



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES: August 17, 2023

Council Chamber & Zoom

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 Chambers and virtual teleconference at 8:30 a.m.

Present: Chair Peter Baltay, Vice Chair Kendra Rosenberg, Boardmember Yingxi Chen, Boardmember David Hirsch, Boardmember Osma Thompson

Absent: None

Oral Communications

None

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Senior Planner and ARB Liaison Claire Raybould indicated there were no Agenda changes, additions, or deletions.

City Official Reports

1. Transmittal of 1) the ARB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record, 2) Tentative Future Agenda items and 3) Recently Submitted Projects

Senior Planner Raybould reported staff is expecting the NVCAP to return for a second study session focusing on the Chapter 7 implementation and they are hoping to receive a report from the ad hoc committee on the same day regarding a roof tops and bird safe glazing. Boardmember Thompson was on that ad hoc committee, staff was hoping for feedback from Boardmember Chen regarding those items. September 21 has the fire station at 3600 Middlefield Road on the Agenda with modifications, as well as a preliminary review for 425 High Street which is an existing hotel looking to add another level with use of transfer development rights (TDR). It will be a preliminary review. Beyond that, staff is expecting a number of items coming forward in October and they hope to have some of the housing projects back for ARB review. There have been no new projects added since the last meeting. Staff did update the status of projects on the most recent list.

Chair Baltay commented he would like to do the ad hoc report outs at the end of the meeting.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 800 San Antonio Road [23PLN-00010]: Consider the Applicant's Request for Approval of a Planned Home Zoning (PHZ) to Allow for a Rezoning to

Planned Community/Planned Home Zoning. The project includes a request for approval of a subdivision map to merge two adjacent lots to create a resulting 0.88-acre parcel and to construct 76 residential ownership units, 16 of which would be below market rate units (21% of the units). The proposed building is 5-stories with two levels of subterranean parking. Environmental Assessment: The City is preparing an Environmental Impact Report Addendum to the previously certified Housing Incentive Program Expansion and 788 San Antonio Mixed-Use Project EIR (SCH # 2019090070). Zoning District: CS (Commercial Service). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Emily Kallas at Emily.Kallas@CityofPaloAlto.org.

Chair Baltay introduced the item and called for Boardmember disclosures.

Boardmember Hirsch stated he visited the site.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated she visited the site.

Chair Baltay stated he visited the site.

Boardmember Chen stated she visited the site.

Boardmember Thompson stated she visited the site and added that she noticed on one of the buildings there was a sign for a proposed new project for that building as well. The street elevations in the current drawings would be different if that proposed project also gets approved.

Ms. Raybould clarified the address and stated that 824 San Antonio is in fact now moving forward. Emily Kallas is the planner for that project as well.

Boardmember Thompson stated she took a picture of the building.

Chair Baltay requested that the picture be put on the screen if possible.

Project Planner Emily Kallas stated she has the information included in her presentation for this project.

Chair Baltay requested the staff report.

Ms. Kallas reported the project at 800-814 San Antonio Road is a Planned Community (PC) rezoning or Planned Home zoning (PHC) project. The location of the project is on San Antonio Road between Lake Horn Street and East Charleston Road. It is in the Housing Incentive Program (HIP) area, but it is not an HIP project. They are using the PHZ process to ask for exceptions for various development standards. There are other nearby projects, 788 San Antonio project that is on the corner to the south of this project and 824 San Antonio which is two buildings to the north. That project is an HIP project for senior housing. The application came in about three or four weeks ago, it is early in its review stage. General project description for 800 San Antonio is a five story residential building with seventy-six for sale condominium units, sixteen of which will be affordable based on the requirements of the APHZ projects. The project will merge the two existing parcels, the 800 parcel and the 808-814 San Antonio parcels as a simultaneous process. Due to it being a PHZ project, the applicants are requesting the following exceptions: 2.99 FAR where 0.4-1.0 is allowed, 65% Lot coverage where 50% is allowed, 60 feet height where 50 feet height is allowed, no ground floor retail/commercial use is proposed, where typically 1500 sf is required, reduced on-site open space requirements, and balconies project six inches into Special setback. They also project

into the rear setback, but that is allowed under the base zoning. Along San Antonio it is a special 24-foot setback, typically projections would not be allowed into special setbacks, so they are asking for an exception. The proposed projection is modest, it's only about six inches for two of the balconies. The front setback is diagonal in a sense; thus, the balcony projections are not consistent. Ms. Kallas displayed the first two floors plans. The ground floor has an added exit leading to the parking garage, and the gym and other resident amenities are pushed towards the street and there is a central courtyard which provides the majority common open space. On the upper floors most of the units have an outdoor balcony, however some of the ground floor units do not have rear private open space because that area is required for a drainage bed. For the height exception, the applicant is asking for a height limit of sixty feet which would be 60' to the top of the parapet and an additional couple of feet to the top of the mechanical enclosure. Staff would typically not count the rooftop material towards the maximum height of the building, there is generally some exception for additional height. There is no daylight plane requirement since the building is more than 150-feet away from other residential zones. Although 788 San Antonio is a residential project, it's not a residential zoning district. Ms. Kallas displayed the proposed elevations streetscapes and explained that there is a physical material board available for review, they are proposing fiber-cement panels, and metal panels to accent metal trim and glass on the railings of the balconies. For clarification, the height of 788 San Antonio is fifty feet, without taking into consideration the distance between grade and finished floor. The proposed building at 800 San Antonio is very close to grade. The building at 788 San Antonio is stepped up about two or three feet. There's about a ten foot height distance between the two buildings. The applicants are asking for an exception to the retail preservation ordinance and are requesting that no retail be required. The existing structures currently contain Enterprise Car Rental and a spa. The open space proposed is that most units have a balcony that's between seventy and a hundred and thirty square feet. Most are five feet deep, where typically six feet is the minimum dimension for private open space and the usable space of the shared courtyard is about 1,900 square feet. The setback areas are not currently programmed as usable space. The front setback is proposing drought tolerant grass and the open space in the rear yard setback is required for drainage. The PHZ process is a little more complicated than other planning entitlements, the project started with a prescreening in August of 2022 and went before Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) in June. The applicants are returning with recommended changes, the process for the future will be once this portion has moved back to the PTC with an ARB recommendation, and PTC makes the recommendation for City Council. Public comments are accepted at all Public Hearings and any time throughout this process by emailing Ms. Kallas directly. The previously certified 788 San Antonio Road and Housing Incentive Program Expansion Environmental Impact Review (EIR) analyzed high-density housing development at this site and on other nearby parcels along San Antonio Rd. The City is preparing an addendum to the previously certified EIR to clarify the proposed-site specific modifications on these parcels and document that no new or more significant impacts would occur as a result of the project and although that is still under analysis, this project must comply with all adopted mitigation measures consistent with 788 San Antonio and other future projects in the area. Staff recommends the ARB provide feedback on the project design and continue the hearing to a date uncertain.

Chair Baltay preferred to allow Board questions for staff prior to continuing with the applicants presentation.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that Ms. Kallas answered his question regarding the rear setback, however, he asked if the department would allow for greater front balcony extensions into the front setback.

Ms. Kallas explained that would be considered as part of the PHZ exceptions, which would mean in addition to being considered here in the ARB, it would need Council approval. Since it is a special setback, there is an interest in potential consideration for expansion to allow bike infrastructure along San Antonio. That is still being discussed by the Office of Transportation.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if that was moving ahead, as it seems incredibly important at this point.

Senior Planner and ARB Liaison Raybould answered that there is nothing currently in the works for that, and comments regarding that were highly discouraged. They are asking for an exception on the balconies.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he had read a comment regarding increasing it so that may be something the ARB discusses.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired about the CS zone versus the PHZ zone and understood that the CS zone allows for fifty feet of height, then inquired if the difference was that the PHZ asks for fifty feet but will allow for exception.

Ms. Kallas explained that the CS zone is what the property is currently zoned the PHZ process is a rezoning where Council is allowed to approve a greater height or increase to the regular development standards for the purpose of providing a public benefit, in this case for the PHZ projects, the benefit is more housing units. The PHZ is simultaneous with the addendum because the development standards are basically crafted around what the proposed project is.

Vice Chair Rosenberg clarified that the sixty foot height extension would be granted under the PHZ which would then make it no longer an exception.

Ms. Kallas responded that was correct.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the retail preservation ordinance and asked if there is generally a minimum retail requirement.

Ms. Kallas stated that with the retail preservation ordinance, a proposed residential project would be required to retain the retail square footage that had occupied the property previously. Certain housing projects, including this project, opted to replace 1,500 square feet, which is the minimum required in a mixed use building, the applicant's requested exception is for this project to have no retail space.

Ms. Raybould added that the code gives a partial waiver for exclusively high-density residential, which is thirty dwelling units per acre, or more. In this case, the project meets that. Under the current code they would be required to replace 1,500 square feet to make it mixed use.

Boardmember Chen asked if the retail were not made an exception, would that affect the parking requirements.

Ms. Kallas stated that yes, if the scope of the project were changed to incorporate retail, it would likely affect the parking requirement.

Ms. Raybould requested a minute to research the code, as there is an allowance to not provide parking for a certain amount of the retail and she didn't know those numbers off hand.

Ms. Kallas stated currently the parking is proposed according to code requirements, which is why it wasn't mentioned during the presentation. They are not requesting an exception. There is also an option to do a TDM to reduce the parking to accommodate retail space as well.

Boardmember Chen asked if parking was considered for restaurant use.

Ms. Kallas replied that restaurant use is considered "retail-like" and could count towards that requirement, even though restaurant does have it's own requirement.

Boardmember Thompson stated it would be good to know how the parking would change and how much more parking would be required. Additionally, she requested that the Board see what 824 San Antonio proposal looks like, it's available online.

Ms. Kallas said she could bring that up as a screen share.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that it sounds like commercial space is not specific at that point and inquired how staff determines which projects would have commercial use and which ones wouldn't.

