



Architectural Review Board

Staff Report (ID # 14286)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 4/21/2022

Summary Title: Minutes of March 17, 2022

Title: Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 17, 2022

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

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

Background

Draft minutes from the March 17, 2022 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: Minutes of March 17, 2022 (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
 MINUTES: March 17, 2022
 Council Chamber & Virtual Meeting
 8:30 AM

Call to Order / Roll Call

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

Present: Chair Osma Thompson, Vice Chair David Hirsch, Boardmember Peter Baltay, Boardmember Rosenberg, Boardmember Chen (attended virtually)

Absent: None.

Chair Thompson welcomed the two new members of the ARB.

Oral Communications

None.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, stated she thought they would continue the California Avenue item to the next hearing for time.

Chair Thompson suggested they make the decision later.

City Official Reports

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

Ms. Gerhardt welcomed the new Boardmembers to the ARB. Boardmember Chen will be on vacation for the next hearing. She shared the ARB 2022 Meeting Schedule and noted that all future meetings are currently scheduled to be held in hybrid format. The next hearing is scheduled for April 7, 2022 and has 250 Sherman Avenue, 3300 El Camino Real, and 2850 W. Bayshore on the Agenda.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 2609 Alma Street [21PLN-00176]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Demolition of Four Existing Residential Rental Units at 2606, 2609, 2611 and 2615 Alma Street and Construction of Four New Three-Story Rental Townhomes. Environmental Assessment: Exempt in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15302 (Replacement or Reconstruction) and 15303 (Small

Projects). Zoning District: RM-30 (Multi-Family Residential). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Emily Foley at Emily.foley@cityofpaloalto.org

Chair Thompson introduced the project and called for ARB disclosures.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he visited the site including the back of the property where he encountered a neighbor. He learned there was no privacy.

Vice Chair Hirsch disclosed he also visited the site and noticed how busy Alma Street is and that it was difficult to get to the project property.

Boardmembers Rosenberg and Chen had no disclosures.

Chair Thompson noted that she had previously visited the site in the past. She called for the staff report.

Emily Foley, Associate Planner, shared her screen and gave a PowerPoint presentation on 2609 through 2617 Alma Street. The project will demolish two existing single-story duplexes and redevelop the site to four three-story residential units in a townhome configuration. Under SB330 they met the requirements to freeze the development standards on the date they applied. The ARB cannot reduce the number of units on site or reduce the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) or density. The project is also limited to only five public hearings with this being the second ARB hearing. She displayed the current Google Street View of the property and the proposed project. The project location is on Alma and in RM-30 zoning that abuts R-1 properties and is across the street from Caltrain tracks. The site is 8,070 square feet (sf). She displayed the site plan and noted the central parking court, building spacing, landscaped private open spaces for each unit, and the two driveways. Compared to the initial submittal the project now includes turf strips, 11 total trees, and additional landscaping. The rear utility easement constrains the ability to add landscaping in that area however there are two large trees on the adjacent property which overhang the site. [video/audio blank at 14:40ish] For privacy a new fence is proposed along the sides and rear of the property. She displayed the front and rear elevations of the project plans. The original white stucco has been changed to a more off white color reflecting prior ARB comment. The height of the landscaping on the rear facing balconies has also been increased. On the sides of the building obscured glazing has been added for privacy and is shown in the side elevations. Staff recommends a motion to approve the project keeping in mind the SB330 restrictions and the overall number of allowable hearings.

Chair Thompson called for the applicant's presentation and provided them 10 minutes.

Khoan Duong appeared on behalf of the client, Gemini Palo Alto, who were unable to attend the hearing. Pam Jones, the landscape architect, and Ryan Mitchka (sp) from Ms. Duong's office were also available for questions and comments. When Gemini Palo Alto purchased the property it was in two separate lots which have now been merged. The goal was to develop to the maximum unit number possible for the property which is 4. She provided images of the existing property, Alma Street, and existing buildings along Alma. Ms. Foley outlined the comments they received in the study session and pointed out the changes. Gemini Palo Alto wants to provide equitably sized housing for families and have proposed 1,200 sf units in three-story buildings. There is room on the roof for solar panels. Overhangs have been added in response to fire requirements for roof access. Additional slides showing the renderings of the project were shown prior to the conclusion the presentation.

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

Boardmember Baltay clarified that the ARB had the updated material samples.

Ms. Foley indicated that his understanding of the materials was correct.

Vice Chair Hirsch inquired about the purpose of the fire department regulations.

Ms. Duong explained that the building is 30 feet high and that in order for the Fire Department to access the roof a platform at 27 feet is required. The platforms which connect the buildings is also for the Fire Department.

Chair Thompson requested that they display the drawing as it was not in the packet.

Ms. Foley displayed the plans and pointed out the overhangs.

Chair Thompson for requested additional information about the overhangs.

Ms. Doung explained that they were solid steel framed overhangs consisting of roofing material on the top and tongue and groove wood in under.

Chair Thompson thanked her for the clarification and stated that the drawings showed it as sort of see through.

Ms. Doung stated that another reason for the connections between the two buildings was to allow for two means of egress.

Vice Chair Hirsch requested to see a rendering the passageway and perimeter walls.

Ms. Doung said that there were no windows in the internal access space.

Vice Chair Hirsch inquired about a lighting diagram for the area or a picture of the fixtures.

Ms. Doung said there was an exterior lighting plan in the submittal set.

Vice Chair Hirsch clarified that he was concerned with the passageway between the buildings.

Ms. Doung showed an image of an exterior sconce and an older plan that displayed the locations of the light fixtures.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if they were up or down lights.

Ms. Doung stated they were direct and indirect.

Chair Thompson confirmed that she was looking at the right plan page.

Boardmember Baltay asked if there was another way to meet the fire requirements.

Ms. Doung explained they had proposed an exterior mounted ladder but that was found not to be a good solution as it is quicker for the fire department to use their own ladders. The only other solution would be

to lower the height of the building by three feet which would decrease the ceiling height and not allow for three stories. After numerous discussions with the Fire Marshal this was the compromise option.

Boardmember Baltay asked if staff had discussed the matter with the Fire Department.

Ms. Foley indicated she had encountered this situation on another project.

Boardmember Chen inquired about any privacy guidelines the ARB had to follow in a multifamily project. She was specifically concerned about the bedroom windows which face each other.

Ms. Foley confirmed she was speaking about the interior of the project then explained that the city does not specify privacy requirements between the residents of a multifamily project. There is at least a 20 foot distance between the windows.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked about the planned ceiling heights for each story.

Ms. Doung stated the top level was 8.5 feet, the middle level is 8 feet, and the ground level is 9.5 feet.

Vice Chair Hirsch confirmed that the two windows closest to one another on the interior of the project were from the stairwells.

Ms. Doung stated that was correct except the middle level windows were bedrooms facing the parking court. She displayed a plan including the dimensions.

Chair Thompson called for further questions, but there were none. She called for ARB comment.

Boardmember Baltay thanked the applicant and stated he had two concerns. The first was the privacy impact and potential mitigations to buildings at the rear and sides of the project. The balcony landscaping notwithstanding there is insufficient protection for the privacy of the neighbors considering the R-1 zone in the back. A 7 foot fence is not adequate to ensure privacy. In order to mitigate privacy concerns they need to do something significant with the balconies and five foot landscaping does not seem sufficient. He also thought the ARB should request robust landscaping in the planting strips due to the lower adjacent buildings. Further he thought the new sample provided for the white was very similar in tone to the last one and would be very visible and too reflective. [break in audio/video at 37:00ish]

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that with privacy they should take into account that the back of the building steps back so that the upstairs bedroom balconies are further from the property line which helps provide privacy. So long as the appropriate plants are selected he felt that the privacy issues were addressed. The area between the buildings is very tall and very narrow and he was concerned with how it would feel to walk through it at night. He suggested adding overhead lighting or considering additional windows to make the space more comfortable. The platforms that were added for fire safety could play some role in the new lighting. Overall he thought the site plan worked and he appreciated the applicant taking the ARBs previous comments into consideration. Noise and the traffic pattern from Alma cannot be ignored, but the planting outside of the first wall could include taller privacy plantings to make it feel less a part of the street. He made it clear that he was not suggesting a structure, but more of a medium scale planting wall. He did not notice a closet in the first unit and noted it would be important to allow residents use of areas under the stairs for storage. The applicant should also consider expanding the living room size for resident's comfort. He further noted the lack of pantry and no cellar access for storage. He thought

Boardmember Baltay's comment was the most significant. He realized that he did not know where the air conditioning unit was located and that he should have asked that question of the applicant. He thought it might be in the rear near the parking and indicated that he noted nonverbal agreement with that.

Boardmember Rosenberg echoed Boardmembers Baltay and Hirsch. The white is quite bright coming down Alma but thought it could be maintained on the front/rear and internal courtyard facades but did some color shift, blocking, or other treatment on the Alma faces. She agreed that there were multiple options that could be employed to bring more light into the corridor as discussed by Vice Chair Hirsch.

Boardmember Chen thought the site planning was very smart and solved the parking issues. She had concerns regarding privacy but noted there was little they could do on the sides as it was very narrow and there were existing trees. Although she enjoyed the windows she was concerned about privacy considering how large the windows are in the bedrooms and how that might feel to residents.

Chair Thompson echoed that they may be able to offset the windows by mirroring the floor plans. That would provide a greater amount of privacy for the residents. The crystal white was too white, but the light grey was growing on her. She held the samples at angles to look for glare and noted that it wasn't a very bright day. Overall she thought she was okay with the approach and that white was acceptable while noting that she might be the only Boardmember with that opinion. If the tone goes too dark the contrast between the wood and the white might be muddied and she did not want to compromise that. The project is handsome and would be a nice addition to Alma. She wanted to keep the integrity of the design intent. The rear planter balconies are a nice depth, but the landscaping plan does not indicate the planting that will occur there. She encouraged screening planting in those planters for privacy. In the past the ARB has received planting plans for upper levels. She agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg about keeping it light between the buildings. The renderings show the fire shelves as see through, but they are not, and the plans should reflect that. If they were clear it would add light but would also add a maintenance consideration for bird poop and dust. The area between the buildings will be most successful if it's as bright as possible. Generally the massing was acceptable, and she appreciated how it was set back from Alma. Overall she could vote to approve the project as it meets the findings. She called for further ARB comment about whether the project could be approved or if it needed to return to subcommittee. She noted that she had heard conflicting opinions on material choice and ideas about privacy.

