



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
APPROVED MINUTES: October 3, 2019
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, David Hirsch and Grace Lee.

Absent: None.

Chair Baltay: ...October 3, 2019, meeting of the Palo Alto Architectural Review Board. Could we have a roll call, please?

[Roll Call]

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: And welcome to our newest member. Thank you.

Oral Communications

Chair Baltay: Okay. I would like to formally welcome Grace Lee, the newest member of the Architectural Review Board. Thank you. First item on our agenda is oral communications. Do we have any comments from the public for anything not on the agenda?

Ms. French: Sorry, we didn't hear what you said because we're talking about the fact that we're recording, but we're not broadcasting live with the video.

Chair Baltay: Should we be waiting, then?

Ms. French: I think we should get an estimate...

Chair Baltay: Okay, we'll hold up. Sure.

[Meeting paused while working on broadcasting video]

Ms. French: Unfortunately, we're not sure how long before we're able to broadcast again, but we do have Caltrain here if we wanted to go forward. We are recording, so it would be available later to the public.

Chair Baltay: Very well. Let's continue our meeting, then. I had welcomed Grace Lee. We're calling for oral communications; I see none.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Baltay: Next item is agenda changes, additions and deletions. Just to make everyone is aware, we're going to hear the Caltrain project first this morning. That's a shift from the originally-published agenda.

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: Official City Reports. Do we have anything?

Jodie Gerhardt, Current Planning Manager: Yes. We just have the schedule, as usual. And then, on the other page, packet page 7, we do have the three items that will be heard on October 17th. We do have a subcommittee item. I believe that Chair Baltay and Vice Chair Thompson were on that subcommittee last time, so we will continue that again on October 17th.

Chair Baltay: I would like to add that staff has arranged for City Council to receive our annual report, I believe it's the October 17th meeting.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: And then, we also have the joint meeting with the Council on December 2nd.

Chair Baltay: Wonderful, thank you.

Vice Chair Thompson: Are we going to note absences for future meetings?

Chair Baltay: If anyone has any absences or scheduling issues, they should bring it up.

Board Member Lee: I'm sorry, I will be absent from the October 17th meeting.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Okay. On to action items.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING: Architectural Review Board Input on Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project (PCEP) Paralleling Station Design and Perimeter Landscaping for Installation Within Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) Right of Way in Palo Alto. Includes Removal of Existing Trees in JPB Right of Way Adjacent to Park Plaza and Planting of Shrubs and Vines Adjacent to the Station that Includes a Proposed 42' Tall Gantry Structure. Separate from the Landscaping Adjacent to the Station Enclosure, the JPB will Evaluate the Feasibility of Planting Trees Along Alma Street as Part of the PCEP Palo Alto Tree Mitigation Plan to Provide Screening of a Gantry. Environmental Assessment: The JPB Certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and Adopted a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP) in January 2015, Following Publication of the Draft EIR in February 2014 for Public Comment. For More Information Contact the Chief Planning Official Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Baltay: First item we're going to hear is a public hearing for the Architectural Review Board input on Peninsula Corridor Electrification Project paralleling station design and perimeter landscaping for installation with Caltrain Peninsula Corridor Joint Powers Board (JPB) right-of-way in Palo Alto. Includes removal of existing trees in JPB right-of-way adjacent to Park Plaza, and planting of shrubs of vines adjacent to the station. That includes a proposed 42-foot-tall gantry structure. Separate from the landscaping adjacent to the station enclosure, the JPB will evaluate the feasibility of planting trees along Alma Street as part of the PCEP Palo Alto Tree Mitigation Plan, to provide screening of a gantry. That's a mouthful. Before we get started, I'd like to go through disclosures. Just so Grace is aware, we've come to the policy that everyone discloses at the beginning of each item, and we consider a site visit something you need to disclose. I'll start with Alex.

Board Member Lew: Yes, I visited the site this morning.

Chair Baltay: Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: I have nothing to disclose.

Chair Baltay: David?

Board Member Hirsch: No, I did not visit the site.

Chair Baltay: Grace?

Board Member Lee: I also visited the site this morning.

Chair Baltay: Okay, and I'd like to disclose that I visited the site, as well. Okay, with that, do we have a staff report, please?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. I have with me, here to my right is Brent Tietjen from Caltrain JPB. I have a brief presentation that includes some images that I photographed myself from the Alma right-of-way, to give a picture for those who have not been out to the site, and looking from that vantage point. Here we are, October 3rd. The last time we were here was in January, before Grace began her tenure here. We had some slides that we showed at that time, showing what a typical paralleling station would look like with one of these gantries, in case... In this case, there's two gantries, one within the site area. And then, there's a control house, which is a metal house. At the January meeting, with the joint meeting of the ARB and Historic Resources Board, the color Juniper Green was selected as the appropriate color from among three potential choices for color. Color was the only thing decided. There was discussion about how there was existing vegetation next to the Park Plaza development at the back there, and that there was some opportunity for vegetation along the Alma right-of-way that would provide screening of this new development. Back in January, the gantry within the dashed yellow area was planned to go in this location, and the transformer in this location. What happened then, since that time, is... Oh, sorry, at this time as well, in January, we gave this overview of Caltrain's proposal for planting, pruning, removal of trees along the corridor. And this is kind of a separate endeavor related to the EIR, to get plantings. In any case, what's now proposed is to have the gantry – which is this 42-foot-tall metal structure – here, and then, a second gantry over here, near the Alma right-of-way and the transformer. They switched places. The control house is still in the same location. This is unmanned. There's an image here on the screen, showing what that would look like – steel, aluminum 16 feet wide, 32 feet long, 12 feet tall. And the juniper green. Here is the... That was the old site plan from January. Okay. Because this came up in January, is, what about those existing plantings behind Park Plaza? This is an image of the as-built from the Park Plaza, so all of these trees here would be removed because this is the location of the paralleling station. Farther to the right over here, the trees in this part of the planting for Park Plaza would remain. This is the list of plantings there that would be removed. This shows the proposed landscaping. There are also four parking spaces proposed here for the staff. The plantings are showing these one-gallon vines and shrubs. There are no trees planted along here. I think Brent will be able to describe the safety reasons why that is the case. There's a fence proposed parallel here to Park Plaza. And there's a gate to ensure that folks are not getting between the fence. Here's the gantry that is proposed. This is fairly tall, 30 feet at first, and then, another 15 feet in the future. I think we'll just... We can go back to these slides when Brent is presenting. This is the security lighting, showing what's proposed here. Some lighting around the control house and some lighting around the perimeter of the site. These are the images from Alma. This is all the landscaping that would remain. This is not to be removed as part of this project, so you will see that there are still some trees here that are next to the Park Plaza project that would remain. These are well viewed from Alma because these shrubs have been cut down, I guess. Here is a partial view of the site. There seems to be some larger trees in this location. This is, I think, where the site would be, so this is visible from this, at this point, from Alma. There is the northerly wall of the Park Plaza building, so this is the location of the paralleling station. The gantry would be seen somewhere around here. Now, this building is, I guess, close to 50 feet tall, I think, so it would be... I don't think the gantry would pierce above this building in this view.

Board Member Lew: Amy, it's going to be storied, so it's probably more like...

Ms. French: Maybe less than 50?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, it's probably within, like 35 feet, maybe?

Ms. French: Yeah. As I was talking, I was realizing I should know how tall that building is. Okay. Here are some other views. You can see the Park Plaza vegetation here, beyond Alma. So, yeah, maybe it would pierce the view above that roofline. I'm going to go ahead and let Brent talk about the project. Is this a slide show, or...?

Brent Tietjen, Caltrain: I don't have any slides.

Ms. French: Okay. Do you want me to go back to...?

Mr. Tietjen: I don't have much to add. That's pretty much....

Ms. French: You need to go to the mic.

Mr. Tietjen: Thanks, Amy. I don't have much to add on top of that. This is part of the overall electrification project. It's all on Caltrain property. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Baltay: Okay. I'd like to thank Amy French for making the effort to take those photographs for us. It's really helpful to see the context, and I appreciate your making that extra effort. Does anyone have any questions of staff or JPB? Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: Could you discuss the hazard of having planting in there? I think Ms. French mentioned that there's more to know about that.

Mr. Tietjen: Yeah, so, for any electrified component of the system, we need to keep a 10-foot minimum clearance from any vegetation. That's a CPUC [phonetic] requirement that we have to follow.

Vice Chair Thompson: The height limit, as well? A lot of the vegetation proposed is low vegetation, so is there kind of a height...? Or is it just 10 feet, but it could be any height?

Mr. Tietjen: Ten feet from the electrified component, yeah.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay.

Chair Baltay: I wonder if staff could explain to us what the format limitations of our review are. I understand we're allowed to provide input.

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Baltay: What does that mean?

Ms. French: This is the agreement that the City has with Caltrain JPB, is that, I mean, because Caltrain JPB is a higher authority as far as that goes, we're not processing this as an application or project within the city. But there is the EIR, which had mitigation measures that specified that vegetation was to be installed to help with the screening of this paralleling station. That's one of the areas that I think input is very helpful. And, the agreement does allow for input on other items, such as the color, and the paralleling station itself. "Input" means please speak your mind, say what you think would be helpful for the applicant, the proponent, Caltrain JPB, staff, to know, and that could factor into what happens next. This will not be going to Council or anything else.

Mr. Tietjen: If I could add. As part of the EIR, we did a Tree Minimization and Avoidance Plan, which looked at 35 percent design for the whole project, looked at what trees we would need to trim or remove, and we came up for a number for each city, how many replacements that would require for mitigation. There were 15 trees that were identified that need to be mitigated on City property in Palo Alto. That's where the mitigation could come in to help screen along Alma, and we would work with the City to look at exactly where those trees would be planted.

Chair Baltay: I'm not sure if this is a question or not, but let me just go at it. My understanding is that when you came to us with your 35 percent design, these trees where the paralleling station are were slated to remain, and now they're slated to be removed. Am I understanding that right?

Mr. Tietjen: I don't think we've identified the trees to be removed, but these trees are on JPB property, and I believe the agreement with the property owner who is leasing it currently and put those in, understood that they could have to be removed as part of electrification in the future. I don't remember specifically saying they would or would not be removed back in January.

Chair Baltay: One last question for you, then. In the staff report, it points out that the EIR essentially requires vegetative screening for the paralleling station as part of the EIR determination. What's your interpretation of what that means? What do you mean by that? What do you think it means?

Mr. Tietjen: There were examples included in the EIR. I'm happy to share those with Amy after. There were trees that were shown to screen the mitigation, so it's... I'm not an environmental expert in terms of that. I can get back with our environmental staff to get you the actual definition of what that would mean for screening. But there were examples that I can share that were included in the EIR.

Chair Baltay: For example, if we felt that trees on Alma Street, on the opposite of the tracks from your station, were required, would you agree that that would make a reasonable mitigation?

Mr. Tietjen: Yeah, and as I mentioned, as part of the mitigation plan, we're happy to work with the City to look at what trees could be planted there. Those 15 trees that were identified as part of mitigation requirements, if there is available space on Alma to plant the trees, which appears there could be, we're happy to work with the City to see where exactly those could be planted.

Chair Baltay: Great. Okay, so, back to the Board.

Ms. French: Could I, sorry, jump in for just a second?

