



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES: February 16, 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 Yingxi Chen, Boardmember Kendra Rosenberg

Absent: Boardmember Osma Thompson

1. Chair Hirsch read the Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for the Architectural Review Board During Covid-19 State of Emergency

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

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

Oral Communications

None

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Manager of Current Planning Jodie Gerhardt indicated there were 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

Manager of Current Planning Jodie Gerhardt displayed the ARB meeting schedule and informed the ARB that Boardmember Thompson has a planned absence scheduled for the March 2, 2023 hearing of 3001 El Camino project and the Stanford Center façade change at Stanford shopping center. The March 16th hearing has one item scheduled related to the Senate Bill (SB) 9 Objective Standards. New projects include the 800 San Antonio Road formal application for a planned community zone change to build a 5-story 76-unit residential building that will consist of 16-units below market rate along with varying market rate units, and Our House retail store in the Stanford shopping center has applied for exterior improvements.

Chair Hirsch noted the San Antonio Road project is already on the chart so it will be an update and called out the wording on the chart for the 3150 El Camino project and commented the description reads in a way that makes it sound like the garage will extend out 84 feet. Additionally he requested clarification on the below market rate units for the 800 San Antonio project.

Ms. Gerhardt responded there will be 11 low-income housing units, with five units listed as below 120% Area Median Income (AMI).

Study Session

3. 3600 MIDDLEFIELD ROAD [22PLN-00406]: Request for Preliminary Architectural Review to reconstruct Palo Alto Fire Station 4. The proposed 7,800 square foot, LEED Silver, single-story building would replace the existing 2,800 square foot single-story fire station. Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. The formal application will be subject to CEQA. Zoning District: PF (Public Facility). For more information contact the project planner at Garrett.Sauls@cityofpal Alto.org.

Chair Hirsch requested site visit information from the Boardmembers. Vice Chair Baltay commented he visited the site. Boardmember Rosenberg stated she visited the site.

Manager of Current Planning Jodie Gerhardt requested a 10-minute break to allow IT to fix the technical difficulties with the microphones.

The ARB Reconvened after 7 minutes with all Boardmembers present except for Boardmember Thompson.

Senior Planner Garrett Sauls provided the staff report for the proposed Fire Station at 3600 Middlefield Road. The building would replace the existing 2,800 square foot single-story fire station with a 7,800 square foot, LEED Silver, single-story building. Mr. Sauls stated he will be providing the staff report and will then present the applicants presentation with them at the microphone for discussion. The 1.75-acre property contains an existing Palo Alto electric substation and is also bounded by the Covenant Presbyterian Church, the Little League and Mitchell Park and is located at the corner of Middlefield and East Meadow Drive. The applicant is looking to include 12 parking stalls, three emergency vehicle loading bays and an emergency generator. Currently 14 trees exist, with 10 trees proposed to be removed, most of which run along the south-eastern side boarder of the property where the fence is located for the perimeter of the substation. The applicant is trying to achieve a LEED style Silver Green building which is one of the highest standards for LEED design development. The front elevation faces Middlefield Road and will be built off the existing driveway with a proposed design incorporating wood porcelain cladding material as well as vertical cladding plaster material and a bay front window system for the emergency vehicles. The rear of the building faces the presbyterian church with three bay window systems for access onto East Middlefield Drive, one of bays would not exit the front onto Middlefield Road. Samples of the proposed building materials have been provided for ARB review which identifies the texture and color of the material. The applicant is looking for ARB feedback for massing, site planning of the plans provided,

and material selection. Staff recommended the ARB Boardmembers review the application and provide comments. No formal action was requested for the pre-screening item.

