



## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD

MINUTES: April 6, 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 Kendra Rosenberg, Boardmember Osma Thompson

Absent: Boardmember Yingxi Chen

### **Oral Communications**

Veronica Dao, Administrative Associate III, stated there were none.

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

Senior Planner and ARB Liaison Claire Raybould reported there were no Agenda changes, additions, or deletions.

### **City Official Reports**

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

Ms. Raybould displayed the ARB meeting schedule and reported an SB330 pre-application project was submitted for 300 Lambert as a 45-unit housing project and was the only new item since the prior hearing on March 16, 2023.

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current planning explained she rearranged the tables on the project list to reflect both pending projects on file and potential projects that are expected to be brought before the Architectural Review Board (ARB). The potential projects are speculative SB 330 projects, which freeze the standards without receipt of a formal application, or they have had a pre-screening before City Council.

Ms. Raybould reported some revisions to the schedule of upcoming meetings. The Agenda for the April 20, 2023 meeting currently has the Study Session for modifications to the objective standards related to townhome design and the Study Session for the SB 9 Objective Standards, and the Chair and Vice Chair Elections. Item 3 on the current Agenda before the ARB is the Council Work Plan, which can also be continued to the April 20 meeting if needed.

Chair Hirsch stated he and Boardmember Chen have prepared a presentation during their pre-meeting review for the modifications to the objective standards for townhomes and requested that be added to

the Agenda to be heard before the item. They have also discussed the general objective standards. That information has not yet been organized for formal ARB discussions and Chair Hirsch inquired about the possibility of having a pre-meeting with staff before the item is heard in a formal meeting.

Ms. Raybould replied they would include that on the standard Monday scheduled ARB pre-meeting prior to April 20, 2023 and explained the April 20 Agenda Item for the Objective Standards will be a study session and not an item that requires action, and the Work Plan will show this will be an ongoing item over the next year.

Chair Hirsch thanked Ms. Gerhardt for separating the list as it makes it easier to determine which projects would benefit from an ad-hoc pre-screening review. It is a very useful tool to help focus on what is coming down the line.

Ms. Raybould reported the plans for the 420 Acacia project that the ad-hoc review used were the SB 330 pre-application plans and not the formal project plans and apologized for the mix-up on what was printed for the website. It would be helpful if the ad-hoc could provide a list of the items they felt were missing if they are prepared for that.

Chair Hirsch stated he and Boardmember Rosenberg were the Boardmembers on the ad-hoc for 420 Acacia and apologized in advance because he did not completely live up to the promise that they would only comment on the sufficiency of the drawing sets. The ad-hoc has had discussions with the Attorney regarding not jeopardizing the ARB's position prior to a public hearing. There is a risk of the ad-hoc having to recuse themselves from hearings and given the ARB size, which could pose an issue for a well-rounded hearing process. There were some specific concerns about the internal circulation of the 420 Acacia project that he hopes will be addressed prior to the formal hearing. Ms. Raybould had some great suggestions.

Boardmember Thompson inquired what specifically was being discussed.

Chair Hirsch explained he was talking about the ad-hoc committee review for the 420 Acacia project that had been discussed at the prior meeting.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if that was an appropriate conversation for the current Agenda.

Ms. Gerhardt explained there is an ad-hoc committee that is made up of Chair Hirsch and Boardmember Rosenberg that reviews pending ARB projects from the list provided in the packet and the intent of the ad-hoc is to review the information before it comes to the ARB for a formal review, to ensure all the material needed is included. The current discussion is the report out of the ad-hoc committee to staff so they can inform the applicant.

Boardmember Thompson stated she understood that information was to be provided to staff and not to the full Board.

Chair Hirsch explained that was his current purpose, to find out what to do with the information they have thus far.

Ms. Raybould stated a quick bulleted summary of the ad-hoc findings provided in an email is the format that would be most helpful to staff. The hope would then be for staff to report the information on the next Agenda for discussion of how to best handle that information.

Chair Hirsch differs in opinion for the same reason Boardmember Thompson asked her question. The ARB needs to come to a consensus on how the ad-hoc handles the review, how the information is presented to staff and what the procedure would be for the ad-hoc, to ensure continuity from each ad-hoc review. He stated that Ms. Raybould's suggestion was a good one and used a description of interior circulation as an example. It gets dangerous bringing that information before the Board prior to a formal hearing and it would be better if the information from the ad-hoc reviews is presented to the planning department staff only, as a suggestion to help the applicant with providing more information to the ARB during the project hearing.

Vice Chair Baltay suggested the conversation for this topic might be better suited for the final Agenda item of *Boardmember Questions, Comments or Announcements*, since there are members of the public waiting to provide public comment on the *Action Items* part of the Agenda.

Chair Hirsch stated he is good either way, he was only trying to respond to Ms. Raybould's request.

Ms. Raybould stated she agreed with Vice Chair Baltay and that made perfect sense.

Boardmember Thompson stated that was why she was confused, because the item being discussed wasn't on the Agenda.

Chair Hirsch continued to the next Agenda item.

### **Action Items**

2. 3200 Park Boulevard/200 Portage/340 Portage [22PLN-00287 and 22PLN-00288]: Consideration of a Planned Community Zoning application to Allow Redevelopment of a 14.65-acre site at 200-404 Portage Avenue, 3040-3250 Park Boulevard, 3201-3225 Ash Street and 278 Lambert. The 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 Two-Level Parking Garage, and Dedication of Approximately 3.25 acres of Land to the City for Future Affordable Housing and Parkland Uses. Existing R&D Uses Would Continue to Occupy the Remaining Cannery Building. 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. The Project also Includes a Development Agreement, Comprehensive Plan Amendment, and Vesting Tentative Map. Environmental Assessment: A 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). Please contact the Project Planner, Claire Raybould at [Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org) for more information.

## RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Architectural Review Board (ARB) take the following action(s):

1. Consider and provide feedback on the proposed Development Plan for the Planned Community Zoning applications at 3200 Park Boulevard, including modifications to the existing cannery building and construction of the new parking garage and townhomes and continue to a date uncertain.

Vice Chair Baltay disclosed he visited the site during the prior week.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she had nothing to disclose.

Boardmember Thompson stated she had nothing to disclose.

Chair Hirsch stated he had nothing to disclose.

Ms. Raybould provided the executive summary and presentation for the project at 3200 Park Boulevard and explained the project has a number of addresses which include 200 Portage, 3200 Park, and 340 Portage and in Fall 2022, the Sobrato Organization, LLC (Sobrato) applied for a development agreement, planned community rezoning, and tentative map, associated with the redevelopment of the 14.65-acre site at 200-404 Portage Avenue, 3040-3250 Park Boulevard, 3201-3225 Ash Street and 278 Lambert. A Comprehensive Plan amendment and subdivision map exceptions would also be required. The project includes:

- 74 townhome housing units that would take the place of approximately 84,000 square feet (sf) of the historic cannery building at 200-404 Portage Avenue.
- Retention and remodel of the remaining portion of the cannery building.
- Construction of a new parking garage on the north side of the cannery building to replace surface parking adjacent Matadero Creek
- Dedication of a 3.25-acre parcel to the city for the purposes of a 2.25-acre public park and a one-acre site for affordable housing.

The plans presented to the ARB for this hearing are still under review and refinements to the design are anticipated to meet code requirements based on comments from plan reviewers in various City departments. Included in the Staff report is the Historical Review.

Ms. Raybould provided background information of the numerous input reviews and hearings that began in June 2022, which include City Council, Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC), Historic Resources Board (HRB), Palo Alto Pedestrian and Bicycle Advisory Committee (PABAC) and the ARB. On December 15, 2022, the ARB held a study session to provide input specific to townhome design. On January 19, 2023, following review from the HRB, the ARB held a study session to provide input specific to the remaining cannery building design. Minutes from these study sessions can be found online. The Board's comments and the applicant's responses to those comments are summarized in the staff report, in addition to the staff reports for the study sessions which provides further background information about the proposed Development

Agreement including the Comprehensive Plan amendment, Planned Community rezoning, Tentative Map and Final Map, HRB review. Previous Council, PTC, and HRB comments and motions related to the project are included in the staff report. All discretionary actions are being processed concurrently in accordance with the Planning Commission (PC) [TIMESTAMP 39:39 Video Skipped] and returning to the HRB on May 11, with a tentative plan to return to the ARB for a second hearing in May. Staff then plan to have formal PTC and Council hearings between June and August. The Environmental Impact Report (EIR) findings included Significant and unavoidable impact on a Historic Resource identified for the proposed project and all build alternatives. Mitigation measures were identified to reduce impacts on these resources to a less than significant level to include biological resources, hazardous materials, noise, and traffic/transportation. Ms. Raybould provided a review summary of key comments from the ARB for the Cannery portion of the project and provided images of the revisions in design based on those comments, and some of the changes made which include retaining the loading dock elevation based on feedback from the HRB and lowering the existing grade of the new parking garage by about 2-feet, which now keeps it in line with the first-floor mezzanine elevation of the Cannery building. The trash enclosure material was changed to better align with the main building, the Monitor roof scale was assessed and revised accordingly, and the applicant has provided basic floor plans for the interior of the building to better help understand how it will affect the exterior. Ms. Raybould went on to provide a review summary of key comments from the ARB for the townhome portion of the project and provided images of the revisions in design based on those comments which includes more variation between the buildings by presenting three unique townhome building designs, more variation in height along Park and articulates the façade through changes in materials and building step-backs, both to provide a more defined base, middle, and top and to create entrances that have a pedestrian scale. The entrances are highlighted through bays, the addition of raised stoops along park and some of the interior pathways, and material changes. The façade improvements help to break up the massing and provide more visual interest as suggested by board members. Trash service removal for dead end units has been resolved to the satisfaction of zero waste. Improvements to the planting plan also complement the revised entries. Overall, the plans are responsive to the ARB's recommendations. Staff noted that in order to achieve the change in height, the revised design includes buildings with a height of 37.5 feet at peak points of the roofline. The Planned Community Zone District Ordinance will reflect this proposed development plan. The 35-foot height limit within 150 feet of single-family uses is maintained for consistency with the requirements set forth in 18.38.150 for Planned Community zone districts. Changes to the width and height of the pedestrian mews were not made, however, the revisions to the planting plan do improve the paseo design. It was revised to slightly offset the pathway entrances to units across the paseo and larger planting areas have been provided to support the larger scale evergreen trees between units. The central tree at the townhome paseo has been updated to *Hymenosporum flavum* (Sweet shade), which is an evergreen tree. An increase in trees between units was made for more privacy. A materials board was supplied for the changes in façade material.