Chair Baltay: Sure.

Ms. French: Thanks to Jodie and her amazing research skills, she found that it was 40 feet, the Park Plaza building, from up to the parapet, to the top of the, you know, main roof. There's other places where it goes higher, but the main roof is 40 feet tall.

Chair Baltay: Is it possible to get that photo back on the screen as we discuss the project? I thought that was particularly appropriate. Okay. With that, I'd like to have Alex start us off on our discussion of this.

Ms. French: Can you tell me which one? The images?

Chair Baltay: That looks good. I think that's a good photo. Osmo, you have another question?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah. For the lighting in the area, do you know if those lights are going to be on all the time?

Mr. Tietjen: They will be on from dusk to dawn.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay, so, throughout the whole night?

Mr. Tietjen: [No audible response.]

Chair Baltay: Any other questions? Thoughts? Alex, where do we start?

Board Member Lew: I have some comments on the planting plan. The first comment is it doesn't seem like we have small perennials and shrubs along the Caltrain right-of-way, so it seems a little out of place here. I think I would support larger shrubs that were about the same height as the fence, just to screen the fence from the train. You've got some issues, I think, with the plant choices here. I think the artemisia californica is fine. The epilobium I think can work. I think it... It does normally require it to be cut down to the ground every year, like, down to the base of the plant, for it to do really well, and I was just wondering if somebody is actually going to do that here, in this case. Also, that one spreads underground, and it also self-seeds, so it can be invasive. But if you're not irrigating any of this landscaping except for hand-watering, that might keep it under control. And then, the clematis lasiantha is a pretty wimpy plant. I had one by my front door for maybe five or more years and it really just is not a great... It's not really doing much. There's another one, another native clematis, the clematis ligusticifolia, which is a little bit more rigorous, but I saw it on the garden tour last month and it's pretty wimpy compared to what we normally think of as vines. I think the other issue with them is that they normally grown in riparian locations, so they're used to having a lot of water, and they're used to being in a different type of soil I would imagine the conditions being, excuse me, than the conditions are here. Another thing about both of those is that they go, like, some are deciduous, so the leaves turn brown, and they stay on the stem, so it looks like it's died. If you don't know, you will take it out, thinking the plant is dead, but actually, they come back once it starts raining again in the wintertime. Overall, I don't think you're going to, even though you've got a whole bunch of them planted, I think the effect is not going to be worth the effort of putting them in. I'm thinking of, if you want a vine covered fence, then I would go non-native because I think you have more choices. Something like violet trumpet vine, or something, which looks good all year, and it does well in part sun conditions. And then, other than that, I think the most important thing that we do here on the project is to increase landscaping on Alma, because that's the most visible piece of this, I think, from the public's point of view. And the middle of the landscape strip for Park Plaza is sort of incredible, but there aren't any windows or anything looking down into it, so I don't know that that is going to have that much of an impact.

Chair Baltay: Grace.

Board Member Lee: I just want to thank the applicant for bringing this forward. It's [inaudible], and it's just helpful that you're willing to take our comments to move forward. And thank you Jodie and Amy for the 40-foot height. That's really helpful. I recall serving on the Board when we actually reviewed Park Plaza and did receive comments from the community regarding the elevation from the Alma Street side, so, I guess my comments will be directed more towards the potential for buffer in terms of visual. Having said that, and visiting the site, if you're on the Park Plaza site, you really don't see that much of those plants, that much of those plants. I ride Caltrain quite a bit and we're moving at speeds and, you know, we think of these as dead corridors. However, from Alma, you can see what's across. And Park Plaza is a rather tall building. I just want to really, my comments are really on the Alma Street side. I hope you work with the City well and provide a terrific plan for trees along that edge. When I look at the planting plan, I appreciate Alex's comments regarding the choice. We live in an area where drought-tolerant succulents that grow quite mature, even to heights of five feet, six feet, there's many to choose from. I encourage you, when I look at the dimension, the planting is six feet to seven-foot-10-inches. That's quite a dimension for really rich choices that are drought tolerant, low maintenance, and will provide some height and buffer. That would be, I think, a positive direction to move in. Thank you for the comment regarding lighting. I'm encouraged to hear that it is dusk to dawn. And then, in terms of clearances from electrified components, completely understand that. I think that if you were to just draft what that 10-foot clearance is from those specified areas of electrification, there's still ample room for terrific landscape buffer. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: David, would you like to go next?

Board Member Hirsch: Well, first, I'd like to comment a little bit about the presentation here, because without the photographs, it's very hard to imagine what we as architects and people who are familiar with planting – and luckily we have some people here who are very good at that – are looking at here in this project. I'm sorry I didn't visit the site because I would have some comments about Park Plaza, that the photographs are very helpful, but they really ought to be a part of our packet here. You know? In terms of your future presentations, maybe elsewhere you would consider more what we would like to be looking at here in these sets of drawings. With my compatriots here, I would agree about the plantings, and they are better informed about what really would work on the fence line there on the Alma Street side. You do have to sort of see this from the point of view of the car, of course, which is a lot lower, so lower plantings would help a lot to buffer what we're looking at. But, after all, we're looking at railroad construction here, and expect it to be engineered. And we've been looking at a lot of engineering drawings here, which are a little less useful to us than the specific architectural vision that we would like to look to see, of both the building, building color. The gantry is going to be a gantry, whatever it is, and you have to sort of accept it. In fact, it's kind of fun to look at some elements like that. So, I'm not opposed to any of that. It does appear from that angled view that we're looking at here, that there are some windows looking out the back of that building, so they'll have to look at the railroad. There's just no choice in the matter. What are they, Amy?

Ms. French: I can you tell you, I put the one with the window next to the yellow wall here, you can see a window here. Everything along this edge at the upper level is hallways to get to the units, [crosstalk]

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Ms. French: ...because nobody's, you know, bedroom or living room or anything.

Board Member Hirsch: Not residential units looking out.

Ms. French: It's a residential hallway that...

Board Member Hirsch: Oh, it is.

Ms. French: ...leads to the residences on the other side of the hallway.

Board Member Hirsch: Oh, I see. Okay.

Ms. French: They mostly provide light to the hallways. I would say light and probably not air.

Board Member Hirsch: Well, you know, I just want to accept Alex's comments about the kind of plantings that would work well, and I think everybody should, you should really consider those, and Grace's comments, as well, about the plantings. The only question I would have, is it possible to get those more mature plants in some way? Or do they have to grow up from the ground and we're going to wait for them to mature? That's a question maybe Alex could answer more than...

Board Member Lew: Alex, do you want to add on to that?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, they've done tests where they've put in the low, small, like one-gallon plant, and then they'll put in a large five-gallon plant. Usually, after five years, you can't tell the difference because the younger plant gets better established roots. I think with the native plants, you also have an issue, which is availability. They tend to sell them as smaller plants and they're just not available. I mean, even if they find a plant that's perfect, like, it may just not be available at the time that they need it. You have to be willing to allow substitutions.

Board Member Hirsch: You do, but you can also try another nursery, and really look around to try to find ones that, in fact, look ahead and see if you could work with the nurseries to get plantings more mature by the time you're ready to plant them. And check your seasonal issues on that as well. I've had some experience with that, actually. Yes, you have to search around, and you maybe go a little further to get the

plantings. If you could insist upon your contractors, you know, really looking into that early on, that would be a good note on your drawing here. I have no specific comments beyond that.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Osma.

Vice Chair Thompson: Thank you. Thanks for your presentation. Thank you to my colleagues for their comments. I'll save any of my landscape comments. They were all well-articulated by my colleagues. The only other comment I had was on the lighting. Fixture A looks like it could be pretty directional and point down, but Fixture C is more of a glowing orb that could shine out and up into the sky. That's really the one that I would recommend finding something that's more directional. Palo Alto doesn't like to have lights shining up in the sky, for birds and for other reasons. And I understand for security, these need to be on all night, and if that's the case, it would be great if they could be pointed down. The other note is 500 Kelvin is a pretty harsh color, and I know that Palo Alto has been changing the colors of their lights. BART recently re-did a lot of their elevator lobbies for security and chose 3,500 Kelvin, which is a bit easier on the eye. And given that you're going to have such beautiful vegetation around that you're going to be lighting all night, why not make it something that looks nice? Those are my only comments. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, Osma. I will echo and share the sentiments of my colleagues, and I'd like to add that I think from the, what's called Page Mill, or from the Park Avenue side of the railroad tracks to the right of the entry gate as you come in, is an opportunity to put additional landscape screening. It struck me when I was walking on, I guess it's called Page Mill Road, a little piece of road adjacent to this – where your cursor is, Amy, just to the down, to the right of that as you're facing the gate. In that area, a couple of trees or something would really screen the view of this from the new building diagonally across Page Mill Road. And I think it would be entirely appropriate to do that. Right now, they don't have this sort of facility, and it would be very easy to do. So, I would suggest that you see if that can happen. And I strongly support additional landscaping on Alma Street at the two gap areas Amy has mentioned. I think it's essential to do that, actually. With that, does anyone else have anything to add to these folks?

Board Member Lew: I have one last comment. On the pole lighting fixture, number A, which is mounted 25 feet high. Normally, in the city, we try to have the maximum height closer to 15 to 20 feet. It's not a hard-and-fast rule, but we do that usually to reduce glare. It generally looks better. In this particular situation, where security is really key, maybe there's an argument for the 25 feet, for the 25 foot height. And then, the trade-off, though, is if you go lower, you need more light fixtures typically, and it's more expensive. I would just throw that out there, that normally we would look for something lower if it were in the city.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Thank you very much. Good luck with the project, and we look forward to electric trains very soon. Thank you.

Mr. Tietjen: Thank you for your comments and your attention. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: With that, Grace, I believe, is going to recuse herself from the next item...

Board Member Lee: I will recuse myself.

Chair Baltay: ... but I don't see the need for taking a break or anything, so let's just say goodbye to you and bring on the next item.

[Short break while transitioning to the next item. Board Member Lee left the room.]

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [19PLN-00110]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of the Existing 94,300 Square Foot Macy's Men's Building Located in the Stanford Shopping Center and the Construction of (1) a Retail Building, Approximately 43,500 sf, (2) two Retail Buildings, Approximately 3,500 sf each, and (3) a Retail Building, Approximately 28,000 sf (78,500 sf in total). Environmental Assessment: Exempt From the

Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance With Guideline Section 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at Samuel.Gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Baltay: Okay, let's keep moving along here. Our next item is a public hearing, quasi-judicial, for 180 El Camino Real, consideration of a major architectural review to allow the demolition of the existing 94,300 square foot Macy's Men's building, located in the Stanford Shopping Center, and the construction of (1) a retail building, approximately 43,500 square feet; (2) two retail buildings, approximately 3,500 square feet each, and (3) a retail building, approximately 28,000 square feet, producing 78,500 square feet in total. Do we have any disclosures for this item? Alex?

Board Member Lew: Yes, I haven't been to the site since the last hearing, but I will disclose that I retrieved an old set of shopping center drawings from 2014, to look at the square footage spreadsheet.

Chair Baltay: Osma, disclosures?

Vice Chair Thompson: Nothing to disclose, thank you.

Chair Baltay: David, any disclosures?

