



## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES: June 1, 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.

Chair Baltay inquired about any new projects.

Ms. Raybould replied that new projects include a Council prescreening to convert an existing 10,000 square foot movie theater at 3001 El Camino Real in the Palo Alto Square site into new office space. Additionally, there will be Council prescreening on 260 Homer to amend a development agreement that currently restricts the amount of space that one or more commercial office tenants can occupy. There is interest in a single tenant occupying other existing space.

Chair Baltay assigned an ad hoc for the movie theater at 3001 El Camino Real consisting of himself and Boardmember Thompson. He did not see a need for an ad hoc committee for 260 Homer.

### **City Official Reports**

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

Ms. Raybould reported that upcoming items include the Sobrato development agreement for the Fry's site on June 15, 2023, as well as a façade modification. Retailer Arhaus is a tenant looking to fill the American Girl space at Stanford Shopping Center. July 6, 2023 has been slotted for 800 San Antonio Road which is a larger high-density multi-family development project. That will be it's first formal hearing.

### Study Session

2. 640 Waverley [23PLN-00092]: Request for Preliminary Architectural Review To Allow Demolition of a Single-Family Home and to Allow Development of a Proposed Four-Story, approximately 10,400 Square Foot Mixed-Use Development Comprised of Ground Floor Office and Three Levels of Residential (Four Residential Units in Total) with a Basement and Below-Grade Parking. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The Formal Application Will be Subject to California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Review. Zoning District: CN (Neighborhood Commercial). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Raybould at [Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org).

Chair Baltay introduced the item and noted that disclosures were not needed as it is a study session only.

Ms. Raybould provided the staff report for the preliminary review of 640 Waverly, a new mixed-use development that will be located on Waverly, near Forest. The project would replace two existing residences on a 5,227 square foot (sf) parcel with a mixed-use development, the ground floor office with four residential units above and five parking stalls (which count as seven with the Americans With Disabilities Act (ADA)) for residential use in a below grade parking garage. It came to Ms. Raybould's attention that this may have originally been zoned for only office use, that still needs to be researched. The applicant noted to Ms. Raybould that there are 7 parking spaces paid into the downtown in lieu program. As part of a formal application staff will be reviewing that further. The applicant intends to meet the objectives standards and follow the standards ARB process instead of meeting all of the objective standards, which are subject to a context-based design criteria, downtown design guidelines, CD-C zone district requirements, and ARB findings. Staff and the applicant are requesting key feedback from the ARB for massing, site planning, material selection, and context-based design criteria consistency for privacy.

Vice Chair Rosenberg requested clarification of the sf of the project as two different numbers are in the staff report.

Ms. Raybould clarified that the new project is for 10,400 sf mixed-use development.

Chair Baltay requested the applicant, Mr. Ken Hayes, provide his presentation.

Mr. Ken Hayes, with Hayes Group Architects, provided a presentation for the ARB on behalf of the applicants, however, clarified that the two buildings there are zoned commercial and in the downtown parking assessment study as commercial with a requirement of seven parking spaces on site, there are actually no parking spaces being assessed. The project is a mid-block parcel that is 50x102 feet deep with two buildings current that are not historical in nature and will be deconstructed. The site is zoned CD-C with a pedestrian overlay and surrounded by Public Facility (PF) and CD-C properties. Both neighbors have supplied a letter of support for the project and displayed site views from different sides of the site. One

level of the residences in the project is intended to be the owner's home. The project has a net zero goal for the building. The applicants are looking to do a pavilion type top floor such as a net zero building that was designed in New York City. The materials will be warm and robust natural materials with a symbiotic edge to the 636 Waverly project, with voids for light and plant material to provide both sun and privacy screening. Mr. Hayes showed several drawings for each floor entries. The driveway into the garage area will be nine feet (eight feet is the minimum allowed), with a lift that will lower the vehicles down to the parking area. Additionally, trash refuse drawings were shown along with how they intend to plan for refuse pick up. Municipal Code for Waverly allows for curbside staging of trash bins for pick-up. The property at 636 Waverly was built with a zero-setback line, this property will have a five-foot setback on the adjoining side, with an eight-foot setback on the commercial façade. The project does not comply with the objective standards; however, they are intending on complying with the daylight plane, particularly on the side adjoined with the historical property. The only exception is at the rear of the building where there is a stair. There was no way to add a stair to the outside of the building and stay within the daylight plane. It is well beyond the historical portion of the building on the abutting property. Mr. Hayes showed the floor plans and the screen walls. There will be a roof garden on the top floor unit. The units above the ground floor all have balconies.

Chair Baltay thanked Mr. Hayes for the presentation and inquired if there were public comments for the study session.

Administrative Associate III Veronica Dao stated there were no cards submitted for public comment.

Chair Baltay opened the item up for questions from the board for both the applicant and staff.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about the thought process of the materiality of the band between the first and second floor.

Mr. Hayes explained the intent is for there to be some sort of metal cladding or standing seamless product that would add some verticality, not unlike the slats located throughout the project. The intent is to add differentiation between the commercial space and the residential space. The material has not yet been determined, possibly some sort of wood type material or metal.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about the privacy screening.

Mr. Hayes replied that it would be the same material as the residential entry slat material. All the other wood-like material will match.

Boardmember Thompson asked about the elevation facing the historical building that is part privacy screening and part concrete, specifically with an inquiry of how much of the concrete wall would be visible.

Mr. Hayes stated there is about four feet from the wall of 650 Waverly in the front portion. The historic portion of the building at 650 Waverly is the front 40 feet of the building, and with the stepping effect of the building, the back portion is about eight feet between the two building masses. There will likely be planting materials hanging over the cement wall from the roof terrace in the sections front closer sections.

Vice Chair Rosenberg and Boardmember Thompson questioned the roof heights on the different portions of the historical building in relation to the proposed building.

Ms. Raybould stated she believed at the peak of the historic building it is about 35 feet. There are two stories, but there's also a portion that is raised. The elevation sheet is A3.03.

Mr. Hayes referred them also to A3.02 which showed the historic building's profile.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the historic building is being used as a residence.

Mr. Hayes answered it is 100% residential, a Mr. McCarthy lives in the building.

Vice Chair Rosenberg continued her questions, still on sheet A3.02, and requested an explanation as to which of the windows are in bedrooms and which need to be egressed.

Mr. Hayes stated the two windows that are closet to the stair tower on the third floor are egress windows. All the windows on the third floor are egress.

On sheet A2.02, the second floor, the first window closest to the stair tower is not an egress window, which is a living room. On Sheet 3.02, the second-floor window that is obscured by some of the concrete wall is a partially egress window. The top piece would likely be the operable piece.

Boardmember Chen inquired if the basement parking would be for residents only, and if the office tenants could have access to the elevator. Both the parking and the elevator would be for residential use only; and requested the elevation for the car lift and trash room.

