



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES: June 15, 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

Jeff Levinsky provided public comment regarding a new State Law AB 2097 that an applicant had mentioned in a prior meeting, which exempts buildings from providing parking. There is a process within that law that still allows cities such as Palo Alto to still require parking by way of showing it would be a problem if parking is not available. Palo Alto has several parking programs that are in place for the purpose of negating the current parking issues it already has.

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

Ms. Raybould reported there is one new project that is not listed on the report, 3150 El Camino Real submitted a formal application after the packet was submitted for the meeting. It is for the McDonalds site that is next to Palo Alto square.

Ms. Gerhardt stated it is the fish market and McDonalds site that is for a 380-unit multi-family project. The ARB had previously looked at the SB 330 pre-application, the major architectural review is now on file.

Chair Baltay noted that the project description can be found at the bottom of Packet page 11. Vice Chair Rosenberg and Boardmember Hirsch were the ad hoc committee assigned to that project and agreed to continue through this stage of the application process. Chair Baltay requested they review the new information and report back to the ARB.

Ms. Raybould noted staff has scheduled 800 San Antonio Road for the July 6 agenda, it is part of a multi-family housing development that is part of a planned home zoning. The second NVCAP may return on the July 15 agenda.

Vice Chair Rosenberg noted she will be absent on the July 6 meeting and Boardmember Hirsch will be absent from the following meeting.

Ms. Raybould requested the ARB inform staff of any other absences so they can ensure there will be a quorum.

Action Items

2. 3200 Park Boulevard/340 Portage: Development Agreement [22PLN-00287 and 22PLN-00288]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Planned Community Zoning application to Allow Redevelopment of a 14.65-acre site at 200-404 Portage Avenue, 3040-3250 Park Boulevard, 3201-3225 Ash Street and 278 Lambert. The Project also Includes a Development Agreement, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, and Vesting Tentative Map. Environmental Assessment: A Draft EIR for the 200 Portage Townhome Development Project was Circulated September 16, 2022 through November 15, 2022; the Final EIR was Made Available for Public Review on May 15, 2023. The Proposed Development Agreement is Evaluated as Alternative 3 in the Draft EIR. Zoning District: RM-30 (Multi-Family Residential) and GM (General Manufacturing). For More Information Contact the Project Planner, Claire Raybould at Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Baltay asked for Boardmember disclosures.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he visited the site many times, but not this time.

Vice Chair Rosenberg disclosed she also visited the site many times, but not this time.

Chair Baltay disclosed he visited the site recently.

Boardmember Chen stated that she visited the site recently, she was absent from the prior project's review in front of the ARB, however she watched the video.

Boardmember Thompson stated she had nothing to disclose.

Project Planner Claire Raybould provided the staff report for 3200 Park Boulevard/340 Portage: Development Agreement [22PLN-00287 and 22PLN-00288], which included a brief summary of the history of the project, applicant responses to prior ARB comments, and changes that have been made. The project packet, along with the attachments, can be found [here](#).

In Fall 2022, the Sobrato Organization, LLC (Sobrato) submitted a development application requesting a development agreement, rezoning, tentative map, and architectural review. The project is the redevelopment of the 14.65-acre site at 200-404 Portage Avenue, 3040-3250 Park Boulevard, 3201-3225 Ash Street and 278 Lambert. The project site is within the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) boundary and consists of a Development Agreement between the Sobrato Organization and the City, rezoning of the site, comprehensive plan amendment, and tentative map. The project would allow for the redevelopment of 14.65 acres located at 200-404 Portage Avenue, 3040- 3250 Park Boulevard, 3201-3225 Ash Street & 278 Lambert Avenue, as shown in the Location Map in Attachment A. The project includes partial demolition (84,000 sf) of the former Bayside Canning Company building (a portion of which was more recently occupied by Fry's Electronics). The existing building is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR). A draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was completed in September of 2022, the formal EIR was submitted in May of 2023. Some of the key ARB comments from the prior hearing are as follows: requests to revise the frontage of the retail façade to eliminate the A-symmetric forms, request for better material samples, reconsider the blue coloration of the glass, provide a schematic design for the Heating, Ventilation, and Air Conditioning (HVAC), improve the views of the monitor roof from the retail areas, provide operable windows in the monitor roof windows. They were asked to revise the pallet in the parking garage through color or material variation, provide higher quality materials with better documentation for the townhomes, all sides of the building should be given the same care with improvements to the sides and back of the garages, consider the addition of sunshades on the north and south façades; the second-floor sunshades conflicted with the fire access; however, sunshades were added to the other floors. It was requested that both paseo's be widened, and the heat island effect be considered on the parking isles. Ms. Raybould showed several slides of the before and after changes that were made based on ARB feedback at the previous hearing.

Chair Baltay requested the meeting be paused while Boardmember Hirsch's audio equipment was fixed.

Chair Baltay stated everything was worked out and Ms. Raybould could continue.

Ms. Raybould continued and stated the applicant has provided a couple of options regarding widening the north to south paseo, however if they had reduced the townhomes size the minimum requirements for garage sizes would not have been met. The options presented were widening the paseo by either 4 or 6-feet. In doing so, it would be at the expense of the drive isles. Staff did a study of what Palo Alto's requirements are, and the options available would meet those requirements. Staff did an analysis of the EIR and found that option three for the 91-unit townhome project, so the development agreement was studied as an alternative. The EIR was circulated for review September through November 2022, the final EIR which included responses to comments was released May 15, 2023. There was a revised final EIR that the City release on June 2, 2023. Staff inadvertently had not included applicant comments, so the revised final EIR includes those comments and the City's responses to those. None of the conclusions were changed. Ms. Raybould highlighted that the EIR does identify a significant and unavoidable impact on a historic resource for the proposed project on the 91-unit project, as well as all build alternatives including the project currently before the ARB, the development agreement alternative. The EIR and a development impact are being brought before the Board.

Staff recommended that the ARB:

- 1) Consider the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and EIR Mitigation Measures in Attachment K.
- 2) Recommend approval of the Development Plan for the planned community rezoning based on the Architectural Review findings in Attachment B, subject to the Conditions of Approval in Attachment C, and recognizing that the development agreement, comprehensive plan amendment, and subdivision map are not subject to the ARB's purview. 35.21

Vice Chair Rosenberg requested Ms. Raybould return to the before and after drawings of the elevations so she could make a few notes.

Chair Baltay called for the applicant to state and spell their name and gave them ten minutes for their presentation.

Evan Sockalosky, with Arc Tec, provided the applicant's presentation with architect David Burton from KTGy, Morgan Burke with the Guzzardo Partnership (landscape designer), historian Matt Davis with Architectural Resources Group (ARG), art consultant Jennifer Easton, Tim Steele and Robert Tersini with the developer Sobrato. Mr. Sockalosky stated the applicant's team has worked hard to consider all the feedback and requested changes from the various stakeholders of the project and mentioned that the Palo Alto Historic Review Board (HRB) recently gave the project unanimous approval and added that Sobrato actually began conversations with the City about this project in 2011 and 2012, and they are excited to see it moving forward, with hope that it will continue doing so.

