



# Architectural Review Board

## Staff Report (ID # 14358)

---

**Report Type:** Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 5/5/2022

**Summary Title:** Minutes of April 7, 2022

**Title:** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 7, 2022

**From:** Jonathan Lait

### Recommendation

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

### Background

Draft minutes from the April 7, 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](https://bit.ly/paloaltoARB)

### Attachments:

- Attachment A: Minutes of April 7, 2022 (DOCX)



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
 DRAFT MINUTES: April 7, 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 (participating remotely), Vice Chair David Hirsch, Boardmember Peter Baltay, Boardmember Kendra Rosenberg

Absent: Boardmember Yingxi Chen

1. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for Architectural Review Board During Covid-19 State of Emergency

Chair Thompson called for a Motion.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to approve the Resolution as presented.

**VOTE:** 4-0-0-1 (Boardmember Chen absent)

**Oral Communications**

None.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, stated there were none.

**City Official Reports**

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

Ms. Gerhardt shared the ARB 2022 Meeting Schedule and noted that all future meetings are currently scheduled to be held in hybrid format. Boardmember Chen had an excused absence. The next hearing is scheduled for April 21, 2022 and has three items on the Agenda.

**Action Items**

3. Request for Major Architectural Review for Sign Exception for the installation of one illuminated free-standing sign that exceeds the allowed sign area. The sign is proposed to be 60" H x 138" L with an area 40.25 square feet where only 24 square feet is allowed. Environmental Assessment:

Exempt from CEQA in Accordance With Guideline Section 15311 (Accessory Structures). Zoning District: PF (Public Facility).

Chair Thompson introduced the project and noted that the area indicated in the staff report might be outdated but was higher than the allowed 24 square feet (sf). She called for the staff report.

Danielle Condit, Associate Planner shared her screen with the ARB and explained that they had an application for a Major Architectural Review for sign exception at the new Public Safety Building (PSB) at 250 Sherman Avenue. The site is in the California business district and is under construction with a completion date of Summer 2023. The monument sign requires an exception from the ARB. She displayed a contextual sight plan showing the sign locations. There are three signs including the monument sign, two of which are in compliance with the code. The monument sign requires a sign exception. She explained the allowed area based on the code. The requested sign exceeds the allowed sign area by approximately 16 sf as 24 sf is allowed, and 40.25 sf is proposed. The memo that the ARB viewed was outdated and the staff report contains the correct number. She displayed the front and back elevation of the monument sign and showed pictures for context. Civil engagement is an integral part of the functions of the city of Palo Alto PSB. The signs are for wayfinding and are a priority for users in need of government services and can be seen from both Sherman and Birch streets. The innate civic nature of the PSB and is considered an exceptional use not found on other sites. The ARB processed a similar exception in 2014 and she provided the numbers for reference. Staff recommended approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Development Services based on the findings and subject to conditions of approval.

Chair Thompson called for ARB disclosures.

Boardmember Rosenberg disclosed she visited the site.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he had visited the site.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated he had not visited the site.

Chair Thompson disclosed that she visited the site. She called for the applicant's presentation.

Colette Chew, Public Works Engineering Project Architect, introduced the project team and explained Mallory Cusenbery of RossDrulisCusenbery Architecture would present the sign. The PSB at 250 Sherman will house the Police Department, The Office of Emergency Services, the Fire Department Administration, and the 911 Dispatch Center. The ARB recommended approval of the project to Council in September 2018, and they did so in November 2018. Construction began in March 2021, and she described the status of the project. Substantial completion is targeted for September 2023.

Mallory Cusenbery, RossDrulisCusenbery Architecture, explained that the PSB was a major civic project in the California Avenue area and repeated its layout and purpose. The building was designed to address the various scales of the California Avenue area. He described the materials for the ARB and how they helped to reduce the overall scale of the building. The sign in question is the monument sign at the entrance of the building and he displayed several renderings for the ARB. The area of the text does not exceed the signage requirements, but the supporting darker colored metal behind it exceeds the area as it was designed to be an architectural element. The size is defined by the architectural responsibility the piece

has and the sign attachment is a corollary to the gesture. He displayed a view from the parking structure with a clear view of the monument sign. The sign is in a transitional space between the entrance plaza area on the right and the pocket park to the left. The pocket park area includes benches, shade, public art, and lighting independent of the functionality of the PSB. The monument sign is the boundary between the two zones. On the entrance side the monument sign provides information and wayfinding, and on the park side it serves as a boundary and a backside to a bench. He displayed additional views of the backside of the sign to provide the ARB with a sense of scale and noted that it was in keeping with the rest of the materiality. He then described in detail the materials used in the monument sign and how it was constructed and illuminated. The text area is approximately 22 sf and is under the requirement. The metal box surrounding the text area is up to 42 sf. Initially the original area in the staff report included the architectural base which was unrelated to the sign. He showed another rendering of the backside including the full height flagpoles. The ARB can look to the parking lot across the street for a precedent. It contains a concrete wall to screen the transformers from the sidewalk and has a smaller sign on a larger architectural element.

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

Boardmember Baltay [pause in audio/video 22:04] ... the architect had a point that this is an architectural feature and inquired about the logic of the determination.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that it came from the definition of sign area in the sign code and the precedent has been set for a number of years. Most of the time they have to figure out the area of the base of a sign, but this project has a wall feature with a sign attached to it. She suggested it was a hybrid and could be discussed. She read the definition of the sign area from the code aloud for the ARB.

Chair Thompson called for further questions. Hearing none she called for ARB comment.

Vice Chair Hirsch thanked staff and the applicant for the presentation, specifically the clarification around the parklet versus the entrance. The backside of the sign is designed to be opened for access to the electrical for the sign. He found the location to be appropriate for the sign and felt that it was an exceptional building that was designed as a service building. He saw no problem with the sign referencing the police only as other functions are mentioned on the other signs. The graphics contribute to the entire building, and he appreciated the two-story entry to the building. The signs are appropriate and appropriately placed and he supported approval.

Boardmember Baltay stated he could comfortably make the findings required to recommend approval and to approve the sign exception. If the sign were viewed as an architectural feature as the architect had proposed then measured just the lettering the exception would not be necessary. The ARB should determine what type of precedent it wants to set in considering this a monument sign versus a architectural detail. Personally, he was inclined to follow staff's interpretation but thought it was an important point for the ARB to consider. These things had to be considered since the sign ordinance was woefully inadequate.

Boardmember Rosenberg was comfortable with the square footage of the sign and echoed Boardmember Baltay's thoughts on the sign. She appreciated the thoughtfulness of the element [pause in audio/visual 29:26] ... she thanked the architect and designers for their good work.

Chair Thompson echoed the other members of the ARB. She felt it was important that the text was compliant because it made it clear that the ARB would allow it for the cohesion of the design. She stated that she could support approval and acknowledged Boardmember Baltay's points about creating a precedent and indicated the sign code could be addressed in the future. She called for further discussion or a Motion.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated he wanted to discuss Boardmember Baltay's comments about the sign size issue relative to what it was placed on. He cited a project the ARB spent time on with the Stanford Shopping Center as something they spent time on. Based on that he suggested they ask Planning staff to look into the question of the surround versus the sign size and determine how to pinpoint the size of the sign. This hearing was not the first time the ARB dealt with this type of issue.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed that she would like to further discuss the sign issues in the future and offered a Motion.

Boardmember Baltay asked if Vice Chair Hirsch wanted a Friendly Amendment to include further work and stated that he would support that.

Vice Chair Hirsch requested that Planning staff look into the question of whether a sign should be defined size relative to the surround, but not be charged for the size of the total architectural expression.

Ms. Gerhardt appreciated the conversation but said that it was not something staff could manage at the moment. The Motion could be made and then discussed more during the ARB work plan discussion.

Chair Thompson confirmed that they would not do the Friendly Amendment.

Ms. Gerhardt thought that Vice Chair Hirsch wanted to include it without a timeframe.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted it would not delay the project.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that the project would move forward.

Boardmember Rosenberg accepted the Friendly Amendment

Boardmember Baltay also accepted it.

Chair Thompson suggested that they decouple the Friendly Amendment from the Motion and discuss it during the ARB Work Plan item since it was not tied to the project.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that was fine.

Ms. Gerhardt noted that the Chair had made a Friendly Amendment.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she would return to her original Motion and confirmed they would revisit the matter in the ARB Work Plan discussion.

Boardmember Baltay agreed.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Baltay, to approve the project as presented.

**VOTE:** 4-0-1-0 (Boardmember Chen absent)

4. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI JUDICIAL. 3300 El Camino Real [21PLN-00028]: Consideration of a Major Architectural Review to Allow the Construction of a new two-story, 50,355 sf Office/R&D Project with 40% Surface Parking & 60% Below-Grade Parking. The Proposal Includes 2,517 sf of Amenity Space. Environmental Assessment: Pending. Zoning District: RP (Research Park). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Garrett Sauls at [Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org](mailto:Garrett.Sauls@CityofPaloAlto.org)

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

Ms. Gerhardt introduced Garrett Sauls and stated he was pulling up the presentation.

Chair Thompson called for disclosures.

Boardmember Rosenberg disclosed she visited the site and drove by several times.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he visited the site and that he reviewed the City Council hearing from June 22, 2020. Of the seven Council Members there six were in support of the proposal to put housing where the surface parking is, with three supporting the proposal as it stood and three requesting some modifications for height or location. However, six of the seven were in favor of the housing.

Vice Chair Hirsch disclosed he visited the site.

Chair Thompson disclosed that she had visited the site.

Garrett Sauls, Associate Planner, explained that the project was for a new commercial building on what is currently used as a parking lot. The project intends to have a majority of its parking underground in a garage with the remaining at grade. He displayed the location of the site and the project's footprint and explained the proposed office building would be about 50,000 sf with 2,517 sf amenity space. Abutting uses are office, hospitality, and commercial. The existing parking lot does not contribute to the adjacent sites ability to conform to its own parking requirements. The project includes the removal of 21 trees but proposes the planting of 76 new trees onsite and in the adjacent right-of-way. He displayed the site plan and explained that there is a 10 foot utility easement running though the property that limited the potential for the site. He then showed several elevations of the project from different vantage points. The project plans contain sections identifying how the materials will interconnect. The second floor area includes a proposed assembly rooftop space and landscaped garden. From El Camino real the building will be obscured by trees, and he showed renderings with and without the trees. Staff requests input from the ARB on how the project conforms to the El Camino Guidelines. Staff also wants direction on the street frontage. The entrance is approximately 70 to 80 feet away from El Camino Real. The El Camino Design Guidelines also list colors that are not allowed and therefore staff requested the ARB pay special attention to the soffits and the wood details. Finally, the tree planting requirements in the El Camino Design Guidelines request a Liquid Amber species as a street tree, but the applicant proposed a London Plane species. The Urban Forrester has noted that Liquid Amber is less draught tolerant and more water intensive than other species, so the City has backed away from that a bit. Staff requests the ARB's input

on the use of the London Plane. Staff recommends continuing the project to a date uncertain, requests the ARB's feedback on materials, architectural design, and the project's conformance to the El Camino Design Guidelines. The City is processing the environmental documents which will be provided to the ARB at a later date.

Chair Thompson called for the applicant's presentation.