Ms. Raybould replied that all projects that have been approved to move forward are required to have commercial space, it is determined by City Council if they grant the exception allowance or not. There was mixed feedback during the prescreening from the public and Council members. To add clarity to Vice Chair Rosenberg's question regarding Planned Community (PC) zoning, the Planned Home zoning is about weighing the requested exceptions to the code and what they are proposing as part of the project to the public benefits. Council will be deciding in the end if the public benefits match what they are requesting. It's question of how many exceptions are being requested, how much are they asking over code, do the public benefits in terms of affordable housing warrant the exceptions requested. This project's benefits came in high in terms of the mix of low and very low income housing being proposed. That deeper affordability is harder for the City to achieve for the Reginal Housing Needs Allocations (RHNA). City Council determines if what is being proposed warrants granting those exceptions, based on what is being requested in those exceptions.

Ms. Kallas displayed the slide showing the 824 front façade elevation on screen, as submitted during the first round of review. It is four stories, fifty feet in height.

Chair Baltay commented that the idea is to provide a public benefit, and inquired if retail is also considered a public benefit, or even additional bike lanes, perhaps off site.

Ms. Raybould replied that bike lanes could certainly be considered a public benefit, the retail would not be highlighted as a public benefit of a project, particularly because it's a requirement of the code. But there is value in it.

Chair Baltay added that it's reasonable to recommend that public benefits be construed more broadly perhaps than just housing. He understood there was a CEQA report for 788 San Antonio, and inquired if it is the same report that was prepared for the hotel a few years ago.

Ms. Raybould answered that 788 San Antonio project evaluated the full housing incentive program being applied through the San Antonio corridor when they went through the CEQA process. As part of that, by applying the HIP, it could result in additional projects, such as this one. Staff had to analyze what the potential was in applying that HIP. As part of that, they evaluated what the potential is on each of these sites using some assumptions about floor area, et cetera. For this project, it assumes 94 units.

Ms. Kallas stated it was presumed a higher number of units than what is being proposed because this project is providing the two and three bedroom sized units. They are larger than what had been envisioned.

Chair Baltay asked if the reason they are having to amend the EIR is due to one of the two parcels not being in the HIP designated area.

Ms. Kallas explained that this project exceeds the floor area that was anticipated because the EIR anticipated maximum build out under what the HIP zoning requirements are, so in that case it's a 2.0 Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and this project is proposing a 2.99 FAR. The addendum is to account for the additional floor area and to be more project specific.

Chair Baltay mentioned the reason he's bringing it up is due to many public comments expressing concern over the additional traffic on San Antonio, based on the EIR reports and additional developments, and asked if that would be studied again as part of the amendment, perhaps bicycle traffic as well.

Ms. Kallas stated it would be helpful for her to go get what the exact assumed unit number was in the original EIR, because the 76 that are being proposed as part of this project is less than the original number, staff is assuming that they will have a less or equal traffic impact as what was previously analyzed.

Ms. Raybould answered Chair Baltay with no, staff would not revisit all of those things, except to the extent that they are providing more detail. Staff would look at the site specific conditions regarding circulation on the site, where they are proposing driveway access and safety measures as part of that. Staff wouldn't expect that it would require re analysis.

Chair Baltay asked if the date of the original analysis was available.

Ms. Raybould replied that she would look into that.

Ms. Kallas commented that the final EIR date is dated October of 2020, she would have to look into what the drafted date was.

Chair Baltay questioned that the study was done based on traffic patterns that took place more than three years ago.

Ms. Ms. Raybould agreed, however the study looks at project plus background, the cumulative scenario in that expected build-out over a period of time, usually a ten year period. She would have to look at what was considered for this particular scenario. It was already considered with a build out of 800 units on the San Antonio corridor.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired for context, if the traffic for 788 San Antonio enters on the right side or the left side of the front façade of their building.

Ms. Kallas replied that since that project is on the corner, their entry is on Acorn.

Chair Baltay thanked the applicant for their patience and requested they begin their presentation.

Mr. Mark Donahue, Design Director for Lowney Architecture, presented the project on behalf of the applicants, at 800-808 San Antonio Road. He gave a brief history of the background behind the RHNA needs and stated that one of their goals for this project is to provide housing for what is critically missing, the missing middle. This area is a very urban area, and the entire block is turning towards residential projects of different sorts. It's switching from a light industrial zone, which is closer to the core of the community, and not appropriate to use as it was in the past. They wanted to introduce a high-end contemporary design as nod to the future. It's located very close to major transportation, it's close to the 101 with easy access to the freeway, and it's close to Middlefield, on the border with Mountainview. There is somewhat of an assumption that in the future Mountainview will also be looking at potentially developing this area for housing since all cities in the bay area are struggling to meet their RHNA goals. This project is outside the 700 foot radius of residential property. There is a development across the street that is a residential use, but it is in a different zone, and this project is about 300-feet from it. Mountainview is currently large boxed retail and industrial zone. The applicants see the PHZ zoning as vehicle for encouraging denser potential housing and not necessarily commercial, and still be near jobs, near transit, and near services. There is 28% inclusionary requirement, the project achieves 21%, they've upgraded that requirement. It's a rare opportunity to offer full sale product to moderate and low income households. Zoning provides some flexibility in development standards. This site was identified in the Housing Element as an opportunity site, which is how they ended up there. It was a site that was targeted for housing development and targeted at 30 dwelling units per acre, which is what is being presented. Mr. Donahue shared a speculation about what the block would look like in the future and the surrounding area. There are several retail outlets within a mile of the property, as well as a major park and three quarters of a mile from one of the minor neighborhood parks. There is opportunity for local recreation. The setback in the front is being held by the City for some type of future development such as potential bike lanes and did have an affect on how they treated the front elevation. The office of transportation expressed concern regarding the heat island effect and based on those comments the applicant made additional changes to add shrubbery in the front and another row of trees to provide another layering effect with the current street trees in place. There is an interior courtyard to provide large open space to be shared by the residents and it was designed in a way that can be seen from the street. The lobby has a double height space that is transparent with glazing for the full height. When you look in from the street the activity can be seen in the courtyard. Additionally, all the residents with a courtyard unit will have it as their view. The firm has experience with many facets of retail and determined this was a horrible location to put retail. There's no parking, even if people were to park in the garage, retail thrives on front facing parking, unless it's a large shopping center with a field of parking. The other consideration given for not including retail is there are plenty of empty store fronts through town that are in far better locations for retail traffic. This is a partially industrial area, there won't be much in the way of local foot traffic. Even if there was a destination restaurant, a larger area would be needed to provide the number of customers to make it profitable. Active retail is always on everyone's mind, architects love to see it, but they have to remain cognizant of the reality of placement. The ground floor frontage is primarily for active uses, the gym, clubhouse, and the entry to the parking garage.

Chair Baltay interjected that the applicant had reached his ten minute time limit and he would allow him an additional minute to wrap up.

Mr. Donahue quickly ran through slides of more floor plans, the roof top mechanical and solar panels, the parking garage, the elevation design on all sides, and a comparison with 788 San Antonio.

Chair Baltay thanked the applicant for wrapping it up quickly and opened the floor to Boardmembers who wished to ask the applicant questions.

Boardmember Thompson stated she had questions but expressed an interest in asking them after the public comments as that may raise additional questions.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he could wait until after public comments.

Chair Baltay opened the meeting to public comments and stated that each speaker would be provided with three minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Joan Larrabee, a resident of the Green House on San Antonio Rd, provided public comment and inquired if the units would be condominiums for sale or rentals. She has experience looking at traffic engineering analysis and is concerned with the amount of residential going in on San Antonio which is only a four laned road with no bicycle lanes, even though one bicycle space is proposed for each unit. There is no bus service to the building, which was removed years ago. Traveling northbound towards the 101, the two lanes drop to one lane at the Charleston intersection which causes a back up of traffic trying to get onto the freeway. This project is taller than both the hotels which were required to set back each vertical floor with plenty of landscaping. She believes this project is too tall, too crowded and lacks clarification on what type of residential housing they intend.

Chris Brosnan provided public comment regarding his appreciation of the mix of below market rates in the units and stated it is exactly what the area needs. Market rate units are adding to the problems that the area already has. Unfortunately, this is not the place to have a large building, the water table is about ten to fifteen feet under the ground at the property and typically a single residential development will take about twenty to thirty million gallons of water out of the ground. There's a river that runs underground into the bay and a dam will need to be built and the ground will need to be filled and which fills the unseen portion of the bay. He urged the Board not to allow extra exceptions to height with two underground stories of parking. It's also not a great space for foot traffic. The green house has about ten units per acre and there's just enough space for kids to play and for people to congregate. This project seems like a lot of units to be adding per acre and then depicting it as a beautiful spacious place for people to be walking around. There are better places in Palo Alto for urban development that is further away from the bay.

John Petrilla provided public comment regarding the comments on the original EIR, and the lack of concern displayed in response to those comments. He hoped any further review of the EIR would allow the substance of public comments to be taken more seriously. He would appreciate seeing more

successful, attractive housing projects. He would also like to see the traffic patterns for students going to school. The school districts are not identified in the project, and it has not been determined how the children who will live at the property get there. Crossing San Antonio and Middlefield Roads are dangerous during high volume traffic hours. He appreciates the additional trees that were added. Canopy is a great organization that can be utilized as a resource for creating more canopy shaded areas. Native California trees are a great addition for any project, they should be able to do better than one or two on the property. Applicants should not be given an opportunity to change their choice of street trees at the last hour. Mr. Petrilla thanked the Board for their time.

Chair Baltay thanked the members of the public for their comments and closed the Public Comments.

Boardmember Thompson asked if there was open space on the roof.

Mr. Donahue responded that all of the open space is at the ground level, except for the balconies which are available to all units above the ground floor. The ground floor units facing the courtyard have patios, the ground floor units that don't face the courtyard do not.

Boardmember Thompson requested information regarding the parking structure encroaching on the new trees in the front lawn.

Mr. Donahue confirmed that the front trees are planted in native soil. The garage is held back a bit and does not encroach on the root structures of the trees.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about the perforated blue panel which seemed like they were fins, and asked how they would be mounted on the cement panels.

Mr. Donahue replied that there are several different ways to detail those, typically they affix a bracket, and that bracket is either behind the panel or it's mounted on top. For this project they would consider mounting it behind with a slot that allows the panel to come through.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the fins would slot into the cement panel.

Mr. Donahue stated they were not yet at the point in the project to provide a definitive response to that question, that is a more refined detail.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the blue panel was also being used for shading on the south façade.

Mr. Donahue answered that it is.

Boardmember Thompson stated the plans were a little unclear and asked if there was a view to the courtyard through the lobby from the San Antonio façade.

