



# Architectural Review Board

## Staff Report (ID # 14025)

---

**Report Type:** Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 2/17/2022

**Summary Title:** Minutes of December 2, 2021

**Title:** Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 2, 2021

**From:** Jonathan Lait

### Recommendation

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

### Background

Draft minutes from the December 2, 2021 Architectural Review Board (ARB) are available in Attachment A.

Draft and Approved Minutes are made available on the ARB webpage at [bit.ly/paloaltoARB](https://bit.ly/paloaltoARB)

### Attachments:

- Attachment A: Minutes of December 2, 2021 (DOCX)



## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD MINUTES: December 2, 2021

Virtual Meeting  
8:30 AM

### **Call to Order / Roll Call**

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Palo Alto met on this date in virtual teleconference at 8:30 a.m.

Participating Remotely: Chair Osma Thompson, Vice Chair Grace Lee, Boardmember Peter Baltay, Boardmember David Hirsch, Boardmember Alex Lew

Absent:

### **Oral Communications**

None.

### **Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

None.

### **City Official Reports**

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

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, stated that the next hearing would normally be December 16<sup>th</sup>, but that would be cancelled and replaced by a meeting on December 9, 2021, to finalize the Architectural Review Board (ARB) Awards. That will be the final ARB meeting of the year. City Council will make three appointments to the ARB at their meeting on December 13, 2021. Boardmembers Hirsch and Baltay have reapplied.

### **Action Items**

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI JUDICIAL: 1310 Bryant Street (Castilleja School): Architectural Review Application Remanded by City Council for Review of Redesigned Academic Building That Does Not Increase Existing Campus Gross Floor Area as Directed by City Council, Alternative Parking Options with Associated Parking Adjustment Request, and Additional Tree Preservation Proposal. The ARB Previously Recommended Approval of the Architectural Review Application in Fall 2020. Zone District: R1(10,000). Environmental Review: Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) Published July 30, 2020; Draft EIR Published July 15, 2019.

Chair Thompson introduced the item and called for ARB disclosures.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed that he visited the site.

Boardmember Hirsch disclosed that he visited the site several times over the past two months and walked the perimeter at various hours.

Boardmember Lew disclosed that he researched the non-complying facility section of Code 18.70.100. He also looked at the Packard Foundation in downtown Los Altos, downloaded the plan, and reviewed the dimensions. He also reviewed the dimensions at Jane Lathrop Stanford (JLS) and Fairmeadow schools on East Meadow in Palo Alto and looked at several Stanford buildings that have portals.

Vice Chair Lee disclosed that she visited the perimeter of the site.

Chair Thompson disclosed she visited the site and rewatched the City Council meeting from the 29<sup>th</sup>. She called for the staff report.

Amy French, Chief Planning Official, had technical issues and needed to log off and back on again.

Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning and Development Services, suggested a short break to address technical issues.

**The ARB took a break until 8:47 a.m.**

Ms. French shared her screen with the ARB.

Chair Thompson called the meeting back to order and for the staff report.

Ms. French explained that following the City Council's meetings in March of 2021 the project was returning to the ARB. She planned to discuss the ARB's 2020 action, the Council Motions, the trees, site revisions, building revisions, parking options/adjustment. Then the applicant will make a presentation and the ARB will move through its process. At the end of the hearing staff will request that the ARB continue the hearing to a date uncertain. In November 2020, the ARB recommended Project Alternative 4 as outlined in the Environmental impact Report (EIR). That alternative recommended 79 below grade and 26 above grade parking spaces. She showed the ARB Motion which included eight ad hoc review items. The purpose of the meeting is not to go through the ad hoc items, but to focus on higher level matters. She shared the Council Motion which called for an ARB re-review of the academic building due to the need to reduce Gross Floor Area (GFA). There was an error found which attributed basement area to above grade GFA in March 2021. The applicant remedied the error with a plan submittal in May and responses to staff requests. The Council's Motion referred other items to staff and to the Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC). Staff requests ARB input on those items, specifically Option E, which is the option that protects Tree #155 and improves upon the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) for Trees #87 and #89. Urban Forestry staff is present. The City hired an independent consultant to investigate additional tree protection measures. The City has also received construction phasing options. Constructing a temporary campus on the circle would add a lot of time to the timeline and delay construction. An independent consultant analyzed and provided summaries of the GFA. There are five options for parking other than the project. The parking adjustment preferred by the applicant was for 9% reduction, for Option D. The Director supports Option E. She reviewed the TPZ plan, including notable Tree #89. They need a better understanding of where the tree roots are, and Urban Forestry has proposed a condition that would use

Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) to determine the information. With respect to Tree #89 the revised plan relocates a stairway and a transformer from the TPZ. Tree #6 will be transplanted elsewhere leaving Tree #13 in the proposed planting place which addresses the crowding. The applicant will show additional plans for the academic building, but she showed two areas where the GFA was adjusted. The study staff prepared showed the existing campus had approximately 114,800 square feet (sf) GFA (not including volumetric area). The proposal is for about 111,300 sf GFA (also not including volumetric area). There has been no change to materials since the last ARB review in November 2020. With respect to parking, Alternative 4 with 104 total parking spaces was selected in November 2020. Option A does not require a parking adjustment. Option B shows 83 total spaces, Option C shows 83 total spaces, and both would require a parking adjustment of 20%. Option D shows 95 total spaces (and a 9% adjustment) and was the applicant's preference, and Option E shows 89 total spaces and saves Tree #155 while helping two other trees (and a 14% adjustment). Option E also includes a soundwall to mitigate delivery and trash pickup noise. She showed the previously published construction phasing plans.

Chair Thompson called for the applicant's presentation.

Nanci Kauffman, Castilleja Head of School, thanked the ARB and staff and indicated they were returning with a modified plan that they believe will bring the project to fruition after 5 ½ years in the City process and 9 years of planning. The project will benefit the school, neighborhood, City, and the world. The modernization is often referred to as an expansion, but the revised plan reduces the footprint and above grade square footage, increases setbacks, lowers rooflines, takes cars off the street, and reduces campus events and traffic. As directed by City Council they worked with architects and City staff to make reductions and modifications in parking, trees, and square footage. Castilleja wants cars off the road as much as the neighbors and agreed with the ARB that underground parking was the solution. There are five alternative parking configurations and a parking adjustment request for consideration. All options better protect trees and reduce construction impacts. Option A does not meet the project objectives as it eliminates a large portion of a playing field. They have clarified the TPZs and have two alternatives available. Both alternatives achieve greater tree protection and reduce delivery noise. Urban Forestry approves the tree protection plan. City Council requested they reduce the size of the buildings to comport with historic permits and they complied by eliminating 1,830 sf. City Council also requested the massing along Kellogg be reviewed. In response to ARB feedback, they made significant modifications by varying roof heights, adding balconies, and updating façade materials. They look forward to the ARB's thoughts on the massing but were concerned that further reductions might create a porous campus. The proposal includes an additional 100 trees and a robust Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program.

Adam Woltag, WRNS Studio, thanked the ARB for its time. They have worked on the massing of the building a lot and appreciate the ARB's input. He showed slides of the Emerson Street, Kellogg Avenue, and Bryant Street views as originally proposed and revised. The massing is now better and more responsive to its neighborhood context. With GFA they adjusted the building's area to match the historic record by reducing the footprint of the building, discounted level 2 decks as open space, and changed a level 2 meeting room from an interior space to a deck. He showed additional slides detailing those changes to the GFA. The proposed GFA of the project is less than that of the existing building. The Council requested the underground garage have a smaller footprint and that is reflected in Parking Options A – D. The area surrounding Tree #89 has been modified by moving the transformer over 70 feet. Upon request

from staff to protect Tree #155 they have developed Option E. Option E allows for more surface parking spaces with the area near Tree #89 being water permeable. To achieve Option E the pool must be shifted 20 feet and other areas such as trash must be modified. Noise impact will be addressed by an acoustic wall running along Emerson Street. He showed a series of slides on Option E. Throughout the process they have been able to focus on site sustainability. Everything meets or exceeds City standards. He thanked the ARB for their work, which has made the project better.

Chair Thompson called for the public comment.

Madina Klicheva, Administrative Assistant, shared a list of the public speakers and a timer with the ARB.