Mr. Davis provided a brief history of how they came to the design of the project with regards to preserving the historic nature of the Cannery building and showed slides of the existing and proposed rooflines. The design seeks to preserve the monitoring rooms while also allowing for visibility of the monitor rooms from the retail locations. There is a precedence for projecting massing at the entrance of the retail area while also keeping the design sleek and simple. In an effort to mitigate strategy to document the property prior to altering it, they are in the process of recording Historical American Building Style (HABS) documentation. The Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) program documents architecturally significant buildings/sites through the development of in-depth written reports, large-format black and white photographs, and architectural drawings. There will be interpretive displays of historical photos of the site which will depict the historical nature of the site for visitors.

Mr. Sockalosky continued with slides of before and after changes that were made as a result of the prior ARB hearing. They considered operable windows in the monitoring room, and between the location on the roof and their goal of net-zero sustainability goal, operable windows were not feasible, as well as the operations in the Research and development (R&D) facility. They enlarged the current and added a skylight in the retail space.

Mr. Burke, of the Guzzardo Partnership (landscapers), spoke about the changes in landscaping in front of the retail plaza and showed slides with drawings.

Mr. Sockalosky added that they opened up some of the landscape next to the building in response to the ARB's comments about potentially using the side of the building for public art.

Mr. Burke continued with slides of renderings of landscape changes.

Chair Baltay opened the Board to questions for the applicants.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired about the existing depth of the protrusions at the entrance of the retail space versus what the proposed depth will be, and she indicated there is both a one-story and two-story number, she wanted them both.

Mr. Sockalosky replied that the two-story depth is matching the existing condition as it stands now, he would have to find out those exact numbers, but he did know they were going to match what those dimensions are now. The depth of the retail portion projects out an additional two feet beyond the two-story projection.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if it will also match the same height.

Mr. Sockalosky stated that it would.

Boardmember Thompson asked about the color added to the parking garage and commented it was difficult to tell where that was proposed to be added and inquired from where it would be visible.

Mr. Sockalosky replied that in response to the ARB's request to pull in some of the colors from the townhomes to the parking garage, they added the colors on the ends of the parking garage and the façade facing the townhomes. They pulled in some of the blues and yellows from the accent colors. The façade facing the Cannery building had a trellis already, so they pulled it into the open spaces on the other sides including the façade facing the residents on Olive.

Ms. Raybould added that in response to Vice Chair Rosenberg questions there is a drawing with the projection dimensions on Sheet A3, 2.1-11.

Chair Baltay asked for a description of the proposed landscaping on the façade facing the residents on Olive.

Mr. Burke responded that they learned the easement on that side is a general easement which does not preclude them from providing stormwater treatment or planting in that area. They reworked the geometry of the stormwater treatment basin to allow for larger box sized trees, so there will be a mix of native live oak trees and redwoods. The redwoods are on the corner of Olive and Park.

Chair Baltay inquired if there are any trees adjacent to the large triangular shaped building.

Mr. Burke answered there was not enough room to put a substantial tree in that area so shrub planting is being proposed. Possibly a hedge type shrub.

Chair Baltay questioned if the developer has considered narrowing the street between the Cannery building and the townhomes in order to widen the paseo.

David Burton from KTGy replied that the street needs to be at the 26-foot width because it is part of the arial apparatus access for the fire department. Additionally, there is necessary parking for the R&D building, as well as guest parking for the townhomes.

Chair Baltay requested that staff comment on that statement.

Ms. Raybould noted that the guest parking for the townhome side is required; when they were looking at getting rid of the guest parking, in order to gain additional space by narrowing that street area, it can't be narrowed less than 26-feet due to the firetruck access.

Chair Baltay recalled that staff had mentioned, from a public life safety point of view, having the private streets between the townhomes reduced from 32' to 29-30' in width. There is also a Palo Alto Statute requiring a 32' width and questioned if that was correct and how it might be overcome.

Ms. Raybould explained that the 32' width is in Title 21 of Palo Alto code, the subdivision chapter, they would have to ask for a tentative map with exceptions in order to approve. The code is not being changed and cannot be changed because it was added via voter initiatives, thus it would have to be removed via voter initiative. Because it is a design feature, they can ask for a map with exceptions to that. The goal of that code section was to have parking. The townhome parcel is still overparked, they're meeting all of their parking requirements, plus some for the guest parking. The intent of the code is still being met, even with a reduction in total width. Reducing it could also reduce the heat island effect.

Chair Baltay inquired about the Historical Review Board's (HRB) decision to approve the Cannery building alterations as they are being proposed.

Ms. Raybould explained that the HRB made recommendations of how to move forward with the project if Council chose to move forward with the proposed project. It is not within the HRB's purview to approve or deny a project. The project was not required to go before the HRB, staff and the applicant chose to go before the HRB because they felt Council would be interested in understanding the HRB's thoughts on the project.

Chair Baltay asked if it would be fair to say the HRB endorsed the project.

Ms. Raybould answered that she wouldn't say they endorsed the project.

Chair Baltay opened the hearing to public comments.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Former Mayor Karen Holman (on behalf of Fred Balin, Pat Hernandez, Tommy Van Duynes, Nelson Ng) and thanked Ms. Raybould for her interpretation of the HRB's opinion of the project, they did not say it was okay to do this. The HRB presumed it was going to be demolished and in case it was, they made recommendations on what they think should happen. Ms. Holman read an excerpt from the ARB's purview: a) promote orderly and harmonious development of the City, and b) encourage and obtain the most desirable use of land and improvements. What is proposed to happen to the Cannery building is nearly a 40% demolition of the California Register Eligible Resource that eliminates its historic standing. She asked the Board to consider what residents want done with any of the City's resources, and asked if it was really to demolish, obliterate, remove, and disregard. She quoted architecture critic Louise Huxtable who said, *"We will probably be judged not by the monuments we build but those that we destroy."* Ms. Holman suggested that this building and site is a monument to the accomplishments of Thomas Foon Chew, a Chinese man who was honored by twenty-five thousand people, including elected officials when

