



## ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD DRAFT MINUTES: March 2, 2023

Council Chamber & Zoom  
8:30 AM

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

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

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

Absent: Boardmember Osma Thompson

Chair Hirsch stated there was not a need to read the Resolution Authorizing Use of Teleconferencing for the Architectural Review Board During Covid-19 State of Emergency.

### **Oral Communications**

None

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

Manager of Current Planning Jodie Gerhardt indicated there were no Agenda changes, additions, or deletions.

### **City Official Reports**

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

Manager of Current Planning Jodie Gerhardt displayed the ARB meeting schedule and explained that Ms. Raybould was out sick and would join the meeting for the 3001 Agenda item and Boardmember Thompson was on a scheduled absence. The March 16<sup>th</sup> meeting will include the Senate Bill (SB) 9 Objective Standards which is currently a temporary ordinance and staff will be seeking reapproval on the current items to make them permanent, the continued discussion for modifications of the By Laws, and 414 California Ad Hoc committee meeting designees. Further down the schedule are the list of newer pending projects. The ARB may want to create ad hoc committees for some of the newer projects to review for missing information prior to placing the item on the Agenda for review.

Chair Hirsch suggested 3400 El Camino might benefit from an ad hoc committee.

Senior Planner and ARB Liaison Claire Raybould stated 3400 El Camino is an older project, and it is not yet clear if it is set to move forward.

Ms. Gerhardt noted the greyed-out items on the list are the projects that are not yet ready for ARB review, and 3400 El Camino was reviewed by the Council however, the application has not yet been submitted so there is nothing in that project yet to be reviewed by the ARB.

Chair Hirsch suggested it might be beneficial for the ARB to look at some of the projects prior to the pre-screening and questioned if 3400 El Camino has a very early pre-screening.

Ms. Gerhardt directed the Boardmembers attention to the information which notes the project went to an initial pre-screening in front of City Council on September 19, 2022, there is a staff report available and plan set in the Agenda packet for that specific City Council meeting. Since that time nothing formal has been submitted so the changes to the plan set are still unknown.

Chair Hirsch inquired about 4200 Acacia Avenue and 3150 El Camino.

Ms. Gerhardt responded that those projects are SB 330 projects which freeze the standards, and there will be very little information to review based on the nature of the applications.

Chair Hirsch requested clarification on what is included in the SB 330 applications.

Ms. Gerhardt explained they generally include site plans and the massing diagrams; the details will be missing.

Ms. Raybould added the only requirements for the SB 330 pre-applications include elevation drawings and a site plan.

Chair Hirsch expressed an interest in the ARB looking at some of those projects in the pre-screening phase as it may help the Board be more concise with some of their comments during the review process.

Ms. Gerhardt replied that the planners welcome the comments of ARB ad hoc committees with the understanding that the ad hoc committees are reviewing the information of the project without making any formal decisions. The greyed-out projects on the list are so early in the process it may not be the best use of an ad hoc committee but they are always welcome to create one and there will be considerable missing details.

Chair Hirsch informed the other Boardmembers that Ms. Gerhardt previously mentioned to City Council that the ARB was interested in having project ad hoc committees and City Council was open to the idea.

Chair Hirsch inquired about the 800 San Antonio project.

Ms. Raybould commented that one had recently submitted a formal application and is scheduled to go before City Council because it involves a zone change.

Ms. Gerhardt stated that one should not have been greyed out, the pre-screening took place on August 15, 2022 and would be a reasonable project to create an ad hoc committee.

Vice Chair Baltay explained that in the Monday meetings, he and Chair Hirsch have been encouraging staff to get the ARB involved in projects earlier in the review process, particularly the larger projects with more limited review processes. The first part of that has been staff producing the thorough list of projects for the ARB and public to see what will be coming forth in future meetings. The thought process was to assign

an ad hoc committee early on to review the plan set, not for judgment purposes, rather to guide the process through for a complete application and to provide the ARB with early feedback on what they should be expecting on future Agendas. Both Chair Hirsch and Vice Chair Baltay believed it could be good use of the ARB's time to have that early involvement. He believed there were three projects on the current list that would fit that criteria: 4200 Acacia, 3150 El Camino, and 800 San Antonio. The decision would be up to Chair Hirsch, and he would support him in creating ad hoc committees for those three projects, and would also support any discussion the other Boardmembers may want.

Boardmember Chen commented she fully supports the idea of ad hoc committees, and they could help make the projects more successful, however, there should also be standards or guidelines to help make the ad hoc committee's comments more consistent.

Vice Chair Baltay suggested hearing from Ms. Gerhardt about what staff would view as the role of an ad hoc committee.

Ms. Gerhardt explained in terms of a completed project, staff has a check list for the ARB on the website and she would ensure the Boardmembers have easy access to that information. The ad hoc committee would take a look at a project and ensure all of the information needed is available. During an Agenda hearing, the ARB makes findings for project standards such as quality, elevations, and other aspects. The ad hoc would evaluate the information provided on that particular project and inform staff if additional information is required in order for the ARB to make those findings.

Vice Chair Baltay confirmed with Boardmember Chen that she understood Ms. Gerhardt's explanation.

Boardmember Chen responded she understood the purpose of the ad hoc but wanted to ensure there were guidelines for the ad hoc committee members to refrain from providing personal opinions of the project itself.

Vice Chair Baltay agreed it is very important that the ad hoc committees do not speak for the Board, or provide subjective feedback to the applicant.

Ms. Gerhardt further explained if the ad hoc committee were to express an opinion or make a suggested change to the project details, they would need an Objective Standard in order to back up that feedback.

Vice Chair Baltay suggested having a broader discussion regarding creating ad hoc committees as an Agenda item on a future agenda.

Chair Hirsch commented the ad hoc committees would be able to schedule the time they meet at their convenience, and then utilize the time to look for potential problems in that preliminary review that could pose future issues during the formal hearings. The items the ad hoc committee members would review would be the checklist that staff provided for the ARB at the July 2022 meeting.

Ms. Gerhardt stated once an ad hoc has been created for a particular project, Ms. Raybould would send the committee an appropriate checklist for that specific project based on what type of project was being reviewed, in addition to a link to the forms page on the website where the base checklist information is located.

Chair Hirsch suggested creating an ad hoc for 3150 El Camino Real, which has already posted a rendering in the newspaper.

Ms. Raybould commented her recommendation would be to create an ad hoc for 800 San Antonio because that project has already submitted a formal application with more detailed plans.

Chair Hirsch agreed with Ms. Raybould and asked the Board if there were any volunteers. Boardmember Rosenberg and Chair Hirsch will be the ad hoc committee for 800 San Antonio.

### **Action Items**

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 3001 El Camino Real [22PLN-00229]: Consideration of Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review Application Allowing Demolition of Two Existing Retail Buildings to Construct a 129 Unit, 100% Affordable, Five-story, Multi-family Residential Rental Development Utilizing Allowances and Concessions Provided in Accordance With State Density Bonus Regulations. The Units Would be Deed Restricted to Serve Tenants Meeting 30%-50% of Area Median Income. The Project Would be Located on a 49,864 Square-Foot lot Located at 3001-3017 El Camino Real. Environmental Assessment: An Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration Was Circulated for a 30-day Public Review Beginning on February 13, 2023 and Ending on March 15, 2023 Accordance With the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). Zoning District: CS (Service Commercial). For more information contact Project Planner Claire Raybould at [Claire.Raybould@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.Raybould@cityofpaloalto.org).

### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

1. Consider the Mitigated Negative Declaration and Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan; and
2. Provide comments and continue to a date uncertain.

Chair Hirsch called for disclosures.

Vice Chair Baltay disclosed he visited the site.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that she visited the site.

Boardmember Chen disclosed that she also visited the site.

Chair Hirsch stated that he visited the site and after a conversation with the previous Mayor, he called Joe Head with Charities Housing due to a concern with the location of the elevator as it pertains to the S-shape of the building in the plans, and the circulation off of Olive Street. As a result of the meeting, Chair Hirsch found that Charities Housing would like the access to the garage to be off Olive Street, other utility requirements would be necessary if the parking entrance was off Acacia, they were open to changing the location of the elevator, and they discussed circulation to the El Camino side of the building.