Rebecca Sanders, Co-chair of Palo Alto Neighborhoods (PAN), explained that PAN is an umbrella organization supporting residents and neighborhoods across the City. The community is interested in the project as the school is in a residential area, is requesting extraordinary amounts of extra floor area, and requesting other exceptions. When another applicant with an R-1 site went to City Council and requested unprecedented exceptions the Mayor told them to return with a compliant project. None of the five parking options comply because all add more floor area to the site than allowed. Council has not agreed to the extra floor area and there could be legal obstacles. PAN wants an alternative parking proposal that complies with the law. Currently there are 89 surface parking spots. If Castilleja adopts a TDM that earns the 20% reduction it would only need 83 parking spaces total. Therefore, they could remove six spaces and no underground garage would be necessary. That alternative would save millions in construction costs, is better for the environment, and gets rid of the need for driveways and easements. Eliminating the garage helps the neighbors and commuters on Embarcadero by lessening construction impacts. Without the garage the City does not have to grant an exemption for the underground facility at all. There has only been one objection to removing the garage and that is that surface parking is not attractive, but the neighbors are not objecting to the current surface parking. The ARB could come up with ways to screen the surface parking if necessary. She requested the ARB consider their alternative.

Cath Garber, resident, explained she is an architect. Castilleja has worked with the City and its boards and commissions on the project for several years. She hoped that this would be the last iteration for the school. Castilleja is fully in compliance with the GFA requirements. As an architect the modifications proposed to Emerson Street and the pool are reasonable and thoughtful responses. She was disappointed the process took so long and hoped that the City would conclude its review and approve the project.

Roger McCarthy, resident, thanked the ARB for their time and service. He noted he had no ties to Castilleja. His interest in the project stemmed from his technological leadership positions and as a resident. He is the Treasurer of the National Academy of Engineering, member of the Governing Board of the National Research Council, and is Director of the National Academies Corporation. As such he understands the acute shortage of women in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. Studies have shown that women are more likely to enter STEM fields through an all-girls secondary school environment. Castilleja is one of the best. For years Palo Alto has traded the interests of a few dozen residents while denying at least 1,000 women a Castilleja education. This has been due to the nitpicky requirements of the R-1 zoning. R-1 zoning was created in Berkeley in 1916 solely to achieve racial segregation. He found it fitting that it was now being used to discriminate against women furthering their education. Further, Castilleja was established prior to the R-1 zoning yet they are still held to the

standard. He asked if the ARB would put the economic interests of a few over the many or if they would further the national interest in getting the project approved.

Alan Cooper, resident, stated he was a neighbor of the school. He was concerned about construction phasing and the driveway design on Kellogg. He thanked City staff for their work on the project and preferred staff Option E. It is important to minimize the impact of the project on neighbors and surrounding roads during construction. He hoped the ARB supported the option for Castilleja to find a temporary off site campus during construction. That way total construction time might only last 21 months, and it would greatly improve traffic safety in the area. He asked the ARB to look at the driveway design on Kellogg. Earlier in the week he sent the ARB pictures of the dangerous traffic situations during student pickup. The problems will be worse with additional students. Two possible solutions would be to either extend the Kellogg driveway to a Bryant Street entrance or to paint the curb red on Kellogg so cars could wait outside of active trafficways. He thanked the ARB for its time and consideration.

Tom Shannon, resident, said that the ARB hearing was the first chance for the neighbors of the project to review the revised plan. The project's design and parking has changed substantially. He had three specific questions. The previous plan indicated all school buses would be used on the inner circle for student drop off and pickup. He asked if that was still the case. He also wanted to know how semis, large trucks, and garbage trucks would navigate the site. Current deliveries are a disturbance to the neighborhood, and they would like the City to prohibit big rigs, semis, and tractor-trailer trucks from making deliveries to the school. He noted that for a higher delivery charge companies could use step vans for the deliveries. Finally, he asked how GreenWaste would access the site. He requested that the ARB study the waste disposal system as revised on the Kellogg/Emerson corner. He thanked staff and elected officials for their work.

Mary Sylvester, resident, said she has been a neighbor of Castilleja for 44 years. She has always supported Castilleja and their modernization plans; however, this is not a code compliant project, and it does not fit with the context of the neighborhood or protect enough trees. She understood that the ARB largely focuses on the visual elements of a plan, but she urged them to look at code compliance and the character of the neighborhood. Castilleja is largely surrounded by smaller bungalows and moderately sized homes. The architect's renderings do not put the campus in the neighborhood context. Castilleja operates under a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) and therefore must consider their impact on the health, welfare, and quiet enjoyment of the neighbors. She thanked community members for their work to save trees and get the massing modified on Kellogg. She also thanked Urban Forestry and resident Robert Levitsky for saving several trees although there was more work to do. She suggested getting rid of the underground garage and did not believe it was environmentally superior option due to the greenhouse gasses produced by construction. She noted that many private schools in the area did not allow students to drive. Under the CUP driving should be a privilege and not an entitlement. Shuttling and public transportation should be used instead.

Rob Levitsky, resident, said that after 5 years of Castilleja claiming that their design followed all rules there is a last minute submission of November 3<sup>rd</sup> attempting to back the pool away from Trees #89 and #87. It is labeled Scheme E. He wished that Castilleja, the Planning Department, and the EIR consultant had respected the protected trees over the last 5 years. He was particularly concerned about Oak Trees #87, #89, #102, #148, #155, and Redwood Trees #115 to #120. For 5 years the TPZs were not accurately placed on any of the drawings. That mislead everyone who looked at the drawings for impacts to trees. Castilleja,

Page 5 of 27

Architectural Review Board Meeting  
Summary Minutes: 12/2/2021

the architects, the Planning Department, and the EIR consultant did not care that the TPZs were not drawn accurately for years. He was happy that through neighbor participation the trees were being respected, but simple TPZ circles are not enough to guarantee tree safety as many trees will have roots that extend beyond the TPZs. He thought a root mapping study using GPR was necessary.

Andie Reed, resident, said that Castilleja was planning to replace five older buildings with a large new building. As a neighbor she supported modernization, but with a lower profile than proposed. She thanked the City for its work requiring the school retain housing stock and its ongoing work to save trees. The staff report compares the latest iteration of the project with one from a year ago rather than to the existing campus. The size of the proposed GFA is around 128,000 sf per the new proposal, which exceeds GFA allowed by code of 81,000 sf. Some buildings were built before the current code while others were built after, but not reviewed for GFA. To build the 111,000 sf proposed Castilleja submitted a variance. Castilleja claims that the large size of the site is a hardship, but they increased the size when they added the 200 block of Melville in 1992. Therefore, they do not qualify based on size. An amendment that would allow Castilleja to build the underground garage without adding the square footage sidestepped the issue. The school is asking for too much. She suggested reducing the footprint of the large building to satisfy the issues. With respect to parking when they discuss shifting the pool it is from iteration to iteration. Castilleja already has a pool and moving it loses 60 surface parking spaces. There are currently 89 parking spaces on site, but the plans show less. The school's plans reduce surface parking by more than 60 spaces. By removing onsite parking to move the pool to accommodate a large building the school creates a need already satisfied in the current conditions.

Dave Dockter stated that he was formerly the Planning Arborist with the City of Palo Alto. He commended staff for commissioning the cohesive tree report addendums. The staff report states that staff welcomes ARB feedback on additional measures that may be necessary to preserve protected trees. He proposed that the ARB direct staff to include a standard condition of approval for a tree security deposit requirement for important at risk trees. That will assure true mitigation for any trees lost by project construction. Palo Alto has used this condition on several projects. the language for the security deposit is available from Urban Forestry Staff and is contained in other project approvals. The security deposit is maintained by the Urban Forestry fund and should apply to significant trees to be transplanted and at risk trees subject to foreseeable root impact such as #89 and #155. The deposit is a financial incentive for contractors to responsibly care for the trees and for general contractors to avoid sloppy management. The amount of the deposit can vary from 100% to 200% value of the tree. If Tree #89 were lost to construction the gymnasium mass and scale would appear more imposing. At today's meeting he suggested the ARB direct Urban Forestry staff to include as a condition of approval a tree security deposit for specific trees to be monitored over a specific period. He thanked the ARB.