Board Member Hirsch: No, I didn't visit the site. Just spent a lot of time looking at the drawings. But I've been there before.

Vice Chair Thompson: We've all been there before.

Chair Baltay: I think everyone has been there. I visited the site actually twice on this issue, once on a Saturday to gauge the traffic, and then, once again on a Tuesday morning, to really look and think about the building itself. I also did meet with the applicant some months ago now, in my office. I didn't learn anything that's not in the public record.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, the applicant was in my office, as well, or my house, as well, and we had...

Chair Baltay: You did...?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I'm sorry I didn't say.

Chair Baltay: Any other disclosures? Great. Staff report, please?

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner: Good morning, Board. My name is Samuel Gutierrez. I'm the project planner for the Stanford Shopping Center. We're presenting, again, the Macy's Men's redevelopment project, before you today. Here you can see an image of the updates. The Restoration Hardware building is on the top, and to the bottom left, you'll see Wilkes Bashford. It's been refined, and I'll go into greater detail. And then, the bottom right is Building EE. That's kind of the El Camino facing portion, and that has also been refined. Just to give you a quick overview on the project, of course, we are demolishing the Macy's Men's building and performing changes to the surrounding parking lot configuration to develop two new stand-alone buildings. Restoration Hardware, three stories, Wilkes Bashford, single story retail building with a mezzanine level, and two single-story tenant spaces directly adjacent to Building J. LaBelle Salon will be the one that abuts up against that one. The project did go before the ARB as a study session on February 7, 2019, and there was a formal hearing prior where the ARB provided formal comments on June 20, 2019. The comments are listed here. There were comments regarding the design of the Wilkes Bashford building, about the corners of the building that face El Camino; there was concern about opening that up, it looked too walled-off; and there were concerns about the green wall. Though the ARB felt that they liked the green wall, there were maybe some modifications that were needed there where it didn't quite connect. The retail Building E has a drive aisle that is across from the Restoration Hardware building, and that was proposed at an elevated level at pedestrian, kind of a platform. There were concerns that that didn't provide

any separation between pedestrians and traffic, so there are some options presented for that, with a traditional curb or the elevated platform drive aisle, but with more bollards and larger planter boxes to kind of form those barriers between pedestrians and the flow of traffic. There were also concerns about pedestrian pathways and details about those bollards and lighting. That has also been provided. There was comments towards the El Camino sidewalk. Previously, we had looked towards doing a much wider one to mimic the south El Camino guidelines, those comments regarding that width, so that has been revised. There were comments about Pistache Place having trees on both sides. I think that was just a reflection of the plan, that it didn't accurately show what's across the way towards the parking lot that isn't in the scope, so we detailed that in the staff report. And then, there were concerns about the infilling landscape along El Camino, that cars could be shown. There's kind of gaps in the landscaping, so maybe to berm that area up a bit and put more plantings. That's also shown on the landscape sheets. And then, to study the use of the existing parking lot, there were concerns about the parking. There's been some parking management policies put in place, along with some other parking treatments I'll go into in a moment. To focus on Building EE, we made [inaudible] to be the same, but the larger changes were, of course, the walking path. The first option has a curb with a drive aisle. The second option, again, is elevated top with bollards. Both designs require more planters, more seating, more trees. That's shown on the plan sheet L-200. Here, we can see one option. You can see here that now there is a curb, an actual curb. Before, there wasn't. It was just flush with the walkway, so that's changed. There's actually a true representation of the planting that would be there, and then, the light posts, and so on. Here you can see the other option. This is without the curb, but it has these planter boxes, much larger, kind of form barriers, along with bollards. And then, this would be the, kind of elevated, level with pedestrians. That's the other option for the drive aisle. Here, we can see Wilkes Bashford. It's actually the corner of Pistache Place and El Camino. Previously, this was kind of a more solid corner. We could see that it's been added with some storefront display windows to open that up a bit. The green wall was adjusted slightly, along with the planters there. You can see, this is the Pistache Place elevation, so as you're entering towards the shopping center from El Camino, you'll see that there has been some refinements there. There's actually a little seating area behind the nice Audi, the white car, that has a trellised area. That's a new public seating area that's been treated with vines. Here, this is facing towards the inside of the shopping center, which is across from LaBelle and Building EE side of Wilkes Bashford. Again, it was refined, and then, there was more trellis features to mimic the one on Pistache Place. You can kind of see that one on the top, kind of center-right, I should say. And then, here is the bigger refinements to some of the primary entry features of the Wilkes Bashford building. This is facing the parking lot on Sand Hill. You can see that the trellis has been refined again, and it has, again, that kind of integration of the creeping vines, kind of having three sides of that on the building. And then, the Wilkes Bashford projection there has a darker material. That's actually on the materials sample board. That was an updated material there. There were comments about the landscape plan and site plan, so, we looked at the non-native plants, and they were removed from the landscape plan. The current landscape plan has what we feel is a sufficient number of native, low-water use, and habitat-sustaining plants, which meet the ARB findings for approval. There were comments about utilities being screened in a greater way than there was previously at the shopping center. Those details are shown on Sheet LS-100, 600, 700 and 800. There are these kind of paneling systems that would have vegetation growing on them around the new utility boxes, to screen them much better from the public view. Essentially, you'll get green walls around the new transformers and switch gears. There was also additional details provided for the pedestrian walkway. Again, that was Option 1 for the elevated walkway between Building EE and Restoration Hardware. There were more details provided for the landscape, hardscape and, of course, screening of utilities, but we feel that it meets some of the concerns of the ARB. However, we appreciate your feedback on that, and how that has achieved, you know, if that is satisfactory to the Board. And then, the planting strip along ECR, or El Camino Real. There is a planting strip between the sidewalk that's existing and the curb and the street. That's currently vacant for the greater portion of this block of El Camino, so that's where we utilized that area that's very small, to actually extend the sidewalk a bit to allow kind of a side-stepping ability for what we anticipate to be a lot more pedestrian traffic with this redevelopment along that portion of El Camino. This goes into detail for the El Camino sidewalk. There is a lot of trees near the corner of Sand Hill and El Camino Real, and at that portion, you have a few trees actually in that mini planting strip. And then, behind the sidewalk towards the site. So, a chicane kind of path needed to be formed for that, and that still was a little narrower than the greater portion, where we were able to take advantage of that planter strip I just spoke about. It's kind of the intermediary, so rather than having a

four-foot, four-and-a-half foot wide sidewalk, we attained a six-and-a-half foot sidewalk, which is a greater walking area, and possibly biking area, because people do cut across from the trail that's along San Francisquito Creek and Sand Hill, and cut across El Camino, and then, head back on to the Stanford University trails, back to the university. We have that. We do recommend, however, because there was an updated arborist report to see the impact of the chicane path, but it did come after the report. We do want to recommend that that item in particular, the sidewalk, be reviewed by the ARB subcommittee after we've had more time to detail that arborist report that has been updated. Here is a blow-up of the El Camino sidewalk that I'm talking about. You can see a bit of that wavy, kind of chicane path between those five trees. After that, it just widens out to that thin planter strip towards the curb. It essentially widens the sidewalk without encroaching into the existing tree areas, so that existing back of sidewalk would remain. Moving on to some of the concerns about the vehicle parking. There are parking lot areas that are removed. The Wilkes Bashford and Restoration Hardware buildings are proposed in areas that currently are occupied by drive aisles and parking stalls. The existing parking for the site is 5,218, and the proposed is 4,078 stalls that are standard, 111 accessible stalls, 29 EV, and 29 EV-ready. The total is 5,265, which is 47 over the code requirement. They are physically losing spaces, but there's also a loss of square footage, which, of course, deducts from the required parking for the site. Here, you can see a blow-up of the site plan, and a little bit greater detail than the previous image of the parking lot. There were other means to address the concern about the parking occupancy on the prime areas, which is, basically, anyone visiting the site wants to park near where they're going. If you're going to Fleming's, you want to park by Fleming's; if you're going to Bloomingdale's, you want to park by Bloomingdale's, and so forth. But there are difficulties with that because these are people coming from the city at large and the region at large. How do we control that flow? It's not really possible, but one thing that's more under the control of the shopping center management is the employee parking. They have a lot of employees that go there every day at fixed times, so to have a policy in place that moves the employees to the parking structures and the upper levels of the parking structures, which are the less-desirable parking areas for guests that go to the shopping center. It was implemented by Simon Property Management. That's a display on this map. You can see the two parking structures on Quarry. The employees would park in the upper levels there. And they have a policy in place that I'm sure they'll go into during their presentation, about having their employees park there, which frees up a lot of the parking that the customers would want to see as prime parking, which is the closest parking to their ideal destinations at the shopping center. The other side of the parking issue was bicycle parking. We did conduct a study of the shopping center and found that there was some deficiencies in bicycle parking, in particular the short-term parking. There was a study conducted of occupancy, for where people are actually parking their bikes. However, that was done during the summer, so we did have some concerns because Stanford University wasn't in session. That would be potentially leaving out a huge population of cyclists. The university is very bike-able, it's very bike-friendly, so people do bike. We asked for another study to be done while school is in session, and that's still pending. That would dictate where we would place the most bicycle parking within the shopping center, so, the primary entry points, and where the most need is. That's an item that we recommend go to the ARB subcommittee to be reviewed. Also, as part of the bicycle parking, we did acknowledge that people going to the shopping center, and to further encourage them to bike there rather than drive there, more consistent with our sustainability goals and our transportation goals for the city, people need actual cargo bikes. If you're going to the shopping center and going to make large purchases, a cargo bike or a bike with a trailer is what you need. To actually allocate a larger area for these types of bikes is needed. In reviewing with Transportation staff, we've conditioned that six new bicycle areas are going to be proposed for cargo bikes. These would be striped larger and noted as cargo bicycle parking. Here, you can see we're suggesting by the Nieman Marcus and Building N. I think Shreve & Co. is currently occupying that corner. Those would be locations for the cargo bikes, and then, towards where Fleming's is, Vineyard Vines, Bloomingdale's and L'Occitane, there would be some carbo bike parking there as well. These are the main entry, the back entry, and then, the front entry to the shopping center for these bikes. And for those who don't know what a cargo bike is, this is what it is. It's a much longer bicycle. There are different configurations, and you can see there's basically a, kind of open chest or bin in front of the bike. This allows you to purchase more goods and transport more goods, or kids, or dogs, or what-have-you. You can see that it wouldn't really be practical for a standard bicycle rack or stall. It really needs to have its own hatched-out area, similar to an accessible space. The other portion of this is the loading. We studied all the loading spaces. The site is what it is for the most part, and there are loading spaces throughout the site, all the way from Nordstrom's to the

existing Macy's Men's building, and many of the spaces are legal non-conforming, for the most part, the legal non-conforming for the width, where the code requires 12 feet by 45 feet. Many of the spaces are actually 100 feet or more long, so they actually account for several spaces in length. When we broke down the math, we came up with the existing number of loading spaces at the shopping center at 24, and there are 25 proposed. There's an additional loading space that you might see near the Wilkes Bashford building. The shopping center does require 29 total spaces. This is just a map, an overview of that that's in the plan set. Lighting was also a concern for the ARB. There was additional details and photo-metrics included for this portion of the shopping center. We did notice that the El Camino portion did have some higher light outputs, but it wouldn't increase the existing conditions as El Camino is really well lit. The higher light output is towards El Camino and not towards Sand Hill, which has more sensitivity due to the creek. The staff recommends the ARB takes the following action, which is to recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning and Development Services, formerly Director of Planning and Community Environment, based on findings and subject to conditions of approval, with a requirement for ARB subcommittee to be reviewed and approved for the El Camino sidewalk design, and the bicycle parking for the site. One quick note. I did hand you the updated conditions. There were some edits to the standard conditions that you can see there on the sheet. There are two. There's one pertaining to the trees, and one pertaining to the parking monitoring condition. That concludes the presentation.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Why don't we see if anyone has questions of staff before we hear from the applicant? This was a comprehensive presentation. Thank you, Sam. Are there any questions of staff?