James Tefend, Principal at Form4 Architecture, introduced his team and explained he wanted to show the uniqueness of the site, discuss the design goals, and address staff's concerns. The project site is the last undeveloped parcel in the Stanford Research Park. The proposed project is a 52,000 square foot office building that is highly sustainable and all electric. The project also includes one level of below grade parking. The site is separate from its neighbor at 611 Hanson Way despite being a parking lot. He provided context pictures of the existing site conditions and its neighbors. The property is an effective gateway into the research park. The owner of the parcel challenged them with designing an environmentally smart building that was strongly connected to the street and established a calm harmony with the neighborhood. They also wanted the ARB to provide guideline clarity and confirmation of the proposed design. Staff raised concerns about the appropriateness of the proposed design with respect to the El Camino Street Guidelines which suggest that improvements should not attract attention. In 2002 new street standards specific to the area called for buildings with prominent facades and pedestrian centered thinking. The project team believes that they comply with the spirit of both sets of guidelines and has Stanford's support and encouragement. He displayed the site plan and noted the utility easement and the 50 foot landscape setback on the south side [break in audio/visual 51:19] ... maintains view corridor to the 611 Hanson Way building. The project complies with RP zoning and has not applied for any Design Enhancement Exceptions (DEE). Parking is 60% below grade with the remainder at the surface. The building has been stepped down to better relate to the Creekside and the materials relate to the 611 Hanson Way building. He showed site context photos from several directions. The building also features a roof garden and terrace for occupants which is gently sloped to protect privacy and noise. The building is designed with mass timber which is greener. The floor plans were displayed as were additional pictures of the façades. There are three public plazas along El Camino. Interior views were displayed as were renderings of the trash area and technical drawings.

Gary Laymon, The Guzzardo Partnership, explained they looked at the El Camino frontage carefully to determine how to make it more pedestrian friendly and beautiful. The parking lot area has a significant tree canopy and there are pedestrian opportunities throughout the site. They incorporated native planting extensively throughout the site and were able to preserve a number of existing trees which combined with the new plantings would create a lush appearance in a sustainable manner. The existing street trees on El Camino are Lemon Plane so they looked to reinforce that and enhance the strong canopy. They tried to create engaging pedestrian opportunities for people to rest and take in the site features. Public art may be incorporated into the seating areas. The entry plaza off El Camino helps tie the building entrance to the street frontage. The geometry of the building is incorporated into the landscape design to create a unity of building and site. The second story roof garden will be enjoyed by the tenants and enforce the indoor/outdoor feel of the environment. He showed an arial view of the project displaying the rooftop garden.

Chair Thompson indicated the applicant's 10 minutes were up and requested they wrap up.

Mr. Laymon displayed several more pictures illustrating the landscape and thanked the ARB for its time.

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

Boardmember Baltay asked if it was possible to relocate the electrical easement on the Northern portion of the property.

Mr. Tefend said that it was possible with a major amount of work by the City. The easement services a significant portion of the City.

Allison Koo, Sand Hill Property, explained that they had had discussions with the Utility Department and learned that the easement provided for the major line into the Research Park that serviced the tenants. Moving it would be a big undertaking.

Boardmember Baltay noticed that during the presentation to City Council there had been housing on the portion of the project the easement moved through. He asked if they had thought they could relocate the easement.

Ms. Koo explained that they had initial conversations about it, but it was never resolved.

Boardmember Baltay understood there was 40% surface parking. He asked staff if they considered it to be fronting on El Camino Real.

Mr. Sauls said that it did in the existing context.

Boardmember Baltay requested confirmation that the South El Camino Real Design Guidelines adopted in 2002 governed the review of the project.

Mr. Sauls indicated that was correct.

Boardmember Baltay noted that Page 26 of that document discussed a limitation of parking lot frontage to 120 linear feet.

Mr. Sauls said that was correct.

Ms. Gerhardt asked to be directed to the page.

Boardmember Baltay indicated it was Page 26 of the South El Camino Real Design Guidelines. It's Policy 3.2.5 and titled "Limitation on Parking Lot Frontage."

Mr. Sauls stated that was the correct document.

Ms. Gerhardt agreed that surface parking area including driveways should not occupy more than 50% of the property frontage along El Camino and the continuous frontage could not exceed 120 feet.

Boardmember Baltay thanked staff for the clarifications.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked for the length of the proposed parking lot.

Mr. Sauls indicated he needed a moment to look.



Boardmember Baltay stated he determined it to be 308 feet.

Mr. Sauls indicated that was correct.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated he had a series of questions about the building. He asked about the required setback from El Camino.

Mr. Sauls stated 20 feet.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if the building was at 20 feet.

Mr. Sauls said it was.

Ms. Gerhardt directed the ARB to Packet Page 46 and the Zoning Table.

Vice Chair Hirsch inquired about the fascia on the top of the building.

Mr. Tefend stated it was finished aluminum and wood panels.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that he was asking about the roofline shown in black and asked about that material. Additionally he wanted to know if the wood was coming inside to outside.

Mr. Tefend explained the CLT could not be exposed to exterior moisture so there were panels in the same color used instead. The dark color he was inquiring about was metal.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked how the steel beams were connected.

Mr. Tefend said that to get the span necessary they had to use steel beams. When the project returns to the ARB he promised additional detail.

Vice Chair Hirsch inquired about the base where the wood met the ground.

Mr. Tefend believed that the code would require an accessible rail to prevent people from hitting their heads and then there would be landscaping or a rock design to hide the connections. The wood would appear to reach the ground.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if there was penetration of the ceiling for lighting.

Mr. Tefend explained that the light study was forthcoming and that they wanted to maximize the view of the CLT panels.

Vice Chair Hirsch clarified that the present street trees would be removed.

Mr. Laymon indicated the existing street trees were Lemon Plane and would remain.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if the drip line for the trees would be in front of the building.

Mr. Laymon said that the trees did not impact construction. The canopies will also be compatible with the design.

Vice Chair Hirsch inquired if Urban Forestry had looked at that and approved the trees as retainable.

Mr. Laymon said that there were no concerns.

Mr. Sauls confirmed that the Urban Forester had reviewed the application.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought he had observed the trees as closer to the setback line. He asked again if the trees would be impacted.

Mr. Sauls said that the trees were accurately located in the plans as determined by the site survey. He directed the ARB to Page 66 of the plans which detailed all the tree plans. He displayed the page on the screen and noted that it identified the trees to be removed and the [audio issues 1:08:15].

Vice Chair Hirsch noted that there were many access doors to the rear of the building.

Mr. Tefend explained those serviced outdoor spaces for the office users.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if it was related to Rivian.

Mr. Tefend indicated they would love Rivian to be a tenant.

Mr. Sauls noted that other recent Research Park projects have incorporated pedestrian walkways between the sites.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if the connections were made so Rivian could participate in the open space.

Mr. Sauls said it was more for people moving between the spaces and for access to El Camino.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if the site plan showed how it opened to the parking lot. He confirmed the route to El Camino.

Mr. Sauls indicated the points on the site plan for the ARB. There is a 5 foot landscape buffer around the property per code. The connections between properties have become standard through the last few projects.

Vice Chair Hirsch questioned the intention.

Mr. Sauls explained the intent was to provide a pathway to El Camino and pedestrian resting spaces. The goal is to increase connectivity between the sites and to El Camino Real. That is a significant part of the El Camino Real Design Guidelines.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought it was nice to have the pedestrian access to El Camino. He also appreciated the open access to the community.

Mr. Tefend said that was correct and that they also saw those areas as places with potential to host public art.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that the perimeter landscaping was inviting in both directions.

Mr. Tefend said that they wanted people to get close to and see the structure of the building.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought that was positive.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired about their plans to incorporate the nearby bus stop into their plans.

Mr. Sauls indicated that he had the diagram on the screen for the ARB.

Mr. Tefend pointed out the area of the bus stop and indicated that staff had requested it be relocated or that the shelter be replaced.

Mr. Sauls explained that two years ago they created the Research Park bus shelter program. He had asked the applicant to consider if they wished to put a bus stop on the location. The intersection of the Research Park and the City could also have a bus shelter and that would be maintained by Stanford. He suggested the ARB discuss if it was appropriate to have a shelter oriented toward the Research Park in a place more visible to other City properties.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked about the distance from the project building to the Rivian building. The Rivian structure orients towards the project structure.

Mr. Tefend indicated that he did not know the number off the top of his head.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought the site plan showed enough room for traffic to go between the Rivian corner, but the orientation was interesting.

Mr. Tefend suggested that their civil engineer could answer the question.

Mr. Sauls pulled up an aerial view and confirmed the portion of the building Boardmember Rosenberg was concerned about.

[Man 1:16:21] stated that it appeared to be about 50 feet.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed that the rear setback from the building to the property line was 20 feet.

Mr. Tefend said that was correct.

Mr. Sauls clarified that the side they were discussing was not considered the rear, but an interior property line. The setback was still 20 feet.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed the location of the rear setback.

Mr. Sauls stated that it was toward Creekside and pointed out the front and sides of the project.

Ms. Gerhardt noted one could eyeball the distance between the building and the edge of the property on the rear.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that in theory if the Rivian site were redeveloped it would have a 20 foot interior side setback towards the project for a total of a 40 foot separation between the structures.

Mr. Sauls indicated that was correct.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked about the building's height.

Mr. Tefend said that the project does not exceed the 35 feet height limit.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked about the plans for the rooftop garden and its water usage.

Mr. Laymon explained that the plant materials are all draught tolerant and either Mediterranean adapted or native species. The garden features a drip irrigation system that is very efficient. The intent is for the planting to be low maintenance and achieve its full natural form.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if they had modeled the garden on another project.

Mr. Laymon said that they had significant experience in rooftop gardens. This garden has a thinner profile so achieving the right soil depth and selecting the correct plants was key.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if they gave thought to a greywater recycling system.

Mr. Laymon said that was not explored as a possibility as it generally is not a cost effective way of approaching it. Additionally because there is a minimal amount of soil the water quality is important.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that the drainage moved toward the building, and they had plans to carry it down and away from the structure.

Mr. Laymon indicated that was correct.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested clarification on the El Camino Real façade. She indicated that Page 29 showed beige portion that was solid.

Mr. Tefend said that was the only solid portion and it contained the bathroom core and elevators.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the people using the building would feel exposed.

Mr. Tefend said that was not a concern.

Boardmember Rosenberg moved to the area of the dais that had the materials and asked to learn more about the light beige stone and the light wood panel.

Mr. Tefend pointed out the correct material and noted it was a simple palette.

Boardmember Baltay asked the developer why they decided not to pursue housing on the site.

Ms. Koo indicated they held a study session in June 2020 and did not receive support for continuing the mixed use and additional density on the site. The current project is zoning compliant, and they were inclined to go through the clear process for a complaint project.

Chair Thompson stated that she wanted to follow up on the beige tile and requested the dimensions.

Mr. Tefend [unintelligible 1:23:19] 8 by 16 inches. He indicated that he would show the ARB the pattern at the next hearing.

Chair Thompson asked if they were still studying the patterning.

Mr. Tefend indicated that they were and that it would be presented at the next hearing.

Chair Thompson inquired if there were a blind system or sun shading for the windows.

Mr. Tefend said that micro shades were most commonly used in the Research Park, but the shading would be dependent on the tenant.

