



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 13710)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 11/18/2021

Summary Title: Minutes of October 7, 2021

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for October 7, 2021

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Architectural Review Board (ARB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

Background

Draft minutes from the October 7, 2021 Architectural Review Board (ARB) are available in Attachment A.

Draft and Approved Minutes are made available on the ARB webpage at bit.ly/paloaltoARB

Attachments:

- Attachment A: October 7, 2021 Draft Minutes (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
 DRAFT MINUTES: September 9, 2021
 Virtual Meeting
 8:30 AM

Call to Order / Roll Call

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in virtual teleconference at 8:30 a.m.

Participating Remotely: Chair Osma Thompson, Vice Chair Grace Lee, Boardmember Peter Baltay, Boardmember David Hirsch, Boardmember Alex Lew

Absent: None.

Oral Communications

None.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

None.

City Official Reports

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

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, provided an updated 2021 ARB meeting schedule to reflect the fact that all meetings will be virtual through the end of the year. City Council discussed hybrid meetings and the Governor's order at its last meeting and have determined that City Council meetings will be held in the hybrid model beginning in November with other Boards and Commissions starting in January 2022. The ARB meeting on October 21st will include 2609 Alma, 160 Waverley, and a second discussion of the ARB Awards. It is not possible to meet in person to discuss the ARB Awards.

Action Items

2. 2585 E Bayshore RD: [21PLN-00121] Request for a Minor Board Level Architectural Review to Allow the Removal and Replacement of Building Façade Materials, Addition of Outdoor Patio/Employee Amenity Space, Replacement of Rooftop Mechanical Equipment, New Landscaping Throughout the Site and Changes to the Parking Lot. Applicant also Seeks a Director's Adjustment for Reduced Loading Space. Zoning Designation: ROLM (E)(D)(AD). Environmental Assessment: 15301 Existing Facilities. For more information, please contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez.

Chair Thompson announced the item and called for disclosures.

Page 1 of 12
 Architectural Review Board Meeting
 Draft Summary Minutes: 10/7/2021

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he visited the site.

Boardmember Hirsch disclosed that he visited the site and the board at City Hall.

Boardmember Lew disclosed that he visited the site, the color board, and completed research on the siding. He was also a member of the ARB when the previous tenants on the site came to the Board.

Vice Chair Lee disclosed that she visited the site and was also on the ARB in 2006.

Chair Thompson disclosed that she visited the site and the materials board at City Hall. She called for the staff report.

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner, shared a presentation with the ARB consisting of façade and site improvements for 2585 E. Bayshore Road. The project proposes to update the exterior building façade with new materials and colors, provide outdoor amenity spaces for employees, improve the parking lot and landscaping, and infill two existing courts that are open on two sides. He provided an aerial shot of the site and noted the zoning was ROLM (E)(D)(AD). The existing single story office building was built in 1969 and shares a common driveway with the adjacent property. The subject area is made up of office-like uses and is bordered on the west by the 101 freeway. He shared photographs of the existing building for context. Staff found that the project is lot coverage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) compliant. The courtyards will be filled in and are exempted from floor area and lot coverage via an exemption for amenity spaces. There is no net gain of space per the code. The project will refresh the exterior of the building, which features rectangular forms. He showed the proposed colors and listed the materials to be used and then showed an elevation in the new materials with new landscaping. Most of the site changes come from the parking lot circulation and relocating the northernmost driveway to the center of the site. There are new planting strips, trees, and landscaping. The site requires 53 parking spaces and is compliant. The site also includes three long-term and two short-term bicycle parking spaces. The site never had a formal loading area but based on the square footage it should, so the applicant is proposing an area to fit a SU-30 vehicle. Staff and the Transportation Office analyzed that and found that it met design and circulation standards. The applicant has proposed four new exterior amenity spaces including a green entry garden area, an outdoor meeting room, an exterior dining area named "Living Room," and a relaxation area. Mr. Gutierrez showed renderings of the exterior spaces. With respect to landscaping there are 27 types of plants proposed, 15 of which are native and 14 are low water use. The planting strips in the parking lot allow for new trees which will bring the property into compliance with the shading requirements. Overall, there are less paved areas than the existing conditions. Key considerations for the ARB are the proposed changes to the site being compatible and consistent with the Baylands Guidelines and whether the project meets the ARB findings. Staff believes the changes meet the findings and recommends that the ARB recommend approval of the project to the Director of Planning & Development Services based on the findings and subject to the conditions of approval.