Chair Hirsch opened up Board questions of staff.

Boardmember Thompson stated she was interested in hearing from the applicant before asking questions.

Chair Hirsch opened the floor to the applicant.

Applicant Evan Sockalosky, with Arc Tec, stated he is joined by architect David Burton from KTGy, Morgan Burke with the Guzzardo Partnership, Matt Davis with Architectural Resources Group, and Robert Tersini with Sobrato who are all available to answer questions.

Matt Davis, a Historian Principal with Architectural Resources Group (ARG), explained in 2022 the Sobrato Organization solicited ARG to develop a series of preservation design guidelines on the Cannery portion of the project. Due to the age and type of the building, Sobrato was aware that bringing the building up to current code would require significant changes to the building and wanted to further understand the parameters required with respect to the historic character of the building. Based on the review by the HRB, the ARG developed guidelines in six categories which include height and bulk, roof forms, cladding, fenestration, entries and canopies, and interior of the building. Maintaining the height of the monitor building was a key factor.

Mr. Sockalosky stated Ms. Raybould did a great job of explaining most of the changes that were made based on the comments of the ARB and mentioned they updated the accuracy of the monitor building, refined Cannery building design in coordination with ARG guidelines and reinforced importance of interior spatial relationship and historic structural elements; he showed photos of the revisions in previous versus current format to the ARB. They refined glazing into the open space. The angled windows have been removed and all the panes of glass have been reduced, which is much more historically accurate. The change in materials for the entrance to the retail portion of the building and accurate elevations show the corrugated metal on the exterior of the building is more like for like to the monitor building. The lowering of grade for the parking garage reduces the height of the original proposal by approximately 17.5% in relation to the neighboring residential area, which reduces the impacts of the lot.

Morgan Burke, Guzzardo Partnership, highlighted photos in changes made to the landscaping around the building and in the pedestrian mews. The change in the loading dock grade was used to take advantage of refining the entry sequence leading into the office space of the building. There are now monument stairs and raised planters and wood bench seating. The active use area stayed the same, however with the change in grade of the parking garage, there are now retaining walls which provide more of a separation between the two areas. The bike parking was scattered around the parking garage previously and has now been joined in one area closer to the entrance of the building.

Mr. Sockalosky continued with the revisions made to the interior plan sets of the building and again showed imaged of before the revisions as compared to after the revisions. The skylight increased in size for better viewing of the monitor area space. The updated design includes modifications to bring the building up to code on structural energy and light safety issues while maintaining functional use of the retail area. Brace framing is still being coordinated for structural upgrades within the open areas. They are also still working through the entry way from the open space of the building to the mezzanine. The glazing and increasing the skylight has helped highlight the open areas of the building. A drawing was shown of the interior layout and the brace frame locations, retail layout with the skylight, and conceptual skylight layout. Final locations of proposed additional skylights are being worked on in conjunction with the roof footing motaics.

David Burton, architect with KTGy, showed townhome revisions compared to previous drawings and explained they really took to heart the previous comments of the ARB. They added a scheme of design

and tried to build different parapets for each building, two of the styles now have more of an asymmetrical base to help differentiate them more. Each building now has a unique way of meeting the ground to give each building a different look and feel at the pedestrian level. Each building has different expressions at the entries points. Different materials have been used in each style to make the styles more distinct. They purposely chose materials in color and styles that could be used in each to create harmony in the overall diversity.

Chair Hirsch opened the hearing up for Public Comment.

Karen Holman expressed concern that she didn't find out about the meeting until the night before and heard similar complaints from other interested parties. She felt the City could do better with their notification processes. Ms. Holman acknowledged the attempts made in the revisions and apologized in advance for not having the time to review all of the details of the changes. The August 2022 City Council meeting displayed a slide in writing stating the modifications to the Cannery building would align with the Secretary of Interior (SOI) standards. One of the goals of the NVCAP was preservation of the Cannery building and it is no longer able to register with the California Historical registry due to over 40% of the building being removed. If the remnant building does not employ the Secretary of Interior standards, it is equal to a complete demolition of the Cannery building. The staff report did not indicate such. What is being presented has not been vetted by staff for code compliant, and code compliance is in question because everything is being presented as Planned Community (PC). There are no development standards for PC zone. What is being presented is inappropriate for CS zoning and the code change being proposed has no maximum listed. The project could have significant impact on future zoning changes. One of the reasons for the PC is the lot division. Ms. Holman referenced South of Forest Area (SOFA) 1 caps regarding land use change in designations. This as well as other ways could be utilized by dividing the smaller lots.

Lissy Bland stated raising her hand was an accident. She is a Ventura resident who is listening to the meeting as an interested party.

Art Liberman, PABAC liaison, thanked Ms. Raybould for bringing the project before PABAC and suggested she return due to a number of questions that were raised by PABAC members after the meeting in regard to the Bicycle Plan connection between Park and El Camino. The proposal for a two-way cycle track that ends at a private road and Portage leaves members of PABAC concerned about safety. There needs to be more information regarding the circulation plan for the proposed project as he did not see a traffic plan included in the packet. Additionally, the traffic TDA study that was included by [TIMESTAMP 2:16:55 Hexigan] contains a number of errors in terms of amenities and bicycle plan in the area. He hoped there would be further discussion on that topic.

Veronica Dao, Administrative Associate III, reported there were no more public speakers.

Chair Hirsch asked the applicant if they wished to respond to public comments.

Matt Davis, Historian Principal with Architectural Resources Group (ARG), responded to public comment on behalf of the applicant by stating for those concerned about the treatment of the building is not in keeping with the Secretary of Interior standards, he encouraged they reevaluate the Historic Resource evaluation that Paige and Turnbull completed, it describes the character defining features of the building which was reviewed and confirmed in conjunction with their own site assessment. If the list were to be

reviewed item by item, other than a few exceptions on window repairs, the character defining features of the Cannery building are being retained to the extent feasible. He is not able to conclude by looking at the plans that they're not being kept within the standards of the Secretary of Interior. It has been Sobrato's main focus to keep the remaining portion of the building as much in accordance with the Secretary standards as it's current problems and flimsy construction will allow.

Chair Hirsch opened the floor to Board questions of staff.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if there had been anything different with the neighborhood communication process for this project's series of meetings as compared to all other ARB projects.

Ms. Raybould stated the standard is to send notices to a 600-foot radius and it was done for this project as well.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired how far in advance are those notices sent out.

Ms. Raybould reported they are usually sent out about 12 days in advance, the date the notifications were sent for this meeting is stated in the staff report. Ms. Raybould did notice that the notices for the current hearing were not sent out to interested parties who had expressed interest in the NVCAP, so she sent those additional notices via email on April 5. She will endeavor to improve those additional communications by sending them out at the same time as the 600-foot notices, particularly in cases when staff are requesting formal recommendations on a project.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if these additional interested parties expressed an interest in the project.

Ms. Raybould clarified they had expressed an interest in the NVCAP in general, and presumably would also have an interest in this project.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if people involved in NVCAP only received notices one day ahead of the meeting.

Ms. Raybould stated that was correct.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if there is a requirement for a 10-day leeway.

Ms. Raybould replied there is no requirement.

Boardmember Thompson stated she had many questions for staff and the applicant and asked if she could do them all together; and asked the applicant if they were able to confirm if 40% of the Cannery was being demolished and if 40% of the building is demolished, does it lose Historic status.

Ms. Raybould stated that is the conclusion of the environmental impact report and the City standard looks at a project as a whole, and not in percentage of the structure. The demolition of that portion of the building is inconsistent with the Secretary of Interior standards and impacts the eligibility of this building to be a Historic Resource under the California Register. Based on Council, ARB and the HRB feedback, and community members, there is still an interest in trying to retain the character features which remain on the building and minimize impacts of the rest. The monitor roof is the main character that was shown to have an interest in retaining. Ultimately, the City was interested enough to do an analysis for informational



purposes to gauge how consistent the changes to what's left of the building would be with the SOI standards.

