



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 13416)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 7/15/2021

Summary Title: Minutes of June 17, 2021

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for June 17, 2021

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

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

Background

Draft minutes from the April 15, 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: June 17, 2021 Draft Minutes (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD DRAFT MINUTES: June 17, 2021

City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
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, Boardmember Peter Baltay, Boardmember David Hirsch, Boardmember Alex Lew

Absent: Vice Chair Grace Lee

Oral Communications

Lorna Naugle and Edith Weiser called in remotely to participate in the meeting regarding 160 Waverley.

Andy Pergam announced his intention to speak on 160 Waverley.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, announced there were 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

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, stated she was representing Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, who was out on vacation but listening to the teleconference. The Objective Standards worked on by the ARB were passed by the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) to the City Council (Council). The target date for the item to go to Council is August 16, 2021. The ARB decided to cancel the July 1, 2021, meeting for lack of agenda items. The July 15, 2021, ARB meeting agenda has the Stanford Shopping Center item and possibly the ARB Awards, which were postponed in 2020 due to the Pandemic. There are revisions to the Castilleja project, and it may return to the ARB by the end of summer.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 160 Waverley Street [20PLN-00301]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of the Existing Residential Structures (3 units total) for the Construction of Two New Structures Containing Three Apartment Flats and Six Tuck Under Parking Stalls at Grade. Environmental Assessment: Pending. Zoning District: RM-

30. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, introduced Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he met with the architect and learned that she considered her former project at 515 Webster in Palo Alto to be like this building. He also visited the project site.

Boardmember Hirsch disclosed he also met with the architect and visited the site of the existing building on Webster and the site for the new building.

Boardmember Lew disclosed that he visited the project site and was aware of the 515 Webster project.

Chair Thompson disclosed that she visited the site and the materials board at City Hall.

Samuel Gutierrez, Project Planner, gave a presentation on 160 Waverley. The project proposes to demolish the existing 3 dwelling unit development and develop two new buildings containing 3 dwelling units and a 6 space parking garage. The project is zoned RM-20, not RM-30 as erroneously indicated in the item's description. The neighborhood contains a mixture of architectural styles and zoning districts. Staff's review found the project zoning compliant as proposed. Staff also reviewed the design, which is modernist. It is unclear if the design sufficiently meets ARB Findings #2 and #3. Staff reviewed the parking design, which underwent several iterations and now the parking for the project meets the design standards. The project provides more open space than required and provides for various trees and shrubs, but staff requests the ARB's opinion on the proposed planting and suggested native replacements. The privacy impacts of the project have prompted public input and concern, predominantly related to the duplex situation at 150 and 134 Waverley. Staff visited the project location and took photographs of the existing conditions. There are also photographs provided by the neighbors included in the public comment for context. Staff requests the ARB's comments and guidance regarding the potential privacy impacts to the adjacent properties. The project is being reassessed per California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and a historic resources evaluation is being completed.

Ms. French clarified that Category 4 is a local inventory historic status.

Mr. Gutierrez explained once the CEQA and historic resources evaluations are complete they will be posted on the project website for the public. Public comments and questions were taken and there were concerns about the design, privacy, sun exposure, rooftop terraces, and proposed setbacks. The ARB's key considerations should include if the proposed design meets ARB Findings #2 and #3, if the landscaping meets ARB Finding #5, and the privacy impacts to the adjacent R-1 parcel. Staff recommended the ARB consider the project, provide feedback on the proposal, and continue the hearing to a later date uncertain.

Heather Young, representative of the project applicant at 160 to 164 Waverley Street, utilized a PowerPoint presentation to show the project and its placement in the neighborhood. With the adjacent zoning at RM-20 the project will not be the first or last multi-family project in the neighborhood. Waverley has a wide range of architectural styles and colors, and the project is not out of the norm for the site. The project as proposed is fully code compliant. The reference project is at 519 to 515 Webster was completed in 2018, is an RM-30 site remarkably similar in its diversity of existing context, has a

lower scale single family home on one side, and is multi-family. The Waverley site is very narrow, 50 feet by 250 feet, which is challenging for parking and resulted in tuck under parking to reclaim as much of the site as possible for landscape and open space. The site plan was shown including the setbacks, parking, and dwelling units.

Chair Thompson advised Ms. Young that her 10 minutes were up and asked her to conclude her presentation.