Chair Thompson stated the applicant had 10 minutes.

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects, made the presentation on behalf of the applicant. He indicated the landscape architects, the civil and structural engineer, and the applicant were also present on the Zoom. He thanked Mr. Gutierrez for his assistance and presentation. He utilized a PowerPoint to highlight aerial views of the project area and its zoning. He also provided photographs of the building in its

current condition. The goal of the project is to create a new home for Vance Brown Builders. They will reuse and dry floodproof the existing panelized concrete building, reconfigure the parking lot, respond to the nature of the site and proximity to the Baylands, and enhance the frontage along East Bayshore. He provided site analysis including diagrams of the existing conditions and the proposed site plan. The proposed site reconfigures the flow of traffic, includes water permeable pavers, reduces the amount of asphalt, increases the parking count, and creates more landscaping opportunities. He explained that the “living room” concept was an outdoor garden area that would be utilized as a break area for Vance Brown employees and customers. He showed renderings of the spaces with the new materials and explained they were playing off the Baylands. The materials are dark and will recede into the background and be a good backdrop for the landscaping. The material palette was presented, and he noted that it had changed from the ARB set. The material was changed because the building is in the flood zone, and they needed to ensure it was approved for that use. The new material has a 50-year warranty with a 25-year in ground warranty and the look is essentially the same. The paint color may have been slightly tweaked since the ARB’s last viewing. Mr. Hayes then showed a series of existing conditions next to the new renderings for comparison. There are ramps on both sides as accessible parking is available on each side of the building. Part of the floodproofing is making sure the windowsill lines are 12 inches above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE). All existing openings are being infilled with concrete walls and water stops to prevent flooding.

Chair Thompson stated that Mr. Hayes’ 10 minutes were up, but that she would let him continue.

Mr. Hayes continued showing the existing conditions next to the new renderings. He stated that he was happy to answer ARB questions.

Chair Thompson called for the public comment, but there was none. She called for ARB questions of the applicant.

Boardmember Lew inquired about the height limit for the trees along East Bayshore and why the southern live oaks were being replaced with California live oaks.

Mr. Hayes introduced Dan Affleck of SWA to address the southern live oak removal.

Daniel Affleck, SWA Group, stated he was not familiar with the easement. As the driveway was moved they needed to remove some trees and others were damaged, so they decided to remove all of them and replace them with native trees. As this is an ecologically sensitive area they settled on the California live oak.

Boardmember Lew asked Mr. Gutierrez to address the easement and the height restrictions on the trees. He noted it was a major issue on the Ming’s site for all three proposals.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that the Ming’s site was a mile up the road towards Embarcadero. City data shows utility easements running along East Bayshore, but the limits that were applied to Ming’s do not apply to this project. He stated that staff and Urban Forestry reviewed the plans, and those limits were not an issue.

Boardmember Hirsch asked where the board formed concrete was located on the building.

Mr. Hayes showed the material on a rendering and explained the material would establish the edge of the ramps.

Boardmember Hirsch thanked him for the clarification. He asked if the ramp was being completely removed and reconstructed.

Mr. Hayes stated it would be.

Chair Thompson asked if the board formed concrete was used elsewhere in the project.

Mr. Hayes stated it occurred with the ramps on either side of the entry.

Boardmember Baltay asked staff to explain the City requirement on the loading zone and how the property was meeting that requirement.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that based on the parking and loading requirements in the municipal code different uses are allocated different requirements. As the proposed use is a general business office and given the size of the building it requires one loading space. The typical loading space in the municipal code is based off an 18-wheeler, but that is not necessary in this case. Via a Director's adjustment the municipal code allows for a modification of the loading area to fit an SU-30 delivery vehicle. Per staff's understanding of the circulation on the site it is compliant.

Boardmember Baltay asked if there was a requirement on how the delivery spot was configured or if it needed to be accessible. He also asked that the proposed site be shown on the drawings.

Mr. Hayes explained that delivery vehicles would come up the shared driveway, turn into the site, temporarily park in the loading zone, and exit the center driveway. He illustrated the flow on the proposed site plan.

Boardmember Baltay stated that the loading zone was essentially in the driving aisle. He asked if that was permitted by the code.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that it was with the Director's adjustment.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that they do not normally allow the loading spaces to be in the drive aisle. For this project the Director would need to state that the loading space is not available. However, a delivery truck could park in front without blocking other parked cars so the Director would still see that as a reasonable adjustment.