he died in the thirties, which makes his accomplishments even more remarkable. The California Register criteria are: (a) The first, last, only, or most significant of its type in the State or in the large geographic region, northern, central or southern California associated with a individual or group having profound influence on the history of California (b) A prototype or an outstanding example of a period style architectural movement or construction or (c) Is one of the most notable works, or the best surviving works of the region or of a pioneer architect, designer or master builder. This site and building satisfy those criteria. She questioned if the photos that were shown as historical photos of the projections were from a period of significance. The final EIR contains conflicting conclusions and statements. Adaptive reuse of the Cannery building, in response 3.8 of the applicants response to ARB comments was incorrect because not every possible alternative was considered to eliminate a significant impact. There are 75 housing units as the alternative to the 91 units, but the alternative that the City looked at was putting housing in the Cannery building, which imposed 281 units in the Cannery building to feasibly obtain the basic project objectives because the City selected three-story adaptive reuse scenario for a detailed analysis. She questions where and why the City chose a three-story scenario. It totally obliterates any comparison or alternative. Seventy-five or ninety-one compared to 281 units. Perhaps only a small, if any, portion of the building would need to be removed if they really made an apt comparison. There are numerous creative examples in a variety of uses in other cities. This building was R&D and retail for decades. City Council will have to make a statement of overriding considerations and find the adequacy of the final EIR. In no other response is this more infeasible because the applicant's own architect was asked to conceive of an adaptive reuse of the Cannery building. Numerous times at the NVCAP, it was requested that the City conduct a feasibility study presumably independent for reuse of the building. There is no evidence known to her or anyone on the call with her that that ever occurred. She asked the ARB to please ask the City Council to conduct a study for the benefit of everyone including Sobrato. Project objectives are stated as cohesive development that respects the historic uses at the site. This proposal does not. It demolishes the history of the site. Another project objective is to contribute to the concept of complete neighborhood. She put forward that the proposal does not do that; it is predominantly R&D office with only 2,600 square feet (sq ft) of retail, which is basically hidden from the view of the neighborhood and travelers on nearby streets and housing. At the same time there's a proposal to change the Comp Plan designation to commercial service. A designation used specifically on El Camino Real because it's characterized as a vehicle destination. This site is near the CalTrain station, it doesn't satisfy that at all. This building is a rare surviving example of Palo Alto and Santa Clara County's agricultural past. It's from the Page & Turnbull's Historic Resource Evaluations (HRE). Yet the response in the EIR, or in the FEIR, has to do with the question about whether this has not just a local, but regional significant impact. It states that "the proposed project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on cultural resources outside the project's site. The valley of the heart's delight is not a historic district and the project area is not within a historic district." I can't get my mind around those responses. The addition of a parking structure, adding a street directly in front, adding a housing project, directly in front, analysis, the applicant's response to those having additional impacts was "Analysis unnecessary due to significant impact". It's important whether or not the Cannery is saved, and as they advocate, the Cannery will be compromised for listing locally due to impacts. It's almost saying if the site is going to bludgeoned, it doesn't matter how bad it's bludgeoned. The applicant used the phrase "replace-in-kind" at the HRB meeting when referring to the remnant building, as opposed to "repair and restore" the elements on the building. That means they don't know what's going to be left of the original building. "Restore and repair"

should come before “replace in kind”. At the August 1, 2022 Council presentation for the introduction of this project, one of the slides indicated that the remaining Cannery building would be subject to the Secretary’s standards. She suggested that it’s not, for the reasons she stated. PC zoning is proposed for four parcels as a part of this project. She suggested that more creative thinking could save them from having to do PC zoning. PC zoning is being requested because of the development on the remaining parcels, the parcels that are being created doesn’t satisfy anything in the zoning code. More creative thinking about land use and agreements would have the potential of eliminating that. There is a lot of talk about displacement and for good reason, to ensure people, who have long been someplace, are not being displaced for the sake of adding more and new opportunities. She suggests they are replacing their culture, their legacies, their important histories, and a community, and beyond, when the past is erased. The ARB, at the first view of this, made very clear their thoughts about the proposal. The ARB did that essentially in the first review. It is also appropriate to make comments about what if this goes forward as proposed, and what the ARB thinks is important. She hopes they will also assert their opinion about the proposal, consistent with the charge of the ARB. The development agreement has been revised and she now understands there is latitude to make changes. They hope Sobrato takes seriously the concerns and care the community has about the current proposal and considers changes. They are all volunteers, and they believe there is a better way to accomplish the goals of the development agreement, the applicant, and the public – community at large, while respecting history, and giving its rightful place in their future. She thanked the ARB for their thoughtful consideration.

Terry Holzemer provided public comment 200 Portage Avenue. He served on the NVCAP working group for two and attended several hundred hours of meetings regarding this topic. They came up with several alternatives and one of the first was historical preservation of the site. The building at 340 Portage is not a typical run-down structure. It is one of the last of its kind in all of California. It is a true historic building due to what occurred there on a daily basis, and because of who built and established the Bayside Cannery Company. It was one of the most important of its kind in the world. It is vital the understand its significance so that future generations can learn and study what happened there. In a very similar way, which is why the community has so carefully preserved and saved the Addison House that will now hold the Palo Alto History Museum. He urged the ARB to carefully consider the City’s own Rincon Consultants report which started on Packet page 59 in the staff report. It states that destroying or demolishing 40% of this important historical structure would constitute material impairment to the historical resource and would not meet the Secretary of Interior’s standards for the treatment of historical properties. More importantly, the next sentence says, “Even though there will be remaining portion remaining, these elements would be inconsistent with the Secretary of Interior’s standards for distinctive and character defining features that characterized this property.” The remaining portion would not be acceptable as an historical structure. The feasibility study is a critical element that should be put together and discussed about the future of this building.

Jeff Levinsky provided public comment regarding the Cannery building and stated it can’t be said often enough that the Cannery and the office on Ash Street are extraordinary and their terms of significance to Palo Alto, to the greater region, and to the world. As the analysis by Page & Turnbull indicates, demolishing almost 40% of the Cannery will be catastrophic and defeat the whole notion of historic preservation at the site. Some perceive that the City has no choice in this matter, perhaps due to the threat of a lawsuit from the property owner because of new State Laws. He asked about that and the answers of the Final

EIR indicate that the City does have choices. The proposed mixed uses do not comply with current zoning laws and will require lifelong changes which are discretionary, that means the City does not have to agree to this project at all. There are questions about whether it complies with the Comprehensive Plan, and experts who wrote the plan say that it does not comply. Given that the City is not obliged in any way to approve the current proposal, there's an enormous opportunity for the ARB to suggest creative ways to preserve the entire Cannery and improve the overall site. He outlined one approach on Page 64 of the FEIR, instead of building a new garage north of the Cannery, park those cars inside the Cannery that was to be demolished. Put the Condominiums where the garage was to be built, that are now proposed for the demolished part of the Cannery. You end up with about the same number of condominiums and parking spaces, but the Cannery building remains 100% intact. The FEIR dismissed the idea in one sentence by saying, "Modifying the Cannery building to convert it to a parking use could not be done without modifying the character defining features of the building." Only part of the building would be for parking, and the only external change needed is to turn the current ramped entrance area on Park, which isn't original, into the garage entrance. No other doors or windows would need to change, neither would the roofline. It would preserve the existing building, avoid the considerable environmental negatives in cost of constructing a brand-new giant garage, move condominiums further away from the train, and still keep about the same number of condominiums. That's just one possibility. Please offer your ideas and consider other cities that have preserved buildings like this, urge the PTC and City Council to as well in your motion. Palo Alto has an amazing one-of-a-kind piece of history, we should be creative and save it.