Ms. Young showed the materials and façade of the building. To address privacy concerns the elevation facing 134-150 Waverley was shown with its proposed and existing trees and view lines. The project reinforces the existing privacy screen, and the applicant is working with the landscape architect to better address privacy from the first dwelling unit. The applicant will continue working with staff and the neighbors on privacy. The final image presented was of the completed project and new plantings in context with the neighboring buildings. The project is transitional and brings more open space and landscaping to the area.

Chair Thompson opened the public hearing.

Lorna Naugle called with her mother, Edith Weiser, a neighbor of the project. Ms. Weiser has not been contacted by Nancy Young or her peers. The family is primarily concerned with privacy. Ms. Weiser has submitted a letter dated June 9, 2021, detailing her concerns for the ARB's review. They were unable to watch the meeting or presentation as they did not have internet access. The family believes the project will be approved and that Ms. Weiser will simply have to deal with the construction and loss of privacy. They strongly believe the rooftop patio is a hinderance to their enjoyment of their property.

Andy Pergam of 134 Waverley called in and stated appreciation for City staff's work and the inclusion of his photographs into the presentation. The project should focus on privacy protection and to be harmonious with the existing neighborhood. Specifically, the roof decks and the landing and staircase in the multi-family building are problematic both for privacy and noise. The roof decks would be an anomaly in the neighborhood and should be revisited and removed from the project. He also voiced concern over the sight lines from 164 Waverley and noted several errors in Ms. Young's diagram. He invited members of the ARB to visit his property and view it in person.

Chair Thompson invited Ms. Young to respond to the public comment.

Mr. Gutierrez clarified he had visited the site and informed the neighbors of Ms. Young and the architect's offer to meet and his willingness to facilitate the meeting.

Ms. Young stated there was a misunderstanding and that they did wish to meet with the neighbors. She thanked Mr. Pergam for his corrections regarding the site lines and offered to meet with him on site to further address his concerns. The tenants of the project at 519 Webster mostly use the elevators. The stairs are required for egress and not expected to be used as a hang out space. The views from the roof terraces are not anticipated to be a problem. She requested clarification from staff on any City ordinances or policies regarding noise levels and multi-family homes. The massing of the building is fully compliant regarding the daylight plain and maximum building height.

Chair Thompson closed the public hearing and called for ARB questions.

Boardmember Baltay requested a comparative size to the houses currently existing on the property.

Mr. Gutierrez said the capacity is comparable and staff confirmed compliance with SB 330.

Boardmember Baltay requested Mr. Gutierrez provide square footage comparisons. He understood that the building is being evaluated for historical significance and asked what happened if it was found to be historic.

Ms. French explained that if a determination were made that it was eligible for the California Register then it would be a CEQA issue and trigger environmental analysis on the historical resource.

Boardmember Baltay stated the project would destroy the historical resource.

Ms. French agreed that it was hard to mitigate demolition. Environmental review is quite different from an exempt project.

Boardmember Baltay asked staff if the project was subject to the Individual Review (IR) process done on single family homes.

Ms. French stated that a single-family home in the RM zone undergoes IR if it is adjacent to another single-family home.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that if there was a single-family use on the property it would be subject to the IR guidelines, but this is multi-family use. It does not go through IR but does have a privacy process under the Multi-family Performance Standards.

Boardmember Baltay asked if the ARB had to uphold the IR standards in this project.

Mr. Gutierrez said the Performance Standards are not as specific as the IR guidelines so it could be used as a template or an advisory guidance document, but it is not explicitly stated in multi-family zoning code.

Boardmember Baltay requested confirmation that if the parcel to the right of the project redeveloped it would have to go through IR.

Mr. Gutierrez stated that 150 Waverley would have to go through IR for a two-story home as related to the single-family home next door, not the multi-family project.

Ms. French clarified that multi-family refers to 3 or more homes. In a duplex situation that would be subject to IR.

Boardmember Baltay asked what happened if 150 Waverley redeveloped.

Ms. French said it would go through IR.

Boardmember Baltay requested clarification on a façade material change.

Ms. Young explained the material changed from engineered stone to a stucco/plaster finish about 10 foot 2 inches from the corner.

Chair Thompson called for additional ARB questions, but there were none.