Chair Thompson asked if a tenant would occupy the entire floor area.

Mr. Tefend did not believe the building to be multitenant.

Chair Thompson asked if any of the windows were operable.

Mr. Tefend stated they were not.

Chair Thompson inquired about the design reason.

Mr. Tefend explained that potential tenants had security needs and because of that demand for operable windows in the Research Park was dwindling.

Chair Thompson called for further ARB questions.

Vice Chair Hirsch requested an explanation about the glass used vertically on the upper levels.

Mr. Tefend asked if he was referring to the glass fins.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated that he was.

Mr. Tefend explained that they would be affixed to the mullions and were for solar control. He further explained the material and noted that they were still studying it.

Chair Thompson asked them to point out where the fins occurred on the elevations.

Mr. Tefend shared his screen and noted that they were on the lower portion for the entire length of the façade.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that they did not need them on the front section.

Mr. Tefend stated that was correct. The need was on the west side of the building and was demonstrated in the modeling.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted that Packet Page 9 showed them along the Rivian side.

Mr. Tefend stated that was the west side of the building. He showed their locations on the slide.

Chair Thompson noted that was difficult to read in the plans.

Boardmember Rosenberg directed her to Packet Page 9.

Chair Thompson stated that she thought she saw fins on the north side of the building in the rendering, but then it was not in the elevation. She clarified they only occurred on the west side, which does not face El Camino. She stated that the El Camino façade would not have fins.

Mr. Tefend indicated that was correct.

Chair Thompson said that they were looking at the west side, but the drawing indicated it was north/south.

Mr. Tefend apologized for the error in their text. He confirmed that what was labeled south was actually west. He stated that they would fix the error.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that on Packet Page 7 it appeared that the fins were there. It also appeared that on the summer and winter solstice the south side of the building had glass fins.

Mr. Tefend said that they were not supposed to be there. After the modeling they were determined to be unnecessary. The rendering may have an error.

Boardmember Rosenberg clarified there would be no glass fins on the El Camino façade.

Mr. Tefend stated that was correct.

Chair Thompson thought she had seen a rendering showing the fins.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that it was difficult to keep all the renderings and drawings straight. She appreciated the clarity.

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

Vice Chair Hirsch directed everyone to Packet Page 7. The horizontal line in the middle of the building the line extends over the solid element.

Mr. Tefend explained that was correct and the trim passes by the wall.

Vice Chair Hirsch confirmed that the line was over the stone.

Mr. Tefend said that was correct.

Vice Chair Hirsch directed them to Packet Page 39 and noted that the line did not go through the stone.

Mr. Tefend indicated he would look at it, but the intent was to have the line pass through the stone. He pulled up the rendering Vice Chair Hirsch mentioned and indicated that it did show it stopping but they wanted it to continue. They intended to reinforce the horizontal element.

Chair Thompson asked if it would stop at the glass.

Mr. Tefend thought they would like to have it extend to the curtain wall. The renderings will be updated for the next hearing.

Chair Thompson asked if it was flush with the curtain wall or if it was proud.

Mr. Tefend said it was proud.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested they show Sheet 29.

Mr. Sauls did so.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted how the linear line moved through the drawing and asked if that was the most accurate interpretation of their plans.

Mr. Tefend stated that was the intention.

Chair Thompson pointed out a section on the drawing and asked if the fin continued onto it.

Mr. Tefend said that it did not.

Chair Thompson confirmed that the ARB had no further questions, so she returned the topic to the Board for discussion. She also asked Boardmembers to speak on the four items raised by staff.

Boardmember Baltay thanked the applicant for their presentation and design and noted that the landscaping was lovely. The ARB is required to make six findings. Finding #6 relates to efficiency and environmental friendliness of the building and the project makes it easy to make that finding. He requested more ventilation for the building especially on the second floor and suggested operable windows near the roof garden. He was concerned about passing Title 24 considering the amount of glass, but if the project did then he could make Finding #6. Finding #5 is about landscaping and the project has beautiful landscape design, but he requested they verify the drip line of the street trees as mentioned by Vice Chair Hirsch. Finding #4 relates to a functional design and could be made. Finding #3 calls for the design to be of a high aesthetic quality and he found the design to be lovely and well thought out. Several details need to be resolved, but overall the project is beautiful. Finding #2 requires a unified and coherent design and the project works beautifully. Finding #1 cannot be made and he did not see how the design could be changed in order for him to make Finding #1. Based on that he could not support the project. While the project meets the zoning and building codes it did not meet the South El Camino Real Design Guidelines, specifically Page 9.1 calls for two and three story buildings, but the project was 1.5 stories. Page 19 discusses the Stanford Research Park frontage and how it should reinforce the El Camino frontage. He did not believe the design fit the requirement. Page 25 requires entries to face El Camino, which the project does not. Page 26 requires surface parking areas to have no more than 120 feet of linear frontage while the project has 300 feet of frontage. The surface lot on El Camino is not desirable or what the City has requested. He repeated that he did not see how the ARB could find that the project met the South El Camino Real Guidelines. Page 34 requests articulated façades but the project does not do that or serve to form an urban corridor. El Camino is intended to be an urban boulevard. The design, while beautiful, is in the wrong place. He also looked at the previously adopted Housing Element and Page 69 discusses the El Camino Real mixed use transit corridor area. He did not see the project as a mixed use building that served the diverse needs of the community. There is no housing or retail and has no connection to what the City requested. Therefore, he could not find that the project met the Housing Element and Finding #1 required that. Lastly, the Comprehensive Plan Program L2.4.3 calls for allowing housing on the El Camino frontage of the Stanford Research Park. It is imperative that there be housing on the site. He further cited Policy T5.6 about parking as a reason he could not make Finding #1. He repeated that because he could not make Finding #1 he could not support the project and apologized because he thought it was a really beautiful design.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that it would be difficult to deal with all the elements mentioned by Boardmember Baltay. He agreed with him related to Findings #3 to 6. He thought it was important to think further than a 20 year old guideline when considering El Camino. The project site is actually two lots, the first of which is on El Camino and the second is in the Research Park. The project is pedestrian friendly but not commercially friendly. He noted that as the street is an intermittent highway it was not a very relaxing place. The Creekside Inn is of a completely different scale. There will be a low scale hotel and outdoor restaurant going in on the other corner. With use the project is a Research Park expression. There was no question about the quality of the building. The building is meant for people to come by car and to enter at the center. The site planning could be expanded to make the front door more welcoming. He felt the building needed more differentiation between the front and back. The interesting front scale does not

project along the side, and he wanted the design team to explore that possibility. He gave thoughts on the wood expressions of the building and indicated that the back of the building is confusing, and the shape is interrupted. He appreciated the landscaping and how it was spread throughout the site. He also liked the roof deck idea and the colors of the landscaping. He agreed with Boardmember Baltay that the largest issue was about the use of the site. He did not see it as a housing site because he preferred not to put housing on major streets but rather in a smaller community like most of Palo Alto. El Camino Real is central to the region and would always have intense usage. He approved of the usage for the Research Park and felt it was welcoming on a grand scale. The trees make a huge difference in the property, and he was pleased the large street trees would remain. With the front parking lot he thought there could be an exception to the rule so long as it was landscaped from the street. He noted that it was nice to have open areas featuring trees along El Camino. He thought the parking lot would not be difficult to look at due to the landscape plan. On the inside of the project he was concerned about the location of the shower rooms near the entrance.

Ms. Gerhardt thought that the elevators were in front of the showers but stated they would have to defer to the applicant.

Mr. Tefend said that the showers were located against the elevator core. It could be rotated so that one would not see the entrance.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought the outside spaces were well used and appreciated how they repeated ideas they used elsewhere in the project. Overall he thought regulations that were more than 20 years old needed to be reviewed and also that the street as a whole should be evaluated. The neighborhood the project would serve is the Research Park and based on that he could vote for approval with possible items to return to committee.

Boardmember Rosenberg commended the architects on a stunning project. She thought it could be a true gateway project for the Research Park. She stated that the project clearly met Finding #3, but there were a few items requiring refinement. First, she agreed with Vice Chair Hirsch that having the entrance on El Camino could be difficult for spacing reasons. However, she agreed with Boardmember Baltay that it was an enticing possibility to have mixed use in the building. She suggested a small café or retail space to provide people with another reason to enter the building. Further, there was an opportunity to create more of a plaza space in the parking lot area. That would reduce the dimension of the parking lot which she found to be well designed but increasing the use of the space would be beneficial. If that was created there could be an entrance to the office on El Camino that was more purposeful. The long façade on El Camino is very linear and simple so she encouraged further articulation. She voiced concerns about the building passing Title 24 but appreciated the passive solar and the analysis of the sun shading element. With respect to the use of the site she found it to be an inappropriate place for housing. Housing at the entrance of the Research Park seemed ill advised so overall she agreed with Vice Chair Hirsch. she repeated that she liked the office use and encouraged them to include some retail. The landscaping was beautiful, but she encouraged more thoughtfulness related to the street trees. She was pleased they were not Liquid Amber, and that the applicant was working with what was already on site. She understood the 120 foot limit to the street parking and encouraged the applicant to reduce the parking in favor of a larger plaza. The underground parking was well done, and the parking lot was well thought out and an improvement over the existing condition. She agreed that the project met most of the Findings with a



potential issue about it being consistent with Palo Alto zoning. She encouraged the applicant to provide mixed use through some retail.

Chair Thompson echoed that the project was stunning. The design was good, and it was exciting to have a beautiful piece of architecture in Palo Alto. She agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg that the El Camino façade was long. The fins on the north side of the building helped break up the façade. Boardmember Baltay brought up the articulated façade and that was an item of contention amongst the ARB. She agreed with Vice Chair Hirsch that there was architecture that worked that did not fall into that box. The project with a bit more work in the middle could achieve that status. She disagreed with Boardmember Baltay about it being a 1.5 story building as the project was 35 feet tall and definitely at least two stories. She was glad to hear the tile was still being studied. Many offices have a lot of glazing and have many blinds as a result; therefore she suggested the applicant give the matter further thought. Having an entry that faced El Camino would be strange because of the setback. Based on that she agreed with Boardmember Rosenberg. She supported a plaza option and a mixed use retail/café option. With the guidelines about the parking frontage she found the setback to be deep enough and the landscaping significant enough to be a landscaping frontage which could be allowed via an exception or DEE. She did not see how housing could be added to the site in the current design but noted that in the future if the easement were relocated there could be an opportunity on the surface parking lot. The comment about buildings not standing out was sad and she disagreed and thought buildings should be beautiful. She also found the color issue inapplicable to the project. She stated that she was fine with the London Plane trees, encouraged the applicant to explore operable windows, and to consider the aesthetic of the ceilings in the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she had further thoughts.

Chair Thompson acknowledged her.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that on Page 39 it showed an entrance on the El Camino side. If that was there she had no issue and found it to be attractive and could retract her comment about the El Camino entrance. She disagreed with Chair Thompson about the glass fins and thought that there could be better articulation and material choice there. She encouraged articulation with some material change along the façade and operable windows.

Chair Thompson indicated that she would be fine with something other than glass fins. She asked the applicant to explain the El Camino entrance as she thought it appeared to be a stair exit.

Mr. Tefend explained there were two; there was a stair entrance and another south of that which was fully recessed.

