



PLANNING & TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION MINUTES

=====MEETINGS ARE CABLECAST LIVE ON GOVERNMENT ACCESS CHANNEL 26=====

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

Wednesday, July 12, 2006
REGULAR Meeting at 7:00 PM
Council Chambers
Civic Center, 1st Floor
250 Hamilton Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301

ROLL CALL: 7:00 PM

Commissioners:

Patrick Burt - Chair
Karen Holman – V-Chair
Lee I. Lippert
Paula Sandas - absent
Phyllis Cassel - absent
Daniel Garber
Annette Bialson

Staff:

Steve Emslie, Planning Director
Donald Larkin, Senior Deputy City Attorney
Curtis Williams, Chief Planning/Transportation Official
Amy French, Current Planning Manager
Beth Bourne, Senior Planner
Zariah Betten, Executive Secretary

AGENDIZED ITEMS:

- 1. Zoning Ordinance Update – Continued to a date uncertain
- 2. 3412 Hillview Avenue

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of Regular Meeting of June 14, 2006

Chair Burt: Good evening. At this time we would like to convene the Planning and Transportation Commission meeting for Wednesday, July 12, 2006. Would the Secretary please call the roll? Thank you. Commissioner Cassel is conflicted and Commissioner Sandas is away on vacation.

At this time we provide the public an opportunity to speak regarding items that are not on the agenda.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS. Members of the public may speak to any item not on the agenda with a limitation of three (3) minutes per speaker. Those who desire to speak must complete a speaker request card available from the secretary of the Commission. The Planning and Transportation Commission reserves the right to limit the oral communications period to 15 minutes.

1 Chair Burt: I don't have any speaker cards for unagendized items. So we will be proceeding
2 with our first item.

3
4 Actually, maybe Staff would like to give us an update on item one the Zoning Ordinance Update.

5
6 **PLEASE NOTE THAT THE SPECIAL MEETING AT 6:00 PM HAS BEEN**
7 **CANCELLED AND ITEM NO. 1 HAS BEEN CONTINUED TO A DATE**
8 **UNCERTAIN.**

9
10 **NEW BUSINESS**

11 **Study Session:**

- 12
13 1. **Zoning Ordinance Update:** Discussion of ways to retain commercial uses on properties
14 designated and zoned for residential development and to limit housing in commercial and
15 mixed-use zones.

16
17 Mr. Curtis Williams, Chief Planning and Transportation Official: Yes, we had planned on
18 coming to you with the issue that the Council had asked us to report back to them on later this
19 month, however, we needed to coordinate with the City Attorney. The City Attorney is putting
20 together a memo to the Council on that so we pulled that off your agenda. Once the Council
21 provides us with direction we will come back to you with whatever the appropriate strategies are
22 to be analyzed.

23
24 Chair Burt: Thank you, Curtis. So item number two is a project at 3412 Hillview Avenue is a
25 request by Stanford Management Company on behalf of Stanford University for a Site and
26 Design Review to demolish two existing buildings and replace them with a new cohesive
27 structure. There was a prior joint session of the Planning Commission and ARB on December
28 15, is that correct? At this time would Staff like to make a presentation on the subject? So at
29 this time would Staff like to make a presentation on the subject? December 7, I am corrected.

30
31 **AGENDA CHANGES, ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS.** The agenda may have additional
32 items added to it up until 72 hours prior to meeting time.

33
34 **NEW BUSINESS.**

35 **Public Hearings:**

- 36
37 2. **3412 Hillview Avenue [06PLN-00157]:** Request by Stanford Management Company on
38 behalf of The Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University for a Site and
39 Design Review application to allow the demolition of two research/office buildings,
40 totaling 68,300 square feet, and construction of a 74,000 square-foot research/office
41 building and two-level parking structure, and associated site improvements, to establish a
42 cohesive SAP Labs campus in the Stanford Research Park. Design Enhancement
43 Exceptions are requested to exceed the maximum allowable building height and site
44 coverage. Environmental Assessment: A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been
45 prepared. Zone District: RP-5(D)

1 Ms. Beth Bourne, Senior Planner: Good evening Chair Burt and Commissioners. The item
2 before you this evening is a review of a Site and Design Review application for the development
3 of a new research and development building in the Stanford Research Park. The proposed
4 project consists of the demolition of two office buildings and the construction of a new two-story
5 research and development building including 2,500 square feet of employee amenity space.
6 Parking would be provided onsite in a two-story parking structure with limited surface parking
7 areas. Sustainable building features incorporated in the design include high performance glazing
8 and sunshades, landscape bioswales and retention ponds and drought tolerant and native plant
9 species. The proposed facility would be occupied by SAP with the intent of creating a more
10 cohesive campus with the adjacent SAP building next door at 3410 Hillview and across the street
11 at 3412 Hillview.

12
13 Preliminary plans for the project were presented to the Planning and Transportation Commission
14 and Architectural Review Board at a joint study session on December 7, 2005. Subsequent to
15 that meeting an ARB study session was held on February 2 and a preliminary ARB review on
16 April 20. At the preliminary ARB the Board responded favorably to the design that is before you
17 this evening with a split-level building that has a mass stepping to respond to the contours of the
18 site.

19
20 There are two Design Enhancement Exceptions requested for this project. One is for the 31
21 percent site coverage, which would exceed the 15 percent allowed in the Research Park District.
22 The second is a proposal for the building to exceed the 35-foot maximum building height for a
23 small portion of the building. The two Design Enhancement Exceptions would be reviewed by
24 the Architectural Review Board.

25
26 Staff would recommend that the Planning and Transportation Commission recommend the City
27 Council approve the Negative Declaration with a finding that the project will not result in
28 significant environmental impacts and approve the Site and Design Review application and two
29 Design Enhancement Exceptions as requested based upon the findings in conditions of approval.
30 Staff would like to add that there are revised findings for the Site and Design as well as some
31 materials describing the difference between a Variance and a Design Enhancement Exception at
32 your place as well as on the back table. The applicant is here to make a presentation and answer
33 any questions that you may have.

34
35 Chair Burt: Thank you. Does the Commission have any questions of Beth or the Staff before
36 hearing from the applicant? Lee.

37
38 Commissioner Lippert: One question for you. We had reviewed a project earlier this year, it
39 was a PC project in which they were asking for a Design Enhancement Exception, our comments
40 or our purview on that Design Enhancement Exception didn't have any relevance. It was the
41 Architectural Review Board. But in this case you are asking us to rule on a Design Enhancement
42 Exception. When is a Design Enhancement Exception our purview and when is it not?

43
44 Ms. Amy French, Current Planning Manager: We had a brief conversation with the Chair and
45 Vice-Chair yesterday and that was that if the Planning and Transportation Commission were to
46 be of the opinion that a DEE is somehow not warranted and that you thought that there was some

1 reason that the site conditions needed a Variance and you wanted to look into providing Variance
2 findings or saying in some way perhaps the City Attorney wants to go a little further on this but,
3 that is where I think the Planning Commission could weigh in on it. We think that the DEE is
4 appropriately in the realm of the Architectural Review Board and we do think the findings can be
5 made in this case.

6
7 Mr. Don Larkin, Senior Deputy City Attorney: Just to be a little bit more specific the
8 Commission doesn't make decisions on DEEs however if the Commission thought that the DEE
9 that is being requested is not minor and therefore wasn't subject to the DEE then the
10 Commission could make a recommendation to the Council that it refer the element and concern
11 back to the Planning Commission for Variance findings or the Commission could make findings
12 that would allow for the Variance or recommend that a Variance be granted instead.

13
14 Chair Burt: So Don, it is not within our purview to review the content of a DEE unless we are of
15 an opinion that the DEE is not an appropriate vehicle at all for this level of exception?

16
17 Mr. Larkin: Yes, and in that case that would be made as a recommendation either to ARB or to
18 Council depending on the next step. ARB or Council would decide that they agree with the
19 recommendation of the Planning Commission and then re-refer it.

20
21 Chair Burt: Karen.

22
23 Vice-Chair Holman: Just a little bit of a clarification on that if I could, please. We can comment
24 on the project. It is a Site and Design Review so we can comment on the project. Part of the
25 project includes the Design Enhancement Exception. So to be specific we can't comment on the
26 findings specifically but I will just make something up here and make nothing of this. If we
27 decided that the building was too much FAR, which it is not so maybe that is a good example,
28 well it's not because DEEs can't be granted for FAR.

29
30 Mr. Larkin: I can elaborate a little bit more. The other option for the Commission is if there is
31 an element that you don't like that requires a DEE then the recommendation could be based on
32 the Design Review function which is somewhat overlapping and you could decide that whatever
33 the element is would not be orderly, harmonious or compatible with the existing or potential uses
34 of the adjoining or nearby sites. That would be another way that the Commission would be
35 within their purview of Design Review but it is not commenting on the findings. The reason that
36 it is important is that it is important not to be influencing another body on findings that aren't
37 within the Planning Commission's purview to make.

38
39 Chair Burt: So if I might try to restate that. We might see a particular aspect of a project that we
40 have comments on it or objections to it conceivably based upon Site and Design Review findings
41 and it may be the same aspect of a project that the ARB is going to be looking at from the
42 standpoint of a Design Enhancement Exception (DEE) for those who don't know our acronyms.
43 Is that correct?

44
45 Mr. Larkin: That is correct.

1 Chair Burt: Okay. Lee.

2
3 Commissioner Lippert: I apologize. I feel like I have opened up a can of worms here.

4
5 Chair Burt: It is okay. This was an issue that we had struggled with as a Commission and then
6 at our pre-meeting yesterday we asked Staff for clarification on that and that is why they
7 provided us tonight with this attachment that is also at the back that talks about DEE versus
8 Variance applicability. Then the other issue is the purview of the Commission.