Boardmember Baltay was concerned about the privacy of the rear neighbors from the balconies at the back and was not satisfied with the current solution.

Chair Thompson noted that there were two privacy concerns, the windows and then the rear balconies.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought the solidness of the ledge between the buildings was unfortunate and suggested some grating to allow the weather and light through.

Chair Thompson suggested they continue talking about the lighting and noted the suggestion for grating and Boardmember Rosenberg's suggestion to use acrylic.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that she suggested a type of Cal Wall system or skylight or series of skylights within the solid structure to draw more light down.

Ms. Doung clarified that the overhangs between the buildings are made of a walkable glass. She appreciated the metal grating suggestion as it allowed for both Fire Department access and light.

Chair Thompson said that it had not been clear to the ARB that it was a walkable glass. She had understood it to be a solid material with a wood soffit.

Ms. Doung explained that was the case for the overhang at the parking court.

Chair Thompson restated that on the parking court they were solid but between the buildings was a walkable glass.

Ms. Doung confirmed that was correct.

Chair Thompson thanked her for the clarification and stated that she had no issues with the walkable glass.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the glass was proposed to be clear or obscured somehow.

Ms. Doung said it would be a laminated obscure glass.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought the bird poop would show.

Chair Thompson noted that it would rain.

Vice Chair Hirsch still preferred grating to glass. He recommended clearing the glass with the Fire Department as he was concerned it might be slippery.

Chair Thompson said she wanted to discuss Boardmember Baltay's concern about the rear decks.

Boardmember Baltay stated that as it was adjacent to an R1 property and if it were a single family home going through an Individual Review (IR) process the balcony would not be approved. The planting does not seem sufficient for privacy and even if it was initially he did not believe it would last over time. There have been increasing concerns in the city about privacy and they must consider protecting the privacy of people in R1. It is a mistake to accept anything less than what they would require for a single family home in the same location just because it was planned as an apartment building. He suggested a standard of anything below 5 feet being required to have an opacity or translucence of 75 to 85% in addition to the planter as designed. He personally viewed the dramatic and real privacy impact to the neighbor when he visited the project site. The preferred landscaping is against the fence and that is not possible with this project so they must do something else on the balconies to protect privacy.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if there was planting allowed at the back of the site.

Ms. Foley stated that the Utilities Department prohibits any landscaping that when mature would interfere with the utility lines.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked staff about the placement of the utility lines.

Ms. Foley explained there was a public utility easement, but she had not verified whether it was for above ground or underground reasons. Either case constrains screening landscaping.

Vice Chair Hirsch requested that staff clarify what was possible back there. He liked the balconies and if there were some ways to create privacy through planting he would support it. [break in audio/visual 59:15]

Ms. Foley stated that the survey confirmed there were overhead lines. There is a 5 foot utility easement and then an additional 5 feet until the lower floor starts. the upper balconies are about 15 feet from the property line and the third floor is set back further.

Chair Thompson noted that Sheet A1.02 showed 23 feet from the face of the glazing to the property line. The balcony is 6 feet plus a 1 foot 10 inch deep planter. There is a barrier of almost two feet between the edge and that sort of complies with the site plane. She pointed out things on the plans and explained them for Vice Chair Hirsch off microphone.

Ms. Gerhardt requested the sheet number.

Chair Thompson said it was Sheet A1.02.

Ms. Doung shared her screen and explained the distances of various points from the lot line. For privacy if they shrunk the balconies they could create a 5 foot high solid barrier. Boardmember Baltay had previously stated that would be an adequate height to prevent privacy issues. They could do the same thing with the third floor.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if lightweight screening counted in the daylight plane.

Chair Thompson asked if he meant a trellis.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated he did.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that trellises and fences both needed to be outside of the daylight plane. Only landscaping can penetrate the daylight plane.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought it was a shame that a lightweight structure for growing landscaping was not allowed.

Chair Thompson noted that the section was also in A3.05 of the drawing set. It also includes planting suggestions.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested that if the ARB could make the findings for a Design Enhancement Exception (DEE), but the item would have to be an architectural feature.

Boardmember Baltay was opposed to making the balconies any smaller. He was interested in providing privacy however that was possible. He could support a lightweight lattice structure projecting beyond the daylight plane a small amount.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed with the concept if the Building Department would approve it.

Boardmember Baltay said that if the planter was shifted back any further then they may as well not have the balcony.

Chair Thompson stated that she could also support the idea of a lattice.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed that some lattice to support planting would help privacy concerns.

Boardmember Chen also supported the idea of the lattice.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed.

Chair Thompson said the second privacy issue was raised by herself and Boardmember Chen about the windows on the second story. She directed the ARB to A1.02. She asked if Boardmember Chen had further ideas about offsetting the windows.

Boardmember Chen stated that it was up to the applicant to present more creative ideas, but it would be possible to offset the windows.

Ms. Doung suggested that they obscure the glazing on the lower portion of the window and keep the top portion clear. The view to the parking lot is not very strong, so providing some obscurity would help with privacy concerns.

Chair Thompson was not a big fan of obscuring windows and thought there was an alternative solution. She called for further ARB thoughts.

Boardmember Baltay did not think they would be able to offset the windows in an effective fashion. The angles are such that no matter how the windows are shifted the privacy impacts would be about the same. He asked if the windows were glazed floor to ceiling.

Chair Thompson asked the applicant to address the question.

Ms. Doung stated they were not glazed floor to ceiling and that there was a raised sill at 30 inches.

Boardmember Baltay thought it was awfully tight to get a high privacy standard between units with the parti. That is for the applicant to determine, and he did not feel comfortable regulating obscure glazing, which is a significant impact to the occupants. Further the rooms in question are bedrooms and will have some type of curtaining or shading. There is a real privacy impact, but he felt it should be left to the applicant to handle. He was most concerned about the privacy impact to the neighbors on adjoining properties.

Chair Thompson agreed and said she was prepared to let the issue go.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed that residents would have many choices on how to screen their privacy from the interior of the unit.

Chair Thompson indicated she wanted to hear thoughts about the updated stucco color. Several ARB members took a moment to take the material sample to the window.

Boardmember Baltay said the material was not very reflective, but it was white.

Chair Thompson said it was not reflective and did not her. She suggested the other Boardmembers take the material to the window.

Boardmember Chen stated she would attend the next meeting in person.

Chair Thompson said that the brightness did not bother her, and she had no issue with the material.

Boardmember Baltay thought that the applicant should tone down the side of the building so it would not be a 30 foot tall white wall on Alma.

Chair Thompson asked Boardmember Rosenberg to repeat her suggestion.

Boardmember Rosenberg explained that the colors could be left at the front, rear, and interior of the project with some toning down of the large side walls visible when driving down Alma. When the street is redeveloped there will be more tall buildings and this issue may not be viewed the same way. Currently it is an issue as it is the only tall building in the area and would therefore stand out. She loved the way the building looked from the front and would not ask for that to be changed.

Vice Chair Hirsch said there was a purity of the building and he agreed with Chair Thompson that the contrast was part of the purity. The building is a prototype of what they are likely to see in other areas along Alma. It may be nice to put more warmth into the stucco, but it would lessen the contrast. Therefore, he was okay with the stucco as shown.

Chair Thompson asked for Boardmember Chen's opinion on the side wall.

Boardmember Chen stated that it was hard to give an opinion without seeing the material board but tended to agree with Boardmember Rosenberg and suggested some plantings.

Chair Thompson I thought that the issue might be more about the massing on the side of the building and not the material. On Sheet A3.02 there are wood trellises that sort of break up the massing. She suggested this issue might require more thought and could be handled in subcommittee.

Vice Chair Hirsch was not interested in bringing the topic to subcommittee and thought the side of elevations were acceptable. The details on the side elevations work well with the overall structure.

Chair Thompson called for a Motion.

Boardmember Baltay asked staff if a DEE could be overseen through the subcommittee process.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that it could. Staff would draft the Findings and the Boardmembers would just need to agree that the enhancement was minor and that the Findings could be made.

Boardmember Baltay suggested they approve the project with a subcommittee to review the balcony. He further noted that he wanted to be on the subcommittee.

Chair Thompson asked him to make the Motion.

MOTION: Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to recommend approval of the project with the following two items remanded to subcommittee: 1) trellis or other device on the balconies that prevents more than 75% visible transmission to the height of 5 feet and would require a DEE, 2) modifications to the outside side edges of the building that are visible from Alma to modulate the overall brightness.

Chair Thompson called for any Amendments.

AMENDMENT #1: Vice Chair Hirsch stated he wanted to see a limit to the change in the perimeter of the building and suggested stucco patterning instead of planting.

Boardmember Baltay accepted the amendment.

Boardmember Rosenberg also accepted the amendment. She understood that the intent of the subcommittee was to allow the designer the opportunity to explore solutions and not that the ARB was trying to impose a solution.

Boardmember Baltay stated that the designer was asked to do something.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed with that intent.

AMENDMENT #1 ACCEPTED

Chair Thompson called for the vote.

VOTE: 5-0

Boardmember Baltay requested Chair Thompson appoint the subcommittee.

Chair Thompson asked who else would like to be on the subcommittee.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated her interest.

Chair Thompson named Boardmembers Baltay and Rosenberg to the subcommittee. She thanked the applicant and concluded the item.