Board Member Hirsch: The cargo bike idea here, is there any analysis that shows that there's likely to be cargo bikes to the site? I mean, are they becoming prevalent enough so that you would provide for them now, at this time?

Mr. Gutierrez: That was reviewed with Transportation staff, and Transportation staff themselves actually utilize cargo bikes. We have a cargo bike for the City that we go to events for, say, for school events. Within that event sphere, the cycling community or greater biking community of Palo Alto. And in Palo Alto, there's actually a fair number of people who have cargo bikes and do already take them to the shopping center and try to strap them to light posts, or wherever they can.

Board Member Hirsch: I mean, I see them in my neighborhood. They're usually taking kids to school with them. Those are safe neighborhoods for riding bicycles. I would wonder if people from the general community in Palo Alto are going to ride across, you know, busy traffic El Camino issues, you know, to get to the shopping center. I can understand... They can probably be used for regular bikes as well. Is that also a possibility?

Mr. Gutierrez: The cargo bike parking would be more reserved for the cargo bike because they are so large, and that area would need to be hatched out. The spacing is larger than other bike rack parking, the inverted use, because they are wider and longer.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Alex, questions?

Board Member Lew: Sam, I have a question about the square footage of the existing Macy's Men's building. If I look at the aerial photo and try to crunch the numbers, I don't come up with the square footage that the City has on record for that building. Can you tell me, is there a basement, or a mezzanine? Is there something that I'm missing?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yeah, there are lower levels to the building, yes.

Board Member Lew: Ah-hah. There's a basement?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes.

Board Member Lew: Ah-hah. Okay. Excellent. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: The basement of the Macy's building below ground counts towards their FAR, of course.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes.

Chair Baltay: That's being considered in this.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes.

Chair Baltay: By removing that basement, they're reducing the square footage of the whole shopping center, reducing their parking load.

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Chair Baltay: Thank you.

Mr. Gutierrez: It's the ratio of 275 per square foot.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions of staff? Okay, the applicant, if you would care to make a presentation, you'll have 10 minutes. Please, if you could state and spell your name for the record, for our transcriber. Thank you.

Matt Klinzing, Simon Property Group: Hi, my name is Matt Klinzing [spells name]. I am an architect with Simon Property Group. Nice to see everybody again. Thank you, Samuel. We prepared kind of an intro for our newest member, but that's not needed, so I think what we will do instead is reiterate what you know we said before. Overall intent for this project is to maintain the same high quality design standards that we have in the existing shopping center. Obviously, break down the scale of buildings so they are pedestrian friendly, and be sensitive to integration of all modes of transportation and pedestrians. I think you pretty much know the rest of our spiel, so we'll go into some specifics. In our last ARB presentation we had here, some comments were brought up, and we were able to have some subsequent individual meetings to go over specific points. This page highlights in general what we have done since then that speaks to those, so I want to go over those real quickly. The number one that's on the left side, there were some concerns last time as to the severity and the fact that we even have a bend in the road as it approaches eastbound from the west, seeing how there is an existing bend further up the west. We took that to heart; we understand it. We didn't want to take out buildings to straighten the road, but what we have done is pulled that grade back a lot farther. About another 40 feet or so, the bend starts. The intent with that is to not have as a severe a turn, but to make that more gradual and more natural as part of it. The other bonus for that is it did increase just to the southeast – you can see there – more hardscape area for us, so that is more pedestrian occupied area, and made where you cross and go across into the parking field a little more, you know, user-friendly as well. Number two. We've had a lot of parking and loading concepts in this cross street. As you might remember, the very first presentation had a number of perpendicular stalls to the south side. We were concerned about that and passing cars. In a subsequent presentation, we changed that to parallel parking. We're still concerned about that, so, what we're showing instead now is one area in the center that's really dedicated to loading. Loading obviously is limited to not-operational hours, before and after the operation of the center, but that would be where we would have loading primarily for those two users we're calling Building EE, just south of there. That is right next to a service door that leads into those areas. That's where the loading would occur. We hope with that change, that takes away any of those conflicts. The other added benefit of that is it allowed us to adjust somewhat the site dimensions in there. Actually, the Restoration Hardware building has pulled south a little bit, six, seven, eight feet – I can't remember the exact dimension – from Sand Hill, which I know was another concern at one time. As you'll see in some of the views later on, and as Mr. Gutierrez also mentioned, we have a couple options for the layout of that street whether it's table-topped or not, because that was a previous discussion point. Number three speaks to really the pedestrian connectivity over to Wilkes Bashford. There was concern before as to its remoteness from the primary sidewalk and how it was connected back. We've indicated now is, both through the inner ring and across the parking drive there, as a table-topped condition, similar to what we have just south of Restoration Hardware. This, again, makes that area more

pedestrian owned. There is a change in pavement material, there's a tabletop; you actually have to take your car up, so that is more of a natural progression of pedestrians across there. Finally, number four indicates, there's been some previous comments on the elevations, that this would be a great place for an entry because it kind of looks like one. So, what we have introduced at this point is a west entry from the Wilkes Bashford building that has direct site line, of course, from the primary sidewalk looking over. We hope that accommodates that issue. In this slide, we're facing southward on El Camino, looking into the project. As we discussed prior, this is the first building you see as you come into Palo Alto, and the nature of northern Palo Alto is very bucolic and very lush. We certainly didn't want to do anything that would be the detriment of that. All the existing trees are maintained as previously indicated. We do have bushes that would be replanted to provide a buffer that comes along there. Mr. Gutierrez mentioned the eight-foot sidewalk that goes along, and I must admit that one of our renderings is not updated because it still shows the empty planting strip along the curb here. I apologize, that should have been updated, but if you could use your imagination, that's gone. That's an eight foot wide sidewalk now. And then, we do have, as you go along with condition, you see the northeast corner there, we have glazing on that northeast corner, so it would be animated in the Wilkes Bashford building. We also want to take a close look at where we are putting the green walls, or the live walls. The comment last time is we like them, like them being part of the building, but weren't kind of grooving on where they were. What we thought made more sense is we've now incorporated it a little more sensitively into the different pieces and plane-ings of the building. We used different materials to break down the scale, because it is a two-store façade along El Camino, and we've now partnered them in a frame of material, either brick or stone, that we have here, that puts them alongside the glazing that we think is a little more sensitive. Of course, you see centered on the west façade or east façade a storefront that, again, addresses El Camino. The southeast corner of the building as you enter Pistache, again, we have glazing on this corner to greet you as you come in, and there is a bio retention that takes storm run-off from the roof in this location. That's something that Samuel talked about, so I don't want to get into too much detail there. We wanted to include some more detailed views, though, for this time. Last time we discussed, there was concern about plain, or thin, or not having an architecture that would turn corners. That's not the intent. We certainly would detail everything, so where materials turn back into storefronts, or where you see corners that turn around, we would return all materials so it doesn't have a paper thin appearance; it really does have a higher design aesthetic. In addition to that, this is a picture of a patio area that's on the south side of Wilkes Bashford that is along the sidewalk, that comes from El Camino, in, along the north side of Pistache Place. We think that will be an added detail. The view here is of the west side of Wilkes Bashford that shows the entrance and shows the tabletop walkway across that parking area that connects it back to the main pedestrian area. And then, this is a more detailed view at the north or primary entrance to Wilkes Bashford, which we'll call their branded entrance. It shows our engineered wood on the right, a roof overhang, the signage and the trellis detail that is currently at the existing building, that we would carry over to this new building as well. We think it helps break down the scale. Now, we get over to Building EE, and this is where we get into the two different options for the table-topping. The last time we presented, we did show the tabletop, and it was pointed out by Board Member Lew that you do require a lot of pieces and parts when you do this to control cars and pedestrians. We have raised wells for trees, we do have bollards. We understood that, so we wanted to show, in addition, the option of, if that was not there. Obviously, they are two different conditions. Looking for your recommendation or your preference on which way to proceed. I think either one is useable from our standpoint. It really gets down to subjectivity and your understanding of Palo Alto and what would be appreciated here most. On the other view – this is now looking east, with Restoration Hardware to the left and Building EE to the right – again, the condition that is not table-topped, and the condition that would be table-topped. Obviously, it changes the character significantly in that area. Lastly, want to talk a little bit about what Samuel had mentioned in terms of our efforts to try to control, modify, manage a little bit, the parking, and the attendant. As he's mentioned, we have put in place a policy for all employee parking, which you might remember in the attached study is a significant number. All employees now, we put out through memo to all of the managers of the stores, are asked to park in the upper levels of those decks that are down along Quarry Road. It was pretty dramatic the day that that went out. We saw a significant reduction, primarily in the parking lot that runs along Sand Hill to the north of there. To date, that has been the extent of that policy. Obviously, as part of our plan as we move forward, we'd like to put signage, we'd like to put other markers there to reinforce that, and we certainly would keep up on that. In addition to that, we were setting up some studies – haven't enacted it yet – how we put into place geofencing for ride

sharing, and dedicate specific areas for Uber and Lyft, so you don't end up with cars continually circling around parking spaces, leading to back up in other areas. There would be a definite, significant area that everyone would understand where to go through signage, through amenities, meaning furniture and other things, as well as digitally through geofencing that would be used for those. Those are some of the things in place, and I'd be happy to answer any other questions that you have.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you very much. I'd like to open the hearing to public comments. Do we have any speaker cards? Or any members of the public who would like to address this issue? Okay, seeing no one, I'll bring it back to the Board. Do we have any questions of the applicant? Osma?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah. The rendering that you were showing had plantings on the trellis. Do we know what...? Sorry, I'm talking about the Wilkes Bashford building, that planting. Do we know what...?

Mr. Klinzing: I knew you were going to ask that. I was sitting there, listening to the previous one, going, I do not know what that planting is.

Vice Chair Thompson: I don't see it in the plans.

Mr. Klinzing: Yeah, I don't either. You're right. We have not selected a species for that. That's something we need to do. I did hear the comments in the previous about not robust. I don't know what we have out there today. I know it's robust on the Wilkes Bashford, on the west side. My concern is that, if it is a sensitive and actually indigenous as opposed to invasive species, that we need to look into. If it is, and it's something acceptable, we would re-use that because it does quite well. But I don't have an answer for you right now. We need to identify that.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay.

Chair Baltay: Any other questions? I have a couple for you then, if I could. On the Restoration Hardware building, on the third floor, I see a closed restaurant space, and then, a large outdoor seating area. What is the function of the outdoor seating area?