9
10 Commissioner Lippert: Well, actually where I was going with this in terms of my line of
11 questioning is that because the site is adjacent to the open space, correct? And we are doing Site
12 and Design Review for this project, Site and Design Review is normally a function of the ARB
13 when it is not adjacent to or in the open space. Is that correct?

14
15 Ms. French: Site and Design Review can also in the current code be a requirement for a mixed-
16 use project on El Camino Real. So open space and the Baylands and the hills but also mixed use
17 on El Camino.

18
19 Commissioner Lippert: Okay. So where I was going with this is that because it is within our
20 purview to look at Site and Design Review we do have the ability to rule on the DEE but if I
21 understand what you are saying Don is very specifically we can either say yes we accept those
22 findings or we need to go to a higher standard which is the Variance process.

23
24 Mr. Larkin: No, not exactly. What I am saying is you can comment on the element as part of
25 your design review. You can comment on whether or not a DEE is for a minor feature that
26 would be eligible for a DEE but you can't comment on whether the DEE should be approved or
27 denied based on the DEE findings.

28
29 Commissioner Lippert: Okay.

30
31 Chair Burt: Okay. Everybody square? Great. Our first speaker will be the applicant and the
32 applicant has up to 15 minutes to speak. I understand we have both Jean Snider who is
33 representing Stanford and we have the architect here and the landscape architect. So Jean you
34 are welcome to divvy up your time however you see fit.

35
36 Ms. Jean Snider, Applicant: Thank you. Good evening. I work for Stanford and we are here on
37 behalf of SAP. What I wanted to do was just give you a little bit of a background on SAP's
38 presence in the Park, talk about the major features that we have focused on in our site planning
39 and then really pass it on to Ted Korth and Gary Laymon for the rest of the presentation.

40
41 What you have in front of you is an aerial view of the area we are talking about. The specific
42 site is located right here formerly occupied by EPRI. SAP is located currently in this property,
43 this property here and here. This is a building SAP actually built five years ago. They have had
44 a longstanding goal to try to create a contiguous campus because disjointed campuses don't lend
45 themselves to productivity or efficiency. This was an opportunity that was created by a
46 downsizing by EPRI whereby Stanford was able to buy this site back essentially from EPRI and

1 are here in front of you now to look at a redevelopment of it. SAP is able to lease half of this
2 campus from EPRI in order to have this contiguous campus. They are all three separately owned
3 parcels. We see the 3412 Hillview parcel because it is in the middle as a means to really try to
4 create more of a connection across the sites but we aren't able to do anything physically on the
5 adjacent properties. I just wanted point that out.

6
7 With respect to 3412 the predominant feature there is its steep slope. It rises I think by 85 feet if
8 I have that correct from Hillview Avenue up to open space. The other dominant feature is the
9 adjacency to the open space. Those two features really factored into our site planning primarily.
10 We also though were given specific criteria from SAP on what they were looking for. Three
11 features were very important to them. One was to try to maximize usable open space. They do a
12 lot of all hands meetings outdoors. They have that kind of condition at their other locations and
13 it has worked well for them. They also wanted us to maximize daylight and avoid burying any
14 space. They have that condition actually at this property over here and they can't get anyone to
15 go down to the basement. So that was a real important issue for them. Then finally as any
16 occupant is concerned about they wanted a very efficient layout. So those were considerations in
17 our planning as well. Through the last hearings over the past seven months we have refined our
18 plan in response to comments by the ARB and comments from you in that December 7th hearing
19 and feel that our plan has evolved to a very site-specific design. We feel that we were able to
20 achieve that and still maintain these goals of the occupant.

21
22 At this point I would like to turn it over to Ted Korth, our architect, who will be followed by
23 Gary Laymon our landscape architect. Thank you.

24
25 Mr. Ted Korth, Architect: Hi I am with Korth Sunseri Hagey Architects. To start off where Jean
26 left off there is an existing building here and a hillside that drops about 85 feet over the course of
27 the site.

28
29 Next one. This is rotated but Hillview is down in this location. So what exists today is a site that
30 is almost entirely parked. It is either roadway or parking and asphalt. There is a building that is
31 essentially buried on these three sides because it is tucked into the hillside. We felt there wasn't
32 any real gesture or interaction with the open space, Coyote Hill, which is in this location.

33
34 This is a view at the top of the site looking up towards Coyote Hill and the adjacent open space.
35 This is a view from Hillview looking up at the existing building and there is a big grove of trees
36 that will remain in the proposed project. So these are comments and elements that we were
37 asked to explore both from comments from you and the ARB. Integrate the building with natural
38 contours of the site to provide a more organic and less symmetrical design. The earlier design
39 that we showed you in December was a symmetrical form. Provide additional information on
40 the project as to how it would appear from Coyote Hill. Develop a parking deck concept to
41 ensure proper screening, shading and appearance. Identify sustainable features of the project,
42 which is in the packet that you have received. To study pedestrian connections between the
43 different SAP buildings which Gary will go through as soon as I am done.

44
45 So the proposed scheme has a stepped building, this is down beginning at elevation 235 and then
46 one floor above that. This starts at elevation 250 with one floor above that with a lobby element

1 that transitions between the two. There is a parking deck one level above grade that is tucked
2 into the location of the lowest floor of the existing building. So the existing building if it was
3 demolished there is a big hole in the ground at that point and we thought this is an ideal solution
4 to elevate a deck and park beneath it, use the natural grade to access the lower level here, slope
5 up – you are going up the site, get to the upper deck, go up once more and there is an arrival
6 court and from that point there is an opportunity for some very nice open spaces that take
7 advantage of the stepping hillside. Go through the lobby and then additional usable open space
8 to the west of the property.

9
10 This an aerial view showing the same information with the parking deck. Our approach, the idea
11 of the deck was to both work within the existing contours but also not create a site plan that was
12 surfaced parked the way the existing property is. The site is beautiful. There are some great
13 existing trees that we are preserving. To tuck the garage into that location you have all the cars
14 beneath that completely shaded and up above there are trellises with planting and a covered
15 element here for accessible parking. An outdoor space there on the upper side as well.

16
17 The materials we have used in the project are tinted green glass to work with the existing and
18 proposed landscape. Then a warm natural colored cast GFRC panel system, and I have samples
19 that I can show you and there are details on the wall and information in your packet on those.

20
21 This is a section showing Coyote Hill and the existing building, which is in this location with the
22 dotted lines. This is the lower portion of the building. So the arrival court is here, this is the
23 lobby and then in the foreground is the upper building stepping up towards the higher contours in
24 the property. So it terraces with the existing site contours.

25
26 This is a view that cuts through the SAP building to the right of our site. Our stepped building
27 and the existing EPRI building to the left, which would be to the south.

28
29 So this is the arrival court with landscaping. These are some of the trellis elements you can see
30 on the parking deck. There is a stair and an elevator that come from the level below. The arrival
31 court gives you a great sequence to come in, drop off, and view the lobby. There is some visitor
32 parking here and then there is additional parking on top of the deck. All of the design just
33 terraces into the existing contours.

34
35 This is showing a warm palette and materials and a sweeping curve that happens on both sides of
36 the building that draws you into the lobby area, which is here with an extended canopy.

37
38 This is a view from the Coyote Hill side with some landscape terrace in here. One of the DEEs
39 had to do with a height extension and that area is four percent of the exterior and it is the area
40 right in here and just a little chunk of it on the other side where because the building is stepped
41 there is one limited area here where there is an extended vertical distance. What we have shown
42 is a really nice textured stonewall there that brings the building down to grade and it is
43 landscaped in the foreground with trees in the front of it. It will not be seen from outside the site.
44 It is only something you would see internal to this as this view shows.

1 This is a view that shows the express stair elements. This is the lower building, the upper one is
2 in this location, lower building form. It is all one building. The trellises with the landscaping
3 lines that come up it and this shows how the parking deck is laid in within existing trees and
4 additional trees to take advantage of the shading, to preserve the trees and to essentially the deck
5 will not be visible from Hillview and from adjacent properties because of the landscaping.
6

7 At this point I will turn it over to Gary Laymon.
8
9

10 Mr. Gary Laymon, Landscape Architect: Good evening. I am with Guzzardo Partnership
11 Landscape Architects. I wanted to summarize real briefly what sort of our goals and aspirations
12 were for this site. I think when you come to the site you see it is a tremendous site and you are
13 struck by the native vegetation that is there. We are looking to preserve a vast amount of the
14 native vegetation all the way around these portions of the project, which includes redwoods and
15 oak trees as well as some other species but those predominantly. We are looking to really take
16 our cues from that native palette and try to expand that around the balance of the site particularly
17 tying in our relationship to the Coyote Hill area.
18

19 You can see in this zone here we have incorporated in new redwoods, new oaks, and new
20 naturalized grass plantings. It is a very drought tolerant palette really trying to enhance that
21 native aesthetic but also bring in that habitat value as well. One of the other aspects of the design
22 we were very interested in was trying to find how we could make usable outdoor open space. As
23 you come in off the entry court here you have a plaza that has seating elements as part of it. We
24 have a roof terrace here that sits over the top of the lobby area with views off to the distant areas
25 both of Coyote Hill and to the Bay. Then terrace gardens, which are in this zone right here
26 where there are various seating elements. This area is more of a passive sort of a space where
27 you can have more individual and small group gathers whereas here is a lawn area that is the
28 amphitheater. We tried to really differentiate those spaces and create an environment that is
29 really connected with the other buildings and complimentary to those functions.
30

