



CITY OF PALO ALTO
Architectural Review Board
Regular Meeting
Thursday, October 03, 2024
10:00 AM

Agenda Item

3. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for September 5, 2024



ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: September 5, 2024
Council Chamber & Zoom
8:30 AM

Call to Order / Roll Call

The Architectural Review Board (ARB) of the City of Palo Alto met on September 5, 2024, in Council Chambers and virtual teleconference at 8:34 AM

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

Absent: None.

Oral Communications

None.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

None.

City Official Reports

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

Jodie Gerhardt, Manager of Current Planning, went over the calendar of future meetings. She spoke about the September 19 meeting to review the 4335-4345 El Camino Real project and Housing Incentive Program and proposed changes. She stated there were no new addresses on the pending projects. She mentioned 660 University where a Builder's Remedy had been filed. She provided information about a code compliance submittal for 3150 El Camino Real.

Boardmember Hirsch queried if 3150 El Camino Real fell into the housing sites they would be discussing the following week.

Ms. Gerhardt confirmed that 3150 El Camino Real was a Housing Inventory Site with at least 113 units allocated to it.

Action Item

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 180 El Camino Real [23PLN-00323]: Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review of exterior storefront revisions and improvements including a redesigned outdoor dining area, façade revisions, new signage and updated lighting for an existing restaurant tenant, The Melt (Space #705A, Building E), at the Stanford Shopping Center. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from CEQA per Section 15301 (Existing Facilities). Zoning District: CC (Community Commercial).

Chair Rosenberg, Vice Chair Chen, Boardmember Hirsch and Boardmember Mousam Adcock all disclosed having visited the site.

Boardmember Baltay disclosed he had visited the site earlier in the week. He noticed that the Pacific Catch Restaurant has now placed a series of umbrellas along the sidewalk in a manner that narrows the width of the sidewalk to less than eight feet.

Tamara Harrison provided a slide presentation discussing The Melt in the Stanford Shopping Center at 180 El Camino Real including the project location, overview of Master Tenant Façade and Sign Program, project overview, existing versus proposed façade, colors and materials board, signage considerations, key considerations and conditions and the recommended motion.

Aliana Ramos talked about her participation in the project and gave a background of the development of the concept. She discussed the proposed changes providing slides for visuals.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

Boardmember Adcock wanted to know where the one new bike rack would be located.

Ms. Harrison explained that the City and Stanford had been working on an existing Bike Plan Layout for the overall Stanford Center that shows where the upcoming stalls versus the existing stalls would be.

Boardmember Baltay wanted clarification on how many new bicycles spaces were being added due to this project and where they are going.

Ms. Harrison replied this project was only required to add one bicycle space per the size of the tenant space. As the new ARB projects come forward at Stanford, the practice has been to condition them according to the size of the tenant space. The 24 spaces that were shown were from previous ARB approvals in the past.

Jason Smith added there was an overall exhibit identifying where all the bicycle parking spaces were located.

Boardmember Adcock queried if there would be a separate project to add these bike parking spaces. She had questions about the finishes including the trim, the existing white tile, the bottom area, the spacing of the slats, the fence and the light fixture proposed.

Ms. Harrison explained as part of the building permit process, staff would make sure that the bike parking location is shown consistent with the bike parking layout they had been working on for the Center. Prior to final occupancy, a final planning inspection would be required to ensure everything to be consistent with what had been approved. That would be checked as a part of that inspection process and if everything is consistent and in place, then it will be signed off on.

Ms. Ramos commented the trim across the top would be removed and patched as needed but the overall texture above that thin brick would remain the same and get painted. She stated the existing white tile that looks like a brick pattern would be pulled out and new brick would be glued in place. The bottom area that looked like concrete would be painted a dark gray. The slats were going to be horizontal planks set to achieve 42 inches above the ground. The final details will have to get coordinated for that piece as it is custom. The plan is for it to be about 20 percent open. The fence will be located in the same place as the current white fence. She pointed out an area to the north that would be getting closed off but the layout of the patio would remain the same. She said that the light fixture proposed would be relocated into the interior to make sure the sidewalk had enough clear space.

Boardmember Baltay had questions about the brick wainscot being replaced, the existing trim around the arched openings, what new trim was being added, the material behind the glass on the spandrel panel, the ceiling and the new signage over the entry door.

Chair Rosenberg asked about the dimensions of the sign and wanted to know if it was in compliance.