Chair Thompson confirmed that there was El Camino access.

Mr. Tefend indicated that was correct and that it had a small awning.

Chair Thompson called for further discussion.

Boardmember Baltay addressed his comments to the ARB, City Council, and City as a whole. El Camino Real is a historic road that runs from community to community. Up and down the Peninsula it is considered

a broad urban boulevard with stately background buildings that help form a public corridor. Other towns have embraced guidelines similar to the South El Camino Design Guideline to create the urban space. Other cities are following the guidelines and building housing and retail buildings up to the sidewalk. There is no surface parking or glass office buildings. He noted the extensive and beautiful housing along El Camino in other cities. The project is not an urban building for an urban corridor. The design guidelines call for a building that conforms to that direction. The ARB finds reasons to talk itself out of following design guidelines and are not creating an urban environment with uses that support the community. Design guidelines are in place to shape the future. The building fits in with the Research Park, but that is behind the hills behind Palo Alto and not on El Camino. He encouraged the ARB to consider the future of El Camino and indicated that the project did not fit the guidelines.

Mr. Sauls shared his screen and showed Page 23 of the plans which illustrated the El Camino entries.

Mr. Tefend noted Gridlines M and N and stated that there was intended to be a door there.

Chair Thompson inquired about paving.

Mr. Tefend said that code required it to be paved.

Chair Thompson called for further comments from the ARB on Boardmember Baltay's comments.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that after they finished the discussion the applicant might have questions of the ARB.

Chair Thompson responded to Boardmember Baltay's thoughts by saying that there was not a static condition that followed such a long road. El Camino changes when it gets to Stanford and there is something to say about the flow of density and relief. It was possible that the future of El Camino was towers, but the concept of a background building was repulsive and a disservice to architecture. Other cities in the world create beautiful buildings on prominent roads as a service to the community. She called for questions from the applicant.

Mr. Tefend cited the 2002 South El Camino Guidelines 2.3.1.1 and noted that entries should face El Camino or be clearly visible and accessible to pedestrians. That was the intention behind the front door. Secondly, he did not believe that the RP zoning allowed retail.

Chair Thompson asked if that was correct.

Mr. Sauls stated that he would review the code quickly.

Ms. Koo said that the property was RP zoned which explicitly allows for office, R&D, manufacturing and prohibits commercial uses such as retail. Due to that they were unable to put in zoning.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that retail could be allowed under a Conditional Use Permit (CUP).

Boardmember Rosenberg asked how housing was handled in the zoning.

Ms. Koo stated that the RP did not allow it without an exception.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that multifamily housing would also require a CUP.

Ms. Koo repeated that they created a zoning compliant project.

Chair Thompson thanked the applicant for the clarification. She suggested some straw polls before they handled the staff request to continue to a date uncertain. She asked staff if the ARB had to opine on the El Camino entrance now that they understood one was there.

Mr. Sauls explained that the applicant indicated an intent for an entrance on the perspective images. If the ARB wanted to comment on the size of the entrance or otherwise they could provide feedback to the applicant.

Chair Thompson called for a straw poll about an entrance on El Camino and a second one about the plaza. She asked everyone to speak on the El Camino entrance.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she would support an entrance and that she wanted a better image of it.

Boardmember Baltay did not support asking the applicant to create an entrance as it would dilute the quality of the architecture.

Boardmember Rosenberg argued that the applicant showed it as an intent.

Boardmember Baltay argued it was not the intent, the intent is to enter from the parking lot by the elevators. He stated that his vote was no.

Vice Chair Hirsch supported keeping the entrance where it was but wanted further articulation on El Camino Real.

Chair Thompson clarified they were discussing a pedestrian entry on El Camino in addition to the main entrance.

Vice Chair Hirsch was not in favor of changing the entry location.

Chair Thompson clarified that they were not changing but adding an entrance.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that he was not in favor.

Chair Thompson said that she was in favor of what was shown in the rendering and the ARB was split on the item until Boardmember Chen was able to weigh in. She called for thoughts on having a plaza near the entry.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated that as she suggested it she supported it.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he thought it was a good idea to include some public amenity. He reminded the ARB that when they reviewed the hotel across Hanson Way they pushed for a public amenity.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed but stated that it was important it tie into the pedestrian and bicycle transportation of the neighborhood.

Boardmember Baltay said that he would like to see the applicant use the plaza to mitigate the parking frontage. That way the ARB could find that the parking was not fronting El Camino.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed with those points and added that it was near a bus stop.

Chair Thompson supported the plaza and recognized the applicant had included benches all along the perimeter of the project.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if they wanted the plaza on the corner of the property or near the front entrance.

Chair Thompson stated that it was up to the applicant and there were options on either side. One would serve the bus stop and the other the entrance.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed and noted the bus stop was on the same side as the main entrance. She encouraged the applicant to explore several options.

Chair Thompson indicated that Vice Chair Hirsch mentioned bringing the green elements from the roof to the front corner.

Vice Chair Hirsch said he had been addressing the roofline. The interior structure at the front of the building could come outside and hold up an extension of the roof. The idea of the structures would carry around the corner.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed he meant the “W” shaped interior structure.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that it could provide scale to the side of the building and continued the concept onto El Camino.

Chair Thompson requested staff show the rendering of the El Camino façade.

Vice Chair Hirsch directed them to the 2<sup>nd</sup> page to see the interior structure.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that Page 41 had a rendering that could see through the glass.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that Page 3 had a good rendering.

Chair Thompson confirmed that Vice Chair Hirsch was suggesting they bring it out.

Vice Chair Hirsch hoped they would consider it but not bring it beyond the vertical wall.

Chair Thompson confirmed he did not want to pierce the curtain wall and make the double height space not be double height.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought it could come outside if the roofline continued.

Chair Thompson asked if everyone was clear on Vice Chair Hirsch’s suggestion.

Boardmember Baltay saw the ambiguity of the angled post on the exterior of the building and on the interior facing El Camino which might create an odd conflict on the corner. The expression should be consistent, but he was reluctant to make a design decision like that. He could encourage the applicant to consider a more consistent design vocabulary. Every Boardmember other than himself had noted the El Camino façade could use more articulation. He did not want to be prescriptive and tell the architects what to do.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed. She thought the end elements were lovely and encouraged exploration of articulation but deferred to the architect.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed it was the architect's decision. He was just suggesting a way to articulate the building. He simply wanted them to explore the detailing of the corner and improve the articulation on El Camino for more dimension.

Chair Thompson stated that they agreed that the El Camino façade needed further articulation.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed.

Boardmember Baltay noted that the architect was nodding his head and it seemed they were understood.

Chair Thompson asked if the ARB wanted to address the red/yellow comment on the building.

Boardmember Baltay asked where the comment came from.

Chair Thompson stated that it was in the staff report.

Mr. Sauls explained it was in the El Camino Design Guidelines and was called out by staff in an abundance of caution. They just wanted confirmation that the ARB were not concerned about the element.

Boardmember Baltay agreed with Chair Thompson's initial comments and did not see the colors as an issue.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought the materials were beautifully selected and he enjoyed the natural feel. The colors sat well with each other.

Chair Thompson indicated that she heard unanimous support for the London Plane trees.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated the ARB confirmed she was correct via head nods.

Boardmember Baltay indicated that the ARB should defer to the City Arborist since they were street trees.

Chair Thompson noted that there were comments in favor of operable windows and ventilation. She asked if that had the support of the board.

Boardmember Baltay thought the building needed some natural ventilation.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated it was his idea.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed.

Chair Thompson stated operable windows were more energy efficient. She stated that she had a note to ask the applicant to consider permeable pavers. She asked if the ARB would support that.

Boardmember Baltay said that if they met the green building guidelines for Palo Alto it was sufficient. He left it to the applicant to determine how to meet the standards.

Chair Thompson called for further thoughts.

Boardmember Rosenberg encouraged their use but stated they were not required. She agreed with Boardmember Baltay it was up to the applicant to meet the standards.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed with Boardmembers Baltay and Rosenberg.

Chair Thompson stated that the last item was about the “building standing out” issue and called for opinions.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought the project was beautiful and should not be penalized for it. The project had the potential to be a gateway landmark. Additionally the architecture while beautiful was understated and modest and she was remiss to encourage the applicant to change it very much.

Boardmember Baltay stated that he had made his views clear earlier.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed with what was stated but was concerned about the scale as it was a big statement. He wanted to see further articulation of the building to help the sense of scale.

Boardmember Rosenberg argued that part of the South El Camino Guidelines encouraged two and three story buildings. Boardmember Baltay called the building 1.5 stories, so she thought the scale to be appropriate. The glass and glazing were less imposing than other materials but noted there could be less glazing.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that the fins changed the scale and made a big difference. He noted that the lot was big and open and that it would be exciting to see the activity inside the building but was a little concerned about the scale considering the building was on the street and not a large parcel of land. He indicated that he simply wanted to voice his feelings.

Chair Thompson stated that she had asked the applicant to consider how the utilities on the inside were handled since the building was so transparent and shading systems. She asked for the ARB’s opinion.

Boardmember Baltay thought that was a legitimate request for more detail on the ceiling.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed that she wanted more detail because the building was so transparent the ceiling plans would affect the outside.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed they should provide more information.

Chair Thompson stated that was her list. She asked if she had missed anything.

Boardmember Baltay requested that the applicant try to put retail or a coffee shop on the ground level or some kind of community amenity as part of the building. The ARB requested that on previous hotel projects in the area. He suggested the ARB request the applicant explore that possibility.

Chair Thompson asked if the zoning allowed for the uses in the hotels cited by Boardmember Baltay or if they also need a CUP.

Mr. Sauls requested a moment to look up the answer.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if there was a way to streamline the process for the applicant since the ARB had requested the retail.

Ms. Gerhardt thought the other properties had a commercial zone where retail would be permitted. A CUP in Palo Alto is not an onerous process, and it would be done concurrently with Architectural Review.

The main thing a CUP requires is circulation and the project clearly had that so there should not be a major issue in the process.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if there was a way to note on the CUP that the ARB was requesting it.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that if it was helping the ARB to make its findings then the staff report would indicate that.

Mr. Sauls stated the hotel properties were zoned CS and retail services were permitted.

Chair Thompson thought that the ARB needed to consider what they were requesting and indicated she was not sure they had the purview to rezone lots.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that a CUP is not a rezoning. Boardmember Baltay indicated he could not make Finding #1 and so if the CUP were something that could help make that finding then that was how the ARB should speak about it.

Chair Thompson called for questions before the straw poll on asking the applicant to consider a CUP to include retail.

B Baltay said he would state it as asking the applicant to explore adding retail uses on the ground level fronting El Camino.

Chair Thompson called for the straw poll.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she supported that.

Boardmember Baltay indicated his support.

Vice Chair Hirsch said he supported it but would like to add that it be on the ground floor level or appropriately within the site.

Boardmember Baltay said that it was important that it have a function that the community could use and not just for building occupants.

Vice Chair Hirsch cited the Vista Center down the block with a coffee shop on the side that saw incredible use.

Boardmember Baltay noted El Camino was busy and it would be a real shame to lose the opportunity for some retail.

Chair Thompson confirmed that Vice Chair Hirsch supported the idea.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated he did but wanted the wording changed to the location being the most appropriate relative to the building and landscape.

