



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
MINUTES: September 21, 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 8:37 a.m.

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

Absent: None

Oral Communications

None

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Senior Planner and Architectural Review Board (ARB) Liaison Claire Raybould indicated there were no Agenda changes, additions, or deletions.

City Official Reports

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

Senior Planner Raybould reported tentative projects expected on the October 5 Agenda include 420 Acacia Avenue, a sixteen unit townhome development using density bonus, and 180 El Camino Real the Stanford Shopping Center has modifications to a façade for Restoration Hardware. In addition, Ms. Raybould will have a brief operational report on housing regulations that was requested by a few Boardmembers. The October 19 Agenda will include the NVCAP study session for Chapter 7: Implementation, and the draft zoning regulations that go along with the NVCAP, that staff will be proposing to PTC and City Council. There will also be a preliminary review for 616 Ramona, which is across the street from City Hall. It is a proposed project for redevelopment with transfer development rights. There have not been any new projects added to the report since 616 Ramona was added. Ms. Raybould requested the Boardmembers consider their holiday plans and offered a reminder to please inform staff if any members have planned absences scheduled. Ms. Raybould stated she has announcements for the end of the meeting.

Chair Baltay requested Ms. Raybould bring the ARB up to date on any changes known for the project at 3150 El Camino Real as the subcommittee has provided two reports.

Ms. Raybould explained her understanding of their status is they have submitted a formal application and staff has completed a single round of review and they are still waiting on revised plans.

Chair Baltay requested confirmation that no formal plans have been resubmitted.

Ms. Raybould stated that was correct.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [23PLN-00009]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Major 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 introduced the item and requested the staff report.

Tamara Harrison with Michael Baker International provided the staff report as the contract planner.

Chair Baltay requested a pause and asked for Boardmember disclosures.

Boardmember Chen stated she recently visited the site.

Chair Baltay stated he visited the site recently.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated she had not visited the site but was on the ad hoc subcommittee for this project.

Boardmember Hirsch stated he had not visited the site and was also on the ad hoc subcommittee for the project.

Contract Planner Harrison continued with the staff presentation and explained the project is in Building V at the Stanford Shopping Center formerly the American Girl Doll Store. It is part of the Master Tenant Façade & Sign Program (MTFS Program), and the applicant is looking to change the façade for the new Arhaus tenant and is located off of the Sand Hill entrance. In June there were four items that were brought before an ad hoc committee, grout color for aged Belgium bricks, color and material details for soffits, potential bike parking locations, and updated renderings for consistency with elevations. At the ARB Subcommittee, it was required that the project return to the full ARB due to a change in material. The Belgium brick is being replaced by a Terra Cotta Baguette system, which prompted a change in color of other front elevation elements. Ms. Harrison showed different slides of the changes and stated that key considerations included ensuring the project is in conformance with the ARB findings and the MTFS program for façade and signage. Staff recommend the ARB recommend approval of the proposed project façade changes to the Director of Planning and Development Services based on findings and subject to staff's conditions of approval.

Chair Baltay thanked Ms. Harrison and requested the sub-committee provide a brief report on their review of the project.

Vice Chair Rosenberg explained the project felt that the changes made were beyond the scope of what had been previously approved by the ARB. The applicant had very clear response to all of the items, however, the change from the brick to the baguette seemed too dramatic of a change that the sub-committee felt comfortable approving without a complete Board review. The ad-hoc provided the applicant with the option of keeping the brick or continuing with the Terra Cotta Baguette and are now returning to the ARB for additional approval of the Terra Cotta Baguette system.

Jason Smith, Landshark Development, stated that Marc Lins with Onyx Creative was also present along with representation from Arhaus.