Boardmember Thompson clarified that there's an interest in keeping the building in compliance with SOI standards, however due to the amount of the building that is demolished, it is not.

Ms. Raybould stated that was correct.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the applicant had looked at not demolishing so much of the building.

Ms. Raybould stated the townhomes could not be built if the building was not demolished. It would be a different project.

Chair Hirsch inquired if the building were retained, would it truly pass as a historic building as it currently stands.

Ms. Raybould stated the building as it currently is could potentially be eligible for historic status, however it has not actually been placed on the register.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if everything the applicant is doing to retain the character of the Cannery is voluntary.

Ms. Raybould replied it is voluntary, however it was a stated desire of City Council.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if demolishing more than 40% of the building is a problem for the City, is it a problem for how it is being renovated.

Ms. Raybould stated what it means is it will no longer be eligible for SOI standards, so City Council would have to make overriding considerations of the project in order to approve the proposed project.

Vice Chair Baltay referenced Drawing Sheet A31.0.7 and inquired from Mr. Davis if this were really the original monitor building, would the changes being proposed for the two monitor structures on the roof line be compatible with the SOI standards if it were a stand alone building.

Mr. Davis replied their stance is that it would be, however the demolition itself pushes them into a different category. It's not just any 40% of the building, it's the portion extending to the east which is in fact an addition that was not part of the original building. The portion being removed is not as old as the portion being retained, with the exception of the board form concrete which is even newer. Thought was given to which portion of the building made most sense to demolish in order to building the housing project.

Vice Chair Baltay stated his concern isn't with the 40%, it is with the end façades of the monitor buildings have new window treatments that are strikingly different than the original façade. Would that be considered acceptable under the SOI standards?

Mr. Davis responded yes because the standards aren't that prescriptive.

Boardmember Thompson stated there appears to be protruding box forms for the retail portion on the façade and inquired if that would be consistent with historic standards.

Mr. Davis stated that when you do SOI analysis, the calculus is between existing and proposed. There has always been a lower-level portion that protrudes from the monitor roofs as original conditions of the building. The question is whether or not the proposed bulb outs are sufficiently in keeping with that historic condition to be compatible, and not compromise the historic character of the building. One could argue that they are sufficiently compatible, given the simplicity of the treatments and the fact that the bulb outs do not introduce radically new shapes or massing. Under Standard 9, both compatibility and differentiation at the same time. Both are necessary under Standard 9.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the bulb outs are consistent with what was there previously.

Mr. Davis responded they are not.

Ms. Raybould stated it is unclear if the bulb out area that exists today across the second-floor level occurred during the period of significance, or when it was added.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he was incorrect in saying the window mullions were not in line with the original windows, as he sees from the photos of the original building that the patterns were previously rectangular and inquired if it is known what the original mullion patterns were.

Mr. Davis responded the original window mullions are still in place.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the intention was to match those.

Mr. Davis stated it was.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about the bicycle path in the area that was mentioned and asked if it could be pointed out.

Ms. Raybould stated it connects Park to Portage and is on a portion of the City dedication parcel as well as the applicant's townhome and Cannery parcels and Mr. Sockalosky showed the site plan slide for reference, and stated it is still under development.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated Sheet L-1.1 seems to have an image that goes from left to right.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if it is known what is on the other side of the bike path.

Ms. Raybould stated it will be the City dedication parcel. The Ash office building sits at the western end which will remain, the rest will be the park land and affordable housing project property.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if the dashed line is the proposed property line.

Ms. Raybould answered it is.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the bike path is on the City future park land.

Ms. Raybould stated a portion of the bike path will be on the future City park land.

Vice Chair Baltay stated it appears as if most of it is.

Ms. Raybould answered that it is just north of the green area on Sheet L1.1.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if it is acceptable to the City that the bike path is on the park land and not their property.

Ms. Raybould responded that staff explored several options for that and in order to address numerous issues raised, they felt it was acceptable to propose a portion of their property and a portion of their property.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired what was included in the original City's ad-hoc agreement.

Ms. Raybould stated there was no agreement related to that. It was identified as an impact for consistency for the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan as part of the EIR. There is a requirement to provide a connection. The connection has to be a minimum of sharrows, which is identified in the Bicycle and Pedestrian Transportation Plan. Staff explored options that looked at sharrows. The concern from the transportation division was that the parking options would pack up into the sharrows space, and with all the parking along that street, staff didn't feel that was a safe connection. They looked at options that included a bike path on each side instead of sharrows, but parking was still an issue. Back-end parking was also reviewed but decided that a more protected bicycle connection would be having a portion on their property and a portion on the City's property, which would allow them to still retain the parking and meet the C-3 requirements while also having a quality connection. ARB or Council may choose otherwise, or propose alternative options, but that was the option that moved forward as what seemed like the most appropriate option.

Boardmember Thompson commented that on the north side there is a lower plane that will step up to the entrance, she was unable to locate an accessible entrance and requested someone point that out on the site plan.

Mr. Burke showed a curb ramp leading to a ramp that directs them to a ramp at the front door. On the back side there is a curb ramp that immediately to the right has a switch back ramp that leads to the upper level for that door as well.

Boardmember Thompson referenced the retail front façade and questioned if changes had been made since the most recent study session.

Mr. Burke stated the landscape had not changed.

Boardmember Thompson clarified she was interested if the bulb outs had changed.

Mr. Sockalosky stated it had changed and brought up the original drawings to show a comparison. The massing did not change, however in coordination with ARG the window treatments changed significantly, on the two-story portion it had previously be a much more a-symmetrical layout and symmetry was encouraged by the over all design as well as refining the window treatment to utilize smaller panes of glass which corresponds more appropriately with the architectural character.

Boardmember Thompson questioned if the G-1 glass on the material board for the Cannery was designed with the intent to look more blue and not clear.

Mr. Sockalosky replied that the challenge with single-paned glazing samples is that they do not glaze accurately with the one-inch system, however the slightly blue tint was intended which helps with the

energy efficiency. If there are concerns about that, they will take those into account with any further renditions.

Boardmember Thompson commented that the material marked M-3 seems to be the predominant material on the Cannery and questioned if there is a reflectivity that's known to be associated with it.

Mr. Sockalosky stated there is not a significant reflectivity to it, it's a prefinished corrugated metal material.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the windows in Cannery are operable.

Mr. Sockalosky stated they looked into that and from a mechanical standpoint they felt operational windows would not function well with the future use of Research and Development (R&D) office building and they coordinated with Mr. David on that. He felt that was not a significant impact to go with the standard fixed windows.

Boardmember Thompson asked how the building is ventilated.

Mr. Sockalosky explained the HVAC units are on the western portion of the building which feed into the space and across side feeding into the monitor roof as much as possible. It is still in development at this stage, however, that is the intent.

Boardmember Thompson confirmed there would be no significant impact to the roofline.

Mr. Sockalosky stated not at all.

Vice Chair Baltay followed up on the ventilation and commented that means there would be fairly large air ducts within the monitor roof forms.

Mr. Sockalosky stated right now they are not going to have it in the roof area, they will be bringing it in across from underneath the mezzanine and potentially projecting across against the wall above the retail and side feed it from the mezzanine side. Some supplements may be added against the east wall to side feed into the monitor rooms. Due to the spacious openness of the monitor building they are working to make sure it is an innocuous as possible while still providing the proper mechanical system and air flow.

Vice Chair Baltay requested clarification that there are no intentions of adding mechanical systems anywhere along the slope line of the monitor building roofline.

Mr. Sockalosky stated that was correct.

Boardmember Rosenberg noticed the interior ceiling insulation material appears to be black in appearance and inquired why that color was chosen and what the specific material will be.

Mr. Sockalosky stated that the paper-back insulation is commonly a black system to cut down on any glare. It disappears from the roof structure while still allowing the structure to be exposed. They felt it was appropriate for an open space and for contrast with some of the wood.

Boardmember Rosenberg clarified the intention was to emphasize some of the existing pearl ends and roof structure.

Mr. Sockalosky stated absolutely.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated some of the existing images on the interior of the building show that some of the cross members are blue in appearance and requested clarification on the material and how they intend to get them back to an all-wood look.

Mr. Sockalosky explained it is all wood, which is one of the defining features, [TIMESTAMP 1:49:30 Video Skipped] that was something ARG stated that was not a historic feature of it, to get them back to as close to natural wood as possible, they will be a little bit of flex left over due to the treatment of the gentle sandblast to remove the 50's paint.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired how they planned to carefully sandblast that and is a contingency plan in place should that structure be damaged through the course of sandblasting.

Mr. Sockalosky stated before they get to the point of the actual treatment, they will work in coordination with ARG to ensure the means and methods that will be used are appropriate and gentle enough for the structure. The means will be studied prior to execution. That would include tests on other areas.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated the mezzanine area appears to have one staircase and asked if there is an elevator in place or secondary staircase.

Mr. Sockalosky stated there are two staircases. There is no elevator proposed due to code restrictions not requiring one for the amount of space that is there.

Boardmember Rosenberg confirmed the location of the two staircases.

Chair Hirsch inquired about the function of the mezzanine.

Mr. Sockalosky explained that is all for future R&D office tenants. They do not have the exact layout for how that will be used at this time. The restroom core is on the first level. The second level is an open mezzanine intended for a future tenant to outfit. Maintaining the openness of the space will be critical both on the first level and the two-story space and above the mezzanine.

