



MINUTES ARCHITECTURE AND SITE REVIEW COMMITTEE

6:30 p.m., September 14, 2011
Community Chambers
One North San Antonio Road, Los Altos, California 94022

CALL TO ORDER

Vice-Chair BRUINS called the meeting to order at 6:30 PM.

ROLL CALL

Present: Vice-Chair BRUINS, Commissioners JUNAID and BAER (for LORELL)
Absent: Chair LORELL
Staff: Planning Services Manager KORNFIELD and Assistant Planner LACEY

PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

1. Architecture and Site Review Committee Minutes

Minutes of the August 31, 2011 regular meeting.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER JUNAID, SECONDED BY VICE-CHAIR BRUINS, to approve the August 31, 2011 meeting minutes as-is.
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. 11-SC-39 – P. Burger – 1115 St. Joseph Avenue

Assistant Planner LACEY presented the staff report recommending approval of design review application 11-SC-39 subject to the recommended findings and conditions.

The project architect spoke in support of the design proposal. A nearby resident spoke with concern about the effect the two-story house would have on his property. The project architect responded by stating that the lot rises four feet to the rear and that the impact was not significant. There was no other public comment.

The Committee discussed the project and expressed their general support.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BAER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JUNAID, to approve application 11-SC-39 per the staff report findings and conditions.
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

3. 11-SC-40 – Flury Bryant Design Group – 685 Benvenue Avenue

Assistant Planner LACEY presented the staff report recommending approval of design review application 11-SC-40 subject to the recommended findings and conditions.

The project designer spoke in favor of the project. Commissioner BAER disclosed that he knew the applicant, but could remain fair and objective. There was no other public comment.

The Committee discussed the project and expressed their general support. A Committee member stated that while front elevation was balanced well with the house, the side elevation did not appear well-integrated over the garage.

MOTION BY COMMISSIONER BAER, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JUNAID, to approve application 11-SC-40 per the staff report findings and conditions.
THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. 11-D-01 – 40 Main Street Offices, LLC – 40 Main Street

Planning Services Manager KORNFELD presented the staff report recommending denial of design review application 11-D-01 to the Planning Commission subject to the listed findings.

Commissioner BAER stated that he was filling in for Chair LORELL and that it was a normal substitution. He apologized for the joke he made at the last meeting on the project and apologized to the applicant, stating that it was not his intent to in any way offend him. Commissioner BAER further stated that he could remain fair and objective. Vice-Chair BRUINS went over the Architecture and Site Review Committee's objectives (reads code) and stated that he Committee would limit the discussion to architecture and site planning.

Vice Chair BRUINS summarized the objectives of the Committee as architecture and site planning and emphasized that the project's broader issues such as parking should be deferred to the Planning Commission.

The project architect spoke in support of the design stating that the project site was a main gateway to town and needed mass and scale at the open entry because there is nothing there now of special quality. She further explained that the gables and towers naturally compliment each other, that three-story buildings were appropriate in a downtown context, and that they incorporated the Downtown Design Guidelines in developing Alternative Proposal "D." The architect said that the ceiling height variance was not perceived compared the height to the project to 1 Main Street, that the revised design recessed the corner to align with 4 Main Street and emphasized the gable, added usable balconies, and meets 20 of the 24 village character features.

Several members of the public including residents and downtown property owners spoke in support of the project stating a 25 percent vacancy downtown, comparable floor area ratio, good designs to provide more foot traffic, that it is consistent with the General Plan, compatible with the vision of town, and that the site should be treated the same as the hotel was and be approved without parking. There was no other public comment.

The Committee discussed the design and the majority gave their general support stating that they had no problem with a three-story building, that the paseo was good and provided a setback from

the adjacent single story, building, that a variety of design and fine grain details were appropriate, that the pedestrian scale was okay, that the gables were compatible and that the tower worked well at the arrival zone to the downtown area. It was suggested that the building design at the north front corner needed to respond more to the adjacent 4 Main Street, and the gable module and parapet should be made the same color.

A Committee member spoke in opposition to the project stating that the building was five feet taller than that allowed by Code and that was a significant concern in the downtown core, that the three-story vertical massing was inappropriate, that the third floor should be minimized either by setting it back or by using a sloping roof, that the design would benefit from a more distinctive and traditional architectural design and that the balconies should be more functional and that the bulk and mass were not compatible with the Downtown Design Guidelines or the General Plan.

MOTION BY VICE-CHAIR BRUINS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JUNAID, to recommend approval of application 11-D-01 to the Planning Commission per the following positive findings 1 (A-H) as amended by the intent of the Committee's action:

1. With regard to Design Review application 11-D-01, the Architecture and Site Review Committee makes the following findings in accordance with Section 14.78.040 of the Municipal Code:
 - A. The proposal meets the General Plan, Downtown Design Guidelines, Downtown Urban Design Plan and ordinance design criteria adopted for the CRS/OAD district with the following exceptions:
 - a. Parking requirements not met. (14.74.110)
 - b. Project structure exceeds 30 foot height limit. (14.54.120)
 - c. The second and third floors encroach into the minimum depth (two feet) of the rear yard as the site abuts to a public parking plaza. (14.54.080)
 - B. The proposal has architectural integrity and has an appropriate relationship with other structures in the immediate area in terms of height, bulk and design:
 - a. Mass and scale of the building, while larger and taller than the adjacent office building at 60 Main Street, it is compatible with the adjacent office building at 4 Main Street and across the street at 1 Main Street.
 - b. The structure is designed at an intensity that is desirable for new development in the CRS/OAD district; at 225 percent of the lot size.
 - c. Building design is in a pattern reflective of the City's past providing 25-foot wide "storefronts", large windows, pedestrian scale elements, well-appointed streetscape and furniture, variety of overhangs and awnings.
 - d. Contributes to an attractive gateway to the downtown by adding interest to a key arrival zone.
 - C. Building mass is articulated to relate to the human scale, both horizontally and vertically. Building elevations have variation and depth and avoid large blank wall surfaces.
 - D. Exterior materials and finishes convey quality, integrity, permanence and durability, and materials are used effectively to define building elements such as base, body, parapets, bays, arcades and structural elements.
 - E. Landscaping is generous and inviting and landscape and hardscape features are designed to complement the building and parking areas and to be integrated with the building architecture and the surrounding streetscape. Landscaping includes substantial street tree canopy, either in the public right-of-way or within the project frontage.

- F. Signage is designed to complement the building architecture in terms of style, material, colors and proportions.
- G. Mechanical equipment is screened from public view and the screening is designed to be consistent with the building architecture in form, material and detailing.
- H. Service, trash and utility areas are screened from public view, or are enclosed in structures that are consistent with the building architecture in materials and detailing.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 2/1 VOTE, WITH COMMISSIONER BAER OPPOSED.

MOTION BY VICE-CHAIR BRUINS, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER JUNAID, to provide a recommendation to support the development incentives on height and setback.

THE MOTION PASSED BY A 2/1 VOTE, WITH COMMISSIONER BAER OPPOSED.

CORRESPONDENCE

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Vice-Chair BRUINS adjourned the meeting at 8:48 PM.

Prepared by:

David Kornfield, AICP
Planning Services Manager