Yugen Lockhart provided public comment as an Olive Avenue resident. He understands the applicant's are looking into drainage but it's critical that they understand the impact of the slope of Olive Avenue towards this property, so there will be additional drainage added to the site drainage. Additionally, ensure the proposed Live Oaks will be able to handle the winter water logging. One the parking garage side, bushier trees would be helpful rather than incredibly slow growing Live Oaks, so it can block out the noise from car alarms and headlights at night. More green space bushes between the garage and residential neighborhood would be greatly appreciated. Alongside the townhouses, it isn't quite as bad, although some green space would be appreciated. The townhouses are still a bit boxy and ugly; they do appreciate they put one of the versions with a slightly sloped roof to represent Ventura. The boxy tends to represent Park Avenue with the industrial buildings. It's interesting that all the photos are not representing the remaining structure on the other side of the monitor roof building, which is going to remain. It would be nice to see in some of the renderings how the old section that is going to remain unchanged is going to represent into the new modified area. It's been rumored that another low-income housing project that will be deeper on the creek side of the parking lot, if that's true it will be allowed to exceed all of the regulations, it gets to be taller and wider, Charities has been courteous about not going way over, it would be nice to see how that development is going to work in with all of this. These three-story buildings going in will be impacted by the five-story buildings regarding sun lines and shades and vertical heights, and that's even separate from the Bol Park/Creek renovation that's also being discussed.

Chair Baltay closed the meeting to Public Comments and offered the applicant time for rebuttal.

Mr. Sockalosky commented that he appreciates the comments from the neighbors along Olive and noted that they lowered the garage with the input from the ARB and took particular care in designing the façade

facing those residents with panels to screen headlights, they definitely understand the importance of that. They were looking to mitigate that to their neighbors as much as possible.

Chair Baltay asked staff to comment on what they perceive is the proper role of the ARB to be regarding the historic preservation of the Cannery building. His understanding is there's the development agreement that the City Council made regarding demoing that building. They've heard members of the public requesting the ARB to get deeply involved in essentially the guts of that development agreement.

Ms. Raybould replied that was a good question, and where she saw the ARB's role was... The role in the ARB findings, do speak to the historic aspects of the site. Staff is anticipating with respect to that is 1) the ARB understand the findings of the EIR and acknowledge that those findings are that this project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact on a historic resource. Staff's finding is that the building would not be eligible for the California Register and National Register following this development. The ARB in making any recommendation on the project need to consider the environmental impacts and understand that that is an environmental impact. Council, in negotiating the key terms of the agreement, had a key understanding, and it was known that this project would remove half of the Cannery building, therefore this building would no longer be eligible. They are still interested in trying to retain this remaining building as much in line with the standards as possible. The analysis that was completed for this project for the Secretary of Interior's standards, will always conclude that it's not consistent with the Secretary's standards because they are demolishing a portion of the building which results in material impacts on the resource. The goal was to try and align and reduce the changes as much as possible to the remaining structure and think about how the project would be used moving forward. There's an intersection of the urban design and how to make the site usable for the proposed use, while also trying to retain as much historical aspects of the site as possible. Going back to the ARB findings, the goal would be to try to retain as much historic integrity of the site and try to further the historic aspects of the sites. Staff believes the applicant is doing that through the required plaques, the HABS mitigation, the public art aspects, as well as trying to retain certain features such as the monitor roofs which are character defining.

Boardmember Thompson requested clarification on what staff's recommendation is for this hearing.

Ms. Raybould explained the ARB is being asked to recommend approval of the project in front of you, the piece that is part of the ARB's purview is the development plan itself, which is one component of the planned community rezoning essentially. Everything else is within the Planning Commission and Council's purview. The development plan itself is what staff are asking the ARB to recommend.

Chair Baltay asked Boardmember Thompson to start since she would have to step away at 10 a.m.

Boardmember Thompson thanked the applicant, staff, and public commentors for their input. In terms of the monitor roof frontage, the final member of the public made a good point about the rest of the building and seeing a lot that in the renderings that is cut off, it can be seen in the elevations, but perhaps in the context of the greater building, she can accept what is over there. She is lukewarm on the proposal, but she can accept it. She appreciated the effort put into the HVAC design. The parking garage pallet appears to not be visible from places in the public, so she encouraged more integration of color. She likes the offset of the different panels, she would suggest they work on bringing in a bit more color into the backside, it looks monotone and like no thought was put into it. She appreciates the material samples; they were helpful and offered much more detail than they last saw. She's supportive of the materials. She

agrees they are still a little boxy however the elevations are much improved since the last meeting. The elevations on Olive and the other side could still use more thought. She supports widening the paseo to six feet. That may have been the minimum that was requested at the prior meeting. She would suggest as much widening at possible. She wished the applicant had responded to more of the public comments. Those comments gave her more to think about. Originally, they had hoped the Cannery building could be this cool farmer's market type of building with a lot of opportunities for what the space could be. She's not sure if it's being used to it's full potential. She had to step away from the meeting at 10 a.m. and hoped she didn't miss much of the other Boardmember comments.

Chair Baltay commented that if Boardmember Thompson stepped away for any length of time and missed the other Boardmember comments, he wanted her aware that he wouldn't be comfortable with allowing her to vote.

Boardmember Thompson stated she understood.

Boardmember Chen thanked everyone for the presentations and stated she agreed with Boardmember Thompson regarding the Cannery building. She's worried that with the parking being so close to the Cannery building and felt that more color on the parking would be quite aggressive next to the historic part of the building. Her thoughts were overall she'd like the Cannery building to stand out and be seen. Instead of adding more colors to the parking garage, she would discourage them from doing so. On the townhomes, she appreciated the applicant making the paseo wider, but believes it is still too narrow. Her original thoughts on the paseo were it could be a really cool place for people to do different activities. Looking at the current site plan it seems to just be a walkway with landscapes on each side. Making it wider would be a benefit to the whole community as well as including activities for the kids and people who live there. She does not feel the paseo is as pleasant as it could be given it's ratio to the building height. She saw good improvement on the materials of the buildings and the rooflines and building design, however, the fourplex next to the single-family zone, there is a corner end unit that was cut off to meet the setback and to meet the daylight plan. It's a weird unit for an end unit. She didn't feel it was compatible with the other part of the townhomes. She hoped they would be able to make improvements to that unit. She encouraged them to work on the unit layout to gain a couple more feet from the unit layout to make the depths of the building narrower, if they could reconfigure the layout of the units, they may be able to gain width for the paseo.