Mr. Donahue replied that was correct. The Lobby is double height glass with glazing on both the exteriors, one facing San Antonio and the other facing the courtyard. Under certain lighting conditions it will be more transparent than at other times during the day. During the mornings it would be likely you could see through the lobby from the street, and in the afternoon, due to the reflective nature of the glass, it would be harder to see.

Boardmember Thompson noticed there wasn't much glazing on the street level and inquired about the design intent on the street level.

Mr. Donahue responded that the challenge in any residential building that doesn't have a side street for access, all the service elements want to be on the front of the building. The transformer, the bicycle storage, all those want to be on the front so a portion of the front of the building allotted for those things. They tried to mitigate it with landscape and with plaza like paving. The main entry was designed as a lobby type with a view, using colored glass on the elevation for added design feature, and the community spaces located to the right/south from the lobby, are also very large windows facing onto protected courtyards. As you pass by on the street, they were avoiding the feeling of solidity. It will be transparent and active with those functions that are primarily south of the lobby.

Boardmember Thompson questioned if there was design intent with any type of lighting for how the building might look at night.

Mr. Donahue commented that residential is limited to uplighting, or any type of lighting that might intrude into the residences. Once does get the sense of the life of the building being projected out when people have their lights on. There isn't a specific night lighting concept intent. As a firm, they generally try to avoid light noise during the night on the exterior of residential community buildings. There will be down lighting on the ground level and in the lobby.

Boardmember Chen requested information on the garbage collection method. She saw there was a loading area outside the trash room underground and asked if the garbage truck would have to travel inside the garage.

Mr. Donahue stated that as part of the building management, they would have the trash brought to the surface during collection periods. They are still working through the exact location of where the bins would be located when the truck comes for pick-up. The challenge is if they put the trash room on the front façade, it consumes twenty to thirty feet of the façade with utility doors. The decision was made to have the trash processed in the first basement level and moved for collection.

Boardmember Chen inquired if the basement storage space is tenant occupied.

Mr. Donahue stated those would be available to rent from the tenants.

Boardmember Chen asked if there is an elevation difference between the ground floor and the street level.

Mr. Donahue stated there is a difference once you get to the residential area. At the front of the building the elevation has a slight differentiation for drainage. The lobby floor, the corridor leading to the community space and the gym are all at grade level. There will be a ramp up to the residential units. There is one unit that is at grade level. The rest are slightly elevated.

Boardmember Chen asked for clarification on where the ramp would be located.

Mr. Donahue stated it is on the ground floor, internally, it is depicted by a dashed line on the drawings and is in the lower left corner corridors slope slightly.

Chair Baltay requested the plan be put on screen for the public's view.

Boardmember Chen continued by asking about the patterned screen on the material and inquired if that was the pattern that would be used for the project.

Mr. Donahue confirmed that it was. The scale of the openings are about three inches across at their widest, there is a lot of light and air that filters through.

Mr. Donahue returned to the ramp question and stated he noticed that the graphics of the ramp location do not show the ramps, and stated looking at the plans may not be helpful. The intent is for the ground level units to be around a foot higher than the adjacent grade, if possible. The drawings will need to be corrected to reflect those.

Boardmember Chen asked if the one bedroom on the front would have the increase in grade.

Mr. Donahue responded that unit is the exception. The rest of the units are above grade. The trade off is that the non-elevated unit will have higher ceilings.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the areas in front of the fire pump facing San Antonio and asked if it will be landscaped or hard scaped.

Mr. Donahue answered that the area adjacent to the entry to the garage next to the transformer will be a combination of pavers and turf pavers. The turf pavers provide infiltration for the storm water system. The rest of the pavers are solid.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired about the EIR relative to the water table. That could be an issue for the whole area, how is that treated in the EIR study.

Ms. Kallas commented that she did a cursory search during and after that comment. She did not find anything that indicated it would be different than a typical project in terms of meeting standard dewatering standards for any large project. The property is not in a flood zone.

Boardmember Hirsch stated the comment made was about the water going into the bay.

Ms. Raybould commented that the public comment was likely related to dewatering that would be required as part of the project and she remembered correctly, there were formal comments on that in the EIR that staff provided formal responses. She stated staff could certainly revisit those when Ms. Kallas returns with this project's EIR and provide a little more detail. There is a detailed dewatering ordinance for Palo Alto that was revisited a few years ago and became more strict. There are a lot of code requirements related to how the dewatering has to be done to protect the environment. There are secant walls which provide protection for the base of the structure to stop water coming in.

Boardmember Hirsch indicated he was inquiring about the water draining out to the bay, not the water coming in from the bay. If it's obstructed with structures like this, one would think that would be a consideration as part of the EIR study, particularly structures with basements.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if a soils report was included as part of the EIR?

Ms. Raybould commented that a soils report is generally site specific, as part of any building development permit, a soils report is conducted.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated that typically those note a water table level and asked if at a future hearing that water table level be noted. It might be useful to know particularly with a building proposing a double level basement.

Ms. Raybould stated they likely don't have the geo-technical report because it wouldn't be required for the building permit, but they can definitely reference the general table level in that area.

Boardmember Hirsch believes the response to the 788 building has improved with the changes on the elevations, it would have been nice if those had been in the packet from the beginning. He inquired earlier about the balconies going further into the front of the building. A six foot balcony would be more useful to the tenants, that could be addressed in the design critique of the building.

Chair Baltay reminded Boardmember Hirsch that this was time for questions.

Boardmember Hirsch asked the applicant if they would consider providing six foot balconies.

Mr. Donahue stated he would be very interested. He would have to ask the buyer of the building. They feel additional depth would help with the articulation of the front façade and would make it more livable.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired if they explored a location for on-sight deliveries. New residential buildings going into this area, particularly the denser populated projects, aren't taking into consideration that there isn't room for loading zones on a street that already doesn't have a bike lane. With a setback it's conceivable there would be a front loading area, food deliveries and package deliveries will have an impact on traffic.

Mr. Donahue stated that it is a challenge that was considered. Certain vehicles would be possible to bring them into the building, it would also require the cooperation of the companies that are making the deliveries. There will be a loading dock that will be tall enough to accommodate trucks on the first basement level. They anticipate that FedEx, UPS, Amazon will not want to come into the building which is why the applicants are seeking a loading zone, which would also be used by ride share services such as LIFT or UBER. That 24-foot zone is tempting, but they were admonished not to utilize it for those types of functions, as it will have to be relocated if they add a bike lane to San Antonio. The applicant is trying to consider future development, so the 24-foot band is being utilized for something more useful for the neighborhood.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that there is also an access point for the garage and the capability of perhaps changing some of the electrical box and turn it in the other direction so there's an area in the front, in addition to some paving. It is conceivable that a drop off point could be created.

Mr. Donahue agreed that it is conceivable.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired if they explored the possibility of adding decks into the back yards over the drainage area?

Mr. Donahue answered they were originally in the plans, the civil engineer stated they would need more space for infiltration. The patios and decks were abandoned for that reason. There are a number of engineering standards for the drainage area, they originally asked if a permeable material could be used. He would be happy to go back and ask again.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if the roof could be used for water retainage.

Mr. Donahue explained that the entire impermeable surface of the roof has to be dealt with as a drainage surface. All the water that falls onto the roof is regulated by storm water rules require that the plans describe how they would get it off the building and into the storm sewer system or into the adjacent grade. The idea of using it as a holding area has never been discussed. Using a planter system requires the planters be down on the next level so gravity would pull the water from the roof and into the plants. To have planters on the actual roof would require a pumping system to get the water into the plants.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if a noise study was considered for the courtyard area and what usage is intended.

Mr. Donahue stated it is primarily intended for use by groups of people. It is fairly well shaded and believe as the climate gets warmer, it will serve well for shaded outdoor space. It's not meant as a recreation area, it's meant as an outdoor area for a quiet gathering or to have BBQ's. The acoustics is something they would have to monitor. There is nothing in the code that requires those kinds of consideration. They are required to have certain acoustical quietness within the units. That is a study where the noise levels would be tested as the units were being built.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if they studied the solar light within the courtyard and how that impacts the ground level units.

Mr. Donahue stated that the ground level will be in shade for the bulk of the year. The courtyard is wider than a usual courtyard, but not wide enough to have sunlight in the middle of a six story building on the ground level, other than during midday in summer months. The materials selected for the north wall are high albedo. There will be light, it won't be reflected in the sense of a mirror, but there will be some light reflected and it won't be a dark space.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired about the growth of the trees in the courtyard. There isn't a landscape person available at the hearing. Some of the trees are under balconies as well.

Mr. Donahue stated they rely on their landscape architects as the professionals to provide them with the proper planting depth and the right species that will survive in that environment. They have consulted with them on what is to be expected in that space. He can follow up with that. All of the trees will be in raised planters to allow for some soil depth.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if they took into consideration that half the trees will be shaded by balconies.

Mr. Donahue stated it was acknowledged.

Boardmember Hirsch stated there seemed to be missing drawings for sections through areas like that. For example, there's a planting wall on the east side of the courtyard.

Mr. Donahue stated that in their experience it's relatively easy to find groups of species that will thrive in those conditions. It's currently planned to grow up to two or three stories.

Ms. Raybould noted that looking at the ground level on A2.1, it doesn't seem like the trees are under the patios.

Mr. Donahue stated there are balconies that sit out over the footprint of the trees.

Boardmember Hirsch stated it's on drawing A2.2.

Mr. Donahue stated he said he has a red maple that is under the eaves, and it does very well.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if this project is above the flood zone.

Mr. Donahue replied that there's not a flood zone in that location.

Ms. Kallas stated that neither 800 nor 808 are in flood zones.

Vice Chair Rosenberg thanked the other Boardmembers for asking a lot of the questions that she had, and asked if there are interior courtyard elevations of the building.

Mr. Donahue responded that they do not.

Vice Chair Rosenberg asked if they had considered opening the gym or the club house to that open space.

Mr. Donahue stated that was part of the original study and in order to do that, they end up with more units facing the street.

Vice Chair Rosenberg asked if the gym would be open to the public or only open to the residents of the building.

Mr. Donahue responded it is currently planned for the residents only.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if having the units to the north and south of the courtyard, abutting that space, is going to pose any sort of privacy or noise issue.