Ms. French indicated that she was prepared to answer questions on noise.

Boardmember Baltay asked staff to explain the noise ordinance implications on the project.

Ms. French stated that the noise ordinance applies. Residential property noise more than 6 decibels (dB) above the local ambient is the limit and that is the same in all of Palo Alto. There are code sections related to construction noise and hours as well. Noise violations are handled by the Police.

Chair Thompson called for ARB feedback.

Boardmember Lew found the project interesting and unique from other 3-unit projects the ARB had reviewed. He was pleased with the project's parking, open space, and landscape possibilities, but had problems making ARB Findings #2 and 3. He suggested lowering the height of the building and voiced concerns about the utility placement, visible trash area, and stone depth on the front wall. Although it was not a code issue, he raised the possibility of flipping the back unit so that the balcony and living area would face the backyard. He supported the inclusion of more native plants, but not Toyon due to its height. The sidewalks and entrance walkways need better landscaping or treatment. Overall, the project is close, but could be better. He understood that the roof decks were controversial and noted that he had not decided about them yet.

Boardmember Hirsch appreciated several things about the project, specifically the access to the rear units, the tight parking scheme, and the interior unit planning. He was concerned about a lack of quality design especially on the street façade. The rear forms facing the courtyards are simple and traditional with quality proportions and a consistent use of materials. The street façade features a mundane and undistinguished second floor. He enumerated his issues with the materials and design. Privacy is an issue with the staircases, and he also suggested flipping the rear unit, although in a different way than suggested by Boardmember Lew. He also suggested moving the stair entrance in the front building to provide scale. The rear courtyard makes no sense given other open space areas. His more minor comments were that the proposed movement pattern for the front unit is complicated, the side elevations look better in brick, the crossover balcony seems unnecessary, and the open shaft to the rooftop is problematic. He deferred to Boardmember Lew on plantings but noted the need for more attention to the front elevation and to look at the feasibility of planting trees where shown. He did not view rooftop decks as necessary, but also had no specific objection. Given the current front façade he did not support the project as presented.

Boardmember Baltay stated he generally agreed with the comments of Boardmembers Lew and Hirsch. He asked if Mr. Gutierrez had the square footage numbers.

Mr. Gutierrez stated the existing front unit is 1,500 square feet (sq. ft.) with two bedrooms, the middle unit is 1,280 sq. ft. with three bedrooms, and the rear unit is 1,000 sq. ft. with two bedrooms. All the proposed units will be three bedrooms.

Boardmember Baltay confirmed it was 3,700 square feet of living space being changed to 4,300.

Mr. Gutierrez explained that in a multi-family dwelling parking is not counted the same way it is in single-family homes.

Boardmember Baltay observed that the project added two bedrooms and approximately 800 sq. ft. of living space. He was concerned that the parking lot as planned was too difficult for drivers. He offered a critique of the building code, not the project or the architect, as he felt a redevelopment of this property should include more than three units. He struggled with ARB Findings #2 and #3 primarily because the compatibility issue is significant and problematic due to the height of the building. Although the neighborhood is eclectic it is also residential, and the project does not seem quite residential enough. With respect to materials, he also was concerned about them looking fake. He stated significant concern over privacy impacts and specifically listed the side walkways and roof deck as problematic. Palo Alto has a strict level of privacy concern and so privacy needs to be taken more seriously on this project. The roof deck in and of itself is fine so long as there is an effective privacy treatment although Council may not be receptive either way. Currently, he was unable to make ARB Finding #2.

Chair Thompson agreed with her colleagues in part. She disagreed with the characterization of the project in the staff report in that a modernist design does not have brick, cornices, and other detail. She felt the materials were acceptable but agreed with the concern that they could appear fake. The ground floor entry to the first unit does not feel residential due to the carport and trash locations. The comparison project has more ground floor interest which is needed in this project. She voiced concerns regarding the change of material around the corner as noted by other Boardmembers. The project fits the eclectic nature of the neighborhood due to its use of different materials and textures. With respect to landscaping she deferred to Boardmember Lew and staff. The carport is thoughtful, but she worried it might not work in practice due to its complexity. Privacy is a difficult issue as the City wants to support more housing, but density hinders privacy. As much as possible the neighbor's privacy concerns should be addressed and mitigated. With a few edits she could make ARB Findings #2 and #3. She called for further Boardmember comment.