Hank Sousa, resident, stated he lived 185 feet from Castilleja School. He was concerned about parking spaces and enrollment. There are currently 86 parking spaces on campus which allows for the enrollment of 448 students. The current enrollment is 426. Many neighbors feel that an enrollment increase of 8% granted by the City is acceptable. There is historical precedence under the CUP. The current number of parking spaces is sufficient for an enrollment of 448 students. Additionally, the Head of School has previously stated that 448 was the optimum teaching number. Therefore, the underground garage and its associated problems are unnecessary. He pointed out that the underground garage could affect the

water table. No garage construction also reduces construction time by two years. The construction timetable is important to resident neighbors. He also suggested that parents could drop students off at satellite sites and be shuttled to school. They could also mandate that students are not allowed to drive to school other than seniors. These suggestions would help limit the number of cars in the neighborhood and is an environmentally superior alternative. He thanked the ARB.

Kimberly Wong advised the ARB of a sign she read on the parking garage at the Stanford Shopping Center. The sign warned people of chemicals present in the garage which could be hazardous and cause cancer, birth defects, or other reproductive harm. It further warned people to stay only as long as necessary. Breathing fumes in an underground garage would be much worse so she questioned why Castilleja had not submitted a plan without the underground garage. She urged the ARB not to approve the underground garage for that reason as well as the other potential environmental impacts. She suggested a phased approach to the project with the classrooms being the priority. Castilleja does not need to build a garage for 30% increased enrollment until they prove they can manage their TDM. The underground parking would be easy to build, but difficult to remove later.

Julia Ishiyama, resident, thanked the ARB for its time. She stated she was born and raised in Palo Alto and attended Castilleja for seven years. She lived in Colorado for a while but has returned. Palo Alto has grown and evolved and both Palo Alto High School and the Junior Museum and Zoo have been renovated to better serve the community. Castilleja deserves the same chance to modernize. She has followed the project since inception and has watched the plans evolve in response to neighborhood input. The project is ready for approval. The Bay Area is booming, but the residential blocks are as quiet as ever thanks to Castilleja's rigorous TDM program to reduce car trips in the neighborhood. She urged the ARB to approve the proposed garage that maximizes the number of underground spaces to preserve neighborhood tranquility. The City Council has suggested 52 spaces be allowed underground and she hoped they would support at least that many. The ARB should consider the option that allows for 69 spaces below grade. That would not increase the size of the garage or the total number of spaces; it would keep more cars off the street level, which is in line with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan prefers underground parking to surface lots. The tree lined streets of Palo Alto are important, and she was happy that Castilleja worked to preserve and add trees to its neighborhood. She hoped the ARB would approve the pool proposal including the plans to relocate a stairway and transformer to responsibly protect another tree. New delivery plans also reduce street level impacts. She understood that the ARB already endorsed Castilleja's prior plans, and she requested they do so again and move the project forward.

Winter Dellenbach was relieved to hear that the Urban Forestry office has required that GPR be used to confirm the roots for Tree #89. Current plans might change depending on the GPR findings. She urged the extension of the GPR use for Oak Trees #102 and #155 and possibly others. She also asked the Urban Forester if they had formally signed off on the Tree Protection Plan and stated she would like to hear the answer during the meeting. She supported the idea of a street tree security deposit. It has been used in the City before and is reasonable. Regarding construction phasing Castilleja's preferred option is to leave students on campus in temporary classrooms on the field. The project is vast, and students cannot be left on campus during both underground and aboveground construction. She practiced law for 20 years and it is not in the best interest of the children to be present during the construction for 34 to 58 months. It is



unreasonable and unhealthy for the students. Each student has been apportioned 20 sf in the temporary classrooms. She wanted to learn from today's meeting if that met State standards.

Cindy Chen, resident, thanked the ARB for its time and indicated she had spoken at a prior hearing in support of the project. She thanked the ARB for its vote in Fall 2020. The update to the campus will be a significant contribution to the neighborhood and City. She appreciates many options Castilleja has provided for review. The willingness to offer multiple solutions to choose from shows that the school is listening to feedback and is willing to compromise. She lives on Emerson and is invested in the modifications to the pool, preserving trees, and the loading options. By moving the pool the school is showing its commitment to the trees of Palo Alto. The overall tree plan increases the canopy by over 100 trees. Both choices on Emerson vastly improve upon current conditions. The existing building on Emerson desperately needs to be updated. She requested the ARB weigh the options and help the project move forward. Castilleja has reduced their square footage to place the new structure in line with previous permitted square footage. With the massing changes, increased setbacks, and lower roofline the building will be more suited to the scale of the neighborhood. As a neighbor she was ready for the project to begin and asked the ARB to help facilitate that.

Ms. Klicheva stated that there were no more public speakers.

Chair Thompson explained that the applicant would have 10 minutes to respond to the public comment.

Mindie Romanowsky, Land Use Counsel for Castilleja, thanked the ARB for its time. She stated that the team would answer questions posed by the public. The question about the frequency of deliveries and trash pickup could be answered by Kathy Layendecker.

Kathy Layendecker explained that the answer was nuanced, but she would try to make it clear. They have very little activity before 6:00 or 7:00 a.m. except for waste pickup. They have tried to move the time to no avail. It is difficult to get the trash agency to change its schedule. They would be pleased to receive help on this matter if anyone could offer it. In terms of large trucks, they do not have any tractor trailer or semi-trucks which come between 6:00 and 7:00 a.m.; the largest trucks come in the middle of the day and only a few times a week. Other deliveries do happen daily such as FedEx and the United States Postal Service (USPS).

Ms. Romanowsky indicated she wanted to respond to a few comment themes. She was grateful to the interested parties over the past 5 ½ years who have given input to the project. The tree work was done at the neighbor's request. They took at critical eye and did what they could to protect the trees. She would let staff reply to the question about if Urban Forestry had blessed the plan. With respect to the questions about the health and safety and environmental sanctity of the below grade parking she stressed that she was not an expert in water tables, air quality, and other concerns but they do have experts in the room. She asked that the environmental consultant speak to the issues for the public's knowledge. The reason the below grade parking was deemed environmentally secure is because that work was done. The proposed acoustic fence in Scheme E was studied by the noise consultant, who is present for questions. The landscape and tree consultants are also present for questions regarding the GPR. She reminded the ARB that the project has been called many things, including an expansion. While Castilleja is looking to grow enrollment, it is not expanding. She encouraged members of the public to study Ms. French's slide and the report on the website which shows the existing square footage on campus and the proposed

Page 8 of 27

Architectural Review Board Meeting  
Summary Minutes: 12/2/2021

square footage, which is less. There is a variance requested to maintain above grade square footage, but they will build less than is currently in place. She thanked the consultants for their work. She asked the project team to add their thoughts.

Mike Bellinger, BFS Landscape Architects, said he worked with Mick Bench during the early phases of the project on testing the tree conditions. Mr. Bench tried to verify the root conditions and feels very confident about it. GPR is a new advancement in technology and could be effective for a couple of trees of concern.

Ms. Romanowsky explained that there were many options for the ARB to explore. They will comment on the massing and square footage. Based on prior ARB feedback they iterated several ways for consideration. They have heard from many neighbors on the Kellogg side who appreciate the design that the ARB informed. Any more porous iterations may cause neighbors to be more involved in campus than they want to be, so the ARB should keep that in mind. There are five parking options for consideration. They are in favor of keeping many of the functions below grade per the direction of original neighborhood feedback. It is important to remember that surface parking would impede on the school's only athletic field. She requested the ARB remember the benefits of the below grade parking both environmentally and programmatically. The record and experts can speak to the benefits of the below grade parking. She thanked the ARB for its time and welcomed their feedback.

Chair Thompson closed the public comment and called for a brief break.

#### **The ARB took a break**

Chair Thompson called the meeting back to order. She called for Boardmember questions of the applicant or staff.

Vice Chair Lee requested clarification on the drawing set. She was looking at the bubbles and understood that was where the project was revised. Secondly, the staff report states that the preferred applicant option for parking is Option D; there was not much on Option D in the presentation, so she wanted to confirm that was the case.

Chair Thompson asked if the applicant understood the questions.

Mr. Woltag confirmed that the bubbles indicate where the project was revised. Regarding the parking preference he asked Kathy or Mindie to speak.

Vice Chair Lee clarified that the ARB approved 78 underground parking spaces. She sees that Option D includes 69 spaces. She did not hear anything from the applicant in terms of a preference for an option.