Project Planner Claire Raybould reported the property is located at 3001 El Camino Real and within a half mile of the California Avenue train station. Single family uses are to the north, Palo Alto Square across the street and commercial spaces along Acacia. The applicant is looking to demolish 9,100 square feet of retail space that has been vacant since 2017 and build a five-story exclusive residential rental building with 129 units of affordable to very low income (30-50% are median) tenants. The parcel is 1.14 acres after a recent lot line adjustment, and it is an SB 330 project. It is a State Density Bonus property which makes it eligible for unlimited density, 33-foot increase in height from base zoning which would allow 68-83 feet and the applicant is proposing 60 feet. No parking is also allowed, and they are proposing 103 spaces. The four concessions requested is the rear setback of the upper levels facing Acacia, the lot coverage, gross floor area, and they are providing some of the open space requirements on the second level which currently is not allowed in the Code. Ms. Raybould went on to explain some of the comments of concern from the previous hearing included vehicular access to the site, moving the Olive Street access to Acacia, internal circulation to the units from the elevator, and access to the fitness room. The access to the building from Olive Street has not been made due to Olive Street providing access to both directions on El Camino Real, and the location of the pump room locations for the utility connections on the Acacia side of the building. The building department has noted the distance to the elevators from the units on the eastern Acacia side is still too far; staff is requesting comments and the plans will be revised to address those concerns in a future hearing. The concerns for the fitness room access sparked conversations of possibly moving the fitness center to a different level, however that would have caused the number of units to decrease. The applicant is instead proposing to offer a dedicated internal pathway to the fitness center. Other concerns from the prior ARB hearing included not enough definition between the top, middle and bottom of the outside of the building, design of the rear façade over the ground floor units needed more articulation, and the materials design of the ground floor façade. Staff believes there is sufficient definition between the middle floors and the bottom level, but there could be more improvement in the definition between the middle and top floors. The applicant has provided some changes to the rear façade by way of adding vertical windows, showing planting of vegetation in that area, and have made some changes in the material of the façade. City Council had expressed a limited number of things they wanted to see in the North Ventura Coordinated Area Plan (NVCAP) area which included fitness rooms, bike parking, lobbies, and residential services in housing along El Camino. Additionally, the applicant has reconfigured the bottom level units along Olive Street such that there is now evidence of habitation. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was circulated for public review on February 13, 2023, the current hearing provides opportunity for public comments, and comments can be submitted to [claire.raybould@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:claire.raybould@cityofpaloalto.org) through March 15, 2023. Any comments received would be considered and the Director will issue a determination based on those considerations. Along with their Recommendations, Staff was seeking additional comments on the overall design for massing and materials and other design aspects, responsiveness to previous ARB comments, and feedback of the project's consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, in particular objective standards for housing development. Ms. Raybould ended her presentation stating that both Transportation and their environmental consultant were available for questions.

Chair Hirsch thanked Ms. Raybould and called for Boardmember questions for Staff's report.

Chair Hirsch inquired if there was any flexibility to extend the balconies of the upper levels over the property line in the areas with no setback.

Ms. Raybould stated the balconies can not extend over the property line.

Chair Hirsch had previously noticed that parking is allowed on the El Camino side of the building, however it is limited on the Olive Street side of the building, and questioned if the parking on El Camino would be restricted only to the use of the building.

Ms. Gerhardt replied that Office of Transportation staff member Mr. Shrupath Patel could provide more details, however El Camino Real is a State maintained road so the City of Palo Alto does not control parking allocation for the area.

Mr. Patel provided confirmation that El Camino Real falls under CalTrans Right-of-way jurisdiction and the Office of Transportation has concerns over mail delivery using the space on El Camino Real due to the heavy volume of traffic and has recommended space be allocated on Acacia for their use. Olive was considered an option and deemed in appropriate due to the proximity of the driveway traffic.

Ms. Raybould added the placement of parking for mail deliveries was one of staff's concerns and has asked the applicant to provide some sort of mail room and possibly access to the mail room from the Acacia side of the building.

Chair Hirsch confirmed it's currently drawn in the lobby area on the plans and questioned if this was the site that had the plume.

Ms. Raybould stated the current staff report or last staff report for the project mentioned the site is within the California-Olive-Emerson (COE) plume and there is a requirement that will be a condition of approval which requires that the applicant work with the Department of Toxic Substance Control, the Regional Water Quality Control Board, or the County Department of Environmental Health. Historically, most applicants choose to work with the County Department of Environmental Health through their voluntary Clean-Up Program. If that route is chosen, the applicant will have to provide a report stating the level of contamination and follow the County's requirements for clean-up which falls under the Water Quality Control Board's environmental screening levels for residential uses.

Boardmember Chen inquired if exemptions were made because under the Objective Standards, private open space requires space that is six feet deep and the balconies in the plans are showing only five feet deep.

Ms. Raybould stated the balconies that are five feet deep were not included in the calculations that have been provided.

Boardmember Chen referenced Sheet G 6.0.0 and asked what the private space calculations include.

Will Bloomer, Project Architect with David Baker Architects responded those calculations include all of the balconies that are six feet deep which are located off of the courtyards and on the rear side of the building.

Vice Chair Baltay referenced Page 15 of the packet and read from an ARB feedback comment that states the project successfully provides a base, middle, and top, and stated several times it's been mentioned staff is not so sure that's the case and asked Ms. Raybould for clarification on staff's assessment.

Ms. Raybould responded that staff feels there still could be refinements to the middle and top levels, but that the project base level provides good refinements to the design.

Vice Chair Baltay questioned how staff knows that relocating the fitness room would reduce the unit count; he could think of a number of ways it could be incorporated without lowering the unit count and inquired if a study had been conducted.

Ms. Gerhardt suggested that might be more appropriately directed towards the applicant and the Board might consider hearing the applicant's presentation soon.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he was directing his question towards Ms. Raybould because she included the information in the staff report in regards to the requirements of SB 330.

Ms. Raybould answered the entire upper floors are designed with units and moving one of the units to the ground floor to make room for the fitness room would not be desirable.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that including such a statement in the staff report puts it on record and is a strong position to make without any design studies to back it up and inquired a second time if a study was conducted.

Ms. Raybould replied she did not have a design study that was specifically provided.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that it was noted the SB 330 limits the public hearings to five total and inquired if any other City agency would be included in those five hearings.

Ms. Raybould explained one hearing would need to be left open for a potential appeal which would be heard through City Council.

Chair Hirsch invited the applicant to give their presentation.

Will Bloomer, Project Architect with David Baker Architects presented to the ARB improved details based on prior ARB comments for the proposed project at 3001 – 3017 El Camino Real. He began by summarizing the prior comments from the November hearing as reconsider pedestrian circulation, refine building massing, articulate residential mews (rear) elevation, add material warmth and variation, and car access. Mr. Bloomer stated he would be showing prior plan drawings before those comments and then the current drawings of the changes they have made. The ground floor updates included moving the elevators to a more central location, an under building protected path along El Camino to the building amenities, and changes to the mews to fit more toward residential scale. Level two changes include the relocation of the elevators are now in the central area of the second floor which cuts the prior furthest distance in half and a new courtyard route that allows for a short cut to the elevators. The changes to the third level include the change in the elevator location for unit proximity. Mr. Bloomer used similar slide sets to show the ARB the changes that were made to the outside design of the building in comparison to what it has been previously. The elements that changed included intentional glazing on store fronts to create a warm and more inviting look and feel, adding massing elements to highlight the entrance portal with framing, and pulled the upper level area over the entrance which provides a covered area when entering the building. They are looking at solid parapets for the roof line of the building, with a setback this railing. The entrance plaza has been improved, they've added a wood siding in the bike parking area that leads to the

lobby entrance. Landscaping design was created by a landscaping architect to ensure it's inviting to the city. On the Olive side of the building, there are residential mews pushing and pulling for an articulated feel, and the parapets on the roof line will continue around the entire building. The pedestrian mews in the back of the building has been updated with vertical slot windows that fit the residential scale, colorful doors, and plentiful landscaping. The units along the pedestrian mew are taller than the other units. Mr. Bloomer continued to the materials pallet and emphasized the textures in the materials. Durability was a consideration, with dominant interest in keeping the materials in their raw and natural form. The car access utilized the input of Charities Housing for the traffic circulation who conducted a transportation analysis. Mr. Bloomer presented the ARB with a rendering of the vehicle access as produced from the firm who conducted the analysis, and remains consistent that Olive Street provides the safest route to enter and exit the property with vehicles. Staff as well supports the Olive location. There is a water main on Acacia side which has pump rooms that would involve utilities to relocate, and one of the findings in the analysis was that if the entrance was located on Acacia, it would lead to many U-turns by traffic on El Camino Real to get to Acacia. Olive has better access from Park, El Camino, Page Mill and Ash roadways, including for emergency vehicles if necessary. The entrance is still in the study phase, but currently all finding thus far point to Olive Street being the best location.

Chair Hirsch thanked Mr. Bloomer and called for Boardmember questions of the applicant.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she's fully on board with the thoughts regarding traffic circulation, and inquired if anyone has considered looking into adding a stop light at the Olive and El Camino Real intersection.

Mr. Patel responded that staff would have to work with CalTrans for that information because all the traffic signals on El Camino Real are overseen by them. There could be a concern for the proximity of the light at Page Mill and El Camino and currently it has not been explored as part of this project.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if the applicants were considering the internal path from Acacia for mail delivery that was mentioned by Ms. Ms. Raybould as a potential option.

Mr. Bloomer stated there is a service space in that area and it could be something to study going forward.

Boardmember Rosenberg was pleased to see the change in elevator location, however, expressed a concern for the distance the residents on the back end of the S-shape would have to carry their laundry with the laundry facilities being in the amenities area and asked the applicant if they had considered making the laundry area in a more central location of the building.

Mr. Bloomer stated the intent was to put the laundry room in a central location in the amenities area to encourage more interaction between residents. They have not looked at a different location, but he noted Boardmember Rosenberg's concern.

Boardmember Rosenberg referenced a prior ARB suggestions of considering an E-shape versus an S-shape and adding height variation and inquired if the applicants response of those being too cost prohibited was based on a study that was completed.