Boardmember Baltay asked if the rear of the building was going to be painted the dark brown color.

Mr. Hayes said that it was.

Boardmember Baltay said there are two small mechanical screens in the back and asked if they were being enlarged.

Mr. Hayes explained the roof screen was being relocated to closer to the center of the building.

Boardmember Baltay asked if anything was being added on top of the building that would be visible from the Baylands.

Mr. Hayes stated that they were not adding anything that was higher than what was currently on the roof. The current roof screen will be reclad. Nothing along the rear wall would change aside from the finish.

Chair Thompson said that the materials board showed dark grey and that Boardmember Baltay had referenced dark brown paint. She requested clarification on the color.

Mr. Hayes showed the color and said it was Benjamin Moore [unintelligible at 36:12] twilight. It would be on the concrete frame and the back of the building.

Chair Thompson explained that she just wanted clarification that it was not brown.

Mr. Hayes presented a slide that illustrated Shou Sugi Ban Sugio Charred Accoya weathering.

Vice Chair Lee inquired about how they selected the material.

Mr. Hayes stated that they had not used the material before although it has been specified on a few projects that are not yet built. They wanted a material that was warm, felt coastal, would age gracefully, and survive in the flood zone. The dark color should make the building recede into the Baylands.

Boardmember Hirsch asked about graphics and signage and stated their importance to the project. Second, he asked how the shared driveway affected the repaving and circulation.

Mr. Hayes said that no sign has been proposed in the application and that he did not know the client's intention. When the client decides what they would like to do they will bring it forward with the interior package. The old monument sign has been removed. He assumed the sign would be sophisticated and minimal and asked if Loren Brown wanted to address the question.

Loren Brown, Vance Brown Builders, said they were currently at 3196 Park and have four 6-inch-high numbers on the building and a 1 foot by 15-inch plaque at the road. They have an understated approach that they will probably remain consistent with in signage.

Mr. Hayes explained that the southern edge of the property had a shared easement and driveway. The parking lot is being resurfaced and adding they are adding water permeable pavers. The neighbor will not be affected by the parking lot construction. After demolition and improvement, they may do a slurry coat over the shared driveway which could be accomplished over a weekend and without disruption to the neighbor. The neighbor also has an additional way in and out of its lots in case the shared driveway needed to be temporarily closed.

Chair Thompson requested they explain the color choices on the materials board.

Mr. Hayes explained that they wanted a natural background color that was recessive, and he felt the darker color accomplished that. They also wanted a long-lasting material, and he has been disappointed with cedar siding and other materials that require constant maintenance. The chosen materials have a 50-year warranty and are Forest Stewardship Council (FSC) harvested and certified Accoya. Since there is a chance of flooding he thought this material was more appropriate.

Chair Thompson pointed out that the numbers in Mr. Hayes' presentation were different in terms of the materials, but she thought she understood. She asked why the permeable pavers were to be placed where they were shown instead of in other areas.

Mr. Hayes said they were placed on the most public side of the building where they would have the greatest impact. They are not used in the handicapped spaces.

Chair Thompson closed the questions portion of the hearing and opened the discussion. She called on Boardmember Lew and asked to hear about his materials research.

Boardmember Lew thanked Mr. Hayes and stated it was a handsome project. He reviewed the past tenant's project and had been concerned with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) traffic travel to the street. Therefore, he appreciated their ADA improvements. In his review of other Baylands projects he noted that the nighttime lighting is terrible. The building currently has wall mounted lighting that shines out horizontally, so the applicant is improving the quality of light on the sight. The existing site also has very little parking lot shading so again the applicant is dramatically improving the conditions. His reservation was on the Shou Sugi Ban because the sample at City Hall was very dark. In researching the material he learned that if it was scraped to show more grain it required more maintenance. He thought that the dark building would be an initial shock, but in the spirit of the Baylands it may be the way to go. He was inclined to allow it because it's a one-story building but wanted to hear what other Boardmembers thought. Otherwise, he was thinking of recommending approval of the project.