Boardmember Hirsch agreed with Chair Thompson on the materials. The front elevation has problems with the podium construction and the materials as discussed. He stressed a strong preference for real brick.

Chair Thompson explained that brick was problematic in seismic zones.

Boardmember Hirsch suggested that the architect investigate doing something interesting with the cornice. The front elevation could be improved by relocating the trash area and doing something interesting with the stairway. The front of the building should be welcoming.

MOTION: Boardmember Lew moved, seconded by Boardmember Hirsch to continue the project until a date uncertain.

MOTION PASSED: 4–0, Vice Chair Lee absent

Chair Thompson provided the applicant an opportunity to ask questions.

Ms. Young asked if Boardmembers were open to individual follow ups on the revisions due to their varied concerns.

Chair Thompson thanked Ms. Young and announced a five-minute break.

THE ARB TOOK A BREAK

Chair Thompson called the meeting back to order and announced that it is at each Boardmember's discretion if they would like to meet with a project applicant or architect so long as it is disclosed.

Boardmember Lew thought that between hearings it was discouraged to meet with applicants/architects as that could be viewed as lobbying. Additionally, when the ARB worked on the Castilleja project the City Attorney reminded them that they had to take and submit notes on the meetings.

Ms. French agreed with Boardmember Lew's recollection. It is acceptable to meet after a preliminary hearing because that is not a filed application, just a study session. Disclosure is always important at the start of an item.

Chair Thompson asked Mr. Gutierrez to advise the applicant of that policy and closed the item.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3241 Park Boulevard [20PLN-00032]: Recommendation on a Major Architectural Review to demolish an existing 4,501 square foot building and construct a new 7,861 square foot office building. Environmental Assessment: Exempt per CEQA Guidelines Sections 15303 and 15332. Zoning District: GM. For More Information Contact the Project Planner Garrett Sauls at Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org.

Chair Thompson opened the item and called for the staff report.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, introduced Project Planner Garrett Sauls.

Garrett Sauls, Project Planner, gave a presentation on 3241 Park Boulevard. The ARB previously reviewed the project on December 3, 2020, and provided comments on the site plan, organization, and appearance of the project. The project is no longer a renovation of an existing building, but a demolition and new construction of a new two-floor office building. He provided a summary of the project's square feet, parking, revised planting plan, and the strong indication that a vapor mitigation system is necessary. An environmental analysis determined that the project would have a Class 3 or 32 exemption. He listed the ARB's feedback from the December 3, 2020, meeting and showed the previous site plan as submitted. The new site plan includes additional landscaping accommodated by a one space parking decrease. He further demonstrated the changes with slides showing the elevations and landscaping plans. The new project includes operable windows, which was a concern of the ARB. The material board has been updated and is posted at City Hall. Staff recommends that the ARB recommend approval of the project as overall the applicant has addressed the ARB's previously provided comments.

Chair Thompson called for disclosures.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he visited the site.

Boardmember Hirsch had no disclosures.

Boardmember Lew had no disclosures.

Chair Thompson disclosed that she viewed the materials board at City Hall and visited the site. She called for the applicant's presentation.

Jeff Galbraith, Hayes Group Architects, thanked Mr. Sauls, stated he covered the project well, and asked the ARB for specific topics they wanted covered or for questions.

Chair Thompson called for Boardmember requests, but there were none. She questioned the reasoning behind not extending the canopy and retaining the framing despite prior ARB comment.

Mr. Galbraith shared his screen and provided images for context. He explained that the concept of the building is planes, and the design is very directional. The steel members in question have no occupied floor in between them, they are gestural members that are expressive.

Boardmember Baltay inquired about the purpose of the private open space at the ground level.

Mr. Galbraith explained they created two different outdoor spaces and they wanted them to feel distinct. The open space on the left is intended to be more public and open, and the second “refuge garden” is intended to be a more private contemplative space. Considering the ARB’s previous comments, they changed the wall in front of the “refuge garden.”

Ken Hayes, Hayes Group Architects, suggested Mr. Galbraith walk through the presentation.

Mr. Galbraith gave a presentation including the elevations and changes made from the last ARB visit. Highlights include that the tree species were changed, planting space was increased, operable windows were added, the “refuge garden” has greater visibility from the street, and the south elevation was redesigned.