Marc Lins provided the applicants presentation and explained they are not altering the footprint of the building and showed slides of the existing design. The most significant change to the material was replacing the brick with the Terra Cotta Baguette System because they felt it was better aligned with Arhaus' design standards and their goal for better sustainability. The baguette system is made from recycled content. They also revised the ecotone color so that it would contrast and play with the Terra Cotta in both color and finish. The soffit color was chosen to blend with the baguette system and the stain on the rain screen panels have a natural patina that will change over time and blend well with the earthy tones being used. The remaining materials stayed the same. They included the elevation drawings depicting the placement of the new materials, also showing the façade hasn't changed, just the materials. Mr. Lins showed several elevation renderings of the new design and noted that there is no grout between the baguettes, they are mounted horizontally, and the mounting will be concealed. Behind the Terra Cotta Baguettes will be a mounting system that will be darker, to show that it is a screened system. Detail 11 explains how they plan to mount the baguette system.

Chair Baltay thanked Mr. Lins for the presentation and opened the item for questions from the Board for the applicants and staff.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the length of the Terra Cotta system.

Mr. Lins stated he believed they were five feet.

Boardmember Chen referred them to the elevations on sheet A3.01 where the dimension is listed as 6'8.5" including the ...

Mr. Lins asked if he could ask Alyssa Arbogast to explain the Terra Cotta Baguette system.

Alyssa Arbogast explained that the Terra Cotta baguettes have a maximum length of five feet, anywhere that was used, there would be a vertical member to divide that up.

Boardmember Chen requested she go to the southeast elevation where the dimension is listed as being over six feet.

Ms. Arbogast replied that the dimension on the southeast side also includes the fin portals but should also have the vertical member in it as well, to ensure they had the five foot on either side.

Boardmember Chen asked what the vertical thing was that she kept referring to.

Ms. Arbogast answered that it is part of the fin system, it would be the same color as what is behind the Terra Cotta Baguette so it would be the same color as the ACMs, a black metal color and they would blend in with the portals that are framing the project.

Boardmember Chen inquired if it continued vertically or if it would be staggered between the different (Interrupted)

Ms. Arbogast stated they would be going in a continuous line all the way up.

Chair Baltay stated as a follow up he didn't understand, is this intended at the edge augmenting the width of the fin to bring the Terra Cotta to five feet or something that would be in the middle of the run of vertical panels.

Ms. Arbogast replied that it would run vertically through the Terra Cotta Baguettes.

Chair Baltay confirmed that it would run straight up the middle of the elevation.

Ms. Arbogast answered yes.

Vice Chair Rosenberg asked if it would be straight up the middle as the intention is to divide it in the middle over the intention to have a full five foot panel of Terra Cotta Baguettes and then sort of the smaller system to the side.

Ms. Arbogast responded that if they are required to have that, they would split it right down the middle, that way it would look even on both sides.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired about the Ipe and if it would require maintenance to keep its rich brown color.

Mr. Lins answered there would be maintenance. The Ipe produce has been used on several Arhaus stores across the country and they understand the maintenance requirements based on geographical locations and subsequent environments and daylighting.

Chair Baltay inquired if Mr. Smith was aware of any maintenance requirements in the lease as Ipe needs to be refinished every six to twelve months, if it doesn't get finished it looks terrible.

Mr. Smith replied that all tenants are required to maintain their storefronts and periodically, onsite management tours the facilities and identifies any deficiencies on the store front and notifies the tenants when needed.

Chair Baltay asked if a fading finish would be considered one of those requirements.

Mr. Smith responded that fading is considered maintenance that needs to be properly maintained. Currently there are fading deficiencies and the management company is working with tenants to make those repairs.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired how the bike parking was being addressed.

Ms. Harrison stated that the bike parking that was addressed at the sub-committee meeting has been addressed with staff and the management company to provide not only bike parking but also bring the

vehicle parking availability up to current standards. There is an iteration that is still in progress but based on that one, it appears as if there is excess bike parking that has been installed. As they move through the approval process, they are chipping away at that overage. With the Arhaus store they will be required to install six short term bike parking, as a result of that change, the six will be deducted from their current overage from the bike parking installed earlier this year. They hope to have that solidified in the next couple of weeks.