Ms. Ramos stated the brick wainscot was being coordinated with the existing height of the tile so the texture difference would not be noticeable. She believed they were keeping the same profile around the arched openings but paint it a darker gray. They are proposing the spandrel to make sure the interior can function well. It will be like a matte black on the interior. The glass will be seen from the outside but it will not be transparent. The dimension between the M and the T of the sign would be 18 inches.

Kate Culley-Rapata stated they proposed some small flex trim profiles to supplement the original arch profile. It would all be painted and be applied to look as if it is a part of the arch. It is meant to highlight the arch. It would be applied to both sides of the arch. She provided a slide for visuals. The reason for changing the spandrel from metal was an effort to unite all three arches with the same treatment. The ceiling below the level of the arch infill is a drop ceiling. She said the signage was individual letters and discussed how they were separated. They come out the same distance from the wall and have LEDs within with the amber acrylic rod. She agreed to come back with the dimensions of the sign.

Ms. Harrison confirmed the sign measurements were in compliance.

Vice Chair Chen wanted clarity about the elevation design above the entrance door. She wanted explanation about the permanently covered area counting toward the grass floor area and wondered if it mattered whether it was fully covered. She observed there should be an update on packet page 19.

Ms. Ramos pointed out renderings that accurately depicted the design.

Ms. Culley-Rapata understood that the letters could be mounted directly and coordinated from the back of the store after demo. The intent was to have a solid panel. The elevation without the reveal line was correct with the letters on the top part of the plate.

Ms. Harrison remarked that the proposed trellis would be considered remaining 50 percent open and would not have any kind of covered gross floor area. The proposed outdoor seating area would not count toward the glass floor area. She confirmed packet page 19 required an update.

Boardmember Baltay queried how an outdoor area qualifies as covered and counting toward floor area. He wanted to know the intent of the roof covering.

Ms. Gerhardt explained if the trellises are 50 percent open they are not considered to be covered. The same is true for standard umbrellas. A 100 percent solid cover would be considered floor area. She stated there are some trellis type features where the slats move locations and would be considered covered.

Ms. Ramos said the intent of the roof covering was for the two umbrellas that can be shifted down or tilted. The slatted area would not have any additional covering over it.

Vice Chair Chen mentioned the two canopies on the right attached to the wall which is glazing and has glass on it. She wanted to know if the glass floor area will be reduced if that is removed.

Ms. Ramos answered the two canopies on the right were not glass. The glass one is over the front door.

Ms. Gerhardt added the original front door would not be considered floor area because it is not being used for tables. The other two canopies are permanently covered and there are tables under them the square footage would be reduced.

Chair Rosenberg asked for confirmation that the wood color of the fencing would be Spanish walnut that was represented in the sample.

Ms. Culley-Rapata confirmed the wood color to be Spanish walnut. She added the lighting affected the appearance of the color in the renderings.

Boardmember Hirsch questioned the function of having a garage door that opens up into the ceiling. He speculated during cold or rainy weather, entry would be through a double door that opens out. He asked if the reflected ceiling plan was taken into consideration that it will close over existing lighting on the inside of the building. He asked about the brick and siding turning the corner between Sushi Roku and the Melt. He queried the post/sidewalk lighting would be replacing a fixture on the perimeter at the roadway edge. He wanted to know who would maintain the lighting fixtures. He asked if they would be modulated.

Ms. Ramos answered that the intent was that it would provide an indoor-outdoor open space depending on the weather. She stated the ceiling plane would coordinate with where the ceiling is being dropped down. It would be developed with the interior package. She explained how the brick would be transitioned to match. She said that Planning wanted a more open sidewalk so they decided to pull the light fixture into the patio space. She stated the light fixtures would not be modulated because they are so tall. The photometric engineer has determined them to be adequate.

Ms. Culley-Rapata confirmed Boardmember Hirsch's speculations about the main entry stating that was the only placed to get into the patio and property. The elevation shown on the right is a garage door with a breakaway to the side for egress. It is not the main entry or exit but would be operable as a

second means of egress if the garage door is closed due to the weather. She added that the existing light poles were noncompliant with the eight-foot required clearance.

Mr. Smith explained the shopping center would maintain the two light fixtures.