31 Also we were very aware that we wanted build and make this a very sustainable site so we were
32 looking at creating a very permeable planted areas, incorporate bioswales into the design and I
33 can show those in the next slide. This is a view to the auto court area here where a terrace, a
34 breakout area that is a part of the upper building, and terrace gardens that occur here. You can
35 see this in elevation and in section here.
36

37 Next slide. We provided some imagery of different plant materials again both to be able to pick
38 up on the native vegetation on the site but also develop gardens immediately adjacent to the more
39 domesticated portion of the site.
40

41 It is very important to take a look at the site circulation, look at the existing circulation patterns
42 on the adjacent sites and how we can connect our site into the overall campus plan. You can see
43 our plan is very permeable and allows us to be able to really have a very strong connection that
44 links all these different sites together.
45

1 It was very important that we look at not only solving the site planning issues but to really be
2 able to look at finding creative ways and very imaginative ways of being able to create a
3 landscape design that is a place that you really want to spend time in to really invite people
4 outdoors. The corporate culture definitely supports that and that is something that we are very
5 much in tune. We really want to be able to draw people outside and make this place some place
6 that is really special that people want to spend time in.
7

8 Last slide. I think overall you can see just from the context we really are reinforcing how we
9 relate to the adjacent open space, adjacent sites and being able to carry the continuity of
10 circulation through the site plan and to be able to create an overall environment that is really a
11 wonderful place to work. I'd be happy to entertain any questions you have. Thank you.
12

13 Chair Burt: Thank you. Commissioners, do you have questions of the applicant at this time?
14 Lee.
15

16 Commissioner Lippert: I think my line of questioning the last time around I had asked on the
17 parking structure about looking at trying to reduce the mass of the parking structure by pushing
18 that back and having half of it sort of exposed and sort of terraced up a little bit more. Did you
19 look at that at all? Ted, you can take the mike.
20

21 Mr. Korth: We did. The reason that we chose to pursue this direction, there were a number of
22 reasons. One was that the void that was already on the site was nearly the right size for laying a
23 decking above it so it seemed like a logical approach. Another reason was that as this has been
24 developed because it is laying into a sloped area of the site it can be naturally ventilated so there
25 is no need to mechanically ventilate. We felt from a sustainable point of view that was a really
26 great opportunity. If it pushed back further into the property then it would be below grade
27 entirely and you would have to mechanically ventilate. One other reason was as we developed
28 the stepped building idea the shape is what it is, it is sort of an elongated form because of the
29 stepping as it follows the contours, we have this arrival court at this location. The way it is laid
30 out now because there is no parking beneath it Gary can plant some really nice trees and it
31 becomes a very nice entry sequence. If parking had been pushed up further into the site then it
32 would have eliminated the opportunity to plant above it in a way that was significant. It would
33 be hard to put big trees in.
34

35 Commissioner Lippert: Were there any discussions with SAP since it is a campus about using
36 maybe the adjacent site for the additional building area, doing an offsite parking agreement and
37 just transferring that to the adjacent site. Did you look at that?
38

39 Mr. Korth: I can try to answer that and Jean may want to answer that question. Go ahead.
40

41 Commissioner Lippert: It looks like the adjacent site doesn't reach the maximum allowable FAR
42 or lot coverage.
43

44 Ms. Campbell: Actually I think they do but more importantly we can't really control what
45 happens on those and we can't impose a parking arrangement now when they are encumbered by

1 existing leases. That is really the main reason but I do believe the adjacent sites are at maximum
2 FAR.

3
4 Commissioner Lippert: Okay. Then I have one last question for Ted. Talk a little bit about
5 lighting on the upper deck.

6
7 Mr. Korth: Okay. I believe there are four light standards to locate. One here, here, there and
8 there and then there will be some lighting attached to the trellis beneath the trellis to augment
9 that. So we tried to internalize the lighting towards the center of the deck and then integrate it
10 into the location of the trellises and the landscape areas where they are. So we really have spent
11 time to try to sort this through to make it really nice. A lot of what is shown here, I think some
12 of the things you actually personally commented on the first time around in our minds we
13 thought about that and tried to address it. I think sort of the tapered step building may have been
14 a direct result of something you mentioned that first evening.

15
16 Commissioner Lippert: Thank you very much.

17
18 Chair Burt: Karen.

19
20 Vice-Chair Holman: The materials board is that available to us?

21
22 Mr. Korth: Can I walk up?

23
24 Vice-Chair Holman: Sure.

25
26 Mr. Korth: The one board is a selection of the different types of glass. It is a green tinted glass
27 and then there are some areas with opaque green glass from a sill to the floor area and then there
28 is some FRIT glass, which is that pattern glass that is from sunscreens up to the ceiling to control
29 solar exposure.

30
31 Then the other sample board shows the aluminum color for the window system and the
32 sunshades and then the cast GFRC panels for the wall system, which are that natural color.
33 There is some that is textured with sort of a red profile to it and there is some that is flat and
34 textured as well. So we tried to pick colors that we thought were appropriate for the
35 surroundings.

36
37 Vice-Chair Holman: There is a fair amount of glass in the building and just looking at these
38 samples it seems like there is a fair amount of reflectivity. Can you speak to that please?

39
40 Mr. Korth: The glass is just tinted glass so it is not a “reflective” glass there is no reflective
41 coating on any of it. It is all tinted. It is meant to be a very soft palette. The glazing that the
42 areas that have maybe a little bit more glass than others are the central area on these two walls
43 which face the entrance and the garden. This one actually has sunscreens on it because it is
44 southing facing south projecting to reduce any sun loads on the glass so there shouldn't be a
45 great deal of reflectivity. On the opposite side it is facing north which is an area that is never

1 going to get direct exposure to the light. Plus, there are trees planted in front of actually all of
2 these glazing surfaces to soften the impact of the building as well.

3
4 Vice-Chair Holman: Then also about materials, the painted aluminum that you have at the top,
5 part of the Site and Design Review is that it is compatible with the environment so I am looking
6 for silver in the environment. So if you can explain your choice of that.

7
8 Mr. Korth: We chose that because it is a light colored material that we felt would work well with
9 the glass. It has a slight kind of a sheen to it. A lighter shade of aluminum tends to lessen the
10 impact of the whole system and gives a little bit of a shimmer. I didn't want to use a dark color.
11 I thought that the glass would be complimented nicely with that silver color. We have used it in
12 the past on a number of projects and it almost disappears. It tends to feature the glass rather than
13 feature the metal.

14
15 Vice-Chair Holman: I have another one too which is about the view from Coyote Hill, the
16 proposed view with the trees. It is actually sort of a three-part question. That is one of the pages
17 in our materials. I am going to do all three at once here. So there is that which I didn't see here
18 but I am sure you have available. So there is that and then the views that you showed up here are
19 mostly looking down on the site but in our packet it had drawings that show ground level. In
20 these ground level views there seems to be a lot more of the building showing through the trees.

21
22 Mr. Korth: Are you referring to this particular view?

23
24 Vice-Chair Holman: It would be that one, yes.

25
26 Mr. Korth: This is the proposed project just in this area and this is the existing SAP building and
27 the existing EPRI building to the right. That is an actual calibrated view of what this would look
28 like in terms of it is pretty accurate. It is showing trees planted here that are estimated what they
29 will look like in about 5 years from the time it is completed or something like that. We try to be
30 very honest about this view.

31
32 Vice-Chair Holman: I appreciate that so very much. So you are taking best advantage I think
33 from what I could tell of existing trees and a lot of those are not in good health. Is there any
34 possibility of screening that further? One of the comments from an earlier review was the
35 building was very rectilinear and it is stepped now but it is still very, very rectilinear. I am just
36 looking for some way to blend that in because again that is part of our Site and Design Review
37 requirements.

38
39 Mr. Korth: Let me try to answer all those questions. I think our thought was this is a very small
40 view in this location. I am trying to point out images that are available right now. There are
41 very short faces on this building relative to even the other existing buildings in the area. We
42 tried to keep these very narrow and then create this big curved swath between them. The width
43 of these building compared to other buildings in the vicinity is much less. We have taken –
44 typically this would have been one large building. I think that the scheme that we showed you of
45 building form we showed you the first evening it was articulated but it was a two-story building
46 set on generally the same area. Stepping it like this makes the building volumes much smaller

1 compared to other projects in the area. If you look at this in an aerial compared to the other
2 existing buildings this one is broken down into pieces that are much smaller and less rectilinear
3 than the others. So comparatively I think it is very sensitive that way. At a certain point it still
4 has to be a building that people can occupy and work within so we tried to balance the need for
5 function but also try to fit it into the context in a way that we thought was sensitive. So by
6 nudging it up against the two adjacent properties we could cut a very large area in center to
7 create these open spaces that are usable and have great solar exposure and can be planted and
8 really be used. I don't know how well I answered that.

9
10 Chair Burt: Dan.

11
12 Commissioner Garber: A couple of questions. Unfortunately I don't think I will be as organized
13 my fellow Commissioners have been thus far. On photo number 1b in Attachment F I note that
14 this particular photo does not mention that you cannot see the project from this view. Is that in
15 fact the case?

16
17 Ms. Bourne: If you look at 1a it is really the same photo. For 1b we just zoomed up a little bit
18 more and you can't see it.

19
20 Commissioner Garber: Okay. It is over the hill.

21
22 Ms. Bourne: Exactly. It is on the other side.

23
24 Commissioner Garber: Some-odd feet above it?

25
26 Ms. Bourne: Yes. Because Page Mill is a scenic route we wanted to make sure that we showed
27 that.

28
29 Commissioner Garber: Okay. For the architect I guess and I apologize I think it is in here but I
30 am not recalling it, what is the actual floor plate size of each one of your different portions? The
31 square footage.