Ms. Raybould added that staff are looking at it from a more holistic approach in terms of how they are getting up to speed with the bike numbers. Each time they make a change that is reviewed. The bike spaces that are being added and where they are allocated are not currently adjacent but that's because there are already existing bike spaces in that area.

Mr. Smith clarified that around Building V, there are currently 32 bicycle parking spaces available. With the expansion of the shopping center and Building EE, they will be adding an additional eighteen spots once the construction is complete. Currently there is a positive of bicycle spaces that they are working around, and the management company is working with staff to ensure those requirements are met.

Chair Baltay opened the item to public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There being non Chair Baltay closed the meeting to public comment and opened Board discussion.

Vice Chair Rosenberg thanked staff and the applicant for the presentations and stated she was in favor of the project previously and the only reason for the second ARB review was to ensure the entire Board was unified in their approval of the full material scope. She's pleased with the improvements and believes it will be quite lovely and it is a bit more modern leaning of a design selection than the brick and it lightens and brightens the space quite a bit.

Boardmember Hirsch stated he agreed with his colleague, he believes it is a good change, he also had reservations about the brick material. This is a more consistent material, and the colors are beautiful, and the front enhancement is improved with these materials.

Boardmember Chen stated she believed the introduction of the new material was an improvement to the project and she liked the way they made the corner elements lighter. She liked the contrast that is now being provided. She is concerned about the joint line that was mentioned and it would have been beneficial to have seen the details and how it would look, she would be more comfortable with a conditional approval. The floor plan widths between the columns and the glazing areas are all different and wondered if it would be possible to make the six-foot-eight inches more narrow to make sure it fits in with the five feet baguette maximum lines. That could be a better solution, she's not looking to do the design, but she encouraged the applicant to think about it.

Chair Baltay shared his colleagues' comments, he believed the design has improved and comfortably supports the changes and also supports Boardmember Chen's concerns about the baguette system. Having a vertical seam is not acceptable and he believed it could be possible to have a condition that the baguette system does not have a vertical seam. They could either make the fins slightly wider or find a different manufacturer with the longer baguette. His suggestion was to approve the project with the

condition that there not be a vertical seam in the baguette system and let staff verify the improvement of that.

Vice Chair Rosenberg offered another option would be to flip flop which material goes into which racing stripe.

MOTION: Moved by Vice Chair Rosenberg, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve the project with the condition that there is no vertical seam on the baguette system, to be approved by staff at Space #820B, Bldg. V (#v820B) for “Arhaus” at the Stanford Shopping Center. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from CEQA per Section 15301 (Existing Facilities).

VOTE: 4-0-0

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3600 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD [23PLN-00160]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Major Architectural Review to allow the deconstruction of the existing Palo Alto Fire Station #4 and construction of a new 8,000 sf fire station. The application also includes a Variance request from the City's 50% shading canopy coverage in the parking lot. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act in Accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15302 (Replacement) and 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: PF (Public Facility).

Chair Baltay introduced the item and requested Boardmember disclosures.

Boardmember Chen stated she visited the site.

Chair Baltay also visited the site recently.

Vice Chair Rosenberg stated she had nothing to disclose.

Boardmember Hirsch stated he had nothing to disclose.

Chair Baltay requested the staff report.

Planner Garrett Sauls provided the presentation for the fire station replacement at 3600 Middlefield Road and provided the background of the project located East Meadow Drive and Middlefield Road, adjacent to the presbyterian church and the Palo Alto Little League clubhouse. It is to replace the existing 2,900 sf fire station with a one store 8,000 sf lead silver target fire station. One slight change from the previous approval is that previously there were twelve parking stalls, now there are only nine. As a part of the application, three emergency loading bays are the same and the emergency generator is still the same. The proposal will ultimately end up removing twelve trees and replace both onsite and offsite within the right of way on Middlefield Road, as well as onto the shared space of the substation along Middlefield Road. This project was previously heard on August 3, 2023. Comments during the hearing included the Board wanted the applicant to provide a comprehensive material Board, which the applicant now has and is Attachment G in the application. All of the materials that are being proposed are identified and provide the details of the colors that will be utilized. The Board asked the applicant to consider a different material