ARB Break

3. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI JUDICIAL: 1310 Bryant Street (Castilleja School): Architectural Review Application Remanded by City Council for Review of Redesigned Academic Building, Alternative Parking Options with Associated Parking Adjustment Request, and Additional Tree Preservation Proposal. The ARB Previously Recommended Approval of the Architectural Review Application in Fall 2020 and Continued its December 2, 2021 Hearing to a Date Uncertain. Zone District: R1(10,000). Environmental Review: Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Published July 30, 2020; Draft EIR Published July 15, 2019

Chair Thompson introduced the item and called for disclosures.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he visited the site over the past weekend and spent approximately 2 hours walking around. He did not speak to anyone about project.

Vice Chair Hirsch disclosed that he visited the site on a school day at arrival time to watch the students arrive. He also spoke twice with Jeff Levitsky who called him to discuss the project.

Boardmember Rosenberg had no disclosures.

Boardmember Chen disclosed that she visited the site but did not speak with anyone.

Chair Thompson disclosed that she had also visited the site. She called for the staff report.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, shared her screen with the ARB and noted it was nice to have a full board of five members. The project was submitted for architectural review in April of 2019. The

Conditional Use Permit (CUP) was submitted years earlier. The architectural review application is the purview of the ARB. The current hearing is tailored to the Kellogg façade study which was the result of the December 2, 2021 ARB meeting. Staff will make its presentation and then take ARB questions. There will be an applicant presentation with time for ARB questions. There are several public speakers. Following that will be ARB discussion and a Motion on the Kellogg façade study. Staff has edited the Findings for Option E. Staff also has the Ad Hoc Subcommittee follow-up condition which could be modified given that they were previously reviewed by the full ARB in December. She recapped the City Council Motion from March 2021 and explained where they were in the process. City Council remanded several items to staff and the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) but some of these items are also in the ARB purview. In December 2021, the ARB noted its support of both Options D and E, with Option D having more than 50% of the required 104 spaces placed below grade. Staff did not support moving forward with Option D because of Council direction that no more than 50% of the required onsite parking be located below grade. Staff determined Option E met Council direction because of the 50% rule and because it saves Tree #155, which is a mature oak. Option E includes a 14.4% parking reduction but is acceptable as the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program addresses the loss of the 15 parking spaces. Option E eliminates the ramp to the trash and recycling area and has an adjustment of the pool toward Kellogg. With the Kellogg Façade Study she showed several comparative slides and noted the applicant would present additional information. In addition to the Kellogg façade the applicant made further modifications based on the ARB comments and she showed pictures of those adjustments. [break in audio/visual 1:44:06] ... below grade and 26 at the surface. Option E has 52 below grade spaces and 37 above grade spaces. From Alternative #4 to Option E there was an 11 parking space increase and a reduction in 26 spaces below grade. Vice Chair Hirsch had a concern about the note on the plan sheet regarding parking between 7:30 and 8:00 a.m. Per the applicant those spaces can be parked in prior to 7:30 and simply must remain in place until 8:00 a.m. She displayed the Option E parking lot and noted that Urban Forestry reviewed it and thought it would protect Tree #89, Tree #155, and improves the conditions for Tree #87. She showed a slide of the prior Ad Hoc review items which were brought forward in the plans reviewed by the ARB in December 2021. One item that was not addressed was the idea to add a transparent sound barrier at the Kellogg balcony. That may not be necessary or desirable per the Ad Hoc. Finally, staff made edits to Findings #1, #2B(2), and #4 in order to incorporate Option E.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that the Director wanted to speak considering there were two new Boardmembers on the ARB.

Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning & Development, wanted to give the new Boardmembers the opportunity to speak on the record about their review of the previous hearings on the item. If the new Boardmembers were unfamiliar with the project then they would need to have additional discussion before the hearing proceeded.

Chair Thompson followed Mr. Lait's advice and invited the new Boardmembers to speak.

Boardmember Rosenberg explained they received the packets relatively quickly and were made aware that they would be hearing the item shortly. They did their best to review all of the materials but of course did not have the full context and history that those on the ARB at the time had. She promised to participate with an open mind and to make a fair evaluation.

Boardmember Chen indicated she had reviewed the drawings and had two questions. She asked if she should ask those questions or hold them until later.

Chair Thompson stated she could ask the questions later and indicated that the Director wanted to know if they had a chance to review the past meetings.

Boardmember Chen stated she had watched the videos and generally understood what had occurred.

Mr. Lait stated that there was considerable history that they did not expect the new Boardmembers to fully grasp but it was important that they had viewed the prior ARB hearings especially because the City Council remanded the project to the ARB. He asked Ms. French to clarify how many meetings there had been on the item.

Ms. French said that the only hearing with the ARB was on December 2, 2021. There were multiple meetings with the PTC.

Mr. Lait asked if the two new Boardmembers had viewed the December 2, 2021 recording. If they had done that and reviewed the information in their packet the ARB could proceed.

Ms. French noted that the staff report included a link to the minutes of the December 2, 2021 meeting. If that is how they reviewed the proceedings it might suffice.

Chair Thompson understood that the ARB had a focused number of things to review. She asked Mr. Lait if they could move forward if they limited the conversation to those specific items.

Mr. Lait apologized that they had to discuss the matter during a hearing. To the extent that there is an understanding of the project based on the staff report they could participate in the conversation. If a Boardmember had not viewed the recording and familiarized themselves with the previous public testimony he would encourage them to abstain from voting on the matter.

Chair Thompson asked if he wanted to confirm if they had watched the December 2nd meeting.

Mr. Lait stated that was important so that the applicant, public, and staff would understand who would be voting on the item.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she had not watched the video and would abstain from voting. She has extensively reviewed the packet and paper documents and requested to know if it was a requirement to have watched the previous hearing in order to vote.

Chair Thompson indicated that she did not know.

Mr. Lait said that they could review the ARB rules and share them with the new Boardmembers. He apologized for having not done that in advance of the item. He suggested a 5 minute break in order to provide the information to the Boardmembers so that they might make their own decisions on voting.

Chair Thompson called for a five minute break

ARB Break

Ms. Gerhardt stated they had the ARB Procedural Rules as referenced by Mr. Lait. Each new Boardmember was also forwarded the document. New Boardmembers were installed in their positions the past Monday, so things have been moving quickly for them and the staff. She then read the ARB Procedural Rules about voting aloud for the record. In order to vote Boardmembers must have viewed or listened to the hearing as well as reviewed all the documents and staff did not make it clear that they needed to do that.

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Chen reviewed the video.

Boardmember Chen indicated she had not but had reviewed all the documents and public comments.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed she reviewed the packet and read the meeting minutes but did not watch the video. That prevents her from voting, but she was confident she was prepared to comment on the project.

Chair Thompson indicated that Boardmembers Chen and Rosenberg were welcome to stay and participate in the commentary.

Boardmember Baltay suggested that it was more proper to continue the item until they had a chance to review the video so the entire ARB could participate. Three days' notice did not allow time to watch the video.

Ms. Gerhardt appreciated the comment. There were several members of the public in attendance to speak. She suggested holding a portion of the hearing and continue the actual vote.

Chair Thompson agreed with the suggestion noting that she wanted to be respectful of the people who came to the hearing. She suggested hearing the project and making some comment.

Vice Chair Hirsch explained that there was a lot of history and context, and it was difficult to imagine that the new Boardmembers would be able to participate in depth on a variety of issues. He agreed that the new Boardmembers should not vote at the hearing without watching the video of past hearing.

Chair Thompson suggested they move forward and welcomed Boardmembers Rosenberg and Chen to give their thoughts. The ARB will hear from the applicant and public then make its comments before deciding if they are ready to make a Motion or continue the hearing. She called for the applicant's presentation and thanked everyone for their patience.

Nanci Kauffman, Head of Castilleja School, thanked everyone for their time and welcomed the new ARB members. She further thanked everyone for visiting the campus prior to the hearing. The plan and building design have benefited from the process and they were excited to present the current iteration to the ARB. There have been many iterations and compromises in the project since 2016 and are confident that the project benefits the school, the neighborhood, and the City of Palo Alto. The changes for consideration [break in audio/visual 2:06:27] ... past year. In response to guidance from City Council they provided an option for a smaller garage which preserves trees, moved deliveries from below grade to at grade, moved the location of the pool to preserve trees, reduced the square footage to under what is currently on the site, and made significant changes to the Kellogg façade to enhance the neighborhood and how the project fits in. The team from WRNS would offer more detail about the revisions and they look forward to additional feedback. She thanked Ms. French and stated that they were asking for an approval of either

Option D or E and approval of the modifications to the Kellogg façade. She introduced Adam Woltag to continue the presentation.

Adam Woltag, Design Partner with WRNS Studio, indicated that they would cover an overview of the site, touch on sustainability, discuss the evolution of the Kellogg design, and review the new design options. He showed an aerial view of the current campus versus the proposal and then an overlay plan showing the difference between the two. The new design maintains or improves the existing setbacks and reduces the size of the central circle. With respect to building height the current design falls within the requirements and is lower than the current condition. Option D reduces the below grade parking, loading deliveries and trash are located below grade and toward the center of campus, and is accessed by a driveway off of Emerson. Option E parks 52 spaces below grade and moves several spots above grade. It also relocates the pool in order to retain some trees and eliminates below grade service areas. He showed diagrams indicating where they planned to put public art including some spots along Kellogg. The public art is still under review, but they wanted to bring the placement to the attention of the ARB. The design of the project is deeply sustainable and supports the strategies utilized in the City's carbon and gas reduction goals. The interior of the building also features sustainable design and systems. All floors will have natural light through the use of skylights, clear stories, and window walls. Kellogg Street has the longest building elevation and has been redesigned for the better thanks to the comments of the ARB. He displayed several slides showing the evolution of the façade. The City Council and the ARB requested they revisit the Kellogg façade especially related to massing, roof types, and eave lines. He provided a rendering of the current design which took those comments into consideration. The roof of the middle school was lowered by three feet. [Break in audio/visual 2:13:54] ... pitched roof. They revisited the elevations of middle school and the science portion of the building to be more residential in scale. He showed a second view from grade of the Kellogg façade. They incorporated a gabled roofline and stayed within the height limits which gives a lower eave line along Kellogg. The high school entry has a new and more protected entry which breaks the two-story massing of the project. A roof plan comparison was shown highlighting the breaks in massing. The massing is broken into three distinct areas along the Kellogg Street elevation. He showed a drawing comparing the proposal to the current building height and explained the revised height of the middle school has been lowered by almost six feet. Slides demonstrating the evolution of the Kellogg Street façade, the Kellogg façade without landscaping, and the Kellogg Façade with landscaping were shown. Finally, he showed a video of a rendering of what it would look like to walk around the project.