Mr. Hayes stated it would be about 3.5 feet lower. The ramping is at 5% or less, so no handrails are required.

Chair Baltay questioned why the parking was lowered by three feet.

Mr. Hayes explained it is a function of the fourth floor, with an original concept of a single exit building. However, the fourth floor has a second floor which requires a secondary egress; the rear stairs become that secondary means of egress. Design logistics for the vehicle lift was the reason for lowering the parking below ground.

Boardmember Chen asked about the privacy wall between 636 and this project what the treatment will be on the wall balconies on those floors.

Mr. Hayes answered that the entry to the residence is on the fourth floor. The balcony would not be covered. The concrete wall is being sustained by the garden that is at the fourth-floor level, the concrete wall is eight 8 feet tall and then open to the sky. There are no visual connections currently between.

Boardmember Chen asked of the neighbor's view is a concrete wall.

Mr. Hayes confirmed the neighbor's view is a concrete wall, they assumed they like concrete walls since their own building is primarily concrete.

Boardmember Hirsch questioned the setback of the building on the property line, and if there actually openings in the breezeway as depicted in the drawings.

Mr. Hayes replied no, there would not be openings on the property line as that is not allowed. They will be infilled with transparent wall, a type of window.

Boardmember Hirsch clarified at that point the neighboring building is only a foot away.

Mr. Hayes explained that is also opposite the recess of the neighboring building. It's a big void. The intent was for light to come into that area. It will most likely be translucent.

Boardmember Hirsch questioned how the garbage is taken from the units to the garbage location.

Mr. Hayes responded they consulted with GreenWaste and what is being proposed is six 96-gallon cans for the residential and two or three for the commercial space. It would all be in totes (the wheeled ones) and would need to be brought to the street for pick up, the same way it's being done at 650 Waverly and 636 Waverly. On trash day they would be brought out and then put away.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired how they would get from the unit to the bins.

Mr. Hayes stated all the residential tenants have access to the garage via the elevator in the building, that elevator would bring them to the lift, they could come up the lift either with their bikes or their cars and put the trash in the trash room. They could also leave via the front entrance of the building and walk the trash around to the holding area.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he felt that was a remote location for the residents and asked if the possibility of a trash shoot was ever considered.

Mr. Hayes stated a shoot was not considered on this project.

Chair Baltay inquired about the second-floor siding that wraps the corner on the 636 building.

Mr. Hayes stated that is not glass, then corrected himself saying it is glass, however there is a concrete firewall behind the glass, and you cannot see through the glass.

Chair Baltay said he remembered in the past one of the neighbor's was upset with a proposed projects concrete walls and it was hard to understand how this will impact 636 Waverly.

Mr. Hayes replied that 636 has concrete and glass on the second floor at the front, probably 15 feet going back into the site. It is a property line wall. The proposed building is five feet back, anything beyond the five feet will be obscured up to the second floor. The building at 636 opens up with terraces, this building opens up with terraces as well on the third and fourth floors.

Chair Baltay requested more information on the parking situation and why there is no commercial parking, and what rules have been applied. Additionally, he'd like to know if it's okay to have all ADA parking, below grade and using a lift. In the past that wasn't permissible.

Ms. Raybould responded that she was not aware of any requirement and Building didn't comment on any concerns about providing ADA parking at grade. If parking is provided at grade, you must also provide ADA parking.

Chair Baltay stated his question is if you can have ADA parking only accessible by a car lift.

Ms. Raybould explained there are five total stalls, it counts as seven because Palo Alto's Code counts ADA parking spaces twice. There are only five actual stalls that are being proposed on the site. Transportation's comments on this preliminary review asked that any formal application provide more clarity about

maneuvering in the below grade garage space to make sure it all works. Staff will be looking for that information when they review the formal application. It is not actually paid into the district at this time. For multi-family and commercial uses, other than hotel, Assembly Bill 2097 does state that you cannot require minimum parking requirement if the property is within a half mile of major CalTrain station. This site is within a half mile of the University Avenue CalTrain station, therefore does not require them to provide any parking. If parking is provided, all the standards must be met for ADA and EV.

Chair Baltay commented that he understands what the State Law requires, but it seems for what is being proposed, the project is under parked.

Ms. Raybould responded that staff would require a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan per Palo Alto's standard requirements under Palo Alto Municipal Code 18.52.

Chair Baltay stated parking isn't within the ARB purview, he just wanted the record to reflect that the ARB was aware of the problem.

Ms. Raybould stated staff is also aware the proposed project is meeting the law.

Boardmember Thompson commented that she could see the design relationship to the non-historic adjacent building, and inquired if there were any type of nods with the historical building as well.

Mr. Hayes stated the main design goal in relation to the historic building was to ensure it kept it's space. Rather than be like the historic building, they attempted to frame it. The owner of the historic building pointed out in his letter that he liked the way they gave him space on both sides to highlight the historic building. Stepping back from it shows considerable effort was made to not overshadow it.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that it looked like all of the mechanical systems would be soffit-ed down.

Mr. Hayes replied that there would be distribution, should they use air, another option would be in core hallways where they could lower the ceiling to accommodate the system.

Vice Chair Rosenberg confirmed that the floor to ceiling height appeared to be 10'6".

Mr. Hayes answered that is correct for the residential portion.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that this probably meant that the ceiling height was about 9 feet

Mr. Hayes commented that it would likely be about that assuming the slab will be 10 to 12 inches thick.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired about the slope of the roofline and asked if this type of design was partially selected to give some deference to the historic building

Mr. Hayes responded yes to Boardmember Hirsch.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that the slab of the fourth floor is an evident corner as it relates to the adjoining property.

Mr. Hayes stated they considered many options at that corner, the third floor in that corner is set back five feet. They reduced the scale of the wall on the fourth floor by adding an additional three feet of

setback. The eight-foot setback wall on the fourth-floor lines up with the roofline of the 636 neighbor, and the commercial space below. And the porch of the historical building is also setback eight feet. Mr. Hayes stated there are other views of that corner in image 4.01 and the upper left of the image on 4.02. Image 4.03 is a what the view would be from the historical building on the 636 parcel. There are three views, the top and bottom images are from the 636 model, looking towards the new project. If privacy is a concern, there is definitely room for more study.

Chair Baltay moved the study session into ARB comments.

Boardmember Thompson questioned not forming an opinion on the project.

Vice Chair Rosenberg read the caveat from the City Attorney regarding the ARB refraining from forming an opinion either for or against the project.