than the stucco siding. After reviewing the consideration, the applicant felt the stucco provided the greatest contrast between the other materials, the wood soffit, and the glass elements of the building. They are proposing to continue utilizing the stucco material as part of this application. The ARB requested a greater connection and openness to the building façade. Mr. Sauls explained the difference between the prior elevation and the current elevation is that along Middlefield Road, the window vestibule was expanded into the cooking and lobby room for the fire fighters. They also included a different kind of fencing along the left hand side of the building. A conceptual sign design was requested by the ARB. There is an orientation and size difference between what is in the application now and what was present previously. Tentatively the materials for the sign that is being proposed would be something that would be aluminum. They have also identified the font type and thickness of the letters that will be used. The applicant was also requested to provide roof construction detailing. On Sheet E1, that is now included in the application; and they identified the slope of the roof. On Sheets H1 and 2, there are section details of the roof eave and there are blown up images on H2. The ARB requested that the applicant provide clear story windows or skylights in the exercise room, the applicant is now wrapping around the clear story windows along the backside as well as wrapping the corner with the rain screening system from the front of the building. The height of the building was raised in that area as well, to provide additional volume within that space. Noted by the Chair, the applicant has requested a variance to the City's 50% shading requirements. This was something the Public Works team communicated to the City after that August ARB hearing, that they wouldn't be able to achieve and would need to request a variance in order to continue processing the application. The City has included the variance findings in the Staff Report. Staff believes with the uniqueness of the site and facilities, and the services and critical functions that they provide for the City and the constraints of the power lines over the property, they can make the findings to approve the variance application. Staff's recommendation would be to approve the project based on the findings and conditions of approval.

Chair Baltay thanked staff and asked if the Board had any questions for staff.

Boardmember Hirsch stated that he clarified some of the comments that were made in the minutes and inquired if those were discussed with the applicant.

Ms. Raybould stated that those were made after the packet had been published and they had the final plan set.

Chair Baltay requested more information on the fifty percent shading requirement for the parking lot and expressed an interest in understanding what those requirements are for a public facility versus a commercial facility.

Ms. Raybould stated she wasn't sure if other fire stations meet those requirements, her guess was anything that was developed before the requirement was in place, likely do not meet those requirements, it is a standard that is required of any surface parking across the city. It applies to public facilities, commercial lots, and multifamily residential. The requirement is to have shading on parking spaces such that it would cover fifty percent of the surface parking lot.

Chair Baltay asked if she was aware of the purpose behind the requirement.

Ms. Raybould answered it is a method of improving tree canopy and a way to reduce heat island effect.

Vice Chair Rosenberg inquired if when they calculate parking spaces, is it just the parking stalls themselves, as this building requires more surface area due to the nature of the size of the emergency vehicles.

Ms. Raybould answered it is the whole paving middle, which is why this is a very unique site.

Chair Baltay requested the applicant presentation.

Chief Stephen Lindsey provided the presentation with Chris Ford and Valerie Tam. While they met as a team to discuss the ARB previous requests, they considered a day in the life of a firefighter at Station 4. They work a forty-eight hour shift, and often come from a shift at another station. The parking itself, they are confident it will work for the station. As far as opportunities to engage with the community, the Fire Department embraces that and one of the ways they came up with was to make the windows a little bit larger in the front and adding an additional window that faces the apparatus bay and the apron area. When they are in the day room or kitchen and see someone outside the front façade, they will have opportunities to engage. They will be in the lobby side Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. engaging in inspections, conducting business, and providing training. During the off hours they will be in the day room side. That is their time to have meals, plan their days, and engage with the public during off hours. Adding a Dutch door on the side allows the community to see the firefighters if they are outside eating. They also added seating and areas where they can walk around the entire station. When they do station tours, there will be an opportunity to walk around and open up the station. They are very proud of the updates and feel it will work for the community and the firefighters. They tried their best to preserve the canopy of the trees, but they have to have the space to park the vehicles and perform required maintenance. They also need the space for loading the hose into the hose bed. There are also drains in the back because that's where they clean the apparatus.