Ms. Layendecker explained that they were really looking to the ARB for its expertise. It has always been the objective to move the noisier activities to the center of campus and below grade as feasible. The City Council suggested the 50% be allowed below grade to reduce the construction impact and preserve the trees. They studied how far they needed to pull back the garage to be completely away from the trees and make a construction reduction and that is how they determined the 69 spaces. The applicant is open to Options D or E as its still the objective to move the noisy activities away from the neighbors.

Vice Chair Lee said that the staff report on Packet Page 11 (report page 3) says that the ARB has the authority to make recommendations, but that the Planning Commission had authority on the TDM plan and other things. Thinking of the ARBs findings, the bubbles in the packet, and the presentation she requested clarification from staff on how to make their comments.

Ms. French stated staff recommended Option E because of how it handled the trees. She asked the ARB to focus more on that option than the other parking options. In the parking options there are ARB focused issues such as the acoustic wall, the relocation of the transformer and the stairway. The subcommittee was supposed to address the stairway, but the item is now before the full ARB so they could discuss it. They should also look at the bubbles on the building plans. Council asked the ARB to reconsider and look at the compatibility of the new building with the neighborhood. Staff spent a lot of time on that and have items to go back to subcommittee. That would be a reason to continue the hearing. It does not need to be to a date certain. The next meeting would be in 2022 and the makeup of the ARB will have changed.

Vice Chair Lee asked for Chair Thompson's recommendations on how to structure comments.

Ms. French said that the PTC report was published. The public has been advised that it is on the webpage. The report covers the TDM and other items that were in their purview.

Chair Thompson said that Packet Page 9 had a list of six items the ARB has been asked to review. The TDM is not on the list, but Item F says, "other direction as the ARB determines appropriate," which is open ended. She asked Boardmembers to discuss the six items in their comments. She asked if there were further questions for staff or the applicant.

Boardmember Baltay stated he had three questions. He asked staff if the basement of the new building was included in the floor area calculations.

Ms. French indicated she needed to address a thought first. She said that members of the public had made comments on the tree conditions. There is a security deposit condition. There are about 12 Urban Forestry conditions provided to Council and Urban Forester Peter Gollinger is present and prepared to speak to the conditions. Additionally, there were questions about the excavation. It is not as low as the water table. Katherine Waugh is available to discuss the EIR. She asked Boardmember Baltay to repeat his question.

Boardmember Baltay said that the new building has a below grade lower level. He asked if the floor area of the lower level was included in the floor area calculations.

Ms. French said it was not. Just as the existing basements on the site when the finished floor is less than three feet above grade in the residential zone is not counted as GFA. It is square footage of interest, but not GFA.

Boardmember Baltay confirmed it was accurate to say that the school is increasing the size of its academic facilities substantially with the buildings. Otherwise, why would they do this?

Ms. French said that the amount of below grade sf is increased, but the above grade sf is decreased from current conditions.

Boardmember Baltay asked if it was viable for the ARB to suggest a tree security deposit.

Peter Gollinger, Acting Urban Forester, stated it was something they could do. It has been done on many other projects and was already included in the original draft Conditions of Approval (CoA) from Urban Forestry.

Boardmember Baltay inquired about the scope of the process.

Mr. Gollinger said it was for specific trees, which are itemized. He believed it covered all the protected trees that would be potentially impacted or moved. Generally, 150% of the value of the tree is held in reserve. The applicant submits an annual tree report detailing the health of the trees and there are benchmarks that must be met. At the end of the monitoring program if the tree is in good health the deposit is refunded. He did not know the length of the agreement without looking at the CoA.

Boardmember Baltay asked about the length of the monitoring program and the valuation process.

Mr. Gollinger explained that the valuation was determined by standards laid out in the Guide for Plant Appraisal put out by the (International Society of Arboriculture) ISA and is specified in the Tree Technical Manual. Generally, for these projects the City has used 150% of the value. Other municipalities are using up to 200%, but Palo Alto has not done so previously. Generally, the time period is three to five years after completion of construction. He would have to review the draft CoA to determine the exact length for this project.

Boardmember Baltay requested a ballpark valuation of Tree #89.

Mr. Gollinger could not provide that number without further work.

Boardmember Baltay indicated he wanted to know if they were talking about \$1,000 or \$10,000. He wanted a sense of how realistic the plan was.

Mr. Gollinger apologized for being unable to provide the number.

Boardmember Baltay asked if the tree deposits were common in Palo Alto.

Mr. Gollinger said that Palo Alto does them, but he had not been involved in the setup of any. The most recent one was set up and monitored by his predecessor, Walter Passmore.

Boardmember Baltay thanked Mr. Gollinger. He asked the architect to explain the changes made to the Kellogg elevation since the March 8, 2021, presentation to Council.

Mr. Woltag stated that since the presentation to Council there were no changes to the façade design. The changes recapped earlier were the ones recommended by the ARB in Fall 2020.

Boardmember Baltay confirmed that the changes were made before the drawings that Council requested changes on.

Mr. Woltag said that was correct.

Chair Thompson followed up by asking if there were any changes since the ARB approved the plan.

Mr. Woltag said that the changes that were shared earlier were recommended and approved by the ARB.

Chair Thompson confirmed Boardmember Baltay was finished with his questions and then called on Boardmember Hirsch.

Boardmember Hirsch said he had no questions.

Chair Thompson asked the applicant if the pool shift would happen regardless of the parking options.

Mr. Woltag explained that the pool shift was in the response Option E with the (below grade) parking the same as in Options A and B.

Chair Thompson said that there were discussions about the benefit to the trees from the shift of the pool. So, if an alternate parking suggestion happened she asked if the pool shift would happen independently for the other benefits.

Mr. Woltag said that the pool shift was about preserving Tree #155. They are linked together.

Chair Thompson clarified that the original proposal had a ramp going down and in the new proposal the garbage truck would be on grade and back out.

Mr. Woltag stated that was correct. They would have to move all the services from below grade to surface to save Tree #155 because of the eliminated access ramp. The pool shift further protects Tree #89.

Chair Thompson referenced Sheet AB808 Section Detail and requested dimension clarification on the wall near the pool.

Mr. Woltag said the wall is 6 feet high.

Chair Thompson noted that the person included for scale seems very tall.

Mr. Woltag said they would adjust that.

Ms. French said that Drawing AB808 did not contain the fence referenced by Mr. Woltag.

Chair Thompson shared her screen and pointed out the dimension she was requesting.

Mr. Woltag said that there may be a graphic issue, but that he understood the fence was 6 feet tall.

Ms. French directed Mr. Woltag to the text on the page and questioned some language, but the misunderstanding was resolved.

Ms. Romanowsky asked to address Boardmember Baltay's and Chair Thompson's questions on the massing.

Chair Thompson clarified that she was addressing the Kellogg façade.

Ms. Romanowsky explained that they took City Council direction to heart. Over the past 8 months they have reviewed the City Council Motion and tried to follow it. The Council moved that the matter be remanded to the ARB to reconsider massing. They did not make changes since it was remanded to the ARB. They are open to feedback on the massing.

Chair Thompson thanked her for the clarification. She ended the questions portion of the discussion and called for Boardmember comments.