Boardmember Baltay thought the choice of materials was excellent. He was excited about how the wood would age with time. Overall, this was an example of what should be done near the Baylands. He did not see the view corridors that Mr. Hayes described so he thought it was important to paint the screens darker as indicated in the plans to try to blend them in. There is a landscaping hedge running the full length of the property now and he would not like it to be changed. He was concerned about the trees and possible Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) easement requirement that the City might not be aware of. It would be a real mistake to cut down the existing trees to move them a few feet and then learn that they cannot be planted in the planned locations. He strongly encouraged them to check the easement and legal requirements and to attempt to retain the original oak trees. He also thought that they looked like coast live oaks and that there were several other inconsistencies on the landscaping labeling. He suggested they check the plan for accuracy. With respect to the loading zone he thought it was a real mistake to call something a loading zone when it is clearly not. Anything that blocks traffic is not a loading zone. So, either the Director should waive the loading zone requirement, or the applicant should put in a real loading zone that does not interfere with traffic flow. He supported the reduction of the loading zone size but stressed that it needed to be out of traffic. He did not want the ARB to set a precedent that this type of loading zone was acceptable.

Boardmember Hirsch did not see the proposed loading zone as unreasonable given the building's usage and size. He also thought there was enough space for traffic to flow around the parked delivery vehicle. Therefore, it was reasonable to allow an exception in this project. With respect to the Accoya and the Baylands it is sophisticated and will blend to the background. He thought that it was a little too buttoned up and suggested the applicant consider colorful signage, at least near the roadway. He thought it was a shame that the garden area was not more open to the Baylands. It would be wonderful for tenants to

see more of the Baylands. The City is careful to make sure that the buildings near the Baylands don't disturb the nature, but it would be nice for the buildings to participate in the Baylands. With respect to the railing there is not much detailing, but he expected the railings around the new ramps would be of high quality and to Mr. Hayes' standard. He agreed with Boardmember Lew that he could probably approve the project during the meeting. He was concerned that the shared driveway would be unattractive compared to the other aspects of the project. In terms of the trees and the easement he thought that more is better, and they could choose larger trees in order to make nature a bigger element in the design. He appreciated how they used the side of the building and protected it from the front and thought it would make the building enjoyable to work in. He also enjoyed the transitions and noted the amenities were well thought out. The lighting is a very important piece for the site, and he was pleased Boardmember Lew looked into it. The project is sophisticated and well thought out.

Vice Chair Lee thanked Mr. Gutierrez, the applicant, and her colleagues. She indicated she could approve the project per the findings presented in the staff report. The presentation was exemplary, and she had faith that the easement issues would be resolved working with staff. The loading discussion was good. When she visited the site there was a truck that blocked her way for a short time, so she saw no issue with the designated loading area. Overall, she wanted to commend the project for providing the amenities for its users. Before the presentation and discussion, she had been concerned with the material choice, but the slide illustrating the aging of the material eased her concerns. The depth of the grain in the treated pine will look good as it ages.

Chair Thompson said that in the .pdf package the renderings made the building look very dark brown, which she liked. When she visited the site she noticed the adjacent buildings were lighter and then she saw the materials board and saw the color was black. She was concerned about the material being too dark and noted that on another project the Shou Sugi Ban looked very rough. They have told other projects that black is too dark in the area. Some Shou Sugi Ban is browner in tone and others are bluer in tone and she did not know how to navigate that. She might prefer a browner tone but was unsure if that was available. Overall, she had reservations about the material and if the ARB moved to approve the project she would want that to go to subcommittee. She was also concerned about the coating on the concrete side being too dark. She agreed with Boardmember Baltay that healthy trees should not be removed. The loading issue is also concerning and needs further review. Otherwise, the building was great, and she commended the applicant on the presentation. If the ARB moves to approve she wanted the Shou Sugi Ban, the trees, and the loading area to go to subcommittee. She asked Ms. Gerhardt to discuss the PG&E easement.

Ms. Gerhardt said that in 99.9% of projects the City does not deal with PG&E, but that they would check on this one. Therefore, the ARBs sentiments are correct, and she assumes PG&E would want ornamental trees. With the loading space the Director should do a full adjustment but there was conversation about the proposed location being reasonable for drop offs. They are adding lighting to the site, which will be good in the early evening. Staff will make sure that there's a code requirement that in the later evening the lighting is reduced to security levels to maintain the quality of the Baylands.

Chair Thompson called for further discussion.

Vice Chair Lee said what she heard from the ARB was mostly positive comments and given that Ms. Gerhardt has stated that staff would work with the applicant she wished to move the project as proposed and see if she could get a second and support.

Chair Thompson asked if she was making a motion.

