



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: January 26th, 2016

City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Martin Bernstein; Vice Chair Margaret Wimmer; Board Members David Bower, Beth Bunnenberg, Patricia Di Cicco, Roger Kohler, Michael Makinen

Absent:

Chair Bernstein: I want to welcome everyone to the Historic Resources Board meeting of January 26th. Would the secretary please call role?

Ms. Amy French: Yes, the Liaison will call role. All present.

Chair Bernstein: Okay, thank you.

Oral Communications

Chair Bernstein: Next on our agenda would be oral communications and the public may speak on any item, not on the agenda. I do have three speaker cards and the first card I have is David Carnahan, thank you. I'm reading you're – Thank you. Welcome.

Mr. David Carnahan: Thank you Chair Bernstein and Board Members. David Carnahan, Deputy City Clerk for the City. I'm here for two reasons today. One is to express the Councils appreciation, again, all of you but in particular to the three of you that were not able to make it to the Board and Commission recognition event; for Board Member Di Cicco? Sorry about that. Rodger Kohler and Michael Makinen, I'll bring up your proclamations and your gifts from the Council for – just express their appreciation for your service last year.

Board Member Kohler: Did we get a raise?

Mr. Carnahan: You did. They did authorize it but I'll give you a 1000% raise, on the spot. Retroactive for all the years you've been here if you so choose. Also, I'm here to talk about our Board and Commission recruitment that's going on. The deadline is tomorrow at 7 – sorry, tomorrow the 27th at 4:30 PM. We're looking for additional applicants for the Parks and Recreation Commission, the Planning and Transportation Commission and the Historic Resources Board. We're hoping, if you haven't had a chance to reach out to people you know in the Community, in particular for the Parks and Recreation Commission and the Planning and Transportation Commission, we'd appreciate you reaching out to members of the Community and convincing them in just over 24 hours that they want to apply. Applications are available on the City Clerk's webpage. I'll give you a flyer. Thank you all very much.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you, David. Next on our agenda – continuing on to the next speaker, I have is Kimberly Wong. Welcome.

Ms. Kimberly Wong: Hi everybody. My name is Kimberly Wong – sorry. I live over at 1260 Emerson Street and my name is Kimberly Wong. I am curious how you request that a historic home be preserved?

Specifically, the Lockey House at Castilleja had just turned 100-years old so, it reached a centennial mark, and I am wondering what is the process to consider preserving it rather than tearing it down for construction. Thank you very much.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. Are we able to respond or –

Ms. French: Yeah, I think – typically oral communications is a one-way thing – people talking. Certainly, through the Chair – I am capable, for Kimberly to reach out to me, to ask me these questions and I will provide her the answers.

Chair Bernstein: Ok. Alright. As far as the response then – again, normal oral communications are we're just listening to members of the public. I guess I should suggest to – if you could reach out to Amy French, Planning Manager, -- is the proper title?

Ms. French: I'm the Chief Planning Official, but close enough.

Chair Bernstein: Chief Planning Official and she can go through the process for that.

Ms. Wong: Alright. Thank you very much.

Chair Bernstein: You're welcome. Next, I have is Leland Francois and you can correct my pronunciation of it that's not correct.

Mr. Leland Francois: Oh, you're right on time Chair Bernstein.

Chair Bernstein: You're welcome.

Mr. Francois: Good morning. Leland Francois from the other end of town; I'm meaning around Ravenswood – Port of Ravenswood, Cooley Landing and Ravenswood industrial park. I'm circulating quickly a few flyers. There isn't a lot of preservation going on in the East Palo Alto jurisdiction as we speak. If it is, it's probably scattered but before I address what some of the subjects that I'm here for. I want to call your attention to the news article that was printed November 24th. I think that was a Palo Alto Daily and it was title, City carts all pieces of history. Well, unfortunately, that was never resolved and a lawsuit was filed. I am the plaintiff and there isn't a whole lot I can say about that but it's matured about 28 months now and unfortunately, I do think because of the fact that there are some voids – time voids in that – it may affect a lot of municipalities around here but nonetheless, it is public information. I do believe that historic resources are part of the municipal infrastructure therefore, it warrants public policy as far as public information but I'm not going to say a whole lot to that. If there're any questions, please contact me. The matter is in litigation right now and I'm sure if we're going to come to (Inaudible) but I wanted to give you a heads up on that. The flyer that I'm circulating for the most part is pretty much self-explanatory. It's pretty much where my minds have been over the past 24-years in terms of my feelings about Ravenswood/ East Palo Alto area. I do want to say that, starting as of this year, I'm initiating a survey at the old Ravenwoods High School campus, which today is the interest to the Ravenwoods 101 shopping center; then, it was 2050 Cooley Avenue. I'll be there every day behind the Office Depot for about 2 or 4 hours surveying the public. Finding out what they know about that particular area. These products I brought here are my latest innovation to Ravenwoods (Inaudible) products and they're free at Last Gardening club. I'll briefly touch on them. They are something different – I'll try to explain to you what they look is hard but that picture tells sort of a 1000 words and I brought something that you know – the first item is called The Golden Free of Last Message, dedicated to Dr. King. The second one is titled The Other Apple Store and I'm not sure if the camera is able to reflect that. The third item of course is The Pumpkin Factory. Black lives history matters first – matters to and a last one of course, is Ali's Office. Now one thing about these planners is, I can't just put them out in the public without getting permission from the authorities – from the founding agents that sort of are the originators. Therefore, on the Golden Free of Last Message, Ali's Office, I am consulting with the

appropriate family agencies in the State, to get permission to circulate these but nonetheless, I can talk about them.