Chris Ford, with BRW Architects, displayed a focused slide show for the changes that were made and provided the updated material board for the ARB. The aluminum soffit now looks like wood and the fencing that was Ipe has now been matched up to be an aluminum system that is now all the same tone and material. The stucco has a smooth finish, and an example has been provided. It is still being determined where the art will be placed, and that stucco finishing is an option, and currently provides the best contrast to the wood and glass finishes on the remaining façade. They added a Dutch gate on Middlefield and a meet and greet patio bench area in the tree area, to enhance the community interaction. Additionally, tables have been provided should the firefighters choose to eat their meals outdoors. A window was added overlooking the apparatus bay, which also allows them to see any activity in the front of the building from the lobby, the day room and the kitchen. They provided more details regarding the front plaza landscaping, bike parking, how to get to the plaza, and provided an aerial view of the proposed plaza, as well as clarification of the location for the flagpole. They added design clarification for the proposed sign with the understanding that the exact signage design will be returned to the ARB for approval during the construction phase. The Department liked the idea of the large number 4 element. Everything else matches the signage of Station 3. They have two opportunities for signage because the building sits on a corner. The roof and façade clarifications are now included, and they raised the ceiling of the exercise room and introduced the rain screen system along two of those walls and added the clear story. They recently finished another fire station that had clear story, it's a balance between offering the firefighters enough hard wall to set up their exercise equipment but also getting natural lighting. The door that opens to the back also allows them to go outside and also take equipment outdoors. They tried to

get as much shading in the back parking area, again, they had to adjust for the amount of space required to maintain the emergency vehicles, while navigating the power lines overhead.

Chair Baltay thanked Mr. Ford for the presentation and asked if there were Board questions for the applicant.

Boardmember Hirsch inquired how they get from inside to the outdoor areas in the front of the building.

Mr. Ford stated there is a gate there currently, which was perpendicular to Middlefield. The gate is moved in the plans to run parallel to Middlefield and as the Chief mentioned, it's a Dutch door gate so the upper panel can stay open for viewing and opens fully to access the outdoor area. There is a shaded canopy on the front of the building and often the firefighters will eat outdoors.

Boardmember Hirsch requested information on the ceiling height of the exercise room.

Mr. Ford explained the ceiling tops out at about eleven feet. The stucco band above it is a little higher than a standard parapet because they are also hiding the VRF compressors and all of the mechanical equipment, as well as the battery back up for the microgrid. It has a bit of a tall look to it, but they believe it's worth it because it will be hiding virtually every piece of mechanical equipment, leaving the rest of the roof simple and flat for the PV panels. It is an eleven foot ceiling in the exercise room.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if the height of the taller sections were about fifteen feet.

Mr. Ford confirmed that was correct.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if there would be a valence in the exercise room.

Mr. Ford replied that previously they had an exposed painted out underside of the deck, but it likely wouldn't be a drop ceiling. They have not yet finalized those details.

Vice Chair Rosenberg asked Chief Lindsey how many firefighters are at the station at any given time.

Chief Lindsey stated they expect to have five fire fighters total for the new station. Three on a fire engine and two on an ambulance. They are also considering the potential future needs of the community.

Vice Chair Rosenberg asked if there was any possible way to shift the trash containers by the generator forward, to get another tree behind them.

Mr. Ford answered that might be possible but that it would then be a trade off between giving the firefighters the outdoor cross fit-workout area...

Vice Chair Rosenberg referred him to Sheet C-2 and noticed there was quite a bit of space between the trash enclosures and the actual parking stalls. But it also says com tower.

Mr. Ford stated yes, it's likely feasible. The generators have doors that open and service panels so that will also need to be considered.

Mr. Sauls added that the trash enclosures will also need movability space in front of them for pick up, they will need to study that request a little further.

Ms. Valerie Tam, Public Works Engineering, explained that the utility station is on the other side of the fence, and they have to maintain two to three feet tree canopy air space from that fence. They had to exclude that whole side from planting trees.

