



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES: January 19, 2023

Council Chamber & Zoom

8:30 AM

Call to Order / Roll Call

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

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

1. Adoption of a Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for the Architectural Review Board During Covid-19 State of Emergency

MOTION: Boardmember Thompson moved, seconded by Vice Chair Baltay, to adopt the Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for the ARB During Covid-19 State of Emergency.

VOTE: 3-0-0-2

Oral Communications

Veronica Dao, Administrative Associate III, stated there is one speaker on zoom.

Ms. Shani Kleinhaus spelled her name for the record and stated she is an advocate for the Santa Clara Audubon Society and is a Parks and Recreation Commissioner, however she was not speaking on behalf of the Commission for this meeting. Santa Clara Audubon society sent a letter regarding 3300 El Camino and the issues with bird safety and lighting. Residents in Palo Alto value the natural environment. The majority of residents of Palo Alto rate the overall quality of the natural environment as good. Part of that natural environment is urban forests and the birds that come with it. Many birds fall victim to hazardous elements in the environment including transparent glass and reflective glazing. Many surrounding cities have requirements that any new buildings over 10,000 square feet must implement safety measures. Palo Alto has implemented for 3300 El Camino that there must be Safe Glazing. When questioned about what type of Safe Glazing there will be, Staff has indicated the City does not have an ordinance requiring Safe Glazing. The building at 3300 El Camino is within 300 feet of a creek and is surrounded by vegetation, additionally it has a green roof. It should have been required to use effective glazing on 90% of the glass façade anywhere near a green roof element. She understands the project has been approved and cannot be revisited, however she requests that the Board reviews the proposed Frye Development, and any other future development, and consider the aesthetics of the building for any non-human residents of the city.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, stated she and Garrett [Sauls] are reviewing the letter and the project is fairly far along. There is not a Code Section regarding bird safe glass, only a Comp Plan Policy, which limits staff's authority on future projects regarding bird safe glass.

Chair Hirsch stated he hoped that someone would be listening because this is an important issue, but the project has been approved.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Ms. Claire Raybould indicated there are no Agenda changes, additions, or deletions.

City Official Reports

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

Claire Raybould, Senior Planner and ARB Liaison displayed the ARB meeting schedule and said the hearing scheduled for February 2, 2023 is planned to be cancelled. The project at 3001 El Camino Royale is scheduled to move forward on February 17, 2023 and is an affordable housing project. There have been three Senate Bill (SB) 330 pre-applications that have been filed. One is for 4200 Acacia Avenue, which was formerly the area in the rear section of the property at 3001 El Camino site, for 16 units of multi-family residential. Another SB 330 pre-application has been filed for 3150 El Camino Royale and is the McDonald's property, as well as the fish market, which are proposed to be merged for the larger 380 unit housing project with 15% being below market rate.

Ms. Claire Raybould asked if there were any planned absences for the Boardmembers during the next couple of weeks.

Boardmember Thompson stated she has March 2, 2023 and June 15, 2023 are the only two planned absence on her schedule at this time.

Boardmember Chen noted she is scheduled to be absent April 6, 2023.

Boardmember Rosenberg said she is scheduled to be absent July 6, 2023.

Vice Chair Baltay commented he believes he is scheduled to be absent from the second meeting in February, however he will have to confirm the date and follow up with staff.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired about pre-application information pertaining to SB 330.

Ms. Claire Raybould explained the pre-application for SB 330 is very limited with information it requires; the applicant is required to give information pertaining to the hazards of the site, elevation drawings and a site plan.

Vice Chair Baltay asked what the entitlement process would be for this project.

Ms. Claire Raybould responded it would depend upon how the applicant files. Currently the applicant is proposing a State Density Bonus project which would put the project in front of the ARB and only the ARB. The only scenario that would put the project in front of City is Council is if there was a need for an over-riding consideration, if there were a need for an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and a significant impact were identified, significant and unavoidable.

Vice Chair Baltay questioned if the current drawings on file are available publicly on the internet.

Ms. Gerhardt added she would verify.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that would be good to confirm as this sounds like a good sized project.

Chair Hirsch inquired if there were zoning changes involved in the application.

Ms. Gerhardt responded there were no zoning changes.

Ms. Gerhardt added the only thing on file is the SB 330 application which is just to freeze the regulations. the actual project drawings are not on file yet.

Ms. Claire Raybould confirmed it is not yet part of the schedule for the ARB.

Chair Hirsch stated the tentative and future Agenda is next and appeared to be edited and inquired if information about the status of projects could be included under submittal area as it can be difficult to know which project is which without going to the listings of pending projects. The last project listed under SB 330 application (interrupted)

Ms. Claire Raybould explained the last column heading was copied by accident and could be crossed out, the project listed before that column is the 380-unit project.

Chair Hirsch confirmed the 380 project was the one specified in the discussions.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed yes.

Action Items

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 900 Welch Road [22PLN-00328]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Modification to Existing Master Sign Program to add Sign Exceptions for Two New Free-Standing Vehicular Directional Signs Along New Road Environmental Assessment: Exempt from CEQA per Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: MOR (Medical Office and Medical Research). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Emily Foley at emily.foley@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Hirsch began introducing the 414 California Avenue project and staff interrupted him to provide the correct project.

Emily Foley, Project Planner, shared her screen with the ARB and explained this project is a modification to the existing sign program for the Stanford University Medical Center (SUMC) and includes two new freestanding vehicular directional signs. The proposed signs would be along the new road Blake Wilber Road extension. The new portion of road was approved at the staff level due to it originally being approved as part of the SUMC Master Plan. The signs are consistent with Master Sign Program in terms of the typology of the signs, however this parcel is zoned Mixed-Office Residential District (MOR) rather than HD for hospital district. It requires a sign exception because the signs exceed the allowable area height and setback. Ms. Foley showed a slide for signage color and typology and explained the max height allowed for the signs is 5' with a sign size max of 27 square feet, and a required setback of 20 feet. The proposed sign size is 29.75 square feet with a height of 7'6 and a requested setback of 2 feet. There is also a

referenced medium and small sign but the larger sign is appropriate as it is the first sign visible as people enter the campus area. The proposed location is where there are currently other vehicular directions signs placed.

Chair Hirsch called for disclosures.

Boardmember Chen stated she had no disclosure.

Boardmember Thompson stated that she visited the site.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he has nothing to disclose.

Boardmember Rosenberg also disclosed she visited the site.

Chair Hirsch stated he has nothing to disclose but has passed the site many times and knows the area.

Ruemel Panglao with Stanford Medicine introduced Project Manager Molly Swenson and consultant Clearstory who provided the applicant's presentation.

Nikki San Miguel, signage designer with Clearstory, shared her screen via zoom and provided the presentation and showed for reference and context the suite of signage used by the SUMC. Many signs are provided throughout the medical campus to help facilitate vehicular navigation to all the medical destinations. Two signs are being proposed for the New Blake Extension and Ms. San Miguel showed the location on a map. For reference the signs marked in blue need modifications, the two marked in yellow require exceptions due to zoning in the MOR district. Both signs would sit across the street from each other and both would be at a setback of 2 feet and strategically location before the decision point of choosing a left or right turn lane.

Chair Hirsch thanked the applicant and checked for questions from the Boardmembers.

Ms. Dao confirmed there were no public comment requests submitted.

Chair Hirsch inquired if there would be a left turn/right turn situation at the main intersection at Sand Hill leaving the area.

Ms. San Miguel explained as traffic is leaving the campus on Welch Road, there will be a left or right turn lane to get onto Sand Hill, or vehicles can travel straight into the residential district.

Chair Hirsch asked if there would be a streetlight at that location.

Ms. Foley responded that is covered by the street work permit that is acquired through Public Works.

Boardmember Chen inquired if the other existing signs throughout the campus are illuminated.

Ms. Miguel responded there are two illuminated signs on campus, both indicating the location of the Pediatric and Adult Emergency Rooms. All other signage is not illuminated however they have the reflective vinyl copy so headlights hit them, and text is visible at night and confirmed the new signs are not illuminated and will also have the reflective wording.

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to approve staff's recommendation of a Modification to Existing Master Sign Program to add Sign Exceptions for two new Free-Standing Vehicular Directional Signs along the new road extension.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 414 California Avenue [22PLN-00207]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Minor Board-Level Architectural Review to Allow the Removal and Replacement of Existing Stucco with new Tenant Colors, Rooftop Mechanical Equipment and Enclosure, Removal of two Parking lot Trees, Replace Existing Front Breeze Block Screen Wall with a new Lattice System, new Landscaping, and new Signage. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of CEQA per Section 15301. Zoning District: CC(2)(R)(P) (Community Commercial).

