? Any comments?

Board Member Lew: Should we abstain if we weren't on the subcommittee? And then if we're on the subcommittee there'd be only two Board Members to vote for the...

Chair Baltay: That's a good point. Two of us can't carry the day and yet only two of us were there. No, I think everybody should listen to the minutes and we should vote whether we think they're an accurate transcription based on a report we're going to get back from the subcommittee itself. The two who are on that subcommittee what were those minutes to you? Do we have any information on that?

Ms. Gerhardt: The subcommittee was Board Member Thompson and Board Member Hirsch.

Chair Baltay: Osma and David, do you think those minutes are accurate?

Ms. Gerhardt: The minutes are just saying that there were revisions agreed to -- the subcommittee agreed with the revisions presented. The applicant shall ensure these changes are incorporated into the design. I think it was really just whatever plans were presented the subcommittee agreed to.

Vice Chair Thompson: What page is this noted?

Ms. Gerhardt: Are you on the agenda or are you on the...

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: On the agenda, there's just the second page that has all the minutes and you should be able to click on the June 4 Minutes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry, I'm in the .pdf.

Ms. Gerhardt: Vinh?

Mr. Nguyen: Do you want me to project the minutes? Is that what's going on?

Vice Chair Thompson: I thought the subcommittee review was in the packet that was sent to us.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, just what packet page number. I'm pulling it up here also. We'll see who gets there first.

Vice Chair Thompson: I think that is right. We did agree to the revisions. I don't remember disagreeing.

Ms. Gerhardt: Packet page number 120.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, I see it. Yeah, I think that's right.

MOTION

Chair Baltay: We don't have any comments on these minutes. I'll move that we approve the minutes as presented. Do we have a second for that? Osma or David, please?

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: We're going to have a vote on this and I can understand if Alex and Grace want to abstain because they weren't there and I'm going to vote for it just because we have to pass it. Jodie, you're putting us in a very difficult position when you bring us minutes like this only two people can vote on it. Vinh, let's have a roll call vote, please.

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Thompson (3)

No: (0)

Abstain: Lee, Lew (2)

MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 3-0-2.

Chair Baltay: Three to two to three zero, fair enough.

Ms. Gerhardt: Three, zero, two.

Chair Baltay: Three, zero, two. Okay, thank you very much.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Baltay: Our next item is Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements. Do we have anything formal, Jodie, that you want us to hear about?

Ms. Gerhardt: I don't have anything specific. I believe there was an NVCAP Subcommittee although I don't know if Alex has information about that.

Board Member Lew: We've had two NVCAP meetings this week and we're in the sausage making process and it's going to continue for the next month.

Chair Baltay: Can you tell us what flavor you're looking for?

Board Member Lew: I know. It's going to be tutti-frutti multi-flavored.

Chair Baltay: The kind where you don't really have a chef. You just put it all in the mix.

Board Member Lew: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Any other questions for Alex, gang? This is the North Ventura Plan. I did notice a few emails, and to move on regarding the other committee we have going, where David and Osma are working on about the zoning prescriptive standards I think it is.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes.

Chair Baltay: Do we have any feedback, anything appropriate to come back to the Board with on that?

Board Member Hirsch: All of you guys should have been forward the piece of work (inaudible) incorrect in doing that and withdraw at this point.

Chair Baltay: Okay. If you two don't feel you have anything to report that's fine. I just want to give you the opportunity if you do.

Vice Chair Thompson: I didn't hear what Board Member Hirsch said. Sorry, the audio wasn't...

[Adjusting Audio.]

Board Member Hirsch: Withdrawing. I had the transmittal which I could have never really sent at this time; too early. Yes, I mean, I think we could say a little something. [Distortion]. Can you hear that? Sorry? And we have a lot more to do. I am concerned personally that the two meetings that we might have will hardly give us an opportunity to review the entire study, only to do pieces of it. I'm not quite sure how we will be able to participate effectively in the entire study. I raise that kind of an issue which could be raised again when we (inaudible) after as well. After the first two pieces to determine that and report later. I'd be curious to know what Osma thinks about that.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, it's a lot to go through. When it comes to you guys it's a lot to go through. Board Member Hirsch makes a good point. I mean, I think we've had a couple of meetings. Well, one real meeting just trying to go over everything and we barely made it to 20 percent of it. I mean, it's a big undertaking. Just fair warning that there is a lot going to come your way for review. I do hope that we have more than just one other meeting to go over it but I also don't quite know what the timeline is. Jodie, do you know when this is supposed to come back to the Board?