Mr. Klinzing: I asked them to be here today, but they're not, so I'll go ahead and speak on their part because I believe I know, because I've been to these. But it's two functions. Basically, they do have a café that's up there that people would attend, so it's outdoor seating. In addition to that, it is an extension of the outdoor sales area, so, they also market their furniture and use it for that.

Chair Baltay: There will be some outdoor, informal dining?

Mr. Klinzing: That is the intent, yes.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. My other two questions have to do with parking and loading. Could you walk me through the loading? Not Uber-type loading, but for merchandise coming into both of these facilities. How is it done? How do the trucks get to Wilkes Bashford and Restoration Hardware?

Mr. Klinzing: I don't have the circulation study up, which we provided in here, but for Wilkes Bashford, we dedicated this area over here for where trucks will come, and where they will leave. These are not large trucks. There are smaller deliveries that come quickly – FedEx, UPS. That is also where we would have, as you know, we have a system set up for trash collection and removal, where it involves a smaller cart-type system. That's also where they would collect that and carry it back. For Building EE...

Chair Baltay: Excuse me one second, could I interrupt? Is there actually a loading door on the Wilkes Bashford building for that area?

Mr. Klinzing: There is, yeah.

Chair Baltay: You have a glass corner there now.

Mr. Klinzing: Well, it's located just in board here, so we've taken it off the corner and moved it farther to the west so that it wouldn't be in primary view. But there is a loading door that will be pocketed into the finishes there.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. Okay, continue.

Mr. Klinzing: Yeah. And then, over on Building EE, as well as Restoration Hardware, this is where the primary service would occur, right here. Obviously, the restaurants would be more service intensive than Restoration Hardware. Believe it or not, the majority wants [inaudible] of their deliveries, again, are FedEx trucks, UPS. A lot of goods don't come and go. But that would be the primary point of service for those.

Chair Baltay: If I purchase a sofa at Restoration Hardware, how do I get it out of the door?

Mr. Klinzing: I wish they were here to speak to it, but having purchased myself from them, I never take something from the store. What happens is you arrange a delivery, or you arrange a pickup, at a point that they have. It's not walking out the front door with a sofa.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Klinzing: I should also mention, which I didn't earlier, is that they have also organized their trash to be right inside of their service door, which is located here. That would be collected, again, in this area, via the cart-type method.

Chair Baltay: On the question of parking, can you tell me how many employees park on the shopping center? I'm trying to get a sense of how many spaces are used for employees. Talk to that number.

Mr. Klinzing: We have a range. We don't have exact numbers. In order to get that data, we put out a survey to all of our stores, and we had, I think it was 80 percent responded. It wasn't 100 percent; it was 80 percent responded. Of that, the calculator that we put in – and I don't have the report right in front of me, but I believe it was between 400 and 600 on a daily basis that we have at any one time in the center.

Chair Baltay: And the way you're doing your parking program to incentivize employees to park at the roof of the garage nearby, what sort of mechanism or incentives are you giving? And what percentage of that...? How many of those 400 to 600 spaces do you expect are going to be shifted over there?

Mr. Klinzing: Well, our hope would be all of them. I don't have data to this date to show how many have been moved over there. As far as incentive, we don't really offer an incentive to employees, other than the fact that it frees up more spaces for patrons. Therefore, the success of the store, you know, helps out. I will tell you that what we have done is research on, call it, not "enforcement," but "monitoring," because "enforcement" is a tricky word in the state of California. But in terms of monitoring, there are companies that we use at other facilities [inaudible] use here. What that involves is we have camera technology, where a vehicle drives around and can see plates that are normally parked in the employee area, and actually, they know if they are parked in an area they are not supposed to be. And that person would just receive a reminder from a notification to reinforce that point. But our hope would be all would go there. You never have 100 percent compliance, but we don't have any data today at how successful it's been.

Chair Baltay: Okay, thank you. That's a good answer. Any other questions?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah, I just wanted to point out that Board Member Lew was kind enough to point out the vines are California grape. It's in the landscape plan. It's very tiny.

Mr. Klinzing: Thank you, Board Member Lew.

Vice Chair Thompson: Found it.

Mr. Klinzing: Is that an acceptable species? I should have asked our landscape...

Vice Chair Thompson: I did have an extra question, while I have this. The mortar joint for the brick material samples, in the renderings, looks like it's an extruded joint. I wanted to know if you guys have that decision. We don't see the mortar...

Mr. Klinzing: We have not spec'd that joint, so, you know, we would basically put in whatever is going to look the best and be the most effective and not... Which is usually just going to be a standard beveled joint. We wouldn't look at doing anything typically in those kind of joints because we want it to last.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay. Just wanted to clarify. Thank you.

Chair Baltay: Staff, do we have an arborist report regarding the trees along El Camino. I noticed that, I think it's Tree 72, is slated to be removed. It's a 16-inch live oak on the corner of Pistache Place and El Camino. Do you have any sort of formal feedback on that, on the trees?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes. Those arborists were done, and it was survey of all the trees that were in the project area. There are a number of trees that are being removed. Some are small oaks, this one being the larger one, and others being the kind of London plane and plum trees that you see along the drive aisles and planting strips. When we looked through the arborist's report and looked with Urban Forestry, there is a replacement requirement per tree based on its size. That's the updated condition that was on the conditions of approval for the replacement of several trees, per the study that was done and the City requirements, and the tree technical manual. The site is large and there are several areas to plant more trees. Specifically where the project area is, to plant all the trees there would be difficult, and it would eliminate a lot more parking and drive aisles or walkways. But there are a lot of areas of the shopping center that currently don't have very many trees, or lack trees, so it could be spread cross the shopping center.

Ms. Gerhardt: Also, for the specific oak tree that you're talking about, I think our focus was on the opposite side of Wilkes Bashford. There's a much larger oak tree that we were wanting to preserve, so, trying to work with the applicant, they have a certain location where they want Wilkes Bashford, trying to also focus on that one tree, to stay away from that. That's unfortunately why I think that other oak tree was not able to be saved. You know, there is room to potentially move Wilkes Bashford closer to the shopping center. It would start eliminating more parking, though, in that area. It's just a push-and-pull circumstance.

Chair Baltay: Thank you. I can understand the complexity of those decisions. David, would you like to start off our discussion?

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you for that presentation. It's an excellent presentation, and the graphics are really, really nice. I'm almost getting familiar with some of the people who are walking on the street there, the razor [phonetic] ladies, you know? They are all beautifully dressed and carrying Wilkes Bashford bags, etc., so it's a complete presentation, which allows us to get a really wonderful sense of how that all, the whole corner of new facilities is going to work there. I'm much more pleased with a transition to the tabletop, or whichever is chosen, between Restoration Hardware and the EE building. It seems like it would work now. I would comment that you really need to develop an idea for the corner area that that is a sidewalk, which needs to have some activities there, more activity seating, or whatever, and I don't think the landscaping extends around the corner there. I would hope that the shopping center itself would have some new ideas for the extended area of sidewalk. Everything is sort of an east-west orientation with the entries. Well, that's not true. Wilkes Bashford is very much a north entry. There is a bit of conflict there, actually. The transitional space that goes between the tabletop area, where the transitional area there, if it comes to the elevation of the sidewalk, it almost suggests that there should be a crosswalk, and then, the crosswalk really doesn't have any meaning for Restoration Hardware. But I'm really quite ambivalent about what that is. I think it is more, in fact, a transition for traffic going around the corner there, which is so much better than what it is right now. I think I would, even if it becomes a tabletop, obviously, the

cross-street is, on the corners, the crosswalk patterning is on the corner, so that it leads you more to the Restoration Hardware entry points. Of course, the parking areas on the perimeter there also do the same. The pedestrian traffic pattern I think is from the parking lots, basically, into the stores, except for the walkway along the front of the EE building. That's a vast improvement over the previous one, I think, where there was parking there, and it was misplaced in that area. Now it's given over to pedestrians and eating establishments, hopefully [inaudible]. I think it's a very, very successful transition at this point. But I am ambivalent as to whether it should be tabletop or not. I'll wait for my compatriots here, too, to voice their opinion about that. I think Restoration Hardware, at a previous time, it was very well done, and I don't have any concern about it. The south facing wall is the least interesting of them, and that's a little unfortunate, but I'm not quite sure what you do with that. I only raise the issue to, maybe there would be more thought as to what happens with that particular wall. On the opposite side, however, I think the EE building is really nice with the extended areas of the lines of the space above, and the way you've shown the tile work, making that corner. But, of course, that's not in the contract here the owner is to provide. I guess I could have asked the question before, but is there any control over what the owner does, or does that come back to us at a later date? You could answer that.

Mr. Klinzing: You're talking about the specific tenants for building EE?

Board Member Hirsch: Yep, yeah.

Mr. Klinzing: Yes, that would be an additional process where, right now, we're showing both, you know, speculative tenant finishes as well as landlord finishes. We also have design criteria and design standards, but then, alternate storefronts would have to come in front of the ARB specifically for approval at a later point.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. Look forward to something good coming, just the way you've shown it there. It's very, very nice. I spent a lot more time on Wilkes Bashford, looking at it and trying to understand it as a building, because the other two elements of the threesome are very well designed as architecture. The Wilkes Bashford, I think, does a very good thing on El Camino, you know, that it's two stories high at that time, and the scale is bigger. I think that's excellent. The actual elevation sort of facing you straight on as your car is passing through the area there is less well defined, and it appears that it really isn't something that's going to attract you into that particular parking lot unless you know you want to go there. And there's a kind of weakness of it at that end, to be honest with you. I like the way that building works, that you've taken a very long, skinny building and kind of divided it into different elements. I think you have clarified those elements that pull forward and back, and they are very clear and distinct. I think it's kind of an interesting arrangement of the building, that you transition around it and actually, it's kind of a walking path, and you keep on having window displays set back with plantings in front of them. And then, you have a canopy that you walk under and... a trellis, I should say. And then, you have the wall, the wooden wall, which is kind of defining an entry on one side, and it's actually kind of closing it up on the other side. That building is really to be seen from the parking lot itself, and I think that elevation is quite good. I have concerns, though, about some of the aspects of the exterior of that building. I think that the side, as I said, towards El Camino is nicely scaled. Concerned that that particular elevation has planting walls and trees that are going to be there, and it's the east side of the building. I don't know if it's due east or not, but will planting walls really work in that area? I think it's nice to have that division because there's plenty of corner display. And it's nice to have the two-story display on that side of the building. Sorry. But I'm not positive that the planting walls are going to work there. I'm just concerned about it, so I'm going to leave it to you to work on that. Going down Pistache Place there, there's an outdoor sitting area. It's just a casual coffee sort of area that comes out from the building. Could you explain that a bit more?

Mr. Klinzing: Yeah. Today, where Wilkes Bashford is located on the other side of the property, they have the same condition. It's a small plaza area. It's meant as a couple functions. Obviously, for their patrons to sit out and have coffee that would be provided inside, but as well, we wanted to provide, you know, a respite, a point as you pass along that sidewalk. We realized that the desire to tie El Camino back, pedestrian activity to the interior of the center is an important one. We obviously wanted to make that available as you walked down that sidewalk, to animate it.