Chair Thompson indicated that Mr. Woltag was over his 10 minutes. She asked how long the video was.

Mr. Woltag indicated it was 1 minute 20 seconds long.

Chair Thompson requested he play the video.

Mr. Woltag showed the video and explained what the ARB was looking at. He thanked the ARB for the extra time to show the video.

Chair Thompson called for the public comment.

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, indicated there were several in person and online members of the public that wished to speak.

Neva Yarkin explained that she lived within 600 feet of Castilleja School and that her family owned the property since 1963. The family has no affiliation with the school aside from living near it. She was opposed to adding additional students due to concerns about traffic and congestion as 75% of the students came from outside of the City of Palo Alto. The underground garage would only add to traffic congestion as she did not believe it was feasible for parents to drop off students in the garage. She was also concerned about the garage's effect on the bike lane and future projects with the Caltrain crossing and increased enrollment at Palo Alto High School or Stanford. She suggested that Castilleja School split its campus like other private schools if they want to expand further.

Hank Sousa stated he lived two houses away from Castilleja School. There is no compelling reason to start an excavation that would require 3,500 large dump trucks of dirt to be removed from the site for the proposed garage and then have a large number of trucks lay CO2 emitting concrete into the hole. He noted the current number of parking spaces on campus and on Bryant, Kellogg, and Emerson. The parking situation has been a longstanding gentlemen's agreement between the school and the neighborhood but moving the pool and modifying the building takes up much of the surface parking and creates a problem that did not otherwise exist. He suggested the school keep its existing lots and street parking, the swimming pool remains, the school makes modifications to its building plan and increases the shuttling program. That would save 18 months of construction on the unhealthy garage.

Andie Reed said that she lived on Melville by Castilleja. The ARB is being asked to approve Findings which are subjective in nature and are at odds with the neighbor's wishes. Finding #2D cannot be made as the large building along Kellogg is too large for the site. She cited the November 2021 Gross Floor Area Study published by Dudek and stated that existing above grade square footage exceeds what is allowed by code. She alleged that the PTC's consideration of the variance was based on inaccurate information. The gym is very tall and should be counted three times. She read a section of the code which stated that when unallowable area is demolished it could not be rebuilt. She asked the ARB to investigate the variance being requested in square feet and noted the answer was not in the staff report. Planning staff should be instructed to provide them with the number of square feet in excess of allowable being requested. Variances are supposed to be granted to overcome special constraints that others in the zone do not suffer or that without exception would create a hardship. That is not the case with Castilleja. Castilleja chooses to move the swimming pool to accommodate the 77,400 sf building taking away their onsite surface parking. She suggested that they redevelop within their circle so as to not impact the neighbors. Both parking schemes being considered do not increase the parking spaces at the school from the current condition. Until 27 years ago Castilleja was a boarding school. It is now a commuter school with 75% of students coming from outside of Palo Alto. If enrollment was reduced and the new building was proposed within code and maintained the character of the neighborhood the project would be complete already.

Lorraine Brown stated that she was astonished and appalled that Director Lait waited until the current hearing to advise the new Boardmembers to watch the previous hearing. She voiced certainty that the Boardmembers would have watched the hearing had they been advised to do so and was disappointed in the situation. She explained she was a longtime resident that cared deeply about the future of the community and appreciated the attention given to the proposal. She also appreciated that Castilleja had been responsive and creative in its responses throughout the process. The ARB has already voted in support of the project and clearly sees the value to the neighborhood and community. The current update

specifically addresses the ARB's suggestions. The Kellogg façade has been transformed and the video shown did a great job of showing the improvements. The new learning spaces which are confirmed to be smaller than the current building offer more educational opportunities for young women without increasing above ground square footage or daily car trips. The project fulfills the ARB's mission to enhance the visual character of the City, to promote investments in the City, and to increase desirability in the surrounding area. Approval of the project will fulfill an important goal that everyone should care about, which is allowing Castilleja to continue to educate a more diverse set of young women for leadership. The December changes presented kept the school's promise to replace and not increase above ground square footage. The plans regarding the pool and deliveries give the ARB several options which will improve the neighborhood. Each garage option has its own merits but neither increases the number of cars onsite as daily trips are capped. The Kellogg façade has been revised according to ARB input and the school has delivered on innumerable promises to the neighborhood, City staff, and City leaders. She strongly supported the project and requested the ARB approve the project.

Rob Levitsky indicated that Ms. Brown failed to disclose she previously worked for Castilleja. The proposed project comes with large impacts to neighbors, trees, and groundwater. The December meeting featured Scheme E, a design that protected several oak and Redwood trees, and it took neighbors 5 1/2 years to get that commitment. He was stunned that Castilleja was now presenting Scheme D, which does not protect those trees. At the December 2nd hearing Boardmember Baltay asked about the increase in the size of the school and Chief Planning Official French failed to provide the numbers. It is a net of 28,000 sf more and is not compliant with allowable lot coverage. At a prior hearing Boardmember Baltay voted correctly to deny the project. On December 2nd Vice Chair Hirsch questioned the large number of classrooms underground. He indicated concern about light and air quality and asked what type of school would build classrooms underground. He then provided an example of a school in New Mexico which was built to be essentially a bomb shelter during the Cuban missile crisis. He was further concerned that the pool was shown at 25 feet below grade and that with concrete it might be 30 feet below grade. At the December 2nd hearing Chief Planning Official French indicated the pool would not be in the groundwater following questions from the public, but she is not an expert and is wrong. Millions of gallons will likely be dewatered just like what occurred with the gym built in 2005. Finally, Vice Chair Hirsch had noted that the design was flawed and could not operate as both a parking lot and drop off location. The underground garage also requires a permanent encroachment to the Public Utility Easement (PUE) which could cause significant issues. Water Gas Wastewater was not in favor of the easement and Mike Sartor, who previously ran the Utility Department, did not remember that type of encroachment being allowed. The project is still not ready to be approved.

Priya Chandrasekar thanked the ARB for its time and indicated she wanted to lead the ARB through the timeline related to the square footage of the project. The school is committed to keeping the above ground square footage of the new spaces at the same level of the buildings they are replacing. In the fall of 2020 the ARB requested the massing be reduced and Castilleja complied. In Spring 2021 the Council requested the design be reduced by 4,370 square feet, which would bring the project into compliance with historic permits. Council also instructed the ARB to rereview the massing. Independent consultants have proven the number incorrect, and an audit showed the square footage only needed to be reduced by less than 2,000 square feet to meet the historic permits. The current proposal is in compliance with the historic permits and the Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC). Some are attempting to delay the project

further by considering the part of the building which was built in 2006 and is not part of this project. She suggested the ARB focus on how the proposed buildings were smaller than the current ones slated to be replaced. The project has been vetted, the facts have been confirmed by independent consultants, the ARB has everything before it, Castilleja has compromised, and the new academic buildings are further from the street, shorter, and have less square footage. The combination of those elements is a huge win for the neighborhood. She noted that the ARB had previously approved the project and thought it was time to approve it and allow the school to begin building.

Mary Sylvester stated she lives about a half a block from Castilleja School and has for 43 years. She was a supporter of the school and its efforts until the new plans were filed in 2016. Castilleja's project is an expansion project that is 50,000 sf over what is allowed by the PAMC and what the consultant found the true square footage to be. Second, the proposed swimming pool is now in the groundwater range. Third only Option D allows for the protection of Oak #89. Fourth, the new Kellogg plan is a Costco sized facility. Fifth, the underground garage flies in the face of the City's sustainability goals by encouraging people to drive and construction itself would cause pollution. The project is not in the best interest of the community as it threatens fragile natural resources and up zones a residential neighborhood. Such overriding considerations should only be made for a project that serves the public interest such as mixed use housing. Castilleja is an excellent site for mixed-use housing. Castilleja's consultant found that the school was proposing to build 128,000 feet while code only allows 81,000 feet. In conclusion, only Option D preserves protected Oak Tree #89. She wanted to hear whether or not the Urban Forester felt that his recommendations had been followed and if he approved of Castilleja's new protection plan.

Chair Thompson indicated that Ms. Sylvester was out of time.

Rodger McCarthy thanked the ARB for its service. He urged them to approve the project quickly and expeditiously. The plans have now undergone multiple years of revision and he bemoaned the loss of educational opportunities for young women in the meantime. Every indication is that young women lost out on several educational opportunities most specifically in the Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields. He noted they were arguing over trees and parking lots while ignoring these missed educational opportunities. The Not In My Backyard (NIMBY) delay has become unjust to the young women whose only sin is they have no vote. He explained that he lives about a mile from the school, but never enrolled a student there. He has no connection with Castilleja past or present and has never even been in the building. His interest is solely related to education, and he explained that he is an officer and treasurer of the National Academy Of Engineering, a governing board member of the National Research Council, and a director of the National Academies Corporation. Studies have shown that young women can develop their leadership skills faster and more effectively in an all-girls environment. Women who attend same sex schools go into the STEM fields at a higher rate. There is a national problem related to women in STEM fields that could not be solved by Palo Alto alone, but Palo Alto could do its part if it stopped arguing over relatively small things and started looking the big picture. Further, R1 neighborhoods are exclusionary zoning and were invented in Berkeley to achieve racial segregation. He urged the ARB to approve the long delayed but worthwhile project and thanked them for their time.