Garret Sauls, Senior Planner, shared a presentation and provided information about the property. It is a Community Commercial (CC) zone, and the property is about 1/3 of an acre in size. The existing bank building will remain and the improvements include replacing damaged stucco, with grey paint, replace the breezeblock with aluminum lattice, new tenant signage, new rooftop mechanical screen and native landscape planting at entry and in the parking lot. Mr. Sauls shared rendering of the site plan, proposed new parking lot and where the landscaping would be. The canopy of the two remaining trees more than exceeds the required 50% coverage of the parking lot. There is a proposed mural on the California Avenue south façade side of the building that wraps around the side of the building, the proposed aluminum lattice will also be on the California side. Climbing ivy will continue down two panels of the side of the building from where the mural ends on the parking lot side, to help break up some of the massing of the 2-story building. The proposed mechanical screening on the roof is located towards the rear of the building. The damaged stucco is located on the rear of the building on the elevation side. Plans include introducing a new horizontal element where the breeze block is removed to create a pedestrian scale to the building. New extruded aluminum lattice structure will infill the three structural bays where the original breeze block stands. Additional study will be done regarding changing the pavers under the entry canopy, in addition to power washing the surface to return the concrete finish to a consistent monolithic color. If spottiness remains, a light grind and seal will be provided. The new signage will be along the new aluminum structure. The paint will be both light and a darker shade of grey. Staff visited the site to discuss, per the ARB's request, trees to be planted behind the bike rack. Due to a significant amount of utilities in the area, and public utilities requirement of not planting trees within 10 feet of their equipment, that location is not feasible. The applicant also determined it would be a security issue to put an operable window on the side of the building. The developer felt additional landscaping would be more appropriate than a bench in the corner of the property behind the existing mail boxes, however there may be an opportunity to put a bench in the area of the mural. Currently the bench is not included in the submittal.

Chair Hirsch called for disclosures.

Boardmember Chen disclosed that she visited the site.

Boardmember Thompson stated that she visited the site.

Vice Chair Baltay disclosed that he visited the site earlier in the week.

Boardmember Rosenberg also disclosed that she visited the site.

Chair Hirsch said that he did not visit the site, however he's been to the location several times prior to the application.

Ms. Gerhardt reminded Chair Hirsch the applicant also has a presentation.

Vice Chair Baltay commented he has questions of staff but was okay with waiting until after the applicant's presentation.

Ben Kracke, managing Principal Architect with STUDIOS Architect, introduced himself and thanked the ARB for hearing about the project. The building is on California Avenue and the property is on the pedestrian access point which is part of the Uplift Local campaign. The property is currently vacant. It is a standalone building with an adjacent parking lot that was built in 1958. Several options have been explored to replace the front breeze block entry. Per the 1997 Uniform Building Code (UBC) and 1998 California Building Codes (CBC) updates, projects with a heavy concrete wall or appendage attached to it will be penalized. To completely rebuild the breeze block for the short side of the building would take significant work, for that reason they are proposing to remove the current concrete breeze block and replace it in kind with a new modern lattice breeze block interpretation. The façade hasn't been updated since 1958, plans are to provide a new stucco wall covering with a new paint scheme that aligns well with the neighbors. Mr. Kracke showed horizontal renderings for the street view and side view. The signage has been brought down along the panel and enlarged slightly from previous plans, which aligns well with the neighbor context signs. The SVB with Chevron part of the logo would be back lit against the opaque portion of the breeze block. The lattice is 7 inches deep and the developer is attempting to use readily available profiles in a unique way to create the depth and texture the Board mentioned the previous review didn't include. The backing would be lighter grey, the backfill and lattice would be a darker shade of grey, Mr. Kracke commented samples are available if the Boardmembers are interested.

Chair Hirsch indicated they were interested, Mr. Kracke's associate passed out the samples.

Mr. Kracke's associate passed the paint sample to the Boardmembers. The white and blue metals shown are the colors of the signage.

Mr. Kracke went on to explain the landscaping plans for the site. Currently there are about 43' of planting along the front of the building, this is being proposed to increase to 305 square feet. The orientation of the parking lot is being modified to take advantage of the in and out through New Mayfield Lane, as opposed to the closed off pedestrian street. The artist for the existing mural is Mary Henry. With the invasive addition of the ATM machine and then covering it with stucco, the integrity of the original mural is likely not sound. The artist for the new mural will be rendering another mural that is aligned with Mary Henry's style of art. The mural will go full height and wrap the corner of the building. Mr. Kracke ended his presentation by stating he is available to answer any questions.

Chair Hirsch commented that was a nice presentation and inquired about public comments.

Ms. Dao replied there are not any raised hands.

Vice Chair Baltay requested the applicant explain which of the sample of colors provide go where on the lattice part of the breeze block.

Mr. Kracke explained the colors Boardmember Chen held up are for the aluminum breeze block profile and the colors Boardmember Thompson held up is the two-tone scheme for the building. The aluminum sample is not indicative to sizing, rather a sample of the material for the lattice.

Boardmember Thompson confirmed the colors of the samples in her hand with the applicant and asked if the aluminum would be shiny or a matte finish.

Mr. Kracke responded it will have a matte grey finish.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the paint samples have names and requested that information be made available.

Mr. Kracke confirmed they do have a name and he will provide the names of the paint samples.

Boardmember Thompson stated the design of the lattice has an appearance of having an offset and asked if the intent was to be a true waffle design or have the offset.

Mr. Kracke explained the lattice material would have more of a design of a true waffle and stated the darker tone grey is a Benjamin Moore Great Timber Wolf, and the lighter tone grey is the Benjamin Moore Bunny Tone Grey.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the mural in the rendering was correct and if an artist has been selected.

Mr. Kracke replied it is just a place holder, the mural has not yet been designed, once designed it will be reviewed by the Public Art Commission. An artist has not yet been selected.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the breeze block in the rendering is higher than the current breeze block.

Mr. Kracke confirmed it is about 8" higher from the streetscape from the original.

Boardmember Thompson commented when she visited the site there is a box on the wall up high, and inquired the plan for that.

Mr. Kracke stated that is an alarm and it will be removed.

Boardmember Chen questioned if the mural design would have a final review by the Public Art Program.

Mr. Sauls clarified this project does not qualify for Public Art Commission requirements. Their specific size requirement evaluations determine whether a piece is required to go before the Public Art Commission. Once the design is complete staff will have their public art planner review the design and identify any copyright issues and staff will approve that at a staff level.

Vice Chair Baltay questioned if it's possible to have the Public Art Commission review it?

Ms. Gerhardt replied this is not public art, it's private art.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if it's possible if the applicant is willing.

Ms. Claire Raybould stated the Commission could certainly view it, but that would be the applicants choice.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if staff could ask the applicant.

Ms. Gerhardt commented she's not sure if the Commission would view it as private art and that would need to be confirmed.

Boardmember Thompson questioned if that would require an extra set of reviews for the applicant.

Mr. Sauls replied yes.

Ms. Gerhardt stated she will follow up with this item.

Boardmember Thompson inquired what's preventing the artist and the design from being chosen at this time.

Mr. Kracke answered in part, the current project approval from this meeting. The client has a history of teaming with local artists for non-branded projects, he would have to speak with his client to see if he would be open to adding the additional time for another Board review process and could not speak on his clients behalf for this review about the design of the mural.

Ms. Gerhardt explained because this will not be reviewed by the Art Commission, it is an exterior element so the ARB is rightfully interested, and the ARB could request the element come back as a sub-committee review item with a recommendation that the applicant work with the Art Commission's staff who has a list of local artists that are often approved by the Art Commission.

Chair Hirsch commented his preference would be for the designers to choose the artist, he would hate to see someone else apply a design to the project and invited other Boardmembers to weigh in with their opinions.

Vice Chair Baltay reminded Chair Hirsch they were asking questions of the applicant and staff.

Chair Hirsch stated he understood; however, the Board will need to make a decision on which way to move forward.

Ms. Raybould explained typically when a project comes in with private art, staff reviews it the same as any modification and will make a determination of what type of review the project will require based on what had been previously approved. That would not preclude the Board from having a subcommittee if that was something the Board wanted to consider.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested confirmation that it was at the request of the ARB that a mural be added to the building due to the historical nature of the previous mural.

Ms. Gerhardt replied that the staff report indicated the Board requested the applicant introduce art elements or other design elements to wrap the corner of the building façade.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented she believed that was due to the historic nature of the original mural mosaic and if that had not been the case the mural would not be a factor in the current project.

Ms. Raybould answered she is not aware of the history.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested the other Board members confirm or correct her recollection of the intent behind the request for the art elements as she would hate to require the applicant replace the mural and then navigate several obstacles in order to do so.

Chair Hirsch recalled there was a considerable amount of discussion regarding the original mural as a feature of the original rendition of the building and stated Boardmember Rosenberg's question is reasonable.

Mr. Kracke noted that the independent third party historical review committee Page & Turnbull analyzed the property and determined the only historic item on site was the original mural and it was not deemed historical because so little remained after years of being compromised. The applicant is looking to bring back life to the front of the building by way of art.

Mr. Sauls confirmed Mr. Kracke was correct and replied to Boardmember Rosenberg's question that a lot of the previous discussion centered around the mural and the removal of the breeze block entirely and what could be done to honor the historic past of the building while keeping it aligned with current modern architecture.