Chair Hirsch referenced Drawing A3 1.0.12 it is shown with an area of a sheetrock type wall and areas that are open and clarified those areas have yet been determined as to what that will be.

Mr. Sockalosky stated that was correct and even on the interior on the renderings that partial wall is more of an existing structural condition that is currently shown as sheet rocked over, however, in coordination with elevation and ARG on how that will be treated, the future build out will be a tenant decision of what goes in those spaces.

Chair Hirsch referenced the same drawing, and requested someone point out Vice Chair Baltay's question of where the duct system would be within that space.

Mr. Sockalosky explained the intent is to side feed the ductwork to come for the western portion of the building, underneath the mezzanine and side feed from that portion out into the space. And referenced a photo of the interior of the building for visual clarification. If supplements are needed based on the volume requirements, they will run across the lid of the retail space at the other end of the planned south

end of the building feeding above and behind the skylight as needed, with a side registered duct below the level of the windows and the trusses to allow an outfeed from that side.

Chair Hirsch clarified that on the end wall of the building the ducts would be behind the columns.

Mr. Sockalosky stated that was correct. It is a narrow wall that has sheet rock over the existing structural columns and the ductwork would be surreptitious behind the columns.

Chair Hirsch inquired if the interior of the structures are diagrammatic sketches or the kind of structure that would replace the existing structures or what's there currently.

Mr. Sockalosky stated the photos reflect what is currently existing, and one of the defining features and showed another photo of the existing interior. Regarding accuracy of the drawings, following the ARB's prior comments, the interior of the building was totally laser scanned for accurate renderings of the existing structures.

Chair Hirsch clarified that the tenants would be responsible for lighting their own spaces.

Mr. Sockalosky replied that was correct. The development of the lighting at this stage will be very general for the open space, but development lighting would be tenant specific. The ARB could set guidelines for future lighting requirements after development of the spaces.

Chair Hirsch referenced drawing A3-1.0.12 and inquired about the vertical members on the column line that ends three quarters of the way up and if they had been added to the building or useful and asked what those elements entail.

Mr. Sockalosky explained those were structural reinforcements that were added at a later date. They are currently going through full evaluation with their structural engineer, and as of now they believe those are critical for the reinforcement of the structure that should not be removed.

Chair Hirsch referenced the exterior metal panels and asked what metal panel is used on the housing as related to what's on the exterior of the Cannery.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if they were moving to the housing, Chair Hirsch stated not yet, he was just curious if the material on the Cannery is the same material on the housing.

Mr. Burton stated the intention is that would be a vertical tongue in groove wood siding, they didn't believe the corrugated metal would be appropriate for residential use, but they wanted to use something with a similar vertical shadow pattern.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if the mezzanine that is shown an existing feature of the current building.

Mr. Sockalosky replied yes, it is an existing mezzanine that they are maintaining.

Vice Chair Baltay asked staff what would happen if a future tenant wanted to add a mezzanine of their own.

Ms. Raybould answered they would not be allowed to do that because the planned community zoning would restrict the floor area of the site. They would need Council approval to amend the PC to add that floor area.

Boardmember Thompson began her housing questions with the materials of the third building and asked if there is a material board available.

Robert Tersini, Sobrato Developer, stated two new material boards were submitted that related to the two new designs and there should have been a third one that was one of the original boards that was submitted.

Ms. Raybould apologized and stated she forgot to bring down the original material board from the previous meeting and confirmed that staff does have that.

Boardmember Thompson commented it's unclear which parts of the façade are getting the textured stucco versus the smooth stucco and inquired if one of the elevations could be used to clarify those and explain the design intent between the textured and smooth.

Mr. Tersini explained that as a general rule, the overall stucco would be the fine sand texture. The smooth would be on frames around windows and things of that nature. The intent would be to maintain the defined crisp forms.

Boardmember Thompson asked if the applicant was able to give the percentage of the façade that will be stucco.

Mr. Tersini stated that he would have to do calculations to find that number, and the elevations include which parts are stucco and which parts are other materials.

Boardmember Thompson commented she inquired due to their objective standards stating a specific limit of stucco on a façade and requested the length of the longest façade of the building.

Mr. Tersini stated it is a seven-unit building, the length would be somewhere between 140 and 150 feet. Each unit is approximately 21' wide.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about the parking aisle between the townhomes and what is being utilized to reduce the heat island effect in those areas.

Mr. Burke replied there are planting areas in between the garages with vegetation. Another option to examine is using decorative paving that lines the drive aisle, with a higher solar reflectance (SR) ratings.

Mr. Tersini stated that the City requires the drive aisle itself be maintained clear and open to the sky.

Boardmember Thompson asked why that requirement is in place.

Ms. Raybould replied it is due to it being a private street. It's also an access for trash and fire trucks.

Boardmember Thompson asked if trees are not allowed in the area.

Ms. Raybould stated that trees are allowed, but there is a 26' area that must be maintained clear along those aisles.

Boardmember Thompson requested clarification of if the 26' ceiling could not have a canopy on it encroaching the full 26 feet.

Ms. Raybould explained there's no buildings so on the ground floor it's actually 32' feet across, where they have the trees, will be partially under the overhang of the building. There's a 26-foot clearance between the second floors of the building. That needs to be maintained clear. Foliage would be okay, if it were obstructive, it could be trimmed. A shading device would not be recommended.

Boardmember Thompson asked if those planting strips have enough space for a tree.

Mr. Burke responded that it was not enough space for a traditional canopy tree due to it being immediately adjacent to the building. They want to be respectful of the plants and trees that are put in the space. Anything columnar in species would become a maintenance concern in the future.

Boardmember Thompson requested the applicant pull up the tree protection plan and inform the ARB of any additional trees that were saved between the prior meeting and current meeting.

Mr. Burke showed the tree protection plan and pointed on screen to which trees were being preserved and stated the trees along Park Boulevard were always going to be retained. One of the changes was a tree that was going to be encroached by the parking structure and they were able to save.

Boardmember Thompson inquired if the building footprint was changed to allow the trees to be saved.

Mr. Burke stated they did a better job studying the ones that they could save as it relates to the townhomes.

Vice Chair Baltay requested the changes in planting that was done along Olive on the northside of the townhomes and inquired what the planting plan is in place of the trees that will be removed.

Mr. Burke shared landscape elevations and stated that entire area is designated to be stormwater treatment for the townhome space. Those trees are not protected according to Palo Alto standards and many of them are not of good quality. The area will be infilled with as much native planting as possible that is stormwater complaint. A tree will also be planted in the basin to try to capture some of the canopy they will be losing.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if they had a profile selected for the horizontal fiber cement siding on the townhome.

Mr. Tersini stated it is a standard lap siding with either a four or seven-inch exposure to it.

Vice Chair Baltay clarified by standard he means that it will be a 7/16 x 4 -6" strip that gets lapped onto itself.

Mr. Tersini answered yes.

Boardmember Rosenberg referenced material pallet C and stated the fiber cement horizontal siding on the Packet Page A1\_2.7.2 and asked if those three painted cement fiber elements shown will have a wood look to it, on the material board they look like a swatch of paint.

Mr. Tersini stated it will be a smooth painted siding. There won't be the color variation that's shown on the board.



Boardmember Thompson inquired about the style A townhomes regarding the previous mention of a sawtooth style with a kind of nod to the skylights as a design intent element and if there was an iteration where they did include skylights for those townhomes.

Mr. Tersini stated no, they had not included skylights for those townhomes. Externally skylights can be a liability issue for the builders.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about a clear story.

Mr. Tersini stated those elements would have to be taller based on the sloping of the roof to get clear story windows in the units. There is also a requirement now to reserve space on the rooftops for solar panels.

Chair Hirsch referenced A1-2.4.2 and requested clarification on what was happening and where in respect to the two-story protruding definition with a deep shadow projecting out. That form is carried through to the areas indicated in grey.

Mr. Tersini explained that everything that is grey is on the same plane and there's a darker type of eyebrow above the windows on the second floor which projects a bit to provide some sort of sun screening to the unit windows and provide shadow and depth to the elevation. Ladder access is required to the third floor by the fire department.

Chair Hirsch stated that's a bit contradictive as the top piece shown and the joint isn't in line with the deep shadow.

Mr. Tersini asked if he was talking about the third level.

Ms. Raybould stated he's talking about the third level setback from the bays.

Chair Hirsch stated he was actually asking about the shape of the piece below it. It looks like there's a deep shadow in the window line and at the end panel.

Mr. Tersini answered below the window would be a deep sill and is setback. The windows above the second floor are extended out a bit with a frame, to provide more living space. The frame provides the shadow lines.

Chair Hirsch asked if the textured wood area to the left of that structure lined up with the outside.

Mr. Tersini replied that it would be setback from the stucco so there would be a change in plane there as well.

Chair Hirsch requested clarification that there would be a side element that could be seen from the window.

Mr. Tersini stated there is a couple of inches of setback in those locations.

Chair Hirsch commented it doesn't read on the smaller drawings, and one element above the window line projecting.

Mr. Tersini stated it would project out six, eight or ten inches, they are limited in how far they can extend those out for emergency access to the above third level.

Chair Hirsch noted there is a step up to access the lower floor and parking is at a lower level.