Boardmember Hirsch addressed the historic issues first and felt Ms. Raybould summed it up well. He added he's had significant amount of experience with historic architecture in New York and gave a summary of the historical significance of the projects he worked on and commented on the knowledge he gained for federal requirements for historical restoration. His judgement is the Cannery is a wonderful remnant of a past industrial fruit-packing era, however the amount of historical detail really isn't there. He believes what the architects have done is a wonderful way of bringing it into the new century. He doesn't agree with trying to retail all of what was there as a memory of what it was, but there are wonderful ways that the artist that's been selected could go back in history and find proper descriptions of how it was used, the number of people who used it, and what it served as not just a part of the building but of the whole city as a completely different kind of place. An agricultural situation of fruit trees and plants, and to see it historically or for the kids in the community to see what it was, is something that can be recreated through art and doesn't need the building to represent it in it's entirety. He prefers there be

a transition to today's time, and it be a different kind of expression, which it has become, and he congratulated the architect for the way it was put together and all of their sensitivity to that. Regarding the planned community zoning issues, he read that it's their responsibility as they review projects large and small, planning also opines using the same findings in the packets at each meeting. There are times when they need to go beyond the specific qualifications because members of the Palo Alto community and as architects, they bear responsibility to recognize the needs of the entire city. That ought to influence their decisions. As he took his first bike ride through Palo Alto, he realized that Fry's was one of the most significant sites in Palo Alto. Recently it became clear that as one of the only few remaining open parcels, it has become an obvious opportunity to advance a significant portion of the Housing Element in cooperation with an owner/developer Sobrato Corporation, capable of producing it and with significant self interest in making it a success. More than 60% of the Sobrato scheme is in his opinion a very exciting proposal. He believed if Thomas Foon Chew could see the end result after it's been repurposed, he would marvel at the change from such a humble processing building near the farms to a gleaming metal, high-tech center, in a transformed economy. We can agonize over some of the small aspects of the design, but the end product will clearly be a thrilling statement. As to the other 40%, he finds he cannot accept the presentation of townhomes. Boardmember Chen and he spent weeks reviewing townhome projects and studying them and visiting them. This townhome plan violates too many of the principles they found that work well in the projects they study. Even more important to him, the decision to fill this portion of the site with townhomes was wrong from the start. It is important to consider this design for the following reasons: 1. The zoning could easily be revised so that substantially more units could be constructed as mid-rise housing which is essential to reach the Palo Alto's requirements; 2. Larger buildings will allow a great diversity of tenant population and it wouldn't be an exclusive family-oriented community; 3. Park Boulevard by commercial office buildings which are not incompatible with a medium density residential use as would be more likely as a lower density residential neighborhood and the scale could be reduced in height as it they approach the Olive Street residential neighborhood; 4. Larger buildings allow better use of the sites residual open space for the residents common use; 5. The building forms can be located in shapes that Sobrato office building that the new rendition is visible from the point of entry from Park Boulevard; 6. The panoramic views from the higher elevations from these buildings will be both towards the Baylands and foothills so rooftop socializing space will be in high demand; 7. Tall buildings will establish a visual identity to the project just as the Charities project will define the opposite corner on Olive and El Camino Real. He asked Chair Baltay if he could make a motion regarding that particular way of considering the site.

Chair Baltay replied after everyone speaks if there's support for that, of course he could make a motion.

Boardmember Hirsch stated he has one other comment to make. Regarding the Comp Plan Goals and policies, Comp plan land use designation for sites in multi-family residential: Project proposes to add a new public park and multi-family residential use, 74 townhomes and affordable project housing project on the proposal city dedicated parcels. These uses are consistent with multi-family residential land use designation, which encourages high density residential uses within .5 miles of transit. This project is close to transit, could use State regulations to minimize some of the parking requirements, and is an ideal location for a denser project that would be much more responsive to the housing element requirements that Palo Alto has. They cannot allow it to be used in the density that is being proposed. The paseo doesn't work, the project uses up the land for single-family homes, if it was designed as a multi-family larger scale

development there would be much better use of the open space and it would be more in keeping with the objective of answering the State's requirements.

Chair Baltay asked Boardmember Hirsch if he wanted to speak on the check list of the changes that were made by the applicant based on comments from the ARB at the prior meeting.

Boardmember Hirsch stated he already stated the site plan doesn't work and doesn't meet the objectives of the designers who were talking about it as a paseo, squeezing a few feet here and there in order to make the paseo work. That was one of the items the Board discovered was really important. Socializing space has to be appropriately scaled so they can work, this one does not. He's confused by the aesthetics of the project, there are many elements within the housing façades, he thinks there's been a modest improvement, but he's less interested in talking about it in detail because he believes the entire site plan is wrong in respect to the amount of housing that could be provided at a much more dynamic project based on increasing the density and creating shapes and buildings that would fit the site.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that she's okay with the monitor roof frontage, understanding and appreciative of the public comment that the photos of historical frontage may or may not be from the timeline of impact and significance. She's okay with how it's being proposed at this time. The HVAC is being reflective and thoughtful. There's one element where it drops down and goes around the dip in the Cannery on the interior, that one moment gave her minor concerns, but it's not the end of the world. She said the potential of painting the duct work black might also potentially help fade those out a bit. The parking garage pallet makes her appreciate the introduction of color and she appreciates the dysregulation of the really long façade behind the houses. She would encourage the applicant to apply that more to the Cannery side, which may be where she and Boardmember Chen disagree. The modulation of the panel really breaks up that façade in a nice way, as does the introduction of color. Touching on Boardmember Thompson's comments there doesn't seem to be any mention of why they are doing the color in the places they are, and why they are regulating where they are regulating. It is reasonably successful, and she encouraged the applicant to lean into that a bit more. Material samples are incredibly helpful. The glass color is great, monitor review is understood. Operational windows understood, disappointing, but understood. The townhome materials show significant improvement, and she appreciated the introduction of more wood elements. The selection of imitation wood is high quality and will look like wood. It's a good solution for long-term and will be easier to maintain. Sunshades would be great. She used to walk in townhomes because of the paseo. She can see this becoming as successful as the townhomes she used to walk in. However, it would need to be as widened as possible. The reduction of parking is not the only thing to consider. There's the potential to put a slanting in the parking that's perfectly adjacent to the Cannery. That may also buy them a couple more feet for the paseo. She is disheartened that more wasn't done on that front to try to understand how the borders of the townhomes and felt as if the applicant said, these are our borders, this is what we can do. The width of 6' is successful for the paseo however, she would appreciate more exploration on that front. She is of the opinion that the townhomes are a good idea. That is in direct contrast to what Boardmember Hirsch believes, she respectfully disagrees. They have to acknowledge that there are single-family homes in the area, and they are butting up to a very significant project which they can't control. Putting up a higher density and taller project would significantly impact those homeowners. A taller building would also directly compete with the Cannery building that they are trying to celebrate. The current project is thoughtful to the property