Boardmember Hirsch was very impressed with the detail and study of the tree issues and commended the experts for their work. Castilleja is the most complex project the ARB has been asked to review due to the neighborhood, natural setting, and historical relevance. There are four major design decisions the school has made which will shape the future and their relationship to the neighborhood. The last evaluation focused on the aesthetics of the façades, but they should have deferred the evaluation and taken a broader view that looked at the commitments the school was making. The first priority is the school program which incorporates all classrooms, faculty, and dining facilities into one building that fills the whole site. Because of the low scale neighborhood, the planned expansion of the program and the zoning limitations the one building concept had to fit into three stories. The second decision was to strengthen and define the center courtyard space. The scheme separates the new structure from the historic 1926 existing buildings. The third decision was the selection of a design palette or modulation of the building's forms for the entire façade. The next decision was to commit to the neighborhood and relieve them of the burden of the parking issue. Several the speakers mentioned that the parking was on grade. Castilleja decided to locate staff parking below grade in an area limited by several factors including significant trees at the border of Embarcadero Road. The Council has focused on this issue and expects the ARB to consider it. The ARB findings under CoA state that they must protect the public health, safety, general welfare or convenience. The education building program requires a three story structure with one story below grade. There are more classrooms and educational spaces on the lower level than there are on each of the two above grade floors. Most of the classrooms will be devoid of natural light and ventilation. Based on ARB findings all projects must create desirable environment and therefore they are obligated to recommend that the designers rectify the omission. The height of the building was limited to 30 feet, but 33 feet is the acceptable maximum height allowed by zoning. A basement can be an additional three feet above grade. If the building were raised by three feet there could be high windows in many of the basement classrooms. The code allows 30% of the perimeter to have light wells. For the ARB to ignore the opportunity to remedy this situation would be a dereliction of duty. In the past the ARB did not consider the issue and he felt strongly that they should. The center courtyard surrounded by building walls designed with a consistent architectural language would be a major improvement. The decks are also wonderful possibilities to modulate the space of the courtyard and for users to enjoy. The ARB would be remiss if they did not comment on the AstroTurf as the centerpiece. He asked if it was a meaningful symbol in a pluralistic society. He thought it would be better to fill the circle with different scaled activity areas that may permit class gatherings, extracurricular meetings, etcetera. This could be an exciting design challenge for the project team. He noted that was only a suggestion. The third and fourth design priorities, the parking garage and building modulation seem like separate elements, but they are related. If the garage were exclusively used for teachers and staff parking it would function efficiently and there would be no need for the TDM. The two entry lanes could be one and the additional at grade parking spaces could be reworked to avoid the visitors having to cross a traffic lane for the garage entry and to maintain similarity to its current condition. That would respond better to ARB Finding #5 and for ease and safety of pedestrian traffic. If the present two lane drop off scheme is retained then 50% of the parking garage for teachers is unusable from 8:00 to 8:30 a.m. He asked where the teachers would park during this period. Students are dropped off in traffic lanes in the garage and must cross one or more traffic lanes with a long

walk to the classroom. The ARB must question this under Finding #4. A proper analysis requires considering an alternate scheme for the student drop off line and the garage should be exclusively for teachers and staff. Without the student drop off the pedestrian access to and from the garage could be simplified and more amenities could be provided. The space saving would likely allow an increase in parking and fulfill Council's tree preservation objectives. Relocating the drop off and pickup area may impact the neighborhood, but that is reasonable. Currently all pickup and drop off occurs on Bryant and is extremely congested. Kellogg is a significantly better location for drop off and pickup for multiple reasons. The entire building could be moved to increase the setback on Kellogg. The result would be a generous drop off/pickup area that is safe and efficient. The garage operation plan notes that the drop off and pickup take approximately 30 minutes. Students who bike or take other modes of transportation can enter or exit from other streets. Handicapped students could enter at Bryant Street. The architectural benefit of the altered scheme is the improvement to the length of the Kellogg façade. The interior façade has vastly improved, but the Kellogg façade has not. The new entry off Kellogg would allow for two or three discrete building volumes instead of one long structure. That was the directive both by the ARB and by Council. He repeated that locating the pickup and drop off on Kellogg is important to allow for convenient and safe entry to the midpoint of the school building while using the breaks in the façade to divide the building into volumes. He also noted that major facilities need a back door and service location. Placing it in a cellar ramp is not a good idea. The entry on Emerson needs to be an elegant entry and the landscaping is more important to move into the campus center. Where the vans are stored is behind tree cover and screened from neighborhood views. That is also a more appropriate area for a service entry. He understood that conflicted with the vans, but the service entry is not dealt with well in the new scheme and should be reconsidered. The transformer location needs further study due to noise and is not appropriate in the current location. Where the transformer is located is where the deliveries should be made to the building. If there needs to be a subcellar it should be under that part of the facility with an elevator to grade for access.

Chair Thompson started to speak.

Boardmember Hirsch indicated he was almost finished. He thought there were four principal items that he wants revised: 1) a program with a proper concern for base room classroom natural light and air, 2) the courtyard with more creative functional use of the design, 3) the Kellogg elevation with separate discreet building elements, and 4) the garage used exclusively for teachers and staff and surface area improvements and relocation of the vans. If those items are properly answered he would vote to move the project forward. He preferred the school to resolve the issues and for the ARB to leave the detailed façade considerations till later.

Chair Thompson called for the next comment.

Boardmember Baltay asked for Boardmember Lew's findings related to his research.

Boardmember Lew noted that he would be stepping down from the ARB in the next week and would not be around for future hearings on the project. He supports the staff's recommended Parking Option E to save Tree #155. He was concerned about the trash being at grade and the acoustic wall. The long fence is a concern and not interesting. He is not opposed to Option D. Exceeding the 50% maximum set by the Council is workable and it does seem to be better to have the services underground with the additional

ramp. He did not have comments on the phasing other than it is shorter and better. He preferred not to have students at a construction site. There are also more impacts to the neighbors if the school is functioning during construction. Regarding the massing, he watched the Council meeting and noted that Council Member Burt was concerned about the 400 foot long façade. Accordingly, he rereviewed the decisions and recommendations made by the ARB. He normally preferred portals or breaks in the building, but due to the Kellogg neighbor's concerns about noise he thought it was better the building was solid. Several Stanford buildings have portals and he looked at them. They vary a lot and are necessary for circulation. Castilleja does not have that need. The quality of the spaces is not great or conducive to students spending time together. He referenced the Packard Foundation in Los Altos which is a similar style to the proposed Castilleja building and explained its layout. He found the building "comfortable looking" and thought it would fit in the neighborhood. The proposed Castilleja project has similar dimensions, so he is comfortable with it. Previously Boardmember Baltay mentioned more variation in the roof and cornices, which he thought was difficult considering the height limit and the photovoltaics. If they want to do anything there it will require a Design Enhancement Exception (DEE) or a variance. He also considered JLS and Fairmeadow as they are in residential areas and those façades are 300 and 500 feet long respectively. The key is that they have windows on the street to add interest. With façade design he is looking for windows and variation, benches and places to sit, and lighting all along the street. The landscaping looks good. The windows and wood are good. Improvements can still be made on the Embarcadero frontage.

Boardmember Baltay thanked Boardmember Lew. With the parking Option E is the best choice because it does the best job of saving trees. The ARB must follow the City Council advice. City Council negotiated a political agreement that 50% underground parking is appropriate. Once a person accepts that fact Option E is the logical choice. He also supported Boardmember Hirsch's comments about the drop off and pickup process. The proposed location in the underground garage will not function well and the current drop off on Bryant Street is too congested. The only long term solution is to utilize the Kellogg frontage. However, that issue is beyond ARB purview, so he just wanted to mention his thoughts. He thought parents would attempt to avoid the garage. If the drop off is moved to Kellogg then a portal on that façade would make more sense. He requested additional detail on how the new service areas would function. He noted that when trucks back up they emit a loud beeping noise which would be unacceptable to the neighborhood. Those details need to be worked out. Regarding tree preservation Option E is ideal. He supported the idea of the tree preservation security deposit and that could be left to staff to plan; 150% seems to be a good amount, but 200% may be better. He requested a ballpark figure for the security deposits and noted that some contractors prefer to pay the fines than deal with the hassle of protecting a tree. The current phasing plan for the project is correct; putting the students on top of a newly built garage made sense. Requiring the school to relocate off campus is beyond what he saw as reasonable but moving the students to the middle of the circle would increase the length of time and safety risks and is also not a good idea. His biggest issue remained the massing along Kellogg. He asked if Ms. French could show Elevation Slide #16.

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Baltay preferred the shorter phasing scheme.

Boardmember Baltay repeated he liked the middle scheme. He thought it was listed at 34 months. He thought that was what the ARB originally recommended and saw no cause to change it. He thanked Ms.



French for displaying the elevation. The issue he has is one of compatibility with the residential neighborhood. The façade is too long and not residential looking relative to the neighborhood. He was distressed that the applicant made no changes. Five and a half years is a long time, but the applicant is not helping its cause when the City Council asks them to address something and they do not. The consistent flat height of the roof does not work and must be modulated. He appreciated the challenges but wanted to see more effort from the architects. The same applies to the trim band at the middle level. It is a nice idea, but it does not work on this building. With the fenestration anyone would say that the windows do not help at a macro level. They do not help separate the buildings or reduce the sense of a 400 foot long façade. It is not sufficient that the design is better than what is there, it must be the best it can be and more compatible with the neighborhood. The project can be improved.

Chair Thompson recognized Vice Chair Lee.