Mr. Tersini clarified the parking is at the same level. From the street up to the building pad there's about a foot in change but the building itself is level with some slope for drainage.

Chair Hirsch inquired if some of the units would then step back down within the units.

Mr. Tersini stated some of the units are flush which are accessible units, and some of the units are based on what is needed for grading on the site to drain water. That will all get worked out in the construction drawings. More calculations will be needed.

Chair Hirsch inquired about the flushing of the frames around the windows.

Mr. Tersini responded that it would depend upon the conditions but where the windows are in the wood-look siding, there is a fiber cement trim that will provide about a two-inch shadow line. The windows that are in stucco will be recessed, when possible, and when not possible there will be a smooth stucco trim so the windows are not flushed with the stucco.

Boardmember Thompson inquired about the profile of the standing seam metal wall panel on the upper third floor.

Mr. Tersini stated the panels are sixteen inches wide and the standing seams are about an inch and a half in depth. It's a standard panel.

Chair Hirsch inquired if it turns the corner at the street face.

Mr. Tersini stated he would have to look at the elevation, and stated at the corner they did turn it around the corner.

Vice Chair Baltay noticed on the very last sheet and on other sheets show the proposed public utility easements for the townhome section of the project and stated it looks like everything surround the building are easements and the exceptions are made for the building themselves. Within those easements, Vice Chair Baltay inquired about the restrictions against planting trees, specifically along the northside of the townhomes facing Olive Street across the way.

Ms. Raybould requested clarification of which sheet Vice Chair Baltay was viewing.

Vice Chair Baltay stated on the very last page in the packet, however there was also one in the landscape plan, possible C8.0 is the same diagram as the last page. It seemed to him they had the entire area as public utility easements with specific all outs for the buildings.

Vice Chair Baltay commented to the staff that it's important to have the ability to have plantings around the buildings and he would hate to see that precluded.

Ms. Raybould stated the easements are slightly setback which shows the drive aisle where they identified the private street so there is the area where they have plantings that are adjacent to the driveway of the

area. There are public easements that run through the main private street “B” from Portage to Park and that has many of the main utility connections.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he was concerned more with the north side of the site, the zig-zag step where the property line is.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented she compared that to L-3.2 the conflict was pretty obvious.

Vice Chair Baltay said he’d like to see if they can have plants in that area.

Ms. Raybould stated that staff would explore that area more to return with a clearer answer, and she believed there are also underground powerlines in that area. It doesn’t prevent them from planting trees along the property line, as many of the other areas are intended to be C-3 storm water area and won’t have trees planted.

Chair Hirsch commented that separate from this portion of the project there is a major access street “A” into the parking lot and there have been transportation studies for the movement of traffic. Various townhomes all access that street and inquired if the private streets are two-way.

Mr. Tersini stated they are all two-way streets.

Ms. Raybould confirmed that to be true.

Chair Hirsch requested more information on which units enter and egress on private Street “A”, and which units enter and egress from Private Street “B”.

Ms. Raybould stated the units can enter and egress either way, but tenants will go to the side that would be the least path of travel, and private streets “A” and “B” connect and are two-way streets.

Chair Hirsch inquired if the traffic study addressed the schemes of morning and evening rush hours and if there will be conflict.

Ms. Raybould stated the traffic analysis concluded that there would be no safety concerns with the proposed design and made assumptions based on the traffic consultant’s and ARB approvals of what the distribution path of travel that would occur varied by number of units and what the units general path of travel would be.

Chair Hirsch asked if the traffic study could be referenced.

Ms. Raybould stated that it’s provided in the EIR and was discussed in the staff report.

Chair Hirsch stated in terms of parking locations and garbage collection, the private streets of “E” and “D” and inquired if the garbage truck would travel up one side to return down the other.

Ms. Raybould stated that was also her understanding. There is access through from streets “E” and “D” for the trash trucks.

#### **THE ARB RECESSED FOR A 10 MINUTE BREAK**

Chair Hirsch opened the meeting to Boardmember comments for the Cannery portion of the project.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented that she felt the response to prior Board comments was intentional, thoughtful, and appropriate. She is concerned with potential future problems with the HVAC layout, and she would like the blue glass to be reconsidered. Overall, she is impressed with the revisions to the windows, specifically with the end façades, the interior wood structures and the thoughtfulness moving forward with those. The retail space still feels small and does not feel that given the size of the space it should be inhabited by one company, which isn't within the purview of the ARB, however, it is her opinion. More public access to the beauty of the space would have been nice. She sincerely appreciated the dropping of the parking structure and felt it was an elegant solution for that area. The landscaping in that space was very nice and she appreciated incorporating the higher and lower areas. She's looking forward to seeing the project return.

Vice Chair Baltay, in general, shared Boardmember Rosenberg's sentiment, and commented that Private Street A on the site plan, from Park will be a major pathway for many of the consumers of the retail space due to it being a short cut from the 101 via Paige Mill Road. It's not really the ARB's purview, however, he believes there is a potential for traffic problems between the residents of the townhomes and the people working in the office building. It would be a benefit to address those challenges now versus later. Related to the massing on the building, he would like to see the monitor building kept as historically accurate as possible and to where it does meet the SOI standards as defined by Palo Alto's HRB. The questions regarding the color of the glass, size of the mullions, and size of the windows should be looked at through a historic lens for consideration of what's appropriate for that building. He likes what's been presented on paper, however he would like to see the glass clear. More so, he'd like the building to be treated historically. He understood that the building no longer meets historic standards when 40% has been removed, but at the same time the monitor building could still be treated as such. Another concern is that the corrugated metal is too shiny, the glass is too blue and the mullion patterns on the windows are too different. He's concerned about the bulb-out on the south side of the monitor building and believes all of it should be a second story or not there at all. The images reflect that the original building did not have that space and it looks better from an architectural perspective without it. One option might be to continue the retail space all the way down which would create one continuous façade. That would also better preserve the original form of the gable ends of the roof. Vice Chair Baltay is bothered by the retail space as it relates to the interior of the monitor structure. The flat roof with a skylight looking up is a dubious scheme of trying to show the public was there and very likely to get lost as some tenant moves in. The retail space should go full to the height of the monitor building. The east end of the parking lot faces the townhomes and needs better landscaping or more detail in design. The lighting on the third floor of the parking garage wasn't detailed, he would like to see what will be used and how it will affect the neighbors across Olive. With those two big changes to the Cannery building, he would be able to support the project.

Chair Hirsch commented that it's hard to understand why Private street A doesn't continue into the parking lot, there would be an easier connection there if one of the townhomes were moved to the other side. He's doubtful of the circulation of Street A as described by the transportation staff and agrees there will be future conflicts. Speed bumps won't solve those problems even though the resolve to those challenges isn't obvious. The improvements to the docks were appropriate, however he agrees with the comments of Vice Chair Baltay regarding the south side of the building. The HVAC plans still need a lot of work, and he doesn't understand why they wouldn't want float ducts within the space, which is how it's

done on the opposite end of the building and is generally standard in buildings of this nature. He believes the intent from the beginning was to keep the building as historically in character as possible and they've come even closer to doing that. He is more concerned with the general site planning, which goes back to the commitment that has been made by the City Council. The parking plan as a whole has never been solved and the Cannery parking on the other side of the red line is an unfortunate mistake because it effects the entire scheme of the townhomes. It's unfortunate that wasn't addressed early on in the project, and perhaps had it been, there could have been a different type of housing scheme. As far as the Cannery building itself is concerned, he believes it's quite a success.

Boardmember Thompson agrees the glass is too blue and perhaps next time the project returns, a more complete material board will be available that will show the glazing unit and the profile of the corrugated metal. Her concern is that being corrugated, it may be too shiny and it's hard to tell with the single sample that is matte. The blue glass is going to affect the interior view looking out, everything will be seen as blue. She would also like to see more renderings of the southern retail side. There was only one included and she'd like to see the space from various angles. She shares Vice Chair Baltay concern about the bulb-out boxes. The different height of the boxes is distracting. They did a fun forced perspective with the paint on the monitor and you still get the essence of the curves even with the obstruction, however none of the design work appears to be paying homage to the buildings. Boardmember Thompson maintained her views from the prior meeting that it's not very contextual, it's not respectful to the historical nature of the building and she is disappointed changes weren't made. She feels the pallet is too grey considering the parking area also has a grey treatment, a good option might be tying in some of the residential color pallet for the parking garage treatment. The foliage alone isn't going to make the parking area look less dismal. The HVAC ventilation is a concern because it will affect how the building looks. It's a bare bones building and maintains operable windows would still be a good option. The future tenant may thank them for allowing thermal comfort without having to pay for it. The duct work will have aesthetic impacts on the interior of the building and recommends the next time the project returns, the applicant has someone on hand who can explain the HVAC plans.

Ms. Raybould suggested giving the applicant a chance to ask questions if needed.

Vice Chair Baltay summarized items the Board was in consensus with. Three board members were not happy with the forms of the bulb outs on the south side and asked Boardmember Rosenberg if she had a position.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she was a bit more neutral; it is less offensive to her because it already existed. She would, however, support her colleagues in that it should be a single form or a single-story structure.