32
33 Mr. Korth: It is 37 per floor so split in half probably 15 on each side. Is that about right? It's
34 about 15,000 feet on each side. They are small.

35
36 Commissioner Garber: The buildings on either side must – the one that is to the right is probably
37 60 or something like that.

38
39 Mr. Korth: I don't know the exact number but they are much larger.

40
41 Ms. Bourne: The 3410 Hillview project is about 85,000 so it is roughly the same and then the
42 portion of the EPRI campus on the left side or south side is about 90,000.

43
44 Commissioner Garber: Thank you. For the landscape architect I note that there are a couple of
45 trees, which are called out in the report on page 3 of Attachment L, table 3-1, Mitigation

1 Possibilities. It wasn't clear to me if these trees were called out specifically because you are
2 looking for specific mitigations or are these just examples of the mitigations?
3

4 Mr. Laymon: We have proposed some specific mitigations. We were looking at having up-sized
5 trees, oak trees of various varieties, in this area here as well as a specimen oak that would be
6 located here. We were trying to place those up-size trees where we felt they would have the
7 most impact.
8

9 Commissioner Garber: When you are saying up-size trees meaning they have a large canopy and
10 a large trunk?
11

12 Mr. Laymon: That's right.
13

14 Commissioner Garber: So these are trees that are actually coming out, that you are replacing
15 with for instance tree number 355 is being replaced with four 24-inch box sizes.
16

17 Mr. Laymon: That is correct.
18

19 Commissioner Garber: Do you happen to know where these trees actually are on the map?
20

21 Mr. Laymon: Yes. There are three trees. There is one protected tree that is located here. It is a
22 redwood. There is a coast live oak that is located in this area right here that is in very poor
23 condition. There is also a designated tree that is also a redwood that is located right in this area
24 here. So those are the three trees of significant value that we are mitigating for.
25

26 Commissioner Garber: I presume that the replacement trees and the alternative replacement
27 trees must be significantly smaller than these.
28

29 Mr. Laymon: That is correct.
30

31 Commissioner Garber: I assume that these are trees that are acceptable to the City Arborist.
32

33 Mr. Laymon: We collaborated with the City Arborist in making selections of the varieties and
34 sizes that we are looking for.
35

36 Commissioner Garber: Thank you. Not at this time, thank you.
37

38 Chair Burt: I have a follow up question for the landscape architect, Mr. Laymon. First I would
39 like to say that I was very impressed with many of the aspects of what has been done on the
40 sustainability practices and the use of extensive native vegetation and it is vegetation that is
41 indigenous to this particular grassland chaparral area. It shows a real commitment both from the
42 designer standpoint and Stanford and SAP and frankly our City Arborist who has I note had a
43 very active role in participating in this. So given that you have really demonstrated this
44 recognition that we are adjacent to an open space and you are utilizing this land as not only a
45 transition but really an extension of the native habitat onto this property that is something that I
46 hope we will continue to see in development throughout this area. I think this serves as an

1 excellent model. Under the theme of never being satisfied I would like to ask you in our
2 Comprehensive Plan under the Natural Environment section we specifically list a set of rare,
3 threatened, or endangered plant species. Predominantly those are ones that reside in the
4 grasslands and the chaparral and there is a specific list there. They are not common in nurseries
5 and not planted and a part of why they are rare is they started off fairly rare and we have had
6 diminished habitat for them. My question is have you looked at those particular species or if not
7 would you be open to trying to incorporate more of those particular endangered species or rare
8 species in your landscaping that is the native species portion of your project?
9

10 Mr. Laymon: I think we would be open to that. I think that would be a nice addition along some
11 of these areas where we are using some of hydro-seeded _____ for instance and it would be a
12 natural place to be able to incorporate that sort of material.
13

14 Chair Burt: Great. Then I noticed on this handout that we had at our places – I should take a
15 step back. There is an overriding theme in that you have done an excellent job at essentially
16 ground level on the landscaping. When Commissioner Holman had raised the issue that the
17 ground level view from uphill the thing that struck me is that you have done a great job at the
18 landscaping surrounding the buildings. One of the things that is typically not addressed is what
19 do you do with all those roofs. In general it is an issue that is becoming more recognized in
20 terms of heat impacts and urban environments and all of those issues. In this case, where we
21 have views from open space areas it is even more of an issue. I notice that on your parking
22 garage it appears that you have some trellises that are actually looking like they might be having
23 vines or some other green covering. So I would like to ask one, whether you would be receptive
24 to considering the expanding the use of those trellises on perhaps the border of that parking
25 garage which would not only add to the area that is not just open blacktop or whatever we have
26 but it would also be a visual screening of that structure from uphill and any place that might see
27 it. I think it is a great concept what you done and I would love to see more of it.
28

29 Mr. Laymon: Sure. We looked at a couple of different strategies for how to be able to both
30 provide shade on the parking structure and how to also make the parking structure as invisible as
31 possible. We have tried to strike a balance there that creates sort of a win/win situation in being
32 able to utilize the existing vegetation along this area, along Hillview, along the property line here
33 to the south, along the EPRI site and then also preserving these trees along the north side of the
34 deck. We have been able to really encapsulate the parking area with existing vegetation and
35 supplementing that with more planting area. We did some sun studies to sort of take a look at
36 how much shading we were getting, what sort of benefit we were getting from those trees. The
37 trees to the south were providing a fairly significant shading coefficient for that southern portion
38 of deck. There was actually shading that was actually occurring in the western sky from the
39 existing redwoods that we are preserving in this area here so they were casting long shadows
40 there. It is difficult to ascertain exactly how tall these trees were but I just went out and just
41 looked at where the shadow was being cast from these trees here. The shadow is coming down
42 to about this point. So there is a fairly significant amount of height there that we have sort of
43 working for us. Along this edge here the trees are lower overall. There are some taller trees and
44 sycamores here. There are some aleppo pines in this corner here. Most of the foliage here is
45 about ten to 12 feet above the roof deck height so you have really great screening in the sense of
46 horizontal screening as you view from Hillview there. So that was giving us a very rich buffer

1 there. We considered the possibility of bringing in another trellis in this location here but what
2 we found when we started do that we started actually seeing the trellis. We felt that the benefit
3 wasn't really there. We were getting a good balance, striking a good balance with the amount of
4 shading we were able to provide.

5
6 Chair Burt: Okay. Then finally on the landscape theme as you are probably aware there is
7 becoming a greater consideration of the use of rooftop gardening. We don't do it on the west
8 coast much on the east coast they wouldn't bat an eye at considering that sort of thing. Are there
9 any opportunities here to incorporate green-space related to the rooftops perhaps even as I don't
10 know what architecturally what the possibilities are and whether it be an additional employee
11 amenity area or not. As Commissioner Garber was pointing out a local famed example is the
12 Gap campus and things like that. So are there any opportunities there to incorporate green-space
13 related to the rooftops?
14
15

16 Mr. Laymon: We are looking at ways of being able to if you will celebrate the site in terms of
17 being able to create usable open space on the roof. You can see here that above the lobby area
18 there is a fairly substantial open space where we will be able to bring people out onto that roof
19 space and they will be able to participate there. We don't have vegetation up there so much we
20 have a paver system that will be a permeable paver system that goes to a sub-drain and such. So
21 there is a lot of very green aspects as to how that particular paving system works in terms of
22 water treatment and shading and such. Really what we have done is gone for the very high
23 performance roof system that gives us the sort of energy conservation that we are interested in.
24 We are using the central space as the most usable portion of that roof area that we can take
25 advantage of. One of the things that this site plan did allow us to be able to do is to develop
26 significant ground level spaces where people can flow out of their offices and be able to take
27 advantage of those breakout areas on casual occurrences as well as organized events. So we
28 have a lot of really nice space we are able to develop on the ground in addition to that terrace up
29 above.
30

31 Chair Burt: I would just like to encourage you before it goes to ARB to take another look and
32 see if there is any additional opportunities to incorporate green elements in the rooftop space but
33 I do appreciate the many things you have done on that. Dan, did you have an additional
34 question?
35

36 Commissioner Garber: Yes, thank you. We have in front of us a revised Attachment A. What
37 were the differences between what we received and what is on our desks?
38

39 Ms. Bourne: The revisions were more an additional amount of examples in the findings would
40 be for finding for C, we give some additional examples of environmental design and ecological
41 balance through the construction of the project. So those specific examples weren't included in
42 the original Attachment A findings.
43

44 Commissioner Garber: Thank you.
45

46 Chair Burt: Lee.

1
2 Commissioner Lippert: I think Chair Burt made a very important point here and I would like to
3 try to reinforce it a little bit. I am tiptoeing around the DEE. Well, I want to be very careful
4 about how I approach this. I guess this would be directed to either Gary or Ted. You are asking
5 for a DEE on an increase of the site coverage here. In a normal situation parking would not be
6 two-story it would be uncovered surface parking. The implications here are that for every ten
7 spaces a tree would be planted. That is what our standards are. In this case because it is a
8 structure we have eliminated those trees. In addition to that Public Works has a requirement that
9 surface parking be done in a way that allows for water to filter down through the surface to
10 recharge the ground water and to water the trees. Are both of those things being mitigated? Are
11 there additional trees being planted to make up for those one tree per ten parking spaces either on
12 the site or on an adjacent sites and how is the groundwater being handled? I'm sorry, the runoff.
13