Boardmember Baltay questioned if there was a consistent plan for sidewalk lighting on this edge of the shopping center. He asked if getting the shopping center to provide a long-term plan for the lights would be something that could be put as a condition. He asked how the width was interpreted regarding ADA ramps projecting into the walkway. He wondered if there were plans to change the canopy at the service entrance to the shopping center just right of The Melt to make it more compatible.

Mr. Smith answered no overall plan has been put in place yet to relocate the shopping center light. It will be on a case-by-case basis when it impedes pedestrian flow in front of patio areas. He said regarding the ADA ramps projecting into the walkway, they chamfered the corners of the patio area for the egress coming into the space. The entry to the right of The Melt was updated recently during another project approval that came through the Board and there is no plan to further update at this time.

Ms. Gerhardt stated the long-term plan for lights could be handled similar to how they are handling bicycles. She stated the eight-foot width for ADA ramps was an unofficial policy but has been consistently applied in the last many years to try to keep the eight-foot clearance for pedestrians around all the tenant spaces.

Boardmember Hirsch asked if the lighting diagrams met standards appropriate for outdoor eating.

Ms. Culley-Rapata replied a lighting designer had been consulted on this project who checked and performed photometrics and agreed the lighting was sufficient.

Boardmember Baltay felt it was not appropriate to condition The Melt with the light fixtures but it was the wrong solution to put industrial level light fixtures right over the dining tables. He advised the shopping center needs to have a fixture solution for what the standard thing is. He supported having staff get that standard from them.

Chair Rosenberg thought it was a clever solution to shift the lights inboard. The question was if The Melt would be satisfied with the street lamps that Stanford Shopping Center uses already. She thought that once they get a comprehensive plan together for what fixtures they're going to use would be an appropriate time for Stanford Shopping Center to switch them out but putting the onus on The Melt seemed inappropriate. She was curious if they should have a meeting with Stanford Shopping Center to discuss these items.

Ms. Gerhardt replied they could have a study session with the ARB.

Boardmember Baltay speculated that the lighting solution was not a thought through design. He thought they should agree or not agree to have a condition of approval that this gets resolved somehow. He wanted to see a real solution for safely and attractively lighting the sidewalk at this whole edge of the shopping center.

Ms. Gerhardt pointed out a similar situation where the lights were installed closer to the curb and offered that as a solution. She suggested allowing a shorter encroachment in limited circumstances to maintain consistency.

Chair Rosenberg thought it was more appropriate to have the light fixtures out toward the curb for safety reasons. She cautioned the Board to be thoughtful about leaving this open-ended to find out what the solution would be without holding up the potential development of the project.

Boardmember Adcock suggested conditioning the approval with not using street lights as part of the lighting strategy for the outdoor dining.

Boardmember Baltay suggested informally stretching the policy to having up to a one-foot projection would give them a solution and give staff something to run with. He thought the shopping center should come to a solution with staff overall.

Chair Rosenberg thought this was an elevation in the design of this building. She preferred the oak color of the rendering. She felt the gray color was complimentary with the neighbor.

Boardmember Hirsch said the brick was lightening up the whole façade so why not the outer element as well. It seemed extremely heavy with the dark black walnut look.

Boardmember Adcock agreed going with the lighter color.

Boardmember Baltay did not understand how the flex trim application detail around the arch would work. He thought it would be a mistake to change it. He recommended just painting what was there and not adding the additional piece.

Boardmember Adcock was in agreeance and did not see a dimension to the existing molding. She did not see how the add-on piece related to the existing molding. He thought the spandrel panels proposed in the rendering were a mistake. He suggested metal panels might be a better solution. He observed that having garage door next to a human door would impede in the dining area. He suggested considering a folding door instead.

Boardmember Adcock thought spandrel glass with a black finish coating on number two surface would read a lot better than film on the inside. She suggested an integrated folding door with the egress door would be a nicer long-term solution.

Chair Rosenberg agreed that a bi-folding door would solve all the problems but did not see an issue with the garage door.

Vice Chair Chen thought there could be refinements and details on the front elevations. She suggested wrapping around the bricks to the Sushi Roku side.

Boardmember Baltay disagreed as he opined it would be a big impediment on the Sushi Roku side to have the very distinctly different material impacting their dining area. He thought lining it up with the Sushi Roku canopy going the length of a brick was an elegant solution. It would be painted to match.

Chair Rosenberg observed pain would best provide the transition between the tiles.

