



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 13415)

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

Summary Title: Minutes of May 6, 2021

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes May 6, 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: May 6, 2021 Draft Minutes (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: May 6, 2021
 City Hall/City Council Chambers
 250 Hamilton Avenue
 Virtual Meeting
 8:30 AM

Call to Order/Roll Call

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

Absent: None.

[Roll Call]

Pursuant to the provisions of California Governor's Executive Order N-29-20, this meeting will be held by virtual teleconference only, with no physical location. Spoken comments via a computer will be accepted through the Zoom teleconference meeting. To address the Board, go to zoom.us/join. Meeting ID is 95873908317. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, click on "raised hand". When called, please limit your remarks to the time allotted. Spoken public comments using a Smartphone will also be accepted through the Zoom Mobil application. To offer comments using a regular phone call 1-669-900-6833 and enter meeting ID 95873908317. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, click on *9 on your phone so that we know you wish to speak.

Oral Communications

Chair Thompson: We have oral communications next. The public may speak on any item not on the agenda. Do we have any members of the public that wish to speak?

Vinh Nguyen, Administrative Associate: Chair Thompson, actually we do have one raised hand.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

[Setting up caller.]

Mr. Nguyen: Our speaker is Juliana. Juliana, if you're there you can unmute yourself and speak.

Juliana Lee: Good morning, everyone. I just want to make sure if there is underground parking that I have no knowledge what is going to impact my building. I just want to make sure nothing is going to go bad.

Chair Thompson: Ms. Lee, are you referring to the action item on the agenda?

Ms. Lee: The underground parking, yes.

Chair Thompson: Okay. We'll have a chance to do public comments for that later on. This was for any item that's not on the agenda. We'll keep a note of that.

Mr. Nguyen: Seeing how there are no other raised hands, that concludes oral communications.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Our next item is agenda changes, additions, and deletions.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning: That's me. No changes.

City Official Reports

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

Chair Thompson: All right. Thank you. The next item is city official reports.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, thank you. The next slide here shows us continuing in virtual meetings for the foreseeable future. The City is talking about going back to in-person work but it is going to be a gradual-type thing, probably around the August timeframe. I don't know when exactly the hearings will come back to in-person, so we are going to stay virtual for the time being. We do have a subcommittee at the end of today and that would be Board Member Baltay and Board Member Lew. On the next page, we have the future agendas. May 20th there are no items, so that hearing is canceled. We all get a day off, yay. June 3rd we do have the 486 Hamilton project. We are expecting to bring that back assuming that the applicant is able to work with us on some vibration issues. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think, Chair Thompson, you also wanted me to talk during this time about an email that the Board Members had received about the pole colors at the CalTrain station.

Chair Thompson: Sure, yes, if you could speak briefly to some email correspondence that we received regarding that.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. The Board did receive an email from a resident concerned about the color of the electrification poles that are happening along the CalTrain line, in this particular case at the CalTrain station. It is a CalTrain state project. We only can recommend, we cannot require, but what we as a City recommended was to have the poles at that particular station be a tan color to be in keeping with that historic train station. The other poles were to be green and black. CalTrain did follow through on our recommendations. They also spoke with the neighbor in February and said unfortunately because the pole has already been painted -- and you will know better than I -- that it is powder-coated and so it is not an easy change to change that color, so they were not able to make the requested change of the resident. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you for the update.

Board Member Hirsch: Could I ask a question about that?

Ms. Gerhardt: Certainly.

Board Member Hirsch: When we look at that photo and think how did that happen, is that pole actually next to the station? Is it in a portion of the station?

Ms. Gerhardt: From my look at the photo -- but we were looking at bird's eye view of the photos -- it seemed to be near the station. I have not checked up on it exactly just because we really don't have purview at the end of the day so there is not much that we can affect, unfortunately.

Board Member Hirsch: One would think that maybe other areas within the system are being painted, perhaps, the green that would work and that an inquiry into whether it is really a part of the station or a part of the landscape coming up to the station, that it would be a consideration which we could bring up to the CalTrain and see if there was some future possibility if they are in fact painting other poles within the distance that could allow them to come to redo this one. It certainly, from the photo, looked really quite out of place and I kind of agree with the person who is making the comment and was feeling a bit embarrassed that somehow we -- even if it is only a suggestion -- wouldn't have stated that the poles would be appropriately colored within the station but that anything in the perimeter landscape would be of a landscape color.

Ms. Gerhardt: I think the poles come pre-painted and get installed. Could this pole be changed out for another and the tan pole go somewhere else? I don't know how far into construction CalTrains is and that would be a decision for them but I can certainly ask the question.

Chair Thompson: If the Board would like to agendize this for a future agenda I think please let me know. Send me an email and we can try to put that on an agenda if we would like to discuss this more.

Board Member Baltay: Osma, I think you should agendize this. Yes, I'll say it right now.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I second that.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you very much, Chair.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL: 4256 El Camino Real [21PLN-00034]: Request for Changes to an Approved Project to Revise the Underground Garage Parking and Clarify the Director's Parking Adjustment. Environmental Assessment: Use of a Previous EIR. Zone District: CS (Service Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Samuel Gutierrez at samuel.gutierrez@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Thompson: All right. Thank you for that. We will move on to our action items. Our first action is 4256 El Camino Real parking garage revisions. This is a public hearing/quasi-judicial, request for changes to an approved project to revise the underground garage parking and clarify the Director's parking adjustment. I'll hand it over to Jodie.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, we should have Sam Gutierrez here, our project planner. He will bring up his presentation.

[Setting up presentation.]

Sam Gutierrez, Project Planner: I am Samuel Gutierrez, Project planner for this item today before the Architectural Review Board. I should note that I have been the project planner for this specific project going on three years now. It has gone through quite a lengthy process, which I will cover in the presentation. Moving to that process that I just mentioned, I wanted to provide some background and context for the Architectural Review Board and anyone listening from the general public. This project originally started with the 96-room hotel that was recommended for approval by the ARB on January 16, 2020, and approved by the Director on June 3rd, 2020. It did have an EIR done and the approval was finalized once the mitigation monitoring program and then the EIR was finalized and certified. The project and project EIR included in the Director's adjustment for loading space which reduced the

required loading area which is quite large, actually for a semi, 12 by 45, in the municipal code down to an SU-30, which is like a standard FedEx or UPS delivery vehicle, and a 15 percent parking reduction that included aisle parking. The project was approved with 85 parking spaces plus 17 aisle parking spaces for a total of 102, six over the 96 required if it were to be fully parked per code. Again, 96 rooms require one per room and that is how the breakdown originally was. It did include a 24/7 valet parking, which is always required when we have lift parking systems and aisle parking. We need some type of trained professionals to manage that system being that this isn't a residential property. This would be new users quite often, so that's where the valet requirement is. The project did have some changes associated with that original approval that needed to go to subcommittee regarding the rear massing. That went to subcommittee and was moved for approval May 21, 2020, noting that last year we were still calling it subcommittee and now we call it ad hoc committee, I believe. Moving on, this current project which is the parking garage revision was submitted in January and the request from the applicant was to submit these garage revisions that I am going to discuss and a clarification of the Director's parking adjustment. These changes to the garage change it from a two-level to a single-level; seek to provide 77 parking spaces physically on-site, down from the 102 that was provided previously. I will go in-depth into those numbers later in the presentation. Other changes associated with this would be the garage lobby area and hotel back of house spaces within the garage. That was originally in two levels and now that has kind of been rearranged to fit within the single level. Continuing here to discuss the Director's parking adjustment, the parking adjustments are not typically subject to ARB purview but given the high level of public interest and public review for the hotel project... again, I believe the project originally took two years of review with two prelims and three formal ARB hearings and then a subcommittee; quite a lengthy review process and involvement with the public. The Director determined that with those things in mind that these revisions should actually be considered by the ARB to allow public discussion and to allow the ARB to provide some comments and feedback to the Director. However, because this is a garage revision -- the hotel itself wouldn't really be changing its massing or exterior -- The ARB's purview is limited to ARB finding number one and finding number four. These findings require that the design is functional, has access for all modes of transportation, and provides support of the necessary operation of the building. The analysis of the proposed changes were reviewed by City staff. This included the new parking and circulation memo that was prepared and is in one of the attachments for the staff report. This memo analyzed several factors for the proposed changes, which is on-site circulation within the garage and for trucks, i.e. the loading area, and the porte-cochere on the ground level, the parking stall dimensions, traffic operations within the porte-cochere which is the driveway area off of El Camino, not that there are any changes proposed there but we did want to analyze and check and see if a single level garage would impact any operations at the ground level. Of course, the valet operation would be key, so that was analyzed and then the projected trip generation, which ties everything together if the projected demand and timing were to be off, for example, then that would make potential queuing issues for the site. But when the analysis concluded, we found that the proposed changes would not cause any queuing off-site, meaning that the site design and these changes, along with the valet operation, are sufficient to have all queuing done on-site and the circulation for the project would function correctly. Everything would be sufficient towards the projected demand for the parking on-site. An analysis was conducted by the same consultant for consistency purposes that was previously on the project, and per City police, that consultant was managed by City staff. Again, the analysis concluded it would not cause queuing off-site, so there would be no issues with El Camino Real consistent with the original approval. The circulation for the site in terms of modes of transportation function correctly and the valet operation, again, is sufficient for the projected demands of the site. Associated with these changes, there was a need for the TDM plan that was previously approved to be revised to correspond with these changes that the applicant is seeking. The TDM plan was reviewed by City staff. After review and working with the applicant, now the TDM plan that is found for this project or these project revisions is on par with what was previously approved for the project in terms of requirements and thresholds. Just to go into the previously approved design, you can see here on the left is the first level of the previously approved design, which has a two-level garage. Here you can see that the driveway ramp starts from the upper level, that's where it's cut off. I think you should be able to see my mouse cursor here, correct? Can everyone see that? Yes? Okay.

Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Mr. Gutierrez: Here the cars enter, they circle around and this was the original valet drop-off area. Then this would be the lower area for the parking garage. This would be level two of the garage. Here are the proposed design changes. This would be a single-level garage requiring less excavation and obviously has a more compact design. You see here there is more lift parking being used. These are the mechanical lifts, three-level lifts and there are some aisle parking as well. You do see some standard spaces which do meet the requirements for the lift parking of ten percent standard which excludes the accessible spaces and of course the aisle parking spaces, which are not standards spaces per our code. Here you can see the lobby redesigned. It accompanies this revision along with some of the back-of-house elements. Here, on the right, you can see a part of the analysis from the updated memo for the project. That was done by the project consultant managed by the City. We wanted to be sure that the vehicle turning radiuses and swept patterns would be sufficient to allow vehicles to efficiently enter into this design. We did have turning radius diagrams and measurements for the previously approved project, so it was only right to do this, of course, for these revisions. This is a simplified table found within the staff report for this project. Here you can see we have 96 code-required spaces before we get into any adjustments; 96 parking spaces for 96 hotel rooms. The approved project had 54 standards spaces, it had 26 mechanical lifts, 17 valet-operated aisle spaces, four accessible spaces. The parking reduction request was 15. The code-complaint spaces was 102 and physical provided was 102. As I get into that, I want to note that since the project was approved, there were code changes where we now count accessible spaces twice towards the minimum parking requirement. That's where you see the code-complaint spaces versus physical parking spaces. That accounts for when we double count. Of course, the previous project was approved before those code changes, so we did not consider that at the time. The current project is subject to those changes. Again, that's where this breakdown of complaint spaces versus physical. Just to run through, the project is proposing eight standard spaces. These are standard stall spaces on concrete or asphalt. The mechanical lifts go up to 59, the valet-operated spaces go to five, the accessible spaces, including two EV accessible spaces, total five, and, of course, those double count so they are equivalent to ten spaces. The parking reduction sought is the same and the total code complaint spaces are 82 with 77 physically provided, again accounting for the double count of those five spaces. I do show a little formula here for the breakdown of how we do the parking reduction. You take the 96, you multiply that by 15 percent and you get 14 spaces. That reduces the parking down to 82 that would be required. Again, once you account for the five double-counted accessible spaces you get 77 physically provided. I hope that wasn't too confusing and I am happy to answer questions later. Then, this is just an example of the more complex table shown in the attachment for the zoning comparison. I did want to show that and it is in one of the attachments for the staff report. Essentially, it says the same information just at a higher level of detail. Getting into the ARB findings, again, the ARB purview for this is found within finding number one, which is to make sure that the project is consistent with applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, zoning code, and any other applicable plans, but, of course, this is not in a coordinated area plan so this is limited to the zoning code and the comprehensive plan. Looking at some comp plan policies, we see here we have program in transportation and goals and transportation. I list in brief summary, which is also found in one of the attachments for the staff report, the consistency with each programming goal. That continues on to additional policies from our comprehensive plan related to transportation. Then, finally, finding number four, which requires that the design is functional, allowing for ease of pedestrian safety, bicycle traffic, and supporting the building's necessary operation. Here, just to touch on that one, after reviewing it we find that the project maintains proper circulation per the analysis of the design through the circulation and parking memo and has access for all modes of travel. Of course, the 24-hour valet service is maintained and access for pedestrian and bicycles are provided throughout the site, the pedestrian and bicyclists who visit the site can access all levels via the elevators on-site which go from the ground level up to the upper floors and the garage level as well. The design changes do not change the function and circulation of the driveways, that being the underground driveway or the at-grade porte-cochere driveway in front of El Camino. One thing to note is that we did receive some public comments, or actually public questions, that were forwarded to the Board. I just wanted to list them here for public view and to remind the Board. These questions really centered on how these changes may impact traffic circulation, queuing on El Camino, and really the function of the parking operation of the hotel. As I went through my presentation, many of these questions were answered. There is maintaining of the 24-hour valet service. There is a sufficient queuing area for vehicles visiting the site within the garage and within the porte-cochere. The loading area is maintained per the previous approval. Hotel staff may

park at the site; the municipal code doesn't differentiate parking that's for staff and guests, but, of course, the TDM program that is associated with this also requires some transit use, carpooling. There is also the on-site shuttle that is maintained which will take people to CalTrain stations. There was a question about the tour buses which we did address in the previous application for the hotel. There was a concern about tour buses visiting the site and blocking driveways. The conditions of approval still maintain that the curb management occurs just like before; red no parking area in front of the hotel; management of the porte-cochere with the loading and unloading areas there and then, of course, the valet service. Noting that, the tour bus phenomenon is a city-wide issue through El Camino being a state highway. It has articulated buses from VTA, it has large vehicles, oversized vehicles coming to and from construction sites. It is a highway so it does have the capacity for tour buses. Of course, any vehicle, be it a tour bus or standard vehicle, that is double-parked or found parked in a red area, if observed by the Palo Alto Police Department would be cited for that infraction. Any vehicles observed blocking driveways or double parking should be reported to the Palo Alto Police Department and they would follow up because all of those vehicles do have registration and coach operators that they can contact. If the ARB wishes, I can go more in-depth in all of these questions but I just wanted to give a brief overview on those public comments and questions that we received. The recommendation from staff to the ARB, again to remind you, is to review the project and provide a recommendation to the Director of Planning and Development Services based on the project's ability to meet ARB finding number one and number four. Also, to provide feedback on the Director's parking adjustment. The Director would consider the ARB's thoughts on that. That concludes staff's presentation.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Can we hear from the applicant?

Randy Popp, Applicant: Good morning.

[Setting up presentation.]

Chair Thompson: Good morning. You'll have ten minutes and please state and spell your name for the record.

Mr. Popp: Thank you. Good morning. My name is Randy Popp, [spells name]. The entitlement support for this project with me today is Dennis Stenmit [phonetic] who is (inaudible). Let me take you through this presentation quickly. The staff report for this was excellent and I really appreciate the very thorough presentation. I'll just try to be brief instead of repeating a bunch of things that have already been said. You know, the big question is why are we back here today and we have a newly configured project team who challenged the two-level parking design and asked if all the requirements could be accomplished in a single level. We anticipated clearly that there would obviously be less cost if we just do a single-level garage but it would be a pretty significant reduction in the duration of the time it takes to construct, minimizing impact to neighbors. We would better use our resources; less concrete; less steel; less fuel for construction; reduce excavation removal. Interesting to note, in the changes that we have made there is a slight reduction in the impact to the adjacent trees. All of that seemed like a great (inaudible). We shared this with staff and the discussion with them raised some questions about what the 15 percent parking reduction means when you have a valet program. It is interesting when you read through the zoning; it's a bit antiquated and not as precise you might hope it would be. It does indicate that the valet parking is defined as being a service that uses any city street, or alley, or city parking facility. There is actually a lack of clarity about how private garages and valet [distortion]. Initially, staff had indicated the one complication was that valet spaces don't count as standards stalls creating a bit of tension in the language. I think in Sam's presentation he clarified that a bit; the interpretations changed and shifted over time here and similar to the Marriot that is down at 477 San Antonio Road, the valet spaces in that garage are counting toward that minimum requirement. (Inaudible) and trying to move through this calculation clearly and adding those valet spaces in was important to how we were accomplishing a single-level garage. Initially, we understood the 15 percent reduction was granted but the valet was not counted toward that minimum requirement and by adding the valet back in then we were creating essentially 100 percent parking project. Remembering that this is a hotel and they don't have a parking demand that is consistent with the zoning regulations. That is something that we can all recognize...

Chair Thompson: I'm sorry. There is... I think it said Jeff Albreze [phonetic], we can hear... can you please mute yourself. I'll pause your time really quick. Okay, I see that Jeff is now muted. Thank you. Go ahead.

Mr. Popp: Thank you. Just jumping in here to what I was talking about, the parking demand study that was done by Hexagon Consultants back in 2017, studied a series of local area hotels. All 13 of them showed that the average rate was actually .66 and we are being asked to be at a .25 (inaudible). This study is in the approved project (inaudible). Here's what we're asking, we just want you to validate our interpretation and (inaudible) would like to have your recommendation in support of this. We are doing this in a public forum as requested by the Director and staff just to (inaudible). We believe a 15 percent reduction (inaudible) and a hotel with a 24/7 valet program should be able to include all available modes of parking that include standard stalls, standard mechanical lift spaces, and aisle spaces provided through the valet program. We believe this interpretation is supported by staff, it's supplemented by the additional memo for parking and circulation analyses and the PTDM (inaudible). I want to just briefly mention that the neighbors did have quite a bit of interaction with us during the review process but their communication was primarily focused on traffic and safety, not really parking capacity. As Sam said, the (inaudible) really addressed all of that. I also was asked a question about how the new design might affect the front elevations of the building, so I quickly prepared this slide for you that shows these are the basement, ground level, and second level plans of the new design. You'll see that this ground-level stair ends over here and represent her in the... I am sorry, this basement-level stair, excuse me, that starts here represent here on the ground level and then adjacent to the glass we have a sculptural stair on the interior of the building that extends up to the lobby that is a second level. You'll see that the initially approved ARB subcommittee elevation is consistent with the glass design and proposed elevation. The structural grace has altered slightly as a result of doing the structural analysis that (inaudible) but the openness of that lobby and that front elevation (inaudible). Thank you for your time today; happy to take any questions if you have them. I will stop my share and let you get to your discussion. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. I think we'll do questions by the Board after we hear from the public. The next item would be to hear from any members of the public that would like to speak on this item. Vinh, I see one raised hands, two raised hands.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, one moment. Let's get the speaker timer up. Thank you, Veronica. We have two raised hands. Our first speaker will be Stephanie, followed by Sharlene. Stephanie, you're up first.