14 Mr. Korth: Yes to both. One of the things that the Design Enhancement Exception allows here
15 is what we like to think of as an exceptional design. We think that the use of this deck as a
16 solution by being able to expand the amount of plantable area taking asphalt essentially off the
17 table as is currently there on the site as you are aware and be able to turn that into landscape area,
18 be able to improve the permeability of the site dramatically and also be able to plant more trees.
19 So we are able to increase the total number of trees significantly over what is there now. So in
20 sort of an ecosystem sense we are dramatically being able to improve both what is happening on
21 the ground plane and also in terms of the number of trees that are going to be present there and
22 really enhancing the quality of the trees, replacing trees that are really substandard and going
23 with trees that are much more appropriate to the site.
24

25 One of the things we are very excited about in this plan, to answer your second question with
26 respect to the storm water management, it is a very key element of this project. We looked at a
27 number of different schemes and we were able to basically treat all the water that is falling onto
28 any of the hard surfaces. So for instance the roof water and the hardscape here is being collected
29 and deposited to a bioswale, which goes through a series of ponds that are vegetated along where
30 the former roadway was here. That is all cleansed in this area before it exits out through the site.
31 The parking structure all the water that falls the surface here is collected and run through a
32 bioswale that occurs along the frontage here. So all the water, 100 percent of all the water that is
33 landing on any impervious surface is being collected and filtered before it is released to the site.
34 So it is really quite I think kind of an exceptional design in the sense of it is all being treated and
35 it is all being enhanced in that way.
36

37 Commissioner Lippert: Thank you.
38

39 Chair Burt: I have one final question for Jean Snider. Jean, this has to do with the transit
40 aspects. In the Staff Report Staff made a comparison to different Comprehensive Plan policies
41 and the conformance. One is Policy L-42, which is encouraging in this district a development
42 that encourages transit, pedestrian and bicycle travel and reduces auto trips for daily errands. I
43 understand that there is 2,500 square feet of employee amenities, which would increase
44 pedestrian use on campus and decrease auto trips off campus. The other aspect that I would like
45 to see if you could share with us is the use of transit and the shuttle system in this area and how
46 that is all being coordinated with this project. I understand that this project has a TDM program

1 that is also mitigating some of the automobile trips. Could you add a little more information on
2 that?

3
4 Ms. Snider: What we found in our research is that SAP is a very progressive TDM user, has
5 actually a dedicated I think it is 50 percent time person focused on TDM. So bringing them into
6 this area is really a great thing from a TDM standpoint. As far as shuttles go we do have some
7 existing shuttles in the Research Park. We have some upcoming requirements to enhance the
8 shuttles through our Mayfield Agreement. We also have a requirement to bring on a TDM
9 coordinator for the Research Park and that is underway right now. There is a Deer Creek Shuttle
10 that runs to this area of the Research Park. It has serviced primarily HP and Agilent. There are
11 some changes, as you know, Agilent is departing Palo Alto. So we are looking into all of this
12 and taking a comprehensive approach and trying to make as a priority really for this new
13 coordinator who is going to be a Stanford employee who is going to look at all the shuttles. The
14 other thing that is happening is [VM Ware] who is building their new project on a portion of the
15 former Roche site is going to have a shuttle to that location that is across the street. So we are
16 going to be talking to them about their openness to having SAP join them in that shuttle effort.
17 So we are looking at all of that and there are a lot of upcoming obligations where we are going to
18 have to focus on the shuttles in that area of the Research Park.

19
20 Chair Burt: In that shuttle concept are you looking at, we have a number of these companies that
21 have done their own efforts on shuttles, are looking at either extending the Marguerite or perhaps
22 encouraging them to participate in extending the Palo Alto Shuttle?

23
24 Ms. Snider: All of the above, yes. I think what we encounter is when it is a newer program for a
25 company they are a little more guarded about it and want to see what works for them and are a
26 little leery at least in the initial stages about inviting other companies to participate. What we
27 would like to do is come up with a program that everyone feels they can buy into and will serve
28 more than just one or two companies.

29
30 Chair Burt: Thank you. Karen, you had a question?

31
32 Vice-Chair Holman: Yes, also for Jean, thank you. Along those same lines I am just going to
33 ask the question here. Are you familiar with first source hiring? I know SAP is very progressive
34 in many of these ways. Are you familiar with first source hiring?

35
36 Ms. Snider: I am not, no.

37
38 Vice-Chair Holman: Okay, thank you.

39
40 Chair Burt: Dan.

41
42 Commissioner Garber: My question is for the architect. To emphasize some of the
43 Commissioners and to follow up on some of them I would just like to ask a couple of question
44 which won't really bear on our auspice this evening but I am curious. When you were doing
45 research for the design of this particular building were there precedents that you were asked to
46 look at in terms of what SAP has done in terms of providing sustainable designs in buildings that

1 they have done either here and/or overseas and if so, what did you learn from those in terms of
2 what culturally SAP was trying to accomplish?
3

4 Mr. Korth: We did look at some of their buildings. Starting out on this Jean mentioned some of
5 the requirements that they have and a lot of it focused on the quality of the workspace for the
6 people that are in the buildings. Much of it had to do with the requirement we have natural light
7 directly adjacent to the workspace. Jean mentioned that there was one building where they have
8 a basement without natural light and no one to work down there. That was a huge part of this.
9 The step building as we went through this we had to demonstrate that that allowed natural light
10 to still occur on all four sides of the building. When you step a building you have to deal with
11 different level changes and how it meets the earth and that is why that one Design Enhancement
12 Exception for the extended wall was necessary to accommodate some of the grade changes. So
13 there were issues having to do with quality of the workspace and there is a list of all of the
14 sustainable items that we have addressed in your packet, which I think is a three-page element
15 there.
16

17 Commissioner Garber: I guess what I was curious about was if there was a culture that would
18 give you license to stretch the envelope even more than you have begun to and although it is a
19 pun I am actually meaning talking about the building envelope and the [mini] corporations and I
20 don't know if it is true for SAP in particular their European subsidiaries or home buildings have
21 often looked – and I guess what is causing me to think about this is that your floor plate is now
22 beginning to be small enough where you could actually look at exterior wall system that actually
23 opened as opposed to being closed, that were actually more active rather than being static
24 relative to the sun and/or other conditions that are being there. I was just curious to see if there
25 are opportunities for even more or intensive sustainable sort of interactions were an opportunity.
26

27 Mr. Korth: It wasn't something that SAP had specifically asked us to pursue. Although I think
28 we have gone a great deal further than many, many projects in trying to address those issues.
29

30 Commissioner Garber: I don't disagree. Thank you.
31

32 Chair Burt: I think just as a comment Commissioners are emboldened to bring up some issues
33 that we would love to see in many buildings and we are emboldened because we recognize that
34 the applicant here is one that is demonstrating a great deal of interest in sustainable development.
35 So please don't take it as a lack of appreciation for what you have already done but we are all
36 enthused about making this as much of a model as possible. One of the things that I hope is that
37 these excellent achievements will get recognized so that they will be replicated more in our
38 community.
39

40 Commissioner Garber: Well said.
41

42 Chair Burt: Karen.
43

44 Vice-Chair Holman: Along those lines another question for you Ted. One of the aspects of
45 sustainability is to design for reuse. What we see happen a lot now is that a lot of these buildings
46 are 20 to 40 or 50 years old so the buildings are all being torn down. That is hardly sustainable.

1 So in the design of this building and the inner workings of it is this building being designed for
2 one specific tenant for one specific use or does this building have mobility within it that would
3 accommodate another tenant so that we don't tear down another building in ten or 20 years?
4

5 Mr. Korth: That is a great question. If you look at the building that is on the site today it is
6 really clear why it is being torn down because its daylighting is a huge aspect of it. The fact that
7 it is just buried into a hillside and it is hard to use that space. This building is designed to be
8 very flexible in terms of the configuration of it, in terms of how the space is used on the interior.
9 There have been a number of space plans done on it by us at the beginning and now SAP is
10 having plans done for themselves to determine the exact configuration of the core elements, the
11 elevators, the stairs, the restroom cores, those areas so that it is very flexible. So we are still
12 working on that and it has flexibility to accommodate many tenants. We did a number of
13 buildings like this and that is a problem if you do a building that is so specific to one particular
14 tenant that when they move out, and there are a lot of examples like that of those situations
15 where it is very hard to reutilize the building. This is a very flexible form. The window line is
16 really going to generate a great interior workspace. So the only obstructions are the elements
17 inside there which are a very few things like restrooms, stairs, one elevator and the rest of it is
18 open space that will be very flexible from forward.
19

20 Vice-Chair Holman: That is good to hear. Thank you.
21

22 Chair Burt: Okay. Lee.
23

24 Commissioner Lippert: One more question for you Ted. Again going back to the DEE you are
25 asking for a DEE on height. Normally what happens is that we have the building height and then
26 in addition to that there is roof screening and we allow for roof screening up to 15 feet I believe.
27 What are doing to minimize the roof equipment so that you do not have to use 15-foot high roof
28 screens?
29

30 Mr. Korth: Ours are nine feet higher than the perimeter parapet right now as opposed to that
31 extended dimension. Our mechanical engineer, Jack Hunt, is here right now. What is shown on
32 the drawing right there is we have tried to squeeze them into the tightest area possible to try to
33 reduce the size of the roof screen as well. So it is very compact and it is as low as it can be to
34 conceal any equipment that would be required on the roof. So that is a result of a lot of back and
35 forth trying to sort that out and trying to reduce the height of the roof screen. So we have not
36 gone as high as the 15 feet.
37

38 Commissioner Lippert: I have a question for Staff. Since they are asking for a DEE on height to
39 restrict the height of the roof screens to assure that they don't become egregious?
40

41 Mr. C. Williams: I think you can limit the height of the roof screens. It really doesn't
42 necessarily have to do with the DEE I think it is back to the Site and Design issue. If you think
43 that for a Site and Design reasons and visibility and such that that's appropriate then that is a
44 recommendation you can make.
45

46 Commissioner Lippert: Great. Thank you very much.

1
2 Chair Burt: Karen.