Chair Thompson called for the public comment, but there was none. She then opened the floor for Boardmember questions and inquired about the shading material.

Mr. Galbraith explained the shades were roll down guided by wires and were concealed by the upper steel. It is an exterior shade cloth. He clarified that there was no horizontal shading.

Chair Thompson stated that was not the case in one of the renderings.

Mr. Galbraith showed the rendering in question and explained that what the ARB saw was the edge of the roof.

Mr. Sauls directed the ARB’s attention to the Plan Set Page 85-1 which showcases the exterior shade fabric mechanism and the roof portion over the steel pieces.

Chair Thompson inquired about the overlap into the open space.

Mr. Sauls stated it overlapped less than 50% in terms of the total area.

Chair Thompson said she wanted to understand the dimension that extends and how much it overlaps.

Mr. Galbraith pulled up a plan and articulated the dimensions.

Boardmember Baltay thought it was an exciting and attractive building that fit well in the area, but noted the project is in the part of the Ventura area that is supposed to be designated housing and it is an office building. He provided specific notes for the architects and stated a preference to open the “refuge garden” and treat it as the other open space area. Overall, he supported the project.

Boardmember Hirsch was delighted with the planes in the roofline and other structural aspects of the project. He was pleased with the other changes made by the architect and voiced enthusiastic support for the project. He disagreed with Boardmember Baltay on the “refuge garden” and thought there should be a place outside with more private open space.

Boardmember Lew stated the project met all the findings but noted that the text on the landscape sheets were blank and should be corrected. Secondly, he was concerned about light spilling into the creek and asked that it be reduced. In the Staff Report Floor Area Ratio (FAR) percentages are confusing and unclear to the public. He reminded the other Boardmembers that there were new Elements in the Comprehensive Plan and read Goal N3 and Policy N3.1. Further the Pedestrian and Bicycle Plan includes a pedestrian and bike bridge near the project area. The Comprehensive Plan and bridge project should be included in the Staff Report. Otherwise, he could make the findings so long as the blank landscape sheets were corrected.

Mr. Sauls requested clarification on the issue with the landscape sheets.

Boardmember Lew directed his attention to Sheet L1.3 and the several following blank pages.

Chair Thompson showed staff the blank pages.

Mr. Sauls stated that there must have been a printing error and shared his screen.

Boardmember Baltay confirmed that his report was also incomplete and suggested that Mr. Sauls show the pages for the record.

Mr. Sauls reviewed the pages in depth for the record and stated that the full report was available on the project webpage. He apologized for the printing error.

Chair Thompson inquired about the green screen feature.

Mr. Sauls explained that it was a cable system on which vines would grow.

Chair Thompson asked for further clarification from the architect.

Mr. Galbraith stated there was a horizontal bar with a few minimal cables for the vines to grow on. There is no heavy mesh, simply vertical cables.

Mr. Sauls continued his review of the missing Staff Report pages for the record.

Chair Thompson confirmed that L3.3 forward printed.

Mr. Sauls showed L4.1. and the next several pages, ending with T03. He apologized again for the printing error.

Chair Thompson stated that so long as the information was part of the public record she was comforted. She thanked the applicant for the updates and noted pleasure with the operable windows. The wall against the substation is still lacking, specifically the wall compared to the fence. The steel structure seems strange despite its sunshade function. The fence in the “refuge garden” is also lacking compared to the substation fence. She called for Board discussion or a Motion.

Boardmember Baltay asked about the windows facing the power station.

Mr. Galbraith confirmed that the windows would be fire glass and were technically a transparent wall with a one-hour rating.

Boardmember Baltay asked staff to remember that the architect stated the glass was feasible.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired about a foundation wall and its proximity to the creek.

Mr. Galbraith explained they did extensive work on that issue with the Board in charge of the creek. The foundation will be constructed deep enough that surcharge loads against the wall are avoided.

Chair Thompson asked for the ARB's opinion on Boardmember Lew's comment about shielding the light.

Boardmember Baltay did not see that as a reasonable requirement.

Boardmember Lew asked staff to explain the requirements regarding light spill.

Mr. Sauls explained that 18.23.30 regulates lighting on commercial properties. The project fronts the creek, and the code is specific to residential properties. There is a condition of approval that identifies lighting between 10:00 p.m. and 6:00 a.m. should be reduced to security lighting. He noted that as an office building the property would generally not be in use during that timeframe.