itself, a good idea for the area it's in, particularly in consideration of the other similar projects nearby. The townhomes are a good idea and much more respectful of the neighbors already in the area. The Cannery's story is something she's just learning about, and she was born and raised in Palo Alto. With this proposal she's seeing the history, the importance on the community and learning about the man who built it. While history needs to be preserved, it also needs to be understood and celebrated. She believes the architecture of the building now shows off more of the Cannery than it did previously. They are being respectful of what was there before, and they are reinvigorating a building that has been quite neglected. If the preservation had been consistent through the years, she would have been more apt to say the entire building needs to be preserved. At this point, with the uses it's been through, she believes the architect and the applicant have made good strides forward to celebrate the building and reinvigorate it in a way that will move forward with new generations coming through Palo Alto, with a better understanding of the history of the building, architecturally speaking. The use is where she has an issue. The problem she sees with the building is that the use of the Cannery, specifically the two monitor buildings, is not being made useful for the public. It's being made useful for a corporation and a retail space at the front, that the ARB asked for, that is being allotted two tiny skylights, to view the monitor buildings. Boardmember Thompson had commented on it being used as a farmers market, or something along those lines, Vice Chair Rosenberg stated she's not there to tell the developer what to put in the building, however, it is a huge shame, that while this building is being celebrated and useful and their history will be acknowledged, all of that is being done for one occupant. That feels like a tremendous waste. The use should be more public, and more open, and should be celebrated for what it is. She appreciates the comments from the public, and the impact this will have on the neighbors. She appreciates the impact of the history of the building. This is a very significant project in the town, likely one of the most significant they've seen in decades. It does need to be treated with care and thoughtfulness.

Chair Baltay appreciated Vice Chair Rosenberg's comments regarding the history. He believed she was spot on in that the use of the building and site is what was truly historic. He agrees with Boardmember Hirsch's assessment that the building itself lacks architectural merit. It's not architecturally a significant building, it is significant because of its past use. Its past use was paramount to Palo Alto. Vice Chair Rosenberg's comment that she never knew it was historic, is very much a majority in Palo Alto. He shares the same comment. He went to Fry's electronics all the time. In doing so, he would look up at the monitor roofs and see something special about the building. Fry's was a public building. Anyone could go in there. What is lacking in this project is that preservation of the use, the recognition of the use. Most people in Palo Alto would likely agree with that simple statement. The use is not being preserved, rather it's being lost. That's the real travesty, that the town somehow can't figure out a way to preserve its use. With that in mind, he did not want to see for the ARB what was forced upon the HRB. The ARB needs to make a clear statement about what should be preserved historically. City Council can choose to listen or not, the public as well. He would like to see them make a motion and vote that effectively the use of the building is not appropriate. Then they can move on with what the Planning Commission needs from the ARB. He offered Boardmember Hirsch the opportunity to convince the Board that they would have a similar vote regarding the use of the townhomes. He understands and supports his statement that a higher density use would be more appropriate to both the town's Housing Element and general policies and goals, that townhomes. He's not sure the entire Board would support that, but he'd like to offer him the chance to make a clear statement, through a motion with a vote that they can offer to the Council. The project has

improved dramatically, they need to go through the checklist. He believed the current design with the asymmetric blocks on the front of the monitor roofs are better than they were before. It's better than what was there. He can support the changes to the HVAC design. The parking garage is fine the way it is, he appreciates the material samples that were provided, same with the glass color, and same with looking into the monitor roofs. It's better than what was there before. He believed there are ways to make operable windows work so he can not accept the applicants statement on that, but he wasn't sure that was a significant enough thing. The townhomes are high quality materials, the buildings have been sufficiently redesigned several times, and they are pretty good given where they are. The sunshades help a lot. He cannot support anything less than six feet wide for the paseos, that's the minimum they agreed to at the prior hearing, it needs to be that much. He was disappointed the applicant didn't come up with a better solution. Narrowing other streets is going to be tough to get through the political process due to the thirty-two-foot code. There's a chance it's not going to get wider, which means the ARB is being put in a position to recommend something with a condition that may or may not be accepted, or they continue the hearing and ask them to return with a serious design that will meet that requirement, which is what he believes should happen. The Board has been consistent regarding the narrowness of the paseos. They've been provided with great level of presentations as to why they need to be bigger. The narrowness as it stands is not suitable. The ARB's unanimous opinion regarding the width of the paseos is not going to change and they should not be made to accept anything less than six feet, at a minimum. He neglected to be clear that Boardmember Chen missed the first meeting. She has stated since that she looked at the past videos, which satisfy the City's requirements to allow her to participate and gave her the opportunity to clarify that in public.

Boardmember Chen commented that she missed the last meeting, she did watch the video and disclosed at the beginning of this hearing.

Chair Baltay asked staff if they are clear with that disclosure.

Ms. Raybould replied that it was perfect.

Ms. Raybould stated for the record that while it is the prerogative of the ARB to comment on the use of the space, staff did not push back on the use of the building because they had the key terms of the negotiated development agreement on Page 15 of the packet. The ad-hoc committee, which consisted of the City Manager, City Attorney, two Council members, the Director of Planning, and Sobrato, spent a year negotiating the uses of the site and the exact square footage of the space. Those uses were accepted as the key negotiated terms of the agreement, this is also in reference to the exact number of housing units, by the Council and approved by the full Council. The directive from Council was to propose a project that met the key terms of that development agreement. The project before the ARB at this meeting, and that will go before Council, will reflect the key terms of the development agreement. The ARB can certainly express their opinions about that, but for the record she clarified why the uses and square footage are the way that they are.

Chair Baltay stated that one of the purviews of the ARB is to advise City Council on the architectural interest of the town.

MOTION: Chair Baltay, seconded by Boardmember Chen, that the Architectural Review Board finds that with respect to the historic reuse of the cannery building:

- The use of 340 Portage is historically significant and should be preserved so the public can experience the interior of the building.
- All of the area underneath at least one of the monitor roof portions of the building should be publicly accessible and usable space, such that entirety of the length of the monitor roof is visible.

Chair Baltay requested a roll call vote.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested they include that in an all-inclusive motion.

MOTION WITHDRAWN: Chair Baltay and Boardmember Chen withdrew the motion.

Boardmember Hirsch responded to Vice Chair Rosenberg’s comments regarding the impact of the project on the neighborhood and how the project faces Park Avenue and that is a mostly commercial area.

Vice Chair Rosenberg disagrees with the idea of making the project high density and taller, due to the impacts other high density tall projects that are currently proposed and already in process, and the impacts a massive three to five story housing complex would have on what they are trying to accomplish with the Cannery building.

Boardmember Chen agreed that it is a perfect location for higher density but agreed with Vice Chair Rosenberg regarding the impact on the existing neighborhoods when you zoom out and consider the number of high-density projects that are already underway and being proposed; and if they were to build high-rises, the Cannery building would appear to be surrounded by a fortress. With regard to the monitor roofs, the Ferry Building in San Francisco is a great example of people being able to experience the interior ceiling element in retail and commercial space.

Ms. Gerhardt commented that the Housing Element is anticipating, along with this project and others around the city, 75% affordable on another portion of the site.

Ms. Raybould stated that what is not shown is that part of the development agreement is 149 total units of higher density housing.

Vice Chair Rosenberg requested clarification as to where the higher-density projects would be on this site location.

Ms. Raybould explained that parcels four and five are not expected to be changed. The high-density affordable housing is expected to be built on parcel two. A specific location on that property has not yet been determined.

