

**THE TOWN OF WOODSIDE
ARCHITECTURAL AND SITE REVIEW BOARD**

Minutes
September 19, 2016

CALL TO ORDER The meeting of the Woodside Architectural and Site Review Board was called to order on September 19, 2016, at 4:30 P.M. in Independence Hall.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Lubin; Vice Chair Larson; Members Carlsmith, and Mah

Members Absent: Member Reyerling

Staff Present: Jackie Young, Planning Director
 Kai Ruess, Town Attorney
 Sean Mullin, Associate Planner
 Jennifer Li, Deputy Town Clerk

CALL FOR CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

None.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

None.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1.	George Roberts	ASRB2016-0039
	3052 Woodside Road	Planner: Sean Mullin, Associate Planner

Presentation and consideration of a proposal, requiring Conceptual Design Review, to remodel an existing commercial building and modify an existing sign in the Community Commercial Zone.

DISCUSSION

Sean Mullin, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Chair Lubin asked about the proposed sconces.

Planner Mullin said a cut sheet was not submitted.

Chair Lubin said that if the lights were lower, they would better light the walkway.

Planner Mullin said that's something the ASRB can recommend.

Chair Lubin said she is only making a suggestion. If they already have overhead lighting that is not visible, it might work better together.

Member Mah said the photograph shows the bulb is exposed.

Planner Mullin said staff will ensure that the proposed lights meet the WMC requirements of being downlight only and shielded. There are a number of fixtures these days that look like exposed bulbs, but they are really LED diodes hidden in the hood. There are also some traditional fixtures with frosted glass that would meet the WMC.

Member Mah asked where the tree was previously located, and if the replacement would impact seating.

Planner Mullin said he doesn't know the original location.

Chair Lubin said she thought it was in the middle. Would the tree go back in the same place?

Director Young said yes.

Vice Chair Larson asked what type of tree was removed.

Planner Mullin said it was a Mayten tree.

Chair Lubin asked if that's what they're proposing to replace.

Director Young said we're not dictating what kind of tree they need to replant. They just need to put a tree back.

Member Mah asked about parking and how that is figured. She understands that retail is figured according to floor area, and eating and drinking establishments are figured according to seats. She asked if the 2.5 required parking spaces per seat for a restaurant factor in employee parking.

Director Young referred to the WMC. There are different uses in the parking requirements which count employee parking. For retail spaces, the parking requirement is one space for every 150 square feet of floor area, plus one parking place for every three employees. The parking requirement for restaurants is one space per 2.5 seats, and does not require employee parking.

Member Mah said it seems very odd.

Chair Lubin said it seems the allocation is a bit skewed. Maybe that would be something to look at in the future.

Director Young said if you look at the parking requirement for the hardware store, it's not generating the number of required parking spaces. Conversely, parking for restaurants is going to be higher.

Chair Lubin said, so the way they're getting around it is with the time requirements, the difference in the hours and the seats.

Director Young said no, the volume of parking during the afternoon versus the evening has to do with the Conditional Use Permit.

Chair Lubin invited anyone from the public to speak.

Tim Stannard, project applicant and restaurant owner, discussed the three Conditions of Approval. They will put the tree back in. The lights are conceptual in design. They are open to staff's recommendation. They're concerned about the comment about shutting down one of the dining rooms. Staff suggested that during the lunch time hours, they dim one of the three dining rooms. That sounds illogical. The Conditional Use Permit doesn't require darkening a dining room. The Conditional Use Permit requires that there are 70 seats maximum during the day, and that can be increased to 90 seats at night. They are happy to comply with the Conditional Use Permit, but we are unsure how to do that. He's curious to hear how the ASRB would like to see that implemented. They do not want to darken one of the dining rooms, so it sounds like they are being asked to physically stack seven tables outside or in the fire corridors in order to comply. Another option is to have big signs that prohibit seating, which they do not want to do either. How would the ASRB like them to enforce that?

Chair Lubin asked if they are able to close off a certain space containing 25 seats.