Board Member Hirsch: You know, you have the people coming out of the store to an area to sit, and it's right there on the sidewalk. Probably there isn't a lot of pedestrian traffic on Pistache Place coming from El Camino. I would imagine that the parking garages in that other direction is one... yeah, parking spaces adjacent would likely come on the inside, not inner-side. They don't come across Pistache Place at that point. But it strikes me that there maybe should be some privacy between the sidewalk and that sitting area. It isn't really an area where you're looking to create an entry. Maybe there would be a planting divider with glass division, some way of creating a separation between the function of that area where you're coming out, and the interior. We would want to see something like that, I think, you know, how it's done. But the wooden wall is kind of a reflection of the wood on the opposite side. Those elements that you move around I think are really quite interesting. It doesn't make a formal building out of that. It's kind of a very casual building in which you're sort of invited to wander around the outside of it almost, and get displays broken up between the masses of the forms that project. I'm kind of fascinated by it as a commercial building because it isn't so definitive as a structure in itself. Kind of an interesting building to walk around, for the displays, which are at the corners, open up, interestingly, and the planting, etc. One of the materials, though, that really kind of bothers me is the brick. Not the color of the brick, but just the scale of a brick wall. I wondered if, you know, something more akin to a smaller-scale tile or larger brick format wouldn't be better for that particular material. I'm bothered by it, by the scale of it being so small when the scale of the rest of the building are larger, larger pieces. But I'm going to wait and see if my cohorts here decide that they think that, too. Other than that, you know, the material boards on Restoration Hardware appear to me to be very successful. Let me just look over my list here. The plantings, you know, show developed plantings on the columns, and how that actually works is going to be a question for me. It's a good rendering, but is it really going to work that way. We've got a few years to watch those things grow up. If you could get something that you could wind around them and get it started early, that would be good. But I think the idea of it as a softening of the trellis, of course, is a good idea. The planting wall on the east... Oh, that I've mentioned already. Those are my issues, basically. I think that parking lots, unfortunately you can't get more trees in it because you really do need as many cars in there as you can possibly get. I find that the three very different elements to that corner will be quite an improvement to the shopping center. Thank you very much.

Chair Baltay: Thank you, David. Osma, would you like to follow on?

Vice Chair Thompson: Yes. Hi. Thank you of your presentation. Thank you, Sam. I will try to keep this shorter. Restoration Hardware and Building EE, I don't have any problems with. I'm not really going to comment on them. I think the palette you have for both are fine. For the raised curb issue between Restoration Hardware and Building EE, I'm a fan of the raised curb. As much as I love driving through there, I know that times are changing. Pedestrian activity is going to get more, and I think it could be a really nice space, potentially. So, I will voice that. I'm going to spend most of my time on the Wilkes Bashford building. I think that is the building that needs the most work. I'll echo some of what David was saying about scale. I think we brought this up last time as well. It's a big building. Building EE does a really good job of breaking down the scale into sort of these, like, five pretty easy to understand components, and almost, like, five, little micro spaces that it's creating, because it's probably going to be five different tenants. With Wilkes Bashford, you don't have that because it's one tenant, but that loss of scale is a little hard to swallow, I think. Visually, I'm really... I think last time I mentioned this; it feels a lot like a blank wall in some places. The palette is really nice. I like the material choice. But the way that it is portrayed in the elevations and the renderings do seem a bit too, too long of the same stuff for a while. That's kind of why I was asking about the mortar joints and the small scale stuff, is because I think those are the places where it does get richer. The rendering of the wood paneling is showing a really big... It's showing a big striation. The sample that we have is small. I'm assuming you're going to go with the big one. I do think a smaller version... And again, the rendering is also not really reflecting the sample. Again, the rendering is showing a really honey-colored wood, and we're seeing a really dark-colored wood here. The elevations are showing the right color, but the rendering is not. And the striations of that is really, really important. It will really affect how we perceive these building. I don't know if this is, you know... I'm looking at the rendering on AWB-12, which is also the rendering on the front page. It's hard to pick at any one thing on this rendering, but... It's really [inaudible] building. I'm looking at the score lines of the stucco, and I think there can be more than just the score lines of the stucco to be the thing that defines the building. I think

more needs to happen with this building, so I would be open to approving Restoration Hardware and Building EE, but I think Wilkes Bashford, I think enough change needs to happen to it that I don't know that it's a subcommittee item. And it mainly has to do with the scale of the building and the amount of blank walls. The sidewalk problem is also a problem. I think, you know, we were looking at a couple of images where the drip line of the tree seems to encroach into the corner of the building, the one that we do want to save. I'm a fan of saving the trees and having less parking. May be a controversial opinion, but, you know, trees are really important, and that's our urban canopy, and people are going to start parking less and less. That's a reality of the future. I'm not in favor of what's happening on the street. I don't like that there's less planning. We're getting rid of that planting strip. We can do something better on that side. And I really want to commend the applicant. This is a lot better than what we saw last time. I appreciate that you added the green walls where you did. The wood trellis detail is, I didn't find the wood trellis detail, but if you're using this material, which you are in the elevations, that edge is still an issue. If you have a wood trellis, you will see sort of the black, you know, synthetic edge of this panel, so it doesn't look like a wood trellis, it looks like a... I don't really know what this is made of. It looks like a synthetic material. That detail is important. Okay. I think that's the main... That's the long and short of it. So, yes, I'm okay with Building EE and Restoration Hardware, but I do think Wilkes Bashford needs to come back.

Chair Baltay: Thanks, Osma. Alex, your turn.

Board Member Lew: Okay, so, thank you everybody. I think the packet looks good. I was inclined to recommend approval today, but we'll see where the Board goes. Staff, thank you for the at-places square footage spread sheet. The comments that I made last... One of my comments was that that should have been in the packet, just because we have members of the community who actually check all the square footages on our projects, on City projects. That there was no way to really check the square footage in the drawing set. I found myself looking at aerial photos and measuring them, just to get a ballpark sense of the numbers. And I just want to say that this has appeared in previous shopping center submittals. On the previous hearing, I had mentioned the trees on Pistache Place, and I think my comment was that the new trees and the existing trees are on different locations, not that there aren't any trees on the south side of Pistache Place. But your new trees are right along the curb, and then, the existing trees are inboard of the sidewalk. To me, that looked like a mistake. I don't know. If they're all the same species, maybe it's fine. For my purposes today, I don't think it affects my recommendation, or not, on the project. Previously, I mentioned tree number 93, which is near the porte-cochere at the Macy's Men's store. In the plans, it's labeled as a privet, but to me, it's an oak tree. It seems like staff has lots of conditions for new native trees, so maybe that's covered under the tree replacement; maybe it's not. But it seems like the general sense of the conditions of approval are to have more oak trees, so I think I support that. There's a little bit of, I don't call it confusion. It's not clear in the landscape drawings. I think there are two T-1 trees. One is a cercis and one is a **sultus [phonetic]**. And my assumption is, after looking at all the drawings, is that the **sultus [phonetic]** are existing parking lot trees near Wilkes Bashford, and the cercis is just in the new connector street by Building EE. I can accept that if that is the way it is, but if it were sort of mixed up, and the cercis trees were in the parking lot, then it would not be acceptable because those aren't really shade. They're tiny little trees, they're not parking lot shade trees. On the Restoration Hardware building, I have no comments. The building has always looked very handsome. On Building EE, I had some questions about the materials in my notes, about capstone and stucco, but I have samples here, so I think that clarifies that. I think this is precast concrete. It looks good. On the Wilkes Bashford building I think I do like the change. You changed the... What is it? The Trespa to Prodema, which I think is a really good change. I've seen it in buildings in San Francisco and in Berkeley, and I think it turns, when you have the corners exposed, it looks a lot better than the Trespa, at least from what I have seen. You've also added the brick. Is that a change? Maybe I missed it last time, but on the Wilkes Bashford building, I thought previously it was a porcelain tile, I think...

Mr. Klinzing: Yeah, we did add brick and amend it to try to provide a little more detail.

Board Member Lew: Yeah. And to me, the brick ties in with the existing PF Chang building and the existing Wilkes Bashford building. It seems to me a natural tie-in to the existing.

Mr. Klinzing: It's a nod back to the [crosstalk].

Board Member Lew: Yeah. I think that that looks great, in my mind. Along the El Camino sidewalk, I think I can recommend staff's [inaudible] in the planting strip. I just have a general comment, is that when you put the sidewalk all the way to the curb, you actually have to look at what's happening in the street. For example, there are places elsewhere on El Camino where there may be cars going 40 miles an hour right next to the curb, you know, where you have double turn lanes and stuff. The traffic is right there. Other places on El Camino, there might be a parked car, so you have some sort of buffer in there. But generally, I think it's not comfortable walking right along the curb when there is traffic right at the edge. I think in this case, it's kind of in between, so I think it's fine. I think the idea of the wider sidewalk was to allow, have enough space for pedestrians, and if there's a bicyclist on the sidewalk, that they can all fit. I can support that. Okay. I can go along with, if there's enough concern about the Wilkes Bashford building, I would support that. I'm not opposed to that. If we are moving towards approving the project, then I have some comments on findings. I would, on package page 32 and 33, I think they could be stronger. I think they could be written better, and I think there's some typos in there. I won't get into the specifics of all the language, but I think I would generally support locating buildings closer to the street. Generally, a shopping center was, like an island of buildings surrounded by huge parking lots and gas stations, originally, around the perimeter of the mall. I think we're trying to get away from that and have something more urban, and I think this project gets us closer to that. I think also the connector street, to me, is a positive addition to the shopping center if you compare that to the existing sidewalk on the north side of the Macy's Men's store, which is just a blank white wall. It's kind of like a no-man's land. I think that's desirable. Previously, the Board had some comments about the isolated parking, like a dead-end parking lot, just for Wilkes Bashford. But in the existing conditions, you already have a dead-end parking lot on the north side of the Macy's Men's store, so to me, it's no worse, it's not really any worse than the existing conditions. That's where I am with the project. Okay.