3
4 Vice-Chair Holman: I do have one more, I apologize, it was on my list and I overlooked it. It
5 has to do with the rooftop equipment. Can you just walk us through briefly how that rooftop
6 equipment not only conforms to the code as far as noise is concerned but how you might be
7 mitigating beyond that what noise is being created?

8
9 Mr. Korth: Jack, would you like to answer that? Our mechanical engineer is here and is
10 probably the best to answer a question about equipment.

11
12 Vice-Chair Holman: Okay. It is important but most especially since it is adjacent to open space
13 it is really important.

14
15 Mr. Jack Hunt, Mechanical Engineer: The tenant was also concerned about that and you will see
16 that the roofs are comparatively close to the open space on the link. They are going to have
17 people up there in the link. So we tested the noise level at the link and we did a study from the
18 noise level of the equipment over to the link and it was quiet enough at the link, about 45 DB or
19 lower at the maximum use of the equipment. The equipment has variable speeds on the
20 condenser fans. So the equipment is quiet in that position.

21
22 One of the things that we would like to do that we did with the pieces of equipment and that has
23 to do with the height of the roof screen is that you want to increase your condenser size the
24 maximum you can and keep your compressor size down. That is what we have done with the
25 units we have. They are the higher efficiency units.

26
27 Vice-Chair Holman: Is there any opportunity for more insulation or any kind of shielding that
28 might further reduce the noise impact?

29
30 Mr. Hunt: You have to get a lot of mass in there between the two of them or they don't work
31 very well. So with maintaining access to the air above it you couldn't do that very well. You
32 would have the same problem they have with sound walls along the freeway. It doesn't
33 eliminate the noise it just moves it past a little way. The noise is a certain amount of energy and
34 the energy is going somewhere and it is going to get outside the roof screen. So unless you have
35 something that is going to absorb it and the mass doesn't absorb it then you don't stop the noise
36 from getting passed the roof screen.

37
38 Vice-Chair Holman: Thank you.

39
40 Chair Burt: From what you just said I realize that this is something that is probably inherent in
41 all projects. We basically have a tradeoff between the mass and the HVAC and the noise
42 because by increasing the condenser size, which takes up a lot more space than compressors, you
43 reduce the noise but you increase the area that is the mass on the roof. So that is a built-in
44 tradeoff that we will always have.

1 Mr. Hunt: That is interesting. On existing buildings that have been in use for awhile you can see
2 the older compressors are about that tall, the tiny things on the roof, and the new ones are about
3 that big. I just did a job and it is in exactly this condition where we are trading off heat transfer
4 area for less energy. It is usually a good tradeoff but it is an expensive one and it just completely
5 follows the price of energy.
6

7 Chair Burt: Thank you. Okay, we did a lot o airing of issues in the questioning of the applicant.
8 I don't have any cards from the public. So if we do not see anyone come forward we will close
9 the public hearing and return to the Commission for questions of Staff prior to a motion and
10 discussion. Do we have any further questions of Staff? I think we have vetted a lot.
11

12 All right, maybe we have done the hard work tonight. Would anyone like to make a motion?
13 Dan? Annette?
14

15 MOTION
16

17 Commissioner Bialson: I didn't say anything because you folks have been asking excellent
18 questions. As always I am very impressed. I just got back from vacation at ten o'clock last
19 night. So overall it worked well for me anyway.
20

21 In general in addition to being impressed by the questions I am very impressed by this design
22 and the project. I recognize that it seems to be more than a minor sort of an exception to ask for
23 31 percent versus the usual 15 percent. I think the numerical standard we have is just a very
24 blunt instrument here. What we are trying to accomplish which I think the project addresses is
25 keeping as much site landscaping and pervious area as possible. In doing that our regulations
26 have an issue with the solution. I think the solution is an excellent one. I think some of the
27 points raised by my fellow Commissioners with regard to additional thoughts and inquiries and
28 the openness of the applicant to consider all these things convinced me that we should approve
29 the Site and Design of this project and move it forward to the ARB who I am sure is going to do
30 what they can to make it an even more desirable project.
31

32 I have been taking some notes and essentially come down to I do think it is an exceptional
33 design. So my motion would be to recommend that the City Council approve the Negative
34 Declaration with a finding that the project will not result in significant environmental impacts
35 and approve the Site and Design Review application and the two Design Enhancement
36 Exceptions as requested based on the findings which are presented in the revised Attachment A
37 and the Conditions of Approval which are Attachment D.
38

39 SECOND
40

41 Commissioner Lippert: I will second that.
42

43 Mr. Larkin: Before we go any further I realize that the Staff Report is asking you to make
44 recommendations on the Design Enhancement Exception and that was an error.
45

1 Chair Burt: Okay. Do you have any further comments on your motion or does the seconder
2 have any comments?

3
4 Commissioner Lippert: I just want to say that I think this is probably the third or fourth project
5 of Ted's that I have had the privilege to review and I think it is an excellent project. I agree with
6 everything that Commissioner Bialson has said. I just think it is really a great building. Having
7 seen the valley grow, Palo Alto grow in terms of high technology, I think this really should be a
8 signal for hopefully a new era for high technology in Palo Alto. I think it has an opportunity to
9 be a leadership type building. So I just want to congratulate you and wish you luck with it.

10
11 Chair Burt: Karen.

12
13 Vice-Chair Holman: I have a small handful of comments. I think the applicant has done a great
14 job in many, many regards. The sustainability aspects of this project are remarkable. They
15 responded to at least most of the comments that came forward from the joint review from the
16 Commission and the ARB previously.

17
18 I would associate my comments with my earlier comments and Chair Burt's comments about the
19 rooftops. I do have concern about the view from Coyote Hill and those rooftops. That is a
20 concern. Our Site and Design findings have to determine that the project is compatible with the
21 natural environment. The comparison by the applicant was made to better than the other
22 development nearby. While you are to be absolutely congratulated for that improvement that is
23 not part of our findings. We just have to be compatible with the other uses but not compatible
24 with the other structures. We have to be compatible with the environment. Again the view from
25 Coyote Hill and those rooftops are troubling to me. So I don't know if I am going to ask for an
26 amendment to the motion here or not.

27
28 The other two things that I would comment on is I personally believe that these aren't Design
29 Enhancement Exceptions that they are Variances. I frankly think I could make the findings for
30 Variances but what is in front of us are DEEs. I know while there is not a hard number applied
31 to it, it would be very hard to have a hard number applied to a DEE I think a common sense
32 approach would say that a doubling of site coverage would be compared to development
33 standards would not be minor. If I can go into a quick example it is like if I go to buy a car and it
34 is \$15,000 and I get there and all of a sudden it is \$30,000 that is not minor. Or if I am building
35 a fence that is three foot high and I get home and it has been built to five feet that is not minor.
36 So I don't know quite what to do about this but I don't find that they are DEEs I find that they
37 are Variances. So I am looking for input from my fellow Commissioners here.

38
39 Then on the Site and Design findings on C I would say that there are some strikes that should
40 happen and the same thing on D because I think they are redundant to the purpose. So if we look
41 at C, I will just read this for these purposes. Sound principles of environmental design and
42 ecological balance will be observed in construction of the project; in that, -- the sustainability
43 features. These next two lines should be taken out in my opinion because they are just
44 redundant. What it says now is the proposed research and development building and parking
45 deck have been designed to be consistent with the Site and Design criteria adopted by the

1 Council. It is just saying basically that it satisfies the Site and Design criteria because it satisfies
2 the Site and Design criteria. I think that should be struck.

3
4 On D, "The use will be in accord with the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan." Can this be followed
5 up on by Commissioners?

6
7 Chair Burt: Yes, and I might suggest that because that recommendation I think might be more
8 succinct for going to the Council and ARB but not necessary for us to be able to approve it.
9 Maybe we can put it as a recommendation to Staff that they refine that but I don't think it causes
10 a substantive problem to have that additional verbiage in there.

11
12 Vice-Chair Holman: Okay. I would like to hear what the other Commissioners have to say. I
13 appreciate that very much and I would like to know if the other Commissioners agree or not that
14 this should be a change before it goes to the ARB or Council.

15
16 So D say, The use will be in accord with the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan; in that, the proposed
17 research and development office uses and related improvements comply with the Site and Design
18 development regulations, etc. I think if it just skips down to "in that" the next to the last line on
19 this page says "the design promotes the following policies for Research/Office Park facilities,
20 including." I think that is clear and more succinct and a little bit more rational, if you will. Then
21 also I would add one of the policies that supported I would add Policy N-6 for the natural
22 environment.

23
24 I am not quite sure where that leaves me. I guess I would ask the City Attorney because I think
25 these are Variances and not DEEs where does that leave me as a voter on this project unless the
26 maker and seconder of the motion would agree with that.

27
28 Mr. Larkin: With regard to the DEEs you are not being asked to approve the DEEs. So you
29 could still support the motion and if you wanted to offer another motion to ask the ARB to
30 review whether or not it is minor and should be subject to the DEE that would be a separate
31 process. Right now you are doing Site and Design Review. If you think that the project is
32 compatible with the Site and Design Review criteria except for these DEEs there is no issue then
33 you can still approve the Site and Design Review because that is all you are being asked to do.
34 The DEEs would be a separate recommendation and you could make that recommendation as a
35 separate motion.