Chair Bernstein: Okay.

Mr. Francois: Feel free to come out and join me every day, 1-5 PM, Old Ravenwoods Campus. Towards the rear of Office Depot; come on out. I have a lot of products in the work.

Chair Bernstein: Okay, Leland. Thank you so much.

Mr. Francois: You're welcome.

Chair Bernstein: Right, that ends all the Oral Communication. Any other members of the public that would like to speak? Okay, seeing none.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bernstein: Next is agenda changes, additions or deletions; Amy?

Ms. French: Yes, it was intended that this would be – this is the first meeting of January and this would be the election of officers. I don't know what happened. We do these electronic packets now and they get messed up. That was the intent, is to have that happen today. The current Chair and Vice Chair has served for a term of the year and so – and of course, the next item, the official reports, we'll talk about amending the By-Laws, to make January the official election month.

Chair Bernstein: Okay.

Board Member Kohler: I'd like to comment on that. We – in the past, we haven't been so rigid in terms of, here's Chair and then we do it because – in fact, some years, we might have only met 4 or 5 times or less. I don't know how many times we met this year but it hasn't been every month, has it? I don't know.

Ms. French: I'm happy to answer that but basically – I mean, it doesn't matter how many times a year you've met; you've served a term of year no matter how many meetings.

Board Member Kohler: I'm (Inaudible)

Chair Bernstein: We need your mic on.

Board Member Kohler: Yes, okay, I'm getting there. I'm just trying to say that it seems – if, in fact, I don't think we had more than 6 meetings at the most. Maybe we've had more.

Ms. French: I've cataloged that in the CLG report.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, Okay. Alright well, that's just my thought that – but I guess if we're happy with who's here now. We can re-elect them. That's true. Yes? Okay.

Chair Bernstein: Then, the other comment I have is that – you see, actually, the City Council is still interviewing – so, actually, we only have four Board Members that are – right now. I guess the election – the Council has not voted on who the three other Board Members will be, correct? So...

Ms. French: They have extended the application period to see who else is out there, you know, but you are serving at the pleasure of the Council...

Chair Bernstein: Of course.

Ms. French: ...unless you quit. So, since you're here, I – you know, suggest that – you can, of course, decide to go through the process to re-nominate for a year, the current Board Members and then if things change for some reason, after this process. Then, that would be another ...

Chair Bernstein: We'd have another election. Yeah, okay. Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I've been thinking about this since the Council decided to continue the interview process and there are four applications for the three Board seats that have expired. It's conceivable that one of the three of us that are sitting here today won't be back here and in light of the fact that Council has decided to extend this whole process because they wanted new Council Members to be part of the selection of Board members. I think it's inappropriate for us today to make any changes because then – assuming that a new Board Member arrives, that Board Member would be effectively left out of the decision-making. We are not in any hurry to do this. I think we ought to have the City Council resolve the membership of the Board. I understand the – I read the ordinance. I understand what the issues are here but Council wanted to have new people participate. I think it would only fair for us to have the – if there is a new Board Member, to have that person participate. I would suggest that we – what's the term of art we use – that we postpone until a date uncertain and wait for the Council to actually confirm the new – the three new Board positions.

Chair Bernstein: That makes sense to me. Let's find out who the seven Board Members will be and then have the nominations and elections of Chair and Vice Chair. Yeah so, I share that thought.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Was that in a form of a motion?

Chair Bernstein: The By-Laws does say that – or as near as possible and I guess what's possible is that, well let's wait until we have – till we know who the 7 Board Members are.

MOTION

Board Member Bower: Chair Bernstein, I'd like to move that we postpone this election until after the Council acts.

Board Member Bunnenberg: That you move it to a date uncertain.

Board Member Bower: Right.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I could second that.

Chair Bernstein: Okay, any discussion on this motion before we vote? Ok, all those in favor signal by saying, Aye.

Chair Bernstein, Vice Chair Wimmer, Board Member Bower, Board Member Bunnenberg, Board Member Di Cicco, Board Member Kohler, Board Member Makinen: Aye.

Chair Bernstein: Opposed? Okay, that passed unanimously.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0

Chair Bernstein: Okay, thank you. Any other agenda changes, additions or deletions?

Ms. French: None.

Chair Bernstein: Okay.

City Official Reports

1. Transmittal of the HRB Meeting Schedule and Attendance Record.

Chair Bernstein: City Official Reports. Chief Planning Official Amy.

Ms. French: So, the first item is just a schedule for the year of your meetings and this reflects as if we're having two meetings a month. We are not currently having two meetings a month. It's too much of a burden, with a vacant staff position, to carry two meetings per month. We are doing as good – as well as we can with one meeting a month at this time. The next meeting, we're looking at February 23rd as the potential for an HRB retreat. Then, we are also considering later in the Spring to have a joint meeting of some kind with the ARB; a Study Session of sorts. So, we are looking into that. I guess, as usual – alert – so Robin Ellner is back in the office again – alert her if you are not able to make one of these meetings; if you know in advance, please do let us know so that we make sure that we have a quorum for the meetings. That's all I have to say about that item. Does anyone have any comments or questions?

Board Member Bower: I'm disappointed we're not meeting on Thanksgiving Day.

2. Recommend HRB Bylaws Modification and 2015-2016 Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report and Discuss Topics for Upcoming 2017 HRB Retreat.