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Lew still supported protecting light off the edge.

Boardmember Lew said that he only supported it if it was a code issue.

Mr. Sauls stated the code only regulates commercial to residential light spillage.

Boardmember Thompson commented that he found the steel structure to be an interesting method of enclosing the space by providing the extension to the perimeter. He questioned the shading device at first but trusts that the architects looked at solar angles. He saw it as a defining element of the outdoor space.

Chair Thompson called for a Motion.

MOTION: Boardmember Hirsch moved to approve the project in its entirety and detail.

MOTION FAILED: Lack of second

Boardmember Baltay asked if the ARB supported changing the privacy fencing in the front to more of a vine screen.

Boardmember Lew stated he had no opinion on that issue as it was not addressed in code.

Boardmember Baltay seconded the Motion.

MOTION: Boardmember Hirsch moved, seconded by Boardmember Baltay to approve the project in its entirety and detail.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0, Vice Chair Lee absent

Boardmember Baltay excused himself from the meeting and said he supported the meeting minutes as presented.

4. Discuss the Draft Architectural Review Board's (ARB) Draft Work Plan, Suggest Changes, and Recommend Submitting the Draft Work Plan to the City Council; and Discuss the ARB's Annual and any Bylaw Changes Needed.

Chair Thompson announced the opening of the item and asked Ms. French to report.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, gave a PowerPoint Presentation covering the ARB Draft Work Plan, which will be presented to the Council on June 21, 2021. The Work Plan and Handbook template were put together by Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning. Some of the items in the plan did not occur this year due to time constraints but will be done in 2022. The Council will provide feedback following its meeting and could always refer more items to the ARB. She stressed that the City was in the early stages of this new process and if the need arose the ARB could amend the Work Plan. The Work Plan is different than the old Annual Report process and the two could be merged in spring 2022, with a Bylaws change. The Work Plan cites ARB general purposes and contains a work chart which will be updated prior to the Council meeting with an at places memo. The ARB Awards were skipped in 2020 and will be held in the late summer/fall of 2020. The Work Plan also contains Comp Plan policies that the ARB is considering tackling.

Chair Thompson confirmed there was still a quorum.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, indicated she was on the teleconference from vacation. She noted that they had not had a deep conversation about the Comprehensive Plan but there may be a few the ARB wanted to focus on.

Chair Thompson directed attention to Packet Page 124, Work Plan, and requested Ms. French share that on her screen.

Ms. Gerhardt explained the Work Plan contained the ongoing review of projects, Objective Standards, and ARB Awards. The completed projects from 2015 to 2020 are eligible for ARB Awards and staff will provide the ARB with a list of eligible projects. she suggested setting a retreat time to review the projects. The Work Plan also includes changes to the Bylaws and the possibility of merging the Work Plan with the Annual Report.

Chair Thompson said that the Annual Report was currently in the Bylaws.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the Council would receive the Work Plan as a forward-looking document, while the Annual Report was a look backwards. In 2022 the two could possibly be merged.

Ms. French explained that the Annual Report was usually done in advance of a joint meeting between the ARB and Council.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested the joint hearing be requested in the at places memo.

Ms. French said that Planning Director Jonathan Lait would address the timing of the joint meetings and when they would resume.

Chair Thompson suggested looking into the Comprehensive Plan line item.

Ms. French displayed a slide of some of the Community Design Policies from the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Gerhardt said in the past the ARB focused on pedestrian access and walkability and capturing that in the Objective Standards. She asked the ARB if they had any issues like that they wished to focus on in the coming year.

Ms. French displayed a second slide of the Community Design Policies from the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan and gave examples of potential ARB projects.

Boardmember Lew stated that in the past Boardmembers had mentioned updating the South El Camino Design Guidelines and writing a separate set of guidelines for San Antonio Road.

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Lew wanted to do either of those items.

Boardmember Lew said that he was not sure and provided examples of past occasions where those items were discussed without consensus.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired about policies requiring greater density in housing and the potential impacts to the Comprehensive Plan. He also asked about the Ventura plan and its impacts and stated the ARB should review the plan.

Ms. French explained the Housing Element Working Group selects sites and through that process there are opportunities for learning and discussion.