Stephanie Tramz: Thank you. I am concerned because the parking situation in our part of town is already very dire. I just received a notice from Las Altos that El Camino Real is going to be resurfaced and there will be bicycle lanes installed. There is not going to be any on-street El Camino Real parking here and there will be absolutely no availability for hotel guests to queue or park in these areas. All of this parking reduction is of great concern to the surrounding properties. That's all I have to say and I am concerned about the crush of... we have already got problems and I am afraid they are going to get worse. I live next door.

Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you for your comments. Our next speaker...

Chair Thompson: Vinh, sorry. Could we bring Stephanie back and ask her to state and spell her name for the record?

Mr. Nguyen: Sure.

Ms. Tramz: Yes, my name is Stephanie Tramz and I live at 4250 El Camino Real. I have been an owner here for many years.

Chair Thompson: Could you spell your name for the record?

Ms. Tramz: Yes. [Spells name].

Chair Thompson: Thank you so much. Okay, let's go to our next speaker.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next speaker is Sharlene.

[Setting up caller.]

Chair Thompson: Sharlene, can I ask you to state and spell your name for the record?

Sharlene Carlson: I am Sharlene Carlson, [spells name]. I am President of Palo Alto Redwoods Home Owner's Association, so I am the neighbor next door. I just wanted to thank Sam and Randy for taking our questions and answering the concerns that our homeowners have always had about traffic and safety issues. At this time I don't have any additional questions but thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Sharlene. Do we have any other members of the public that would like to speak?

Mr. Nguyen: We do not have any more raised hands. That concludes public comments for this item.

Chair Thompson: All right.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair, did Juliana Lee want to speak on this item? She had spoken earlier in the meeting.

Chair Thompson: That's true, she did. I'd give her the opportunity to speak again, if she'd like.

Mr. Nguyen: her hand is not raised but I can go ahead and unmute her to see if she wants to speak.

Ms. Lee: I really appreciate the one level and then I think that three make me less nervous. Thank you for letting me talk.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Could you spell your name for the record?

Ms. Lee: [Spells name].

Chair Thompson: Thank you.

Ms. Lee: Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Do we have any other members of the public that would like to speak?

Mr. Nguyen: We currently do not have any other requests for speakers.

Chair Thompson: All right. Thank you. Typically, we give the applicant a chance to respond to public comment at this time if they would like to. Would the applicant like to? I see a head shaking. We'll move on. Are there any questions by the Board of staff or the applicant?

Board Member Baltay: I have three, Osma, if I am the only one but I don't want to take up everybody's time.

Chair Thompson: Go ahead, Board Member Baltay.

Board Member Baltay: Okay. The one that is most interesting to me, and this is a question to staff I suppose, as I understand it, the maximum allowed parking reduction is 15 percent through a TDM. Is that right? That sin code or is that... what am I missing on that?

Ms. Gerhardt: No, that's incorrect. It is in the code and I want to say it is 20 percent, correct, Sam?

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, 20 percent.

Board Member Baltay: Okay, great.

Ms. Gerhardt: If there was shared use, you could go up to 30 percent but they don't have that type of shared use, so it is just 20 percent maximum.

Board Member Baltay: Okay. What that would mean is that if they're supposed to supply 96 spaces, the Director could approve to a reduction of 20 percent from that within the code as it is?

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct.

Mr. Gutierrez: Correct.

Board Member Baltay: Then, what I am grasping at understanding -- this is a question to Sam -- is that it seems to me you're counting the aisle parking spaces as legitimate spaces and then applying the 15 percent reduction in your math. Is that right?

Ms. Gerhardt: We're counting the aisle spaces given that they have the valet to park those spaces. That is correct.

Board Member Baltay: So, you're essentially agreeing with the applicant's argument that because they have a valet program there, the aisle spaces count as legitimate parking spaces? Because if you did not agree with that interpretation, then it would seem to me that the math would be different. I am struggling to understand why you would be... why don't you address for me, please, why are the valet... why are aisle parking spaces considered normal parking places?

Ms. Gerhardt: They wouldn't normally be if we did not have the valet but because we have the TDM program and we have the valet that is part of that program, that's a required part of this project, that's how we're able to count those parking spaces.

Board Member Baltay: But wouldn't... okay. Fair enough. Okay, I understand what you're saying. My second question is, again, regarding valet parking. In the code, I saw something that said that valet parking is not allowed to have any fees associated with it. I think I also saw in the applicant's presentation that all parking spaces are going to be charged a \$20 fee. Has the City Attorney looked into the question of whether that is legitimate, the overall parking fee, including valet fees?

Mr. Gutierrez: The parking fee does come from the TDM program. In the TDM program, it does detail that that is a way to incentivize the ulterior modes of transportation, in particular for hotel staff.

Board Member Baltay: I am referencing in the code where they allowed mechanical lift parking. It said there can be no fee associated with using the mechanical lifts. Has the staff or the legal department in the City looked into this because this is essentially a fee as I see, even though it is associated with all the parking?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think it is something we're going to have to look deeper into, but my initial thoughts are that this is a parking adjustment. This is not valet parking that's under code Section 10. This is a parking adjustment that's under Title 18. There are different regulations that apply. We are really working off of the TDM program and what is contained in there.

Mr. Gutierrez: Right. Title 10 of the code, I believe, refers to the public parking or use of public right of way for the valet, which would be consistent because if you're using the public right of way or public property and then charging private fees for that, that's where the conflict would be but this is a valet operation wholly on private property.

Board Member Baltay: I guess I am referring to the section where it allows mechanical lift parking and there is a clause in there that prohibits charging fees to use those lifts in order to count those as regular parking places. I am just pointing that out. I think that is something that needs to be looked at, obviously, but the question really is what the City staff has interpreted that to be. My last question -- I guess I can direct to the project architect -- is that when I look back at the plans that were approved by the ARB last April was it, there was a fitness room of some kind out at the façade with a glass wall where the staircase is not coming up from the basement. We weren't supplied with any floor plans for the main floor or the second floor, perhaps where this new staircase is and I am confused as to what the application is regarding the changes to the façade, if any, adjacent to the porte-cochere where there is a new staircase coming up. Randy, at the end of your presentation, you showed two slides. Maybe you could clarify that for us, please.

[Setting up presentation.]

Mr. Popp: Yes, Peter. We have decided to internally reconfigure the lobbies (inaudible) that will be a more attractive to have on the glass rather than a bunch of (inaudible). The original design had people working out on treadmills and things literally at the lobby entrance, so we altered the interior of the building slightly and hid those uses to the interior (inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: Can you explain, please, Randy, how this new staircase works? Lead me up from the basement to the lobby level.

Mr. Popp: Sure. At the basement... can you see my cursor, Peter?

Board Member Baltay: I can. Thank you. That's very helpful.

Mr. Popp: At the basement, you would enter the stair here.

Board Member Baltay: Okay.

Mr. Popp: You would exit the stair here. Then, you would circle around and enter the stair here and move up to the upper lobby exiting here.

Board Member Baltay: I see. Does the stair continue above that level or is it just two stories?

Mr. Popp: I am sorry to say, I don't recall if this continues. I don't believe it does. I am sorry. It stops at the lobby (inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: You're proposing a glass façade on the side of the stair facing the covered porte-cochere, as in the original plan? I see that on the elevation here. That's really my concern.

Mr. Popp: Yeah. We are going to do... it's not fully designed yet because we still haven't submitted the building permit but the intention we used to (inaudible) at the lobby.

Board Member Baltay: Is that staircase and emergency egress from the garage though? Is it allowed to have a glazed wall?

Mr. Popp: The stair that comes up from the garage is actually enclosed. It is inside this (inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: I'm sorry. So, on the floor plan that straight-shot stair is fully enclosed and the other one is not?

Mr. Popp: There is a wall on this side of it; on this side of it it would be open but you won't see it from below. Again, I don't have all of the detail about this, I don't want to misspeak and I don't want to (inaudible). I'll just admit to not fully knowing all of the details of it yet, but from the ground-level, inside an enclosure that is (inaudible) up the stair and arrive at the lobby level (inaudible) and all of that would

be (inaudible). This stair is in front of that essentially really limiting your view through the glass through the stair and all of the elements of this secondary stair (inaudible).

Board Member Baltay: Okay. Thank you for the explanation. I have no other questions, Chair Thompson.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Are there any other questions of the applicant? I am not seeing any. I just had a quick follow-up question on this item.

Board Member Hirsch: I do have a question.

Chair Thompson: Sorry, Board Member Hirsch. I didn't hear you.