Julia Ishiyama indicated that as previously stated to the ARB she is a lifelong Palo Altoan, a beneficiary of the City's excellent public and private schools including Castilleja, a volunteer, a frequent driver, bicyclist, and pedestrian, and a current homeowner in Old Palo Alto. She is grounded in Palo Alto's past and deeply

invested in its future. She urged the ARB to review Castilleja's plans guided by their purpose and read from the ARB's Bylaws. Castilleja's plan meets that purpose. The latest design is in direct response to ARB comments from December 2021. The building is beautiful and meets the aesthetic of the surrounding residences. The project team has worked closely with neighbors and solicited feedback that has been directly integrated into the designs. Proposed changes include an increased setback, alterations to the rooflines, eaves, and pitches of the roofs, window designs along Kellogg that reflect residential design, and a smaller building than the existing state. The underground parking garage further improves neighborhood aesthetics, and she preferred the option that maximized underground parking. Increasing the underground parking would not increase driving but would positively impact aesthetics and preserve trees. Further, the ARB should consider the long term positive impact of the project on the community. The ARB is also supposed to enhance the desirability of residence or investment in the City. Palo Alto is a great place to live in large part due to its schools. Castilleja's purpose to provide young women with an excellent education in an all-girls environment makes it an asset to the community. She strongly urged the ARB to approve the project and explained she was nervous about a future where attempts to modernize are tied up for literal years. She appreciated the City's diligence but stated it was time to move forward.

Jeff Levinsky said he hoped that staff and the ARB could clear up some questions he had on the current plans. First, he inquired about the location of the underground equipment by the pool and any noise which it might create. The pool is to have bleachers which would face the neighborhood, not the school. The plans, the findings, and everything the public has been told should agree and that is currently not the case. Second, he inquired about the basement under the building on Kellogg and whether it was exempt from Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Page G.04 states the basement is 46,635 sf and the next page indicates the floor above it is 33,851, which does not make sense. The part of the basement that is not under the building should count toward floor area. The City claims that the basement under "uncovered porches and decks" are exempt from floor area as they are under the building envelope, but the law says building footprint. [Break in audio/visual 2:51:24] If the equipment near the pool and with the basement are considered floor area then the project is expanding. He asked the ARB to inquire about these questions and ensure that they have accurate information.

Cindy Chen indicated she is a neighbor of Castilleja on Emerson and supported the proposal. She has spoken to the ARB twice previously on behalf of the school and wants the plans to be moved forward for the neighborhood, the City, and the school. The school has been incredibly responsive to feedback and made extensive changes to the Bryant side of the project and the Kellogg façade. Castilleja also compromised on the garage, pool, and location of deliveries. They have made additional changes to the roof and eaves on Kellogg. The willingness to respond to guidance and offer multiple options prove the school is willing to compromise. She asked the ARB to note Castilleja's commitment to the trees of Palo Alto and stated that all changes before the ARB further preserved trees. The planting plan also adds 100 new trees to the block. Of all the parking options presented she is one of the many neighbors that supports the garage, specifically the plan that maximizes the number of spaces underground. Moving at least half of the parking underground should be the ARBs priority to "promote visual environments of high aesthetic quality." Castilleja reduced the square footage in the new buildings to be in line with previously permitted square footage. With the massing changes and updates to the Kellogg façade the building is a gift to the neighborhood. She thanked the ARB for its leadership and their time.

Ms. Klicheva indicated that concluded the public comment.

Chair Thompson advised the applicant that they had 10 minutes to respond to the public comment.

Mindie Romanowsky, Land Use Counsel for Castilleja School, thanked the ARB for its feedback throughout the years and especially the feedback provided following the Council's vote in March of 2021. She recognized the new Boardmembers and thanked them for the time they had taken to get up to speed. It was unfortunate they were not told to watch the video of the recent meeting but assumed that would happen shortly. She further suggested that if the ARB needed to continue the hearing that all they continue is the vote. There are many interested parties present at the hearing and the new Boardmembers could ask questions. If the hearing were continued they hoped it would be to a date certain in short order and preferably prior to the planned PTC hearing date on March 30th. They welcomed further ARB feedback on the options presented but respectfully, the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) regarding enrollment and trips and the variance with regard to square footage are in the purview of the PTC and City Council. They are awaiting the ARBs thoughts on the Kellogg Revision Study, parking options, trees, and other things under their purview. The Kellogg Revision Study responds to ARB and neighborhood feedback. Neighbors across the street from the Kellogg façade support the changes. Legally the architectural plan included in the staff report is supported by many findings as outlined in the report. With parking staff recommended Parking Option E but the applicant still believed that parking more cars underground would be a better neighborhood condition. For the new Boardmembers understanding of the history of the project the underground garage was originally in response to neighborhood feedback. The applicant understands that the City Council wants only 50% parking below grade and so they will move forward with Option E if chosen. The utility easement issue is not in the purview of the ARB, but they are not changing the width of the easement. Public Works has reviewed the plan and the tunnel under the easement and have agreed with the proposal. The pool equipment is less than 50% covered, uninhabitable, and will be screened. It is not a room and will only contain pool equipment. Finally, the project has iterated numerous times over the past five years. The current plan is a product of neighborhood feedback, the school's goals, staff, the ARB, the PTC, and City Council feedback. The garage has been reduced by 50%, each façade has changed over time, and is supported by Urban Forestry. Urban Forestry is particularly in favor of Option E which protects Tree #89 and saves Tree #55. The applicant believes that the project meets the direction of City Council and the ARB and urged the ARB to recommend approval.

Chair Thompson called for ARB questions of staff or the applicant.

Boardmember Baltay asked if Parking Options D & E had a difference in impact to the redwood trees to the west of the parking area.

Ms. French stated that the Urban Forrester was in attendance and available to the ARB. Additionally, the environmental consultant was available as well. Staff evaluated that Option E had the farthest distance from the garage walls to the trees and no more than 50% of the required parking in the garage. Staff has focused on the direction given by Council. The soil nail wall method of construction would be employed no matter which option is selected to ensure the soil around the trees was maintained during the excavation.

Boardmember Baltay asked if Parking Option D was outside of the drip line of the Redwood trees.

Ms. French said that was her understanding.

Ms. Romanowsky indicated that it was as the option was designed with that in mind. They also had a member of the architectural team available to provide further clarification.

Boardmember Baltay asked about the difference between Schemes E & D with regard to the pool location. Specifically, he wanted to know the distance between the pool and Tree #89 in each scheme. In both plans a large amount of bicycle parking will be placed below Tree #89 with four additional vehicle parking spaces in Scheme E. He asked if that was correct.

Mr. Woltag indicated that they were looking at the dimensions and would provide them in a moment.

Boardmember Baltay stated those were his only questions.

Chair Thompson stated they would return to Mr. Woltag for the answer. She called for further questions of the applicant from Boardmembers.

Boardmember Chen noted that the site plan showed the exit on Emmerson would have an alert system and inquired how that would work. Second, she asked if there was a study or an approximate number of vehicles that would go through the garage during drop off/pick up.

Ms. French explained that the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Project Alternative #4 contained a percentage breakdown of the morning drop off trips which occurred before the PTC recommendation that there be no new net trips. Staff will determine the number for Boardmember Chen.

Chair Thompson indicated that there were two questions they would revisit. The updated Kellogg façade shows photovoltaics (PV) on both sides of the pitched roof and asked if that had been analyzed for efficacy.

Mr. Woltag stated it was analyzed for efficacy and the PV should maintain the production goals to have the campus be net zero. They are necessary on both sides of the pitch.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked who provided the analysis.

Mr. Woltag explained they had an electrical engineer on the project as a consultant that did all of the energy modeling.

Chair Thompson asked about the measurement from the pool to the tree.

Mr. Woltag said they were still measuring and would provide it momentarily.

Chair Thompson called for further questions.

Boardmember Baltay said that he observed the distance from drip line of Tree #89 in the direction of the pool to be approximately 30 feet. In any of the designs it will overhang the pool a bit.

Ms. Kauffman inquired about the bike rack question so that they could answer it.

Boardmember Baltay said Sheet GSD.1 shows space for a single row of bicycle racks, Scheme E shows more bicycle and car parking in the same space. He asked if he was interpreting the drawings appropriately.

Ms. Kauffman asked if Mr. Woltag was able to answer the question.

Mr. Woltag asked for a moment to review the information.

Chair Thompson said it looked as though it was as described by Boardmember Baltay.

Boardmember Baltay stated he was just looking for a clarification as he compared D and E.

Mr. Woltag confirmed that Boardmember Baltay had a correct understanding and that it was bicycle parking.

Boardmember Baltay said that he still wanted to know the distance from the pool to the tree.

Kathy Layendecker, Associate Head of School Castilleja, pointed out that the parking around the tree was an existing condition.

Boardmember Baltay said it was currently paved.

Ms. Layendecker agreed. Currently there is more parking there than either proposal.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if it was structurally possible to dig the pool without affecting the tree.

Ms. French noted that Urban Forester Peter Gollinger had his hand raised.

Chair Thompson indicated that she was unable to see raised hands on Zoom and needed staff to assist her when there was one. She acknowledged Mr. Gollinger.

Peter Gollinger, Acting Urban Forester, indicated he did not have the exact numbers regarding the distance between the pool and the tree. The excavation of the pool in Scheme D was within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of Tree #89 and Scheme E moved it outside of the TPZ. [break in audio/visual 3:13:40] The zone can be adjusted based on what is known about the tree roots but in this situation they do not know where the roots are. Scheme E moved Tree #89 outside of the TPZ and that is why it is the preferred option.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that normally very deep holes had to be supported quite a distance away and asked if it had the potential to exceed some of the requirements.

Mr. Gollinger indicated they would have to look at the measures planned to be used to shore up the hole. The applicant decided to use the nail wall for the garage in order to disturb as little soil around the redwoods as possible. He was unsure whether the detailed excavation plans for the pool were included in the packet but indicated they would be reviewed during the next phase of the project.

Boardmember Baltay asked about the dimension of the PTZ for Tree #89.

Mr. Gollinger apologized and asked for a moment to look that up.