Boardmember Thompson stated it's an Eclectic street with many styles, and this particular site is nested between two very different styles of building. She appreciates the architect's response to her questions and comments regarding finding a balance to both sides of the property. She believes there are some very good seeds overall for the project, however, the proposed building shows too much difference from the buildings on each side. She appreciates the attempt being made to be mindful of zero waste and using biophilic materials when possible. She encouraged the applicant to consider bringing some of the detailing from the sides of the buildings and extending it across the front of the project. More planters in the front would also help. Given the location and differences in the design of the area, they have an opportunity to do more with design. Boardmember Thompson had concerns regarding the façade of the concrete wall and the wall facing the parking lot. Additionally, she would encourage more treatment along the sides of the stair tower. She'd like to see more warm materials, more wood and more green, and along the roofline.

Boardmember Chen commented it is probably a challenge to do a lot of stuff on such a narrow and deep site. Her comments are focused more on two areas, one being the trash room. She believes there are functional concerns there, she would like to see more thought put into how trash is disposed of and collected in the formal application. She would also like to see more thought put into the privacy wall and the stair tower. There could be more treatments on those rather than just concrete. Particularly on the 636 side because there are some good sized south facing terraces on that building. As it stands in these drawings, this project would block their views and provide them with a cold big solid concrete wall as their view.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented she echoes the concerns of the first two Boardmembers, as well as basement parking and traffic flow could use more thought to make sure the maneuverability of the cars which is important. The trash room is a bit of an issue for her. A trash-shoot next to the elevator could use consideration, or something secondary for the residents. The concrete wall on the historic side could use a second pass and more thought. She would also like to see a second look at the rear façade, particularly on the commercial level. It feels a bit abrupt. She would encourage more of a detailed landscape plan with the formal application, along with more information on the plants. Additionally, she suggested they label the floor-to-floor heights, the ARB loves to see that, and the emergency egress windows on the one façade.

Boardmember Hirsch commented Boardmember Chen did a great job of expressing his concerns with the trash circulation for the residents. He would like to see more study on the aspect of trash removal for the residents. The comments made regarding the rear stairwell were good. Ultimately, there could be a lot and building behind it someday, and what may appear tall in the rear doesn't always appear tall from the street side. The element at the top of the building seems like a great opportunity to do more. A nice stand-alone element could provide great added character to the building. The step-back issues at the front of the building could use more thought. They may be able to notch the slab on the fourth floor so that is could be even more respectful to the neighboring building. The rooftop is very important and provides an opportunity for a distinct quality to the building. He agrees with Boardmember Thompson and hates the fact that they can't use wood in some way, or at least more natural materials. It might be beneficial to go back and consider more wood material to soften the feel in that respect. More details about the landscaping would also help to soften the look. The images of the building make it clear that the building relates to its neighbors. He appreciates the entry into the modern era and design ideas for entry ways. Again, it's a great opportunity to put more formal treatment. It's an interesting study of the way one can deal with three dimensionality on a relatively small site.

Chair Baltay stated that he supported items his colleagues pointed out such as the trash room access is not yet solved. He agreed with Boardmember Thompson regarding the materials aren't warm enough. His concern is 636 has too much concrete and is too stark and too tall for downtown and the neighborhood. He would hate to see that get repeated. The back stair tower is too much. People see that everyday walking down Gilman street. Consider bringing in more eco-friendly materials, things that are native, or landscaped; things that are looking to the future, not just a concrete wall. In looking at the fourth-floor roof he was stuck thinking it was a nod to Palo Alto's residential style, and it didn't fly. Listening to the explanation and looking at the 3D renderings he understands it more, however in listening to the other Boardmember comments, there are many other forms, shapes, and ideas up there that will provide the same level of success. The building steps down nicely to make the distinction between the neighbors on the left, and on the right. What it doesn't do is step down by material selection or design style. The expressed concrete structure is being repeated. It would be great to see Mr. Hayes make a nod towards it being halfway residential through the material choice and material expression. Chair Baltay commented to the owner regarding the parking situation. There is not enough parking for the number of cars that will be in the building. Regardless of what the code or the law says, it's responsible for the owner to find a way to park the people who live there. Otherwise, they will park on the street and that's just not fair. There are ways to get a few more spaces. The lack of commercial parking is understandable, but to not park the residents seems wrong to Chair Baltay. They can't force him to do it, by the force of persuasion, consider doing something more. Chair Baltay invited Mr. Hayes to respond to ARB comments and ask clarifying questions.

Mr. Hayes commented that what really made the project feasible at this time is that they aren't required to provide commercial parking. AB 2097 provided the window to make the project possible. This project was started in 2012, somehow 636 got ahead and the city worked out zoning compromises that made that happen. This project was not afforded the same opportunities months later. By only having residential parking in the garage, which again, they are not required to do so, they would have to make the driveway 16 feet wide. It renders the narrowness of the site very problematic. They elected to provide residential parking in such a way that the driveway can be seven feet narrower, and still provide



landscaping and the needed floor area back to the building. It increased the commercial space by about 400-feet. Mr. Hayes thanked the ARB for their comments, he appreciated the consistency from the original review in 2017. He does like the idea of working with concrete and totally gets it's not the best of building materials from an environmental standpoint, they are investigating low carbon concrete, which reduces the GHC by 40%. What he likes most about concrete is it doesn't have to be decorated. He loves the idea of trying to warm it up.

**The ARB took a 12-minute break.**

The meeting continued with all ARB Boardmembers present.

**3. Study Session to Review the Draft North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan**

Planner Sheldon Ah Sing provided the staff report and history on the Draft North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) along with the consultant Marc Asnis with Perkins & Will, and Transportation staff member Shrupath Patel.

Principal Planner Sheldon Ah Sing began by explaining how and when NVCAP began. The North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan is a long-range planning document for an area of the city near the California Avenue Caltrain transit station and located within the City's only Priority Development Area – a boundary intended to focus commercial and residential development due to its proximity to high quality transits. The City's adopted Comprehensive Plan includes policies to guide development and plan for community amenities and specifically encourages the preparation of a plan for this area. During this process they have continued receiving applications for development which are called pipeline projects and do not have to be consistent with NVCAP, however they do have to be consistent with the existing zoning. Notably these projects include Mike's Bikes, Sobrato project, and the project on Lambert. Staff is seeking ARB's confirmation that the draft NVCAP provides aesthetic and design principles that substantially support the Council's endorsed plan; provides aesthetic and design principles that substantially support the state goals and objectives from the Council for the plan; and conveys urban design principles that are achievable. There are six requirements staff is asking the ARB to convey the draft NVCAP remains consistent with which include Location of proposed land use designation, proposed public and private improvements, development regulations/public works projects and financing measures, site design and architectural standards and criteria for private development, determination of the economic feasibility of the plan, and environmental review with the maximum extent feasible tiering from the Comp Plan.