Vice Chair Rosenberg mentioned the stucco joint lines on the front white façade and requested more information.

Mr. Ford explained they are very thin, and barely show up on the renderings. It's a light shadow line that is crack control for the glass and won't be accentuated or a design feature. It's to help organize the graphics but also just a slight shadow line, much like the division of the panels behind Vice Chair Rosenberg in the meeting room.

Chair Baltay opened the meeting to public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Seeing no public comment Chair Baltay closed the meeting to public comment and brought the item back to the Board for ARB discussion.

Boardmember Hirsch commented that the applicant did a fine job with the landscaping and the use of the site and the building, it's very publicly oriented. The ARB pushed for that early on and he thanked the applicants for having recognized the importance of the firemen being able to access the area out front. He wished it was a little more open, but he understood that it's a trade off with the living area. He felt the corners could have been opened up a bit more by adding more glass. Another glass door could have been added to create more sight of the front apron, more could have been done in the front to keep it consistent with what is being done on the opposite side. His biggest concern is the view from the back of the building. As one is traveling down East Meadow, the view of the back of the building is going to be very busy, however the potential possibilities for landscaping in the rear is nowhere as nice as the front. He is unhappy with how the two sides relate to each other. There are two important aspects between the front lobby and training room on one side and the living quarters on the other with the high roof in between. The interesting part of the concept of the building gets lost in the rear of the building. He would have liked to have seen the tall fifteen foot section extended all the way to the rear of the building, which could have eliminated the mix of materials that don't work well together. He felt it is conceivable to rethink how the mechanical system is placed above, perhaps move them to a different area of the plaza, or possibly extend the fencing in a way to incorporate some of the mechanical on the ground level. That would allow a repeat of the same idea as the front for the conference room, in the rear of the building. It isn't a major piece of the project, and it could have been if they had extended the two lower parts of the fifteen foot high roof line around to the back of the building. There are other ways to have eliminated putting the mechanical in the roof extension, and to make that work. It also would have made a significant difference in the view of the back side of the building. All of their activities in the rear of the building are very interesting, it would have been nice if the area around it was as nice as the front. It's amazing to watch them train for the incredible things they do. He doesn't have a problem with the landscaping, it is what it is, and they did the best that they could. Some of the other details mentioned at the prior hearing, like the skylight for more daylight in the back area of the living quarters would have been nice and it's such a simple idea. The front is taller than he felt it needed to be. He emphasized that they should consider the rear of the building more to make sure they coordinate with all the rest of the forms.

Boardmember Chen thanked them for the presentation and commented that she is a big fan of the project since the study session, and she really likes the cleanness of the design. The building itself is really attractive and she appreciated that they provided greater openings at the bay room and created the plaza outside the kitchen area to create an ability to be interactive with the public. She echoed Boardmember Hirsch's comments about the elevation design of the exercise room. Currently it seems the parapet wall is kind of tall, but with the introduction of new materials there competes with the stucco wall below it. She recommended they consider relocating the mechanical room above the bedroom area, because that area doesn't need high ceiling space. In doing so, they could lower the parapet wall above the exercise room and make the rear elevation more proportionately right. She was not sure if an opening to the rear courtyard was necessary; she drove down East Meadow everyday and there's a big buffer zone between the courtyard and the road itself. It's hard to see behind the trees what will happen there.