Board Member Hirsch: I was muted. I'm sorry. I wonder if you could describe, Randy or I don't know who is best to do this, the valet idea here. Somebody comes to the hotel, they take out their luggage, I gather, under the porte-cochere and the valet then takes the car down to the basement and also then there are valets in the basement and families would come and go to the basement first? Be directed by signage to go to the basement area and unload? Could you describe a little better how that's really going to work, the valet situation?

Mr. Gutierrez: I could actually speak to that. The valet operation for vehicles that are going to be parked on-site has to take place in the garage level, not at the porte-cochere. The porte-cochere is really for drop-offs, like from Uber or Lyft, or some other taxi-like service, or for loading area for service vehicles as it has a double driveway. If you are going to the hotel with your vehicle and will park, you would be directed to the lower level where you would have the valet booth stationed and that's where the valet operation is to take place.

Board Member Hirsch: Who directs you, Sam?

Mr. Gutierrez: There is signage that was previously approved and I believe actually that was refined during the subcommittee hearing. It was one of the items, I think, during the subcommittee also with the rear massing. The signage does say valet parking, turn here, go down the ramp; for pick-up and drop-off and loading is in the porte-cochere.

Board Member Hirsch: Continuing on that, I note that the area where the drop-off is in the basement is really a parking area as well and there is kind of a central areaway that takes you through to the elevator. I assume that from Randy's description it takes you to that staircase as well. The picture doesn't show it with two cars in that location. How will that really be seen? Is it really a wide-open enough space to create access to the elevators or is it going to be a place where vehicles are moving in and out of storage in that same area where the drop-off is? I don't know who answers that.

Mr. Gutierrez: There are two accessible spaces that are there because the accessible needed a dedicated location per their standard. There is an accessible path to travel and a walkway adjacent to the parking spaces that do lead to the valet booth. There are a couple of areas for movement of hotel guests. They're not necessarily walking between a narrow space between two cars.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. I just want to comment about the staircase. Although it isn't clear from the diagrams we are looking at, I recall that there was some usage in that space of that glassed area that wasn't exactly compatible with entering a hotel, I think if I remember correctly. The staircase, if it is easily accessible from the basement, then that is certainly a better entry into the hotel from the valet area and the basement than some other usage that I think was there before. This is in response, in a way, to what Mr. Baltay was asking. I think that if it can be shown that that is easily accessible, that staircase, it certainly is an improvement in the lobby area. This might be better off stated later but I am stating it now just because it seems to relate to what were discussing. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thanks. I actually have a question for you, Randy. I see that you're hand was raised, so maybe we kind of combine. I do see in the previous plans there was a Board room on the ground floor and a fitness room on the upper floor. I also noticed that some of the other stairs have shifted around in the plans potentially affecting the rear façade and the side façade as well. Can you confirm all the ramifications of the change that is happening here on the ground floor?

Mr. Popp: Thank you. I can confirm that the changes (inaudible) does not affect the elevations (inaudible).

Chair Thompson: Sorry, it's really hard to hear you.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Mr. Popp: I can confirm that the changes that we made below grade do not affect the elevations above-grade. It's just many are happening in the basement and we have been very careful to maintain the character of the building as approved so we don't have conflict (inaudible). I can also just briefly respond to Board Member Hirsch's (inaudible) and say that the (inaudible).

Chair Thompson: Sorry. Your voice keeps coming in and out.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Mr. Popp: I just wanted to respond to Board Member Hirsch's question as well, if you don't mind. The report that the City Commission, from the City's traffic and transportation engineer, really did study the efficiency of that garage and the valet operation, and the conclusion is that there is ample room for queuing and vehicle movements for a valet program in the garage as designed. Sam, if you want to articulate anything further about that happy to have you jump in about that but it is my understanding that the design is supported by that memo without any kind of condition. I think that's really all I needed to say. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Thank you. If there are no other questions by the board I will close the public hearing and bring it back to the Board. Who'd like to go first? Takers? Board Member Lew, I'll call on you first.

Board Member Lew: Sure. I don't really have much to say on this particular item. I will disclose that I have reviewed the number of condominiums sold at the Palo Alto Redwoods since the design review for this project started. I have reviewed the TDM program, which was previously proposed but I did review it again looking at the transit options. Then, I will just also add that I have considered people that I have met who have stayed at hotels nearby, mostly the Courtyard Marriott and also people I have met while I have been on CalTrain who have been trying to get to hotels on El Camino. There is something that is a little counterintuitive here on this particular site. It is actually easier to get to this site on transit if you actually get off at the University Avenue CalTrain station and take the Express Bus. That's two stops away. It's farther away but it is actually easier and faster because there is better service getting off at the University Avenue station and then taking an Express Bus down to this site. That's all that I have on the TDM. I think for the revised parking lift, it seems to me it meets the comprehensive plan goals as stated in the staff report. I can support that. I don't really see any huge change in the layout that would affect the functioning of the valet service. I think I can support that. That's all that I have. Thanks.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Lew. Let's go to Board Member Baltay.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you, Osma. I support what Alex said and that I think the valet service is, if anything, improved the way it functions having it closer to the bottom of the ramp, you don't go around the corner. I think the sketch the applicant provided convinces me that although there are two parking places in front of the entrance into that lower lobby, there are not as likely to be filled and so it probably will work better than what we already approved. I have no problem with that layout that way. I am concerned that the changes that are being made to the lobby level are something that are not presented

and I would like to, at a minimum, have those come back to an ad hoc committee to really understand them. My concern is that that glass façade facing the porte-cochere is something that was previously approved and I don't want to see that go away, at least not without the Board considering the impact on the design. I think it might be a little bit of a challenge to get a stair out of the basement with an enclosure and keep that glazed wall. I did toy around with it quickly and thought you could also put the stair back as a straight shot to the backside of the elevations but that's up to the applicant to propose how they want to do it. I think that should be something that we see before we sign off on it. It does have an effect on the layout of the building. It might also be worth checking, as Chair Thompson points out, that if there is other changes to staircases throughout the building, we should verify that that is not affecting the external appearance of the building. I am modestly concerned about that. In principle, I think the parking count business works fine and the TDM is good. I am very concerned, though, that we are concerning aisle parking spaces as normal places and then applying the percentage reduction. As I do the math, we are supplying 77 actual parking places, which comes down to about a 20 percent reduction, and then we are using the TDM to justify the aisle parking places, which is fine, but I think we should be clear that it's a 20 percent reduction, not a 15 percent reduction. I really cannot make finding number one that it meets the code when aisle parking spaces are clearly not defined as parking places in the code and the code does not address this question of whether valet parking programs make aisle parking spaces a legitimate parking spot. I think that is a very slippery slope to go down. I absolutely cannot support the tacit assumption here that aisle parking spaces are bona fide parking stalls. Fortunately, the applicants can still do what they want to do and meet it within the required reduction allowed by the TDM but I strongly feel that the Director should consider it to be a 20 percent reduction, and five of those spaces are now legitimately allowed because of the TDM. I guess I should disclose that I went through and read the actual traffic hotel parking study that was made by Hexagon Consultants that was not included -- the actual study -- in our report. I found it very convincing that 13 different hotels in the area are tracking about .66, or 66 percent, of parking places per room, which is convincing that this will actually function. I think everything the staff and the consultants and applicants say about the parking functioning with the size of this building is true. I think it will function just fine. Lastly, I would like staff to investigate the fact that mechanical lift parking is not supposed to have a fee associated with its use. That was something the City council made clear when they allowed mechanical lift parking to count as regular parking; yet, I am sure that the valet service in this hotel, the parking service, is going to have a fee associated with it. I would really appreciate it if the City Attorney could chime in and make sure that that is a proper interpretation of those conflicting code requirements. Those are my concerns. Thank you very much.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Baltay. Board Member Hirsch.

Board Member Hirsch: Thank you, Osma, First, I would like to just, if he is still around, thank Sam for his very complete description of everything that's gone through this project from inception on to the present. It was a very excellent presentation. I sort of agree in some ways with Mr. Baltay's comments here but have a slightly different slant on it. There was one question about what happens when the lift isn't working and I guess you have to assume that transportation has looked at that issue and dismissed it as an issue here. We didn't really get an answer to that particular question but it appears that Redwoods is happy with the parking arrangement here and it would certainly affect them the most, but it would also affect El Camino Real. We have to trust that the City has looked into this and I guess I will do the same. I agree 100 percent with the question of how this staircase description really affects the façade. As I noted, I thought it was an improvement that the ground level wouldn't be a conference room as noted, but rather be an access from a staircase. We haven't been given the appropriate description of how all of those changes are really working in the building. I suspect that one answer to a question asked of Randy is that there are some other exits from the hotel and so all of those could be described rather than leave it up in the air at this point. I would be okay with it going to committee so that it isn't held up for another ARB, but they need to be addressed in some way, including the use of the second floor as it affects the façade and how the staircase is working; that whole area. It seems to me that -- just to question Peter's comments about the five spaces that count -- most parking areas that are valet run seem to work pretty well and they find a way to accommodate all of the cars and move them around as need be as they might be warned that somebody is coming down to pick up a car, and, therefore, they have to make some adjustments. In terms of the count, based on the numbers that are