[Jumped to study Session]

Chair Bernstein: Ok, recommended HRB Bylaws modification and the 2015-2016 Certified Local Government Annual Report and discuss topics of upcoming 2017 HRB retreat. Does the Planning Official have...

Ms. French: Yes. Staff has recommended that you – hopefully, you've seen the amended bylaws. There are annotations there in that document to talk about, you know, January each year as being the time for election of officers or as soon thereafter as possible. Maybe we could add a clause, you know, -- anyways, to address the situation we're in now... "or other good reasons". Then, the second piece is to – if you could confirm your availability on February 23rd. It's a normal HRB meeting date and we think to have the HRB retreat on that date. Then, thirdly, I have already – I had provided already the Certified Local Government Annual Report, that I had prepared to convey what the City's been up to for the period – for reporting period and so, I did receive one additional item from Martin, thank you, which I've incorporated into the document. That concludes my presentation.

Chair Bower: I have a question.

Chair Bernstein: Yes.

Chair Bower: Amy, why are amending the bylaws? What's driving that? What's wrong with having the elections in October as we've had? I think that's what we're currently operating under.

Ms. French: Except that it didn't happen in October and I think we're trying to go to a standardized system for the Boards. So, January, every year – you know – hopefully you've got a Board already in place. I mean, what happen this year, I think – I hope is an anomaly. I'm going to limit that commentary but typically, we would have all Board Members in place by January because the applications are due in the fall.

Board Member Bower: Except for the fact that the circumstance we find ourselves in this year is likely to happen every 6-years because we have 3-year terms and the Council has 2-year terms and every 2-years, the Council turns and I can foresee the same problem happening. I'm expecting it won't because I don't think this looks very good. I don't think the Council performed well on this and I'm not being critical

of the Council, I'm just making the point that the message that was sent to the 200+ volunteers is that your time is simply not valued because you can go through an entire set of interviews that are totally tapped and the new Council can't be bothered to look at those tapes and make decisions about them. I'm not inclined and not in favor of a change. In fact, I think it was better before the Council changed the terms. Our terms ended in June. This problem would not exist if the Council had left the term change. Now, I remember the discussion and I do appreciate that there was a reason for doing this but I don't want to now make a bylaw change that puts us in the position of having to confront this particular situation again. I think October is fine. I understand we didn't do it but that doesn't mean we can't pick it up. We don't need to change the bylaws in order to try to undo a housekeeping issue.

Chair Bernstein: I also thought about the – yeah, there's going to be repeating frequency of when interviews for Boards and Commissions occur, tied in with when new Council Members get sworn in in office. It seems like interviews for Boards and Commissions should happen after new Council Members are sworn in that way, Council Members can vote on – anyway, I share Board Member Bower comment about, what's the time of the election? Well, let's make sure we have Council interviews first, to see who's on the Board and then have the elections. So somehow, if the bylaws are going to allow for Council Members to pick Board Members first – yes. Yes, welcome Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Yes and I respect and appreciate the comments that Board Members have made. I will actually apologize for the process that currently took place because it wasn't the intention and the Staff has moved at Council direction and Staff support to move to a twice-yearly application and interview and appointment process so, that we just won't just have one time a year when applications can be due. That said, there's also some conversation recently among some of the Council Members that we need to relook at and make some adjustments so this kind of thing doesn't happen because I appreciate very much your comments Board Member Bower. It's really a disservice to the people who have volunteered and who have offered to volunteer. Apologies from my colleagues and myself; so, this is a bit of an anomaly but at the same time, it shouldn't happen. Comments accepted.

Ms. French: I would also like to add as Staff, my appreciation and heartfelt appreciation for the numbers of hours of training that the HRB in particular – you know, as a CLG representative, have to go through every year and you know, I don't know how clear that is for folk that are applying for this position but I want it to be clear that there's an obligation to go to training, there are conferences, there's all of that.

Council Member Holman: I'll support those comments very much. Thank you, Amy.

Board Member Bower: I would just like to say that Council Person Holman, was pretty outspoken about the fact that this situation we are in should not have occurred. She did not support the delay of these appointments and there were other Council Members, new and previous Council Members – I don't know how you say that – the non-newly elected who supported making a vote and not drawing this out. Council Member Holman, I appreciate your comments. I don't think an apology is necessary certain but I just thought it sent the wrong message and I think you would probably agree with that.

Chair Bernstein: So, we've been requested to vote on this change.

Ms. French: Can I just jump in for a second? If you're thinking of moving along in the direction of leaving it as October – might the clause "or as soon thereafter as possible", or maybe "practical", be left in so that we can address this condition?

Chair Bernstein: Yes. I agree with that. Yeah. Board Member Bower.

MOTION

Board Member Bower: I'd like to make a motion that we only change the bylaws to add the phrase, "as soon thereafter as possible" leaving the October month in the bylaws; thus, eliminating all the other changes that are proposed here.

Chair Bernstein: Looking for a second; is there is a second to the motion?

Chair Bernstein: Ok, I'll second that motion – that motion? I'll second that motion. Any discussion before we vote? Ok, all in favor say aye.

Chair Bernstein, Vice Chair Wimmer, Board Member Bower, Board Member Bunnenberg, Board Member Di Cicco, Board Member Kohler, Board Member Makinen: Aye.

Chair Bernstein: Ok, that passes unanimously. Thank you. Any other discussion items on this particular agenda item? Ok.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 7-0

Ms. French: If the Board has no question about the CLG Report then, it stands as submitted to the State.