Vice Chair Rosenberg thanked the applicant and stated she was the sole supporter of the project at the last meeting, and she still supports it. She was pleased with the improvements, and this is one of the times she appreciates the other Boardmembers pushing for further improvements to the design. Those improvements are successful. She hears what her colleagues are saying about the high parapet wall, there's a potential that could be moved, maybe over the restrooms instead of the bedrooms, she doesn't feel it's enough to require a change, she thinks it's nice the way it is, but she could see room for improvement. She did, however, believe that was up to the architects to design. She did not see any major issues with the design as it was being presented. She likes the improvements to the exercise room, but she does get the comment about it being a little discontinuous with the opposite side, however it is a major improvement over the all-white wall. She appreciated the new windows on the sides for the day room and Middlefield. She likes the dayroom window out to the apparatus area and believes it will be very useful. Regarding the central main height, there was a lot of discussion on whether this building should be civic or residential, she appreciates the height that it is. It hits that sweet spot between being tall and interesting and having a presence, without overtaking the primarily Eichler neighborhood that it sits in. She personally believed it was very responsive to its surroundings and she appreciated the height on the front portion. She appreciated the grout lines; those are looking good. Regarding the courtyard, she doesn't believe it's going to be a public courtyard, but she did believe it's going to be great for when families come to visit. Her final comment was that the "No." portion of the Station No. 4 is just a little big. It's a very small comment, but because it's the same size as the "Station" portion, they compete with each other. A small tweak to the size of that would improve the signage.

Chair Baltay said hats off to the architect, he did a bang up job getting the building to fit into the community and have a civic presence. The corner elevation did wonders for him and it's going to be a wonderful building. They nailed it by being tall enough to have presence and just low enough to fit into the community and he appreciated what they had done. His comment is exclusive on the exercise piece; he felt Boardmember Hirsch was correct that the building will be seen from East Meadow drive and that is a weak element on the building. He's comfortable recommending a condition of approval with the exercise room coming back to an ad hoc committee for one more pass at possibly changing the roof parapet, the roof eave. He believed Boardmember Hirsch summarized what the issue is, and improvements could be made, but he would like to see the project get pushed forward. His recommendation is they approve it with that element returning for a subcommittee review.

MOTION: Chair Baltay motioned, seconded by Vice Chair Rosenberg , to approve staff’s Recommendation on Applicant’s Request for Major Architectural Review to allow the deconstruction of the existing Palo Alto Fire Station #4 and construction of a new 8,000 sf fire station, with the condition that the exercise room element be redesigned subject to the comments that Boardmember Hirsch made - to be reviewed by a subcommittee.

Ms. Raybould ask for specific requests based on the comments of Boardmember Hirsch.

Chair Baltay explained the exercise room needs to have a character that’s more consistent with the rest of the building, which means having a roof eave of some kind, and not being so tall. Likely the mechanical equipment needs to then be relocated.

Boardmember Hirsch stated in looking at the front page elevation, it includes two materials and a glass panel in between. That should also be the material on the outside of the exercise room. It does in part, but it’s mixed with the stucco. That and move the mechanicals, which would require some coordination, but it could be done.

Ms. Raybould wrote on screen to create a bullet list for the conditions.

Chair Baltay stated provide a character that is more consistent with the rest of the building to include:

- Provide a more consistent eave treatment.
- Consider relocating the mechanical equipment to allow for the removal of the big parapet wall.
- Have exterior material treatment on the exercise room that is consistent with the rest of the building.

Mr. Ford stated they’ve been chasing the mechanical equipment around since the very beginning, it’s a tight sight, and the site is shared with the substation. The last spot left is their outdoor dining area. Putting the VRF condensers above the bedroom is not good for the well being of the fire fighters. The other option was putting them above the bathrooms, but then they will be seen from Middlefield. They can’t design it during the meeting, they will try to see what they can do. He liked the idea of returning to a sub-committee and bringing back the model.

Chair Baltay suggested that even if the mechanical equipment has to be in the same location, put it there and put a separate screen around that, pulled back from the edge of the roof.

Boardmember Hirsch didn’t understand how it would be seen if it was put over the bathrooms. They are far enough back in the building, and they’d be screened by the rest of building. He believed it was a reasonable idea, and suggested they consider that carefully.

VOTE: 4-0-0

Chair Baltay assigned Boardmember Hirsch and Boardmember Chen to the ad-hoc committee for the return of this item.

Boardmember Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Baltay announced that City Council appointed Mousam Adcock to the Board, she will be joining the next meeting.

Adjournment

Chair Baltay adjourned the meeting at 10:07 a.m.