Mr. Stannard said no. During the time the Conditional Use Permit was granted, nobody contemplated a reservation system that calculates how many seats would be in use at any given time (e.g., Open Table). Would the ASRB be open to a system in which the restaurant commits to never seating more than 70 people during the hours of operation, and 95 people at night? That is easily checkable by staff. The Planning Department can stop in anytime, ask to see the computer, and the computer will say exactly how many people are seated. That would avoid having to darken one specific dining room, as staff is asking, or picking up furniture and stacking them in the parking lot.

Director Young asked him to clarify his reference to darkening a dining room.

Mr. Stannard said the staff report says that only two of the three dining rooms should be available for use during service hours. In effect, one of the three would not be available.

Director Young said staff is not recommending that they physically take tables out of the restaurant.

Mr. Stannard said he understands. He's not suggesting that staff is. He doesn't know what the solution is to that problem.

Director Young said the reason the Conditional Use Permit limits the number of seats during lunch is because there is not sufficient parking during the lunch hour to accommodate all the uses in the center. Staff looked at the number of seats in the patio and dining rooms. Staff is not in the position to police how many people are sitting in the restaurant.

Chair Lubin said she's hearing the restaurant can control the number of people they actually seat. Patrons can sit anywhere they want without closing a specific section.

Director Young said that's getting into the Conditional Use Permit requirements, which isn't the purview of the ASRB. Today, the ASRB is reviewing the exterior modifications to the building. The applicants are proposing to change the sign and add lighting.

Member Mah asked if there will be someone seating people.

Mr. Stannard said there are two uses. The café is more quick grab-and-go (e.g., coffee). They are limited to six seats for customers. The remaining seats are allocated for the restaurant. The restaurant will have a reservation system and host team managing the door.

Chair Lubin invited anyone else who wished to speak.

Steve Zaleznick, member of the audience, said he has seen what has been going on at the location for a long time. He thought the discussion tonight included parking; however, it's not. That's a contingency about using this place.

Planner Mullin said parking will be discussed during the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Zaleznick asked when that will be.

Planner Mullin said following the Formal Design Review. This meeting is Conceptual Design Review.

Mr. Zaleznick said he has seen buses coming in and unloading 30-40 people. He has seen bicyclists come in for a full day, and no one asks them to move their car. He has discussed 15 minute limit spaces with the hardware folks. It isn't enforced. He would be delighted to come back to talk about the parking. There are many more solutions besides what's apparent of just cars parked in the spaces.

Maurice Werdegar, Corto Lane, said he has been a resident for 15 years. He supports the project. We're very lucky as a small Town to have an operator like Mr. Stannard who has done a great job with the Village Pub and is considering doing a second project in Town. Residents in Town feel restricted because we are far from other businesses. Many people in Town are excited about the prospect of bringing another option for our families and the community.

Larry Bowman, Woodside resident, expressed support for another restaurant in Town. Traffic has become awful over the past few years. Having another great restaurant option with a proven operator is exciting. They're looking forward to more dining options in Woodside. Regarding further constraining it, he suggested they make it as inviting to as many people as they could. They have many friends who couldn't make it today who are in support of the project as well.

Nicole Thompson, Woodside resident, said she has noticed how stale the restaurant options have been around here, and how difficult it is to get to Palo Alto and Menlo Park. She was happy to hear that Mr. Stannard and company would be taking over the bakery space. Recently in the news, she was reading about how many projects have stalled due to parking regulations. She's dismayed by some of the in-lieu parking fees (in other cities), and the WMC chart that allocates so many parking spaces to the hardware store. She thought the parking issue was going to be discussed today. There are solutions out there. She supports the project, and hopes the parking issue doesn't end up holding up the project. People in her generation who are moving back to their hometown are excited to be here, and would like to see the place be friendlier to small businesses and have a community place to see old friends.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Vice Chair Larson said the proposed signage is great. It's aligned with existing conditions. The aesthetics are exactly what the Town wants. The proposed lighting is an improvement. The doorway makes an impact and is meaningful. He's very supportive of the proposal.

Member Mah agreed. The overall proposed design makes the front and rear façade more cohesive. Circulation is improved. She does not agree with staff on can-lights in the soffit. She would rather see a fixture on the wall that would comply, not spread too much light, and have a rustic look. A can light creates the wrong ambiance in Woodside. It seems jarring. She advocated for a good low-wattage fixture. A small wash next to the wall would be preferable to an overhead light. The proposed signage is fine.