Chair Bernstein: Ok, Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Just a quick question for Staff is the date that this submission is due, when is that?

Ms. French: In the past, it was submitted already.

Council Member Holman: It was submitted already, ok. I might suggest that – I don't know, it's up to you all. If you want to look at this and approve it now, or if you want to discuss it during the retreat?

Ms. French: I think I would appreciate if there are concerns or inaccuracy with this report that's been submitted to the State, I would like to hear that. How this gets filled out? Who participates in filling it out? All of that, I'm certainly welcome and eager to have that kind of conversation. This was the first one I've done. I modeled it after the one prepared by Historic Planner Matt Weintraub last year. I think I hit the mark on things but I'm ...

Council Member Holman: I don't take issue with it. The only thing I was looking at is things like we haven't updated our inventory and that really is a requirement of CLG – of us as a CLG City so, I just thought there might be some discussion around this. Maybe this can still be approved – it's a procedural thing so this could still be approved, except your recommendation on that but if this could be on the agenda for the retreat. That'd be my suggestion if you all...

Chair Bernstein: Speaking of that, there is actually, part of this agenda is to discuss topics for the upcoming retreat, which is happening four weeks from now. Why don't we open that up to see if any Board Members would like to contribute to what topics we should talk about? Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I would like some additional training and direction in terms of the moving of historic structures. I have concerns and would like to know exactly what the Secretary of Interior Standards directs in this respect.

Chair Bernstein: That's an excellent topic because we obviously get applications requesting such action. Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I have 4 items that I would like to have on a retreat agenda. One is the HRB report directly to the Council. No longer report to the ARB. Second, that we have a mid-century building protection plan. We have really been unable to address that and we're I think, remiss on not having done that. I'd also like a discussion of making demolitions discretionary instead of ministerial because I think San Francisco has had a very successful program in maintaining historic structures because it is not a

ministerial decision. Finally, less important is a discussion about a Mills Act Program that we can develop to try to provide an incentive program for saving residential properties. Similar to what we have already in place for commercial properties. Those are my 4 items.

Chair Bernstein: Vice Chair Wimmer.

Vice Chair Wimmer: Yes, I also agree with David on the incentive program. I think that's been something that we've been talking about ever since I've become a Member of the Board and we throw around the idea of talking more about the Mills Act but we've not really made any action towards that. I think we can also come up with our own internal incentive of ideas. Maybe it's a reduction in application fees or expedite the amount of time that it takes to go through a Historic Review Process. I think that that should be high on our priority list as far as what we talk about. Also, I think we should review our ordinances – review the historic ordinance because I think another item on that is penalties. So, if someone instances tear down a historic building, their penalty is \$2,000.00 or something like that. I don't think the penalty really matches the action so maybe we can take a second look at that.

Chair Bernstein: I would like to have – I have 2 suggestions that we speak at the retreat and one is looking at the historic categories themselves. For example, we have 1, 2, 3, and 4. There are some – my belief that there are some missed categorized buildings. For example, the former University Art Building is a Category 3. The idea that I have been mentioning for a few years now, is that a possibility of 2 Categories. One Category being historic, one Category being non-historic. Makes it from a consumer's point of view, property owner's point of view, public point of view – might be a simpler thing rather than what's the difference between a 3 and 4 and 2 and 3. Non-historic Category, historic – I'd like to just discuss that. Also, there's a new State law that went into effect 26 days ago, regarding accessory dwelling units. So, there are a number of historic properties in Palo Alto that have accessory structures like, barns or garages or carriage houses, before car where here. I'd like to just have the – at least the Historic Resources Board get an update on the State Law that is requiring or at least encouraging Cities to amend ordinances to allow secondary dwelling units regarding parking, daylight (Inaudible) – all of the regulations that apply to setbacks for sure. There are a lot of historic properties that have accessory dwelling units and at least have a discussion on what that – how that law and then how we might respond to it with any ordinance proposals. Any other items? Ok. Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: I'm recalling that last year, when I first became a liaison to the HRB, there was a retreat and there was an indication that there were several items that were discussed that were going to be taken up again during the next retreat and that never happened. I don't off the top of my head remember all of those. Some of them I think were brought up today but I don't remember all those items but those could surely be found in minutes and forward those. One of the things I do remember and I know it's a Staff constraint but it's still a little puzzling to me that we don't have on the City's website, the list of the National Register Eligible – determined Eligible properties and nor do we have the list for potential California. That can be a discussion that we have with Staff and HRB. I remember that was one of the things that discussed at the prior retreat.

Board Member Di Cicco: I think if I might comment as well. I think it's been discussed about the inventory. I don't know how many times – about having it updated. I think it is truly something that should be a priority because as a Martin also said, there's some certainly missed Categorized at this point and I think some combinations of 2 and 3 and 4 need to be changed. Maybe we ensure – I think we were going to have volunteers, in fact, go in the neighborhoods and you know, revisit the list. I think definitely that and I'm very interested also, that I was going to mention about the accessory dwellings and I read Jerry Brown's comment on and where the City actually stands with it right now.

Chair Bernstein: Do we have a location for the HRB retreat?

Ms. French: No, we don't. Not yet. Do you have any preferences?

Chair Bernstein: I'd say – then also, a time too.

Ms. French: I would just assume an 8:30 start but if there's a preference for later, let me know.

Chair Bernstein: Regular meeting time sounds fine for me. Location lets see, if we have it here, then we have this arrangement here.

Board Member Bower: (Inaudible)

Chair Bernstein: Oh...