Vice Chair Lee thanked Ms. French, Chair Thompson, and the ARB for their work with the applicant to move the project forward in a positive way. She also thanked the community for attending multiple meetings and being engaged. She also appreciated the Council and PTC for their thoughts and direction. The ARB provides recommendations to Council as experts in their fields and spends time with each application. She thanked the applicant for five and a half years of work. The site and neighborhood are beautiful, and Palo Alto wants this to be a meaningful project. The ARB has specific findings to meet and there are some challenges. Council remanded the project to the ARB for additional direction. She recalled that the ARB saw the project in November 2020 and spent a lot of time with the applicant requesting revisions. There was a break in the Kellogg façade and other discussions that went back and forth. She did not believe there was a need for refinement or modification in the massing. She is pleased with the refinement of the elevation. She felt strongly that no further modification or adjustments are needed to Kellogg. The material palette and the setbacks that exist with the preserved landscape and trees are wonderful. She is a strong proponent of the project. With respect to tree preservation and protections she had the utmost confidence in staff and Urban Forestry. She supported standard draft conditions like those used on other projects of this size. There has been a huge effort in protection measures, well beyond what the ARB had previously requested. She is comfortable with the tree preservation and protections cited in the packet. Regarding construction phasing, she agreed with Boardmember Baltay. She has been on campuses and at schools where they use the portable classrooms, and it is feasible. What the ARB previously approved remains her recommendation for the way forward. Boardmember Lew made comments about the fence, its length, and some landscaping opportunities and she thought that was something to explore. The acoustical fence along the pool is fine as presented. She appreciated Option E for preserving the trees and supported that option; however, Option D with more underground parking makes sense. Given the remand and the Council requesting the 50% Option E is the direction to go. Underground parking and a parking garage at the site are not negatives in her opinion. The underground parking and modernization of the school go hand in hand. She appreciated being able to review the application.

Chair Thompson thanked the ARB, applicant, and staff. She also supported Option E but had concerns about the truck delivery. The long acoustic wall is not visually represented in the packet since it was a late addition. When the applicant returns they should include the information. She was concerned that it was very long and did not have enough visual interest. She suggested landscaping or using a material like that

which is proposed to surround the transformer. She agreed with Boardmember Hirsch that the transformer might be noisy and could require an acoustic fence.

Boardmember Hirsch stated the fence was there.

Chair Thompson clarified that it was a different fence. She was open to a different location for the transformer, but if it does stay in that position it needs mitigation measures. For the building façade she agreed with Vice Chair Lee. The changes the applicant made since the last round of recommendations are sufficient to mitigate the façade. She watched the City Council meeting and heard the comment about the long façade. She shared her screen and demonstrated the breaks in the façade. She disagreed with the comments on the rooflines. Changing the roofline interrupts the design intent and she wanted to emphasize that there were many breaks and voids in the façade. The applicant was very responsive to previous ARB comments. The material choice makes a large difference and she stressed there was more complexity to the project than a giant façade. There is a lot of in and out and nuance. The façade is sufficient in her opinion. If there is a desire to push it she would like to keep it in the parti. She did not want random roofs that do not relate to the overall design. She was pleased with the changes made to protect trees. She could support either construction period. She looked at the subcommittee items that were open from the last meeting and noted that many were addressed. She listed several and noted their resolution was acceptable. The items not fully addressed were related to the lighting plan so the applicant should review that prior to the next City meeting. The applicant was also asked to consider a transparent sound barrier at the Kellogg balcony. That is a considerate suggestion, but she thought it would damage the façade. She asked the applicant to focus on the Bryant Street elevation before they returned. She called for discussion or response to comments.

Ms. French clarified that the acoustic wall was along Emerson, not Bryant.

Chair Thompson agreed that she had meant to say Emerson.

Ms. French said that she wanted a clear Motion from the ARB. If there can be direction that would be preferable to staff.

Vice Chair Lee commented that the Council had asked for the ARB opinion on the construction phasing. She felt portable classrooms in the circle was not a proper direction. She noted that moving forward she and Boardmember Lew would not be on the ARB so she suggested if there would be an ad hoc subcommittee that it should consist of two Boardmembers who have seen the project historically. It benefits the process to have people involved who understand the history and community engagement.

Chair Thompson stated that she heard support from four Boardmembers for Option E. She asked if Boardmember Hirsch supported Option E as well.

Boardmember Hirsch wanted to make further comments. He felt that maximizing the underground parking was the objective and there is a conflict between the easement, trees, above grade parking. There is not total agreement on the idea of making Kellogg Street the main campus entrance for the pickup/drop off. He thought it would be important to include that in a Motion. With the drop off changed there would be a change in the parking design. He felt the project needed to return to the ARB with a capacity and if the Council insists on 50% then that is what should be used. The extra space that might be allowed if the

parking were decreased could be used for a better egress from the garage to the open space above. That should also be mentioned in the Motion. If the garbage pickup were moved then the fence was not necessary. The garbage could be accessed off the present location for van storage. That area needs more study. He disagreed that there should be fencing or other visual limitation at the Emerson entry to the courtyard. The van issue is a conflict as the proposed area could be the service area instead. Nobody discussed the basement classrooms, which are 20 out of a total of 26. They have no natural light or ventilation from the outside. He did not see how the ARB could approve a building with cellar classrooms, but no other Boardmember mentioned it. He put it to the parents to consider. There are possible alternatives to improve the classrooms as he previously discussed and that should be studied. Boardmember Lew mentioned that he had said there should be a break in the building. He thought there could be two breaks and they do not have to be passageways to the center, but rather an entry point to the property. The breaks are the things that could be of a completely different nature. They could be glassier, or the top floor could be setback. The Kellogg façade needs to be restudied. What the ARB suggested created a modest change but did not break up the volume appropriately. He was concerned that the vans were never discussed and were scattered throughout the site. The idea of the garage was to put vehicles below grade. The housing sites might be a better location since they are part of the campus. They could be used for van storage and to create a backdoor entrance to the courtyard. He was sorry to hear that his fellow Boardmembers were not focusing on the fact that there are classrooms in a cellar with no windows.

Ms. French apologized for interrupting and indicated she needed to make some corrections. The classrooms have light and ventilation, and the applicant could share that information.

Boardmember Hirsch stated he would like to hear from the applicant.

Ms. French asked if the architect was able to describe light and ventilation.

Mr. Woltag said that he appreciated Boardmember Hirsch bringing up the subject. He explained that the plan was covered previously at prior meetings. He stressed that not all classrooms are the same. Some are for music and other subjects which would benefit from acoustic separation from the rest of the environment. Sometimes they have to fight the light or sound in above-grade classrooms, and it is better for the subject to be taught below grade. These are the reasons why the applicant team wanted to locate those classrooms below grade. Some of the acoustics from those classrooms might bother the neighborhood if above grade. They did have lots of consideration about day lighting. Per Boardmember Hirsch's suggesting there is clerestoried lighting along the Kellogg Street elevation. There are also skylights to bring daylight to the common spaces and lounge spaces in the lower level. They have completed daylight analysis and feel very strongly that the spaces will be wonderful. The rooms do not feel like they are in a cellar and there are many places with views to the outdoors. He agreed with Boardmember Hirsch that lighting was extremely important and noted that the design focused on making the lower level classrooms great places to be.

Boardmember Hirsch asked to see the drawings.

Mr. Woltag said he was looking for the drawings and would try to pull them up.

Boardmember Hirsch said that from what he could see approximately 20 of the classrooms did not have either skylights or light wells.

Chair Thompson suggested they hold their comments until they saw the applicant's drawings.

Ms. French said that Boardmember Hirsch mentioned using the two residential parcels for something other than the homes that are there. That was a contentious part of the prior application design. The homes are not part of the campus, they are part of the housing pattern on the street and neighborhood. The neighbors very much want the houses retained. She would not want to go backwards on the issue because its resolution took a while.

Boardmember Hirsch said he understood that the neighbors wanted that, but the school has a need. To not use the properties as needed for the school did not make sense to him as the school has property rights.

Chair Thompson noted that Urban Forestry had raised their hand.

Mr. Gollinger explained he wanted to address Boardmember Baltay's question. The ballpark appraisal for Tree #89 would be approximately \$50,000 so the security deposit would be \$75,000. He stressed the number was not official, only an estimate. The public had also asked if Urban Forestry had officially signed off on the project and they have not. They have accepted and approved the Arborist's Report which was submitted by Dudek and are close to consolidating the conditions of approval. They have not officially signed off on the project yet.