Mr. Bloomer stated there would be considerable costs involved to change to a Type 3 construction type. They have a construction architect that has experience with cost exercises, he was not sure if Charities Housing had performed a specific study to the actual amount.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented she likes Corten steel replacements and added Corten Steel replacements tend to stain the sides of buildings with age and it was good to note that didn't seem to be a cost issue with the applicant; and inquired if the applicant had considered splitting two elevators verses having one central elevator.

Mr. Bloomer stated they did look at that possibility however that would entail providing two lobbies and Charities Housing requires sufficient security for the residents coming and going so the applicants chose not to pursue that option.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented she gently encouraged the applicant to consider making the laundry area more centrally located.

Boardmember Rosenberg expressed a concern with the variation between the middle and top of the façade and didn't feel it would pop as much as they would have hoped. She appreciates the concept of bringing down the mass and it being a lighter element at the top and questioned why they chose not to proceed with the residential units on Olive.

Mr. Bloomer cited the space constraints from the parking garage would have limited the depth availability.

Boardmember Rosenberg relayed that the community feel of the project feels somewhat lost with the lobby and amenities at the entrance of the building, the elevators and mail room in the center of the building and the fitness center at the back end of the S-shape and invited Mr. Bloomer to share his thoughts about that.

Mr. Bloomer believes the distances between the common areas are not as considerable as suggested, and believes the entry experience of the lobby, a short walk to a community room, and the exterior pathway that also leads to the fitness amenity are all included in the centralized core of the arrival experience to the courtyard, and from the courtyard there are walkways that lead to a number of the amenities offered.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented in the prior ARB meeting the Boardmembers had requested the applicant include floor plans for this hearing, and she believed that detail may have been lost in translation. They were looking for the unit floor plans so they could get an idea of the layout of the different unit types and inquired if floor plans would be available for the next hearing.

Mr. Bloomer replied that they have been working on the unit floor plans and they could possibly change however he would be able to provide what they had.

Boardmember Chen thanked Mr. Bloomer for the changes that were made and inquired about the center circulation and if trash locations were provided for the residents on the furthest side from the entrance in the upper floors so people don't have to carry their trash through the building.

Mr. Bloomer replied that there are single trash rooms on the upper levels which would require some walking, and typically there is only a single trash shoot per level in their residential projects, however adding another shoot could be considered. The trash room near the community area on the ground was

intended to also be accessed by the units in the mews, and would also serve Charities Housing and any of their services that occurred on the ground level.

Boardmember Chen requested floor to ceiling height for the special units in the garden area.

Mr. Bloomer answered seventeen feet and was based on the stackers. The exact details of that floor plan are not yet completed.

Boardmember Chen asked if they were loft apartments.

Mr. Bloomer stated seventeen is tight for a mezzanine and they studied that with Charities Housing, currently they are not multi-level units.

Vice Chair Baltay commented that the project proposed for the old Fry site exits onto El Camino from Acacia and inquired if Transportation had considered impacts of traffic circulation with regards to this building's entrance and exit location.

Mr. Patel replied the traffic circulation analysis from the other site did not identify significant impact on traffic circulation for those intersections, the Portage location will have exits onto Acacia and on Portage Avenue.

Ms. Raybould added that the transportation analysis for 3001 El Camino project did consider the trips from the 200 Portage project.

Vice Chair Baltay stated there is bound to be an increase of traffic from Acacia onto El Camino given the number of units at the 200 Portage project.

Ms. Raybould explained the commercial location would exit out onto Acacia and the residential areas have two exit locations, one onto Park and an access point on Portage, one street over.

Vice Chair Baltay expressed a concern that it seemed Acacia would be more heavily used in the future and inquired if the Transportation Department had completed a study for traffic signal and other traffic control impacts for traffic turning onto El Camino Real and also asked if Transportation was concerned about the traffic exiting Olive and turning left onto El Camino without a traffic signal.

Mr. Patel stated the number of traffic exiting left onto El Camino from Olive was not found to be high enough to warrant an exit signal.

Vice Chair Baltay clarified he was looking to see if Transportation had a concerns about safety risks of traffic turning left onto El Camino and traveling through three lanes of oncoming traffic without a signal.

Mr. Patel stated the safety concerns for cars turning left from Olive onto El Camino Real had not yet been explored. The traffic study was more focused on the level of service for the selected intersection.

Ms. Raybould added that the traffic study does look at any safety concerns and the environmental analysis looks at whether the project would result in safety concerns and the transportation consultant that prepared the analysis, W-TRANS, did not feel that there was any concern with respect to that.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired from the applicant information about the material for the parapet railing on the roofline of the building.

Mr. Bloomer stated they do not have details for that yet. The solid parapet will have metal parapet cap that will be dark and thicker than their normal parapets and there would be a metal setback rail to comply with The Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) safety regulations. They still need to determine the details for the profile but believe the rail has potential to add a pop to the roofline detail.

Vice Chair Baltay questioned how they determined the number of parking spaces being proposed when staff mentioned that zero parking is required for the project.

Mr. Bloomer replied that Charities Housing ran the numbers and he's not exactly sure how they configure that number for their affordable housing projects.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired if anyone was present from Catholic Charities who could provide that information.

Joe Head from Charities Housing explained the amount of parking is a commonsense reaction to the management of similar projects in which they feel there are a number of residents will use the car for primary employment and other purposes. It is a less significant number than the market rating housing would have, but a zero-parking goal for this site would likely putting a greater strain on the neighborhood than would be reasonable for Charities Housing to ask for them to endure. They consider the impacts of increased traffic on Olive to and from the site and one of the advantages of the site is that residents will be able to walk, drive, or bike to the California Avenue retail area and to the CalTran Station using Olive and Park. That has a potential for being great in terms of biking and pedestrians and most of their clients tend to be more into those modes of transportation, but also provides opportunities for residents with vehicles. It's not a refined number from a study, it's a working number from Charities Housing standpoint which take into consideration their neighbors in other settings. They tend to try to stay around .7 to .8 ratio to number of units. The quality of public transport usually affects that ratio up or down.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if they feel this location has good public transport.

Mr. Head stated that they do.

Chair Hirsch referenced the Corten Steel pieces and inquired if the aging process of the steel has any effect on the concrete color for concrete that is attached.

Mr. Bloomer stated Corten is a material that has natural variation and they've used it on previous projects and there are ways to reduce aging discoloration by pre-weathering the steel. There can be limited discoloration and that information is provided to the client so they can mitigate those concerns.

Chair Hirsch commented regarding the change on the El Camino elevation to reduce the amount of glass and inquired if those changes were made due to the ARB's prior concerns.

Mr. Bloomer responded that was a large part of the considerations and changes, however multiple factors went into those changes. They also wanted to be very intentional on where they put glass and which activities they are showing through the glass. One of the items there is parking, they didn't want too much visibility into the bike parking space, but wanted the glass to help draw people into the community area of the building.

Chair Hirsch expressed a general concern about the number of electric charging stations and how it will affect the number of regular vehicles that will be able to park.

Mr. Bloomer stated with regards to the size of the lifts, they have to plan for the space required for those lifts, but the current plan is to have half of the garage EV ready with charging ready for those lifts. Chair Hirsch's comment was very well taken as those state requirements often change daily.

Chair Hirsch stated he took a view of the lifts at 2500 El Camino and noted they aren't being used at all and when he asked a resident why they weren't used, the resident stated size of vehicles are a factor, in addition to the time it took to retrieve the vehicles from the lifts when trying to get to work and expressed a concern that they were likely finding other parking in the neighborhood. Chair Hirsch suggested now would be a good time to re-evaluate the lift usage in this project before they are in need of reconfiguring the garage in the future.

Ms. Gerhardt added in any lift situation, the City requires the lifts accommodate a large sized sedan or a medium sized SUV. Most cars could fit in this system, and there are five different entry points, which will help with the time frame of retrieving the cars.

Chair Hirsch appreciated Ms. Gerhardt's point and stated that was good information.

Ms. Gerhardt commented it's a good detail they could provide in the next hearing.

Chair Hirsch referenced the residences in the mews and inquired if the design of those units allowed for a seventeen foot height in all of the unit rooms.

Mr. Bloomer responded they would have to return with the exact layout. They adjusted the heights based on the parking lifts and the points just being discussed and the unit plan was still under review, with a mezzanine still being considered.

Chair Hirsch expressed similar to his colleagues; he is interested in seeing the unit plans.

Chair Hirsch requested further explanation regarding the length of the corridor to the community amenities and inquired how the residents would utilize the outside path to the fitness room.

Mr. Bloomer stated it's an exterior paved walkway that is underneath the cantilever setback of the building. It would not be a cemented sidewalk.

Chair Hirsch inquired if that was represented in the plans.

Ms. Raybould responded the plans that were provided to the Board did not reflect that change and staff made mention of that to the applicant. It does provide a pathway in the revised plan sets, but not one that is covered. The applicant showed an alternative in their presentation for this hearing, that is currently being considered. It would mean that some of the current proposed landscaping would need to be removed.

Mr. Bloomer apologized for the missing details, it was a miscommunication with the landscape team, and the covered walkway is the intent.

Chair Hirsch inquired if an image was available.

Ms. Raybould shared her screen to show the drawing.

Chair Hirsch asked what the facility is between the fitness room and the bike storage.