Ms. Gerhardt stated Elise DeMarzo, Director of the Public Art Program, is available on zoom if the Board was interested in asking her questions and requested Ms. Dao add her in zoom as a panelist. Ms. Gerhardt asked Ms. DeMarzo to provide information to the Board on how private art is handled at the staff level within the department and any special programs CalAve may have.

Ms. DeMarzo explained this artwork falls under the size threshold to be considered public art. When private art is submitted it does not typically go before the Art Commission, rather is reviewed by her and her staff for any obvious issues. Ms. DeMarzo stated the city needs to be cautious about judging what people consider art on private property and used the press the Flintstone House in Hilldale as an example. However, there is a current Open Call for Walls in the California Avenue district which was launched for a mini mural festival that will take place in spring or early summer. In this program they are hoping to get interested property owners to offer their walls and the city will fund the murals on those walls and encouraged the applicant to look into that, with the understanding that if they pursued that, it would not be tied to this approval process.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested confirmation that if the applicant chose to participate in that program, it would not hinder the project approval process.

Ms. Gerhardt asked Ms. DeMarzo if the applicant chose to engage in the Call for Walls program would it hold up their permitting or renovation process.

Ms. DeMarzo confirmed it would not hold up their permitting or renovation and both the front wall under the breeze block and the side parking lot wall would be great walls for the program to help liven the district.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested the Board might consider making a condition that a private mural be brought back before a sub-committee, a mural designed through a public program would not need further review.

Ms. DeMarzo commented that murals commissioned through the city follow the city's vetting process.

Chair Hirsch stated subcommittees for the upcoming year will be determined later in the meeting.

Boardmember Thompson inquired what the interim color of the wall would be if the applicant chose to participate in the city's mural program.

Mr. Kracke stated for consistency the wall would be the darker in-fill grey.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the applicant might be interested in also doing the parking lot wall in the program.

Mr. Kracke said the square footage of the wall is substantial and they would consider it depending on the scheme of the design.

Boardmember Thompson questioned the material of the diamond shape on the ivy wall.

Mr. Kracke answered it's a diamond shaped cable system with stand offs.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if any structural retro-fit is being done to the building.

Mr. Kracke replied the applicant is not.

Vice Chair Baltay asked how that would affect the front breeze-block.

Mr. Kracke explained that due to the weight of the current concrete element, and it was built pre seismic code standards, there is no sheer volume frame. Current code does not allow that type of building front. Mr. Kracke stated it would be exorbitantly expensive to construct a code compliant brace for the current front of the building.

Vice Chair Baltay requested confirmation that Mr. Sauls had stated street trees could not be placed due to proximity of utilities and asked which street trees on California Avenue are not within 10 feet of utility equipment.

Mr. Sauls confirmed Vice Chair Baltay was correct and answered the existing street trees are treated differently.

Vice Chair Baltay questioned if the utility department has to approve all new trees.

Mr. Sauls answered that both utilities and public works review the location of new trees.

Boardmember Rosenberg referenced sheet 20 of the packet, under Pedestrian and Bicycle Circulation, and commented in the rendering of the parking lot there is an area where the pedestrian area overlaps where the intended planting is located and asked Mr. Kracke to clarify that area.

Mr. Kracke explained the blue dots in the drawing depicts the truncated domes for the Americans with Disabilities Act Standards for Accessible Design (ADA) parking, and part of the blue lines are not placed accurately in the drawing, pedestrians would have to walk in the parking lot.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired what the distance is between the parallel parking and the standard parking area.

Mr. Kracke replied it is a two way path area, currently it is a one way thruway as cars are not able to enter from California Avenue due to the pedestrian enclosure. There will only be rear alley access unless the pedestrian access uplift program is removed and explained the current curb cut is outside the property line. The applicant has proposed in their civil application to extend the greenway into the curb cut, additionally the current handicapped parking area is not compliant and will be reconfigured to current code standards.

Boardmember Rosenberg strongly encouraged the applicant to continue the pedestrian traffic are from where it's located against the side wall, rather than forcing them to walk through the parking lot and through the handicapped spaces to get to the front of the building.

Mr. Kracke stated he is not able to say at this time that they could make that alteration without first reviewing the turning clearances.

Boardmember Thompson requested clarity on the sprinkler apparatus on the parking façade and what effect it will have on the façade.

Mr. Kracke explained the building is currently non-sprinklered and the exact location of the sprinkler on the side façade will be determined by where the utility connection is located, the intent is to place it as far back on the wall as possible, there will be very little effect on the façade. It has to be accessible to the fire department and clearly visible. It can't be placed on the north wall due to the alley, or the rear wall of the building due to limited space. It will be the standard color red, with emergency valves.

Chair Hirsch inquired if the location has to be on the parking lot façade.

Mr. Kracke explained it is a pipe that is buried from California Avenue and putting it at the rear of the building would require another hundred feet of trenching and tearing out existing sidewalk.

Mr. Sauls commented that the Fire Department would likely need to have a say in any change in location.

Mr. Kracke stated they had hoped the main utility line was in a different location, however, it is buried right outside the front of the building on California Avenue.

Chair Hirsch thanked the applicant and turned the discussion back to Board comments.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that this is a minor architectural review and it's being grinded out. He feels back but it's an old building so unfortunately the more they look at the project, the more they are finding things to look at. The Public Art review process is if the project had been presented as a new build, the Board would have requested the Art Commission be involved. It is indeed private art; however, people have to see it which is why the Council created the Public Art Commission. Vice Chair Baltay stated he is distressed that staff can't find a way to facilitate the public volunteer Board to look at the application without forcing the applicant to navigate additional hearings, permits, and processing time. Since that can't happen he feels strongly that as private art, it should be brought back before a subcommittee. The mural was originally put there for a reason, as a Board we should hold the same standard. He is comfortable with adding additional review but would like to see it facilitate the application rather than

hinder it. Vice Chair Baltay is appreciative of the lattice work and believes it's a great idea, but he would like to see more detail on what it's going to look like, and believes the current drawings are a sketchy design intent and would like to see one final design again at the subcommittee level. Additionally, he's disappointed the bench idea didn't follow through. Some type of public seating is important on such a large stretch of California Avenue, and he would like that to be a condition, and he would like to see a better contrasted color on the top trim and feels the current colors are too muted. The lighter grey color seems a little too grey. That could also come back to the subcommittee level.

Boardmember Thompson commented she's struggling with the project because the drawings are not detailed enough to be approved at this hearing. The names of the colors are not defined in the drawings, the elevations do not show all the elements that will be on the elevations, and the mural, which is 30% of the front façade, is not defined. She's having a difficult time approving what's in front of the Board because of the vagueness. Similarly, the details of the lattice are not right in the drawing which makes approving the lattice difficult as the design intent of the drawings does not match what was described. Boardmember Thompson agrees with Vice Chair Baltay that the colors are washed out. It was stated the design intent was to achieve warmth, these colors are not warm. Grey is a cool color, warmth would be more in the taupe shades, and the contrast is lacking. The mural is a bold idea, she recommends the building get a little bold as well. Introducing a color could make a statement. As the applicant considers the detailing on the lattice, she might recommend the applicant look closer at the lattice design, doing something more delicate and less clunky might be better since it doesn't do anything structurally for the building. The dark grey color is a heavy grey and seems cold. The details of the designs are not present in its current submission and Boardmember Thompson is currently not ready to approve the project as it stands. If the applicant returns for another hearing she would recommend a more detailed look at the colors, consider the detailing of the lattice. The applicant is going in a good direction with the lattice but more could be done to make it more refined so it competes with what is currently in place.

Boardmember Chen thanked staff and the applicant for the presentation and all the information that was provided and commented there's been an improvement in the information that was previously provided and believes the applicant is moving in a good direction. The aluminum lattice on the front is a good idea, however she believes the scale is better than what is existing and adds a contemporary feel to the building. She agrees the colors are too washed out and suggested possibly going a little darker since it is a south facing elevation. The mural is a large feature for the building and will wrap around the building, which makes it viewable other than from the front. For this reason, she hopes the Public Art Commission can be involved in the reviewing process. More attention should be given to the scale of the graphics. Boardmember Chen believes the project is approvable at this level and all the details could be reviewed by the ad-hoc committee since it is a minor architectural project. She doesn't feel it's right to hold up the project at this point since the ad-hoc committee could review the details further.

Boardmember Rosenberg is somewhat in disagreement with her colleagues and likes the project and believes the colors are interesting; knowing they will be the backdrop of the mural she does not have an issue with the grey. There should be some oversight of the mural because it is a significant portion of the façade. She likes the rendering of the front of the building on the cover of the presentation. Art is highly subjective thus there will never be total agreement. Boardmember Rosenberg loves the idea of the mini mural festival, it's a unique way to get the city involved. Having an ad-hoc committee is also a great option,

or the applicant can return with a more firm design. The lattice is a beautiful design and the scale is appropriate for the front of the building and she likes the intent of angling the extrusion in order to create an interesting pattern. It is in the drawings of the lattice that she believes everything appears more plain, however, on page 12 the details of the lattice provide a more interesting look and feel. The pedestrian path should be all the way around the building and there should be a reasonable solution. Boardmember Rosenberg commented she did not have any issues with approving the project with additional conditions and believes it is a good improvement from the previous submission.