Ms. French: The Community room with the glass. Is that of interest? I can explore that.

Chair Bernstein: If that's available, I think that's a more comfortable place. (Inaudible) Beth?

Board Member Bunnenberg: The other possibility is for us to utilize one of our other historic structures such as the Museum of American Heritage which has a meeting room in it and there are probably others.

Vice Chair Wimmer: There are, through the library system, you can reserve their – the Downtown library, at Mitchell Library and at Rinconada, they have conference rooms that are available for – but we would have to reserve them in advance.

Chair Bernstein: So, it's now – if you can check the Community room? That's maybe the easiest location I would think.

Board Member Kohler: How about the – something in South Palo Alto, like at the new library by Mitchell Park? Then I won't have to drive as far.

Chair Bernstein: That's a long walk Rodger. Ok, well we have...

Board Member Kohler: We in the South end of town usually feel left out so everything is at this end. The south end – but now we have that big library so I'm just thinking.

Chair Bernstein: OK, we have several options here. Is there – how do you want to decide?

Ms. French: Well, thanks for the input and we'll explore what's available.

Chair Bernstein: Ok.

Ms. French: If the notion of going to South Palo Alto is something that the rest of the Board is interested in – I mean, I think we probably – you know, we have this van. I could potentially reserve the van for those of us that don't drive to work and utilize that. I would probably have the meeting start at 9, so that I could catch a train here and do what I normally do.

Chair Bernstein: Sure. Ok. Alright. This way you can maybe just let us know what's available and we can go from there. Right, anything else on this agenda item? Ok, I think we're ready to move on. Study Session. Oh – did we need to vote on anything? For example, the HRB bylaws, we voted on that, already right? Ok good.

Board Member Bower: (Inaudible)

Ms. French: Maybe on the CLG Report, if you could just do something official then, I can report to the OHP that there's been an official something.

Chair Bernstein: So, I looked at the CLG Report and it looks like it meets all the administrative requirements.

MOTION

Board Member Bower: Chair Bernstein, I move that we accept the report.

Chair Bernstein: Ok.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I second.

Chair Bernstein: A second. Any discussion? All in favor say, aye.

Chair Bernstein, Vice Chair Wimmer, Board Member Bower, Board Member Bunnenberg, Board Member Di Cicco, Board Member Kohler, Board Member Makinen: Aye

Chair Bernstein: That passes unanimously. Thank you.

MOTION PASSES UNANIMOUSLY 7-0

[Moved back to the Study Session]

Study Session

- 3. 1451 Middlefield Road [16PLN-00217]: Request for Preliminary Review of a 14,790 sf replacement building for an expanded Children's Museum and Zoo and reconfiguration of the adjacent parking lots. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is being prepared. Zoning District: Public Facilities (PF)**

Chair Bernstein: Alright, that brings us then to our next item on our agenda which is a study session. I'll read it: 1451 Middlefield Road. Request for Preliminary Review of a 14,790 sf – Oh. You are correct.

Ms. French: The CLG report.

Chair Bernstein: Yes, thank you Board Member Bower for reminding me of that.

[Move back up to City Official Reports]

[Continued Study Session]

Chair Bernstein: Ok, next, study session. 1451 Middlefield Road. Request for preliminary review of a 14,790 sf replacement building for an expanded Children's Museum and Zoo and reconfiguration of the adjacent parking lots. Environmental Assessment: A Draft Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration is being prepared. Zoning District: Public Facilities (PF). Shall the Chief Planning Official have a report for us?

Ms. French: Yes. First of all, I just this morning sent to you the Architectural Review Board minutes transcript from last Thursday's meeting. I don't expect that anyone has opened that email up. I just got them this morning; do, apologies for that. I do have a summary of what transpired last week. Also, I had last week – or maybe it was Saturday, sent you a Power Point – this PowerPoint but I have some additional photos that will be fun for you, I think. I'll just give a general overview of the context and then I'll let John Aikin, who is the Director of the Zoo and Children's Museum to go more into detail and of course, the architect is here. Also, I believe in the audience we have John Rusch of Page and Turnbull, who will be supporting us in our efforts on this project. With no further ado, there is – on the screen, the context aerial for the site, which includes the museum and zoo and the parking lots that go between the zoo and the Lucie Stern Center and the Girl Scout House; also, known as the Lou Henry Hoover House.