MOTION: Boardmember Baltay moved to recommend approval of this project as presented with the following modifications and seconded by Chair Rosenberg:

1. Eliminate the flex molding around the arch openings.
2. Use spandrel glass with a dark surface on the number two surface.
3. Do not relocate the existing streetlights into the dining area. Rather, allow streetlights to be relocated such that a seven-foot clearance is maintained.
4. Change the color of the wood planks to match the coloring in the rendering on the patio wall.
5. Consider using bi-folding doors instead of overhead garage doors.

VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

3. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. [23PLN-00110] 3000 El Camino Real (Palo Alto Square): Recommendation on Applicant's Request for Approval of a Major Architectural Review for facade changes and site improvements associated with conversion of a vacant theater use to an office use within Building 6. Exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15303 (new construction and conversion of small structures). Zoning: PC-4648. For more information contact the project planner Claire.Raybould@Cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Rosenberg, Vice Chair Chen, Boardmember Baltay, Boardmember Hirsch and Boardmember Adcock all disclosed having visited the site.

Chair Rosenberg announced they read through each email sent as public comment.

Claire Raybould, Principal Planner, brought a slide presentation discussing the 3000 El Camino Real project including the project location, project overview, key considerations, feedback from public comment and staff recommendation.

Krista Olson, HGA Architects, and Claire Adams, landscape architect at SWA, shared a slide presentation of the project including an aerial view of the site, site plans, existing views, a rendering of the proposed glazing, an illustrative site plan, landscape plan, tree protection zone, landscape palette, architectural materials, ground floor plan, mezzanine floor plan, building sections, west elevation, north elevation, east elevation and south elevation.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Herb Borock believed the item should be continued until a proper environmental document was presented for the entire project that would include amending that portion of the planned community zone.

Boardmember Baltay wanted clarification that a sign on the site was not a requirement for proper notification and if the language of the code stated that they could not recommend approval if they were unable to find that the project is in compliance with applicable portions of the comprehensive plan.

Ms. Raybould explained that a sign on the site was not required for minor architecture review applications. The applicant's argument was that the project was a minor architecture review application. The city stated that if the application was going to be processed, it would be moved to the Board, which is within our purview if we feel that it requires a public hearing. The city also has the discretion to defer the final decision to Council under the code from the director to the council, which they felt was appropriate in this circumstance. She confirmed that the Board could not find that the project complies with those things they could choose not to recommend if they found it not to be in compliance.

Ms. Gerhardt explained the comprehensive plan is a broad brush document. No project could adhere to all of the different policies and programs that are in the comprehensive plan. Their analysis is usually that on balance, a project conforms with the comprehensive plan. Zoning would need to adhere to all zoning requirements.

Chair Rosenberg wanted clarification where the zoning stands for this property.

Ms. Raybould explained the applicant's position was that a zoning amendment was not required and that they could submit an architecture review application and that they are consistent with the zoning because the zoning allows for a mix of land uses of which office is included. It does not specify a specific mix that has to be achieved on the site. There is additional language with respect to net leasable floor area that is detailed in the staff report that they feel that they are compliant with.

Vice Chair Chen asked for clarification which code sections they could look into regarding adding square footage on the second floor. She wanted to know if there were thoughts about shading consideration on the west elevation or if there were additional architectural features to reduce glare inside. She observed the two green walls on the south elevation were not symmetrical. She wanted to know the design intent of the stairs. She wanted explanation as to why turf was being used. She asked for the scale of the breeze block wall. She wanted explanation about the materials.

Ms. Raybould answered the PC zoning for the site was on packet page 61, Item number 3 under B, Improvements. It states the 1 and 2 story buildings, which includes 4 of the 6 buildings on the property, shall not exceed a total of 85,000 square feet of net rentable floor area with 65,000 square feet to be on the ground floor. They are providing 67,000 square feet in total so they are under the 85,000 total. The actual square footage was on page 44.

Ms. Adams stated they would not be adding any additional trees on the west side because they would not fit on the sidewalk. She explained the decision to use turf was to keep material selection low water usage and drought tolerant. She explained the breeze block feature wall would be CMU blocks, six inches in height. It would be on the upper portion of the wall, around four inches in height. The

materials were made of terracotta clay tiles. She thought they were four by six inch blocks and would be stacked and mortar set on top of the CMU wall.

Ms. Olson added there would be some type of window shading devices inside. They had not proposed anything to be added to the exterior of the building at that time in order to keep with the original architectural features. The asymmetry of the south elevation had to do with what could be proposed on the inside and where they would want the light coming in. She said there was no stair design yet.