Mr. Donahue explained that in the landscape plan, each of those units will have a fenced patio of their own. There will be some acoustical consideration when the space is active. The privacy fence should provide an exterior area for those units to enjoy.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated that if there were not those dedicated patios there would be up to 3,000 square feet (SF) of open space for the public and asked if they had considered making the open space larger. Vice Chair Rosenberg noted she appreciated his earlier candor in his presentation in saying the nearest park was over a mile away and parents would get in their mini vans and go.

Mr. Donahue answered her inquiry in making those public patios versus using that as open space and explained that if there were no patios, those who are using the courtyard could step right up to the windows and doors, in which case the privacy issue then becomes a concern. Additionally, the question regarding exterior recreation on urban infill projects is always troubling because a lot of time roof terraces requires a level of vigilance with watching children and property owners aren't comfortable with the liability. They were trying to balance a number of concerns, first being how many units to include in order

for it to get built. There is small room for error in the proforma once the number of units starts to decrease. Particularly with the recent cost increases on materials used to build.

Vice Chair Rosenberg then questioned if they were accidentally pricing out retail, particularly with low income residents in the building. If they price the retail space low enough, they will likely find a potential renter for the space.

Mr. Donahue replied they had several long conversations regarding retail in the building and reached out to their broker partners in real estate to get potential proformas for many potential types of retail and based on that input, the numbers didn't make sense, the space would be best served as community use for the building. Looking further into the future, if they ended up with more traffic that could justify retail, with the way the space is designed, they could potentially look at the community space for a conversion to a future retail use.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired about bike and school traffic and families would be renting...

Mr. Donahue interrupted her and clarified that this is a condo building, not a rental building.

Vice Chair Rosenberg asked if they expected families to purchase the space and live there for a period of time.

Mr. Donahue stated that was correct.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if they had accounted for the path finding and safety of the children getting to the local schools, particularly to the closest elementary school which is Cubberly.

Mr. Donahue stated they had not done that, mostly due to that part is beyond the purview of the project and would likely change if the bike lanes came to fruition on San Antonio. He added that as a parent and after the conversations in this hearing, he plans to seek that out as he himself would want to know. Additionally, if all the schools are located to the south, away from the 101, that becomes a much broader question regarding who controls the crosswalks and signaling.

Chair Baltay stated he didn't have any questions of his own.

Boardmember Thompson noted they had said something about a multi-colored glass in the lobby and the material board only had one single-colored glass sample.

Mr. Donahue answered that the glass on the material board was a representative of the glass quality, they would provide additional information about what is illustrated, they could bring alternate glass colors next time they are scheduled to go before the ARB.

Boardmember Thompson asked him to describe it.

Mr. Donahue responded that it's flat along the plane, and there is a clear and a blue.

Chair Baltay suggested they take a break before they continue to the Board discussion.

The ARB took a 12-minute break.

The meeting continued at 10:26 a.m. with all ARB Boardmembers present.

Chair Baltay resumed the meeting.

Boardmember Thompson thanked the applicant and staff for the presentation and the public who spoke and commented that in general she appreciates a lot of the discussion regarding the design intent. The diagram in the presentation was helpful to understand the thinking behind their parti. She believes the elevation gets a bit muddled, the white blocks, which she felt were an important part of the parti is being encroached upon by the balconies. Because this is a taller building, she believes a step back at the upper levels makes a lot of sense and they are doing that with other tall buildings along San Antonio. The buildings scale down to the greenhouse projects. She believes it would also give it more hierarchy to the façade. She spent time walking down San Antonio on both sides and it has a lot of texture. There is masonry and art all along that area and as a result that texture is starting to get a bit lost. Initially she felt the ground level was too blocked off from the rest of the street, and while she understands the conversations surrounding retail, she felt for the solid elements on the ground, it is critical that those have a lot of texture. More than what is showing know. It lacks visual intrigue compared to other projects that have a lot of depth and play on the landscape part of those properties. That's a critical part of maintaining the character of the area. She appreciates that there is a few into the courtyard, she'll be curious to see how that works with the colored glass. The side elevations will also be very visible, and she finds those too blank as well. She recommended adding a bit more visual intrigue and character into those elevations as well. The pallet is quite cold. There are light grey and dark grey tones. She understands those are colors being used across the street, but she feels in the greenhouse project there is so much greenery it plays with the greys more. This project lacks the character of a contrast color to bring a warmer element. The blue and brown colors work well together, it would have been nice to see the powder coat chip, and samples of the scale of some of the materials. It could be easily adjusted by swapping out one of the colors for a warmer tone. Maybe a wood grain or something with some texture that would give it a bit more richness. She didn't realize the blue elements were on the fins and originally thought the elevations were inconsistent. She's never been a fan of using greys in urban areas because it tends to lend itself to depression in urban areas. It only makes sense if there's nothing there to play against the grey. She might recommend an air flow analysis for the courtyard given that it is going to be in shade potentially on hot days. She feels it might be worth it to add a breezeway or something that would help the air circulate through the courtyard. She believes the interior elevations would be great.

Boardmember Chen thanked the applicant for the presentation and felt she heard a lot of good ideas and design intents behind the project. Her comments on the site plans were to provide a loading and deliveries on site due to the busy-ness of San Antonio Road. She suggested including retail on the ground floor. In the bigger picture there will be an increase of over 800 in the neighborhood. Retail will be needed. There is already some retail in the surrounding area that is doing well. The place across the street is very popular, however parking is a problem. She suggested relocating or replacing the one bedroom unit to face the courtyard. With it facing San Antonio the privacy will be comprised with it being on the street level. It's nice to have the courtyard at the center but it is relatively small compared to the height of the building. It will be even smaller with the added fences on the patios, which is less than what is shown in the drawings. A larger courtyard would bring more natural light into it and would make the courtyard more pleasant. She agreed with Boardmember Thompson regarding the materials. She suggested adding some warmth

to the ground level to make it more welcoming and inviting. For the next meeting, she suggested providing elevations for the courtyard.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated she echoed some of her Boardmembers comments. The interior courtyard elevations are a must, the Board really needs to see those, particularly regarding height, colors, textures, all of that information. Many of the windows on the south side do not have sun shading. If those windows are not deeply recessed windows that will potentially pose a problem for the residents in those units. She suggested they consider the shading on the south facing façades, including the south facing courtyard façades. The front elevation façades should also be considered because it almost looks like the sun shading is on the wrong side. The blue strips are on the left side of the windows rather than the right, which shades the north sun and not the south sun on those windows. She had a lot of concerns regarding the courtyard and has a full understanding of what a courtyard should look like in the middle of a six-story building and can be successful, they just need to be amenable to that as air flow matters. Sun light matters and use on the ground level matters. She encouraged them to really consider if they want that area surrounded by residential units. Maybe the north two be units and the south two could be the clubhouse and the gym that open up into the courtyard. It would feel much more like an indoor/outdoor space a creates the illusion of adding more SF to the courtyard but also allows that space to flow in and out, which would make it feel bigger and much more welcoming to the people using the building. The long skinny patios in the courtyard don't really work. She understands they are there as buffers, but they are not really usable. Maybe there could be two large planters on the left and right side and make two more of a squared area which would make it a much more usable space for those two ground courtyard facing units. She doesn't have an issue with the 60' height limit. It's the center of the block, if they are asking for more on the ground level, it stands to reason the height may need to be increased to add more units which would make the project worthwhile. She knows they are asking for a lot on the ground level. Including retail. She believes it needs to happen, and it doesn't necessarily need to be the full 1,500 SF, it could be 500, a smaller retail space, but there needs to be retail of some sort. The reason it's important is when they talk about forward thinking, they need to full play for forward thinking. Having retail creates a vitality to the streetscape, otherwise there's a really long façade that no one is going into other than the patrons that live there. If they want the area to be walkable and bikeable, they need to think about the future plans of that area now. She encouraged them to begin processing their transportation in and out traffic flows now. Look into bike paths, consider what's feasible. Whether it's today or ten years from now there will be kids living in those units that will need to get to their schools and the park. While it may not be the purview of the building itself, it is the purview of how the building relates to the greater community in the area and that's important. It doesn't need to be solved right now, but it should be addressed. Trash and circulation, she believes asking management to haul the trash of 76 units on a weekly basis is asking a lot, unless there's a dedicated person receiving just pay to do so. Door Dash, UPS, all those will be in and out. Make it easy and put a loading zone right there near the mail room. There's an area there with the bike room, the fire pump, and the switch gear rooms that are all in the front near the garage entrance. There could possibly be a loading zone solution in that area. She loves the concept of being able to see through the entry into the courtyard. It's elegant and inviting. It makes this building super interesting. Her concern is that the entry, where the address is, has a horizontal band right through the middle. She would love to see that as more open. They could make that look like a double height entry as opposed to where the horizontal band cuts that are in half. It's a great idea having that area open with a view into the courtyard,

they should incorporate more of that. With some small refinements that could add a lot of wow factors to the front façade. Vice Chair Rosenberg agreed with her fellow Boardmembers about the materials. She looked forward to seeing them again next time.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that several Boardmembers covered a few of his comments. He believed they should push hard to extend the balconies to six feet, they would become so much more useful. He still believed that decks could be possible in the rear yard in a way that would allow the water retention below the decks. Engineers should be able to figure that out. He believed the issue of hauling the garbage to the grade level in front reduces the use of the space. It could be designed in such a way that by adding more landscape and using the sidewalk leading to the garage, a loading area could be created. Adding signage to the front on San Antonio might defer people from using the front of the building. The bike path on San Antonio Road is a current critical need for the area and will affect the use of the street side on the front façade. Rooftop retention is something he asked the applicant to explore. He's concerned about the courtyard use. Given the size, they need to be careful regarding the use of it. He liked the idea of incorporating some of the ground level community use areas into the courtyard. It would make it a more interesting space. With them still being flexible they may consider moving some of the courtyard units to the front of the building where the current community area is. That, along with opening the community area up into the courtyard, would increase the size of the courtyard. That would also put the courtyard activity further away from the units on the opposite façade and would encourage the noise of the activities to be in the rooms adjacent to the courtyard, rather than in the courtyard. He disagreed with the other Boardmembers regarding adding retail. He thinks the applicants explanation for not including retail was valid. There isn't good access and there isn't good parking. Boardmember Hirsch believes that retail will happen elsewhere on the street and is already. He visited the Ramen restaurant to view the site from across the street. Retail is going to be figured out more once they determine the best way for pedestrians and bikes to cross El Camino. He doesn't like the idea of one small retail space in each of the buildings. It's not a useful concept and retail is more efficient in plazas with combined uses. He's concerned about the whiteness of the building. They could be more subtle with that in the way they did with the perforated panels on the front façade. He would like to see some of the texturing on the ground floor extended. The idea of looking into a building and seeing the courtyard is an interesting idea, but it isn't happening for any of the car traffic. It's more important to create textures that are friendlier for people visiting and living in the building every day. The ground floor textures in the perforated panels are quite exciting. The entry itself is rather cold and uninviting. They are missing an opportunity on the top floor by not adding sun shading. If that were added, it would animate the top of the building more. There are many options that would accommodate having shading and would add character to the front façade. He liked the idea of the aesthetics of the darker panel extending beyond the edge of the building to create a framework. He believed it was very well done. He complimented them on the planning of the building, he believed it was excellently done. They did a brilliant job in planning the units and he liked to see the way they were organized. The ARBs list can sometimes become long and confusing and applicants have to pick and choose what they consider because they can't answer to all of the changes. He believed the ARB believe the street façade as a whole has been something they've all been concerned about in some way or another. It looks like the project next to it may be an interesting one as well. Both projects on either side will be different, and the City is beginning to have some regulation as to the massing of the new projects, setback areas which are beginning to shape how that side of the street will be organized.