Member Carlsmith agreed with Vice Chair Larson's comments and most of Member Mah's comments. He's in favor of the proposal.

Chair Lubin concurred. The new signage is crisp and new. She would like them to consider her suggestion about the low-lighting because she has seen people trip on that curb.

Mr. Stannard said that's one of the reasons for the sconce lighting. Overhead lighting that is more aesthetically pleasing is fine.

Chair Lubin said one thing about recessed lighting is the fixture is not visible. There are advantages and disadvantages with that option.

Member Mah asked what's wrong with the fixture. If the light source is shielded and not illuminating the entire area, it would add more visual interest to the front façade.

Chair Lubin said it's more in keeping with what's currently there.

Planner Mullin said a project in the commercial district requires both Conceptual and Formal Design Reviews. The ASRB can recommend moving a project to Formal Design Review with staff as long as story poles are installed at least 14 days prior to the hearing. Due to the scope of this project, story poles cannot be installed because they're not proposing any changes to the mass of the structure. The recommendation in the report is that Formal Design Review take place with staff ahead of the Planning Commission review of the Conditional Use Permit.

Chair Lubin asked if any changes are proposed to the exterior of the patio enclosure.

Director Young said not at this time. She proposed to change Condition I.c. to indicate that the applicant will work on the exterior lighting with staff.

ACTION

The ASRB supported the proposed project, and recommended that the project be forwarded to staff for Formal Design Review, subject to the following Conditions of Approval:

- I. Prior to Formal Design Review, the applicant shall submit:
 - a. Revised plans to include a maximum of 95 seats;
 - b. Revised plans including a 48-inch box replacement tree for the removed Mayen tree in the outdoor patio; and,
 - c. Revised plans to locate and specify non-formal exterior light fixtures, which comply with WMC Section 153.049(H) and (I). The location, quantity, and design of the light fixtures shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director.

- II. Prior to Planning Commission review of the Conditional Use Permit for the entire commercial center, the applicant shall submit:
 - a. Floor Plans and Floor Area calculations for all businesses in the Cañada Corners commercial center;
 - b. Site Plan showing all parking spaces;
 - c. Statements of operational characteristics (hours, type of business, total number of employees, maximum number of employees on site at a given time) for all businesses in the Cañada Corners commercial center; and,

- d. Details of all existing signs on the site, including dimensions, materials, and location.
- III. Prior to issuance of a Building Permit, the applicant shall submit:
- a. All project details required for review of a Building Permit.
- IV. During construction, the following shall occur:
- a. The project is to be completed per approved plan. Any deviation from the approved plans requires review and approval of a revision by the Town. "As-built" plans are not acceptable.
 - b. Applicant shall be responsible for compliance with requirements of all other applicable regulatory agencies, including but not limited to State Water Resources Control Board, Regional Water Quality Control Board, California Department of Fish and Wildlife, Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, OSHA, EPA and Caltrans.
 - c. All construction staging and construction parking shall be located onsite and shall not be located within any right-of-way, ingress/egress easement, access route for other parcels, or within any stream corridor, area with slopes in excess of 35%, area designated to meet the Town's natural state requirements, any areas where it may harm protected trees, or within any other environmentally sensitive area.
 - d. A sign shall be posted in a location readable from the roadway stating the permitted hours of construction pursuant to Municipal Code Section 151.55(B), and a contact name and phone number for the contractor. The sign shall be posted and maintained for the duration of the project, and shall be removed upon approval of the final inspection of all permits onsite.
- V. Prior to final inspection, the following shall occur:
- a. All exterior finishes, colors, and materials approved by the ASRB shall be used. Any changes may require further review by ASRB, as determined by the Planning Director.
 - b. Install all approved exterior light fixtures. The bulb or light source shall be entirely located behind a non-translucent surface. No additional lights or alternate fixtures shall be installed without first being reviewed and approved by the Town.
 - c. All construction debris, trailers, material storage containers, and portable restrooms shall be removed from the site.

Motion: Vice Chair Larson/ Second: Member Carlsmith
Ayes: Chair Lubin; Vice Chair Larson; Members Carlsmith, and Mah
Noes: None
Absent: Member Reyerling
Abstain: None

The motion carried.

Chair Lubin adjourned the ASRB meeting at 5:02 P.M.