Here is the present facade, currently on Middlefield, of a residential kind of quality and it's facing residential homes across the street. This is a larger context map showing the Girl Scout House here, the Hayes School – elementary school. Here's the neighborhood all along here and the Lucie Stern Center. Ok. Here I found a photo, an aerial, from 1937. It's fun because it's showing the Lucie Stern Center. This might be under construction over here, I'm not sure. With the theater – the adult theater, the Children's Theater and you can see, just at the tip of this, the Girl Scout House -- which was originally, potentially – maybe – you know, this is to be explored but first placed in alignment this way or perhaps, this was prior to an add-on. All of this research has not been done. A summary search has been done to see what the qualities were of that potential historic resource. It's not listed on a – specifically, with the Lucie Stern Center. It has a different address. Here we have just a listing of all of the addresses on the property. This is the Hayes school, this is the fire station that recently – you all saw and the pool over here on this side. Really, the immediate site area is the Lucie Stern Center, the parking lot, the zoo and the Girl Scout House. This is kind of the area we're focused on. Here are some images of the Lucie Stern Center and here's an image of the library that came after the Lucie Stern Center; Children's Library. Here's an image of the Girl Scout House and Lou Henry Hoover was the first lady of course, who was very much involved in the Girl Scouts and so, this has a quality of interested, culturally, that seems like it would rise to the level of National but you know, it hasn't been studied in an evaluation to date. There's a little fountain outside here that is dedicated to a former Boy Scout Master so, maybe it belongs on the other side of the campus here. The playground behind the Scout House is shown here. Then, here's the parking lot that would be a part of this project. So, the parking lot is actually a City capital project; the parking lot improvements. The Junior Museum and Zoo project is a collaboration between the friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo and the City. Again, here is the existing footprint with the existing parking lot layout. Diagonal spaces here and then kind of a barrier here and then, here is the proposed footprint as in the current plans; sort of a 'U' with this whole Loose in the Zoo and it's – key to this project was, you know, preservation of the Dawn Redwood which is here and the Pecan which is very large. They are not protected trees in the sense of species that is called out in the ordinance but they've been there a while and they're of esthetic value. The proposal is to delete the driveway here and put landscaping and have just the one driveway that aligns with this street here or circulation through the property. The ARB discussed this last week and had some comments. They were concerned about the context and the missed opportunity for more child-friendly architecture and a child's scale. The fact that the materials and colors seemed to be more Research Park looking than, you know, borrowing from the materials found on the site. There was some concern about how transportation would be handled. There's a bus parking area that has been considered here and so, this is a busy street and there was some concern about that. Of course, the Girl Scout House was called out because of the proximity of the pavement that was proposed here, coming into what is now, kind of a landscaped area in front of the Girl Scout house. Those are the main points. I'll just now turn this over to [John Akin] to discuss the excitement about the proposal.

Mr. John Aikin: Good morning Chairman, Vice Chair and Board Members. [John Akin] Junior Museum and Zoo. The plan is to rebuild the facility to right size it for our current audience and that includes replacing the building with a larger building, replacing the zoo with a larger zoo but also, rebuilding the components so that we're accreditable by the American Alliance of Museums and the Associations of Zoos and Aquariums. The – let me click to it – I've got a button. The Zoo will be completely netted and the netting will be viewable from Rinconada Park especially, perhaps the parking lot too; although the building and the Pecan Tree will hide most of that view. The idea here is to not only, keep vandals and predators out but to be able to have some of the animals Loose in the Zoo so that children can explore the zoo and find animals where ever they might encounter them in nature. We are replacing many of the exhibits that we have for our animal collection today which are mostly rescued animals, pets, and wildlife that's been rescued but we are adding a Meerkat Exhibit and a substantial area for management of animals to make the Zoo really endure for the next 100-years; a long-term investment. Roll it? There we go. It's a very tight site. One of our goals is to enhance parking because parking seems to be an issue everywhere and thereby enlarging the parking lot but also, connecting all of the other pieces of the park to the Junior Museum and Zoo. So, pathways will connect the Girl Scout House and Rinconada Park and to Lucie Stern Center, bicycle pathways to Middlefield and through the park as well. There are a number

of constraints on the site but I think I'll let the architects talk about that as they laid this out. Let me introduce Bret McClure of Cody Anderson Wasney.

Ms. French: Let me just finalize that by saying the next steps would be – because we do not have a formal application for architectural review and of the course the HRB would be involved in the next stage as well; providing recommendations to the Director, who's the decision maker in this process. The ARB is not actually the decision maker. Then, we have an initial study that would be prepared, is being studied right now and final action, there's a Phase 2 that the architect will describe. Let me get out of this now.

Chair Bernstein: Welcome.

Mr. Bret McClure: Thanks. One second. How do I go full screen? I can't read it. There we go. Hi, there. Brent McClure with Cody Anderson Wasney Architects. I want to reiterate – follow on some of the things and the key points that Amy and [John] both highlighted about the project and the site. She's alright kind of touched on some of the things. First is the existing site plan. You know, we've got the two existing driveways that enter in; one closer to Lucie Stern and one imminently adjacent to the Museum with diagonal parking that kind of rounds about and there's this separate parking area that's over here; the landscape buffer zone in front of the Girl Scout Building. This is the outline of the existing Museum and then the zone that is – encloses the existing Zoo right now and the little circles representing of the variety of trees. The green line represents the park boundary. As Amy mentioned, what is part of our design, is we are looking at having a building that stays completely out of the park. Part of our charge was to maintain the same number of parking stalls and ideally, increase the number of parking. Build around the Dawn Redwood, which is a species of tree that dates back to the Jurassic Era so, there is a tremendous amount of rich science opportunities with this tree. This species of this tree it's self doesn't go back to the Jurassic era. There's the Pecan Tree up in the front as well and so, as part of the design, we are connection off of Middlefield. Having some pathways that link up and around and then kind of having a gateway into Rinconada Park. Part of the City's Master Plan for the park is to have connecting pathways that then link Lucie Stern complex and then into the park. We're trying to fit this building in and around sort of a variety of contextual issues. The – part of the parking also allows for drop-off. It was – there is drop-off along the front however, there's dedicated bus drop-off as well that kind of comes in so, that was something that was an oversight at last week's ARB session. The Zoo zone is all outdoors space, enclosed by the netting along with the Zoo support. The blue represents really, what the new structure is. As I mentioned, we're kind of threading the needle with the area that we have to work with. It's probably one of the most complicated sites I've worked on in my career. As far as the amount of space and all of the things that we're trying to fit and preserve – you can see the boundary of the parking, the park boundary and then the other piece that we're working about is that there's an existing utility corridor that runs through. So, we've got City utilities that we're having to not build around. We didn't investigate relocating those but it was infeasible from a budget stand point. This project is also 100% donor funded by the friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo so, there's been – it's really been a labor of love over the last 4-years as they looked to raise close to 25 million dollars to solely fund this project. The parking lot, as – I just want to highlight too, is that there's a landscape zone that's in front of the Girl Scout building and then as part of the City's design that we were working with them on was to expand parking and then now, the parking edge in this current state – which I'm sure you'll want to talk about a little bit – is approximately 15-feet off of the edge of the Girl Scout building. Jumping ahead to the plan. This is a diagram – we can show plans if you have questions about it but really, I think, this kind of sums up how the building is assembled. There's the Dawn Redwood tree here. We're using that outdoor space as the entrance court yard for ticketing and then that front piece is the exhibit hall that links up into the Loose in the Zoo space. The building zones the front of Walter Hayes and Middlefield is sort of the back of the house support. There's such a shortage of Zoo support rooms for animal care and whatnot that [John] mentioned that we need to put into this project to get accreditation. Then, another piece that most people don't know about is the educational component of this program. They do huge amounts of classroom and outreaching to the school so that would be the blue spaces off the sides of the building. Here's an image of an Ariel perspective kind of showing our design concepts as it stands. We've tried to design this as somewhat of a court yard building with the Dawn Redwood sort of being this focus and center pieces. A portico and gateway that allows you then to enter into this court yard and then,