Mr. Bloomer answered that is currently a flexible space and still a moving target. Charities Housing has been looking into what makes the most sense for that space. It has been discussed as possibly being used as maintenance needs, however it is also being considered for some type of community space but a specific program has not yet been discussed.

Chair Hirsch questioned if some type of bathroom facility would be included in the exercise area.

Mr. Bloomer stated all of the fitness rooms they have designed included a bathroom facility but that has not yet been finalized for this project.

Chair Hirsch reinforced Boardmember Chen's question regarding ground floor trash storage and confirmed that all of the floors on the Avenue side have shoots to a ground floor trash room and inquired about the second garbage area on the ground floor.

Mr. Bloomer provided more detail that the garbage area on the Olive Avenue side would not be considered public access and would be for Charities Housing use. The additional trash room added based on staff comments, that serves the community facing the news area in the rear.

Chair Hirsch opened the hearing for Public Comments.

Administrative Associate III Veronica Dao stated one speaker card was submitted by Sandra Lockhart.

Ms. Sandra Lockhart, Olive Avenue resident, provided public comments regarding the neighborhood concerns about the high density of the building. There seems to be a trend in Palo Alto with the new high-density projects that will change the look of Palo Alto and will bring 12 hundred to 15 hundred new residents to the area. There will be additional traffic in the area and all of the new housing will cause people to park on the streets in the neighborhoods. Additionally, there doesn't seem to be anywhere for the children to play that will be living in the building. According to her calculations the density will be 113% per acre which seems very high. The crossing at Olive and El Camino is not a safe crossing already, adding the traffic without adding a signal will make it worse. The State seems to be controlling how neighborhoods should be built and it's not fair. She also sent a letter to Ms. Raybould with additional comments.

Chair Hirsch responded that the Boardmembers received her letter, they letters are always forwarded.

Ms. Lockhart commented further that when Fry's redid their building, the neighborhood informed them of the creek behind the building; upon completion the neighborhood flooded after the first big rain. She hopes the applicants for this building will take water run-off seriously and use proper engineering standards to prevent flooding.

Ms. Gerhardt stated Ms. Lockhart's letter is on Packet Page 45 in the Agenda Packet.

Chair Hirsch thanked Ms. Lockhart for her comments.

Rene Baez, representative for Carpenter's Local 405, spoke regarding basic labor standards, use of apprenticeship programs, health care for workers and their families, and local hiring. Projects such as this should consider hiring local workers who will in turn invest their income back into the community. They have the ability to change lives positively if they would contract local apprenticeships and provide health care for their workers.

Chair Hirsch thanked Mr. Baez for his comments and closed the public comments.

Boardmember Chen had one additional question for the applicant and inquired what the alternative material is that was previously mentioned for the cored tin and what would prompt that change, as it would make a considerable difference to the appearance of the building.

Mr. Bloomer explained that in the last meeting the Board had requested the applicant consider an alternative material, they were looking at raw aluminum which has some weathering and is similar in appearance to the cored tin.

Ms. Raybould added that at the prior meeting Boardmember Rosenberg had requested the applicant provide the material if an alternative were to be explored at a later time to help reduce costs, however, there is no plan to change to that material at this point in time.

Chair Hirsch inquired if any one was interested in taking a break.

Boardmember Rosenberg felt they should wrap up with Boardmember comments before taking a break.

Vice Chair Baltay reminded Chair Hirsch that allowing the applicant to rebut the public comments is required.

Chair Hirsch inquired if the applicant wanted to speak with regards to public comment.

Mr. Bloomer stated he didn't have any specific response but all of the concerns are being considered and they can account for all of the storm water as that is a key piece in the design of the property. They are being diligent and responsible for how they consider the traffic impacts of the project and in terms of density this is a prime location in proximity to public transportation for a much needed affordable housing. They will keep all concerns in consideration and appreciate the public comments.

Chair Hirsch continued to Boardmember comments.

Boardmember Rosenberg thanked the applicant for the revised proposal and appreciated the efforts to continue the project moving forward. It is an improved design from what was originally submitted. The entryway is a vast improvement and is interested in seeing what the landscape will be in that area. One suggestion would be for the applicants to seriously consider flipping the bike room and the fitness space. She understands the reason for them being where they are, but believes the lobby area will be reinvigorated by having the fitness space in that location. Bikes are often dropped off and left. The bike room is transient in that people pick up or drop off their bikes and leave. People enter the fitness area and stay a while and will have a constant presence of people. Or use the unmarked corner vacant spot for the bikes. It would be nice to see the fitness center more accessible and closer to the lobby and elevators for daily use. The mail delivery access route from Acacia is something worth considering. There might be a straight forward path for making that happen and encouraged the applicant to explore that farther.

Similarly, the trash shoots could be more centrally located like the elevators. The community room and the laundry facility are at the end of the hall, it seems a little lost that the community room is wedged between a hallway and a parking structure and a laundry room that people don't need to see into, is on the exterior portion of the building, that could be another flip flop occurrence that may benefit the residents. And access to the bike storage from the parking facility would be nice to see. It was mentioned in the previous meeting and doesn't appear to have been addressed. Wherever the bike storage ends up being, it would be nice to have an entrance into it from both the interior of the building and the parking garage. That could be tricky with the installation of the lifts, but it is food for thought. The rear view of the exterior is beautiful, the area of the mews is beautiful, the exterior façade on El Camino Real has an interesting point with a black vertical point on the right side, the left side seems to get a bit lost. It's a big white chunk. She encouraged maybe more thought in the upper left side as you are looking at the building from El Camino, possibly a material variation, or a texture change. There have been some really good materials chosen, consider making that side of the façade more interesting.

Boardmember Chen thanked the application for the presentation and for making all the changes. There are still areas where there could be improvements on a more functional side. She suggested considering two separate trash rooms on each side of the building for easier residential access and sees some potential space for adding an additional shoot on the Acacia wing. Same for the laundry, it should be more centrally located, or have two separate locations within the building. Boardmember Chen suggested the applicants mitigate the noise from the elevators with more massing or additional wall coverings, not only due to the traffic of people but for the noise of the equipment. The front elevation feels warmer with the addition of the wood siding, but questions the solid wall along El Camino Real. Possibly more thought could go into that, as well as the location of the fitness center, which would eliminate the long solid wall in the middle of the building. The rear elevation shows improvements with the tall windows; however, she hopes they can work with the floor plans of those units to ensure it works well. Fifteen-to-sixteen-foot ceilings don't work well in smaller units. Please bring the updated floor plans of all the units to the next hearing. Boardmember Chen would also like to see more detail about the roof line parapet to include the material and how they plan to pull it together with the middle and lower levels.

Vice Chair Baltay thanked his colleagues, he was in general agreement with most things that were said. Overall he does not feel the changes have been sufficient to the Board's previous comments and is quite concerned that they are making similar comments and feel the project needs real change. The struggle appears to be with the overall concept of the S-shaped building which comes with a number of issues that are not easily resolved as shown by the comments about the trash access and laundry room. The project has effectively a 330 foot long S-shaped hallway throughout the building, with only one elevator, two stairwells at either end, laundry room on one side and the trash on the other; a number of functional issues that are not being resolved. Basic code issues are still not resolved. A central elevator in the 330 feet is appropriate, however essentially there should be two elevators to make the building functional, which doesn't work with the client's requirements about access control. Having only two exit stairs leading out is a serious safety issue, there needs to be a third stairwell near the elevator, which will be a big change in the designs. There has to be an internal access point to the fitness room. It's unreasonable to expect people to walk along the sidewalk in their tights to get there. To bring laundry from one end of the building to the other is a long haul the way it's designed right now. The community room should be oriented along Acacia, which would enable the laundry facility to be put deeper into the building. The community room

could benefit, and the community would benefit from having that room oriented onto the street. The prior response the applicant gave was that the community room would be oriented along the courtyard, as a private outdoor space, but that also would be a non-answer. He didn't want to seem harsh, but felt they weren't talking all of their comments about the community room because all the comments made at the prior meeting are being repeated. The bicycle area is important in the front area, but the fitness center location needs to be worked out. The current location leaves a blank wall running along the front of the building and the good design practice of the Comprehensive Plan prohibits that. There should be some sense of visibility in and out, see life on the street. If the fitness center was located in that area people working out could have a nice street view. The security is important in the bicycle room but you have to let people see what's there. He's more convinced the transportation access should be off of Acacia and not Olive. Olive is the street that serves a single-family neighborhood. There are several dozen single-family homes in that back community that are feeling threatened by all the construction and the impending increase in traffic and with good reason. It would be much more respectful to them and it would really only take flipping the plans. The water / pump room is a technical problem that could be solved. Making a left hand turn across El Camino is not a good idea, particularly in morning rush hour. There is a base, middle, and top design standard and putting a railing or painting a metal top on top of the wall is hardly adding a top to the building. He would appreciate some effort in embracing the design standard and create some sort of a cap on the building or provide a better solution. The current options don't provide an answer to what's visually required. The large blank elevation on the front of the building is a result of the S-shaped basic design parti but it needs more modulation. They accentuated the entrance of the building nicely on the right side, on the left there's a vast line indicating that but nothing on the building is doing so. A consider might be pulling the building out a little bit or change the material to break it up. More variation in the façade would make it seem not quite so large. He likes the idea of the single story residences in the mews, choosing to use the vertical ribbed concrete is a very industrial type product for residential projects. The residents would likely appreciate it looking more residential. Warm wood and materials in the front should be considered in the back as well. Vice Chair Baltay expressed concern there isn't an answer for delivery and drop-off's for the project. Staff indicated there isn't an option for dedicated spaces along El Camino, if there's not a dedicated space other than the front of the building there will end up being double parking which is highly unsafe given the current challenges of someone trying to turn left onto El Camino from Olive. A small side entrance off Acacia could easily fit into the plans. It opens up two entrances to the lobby which may be a concern for the client, but it's a fundamental need that should be met. The ground floor units in the back could use more differentiation and more privacy. The rendering is attractive; however, the entry areas are in a public space. The residents likely won't feel they can leave chairs outside the unit entrances for fear of them being stolen. There could be a little more articulation for each unit if there was a little more push and pull between the units. A front porch area would give it more of a residential feel. If the parking were reduced from 103 spaces to maybe 80 spaces, the double width parking in the back could be reduced which would allow for an internal connection to those services along El Camino which would improve the functionality in the building. It could be a good trade-off if it could be worked through. Vice Chair Baltay addressed the draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and commented on biological resources, and believes the impacts are less than significant and mitigation should not be necessary. There's a current requirement that BIO-1 (checking for bird impacts) is completed due to construction and the removal of some trees. That's an unnecessary burden on the applicant to do for construction like this. BIO-2 mitigation measure is essentially a duplication of the Tree