Boardmember Thompson stated it is not already existing and showed Boardmember Rosenberg a photo.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented she's not sure if that changes her opinion, however she still supports her colleagues opinion if they felt it should be brought down to a single level.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he supports Boardmember Thompson's comments that there should be ventilation in the monitor structure and inquired Chair Hirsch and Boardmember Rosenberg's opinion.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she supports the idea of operable windows.

Vice Chair Baltay commented he was trying to summarize a list of items the Board had consensus on.

Boardmember Thompson commented she thought she was the only one who brought up the pallet of the parking garage.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she was completely on board with that. Since Vice Chair Baltay brought up the fact that it faces the townhomes, it was a great idea to try to tie the pallet of the townhomes over to that structure.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he supported that.

Chair Hirsch commented he would like to see some of the colors of the main building more so than the colors of the townhomes specifically and that he remembered there being more colors in the previous meeting than what was being shown now.

Regarding the massing, Vice Chair Baltay commented he believed there was consensus that they all wanted to see more information on the materials being presented.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated specifically she would like to see a better sample of the corrugated metal.

Chair Hirsch stated everyone agreed that the blue glass was not appropriate.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented that seeing the fenestration and proportion of the mullions will be important, particularly since the windows are a huge element of the façade.

The Boardmembers moved on to the townhome portion of the project.

Boardmember Rosenberg believed the plans of the townhomes is a big step forward. Breaking up the buildings has been a huge improvement. The variation of the heights of the first level to the second level on Types A versus B versus C feels much more interesting and more elegant. Her concern is she's not a big fan of how flat everything is. The renderings on the sheets that show styles A, B, and C show a wood look and that variation in color is very flat and disheartening. She encouraged the applicant to look for something a bit more high end in quality of material. Each material separately is fine but put all together it's flat with flat with flat and makes the whole building fall flat and encouraged the use of a more natural material whether that be actual wood, or a wood look metal panel, something with more variation in texture. The metal being proposed is one element that brings that in and encouraged them to do same with the fiber cement. The angle's of the ceiling height are interesting, and she likes how they treated the entrances differently. The garage façades probably need a little more attention. Boardmember Rosenberg is concerned with the texture of the stucco on the material board. It feels as if it's on the cheaper side, and reiterated Vice Chair Baltay's comments about the percentage of stucco to make sure the project doesn't go overboard with stucco. Regarding the site layout, Streets A and B may be used as thorough fares. Just like traffic will use the Ash Street to enter from the El Camino side, people will use Street A and B to access the parking structure from Park and encouraged the developer to figure out a way to discourage people from using Streets A and B as thorough fares. Going down Street B and D, and less specifically E and F, she would encourage the use of speed bumps or raised platforms for the pedestrians.

A secondary look at where the residents will be crossing from the parking structure would be beneficial. The landscape is nicely done, she likes to see lots of plantings, lots of trees and lots of shading and privacy between the residences. The bike path on the property line left her concerned about who would maintain it, what would happen if there's a future dispute. If the bike path is going to straddle the property line, something needs to be in place prior to building the project with regards to who will be responsible for maintenance and care of the bike path. The bike parking seems sparse. They did a good job at the Cannery building for bike pathing and parking, the townhouses could use more consideration for additional bike parking.

Vice Chair Baltay shared Boardmember Rosenberg's opinions with regards to the massing of the townhomes. It could use more detail and refinement, particularly the parallel lap siding, which could be a heavier profile. The standing seam metal point that Boardmember Rosenberg shared was a good one and he's like to see more consideration given towards that. He is concerned about the elevations facing across Olive. There are four buildings on the north façade that can be seen as you come down the street because it's a sloped street. Building B4 on Sheet A1 2.4.1 has a fairly large façade that's a stucco finish, which would end up being one blank wall. Each building has the same issue. He doesn't believe it needs to be redesigned, but he would like the color to be toned down or more thought to what that finish will be. In response to Boardmember Thompson's comments about the heat island effects, it would be nice to see a paving pattern plan. The private streets could be done in a material that radiates less heat, and it would look better. It would be nice to see what their proposal would be for that. He would like to see more privacy inducive landscape on the northside of the townhomes where they face Olive. He's doubly concerned when he hears it's a storm-water system and then the plans show it's all a public utilities easement, it makes him think there won't be any large trees in that area, particularly when there are already trees in that location. If they aren't healthy, maybe propose replacing them rather than removing them. Removing them has a negative impact on the community. On building #1 facing Olive, in one drawing it appears private, then on Sheet A1-2.1.0 in the lower left drawing, the windows on the second and third levels look directly into the folks across the way and into their backyards. Residential use standards in Palo Alto do not allow that. On the third level, the floor plan could be flipped so that the closet is on that side and the larger windows would face west, and the three smaller windows in the living room could be raised up to improve privacy; it would be a small change that goes a long way for the neighbors. When you have the buildings across from each other on the paseo, if you were to mirror one of the floor plans, you wouldn't have doors opposite from each other, which is generally a nice variation and while it may be more architectural work, there wouldn't be any construction difference in the cost. The massing is much improved and appreciates the effort put into it overall. He suggested on Buildings 4, 9 and 11, seen best on Sheet A1-2.4.1, this building is the least successful on the modulations and it could be improved by taking the setback thin pieces of the building between the decorative elements and lower it down another foot, which gives it a little more up and down effect. The drawing above it shows that on one side, it should be on both sides. It's just a parapet wall so it would be a fairly straightforward change. The big issue he'd like to address is the comments regarding the site planning. He feels that the ARB should respect the City Council ad-hoc's decision on this. He's gone back to the records and looked at the negotiations over the past ten years in some detail, and his conclusion in the end was that this was the compromise the City Council and the City want. This is the site plan they agreed to; and he believes they did it intentionally. He's not comfortable with the ARB looking to push for different changes in site

planning at this point. It's a done deal and Vice Chair Baltay thinks it's hurtful to the process to push that any further. It's not the best site plan that could have been done, but he believes there was a compromise that took place that's quite extensive and the City was very pleased to receive a free park with additional land for housing, a solution so that this project could move forward, and to avoid a lawsuit. It's not appropriate for the ARB to keep pushing without consideration of all the other elements that were involved. An example could be he felt more of the Cannery could have been used for more retail space and as it turns out, the ad-hoc committee felt the same way and they fought hard for it. There were other reasons in the negotiation process that they decided not to continue pushing for that, and instead got the park. He would like to see this project move forward. With that, Vice Chair Baltay stated there is one site change that could be made and should be made, and that's the width of the paseo. There's a public paseo in the middle of the project and it's too narrow. It could be made wider if they made private Street C a little narrower. As a Board, he'd like to see them agree that at a minimum, it should be as wide as it is tall, which would be adding about six feet. They could make that change without dramatically changing the site plan of the project.

Chair Hirsch commented he felt from the beginning that they have a very long linear repetition of housing typology and the project with a paseo is missing it's general usage which would make it a community use facility that's found in better townhome projects. Relative to how decisions are made here in Palo Alto, he feels the process could have included some negotiations from the Council. It's not the applicants problem, it's a problem with making deals with a developer. It's difficult to come to an end result where you have this particular scheme because it was the best they could do, with the amount of land for seventy—four townhomes. An example would be had the red line been closer to the Cannery building and that parking was moved elsewhere, perhaps at the other end of the building, it would have allowed some extra property that would have significantly improved the paseo, and the paseo could have been used for other uses common to areas that are common to the whole community. It would have then become kind of a center piece for this community. He agrees with Vice Chair Baltay that at this point there won't be many changes to the streets to make the paseo wider, and that in itself is unfortunate. The typology of the housing, he's not quite pleased with yet. The improvements of changing the access to the doors and changing the street access and entry elevation is a grand improvement. When he looked at A1 2.0.2 and sees the same thing they saw in the beginning, he likes that the end had an important change in elevation and he's not so intrigued that they wouldn't try that in the whole block, and mid-block on A1 2.4.1 still bothers him in the sense that more variation could happen. All of the houses are the same with the same number of bedrooms so there are no tandem parking type houses or alterations. More variation within each housing block would make the residences feel more personal to the people who buy them. In terms of street access, it doesn't do any good to have the bend at the end, if they did 6 homes on one end and put the other six on the other end, it would have better alignment and the traffic flow would be improved. Site planning would have been better if they had more land, but there are other ways to make the traffic circulation better. Tandem parking on some of the units in the middle might also help. That would increase the space between the buildings, and it would increase the air to the project. The more you can increase the paseo to make it more significant in general use, the better this project will be. When you have townhomes entirely in a project such as this, you miss the diversity within a community that has a greater mixture of typologies. If a portion of this project had been a podium type of scheme and a



portion had been townhomes, there would be a better mix of population and more appropriate as a neighborhood.