Consultant Marc Asnis continued the presentation by providing further details on the current plan area consisting of about 60 acres bounded by Oregon Expressway and Page Mill Road to the north, El Camino Real to the west, Lambert Avenue to the south and the CalTran corridor to the east. Notable sites within the Plan area include Matadero Creek Channel, and the buildings associated with the Cannery. The plan is designed to help set up the framework for the addition of integrating over 500 new high-density residences within this area and provide standards for this growth in design, urban planning, and implementation. The intent is to create a rare opportunity within the City of Palo Alto to plan proactively for a transit-oriented, mixed-use, mixed-income, and walkable neighborhood. The NVCAP is broken down

into 7 chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction on the physical and regulatory context, Chapters 2 outlines the long-term vision of the urban design vision for the transition of the built and natural environment, Chapters 3-6 are design standards and guidelines focused on the public realm, streets, parks and buildings, and Chapter 7 is implementation actions including infrastructure improvements, capital projects, and funding and financing strategies.

Mr. AhSing provided land use development standards information in the draft, as well as zoning implementation for the transfer of commercial zoning to mixed-use zoning.

Chair Baltay opened the item for public comment; seeing none, he continued by commenting that he and Vice Chair Rosenberg met earlier to review the large packet of information. He requested the study session be structured by the ARB looking at sections three and six of the NVCAP, with those two sections being of direct interest to the ARB. The Coordinated Area Plan is a broad zoning guideline that does not actually act on any zoning changes. Chair Baltay would like to have an ARB discussion on the zoning changes and how they would be implemented in a subsequent meeting that would allow for greater detail. The intent was to try to structure their time to provide clear feedback. At the end of the design standards discussion, Chair Baltay wanted to take a look at if the NVCAP is meeting the Council's preferred options and stated goals, which a matrix in Appendix D had those carefully lined out. Chair Baltay requested a thirty-minute timer for ARB comments on chapter three, with more time allotted for Chapter six, followed by comments and discussion on Chapter two per the request of Boardmember Thompson and Boardmember Chen.

Chair Baltay began comments for Chapter three, the public realm. He had two concerns with the questions about the sidewalk; first it doesn't describe how the zones of the sidewalk are separated. More detail on that would be helpful. His second thought on sidewalks is that it often says that it "would allow for the following details" and it should be more specific; they should require certain features. The way the traffic lanes are written in 3.2.2 regarding the fire code limits, they are trying to allow for pedestrians, vehicles and bicycles, and the fire trucks are requiring sixteen feet down the middle for emergency access, and it doesn't seem like it would work. Some of the technical requirements need to be addressed and superseded by a greater requirement. Regarding Green Storm Water infrastructure, Chair Baltay believes it's unrealistic to expect a street to manage its storm water disposal. That would mean putting basins under the streets to capture and disburse the water and would likely be very expensive.

Boardmember Thompson and Ms. Raybould requested a page reference for the storm water information.

Chair Baltay stated on Packet page 110, where it's referring to the public realm, his concern is that a public park or plaza or something of that sort could have its own on-sight storm water treatment, however, to think that would be applicable to a street seems to be a big reach and difficult to do.

Ms. Raybould commented she would note that with respect to that, the new C3 storm water regulations that are coming into effect July 1, when a site is redesigned, the total square footage of replacement will now include the public sidewalk as well as the parcel.

Chair Baltay commented that Ms. Raybould's comments segways into his next comments regarding paving. They talk about responsible material use, leading towards some type of permeable paving for sidewalks and roadways. That could be considered an overreach. They are expensive and difficult to build,

to stretch that this particular neighborhood has to do that everywhere is going to result in it being done nowhere. He loves the idea of accent paving in intersections, it makes a lot of sense. The City needs a better standard for exterior lighting overall. Public Works should have a dedicated set of standards for exterior lighting, the ARB has come across that before where there are different requirements for different areas. There should be one set of guidelines for the whole thing.

Vice Chair Rosenberg agreed with several of Chair Baltay's comments. However, her comments are more with respect to how the packet reads and will be presented to applicants, and the public in general. On pages 110 and 111, packet pages 64 and 65, the tables are noted as Table 6 – Local native protected tree species and Table 7 – Trees exempt from protection. She had no idea what each one of those tables were. The labeling for the table is tiny and at the bottom. The text should be visible and with a header. She understands that may be nit-picky, however it needs to be clear. On that same page, the whole concept of 3.3 is it covers trees and storm water infrastructure which feels very disjointed. If the two are meant to be together, some clarification as to why and how they are supposed to interact together may make the point more clear. She agreed with Chair Baltay regarding the frontage zone to pedestrian clear zone, as shown on packet page 107, even the image shows the porch and front steps going into the sidewalk. If the intent is for there to be a setback and a sidewalk is there, the picture could be misleading. Dimension lines may help as well. She believes there should be some type of public features such as public art could use a certain requirement per block and provided example scenarios. She agrees that the first code for the trucks should take precedence. She appreciates the list of intersection enhancements. They could also dissuade the use of trees that require high water usage. Storm water runoff is a bit of a reach. Paving sounds great.

Boardmember Thompson reference Figure 49 under sidewalk zone and suggested making that more clear. In chapter 4, packet page 123, there are some pretty clear dimensions per street. She wonders if that is why it was left ambiguous in the previous chapter. Further suggesting it might be different by street. Ash Street is the next street over and it has a different setback requirement.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that Boardmember Thompson's explanation made perfect sense, however, it should be dimensioned in both places, not just one. Vice Chair Rosenberg read from section 3.1.1 "where conditions allow, public sidewalks shall have a minimum of at least 12 feet". That's pretty clear, however prefaced with "where conditions allow".

Mr. AhSing explained that on page 107 at the top, there's an icon with a book that says, "for more information go to Chapter 4", they attempted to make that connection, but it looked to him like they could go back and make that better and more clear. He added that he completely appreciated the comments because that type of information was what they were hoping to get from the ARB.

Vice Chair Rosenberg added that again on Packet page 107, top right, there's a little book icon that says, "for more information", and due to the how it was printed out for the ARB, they also have a grey bubble that says, "Item 3 Attachment A draft".

Boardmember Hirsch commented that there is an existing neighborhood, and they are talking about it like it's an open book and they can start developing in it. There are many different schemes and setback situations, they won't actually have the opportunity to do all of the ideas listed. He doesn't understand how you make a transition from an existing neighborhood with setbacks already existing without defining

where the possibilities really are. It can't be don't piece meal. The NVCAP is as if it's a brand-new neighborhood and it's not. He asked Mr. AhSing to explain how they are going to deal with neighborhoods that already have established schemes and setback requirements.

Boardmember Thompson commented that the El Camino setback and Page Mill setback is in Chapter 4.

Mr. Asnis explained that Boardmember Hirsch is correct, it will always be on a project-by-project basis and that this is a long-range planning document that is trying to provide guidance and design frameworks and best practices for future long-term development. In terms of Chapter 4, they have done to the best of their ability, looking at a typical type of section for each street, to really provide a sense of what can actually be done with the curb to curb, and right-of-way, and also thinking about the types of minimum and maximum setbacks to really respect the existing context, and also help create something compact and comfortable from a pedestrian experience moving forward with development.