Valerie Tam with Public Works Engineering introduced BRW Architecture's Chris Ford and Megan Zhang as consultants who provided the applicant's presentation for the proposed Palo Alto Fire Station No. 4 replacement project. Mr. Ford provided background information about the site constraints due to the existing substation, the operational sequence of the fire station, and some of the collaborative decisions that evolved by working with public works and the Fire Department on how to arrange the site. The building was designed with the intent to keep the trees along Middlefield intact, including an older tree in need of care, and the back side of the building was designed around the substation. Vehicle exit from the building onto Middlefield is critical. The vehicles will return to the building from the rear access point and the staff parking will also be in the rear driveway area. The current side entrance driveway for substation utility workers will remain in place and is proposed to also accommodate station visitors. The building will contain a visitors meeting room component and two parking spaces will be added in the current side driveway that the utility workers access, for the use of visitors. For large meetings there will be parking also available on the church side of the property, so not to interfere with fire station staff parking. The living quarters for the attendants is on the Middlefield Road side of the building located as far from the intersection and Middlefield Road as possible to defer noises while they sleep. An exercise and equipment room will be located behind the living quarters at the back side of the building. There will be a building exit from the fitness area. Megan Zhang continued the presentation and provided information on the 3D massing of the fire station. It was a request of the City Manager and Fire Department to have the building be a public safety beacon to serve the community and be pedestrian friendly. Due to the presence of little leaguers and attendees of the church it was determined to have the main vehicle massing in the center of the building rather than on the corner. The after-life recyclability of the building materials, durability for minimal maintenance and aesthetics of the building were the top three factors in choosing the building materials. The side of the building will be vertical porcelain cladding is durable, vandalism proof, is recyclable, and has a 10- and 20-year warranty on fade.

Chair Hirsch inquired if there were Board questions for the staff report or public comments and there were none.

Vice Chair Baltay requested specific information on how the fire engines would exit the building and turn northbound onto Middlefield Road and if exit onto East Meadow was considered due to the high volume of traffic on Middlefield Road.

Mr. Ford explained the current vehicles have sensors that turn the traffic signal in the direction of the fire station and that system is proposed to stay in place. An extensive operations review was conducted with the Fire Department and his recollection was one of the reasons was due to the legacy vantage of that being the direction the staff was used to.

Boardmember Rosenberg expressed concern that all parties involved in the project are on the same page with what aspects of the station could stand to be changed and what aspects should stay the same and agreed that portion of Middlefield Road is quite congested during certain periods during the day, and this would be the best time to make any needed adjustments.

Palo Alto Deputy Fire Chief Steve Lindsey replied early in the design process they explored other options and found access to Middlefield kept response times lower and provided more options for traveling north or south from the exit driveway.

Boardmember Rosenberg questioned if the two existing curb cuts on East Meadow would remain the same.

Mr. Ford explained the middle curb cut would be widened to meet the city standards for The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant driveway, as it has previously always been an exit only. Public Works had indicated in previous meetings there may be changes along East Meadow to accommodate bike lanes.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired about an arrow on the traffic flow plans for the area leaving the barn door fueling area that was not on the traffic flow side and confirmed the driveway is intended to be entrance and exit, however the traffic from the barn door area is exit only. Additionally, it appears the vehicle in the reserved bay would back into the bollards in front of the barn door area.

Ms. Zhang replied that the square with the two circles are not bollards, it is the underground tank for the fueling center and the flow of the non-emergency vehicle would be exiting through the entrance of the inbound driveway; and there were no consideration for three pull throughs in the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if the reserve truck would have to exit the entrance driveway on the lower portion of the property.

Mr. Ford stated that arrow had been blocked as it is not a common flow area since it's used for the non-fire station public work vehicles and the area leaving the barn door is exit only. The reserved engine is always backed into the bay when parked and would be exiting the building in a forward direction.

Boardmember Rosenberg questioned if the electrical substation would have any noise affect on the sleeping quarters for the firemen and women, and inquired if third pane windows or black out curtains are used to ensure proper rest for the on-duty fire personnel.

Chief Lindsey answered the current rooms are very close to the proposed rooms and there have not been any complaints about noise obtrusion thus far.

Mr. Ford explained it is normal practice to install extra sound control on the windows and walls of the sleeping quarters for fire stations with operable windows for needed escape.

Ms. Zhang added of the samples provided for the board, the darker color is the color of the siding material, and the lighter color is the texture sample and confirmed Boardmember Rosenberg's inquiry of the material for the underside of the soffit eaves.