being provided and agreed to by the city so far, I can see how that would work, but it is a bit of a surprise because it seems like -- seems, this is just seems to me -- the whole floor is extremely tight and I wondered why it wasn't possible somehow, even if it was on the same level, to expand that area to accommodate but it isn't done and it seems to solve the numbers so I guess I can say I will go along with it. The idea, again, of access to the elevator and the valet treatment down in the basement also seems tight. You are all saying that you think it will work and Sam says it was reviewed, but, frankly, to me, it is not the best the way it works with the cars that are actually parked in that same location. People getting out of cars where you get out of the side of the car and the back of the car is still in that location; you have to come around the extra space that is required for a whole family getting out of a car and luggage getting out of the back of the car and it doesn't seem to me to be very well solved. If this project were to come back to the ARB, I would ask for that to be looked at in more detail. I just think in terms of the workings of a hotel you need more space in that area than is given, especially when there are other cars that are also parked in that area making access to the elevators more difficult. I would like to have seen that shown in a way that you could see it working, with a car parked there with people getting out of a car and luggage coming out of the trunk of a car, et cetera. It is a normal, very busy area. I almost wonder why it isn't better to have the car with that happening above in the porte-cochere where there is more space. I think there are questions of the tour bus and the issue of that that haven't really been properly addressed in transit study, if in fact there are going to be tour buses coming to this location; if the hotel is intending to service a tour bus kind of access to the site. Actually, I disagree with Alex's comments about somebody can get on a train and get off the train and get on a bus and come to the building, but what about tour buses? How do they come to this hotel, or do they go somewhere else? A nearby hotel is certainly a better location to deal with tour buses but this one would have a problem, so are they eliminated? Has that traffic study really been well done? Let's get back to it, folks. We are not the ARB and Transportation Department, here. So, we have to leave it to the Transportation Department but I am raising the issues and letting everybody else think about that. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Hirsch. I see that Sam has his hand raised. Are you wishing to speak, Sam?

Ms. Gerhardt: I think we can wait until the end if you'd like, and we can address everyone's concerns.

Mr. Gutierrez: Yeah, actually, that would be better.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Let's do that. Okay, Vice Chair Lee.

Vice Chair Lee: I can be brief. I want to thank everyone who has spoken. I support the Director's parking adjustment here. I appreciate the Director's direction to talk about this as a public forum. I understand that City staff has given careful review; we have a compelling traffic report. I, too, was heartened to see that there were 13 in the area hotels and that points at six at the peak. The zoning code is antiquated and I believe the one per guest room is really too much. I do not see any issues here. I did also want to mention that the findings one and four I can support. I believe that the questions that have been raised by my fellow Board Members... the one that I wanted to bring up was I heard from the applicant that there are no elevation changes per our previous approval. I just wanted to confirm that is the case. I do not believe that we need to hesitate here; it's time to move forward. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Vice Chair Lee. I appreciate all of the sentiments from my fellow Board Members, and the members of the public, and the applicant and the City's presentation. A lot of my original questions were answered. In general, I can support this adjustment because of all the reasons noted by my fellow Board Members. As to the façade change, the changes that I noticed when looking over the approved and the new plan that came to us this week, it is just the stair locations are a little different which means they probably daylight in a different location on the upper floor. That was where my concern about the façade change came from. I believe the applicant in that it may not be that significant of a change to the façade potentially, but I would support an ad hoc committee just to look at the ramifications of this change. The stair coming up the two stories is really interesting but it leads me to ask where those other pieces of the program have gone. In the old plans, we have what looks like rooms that are on the ground floor against the backside, and in the new plan, we have a stair day

lighting there. I am sure things have changed a little bit. I am sure it's not that bad; I'm sure it's not very significant, and if the Board felt the need to have an ad hoc committee to look any of these other subsequent changes to the façade, if there were any significant ones, I could support that as well. Those are my two items. In general, I can make the findings of one and four, and recommend approval. Go ahead, I will let the City respond to some of the concerns that they heard.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, thank you, Board Members. There are some great questions that we are hearing. Related to any possible exterior changes, staff has not reviewed a building permit yet. Is that correct, Sam?

Mr. Gutierrez: That's correct.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. We will take a look at any drawings through the building permit review. If we do see significant changes then we will bring that back to an ad hoc committee. We will be able to better judge at that point. Board Member Baltay brought up the counting aisle spaces as regular spaces, I think it is a good point; we do want to make sure that we are setting the right precedent, and, so, the Director will take another look at that to make sure whether this needs to be a 15 percent reduction or a 20 percent reduction because we do want to set that right precedent. Regarding fees, I did find the code section that Board Member Baltay was referring to. It does look like it is actually broken into two sentences, though, and it does say that hotels can use lifts. It does say that other uses... let me read it clearly, "mechanical lifts may be used for multi-family, office, hotel, automotive, industrial, or institutional uses. Other uses need Director approval..." Then, it says cannot have a fee for those users. I believe those are two separate sentences; two separate regulations, but, again, we will double-check with the attorneys and make sure we are setting the right precedent there, as well. As far as the lifts not working, we do have conditions and I believe the conditions in the previous approval, correct, Sam, about maintenance and having a system in...

Mr. Gutierrez: Yes, there has to be a maintenance agreement for the lift systems, and I believe that is a standard condition when we have lifts for commercial projects like this.

Ms. Gerhardt: Okay. We hear the concern about people getting to the stairs and the elevators. We believe we have a sufficient walkway that has been reviewed by Transportation. We can look at that again, but I think we have done the best we can with this particular floor plan. The reason that the floor plan was not expanded, at least to the rear, is that we do have some significant Redwood trees and we want to maintain our distance from those trees. Those are the clarifications that I had. Thank you very much.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Jodie. I will bring it back to the Board if there are any other items that Board Members would like to discuss, or a motion.

MOTION

Board Member Baltay: Could I make a motion, Osma, please?

Chair Thompson: Sure.

Board Member Baltay: I move that we recommend to the Director that this revision to the project be approved with the following request that revisions to the lobby staircase be brought back to an ad hoc committee either in the planning process or during the building permit approval process for verification that there are no changes to the exterior façade. I don't want it to go beyond that, but I think that's a fair piece for us. The second part of my motion is that we provide feedback to the Director that, A) aisle parking spaces not be considered as normal parking places, and B) that parking fees be verified by the legal department of the City that it is properly done per code.

Chair Thompson: Okay. We have a motion. Is there anybody that would like to second that motion?

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT

Vice Chair Lee: I'll just ask a question as a friendly amendment. I think I heard that Jodie suggested that staff would raise the question if there are significant changes to elevations. I am just wondering if we need to state in the motion in that way since the staff will be... maybe we should just say it the way Jodie said it.

Board Member Baltay: That's a fine point, Grace. I am happy to remove the section strictly to the elevations if you think that matters. I don't want to get into any other redesign of the building anymore than we have to. I am trying to keep it clean. If that earns your support, I am happy to do that.

Vice Chair Lee: Then, I guess, my other thought -- just thinking out loud -- I am just wondering about the other two parts of your motion if those are appropriate for ARB to be bringing up.

Board Member Baltay: I hear you, Grace, and I agree, normally. Frankly, I am concerned. We approved Castilleja the other day based on staff assuring us that basements in neighborhoods didn't count and it went to Council and they completely disagreed with that point. I feel that this is a similar thing. There is a fine line on what the code is actually doing, but, to me, an aisle parking place is not a parking place. I think if the town, if the staff, if the code wants to be changed to make it otherwise that's fine, but, to me, it's a very slippery slope and I think we owe it to the Director to give them a clear statement that aisle parking is not the same as regular parking, even for valets you have to move a lot more cars to make that work. They asked for recommendations to the Director and this is the recommendation I think we should make.

Vice Chair Lee: Okay. It sounds like...

(Crosstalk)

Vice Chair Lee: My feeling is that that is a staff... that we really on City staff to define what these aisle spaces are, and, clearly, this is not something we normally talk in ARB. I feel like that is something that should be defined by staff before it comes to us. I am not sure if it is appropriate to put in an ARB motion. I just wanted to raise that.

Board Member Baltay: That's a fair point. I agree with you, normally.

Chair Thompson: Yeah. Just to continue the discussion on this, I am trying to think if I have read any code that says one way or the other; would the aisles count as parking spaces? I don't know if City staff can advise if that is currently in the code.

Board Member Baltay: I thought the applicant showed us the section in the code where it said it did not at the beginning of the presentation.

Ms. Gerhardt: The applicant is showing you Chapter 10, which is not necessarily in play here because it is a private valet lift system. Again, I don't have a full answer for you today but that is why we are going to go back and take a look at it and make sure we are setting the right precedent. As Board Member Baltay said, even if we don't count those aisle spaces we would just have to increase the Director's adjustment to 20 percent and the project would still be able to move forward in the same fashion.

Board Member Baltay: Actually, if I could amend my motion to include an advise to the Director that the Board supports a 20 percent TDM reduction in parking to make this feasible.

Chair Thompson: Board Member Baltay, if I could restate your motion.

Board Member Baltay: Please.

Chair Thompson: You are moving to recommend approval with an additional note to the Director of Planning that should all parking be considered in the parking count, that we could recommend approval of the 20 percent reduction. Then, you had said you agreed to strike the time about the exterior façade, with the knowledge that staff will bring it back if there are changes. Is that right?

Board Member Baltay: No, I want the new floor plan for the staircase and the lobby to come back to the ad hoc committee. We can leave it at that. There's no additional stipulation of what the committee is looking at, in response to Grace's concern about it just being the elevation.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Then, you had a third item about the parking fees.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, I was just concerned that what seems to be a conflicting element in our code be addressed by staff before this is approved, but I can strike that if that's what it takes to earn a second. So far I am not having much luck.