Chair Baltay stated that was not helpful because he didn't address Boardmember Hirsch's concerns that the guidelines weren't going to be used for only short-term.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he has experience with biotreatments of the streets. They were a good concept, but they would be very difficult to maintain, particularly if they were planted and through a drought. The biotreatment issue is a bigger project for streets where something like that can be done. He's not sure how you deal with capturing storm water when there's only a three-month period that they have to deal with that. He's not sure if he's ever seen any good solutions for that. The drawings are pretty standard drawings for different areas and to Chair Baltay's point, Emergency services will always have to be considered. This document wasn't prepared so that it tells you where you can do what and on which streets, that needs to be defined.

Boardmember Chen commented she had similar comments regarding image 3.1, there needs to be more of a definition of how and where to use which requirements. Additionally, she believes they should also be including Chapter 4 in their discussions because there are dimensions and setbacks labeled in that chapter, and listed street by street and block by block. It might affect future development. She also agrees with Chair Baltay on 3.2.2 and the walkway pathway. The tables are listed as Table 6 and Table 7, but in the text, they refer to Table 7 and Table 8.

Boardmember Thompson referred to the woonerf comment on Packet page 139 in Chapter 4, it does look like it's a walkable path and appears to account for an emergency vehicle. Similar to the sidewalk zone, on packet page 107 where it talked about adding the dimension likes, that would definitely enhance that diagram, and could also reference Chapter 4 a bit more clearly. On Packet page 114 in item 3.4.3, about responsible material use, she believes that EV's are expensive, there's something to be said about being responsible in the long term, even if the market isn't great. She would also encourage that they need pervious paving, with the most recent atmospheric rivers, all the water washed away, it didn't stay, and California will likely see another drought. Currently cities are being designed incorrectly in that way. Changing the design of a city to keep the runoff water is important in the scheme of things so they don't get three atmospheric rivers and still find themselves in a drought.

Boardmember Chen believed Boardmember Thompson brought up a very good point, sustainability in the long term, but in reality, how to make it happen is very expensive. This is also just one area within the

entire town, if it's going to be changed in this area, would it also then apply in the remaining areas. That also needs to be considered.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated in general she's in support of permeable paving, at a high level of cost and existing structure, not withstanding, the concept of having retention water is a nice thought. How to execute it is completely different. The Matadero Creek re-naturalization is going to be very important for that and this area. Having the permeable paving adjacent to the re-naturalized creek bed is going to make a pretty tremendous difference for how the rainwater flows out of the area. In theory it will help prevent flooding. And again, in theory, it will help recharge the groundwater table.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that it's very hard to change standards in a city where you have existing materials, and when you do, other problems are created. The idea of trying to retain the water to negate the drought situation is great in theory, how to do it environmentally to make it work for the whole City is a different item altogether. At this point they are likely trying to avoid the flooding. Storing floodwater is a major piece of work and he believes the standardization of the way they deal with the water run-off is the best way without changing paving. While changing paving might be aesthetically appealing, it's a pretty dumb idea.

Ms. Raybould commented that staff can look into it a little more but part of this came also from goals and policies set forth in the Green Stormwater Infrastructure Plan (GSIP) which was a requirement that the City prepare as part of their permitting requirements for stormwater.

Chair Baltay inquired if it would make sense to steer the NVCAP towards the GSIP for addressing the stormwater. When you restate it in this document the debate is opened up again, when it has already been decided by the City.

Mr. AhSing commented that there is another chapter that defers to other City documents.

Chair Baltay and Boardmember Hirsch agreed, keep this focused and the more you can defer to documents that are already in place and addressed appropriately, the powerful this document becomes. Chair Baltay requested a thirty-minute timer is set and moved on to Chapter 6.

Boardmember Chen started with Packet page 152, the diagram reflects that the daylight plane applies to the rear property line and inquired if it would also include the interior side property line daylight plane.

Mr. AhSing stated he will have to look into that.

Boardmember Chen referred to Packet page 153, it shows the height limit for different areas, and it also mentions that if it's 100% affordable housing, it will allow up to thirty feet additional. If that's the case, would that mean it could be built up to 88-feet high.

Mr. AhSing stated that was correct. That is consistent with State Law regarding density bonus. They are trying to be consistent with Housing Incentive Program specifically for this district. There has been some dialogue regarding that much additional height, and the conclusive thought was that there really are not many 100% affordable housing projects.

Chair Baltay stated that they've seen two in the past year.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if that is regardless of whether or not that building is next to a residential or mixed-use.

Mr. AhSing replied that if it is a 100% affordable housing project, that is correct.

Boardmember Chen stated that was why she asked the previous question about the interior side daylight plane. Because it might apply.

Ms. Raybould noted that the 100% affordable that is also within a half mile from transits.

Mr. AhSing added there are several concessions for 100% affordable.

Ms. Raybould stated that the additional thirty-three feet is only if the project is providing low- or below-income housing, it's not 100% affordable in general. Once it gets taller, it gets into a different type of construction as well, which is the other consideration.

Boardmember Chen continued with her comments and reference Packet page 154, 6.2.2 the ground floor retail height states the minimum is fifteen feet, the objective standard she believes states fourteen feet. That could be another spot where it could reference another document, or at least align with the document that is already in place.

Mr. AhSing stated that they are using fifteen feet because that is what the City Council had endorsed.

Vice Chair Rosenberg questioned why there's a difference.

Mr. AhSing responded that in general this is a sixty-acre area of the city and there are going to be some unique things about it that are going to be different than other aspects of the city, which is why they wanted to consolidate guidelines and standards to one space.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that that was more restrictive. They are forcing the applicant to build an additional foot.

Mr. AhSing stated they were also giving them additional height overall.

Boardmember Chen continued with the next page, Packet page 156, 6.3.1, it requires a minimum of four active doorways per 200 linear feet. She believes more clarification on whether that applies to a single tenant or to all multiple tenants.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he found the massing study to be reasonable on Packet page 153. What disturbs him is how do you change an entire neighborhood to a completely different zoning, and how do you do that in a consistent manner. Boardmember Hirsch's sense of this, is Council has decided this is an area where there can be an increase in density, but the actual application will happen in a way that is going to be very piecemeal because there is a variety of ownerships. It's not going to create a consistent neighborhood which leads to the question of if that is the way an urban area should be developed.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that when she flips back and forth between Packet pages 55, 79, and 153, Cloudera is designated on page 79 as a high density residential. In the future, if anyone wants to build on that property, it will not be commercial, it will only be residential and questioned if that is the goal.