Chair Thompson thanked Mr. Gollinger for the clarification.

Ms. French said that regarding the reimagining of the drop off/pickup line, involves the Tire Index, queuing, and other issues. If the ARB gives that direction it brings up a whole host of environmental review items.

Vice Chair Lee stated she did not have any requests for further study of the drop off/pickup area. She asked Ms. French to clarify what was needed from the hearing. She thought they were just commenting on the project and that a summary would be provided to the applicant.

Ms. French said that members leaving the ARB is a factor. She would appreciate getting an understanding from the current ARB on the project since it had worked on the project for two years. Straw polls or voting on site planning and Option E would be helpful. She suggested Chair Thompson run through all Items A through F.

Chair Thompson said that the first item was the overall site planning refinements. That includes the new location for the transformer and stair. She called for a straw poll on those items.

Vice Chair Lee said yes.

Boardmember Lew said yes.

Boardmember Baltay said he was in favor of those items and suggested that he heard an impassioned plea from Boardmember Hirsch to study the project at a higher level. He asked if the ARB could vote on

whether to pursue those issues for the record. He respected Boardmember Hirsch's opinions but noted the ARB could not continue to argue the same items over and over.

Chair Thompson explained she planned to take a straw poll.

Boardmember Baltay supported that plan.

Chair Thompson asked for Boardmember Hirsch's vote on the original straw poll on the relocation of the stair and the transformer location.

Boardmember Hirsch voted no and then requested clarification about which staircase they were speaking about.

Chair Thompson explained it was the stair by the pool around Tree #9.

Boardmember Hirsch said that he needed to change his vote. He voted yes on the relocation of the stair and no on the transformer.

Chair Thompson said she wanted to redo the straw poll and split the items up. She asked if anyone wanted to change their vote on the transformer.

Boardmember Baltay said he was amenable to moving it if there was a better place, but that he was also fine voting yes.

Chair Thompson said that the majority of the ARB is fine with the two items as presented. Boardmember Hirsch suggested that they fatten the Kellogg pull in area and make it more prominent. She asked if that was correct.

Boardmember Hirsch stated it was.

Chair Thompson called for a straw poll on the issue.

Vice Chair Lee was not in support.

Boardmember Lew stated he was not clear on the issue. He recalled that there were no drop off plans in the initial schemes and then it was added back.

Chair Thompson shared her screen and said the pull in area was added according to the comments made at the last ARB hearing. She showed the ARB how Boardmember Hirsch wanted the area widened and lengthened.

Boardmember Lew said that Boardmember Hirsch had suggested running it down to Bryant, but that would not be possible due to the light well for the basement classrooms.

Boardmember Hirsch said that was correct.

Boardmember Lew said there were also existing trees and so he voted no on the straw poll.

Boardmember Baltay abstained from the vote and repeated that Boardmember Hirsch was discussing a series of smaller items that lead to a redesign of the project. They could not take little pieces and straw

poll them because staff wants other issues addressed to finish their report. If the project is to be redesigned at a larger level then this could be part of that effort.

Vice Chair Lee agreed with Boardmember Baltay and suggested straw polling the idea of a redesign. Further, she thought redesigning the project was incongruent with the ARB's former approval. She did not feel comfortable going through the list.

Chair Thompson thought a straw poll on a general redesign was too vague. She asked for a suggestion.

Boardmember Baltay suggested Boardmember Hirsch could make a Motion of what he would like to see redesigned and see if he could get a second.

Chair Thompson said she had a list of the items Boardmember Hirsch wanted to redesign which she would go through.

Boardmember Baltay suggested Boardmember Hirsch make the Motion and cluster the items as he saw fit. If he could get a second then there would be a vote. If the Motion fails then the matter is put to rest.

Vice Chair Lee said she was fine with going through Chair Thompson's list.

Boardmember Hirsch said he would be happy to make his own request.

Chair Thompson said he was welcome to but thought he would get more support item by item.

Boardmember Baltay suggested Boardmember Hirsch hear the list.

Chair Thompson said that the items were Kellogg Drive, the clear story, raising the height of the building, and Option E.

Boardmember Hirsch said the first one was to relocate the drop off/pickup area from the garage to the Kellogg Street side of the building. He had not voiced an opinion on it, but the phasing issue needed to be addressed. He was in favor of the school moving off site during construction for all the reasons mentioned by other people. It is unacceptable to have the children in the construction zone.

Chair Thompson indicated that she had only listed the items Boardmember Hirsch brought up. She did have a longer list including the other issues.

Boardmember Hirsch suggested they return to her list.

Chair Thompson said that she would revisit the idea of making the Kellogg drive in larger.

Boardmember Hirsch wanted to focus on that and making Kellogg the drop off/pickup spot.

Chair Thompson called for the straw poll.

Vice Chair Lee voted no.

Boardmember Lew voted no.

Boardmember Baltay supported the idea.

Chair Thompson indicated she was a no and the straw poll failed. The next item for straw poll was the preferred parking layout Option E, as proposed.

Vice Chair Lee supported Option E and asked if Chair Thompson would review the other options.

Chair Thompson said no.

Vice Chair Lee said she would support Option E or Option D.

Chair Thompson indicated that Boardmembers were welcome to state other preferences in their comments.

Boardmember Lew said he felt the same as Vice Chair Lee.

Boardmember Baltay also agreed with Vice Chair Lee.

Boardmember Hirsch agreed with Vice Chair Lee as well.

Chair Thompson stated she also agreed. The ARB could support Options D or E. Only one Boardmember discussed the roof deck changes to the plan. She asked if the ARB supported the change.

Vice Chair Lee was in support as presented.

Boardmember Lew voted yes.

Boardmember Baltay stated he would like to see further changes to the cornice design.

Chair Thompson clarified she was polling on the roof deck change. The applicant removed gross footage.

Boardmember Baltay stated he was in favor.

Boardmember Hirsch was in favor.

Chair Thompson indicated she was also in favor. The next item is the Kellogg façade length and if the applicant should be encouraged to change what was previously approved.

Vice Chair Lee did not desire any modification.

Boardmember Lew supported additional modifications.

Chair Thompson asked if there was anything specific he wanted.

Boardmember Lew explained his vote was just generally supporting the Council's direction.

Boardmember Baltay said he supported further refinements to the Kellogg design.

Boardmember Hirsch supported making changes to Kellogg's elevation.

Chair Thompson stated she did not support changes, but that changes won the straw poll. She asked the ARB what kind of changes they wanted the applicant to explore.

Boardmember Lew said he was comfortable with the dimensions but was open to changes in the cornice line. He thought the middle portion of the building was a bit muddled and could be better. He thought he was in the middle on the issue but leaned toward making changes since that was Council's direction.

Boardmember Baltay thought there were three items to work on. First, the cornice line on the roof. Second, to question the trim band down the middle. Third, the fenestration patterning seems too consistent. At a higher level he did not think it was healthy for the ARB to have "camps" on the project. With new members coming in the applicant deserves feedback to act on. He wanted to be clear on the few things he wanted to see changed. The building has an elegant design and he agreed with Boardmember Lew's assessment that the massing has been broken up sufficiently. The pieces will be okay. The material selections are wonderful. He just wanted the school to be more contextually compatible. Currently it is not compatible with the neighborhood so something must change. He asked Chair Thompson and Vice Chair Lee to consider the concept of compatibility so that they could give the applicant direction that the entire ARB could support. The project deserves to move forward.

Vice Chair Lee said she was going to ask Boardmember Lew if he wanted to change his straw poll vote because it seemed as though he was conflicted. Council requested they look at the façade again, but he did not really have any comments. That could be seen as a vote on the other side. Secondly, there are no sides in the ARB. She felt that the design as presented and approved previously by the ARB was compatible with the neighborhood.

Chair Thompson said that she was not trying to create division in the ARB and welcomed a debate. In one of the first presentations the applicant did for the ARB there was a diagram showing the elevation of the streetscape and used that to inform the rhythms of the new building. That was one of the most convincing diagrams she had seen about how the project is contextual. She asked why other Boardmembers felt it was not contextual. She thought there was a rhythm that felt small scale and made the façade nice.