36
37 Vice-Chair Holman: Let me ask a clarifying question then. So if they were Variances however,
38 if I believe that they should be Variances would I not have to be able to say I could agree with
39 the findings for the Variances?

40
41 Mr. Larkin: No because it is a separate process. What you really want to be doing is making a
42 recommendation to the ARB or Council that they not be considered minor and in that way they
43 would have to go through the Variance process, which may or may not end up back at the
44 Planning Commission.

1 Vice-Chair Holman: Bear with me for just a moment here. So the recommendation would be
2 really to Council because the ARB probably would not make the determination of whether they
3 were DEEs or Variances, am I right or not?
4

5 Mr. Larkin: The question of whether or not it is even eligible for a DEE starts with the Planning
6 Director – ARB-Council anywhere along that step one of either the Director, the ARB or the
7 Council could say this isn't even subject to a DEE you need to go back and get a Variance. That
8 is the recommendation that you would be making.
9

10 Vice-Chair Holman: Okay, thank you for that. I guess I would ask one friendly amendment of
11 the maker and seconder of the motion. That is that the applicant address the views from Coyote
12 Hill through some other means and not to dictate those means whether it be rooftop gardens,
13 trellises or whatever but just address those views to make the buildings more compatible from
14 that perspective.
15

16 Commissioner Bialson: I think we have mentioned many things to the applicant who has
17 responded very positively to everything. So I am very hesitant to add something as amorphous
18 as what you are saying and have it be part of the motion. I think the motion is clear and succinct
19 at this point. So I would be interested in what the seconder has to say because my initial feeling,
20 but I could be convinced otherwise, is not to make it part of the motion.
21

22 Commissioner Lippert: I am generally in agreement with Commissioner Bialson here. I don't
23 see a need for an amendment to the motion. In fact when you are up on Coyote Hill looking
24 down on this facility the fact that it exceeds the height limit is irrelevant here. It is really internal
25 to the site it is not – I agree. I believe with the roof screening and everything it is taken care of.
26 It is no different than any other building on the site. The only thing that is different here is the
27 fact that this building happens to be a little bit further uphill than it was previously. So I don't
28 believe that there are any roof issues here that wouldn't apply to any other building in the
29 Research Park.
30

31 Chair Burt: Dan.
32

33 Commissioner Garber: Not to sidestep the topic but let me just ask from the attorney, your
34 instructions prior to this topic being discussed were that the motion should not include reference
35 to the DEEs so therefore if I may paraphrase what Commissioner Bialson just said that the
36 motion would then read something like “the Commission recommends that the City Council
37 approve the Negative Declaration, Attachment K, with the finding that the project will not result
38 in significant environmental impacts and the Conditions of Approval,” and essentially strike out
39 the portions that talk about the DEEs.
40

41 Mr. Larkin: That is right. It is the recommendation without the sentence “and the two Design
42 Enhancement Exceptions as requested.”
43

44 Mr. C. Williams: So it does include the Site and Design Review though. I think you skipped
45 that.
46

1 Commissioner Garber: You are right. I apologize. Yes, “and approve the Site and Design
2 Review application and then the Conditions of Approval.” Right? As requested based upon the
3 findings in Attachment A and the revisions or as revised. As that stands that makes sense to me.
4

5 Another point of clarification. Do we need to rule or give notice or make a recommendation
6 relative to the DEE/Variance topic?
7

8 Mr. Larkin: No. You are certainly not required to. That was an option if there was a concern
9 that was among a majority of the Commission that the DEEs were not for a minor change then
10 there could be a motion to make a recommendation but it is not required.
11

12 Chair Burt: Right so why don’t we consider that after we vote on the primary motion. Lee.
13

14 Commissioner Lippert: Commissioner Holman had asked that we comment on the DEEs.
15

16 Chair Burt: Let’s be clear, comment on whether DEEs are appropriate for the project not
17 comment on the content of the DEE.
18

19 Commissioner Lippert: Correct. I believe that the DEEs in this case are appropriate versus the
20 Variance process because the questions that I had asked with regard to the DEEs are basically the
21 background behind the Architectural Review Board’s review of the DEE. It addresses those
22 concerns specifically. So I believe that in this case when it comes forward to the ARB they will
23 either be able to determine that those DEEs are appropriate or they will in fact say that it should
24 go to the Variance process.
25

26 Chair Burt: I would like to wade in on my comments on the motion. Part of it is this issue on
27 the DEE. I think it was very helpful that Staff provided this additional information on DEEs
28 because it is something that has come up a number of times recently and this gives us more
29 context. I think it is something we may want to discuss in greater detail as a Commission as
30 more of a policy discussion. My gut feel is that this pushes the envelope but is probably within
31 the envelope but I would like to at a future time look at this in greater detail. It also as I looked
32 at what this lot coverage exception that it is driven by the fact that we are having a parking
33 structure that counts against coverage and if it was surface parking it would not. I think that is
34 something that we really should try to fold into our discussion within the ZOU and see whether
35 that is a policy change we ought to have. The part of the DEE that stretches the envelope may in
36 fact be something that in the future would not require an exception if we reconsider that
37 requirement. I am not sure that the way the code is written is in fact what we want to encourage
38 people to do. So I would hope that we could fold that into our ZOU whether it is under the
39 landscaping or whatever aspect.
40

41 I do concur with Commissioner Holman on the importance of including Policy N-6 in just the
42 Staff references. I don’t think we have to have it as part of the motion but the reason for doing
43 so is that is a really important policy and the applicant has done a good job of addressing that
44 issue. I think we want to make sure that there is that consciousness of the importance of that
45 policy to future applicants, to the Council, to the ARB and that will be an important one to
46 include there.

1
2 We have talked about the rooftop gardens. I will defer to the applicant and the architect whether
3 there are any other opportunities to do something with those roofs prior to it going to the ARB.
4 Whatever they decide I will live with but I hope they will look at it one more time.
5

6 The one final comment is that this applicant, SAP, we have all kind of had a recognition that we
7 presume that many of the things that they have done and their willingness to embrace some of
8 the most progressive development aspects that we are seeking are not so foreign to them given
9 that they are a German company and many of these same principles have been more widely
10 adopted and integrated in design in some of the more environmentally progressive nations in
11 Europe. I just want to say that because as we try to do some things here in Palo Alto in our
12 Zoning Ordinance Update, in our sustainability program, that reflect the environmentally
13 progressive tradition of Palo Alto we sometimes get criticism and push-back that we are going
14 over the top here. Well, if this same project were in Europe it would maybe be closer to the
15 norm and here it is viewed as exceptional. As much as we appreciate the project I want to see
16 this kind of project become the norm and I hope the Commission in the future will push to have
17 these kinds of policies as what we adopt in this community as standards and that Palo Alto
18 continues to be a leader in these fields.
19

20 Annette.
21

22 Commissioner Bialson: I agree with what you are saying and sort of building on that when I
23 mentioned that the site coverage issue is expressed as a percentage and I felt that was a very
24 blunt instrument to use what I meant by that is the underlying reason for that percentage was to
25 try to preserve as much site landscaping and pervious area as possible. So rather than being
26 focused on it being a numerical difference of a substantial amount, which is what I think
27 Commissioner Holman was focused on, I think we need to focus on what the reasoning behind
28 that percentage is and to recognize that that is of great interest for us in trying to have buildings
29 developed as we would want them to. When we look at new urbanism principles they speak of
30 massing rather than strict percentage of FAR or site coverage. So I would hope that we could
31 consider all these things and recognize that what is being asked for here is truly minor and is an
32 attempt to meet our espoused principles and to have this business go through as much regulation
33 and additional procedure as the Variance would require is not what we want to do in Palo Alto if
34 we want to encourage these type of buildings and these types of innovative approaches to solving
35 the issues that we see. So I am very much against having any consideration of this as a Variance.
36

37 Chair Burt: If I might jump in before Commissioners Lippert and Holman I also want to add I
38 think we are all kind of on the same page on this. The solution is that we need to look at
39 changing our code or at least seriously consider it. What we basically have is something that is
40 mathematically significant as a Variance or Exception I should say but the outcome is something
41 that we are viewing as favorable. That is the gist of it I think. Lee.
42

43 Commissioner Lippert: Actually I would like to support what Commissioner Bialson and Chair
44 Burt have said but I think one of the things that probably would have helped in illustrating this is
45 when you look at the Attachment C, the criteria in terms of setback and site area, etc. Because
46 there is an existing building and there is existing surface parking if those numbers had been

1 included in this table we would have been very easily, or the applicant would have been able to
2 illustrate very clearly that it would be a reduction of site coverage even though the parking
3 doesn't count as site coverage. I think that is really what the discussion is here.
4

5 The second comment I want to make is that because this is a hillside site and not a flat site this is
6 also appropriate because when you get into a hill site it is far more difficult to grade, you have
7 issues of cut and fill, you have other site constraints. So in this case the most efficient, most
8 sustainable approach is actually the stacked parking approach.
9

10 Chair Burt: Karen.

11
12 Vice-Chair Holman: I will remind Commissioners I have not argued against the approach. I
13 have just said I could make the findings for Variance for these just that I thought they should be
14 Variances not DEEs. I stated I believed I could make the findings for the Variances. The focus
15 has been on the site coverage there is also a building height exception. I want to be very, very
16 clear my argument has not been against the approach but just opposed to the instrument that is
17 used.
18

19 The other comment I will make is I sometimes find myself in this position. The applicant has
20 done as I said earlier many really, really great things with this project. The one thing that really
21 does bother me is – I am just going to state it again because as it stands now I won't support the
22 motion and I want to be really, really clear why. It is because the view from the open space is
23 very, very important thing and this project abuts the open space. I know a lot of times when I am
24 out hiking here or there and I see a building sticking up out of the landscape I feel like gee,
25 would I have felt comfortable if I had approved that. There is the structure, there is the building,
26 and there is the impact. Is that compatible? I feel like with so many wonderful things about this
27 project that is the one thing about this I can't, if you will, put my name on and that is why I was
28 asking earlier for more screening, more rooftop gardens. I didn't want to describe what the
29 solution was but that is the one thing I cannot feel comfortable in supporting. So for that one
30 reason I will not be supporting the motion.
31

32 Chair Burt: Dan.

33
34 Commissioner Garber: Was it the Chair's intention to take the vote and then talk more about the
35 DEE versus Variance or if we want to talk about it then talk about that now?
36

37 Chair Burt: Yes, let's take the vote and then if we want to have any further discussion on that.
38

39 Ms. French: I want to jump in just to make sure we are clear. The motion was clear but I would
40 like to clarify that the revised Attachment A, the finding, I would scratch, "and Design
41 Enhancement Exceptions." So it is just Attachment A – revised, Findings for Site and Design
42 and if Annette you are suggesting that the changes suggested by Karen or a facsimile that we
43 scratch out some of that superfluous language in C and D and add Policy N-6 at the end of D.
44

1 Commissioner Bialson: I think that both in the statement of the motion and in the Attachment A
2 we need to remove Design Enhancement Exceptions and I think the addition of Policy N-6
3 would be appropriate.