It's good progress for the area and the size of the building doesn't bother him at all. There will always be a push a pull between the size of a building, the number of units, and the economics of construction; he didn't believe the mass of the building will be a problem for that side of San Antonio. The setback is establishing a proper relationship to the street. There is a base, building, and top that is very clearly defined. The street is starting to establish character and he was happy to see that. The glass panel along the side, the vertical panel, seems to be more of a privacy panel than a sunshade panel. He didn't ask the question but he's not quite sure the use of it, or if it's addressing some of the other questions regarding the shading. He suggested they loosen up some on the brightness of the building and create more textures on the ground floor. He also recommended that they keep in mind there will be a need for places to sit outdoors along the front façade, which could impact where the bike racks should be located.

Chair Baltay commented that it's unfortunate that the drawings are not complete enough. The elevations are not clear, there's not a good site plan. They definitely need to see a unit plan for each different floor plan in order to understand how the open space really works and how it impacts the façade. The ARB needs to see renderings of the buildings along San Antonio Road and even perhaps into the courtyard. None of that has been provided other than one rendering. This is not a preliminary application, and the ARB is being requested to keep working with them on it. It helps to speed the process along when the drawings are more complete and comprehensive. He believes there should be some sort of onsite loading capability for trash pick-up, deliveries, uber drivers and ride sharing. It's not at all realistic to think there will be a pull out along San Antonio Road given the traffic, it's 24' from the front door, or that the trash will be brought out to the street, or that the trucks will pick it up that way. San Antonio Road is too busy of a street. Chair Baltay believed the answer lies in using the 24' setback, but that is up to the applicant. They have to find some way to get that on the site. He believed they should incorporate ground floor activity. He refrained from using the word retail and explained that right now on San Antonio there are many small scale commercial activity taking place and they need to anticipate more of that in the future as there becomes more housing units on that street. He doesn't disagree with the analysis from the real estate agents; however, he thinks the future will change and everyone needs to plan for that. Saying that the building will change later to accommodate that isn't realistic. They also need to make better use of the San Antonio frontage. There's a 24' wide strip with some sort of hardscape landscaping, there are plenty of places to put patios, or some sort of commercial activity. Using that area as a buffer is a shame. They are forced to have the setback, they should design it and put more thought into what happens in that space. He's concerned about the planning regarding transportation. He knows it's not fair to put it all on this project, but they need to understand how the residents in this building are going to access and integrate with the rest of the town. In the case of San Antonio, it's obvious that it's not good, but you will find a lot of families who want to bike to school. It's prominent in Palo Alto. He'd like to see them come up with some solutions for that, or work with the city to find solutions. They should take part in providing a bicycle lane along San Antonio and find a way to make the crosswalk safer. He wants this project to be more actively involved with the City to come up with transportation solutions that benefit the residents of the building and the residents of the area. It's essential to include that in the site plan. Regarding the building design, he's concerned with everything being on the ground level. If they were to raise the residential units, even perhaps even two feet, a lot of good things would start to happen. Currently they are forced to have the ground level units at the courtyard. Some level of separation would be nice. The same applies to the rear of the building. The reason it's hard is because they can't have a deck at grade.

There has to be some solid surface which affects the bio swell. If there were to be a deck above it, that would work. Those things are possible with a little more separation. It also might help activate the façade by having a taller base level. It's a common thing the ARB sees with residential design, and it's part of the objective standards to have some type of separation there and he believed it would help in this case. He's concerned about the courtyard being too small. They really need an aspect ratio of about 2:1. Twice the width to the height. In this case they are 55' high and 80' wide at the maximum east to west and it needs to be more like a 110'. He's not even sure if courtyard applies. He would use the word airshaft. It's entirely dark at the bottom all the time and even on a warm day, it will be too chilly to comfortably sit there. At night, it's a fallacy to think there will be a BBQ there, it will be way too cold. There needs to be a courtyard that functions in order for it to be a proper open space, and they need open space. He very much liked the idea of a two story entry, and he liked the idea that people can see from the street into the courtyard. It's worth picking up on. Vice Chair Rosenberg noted accurately that the façade design interferes with that, however that's something that can be worked on. He encouraged them to keep that integration. He noted to consider some type of roof top terrace, and he understands that that's hard to make use of for everybody, but it has been successful in other projects along the street. People find that's what they have to do in order to get the amount of open space that is required. There is a standard that was debated at some length, the balconies need to be six feet in order to be useful to the residents. He's perfectly fine with greater projections into setbacks and those types of things, but he'd like to see the balconies be large enough to be properly considered as open space. He agrees regarding the material selection. They are too cold. He has a question regarding the fiber cement panels in general. They are not as high quality of material that he likes to see used as opposed to porcelain tile. It's all in the execution; the ARB needs to see much more detail regarding the size of the panels, how they are put together, what kind of shadow they will cast, and what size will they be. The detail is lacking. Based on looking at the material board and flatness of the cement, the current greys are too cold. There's a lot more to it, particularly with fiber cement and how it's put together. The landscaping plan also lacks a good deal of information. The questions Boardmember Hirsch was asking regarding the courtyard landscaping were spot on. There are trees growing under balconies. The courtyard will not be a heavily irrigated area. The ARB is required to make a finding regarding the sustainability of the project. He is deeply concerned with the proximity of the water table, and how they expect to deal with that. He understands that Palo Alto has a significant ordinance that will make it possible to build if they would follow that ordinance correctly. The cut off walks are a significant expense; he'd like to see that issue dealt with. If they plan to dewater, he has serious concerns with that. The water tables are about ten to eleven feet in that neighborhood. This building is going to require an excavation of at least twenty-five feet. That's a significant dig into the water table. When they built the hotel in the area, they proposed a two-story basement and would deal with the water table, as they got into construction, they wanted to eliminate the second level due to the water table being very challenging. That affects the design of the building now. If there is going to be one-level parking and not two, that needs to be planned for. The second level basement will affect the construction budget significantly. That will affect the ARB's decision on if the building is sustainably designed.

Chair Baltay reported that when City Council reviewed the project, they were asking for changes to the zoning code. The justification for that was that it provided a public benefit. The public benefit is the affordable housing that it will provide. In his opinion that is not a justifiable public benefit enough. The building has to do more to benefit the public and specifically for this project, it comes to the transportation

issue. Specifically bicycle usage. If they ask every project going in along San Antonio to participate improve that bicycle connectivity to town, they will get someplace in terms of public benefit. The real issue as he sees it is that San Antonio is a pretty heavily trafficked street that blocks anyone on the south side of it from accessing the rest of Palo Alto. People living in the area have to go to the Palo Alto schools. They will attend Mitchell Park, and Cubberly. There's an enormous, almost freeway, blocking them. It needs to be solved and it is almost a travesty that City Council has yet to address this issue. When an applicant wants to come in and provide public benefit, that's a benefit that the ARB needs to ask them to do. Helping to solve the transportation problem needs to be a benefit that new construction provides. He also believes that another benefit is the retail activity at the ground level. He fully agrees that right now from a proforma business point of view, they won't get the rent from a retail space on the ground floor. Five years from now once all those residential buildings have been built, that will be a different story. Particularly once the bicycle lane issue is resolved. When they make it into the environment, they all think it can become, the retail space will work. That is also a public benefit, to ask an applicant to do future planning. He stated he said all this because he would like the Board as a whole to stand firm in saying they support public benefit being more than just affordable housing. If they can collectively make a statement along those lines, it will be amplified through the City. He believes that is important to do.

Boardmember Thompson stated she heard many of the Boardmembers comment on how deep the courtyard is, and their concerns about it. She suggested a possible solution to the applicant that may also mitigate the water table issue. There are projects they have worked on that instead of going underground with the parking because the water table is too high, they've gone into the building, so that there are two levels of mezzanine parking and that pushed the courtyard up to the four stories below the top of the building. So instead of it being a six story hole it's a four story hole and then they wrapped the parking with residential, townhomes, retail. The parking is inset. The character can stay as designed or can be improved. The design can have very active street frontage, but they get out of the water table, they get a high courtyard that gets more sunlight, and they get their parking as well. That is a multifamily housing plan that she has seen in the past that this project may benefit from.

Chair Baltay thanked Boardmember Thompson and stated that is a legitimate idea.

Boardmember Hirsch stated he's reluctant to ask the applicant to revise something as major as the parking, in the manner Boardmember Thompson described. He believes another alternative would be to have the staged parking with a machine lift to consider for a taller parking structure, without having to use the double level basement. That would reduce the water table. From an engineering standpoint the applicant will need to look at the impact of those changes. It would have a significant financial impact. He's concerned that sometimes they say this is what the ARB would like, but then it doesn't price out properly for a development project based on the economics of the project. Changing the design is really a lot of work. Additionally, affordable housing right now is a huge benefit for that area. He also disagrees with the retail issue. He doesn't believe they should insist on as much as possible from a smaller building such as this particular project. There's a whole street of buildings, some of which are bigger and commercial spread out in such a way that people have to walk to it isn't as efficient and crossing the street is so difficult. Mixing in commercial is potentially financially dangerous unless it can be converted to something useful at a later date. He would prefer they keep in line with the aesthetics of the building

rather than push for commercial in a building of this size when there will be many other larger projects where the commercial would be better suited.