Boardmember Baltay said Vice Chair Hirsch's wording was fine.

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Rosenberg agreed with the wording change.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that she did and that the most important thing to her was the amenity was beneficial to the community.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed.

Chair Thompson indicated that she would abstain from the straw poll. She loved the community benefit but respected that the applicant designed to a specific zoning. She hoped the ARB feedback was helpful to staff and the applicant and called for questions from either before the Motion.

Mr. Sauls indicated staff was satisfied.

Chair Thompson called for a Motion.

Ms. Gerhardt stated they could not approve the project at the current time as environmental review was not complete. Staff requested they continue to a date uncertain.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Hirsch moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to continue the project to a date uncertain for review of final design and environmental documents.

**VOTE:** 3-1-1-0 (Boardmember Baltay no, Chen absent)

Chair Thompson thanked staff and the applicant.

Ms. Gerhardt noted that Boardmembers were allowed to speak to no votes.

Chair Thompson apologized and recognized Boardmember Baltay.

Boardmember Baltay indicated that he had made his views clear.

Chair Thompson indicated that there were two more action items and asked if the ARB wanted a break.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested a shorter break as lunch had not arrived.

Chair Thompson called for a 10 minute break.

#### **ARB TOOK A BREAK**

5. Public Hearing: Discuss Revisions to Objective Design Standards based on Feedback from City Council and Analysis of Missing Standards (Continued from March 3, 10, and 17, 2022)

Chair Thompson called the meeting back to order and introduced the item. The ARB is asked to provide feedback on the menu of options and the crosswalk documents. She noted that both staff and Vice Chair Hirsch had presentations.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that she would give her presentation and then she had Vice Chair Hirsch's slides available.

Chair Thompson noted they needed to allow for public comment and there was one person attending.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that Jean Eisberg was not available, but that she and perhaps Amy French were available. The ARB approved a majority of the project in April 2021. Council heard the project on November 8, 2021 and directed staff to look into some of the items further. Staff requested ARB assistance



and there were two previous hearings on the matter. The new Boardmembers were provided with links to the videos in order to get up to speed. She explained she would recap the items from March 10<sup>th</sup>. There is a height transition moving forward to the City Council that is separate from the height step back that the ARB would discuss in the hearing. The key remaining items include the menu of options and the missing standards staff found when completing the crosswalk documents. On March 10<sup>th</sup> there were public comments made about privacy, requests to clarify sight lines, and clarify how proposed standards would be objective. She explained that the ARB agreed on March 10<sup>th</sup> to add a privacy statement to the intent statements and then read it aloud. The statement was not objective, but the intent statements are to be used by the ARB on a discretionary project. The ARB also agreed on 30 feet separation being the distance at which they no longer needed additional measures and she read the agreed upon measures aloud. She also read the balcony standards aloud for the ARB and showed illustrations of the concepts. They also worked out the height step back at the March 10<sup>th</sup> meeting and she read those draft standards aloud. The ARB needs to further discuss the menu of options and Vice Chair Hirsch put a lot of effort into the matter. The Council requested that the ARB require more options relating to massing and façades. The detailed crosswalk documents are in the packet and on the City's website for the public. Everyone is interested in maintaining the elements that make Palo Alto a high quality city. Staff prepared the detailed documents to show the ARB the old standard versus the new standard. The purpose or intent statements still need to be titled and are discretionary. There are four items that could potentially need additional discussion and a standard and needed to be discussed by the ARB. In closing she reminded Boardmembers that the height transition is different than the height step back. The entire Objective Standard project should go to Council in May. There have been more than 15 hearings on the matter and the ARB approved it in April 2021, so the purpose of the hearing was to look at the items brought up by Council at their November hearing. Staff recommended they discuss the menu of options, missing standards in the crosswalk document, and refinements to the other items.

Chair Thompson called for the public comment.

Jeff Levinsky thanked the ARB for the hearing. He reminded them that the public wanted the standards to be simple and turn the subjective rules into objective rules. The rules should be rigorous and as or more restrictive than the current rules as applicants would always have the option to go to subjective review. Finally, the public wanted the changes to the rules to be minimal in order to make the process simple overall. The ARB did not need to construct a new framework for how Palo Alto evaluates buildings, but rather they need to make precise changes to the rules.

Chair Thompson thanked Mr. Levinsky and called for further comment, but there was none. She called for Vice Chair Hirsch's presentation.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that she would pull up the presentation.

Chair Thompson indicated that after Vice Chair Hirsch was done they would hold a round of questions.

Vice Chair Hirsch explained that he had worked on the issue for two years and some aspects remain unsolved. He noted that the task was large and necessary and since it would be the default method of approval for all projects that use the State law it was important to get it right. He felt it required another review before it returned to Council for their consideration. He explained that he had prepared photographic examples for the ARB to review and discuss. There should be descriptive language that

Page 24 of 46

Architectural Review Board Meeting  
Draft Summary Minutes: 4/7/22

relieves the City of dependence on the commitment to base/middle/top (BMT). Therefore there should be five categories of architectural design as follows: 1) the BMT should be referred to as “classical proportions”, 2) traditional historicism, 3) functional expression, 4) textural layering, and 5) contextual urbanism. He read proposed language aloud indicating that a project should be in one of the five categories and defining the categories.

Chair Thompson asked if the slides should have advanced.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that they should and that she emailed Chair Thompson the four page document he was reading from. There would be photographs shown later in the presentation.

Vice Chair Hirsch continued reading the definitions of the five categories. Alternately they could choose to eliminate all references including BMT from the regulation. He asked Ms. Gerhardt to show her PowerPoint.

Ms. Gerhardt shared an image of Wilton Court.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked her to return to that later and suggested they move on.

Ms. Gerhardt said that he also discussed a list of objective standards to study further in his list and asked if he wanted to stay on the BMT topic.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that he wanted to review the slides first. The first shown was a building in San Francisco and was four story. There was no specific verticality to the building and varies along the street front. The next slide showed a building featuring ins and outs and color. It had a simple palette and that was important to the design. The third slide was also of Wilton Court, and he asked Ms. Gerhardt to move on. The fourth slide showed a varied use and he indicated that he was partly responsible for it. He used the exterior patterning as the concept for the building and he noted it would not pass BMT. The fifth slide was of a building done by architect [David Acre 3:34:08] out of San Francisco. He used an overlay to create a top and does not have a cornice or other defined top the way the Palo Alto description requires. The sixth slide featured a step down to meet the local street and that form determined what the building would become. He indicated that he thought there were additional slides demonstrating BMT but indicated that he may not have sent them to Ms. Gerhardt. He indicated that he would provide them to the other Boardmembers later. He explained that he wanted to see if it were possible within the document to insert the categories so that the objective standards would be that all buildings three stories or taller on lots 50 feet wide should be designed to utilize as its major expression one of the five categories or styles. Buildings three stories or taller on lots wider than 15 feet and less than 100 feet should utilize the design concept of BMT. He indicated that he had notated all the standards and asked Ms. Gerhardt to review them and determine their reasonableness. With Wilton Court he requested Ms. Gerhardt show the slides.

Ms. Gerhardt showed a photograph and indicated that it was an illustration of BMT.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that it was a New England BMT and was a perfect urban building.

Ms. Gerhardt displayed a slide of Wilton Court.

Vice Chair Hirsch noted the dominant terracotta material, the square windows, a beautifully modulated horizontal building, and other features of the building. There was no upper floor modulation and so it would fail for that reason which he went on to explain at length. The ARB needed to be careful that it did not write something that was so simple that it caused architects to use one device. The Chapter also did not offer the possibility of recessing the ground floor, a fact that he thought had surprised Ms. Gerhardt to learn. That piece needed to be addressed. He spoke of the required recesses and noted that Wilton Court was flat faced, but highly successful. The ARB did not want to eliminate that possibility either. Vertical expressions will happen automatically as that was the way housing was built. Wilton Court was an example of excluding vertical expressions successfully. In the case of BMT there needs to be a cornice at the top made of a different material per the resolution. Wilton Court did not need that differentiation.

Chair Thompson stated that part of the task the ARB had before it was adding items to the menu of options. She asked if Vice Chair Hirsch had any suggested items to add.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked Chair Thompson to hold her questions to the end of the presentation.

Chair Thompson stated that was the main focus of the discussion and that she did not want the ARB to lose sight of it.

Vice Chair Hirsch said he was trying to wind up the presentation. He asked if it would be reasonable to require Wilton Court to go through the extra ARB process because of the regulations or if they should consider revising the text now. Currently quality projects are not approved because of the regulations. He then stated that it was important that the design features were guided by sensible limitations written into the code and noted that was what Mr. Levinsky spoke to. He then read aloud his slide containing a list of objectives for further study. He advocated for specific regulations like a 30 foot separation between neighbors with planting. He thought that was moving in the correct directions. Per Ms. Gerhardt's request he reviewed the packet and notated it with tabs. He suggested the other Boardmembers review it and think about each item because at the end of the process it was important the ARB be happy with what it produced.

Ms. Gerhardt thanked Vice Chair Hirsch for his work. She explained that she wanted to focus on Packet Page 49 Item F which came out of the Council's Motion. Council asked that they increase the number of required choices on the menu of options related to building massing and façade sections. The ARB believed that just increasing the requirement was difficult and that was why they needed the further discussion. Council specifically was concerned about the sections starting on Packet Page 65, which were the objective standards passed by the ARB in April 2021 and the façade design on Packet Page 68. Packet Page 69 deals with the BMT issue focused on by Vice Chair Hirsch. Lastly, Packet Page 87 tried to take the objective standards and build a checklist for staff review. The ARB needs to determine how many options had to be picked and if any options needed to be added.

Chair Thompson asked if the checklist from Packet Page 87 would be the main item that future applicants looked at or if it would be the document from Packet Page 65.

Ms. Gerhardt said applicants would have to look at both. The information from the Pages in the 60s would be in the actual code. The checklist on Packet Page 87 was meant to be reviewed by the architect and used as a checklist by staff.

Chair Thompson thanked her for the clarification and indicated that she wanted to discuss additional menu options with the Board. At the last hearing they asked Vice Chair Hirsch to research what the additional items could be and so that was what she had expected the presentation to be about. She asked if there were any extra items Vice Chair Hirsch wanted to add to the menu of options.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated that he had not looked at it that way specifically. He looked through the regulations to determine what he felt needed to be changed.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that for C1 on Packet Page 89 Vice Chair Hirsch changed BMT to “classical proportions” and then added the other options.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated that he wanted to hear comments from the ARB on that.

Ms. Gerhardt said that there were proposed additions to that page.

Vice Chair Hirsch struggled with the language and wanted something to represent categories of architecture, which was a broad thing to do. He requested they review that and indicate whether that was enough and was certain that BMT was not enough though the explanation of it was sufficient.

Chair Thompson stated that Page 89 C1 had the BMT language. She asked if they would add C1b and C1c, etcetera, for the extra architectural styles.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that he was not sure if he was there yet, but that he wanted to hear the ARBs opinions. With respect to façade descriptions there was a host of things that happened there.

Chair Thompson interrupted and requested a page number.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated he was on Packet Page 21.

Ms. Gerhardt asked which packet he was referring to.

Vice Chair Hirsch said he was looking at the old book.