Ms. Gerhardt thanked Boardmember Rosenberg for providing better language and expressed an interest in changing her previous comment. Because private art is so subjective, it is probably not something the ARB should be involved in. Elise DeMarzo is highly qualified to review private art and it would be best left in her realm of expertise, if the applicant wanted to participate in the city program, [Ms. DeMarzo] would handle that as well.

Chair Hirsch stated he's intrigued by the Board's comments and believes the improvements have been incredibly well made and appreciated that all of the ARB comments made in the previous submission were considered. There is opportunity for the applicant to play with the contrast of the colors and fully qualified to make that decision. He believes Boardmember Rosenberg was on target with all her comments about the breeze block design. The detailing will be more evident in the shop design phase of creating the lattice. He does believe having metal around the columns will create a heavy feel, a reveal would be nice where the lattice meets the columns so it defines itself in that space and feels as if that could be a missing element from the drawings. The pattern of the lattice will make the colors in the mural more interesting. Thus the artwork itself will be very different once it's viewed through the spaces of the lattice. Vice Chair Baltay's comment is accurate in that it will make what's viewable of the mural even more dramatic. He is happy the graphics were brought down and is intended to be full bleed on the wall, and proportionately pleasing in aesthetics. He's not sure he agrees with Boardmember Rosenberg about the parking lot issue due to it being a small parking lot. To make the pedestrian change changes everything in the parking lot. Often times people have to walk through parking lots to get to a building entrance, and his preference is to see the ivy and plants along the wall to soften the aesthetics of the wall. The only issue he sees in the project are the small planters placed in front of things. Chair Hirsch preference would be to have the whole area from column to column turned into a planted area, or even place a bench. Most people won't walk through the dead area to the right of the door, it provides an opportunity to do something more interesting with the space. In response to comments about the mural, that is a very exciting piece of work and there will likely be more thought put into it, as it is a tremendous addition to the area and is very eye-catching. Chair Hirsch believes everything in the project is per the applicants intent and is carried to the level of being approvable, and that the applicant will carry it through the rest of the way.

Boardmember Thompson cautioned the Board that when a project is approved, the Board is approving what is in front of them at the time, and what is currently in front of the ARB does not have colors defined, the rendering on the front page is showing flat bars and detail is not showing that. The Board would be approving the details of the project, which do not represent what the drawing depicts. The current package is not what the Board would normally approve of in terms of the level of details provided. The entire scope of the project includes the colors of the walls and the lattice which are the two items that

are not defined. Approving the project as it stands would set a precedent for future items submitted before the Board. Additionally, the green screen is not defined, with no material noted.

Mr. Sauls requested Boardmember Thompson define what she meant by green screens.

Boardmember Thompson explained there is a part of the parking lot façade that is supposed to carry the ivy that was described as a cable structure for the ivy to grow on and it's not defined anywhere in the package. It is drawn as black lines without any information calling it out.

Vice Chair Baltay requested at the indulgence of the Chair he would like to find a way to push the project forward. He believes [Boardmember Rosenberg] is correct in wanting to push the project forward, and there is not enough information in the current set of drawings to justify approving it at this time. It's a small minor architectural project, that could be reviewed and approved through a subcommittee process.

Vice Chair Baltay recommended that the ARB make approval of the project with the following conditions: 1.) Colors of the façade return to the Board with greater detail and more contrast, 2.) The lattice screen information will return with exactly how it will be built and what it will look like, 3.) The applicant considers adding a bench or more landscaping in front of the building to the right of the entrance, and 4.) The applicant either returns to the Board with a final design, goes before to the Public Art Commission for their approval, or the applicant participates in the public mini mural program as described by staff.

Chair Hirsch seconded the motion with the additional condition that the details of the ivy mechanism also be included with the return to the Board.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he supports adding that as condition number 5.

Boardmember Thompson requested the details of the lattice include specifically the connection of the lattice to the corners.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that lattice details include the full constructible details of the lattice, including the materials, the design and how it will connect to the building.

Chair Hirsch commented that in general the Board agrees with the idea of the lattice, the details will need to be reviewed.

Ms. Raybould requested confirmation that the friendly amendment by Boardmember Thompson was accepted.

Vice Chair Baltay stated yes, the friendly amendment by Boardmember Thompson was accepted.

Boardmember Thompson added she believes the material for the window was also not defined in the presentation and would like to see that included when the applicant returns.

Boardmember Rosenberg walked the material sample for the window over to Boardmember Thompson.

Boardmember Thompson stated normally the Board receives the window mullion.

Mr. Kracke stated there are not window mullions. There are no new windows on the front of the building and the door will match the existing fixtures.

Boardmember Thompson retracted her request for more details about the windows.

Ms. Gerhardt requested more discussion about the artwork. She no longer recommends the art work return to the ARB due to artwork being subjective and no one at the hearing is qualified to review the art, and going to the Art Commission with private art would be an added process that is not normally required. Adding that would set a precedent and the ARB should remain mindful of that.

Chair Hirsch explained he believes they could handle that situation differently by having Ms. DeMarzo meet with the ARB in an ad-hoc environment.

Ms. Gerhardt added Ms. DeMarzo indicated that would be possible and that is likely a happy median.

Boardmember Thompson commented the first option was to return to the board with details of the art, if they would return with an elevation of the wall to include paint colors, texture, and line placements, it could be easily approved as part of the ad-hoc committee as architecture.

Chair Hirsch stated his concern is the architect may feel they are not capable of answering to those details without an artist's point of view.

Vice Chair Baltay addressed the staff and stated he envisioned the architect would find an artist would render a design and that is what would be presented as part of the building design. The city cherishes and encourages public involvement and this is a large mural on a major public part of the City, a part that the City is trying to bring more life into. It doesn't make sense not to involve the citizenry of the town in that process. The Art Commission are citizens who volunteer to help improve public art, and an applicant willing put up a mural design. The process should include the public and the city should strive to do it in a way that does not hinder the applicants process.

Chair Hirsch replied he is in agreement, however, all the Boardmembers have indicated they would like to see the project move forward as expeditiously as possible. He is concerned about involving the Art Commission and feels the presentation has been sophisticated enough with the plans to create the mural. However, he also feels the Art Commission will be concerned by seeing this type of artwork that was not presented before them. The agency has a qualified person who has experience in reviewing art and making the determination of whether or not the Art Commission should be involved in the permitting process. It is possible that between her review and that of the ad-hoc, the problem can be resolved.

Vice Chair Baltay stated all three options he provided in the motion includes public involvement via the ARB, the Art Commission or the City's mural program which is critical. The applicant should choose which process to follow. His fear is staff will review the mural for copyright compliance and nothing further and Vice Chair Baltay believes that is wrong. Staff can decide how it could work in an Art Commission review or an ARB ad-hoc review. The community needs to be involved.

Chair Hirsch requested hearing the motion again.

Boardmember Rosenberg added she has a concern with this being a private building, if the City wants to encourage more buildings and applicants to engage in this type of artwork, they need to make the process as straightforward as possible. By adding additional permitting processes, it will make sure that applicants who follow will come back with grey buildings and no art. Everything Vice Chair Baltay has presented is

fair and leaves the options open for the applicant in the direction they would like to follow, it engages the public and it moves the project forward. It accomplishes the ARB's concerns while maintaining it is private art.

Boardmember Thompson requested a friendly amendment to request the applicant to consider a color that is not grey.

Vice Chair Baltay requested help in rewording the motion to elaborate on more contrasting colors in such a way that the project receives 4 or 5 votes of approval.

Boardmember Thompson commented she would be open to a blue.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated changing the colors profoundly changes the application.

Boardmember Thompson clarified those colors would be approved at the ad-hoc committee.

Mr. Sauls interjected that the applicant had a blue in the previous design and the ARB requested they change the colors.

Mr. Kracke stated that it was originally a darker blue.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the friendly amendment is not accepted.

Vice Chair Baltay replied the motion stands with "greater contrast".

Ms. Raybould restated the motion as being the ARB make approval of the project with the following conditions:

- 1.) Colors of the façade return to the Board with greater detail and more contrast
- 2.) The lattice screen information will return with exactly how it will be built and what it will look like with a friendly amendment that the details should include the connection of the elements as well as the connection into the columns of building.
- 3.) The applicant considers adding a bench or more landscaping in front of the building to the right of the entrance, and
- 4.) Add details about the ivy connection on the side of the building.
- 5.) The applicant either returns to the Board with a final design, goes before to the Public Art Commission for their approval, or the applicant participates in the public mini mural program as described by staff.

Ms. Raybould requested Elise clarify if the Public Art Commission would be open to reviewing a project that is private art.

Ms. DeMarzo explained the Public Art Commission has had applicants previously submit private art for a courtesy review. They are open to it, but as private art, there's not much in the way of direction that they can add.