Boardmember Rosenberg questioned the intent of the location of the lobby visitor entrance and the proximity from the visitor parking.

Mr. Ford stated they were challenged with how to balance the accessibility of the visitors entrance to the building with the location of the parking area and had to keep in mind the accessibility of someone in need of emergency help and them being able to access the emergency button quickly at the front of the building from the main traffic area.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired about where the washing of the rigs would take place.

Mr. Ford stated they clean in the back of the building and not in the bay. There are accommodations for washing the vehicles in the back of the building, the water run off goes into the sewer unless the storm grade is opened.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the north elevation of the drawing in the slide presentation not appearing to match the floor plans and the window placement isn't on the floor plan.

Ms. Zhang explained the north elevation is the kitchen and dining area and on the floor plan the windows are located above the kitchen sink. The next window is located in the day room.

Vice Chair Baltay commented he believes the elevation drawing is not yet in sync with the floor plan but probably not important in this phase.

Boardmember Chen asked how the fire fighters access the bedrooms from within the building.

Ms. Zhang replied they go through the day room and living space due to the emissions from the trucks when parking them in the bays and often they get different calls for different vehicles and they don't want the trucks to disturb the ones who may still be resting.

Chair Hirsch inquired about the detailing of the perimeter fence material.

Mr. Ford answered they have not yet chosen that material and welcome any suggestions the Board may have. One of the LEED goals is to use recyclable material if possible. There would be a deconstruction standard for the existing wood fencing that is currently in medium condition. Some of the fencing between the fire station and the substation could likely be repurposed. The patio fencing off of Middlefield Road will need to be replaced due to wear from the bushes.

Chair Hirsch requested clarification about the traffic flow of the reserved vehicle.

Chief Lindsey explained the rear bay is for the reserve truck and the traffic flow consisted of the vehicle backing into the bay when parked. The vehicle would exit the rear bay from a frontal direction and would not be used for emergency calls as it is the reserve vehicle for when the main emergency vehicles are out for maintenance or being used in community events, in which case it is taken to the station that needs it without the emergency signals and sirens and it would make a turn from the building to exit onto East Meadow Drive. Flaggers are used to retrieve the vehicle.

Chair Hirsch inquired about future detailed landscape and sidewalk plans.

Mr. Ford replied to Chair Hirsch that the landscape and paving plan will be part of the application final review. They have acquired the help of an arborist consultant to assist with the older oak in the front of the building to help facilitate how to design the area in such a manner to not further disturb the tree and determine the care the tree needs now. One of the factors to consider with the landscaping is the detention basin. They received an engineer's report after the submittal of information currently being reviewed that suggested there may be a need for a retention area that could alter the current landscaping plans. The original idea was to plant low-level landscape along East Meadow to replace the trees that will have to be removed.

Chair Hirsch questioned the reason for the sliding door in the back area and if the current driveway to the area is gravel.

Mr. Ford answered the sliding fence door was to distract the general public from accessing the operational zone which is utilized for fueling other emergency vehicles and the current gravel driveway will be paved.

Chair Hirsch asked if consideration had been given to making the outdoor exercise area for the firefighters more private and not accessible to cars.

Mr. Ford stated they would be consulting with the station captain and firefighters about their needs for the area prior to finalizing the plans. The perimeter will be fenced.

Chair Hirsch inquired about samples of the white plaster material on the front of the building.

Ms. Zhang stated the plaster sample was not provided because the public art committee has expressed an interest in having art on the white plaster portion of the building. They will finalize the plaster material once it's determined if art will be added.

Chair Hirsch inquired if the windows on the south elevation are full frontal windows.

Ms. Zhang said the fire chief had expressed a concern that there may be too many windows so that may be a change that would be included in the final review.

Chair Hirsch suggested lessening the amount of glass in that location since there isn't much to look at outside the windows.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired about the existing fuel tank and why it's imperative to leave it in the current location and if adding a fuel component is typically involved with new development of fire stations.

Ms. Zhang indicated the cost of moving the tank is quite high and would involve additional environmental requirements due to the nature of having fuel onsite as this location is the only fire station in the city that has a fuel site due to the substation utility trucks also using it to refuel. Police, fire, and utilities use the fueling station.

Vice Chair Baltay asked about the condition of the fuel station.

Ms. Zhang suggested the site has seen better conditions; there are steps they will need to take to ensure it's more water-tight.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if the training room and conference room would be available for community use.

Chief Lindsey said the training room would be available for firefighters, with possible opportunity for Office of Emergency Services (OES) as they have submitted a request to use the new fire station as their emergency substation on the south side of town. It would also be available for Paramedic and Emergency Medical Technician (EMT) continued education courses who are currently having to utilize the Stanford University campus facility.

Chair Hirsch asked about the Captain's office being surrounded by glass.

Mr. Ford indicated that the Captain's office is considered a "watch nest" so they are able to know what is going on in their surroundings and if vehicles pull up in front in need of emergency or critical care.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if they also needed to have eyes on the apparatus bay.

Chief Lindsey replied that is no longer a need like it used to be in prior years. The critical needs expressed are visuals of the street, front apron area and the lobby.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked what the proximity would be from the training area to the public restrooms.

Ms. Zhang answered the restrooms are located behind the secured area to prevent random people from accessing the firefighters area unnoticed.

Boardmember Rosenberg questioned if the building will be all electric, Ms. Zhang responded that was correct.

Ms. Tam added that Public Works will be holding public outreach meetings that will begin after the first formal ARB hearing, similar to the Fire Station No. 3 process. If any further questions arise, they can be directed to Valerie Tam or the project manager by email.

Vice Chair Baltay expressed a concern about the community generally prefer to be involved prior to landscape, paving, and entrance and exit plans have been created.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that the proposal is excellent overall, and very close to meeting their required findings. The items he would like to see considered include the property being overly constrained by the existing fuel tank which prevents them from shifting the entrance off of Middlefield further from the building and allowing the parking to be closer to the building and encourages Public Works to strongly consider relocating the fuel tank so the traffic on the rear side is not as limited for navigation through the area considering the cost going into the project and the current plans seem poorly thought out, particularly given the current condition of the pumping station and the multiple departments which access it. The building massing has a low key residential form that is appropriate for the neighborhood and is disappointed they aren't doing more to make the building look more like the important civic part of the community that it is and perhaps they are feeling too limited by the Palo Alto process. The new building resembles a house and Vice Chair Baltay doesn't believe that is what is expected since there are no houses in the general vicinity of the station. Broader roof overhangs and more vertical components would make a nice statement. It's a shame there isn't corner glazing at the lobby corner so you can see the intersection at Middlefield Road and East Meadow. It's the eyes on the street that make that pedestrian and community connection. He's disappointed the material for the massing is printed wood and believes if it doesn't make sense to use actual wood, they could put more consideration into finding something that looks more like wood. Vice Chair Baltay extended a question to the City, by asking if this is truly the best use of the land. Could they find something where they could build a taller and more dense building. In final, he requested Public Works consider putting forth an effort to begin the community outreach process sooner, so the community is able to make inquiries and be a part of the process before the drawings are completed.

Boardmember Chen thanked everyone for the presentation and believes the site plan is appropriate considering the current land constraints and the massing is appropriate for the neighborhood. She understands her colleagues concerns regarding the massing, however, believes the Eichler feel of the building matches that of the neighborhood. The scale is appropriate and pedestrian friendly and that is important given the pedestrian traffic that will take place along the building because of the multiple schools nearby. Overall, Boardmember Chen believes it is a successful design and would like to see more developed landscape and paving plans in the next submittal and make sure the floor plans match the elevation drawings.

Boardmember Rosenberg thanked everyone for the presentation and commented a building of this nature much be functional first and design considerations not a factor if that requirement isn't met and agrees with Vice Chair Baltay's comments regarding the fuel tank. This project is a significant investment to be trying to arrange it around an aging fuel tank. Big picture, that is an item that needs to be thoroughly investigated and considered now before it affects the circulation, design and functionality if becomes a problem that needs to be addressed at a later time. She appreciates that the building looks like an Eichler but also agrees that the building could go bigger and more bold in design. The lobby could be a little bigger and the frontal glass overlooking the intersection would be a nice feature. When looking at the frontal massing, the entrance to the building appears to get lost and could use some additional pop feature. The exercise facility has the potential to include a garage door where they could truly spill out into more of an indoor/outdoor space, and that would also be a nice feature for the firefighters in the kitchen area for outdoor dining. Boardmember Rosenberg appreciates that they worked with the property angles, it's a great opportunity to make great use of those angles and she's looking forward to seeing the project return.

Chair Hirsch thanked the Board for their comments and stated the planning concept was well thought out and the space on the lot was well utilized as with the functional aspect of the building and agreed with his colleagues comments regarding the aesthetics of the corner of the building which is an important part of the building, it would be a shame not to take advantage of the opportunity to do more for the presentation of the entrance of the building. There's no reason the building has to emulate an Eichler building when it could take a shape of it's own. The massing could be a variety of cubistic elements to make that corner more interesting. Detailing the space outside of the conference room with more glass could make it more of an outdoor welcoming space and more multi directional. He believes the placement of the fuel tank is sufficient providing there's not a potential for erosion and contamination of the space in the future and its equipment will parallel the life of the building. The landscaping still needs work, and he looks forward to seeing those details in the future. In addition, he agrees with the prior comments about making the building more of a civic statement. Chair Hirsch is encouraged by the planning but questions if the Eichler similarity is necessary.

Mr. Ford added the fire trucks have an optical system that when it turns and hits the traffic signal at the intersection it turns the light green for them and appreciated all of the comments and takes to heart the comments about the corner of the building and will factor that into the comments of the arborist who mentioned it would be a waste to design something around the beautiful tree when it's in a state of condition that it may not make it. They will review the information with the client and appreciate the advice.

Chair Hirsch commented he would like to support Vice Chair Baltay's comment regarding the wood print massing material and they could have chosen something that looked more similar to wood. If the design of the front entrance changes, the material might change with it. It is an important area to consider and he's confident they could do more with it. There is a relationship between the final design and what the materials may end up being.

Boardmember Rosenberg added she believed the wood print material was a clever solution for being fire retardant, recyclable and easily maintained.

Boardmember Chen stated she appreciates the wood appearance and believes the material is appropriate.

Action Items

4. Review and Adoption of the Revised Architectural Review Board By-Laws to Address Remote/Virtual Meeting Attendance

Senior Planner and ARB Liaison Claire Raybould stated she does not have a formal staff presentation for this item, however the changes to the former procedures in the bylaws have been provided in the Agenda packet Staff Report, with strike-out underlines for the bylaws that have been edited and provided a brief summary of the changes that were discussed by the Board in previous meetings. Regarding State law allowances for remote attendance of meetings, a city is allowed to make as many edits as needed providing the state requirements for remote access are met. City Council adopted a version for City Council and based on what was adopted, staff is recommending changes can only be made five times. The Board can attend under "Just Cause" for 20% of the ARB's meetings, or emergency circumstances. Those would not require the additional noticing that would be needed. What constitutes just cause is limited and listed under the new bylaws in Section 4.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if they could attend remotely without just cause.

Ms. Raybould responded they would be allowed to do that, however there would have to be proper noticing in order to do so. If one of the Boardmembers were traveling for work and wanted to attend the meeting via remote, that would not constitute just cause to do so without the proper noticing, unless they were traveling on behalf of the State or City.

Vice Chair Baltay questioned why the ARB was going through the process of making the determination when there isn't much flexibility.

Ms. Raybould stated City Council is allowing flexibility with allowing Boardmembers to be remote more often provided they followed standard noticing procedures. The City Council's intention is to encourage in-person attendance but allow each Board to make their own determination of how many times you can attend, not under just cause or emergency circumstances.

Vice Chair Baltay thinks this process is ridiculous. There are already three pages of bylaws that are now doubled, for rules that most of them won't be able to follow. He is unable to support changing the bylaws to that level of detail when it's not the intent or purpose of bylaws. The bylaws for SB2449 allow members

to attend remote under sick leave, he doesn't understand why that can't be a one-line addition to the bylaws.