Chair Baltay noted that he didn't believe any of the Boardmembers had an issue with the building being ten feet above the maximum height limit, with a 3.0 FAR compared to the 1.0 that is currently required. It exceeds the lot coverage. There are a number of zoning parameters that are not small zoning changes as the PTC said, but rather pretty significant. He heard everyone feel extremely comfortable with that.

Boardmember Thompson stated she made a comment that she feels it should be set back.

Chair Baltay stated that Boardmember Thompson idea for the parking would make the building even taller, and that might actually receive support from the ARB. He wanted to point out to the applicant that they haven't had a negative reaction to the overall request to the zoning changes, he believes if they do, they need to be clear about that.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that she was clear in saying she doesn't have an issue with the sixty foot height. It's a nice transition between the two fifty foot buildings on either side. If they try to bump it up to seventy or eight feet, they may run into a bit more concern. She believes the sixty foot is appropriate, particularly given where the site is located and the length of the block. She did not, however, want to set a precedence that every building could be sixty feet tall. As a Board they should consider being cautious about that. It's not that the FAR is inappropriate as much as the open space isn't being through of in a way that could be more beneficial to the residents. It's small and it feels low. The coverage is also not an issue, they just want those things to be handled thoughtfully and carefully.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that Vice Chair Rosenberg's thoughts were appropriately expressed relative to the street façade.

Chair Baltay commented that the staff report listed six items that were essentially the request for exception from the zoning code. At least four of them he had heard support from all of the Boardmembers. The height limit increase, the FAR increase, the lot coverage, and balcony encroachments into the special setback.

Vice Chair Rosenberg referenced the top of packet page 17 for the list of exceptions.

Boardmember Thompson stated that she heard four say they felt the building needs retail and she could get on board with that.

Chair Baltay stated the division was on the retail space and he didn't hear conclusive decisions on the balcony dimensions in the open space. He believed they were going to push for six feet on those.

Boardmember Thompson agreed the six feet is important for the open space balconies.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that she's neutral regarding the balconies, so she deferred to the Board on that item.

Boardmember Chen inquired if everyone was alright with the six inch encroachment into the special setback. She understood that it is tiny for this project, and it's only some of the balconies. If in the future some projects come back wanting to encroach 18 inches or event just a foot, would it be as simple as

changing the numbers. For this project it's just part of the balcony. They haven't seen the unit floor plans so there may be a possibilities that they could set the balcony in on the unit side, instead of using the six inch encroachment.

Chair Baltay asked how each Boardmember felt about the encroachment.

Boardmember Thompson stated she was not supportive of the encroachment. She was fine with the six foot balconies everywhere else, but on the special setback, she would not be okay with making that exception.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that she was inclined to agree with both Boardmember Chen and Boardmember Thompson and would like the applicant to respect the setback. There are several different ways to do that. She agrees that this is setting a precedence and they need to be careful that while on this project it's only six inches and it's only two of the front balconies, another project might do a whole front patio that suddenly encroaches.

Chair Baltay commented that he cautioned that they are trying sell something with this project. They are giving an exception to the code, to get something back in benefit. If they don't give them something valuable, they won't do something valuable in return. Letting them project into a twenty-four foot setback on San Antonio Road, in his opinion, is not a big deal. From a design point of view, it will help the building. There's no real specific need to buffer it. It's not breaking a strong daylight plane, it's not in a residential area that has established planes. He believes that is an exception that is worth the public benefit.

Vice Chair Rosenberg agreed and stated that on that note, a possible solution could be to say this one can be approved, but maybe the precedence could be to add that it can't be more than ten percent of the façade, even if it was something like five percent, this project would comply with that.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he was convinced by Boardmember Chen that it could be handled without allowing the extension. He believed that is a more reasonable way of handling that verses allowing an exception to the regulation. The trade off for this project is the height of the building for the number of units. That is also the economical trade off for the developer.

Boardmember Thompson added that she had comments on the massing. She agreed that she was with Boardmember Chen and Boardmember Hirsch in that they are allowing other concessions and space on San Antonio is sacred. The conversations have been about how congested it is and there needs to be improvements for widening the streets and that special setback is there because it's meant for something that San Antonio needs in the future.

Chair Baltay summarized that the consensus is that the Board is not unanimous about the encroachment into the special setback is not okay. The next item is the open space and the use and the definition of it. There are three proposed types of open space on the project, the first is the courtyard which is common open space, another is the balconies, and then there is the street frontage. They all agree that they need the open space that's required. The question seems to be whether the courtyard is good open space, if the balconies need to be increased to six feet for them to count as open space, and the frontage. He heard all but one Boardmember agree about the six foot balconies.

Boardmember Hirsch felt that from the beginning something could happen that was never mentioned, and that is that if they were to change the shape of the courtyard at the top of the building, they could actually expand it to get more light into it, it would change the plan and make it much more interesting. He believed there's an alternate consideration for how to design the courtyard in order to improve it. He was concerned about making any other change to the general plan of the whole building. He didn't believe it's too small of a space to be useful, just that consideration should be given to changing the shape of it.

Chair Baltay commented that was fair enough and maybe the consensus would be that the courtyard isn't designed correctly at this time. Several ideas have floated about what to do about it, but that's up to the applicant. Chair Baltay asked if it was fair to say that as the project is currently presented, it's not adequate common open space.

Boardmember Hirsch answered yes.

Chair Baltay summarized that there have been concerns about air flow, sunlight, the overall dimensions of it, and concerns about the landscaping inside of it; with concerns about the proximity of residential uses on it.

Boardmember Thompson commented that the idea she floated about raising the courtyard and having units wrap or program being wrapped around it, potentially that may not compromise the unit count, it might compromise the unit mix. They may need to change types of units. The good thing about that solution is that parking doesn't need a very high floor to floor. If they wanted to do stackers, then they could just do one level. Increasing the parking would also increase the viability of retail. That extra height has been a successful solution, especially if there is ground floor retail and they want the extra height. Additionally, they could include unit types such as townhomes that can have mezzanines along that side. She agrees there are solutions that could make the courtyard work better.

Chair Baltay moved on to a conversation about the separation of the units from the street frontage to the courtyard. Vice Chair Rosenberg raised the idea that perhaps residential units shouldn't be much less prominently relating to the courtyard. Possibly other uses would work better there, particularly if there was commercial activity on the street. The gym and the clubhouse would be much more suitable facing the courtyard. That would be up to the applicant to configure their building. He believed it was fair to say that the ground floor units, at grade with the public spaces, just don't work. They need more than just a six foot landscape buffer and then call it a patio.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he likes the idea of some type of mixed use for the courtyard. It animates it more and makes it more useful to the whole building. He also didn't understand why more units could face toward the street.

Chair Baltay added that if they were raised up in grade, or they use the landscape buffer much more creatively. There are many options with twenty feet of space.

Boardmember Thompson stated she could see the benefit of it, but so many other things are in flux that it's hard to say if she would support that.

Chair Baltay explained that what he was trying to do was make a statement about what the ARB as a whole feels that the currently proposed separation between the private residential units and the public spaces is not adequate.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if he meant just in the courtyard.

Chair Baltay responded that he meant in the street too, and in the rear. When there are ground level units in the back, then the bio-swell becomes a significant limitation. When the units are raised just a bit, there are a lot more options. When there are ground level units along San Antonio that creates all types of issues. The basic statement from the ARB is that it's just not there yet. The Board has floated a lot of ideas, ultimately the decision is up to the applicants. What is being presented just isn't working.

Chair Baltay moved into the conversation regarding ground floor retail or commercial and that Boardmember Hirsch made a strong pitch against it, Chair Baltay felt the opposite and inquired how the remaining Boardmembers felt.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated that she believed the project needs it but possibly not the entire 1500 SF. She also argued respectively to Boardmember Hirsch's point that the ARB pressed the developers at 788 that they needed retail space, and that building is right next door. The Sherman Avenue project on California Avenue, while it's closer to a series of retail spaces, it's off to the side and down a block and the ARB still required it for that location. Either they are going to set a precedence along San Antonio and in those areas, or they say they aren't going to push on it, and it will be a long walk of nothing but residential.

Boardmember Thompson stated that she's for retail.

Boardmember Chen agreed that retail is needed in the neighborhood and just considering the increase of the units in that neighborhood in the next ten years or so, they will need some retail. If they had retail in different projects along San Antonio, the street would become more pedestrian friendly.

Chair Baltay stated he agreed with the majority of his colleagues and offered Boardmember Hirsch one more opportunity to debate his position.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he's definitely in the minority and commented that he also disagreed about the retail in the other one, as it didn't animate the front and causes confusion for people going into a private building. The access isn't always easy and there isn't enough parking, even for bikes. He liked the idea of there being more concentrated shopping areas. The street needs design to satisfy bike traffic and pedestrian movement.

Chair Baltay commented on that topic they had four Boardmembers feel that retail or commercial activity should be included on the ground level and moved into the discussion on the utility and trash circulation of the building, whether it be permitted to be at the curb side, to include ride sharing, deliveries and pick-up services. He made the comment and heard others with the same position in believing that should really be on site.

All Boardmembers did a verbal agree on the point of needing a dedicated area on site for those services.

Chair Baltay expressed hope that staff would take to heart what the ARB had said and insist that they provide some sort of solution for these services. He added that he hadn't commented on it prior, but he

agreed that the building should consider a step back at the top and opened the discussion about the ARB requesting the massing of the building to be modified. Currently it's a five story box with some texture. He noted that every building along San Antonio the ARB has requested significant step backs and believed that this building is no different. At the top level, and perhaps at the sides. Chair Baltay inquired how the other Boardmembers feel about that.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he disagrees, that one has to look at the design of the paneled background with projecting volumes, some being transparent and some being more solid. He does believe the textural aspect of it should be changed and the color should be changed, but believes the concept is a good idea. He would hate to see that lost with a setback that changed the basic concept of the design. He does believe that the volume could change where the windows are. They could recess, which would allow for the balcony to increase. Sunshades or canopies could be utilized at the top floor, those would not disturb the shape or the idea that the plane that is being projected in the current design of face of the building.