Chair Hirsch commented he believes a courtesy review is a good idea for this project.

Vice Chair Baltay cited part of the duties of the Public Art Commission is to “advise the Director of Arts and Culture on the selection and commissioning of artists ...”. And added there’s plenty of room within the Municipal Code for the Art Commission to weigh in on this project.

Ms. Gerhardt asked if the applicant would return to an ad-hoc committee on the conditions.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed yes.

Chair Hirsch called for a vote.

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Chair Hirsch, to approve the project and return to an ad-hoc committee with the following conditions:

- 1.) Colors of the façade return to the Board with greater detail and more contrast
- 2.) The lattice screen information will return with exactly how it will be built and what it will look like with a friendly amendment that the details should include the connection of the elements as well as the connection into the columns of building.
- 3.) The applicant considers adding a bench or more landscaping in front of the building to the right of the entrance, and
- 4.) Add details about the ivy connection on the side of the building.
- 5.) The applicant either returns to the Board with a final design, goes before to the Public Art Commission for their approval, or the applicant participates in the public mini mural program as described by staff.

VOTE: 4-1-0-0 (Boardmember Thompson voted no)

Boardmember Thompson spoke to her no vote as being the quality of the drawings.

Vice Chair Baltay requested the ad-hoc committee be appointed.

Boardmember Rosenberg and Boardmember Chen volunteered to be on the ad-hoc.

Chair Hirsch thanked staff and the application for the presentations.

Ms. Gerhardt requested the applicant follow up with Mr. Sauls on the process of the ad-hoc committee.

Chair Hirsch called for a 10-minute break.

The ARB took a break.

Study Session

5. 3200 Park Boulevard/200 Portage/340 Portage [22PLN-00287 and 22PLN-00288]: Study Session to Consider a Request for a Development Agreement, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, Planned Community Zoning, and Tentative Map, to Allow Redevelopment of a 14.65-acre site at 200-404 Portage Avenue, 3040-3250 Park Boulevard, 3201-3225 Ash Street and 278 Lambert. This Study Session will Focus on Feedback Regarding the Design of the Townhome portion of the Development Plans. The Full Scope of Work Includes the Partial Demolition of an Existing

Commercial Building That has Been Deemed Eligible for the California Register as Well as an Existing Building With a Commercial Recreation use at 3040 Park and Construction of (74) new Townhome Condominiums, a one Level Parking Garage, and Dedication of Approximately 3.25 acres of Land to the City for Future Affordable Housing and Parkland Uses. The Existing Building at 3201-3225 Ash Street Would Remain in Office use, and an Automotive use at 3250 Park Boulevard Would Convert to R&D use. Environmental Assessment: Draft Environmental Impact Report for the 200 Portage Townhome Development Project was Circulated on September 16, 2022 in Accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The EIR Comment Period Ended on November 15, 2022. The Proposed Development Agreement is Evaluated as Alternative 3 in the Draft EIR. Zoning District: RM-30 (Multi-Family Residential) and GM (General Manufacturing). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Raybould at Claire.Raybould@cityofpaloalto.org.

Ms. Raybould explained the project before the ARB is located along Park Boulevard. In accordance with the development agreement the parcels were labeled as they were intended to be subdivided into the cannery area, the townhome parcel, the City dedication parcel along Matadero Creek, the Ash parcel, and the Audi parcel. The ARB chose to split the study session and the portion of the town homes were discussed in the prior study session in December 2022. This study session is to review the Cannery building and the new parking garage on the same property. Ms. Raybould shared a presentation with a map of the property and the location of the proposed locations of each of the projects. The Audi dealership and Ash buildings would remain the same with no changes. The existing building was deemed eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources under Criteria 1 offense because of it's association with the cannery industry. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) identified that the demolition of a portion of the building which is everything east of the monitor roost, was deemed a significant and unavoidable impact and not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's (SOI) standards. The Council ad-hoc, the Historic Resources Board (HRB), and members of the community have expressed an interest in maintaining the remaining building as consistent with the standards as much as possible. Consistency with the standards is not a requirement because it's already identified as a significant impact and the building would already lose its integrity by demolition of a portion of the building. The defining character features of the building include the form and massing of the building, varied roofs, and structures with prominent paired monitor roofs, arched roofs, and visible gable roofs, and exterior wall materials, board formed concrete with corrugated metal cladding. Exterior cannery features include concrete loading platforms, cooling porch at rear of the building, exterior shed awnings with wood post-and-beam construction. Fenestration includes frame windows, garage door openings, and wire glass skylights over the former warehouse. Interior features include exposed wood truss ceilings, wood and concrete post-and-beam construction and concrete floors. Key changes identified as inconsistent with the SOI standards are the addition of the windows and doors for the north and south side of the building, fixed windows following sloped roofline, new entries, and the removal of shed awnings, changes to the north side to remove the loading docks and the materials for the parking garage. Staff is looking for Board feedback on some of these changes in trying to remain consistent with the SOI standards without losing some of the pedestrian features and site improvements. The Public Art of the project would be subject to the City's public art for private development requirements, with an estimated required contribution equivalent to \$840,000 for an anticipated piece that relates to the historic use of the site. The initial Public Art Hearing is scheduled for

the evening of January 19, 2022 for feedback on possible requested art styles. The applicant will choose an artist following the outcome of that meeting so a conceptual design could be created and would be presented as part of the project. The parking garage replaces surface parking spaces adjacent to Matadero Creek on a proposed City dedication parcel. The levels of parking at grade with a single two way ramp to second level on the west end. Key considerations of privacy and lighting adjacent to single-family residential uses. It does meet the daylight plane requirement and has a setback of at least 10 feet on the west end, with the rest of it set back about 25 feet. Room has been left for landscaping between the parking garage and the residential single-family uses. Staff is seeking feedback for consistency with the SOI standards for rehabilitation, while meeting the context-based design criteria and ARB findings, and consistency with the key goals of the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) of additional retail space, interest in having a public park area, and an interest in retaining at least the same amount of parking availability. Staff's recommendation is for the ARB to conduct a study session to consider the design of the commercial portion (remaining portion of the cannery building and new parking garage) for the proposed development agreement at 3200 Park Boulevard.

Chair Hirsch inquired if the Board had any questions about the staff presentation.

Boardmember Thompson answered she will ask her questions after hearing from the applicant.

Tim Steele, Senior Vice President of the Sobrato Organization (Developer), introduced his team which includes Evan Sockalosky with Arc Tec as the primary architect of the cannery building, the landscape architect Morgan Burke with Guzzardo Partnership, and Nektarios Matheou a civil engineer with KEIR+WRIGHT.

Mr. Sockalosky with Arc Tec introduced himself to the Board and commended Ms. Raybould on her presentation and began his presentation by stating the project encompasses five different parcels and showed a slide of the cannery parcel which is the focus of the meetings discussion. Matt David with Architectural Resource Group was enlisted to assist with the plans of the cannery building due to the historical nature of the building. The existing condition of the building is rundown and much of the glazing and light elements have been covered up through the years. The proposed project includes demolition of a portion of the building with historical rehabilitation as a guide for the changes. The original window line will remain intact, and the original skylights will be replaced. Large windows would be added at the front of the northside of building and on the southside of the building to allow more visual access to the inside private part of the space. Adjacent to the cannery building is the intended parking garage which was needed to replace the vacated parking area. The corrugated metal used on the cannery would also be used on the parking structure to tie the two buildings together and to provide additional light screening from the parking garage to the residential area and proposed townhomes. The previous dock area is being reconstructed into an amenities area and is the space between the building and the parking garage. The shed roof is being replaced with a beam structure to tie into some of the original features of the building. An open trellis and covered space will be utilized to help facilitate and indoor/outdoor community environment. A skylight is being designed for the retail portion of the space to give the community the opportunity to experience some of the historical elements of the building.

Morgan Burke with Guzzardo Partnership continued the presentation on the proposals for the landscaping of the property. On the corner of the building near the retail space an outdoor seating area has been

planned with a seating wall and a circular raised planter with integral seating. A coastal live oak tree will be planted on one side with an opening left on the southside for possible future integration with the development across the street and a bike rack is included. The commercial tenant's break out space, which is partially located under the rehabilitated canopy, will include accent paving which will allow future tenants to utilize flexible furnishings for outdoor space uses. Under the trellis space there will be raised planter walls, two outdoor cooking counters, and a central freestanding green living wall. The entry walk leading into the plaza space has been kept open to accommodate pedestrian traffic. Circular planters with seating will be used to unify this space with the retail space under the trellis, and another coastal live oak will be planted in this area. Accent pavers of varying colors will be used to help identify it as the entrance to the commercial space.

Mr. Sockalosky continued the presentation with the elevations portion of the project. He noted that the landscaping slide for the area between the parking garage and residential area did not make it into the presentation and they will follow up with the Board with that information. There is significant setback area that will allow for planting along that side of the parking garage. Mr. Sockalosky showed a slide of the building and parking elevations for context, due to the length of the building. The parking elevations will be low profile, with modern features that tie back into the historical features of the existing building.