Protection Ordinance, and it shouldn't be listed twice in the EIR. There's already a law on how to go about protecting trees during construction. Mitigation for Item 7-F of the EIR for GEO-1 is excessive. It's asking for training of the crews that will work on the site to recognize a fossil if they find something while digging. It's overreach for a site such as this. There's no indication that there's historical presence and the site has been built on previously; and there will be no basement in the building. Vice Chair Baltay addressed his colleagues and stated this is the type of project that requires specificity on what the ARB needs to see for future hearings otherwise they aren't helping the applicant or staff, and suggested they coalesce around a group of recommendations that are fairly strongly worded.

Chair Hirsch agreed with much of what has been said by the other Boardmembers. It's pretty obvious there are some functional issues in the building that are simply not addressed properly. The laundry and the garbage are two clear issues that should be changed in the planning. Laundry rooms should be as convenient as they can be to the tenants. Most buildings of this density have two laundry rooms and it makes sense in this project as suggested, or perhaps each floor has an area for laundry. There is incredible opportunity with the S-shaped scheme, and it would be added to the community open space. A single laundry on one end of the building is the same reason the ARB requested a single elevator be placed in the center of the building. It needs to be readdressed due to the proximity of all the tenants. The garbage is the same matter, and the east side of the building provides space for additional trash shoots. Given the shape of the building, one could wonder why a balcony corridor isn't being built to access the upper floors on the east side of the building from the front of the building. Or a corridor would go all the way around and enclose the center space on the bottom level. You might lose square footage; however, the convenience of the tenant is very important. Chair Hirsch agrees with Boardmember Rosenberg about the exercise room and believes that is something the Board should make clear they prefer. The single entry into the bike parking is going to lead to a lot of conflict of people in and out of the building. It's a pretty image but the practicality of taking a long bicycle into a corridor and out the front door and it seems to not fit the area. Going to the far end, you could pick it up from the garage as one suggested. Bicycles imply one will be outside coming in or inside going out. Fitness is an every day activity people will utilize and should be able to do so without leaving the building, particularly during inclement weather. The applicant should consider further options, and extending the corridor past the elevators for the fitness room could be another option. If the center circulation is going to be public use, there could be an access from there to the center of the building. There are concerns with the solidity of the entire outside of the building. There's space for three people high because it's been scaled to a garage that includes a lift. The windows that extend higher in the mews just emphasizes that space as nonresidential and it should look and feel like people's homes. Typically, he has said that base, middle, and top of buildings are not as important, this design doesn't really project a clear base, middle, and top but he doesn't feel as strongly against that as other Boardmembers do. There seems to be a basic issue with the individual units in the back and the windows are entirely too high for individual small dwellings. Vice Chair Baltay suggested creating a stoop for each unit and that's a great idea. It defines the entry and doesn't really reduce the space of the unit. He likes the vertical siding but will leave that up to the rest of the Board as to if they would like to see an alternative. The blank white space in the front is a bit overwhelming, and the contrast to the cored tin brings it down in scale but it could be an area where other alternatives could prove to be better. The ARB is always open to samples of alternatives. The wood is a nice idea and makes the front of the building nice and inviting and the landscape architect should be commended for doing an excellent job, however an

area for child's play should be carefully considered. There will be many children in the building. Hopefully there will be a park nearby at some point soon, but there are always toddlers that people like to take outside and still be close to home. He agrees with the entrance on Acacia for mail and other deliveries. And he believes the idea of flipping the two facilities and providing an outside community room, with a laundry facility on the inside is also a suggestion worth considering. Chair Hirsch recognizes that if you don't have control over the signaling of an intersection, it's going to be a problem. It's dangerous to cross over and turn left from Olive onto El Camino Real. It's an illusion to think traffic will be able to do so easily. He agrees with Vice Chair Baltay that they should seriously consider moving the entry to the opposite side. It isn't a determinate that utilities control a decision such as that. Should you consider that, some of the management could be moved to the central space that is currently unplanned. That would free up the east side for other uses as well. He agrees the language in the motion should be specific.

Boardmember Rosenberg added to her comments and stated when the low income projects are discussed, many of the people who utilize lower income housing have hard labor jobs. Many people drive larger vehicles that allow for hauling equipment. By allowing some of the lift parking spaces to be the standard on low income properties is a detriment to the people who work there. They have expensive equipment that needs to be protected and they aren't able to fit their vehicles into one of the lifts, and urged the City to consider that the parking lifts are not going to automatically solve all the problems of parking. While it's appreciated that parking is available, the people who will be utilizing that parking and their needs should be considered. Maybe a portion of the spaces should be dedicated for people with larger vehicles. The parking lifts should not be considered a feasible long-term standard for some of the lower income housing projects.

Ms. Gerhardt stated Boardmember Rosenberg made a good comment but it is better directed toward the applicant because there is no required parking for this project, given that it is 100% affordable.

**MOTION:** Vice Chair Baltay moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, that the ARB direct the applicant to make the following changes and have the project return at a future date uncertain for further review:

- Direct internal connection is required to the laundry area with a minimum of 200 linear feet horizontal corridor.
- A trash room with a similar minimum of 200-foot horizontal linear corridor
- Direct connection to the bicycle parking
- Direct connection to the vehicle parking
- Direct connection to the fitness center
- Central building circulation that meets the code
- Drop off or curbside locations with access to the internal needs of the building
- The parking access needs to be from Acacia, not Olive
- The El Camino Real façade should be further articulated by doing the following things: Break up the left side of the façade, provide greater differentiation at the top of the building, reconsider the verticality of the windows, and provide greater visibility on to the street from the lower uses on the El Camino Real side.
- Community room should front onto the public right-of-way.
- Modify the white material to be less bright/dramatic.

- Verify the use of cored tin and natural wood finishes will work within the budget of the project.

Boardmember Rosenberg offered a friendly amendment for the parking on Acacia and the drop off location of deliveries; she feels the Transportation Department was clear that parking access on the Acacia side would not be a useful way to go and doesn't want to get into a situation where the ARB is fighting with their own internal public transportation group to make something happen that's not going to happen.

Vice Chair Baltay expressed the importance of having a designated drop off zone on El Camino Real and if that is not possible, on another side of the building to include an entrance into the building.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed about the designated loading and drop off zone.

Vice Chair Baltay believed as a Board they should agree with the parking on Acacia.

Boardmember Rosenberg questioned if as a Board, does the ARB have that authority, and commented she does see the potential of the parking being on the Acacia side as better for the residents, and that the left hand turn from Olive onto El Camino Real is problematic, and Olive and El Camino Real is a site for a potential new light which would vastly improve that situation as it is a safe distance between the two existing lights. Additionally, the Fry's property is going to have a large influx of traffic that may access via Acacia and questioned if adding this properties traffic to Acacia is the right way to go. There is a concern that adding this property may cause a bigger problem further down the road as more housing projects in this area are completed.

Chair Hirsch commented that making the parking access on Acacia changes the entire scheme of the plans. If the Board is suggesting this be considered, it will entail a major replanning consideration. All of the other items would not be major replanning, he wants to make sure they are not asking more than what they can expect.

Vice Chair Baltay replied that those are very legitimate concerns from both Boardmember Rosenberg and Chair Hirsch and his motion would stand either way, citing that the reason he requested the parking change is not regarding safety or transportation issues because those are not within the ARB's purview. The reason is regarding the Context Based Design Criteria which states: For low density resident transitions where new projects are built abutting existing lower scale residential development, care shall be taken to respect the scale and privacy of the neighboring properties. That is the only reason they can stand on that request.

Ms. Raybould noted if the building were to be flipped in the design, the open space area would no longer be in the same location and it would entail a complete redesign of the project. It was designed with the second floor open space specifically to meet that Context Based Design Criteria where you have the setback from the single-family residential of 50' or more on the second floor and for the upper massing above.