Abigail Hammett, HGA Architects, suggested it would be helpful to look at the northwest rendering of the breeze block wall.

Chair Rosenberg queried if there was any interior design plans for an elevator. She observed there was discrepancy between the rendering that shows all of it being breeze block and some of the other images show a bit more CMU and sort of a breeze block infill panel.

Ms. Olson answered there were no design plans for an elevator as it was not needed for code since they were meeting the mezzanine code requirements.

Ms. Adams used a slide of the elevation to view the rendering and explained the one shown previously was outdated. She explained it would be two layers of breeze block stacked on top of each other. The total height would be 7 feet.

Boardmember Adcock had questions about the wall panels, glazing material and mullion pattern.

Ms. Olson replied a part of putting the glazing in would spark doing some structural seismic upgrades. The mullion lines were lining up with the new doors that would be added to the backside and the doors on the front side. The other mullions would try and mimic what exists on the front. There an eight-foot horizontal mullion would loop back around to the existing entry doors. She said they would keep with the bronze anodized mullion glazing and propose a more clear low E glass glazing, high performance to meet title 24. It would be replaced with dual pane. They preferred the clear glazing for transparency.

Jared Willis, director of construction with Hudson Pacific, remarked they were precast concrete which would be saw cut out and replace with a structural system on the inside to re-support the sheer activity of the walls and replace the glazing in place.

Boardmember Hirsch did not see any cellar plans. He asked about the mechanical system. He asked if the wall could be cut in a vertical panel.

Ms. Olson remarked the back stairs on the backside were egress doors from the theater. They were proposing to remove or fill in the stairwells going down and it would become one level area. She said a mechanical upgrade would have to be done. They would expand the mechanical screen on top to accommodate additional mechanical equipment when the interiors are done. She thought it would be kept open in order to keep the height. There would exposed ducts for the HVAC. The mechanical equipment would be on the roof.

Mr. Willis explained the exact structural and demo requirements had not been fully explored at this stage but the southern elevation wall would be cut into smaller sizes to reduce heat gain. They chose smaller windows because of the less desirable view.

Boardmember Adcock asked if the wall on the east side would have the floor line visible through or have spandrel somewhere halfway up the glazing.

Mr. Willis used a slide to explain the mezzanine level was to the right on the bottom image and is not intended to extend out past the last panel. On the parking lot side, it would be cut horizontally across the windows with something to obscure the floor line.

Chair Rosenberg observed a space on the mezzanine level that had no space for windows which would not allow for ventilation. She asked if there was any understanding of what the intent of this interior upper mezzanine will be. She asked if it would be maintained so every office has a window. Her concern was that the project had not been thought through. She asked to have the where the transition on the ground floor would begin pointed out on the gridlines. She wanted to understand where the bronze glazing would remain versus where the new glazing would come in and what they would do with the infill panels. She asked if there were any potential landscaping that might be more conducive to just blocking the doors off.

Mr. Willis answered they would have offices on the upper mezzanine area. He imagined the space identified might be more support spaces but it was not yet determined. He did not know the final layout of the offices and could not promise every single one had a window. He explained the transition on the ground floor would begin roughly at the R line. He did not yet know the depth that would need to be filled in. He said the doors that were becoming conference spaces in the front. There was just concrete in front of the doors and they were not proposing any changes to the exterior property in that area.

Female stated they were going to try and match the infill panels.

Chair Rosenberg asked if they would be power washing or painting the building.

Mr. Willis answered the intent was to keep the original concrete and it would have to be cleaned to remove the ivy.

Vice Chair Chen asked where the site plan showed the location of removal of 14 short-term bicycle parkings.

Mr. Willis stated short term parking exists in the tree grove on the south side, which he thought would need to be removed for the construction but there was no intention to delete bike parking.

Chair Roseberg asked if there was any pathing or progress for where the trash would be.

Mr. Willis stated there is a large trash enclosure on the south side next to the existing parking structure. They would have standard office millwork trash cans.

Boardmember Baltay asked if he was correct that they have chosen to define the PC zone by the PC text. He wondered how they could make a finding that it is compliant with zoning when the zoning was not defined.