Mr. AhSing replied yes, that is the goal.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that the building heights in Chapter 6, better labels on the figures would be helpful. A chart listing just all of the levels of affordability with allowed height in one table would be helpful. The thirty-three feet additional height is super problematic next to residential. The daylight plane will hopefully prevent that from going to tall, she has serious concerns with that height next to a residential zone. Looking at Olive, there is residential that backs up to medium density residential. There are three conditions for residential intersects with anything else: 1. medium density mixed-use 2. Low-density mixed-use and 3. medium density residential. If the daylight plane applies to all three of those, that's great. If it's slightly different per intersection, she'd love to see all three. Regarding residential frontage in 6.4, the ground floor entry at 6.4.1, she's curious if there was any consideration for ADA compliance or allowing those residences to be very low threshold or allow access in. She would urge them to consider that by requiring it to be a level up, they may be prohibiting appropriate ramping, particularly if there are very low setbacks. Similarly, with the stoops, consideration should be given to how deep they need to be for privacy concerns.

Boardmember Hirsch commented on 6.4.1 and inquired if the objective standards deal with some of that.

Chair Baltay commented that the objective standards are very detailed, and this would again be another place where it would be fair to reference what is already in place.

Mr. AhSing commented that was noted.

Boardmember Thompson commented that she agreed with most of the comments already stated. She also had the note on the ADA concern on figure 6.4.1. For the building heights on 6.1.2, the affordable height bonus, she inquired if there is also a Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) bonus.

Mr. AhSing answered not in this case. The base FAR is already pretty high or higher. For this district they are only considering the height so that it will be consistent with State Law.

Boardmember Thompson commented they might consider adding a FAR bonus, because that tends to make projects more viable. In terms of heights, it does feel a bit jumbled, but it seems a little bit like a fortress. There's the high stuff on the edges and the low stuff in the middle. She referenced Chapter 2, the ground floor uses, on Packet page 85 item 2.3, and noted that they have office edges in a different location from the retail edges and noted that she might consider recommending changes to this because people in offices are going to want to go to retail and so having office edge near residential might not make sense. Retail space often makes more sense to concentrate it in one area. It might be more successful if it were concentrated. The ADA issue for the stoops, instead of requiring that, they could make it an option to allow for direct access as well. On Packet page 158, item 6.5, item C under the bird safe building design, the UV coated glass. She recently found out that really isn't very effective. She suggested flagging that item as a not preferred option. She doesn't remember why, possibly because of the glazing backlit. In 6.6, heat gain, a lot of those are good, however the term eggcrate façade stood out to her and wondered if there's another way of wording that. There are other kinds of façades that do the same thing but don't look like egg crates. Under 6.6.5, roofs, she appreciates the intent, she would love to see a picture of a green roof included. The working in itself is fine however, she wondered if there is a way to encourage more green roofs. If there isn't some sort of minimum requirement on green roofs, there will

be a bunch of white roofs everywhere. The ecology and long-term of the space should be factored in with the considerations. Additionally, she believes there should be an open space requirement for each of the parcels. There is a specific plan happening at Moffit Park, for each space there is an open space requirement for each site. If they are not able to give the ground open space, they are able to go vertical with the green, or roof green space that could allow for the same amount of vegetation. She encourages everyone to look at that plan, it's a very interesting read. They are trying to make an eco-neighborhood in a college-y neighborhood.

Chair Baltay commented on the building heights and massing. He is struck that the 30-foot residential areas in the middle are going to get lost and won't work if the rest of this comes to pass. A good resolution may be to say that when those properties are changed to higher density residential, then the height limit can be changed. It needs to be acknowledged it's creating a fortress of thirty or so houses that are completely surrounded by high-rise buildings. There needs to be a clearer daylight plane regulation regarding development adjacent to single-family residential development, to protect the houses on Pepper and Olive. The 60-degree daylight plane from grade that is shown in the report, at the rear property, should really be at the side property as well and it should start at ten feet higher. Similar to what is in the R1 Code. The daylight plane is the best way to regulate the impact of different heights of buildings adjacent to single-family residential. At a high level in a coordinated area plan, the use of daylight planes to enable transitions from higher density to single-family residential is what is appropriate. That needs to be more clearly spelled out and maybe under implementation, actually figure out how to do it. On retail and active use, limiting uses of commercial to professional services with regular customers that are less than 5,000-square feet should be more broadly defined. There are a lot of businesses that provide services to residents of Palo Alto that are really under threat because they can't afford fancy new office space. If you let them use street frontage and side streets, it would actually be quite effective. He would like to see that definition of what's professional services at the ground floor level in an attempt to save something that is really at threat in Palo Alto. Regarding ground level retail height, Chair Baltay believes it should be questioned. Recently an applicant stated twelve feet was too much because it threatened their ability to do development above. Fifteen feet minimum is really ambitious. As they look at implementation, they need to reconsider what that number should be. This is one that Council has already amended; however, the ARB should give them advice on that. Regarding Portage Avenue, what is really in question is the Cannery. It bothers Chair Baltay that they don't have a clear statement that development or reuse of the Cannery building, which is a historic building, should be done to meet the Secretary of Interior standards. It seems pretty basic. He strongly supports the bird safe glazing standards on sustainable design. He questions if the ARB should come up with a subcommittee to come up with really good implementation ideas. He questions that there isn't anything about natural ventilation. The ARB has repeatedly questioned, pushed, and told applicants to put natural ventilation in their projects, even commercial, and there is nothing in the NVCAP requiring it and there should be. He'd like to see the plan ask for that in some form.

Boardmember Chen believes more detailed research and additional information for bird safety would be helpful in the NVCAP. She agrees that egg-crate façade could also be changed to different terminology.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he questions whether or not planted roofs is a good idea due to the limited water resources and what it would take to keep them maintained. He likes the idea, however, in



a drought-stricken environment they have to be careful about the amount of water used. Sustainability is a good one to deal with and in other ways is really important. Caution needs to be taken for the use of too much glass, and too many enclosed office buildings, there really are no great answers yet as part of a zoning regulation. Shading devices and other elements outside the building are important and should be incorporated in some of the codes. Regarding the historic issue revolving around Fry's, he doesn't really come down on the side of it being an important historic monument in itself, however the social importance of the building and the original owner is very important. He finds the new design that has been presented is good to describe what it's function had been originally. He doesn't believe they should push for the national registry. It's too limiting. But it is important to try to maintain the historicism where appropriate.

Vice Chair Rosenberg is in full agreement that incentivizing applicants to use sustainable with green roofs is a good idea. She understands the limitations of water shortages, but if an owner is willing to take that on, they should be allowed to do so. It could be incentivized but ultimately it would be their decision to make. There is the natural ventilation comment in 6.6.4, however it's not a requirement. If it were to be required, consideration should be given to whether it should have a per square-foot designation.