Boardmember Baltay referenced Drawing AB.808 proposed a concrete structure below grade with a nail tie back system underneath the PTZ. The PTC recently received the drawing and he asked if Mr. Gollinger had reviewed it.

Mr. Gollinger stated he had not seen it unless it was part of a previous review.

Boardmember Baltay asked if it was plausible to excavate further under a tree if they were below the PTZ.

Mr. Gollinger said it was theoretically possible to go under the PZT but did not know what was discussed in that portion of the design plan. The majority of tree roots are within the top five to six feet.

Boardmember Baltay said that he had asked the question every way he could think of and wanted to know how far the tree was from the pool in Schemes E and D.

Mr. Woltag indicated that the difference between Schemes E and D was 10 feet. Scheme D is 10 feet closer to the tree than Scheme E. In Scheme D the distance is approximately 27 feet between the pool and tree. In Scheme E it is 37 feet.

Boardmember Baltay thanked Mr. Woltag for the clarification.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed they were looking at Sheet AB.808.

Chair Thompson agreed that Boardmember Rosenberg was correct. Page GSE.5 contains the acoustic fence and she asked to confirm that the fence was located on Emmerson. The staff report indicated Kellogg, but that appeared to be an error.

Mr. Woltag agreed that Chair Thompson was correct, and the acoustic fence was along Emerson and not Kellogg.

Ms. French stated it was along Emerson and screened the Kellogg parking lot and that she may have misstated that during the staff report.

Chair Thompson confirmed that it was the parking lot on the corner of Emerson and Kellogg.

Ms. French said that was correct. The fence goes along Emmerson with some breaks and also screens the parking lot.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked why it was necessary for the pool to be so deep from grade.

Mr. Woltag explained the pool was located below grade to address acoustic concerns.

Vice Chair Hirsch confirmed that 25 feet was the optimum dimension.

Mr. Woltag stated that the deck was 15 feet and that was where spectators would be located. The depth of the pool is 25 feet. The majority of the section is 15 feet below grade.

Ms. Kauffman added that the pool was deeper to accommodate water polo.

Chair Thompson called for further questions of the staff or applicant. She called for ARB discussion and noted each Boardmember needed to address the items they were asked to review.

Vice Chair Hirsch requested a break.

Chair Thompson called for a five minute break.

ARB Break

Chair Thompson thanked everyone and resumed the meeting. She noted that Boardmember Chen had inquired about the alert system and asked if there was an answer.

Ms. Romanowsky indicated she had learned from their garage architect that the alarm would be both visual and audio.

Ms. Kauffman explained her understanding was that alert system was per the request of City staff.

Chair Thompson said that Boardmember Chen had noticed it in the report.

Ms. Romanowsky did not remember the impetus to the alarm system. They think it is safer but were sensitive to having it alarm in a way that is sensitive to neighbors. Currently it is both visual and an audio alarm.

Chair Thompson called for further questions.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired about the light and ventilation in the basement. She stated concern with the habitability of the basement based on her review of the plans.

Mr. Woltag asked if she was speaking about the classroom building.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that was correct.

Mr. Woltag explained extensive study and design went into making the lower level feel as welcoming and full of light as the other floors. They previously showed a cross section of another project that illustrated how light would enter the lower level. There are also drawings which explain the strategy. There are skylights which bring daylight into the classrooms on the lower level. There are also clear story windows in the non-classroom spaces of the lower level. There have been many design measures taken to bring daylight to the entire project. They also located parts of the program that would benefit from sound and light isolation in the lower level. There are also mechanical and other types of spaces in the lower level. All of that was considered from the very beginning of the project.

Ms. Layendecker added that examples of classrooms to be located in the lower level were things like choir and orchestra rooms for sound attenuation.

Vice Chair Hirsch understood that there would be glass in the stairwells and asked if the classrooms would contain glass to bring light in.

Mr. Woltag said that was exactly what they were doing.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if the details were in the drawings.

Mr. Woltag shared his screen with the ARB and indicated the drawings were from a previous ARB submittal. He then thoroughly explained the lighting concept and showed several slides including the roof plan showing the skylights and the windows to the classrooms.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked specific questions on the location of the slides.

Mr. Woltag pointed out sections on the slide and confirmed that Vice Chair Hirsch understood what he meant.

Chair Thompson thanked Mr. Woltag and called for further questions.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked a follow-up question regarding the ventilation in the basement.

Mr. Woltag said that the skylights were not operable for ventilation purposes. The lower level will have mechanical ventilation.

Chair Thompson called for Vice Chair Hirsch's thoughts.

Vice Chair Hirsch said the intent of the garage was for teachers and staff to park out of sight as a relief to the neighborhood and as part of the TDM solution. He preferred Option D so long as every tree root remains unhampered. He hoped it would not be necessary to park cars above on the playing field. Drop off/pickup in the garage is more of a concern because it is an undesirable environment, which is Finding #2. It was too far from the classrooms, contained dangerous elements, and would be seen by parents as an inconvenience. The exit to Emerson was noted in the study to be a potential traffic issue. He did not find it reasonable for the students to be underground and have to traverse a staircase 20 feet to grade. He further questioned that cars would be parked in place before the drop off rush began. The garage would be much more useful if it was exclusively for the use of staff. [Break in audio/visual 3:43:30] if the staff parks in the garage then the rest of the campus perimeter can be used for close, safe sidewalk drop offs. The perimeter can be flanked with signage indicating that it is for the exclusive use of the school as it is done elsewhere all over the country. With respect to trees, Tree #55 in the courtyard (#155?) ... any large school facility needs a large surface component, and he thought this one was cleverly located below grade under Tree #155. It was a shame no solution had been offered. It was not reasonable to approve the project without a solution presented to the ARB. The architects are clever and can figure it out below grade, but the ARB must see the design. The timeline for construction was not noted as a matter for the current hearing but no project ever finishes on time so he did not believe this project in all of its complexity would be completed on time. Accordingly he recommended relocating the school during construction and noted that the ARB had agreed on that during prior hearings. The item he was most concerned about was natural light and airflow and although they have reviewed the drawings he did not believe they had seen them before the hearing, and they had not been discussed. He did not believe the applicant had answered the issue. Three classrooms have windows on the Kellogg Street façade, and he wanted to know why it wasn't possible to dig lightwells into the perimeter the façade to allow for natural light and real air into the classrooms. Ventilating windows are a big point for him that he notes even on office projects. The light and ventilation problem has not been solved and needs to be resolved. He questioned the findings that the light would penetrate to the cellar. There are 23 classrooms out of the total of 58 located in the cellar. That's 30% of the classrooms below grade. He would be able to accept the project if they added lightwells along the perimeter of the building but could not accept the present scheme. He questioned if parents would approve of this idea if they really understood it and suggested that they might be outraged. With minor exceptions he overwhelmingly preferred the original scheme to the revised Kellogg façade. He pointed out wall sections AB801 and AB802 and noted what he appreciated about it. The façade is extremely long, but there were two natural breaks that could be convenient entries and ought to be transparent like the one on Bryant Street. The community wanted the project scaled back and the height reduced but that was an inappropriate idea as the building was one building that looked like a school building and should remain a school building. Kellogg Street is lined with trees and that is what the neighborhood will see. The trees will break up the façade. the Council was correct that it was very long

Page 24 of 35

Architectural Review Board Meeting
Summary Minutes: 3/17/22

and therefore he encouraged glass entries but no changes to the rest of the façade which was a nice consistent piece of architecture. He felt it was scaled beautifully as well and encouraged the applicant to not accept the pressure from outside and to develop the building they first designed. The Kellogg revision is not better, and he hated to see the applicant give up on the original idea. He could not vote for the building elevation as shown or submit the drawings to the Council.

Boardmember Baltay thanked the staff and the applicant for working so hard on the Kellogg façade. The elevation is much closer to what he had always envisioned and was more compatible with the neighborhood. He was comfortable recommending to Council that the elevation on Kellogg was appropriate, suitable, and compatible with the context, and a beautiful work of architecture. Parking Option E meets all the requirements, and it is wonderful that the pool was shifted to preserve more trees. He strongly recommended supporting those items to the Council and Director but wanted to push for the larger underground garage. Scheme D allows for 30% more underground parking which would be valuable in the long run for the neighborhood and community. He quickly listed several reasons why he preferred D to E and noted that Palo Alto would need the underground parking eventually. Moving cars underground leaves more room for bicyclists and neighborhood parking. Lastly, the garage is a multifunctional space, not just a garage. It's a drop off zone and therefore it may be reasonable to allow for a larger garage. The comments are just made for Council's consideration. The shift of the swimming pool proposed in Scheme E is essential and the only way to save Tree #89. If that were combined with Scheme D then the extra parking under the tree would not be required and the loading zone could be reconfigured to work better. Currently, as Vice Chair Hirsch mentioned they did not know how the loading zone would work. It was not preferable to park four cars so closely to the bicycle parking. For all those reasons a larger underground garage makes more sense. He advised the ARB to strongly endorse the Kellogg façade and Parking Option E but let the Council know that Option D parking is the preferred solution, and the ARB suggests a hybrid of Options D and E.

Boardmember Rosenberg repeated that she was not able to cast a vote at the hearing but would like to provide her thoughts. She indicated that she would be repeating some of the thoughts brought up by other Boardmembers. They should take advantage of the option of creating a larger underground garage [break in audio/visual 3:58:18] ... Having a larger parking garage be for staff and people at the school for longer amounts of time. Shifting the pool to save Tree #89 is wise and she agreed that parking next to the bike racks seemed inappropriate. The ground level should be utilized for drop off/pickup and bicyclists as a safe zone for students. The environmental impact related to the two garages are similar therefore the larger garage is preferable. She still had concerns regarding ventilation and egress in the basement zones. She appreciated the lighting plan that was discussed and stated that was not so much of a concern to her as ventilation and fire egress. The Kellogg façade is beautiful but mostly liked the previous design with the exception of the corner of Kellogg and Emerson. A nice compromise would be some combination of the two designs.

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Rosenberg had meant Kellogg and Bryant.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that was what she had meant.