Chair Thompson: Would anybody like to discuss, or is there a second? I am not hearing a second.

Vice Chair Lee: I'll just ask the question, it sounded like staff is going to be finding the answer to that question regarding the parking fee whether it shows up in a motion or not. I don't know if that needs to be placed in the motion in that staff is hearing our comments and going to be moving forward with that research.

Board Member Baltay: Can I get your second, Grace, if we strike that one?

Vice Chair Lee: Maybe you could just repeat what the motion is.

Board Member Baltay: Okay. I move that we recommend to the Director that the project be approved as submitted with the request the final staircase floor plan be brought back to an ad hoc committee of the Architectural Review Board. Secondly, that the Board recommends that the Director approve the revised parking count with up to 20 percent TDM reduction, and that the Architectural Review Board recommends that aisle parking spaces not be considered as normal parking spaces in the parking calculations.

Vice Chair Lee: I'll just say that I am not one that needs to see anything back, even at the ad hoc and I am not sure about adding the aisle. I don't think I'll second.

Board Member Baltay: Okay, thank you.

Chair Thompson: I see that Board Member Hirsch is trying to say something but you're on mute, Board Member Hirsch.

[Adjusting Audio.]

Ms. Gerhardt: If I may, I think maybe the Board Members are struggling because this is a little outside of the purview. I think might be worthy of making a motion on the proposed project and then afterward providing comments to staff that we would... I mean, we are always willing to listen to the ARB and we could take those more as comments versus a motion. We are very willing to look into the things that Board Member Baltay has asked for.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. I see that Board Member Hirsch was able to unmute himself.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes. I think we could leave most of this to the staff and it will eliminate the requirement for a response, at this time, regarding the valet spaces, the five extra spaces. I don't see why it is critical to an approval at this time. I would ask Peter to re-describe the motion without that if that's possible.

Board Member Baltay: I'll leave it to somebody else to make a motion then if that's okay. It's fine; the motion fails for lack of a second. Osma, go on.

Chair Thompson: Yes, okay, would anybody else like to make a motion?

Board Member Hirsch: I thought Grace could put hers together. If not, well okay. Go ahead, Grace.

Vice Chair Lee: I feel like I am always speaking up too much. Alex, feel free to chime in...

(Crosstalk)

Chair Thompson: Okay, I'll make a motion. I move that we approve the project per the staff's recommendation with the stair coming back to ad hoc committee.

Board Member Hirsch: I second.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Motion by Thompson, seconded by Hirsch. Would anybody like to discuss this further?

Vice Chair Lee: Can you simply repeat it again? I'm sorry.

Chair Thompson: I just move that we approve the project and then a=have the stair and any other exterior façade changes come back to ad hoc committee. Okay, can we get a vote?

Aye: Hirsch, Lee, Lew, Thompson (4)

No: Baltay (1)

MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 4-1.

Chair Thompson: Okay, thank you. I see that you have your hand raised, Randy. Do you have a quick comment?

Mr. Popp: Yes, thank you so much for your discussion. I'm not trying to derail the process at all here, but we have literally been waiting months and months to get to this hearing and our ability to have our project reviewed and approved is being held up by this discussion. While we very much appreciate the detail, I'd like to be able to get back to ad hoc committee or have the process move forward with plan check review with staff concurrent with that process. If we can come back to ad hoc at the very next meeting on the 20th we are available to do that. Thank you.

Ms. Gerhardt: Just to be clear, staff has not allowed the applicant to submit a building permit just yet because this garage is very foundational to that structure and we wanted to make sure that the one-story versus the two-story was going to be approved. Now that it is approved, now we can let the applicant submit their building permits. As part of those building permits, we will see what the changes are to the stairways and we will bring that to the ad hoc committee before we approve the building permit, but the building permit can be submitted at this time.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. I think this item can be closed.

Ms. Gerhardt: Thank you. Chair, if I may, can I get a five-minute recess before the next item?

Chair Thompson: Certainly. Yeah. Let's meet back here at 10:10.

[The Board took a short break.]

Study Session

3. Review the City of Palo Alto's Boards, Commissions, and Committees Handbook, and discuss implementation of its contents

Chair Thompson: All right. I think we are all back now. We will move on to our next item, which is a study session. This is a review of the City of Palo Alto's Boards, Commissions, and Committees Handbook, and discuss the implementation of its contents. Jodie, I understand you have a little presentation.

Ms. Gerhardt: I do. Just one second.

[Setting up presentation.]

Ms. Gerhardt: Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning. I just wanted to give a short presentation on the Handbook. On November 30, 2020, the Council ad hoc committee presented the Handbook to the full Council and at that time Council made a motion that they adopted the Handbook. They also made some other clarifications, and these are just the ones that affect the ARB. They are going to be using the ARB application. They modified the terms for the ARB and the HRB to be three terms. The term limits would apply to current Board Members. They are requiring staff reports be provided seven days in advance of the hearing. Also, the Clerk's Office does need to make some ordinance changes and the term limits are one of those things that do need to be changed in the ordinance. That's not effective quite yet but by the time it matters, it will be effective. Staff and Board Members did attend a training in March of this year. As I said, the Clerk's Office will be bringing forward the necessary ordinance changes to a June 1st hearing. In the Handbook, it does list out the goals and purpose for the ARB as directed by City Council. The goals and purposes are to promote orderly and harmoniously development, enhance the desirability of residences or other investments, encourage the attainment of the most desirable use of land and improvements, enhance desirability of living conditions upon the immediate site or in adjacent areas, promote visual environments which are of high aesthetic quality and variety and which, at the same time, are considerate of each other, and to implement and enforce City ordinances pertaining to architecture and design. The Board is also composed of five members, three of whom are required to be architects, landscape architects, building designers, or other design professionals. Terms are for three years and they will start on November 1, whereas in the past they have started on December 16, and residency is not required. A large portion of the Handbook is dedicated to Board Members' personal code of conduct. We do ask that you review that and there is a form that needs to be filled out and returned to staff. I believe some of you have already done that. There are also roles for the Chair. At the beginning of the year, the Board would select a member to be Chair, where as currently in our bylaws it says October. The Chair exists to structure productive meetings, encourage the input of ideas, promote inclusiveness, and facilitate the overall decision-making process. However, they do not have any greater power than any other member. The Chair would also ensure that the ARB completes an annual work plan in June and reports the results annually to the City Council. Now, given we are so close to this June, I will need to confirm with the City Clerk how it is going to be handled this first year. The Handbook also discusses subcommittee and ad hoc committee. We had previously referred to our committee as a subcommittee, but in reading the Handbook we now will be calling it an ad hoc committee as that are committees are short-term, established for a specific project usually. They convene for a single topic and they disband once that work is done as will be done later today. The ad hoc committee does not need to be noticed or open to the public; however, normally we are in chambers where the public could see what's going on, and the Chair makes the assignments to the ad hoc committee. Effective today, staff will be ensuring that future minutes are in summary form, that's one of the other items that is in the Handbook so that we no longer need to do the verbatim minutes, which I think will be helpful for everyone that they will be in a more condensed fashion but still get everyone's point across. We will also be gathering those signed statements from Board Members saying that you have read through the entire Handbook. We will also return to the ARB in the near future with the necessary changes to the bylaws, mostly the Chair election that that would be at the beginning of the year, and we would be using the ad hoc committee title going forward. That's the end of my presentation. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thanks. Are there any questions or comments from the Board on this item?

Vice Chair Lee: I had a couple of questions.

Chair Thompson: Go ahead.

Vice Chair Lee: I would love to hear what other Board Members think, or Jodie, you could just simply answer. I did go to that orientation, or meeting, recently online and I see in the Handbook that when we talk about the terms I just want to make sure does that mean... because on page eight, packet page 144 today, I just was wondering about this consecutive terms or successive as it applies to ARB because I understand the term limit as it is shown in your slide. That was one question. The other question is I saw you mentioned November 1, and then I just recall that Chair Osma and myself, we came on not November 1 this year. Does that mean our term is three years but it would be November 1, right?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, as far as term limits, what you see written here was amended by the Council motion. For the ARB and the HRB, they would be allowed to serve three terms of three years, which equals nine years total. That is an ordinance change that needs to be made by the City Clerk and that will happen in the near future before we need to reappoint anyone.

Vice Chair Lee: Okay. Some cities have this not-successive terms. I don't know if there is any language in that just so we are understanding because if it's not over nine years how does it work in terms of... I mean, could it be you serve once, and then you come off and come back again. I am just thinking of some of our Board Members who have been on for a while.

Ms. Gerhardt: It currently says two successive terms. My understating is that they would change that to three successive terms for ARB and HRB members...

Vice Chair Lee: Oh, I see.

Ms. Gerhardt: ...so that it could be a solid nine years.

Vice Chair Lee: Okay. Then, I just thought to ask because we do have it and it's not required, but normally we do an ARB retreat and is that something that is going to be on our calendar, and then this June work plan... can you tell us or chair YOU can tell us what the plan is for the work plan.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, so the retreats have kind of been as requested, as needed, but that is something that could be put into the work plan.

Chair Thompson: Yeah, I think we were discussing doing a retreat but I think the logistics are still up in the air. I think we should discuss it given that all of our meetings are still virtual, maybe it is something we can agendize for next time to discuss our retreat and how we want to do it.

Ms. Gerhardt: We can certainly add that to the agenda.