Chair Hirsch agreed that aspect would have to be studied, along with other aspects of the building would also have to be restudied, and suggested if the ARB is going to strongly suggest that, the ARB should look for that to come back as a primary element to be looked at.

Ms. Gerhardt requested Transportation weigh in on the subject since many other factors are involved including the NVCAP Concept Plan that may affect future roadways.

Mr. Patel stated the signal at Olive and El Camino is not considered as part of this project, but the City may connect with CalTrans for future consideration as part of the NVCAP process that is based on future traffic needs, and noted that the traffic turning left from Acacia would have to cross the same three lanes to travel southbound and it could be a similar situation to the access on Olive.

Vice Chair Baltay stated they made the same set of comments at the meeting a month prior. That would have been the time for the applicant to take those comments seriously, come back with a study showing the reasons why it wouldn't work off Acacia. That was not provided and now it's being pushed again. It should, at minimum, be studied.

Boardmember Rosenberg agreed the study was shallow, however believes they did conduct a study and showed the diagram of how turning from Acacia, traffic would have to turn quickly to make a U-turn. The secondary path is, if they can't make a U-turn fast enough, cars will have to travel to Page Mill, make a U-turn there and travel back. The applicant showed those diagrams as well as the right and left turn off of Olive. Maybe the way to phrase it is if they are going to keep it on Olive, they actively pursue getting a light installed at that intersection and make that the stipulation. It's a big ask, but keeping the parking access on Olive is also a big ask.

Vice Chair Baltay stated that goes beyond the ARB's purview. Transportation and Public Works are the authorities who decide where traffic lights are needed in town. It is a commonsense idea but not practical. He is basing the request from a privacy concern as Olive is a direct access road into a single-family residential neighborhood who are already dramatically impacted by this and other housing projects going on around them.

Boardmember Rosenberg argued the privacy issue isn't really a factor because as soon as they turn onto Olive, traffic immediately enters the garage. The traffic would impact the existing neighborhood, but they won't be driving directly into or past the residences. Additionally, if the plans were to be flipped, that would put the common space location right next to the residences.

Vice Chair Baltay agreed some sort of design study should be completed to weigh those balancing issues and determine what is the least impact on the neighborhood. It is possible that leaving the parking on Olive is the least impactful, given the information provided he was not seeing that clearly and was left frustrated.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented it might be feasible to go back to the E-shaped building. That would make both the common spaces on the second level face El Camino, however then more facilities would be looking into the back yards of the single-family residences. She agrees with Vice Chair Baltay that the ARB is trying to make decisions based on factors that are not within their purview, and based on information that wasn't provided and to some extent should be provided by the applicant.

Chair Hirsch added there is a good likelihood that due to some of the options not being within their purview, if they push it too hard, they could end up getting a project not at all how they would like and could lose out on some of the other elements they are now requesting, and suggested a friendly

amendment that the applicant look into a bridge element on one end of the S-shape to add an element of functionality.

Vice Chair Baltay commented it's a good idea, however, it's a design element that they can't require. Supplying basic parameters of less than 200-feet minimum, they will have to do something like that to make that requirement work.

Chair Hirsch stated he was okay with that providing they make that concession even if it requires redesigning the circulation scheme.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested using the wording Direct internal connection with a more efficient internal circulation on all floors.

Vice Chair Baltay accepted that as a friendly amendment.

Boardmember Chen accepted that as a friendly amendment.

Vice Chair Baltay asked Boardmember Rosenberg how she would like to rephrase the parking condition.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested the friendly amendment for the parking access location should state "The applicant needs to move the parking entrance to the Acacia side of the building or provide adequate information to explain why Olive is the better location."

Vice Chair Baltay stated it should read "Study parking with access to Acacia with a compelling report demonstrating the best solution".

Boardmember Chen inquired if they should add for them to work closely with Transportation.

Ms. Gerhardt confirmed they would have to work with Transportation as the NVCAP study is due sometime around the end of the month and staff will have more information at that time. Potentially a signal for Olive at El Camino might be in NVCAP project and would be confirmed through the study.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if the residents petitioned for a traffic signal at that intersection would that get the process started sooner.

Ms. Gerhardt replied Transportation is already looking at that intersection needing a light and it might be beneficial to wait and see what is determined by the NVCAP traffic study.

Vice Chair Baltay provided a revised comment for the parking access point locations based on friendly amendments; Reconsider parking access from Olive or Acacia, with a compelling report to demonstrate the best solution.

All the Boardmembers agreed to the revision.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested a friendly amendment to reword the front blank wall space to read 'Modify the white finish to be more varied and/or textured'.

Ms. Gerhardt inquired if the ARB's intent was wanting a change in color or more articulation.

Vice Chair Baltay stated he already included greater articulation of the front blank space.

Ms. Gerhardt requested the motion be reread for the record.

Vice Chair Baltay stated the motion is as follows:

The ARB direct the applicant to make the following changes and have the project return at a future date uncertain, for further review:

Item #1:

- a) Provide a direct internal connection with a more efficient internal circulation on all floors.
- b) A laundry facility with a minimum of 200-foot horizontal linear connection to the corridor
- c) A trash room/shoot with a minimum of 200-foot horizontal linear connection to the corridor
- d) Direct connection to the vehicle parking
- e) Direct connection to the bicycle parking
- f) Direct connection to the fitness center

Item #2:

- a) Provide a Central building circulation that meets the code.
- b) Provide Drop off or curbside locations with access to the internal needs.
- c) Reconsider parking access from Olive or Acacia with a compelling report that demonstrates the best solution.
- d) Provide greater El Camino Real façade articulation by: Breaking up the left side of the façade, provide greater differentiation at the top of the building, reconsider the vertical of the windows on the ground floor, and provide greater visibility on to the street from El Camino Real facing uses.
- e) Locate the Community room so it fronts a public right-of-way.
- f) Modify the white material to be less bright or white.
- g) Verify the use of cored tin and natural wood finishes will work within the budget of the project.

Chair Hirsch requested adding “To consider adding a front area to the exterior units in the mews.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented they will need to be careful of ADA compliance as well and raising those areas as steps may make it less accessible for certain families.

Vice Chair Baltay commented he’s very hopeful the applicant will make changes to those units both to the front entrance and height of the windows, and the façade around the windows.

Ms. Gerhardt requested clarification on the additions requested to the mews units and suggested using that verbiage.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated that was a nice way to phrase that item and maybe state the mews units needed some articulation of privacy at the door entry area of the units.

Vice Chair Baltay stated they were adding an eighth item as a friendly amendment by Chair Hirsch to read: Provide greater privacy and greater façade articulation at the rear ground floor housing units.

Boardmember Chen questioned if it addressed the Board’s concerns about the interior space 17 foot ceiling space.

Vice Chair Baltay answered not directly.

Ms. Gerhardt commented the Board did ask for the articulate unit floor plans so that should also be added.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated the Board had asked for that last time as well, and the applicant had responded they had that ready.

Vice Chair Baltay added if they add a requirement to lower the ceilings they would likely just put in artificial ceilings.

Boardmember Rosenberg commented that would also reduce the walking space around the building on the second floor and taking that away would not be sufficient.

Boardmember Chen suggested “reconsider human scale interior space”. However, the applicant did say they had considered the mezzanine concept and if that was the case seventeen feet would not be sufficient.

Vice Chair Baltay said they could try to raise the ground level up and provide a stoop however as Boardmember Rosenberg mentioned the obvious problem with that option.

Boardmember Rosenberg suggested making the eighth item state that the ARB has serious concerns regarding the 17-foot scale of those rear units and leave it at that.

Vice Chair Baltay replied he added the second sentence “Provide floor plans and sections” and they could add “Provide unit floor plans and sections demonstrating livable building units”. Item number 8 has been added, suggested by Chair Hirsch as a friendly amendment to read “Provide greater privacy and greater façade articulation at the rear ground floor units, provide ground floor unit floor plans and sections”.

Boardmember Chen stated she accepted that amendment.

Chair Hirsch stated he accepted the wording of the friendly amendment.

Ms. Gerhardt stated they hadn’t been good with the friendly amendments and voting for them but didn’t see any Boardmembers objecting. It seemed super friendly.

Chair Hirsch called for a roll call vote.

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

The motioned passed.

Chair Hirsch called for a 10 minutes recess.

The ARB reconvened with all Boardmembers present except for Boardmember Thompson.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [22PLN-00237]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review Application to Allow for a new Storefront Façade, Outdoor Patios, and Signage for Sushi Roku (Space #700B, Bldg. E-formally Yucca De Lac). The project also includes a request for a Conditional Use Permit for Alcohol Sales. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from CEQA per Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial). For more information Contact the Project Planner, Tamara Harrison, at Tamara.Harrison@mbakerintl.com.

### **RECOMMENDATION**

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

1. Recommend approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Community Development based on findings and subject to conditions of approval.

Chair Hirsch introduced the item and requested site disclosures from the Boardmembers.

Vice Chair Baltay commented he visited the site.

Boardmember Rosenberg stated she visited the site.

Boardmember Chen stated she visited the site.

Chair Hirsch stated he also visited the site.