Boardmember Chen stated the project had many design challenges to solve and felt that the project team had done a good job solving the problems. With respect to the garage she supported staff recommended

Parking Option E as it preserved the most trees. She did agree with the other Boardmembers that a larger underground garage with more parking was a better solution since the environmental impact of the two garages would be about the same. She noted that a larger garage would also be helpful for event parking and would relieve street parking issues. The applicant needed to be careful about who used the garage system and what would trigger the alarm. No matter if it was audio or visual or both the project should minimize the impact neighbors. The Kellogg elevation is now generally compatible with the neighborhood and has been improved over past iterations. She agreed with Vice Chair Hirsch that if it was possible it was always preferable to have more natural light and lightwells could be the solution. She also requested more natural ventilation if possible.

Chair Thompson thanked the applicant, the members of the public, and the new Boardmembers. With parking she appreciated Option E for the location of the pool and preserving Tree #89. She agreed and thought it should be clear to Council that as architects they were familiar with the impacts of underground parking and are aware that in terms of the EIR the difference between Options D and E is “a wash.” Therefore, she supported the garage part of Option D because of size and might recommend a hybrid solution like Boardmember Baltay suggested. The pool location and tree preservation of Option E is retained, but the size of the parking garage in Option D. she thought that made the most sense and was mentioned by several Boardmembers. She pointed out that on Sheet AB101 between gridlines 9 and 11.5 and between gridlines 6 and 7 along Kellogg there were walkable skylights, and those were in the plans previously. She supported more skylights if that was an option and appreciated the clearstory parts of the Kellogg façade. Last time they spoke she was adamant that the Kellogg façade not change because she appreciated the parti of the last iteration. Her initial thoughts on the Kellogg Revision Study with the pitched roof in the middle were that it compromised the design integrity of the building. The walkthrough video helped because the trellis part in Section 2 does great things with light. She further appreciated the extension of the planter on the second floor. There are things in the revision that she is growing to like and thought a shed roof might be more interesting but noted that might change things on the interior too much. The strongest thing in the revision is the trellis piece with the play of light, the extension of the planter, and the punched openings in the shingles are different and add visual interest. She suggested the ARB summarize what they had heard and then continue the hearing to a date certain so they could all vote. Otherwise they could summarize and do a straw poll.

Boardmember Baltay noted that if the old Boardmembers could agree it would be irrelevant how the new Boardmembers would vote, and they could move the project forward. The project has waited long enough so if it was possible to move it forward they should. The question was if Vice Chair Hirsch could support the Kellogg elevation.

Vice Chair Hirsch felt extremely strongly about the elevation and thought it was dangerous to look at it from Boardmember Baltay’s viewpoint and argued how he thought it would look from the street.

Chair Thompson requested that the architect display the street view.

Vice Chair Hirsch wanted to see a street view from the perspective of the street.

Chair Thompson thought there had been one in the presentation and directed the applicant to the elevation.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that it was solid looking and had lost the wonderful glass that was present in the other iterations. He could not accept the upper windows being small.

Chair Thompson explained that Vice Chair Hirsch was talking about the corner of Kellogg and Bryant.

Vice Chair Hirsch requested they show the sectional views at the end of the set and noted that with the pitched roof the classroom only had 8 foot ceilings, which is not standard for classrooms. The reason for that is because of the mechanicals and the sloped roof. Sometimes you have to look at the inside of the building to know why the outside does not work. An 8 foot ceiling in a classroom is too low.

Chair Thompson stated that Vice Chair Hirsch was concerned about Section 3.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated that was correct and that he wanted them to return to the first proposal. AB805 shows the center wall with the big windows. AB803 shows how the detail would work to the outside.

Chair Thompson paused the meeting and asked whoever was speaking to mute their microphone. She suggested they speak about Section 3 of the Kellogg façade and indicated that Vice Chair Hirsch suggested they revert to the December plan, which she could support.

Boardmember Baltay stated he would support that if it delivered Vice Chair Hirsch's vote.

Vice Chair Hirsch disliked the little windows.

Boardmember Baltay said it was in a residential neighborhood.

Vice Chair Hirsch argued that the larger windows would be blocked by trees and the neighbors would not see them.

Chair Thompson asked them to discuss Section 3.

Boardmember Baltay said he could support that compromise change.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if everyone accepted Section 1 since it had not changed.

Chair Thompson said that they were going backwards.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that people preferred the previous design for Section 3.

Boardmember Baltay noted that Vice Chair Hirsch preferred the original design.

Chair Thompson indicated that she supported the change. Everyone wants more natural light.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that her only comment was that if they were going to have a reduced height somewhere the corner was the best place to do it. She hesitated for the corner to be the tallest and the middle to be lower.

Boardmember Baltay noted that those were urban design principles and that this is a residential neighborhood.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed and indicated she meant to deemphasize the corner.

Boardmember Baltay said it was most important not to have such a long continuous looking building.

Chair Thompson called for Boardmember Chen's comment on Section 3.

Boardmember Chen stated that generally larger windows in classrooms were better but wanted to hear more history on the design process before she made a decision. She noticed cabinets in front of the windows in some of the drawings and asked if the change was functional for the interior or if it was just a result of ARB comment. She agreed with Vice Chair Hirsch that an 8 foot classroom ceiling was low.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought a school building should look like a school building and not the adjacent housing.

Chair Thompson suggested they discuss Section 2 as she had heard enough support to recommend changing Section 3 back to the prior iteration.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that it was not the area to make a change in the scheme. He indicated that the first presentation was preferable and that he had voted for it. He had issues with the airflow and natural light but thought the scheme was wonderful. There were acceptable modifications, but he did not like the idea that the building should look like the residential neighborhood. A school should look like a school. Once the window style was changed it no longer looked like a school.

Chair Thompson asked if Vice Chair Hirsch was suggesting they return to the original scheme for Section 2.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated that he was.

Chair Thompson repeated that the trellis and updated planter were very nice additions.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed and noted that was an entry.

Chair Thompson agreed it was an access point.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought that was well used.

Chair Thompson agreed with Vice Chair Hirsch in principle that an institutional building should look like an institutional building. She liked the original section too but saw nice things in the trellis and extended planter. If they could incorporate those into the original scheme it would be an improvement. On the right half of Section 2 there is less glazing and could be considered for natural light. She called for further comment on Section 2.

Boardmember Baltay indicated that the entrance with the trellis was lovely and noted it only worked because the roof had changed. Anything they can do to use the middle of the building to break up the continuous eave line would be helpful. He supported raising the ceiling in the classroom but asked the other Boardmembers to support him in breaking up the middle to reach a compromise.

Chair Thompson asked if he thought the trellis and extended planter could happen on the original scheme.

Boardmember Baltay was not interested in redesigning the building from the dais. He was comfortable to say that a corner could be raised, but the rest is the architect's job. They submitted the plans and like them. Why should the ARB say that it does not want what the applicant wants?

Vice Chair Hirsch noted that the applicant had not indicated that they did not like what had been presented previously.

Boardmember Baltay explained the applicant called it an improvement and thanked the ARB for pushing them to do it.

Vice Chair Hirsch said he was pushing back to where they were.

Boardmember Baltay noted that the applicant wanted to be here.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that they would have to talk to the designers to know who was happy and not. They compromised their first plan and he asked why they should do that.

Boardmember Baltay stated that the process was compromise and that everyone had compromised. The applicant brought an application that they support.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought it was important for the building to be consistent all the way though. The original design was consistent.

Chair Thompson encouraged the ARB to make an aesthetic judgement about what was superior.

Boardmember Baltay thought the revised Section 2 was superior on the site.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed with Chair Thompson about the trellis and the planter. She had an issue with the boxed portion of the right half of Section 2 and thought the new design was a step backwards. Given the choice between the old version and this one she would choose the previous iteration. Both designs have elegant parts and she felt that a school should look like and function as a school while still being respectful to the neighbors.

Boardmember Chen generally agreed that she expected larger windows in a school than those shown. The lower eave line with the trellis is compatible with the residential neighborhood. She wanted to see the ceiling height in the classroom increased and agreed that a school should look like a school and not a residential building. The roofline is acceptable, but there should be more windows.

Chair Thompson asked Boardmember Chen if she preferred the December scheme or the current submittal.

Boardmember Chen said she would prefer a combination. She preferred the current roofline with the slope, but if she had to choose between the two the December iteration was better.

Chair Thompson heard an ARB preference for the original scheme as well as a suggestion to merge the schemes. There is a split on the roofline with three Boardmembers in favor of the flat roofline and two in favor of the pitch. She asked staff if there was anything else the ARB needed to consider.

Ms. French suggested that they question the applicant regarding its preference.

Chair Thompson said that she was open to hearing briefly from the applicant on merging schemes.

Ms. Kauffman explained that the school wanted a project that worked for themselves and their neighbors. The school has always looked at the project from the standpoint of how it can reach a compromise and

has always put forward solutions that it found appropriate. What the ARB was seeing was that it was a difficult process and coming up with a compromise is not easy to do. She requested that they approve the general scheme and send some of the questions to committee.

Chair Thompson thanked Ms. Kauffman for the input. With Section 2 Boardmember Rosenberg and others said the reduced glazing caused aesthetic concerns. she asked if Boardmember Baltay would consider looking at Section 2 in two parts with Section A to the right and Section B to the left. She asked if the ARB was in favor of reverting Section B to the previous scheme while keeping Section A in the current scheme. The roofline might be an issue. The only parts of Section A she wanted to keep were the trellis and the planter.

Boardmember Baltay said that what was truly important to him was not having a continuous roofline that Section 2 had in the previous design.

Vice Chair Hirsch noted that the entire building was three feet lower than the allowable height. It would be possible to raise the center and have it stand out as a form. It would define the separate volume.

Boardmember Baltay had no issue with the height only with the continuous eave line being the same across the length of the building. He could see a redesign keeping Section 2A.

Vice Chair Hirsch suggested that it get taller.

Chair Thompson explained they were discussing keeping A with the lower roofline and the pitched roof and then B would be raised and would retain what they appreciated about the December scheme.