Ms. Gerhardt agreed but stated she would put in the memo that the ARB would like to be involved regarding potential height increases.

Ms. French said that typically after the Housing Element legislation is introduced to implement the policies. That could alter the Zoning Codes and Development Standards and should involve the PTC and ARB.

Boardmember Hirsch understood but stated that how to and where to increase density is a planning activity.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the increase in Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA) numbers will have to be handled by Council. How that conversation will evolve is unknown. She thought it would be good to note that the ARB wanted to be involved in the conversation.

Boardmember Hirsch agreed.

Chair Thompson asked if Staff was requesting the ARB approve the Work Plan.

Ms. Gerhardt explained approval was necessary in order to be ready for the Council meeting on June 21, 2021.

Ms. French stressed that changes could be made later.

Chair Thompson voiced regret that two Boardmembers were absent for the conversation and disliked the question mark in the Comprehensive Plan description for the programs. She thought bird friendly design was an interesting subject and could be made part of the retreat and discussed how pedestrian friendly University Avenue is now. She voiced hope that Council would continue supporting the trends on University and Cal Avenues.

Ms. Gerhardt said that staff had time to make edits prior to the Council meeting so they would remove the question mark and state that the ARB will explore the policies it wants to focus on.

Chair Thompson agreed.

Boardmember Lew inquired about equity in work, including measuring community engagement on projects, and a possible public survey. He noted Council's interest in public engagement.

Ms. Gerhardt responded that some Council Members spoke of equity in terms of participation and allowing the public to continue to call in using Zoom and suggested the ARB could support that. There also could be diversity proposals related to equity but that would come from Council. Surveys take staff time and money and would require Council approve.

MOTION: Boardmember Lew moved, seconded by Chair Thompson to adopt staff's Draft Work Plan with edits stating that the ARB will explore which existing Comprehensive Plan policies to pursue further in 2022.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0, Boardmember Baltay and Vice Chair Lee absent

Ms. Gerhardt excused herself from the meeting.

Approval of Minutes

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 15, 2021

MOTION: Boardmember Lew moved, seconded by Boardmember Hirsch to approve the Minutes for the ARB meeting for April 15, 2021.

MOTION PASSED: 3-0, Boardmember Baltay and Vice Chair Lee absent

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

North of Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) Working Group Updates – Boardmember Lew
Boardmember Lew reported the Council met on June 14, 2021, and took 22 public comments then held debate. The Council closed the hearing by unanimous vote without taking any action and will reopen the hearing in the fall. There are two houses with Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) that have been submitted within the plan area despite the plan not being finished.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired if Boardmember Lew supported 3B.

Boardmember Lew said he abstained as did the Planning Commissioner on the Working Group.

Boardmember Hirsch suggested setting a date to review the latest Objective Standards.

Chair Thompson stated the ARB received the updated graphics and needs to provide feedback. She suggested speaking over the weekend or early the following week.

Adjournment


Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting at 12:04 p.m.



Architectural Review Board Ad Hoc Committee Review

TO: Randy Popp, Randy Popp Architect
 SUBJECT: 4256 El Camino Real Parking Revisions [21PLN-00034]
 DATE: June 24, 2021
 FROM: Samuel Gutierrez, Planner

PLANNER'S SIGNATURE

DocuSigned by:

 CCD37B1502534AC...

The application, and plans dated June 24, 2021, were reviewed by the ARB Ad Hoc Committee on June 17, 2021, in accordance with condition of approval #5, as stated below. The ARB Ad Hoc Committee comprised of Board member David Hirsch and Chair Osma Thomson presided.

5. ARB Ad Hoc Review: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall return to the ARB for Ad Hoc review approval of the following items, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning & Development Services:

A. Project plans are required that include interior floor plans for the lobby staircase to ensure that the proposed garage changes do not change the exterior design of the building.

At the virtual meeting, the Ad Hoc Committee reviewed the submitted plans and agreed that the approved garage revisions to the previously approved hotel project at 4256 El Camino Real did not significantly alter the exterior of the hotel project. No conditions were added by the Ad Hoc Committee.

The applicant will ensure the building permit plans are consistent with the approved parking garage revision plans as approved on June 4, 2021, and as reviewed by the Ad Hoc Committee. This letter shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s).