Boardmember Thompson thanked the applicants and agreed with much of what her other Boardmembers had to say. She appreciates the effort to diversify the townhome architecture and liked styles A and B. Style C feels like a little bit of a Frankenstein thing where it has something going on at the top and something very different at the bottom. Her recommendation for what does work is on Sheet A1-2.7.2 where you can see the profile on the side with a ribbon on the upper level that's modulating in section and that party is really successful. It could have variation in color and having that terminate the way that that tectonic terminates might make it feel less abrupt. In general, she liked the color pallet except on the backside on the same page, it's very monochromatic. A lot of the façades will be facing the south, but it's also going to be facing other people with balconies and it's going to look dismal. Particularly the parking aisles. It would be great if there were a way to make those streets feel less isolated. She appreciated Boardmember Rosenberg's mention of the wood material. She thought it was wood, it didn't occur to her that it was paint. Biophilia is so important, we need to have warmth and we need to want to look at it. There needs to be variation across that material. The wood colors look great, just make them wood. People have big veranda style balconies on the back, they'll want to look at something biophilic, and something with warmth. These are 360° buildings, there's not really a front or a back, with the limited foliage, those are going to be the most visible façades. The trees are lovely on the front side, you can't ignore the backside. Boardmember Thompson agrees with Vice Chair Baltay about the side elevations as well, only he stated he didn't want you to redesign it, she would like it redesigned. She believes it's quite plain, particularly for building B, and consideration should be given to the side façades. More treatment should be given to the façades that are going to get more sun exposure. Particularly since it's more of a modular based design. She encourages them to find a modular where they can insert sunshades for the sides that are getting a lot of sun exposure. That would also provide greater variation without adding a lot of cost or design changes. They are in a similar style in the sense that they are this modern contemporary style. Similar to her comment on the Cannery, the material boards would be better if the colors were on the samples themselves. Textured stucco looks very different from a flat white sample of stucco. It's hard to determine actual color of a material prior to seeing the color on a sanded finish. Boardmember Thompson requested at the next meeting the materials have the appropriate colors on the finished sample of materials. Wood samples or something similar of nature would also be nice to see. A rainscreen panel might be a good option; they have a lot of variation, and they last. She agrees with Boardmember Rosenberg about the flatness, not just in color but in the material variations as well. The punched openings don't seem enough, and the changes in material don't actually change plane and only a trim is added. She appreciates Vice Chair Baltay's comments regarding the site planning. Like the rest she is disappointed that it didn't change, however she believes he's right, they do need to move forward. She agrees with widening the paseo if possible. Boardmember Thompson encouraged more thought into the heat-island effect that will happen on the parking aisles, something without a blinding effect. In general, she appreciated adding more trees, but the number of trees being demolished is quite high. At the last meeting there were some suggestions on how some of those trees could be saved and she doesn't believe any of those trees discussed were saved. She pushed one more time to request the applicant take a look at saving more of the trees, as some of the added trees look like they would fall into the paseo.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she heard three Boardmembers mention widening the paseo. In theory she liked the idea, however, she has concerns it will force all of the six building chunks to the left. That top left building is already impacted by the daylight plane in a notable way. They showed iterations where they canted the roof line to follow the daylight plane. The applicant is likely going to find it too expensive to move them all by six feet. They would have to lose an entire unit. The secondary concern in widening the paseo, if Street C is turned into a one-way street, it affects the circulation of vehicles trying to move around the building. That will force them down Streets A and B in a way that is not wanted. She urged the Board to discuss that a bit before they make it a formal request of the applicant.

Boardmember Thompson clarified she was talking about the Plan East-West paseo.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated if they widen the North-South paseo, it will take moving all those homes to the left.

Ms. Gerhardt stated she believed the Boardmembers were talking about two different paseos and asked Vice Chair Baltay to clarify which paseo he was talking about.

Vice Chair Baltay he was referring to the paseo that runs parallel to Street C, which is North-South, the longest and widest one, and he believes they could widen the part that's between Streets A and B without effecting the daylight plane issue. The impact would be on Street C or the parking along Street C. To respond to Boardmember Rosenberg's comment's, he believes Street C would not be used by the commercial building, more the townhomes and one way circulation wouldn't have that much of an affect but would leave it to the applicant to figure how they capture six feet. Traffic leaving the parking structure could still go both ways and his thought is they want to encourage traffic towards El Camino as much as possible. Making the street narrower is good in that way. The paseo at the proposed width just doesn't work. When there are houses at the same grade level claiming their public space in front of them, it will end up being a zigzag pathway through the trees, with no public function. Just a few more feet would give them more options for landscaping and possibly a bench or two. His intent isn't to make it an absolute, however strongly encourage the applicant to revisit that if possible.

Chair Hirsch supports that wherever they can find the extra footage to make it work, and explained he wasn't talking about moving all the units by six feet, only taking one unit, and shifting it to the opposite side.

Boardmember Rosenberg clarified they are talking about two different elements, which would cause reason for a whole different conversation. Then Boardmember Thompson's point of the second East-West paseo is too narrow brings in a completely different challenge. Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if the dimension of the North-South paseo was known.

Ms. Raybould replied that the paseo is twenty feet, and the height of the buildings are 37.5' at their highest point.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated if they really wanted it one to one, the paseo would have to be increased by seventeen feet.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he scaled twenty-two feet in the plans. He thought they were closer to twenty-eight feet but that wasn't the case. He believes if they can get six feet of width on the paseo that would

be sufficient. Ideally, he's like the ARB to give them direction on what to do with both paseos. He's hard pressed in believing they can't capture an additional six feet over a space that's over several hundred feet between parking, landscaping, building designs and firewalls. His opinion is the applicant is pushing back because they don't want to go back to the drawing board. It comes down to the quality of life of the people who will be living there and widening the paseos would make a big difference.

Boardmember Thompson agreed and stated she would support that.

Ms. Raybould stated that is something they could explore further. The changes would affect a few different aspects and she would need to get feedback from zero waste and green waste who provide trash pick up to better understand how changes to the street widths and turning radius might affect their vehicles. In addition, to fire to understand their minimum widths for the emergency vehicle access. Some discussions took place with the applicant in possibly increasing the width of the paseo by getting rid of the [TIMESTAMP 3:45:58 Video Skipped] additional parking that's not required parking. The applicant stated they wanted to try to have some additional parking along different areas to near each unit, that would have to be explored. On Sheet A0.1.2 the minimum street width per Title 21 of the code is supposed to be 32', the applicant is requesting a map with exceptions for the streets for the two aisles that go down the center, Street E and Street D, G and F, to be 26' across in width. Currently they are maintaining 32" for Street A, B, and C. If you look again at A0.1.2, it shows where the private streets are, shifting that would reduce the street width on Street C. That is something the Planning Commission and the Council would have to agree to as part of a map width exception.

Chair Hirsch inquired if this considers the possibility that Street C could be a one-way street.

Ms. Raybould answered she believes there still needs to be a twenty-two foot back up width for those parking spaces on the Cannery site. There could be a one-way street but there would still have to be 22'.

Vice Chair Baltay stated the plans right now show the width at 26'. If they could make it 22', that's four of the six feet.

Ms. Raybould added that would be in the car park.

Vice Chair Baltay stated changing the parking to angled parking would shift the dividing line in between the two parcels.

Ms. Raybould stated there is parallel parking on the right side as well.

Vice Chair Baltay stated they also have a 7.5' landscaping buffer and a 4.5' sidewalk. A couple of feet could be captured in way.

Ms. Gerhardt stated they are hearing that six additional feet is being requested in the North to South paseo and inquired if there was consensus from the rest of the Board on that and if so, they should leave it to the applicant to find the additional feet.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he would like to ask the applicant to find six feet for both paseos.

Boardmember Thompson stated yes, she supported that.

Chair Hirsch stated he also supports that.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she also supports that.

Chair Hirsch commented that the other request was asking them to shift Private Street A.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he does not support that request as it would cause issues with trash pick up and would be too costly of a change to make in design.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she would argue that people tend to go faster on a straight thorough fare versus having it curved in some fashion. There will be a lot of pedestrians in that area, making that left turn will cause people to slow down versus making it a straight shot in and out. It makes it safer for the transition between traffic, parking structure to habitable living space.

Chair Hirsch stated he's okay with that if there is consensus.

Moving on to massing, Boardmember Thompson stated she heard two comments about adding a wood element.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he supported that. He would like to see greater variation and higher quality of the massing materials, and he would like to see better documentation of what it is.

Chair Hirsch stated he's not on board with that. In terms of the design of the buildings themselves, some of them are better than others, he doesn't see a good relationship between the base of buildings when the tops are so different. He's not happy with the design of the units themselves.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that Boardmember Thompson mentioned sunshades and modulation and he supported that completely. It's an easy thing to do. It would also fix what Chair Hirsch doesn't like.

Chair Hirsch agreed.

Boardmember Rosenberg believes there's some really nice geometric lines with the angles and the saw-tooths at the top and maybe the sunshade can be evocative of that geometry. Her concern would be them slapping on open trellises and cautioned the language should be very thoughtful.

Chair Hirsch agrees there are different ways of modulating the sun on the inside of the building. Larger volumes are not a bad idea if they are very well done in manner. His concern is the lack of variation.

Vice Chair Baltay believed they could modulate the height in some of the townhomes façade.

Boardmember Rosenberg agrees completely particularly on Style A1-2.7.0. The first chunk is modulated down and the rest is not; she believes that first modulation is very successful. Style B is the most repetitive of the styles. Style C has quite a bit of variation, possibly too much.

Boardmember Thompson felt Style C was too different styles stacked on top of each other, and encouraged the applicant to take the top half of the folded ribbon aspect and use that tectonic all the way down and have it terminate the way that tectonic terminates as best the applicant sees. She likes the wood tones in Style C so she wouldn't ask the applicant to remove that.