Chair Hirsch requested information on if the Boardmembers had visited the site.

Boardmember Chen commented that she has not visited the site.

Boardmember Thompson stated she has visited the site.

Chair Hirsch stated he hasn't visited the site recently but has visited the site multiple times.

Vice Chair Baltay replied he spent a good amount of time at the site the previous day.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented she has visited the site last week.

Boardmember Thompson questioned if public comments are included in study sessions.

Ms. Raybould answered they do generally open public comments.

Ms. Dao confirmed there are no raised hands for public comment in zoom or in person.

Vice Chair Baltay called attention to the numerous letters included in the Agenda packet.

Boardmember Thompson asked for clarification on 380 Portage and if anything is being reviewed for that property.

Ms. Raybould explained the remaining cannery building will include 380 Portage, however, there are no proposed changes to that portion of the property. Playground Global currently occupies the space and will continue to do so. They completed a buildout of the space in 2016 which did not include any changes to the exterior of the building.

Vice Chair Baltay commented on his understanding of the development agreement was the whole building was to be rehabilitated and that included 380 Portage and inquired why it's not included.

Mr. Sockalosky replied the 380 Portage building is a different structure of board form poured in place and there are no historical significant changes in place to that building that would require immediate modifications. The interior of the building was in need of electrical and plumbing updates so that is where the focus has remained.

Boardmember Thompson questioned the south side monitor roof treatment that is different from the symmetrical glazing treatment of the northside monitor roof and what the design intent was.

Mr. Sockalosky said in part to try to accent the retail space as a distinct feature of the building and in part to highlight the monitor roof itself. The intent was to improve the views of the old monitor roofs.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about the front setback between the front façade along the south wall and the beginning of the monitor rooms.

Mr. Sockalosky answered approximately 10 feet.

Boardmember Thompson asked if there are setbacks between the two accents, or a plane difference.

Mr. Sockalosky responded there is a plane difference of about a foot.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the idea was for the retail space to be darker and it shade lighter as the building progresses back.

Mr. Sockalosky commented yes that was the intent.

Boardmember Thompson reference sheet 8C – 2.7.0 for the corrugated steel and commented the steel has a round corrugation and the renderings look more like a standard seam faceted corrugation and asked for clarification of which the developer was considering and what the finish would be.

Mr. Sockalosky confirmed they will be utilizing more of the rounded corrugated steel as it is more historical in nature. The architects are in the process of updating those renderings, however they wanted the Board's feedback before they made any changes and the finish would be more of a matte finish. A materials board should have been submitted to Ms. Raybould and if not, they will send one over.

Ms. Raybould confirmed she does not have a materials board but could have missed it.

Boardmember Rosenberg questioned the applicant if there are three different colors and two textures for the corrugated metal and referenced the M2 and M3 textures are listed but there's not an explanation of what the difference is between the two. The rendering on AC 1.0.7 looks like the dark grey and the mid-tone grey are on the larger wave and the lightest grey is on the smaller wave.

Mr. Sockalosky answered that the renderings on the corrugated steel are slightly off dependent upon the feedback that will be received from the ARB. The intent is for it to be a smooth wave of a traditional corrugated metal and they will all be of similar profile to what had been historically installed on the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated on AC 2.7.0 it's noting the two textures and asked if the only difference is the color and there should be three types listed for the three different colors.

Mr. Sockalosky replied that is correct, the only difference is the color and there should be three listed.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the retail element was thought to be potentially food and beverage.

The developer had originally requested food and beverage; however, they are open to what type of retail that would be. They are looking for a tenant that would actively engage the corner of the space along with the park.

Boardmember Thompson questioned if other openings were explored for the access to the area.

Mr. Sockalosky stated that as well is tied to not knowing what tenant would assume occupancy of the space.

Chair Hirsch added that the plan for the retail space on sheet AC 2.1.9, the rendering shows lines of the store being full bay and inquired why what is shown on AC 2.1.5, the retail sky lighting lines do not indicate full bay.

Mr. Sockalosky explained that both drawings are correct, but the angles are different in the renderings.

Vice Chair Baltay paraphrased and stated the skylight in the retail space is an open space in the center of the right monitor area that allows people to look up and into the monitor room at the skylights.

Mr. Sockalosky stated the goal is to give the public as much access to look into the private space as possible without jeopardizing the privacy of the non-retail space.

Boardmember Rosenberg noted in some of the sections a portion of the building looks as if there is a mezzanine and questioned if there is any intent to ever open up the two-story space and keep the mezzanine in place and questioned how it's going to work for the first-floor retail space looking up into the second-floor private space.

Mr. Sockalosky answered there is a partial mezzanine space that they are looking into to reinforce any structural requirements to maintain the western side of the monitor roofs, currently the interior space will become an open type of two-story space for a future tenant and the intent with the skylight is for the public to be able to look up and into the skylight space without looking over and into the space.

Boardmember Thompson questioned if any of the windows proposed are operable and asked if there were any sustainable elements the developer would like to point out.

Mr. Sockalosky stated the current intention is not to make the windows operable, but rather include sliding glass doors to allow for integration into the indoor/outdoor space. One of the sustainable elements they are looking into is adding [3:17:15 Unintelligible – sounded like photo mosaic] onto the roof as well as meet all the sustainable green requirements of the City.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired about the width of the light monitor rooms and stated they look much larger in the rendering and in person than what is in the photograph.

Mr. Sockalosky explained they feel the modeling is accurate in terms of scale and proportion as field verification measurements were taken of the existing building and the developers have been monitoring it to follow those as accurately as possible. Some of the views perhaps feel a little different due to the structure that has been taken off in front of those monitoring rooms.

Vice Chair Baltay expressed concern and referenced drawing AC 1.0.7 where the rendering shows it about twice as wide as it is tall, possibly even more, and when he looks at the original it appears almost one to one; and inquired if the applicant has seriously analyzed what it's going to take to keep the building while making this amount of changes. Additionally, a seismic analysis will have to be done and Vice Chair Baltay questioned how the building will stand up to that with that amount of glass.

Mr. Sockalosky stated when they started the project and realized the appreciation for the historical nature of the building, they brought on Matt David with Architectural Resource Group, and a structural engineer, to help guide them from the initial development stages to ensure they can make the required reinforcements to the entire building. They would not have continued the project had they not included that assessment early in the process, and feel that even though the building will no longer be a historical resource once the changes have been completed, they felt the money was worth the expense to save the integrity of the historical presence of the building as much as possible.

Vice Chair Baltay questioned if the engineer suggested steel moment frames internally for lateral support.

Mr. Sockalosky explained there are additional framing that the team is working on that will be added, he does not have that information at hand, but he will provide that to the Board at a later time.

Boardmember Rosenberg interjected that on sheet AC 2.1.2 and the demo elevation and the proposed south elevation lined up above one another, in Demo #2 the models do look significantly thinner and when you looked down at proposed south elevation #3, they look significantly wider, and suggested clarification would be helpful.

Mr. Sockalosky stated he will get additional clarification on the framing and dimensions of the monitoring rooms and the continuity of those structures; and correct any irregularities that are found, with details of any changes if necessary, and provide that information to the ARB. The current intent is to maintain the original structure.

Vice Chair Baltay commented on the many letters included in the staff packet, most of which commented on the draft EIR. The one that caught his attention the most was from former Mayor Karen Holman who pointed out that there is no alternative presented that avoids the significant impact to the historic property as required by California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and inquired if staff had responded to that yet.

Ms. Raybould replied staff is currently preparing responses to comments on the EIR and anticipate that being completed before staff returns to the ARB with a formal recommendation on the project, however, what Ms. Holman was speaking to was considered, however then dismissed in the EIR as an alternative.

Boardmember Chen inquired what the material will be on the canopy leading to the entrance.

Mr. Sockalosky explained the canopies leading to the entrance are a composite metal material with a type of copper finish.

Boardmember Chen asked if the canopies connecting to the wood trellis are the same material.

Mr. Sockalosky stated the canopy connected to the trellis will be a metal fascia with a stucco inset on the underside with the roofing above.

Boardmember Chen questioned what the wood slat screening wall is between the garage and the commercial courtyard and its height on sheet AC 2.2.0 and is that on the same wall as the green wall.

Mr. Sockalosky stated the height is approximately 8 feet.

Mr. Burke responded to Boardmember Chen and stated it's in the center of the wall and is better depicted on sheet L 1.3, there's an orange wall, right now it's the outboard of the fence and ultimately it will be incorporated into the fence.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the railing height on the second level of the parking garage.

Mr. Sockalosky answered the railing is 3'6".

Boardmember Chen commented that she noticed the material is different on the north parking and the east parking elevations and questioned the design intent.

Mr. Sockalosky answered those are the areas facing into the residential areas so they incorporated the additional horizontal corrugation in those areas to assist in blocking the lights in the parking garages during evening hours.

Boardmember Chen stated in staff's presentation they mentioned art and inquired if there is art in this project and if so what format.