Chair Hirsch inquired why it's important to have the level of details that are provided in the edits.

Manager of Current Planning Jodie Gerhardt commented that they were advised by the City Attorney to include the language added into the bylaws. Staff could create a separate internal document if approved by the attorneys. Another option would be to never allow remote attendance. Additionally, under AB 2449 they could opt to allow remote attendance only four times, which would cut the staff's notice requirements in half.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated the different between remote attendance and standard remote attendance in that if they were in a hotel room for standard remote attendance the Boardmember would be required to post a notice on the hotel door and allow people into their hotel room. The Boards intent was to allow remote attendance if they were sick and Boardmember Rosenberg failed to see how the current changes are helping that intent.

Vice Chair Baltay read a section that stated under standard remote notice requirements the Boardmember would have to state at the beginning of the meeting that the remote location was ADA accessible and there's not an architect any where that would state that from a hotel room.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that they've established the standard remote procedures are not going to work for the ARB. That is the law, the ARB is allowed to not take advantage of it if they so choose. AB 2449 Attendance does allow Boardmembers to attend remotely, just cause or emergency circumstances are required.

Ms. Raybould stated they do not have to include the Standard Remote procedures if the Board does not intend to use them. Under AB 2449 four meetings are allowed providing it falls under just cause. Being sick is considered just cause, however they will be limited to four times it could be used within a calendar year.

Chair Hirsch inquired what the ramifications would be if they went over the four.

Ms. Gerhardt shared the legal reasons that constitute just cause.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that being able to attend remotely for just cause can certainly be valuable and the Boardmembers are professional enough to not abuse that limit. He would like to see each Boardmember be allowed 3 instances each and inquired if they could make a recommendation to Council.

Ms. Raybould stated they have to concede to Brown Act Regulations.

Vice Chair Baltay stated the Brown Act is governed by State law and cities must conform to State Law. Bylaws are intended for cities to establish procedures for running the Board. If the intent isn't to do anything different, the changes don't need to be made.

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Chair Hirsch, to request the City Attorney revisit the changes to the bylaws based on the ARB's comments.

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

Ms. Raybould requested clarification on the motion.

Vice Chair Baltay stated the intent is for the City Attorney to create a more consolidated version of the bylaws.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested staff make this item a continuance so they can bring back the changes made by the attorney.

Vice Chair Baltay stated the motion was intended to be a continuance.

Approval of Minutes

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for December 15, 2022

MOTION: Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve the meeting minutes for December 15, 2022, as amended.

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

Boardmember Questions, Comments or Announcements

Ms. Raybould commented Boardmember Thompson is supposed to be at the Ad-Hoc meeting and is absent due to illness and requested another Boardmember sit in her place.

Vice Chair Baltay agreed to take her place.

Ms. Raybould had a question regarding the size of the plan sets and asked if anyone desired a larger plan set for projects, they could be produced.

Chair Hirsch requested they agree the plans could be presented on the large screen, or a larger printed set would be needed.

Vice Chair Baltay stated traditionally Boardmembers have been allowed to request a full set. It might make sense to inform the applicants they would like full sets, but they can produce them digitally.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented it is an industry standard that half-sized prints should always be legible. She prefers the smaller sets but it is helpful to see them on the large screen.

Boardmember Chen commented it's good to be flexible.

Chair Hirsch stated each Boardmember will request what they individually prefer on each project.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested if each Boardmember has a different preference, staff should include that with the checklist they provide to the applicant prior to a hearing; staff will send the checklist to each Boardmember to review for their individual preferences.

Adjournment

Chair Hirsch adjourned the meeting.

AD HOC Committee

6. 788 San Antonio [19PLN-00079]: Ad Hoc Committee Review of Previously Approved Project to Address Conditions of Approval and Related Architectural and Landscape Element Design Changes
7. 901 California Avenue [22PLN-00142]: Ad Hoc Committee Review of Previously Approved Project to Review Window Modulation and Details of the Terracotta Material. The Project is Exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in Accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15302.