Vice Chair Baltay also believed style C was interesting architecture and he liked the profile of the roof form and the way they rotated it the ends. The grey metal and the wood, assuming that will be some kind of real wood, is pretty strong. And agrees Boardmember Thompson's comments are good too, and it would

make it stronger by taking it all the way down, and Chair Hirsch indicated is the integration of the upper and the lower pieces he didn't care for. He supports asking the architect to consider pushing it further by following the language that's used on the upper portion of the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg believes the white portion on the left of the upper image is doing that, where it's coming all the way down and it's breaking the façade to some extent. The little white pieces in between do the same thing. She also stated she feels like she's constantly having to flip between the three pages constantly, she would like to see all three elements together because that's what will be seen as people walk down the street. Yes, B alone is repetitive, but once you put it together across from Style C, it's going to have a lot more variation and the three styles are working together. They aren't identical, they're not overly repetitive. She likes that A has this sort of chunk at the bottom and a two-story element up above and that B seems to be floating somewhat, and everything is on the second floor, and then Style C is different, and the chunk is at the bottom with the ribbon up above. By having that difference in façades from upper to lower and then left to right, it's helpful overall to break this up. She doesn't appreciate houses that are identical from building to building. That was the ARB's original issue in that the three styles were too similar.

Boardmember Thompson agrees with everything Boardmember Rosenberg said and thinks her issue is, in looking at 2.7.2, the white plane at the back is doing its thing as the base and the ribbon comes out, her issue is there's a third thing that's nothing like the other two, that is just chopping the ribbon off. It feels like three different elements on one façade, and the way the ribbon terminates doesn't feel natural in the way a tectonic ribbon would terminate. She likes the top-heavy/middle-heavy/bottom-heavy aspect of the buildings together. She feels the applicant could revisit the façade with the ribbon and make adjustments, so it doesn't feel pieced together but rather flowing between all the elements, or between planes.

Vice Chair Baltay is concerned that the Boardmembers need to be more specific when requesting a change in tectonic of the form otherwise it leaves room for the applicant to return and say they weren't specific in what they wanted to see. He doesn't support what Boardmember Thompson is saying.

Boardmember Thompson stated she's uncomfortable suggesting a design, as that should be left up to the architect.

Chair Hirsch feels the complication of having so many different materials on the fronts adds to the complexity of it and they should look at the façades and find a way to unify them in a way that's not creating a total repetition each time. He's seen it done, but a possible alternative could be to have a change in unit type within the structure. It allows for different variation within the cluster.

Boardmember Thompson suggested the Board weigh in on requesting the applicant to add an additional unit floor plan.

Chair Hirsch commented that it's a way of looking at the project and identifying that the people who occupy them will occupy different sized houses and it creates a variation from the inside out.

Vice Chair Baltay fully supports what Chair Hirsch is saying. It would be better if they did that, however, City Council wanted three- and four-bedroom family townhomes on the site. That's what they agreed to

do. That's what they negotiated; the record is clear. That's what is being proposed, and he doesn't feel they can keep asking the applicant to continue going back to the drawing board on that. He agrees, the town would be better if there were a bigger variety of housing elements, greater economic drive, and greater diversity.

Chair Hirsch stated in looking at requesting the paseo to be wider, creating a variety in floor plan would give them the opportunity to take care of the paseo issue at the same time.

Vice Chair Baltay commented he would support them doing that, he just didn't feel he could support demanding they do that.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented if this was supposed to be mixed-use, that is something that should and would have been addressed a long time ago.

Chair Hirsch stated it's too late for that.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated in terms of tandem parking versus side-by-side parking, that goes back to them requiring tandem parking, and that making it more difficult to sell the units. That's placing significant financial impact on the developer in a way that she's not sure they can justify. It is also beyond their scope.

Boardmember Thompson agrees with Boardmember Rosenberg and Vice Chair Baltay on that.

Vice Chair Baltay apologized and stated it's not that he doesn't agree with Chair Hirsch, but he really wants to see the project built.

Chair Hirsch stated he agrees that all of the ARB would like to see the project get built.

Ms. Gerhardt stated she's impressed with the stamina of the Board with this project and inquired if they were ready for the summary of consensus.

Boardmember Thompson stated there are two more items she wanted to try to get consensus on. On A1-2.4.1, Vice Chair Baltay and she both made a comment about the side elevation B and similarly the elevation along Olive requesting the applicant to reconsider the design on that side, particularly the elevation that faces the park.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he can support asking the applicant to reconsider the design of the end façades of all the units, with the eye towards making them more attractive, and more continuous with the rest of the buildings and less aggressively visible from Park Avenue and the future park, meaning less of a bright white wall.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she could support that.

Chair Hirsch stated he's fine with that.

Boardmember Thompson stated her last item was lessening the heat-island effect on the parking access lanes.

Chair Hirsch stated he thought that was addressed on the paving.

Vice Chair Baltay asked Boardmember Thompson if she means more than understanding more of the material that will be laid, as they made it pretty clear they don't have a lot of options on landscaping.

Boardmember Thompson replied that it could be just paving.

Vice Chair Baltay stated it would be an improvement if they could just get them to tell the ARB what the material will be and they could then push to make it nicer or more reflective, or more permeable.

Boardmember Rosenberg added in looking at the LOI, what the color choice of the paving would be as well.

Boardmember Thompson stated they don't have paving samples included and they could ask for that for next time.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that's part of the request as a whole when asking for more of the samples of what's being used and in the finished state of how they will look with the colors that have been chosen, to include material specifications.

Boardmember Thompson added that in tandem with that, there was the façade elevations along those streets and how those could be quite visible and less monochromatic in their treatment on Sheet A1-2.7.2, the backside of Style C.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated it would be fair to ask that the ARB receives better views of all of the end elements, possibly even a streetscape elevation from each of the Streets and the views for the ends of the buildings side by side, from both directions.

Vice Chair Baltay stated if they extend their comments about using a higher quality of materials, to include all four sides of the buildings, that will help eliminate the flatness of the material on the end sides.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented she would like to see additional shots of the elevations of all the buildings together as they would be seen from the street, similar to Sheet A1-2.0.1, but with better visual of just the ends of the townhomes. The sheet could have a little more attention and thought put into it.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he would like to see better landscaping on the side that faces Olive street.

Boardmember Rosenberg and Boardmember Thompson both agreed with that.

Ms. Raybould recapped the ARB consensus with concerns and comments as followed for the Cannery:

- Consensus was that it seemed it would be better to have a single form from the single-story structure above the retail area, not as a-symmetrical in design.
- There should be more consideration of proper ventilation into the monitor structure and the ARB would like to see schematic drawings of the HVAC design with respect to the monitor area and the glazing, and the operable ventilation window.
- The pallet of the parking garage should consider bringing more colors of the townhomes into the garage structure to mix up that pallet more.
- An interest in seeing a corrugation sample, noting that there's a distinct difference between having something flat versus corrugated.
- Reconsideration of the blue coloration of the glass

- Seeing fenestration proportions of mullions so that samples received since it's a huge element of the façade.

Ms. Raybould recapped the ARB consensus with concerns and comments as followed for the townhomes:

- There should be greater variation of materials for higher quality of materials, in particular better documentation of those materials and how those relate to replace some of the existing stucco.
- There should be some wood feature to help bring in warmth.
- Consider the addition of sunshades on the south façade units and they should not be added on, rather pulled through the language of the building design with respect to the geometric lines.
- Improve the design of the pedestrian mews to increase the width in both directions to six feet on both the north to south and east to west paseos.
- Consider the façade elevations on all sides of the building, including the parking façades, as they relate to the façades that can be seen from Olive Avenue and from the future public park area for higher quality material and more textuality.
- Consider the heat island effect on the access aisles and if anything can be done to improve that through color choices of paving or permeable pavers.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Thompson, that the project be continued to a date uncertain subjective to the comments Ms. Raybould outlined.

**VOTE:** 4-0-0-1 (Boardmember Chen absent)

### 3. Draft Architectural Review Board's (ARB) Annual Report and Draft Work Plan

Ms. Raybould stated the Work Plan could be pushed to the next meeting.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested the Chair consider Item 3 be pushed to the following meeting on account of time.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Rosenberg motioned, seconded by Vice Chair Baltay, to move Agenda Item #3 to a meeting date certain of April 20, 2023.

**VOTE:** 4-0-0-1 (Boardmember Chen absent)

### Approval of Minutes

#### 4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for March 2, 2023.



Vice Chair Baltay commented that on Packet Page 150, and Packet Page 154, both places refer to the building having connections to bicycle parking, vehicle parking and fitness center; the Board's intention was to have a direct internal connection. The motion states there should be an internal connection and items D E and F should also include the word internal. Additionally, Line-Item G should be Corten Steel.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested clarification on direct connection.

Vice Chair Baltay stated it was included in the motion so it should only be changed on Packet Page 154.

Boardmember Rosenberg restated the change should be in items D, E, and F to include direct internal connection.

Boardmember Thompson abstained due to her being absent for that meeting.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Rosenberg, to approve the meeting minutes for March 6, 2023, as amended.

**VOTE:** 3-0-1-1 (Boardmember Chen absent, Boardmember Thompson abstained)

#### **Boardmember Questions, Comments or Announcements**

Vice Chair Baltay requested the discussion regarding the ad-hoc committees be deferred to the next meeting.

#### **Adjournment**

Chair Hirsch adjourned the meeting.