Chair Baltay: We'll be sure to come back to you, Alex, on some of these findings, if we get to that point. I think all of us might want to contribute. Thank you. It's nice to follow you all because you've made a lot of good points that I agree with. Certainly the Restoration Hardware building is a handsome building. I think Building EE is good, and I appreciate the subtle changes you've made to the way the drive aisle integrates to the rest of the shopping center to the west, I guess. It does somehow feel much better than my first look at it, and I like it better, so I think that will be very successful. However, I'm extremely concerned about the Wilkes Bashford building and the impact on the parking situation, so I'll address this to my colleagues. I've been going over to the shopping center a lot, just to get a sense for the parking situation. This last Saturday, it took me about 15 minutes of jostling around to find a place. You'd wind up in one dead-end parking lot, and there's nothing there, so you're backing up, or turning around, and everybody is getting frustrated. I think the shopping center is at its maximum right now. This is at its maximum with this enormous square footage of the Macy's Men's store being offline. The applicant is proposing to remove 240 parking spaces. That's a five percent reduction in what's already, I think, frankly, a hazardous situation. Certainly can't be helpful for your business. They're proposing to create a parking area by the Wilkes Bashford building that will just exacerbate the problem. It's another one of these dead-end drive aisles near a very attractive part of the shopping center, only more so with this new Building EE and Restoration Hardware. I can't help but to see how people will be driving down that, and back up, and just not really functioning properly. I call our attention to Finding #4, which we're required to make, which says that the design is functional, allowing for ease and safety of pedestrian and bicycle traffic. I'm unable to make that finding because of the way the Wilkes Bashford building is situated and its impact on the parking in the shopping center. Area counts notwithstanding, I can't make the finding that it's a functional parking arrangement. My second concern has to do with the proximity of the Wilkes Bashford building to El Camino Real and the trees. Currently, there is a very strong presence of live oak canopy along El Camino, and that intentionally gives Palo Alto a bucolic feeling as you're coming from the north. The Wilkes Bashford building, as best I can tell, goes into the drip line of the one tree we're trying to save by at least five feet. When you stand out there, the drip line is 30 feet from the trunk. The drawings don't all accurately represent that. Certainly the renderings don't. But the branches of that tree will have to be trimmed back just for the building to fit, and I don't understand how, in the long term, you're going to have a commercial building of this status with branches of an oak tree bumping into the building. I mean, you just don't do that. And

on the other corner where Pistache Drive comes in, there's another lovely live oak tree. It's been maintained beautifully over the years; it's a real specimen piece. Now, we're taking it out completely. Both of these things are happening because Wilkes Bashford is so close to El Camino. I think the answer is that the building is just too close to the street. What we really need to do is decide. If we want this to be an urban frontage where we have buildings to the street, to the sidewalk, as we're doing in South Palo Alto, we ought to call a spade a spade, remove those trees, design a building that's intended to be seen from the street as an urban building. Or, do the opposite. Pull the building back. Let the plants remain and thrive. What we're doing now is the worst of both. We're going to just impact that old tree. No matter what anybody says, I promise you, when you're building five feet into the drip line of a heritage tree, you're going to impact the tree. Over time, you're just going to cut away at those branches because of maintenance. The tree won't make it. The other one, we've already agreed to lose. It doesn't work. It's too close. That landscaping is very heavily impacted. I also think we have an issue with the sidewalk. The sidewalk is about five feet now, and there is quite a bit of traffic on El Camino there. And people accelerate coming into town. As soon as you cross the bridge from up north, there's about a quarter mile of a straight stretch, and traffic really is moving, as Alex said, at 40 miles an hour. There's no parking along that street, so if you put the sidewalk to the curb, I think it's a rather scary, hazardous situation. Yet, you have a tree on the other side, so it's not clear to me what you should do. Probably the curve path, or maybe a narrowing and a widening of the sidewalk, but just saying we're going to fill in the planter strip I don't think is a solution. I just feel we're squeezing ourselves on both sides, and really, it comes down to putting Wilkes Bashford just too close to El Camino. And it comes down to, I think, finding more parking for the shopping center somehow. I think there are other solutions that would be possible. Certainly, as I realize that the Macy's building square footage is, part of it at least, being taken up in the basement there, it just seems reasonable that you should have a basement then in Wilkes Bashford. Maybe that's a place to put more parking, solve your problem. Maybe if you pull Wilkes Bashford away from El Camino, you can get your parking lot to loop around. There are other solutions that come back to basic site planning. But I said this at the previous hearing, and I say this to my colleagues now, the Wilkes Bashford building is not working in its current location, for a couple of reasons. I cannot support this project as a whole. I can support the Restoration Hardware and Building EE. I think they are handsome, well-done, and that the process has worked well there. I don't know that we have the liberty to do line item vetoes up here. A comment about the bicycle parking. I was a bit surprised to see the cargo bicycle parking request, and I spoke to my colleagues and staff, and I find myself convinced that, indeed, that is coming in the future. Osma is right. We'll have less car parking and more bicycle parking, and we need to accommodate for that. So, as much as I've never driven a cargo bicycle before, I can see that actually being a real case. I can strongly support staff's request to push a little more on that. Do we have any other comments on the group, or thoughts? David, I don't think you addressed the sidewalk issue.

Board Member Hirsch: No, I didn't. But thanks for your observation on that because it raises the issue. And now that I have a feeling that it's a good idea to go back and kind of take another look, and that there probably is more to be done on the building and the design of it here. Nonetheless, I still say that I like the kind of building that it is, with the exception of some of the brick material as a scale element. Nobody else seemed to be so concerned about that, but I do think that somehow the elevations should be drawn for us to be able to see what those materials would look like. And I get a little upset at the fact that we have to look at half-scale drawings, and we can't really see exactly what those materials will be like from the scale of the drawing. But I think there should be somehow more... You know, you look at the corner rendering, which is on the corner, and the corner of the building that faces towards the shopping center really isn't a strong element at all. I do think that there could be some improvements there. Maybe, again, it jumps up a smaller element at that time. You know, it kind of emphasizes the end of the building there. And there should be, maybe more contrast between the stucco and the brick. Everything is kind of monotone, and I think it would be a stronger design if there were more contrast between the forward element and the backward element. I'm not so sure that the forward-moving element, which is like the wooden wall, you know, could be darker tone, rather than a washed-out – my feeling – a washed-out brick. But as to Mr. Baltay's comments, it's hard for us to really, I think, comment on the parking of the whole of the shopping center at this point. Yes, it's a very busy shopping center, yes, I've been one of those people who have wandered around for quite a long time, trying to find a parking space there. But that's a larger topic, I think, how you solve the parking for the whole of the shopping center, and I don't think it should be mixed

in with this particular building. In other words, I don't think that every building has to try to solve that parking problem by providing, say, underground parking under the building. It's something beyond, I think, our scope at this point, that we should be concerned with recommending that the shopping center solve the parking in some way, but not solve it by denying this building the use of this particular corner of the site. However, that said, I also feel it's important to comment on what Mr. Baltay did say, which is correct – That the building is prominent on the El Camino side. Like no other building right there on that façade. And that if there is a... And that's why I really want to take another look at the oak feeling of the street, because I think that if it is going to be intrusive that way, we should recommend that the building is redesigned to accommodate the proper feel of El Camino Real. One thing that I find really, really impressive about El Camino and Stanford and the whole open spaces of Palo Alto is this feeling of the trees as you go through town here. I'd hate to see any of that lost at this point. And so, I would say that there's more design work. I would agree with my compatriots. There's more design work to be done on this building, and I'd like to see it come back to us. I do want to say, however, that I like the way it's presented as well, because those materials move around in a very interesting way between the parts that you pull forward and the parts that are back. And you know that the corners are not always the same. But my sense of it was that there should... The brick material would be better if it were scaled to a kind of terracotta brick element than the smaller-scale brick. Terracotta, you know, you've probably seen them. There's some really wonderful designs of terracotta, kind of... European buildings in particular. The scale is just better. There's just generally a large scale feel to this building, larger elements that pull forward, so to get to a small-scale brick just doesn't work for me. Along with some formal changes to the façade that's facing in towards the... I would recommend reconsideration of some of the materials and the colors and the contrast of the building. And, to take into consideration what Mr. Baltay was saying about the El Camino side.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm going to respond to that really quick. I think in terms of the massing of Wilkes Bashford, I kind of agree that the massing needs work. In terms of the scale of the material, however, I feel like once they change the massing, it might change the feel. So, your comment that a large scale is applicable to large-scale building might be true, but if the design intent is for it to not feel so massive, given that the shopping center is starting to get more granular and more small scale, but if the design intent were to change to make this a bit smaller scale, then potentially, the palette would reflect that accordingly. Right?

Chair Baltay: Alex, you seem to be the most supportive. Do you want to take a crack at trying to get three votes to get this through right now? I want to give the applicant a fair chance. Clearly, I've made a strong statement, but I want to see if you can gather your colleagues and get them to a subcommittee. Or at least have a chance at doing that.

Ms. Gerhardt: If you could in your motion, also clarify, for the drive aisle, I think I heard the ARB supporting the tabletop design, where it's all elevated for that drive aisle between EE and Restoration Hardware.

Chair Baltay: No, I think at least...

Ms. Gerhardt: I just want to confirm that, if that could be part of the motion, because we do have Option 1 and 2.

Chair Baltay: Let me hold off on that. Alex, I'm not asking you to make a motion. I'm saying, try to persuade us.

Board Member Lew: Okay. Well, as I understand it, Peter, I don't think we're going to get a vote from you, unless there's a significant change to Wilkes Bashford and the parking situation, right?

Chair Baltay: That's right, but I'm giving an opportunity for...

[crosstalk]

Board Member Lew: ... opportunity to try to do a minor change, shifting the massing, or shifting the building and maybe modulate the massing. I'm throwing that to you guys. I guess what I think I would need, I think I would request more information from the arborist's report on tree number.... Is it 27? No, 72. The one that is being removed. Is there another reason to remove the tree? I guess would be my question. And with regard to tree number 39, which is being retained, and I think there is concern about the five-foot encroachment, I would assume that we have arborist report conditions of approval for that. My understanding is that our City's tree protection requirements is to not impact the tree within 10 feet of the trunk, so it seems like this is allowed, and we've done it before on other projects. Now, I understand that, like, California Native Plant Society, I mean, they have a stricter recommendation, which is no work at all underneath the drip line. Like, not even changing the irrigation or any existing landscaping. They're saying, "Don't touch it at all." That's a higher standard that's not part of the City's requirements. The other thing I would throw out there for the El Camino frontage is that when I worked at the Stanford planning office and the university architect's office, they've always looked at the big idea, which is Frederick Law Olmsted, the master planner at Stanford, and it showed that area as just woods, like the arboretum. That was the big idea. It was just a narrow strip, and everything behind that was part of the farm and the winery. And it seems to me it makes sense to kind of honor the big idea there and not try to change it and make it something more urban. But that could be argued both ways. I didn't weigh in on the tabletop thing. I don't think I have a preference at this point. I think it could work either way. I did look at Santana Row, where they have a curbside condition, and I thought that actually was very nice. It helps facilitate cross-traffic. Okay, I think we have to have a discussion about the Wilkes Bashford building and how much change you want. And I don't think that I'm in the middle. It seems like Osma is the one in the middle.

Chair Baltay: Fair enough.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm not in the middle.

Board Member Lew: You're not?

Vice Chair Thompson: Nope.

Board Member Lew: I know you want change, but... the parking? Underground parking?

Vice Chair Thompson: Underground parking?

Board Member Lew: Well, that's what Peter's arguing.

Vice Chair Thompson: Oh, I didn't hear the word "underground."

[crosstalk]

Chair Baltay: ... I said they need to solve the parking problem, and I think it's appropriate for buildings of this scale to be asked to help do that. And I think they are doing the opposite. There's a five percent reduction in actual parking places with this project.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm going to... I don't mind either way with the parking, but fundamentally, the design and the massing of the building façade is problematic. Just shifting the building around would not ease my concern about how this is.

Ms. Gerhardt: Do we want to break this into pieces as far as the, you were talking about the setback of the building from El Camino? Can we maybe have a discussion about that, and have a proposed setback? You could increase that to preserve more of the oak trees. It would further reduce parking, though. If we can just hear about that.

Chair Baltay: If the building became smaller, would that still reduce parking?

Ms. Gerhardt: That's not the applicant's proposal, but that is an option.

Mr. Gutierrez: There could be a reduction in the size of the building in the sense of the footprint, and then, there could be an expansion of the mezzanine. The footprint is small, but the square footage is essentially the same. That would [crosstalk].