Ms. Gerhardt: Well, we were trying to come back to the Board -- we were going to back to a joint meeting between the ARB and the PTC. We were hoping to do that on August 20, but I agree with you that, you know, it feels like we only, kind of, got through 20 percent of it. We may try and rethink that. We are trying to complete this by the end of the year. We just have to, kind of, balance those two objectives. The one thing I can say to the rest of the Board is that if you could please take a look at the existing criteria that we have. The design criteria is spaced out between all the different chapters, you know multi-family, commercial, that sort of thing. But if you could take a look at those maybe ahead of time that'll give us a jump start because really what we're trying to do is take those existing criteria and go from subjective criteria to objective. Trying to put numbers to those sorts of things if we can or in other places where we maybe put a menu of ideas that makes it more objective. Those are the things that David and Osma are wrestling with. We're also wrestling with just, you know, making sure that we can present it in a coherent manner because it's a big task. How we present it is just as important as how we change it.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Jodie. Yeah, I think it's a big task and the Board is at your disposal if you'd like to bring things on our agenda or whatnot or through the committee. We're all more than happy to help, especially at some of our meetings. It seems like the next one, at least, we don't have a lot else on the agenda. I can react to something you just said about hoping to bring this to a joint meeting with the ARB and the Planning Commission. I'm not sure I think that's a very strong way to get a good

recommendation from us. It's a complex group bit of information and the more people involved in one of these meetings the more difficult it is to really get anything done. Unless you're just looking for sort a blanket approval I don't think a joint meeting is a good way to go about it. Just for the record so you hear that. Any other Board Member Questions, Comments, or Announcements? Okay, with that we're adjourned. Thank you, everybody. And we have two subcommittee items. Board Member Thompson and Lew on the first and Thompson and Hirsch will handle the second. David, you might want to either stay on the line or communicate with Vinh so you can handle all that. Thank you very much, everybody. We are adjourned.

Adjournment

Subcommittee Items

6. 620 Emerson Street (19PLN-0326): Subcommittee Review of Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return with Details on the Design, Pattern, and Material Samples for the Bronze Metal Gates and Grate Proposed Along the Front Façade. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) per Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: CD-C(GF)(P) (Downtown Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.
7. 3215 Porter Drive [19PLN-00220]: Subcommittee Review of a Previously Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Additional Details Related to Building Facade Materials and the Rear Stairway/Balcony. Environmental Assessment: Mitigated Negative Declaration. Zoning District: RP (Research Park). For More



Architectural Review Board Subcommittee Review Memo

TO: Greg Stutheit, Montalbe Architects, 2525 Michigan Ave, Building T4, Santa Monica, CA 90404
SUBJECT: 620 Emerson St [19PLN-00326]
DATE: July 2, 2020
FROM: Samuel Gutierrez, Planner

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE

On April 16, 2020, the ARB recommended approval to the Director of Planning & Development Services for the subject project while conditioning that certain project elements return for review by a subcommittee of the ARB. On July 2, 2020, the ARB Subcommittee comprised of Vice-Chair Osma Thomson and Board Member Alex Lew, reviewed the plans and material samples dated received on June 5, 2020, in accordance with ARB conditioned items below that were to return to the ARB Subcommittee:

- A. A detailed design/pattern, and material samples, shall be provided for the bronze metal gates and grate proposed along the front façade.

At the meeting, the Subcommittee reviewed the following revisions presented by the applicant.

1. The applicant provided plans and images to provide greater detail for the decorative bronze screen at the facade of 620 Emerson Street. Page 1 of the subcommittee plans shows the approved overall view of the facade. Page 2 shows a rendering taken from the sidewalk that displays the depth and rhythm of the bronze screen. The planting images have been faded so the screen can more clearly be seen in the diagrammatic view. Page 3 is a drawing (A5.13) that offers more information on the layout and dimensions of the screen. Page 4 shows images of the proposed oil-rubbed bronze material. Included in the plan set are photographs of the bronze to show the materials in lieu of being physically present.

The Subcommittee found the plans to be acceptable as submitted with no additional changes required and recommended approval of the submitted subcommittee plans to the Director. The applicant shall ensure these changes are incorporated into the final construction design and this Subcommittee Review Memo shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s) along with the approval letter for the project.



Architectural Review Board
Subcommittee Review

TO: Lisa Lu, Stanford University, 415 Broadway MC 8873, Redwood City CA
94063

SUBJECT: 3215 Porter Drive [19PLN-00237]

DATE: July 21, 2020

FROM: Garrett Sauls, Associate Planner

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE

DocuSigned by:
Garrett Sauls
5307CC6EABDF4E4...

On May 7, 2020, the ARB recommended approval to the Director of Planning & Development Services for the subject project while conditioning that certain project elements return for review by a subcommittee of the ARB. On July 2, 2020, the ARB Subcommittee comprised of Vice-Chair Osma Thomson and Board Member David Hirsch, reviewed the plans and material samples dated received on June 4, 2020, in accordance with ARB conditioned items below that were to return to the ARB Subcommittee:

- A. Make the color and materials board available to the ARB Subcommittee and the public.
- B. Provide additional details of the rear stairs, showing drainage details, railing detail, and connections between different materials.
- C. Provide a detail for the edge of the metal panels to show how they join together.
- D. Provide details of how different materials join/come together, especially where the fascia meets the windows.

The Subcommittee found the plans to be acceptable as submitted with no additional changes required and recommended approval of the submitted subcommittee plans to the Director. The applicant shall ensure these changes are incorporated into the final construction design and this Subcommittee Review Memo shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s) along with the approval letter for the project.