using the building to try and resolve the intersecting geometries of the two City grids. This mass over here – this low-slung mass is the education and Zoo support building, that then links and wraps around the back and then this taller mass at the front with this bump out piece, forms sort of the public display and the exhibit space. Some of the finishes that we're proposing today is – we're mindful of budget and trying to use splash and different things in mindful ways. The low building would be sort of a cement plaster. There are some Lithocrete walls, which is like an exposed sand stone looking concrete and then, intersecting this kind of low, climbable walls and little pops of color with this blue at the entrance portico and then this blue canopy that's part of the enclosed zone back around the Pecan Tree. With this being a new building on existing site, I think the one Standard from the Secretary of Interior Standards to do of – discussion would be #9 about differentiation and compatibility. How does that fit with a new building on existing site that is adjacent to other historic structures? In our – you know, we've kind of gone back and forth with this at some degree – we kind of welcome the Boards input as well. Is that we're kind of looking at finish, at some degree as far as the color of the Stucco and the texture as it relates to the Lucie Stern complex. We're using some wood elements kind of to echo some of the Girl Scout building and then different – and then also, trying to kind of look as a court yard configuration and arrangements to start to echo a little bit of it. We don't have gabled roofs. We're proposing some parapet forms and some flat roofs to kind of echo and suggest, you know, more modern construction of this time as well as having some fun elements and some pops of color. Here's a quick section that shows, sort of the heights as it relates to the Girl Scout building and I think this gives you a sense to the aspect ratio of where that outdoor space in the Zoo stops and how it relates to the Girl Scout building. Then some of the heights as it relates to the neighborhood. To kind of quickly go through some of the elevations; there's a perspective of the top and then a rendered elevation at the bottom. This would be the view off of Walter Hayes. Trying to take a quite approach just to how it's seen from the street and then along the street, kind of having the landscape blend in so that what you really see is when you come around the corner and into the complex, you know, you've got this gate way window display so that you can see some of the exhibits from the outside; a wall for kids to climb on and other areas of exploration and then an entrance into the court yard. [John] already kind of touched on the Zoo but it's interactive and connects with the museum. There're pathways that wrap around, you know, things to climb on, animals are on display and then the Zoo support space in the back, which is more for service and kind of out of view and whatnot. Here's an enlarged section and view of an early concept and illustration of what it might look like in the Zoo itself. Just a diagram we highlight – probably some discussion on how the parking – you might want to adjust around the Girl Scout building and as well as, you know, the street approach off of Middlefield. That was really, I think, a key point from the ARB. I think that kind of concludes the points I wanted to touch and turn it back over to the Board.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. At this point – thank you so much. Does anyone have questions for the applicant or Staff? Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: Amy and [John], can you clarify who's developing the parking lot? That's not going to be the Junior Museum, correct?

Mr. Aikin: We're in the process right now. The friends of the Junior Museum and Zoo have committed to raising the funds and building the Museum itself. The parking lot needs to be reconfigured and they presented a design for that and the City and the friends of the Junior Museum are in negotiation right now about who's going to pay for the remodel of the parking lot.

Board Member Bower: I notice in the plans that there is a proposal – I think is the best way to put it – that the barrier now between – I guess Hopkins or no, that's Rinconada, that runs on the backside of the park?

Ms. French: Hopkins.

Board Member Bower: Hopkins and Middlefield, which is current – which was installed to keep cut through traffic from moving from Middlefield into the neighborhoods. I think that's being removed – the barrier would be removed. Is that, right?

Mr. Aikin: True. It's being removed but it's being replaced with a large hump, like the one in front of the Art Center. Between the Rinconada Library and the Art Center, to provide a broad pedestrian walkway that connects Rinconada Park to the Lucie Stern Center. It's also relatively – the main pathway is circuitous so, we're hoping to try and cut down on cut-throughs.

Board Member Bower: Right, ok. I wonder also if the age of the Girl Scout House is known. Do you know when that was built?