Chair Thompson stated that it had been copied to the new packet.

Ms. Gerhardt said that they were looking at the BMT on Page 69 in the current packet.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated he would continue to work from his marked up packet. He explained that it discussed what one should do to make a building interesting. He suggested they remove “approve by Director” and complete some edits. Otherwise it applied to just about everything and was very general. He did not think that each one should be called out with the aesthetics explained. There should be very general rules and the alternatives should also be more general. The BMT rules are pretty complete and should apply to the smaller buildings, but since that approach might not be successful in a wider building the rest of the book would be applied. Everything in the study was described from the point of a smaller building. He read aloud a passage about buildings that were longer than 200 feet in length. The one large break referenced should be expanded into multiple breaks. The wording could be changed to “one or more.” He then read from the guidelines on balconies and explained that he was trying to expand on the alternative in which all buildings that are 200 feet or more have one large, recessed court. That is a major requirement that he found to be inappropriate to state as a specific.

Chair Thompson stated that the conversation was drifting around. She indicated that much of what was being discussed was previously approved and she did not want to revisit them unless there was an ARB majority to do so. She suggested they focus on adding items to the menu of options.

Vice Chair Hirsch disagreed with Chair Thompson and stated that the ARB had not done an appropriate review as it had just been the two of them working on the items for a few years.

Chair Thompson stated that was not true and referenced the meetings with the entire ARB. The ARB approved many of the items and unless there was a majority wishing to overturn the approval she did not want to spend the time on it.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought it was important and wanted to have the conversation as the full ARB.

Boardmember Baltay stated that Vice Chair Hirsch had attempted to reopen the conversation before. The ARB agreed to go in the direction they took and the items he raised were not on the agenda. He wished they had additional time to get the standards together but noted that if they did not complete the standards the City would have nothing. The ARB had to publish something. Everyone agreed the document was fairly good.

Vice Chair Hirsch argued that they had not.

Boardmember Baltay stated that a majority of the ARB voted. The City Council indicated they should move forward and revisit it and amend it over time. That was the appropriate course of action. He agreed that BMT is crude and perhaps antiquated way of looking at urban design but trying to introduce additional categories of building design at this point was a step backwards. He thought Vice Chair Hirsch's ideas and concerns were legitimate.

Vice Chair Hirsch said there were two options, and one was to eliminate BMT as a stated style of building. Wilton Court was approved and did not have a BMT and had a corner recessed entrance which was not described in the regulations. There are two aspects, one being style of a building and the other being the regulations. He wanted to see both changed so that they did not emphasize one. Either they eliminate the requirement for BMT and have no description of style or put something in that described a variety of styles. There would be specific regulations for all buildings.

Boardmember Baltay asked how they would produce an equivalent level of description for the other design options.

Vice Chair Hirsch did not believe that they had to, only that the design restrictions would cover it. As long as the design restrictions were appropriate then...

Boardmember Baltay asked Vice Chair Hirsch to take "textural layering" and ask an applicant to choose either BMT or C2, textural layering, how they would define that description.

Chair Thompson interjected that it had to be defined objectively.

Boardmember Baltay explained that process would take the ARB many meetings to review and implement that. He stated it could take months.

Vice Chair Hirsch disagreed. The regulations were there already.

Boardmember Baltay asked what Vice Chair Hirsch wanted the ARB to do.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that he wanted the language substituted so that there was variety to what one could do based on stylistic building typologies and then wanted the regulations listed. The only time the ARB followed though on BMT was with smaller buildings. All buildings do not have to be vertical. He thought that there were mistakes in the text that needed correction and they needed to be changed. His packet was annotated and ready to go to Ms. Gerhardt.

Chair Thompson stated that it needed to go through the ARB first if he wanted to change text and he needed to be extremely specific about what he was suggesting. The ARB had approved the text and it was not their charge to revisit old items at the current meeting. Many options had been discussed and it was always determined that if projects did not want to conform to the Objective Standards then they would come to the ARB for discretionary review. The ARB was tasked with taking the current code and making it objective. Even though the standards say BMT there were many ways to get to the rest of the options Vice Chair Hirsch wanted. She requested that the ARB focus on the current agenda and adding menu options. She stated that unless Boardmembers Baltay and Rosenberg had suggestions they did not seem prepared to do that.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he had suggestions. He respected the work put in by Vice Chair Hirsch. On section C1 BMT the checklist required two options. It seemed Council had requested they require more options be selected, not only more items available on the checklist. With BMT he read the current requirements and stated that he thought most applicants would choose options 3 and 4. That would eliminate real variation in the building massing. To fulfill Council's request he thought that instead of saying "two or more" they should state "three or more" to force more building modulation.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought that was terrific.

Boardmember Baltay suggested that on Section C1 they change the text to "three or more" from "two or more."

Ms. Gerhardt confirmed that they were on Packet Page 89 under BMT.

Boardmember Baltay stated that was correct. He indicated that he had made notes on his packet along those lines throughout and that was what he thought Council had requested of the ARB.

Chair Thompson agreed that was what the ARB was supposed to be doing.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that he had no problem with that change but had an issue with 80% of the façade length.

Chair Thompson asked if that was part of the checklist.

Ms. Gerhardt directed her to Checklist Item #2.

Boardmember Baltay asked what Vice Chair Hirsch wanted that changed to.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought it should be 60%

Chair Thompson requested confirmation of where they were.

Ms. Gerhardt directed her to “variation of building modulation.”

Vice Chair Hirsch argued for alternative modulation.

Boardmember Baltay noted that 80% was listed twice, once under the general category of C1 and then a second time under variation in building modulation itself. He asked which one should be changed or if they should add a comment that it could be in as many as three different pieces that sum up to 80%.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that did not work in a building that was 50 feet wide and again argued for 60%. There were many specific dimensions which if you were looking to design a building would not provide flexibility.

Boardmember Baltay stated that was not what City Council requested that they do.

Vice Chair Hirsch understood that.

Ms. Gerhardt said that if they wanted to say “three or more” then they needed to make sure that the three or more could be accomplished.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that they were going back to make that change, which he agreed with. Broadening the possibilities was the ARB’s task.

Chair Thompson indicated that they needed to be clear and that what they were doing narrowed the possibilities.

Boardmember Baltay stated that it was making things more restrictive.

Ms. Gerhardt believed that was the Council’s direction.

Boardmember Baltay moved to change Section C1 to read as “three or more of the following four” instead of “two.”

Chair Thompson indicated that before they voted Boardmember Rosenberg should have a chance to comment.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that she had spent hours reviewing the videos. She agreed that “three or more” was a good addition. She agreed with Vice Chair Hirsch that it would be tragic if every building looked cookie cutter but agreed this was the type of change they had been tasked to make at the current hearing.

Chair Thompson asked if they needed a second on the Motion.

Ms. Gerhardt stated the items could be taken as straw polls.

Chair Thompson called the straw poll on the change to “three or more of the following four.”

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed.

Boardmember Baltay agreed.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked about the page number.

Chair Thompson directed him to Packet Page 89.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed.

Chair Thompson stated she also agreed. She asked for Boardmember Baltay's other suggestions.

Boardmember Baltay directed them to Section C2 on façade composition he suggested changing two to four. He indicated that he was looking at Page 97 of the March 3<sup>rd</sup> packet.

Chair Thompson said that it was Page 91 in the current packet.

Boardmember Baltay explained there were six possible ways, and he was proposing they make four required.

Chair Thompson asked why four and not three.

Boardmember Baltay thought that most buildings met two defacto. Therefore, three was not sufficient and four was reasonable. He explained it was his response to City Council's request to make the standards tougher.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked what it would look like.

Boardmember Baltay explained that he looked at buildings to determine how many would meet the requirements and all met two easily. Most met three or four and the ones that looked great met all of them. Wilton Court met the standards except for having balconies.

Vice Chair Hirsch cautioned that sometimes simplicity was better.

Boardmember Baltay stated that if Vice Chair Hirsch wanted to they could pull up Wilton Court and see.

Ms. Gerhardt displayed Wilton Court.

Boardmember Baltay stated it met Requirements 1 and 2. He and Vice Chair Hirsch then discussed the building's datum line.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought it was in conflict to require vertical projections and a horizontal datum line.

Chair Thompson agreed.

Boardmember Baltay said that Wilton Court did not have balconies so if it failed on the next two then the last two... he indicated that he was looking at it like a planner and checking the boxes. He asked Ms. Gerhardt if it met the criteria.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated it did.

Boardmember Baltay stated the last one was dependent on the terra cotta. He asked if Ms. Gerhardt would interpret it to be fine grain.



Ms. Gerhardt said that it was a Planner making the decision, but also bringing the project to the ARB for one hearing for confirmation. If the tiles were 8 inches in height then she would state that it met the standard.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that they could be 10 inches.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that the applicant would be told to reduce the size to 8 inches and then the project would pass through.

Boardmember Baltay stated that the standard should be for three options, not four.

Chair Thompson stated that Wilton Court met Requirements 1, 2, and 6.

Boardmember Baltay thought terra cotta was not "fine grain."

Chair Thompson noted that the project could benefit from a more fine grain material.

Boardmember Baltay agreed. The guidelines were not perfect.

Chair Thompson preferred three to four.

Boardmember Baltay stated support for that.

Ms. Gerhardt called for a straw poll.

Chair Thompson called for questions before the straw poll.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the datum line was supposed to be the entire length of the building or for a majority of the length of the building.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that they were not supposed to interpret anything, it was supposed to be pretty apparent.

Chair Thompson agreed that it meant the length of the entire building.

Vice Chair Hirsch noted that Wilton Court did not count.

Chair Thompson said that some buildings had datum lines across the whole façade.

Boardmember Baltay noted one of the buildings that Vice Chair Hirsch displayed with a cornice across the top as a BMT. That was a brick building.

Ms. Gerhardt pulled the building up on the screen.

Boardmember Baltay explained that the building would need to add balconies to meet the third requirement. He noted that would be better.

Chair Thompson pointed out that datum line.

Boardmember Baltay suggested they put the building through the checklist. He noted it did not have recesses or vertical or horizontal projections. It had a datum line but no screening device. Assuming the material is brick it had a fine grain material.

Chair Thompson stated that it met two requirements.

Boardmember Baltay explained it met two but not three requirements.

Chair Thompson said that they may have decided on two because they did not want to limit projects. She asked if the project would be made better by adding an item or if it was meant to be only two requirements.

Vice Chair Hirsch noted that it already said "two or more."

Chair Thompson repeated "a minimum of two."

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that with objective standards developers would also choose the lesser amount.

Boardmember Baltay noted that if the storefront of the building had the entrances recessed then the finding could be made.

Ms. Gerhardt agreed. The building might only have two items, but clearly it would be easy to add a third item and that was the criteria the Council was looking for from the ARB.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked to discuss another building and directed Ms. Gerhardt to it on the screen.

Boardmember Baltay noted that was Vice Chair Hirsch's building.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested they evaluate it. She thought the building was beautiful and wanted to know if they would prohibit themselves from allowing something like it to pass through.

Boardmember Baltay said that the first two categories work. He asked if there were balconies.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that they were not.

Boardmember Baltay did not know if the cornice was considered a datum line but said they could assume it was not.

Boardmember Rosenberg adored the patterning but thought it would not qualify as a datum line despite being a horizontal banding system.