Boardmember Hirsch commented regarding the benefits of adding more density to the project and suggested they could find additional footage by moving “Private Street A” more south than it is depicted in the plans, and buildings 1-4 can be increased into higher density housing. It makes for a better project as opens up more square footage, allows for different scaling of all of the aspects of the project, and could potentially allow a bigger open space area for people to enjoy.

MOTION: Chair Baltay, seconded by Vice Chair Rosenberg, that the Architectural Review Board finds that:

1. With respect to the historic reuse of the cannery building:

- The use of 340 Portage is historically significant and should be preserved so that the public can experience the interior of the building.
- All of the area underneath at least one of the monitor roof portions of the building should be publicly accessible and usable space, such that entirety of the length of the monitor roof is visible.

2. With respect to the townhomes

- A portion of the site currently designated for townhomes should be higher density residential housing.

3. The Architectural Review Board recommends approval with the conditions that the project return to an ad hoc committee to ensure:

- The paseo width shall be a minimum of 28-feet wide, and the drive isles may be a minimum of 29-feet wide on the ground level.
- The end unit on Building #1 (closest to Olive Avenue) be redesigned to eliminate the angled roof form that is incompatible with the rest of the building.

Chair Baltay called for a roll call vote.

VOTE: 4-0-1-0 (Boardmember Thompson was not present for the vote)

Chair Baltay appointed Boardmember Hirsch and Boardmember Chen to be the ad hoc committee for the return of the project.

The ARB took a 12-minute break.

The meeting continued with all ARB Boardmembers present.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [23PLN-00009]: Architectural Review of a new storefront façade including new glazing and signage within Space #820B, Bldg. V (#v820B) for “Arhaus” at the Stanford Shopping Center. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from CEQA per Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial).

Chair Baltay asked for Boardmember disclosures.

Boardmember Thompson stated she visited the site very recently.

Boardmember Chen visited the site over the weekend.

Chair Baltay visited the site over the weekend.

Vice Chair Rosenberg visited the site a week and a half ago.

Boardmember Hirsch visited the site.

Project Planner Tamara Harrison provided the staff report for 180 El Camino Real [23PLN-00009]: Architectural Review of a new storefront façade including new glazing and signage in Stanford Shopping Center in Building B, Suite 820-B, formerly the American Girl Store. It is subject to the Master Tenant

Façade and Sign Program (MTFS) for the center. The shopping center identifies which tenants require City review. The project does not increase the FAR or lot coverage of the site nor does it propose to change the use of the tenant space. Proposed exterior façade improvements include steel rainscreen panels, aluminum curtain walls, aged Belgium bricks, Equitone panels, new storefront glazing and acrylic and aluminum signage. The design is consistent with the MTFS program for the shopping center and is consistent with the shopping center's character. The proposed building height will be increased to 42-feet, at the brow features over the entry and at the corner of the building. The remainder will remain the same at 38.5-feet. The frontage facing Sandhill Road and the parking area will be pushed back approximately 8-feet from its current location. Ms. Harrison showed slides in her presentation of the materials being proposed. Municipal Code allows for several wall signs within the allowable sign area and the subject façades are 38'6" by 79'1" for 3,053 sf, allowing a maximum of 115 sf of sign area for wall signs. The second sign is 38'6" by 99'9" for 122 sf of sign area for wall signs. Municipal Code sign regulations allow for blade signs up to 3 sf in the area. MTFS signage regulations allow for one primary wall sign, one secondary sign, and one blade sign. The proposal includes one wall sign, one wall/canopy sign that will be acrylic letters, and one aluminum blade sign on the primary façade. Staff recommends that the ARB recommend approval to the Director of Planning & Development services for the project façade changes and signage, subject to staff's conditions of approval.

Jason Smith, applicant, provided a presentation with Abby Wimpsett and Felipe Bermudez. Ms. Wimpsett gave a history of Arhaus and the owners, who founded the business based on sustainable sourced materials. Architect Felipe Bermudez, with Onyx Creative, presented the drawings of the proposed project, site plan and exterior accessibility through the site, floor plan and materials, and landscaping diagrams and photos. The design is consistent with the brand design of their other stores.

Chair Baltay opened for Board questions of staff or the applicant.

Boardmember Thompson asked the applicant the intent behind the Belgium bricks versus the wood treatment on their other buildings, if there is grout between the brick, and the color of the grout.

Mr. Bermudez explained the Belgium bricks is a new material the stores are now using. Ms. Wimpsett answered they have moved to the brick material due to the cost to maintain the wood treatment, there is grout between the bricks; they would have to research the color of the grout.

Boardmember Chen thanked the applicant and stated she appreciated the well documented plan set and referenced Sheet A-300 for the front elevation and inquired about the bottom of the Canopy as being 15' in height and the door height as 9'. The rendering of the frontage on the cover sheet seemed like it didn't proportionately reflect what is being shown on Sheet A-300.

Mr. Bermudez answered that the data on Sheet A-300 is accurate.

Boardmember Thompson commented that it looked like a shorter building.

Boardmember Chen questioned how they intended to use the patio space on the front of the building.

Ms. Wimpsett replied that they display their outdoor furniture in that space.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the LED lighting features of the signage.

Mr. Bermudez answered there would be LED strips going around the exterior edges of the metal features.

Vice Chair Rosenberg noted that on rendering A-400 the pop up shows the LED strips going around it but corner one with the pop-up does not, and inquired if that was correct and if the secondary "Arhaus" that does not have a pop-up also have LED strips.

Mr. Bermudez responded that was correct.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired about the top of the areas in between window frames noting that the rooftop shows a metal piece of ACH-1 and PC-1 and asked if there was a metal strip along the roofline.

Mr. Bermudez stated that the roofline does have a metal strip trim cap.

Mr. Smith noted that can be found in Detail 7 on Sheet A-531, the last sheet in the set, the parapet detail. It isn't being shown in the rendering.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that it's unfortunate the building isn't being shown relative to the Pottery Barn, which has similar dimensions and they both cap each end of the building.

Mr. Smith stated the Pottery Barn is set forward and Arhaus is set back.

Mr. Bermudez commented that on Rendering A-400 the lower left picture reflects part of the Pottery Barn frontage.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired about the grout in the brick.

Mr. Bermudez replied that the grout will match the color of the brick.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired if the same vertical façade would also be on the site entrance, stating in the rendering the side elevation is different that the front.

Mr. Bermudez explained that on the south side elevation there are mullions at the door. On the second story it is butt glazing.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that the side elevations don't pick up the divisions, except when you reach the side elevation doorway.

Chair Baltay opened the meeting to public comment.

Public Communications

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Baltay asked if there were public comments and there were none.

Chair Baltay closed to the meeting to public comments.

Chair Baltay commented that it seemed the renderings are not the project in front of the Board in height parameters, glazing patterns, things of that nature. It's hard to get a good impression then be told it's not accurate.