Boardmember Thompson believes the massing is lacking, it is too simple and too much of a box. There are some hits on the fifth floor of a little serrated edge happening. She would suggest if that were going to be an element of the building it should be more pronounced. Stepping down is essential because that gives a lot of depth to the façade and right now the façade does not have a lot of depth. It's relying on the balconies and the fins and the white boxes, but they aren't playing together in the current design. In her opinion the massing needs considerable work to provide more order, make it a bit more simplified so that the concept really shines though.

Chair Baltay clarified that he is asking for changes to the massing of the building, not the textural detailing on the façade. He believes the upper floors need to be stepped back from the lower floors on the front and the sides of the building to some degree. Similar to what the ARB requested from the building to the right and at the hotel up the street. In his opinion that request has shown to be tremendously successful, as compared to what was first presented in those projects.

Boardmember Thompson commented that she's very much in support of that.

Boardmember Chen commented that generally speaking she is okay with what they proposed because it works well, but she does agree that there could be some step backs on the interior courtyard façades. The courtyard could be a funnel shape to bring in more natural light. Street front is okay, and she doesn't have a big issue, and doesn't want to see San Antonio be like a cookie cutter with all the buildings being the same. There could be variations.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that she is not necessarily inclined to force them to step back the upper level on the front façade specifically. She hears Chair Baltay's point about how it's been successful in some of the nearby related projects, but there's no daylight plan going to San Antonio so there's nothing that's protecting on the front façade. She's less inclined to force the issue there. She would be more in support of stepping back on the courtyard façades or funneling away from the neighboring side buildings. To her that makes more sense. She believes having the variation of the front façades of the buildings will provide for a more interesting street scape.

Chair Baltay stated that when he's talking about the public facing massing, not the courtyard which is a separate design issue internal to the building. The ARB is tasked in part to find that the building is contextually compatible, which is their code. He challenged them to look at any other tall building on San Antonio and they all have setbacks on the top level, even the JCC has the wonderful upstairs patio at the top level with a deeply recessed floor setback. The hotel steps back on the third, fourth and fifth floor in a cascading effect. When traffic exits the 101, they will see the wall very directly, which is why they asked for 788 to step back. A fifty foot building wall with no real modulation is not within context or good urban design.

Boardmember Thompson commented to piggyback on Chair Baltay, it provides a precedent for other buildings to also make huge walls that go all the way to the front and this project needs and wants to be successful, and she believes that. It can't just be a big block of wall across the whole street, there needs to be breathing room from the street and part of that is the setback. She believes in response to Vice Chair Rosenberg's question, it's the aesthetic element that they are trying to protect, in making sure the street has character and it has modulation on the front. The trees on San Antonio need light as well, those need to thrive.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that they have a plane that's expressed and the darker element on which the other elements project. They are sculptural elements to a plane that is establishing a setback. It is setback, and he doesn't understand why they feel it's not.

Chair Baltay asked Boardmember Hirsch to show them on the floor plan where those changes are that he's referring to.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he's looking at the front elevation.

Boardmember Thompson inquired how deep the setback is.

Chair Baltay asked where it is located in the plans.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated that they have to flip-flop back and forth between A2.4 and A2.5, and unfortunately, it's not noted what that setback is, which would be helpful.

Boardmember Thompson believed the plans don't show any variation.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated that when she flips from A2.4 to A2.5, they are setback but by only a couple of feet and it would be helpful if it was noted what those dimensions are.

Chair Baltay said that he was able to see the foot setback.

Boardmember Thompson commented that she wasn't sure if a foot setback counts.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that the whole plane on the front is the darker element, and everything on the front elevation is pushed forward from that.

Ms. Kallas stated that she pulled she section and shared it on the screen and they could see that the left side is the San Antonio side and that there is a slight recess. As Vice Chair Rosenberg noted, it's not dimensioned, however there is a slight step back and it is offset by the balcony also projecting some.

Chair Baltay noted that he now sees that. To him that's not nearly enough for what he was talking about, but he understood that it was part of the parti of the design and he doesn't buy that design in that location. He believes that is the wrong parti, and that's how he feels.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he feels that it is sufficient.

Chair Baltay inquired how the rest of the Board felt.

Boardmember Thompson stated that she doesn't feel it is sufficient.

Boardmember Chen commented that she's totally fine with what is proposed for the street front elevation.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that she appreciates the desire for the setback, her thinking is if they go back and look at that section, they could pull that building quite a few more feet forward. They are only holding it back because of the allowance for the balconies. She questioned if they should allow for the two foot jog; or would they rather have them keep the upper level where it is but pull those three or four middle levels all the way to that setback. She believes that is a design decision and not for the ARB to say. They aren't riding the special setback the whole way and she wanted to account for the fact that they haven't tried to create a wall at that setback. They are allowing for some modulation, whether it's exaggerated enough to be a truly successful design is the question. She had a hard time saying as much as she would like, it would be nice if there was a little more, however she also didn't want to see them push everything forward to the setback either.

Chair Baltay stated to staff that he heard 2.5 votes for and 2.5 votes against it, and they will likely revisit that point in future presentations, currently there's not clear consensus that they need to step the building back. The next discussion was on the use of the materials on the building; he heard a fairly consistent commentary that the colors were not warm enough, several comments regarding the detailing of the material and textuality, which is fairly subjective.

Boardmember Hirsch believed there had been an expression of textures and what was proposed for it, with the panels and the perforated panels; and believes that they are moving in the right direction, but they aren't there yet. There has to be more of that, particularly with some sun shading on the roof level. Another appropriate material at the top to create shading is an addition to the textualization and on the ground floor he could imagine that projecting into the entry, which he finds is cold. They could use those materials and colorization as they move the design into the front the building. He likes the idea of the two story expression and the light from the inside coming out, but that doesn't mean it should be without texture or color change.

Boardmember Thompson commented that in terms of textuality the comment is basically more small scale muse, particularly on the ground level. She could see that carried up through the façade. Throughout San Antonio Road there is a lot of texture on the ground level, with an interesting flow of depth. Some of those walls have a lot of depth by using patterning and character. She said that one scale smaller than what is being proposed currently on the façade, and having something more human scale that feels like it has a good relationship with the people on the street would be good.

Boardmember Hirsch emphatically agreed.

Vice Chair Rosenberg believed that it feels like a rough draft in a sense. Maybe take a look at it and see if they need to have the four panels exactly the same, maybe there could be variation in texture or even slight color changes. It could be taken to another level and having more warmth in the colors could be beneficial.

Boardmember Hirsch added that had all been talking about the landscaping in the front and one could imagine that if there were some sort of walls built there to separate a bike path from the landscaped areas, the top of a wall for that separation could be a spot to use more of that metal topping that creates color and texture.

Chair Baltay asked if staff felt they had given clear direction on what they would like to see.

Ms. Kallas responded that when she looked back at her notes, she turned Chair Baltay's six points into about ten. In addition to general refinements to the plan, she has a more specific list. They noted that while generally the proposed 2.99 FAR is acceptable, it needs to be potentially allocated in a way that has more thought towards open space, the Board has expressed that they do not support a front setback encroachment, however the open space balconies should be increased to the six feet to meet the minimum required by the code. The courtyard open space is not currently adequate, but the applicant will need to consider how to address that. However, at least two Boardmembers supported doing a funnel type design. Overall, the separation of public and private space is not adequate in the courtyard, the applicant should consider if it would be possible for the gym or clubhouse to open up into the courtyard, additionally the street facing unit on the ground level would need more of a buffer. The Board supports retaining the retail and unanimously agreed that circulation needs to be improved for loading, deliveries, trash pickup, ride shares and bikes. Specifically needs an onsite loading space as opposed to the curbside. The Board is split 50/50 on if the upper floors need a step back, however generally having slightly more modulation would be supported. The materials need more warmth, the two story entry is good, however, at least two Boardmembers noted that the address signage piece cuts it off. More ground level human scale texture should be added.

Chair Baltay provided the applicant with the opportunity to comment or respond to any of the ARB feedback and asked if they had any questions.

Boardmember Thompson stated there was one more item, she had made a comment about the side elevation being too blank. She would like the rest of the Board to comment on that.

Vice Chair Rosenberg agreed and stated that the blank spot is repetitive.

Boardmember Chen commented that she is okay with what was proposed because there is some variation on the east elevation and some shading that provides nice details. In the future, when the adjacent neighbor builds a four or five store building, the blank spots on the side elevations would not be that noticeable.

Vice Chair Rosenberg noted there was a minor typo on sheet A3.1. Those are also labeled as east and west elevations and she believes they were supposed to be north and south.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that if they were going to work on some of the texture issues, the fiber cement panels don't all have to be the same color. There could be some subtle variety which would allow for some improvements on the side elevations if it were to be carried through from the front to the sides.

Chair Baltay understood that the Board's comments regarding materiality applied to all sides of the building. He believes the side elevations certainly need the same additional treatment. He's not in the majority in thinking they need to do more for modulation on the sides, however at least half the Board believed it to be okay.

Mr. Donahue commented that in terms of the fiber cement material the specific brand they are considering is called aquatone and it comes in a wide variety of textures and patterns. He agreed that they are not getting close enough to the building for them to see it. The presentation had a closer view of the entrance that wasn't shown because he ran out of time, and he believed that some of their concerns would be immediately addressed by getting closer to the building. They will also consider using entirely different patterns based on some of the feedback received at this meeting. As far as the massing goes, all of the things requested would reduce the amount of sellable square footage so yes all of the suggestions would work, however, they would have to consult with the owner group for the final decision. The proposal which has the changes in it still has to meet the demands of the proforma. Regarding parking, wrapped parking is done often, this site is too small. There are 144 spaces, the entire lower level of parking already has stackers. To achieve the same count within a 14' volume would take up the entire footprint of the site. It's not practical for this site. They are aware of the challenges with dewatering the site. The average water table is eight feet below the surface. He has worked on projects where they were thirty or forty feet into the water table, and it is a serious challenge and acknowledged the ARBs concerns. They absolutely want to get ahead of that and not return at a later date saying they didn't know how bad it is. He appreciated the suggestions, and they can start looking into those now. Putting the community areas on the back side looking into the courtyard is worth considering. It does present the challenge of having to move those units to the street, and Boardmember Chen mentioned that street facing ground level units are also problematic. His understanding from staff was that no permanent improvements were allowed within the twenty-four foot special setback and requested clarification.