Vice Chair Lee thought it was clear where each Boardmember stood with their comments other than Boardmember Lew. Maybe it was enough to say that the ARB was split 3-2 on the issue.

Boardmember Baltay said that ordinarily he would agree with Vice Chair Lee, but as Boardmember Lew was stepping down that leaves the applicant in an awkward position.

Vice Chair Lee said that maybe Boardmember Lew needed to speak.

Boardmember Hirsch said that he agreed with a lot of what Chair Thompson and Vice Chair Lee were saying, but that the distinction between the volumes was not strong enough.

Chair Thompson asked specifically how it should be strengthened.

Boardmember Hirsch said that the entry on the left was weak. The reality of what would happen is not just the outside of the building and he accepted that. The building was pretty well done above grade. The definition of the separation of the volume does not work with the entry on the left. The building needs work, but otherwise the texture is residential in feel and the window patterning works well. It does not emphasize the two in between entry points. He was not thrilled with the roofline and requested to see how the building would look at dusk. The façade should not be dramatized like the center courtyard.



Ms. French suggested the applicant show the compatibility study. That was last shown in August 2020.

Chair Thompson said that she would like to know if Boardmember Hirsch and Boardmember Baltay wanted to see it.

Boardmember Hirsch said he would like to see it.

Boardmember Baltay agreed.

Mr. Woltag said that he found the presentation Chair Thompson had referenced and shared his screen. He explained it was previously presented. They walked through the neighborhood and took in the variety of the residences. There is a variety of materials, eaves, window sizes, and setbacks. The residences form a fabric that does not have a hierarchy of a grand gesture. They wanted to reflect that back on the longest façade of the project, Kellogg street. He displayed the diagrams they used to inform the design. He showed the ARB how the façade of the building overlaid the neighborhood context diagram. The façade meets the street with variation. There are eave and parapet conditions, there are outdoor balconies and garden spaces that they believe define a variety of conditions on Kellogg.

Chair Thompson requested Mr. Woltag go back to the previous slide.

Mr. Woltag showed the slide titled "Neighborhood Context."

Chair Thompson told Boardmember Hirsch and Boardmember Baltay that this was the parti diagram she had referred to and had remembered seeing.

Boardmember Baltay did not find the diagram convincing as it was not the way the neighborhood was perceived; it was a clever graphic. He did not find it to be the context.

Chair Thompson said that it was the parti, the design intent, not the context. If the ARB is going to suggest façade changes then it needs to be part of the parti.

Boardmember Baltay pointed out that the second story plate line was dead flat over the length of the blocks. That is what is not true in the context and is what he objected to on the project. It should not all appear to be the same height.

Chair Thompson said that she could not agree because she thought the façade was in response to the context. The context has the variation, and the façade is a calm, flat thing in the sea of varied heights.

Boardmember Hirsch said that the applicant could raise the roofline and make breaks in the one long line. He thought that was what the Council Member was most concerned about. One could take the interior plan and express it differently on the outside and that would give variety and be more like the neighborhood.

Vice Chair Lee requested the applicant show a 3D perspective and material palette. She did not want to continue the debate, only to point out that the ARB had approved the elevation. There was a lot of agreement in the past meetings. She again asked to hear from Boardmember Lew as it was clear how the other four Boardmembers felt and that would give Ms. French, the applicant, and the community direction. Then the ARB could move forward.

Chair Thompson agreed.

Mr. Woltag showed several slides illustrating the variation. He said it is not a consistent eave line across the whole façade.

Chair Thompson showed the elevation.

Mr. Woltag said that the eave line is not experienced in the elevation as it is broken multiple times across the length of Kellogg. There are openings that go through the whole façade. Elevations do not tell the whole story.

Vice Chair Lee thought that was helpful and that everyone had given their thoughts on compatibility and context. She felt strongly that no modifications were needed.

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Lew would like to speak.

Boardmember Lew said he had nothing further to add. The project will be sent back to the Council, so they need to reexamine all the items again. There is room for improvement on the façade, but he had no specific recommendations. There are several issues with the height. Sending the project back to the Council as-is is not the correct decision.

Chair Thompson said that they might need to meet with the Council to understand its concerns. She stated that the ARB seemed split on the issue, but many helpful comments were made. She called for a straw poll on Boardmember Hirsch's recommendation to make the building taller and have more clerestory windows. She asked if that had support.

Vice Chair Lee did not support it.

Boardmember Lew supported it.

Boardmember Baltay thought that was possibly a good idea.

Boardmember Hirsch supported it.

Chair Thompson said that she would support it if the applicant wanted to do it. She called a straw poll on if the ARB was pleased with the changes to the tree preservation protections.

Vice Chair Lee supported it.

Boardmember Lew supported it.

Boardmember Baltay wanted to see the tree security deposit set at 200% replacement value and supported the changes.

Boardmember Hirsch was very much in support of the changes made to protect the trees.

Chair Thompson indicated her support. The next straw poll was related to the construction phasing. The middle length scheme of 34 months and the shorter scheme of 26 months were mentioned. She noted that the 34 month scheme was not in the packet and asked if it was still viable.

Ms. French said that the 34-month was the project the ARB previously reviewed related to Speiker Field. The other options from the project are the 58 months in the circle and the off-site option of 26 months.

Chair Thompson called for a straw poll on if the ARB supported 26 or 34 months.

Ms. French added that the 34 month scheme was analyzed in the EIR.

Vice Chair Lee supported the 34 month scheme. She did not see the proposal for 26 months.

Chair Thompson explained that was where the students would be off site for the duration.

Vice Chair Lee said there was no site or other context provided. If the applicant wanted to pursue going off campus she could support that as well. Otherwise, she deferred to what was previously reviewed.

Boardmember Lew shared Vice Chair Lee's opinion but held a slight preference for 26 months.

Boardmember Baltay shared Vice Chair Lee's opinion.

Boardmember Hirsch preferred the 26-month plan to expedite the construction but would accept the 34 months if it was the only possibility.

Chair Thompson agreed with Boardmembers Hirsch and Lew. She could accept either timeline but preferred 26 months. That concluded her list of straw polls. She called for further discussion and asked staff if they had enough direction.

Ms. French indicated that she thought they did and appreciated the effort of the straw poll.

Chair Thompson asked if the applicant had any questions.

Ms. French thanked the ARB, applicant, public, and consultants.

Chair Thompson also thanked everyone and closed the item.

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

Chair Thompson called for the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) report.

Ms. Gerhardt said that NVCAP was removed as there should be no further updates.

Chair Thompson remembered that they did not continue the prior item to a date uncertain and called for a Motion.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Lee moved, seconded by Boardmember Hirsch, to continue 1310 Bryant Street (Castilleja School) to a date uncertain.

**MOTION PASSED:** 4-1

Chair Thompson asked if Boardmember Baltay wanted to speak to his no vote.

Boardmember Baltay felt that the ARB was doing the applicant a disservice by not providing them more solutions. The four Boardmembers who will still be on the ARB when the project returns have not compromised internally enough to give the applicant a fair description of what they need to do. The result will be that the applicant will look to the new Boardmember for answers, especially with respect to massing and façade design. That was not appropriate, and the group should compromise and find something that they could all support rather than continuing an already drawn out process.

Chair Thompson said that was a good point. She stated that Boardmember Baltay and the rest of the ARB want to be helpful. She took notes on the items discussed and what could be improved and assumed the applicant would take them into account.

Boardmember Baltay did not want to be publicly critical of Chair Thompson and Vice Chair Lee, but neither suggested modifications to the façade along Kellogg. By doing so they refused to compromise. City Council asked the ARB to compromise, and he was disappointed they did not put out a possible solution. If changes have to be made they should tell the applicant where they think they could reach consensus.

Vice Chair Lee said that she respected (interrupted)

Jonathan Lait, Director of Planning and Development Services, apologized for interrupting and stated that the hearing was continued, and debate was over. It was appropriate to give Boardmember Baltay time to voice his dissenting perspective and it was time to move on. The item was closed.

Boardmember Baltay apologized for continuing the debate.

Chair Thompson asked if there was an NVCAP update as it was on her agenda.

Boardmember Lew said he was not aware of any updates and the item could be removed from the agenda.

Ms. Gerhardt said it was taken off the digital agenda but may have stayed on the paper version.

### **Adjournment**

Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting.

Ms. Gerhardt stated the next meeting would be December 9, 2021.