MOTION #1: Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Boardmember Hirsch to approve the project as proposed.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: The tree issue, material choice, and loading zone to be reviewed in subcommittee.

Vice Chair Lee said that from the City side there would be discussions based on the proposal, so she did not see the need to amend.

Chair Thompson said that an example of why it should go to subcommittee would be if the proposed landscape plan needed to change then the ARB subcommittee would see it.

Vice Chair Lee asked if Boardmember Hirsch or others had thoughts. She felt that she would rather see if there was support for her Motion.

Boardmember Hirsch thought there was enough information presented by the applicant to make a decision and should the trees need to change it could be handled without ARB input. He agreed with Vice Chair Lee that the project was approvable at this time without committee.

Vice Chair Lee saw no need for a second hearing or a subcommittee, so she did not accept the Friendly Amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT FAILED: not accepted by Vice Chair Lee or Boardmember Hirsch.

Ms. Gerhardt confirmed that if PG&E requires ornamental trees then staff would interpret it as meaning the new trees could be smaller.

Boardmember Baltay stated the Motion should not be supported because if PG&E requires ornamental trees there would be seven redbuds along the front of the property and that would be a step down from the current oak trees. It was irresponsible to pass off the landscaping plan for the front of the building because of a lack of information. He cannot support the Motion.

Boardmember Lew stated he also could not support the Motion either. If the trees are an issue he would expect a completely different treatment on the landscape, something with a lot of texture that would fit in with the Baylands. A quick substitution would not be acceptable.

Chair Thompson agreed with Boardmember Baltay and Boardmember Lew. She asked if Vice Chair Lee wanted to move forward.

MOTION #1 WITHDRAWN

MOTION #2: Chair Thompson moved to approve the project subject to the conditions in the staff report with the following items to be revisited in subcommittee: 1) tree design at front of the building, 2) revisit the loading space definition, and 3) request the architect consider a warmer material for the siding.

Boardmember Baltay said he could second the Motion if they could get physical samples of the exterior finishes to ensure they are not too dark. The treatment the applicant is proposing has many shades that could be selected, and they do not want a black building. If the Motion would say that the architect will provide samples and consider not making the building so dark he could support that.

Chair Thompson agreed to Amend the Motion.

AMENDED MOTION #2: Chair Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Baltay, to approve the project subject to the conditions in the staff report with the following items to be revisited in subcommittee: 1) tree design at front of the building, 2) revisit the loading space definition, and 3) have the architect provide samples of the exterior material and consider making the building less dark.

Chair Thompson asked if anyone wanted to speak to the Motion.

Boardmember Baltay explained that he was not opposed to a loading zone in the front of the building, but he did not want to establish a precedent that drive aisles are loading zones. He hoped that staff could clarify the exception being granted.

Chair Thompson agreed.

Vice Chair Lee said that she thought it was an exception to the rule of having a loading zone and in no way was that granting that drive aisles should serve as loading zones. She thought it was a case by case.

Boardmember Baltay thought that they were granting an exception to the size of the loading zone, with no mention of the configuration.

Boardmember Hirsch requested clarification that Boardmember Baltay was not trying to name another specific loading zone and that he'd accept it where it was shown.

Boardmember Baltay said that the City Council has put in place a law requiring loading zones. In this case they do not need the full space for the zone so he's asking that staff properly document the circumstances and what is being done so that the record is clear. Then whether the loading zone works or not can be left to staff.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if it should be left off the Motion.

Boardmember Baltay said that it could not be because what is proposed is not adequate. It says the drive aisle is a loading zone and he objected to that.

Ms. Gerhardt explained staff agreed with Boardmember Baltay. Paperwork cleanup needs to happen to create the right precedent.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if it would go to committee or not.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the approval would be cleaned up around the loading space.

Boardmember Hirsch said he could agree with that.

Boardmember Baltay said that he wanted the committee to review that and make sure the ARB was comfortable.

Boardmember Hirsch said he was convinced.

Chair Thompson called the vote.

MOTION PASSED: 4-1

Chair Thompson asked if Vice Chair Lee wanted to speak to her nay vote.

Vice Chair Lee thanked Chair Thompson and explained that she was convinced the darker color and material choice was fine and would recede into the landscape. She was also confused with the loading discussion and did not see the need for it.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if they wanted to set up the ad hoc subcommittee in meeting or later.

Chair Thompson asked if Vice Chair Lee wanted to be on the committee.