Ms. Raybould explained the development plan is the buildings and the PC language defines the uses that are allowed on the site. She confirmed the project has been brought as an architecture review because the physical buildings are being modified and were defined not by the text of the ordinance but rather

by the existing buildings. She stated the recommendation was phrased so they would make a recommendation with the caveat that that recommendation that if Council felt that the project to be consistent with the zoning, they would make a decision to approve the project. If they fundamentally felt it was not consistent with the zoning, then they would deny the project.

Ms. Gerhardt added all of their PCs have permitted and conditional uses. Over time the uses inside of the structure are going to change so they write the PC in such a way to allow for changes of uses. The code allows for minor changes to a PC through the staff level architecture review process.

Boardmember Hirsch asked how they would be treating the surfaces of the panels they would be cutting.

Mr. Willis said they were leaving the existing concrete panels.

Chair Rosenberg thought the intent of the exterior design to be thoughtful. She had a concern with approving something when they did not know what was happening inside. Keeping the bronze was concerning to her. She personally had concern about whether more office space was needed. She was uncomfortable with the building not having an elevator. She was concerned with all of the issues that were left undecided.

Boardmember Hirsch agreed with Chair Rosenberg's discomfort of approving something without knowing about the interior.

Boardmember Adcock shared hesitation due to the lack of design of the interior that leads to lack of exterior design.

Vice Chair Chen agreed a lot of things were pending.

Boardmember Baltay pointed out they had to make six findings to recommend approval. He did not think they could make the last five findings because they did not have a complete enough design. He opined they could continue this and get additional work done to make those findings. He was struggling with number one related to zoning and the comprehensive plan. He discussed the Comprehensive Plan Item Policy L1.6 that specifies the project should encourage land uses that address the need of the community and manage change and development to benefit the community. He advised recommending denial of the project based on not being able to make finding number one. He did not think the proposed changes would allow them to make Policy Finding L1.6.

Boardmember Hirsch opined using the legalities of their zoning against the owner was unreasonable. He thought Council should advise a replanning of the site rather than just not approving it. He felt that a larger plan for the site was what was missing.

Chair Rosenberg wondered if they used the same proposal and façade but changed the use, would the best path forward be to deny the application or continue to a date uncertain and allow them the opportunity to figure out what they really want to use this space for. She agreed that finding number one Policy L1.6 was not being met.

Boardmember Adcock was in agreement with Chair Roseberg's comments. She thought it was unclear if it meets the zoning requirement and was the Council's decision to make. She did not think it made sense to completely deny it because they proposed an office.

Boardmember Baltay recalled recommending denial of a project in the past due to not meeting the fundamental tenant in the comprehensive plan. The applicant proposed an alternate project that was in compliance and the project moved forward. He said they should let Council know they could not make finding number one.

Chair Rosenberg requested input from staff in regards of denial versus continuance and how that may affect the process of the project. She wondered if it was for them to tell the current owners how to use the site.

Ms. Gerhardt agreed that if they have architectural concerns would be a good reason to continue the project but if they have concerns with finding number one, denial was the better course of action.

Ms. Raybould remarked the question for Council was if a change in the uses require a zoning amendment if they are considering a mix of uses on the site if there's a list of permitted and conditionally permitted uses.

MOTION: Chair Rosenberg moved to recommend denial of the project based on the proposed use not meeting Finding #1, Policy L-1.6 of the Comprehensive Plan, seconded by Boardmember Baltay.

VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

Approval of Minutes

4. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for July 18, 2024

MOTION: Boardmember Adcock moved to approve Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for July 18, 2024, as written, seconded by Chair Rosenberg.

VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

5. Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for August 15, 2024

Vice Chair Chen pointed out her name was misspelled in the roll call.

1. **MOTION:** Vice Chair Chen moved to approve the Draft Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes for August 15, 2024, with the change in spelling of her name from Ping to Ying, seconded by Chair Rosenberg.

VOTE: Motion carried 5-0.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements Or Future Meetings And Agendas

Chair Rosenberg thanked the Board for their thoughtful, dedicated comments on both projects.

Boardmember Hirsch announced they finally approved the San Antonio project and agreed they could do the garbage collection where they recommended it. They talked about other possibilities but would lose bicycle space in one scheme and retail space in the other scheme.

Boardmember Adcock summarized that sticking with the original plan was particularly based on the fact that it was not ideal for the people who have to deal with the trash on a weekly basis but any other location was going to greatly impact a large number of residents.

Adjournment

Chair Rosenberg adjourned the meeting at 12:15 p.m.