Michael Baker International Consultant and Contracted Project Planner Tamara Harrison provided the staff presentation for 180 El Camino Real in the Stanford Shopping Center for the project of Sushi Roku. The project is located within Building E, Suite 700 (formerly Yucca de lac). This space is adjacent to the existing The Melt and across from the California Pizza Kitchen. This project is part of the Master Tenant Façade & Sign Program (MTFS Program). Storefronts with a length greater than 35-feet require ARB public hearing while storefronts less than or equal to 35-feet in length require a staff level review. The project is located near the Sand Hill and London Plane entrance and the applicants are seeking to change the existing façade to accommodate the new tenant Sushi Roku, proposing new signage for the new tenant, proposes to update the outdoor dining space and landscaping, and seeking proposed alcohol sales under a Type 47 permit. The project does not increase the Floor Area Ratio (FAR), height, or lot coverage of the site and does not propose to change the use of the tenant space. Proposed exterior façade improvements include a smooth troweled plaster, Acoya wood screen, brick and porcelain wall tiles, new storefront glazing, metal accents and signage, and glass enclosures at patios. The design is consistent with the MTFS program for the shopping center and is consistent with the shopping center's character. Ms. Harrison presented the materials slide for the primary façade which faces the parking field off of London Plane. The top is proposed as wood planes with metal framing under the canopy and the ceiling under the canopy is proposed to be wood ceiling material. The brick tiles would be located on the façade under the canopy. The secondary façade that faces the California Pizza Kitchen. The top of the façade is the smooth plaster with a wood screen that wraps around to the front elevation, with metal accents at the canopy, a metal accent wall joining the two sides as well as glass railings for the outdoor dining space. Signage considerations under the Municipal Code allows for several wall signs within the allowable sign area. The

primary façade is 25'6" by 54'8" for a total square footage of 1,403, allowing a maximum of 80 square feet of sign area for wall signs. The secondary façade is approximately 1,060 square feet allowing a maximum of 65 square feet of sign area. The Code also allows for blade signs up to three square feet in area. The project is also allowed under the MTFS program, one primary wall sign, one secondary sign and one blade sign. The proposed signage is consistent with the Palo Alto Municipal Code and the MTFS Program. The height of the signs is consistent with the codes and staff requested the ARB provide feedback regarding the quality of the signage. The vehicle and bicycle plans are not yet completed by the shopping center and will be available before the Director's final approval. Staff recommends approval of the proposed project to the Director of Planning and Community Development based on findings and subject to conditions of approval.

Chair Hirsch called for Board questions of the staff presentation, there being none, he called for the applicant's presentation.

Jason Smith, Owner of LandShark Development Services group introduced the applicant Philip Cummins with Sushi Roku who provided a presentation to the ARB and staff.

Mr. Cummins, founding member of Innovative Dining Group, provided a brief history of the Sushi Roku dining chain located in California, Nevada, and Arizona and introduced his architect Sean Finn, Partner of Finn Wijatno Architects.

Mr. Finn stated he is part of the executive team for the project and presented the project details on behalf of their design team, further explaining the site is one of the main entrances to the shopping mall and referenced the context slide for the site plans.

Ms. Gerhardt informed the Board that they had also received additional sheets for the proposed plans of the project.

Mr. Finn continued explaining the existing façade is very inward looking, blank, and heavy. They are proposing to open the space up to the context of the mall and create a much more outward facing façade with more refined and elegant materials. The patio area will buffer the parking area, however they will have to work around an existing gas meter and water line. Japanese inspired garden elements will be used for the buffer with the intent to keep the view and light in the indoor and outdoor dining areas. The site location is in a prominent corner location at one of the main entrances to the mall and the applicant is looking to create a welcoming experience to the patrons entering from London Plane. Some changes have been made based on ARB comments that were made as a result of the past Monday ARB pre-meeting. They added blue to create an eight-foot path around the patio area. Not many changes have been made to the interior kitchen and dining room plans. Some of the comments in the pre-meeting centered around the wood paneling of the front façade that is resting on the canopy, with a concern that the canopy would hold the weight of the wood paneling. The applicant contracted a structural engineer as they had that same concern. KPFF Engineering stated the canopy would support the added structure provided it would be tied into the existing roof structure more robustly. The dimensions of the canopy and the new structure were added to the plan set for the ARB's review. On plan set page A201 (Page 22) the existing façade and proposed structure were drawn to show a better human scale of the project. The base will be articulated in the Japanese tile, the middle portion of the façade will remain the same, with the addition of a subtle sign. The applicant wanted to bring focus to the backlit screen as the image of the store. The material for

the backlit screen is Acoya, which is the defining image of the store, and extends from the floor to the height of the canopy which balances the proportions of the facade. The wood screen will turn the corner of the store. They will be dropping a single column and a solid wall with a moon door type opening, in place of the diagonal braces of the canopy. The articulation is a humanistic modernism of sort, inspired by Japanese elements. Slide A205 provided the materials pallet, and a physical materials board was provided for the Boardmembers. Natural understated materials with neutral colors will be used to compliment the modern-day cuisine that will be served. Slide A211 provides additional views. Photo 1 is the primary façade, Photo 2 is the secondary façade, Photos 3, 4 and 5 provide additional views and Photo 6 depicts the site layout. The following page provides photos of nighttime views of the backlit screen. Slide A311 provided a drawing of how the wood screen would be constructed. The Acoya wood is pickled to make it rot and weather resistant. The variant in colors indicated the changes in coloring through weathering processes.

Chair Hirsch opened the floor to public comments, Ms. Dao replied no comments had been received and there were no raised hands via zoom.

Chair Hirsch returned the hearing to Board questions directed to the applicant's presentation.

Vice Chair Baltay inquired about the difference in outdoor seating. He believes it is due to the current situation including the area under the canopy on the store front and the proposed situation includes only the seating on the side of the store front and asked staff to confirm. That would not necessarily affect the project but could effect the mall's calculations and wanted the record of the hearing to reflect that accurately.

Ms. Harrison responded that those calculations were provided by the applicant.

Ms. Gerhardt commented that generally they do not include the area in front of the door as dining area and after looking at the plan set closer, agreed there is a rather large area in front of the door that was not counted and would follow up with the ARB after taking a closer look at that.

Vice Chair Baltay asked if the applicant was planning to leave the large glazed window to the left of The Melt.

Mr. Finn stated he didn't believe they had the ability to change that because it is the adjacent tenant's space. The Melt has self-ordering stations in front of that space and a portion of the glazing has film over it to hiding that. They may consider placing a planter there to create a separation of the two spaces.

Vice Chair Baltay said in the plan set a dining table is located in that corner which seemed like it could be an awkward space for a dining table, and inquired if the new tile floors would be placed on top of the existing floor surface and if so how is the transition handled.

Mr. Finn responded the patio currently has a brick finish. A portion will be demolished for the addition of the new wood tile. The slope transitions will have to be worked out, with the intent for it to flush out with the material outside of the demised patio.

Vice Chair Baltay cautioned them on the number of utilities in that area to consider before doing any demolition.

Mr. Finn commented the intent is for the demolition to be very shallow, the grease interceptor is about 8-feet down.

Vice Chair Baltay asked staff about the ARB approving the Alcohol Permit and questioned that as something new for the ARB to consider.

Ms. Gerhardt explained that alcohol sales are done with a conditional use permit that is done at a staff level. It gets processed concurrently with the application, however the ARB doesn't need to comment on that particular piece of the project.

Chair Hirsch commented about the recent onslaught of recent rains and inquired how they intend to deal with the run-off from the roof structures.

Mr. Finn explained one of the reasons for the backlit screen behind the Acoya is so they can create a new roof with a single line membrane for new roof drains. The lower canopy will have sloped exterior with new roofing as well. One of the first iterations was to have the wood screen open where the rain would collect inside, which was the reason for boxing out that area with light gauge metal so they could accommodate the storm water.

Chair Hirsch inquired if that is carried down to the ground.

Mr. Finn indicated there is existing roof drain at line C and 11.7 will tie into the existing roof drain line that ties into the existing internal roof drain.

Boardmember Chen asked about the accessible pass and if the bamboo planter will be in the same location of the existing planter.

Mr. Finn explained they are keeping the existing planter in its current location and will be demolishing the raised curb to create a more flush entry into the area but they will not be reducing the landing area at the top of the accessible ramp.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the service flow circulation for the patio, would the servers, and the patrons needing to use the restroom all go through the main entrance.

Mr. Finn replied the servers and patio patrons would gain access to the interior through the main entrance.

Boardmember Chen asked if there would be a separate take-out station/window.

Mr. Finn stated currently they do not have a separate take-out station, presently they are not able to anticipate the projected amount of take-out orders.

Mr. Cummins replied that their take-out numbers average roughly 11-12% of their customer base. They generally attempt to keep the open and closing of the entrance doors to a minimum due to the exposition cooking in the dining room where patrons can watch them make the sushi. The only store that has a take out window is the store in Newport Beach which was utilized at 100% during covid, and has since dropped back down to 11-12%.

Boardmember Chen questioned if there is an outdoor service station.

Mr. Finn responded that currently they do not on patio two, and will likely accommodate an indoor service station for the exterior dining of the restaurant. Patio one had a service station on the interior of the store previously and they will likely do something similar. The Health Department doesn't generally like outdoor service areas and they can tend to look untidy which is not what they want to portray for patrons to see when driving by.