Ms. Raybould replied that was an incorrect understanding. They can make certain improvements. Any sort of building would not be allowed. Low garden walls, landscaping and trees are allowed, along with grade level patio areas can be programmed into the open space.

Mr. Donahue stated in that case that whole area will be changed and also requested clarification about if they could put a loading zone within that twenty-four foot zone.

Ms. Kallas responded that generally yes and noted that there are specific comments that the trash haulers provided that have not yet been related to the architects because she wanted to include the comments from the meeting.

Ms. Raybould commented that the loading zone and trash area is something that Ms. Kallas will likely need to work with the architects and the Department of Transportation more in terms of considering what the future transportation plans are for this area. She believed several Council members expressed similar concerns regarding about congestion on San Antonio and putting loading and trash collection on the street front.

Mr. Donahue stated that they would be happy to work with staff and transportation on that. The last thing is the ground floor commercial. Their main concern isn't that it should be there, but rather having an empty space for the next five years. That can be dealt with on a rental basis by lowering the rent, however, then they get into what type of commercial would they attract with cheaper rent. He heard that the ARB believes it is a good idea and the owner has some comments regarding that as well, they will address it how they need to address it.

Yorke Lee, TS800 SA LLC and owner of the development, wanted to provide more information in regard to the commercial space. They originally discussed the retail space with staff and City Council in a Council pre-screening meeting. City Council recommended that they provide more AI units in place of the commercial space. The below market rate (BMR) requirement is 20% and that was what was initially proposed. After several meetings with staff and the Council prescreening meeting, they are now providing 21% BMR in exchange for the retail space. They have to determine which is more useful and different people have different answers. Council and staff convinced them that more BMR is more beneficial than a small commercial space such as this project. He felt the ARB was missing that information and it might be helpful to them to know.

Chair Baltay thanked him for his comments.

Ms. Raybould commented on record, she was the planner at the prescreening for this project and Ms. Kallas took over for the formal application. What she heard at Council from individual members was that generally the idea of the exceptions that are being requested, more public benefit was needed. The context of providing more BMR housing was based on the idea that if they were going to ask for the exceptions, then Council would want to see more. Whether the one additional unit is sufficient to address those concerns, she had heard from some Council Members some concerns about the retail component. That is something that PTC and Council would be weighing in terms of sufficiency for the exceptions being requested. It is also her recollection that the applicant did also provide deeper affordability of the units, which was the other consideration... if they couldn't provide more BMR, the units needed to have a deeper affordability. Staff also expressed that other considerations could be making bike lanes or other transportation improvements to that area.

Chair Baltay thanked Ms. Raybould for putting that on the record.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he believes the ARB is asking for some other improvements to this project, changing perhaps the shape of the courtyard and reducing the unit sizes in order to make that happen at the top of the building. That's a significant change, as is moving other functional use to the courtyard area. It affects the commercial aspects of this project in some way. That's a fair trade off in improving the design, rather than forcing the issue with the commercial which has already gone through the processes.

Chair Baltay stated he's going to close this up. To the applicant, he cautioned him to be careful how he hears what he's hearing from the Council and the ARB. He's seen a lot of projects that were approved over the last ten years and almost all of them ended up putting some type of retail on the ground floor, the extend that they listen to the City's recommendations is the extend of how smoothly the project will go through the process. They want the project to be approved. Chair Baltay requested the applicant with

work this and not against them. They appreciate and really support the big picture of what they are doing. It's a great project.

MOTION: Boardmember Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, that the project at 800 San Antonio Road [23PLN-00010] be moved to a date uncertain.

Chair Baltay requested a roll call vote.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Boardmember Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Baltay commented that they wanted to get the reports from the ad hoc committees.

Vice Chair Rosenberg referred them to packet page 9 and listed the project report outs on 3150 El Camino Real, one packet page 11 is 3265 El Camino Real, and 3997 Fabian. She started with 3150 El Camino.

Chair Baltay explained that each project had a subcommittee assigned to it and the idea is to report back as a whole on what they saw regarding the project, with the comprehensiveness of the information that was there, and if there were things that the subcommittees felt the Board should be looking at. Please remember they are not passing judgement or presenting opinions on the design as of yet, rather alerting their colleagues to feel free to take a note of it and they can independently report to staff what they think about the project, which will be provided as early feedback to the applicant.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated she will try to keep her comments brief. They've had two meetings on this project, with 3150 El Camino Real they looked at the package for completion and there were significant items missing. Those items were the blow ups of the typical apartment type floor plans, it is very beneficial information in determining the functionality of a project. The traffic flow and processing plan is not provided. That is extremely important for the traffic circulation of bikes, pedestrians and vehicles and they need to know where they will enter the building, for trash, loading zones, deliveries, and ride shares. They found some significant concerns regarding the traffic circulation of the ground floor and path of travel in and out of the building should be noted. The bike storage is on the second floor.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he wanted to add to the discussion, regarding the process. They, as a Board, are making comments on planning aspects that have to do with the functionality of the building and some of those aspects need to be addressed in all of the projects, particularly now larger projects, at a very early stage of development. That's part of what the subcommittees objective is. This is an open subject they should be discussing with planning. He asked the Chair if they could address it in a general way so that in the future there's some manner in which either the subcommittee or they as a Board, however it's done, have discussions with planning at an early stage in order to effect the issues that have to do with functionality.

Chair Baltay responded so noted. They should keep pressing this and had discussed it before. They have to be careful during the subcommittee phase because they are preliminary applications. This isn't an Agenda item, but he will allow staff to comment.

Ms. Gerhardt stated she was happy to speak about it briefly and staff could certainly Agendize the discussion for a later date if needed. An ARB checklist is used by staff and provided to architects so they will know what they should provide in the application they submit to staff. The traffic flow with the trash room and loading zones isn't necessarily mandatory on that check list, and maybe that's something that needs to be added. If the ARB wants to look at that checklist, she will provide that, and asked if she heard the ARB comments correctly.

Chair Baltay stated that he doesn't know that every project would need to do that. He believed the checklist states that they have to show a site plan. To him, part of the site plan would include things like transportation, delivery, and drop off.

Ms. Gerhardt replied that they could list it with the caveat that it's only needed for multi-family projects, something to that degree. All architects are different, it helps staff to go down the checklist to make sure everything is in the packet that the Boards need to see.

Chair Baltay suggested they Agendize for a future meeting, a discussion where the ARB can help staff revisit the check list for potential changes.

Ms. Gerhardt commented that all of these projects are very early in the process, and staff was hoping that the ARB can provide staff with items that may be missing from the plan sets, such as floor plans, or site plans.

Vice Chair Rosenberg summarized there are five items they feel are missing that they would like to see. The blown up floor plans of the different type of units, a traffic flow, traffic flow, drop off and pick up plan, a bike flow plan, a solar analysis to some degree of the courtyard, and the materials need more information and refinement.

Chair Baltay commented he felt that was good feedback for staff and the Board.

Boardmember Thompson stated her project is 3265 El Camino Real.

Chair Baltay stated that project was Vice Chair Rosenberg and Boardmember Thompson.

Boardmember Thompson reported this is a housing project with commercial on the ground floor. Some of the things they noted were similar comments regarding site circulation and for trash pickup. There are three main façades that will be very visible. The material clarity and landscape choices are things they would suggest their colleagues also note.

Chair Baltay commented he believed the last project was Boardmember Chen and Boardmember Hirsch, 3997 Fabian Way.

Boardmember Chen reported they had similar comments as the other housing projects. They would like to see the circulation diagrams showing the visitors flow, where they park and how they get access to the lobby, bicycle access, garbage collection and mail delivery circulations, loading zones and package delivery

areas. They also were interested in seeing the distance to the community facilities. They also would be interested in seeing the distance between the proposed building and the adjacent building. The existing JCC housing unit is quite close to the property. They would also like the applicant to provide additional sections showing elevation changes such as the pool and garage ramps as it impacts the functionality of the project. The last item was to provide large diagrams of the unit floor plans and of the back of the house (BOH).

Boardmember Hirsch added that they want to see the relationship of street parking to those facilities within the building and for servicing the building, as well as street parking. They also need to understand the sun angles in the open courtyards.

Chair Baltay commented that they are expecting to hear back from Boardmember Chen at the next meeting regarding the bird safe glazing feedback.

Chair Baltay stated he wanted to publicly acknowledge and provide thanks to Boardmember Thompson who is retiring from the board today. Each Boardmember will have the opportunity to provide a quick comment if they'd like to.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that's she's a newer Boardmember and when she started Boardmember Thompson was the Chair. It's been wonderful working with her, and she feels very inspired by her. She's excited for her new adventure to begin.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he's been sensitized to textures, materials, colors over the years due to Boardmember Thompson. He thanked her for providing good lessons on materiality of buildings. He will miss the comradery even more than everything else.

Boardmember Chen stated she had a similar experience that Vice Chair Rosenberg mentioned. She appreciated Boardmember Thompson as the Chair of the Board as it made her transition easy and smooth onto the Board. She has enjoyed listening to her and had enjoyed the wide range of perspectives from Boardmember Thompson at each of the meetings. She also appreciates the manner in which Boardmember Thompson asks questions and pushes back. She set a really good example to future Boardmembers. Boardmember Thompson will be missed, and she wished her much luck in her next chapter.

Ms. Raybould stated that this is the first Board that she was a liaison to and has been for the ARB for most of the time Boardmember Thompson has been on the Board. She as appreciated her comments and as noted, from a staff perspective, each Boardmember leaves their mark in terms of something they always comment on and she believed that Boardmember Thompson championed the sustainability aspects, passive ventilations, and roof tops and bringing greenery in and she thinks that's a really valuable thing that Boardmember Thompson brought to the city.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that staff really did appreciate her work on the Board, and who ever convinced her that it wasn't going to take a large amount of time, it does take a fair amount of time, but all of that effort was very much appreciated, and she thanked Boardmember Thompson.

Chair Baltay thanked Boardmember Thompson and stated that it's been a distinct honor and pleasure having her as a colleague on the Board, as a professional colleague but mostly as a friend. He thanked her for her friendship and stated that she's a wonderful person.

Adjournment

Chair Baltay adjourned the meeting at 12:29 p.m.