Chair Thompson asked if there were projections in the tile.

Vice Chair Hirsch explained that the whole of the face was projected in front of the structure below.

Chair Thompson confirmed that there was a ground floor recess.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that the front was an overlay element that carried around the corner.

Chair Thompson explained that she was wondering if the grey tile projected in front of the white tile.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated it did not.

Boardmember Baltay thought the building qualified for categories 5 and 6 as well and explained why.

Chair Thompson asked he state the other two he could find.

Boardmember Baltay said he could also make 1 and 2.

Chair Thompson asked where the horizontal projections were.

Boardmember Baltay asked Vice Chair Hirsch if they were at the windows.

Chair Thompson stated they looked punched.

Vice Chair Hirsch said they were punched.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if it counted as a fine grain material. She thought the project would suffer if they had to reduce the scale of the paneling.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed.

Chair Thompson said that the alternative was the project came to the ARB for discretionary review.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that was fair but noted they were trying to streamline the process.

Chair Thompson noted that it might be impossible to account for all of the different possibilities.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed.

Boardmember Baltay teased Vice Chair Hirsch about a cornice.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if they could add a cornice.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that they could not.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he had made a joke.

Chair Thompson said that a cornice was not part of the design parti of the building.

Vice Chair Hirsch was concerned that they expand the list of requirements and then they would be screwed up.

Boardmember Baltay repeated that would only bring more projects back to the discretionary process. It does not close the door to approval.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that applicants that could prove they met the requirements got approval.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that if an architect made the case that they had a datum line in the building the staff would bring it to the ARB. She reminded them that every project would have one hearing even under the streamlined rules. Council would see the meeting's minutes and realize the struggle the ARB had and make the decision. She encouraged the ARB to come to a recommendation.

Chair Thompson thought that if they left the requirements at 2 then Vice Chair Hirsch's building would pass. If they put it to three it would not pass. For that reason she suggested they leave it at two.

Boardmember Baltay stated that he thought he could find for three requirements.

Vice Chair Hirsch asked if the one before was changed and noted that the building would not meet those requirements.

Boardmember Baltay indicated there was a screening device or cantilevering device at the left at the cornice line.

Chair Thompson stated that counted for 5 but not for 2.

Boardmember Baltay argued that it looked like shading protection to him.

Vice Chair Hirsch pointed out that other parts of the text call for ground floor verticality in the windowpanes. He suggested they return to the BMT building and noted those ground floor windows would not pass the wording of the requirements.

Boardmember Baltay asked which wording he was referring to.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that it was in other parts of the text.

Chair Thompson asked the ARB to stay on topic. They were discussing whether C2 should be changed to "a minimum of three." She suggested a straw poll.

Boardmember Baltay thought three was fine.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought four was too restrictive but was able to change it to three with some hesitation.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that his building would fail.

Chair Thompson asked if he wanted to keep the requirement to two instead of three.

Vice Chair Hirsch indicated that he did but noted it would still fail.

Chair Thompson said it would pass with two. She also thought that the requirement should remain at two despite Council's request to add more. That requirement was not the place to request more.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that he would bring his thoughts to the Council.

Chair Thompson indicated that it was 1:10 p.m. and the meeting was scheduled to end at 1:00. Lunch was also available. She asked if Boardmember Baltay had further suggestions.

Boardmember Baltay said that he did not. Council asked the ARB to tighten the requirements and the ARB should respect that. The issue was not about making better design it was about tightening the standards. the Council might be happy with two changes. The City is worse off for not having the objective standards in place.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that Vice Chair Hirsch's building could go horribly wrong in the hands of a less skilled architect. Based on that she felt more strongly about changing the requirement to three.

Boardmember Baltay argued that if the ARB changed those items it could be done and send the item to Council with the changes.

Chair Thompson acknowledged that Council wanted things changed but noted the ARB was also charged with using their expertise to vote for what was right and made sense architecturally. If that was in conflict with what Council wanted then they should hear that. The hired everyone on the ARB to advocate for the

beauty of the City. She argued how requiring a third option might detract from Vice Chair Hirsch's building and noted it was important that the ARB recognizes that part of their charge.

Boardmember Baltay noted that Vice Chair Hirsch's building was dramatic and unique and was the kind of thing that maybe should go through a full review. The checklist is supposed to catch this kind of building.

Vice Chair Hirsch said the building would not make it.

Boardmember Baltay argued it already met three requirements.

Vice Chair Hirsch supported Chair Thompson's comments about how the Council depended on the ARB for its expertise. If the ARB suggested they limit the options the Council might listen. Further, he was concerned that colors and materials were not mentioned as they were also particularly important. The BMT buildings he reviewed were a mess. It was appropriate for the ARB to tell Council when something would not work architecturally.

Boardmember Baltay said that in the March 3<sup>rd</sup> packet there was a picture of a building by Heather Young that would meet two criteria; however, the ARB was determined that project should be revised. So it was important to note that only two would have allowed that building to go through. Almost every building he could think of met the requirements for two items.

Chair Thompson asked if the building would be improved by having to comply with a third requirement.

Boardmember Baltay said that a sunshade would improve the functionality. He guessed the building was designed on a tight budget and that was the reason the detail was left off.

Chair Thompson clarified she was speaking of the Heather Young project. She asked if that project would be improved if it met three requirements. She voiced concern that if it met three it might become discombobulated.

Boardmember Baltay said that they might include a second floor balcony instead of a wall recess and that would improve the building, or the material might be more fine grain and would probably improve it. Two of the criteria could be met by almost any building so that is too loose in that regard. He thought that was Council's belief as well.

Vice Chair Hirsch did not think that the ARB's criticism was to the point where the project would not be approved as designed.

Boardmember Baltay said he was not trying to be critical of the building. He suggested Ms. Gerhardt display another building.

Vice Chair Hirsch suggested Wilton Court.

Boardmember Baltay thought that if they could make a few changes they could be done with the project.

Chair Thompson was proud of the one change the ARB agreed upon.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired about Vice Chair Hirsch's comments on color. There were no comments on color, just that materials must be a certain size and fine grain.

Boardmember Baltay thought that colors were addressed somewhere in the standards.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated there was a different section for that.

Chair Thompson did not believe they defined preference for palettes, just for material types.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted that in Vice Chair Hirsch's building a color change broke up the façade.

Boardmember Baltay suggested they change it to three requirements and add a seventh category.

Chair Thompson indicated that she was open to that.

Boardmember Baltay suggested it be a variation of contrasting colored materials.

Chair Thompson said she previously considered that and was open to the idea.

Boardmember Baltay asked how they should phrase the idea.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought it was important how to phrase it but enjoyed the idea. She suggested "notable color variation or patterning."

Chair Thompson suggested that it be a material variation. She asked if "color of material" was too vague.

Ms. Gerhardt directed the ARB to Packet Pages 83 and 84 to look at the discussion of materials and percentages. They would need to indicate a percentage or something else that was objective.

Boardmember Baltay noted that Boardmember Rosenberg's suggestion displayed how everything worked together despite the standards trying to separate them. He suggested that #7 say "the use of contrasting materials or colors over 60% of the façade area."

Chair Thompson suggested "color, material and/or texture."

Boardmember Baltay restated "contrasting color, material, or texture over 60% of the façade area."

Chair Thompson asked if they should use "contrasting" or "modulating."

Boardmember Baltay asked for staff's assistance.

Ms. Gerhardt said that she did not know how to implement it.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested "use of contrasting color, material, and/or texture variation over X% of façade." Using Vice Chair Hirsch's building as an example she noted that it might not reach 60%.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he had meant the entire top portion of the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg understood.

Boardmember Baltay stated they could use "the predominant façade element" but said that would be hard to determine about the current building shown [4:50:43].

Chair Thompson suggested "modulate color material and/or texture over 60% of the façade area."

Boardmember Baltay agreed.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked how they would determine the 60%.

Chair Thompson stated that it was façade composition. Alternatively, she suggested “incorporating a minimum of three different color materials or textures across the façade.”

Boardmember Rosenberg said that was simple.

Boardmember Baltay was fine with whatever Chair Thompson thought worked.

Ms. Gerhardt said that she could implement that more easily.

Boardmember Baltay asked how she phrased it and noted that every building had three façade colors.

Chair Thompson sat in thought for a moment. She asked if they were forcing things on a small scale and if the ARB should try to force the scale in addition to the change in materials and texture.

Boardmember Baltay said that they needed to get it done so that it could be put in place and evaluated after a year. The City needed the objective standards and was worse off without them.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the ARB was happier with the choice of three or 60%.

Boardmember Baltay thought it had to occur over a defined portion of the façade area. Over 60% of the façade you either need three contrasting materials, textures, or colors or three modulating materials, textures, or colors. Alternatively they could say, “a modulation of materials, textures, and colors.” Then staff could interpret the standard as the saw fit.

Ms. Gerhardt requested assistance interpreting the contrast over 60%. She asked if they could say something like “the primary material would be no more than 60%.”

Boardmember Baltay explained they were reacting to Vice Chair Hirsch’s building that had two different color tiles artfully arranged. That tile gave the façade composition and made it successful.

Ms. Gerhardt thought the ARB also said that was a high degree of skill to make that come together appropriately.

Boardmember Baltay repeated that they needed to complete the standards.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought the new option would help the less skilled.

Chair Thompson thought that it already discussed the prime material being a certain percentage of the façade elsewhere.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that Packet Page 83 and 84 discussed that and Page 84 stated that brick could be 100% of the façade. Therefore if they narrowed it to say that the primary material would be a maximum of 60% or whatever the ARB saw fit it might work.

Boardmember Baltay said that in the façade composition section they wanted one more option.

Chair Thompson suggested “incorporate a minimum of three variations on color, texture, and material.”

Boardmember Baltay asked if that was over a percentage of the façade.

Chair Thompson said no.

Boardmember Baltay restated that it would incorporate a minimum of three materials that vary in color, texture or...

Chair Thompson said material.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if they meant three different per façade or the whole building.

Chair Thompson indicated they meant the whole building.

Boardmember Baltay said that he was satisfied.

Chair Thompson confirmed that the ARB was suggesting changing the minimum from two to three and add another option that states “to incorporate a minimum of three variations on color, texture, or material.”

Boardmembers Baltay, Rosenberg, and Vice Chair Hirsch agreed.

Chair Thompson asked if Ms. Gerhardt had the text.

Ms. Gerhardt requested she send it to her.

Boardmember Baltay said he had no other suggested changes.

Chair Thompson asked if the ARB had other items to discuss on the objective standards.

Ms. Gerhardt thought that answered the massing and façade questions, but they still had to discuss the missing items related to the crosswalk.

Chair Thompson said there were four missing items and she hoped it could be handled quickly.

Ms. Gerhardt directed them to Packet Page 50 and the four items.

Chair Thompson thought Item 2 was difficult to make objective because she did not know they could decree how many unit types a project had to have given the nature of different sites. She thought it was connected to Item 1 and the diversity of building types increasing with lot size.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that Item 1 indicated that a larger piece of property could include more variety.

Chair Thompson asked if what listed was an example.

Ms. Gerhardt explained they were two different standards in the current code. They could be combined. Item 1 they would have to state what they meant by “diversity of building types.”