Boardmember Baltay just wanted a breakup of the eave line and a different treatment.

Vice Chair Hirsch said he would rather go up.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he wanted to let the architect design the building.

Chair Thompson thought that one could see the pitch from Bryant and Kellogg. The parti has horizontal lines.

Boardmember Baltay stated that his problem all along was that it was an inappropriate parti for the site.

Chair Thompson disagreed.

Boardmember Baltay said that the process has come this far and if Section 3 is reverted then all they are changing is the middle piece. If the ARB does nothing Council will return the project again. He was willing to compromise on Section B of the middle piece and request a redesign to return to subcommittee.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated he did not know where the ARB stood.

Chair Thompson thought they were coming to an agreement.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if they could take the section to the righthand side of Section 2 and make it the same height that it was with the old window pattern.

Chair Thompson thought it would require some study from the architect because what they were asking was a little surgical. She summarized that the ARB was reverting Section 3 to the original Kellogg elevation

from December and for Section 2 they are suggesting the applicant keep the left side with the trellis and planter per the revised proposal and then revert the other side to something like the original scheme with more windows and fenestration.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that if they had to go up another foot or two then they would do something that everyone wanted.

Boardmember Baltay supported making the section taller.

Chair Thompson stated that she could also support that. She asked to hear from Boardmembers Rosenberg and Chen.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed with everything stated.

Boardmember Chen supported the general idea that they have discussed.

Boardmember Baltay asked if staff and the applicant could give their opinions.

Chair Thompson asked the architect if what the ARB had discussed was feasible.

Mr. Woltag appreciated the discussion. he could not answer that it was doable on the fly and indicated that he would have to draw though it. However, the direction is very clear and something they could make feasible. The clear direction is very helpful.

Boardmember Baltay asked if staff could process it as an ad hoc committee.

Ms. French clarified that they were discussing the Kellogg façade and wanted to review a few other items. They had questioned the percentage of drop offs and she did have an answer for that before they voted on the project.

Boardmember Baltay wanted to make sure the project moved forward.

Ms. French said that she understood. She just wanted to make clear she had an answer for the percentage of traffic. It's off topic, but she has been accused of not answering items in the public hearing, so she wanted to be clear she had the answer prior to the vote.

Chair Thompson asked if that was a question by Boardmember Chen.

Ms. French indicated it was.

Chair Thompson asked her to answer the question.

Ms. French said that 27% of the drop offs would use the garage. That is shown in the TDM Plan on Page 23 of the clean format document for the public's information.

Chair Thompson thanked Ms. French for the answer. She called for a Motion.

Boardmember Baltay asked if they were agreed on the parking plan.

Chair Thompson thought the ARB was pretty unanimous that they prefer the garage for Option D and the pool and tree preservation of Option E.

MOTION: Boardmember Baltay moved to recommend approval of the project as revised with the following changes: 1) Kellogg Avenue façade – Section 3 revert to previous design option; Section 2 remain as is with trellis with the righthand side to be modified as in the previous elevation with the caveat that it may be taller to be returned to an ad hoc committee. The ARB further recommends acceptance of Parking Garage Scheme E with a recommendation to use the parking configuration from the Parking Garage Scheme D.

Chair Thompson asked if they could state a preference for a hybrid in the Motion.

Boardmember Baltay explained he was trying to approve E and then tell the Council that the ARB disagrees with their judgement regarding parking.

Chair Thompson said that should be part of the Motion.

Boardmember Baltay restated his Motion.

RESTATED MOTION: Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Chair Thompson, to recommend approval of the project as revised with the following changes: 1) Kellogg Avenue façade – Section 3 revert to previous design option, and 2) Section 2 to remain as is with the trellis except the righthand side is to be modified as in the previous elevation with the caveat that it may be taller. Change #2 will return to an ad hoc committee for review. The ARB further recommends acceptance of Parking Garage Scheme D while moving the pool as indicated in Scheme E and eliminating the surface parking near the bicycle racks and the service entrance.

Ms. French asked if the additional surface parking spaces would not be approved then if Council choose the Scheme E garage.

Boardmember Baltay noted that was for the PTC or staff to determine, not the ARB.

Ms. French explained that design was the purview of the ARB and requested to know what the ARB had to say about the surface parking from a design perspective.

Chair Thompson noted that Vice Chair Hirsch and Boardmember Rosenberg both had thoughts on the matter.

Boardmember Baltay explained that he was trying to work out how to word the Motion. The ARB accepts Scheme E for the pool location, but not the surface parking by the pool or the service area.

Chair Thompson thought they should note that they preferred those spots be underground.

Vice Chair Hirsch said it was complicated because there was an increase in parking in the garage but not above it.

Boardmember Baltay noted that Scheme E had additional surface parking near the oak tree by the bicycles and at the service entrance, along the entry ramp on the curve, and in front of the current main entrance. He proposed that by the tree and by the service entrance are inappropriate places. The other two locations should be left to staff.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated he had an opinion and did not think there should be parking above the garage.

Boardmember Baltay asked if Scheme E had parking above the garage. He pointed to Scheme E on Sheet GSE.2 showed four parking areas.

Chair Thompson pointed out the locations on the plan to Vice Chair Hirsch. she confirmed that Boardmember Baltay wanted to remove the surface parking along Emmerson.

Boardmember Baltay suggested those were not safe functionally or practically.

Chair Thompson noted they were otherwise okay with the other parking locations.

Boardmember Baltay was concerned that the City Council would be in a bind because the ARB did not approve a solution in line with the 50% solution. They had a political compromise to put 50% underground. The ARB disagrees but should not compete with the Council.

Chair Thompson thought it was fine for the ARB to recommend things. The City Council may or not accept the recommendation.

Boardmember Baltay said that his restated Motion stood.

Chair Thompson asked staff if the Motion was clear.

Ms. French indicated that it was.

Chair Thompson called for a second.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if they were voting about using the garage as a drop off location.

Boardmember Baltay said they were not voting on that.

Chair Thompson did not believe that was in the ARB's purview.

Ms. Gerhardt noted that no Amendments could be made without a second.

Chair Thompson seconded the Motion.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Vice Chair Hirsch suggested an amendment that the school explore an option to not have the drop off location in the garage.

Ms. French indicated that Amendment had California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) impacts because the garage drop off was studied extensively in the EIR.

Boardmember Baltay said he was not comfortable with the amendment.

Chair Thompson also rejected the Friendly Amendment.

FRIENDLY AMENDMENT FAILED

UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT: Vice Chair Hirsch suggested an amendment that the school explore an option to not have the drop off location in the garage.

UNFRIENDLY AMENDMENT FAILED FOR LACK OF SECOND

Boardmember Baltay apologized to Vice Chair Hirsch and noted that he agreed in principle, but it was not appropriate at this point in the process.

Chair Thompson called for the vote.

VOTE: 3-0-2-0 (Boardmembers Chen and Rosenberg abstained)

Chair Thompson thanked everyone.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that they had not discussed lightwells and asked to make another Motion. There was support that the ARB request lightwells in as many classrooms as is reasonable to provide natural light and ventilation.

Chair Thompson asked if they could do that.

Ms. Gerhardt said that would normally be in a Motion and so at this point it would only be a comment.

Mr. Lait said that the ARB was still considering the item and if they wanted to modify the Motion they could do so. He suggested seeing if the idea had support for a second and if so they could do another Motion.

Chair Thompson confirmed that Vice Chair Hirsch's Motion was to consider using lightwells where possible as part of the ad hoc committee review.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that was with the wording being "as many as possible."

AMENDMENT/MOTION 2: Vice Chair Hirsch moved, seconded by Boardmember Baltay, to request the applicant consider using as many lightwells as possible to bring natural light and ventilation to classrooms and return to the ad hoc committee for review.

VOTE: 3-0-2-0 (Boardmembers Chen and Rosenberg abstained)

Chair Thompson thanked everyone and closed the item.

4. Public Hearing: Discuss Revisions to Objective Design Standards based on Feedback from City Council and Analysis of Missing Standards (Continued from March 3 and 10, 2022)

Chair Thompson introduced the item and noted that it was 1:20 p.m.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that she had a presentation to give but suggested they may need to break for lunch.

Chair Thompson explained that they try to end meetings by noon but sometimes go over and that things could be deferred to a later meeting if necessary. She asked if the Boardmembers wanted to defer some items or take a break and then continue.

Vice Chair Hirsch said he had no preference.

Boardmember Baltay thought they should finish the objective standards. He preferred having a lunch break and then handling the item and continuing the rest.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that she was unable to reschedule her afternoon, so she agreed with Boardmember Baltay.

Chair Thompson asked when Boardmember Rosenberg had to leave.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she had to be somewhere at 2:00 p.m.

Chair Thompson thought the objective standards would be a longer discussion.

Boardmember Baltay asked if Boardmembers Chen and Rosenberg had to have watched the previous hearings to vote on this item.

Chair Thompson stated that was a good point and asked about Boardmember Chen's time constraints.

Boardmember Chen also had an engagement at 2:00 p.m.

Chair Thompson recommended that they move the remainder of the items other than the minutes review.

MOTION: Chair Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to continue Items 4, 5, and 6 to the next hearing.

VOTE: 3-1-1-0 (Vice Chair Hirsch abstained)

5. Discuss the Draft Architectural Review Board's (ARB) Draft Work Plan, Suggest Changes, and Recommend Submitting the Draft Work Plan to the City Council; and Discuss the ARB's Annual Report and any Bylaw Changes Needed (Continued from March 3 and 10, 2022).

Continued.

Study Session

6. California Avenue Street Improvements / Parklets

Continued.

Approval of Minutes

7. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for February 17, 2022

Chair Thompson called for a Motion.

MOTION: Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Vice Chair Hirsch, to approve the Meeting Minutes for February 17, 2021 as presented.

VOTE: 3-0-2-0 (Boardmembers Chen and Rosenberg abstained)

Subcommittee Items

None.

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Adjournment

Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting.