



CITY OF
**PALO
ALTO**

Architectural Review Board Staff Report

From: Planning and Development Services Director
Lead Department: Planning and Development Services

Meeting Date: April 4, 2024
Report #: 2403-2773

TITLE

800/808 San Antonio Road [23PLN-00010]: Ad Hoc Review of Modifications to the Proposed Application to Rezone 800 and 808 San Antonio Road from Commercial Services to Planned Community, which the ARB Previously Recommended for Approval. The Proposed Modifications Address Refinements to Setbacks, Further Consideration of Trash Management, and Other Minor Interior and Landscape Modifications.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the ARB Ad Hoc Committee:

1. Discuss and provide further direction or recommend that the modifications address the ARB recommendations to Council.

ANALYSIS

On March 7, 2024, the ARB recommended approval of the subject project with a condition that certain project elements return to an ARB Ad Hoc Committee. Board members Adcock and Hirsch were selected to act as the Ad Hoc Committee for this project. Below are the items that board recommended return to the Committee and the applicant's response to the ARB's comments:

Architectural Review Recommended Condition 1

- The Board recommended that the project be revised so that no projections encroached above grade into the special setback

Applicant's Response:

- The ground floor, street-facing unit's patios have been reduced so that they do not encroach into the Special Setback. See sheet A2.1.

Architecture Review Recommended Condition 2

- The board recommended that private and common space be revised to meet the open space requirements

Applicant's Response:

- Sheet A0.4a has been updated to correctly calculate the useable space of the courtyard as 1,529 sf and the rooftop garden as 1,830 sf. Although the reduction of one of the patios that was within the special setback means 1 private open space is no longer considered "useable", the total average usable open space for the project meets the 150 sf/unit minimum.

Architecture Review Recommended Condition 3:

- The hallway adjacent elevator 2 be revised to have fewer bends in the hallway and to have more functional space adjacent the trash storage and elevator

Applicant's Response:

- Sheet A2.1 shows that the hallways width has been increased near the trash room from 4'6" to 6'6". Further verification is needed that this was done equally to all floors of the building. The typical hallway width is 6 ft. The total building floor area increased approximately 300 sf, from 2.99 FAR to 3.00 FAR to accommodate this.

Architecture Review Recommended Condition 4:

- Recommend considering alternate locations of the trash collection area, means of bringing trash to the street staging area, and location of the trash staging area

Applicant's Response:

- Alternatives have been prepared, see Attachment A. The first alternative shown is the currently proposed process of bringing the bins up the ramp from the trash room via a powered hand trolley to a staging area adjacent the at-grade parking. The second alternative describes the lift system as proposed during the meeting by the ARB. Adding a lift here would remove parking, impact units on the first and second floors, and require a new location for the backup battery. The third alternative would require relocating the switchgear and fire pump, however no proposed new location for the switchgear and fire pump is identified. It also would require relocating the upper floor trash rooms in a way that is not fully developed.

Architecture Review Recommended Condition 5:

- Schematic foundation design including consideration of planters, bioswales and secant walls

Applicant's Response:

- Sheets A2.0a and A2.0b have been updated to verify that the previously reviewed garage configuration is within the property lines with the planned secant walls. See Attachment B for a diagram of the typical planters and bioswales.

Architecture Review Recommended Condition 6:

- More comprehensive landscape plan in the courtyard including provisions for planters, furnishing and pathways through the courtyard

Applicant's Response:

- Sheet L-1 has been updated to better demonstrate the layout for the courtyard. The table layout has been clarified to no longer block the doors, and the rear door has been increased to a double-width door.

Architecture Review Recommend Condition 7:

- Provide clerestory windows in the bicycle storage area

Applicant's Response:

- Thin vertical obscured glass windows have been added, see sheet A3.0.

Staff Analysis

Overall, the applicant's changes have addressed the ARB's comments and improved and clarified the project. However, staff believes that neither of the proposed alternative trash storage options are viable. Either one would require significant redesign. The alternative trash staging location is viable, but undesirable. And if the location of the trash storage is not revised, then the trash staging location would be a considerable distance from the current storage.

Specifically, under Alternative 2, the location of a trash immediately adjacent to a resident's open space would make that unit/open space undesirable. Moreover, the lift system results in the loss of parking where no parking reduction is currently requested. This would require additional staff analysis and likely required a TDM plan for the project. This design also reduces the size of the unit and requires relocation of the battery storage in a different location; it is unclear where this could be located without displacing additional parking or similarly impacting a different requirement.

In Alternative 3 there is no alternative location for the displaced switch gear or fire pump that could comply with code. These facilities are required to be along the frontage and the switchgear must be within 30 feet of the transformer.

Therefore, staff recommends allowing the currently proposed method for bringing the refuse bins to the street level and continuing to provide the staging in the current proposed location.

A video recording of the Board's last meeting on this project is available online: <https://midpenmedia.org/architectural-review-board-77-372024/>

The Board is encouraged to provide direction to staff and the applicant as to whether the proposed changes are sufficient or require further refinement.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Trash Alternatives

Attachment B: Planter Diagram

Attachment C: Link to Revised Plans

AUTHOR/TITLE:

Emily Kallas, AICP, Planner