Chair Thompson: Okay.

Board Member Baltay: Osma, can I point something out that I wonder about.

Chair Thompson: Yeah, sure.

Board Member Baltay: In the past, we have made an annual report to City Council and that is because it was required for us to do so in the bylaws to both City Council and the Planning Commission. Is it the intention that this work plan will now replace the annual report? That would seem to make sense to me but I am just trying to be clear.

Ms. Gerhardt: It would seem to make sense. I think that is a discussion that the Board Members could have because the Council is asking for the annual report in the summertime period versus at the end of the calendar year.

Board Member Baltay: I think it would be a good idea for us to remove from the bylaws the annual report requirement and instead bring in the work plan requirement that the Council has requested schedule. I don't think other boards and commissions have an annual report requirement, and, certainly, it has been something that has been spotty with the ARB over the years.

Chair Thompson: The packet pages that I'm looking at kind of speak to those things in the same breath. It says work plans/annual report, almost as if they are the same thing.

Ms. Gerhard: I think it is a look forward and a look backward, yes.

Board Member Baltay: Yeah, the Council has asked the annual report to include some metrics of how you're passed annual reports have done, which is, effectively, a look backward. I am just suggesting that when we make the bylaw changes, we should get rid of the annual report then so it is not lingering.

Chair Thompson: I guess you're seeing it as a separate, additional thing than the annual report that they're asking us for.

Board Member Baltay: I know I started pushing for us to do the annual report a few years ago back when Wynne Furth was the Chair because a couple of members of the Planning Commission had come to us and said look this is required in the law, you have to do this. It is true; that's what it says. So, we did and it takes a bit of work to do that. I don't think we should do that and a work plan. That's a lot of work and they are redundant.

Chair Thompson: What do other folks think?

Vice Chair Lee: I agree.

Board Member Hirsch: I agree, too.

Vice Chair Lee: It makes sense.

Chair Thompson: Board Member Lew?

Board Member Lew: Yeah, I think that is fine. I don't have any issues with that annual report and meeting. I think in the past, it was considered the annual report or joint City Council meeting. A lot of the times, a meeting would be scheduled, and then it would get bumped several times and then not happen. That was the reason why sometimes the annual report didn't get written. It seems to me that the process going forward seems to be clear.

Chair Thompson: I am actually a little confused about it. I see the work plan as what we plan to do throughout the year, like the look forward, and then in the text that I am reading here it doesn't say anything about summarizing what's happened to date, which would be what was the annual report. Is the Board suggesting that we don't summarize our comments from the last year at all?

Board Member Hirsch: Wouldn't an annual report be just a listing of projects that were reviewed and the date of approval and the general opinions or whatever; some summary of opinion. Just like we're doing a summary of the meetings you could do a summary of the opinions after each. I wouldn't say it was necessarily our responsibility to do this either.

Chair Thompson: Yeah. I think our last annual report wasn't quite that explicit. I think it was more our thoughts and understandings of things we had noticed in the past year when we have been reviewing

stuff that might be helpful for City Council to know. Am I hearing from the majority of the board that we don't want to do that anymore and we just want to do a future/looking forward work plan?

Board Member Baltay: Osma, if I can interrupt, I am reading the Handbook now on page 20 of the Handbook, or at least as it is written now, it says the annual report should include the results of the prior year's plan. In our case, that probably is the same thing as our annual report. Actually, it calls it here the annual work plan and performance measures.

Chair Thompson: Okay. I was looking at a different thing.

Vice Chair Lee: Yeah, I see that, peter. I just wanted to let you know also on packet page 1169 or Exhibit A page 33, it just seems like that what you just read, which is kind of summarizing what an annual report is, is not in the work plan guidelines and process. I feel like it's just a missing bullet point that is not included in Exhibit A. That's why it is confusing.

Board Member Baltay: I think that's a good point, Grace. Maybe we could ask staff to see if that can be included in Exhibit A if it is intended...

(Crosstalk)

Vice Chair Lee: Yeah, because it does seem funny, right, because it is in the paragraph description, then it says see Exhibit A but when you go to Exhibit A in the bullet points there is no reference to any of that.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, you're absolutely correct, Grace, about that.

Ms. Gerhardt: I guess I am reading packet page 169 sort of at the very end there. It does say to give a list of priorities, projects and goals, but it also says status updates and that if items are not complete include why and those sorts of details. I think, too, on packet page 170, you see a work plan template, but that is really just a template. The Board can choose to do this in a slightly different manner if they choose.

Vice Chair Lee: Okay. So, status updates, Jodie, might refer back to what has happened this past year in your mind?

Ms. Gerhardt: That's how I was reading it. I agree it is not 100 percent clear. I can go verify with the Clerk's Office but I think if the Board wants to look forward and backward, that would seem appropriate.

Chair Thompson: Okay, I see. It should include both, the forward and the backward. It's not specifically written. Okay, well that makes sense to me now. Like you were saying, Jodie, they are asking for us to have this by June. Our next meeting is canceled, so the next time that we are all going to meet is June. We just discussed agendaizing this for that meeting in June, but it seems like we were agendaizing it to discuss it for when we actually discuss it later in that month. Does that sound about right to everybody?

Board Member Hirsch: Are you looking for additional comments on any of this wording at this time?

Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Board Member Hirsch: Just on the Board's goals and purposes are to, and then the final one is to implement and enforce. Is this what we do or do we recommend conformants with City's ordinances pertaining to the architecture and design? Are we the agency that implements and enforces this?

Chair Thompson: What page are you on?

Board Member Hirsch: Page 133.

Ms. Gerhardt: Packet page 145.

Chair Thompson:

Board Member Hirsch: Packet page 135?

Ms. Gerhardt: Forty-five has the purpose.

Board Member Hirsch: I was looking on page 133, which are goals and purposes of the ARB, page nine. Packet page... to implement and enforce the City's ordinances.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, 133 and 145 are the same thing.

Board Member Hirsch: Oh, okay.

Board Member Baltay: Jodie, can you steer us to where... yeah, 145 is the actual Architectural Review Board language.

Ms. Gerhardt: Correct. That's straight from Council.

Board Member Hirsch: Yeah, it's the same thing. Okay. Exactly.

Board Member Baltay: Yes, David is correct that the word enforce is not consistent with the role of the ARB I don't believe. Our authority, essentially, extends to a recommendation.

Board Member Hirsch: While I am at it if I could bring up just a few other issues here. I note that I just went back to look at the findings and so if I might just aggress the study here a little bit. If we took this to packet page 30...

Chair Thompson: Wait, hold on. Before you go there, Board Member Hirsch, I'd like to discuss enforce a little bit or just get other Board Members' comments because I just googled the definition of enforce and it does say compel, observance, or compliance with a law, or rule, or obligation, and that's what we are doing here. I have no problem with the word enforce.

Board Member Hirsch: I think it's better to say recommend conformance with the City's ordinances.

Chair Thompson: Are there any comments from Board Member Lew or Vice Chair Lee.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, Osma, in the past the City Attorney's Office has said that our purview does not extend to code enforcement. Say, like we used to have a code enforcement department, so we were not supposed to involve ourselves with, say like, illegal finds that were not ARB projects. I think that the way it is written is a little too broad. I think that maybe we should point that out and highlight that to staff. There is a role of enforcing existing codes, but then there are other issues beyond that, you know beyond the ARB's purview, as well.

Vice Chair Lee: I'll just say that I agree. If you turn the page to 146, it is interesting how the language is very different for the HRB in terms of review and make recommendations; research and make recommendations. I do think the word enforce is... the connotation is we aren't compliance officers. Maybe it should be reviewed by staff.

Chair Thompson: Okay, that's fair.

Board Member Hirsch: This is far-field but take it as you will. I look back at findings number three and it says design of highly aesthetic quality using high quality integrated materials and appropriate constructions techniques and incorporating textures, colors, and other details that are compatible. I personally would like to add with each other and enhance the surrounding area. You know, compatible with and enhance the surrounding area doesn't mention how they relate to each other. It is a small

addition; is it possible to pass findings that are different? Does that have to go through a legal procedure here in Palo Alto? I don't know but I find the wording isn't appropriate.

Board Member Lew: (Inaudible) talking about (inaudible) not on the agenda.

Board Member Hirsch: It isn't on the agenda, you're right.

Board Member Lew: (Inaudible) discussing this.

Board Member Hirsch: Shall we leave it alone?

Chair Thompson: Yeah, we're just talking about the handbook right now.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay. The Handbook, all right. I do have some other comments here, and that is Council liaison. There is no Council liaison for the ARB, is there? I don't know of one. I think it would be nice to have one. I note that in particular, it would be good when information that is decided upon by the Council is noted to us. For example, there was a project, I think, that they disapproved on Bayshore; the one that we actually discussed in a recent meeting because it was in a flood zone and mentioning this to Peter the other day he was unaware of it because it was a news item that if you read the newspaper you would have heard that. Items like that that don't get back to us that we ought to be able to know about, I think, are important. How to make that information available to us would be normally through some kind of liaison with the Council but we don't have that relationship. I think it should be done. We should have that. Under the work plan, I think we have already been discussing that in plenty of detail so far. One other general comment I have is that the Board would include a landscape person. I personally wish that that were person, not leaving it all on Alex's back all the time. He does a great job but landscaping is certainly a specialty in itself, which we, as architects, would normally turn to some consultant and the projects that are presented to us normally have a landscape architect, the better ones, anyhow. It would be beneficial for us to have a landscape architect as a member of our committee as well. How to achieve that? I think it is an important thing to try to achieve but how is it possible to include that in our committee.