Boardmember Hirsch thanked the applicant for the presentation and believed it will be an elegant building. It was nice to see the history of other Arhaus buildings. He liked the rendering of the cap flashing idea, he liked the rendering rather than the cap and wondered if it would be possible to do that differently, it would be nice to see that material going all the way up to the top. It seems to lose something by breaking it up. The divisions at the glass of the major façade are really very nice and the proportions look nice, and definitely an improvement from the previous tenant. The comments made about lighting are significant. The same thing is done at the corner that is very expressed, it would be nice if that element had similar lights. It looks like the side has lighting as well. That's an important entry, many people will be coming from the center of the shopping center, it's important to emphasize that elevation as well. It would be even more impressive of a statement if you could keep going through all of the three entrances. Furniture in the portico area becomes an issue as how to monitor the furniture at night, he hoped they had a way to secure it. The metal strip seems to have two colors in it. There needs to be more bicycle racks for the plaza.

Mr. Smith replied that Simon Properties has been working with planning staff on the placement of all the required bicycle parking. Currently they are on the way to being up to date.

Ms. Gerhardt stated they are working on upgrading that property one location at a time.

Chair Baltay inquired what the requirement is for this property.

Ms. Harrison answered this property is at six required spaces and there are also existing bike racks and lockers in front of stores.

Mr. Smith stated that Sheet G-101.1 there are three sets of existing racks near gridline K and again between G and F.

Boardmember Thompson asked if those were part of a proposed project or existing.

Mr. Smith replied that they already exist. The proposed ones have not been located yet because sometimes they aren't allowed to be adjacent to the property.

Mr. Harrison confirmed that is what they are in the process of working out with Simon Properties. As new projects come forward, they are commissioning them for the number of racks they are required per tenant space that is being worked on.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that he would suggest putting them in the open spaces as a means of attracting bikers to the store. He likes the subtle black elements; he believes it's an elegant building and thanked the applicant for the presentation.

Vice Chair Rosenberg thanked the applicant for the presentation, she liked the material choices and believes they are high quality and make the building interesting and dynamic. Her two comments are that she would like to see LED lighting at the corner pop-up and encouraged the third entrance to also have a pop-up. The entrance without the pop-up makes that façade look a bit mundane. She believes the door selections are nice, and the door selections are likely less accurate, and she believed the elevations should be adhered to. The mullions could be tidied up a bit, to maybe line up with the door. She would love to see a sample of the grout color, as long as it's not white, that would be great.

Boardmember Thompson noticed she had another question regarding the canopy soffit, one of the renderings is showing a light-colored earthy material underneath the canopies and the other one is showing it black up to a certain point and requested clarification.

Mr. Bermudez replied that the canopies at the main entrance have wood paneling underneath and the other ones continue metal. The wood material samples were not provided and will be inside the arcade.

Boardmember Thompson asked if that would be transitioned to the metal soffit at the other canopies.

Mr. Bermudez responded that was correct.

Chair Baltay questioned which detail sheet that was.

Boardmember Thompson said the other canopies showed partially under the canopy and stopped.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated that Sheet A-501 section 1 shows the depth of that area but does not show a material change at any given point.

Chair Baltay requested clarification that those materials were not included.

Mr. Bermudez stated that was correct.

Boardmember Thompson commented that in general the concept of the building is very strong, she's not a fan of all black buildings but in this case, it works for the brand, and there are other brick materials in the other corner, with brilliant earth and feels this will be compatible with it's surroundings. It would be nice to know what that wood material is and the extent of it. She also agrees that the elevation should be adhered to. If the rendering were more accurate, the building would look a lot taller so she wondered if that were true, would it be necessary to go even taller with the eyebrows. It does emphasize the entrance. Concept and design intent, she didn't have too many comments.

Boardmember Chen thanked the applicant for the presentation and felt it was a very beautiful and elegant design for that corner of the site and well delivers their brand. All the materials looked carefully chosen and looking at the elevation sheet it appeared nicely proportioned, with the combination of different materials. She agreed with her colleagues suggestions on the corner, it would be nice to add the lighting fixture.

Chair Baltay agreed with what had been said and had no further comments but asked the applicant to address Vice Chair Rosenberg and Boardmember Chen's comments regarding the lighting.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated on Sheet A-300 where the Arhaus entry doors are located, it would be nice to have that additional pop-up to re-emphasize the entrance on the façade.

Mr. Bermudez responded they had previously had it as a pop-up, and they lowered it. He's not sure why it was changed, he believes they were asked to lower it.

Mr. Smith stated they would definitely entertain that idea and look forward to making that modification, as well as adding additional lighting to the corner if necessary.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that would be great.

Chair Baltay stated he heard unanimous support for the project and stated that he was disappointed that the elevations and renderings were out of sync. They have confidence in Mr. Smith's projects, perhaps this was something that they should send back to an ad-hoc committee just to verify. To reiterate that the ARB needs to see these things more carefully put together.

MOTION: Vice Chair Rosenberg, seconded by Boardmember Thompson to approve the project with the condition that it comes back for an ad-hoc committee to address the following items:

- Grout color.
- Wood sample of the underside of the canopy with better drawings of where it starts and stops with dimensions.
- Potential bike locations, if possible.
- Renderings updated to match the elevations.

Mr. Smith asked if it could be a "date certain".

Ms. Raybould stated she wouldn't be able to make a date without getting the plans back. The Board motioned to approve the project, and the ad hoc is quite flexible in terms of scheduling.

Chair Baltay requested a roll call vote.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Chair Baltay appointed Boardmember Thompson and Vice Chair Rosenberg to the ad hoc committee.

Approval of Minutes

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for May 4, 2023.

Chair Baltay asked for comments or a motion.

MOTION: Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve the meeting minutes for May 4, 2023 as written.

VOTE: 4-0-1-0 (Boardmember Thompson abstained)

Boardmember Hirsch commented that on Packet Page 159, the paragraph which begins with Boardmember Hirsch, instead of edition, it should be addition.

Vice Chair Rosenberg commented that Packet page 157, third paragraph down, "Vice Chair Rosenberg commented the muse on the pathway", she believes it should be mews.

MOTION: Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Thompson, to approve the meeting minutes for May 4, 2023 as amended.

VOTE: 4-0-1-0 (Boardmember Thompson abstained)

Boardmember Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Baltay stated there are no report outs and asked if there were comments.

Boardmember Thompson stated that she and Boardmember Chen discussed 300 Lambert. There were a handful of comments for the applicant to consider before it comes before the Board. It's located at the NVCAP next to Matadero Creek. They asked the applicant to clarify the interface of the buildings backyards, and setbacks from the creek, and on the sides and the front. The application was showing details for upper units and not for the ground floor, they asked those be included. Consider fire access to the units in the rear of the property. The solution is not clear in the application. They also asked for more clarification on material choices. There appears to be an open space on a second-floor level but it's not clear if it has access to tenants or just open.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated she will not be at the next meeting; she will watch the video to catch up.

Adjournment

Chair Baltay adjourned the meeting.