Boardmember Chen inquired about the elevation wall tiled posts with different textures on them and asked for clarification on where it is applied.

Mr. Finn suggested the intent is to have a mixture of those, however he would have to confirm that with the design team.

Mr. Cummins stated those tiles are designed to be used in conjunction with one another and integrate back and forth.

Boardmember Chen requested information on how the wood backlit screen would be constructed and applied.

Mr. Finn commented that is a great question and one they continue to explore. The current idea is that panels would be fabricated and hoisted into place and the two inch steel substructure would get hung on the fabricated panels and fastened from the back.

Boardmember Chen asked if the wood screen had holes that would allow a view through them.

Mr. Finn answered that is current and the dimensions of the holes are illustrated on elevations 2 on Plan Page A201. The width is regular spacing of the verticals and horizontals are about a foot on center. The articulation is more vertical than horizontal.

Boardmember Chen inquired if an inside screen would be applied on the back of the wood screen.

Mr. Finn asked if Boardmember Chen was alluding to bird control.

Boardmember Chen replied she was and was just curious.

Mr. Finn stated they are looking into a product called Stealth Net that is manufactured by Bird Barrier to ensure they don't get birds or vermin trapped behind the screen and acknowledged that had been expressed as an ongoing issue at the mall with pigeons.

Chair Hirsch noticed there is no rear door to the facility and inquired how they deal with the daily garbage out situation.

Mr. Finn answered there is a rear door that may be hard to see, and referenced Plan Page A111 on the proposed plan, a rear door is depicted on the left side of the space near line E and line 10.3.

To the left on the outside of the door is an area for trash and parking for outside deliveries.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested confirmation of the circulation from the kitchen to the outdoor dining area on Patio One and confirmed there is no secondary door leading out to Patio one and inquired if they intended on adding a secondary door.

Mr. Cummins responded that an additional door has proven to be not necessary in other store locations.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired about the cantilever cover on Patio two and asked if it was an open roof style with slats.

Mr. Finn confirmed that was correct, and there is another 5-feet that extends from the main canopy which runs about 9-feet out.

Boardmember Rosenberg asked if there is a column holding the cantilever up.

Mr. Finn replied that there is not a column, however it is an existing cantilever steel structure that is 2x8x16 that is getting repurposed. Braces extend out from other corners to help support the structure. They will provide verification of all of that from their structural engineer for the ARB Boardmembers.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested clarification of the samples provided.

Mr. Finn referenced the material Plan Page A205 and explained the WD2 on the material board is the patio ceiling wood. Sample F1 is the patio floor tile. WD1 is the sample of the weathered version of the wood paneling on the top front façade and the loose 2x2 sample is in response to some of the comments from the preliminary meeting with the ARB requesting a sample of the material after a year or two of weathering.

Boardmember Rosenberg inquired if the metal structure was cored tin.

Mr. Finn replied it is not cored tin due to the concerns about potential staining of the concrete through weathering. It is a powdered covered simulated cored tin material.

Boardmember Rosenberg referenced Plan Page A311 and inquired about the roof at the boxed out portion that will collect the rain water which will divert to an existing rain water line and confirmed it will exit from that point and confirmed what the underside of the box will be translucent to see the roof above.

Mr. Finn answered that is correct. There will be some lighting to create a glowing effect and will likely match the smooth style stucco or a similar tone to that. The glowing wood is the effect they are seeking with the outside be a gap with lighting behind the steel structure.

Boardmember Rosenberg requested confirmation that the sheathing would be on the backside of the lighting element and further asked if the backside of that sheathing is what you can look up and see the back, and that would be that light white color.

Mr. Finn responded that Boardmember Rosenberg was correct.

Chair Hirsch inquired about the lighting and the larger piece of projection that goes vertically and if the lighting would be mostly on the bottom edge of the canopy.

Mr. Finn answered their project on Manhattan Beach and found an LED grazer that has very narrow beams that allows for grazing of the front of that surface fairly consistently up about five and one-half feet and down the same distance.

Chair Hirsch requested a section he could reference.

Mr. Finn replied that is depicted on Plan Page A311, the wall section the steel tube frame. There are dashed lines just above the connection from the existing to the new.

Ms. Gerhardt explained its on the right hand edge next to the LED light.

Chair Hirsch called for other questions. There being none he called for comments.

Boardmember Rosenberg thanked the application and expressed she felt the project was a very clever design and by utilizing the tube steel diagonals and building the wood type lantern it floats above the façade in a very compelling and very interesting design choice. Using what was already in place she appreciated the structural analysis being done for the validity of the design choices. The completely floating canopy freaks her out a bit, however she trusts the structural engineer. She might be found on the moon door side of the patio. Boardmember Rosenberg liked the choice of elements and has only minor concerns of how quickly the wood may begin to look weathered however the choice makes sense and is logical, beautiful, and very natural. This is going to be an exciting addition to the Stanford façade and a vast improvement over what's currently there. In final, Boardmember Rosenberg expressed well done and she appreciated the work put into the design elements and she's looking forward to seeing it completed.

Boardmember Chen commented it's a nice addition to the shopping mall and appreciates the way they opened the cantilever instead of the dark curtain effect it had previously. The landscape design and materials used accentuates and respects the tradition, yet it doesn't lose the contemporary feel of the restaurant. She hopes they will consider adding another service door to the patio two area there could be functional challenges without it, even though the owner expressed there hasn't been a need for one at other stores. Overall, the project is nice, and the design and layout is in sync with the concept of the restaurant. It's a beautiful design. Boardmember Chen thanked the applicant.

Chair Hirsch provided comments on the project and said he was in agreement with the previous two Boardmembers comments and inquired about the size of the lettering for the signage and if it was similar to the signage they have on their other restaurants.

Mr. Finn explained each of the Sushi Roku locations have different articulations. It's probably not the best way to roll out a brand identity, however the signage in each location is more a response to the location façade designs and the design team felt this lettering was better suited understated at the Stanford Shopping Center location and let it be secondary to the wood screen which is the centerpiece of the design.

Chair Hirsch inquired how they consider the replacement of the outside concrete when needed.

Mr. Finn stated they are limited to what they can do on the exterior of the space, however, that was part of the reason they are demolishing part of the front curb to create clean breaks with the rest of the shopping center.

Chair Hirsch looked at the outside window and the use of a planter was probably a good idea. He believes it's a beautiful piece of work, he looks forward to the completion and believed it's a good addition to the shopping center.

Vice Chair Baltay commented it's a very clever and tasteful design and he was glad to welcome Sushi Roku to Palo Alto and expressed two concerns. Adding an eight foot canopy projecting out from the building with a fixed roof is a gross increase in the size of the building. On the corner it appears to fight the building across the alley and isn't good urban design for the shopping center and is concerned about the increase in the size of the building. If all applicants went into the shopping center with this type of design that would be a real problem. He's seen this type of design as a steady increase in the shopping centers. More and more restaurants are trying to create outdoor dining in spaces that are actually indoor dining space and this project is even adding a solid roof over it with pretty intense finishes which increases the size of the building without any further considerations and for those reasons couldn't support the project due to the building space is increased more than he felt comfortable with. Additionally, he was uncomfortable with the front signage. He understood the reasons for understating it but felt seven inch tall by half inch thick plastic lettering looks cheap. It could be a little bit bigger, a little bit thicker and a little bit higher quality. It will be difficult to make out the letter from across the parking lot, and supports staff comments about it not meeting their requirement for high quality. Vice Chair Baltay pointed out that at the Stanford Shopping Center applicants are required to park their projects at the ratio of one parking space per 275-square feet regardless of the function of the space. For this building that's about 13.2 parking spaces required. The same building downtown having take-out services has a ratio of one to 33-square feet and is required to have 77.7 parking spaces. If they didn't have take-out, it is still required to have one to 60-square feet which is 42.7 parking spaces. There is a gross unfairness when the shopping center starts having restaurants. The one to 275-square feet was designed for a shopping center in the 1960s when they were retail store locations. There is an increase time after time of high-end destination restaurants and people will travel to the location to go to Sushi Roku as it's a fantastic place to go to. They won't be going to go shopping. The result is the shopping center is under parked, especially in this corner of the shopping center. There is a gross inequity in the City's code currently and it's a gross inequity in what the shopping center is being allowed to do. It may appear as if he's being fussy, but the result is the downtown area is being hollowed out. The parking is likely the reason a spot wasn't sought on University Avenue. Vice Chair Baltay expressed a concern that that ARB be focused on that as well, and he thanked the applicant.

Boardmember Rosenberg appreciated Vice Chair Baltay's comments.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve staff's recommendations for the project.

**VOTE:** 3-1-0-1 (Boardmember Baltay voted no, Boardmember Thompson absent)

### **Approval of Minutes**

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for January 19, 2023.

Chair Hirsch introduced the item and called for any additions, deletions, or changes.

**MOTION:** Boardmember Rosenberg moved, seconded by Boardmember Chen, to approve the meeting minutes for January 19, 2023, as noted.

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

**Boardmember Questions, Comments or Announcements**

None

**Adjournment**

Chair Hirsch adjourned the meeting.