Chair Thompson: Thank you, Board Member Hirsch. Are there any other thoughts from other Board Members either on items that Board Member Hirsch brought up or other items?

Board Member Baltay: Just some background information, maybe, David. The City Council went through -- maybe four or five years ago -- a real overhaul of the findings we have to make. It was quite a process. It was really a thing that took several Council meetings to close on. So, even a change of one word there would be a big deal.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay.

Board Member Baltay: The same thing applies, I think, to other aspects of how we work. Thing like putting a landscape architect on the Board. It doesn't seem like it, perhaps, but they have given a lot of thought politically to what is the right way to make it up and that is where they have landed on this. The Board's Handbook, I think, is more just sort of a guideline on how to operate than it is to any change to ordinances that establish out Boards. The second thing I can point out is I think the Council is fairly conflicted on whether they want liaisons to the Architectural Review Board and the Planning Commission, and that's why they don't explicitly say here that they're going to have it. I don't think they had a consensus when they were discussing even this booklet. I think the Board has been very clear that we would like to have a liaison to City Council for exactly the reasons you mentioned, and I think it would be great if staff could help us bring that message to them. I think we have consistently and repeatedly asked them for more communication between the Council and whether they're doing and our operations. I think they did not put it in this booklet because that was as much as they could get approved. That is just background. Alex is right; some of these are not even on the agenda today. I just offer that for thought.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes. Today is just a study session, just a discussion. No motion is needed but I am obviously taking notes. Thank you, Board Member Baltay, for the discussion about findings because it is a long process, but obviously if something's desired we will go through that process. As far as the Council liaison, we will bring that message forward. I think another option is that planning management can do a summary that I can read out for things that would affect the ARB or be relevant. We can certainly try to do a little bit more on that. Then, as far as the landscape architect on the Board, three of the members do have to be an architect, a landscape architect, or a design professional; that actually is a requirement. I would assume that maybe we just haven't had as many landscape architects apply. It might be a matter of talking to your friends. Thank you.

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Any further thoughts?

Board Member Lew: Osma, I had one question.

Chair Thompson: Yea, go ahead.

Board Member Lew: I guess this is for staff, maybe, social media posts by Board Members... I was watching the Housing Element Working Group selection by the Council and they were reviewing social media posts by the applicants, and it seemed to me years ago -- I am saying over ten years ago -- the city attorney really tried to discourage board members from posting just because it was a real gray area with regard to bias and ethics and stuff. It was just -- at least from his mind at the time -- safer for board members not to post. A lot has happened in that time and I don't really see very much in here about that. I think if there is another edit of the booklet, I would appreciate guidance on that. I think when we go through our ethics training, I think the city attorney says it is kind of a gray area and to be careful about posting and what gets posted. At the same time, just at this last Council hearing, it seemed like they were expecting the Housing Element Working Group to be social media active and to be promoting things through their own social media. That seems to be a departure from past guidance.

Chair Thompson: Interesting. Thank you for that feedback. Any other comments, Vice Chair Lee?

Vice Chair Lee: I don't have any. No comments. I did think to just touch upon... I think we have talked previously about the liaison and I understand the Council has never achieved it. In a way, that represents all boards, commissions, and committees with a liaison and I just ask the question asked for one or PTC, maybe all the board, commissions, and committees deserve to have that liaison and there isn't capacity given the ask. Then, the comment about landscape architects, I appreciate that. I do feel like landscape is a big part of our purview. I also just want to point out that the current language does include landscape architects, as Jodie mention. At the time that many of our terms are completed, sometimes there are very few people who want to step up to service to the City. And I do think it is something that we as Board Members should be aware of that this is an important position and during that time of term limits it is important to check in with current Board Members and see if they are going to be reapplying, but also welcome new members and just ensure that the Board continues quality review and service to the City. I think that's important.

Chair Thompson: Yeah.

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair, if I may, I did want to note on the Council liaison that Council thinks that ARB projects that get appealed do go before the Council, and so there may be some conflict there which is likely why we don't have a liaison right now but I will go double-check all of that.

Board Member Baltay: Osma, can I come back to something Alex was just talking about?

Chair Thompson: Sure.

Board Member Baltay: He was talking about social media posts and just in general interacting with the media. I am reading again more clearly the packet page 163 where they talk about interaction with the media and the public and I think Alex's words should be taken fairly seriously because we interact, we

behave as a quasi-judicial body quite a lot and I would think that the standards they are putting here would be inappropriate when we are evaluating some of our projects. Certainly, I think we would want to have another bullet point even when you're acting in a quasi-judicial manner there is a much higher standard, I believe, we have to follow. Between reviews of a project, we really shouldn't be expressing opinions online, even if we clearly state that they're our own and I don't think any of us do that but reading this it would seem that that would be okay and I don't think it is.

Chair Thompson: That's a good point. What do others think about that?

Board Member Hirsch: I have a comment to make on it. Maybe it would be best if we ever did something like that to say this is not an opinion as a member of the ARB.

Ms. Gerhardt: You should always be making clear when you're speaking for the ARB versus when you're speaking for yourself, but, as Board Member Baltay said, if it is a pending project then you need to make sure that you're not making a decision on a project outside of the public hearing.

Board Member Hirsch: Yes.

Chair Thompson: It seems like it would be a worthy clarification on that packet page.

Ms. Gerhardt: We will certainly bring that to the Clerk's attention. As I said, the Council will look at this again on June 1. I will get those suggestions to them as quickly as possible.

Approval of Minutes

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 1, 2021

Chair Thompson: Sounds good. Any other final thoughts? Okay. I guess we'll close the study session. Thanks for everyone's feedback. I thought it was cute that they mentioned PDA's on there. You've got to turn off your PDA's. That is it for our study session. Our next item is approval of the minutes for April 1, 2021. Can I get a motion or are there any comments, edits?

MOTION

Board Member Lew: I'll move that we approve the minutes.

Board Member Baltay: Second.

Chair Thompson: Motion by Lew, seconded by Baltay. Can I get a vote, Vinh?

Ms. Gerhardt: I'll do the roll call, here.

Chair Thompson: All right.

Aye: Baltay, Hirsch, Lee, Lew, Thompson (4)

No: (0)

MOTION TO APPROVE PASSES 4-0.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Thompson: Thank you. Our next item is Board Member questions, comments or announcements. The first item is the North VCAP working group updates.

Board Member Lew: Yeah, there are no updates. It is going to the Council in June for discussion.

Chair Thompson: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments or announcements?

Board Member Hirsch: Yes, I have one. This is going back. I am sorry to go back on an item but packet page 117, I would like the name of Su Hong Restaurant to be removed from the restaurants, cafes, delis, and bakeries within the neighborhood of the new hotel. That's packet page 117.

Ms. Gerhardt: You're asking for a change to the minutes?

Board Member Hirsch: Just a joke.

Board Member Baltay: I'll second your joke, David.

Chair Thompson: Sorry, I missed that. Okay. It sounds like it was just a joke, though.

Board Member Baltay: Think about it, Osma.

Chair Thompson: I don't get it.

Board Member Hirsch: Okay, Osma. It's the site of the hotel.

Chair Thompson: Oh, the site. Yeah. That's interesting. Okay. All right. If there is nothing else then we will adjourn.

Board Member Baltay: Thank you, Osma.

Ms. Gerhardt: Yes, and Board Member Baltay and Board Member Lew will stay on for the subcommittee. Claire Raybould is the project planner. She will take over from here and I will say goodbye to everyone.

Chair Thompson: All right.

Adjournment

Ad Hoc Committee Items

5. 233 University Avenue [18PLN-00344]: Ad Hoc Committee Review of Two Benches. Boardmembers Baltay and Lew will preside. Environmental Assessment: Exempt From CEQA per Guideline Section 15332 (In-fill Development). Zoning District: CD-C (GF)(P) (Commercial Downtown Community with Ground Floor and Pedestrian Shopping Combining Districts). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Raybould at Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org.



Architectural Review Board Ad Hoc Committee Review

TO: Jeff Galbraith, Hayes Group Architecture, 350 Sansome, Suite 750, San Francisco, CA 94104

SUBJECT: 233 University Avenue [18PLN-00034]

DATE: May 6, 2021

FROM: Claire Raybould, AICP, Senior Planner

The application, and plans dated April 1, 2021, were reviewed by an ARB Ad hoc Committee on May 6, 2021 in accordance with condition of approval #6, as stated below. The ARB Ad Hoc Committee was comprised of Boardmembers Lew and Baltay.

6. ARB AD HOC COMMITTEE: Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall return to the ARB Ad hoc Committee for approval of the following items, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Development Services:
- a. Provide at least two benches along the Ramona or University frontage within the vicinity of the project site in order to improve the pedestrian environment within this area. Benches may be within the private property or within the public right-of-way. Any benches placed within the public right-of-way must be located and designed to the satisfaction of Public Works Engineering, the Office of Transportation, and the Director of Planning. Benches may include traditional benches or other seating areas built into the design of the building such as seating areas built into windows or planters.

At the meeting, the Ad hoc Committee agreed with the revisions presented. The applicant shall ensure the changes presented in the Ad hoc are reflected in the plans submitted for building permit(s). In addition, this Ad Hoc Committee review letter shall be printed on the plans submitted for building permit(s) following the Record of Land Use Action.