4
5 Commissioner Lippert: I will accept that.

6
7 MOTION PASSED (4-1-0-2 with Commissioner Holman against, Commissioner Cassel in
8 conflict and Commissioner Sandas absent)

9
10 Chair Burt: Okay. So let's go ahead and take a vote. All those in favor say aye. (ayes)
11 Opposed? (nay) So that is four in favor with Commissioner Holman voting no and two
12 Commissioners absent.

13
14 So let's go ahead and see whether we need to do any further consideration of the issue of
15 whether this should be a DEE or a Variance. Dan, did you have some thoughts on that?

16
17 Commissioner Garber: Yes. Just to answer Karen's direct question to us, which is our take on
18 Variance versus DEE and reading over the purposes. The Variance purposes are to provide a
19 way for a site with special physical constraints resulting from a natural or built features to be
20 used in ways similar to other sites in the same vicinity and zoning district and, two, provide a
21 way to grant relief when strict application of the zoning regulations would subject development
22 of a site to substantial hardships, constraints, or practical difficulties that do not normally arise
23 on other sites in the same vicinity and zoning district, which I would have to agree sounds an
24 awful lot like the project that is in front of us. DEE, the purposes there are one, to enhance the
25 design of a proposed project without altering the function or use of the site or its impact on
26 surrounding properties or two, enable the preservation of the architectural style of existing
27 improvements on the site. In this case item number two certainly would not apply or I don't
28 believe it would. Number one would although I could add up that the Variance has more clauses
29 that support the project requesting a Variance rather than the DEE. I do believe that item number
30 one is enough to cover what is being asked for in the DEE. As I understand it the process for the
31 Variance involves several more procedures, which would allow for greater insight, discussion,
32 etc. to be drawn out. I guess in my mind as I think about weighing the two I don't see that there
33 is a benefit to the community to do that to have the additional inspection of the project and that
34 we get what we need from the DEE. So although I think there are certainly circumstances where
35 the definition is probably of greater criticality I wouldn't find this project as being one of those
36 projects that require that. So that is just sort of my take on those two.

37
38 Chair Burt: Lee.

39
40 Commissioner Lippert: I certainly agree with Commissioner Garber's comments here. I believe
41 that if in fact they were looking for an increase of lot coverage associated with building area not
42 with parking then I would say yes, the DEE would not be an appropriate process and that the
43 Variance should be looked at. But because the overage is in the area of parking and it is within
44 the purview of the DEE B-3 it is appropriate plus the height as well. What my comfort level is is
45 the fact that one of the wings has actually been depressed even lower and that it is completely
46 internal. That alleviates all of my concerns.

1
2 Chair Burt: Karen.

3
4 Vice-Chair Holman: The dog is almost beat. I agree with Commissioner Garber's comments
5 that probably there is no real benefit to making this project go through the Variance process other
6 than if we think it is the wrong process we are adhering to our rules. If we garner nothing else
7 out of this conversation tonight we have had the discussion and it has been a public discussion. I
8 just wanted to make one other mention about Design Enhancement Exceptions under
9 applicability number two for instance says items for Design Enhancement Exceptions may be
10 granted and not limited to but are dormers, eave lines, roof design, bay windows, cornices,
11 parapets. They are talking about accoutrements if you will and it is not limited to that but that is
12 the kind of thing along with minor changes to setback, daylight plane, etc. So that is why I do
13 think it is a Variance and we might have further discussion about this as a separate item but I
14 think this discussion has been helpful to have.

15
16 Chair Burt: Annette.

17
18 Commissioner Bialson: I didn't get much time in the questions so I will just take a little time
19 here. I disagree with my fellow Commissioners I do not think this is a Variance item because a
20 building could be put on this property, the surface parking all over it, there is no physical
21 constraint on this property just because it happens to be on the hillside that keeps it from
22 developing the property and putting surface lots all over. What we are dealing with here is the
23 design, which is asking for a parking structure rather than surface parking is what is requiring the
24 exception. I think if you go back to the basic design that we appreciate and see a lot of benefits
25 in that is the reason for the exception not the physical condition of the property and not when the
26 strict application of zoning regulations would subject the property to substantial hardships. So I
27 disagree wholeheartedly with my fellow Commissioners and maybe it is my legal background, I
28 don't know, but having dealt with this for over 30 years I don't see this as a Variance.

29
30 Chair Burt: Karen.

31
32 Vice-Chair Holman: One last thing I guess I will put on the table here is the findings for the
33 DEE. The first finding is very similar to that for a Variance. It says there are exceptional or
34 extraordinary circumstances or conditions applicable to the property or site improvements
35 involved that do not apply generally to the property in the same zone district. So unless that is
36 misplaced that is the first DEE finding. So that is very, very similar to the Variance findings.

37
38 Chair Burt: I will just briefly say that I think that where it is allowable to treat this as a DEE as I
39 said before I think it is pushing the envelope and the best fix is for us to address this in the ZOU
40 and make it so that we don't require either a DEE or a Variance for something that we in fact
41 might want to encourage.

42
43 So having said that I think we have had a good discussion on this and it brings more
44 consciousness of the distinctions and it lays the groundwork for our future ZOU discussion of it.
45

1 That will conclude this item. Once again I think it is the consensus of the Commission that the
2 applicant and the Staff and the tenant are all to be commended for doing some very outstanding
3 efforts here. We look forward to the project going forward. Good luck at the ARB and the City
4 Council. Thank you.

5
6 So I think we are now at the point for Approval of Minutes.

7
8 ***APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Minutes of Regular Meeting of June 14, 2006***

9
10 Chair Burt: We have one set of minutes here for Wednesday, June 14, 2006. We had
11 Commissioner Sandas absent from the meeting and she is not here tonight to vote on it so we
12 don't have a problem there.

13
14 MOTION

15
16 Commissioner Bialson: I will move to accept the minutes.

17
18 SECOND

19
20 Commissioner Lippert: Second.

21
22 MOTION PASSED (5-0-0-2 with Commissioners Cassel and Sandas absent)

23
24 Chair Burt: Motion to approve by Commissioner Bialson and seconded by Commissioner
25 Lippert. Any comments or questions? All those in favor say aye. (aye) That is passed five to
26 zero.

27
28 ***REPORTS FROM OFFICIALS/COMMITTEES.***

29
30 Chair Burt: Do we have any Reports from Officials or Committees? No? Very good.

31
32 ***COMMISSION MEMBER QUESTIONS, COMMENTS, AND/OR ANNOUNCEMENTS.***

33
34 Chair Burt: Any other questions or comments or announcements? We had one issue about an
35 upcoming meeting on August 9. Curtis, the Tentative Agenda does not have any items and I
36 think you had thought we may not need that meeting?

37
38 Mr. C. Williams: That is correct. We would like to request that we cancel the August 9 meeting.
39 However, we also would like to see if it is possible, we are not sure we are going to have an item
40 for this but it sounds like we could have an item for August 23 if Commissioners could meet on
41 the 23rd as well as the 30th.

42
43 Chair Burt: Are Commissioners available for the 23rd should that arise?

44
45 Mr. C. Williams: We will have two new Commissioners by then as well so you can't ask them
46 tonight.

1
2 Chair Burt: Okay, so tentatively that sounds like that would work.
3
4 Mr. C. Williams: We will see if we can make that work on our end to have that meeting.
5
6 Chair Burt: Karen.
7
8 Vice-Chair Holman: Do you need a motion to cancel August 9?
9
10 Mr. Larkin: No but it wouldn't hurt.
11
12 MOTION
13
14 Vice-Chair Holman: Okay, I move that we cancel the meeting of August 9.
15
16 SECOND
17
18 Commissioner Garber: Second.
19
20 MOTION PASSED (5-0-0-2 with Commissioners Cassel and Sandas absent)
21
22 Chair Burt: Seconded by Commissioner Garber. All in favor? (ayes) That meeting is cancelled
23 for August 9 and we may have another meeting on August 23rd.
24
25 Our Commission Representation for the balance of this month is Commissioner Cassel and then
26 in August is Commissioner Holman.
27
28 Any other items? All right. Thank you all very much. Good night.
29
30 ***NEXT MEETING***: Regular Meeting at 7:00 PM on July 26, 2006.
31
32 ***ADJOURNED: 9:25 PM***
33