Vice Chair Lee said she would pass.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he would like to be appointed.

Chair Thompson said that was fine and that she would also join the ad hoc subcommittee. She thanked the applicant.

Mr. Hayes thanked the ARB and noted that Mr. Brown had a question.

Mr. Brown said that they had carefully considered the sidings and selected the dark siding. They want it for their building, and it sounds like the ARB may want something different. He asked when they could get consideration because it is their building. He did not want the ARB to design the building.

Ms. Gerhardt said that Mr. Brown will have a chance to make his case at the subcommittee meeting with other samples of other colors that may be acceptable to him as well.

Mr. Hayes asked when the committee meeting would be.

Ms. Gerhardt said that Mr. Gutierrez would schedule the meeting shortly.

Boardmember Baltay stressed that it could take awhile to hear from PG&E and stressed that they would have to be dealt with.

Mr. Hayes said that there was a possibility of leaving the southern oaks.

Chair Thompson thanked the applicant.

Boardmember Hirsch said that the corner site had a demonstration of acceptable trees although it did not get built.

Chair Thompson indicated the item was closed.

Boardmember Hirsch said he wanted to know if there was any history of discussion about the trees on the other site and the result.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the Mercedes project located on the corner needed to do more reconstruction and that's why the existing trees could not remain. This is a different situation. They have the information and can provide it to the applicant.

Boardmember Hirsch thanked Ms. Gerhardt.

Approval of Minutes

3. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for September 2, 2021

MOTION: Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Boardmember Lew, to approve the Minutes for the ARB meeting of September 2, 2021.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for September 9, 2021

MOTION: Boardmember Lew moved, seconded by Boardmember Hirsch, to approve the Minutes for the ARB meeting of September 2, 2021.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) Working Group Updates – Boardmember Lew

Boardmember Lew announced the City Council met on September 20th and selected Option 1 in a 6 - 1 vote with Council Member McCormick voting no. Option 1 contained the least amount of new housing units. Staff will complete the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) analysis. The committee is not necessarily meeting but Planning Staff could convene it again so another Boardmember may need to be chosen to cover the committee after his departure.

Chair Thompson asked if they needed to select another Boardmember

Ms. Gerhardt said Boardmembers Lew, Hirsch, and Baltay's terms conclude at the end of the year. Boardmember Lew has termed out under the Council's policy. It is possible the ARB will need a new member of the NVCAP; she will keep the Board informed.

Chair Thompson confirmed there would be new Boardmembers in January.

Ms. Gerhardt said that was correct and explained that if Boardmembers Hirsch and Baltay wanted to reapply they could.

Boardmember Lew noted that the applications were due by October 19th and could be submitted online. He has reached out to architects and previous ARB members, but there had not been a lot of interest.

Vice Chair Lee voiced appreciation for Boardmember Lew's work on NVCAP and his attempts to recruit. She wanted to recognize his service and thought the term limit was unfortunate.

Chair Thompson echoed Vice Chair Lee's thoughts and stated that if not for COVID restrictions she would have liked to throw Boardmember Lew a party.

Ms. Gerhardt said that staff had a few ideas and welcomed ideas from the Boardmembers.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that Boardmember Lew leaving was a big loss to the ARB.

Boardmember Lew thanked the ARB and said it was important for new members to come to the Board with a mix of older members.

Boardmember Baltay said he was sorry to see Boardmember Lew go and that he was on the fence about reapplying for a third term. He praised Boardmember Lew's work and said he appreciated him as a colleague. He asked Chair Thompson for a recap of the presentation to Council on the Objective Standards.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that an announcement would be acceptable, but not a discussion.

Chair Thompson announced that the City Council held its first hearing on the Objective Standards on Monday the 4th. There was a presentation, and she recapped the ARB discussions for Council. There were a lot of questions about the ARB's decisions and debate. The hearing was three hours and had some public comment. Two more hearings are planned.

Ms. Gerhardt stated the next hearing was scheduled for October 25th. On the 4th they reviewed the Design Standards and the new proposed process. The October 25th hearing will be about the legislative changes. Then following time for staff research there would be a third hearing about the overall project.

Boardmember Baltay noted that the ARB intently discussed the stepping down of buildings close to R1 zones and asked if that was still included in the project.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that due to the controversy staff removed that from the Objective Standards project; however, the Council would like that issue settled so the discussion will move forward.

Adjournment

Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting at 10:11 a.m.