Chair Thompson asked if that was already defined and noted that it came up related to a Bayshore project.

Ms. Gerhardt agreed that it had come up. It would be good to make the standard more objective. The ARB should define different unit types.

Chair Thompson said that building type was defined by code.



Ms. Gerhardt said that they could go by unit type or better define building type. The Bayshore project has some buildings with five units and others with six so that could be called different building types.

Chair Thompson called for ARB thoughts.

Boardmember Baltay indicated support for Items 1, 2, and 3 as stated.

Chair Thompson noted that they were not objective. Item 3 would need to state that the side yard had a six foot diameter or something similar.

Ms. Gerhardt agreed.

Chair Thompson said that all the items were subjective and needed to be made objective by the ARB's feedback.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested taking them one at a time. Item 1 should read "unit type or housing type" versus "building type." Building types might actually change the architecture, which is not the intent.

Chair Thompson asked if she meant bedroom count.

Boardmember Rosenberg explained she meant townhouse versus apartment versus a one bedroom or studio, just more mixed housing usage.

Vice Chair Hirsch said that good planning contained a mix of housing typologies. He suggested low-rise housing mixed with mid-rise. He thought that was the intention.

Chair Thompson said that she needed to list the different types. Townhome would be one and something on a double loaded corridor would be another. She did not think that needed to vary by the size of the lot as even a small lot could have multiple building types.

Boardmember Rosenberg mentioned a property near the corner of El Camino and Los Altos Avenue there were condos with townhomes on the exterior and apartments at the center. The buildings varied in height and broke up the massing.

Chair Thompson asked the ARB if it were to suggest three housing types what the third would be. The two she could think of were townhomes and single story.

Ms. Gerhardt said that a townhome could be detached as well as attached.

Chair Thompson asked if Item 1 could stand on its own if the building types were defined as attached townhome or detached townhome. She further asked if that could be written out for the ARB to review later.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated she was pulling up the existing code to show the ARB where the item came from. the housing type or unit type was more what they were after. Townhomes are straight up and down, condos can be in other configurations, and there was a mixed-use building listed.

Chair Thompson asked if it was already clear.

Boardmember Baltay suggested they use "housing type" and then in parentheses list four or five types of housing. The word "etcetera" could be used.

Chair Thompson thought that made sense.

Boardmember Baltay noted that the current code did not define it well. Housing type is better than building type.

Ms. Gerhardt confirmed that she could give examples of attached townhome, detached townhome, condos, single family dwellings.

Boardmember Baltay noted it could also be a larger apartment building.

Ms. Gerhardt said mixed-use was allowed as well.

Chair Thompson said that she conflated 1 and 2. She asked if everyone was comfortable with that.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she was.

Boardmember Baltay agreed.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed as well.

Chair Thompson stated that was the direction on 1 and 2. For Item 3 she had a note about a 6 foot diameter outdoor side yard.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if she meant 6 foot minimum width.

Chair Thompson said diameter.

Boardmember Baltay said that it related to allowing passage between two parts of the property so it's a clearance width.

Chair Thompson indicated she understood.

Boardmember Baltay thought the 6 foot side yard might be excessive for a larger building.

Ms. Gerhardt clarified they were discussing useable side yards. She asked what a useable size was.

Boardmember Baltay joked that depended on if one was asking him or Chair Thompson.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if they meant useable for passage or useable for garbage storage. Passable could be as low as four feet, but useable and accommodating some other purpose would require 6 feet.

Ms. Gerhardt thought of it as usable open space.

Chair Thompson confirmed she meant like a patio.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that needed to be bigger than 6 feet.

Chair Thompson indicated it was a typical balcony diameter.

Boardmember Baltay said that 6 feet was the standard in town and noted they had not been asked to rework things.

Vice Chair Hirsch agreed.

Boardmember Baltay explained that 6 feet was enough for passage and another use like trash can storage, so it made sense.

Ms. Gerhardt indicated that 6 foot was a single family larger lot requirement.

Boardmember Baltay said that they should be stricter now and that they could always revisit the standards.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if it would be a 6 foot width or diameter.

Boardmember Baltay stated width.

Chair Thompson agreed width was fine. With Item 4 she did not know how to make it objective.

Boardmember Baltay asked where Item 4 came from.

Ms. Gerhardt explained there were view corridor regulations in the Comprehensive Plan which would be more discretionary. The rule was only in the PTOD which Palo Alto does not use.

Boardmember Baltay thought it established a terrible precedent and reeked of someone being paid off to include it in the standards.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought it was hyper specific.

Boardmember Baltay did not think Palo Alto had view corridor issues.

Chair Thompson stated that the ARB would omit that item. She asked if they got through the objective standards.

Ms. Gerhardt thought they got through the ones they needed to discuss so long as they agreed with the other items about privacy and contextual height on Page 50 and 51.

Chair Thompson asked to go around and confirm that staff captured the privacy and contextual height conversation accurately.

Boardmember Rosenberg indicated she had a clarity question related to Number 2 Part A Item 1. She asked if it was for residential.

Boardmember Baltay said it was.

Ms. Gerhardt explained the standard was used on single family homes during the Individual Review (IR) process. They are bringing the theory forward to multi-family projects. It is an "or" so that frosted windows were allowed if the applicant did not want to do high sills.

Boardmember Rosenberg was concerned about fire access and egress. She thought that it had to be 44 inches maximum about finished floor (interrupted)

Ms. Gerhardt said that if they needed egress windows they could use the frosted glass.

Boardmember Rosenberg said that every bedroom window would have to be opaque.

Chair Thompson said she had a big problem with that.

Ms. Gerhardt said that was true within 30 feet facing a residential window or private open space.

Boardmember Baltay advised Boardmember Rosenberg that was the standard for design in Palo Alto. He noted that he has made her argument before, and that it usually did not land well.

Chair Thompson said that it made sense in a single family residential home where there were other places to get clear glass, but in a multifamily it makes the unit unusable. Therefore the developer would have to set the building back 31 feet.

Boardmember Baltay stated that was the intention of the guideline.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted that they only needed to set it back 30 feet and 1 inch.

Chair Thompson agreed.

Boardmember Rosenberg appreciated the clarity.

Chair Thompson noted that floor to ceiling glass were allowed so long as it was 15 degrees away. She asked if 15 was a little harsh and asked if they could make it 30 or 45.

Boardmember Rosenberg thought that sounded more restrictive.

Chair Thompson said that it would provide for more glass and requested Ms. Gerhardt show the drawing of the angled windows.

Ms. Gerhardt did so.

Chair Thompson explained that was 15 degrees and she was suggesting 30 to 45 degrees to allow more glazing without reducing privacy.

Vice Chair Hirsch preferred 45 degrees.

Boardmember Baltay said he did not know without knowing the thickness of the wall and the width of the window. He thought 45 degrees would not meet the target.

Chair Thompson sketched it out.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he was comfortable with 30 degrees.

Boardmember Rosenberg was also comfortable with 30 degrees.

Vice Chair Hirsch stated that he was okay with 30 degrees.

Chair Thompson indicated that they would compromise at 30 degrees. She called for further comments on previously discussed items.

Ms. Gerhardt said that the other item was the height setback.

Chair Thompson said she had no further comment.

Boardmember Baltay thought they settled that matter.

Chair Thompson repeated they were just confirming staff had captured the comments.

Ms. Gerhardt showed the two drawings because the item was “and.”

Chair Thompson thought it was “or.”

Ms. Gerhardt said “and.”

Boardmember Baltay stated that Chair Thompson wanted “or” and noted that she had yelled at Vice Chair Hirsch for reopening things.

Chair Thompson said that she was concerned.

Vice Chair Hirsch thought it was correct.

Chair Thompson confirmed it was “and” not “or.”

Boardmember Baltay said they proposed a higher daylight plane.

Vice Chair Hirsch noted it was much higher.

Boardmember Baltay said that was suitable for the type of use. “Or” made sure that the daylight plane would never be followed and would only use the 6 foot setback.

Ms. Gerhardt agreed.

Chair Thompson remembered Vice Chair Hirsch wanting the image that was in front of the ARB.

Boardmember Baltay said that Vice Chair Hirsch was persuaded by his logic. He then noted he had a client coming in at 2:00 p.m.

Ms. Gerhardt said that they agreed to “and.”

Chair Thompson said she still disagreed with it.

Boardmember Baltay said that everyone disagreed with at least one of the objective standards.

Ms. Gerhardt summarized that on Packet Page 50 they changed Number 1 to “diversity of housing types,” Number 2 will be incorporated into Number 1, Number 3 will say “at least a 6 foot width of useable side yard,” and Number 4 will be eliminated.

Chair Thompson said that was correct.

Ms. Gerhardt said that they discussed expanding the menu of options and added a requirement to the BMT C1. It says there should be three out of the four. Then C2 they said three items would be required and added Number 7 about the three different types of materials, colors, and textures across the whole building.

Chair Thompson said that was correct.

Ms. Gerhardt further confirmed that for privacy they changed the 15 degrees to 30 degrees and were otherwise going with the staff report. Contextual height would be left as written in the staff report. She suggested a Motion including everything she read.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to approve the item as stated by Ms. Gerhardt.

**VOTE:** 4-0-1-0 (Boardmember Chen absent)

6. 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, 10, and 17, 2022).

Chair Thompson asked if everyone had the chance to review the Draft Work Plan.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he had not.

Chair Thompson suggested they defer it to the next meeting.

Ms. Gerhardt asked the ARB to let her know if anything should be added to the Work Plan. She suggested they could hold another round on Objective Standards and do more work on El Camino Real Design Guideline updates. She asked the ARB for a Motion to continue to April 21<sup>st</sup>.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Chair Thompson, to continue the item to April 21, 2021.

**VOTE:** 4-0-1-0 (Boardmember Chen absent)

### **Study Session**

7. California Avenue Street Improvements / Parklets

Chair Thompson asked if the item was already continued to April 21, 2022.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that they needed a Motion.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Baltay, to continue the item to April 21, 2021.

**VOTE:** 4-0-1-0 (Boardmember Chen absent)

### **Approval of Minutes**

8. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 3, 2022

Chair Thompson called for a Motion.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to continue the item to April 21, 2021.

**VOTE:** 4-0-1-0 (Boardmembers Chen absent)

### **Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements**

None.

### **Adjournment**

Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting.

### **Subcommittee Items**

2. 300 Pasteur Drive [21PLN-00235]: Ad Hoc Committee Review of a Recently Approved Project That was Conditioned to Return With Consideration to Alternate Treatment to the Base of the Building as it Interfaces with the Promenade to Provide More Visual Interest. Environmental Assessment: Certified EIR for the Stanford University Medical Center Facilities Renewal and Replacement Project (Council Resolution No 9168). Zoning District: HD (Hospital District). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Emily Foley [Emily.foley@cityofpal Alto.org](mailto:Emily.foley@cityofpal Alto.org)

Chair Thompson and Board member Hirsch acted as the Ad Hoc committee for 300 Pasteur, which was approved by the ARB on 2/3/22. At the meeting the applicant, Molly Swenson for Stanford University Medical Center, explained the activation areas along the promenade, and substantiated the rationale for the currently proposed materials. The Ad Hoc committee asked for the applicant to return to Ad Hoc at a later date with a study of alternative materials for the two building façade elements closest to the promenade.