Ms. Raybould explained the initial meeting with the Public Art Commission was to receive their feedback about possible locations and appropriate types of art they would be interested in seeing the applicant consider. There has been some talk around the outdoor retail space and possibly on the west side of the building, and possibly wrapping around the building on the Portage side of the building.

Boardmember Thompson requested a description of the circulation of the parking garage.

Mr. Sockalosky responded that the upper level is only accessed from the west side of the structure and the grade level of the parking can be accessed from both the east and west sides of the structure.

Boardmember Thompson commented she did not see the mechanical systems in the elevations but it is located on the roof plan and inquired if the idea.

Mr. Sockalosky answered it is being proposed as a single space and in the feeding of that they would consider where any duct work will be to minimize impacts so it can be fed into the building from the side.

Chair Hirsch followed up on the circulation question and asked if the intent was to access the second story of the garage from inside the grade level of the garage.

Mr. Sockalosky replied traffic can follow the lane from the east side of the garage to the west side and access the ramp from that point.

Boardmember Rosenberg referenced sheet AC 2.1.10 it shows the north facing side of the parking garage in relationship to the residential homes and commented the daylight plane is not designated for that location and asked if that could be added to the drawings for follow-up.

Mr. Sockalosky responded they will add that daylight plan diagram to the plans.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented it is available on the side for the townhomes, she would appreciate seeing it for the existing homes as well.

Chair Hirsch commented there's been some discussion regarding the view of the parking garage from second story single family homes in the existing residential area and inquired if a survey was done with the neighborhood to establish any possible impacts. An assessment was made that there aren't any current impacts however public comment letters indicated there were concerns for future two story homes built.

Mr. Sockalosky explained the developer has attempted to make the parking garage as low profile as possible in the current location, as well as using as much of a setback as possible from the property line as they could to minimize view impacts, and working to minimize the lighting impacts as much as possible while still providing replacement of the parking that's needed for the park which is why they are doing only single story with a slightly lower parking ratio than to the current parking on the site.

Chair Hirsch asked if the parking requirements set forth by code have been fulfilled and if the parking numbers represent the parking of all three areas listed in the plans.

Mr. Sockalosky stated it's an equivalent ratio to what is existing on the site now based on the existing square footage and current parking. Part of the development agreement with the City allows for a slightly lower ratio of new parking to new square footage. The surface parking on the south and east façade parcel #3 are included in the parking for the cannery building.

Chair Hirsch questioned if the doors on the south façade of the building are all operable.

Mr. Sockalosky responded the intent is there will be some access points, some of that will be for the required egress from the interior space of the building. How they will be utilized by future tenants will determine if they are for egress only. The majority of the flow of pedestrian traffic will be in and out of the north side of the building as that is where the parking area is located.

Chair Hirsch inquired if the applicant has yet considered how the passage on the south side will be utilized in the future.

Mr. Sockalosky explained the passage is functional in a way, they are in the process of determining whether the original canopy structure will be rebuilt, they are looking to continue the canopy structure that is on the 380 building, however they are also considering that the connection between Park and Ash will become a street and the retail portion on the south east corner of the building is still available and foresee the that covered walkway as being a feature that could be developed on the south side of the park. It could potentially be something that ties the building to the site across from park.

Chair Hirsch commented that area is a raised area in elevation and inquired if there are any future intentions of relating the area to any future park.

Mr. Sockalosky stated on the south side of the building there is only roughly a 6" elevation for most of the portion of off the parking.

Mr. Burke stated the retail plaza is intentionally kept open on the south end so the curb line can create that potential connection to the adjacent parcel.

Ms. Raybould asked Mr. Burke to clarify if he means the connection to the townhomes or to the connection to the park.

Mr. Burke replied there's a connection to both. There's a crosswalk on the east side leading to the townhomes parcel and the area on the south side which will have a crosswalk and a curb cut entrance to a potential street.

Ms. Raybould explained the EIR did identify a significant impact with respect to inconsistencies with an adopted transportation plan, specifically the bicycle and pedestrian plan does identify a connection from Park to Portage and it's also consistent with the county wide trails plan. The EIR identified a mitigation measure to address that, which requires public access through and an enhanced bikeway. Aligning with what Mr. Burke was saying, and add that staff are exploring potential options for the enhanced bikeway, which only requires sharrows. Staff has expressed some concern about the sharrow design because there are so many parking spaces that would back into those sharrows. There is a City Schools Safety meeting scheduled next week and staff went to the Palo Alto Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) in November to get initial feedback. The staff plans to return to PABAC in February to get feedback on a more design. Currently they are researching the possibility of having a Class 1 bike lane that would be shared between the applicant's property line and the city dedication parcel that would entail a bike lane all the way through to Portage. This would align with the current design of the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) which is exploring a Class 4 bike path on Portage Avenue. A Class 4 bike path involves a completely separate connection and is expected on the south side. Details are still being reviewed and researched to make sure all the ADA compliances and C3 storm water requirements are met. It doesn't completely answer the question about pedestrian access, but it lets the Board know that staff are aware and currently working to resolve the concerns.

Chair Hirsch inquired if a transportation study has been done to date for the new street that's expected and possible impacts not only to the park but the residential area, and parking garage.

Ms. Raybould explained the traffic study does explore anticipated trips coming to and from the parking garage through Acacia. Only the bottom portion of the parking garage can be accessed through Park. Most of the trips were assumed to originate from Acacia.

Chair Hirsch raised the question of Acacia being a one-way path in that area.

Ms. Raybould explained if people wanted to leave the property they could travel that path out to Portage if they wanted to turn south onto El Camino. She would have to confirm what the traffic distribution looked like but the traffic study looks at the property as a whole, including the affordable housing units that are being planned.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if there was a total number of available parking spaces listed and how many are electric vehicle (EV)?

Chair Hirsch responded he believes approximately 450 spaces.

Mr. Sockalosky answered the garage itself has 330 spaces. The applicant is looking to provide 100 EV conduit only spaces and 5 electric and green vehicles (EVSE) chargers. There will be 3 standard accessible spaces and 2 van accessible spaces and an additional ADA accessible space.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if this meets the minimum requirements.

Mr. Sockalosky replied that it does meet the minimum requirements and they are all located on the ground level and there are no plans to install an elevator to the second story parking area.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed open corrugated information on the top level of the parking garage.

Boardmember Chen questioned if the trash collector was shown in the plans.

Ms. Raybould confirmed the trash collector is shown along the Portage side where the parking spaces are located, at approximately the center and looked to see if that elevation was provided. It is A 110.

Mr. Sockalosky stated the elevation of the trash enclosure is included on sheet AC 2.1.11.

Boardmember Chen questioned if there are any other locations at the building that uses the same materials that are used for the trash enclosure.

Mr. Sockalosky responded that they do not have that information at this time and are open to comments and suggestions if the Board would like them to consider different material.

Boardmember Rosenberg continued her questions by asking if there was a specific paint in mind for the darker grey corrugated metal used in the parking garage.

Mr. Sockalosky responded the material board has the manufacturers details on the paint color and he will ensure Ms. Raybould receives that and it picks up the same darker grey that is used at the retail space.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed they will include the specifications used for the open railing as well as the vertical elements at the next review. On sheet AC 2.1.9 in the longitudinal building section, there appears to be two windows that over look the mezzanine and she has not seen the elevations for those windows and inquired if there are any for that façade on the west side of the cannery building.

Mr. Sockalosky responded they do not yet have the elevations for that area the team is still working on that area. It will not be visible to the public due to the walkway structure, however he will make sure the elevations are included for the next review for the Board.

Chair Hirsch inquired if there will be bicycle parking at the facility.

Mr. Burke responded to the Chair that the information is on sheet L 1.7. Currently there are 10 racks for 20 short-term biking spots, with 6 lockers in the parking garage for long-term.

Mr. Sockalosky confirmed it meets the minimum requirements and there are additional long-term lockers located in the building.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the picture or the drawing should be used for the bike racks.

Mr. Burke replied that the picture is the actual bike rack, the drawing depicts the details of location and sizes. The color would not be green, it would match the intended color scheme. If a picture is not available for the next review they will include a swatch of the actual color.