Boardmember Chen added that she wondered if they could add one item under sustainability, to explore and reuse the existing structure. Not only the Cannery building, but as listed on Packet page 79, the existing office building on Page Mill which could be turned into high density. That would save a good amount of new construction .

Chair Baltay asked Mr. Asnis if it would be helpful if the ARB created a subcommittee to review some of the unanswered questions.

Mr. Asnis responded that it would be helpful. And regarding the use of UV glass, it's really about balancing all of the urban design objectives.

Boardmember Thompson stated that was a good point and she forgot to mention there was a recommendation of pairing the glass with a planter or screen. That strategy isn't included in this document, but she recalls an article.

Mr. Asnis commented that you have to be careful with vegetation next to glazing can be dangerous as birds may think it's a fly through.

Chair Baltay appointed a subcommittee for sustainable massing consisting of Boardmember Thompson and Boardmember Chen. The committee should address items 6.6.2, bird safe building design, item 6.6.4 P – daylighting and natural ventilation, and 6.6.5 roof design. The ad-hoc can help guide the ARB when they get to the section of implementation.

Boardmember Hirsch wanted to comment that using the daylight plane as a means to control high buildings next to residential was a good point because it comes up in every project, and the ARB is rather unified in what they would like to see regarding specific daylight plane that would answer all issues regarding height.

Mr. AhSing commented that in the packet there's a draft on how to address that issue and made note of their suggestion of pointing back towards standards that have already been created and that are effective. If there is something more specific that can be applied, they can look more closely at that.

Chair Baltay questioned if figure 77 is from the objective standards.

Mr. AhSing answered he doesn't believe it is and staff needs to go back and reconcile the figures and what they pertain to, and which can be directed to standards already in place.

Chair Baltay commented that several times they came across diagrams that were really unclear and, in this case, it's not referencing the standard that staff said it was intended to reference; and yet, it's the only diagram in the packet. The ARB can figure it out, the public will not, and the Council will not. It would really be a disservice not to be consistent.

Chair Baltay asked if they wanted a break before they moved into sections 4 and 2.

### **The ARB took a 5-minute break.**

The meeting continued with all ARB Boardmembers present.

Chair Baltay moved into Section 4.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated she did not have comments on Section 4.

Boardmember Chen commented she has a major issue on Ash Street, on 4.1 on Packet page 124, between Page Mill and Olive Avenue. It says that it will change from a two-way lane to a one southbound lane. Considering the long-term development of this area, it will be just the high-density residential just northeast to Ash Street and wondered if it would create a huge burden to the other street. She suggested considering keeping it a two-way lane street.

Boardmember Thompson questioned the thinking behind changing it to a one-way street.

Mr. AhSing stated that respectfully, questioning the decision to change a road from two ways to one-way is not in the purview of the ARB. However, the reason for that is there has been a lot of cut-through traffic in that area.

Transportation staff member Shrupath Patel commented that the street they are referring to is coming from El Camino Real making a right onto Olive Avenue and then making a left onto Ash Street to access the Eastbound Urban Expressway. The object behind making Ash Street one way is to stop that cut through traffic.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he found it to be appropriate the way it has been handled and they recognized that each one of the situations is a little bit different and even the length of the street, which is not long, they addressed the issue well in terms of the specific needs of the specific areas.

Boardmember Thompson commented that on Packet page 132 permeable paving was mentioned again and she recommended that there are some products that could be looked into, some work and some don't and some of the Boardmembers know those differences. It might be a good idea to show some

examples of those, in addition to the kind that makes wheelchair accessible difficult. She appreciates the curb-less design along Portage Avenue, that's a nice touch.

Boardmember Hirsch added throughout the presentation they have not at all looked into what is being planned for Fry's development, it's not included in any of the drawings. One of the aspects of Portage that is planned in the drawings is to include parking along the building façade whereas in figure 6.3 it's shown as being a landscaped area that is being used publicly in the woonerf idea. Which one is it going to be and how is that decision going to be made.

Chair Baltay commented that they will have a subsequent meeting for the implantation of ideas and that may be a better time for that question, and asked Boardmember Hirsch if he had a suggestion on how it should be done. It's about a coordinated plan for the whole area and not specific to one project.

Ms. Raybould commented that she can assure they speak to that in the staff report for the Sobrato project when it comes before the ARB.

Mr. AhSing added that the Sobrato project is one of the pipeline projects he mentioned earlier that is already in process.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that the opportunity to use the street width could be more detailed with more of a design concept and should be more of a social street and not just a regular street and it should follow a format that is being approved.

Chair Baltay moved into Section 2 and commented that it's about a vision and a rather loose topic and asked that the timer be set to 15-minutes which would allow for three minutes each to address this and anything else in the NVCAP that they see.

Boardmember Thompson commented on 2.5 located on Packet page 97, this diagram is a really important diagram because it is talking about the ecology of the site and initially it seemed they were focusing a lot of the nature stuff where the creek naturalization is happening, however this diagram is the only one that depicts that this is not really how nature works. Nature is everywhere, birds are going to fly everywhere. This is the only diagram that speaks to the greater ecology of the whole site. She would encourage showing more green roofs, more wood fake panels; green roofs are great thermal masses. Drought tolerant planting requires less water. It's important to enhance this diagram. It would be good to see what kind of habitats are coming out of the different areas and possibly push the idea more. She felt like each part has a nature character to it and that's missing as part of the vision. Matadero Creek has a section that has a 45' height near it and that may not be the best area for that. They are going to want as much solarization in the naturalization process of Matadero Creek as possible. Lower density around the creek might be a better idea. The design standards and guidelines talk about sustainability on an ecological perspective, but there is much more research coming out on the mental health sustainability of structures and architecture with regard to color theories and biophilia and which elements tend to boost mental health. She wondered if there could be a mental health sustainability aspect in this NVCAP because our built environment does contribute to it. There is much more research now about how urban environments cause depression and anxiety because they aren't thinking about that as they think about the future scheme.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented about the same diagram and how it's misleading. If you look at Packet page 79 versus 97, 79 is the colored land use in 2.2, and on the third sheet on Packet page 153 that talks about the heights, the diagram shows a very nice wide green stretch along that whole Matadero Creek when you flip back to Packet page 79, it's showing that as medium density mixed use quite narrowly at the bottle neck. If they don't require there to be certain setbacks, they may see buildings encroach that bottle neck at Matadero Creek. She would appreciate clarification as to which the goal might be from that bottle-necked area coming in from Matadero Creek. Referring to Packet page 79 where the residential curves out, it goes to a medium density residential with a 36' tall stretch of building potential and when you flip back to Packet page 97, that is shown as mostly an orchard. While she would love the orchard, if that gets developed, it's not going to look like that at all. She believes the diagram is a bit misleading to what the actual intent is meant to be and what the final result of the area is going to be.