Chair Baltay: It's not for us to get into that level of design, I'm afraid.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. I think we just...

Chair Baltay: Jodie, do we have the option of approving the Restoration Hardware building and the EE building and the associated improvements and not the Wilkes Bashford?

Ms. Gerhardt: The applicant would need to change their project description.

Chair Baltay: That's what I'm afraid of, yeah. Well, I don't hear the support for approval right now. I'm sorry to continue this again. You've made a good effort; the design is moving in the right direction, but you don't have the votes up here. I don't know what to say. I think the Wilkes Bashford building needs work by most of us. I propose a motion to continue, is all we can do for you.

Ms. Gerhardt: Can we talk about the setback, though? About what the desire is to set it back further and save more of the oak trees, or to leave it as is? Just from the front setback perspective?

Vice Chair Thompson: That's what I'm hearing. At least I'll speak for my own, that would be preferable, to preserve the trees and have the building further set back.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. Just so we have some clearer direction from the applicant, that the ARB would like to see Wilkes Bashford further set back in order to protect additional trees.

Vice Chair Thompson: Correct.

Ms. Gerhardt: They could... With that information, they could just slide the building back, which would eliminate at least seven or so parking spaces. Then, maybe we can have a conversation about that. I would assume from previous discussions, the loss of parking is not a great idea.

Board Member Lew: I think what's going to be tricky is shifting the building and removing the parking, and then, there's also a transformer there, so it may not be able to happen. I think it's just going to have to... Yeah.

Vice Chair Thompson: Like a different footprint.

Board Member Lew: Yeah.

Vice Chair Thompson: It doesn't seem like sliding it would solve...

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, so, just moving the building, we'd like the other end of the building to sort of stay as is. And then, you were talking about materials, and colors, and sort of the ins and outs of the building. It sounds like there's a fair amount of conversation that needs to be had there. I don't know if maybe the applicant, do they feel like they have a sense of what's needed to fix that? It seems like the elevation on Pistache is maybe the elevation that needs the most work.

Vice Chair Thompson: I would say it's both the long elevation...

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, the elevation towards the shopping center, as well.

Vice Chair Thompson: And the...

Board Member Hirsch: The west elevation.

Vice Chair Thompson: Three elevations.

Mr. Gutierrez: To clarify, that's the elevation facing the parking lot, facing Pistache, and facing the shopping center, not the El Camino elevation.

Vice Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: Facing the parking lot is fairly successful, you know, except maybe on the corner.

Ms. Gerhardt: Basically, the front of Wilkes is facing the parking lot. Does the front of the building need additional work?

Vice Chair Thompson: I believe it does.

Board Member Hirsch: Probably does.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay.

Board Member Hirsch: If you're changing the west elevation, then you change the parking lot side as well.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay, so, we think El Camino has, they've added some extra windows on El Camino, we think that's reasonable.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Ms. Gerhardt: It's the other three elevations that need work.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Vice Chair Thompson: Correct.

Chair Baltay: Let's get resolution to the drive aisle at Building EE and Restoration Hardware. Alex said he's ambivalent. Osma said she supports a raised curb design. David, I didn't get from you a clear direction.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, I'll support, you know, I deferred to others to comment on it, and the comment seems to be for a raised aisle and a tabletop idea. I think it's a good one.

Chair Baltay: So the drive surface is flush with the sidewalk.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah.

Chair Baltay: Okay. And I support, for what it's worth, Osma's idea, that I think the curb is perhaps better, but I don't have a strong opinion. So, you're not going to get a clean recommendation from us, except that the applicant should propose what they think is the proper solution, and the architect...

Vice Chair Thompson: I should clarify. I'm in favor of the raised drive aisle, so that it is flush with the sidewalk.

Chair Baltay: Well then let's just go with that. We recommend that it stay flush.

Vice Chair Thompson: Sorry if that was unclear.

Chair Baltay: The image right now on the screen.

Vice Chair Thompson: Correct. I'm in favor of this option. Did I say, "raised curb?" I meant raised drive aisle.

Chair Baltay: I wrote down "raised curb."

Vice Chair Thompson: I'm sorry.

Chair Baltay: Okay, so, that's fine with me then, too. That gives you an answer on that at least. To the applicant, you really have two-thirds of this project ready to go, if you want to find a way to make that happen with staff.

Mr. Klinzing: Can the applicant ask a question?

Chair Baltay: Absolutely. Please come forward.

Mr. Klinzing: I honestly have no clarity on Wilkes Bashford, the design. I completely understand the site planning issues; that's clear. We've heard a lot of different things. What I hear is, is that there is an issue with massing, so what I'm trying to understand is, is there a concern with the physical size of the building where the mass is located along El Camino? Is that the issue? And then, Mr. Hirsch, heard you, you're concerned about a lack of a priority point or a higher point on the west façade, I think is what I heard. And then, I think the other thing I heard is we don't like the standard modular brick, and that we would be in favor of a larger brick. And I guess the only other thing I'd say... Okay. That's my confusion. The only other question I think is, I've used Prodema in a lot of places. It comes as a sheet good. You detail it so you don't see the black edge. If you have a trellis piece, you miter the cuts and you don't see it. I don't want you to worry about that. I can show you plenty of examples where it's detailed and not have that issue. I'm just looking for a little more clarity. The other thing I would say is that we have two different types of retail at the center. We have in-line, obviously, that's got a lot of nothing, and then a store front, and then we have separate buildings. This perimeter is 40 percent glazed, which is more than any other freestanding building, or anything that it's like in the center. I just want to get that out there as well. So, if you could give me any clarity on where I'm going, I'd really appreciate it.

Vice Chair Thompson: In general, it would just be the breaking down of scale on the façade. At the moment, the façade is very flat and expansive. The material choices that you have, I understand that you're using that to try and create visual stimulation along this wall, but I'm basically saying it's not enough. It's the ins and the outs. Yeah. It's the ins and the outs. And the reason why El Camino façade, the reason why I think we all like that is because you have an inset where the green wall is, and the scale at which that is done is really nice. It feels cozy, and it feels like... It's stimulating for someone that is walking along. But on the other three elevations, it feels too expansive, and it needs a bit more relief on the façade.

Mr. Klinzing: Clear. Thank you.

Vice Chair Thompson: And, sorry, just to follow that up. The scale of the brick, you heard me and Board Member Hirsch say sort of conflicting things. Board Member Hirsch was in favor of a larger scale, and my argument is, if you're creating these ins and outs, the scales of the brick will have to match that, that scale of that in and out. Part of me doesn't want to dictate what it is. I mean, you might come up with something, and then, whatever scale you show us, that's appropriate to that inset or that relief that you've chosen to do. I was just going to encourage you to not necessarily take what we're saying as gold, but it really depends on what you come up with. If you agree with that.

Board Member Hirsch: That's nicely stated. Yes, I think somewhat bigger scale to the material will relate better to the rest of the building. I'm not saying it shouldn't be smaller than, say, the stone façade, but the scale relationship there, for me, is critical. But as well, the façade issue of that corner is kind of important as well, facing... When you look at the overall picture from above, and you see it all kind of falls off facing

inward, it needs something at that west end of the building to tie it back in massing. I think that's pretty clear somehow when you look at it from the top. I hope that's what others here feel as well, but I can let them speak for themselves. But Osma's points were very well put.

Chair Baltay: Are we ready for a motion? Does anybody want to...?

Ms. Gerhardt: One more item, sorry. Just some clarification on the sidewalk. I think we're proposing, sort of an eight-foot sidewalk at this point. I think we, we certainly take your comments about having that eight-foot sidewalk right along El Camino. It is a pretty fast street, so I think we can work with the applicant to see about pulling that away. We do run into some trees, so if you could just talk about that for a second.

Chair Baltay: I don't think we have a good answer. The tree is there, and we want it saved, and the street is there, and we obviously want that. There's only so much space between them. There might be some creative idea, the way you're doing a wavy sidewalk further north of this. Maybe make it narrower just at the tree, and then, wider. Just think a little bit out of the box. That's probably the best we're going to get on that. I don't think any of us want to see the tree removed, and I don't think any of us really want to see, in spite of what Alex said, having this sidewalk right next to the curb. But I don't see that as a deal-breaking issue for this project. That's not they are creating this problem; they're just trying to do what they need to do to help out. What I'm hearing is save the trees by pulling the building away, more ins and outs, think about the corners. If you have to have a three-word summary.

Mr. Klinzing: That's very clear. At the risk of testing your patience, can I ask one more question?

Chair Baltay: Please, please. No, we want to provide whatever feedback we can.

Mr. Klinzing: The only question, and this is really for staff, is, if we're to revise the project description quickly, realize there's a public notice process, could this come back quickly for solely EE and Restoration Hardware while the other is considered?

Ms. Gerhardt: If we were to take Wilkes Bashford out, maybe we can... We'll have to see about the sidewalk, too. But, yes, if we were able to take portions out, I think we could come back to November 7th, if we wanted to do a date certain for a smaller project.

Chair Baltay: I'd be okay sending that to a subcommittee. Make it easy for them. If they just want to remove the Wilkes Bashford, so it's Restoration Hardware and EE. I think all of us are in favor of letting that go forward. Anything we can do to help them get these buildings built, we want to do.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, I think it might just be best to do it as a full board, just because the project description will... I mean, we want to ensure that it changes appropriately.

Chair Baltay: Okay.

Mr. Gutierrez: We would have to account for utility changes because that project would need to then be reflective of that new project, which eliminates Wilkes. So then, other pieces would need to move and shift and get confirmed.

Chair Baltay: Fair enough. Does anyone want to make a motion to continue this?

Vice Chair Thompson: Does staff prefer that we continue this to a date certain?

Ms. Gerhardt: I'm assuming I'm hearing from the applicant that they'd like to move forward with the two buildings quickly, so it would be helpful if you could just, you know, that we would move forward with this smaller project on 11/7.

Vice Chair Thompson: Okay.

MOTION

Chair Baltay: I'll make a motion, that we continue this project to a date certain, to allow for the applicant to submit a revised project with a smaller scope. I'll leave it at that. And then, I'll leave the record to stand for the comments regarding the design. I'll need a second.

Board Member Hirsch: Can we approve the project at this point for the two?

Chair Baltay: No, we can't. We're trying to give them a fast way to do that. I made a motion; I need a second.

Vice Chair Thompson: I'll second.

Chair Baltay: Okay. Does anybody have any comments, amendments, changes to that motion? Okay, so, motion is made and seconded. All in favor? All opposed? Motion carries 4-0.

MOTION TO CONTINUE PASSES 4-0.

Chair Baltay: Thank you very much.

Study Session

Chair Baltay: Moving on, we don't have a study session today.

Approval of Minutes

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for August 15, 2019.

Chair Baltay: We have minutes to review and approve from the August 15th meeting. Do we have any comments on those minutes? Okay, can I get a motion, anybody?

Board Member Hirsch: I move that we approve the minutes of the August meeting.

Board Member Lew: I will second.

Chair Baltay: Okay, motion is made and seconded. All those in favor? Opposed? Motion carries 4-0.

MOTION PASSES 4-0.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Baltay: No subcommittee items.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Baltay: Board questions, comments or announcements? With that, we are adjourned. Thank you very much.

Adjournment