Chair Hirsch thanked everyone for the presentation.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he tried to look at this in the same way he looks at other projects, when he looks at the site development he can't really sit in on the project because of the residential development and how that will affect this project. It's difficult to analyze the project without that information. The connection to the future park and housing on the south would have to be considered. It's tough to currently analyze that without knowing what that will be. Modifications to the historic structure affect the site layout dramatically. For those reasons it's difficult to consider. The parking structure is too long and close to the building. Any place in town, such a structure would not be considered. The surface parking lot has a lot of landscaping and as soon as you make a 2 story structure you lose a lot of that. The previous parking area was located next to a creek and had all the great landscaping. The applicant should strongly consider leaving the parking area down at the grade rather than building it up to be flush with the building. Anything that can be done to minimize the bulk of the building would be good. In this project the dirt has already been taken away, which would minimize the impact on the community. The developer could create variety by breaking up the massing more and by integrating landscaping and public areas. Vice Chair Baltay expressed concerns about the interior layout of 340 Portage, the building with the light monitors. His concerns stem from the fact that nothing is proposed. If you do the math, it's a 230 by 230-foot square blank space. He doesn't understand how they intend to turn that into useful space without adding light wells, monitors, a courtyard, or anything else. It will no longer be a manufacturing environment, it's a place where people will work and live all day long. When you make the use of the site change, the building must also change. Vice Chair Baltay questioned how a review can be changed when there is a lack of understanding of how the site will change. It's a very large space with zero definition provided. The retail space is even more problematic. What is being shown is a square box being thrown into a corner without any effort of integration with the light monitors and that is the important historical element that people want to see. He is flabbergasted that nothing better than a hole being cut in the ceiling is being considered for viewing the monitors from the retail space. Without a minimum of more detail, of what they proposed to do with the space, he is unable to do an analysis or review. The changes to the old building are too much to preserve the historical integrity. All the changes are such a dramatic alteration, the building is no longer historic. The changes that Frye's and other previous tenants made have left the building in a mess. In conclusion, the structures may remain standing but the faint trace of our past is lost and this proposal does not preserve our heritage.

Boardmember Thompson thanked the staff and application for the presentations and answering their questions. She agrees with many points that Vice Chair Baltay made. The parking garage is hidden away so she had not considered the façade closely, she's not sure who would be affected by it. She would be open to doing something more accessible. She liked the idea of doing more landscapes, or light wells. Some parking structures include a courtyard, possibly existing trees. She might recommend something to that effect. It is hard to evaluate this project, it does look like a new building. She made notes of integrating operable windows. That type of structure is made for some type of ventilation system, exhausting hot air. Prior to the study session she thought this was going to be a big thoroughfare which would have been really nice. Dallas has something where there is an old barn structure with food and beverage and boutiques surrounding it that hosts food festivals, or farmers markets. That would have been nice with garage doors on the side. It's imperative that these upper elements are operable. Treating this project as one big space is very unsustainable and inefficient. She recommends keeping the space as flexible as possible so the applicant isn't designing something they don't know will happen in the future and it

doesn't end up with a very costly energy bill. Boardmember Thompson would like to see more sustainable elements, in addition to PVs. Operable windows, façade treatments, shading elements. It would be nice to see this building function and perform well without energy. She didn't catch that the elevation didn't match between the demo's and the proposed and appreciates Vice Chair Baltay for pointing that out. It's true what is seen in the drawings doesn't really match the pictures and she encourages the applicant to look closely at that. On the south façade there's two levels with the retail being one and R&D being another, there's already issues with seeing the roof line and adding the pop up would obscure the view more. She would not support that, as the intent is to celebrate the form. She the standing seam corrugation is popular currently, which is why it looks more like a new project. She is concerned with corrugated metal due to past experience, with the metal wearing through time. She'd like to see something that would prevent that from happening in this project. Having more definition of what will happen on the inside will make a huge difference. It is difficult to do that without having current tenants, but it would better enhance the overall design of the project.

Ms. Raybould clarified that the pop up exists today and what the applicant is doing is bringing the area on the eastern portion down for a portion of it.

Vice Chair Baltay added what is existing today is less important than what was historically there, which is what the Board is looking at and the photo in the packet is clear on what that was.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented that when she first looked at the packet and saw the proposal, she was excited that this was going to be a really great space for people to utilize and enjoy. She was excited to see the prospect of people being able to walk from the front to the back. In hearing this project is one small space for retail and the rest is dedicated private space with a lot of unknown variables, it feels like a missed opportunity. Office space is abundant and will fit in any space you put them in. Retail vibrancy takes a specific type of architecture and this type of architecture is already asking for that. Townhomes and housing are being added to that area and here's this beautiful historic building and the plan is to close it off and not allow the community around it to enjoy it. That is a tragic perspective given the opportunity to do something better with a building of this historical importance. Boardmember Rosenberg feels like there's a way to make the cannery portion with the pop ups be more interesting. Office space fits into where they are put. She has concerns about the boxed like nature of the space on the west side. She doesn't understand where the light is going to get into the building, in the center of the building, where will the vents be. There's a lack of information. Even from a future build out perspective. It's difficult to review what's not there. Regarding the cannery, historical preservation is very important particularly on a building such of this. When the condition of the historical building is not safe, it needs to be addressed and revitalized. During the revitalization history needs to be preserved. Homage needs to be paid to the past. She appreciates the windows on the east side, the monitors popping up with extensive glazing, they are historical in context for the pop ups but the windows on the east side are modern. There needs to be a balance between preserving history, celebrating new, revitalizing this and giving it new life. The north façade is a much more successful homage to what was previously there. The southern side is not a celebration of the historical context of the building. The upper box is problematic visually. What is being shown for a floor plan, the retail is in there on the right, then there's a hallway and with a big box up and over so the plan is hard to follow. Why is the middle box going up and over the retail. There's not a clear context. It's beautiful for a new building but for a historical context building it's pushing the envelope too

far. Boardmember Rosenberg appreciates the color plans, the materials being used, the window color selection, she urges the applicant to revisit the historical context and find ways to bring that back more. With the monitors, there are a lot of mullions in the windows, it's very typical to have that type of ventilation, and very evocative of the old cannery type buildings. The lower windows are very modern with no mullions, no breaks up, they are mostly large panes of glass that don't highlight the historical preservation of the building. This site plan is tricky, there are so many moving parts and pieces of the project. The townhomes and the elements below, the urban planning in this project will be crucial. She would love to see each portion of the project, as it progresses through this review process, present more context of where the project being reviewed sits in relation to everything else that is planned around it. How will it integrate and what will the impacts be. That context is vitally important for this project every step of the way. Boardmember Rosenberg thanked everyone for the work put into it and looks forward to seeing the project return.

Boardmember Chen thanked everyone for the presentation and agrees with the comments of the previous Boardmembers. She appreciates the large opening at the entrance and the large windows, the introduction light into the open space, however there is still a lot of work that needs to be done. The parking garage is a massive structure that is very close to the cannery building. It might help to make it smaller and keep as much of the existing landscaping as possible. Regarding privacy of the residential area behind the parking structure, she suggests keeping the building at a 20' setback. The railing is only 3' tall, everyone will be able to view the backyards of their homes. The trash enclosure doesn't blend with the cannery building, other materials could be used to make that less obvious. The 60' blank wall would be a great candidate for the mini mural festival program the City was talking about earlier.

Chair Hirsch began with agreeing with Boardmember Rosenberg in that there are all these projects for this site and he is unaware of one large master plan for the area. The building is rimmed with cars, it's a tremendous conflict regarding all the cars and the privacy of the residential areas. There's a problem with the site being polluted and you can't dig below grade to lower the parking structure. He would ask why not at this point. Why not dig the parking down to add more spaces in the garage and have less parking around the entire perimeter of the building. Even a slightly large parking area to include part of the west side of the building. The traffic patterns may not have been studied and Park Ave may ultimately conflict with the housing portion of the property. This is part of the urban planning of this site and that hasn't been discussed. Some of the comments about the materiality of the have been very good. The question of the historical quality of the building is missing. Perhaps not described as what would satisfy the historic committee of the city. They are very concerned, as is the Board. There is an art element required and that's a great opportunity to highlight the history of the property. It's a very public piece of work and he hopes the art commission will consider how it will effect the exterior of the building so it can be a statement of what the history of the building really is. It's incredibly important to Palo Alto to describe what when on this building 100 years ago. He appreciates the exterior of the building and facility that's there now and how it's open with plenty of light. And open ceiling showing the duct work running through the space is interesting and exciting. It's possible to do that with that space. He questions what will happen to the south side of the property in relation to the park. It's important to recognize the people who will utilize that space. The only impacts being discussed are regarding the commercial parts of the building. Consider all the people who will be in the area in the future. He is concerned about the housing and how

it will be impacted by the entry ways into the parking garage. The potential problem in and out of the passage through the garage is a concern because of the amount of traffic in that small space.

Vice Chair Baltay concluded Boardmember comments by reading his essay entitled "To Save Less and Remember More."

Mr. Sockalosky appreciates the feedback and looks forward the continuing the process. They received valuable input from the Board.

Approval of Minutes

6. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 1, 2022

MOTION: Boardmember Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to approve the meeting minutes for December 1, 2022, as amended.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

7. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for November 17, 2022

Boardmember Thompson commented on packet page 184, there was a typo under the paragraph that starts with Boardmember Thompson thanked the applicant, there's a line in there that says the building was quite "hash", it's a typo, it should say "harsh". Closer to the bottom there's a comment that says the E shape allows for more sunlight, she was proposing that an E shape would allow for more sunlight and would break up the massing. A change in sentiment.

MOTION: Boardmember Thompson moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to approve the meeting minutes for December 1, 2022, as amended.

VOTE: 5-0-0-0

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Chair Hirsch commented on committee assignments, there was one change.

The board reminded Chair Hirsch that Boardmembers are appointed by project when the it's necessary, at the time.

Adjournment

Chair Hirsch adjourned the meeting.