Chair Baltay requested staff address Vice Chair Rosenberg comment.

Mr. AhSing commented that they need to get more eyes on the images in the document to make sure they correspond correctly to what is being planned, and how they are interpreted. There will be setbacks from Matadero Creek, and he believes they are already in the code.

Ms. Raybould answered that setback is twenty feet.

Vice Chair Rosenberg confirmed the setback would be from the top of the creek bank and then the creek bank would be redefined. Once they redefine the Creek banks, there will be new setbacks imposed on those properties directly to the west and east of the mouth of the creek. Those two properties will be significantly impacted by new top of creek banks and new setbacks and inquired if staff foresee any issues with the owners of those properties.

Mr. AhSing stated they have some ideas they are working with the owners of the pipeline projects; however, they don't have any detailed information as of yet, that will define where the top of bank would be.

Vice Chair Rosenberg suggested they use diagrams that reflect the area and it's intent more accurately.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that the problem with using the picture that's there, is years from now people will question whatever happened with that; it never ended up the way the picture was shown. It would be better to use diagrams that reflect a more realistic view of what is intended with the naturalization. Packet page 79 is likely closer to reality.

Mr. AhSing added there's a concept that was endorsed by the Council so they can overlay that in that spot.

Boardmember Chen agreed Packet page 97 should be updated with a plan view of the ongoing projects. Maybe there could be the possibility of connecting the green area of the creek to the pathway between the buildings for the townhome project. It would be nice to see the greenbelt connect to the entire neighborhood.

Chair Baltay stated he shared his colleagues' comments and didn't need to add anything new. He had been very impressed with the document as he looked at it originally. As they went through the detail of

it, he was less impressed. There are nice graphics but there seems to be significant content that is inaccurate. It's important to get it right. They want the public to support it in a positive way.

Boardmember Thompson requested the resolution be increased on the graphics of the pages.

Boardmember Hirsch requested they look at Packet page 89 and what appeared to be pedestrian paths, they don't reflect projects that are going to be happening and the circulation could be revised so that the circulation patterns are realistic. In general, the lights on the pedestrian pathways should be reflected accurately as well, and requested an explanation of what the purple dashed lined are that say first mile and last mile connections on Packet pages 88 and 89.

Mr. Patel explained the first mile and last mile connection has to do with pedestrian and bike trail activity to major CalTrain stops and neighborhoods as they relate to retail areas nearby. The purple rounds are reflecting as part of the NVCAP that those intersections are identified as major or minor intersection, signal, or bike improvements.

Mr. AhSing explained the red dashed lines are opportunities to negotiate how they can get the connection to the pedestrian and bike paths to happen.

Chair Baltay inquired if the connections are included in the plans for redevelopment that are currently happening.

Ms. Raybould responded that is where the pedestrian muse is, it's not public. It's gated and for residents only.

Chair Baltay referred the Board to Appendices C and D on pages 212 and 214 respectively and requested comments from the Board on if they feel any of those are not correct. He does not see any issues with Appendices C and believes the guidelines meet those objectives. On attachment D, he believes there's an issue where it says the preferred plan emphasis townhomes near existing residential. The only housing provided is townhomes so it's not emphasizing. On Packet page 216 regarding the Cannery building, "maintains the Cannery building and allows for two possible uses of the building ", the second possible use it claims to allow is adaptive reuse in to housing and he doesn't see anything that does that or attempts to do that or makes any provision to do that. Regarding woonerf's and transportation and he doesn't see anything included from transportation to evaluate what details are required to make that happen within transportation requirements.

Vice Chair Rosenberg echoed Chair Baltay comments particularly the adaptive reuse of the housing transition into long-term vision. She was surprised when she read that. She doesn't know how they would readapt the Cannery building into housing without appropriate egress windows and there are no windows in the building other than super high up. It should be removed; they aren't even close to that. More transition space is needed between the single-family homes and the townhomes are a good way to do that.

Boardmember Thompson commented she can agree with all the other comments that have been made and on Packet page 216, there's a comment about increasing FAR. That is something she felt could be added to the incentives.

Boardmember Hirsch commented he doesn't believe they can make the statement they are asking. He hasn't gone into the detail in the back of the book, but he would like to see opportunities there that are realistic, and the drawings should show what programs are in the works currently.

Boardmember Chen requested clarification regarding Packet page 214 the preferred plan and if it includes 100% affordable housing had limits based on the other five story retail affordable housing that is 55' or a six-story nonretail affordable housing which is 65' tall, how is that related to the 33-additional feet.

Mr. AhSing explained the relationship is that State Law has stipulated the 33' so when they were going through and Council had said 65', staff doesn't want to set that as the base for affordable housing because then they can go 33' above that.

Ms. Raybould explained the 33' is a co-provision and State density bonus that applies to 100% affordable to low income or below, so very-low income was 30-60%, so low income is 60-80% and within a half mile from transit.

Mr. AhSing questioned the timing of the subcommittee.

Chair Baltay stated they created the subcommittee to come back the same time staff returns with the NVCAP project again in more detail. He will leave it with staff to coordinate that time frame with the subcommittee. They are not looking to do the consultants work, but rather to make sure the ARB is well informed on the issues.

### **Approval of Minutes**

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for April 20, 2023.

Chair Baltay introduced the item and called for any additions, deletions, or changes.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Thompson, to approve the meeting minutes for April 20, 2023, as drafted.

**VOTE:** 5-0-0-0

### **Boardmember Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Chair Baltay requested a report on 4075 El Camino and 300 Lambert.

Boardmember Chen reported that the project for 4075 El Camino is pretty straight forward for senior housing with additional units added on to the existing building and they asked staff to request the applicant to provide the following: a) an arial rendering showing the new editions to the existing buildings, it's currently not clearly depicting the scope or scale or intent of the work b) the rendered elevation with the new editions and modifications more clearly identified c) the photos of the existing buildings to more clearly show the existing forms and finishes. They also requested they show additional information regarding the neighborhood context. On the site plan they suggested including the major vegetation, building footprint, and adjacent single-family residences.

Chair Baltay said he would push 300 Lambert off until next time, Boardmember Thompson did not see the notice requesting the report. The type of report is Boardmember Chen just provided is the type of report he would like to see.

Ms. Gerhardt commented that the comments were broken into two different tables for projects pending for the ARB versus projects that are potential projects. The projects Chair Baltay requested reports for, are SB 330 pre applications, so they are automatically not going to have detailed information in their plan set.

Chair Baltay stated the ad hoc committee comments are things he would like Council to see and the ARB to see when it returns with the formal application.

Boardmember Hirsch felt that Ms. Gerhardt brought up a good point and the items requested of the applicants should be for the purpose of the ARB's formal application review to help with their decision and not for the Council.

### **Adjournment**

Chair Baltay adjourned the meeting.