Ms. French: It was in the report but it pre-dates the – the original home was relocated to the current site and it was built – designed by Birge Clark and built prior to Lucie Stern Center. It was – the research we had done, just by Staff at the Cubberley Center, was that it was relocated from near Melville over to Hopkins and kind of the Boy Scout House area replaced – came to that...

Board Member Bower: Right

Ms. French: ...former location.

Board Member Bower: Prior to Lucie Stern?

Ms. French: (Crosstalk) Prior to the design and build of Lucie Stern.

Board Member Bower: So, it's the oldest building in that ...

Ms. French: Yes, in the whole area.

Board Member Bower: Thank you.

Chair Bernstein: Any other questions for the Staff? Vice Chair Wimmer.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I was wondering because the site is so small and so limiting, what's your flexibility on height? Do you have to stay at a single-story level? I mean, is there possibility – I know you're right on Middlefield but is there a possibility of you having some of those facilities offices may be on an upper level so you can have public space on the lower level?

Mr. McClure: This project has been a labor of love for the last – I think we're going on 5-years now and we're still at entitlements and we've – the design that is before you are one that their confident and I think our team is confident that it can be constructed to meet their program for their budget. We explored – we've had an earlier version that is prior to this that had two-story designs. We've explored basements. We've kind of exhausted, I think all possible aspects of this and so, really, it's sort of pushing up against either park boundary or parking edge and determining kind of what can give and not at this point. Yes, we've explored it but I think the one-story solution is sort of the direction of the client at this point.

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Yes. Strictly by reason of history not by financial, I should disclose that some 40-years ago, I was hired to teach outreach classes for the Junior Museum and then at times, did substitute for [Dale Bruce] in teaching art right there in the Junior Museum. That this -- and of course my children attended many classes there. I was concerned to hear that you had discarded a gable roof as a possibility and would like to suggest thinking about the very steep gable roof which would repeat gabled roof that is across the street. You show boxes, they're gabled rooves across the street. Lucie Stern is gabled roof but a gabled roof or a very steep pitch could be used as a teaching tool to say that Palo Alto is very unusual in that it goes all the way from sea level up through different climate zones, to the hills that are in Foothill Park. That – to say that for instance, the indigenous people right up to now have

enjoyed this span and the shells down on the beach where – had many uses to the people and food support and the acorns up in Foothills park where used on grinding stones. So, that – it would sad to miss a chance to have this kind of thing and a gable roof –steep gable would not be that – in fact, would call attention to the building from Middlefield. You have your wonderful sign and you have your fanciful playground that does respond to children. What about one more item?

Chair Bernstein: Ok, thank you. Any other questions for the applicant or Staff? Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: I think read in the report that the decision or the preparation was that the site was not historic, it had lost integrity. Is that correct?

Ms. French: There was a Historic Resources Evaluation actually, two. One back in 2004 and another one more recently to respond to the current proposal and yes, it was determined by that study that it was – while culturally significant, the building itself had gone through many variations...

Board Member Makinen: That was never brought before the HRB for concurrence or?

Ms. French: It's before you today. It's in your packet.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, it's in the packet but was it actually brought before the HRB?

Ms. French: It's before you today so no, it has not been brought before you. There's been no determination on this project because it's not a formal application.

Board Member Makinen: Ok.

Ms. French: It's all right for your comments.

Board Member Makinen: I will take that as an opinion right now. Is that correct? That's an opinion.

Ms. French: It's a historical – qualified professional opinion that was prepared after significant research and the preparer is here today. At least a representative of Page and Turnbull is here if you had a question.

Board Member Makinen: The point is I think it should be subject to a review by HRB; that decision. Maybe we don't concur with it.

Chair Bernstein: We'll discuss when it comes time for the HRB to discuss. We'll discuss all the things you're bringing up. That would be great. Board Member Di Cicco.

Board Member Di Cicco: I have a question. I'm kind of – the report was rather lengthy and I'm getting a little bit confused, shall I say. The original building is going to be demolished. Are any parts of that being retained or you're starting from scratch?

Mr. McClure: At the current state, no. That's correct.

Board Member Di Cicco: Pardon.

Mr. McClure: We're not preserving any aspects of the building.

Board Member Di Cicco: The original building as it stands right now, part of that building has the gabled roof and in part, two-stories so, that would be a consideration or not?

Mr. McClure: I think we could consider gable roofs. We're not opposed to it.

Board Member Di Cicco: It's hard – from the plans and such – it does look kind of industrial with just flat roofs and I would agree with – as Beth mentioned that it would be a – it might fit into the neighborhood a little better with the massing and the appearance of the building. That would be a possibility and it's going from – what is it? How many square feet are being – increased by 5,000-square feet?

Mr. McClure: We're adding approximately 5,000 – 6,000-square feet.

Board Member Di Cicco: Ok. Well, thank you. I just wanted to clarify it to myself.

Chair Bernstein: Before we go to members of the public, any other questions for the applicant or Staff? Yeah, we'll go to the public and then we can discuss. Do any Board Members have any other questions for applicant or Staff before we move to the public? Seeing none. I don't have any cards on this. If there are any members of the public that would like to speak on this, you can let yourself be known. I see none. OK, we can bring it back to the Board. Board Member Kohler, where you prepared to continue with your train of thought?

Board Member Kohler: I – looking at this, it's – I moved here in '54 and started 4th grade at Fairmeadow from New Jersey and I remember vaguely, going with my mom and dad to the Children's Museum there and being kind of overwhelmed. Vaguely, remembering thinking, you know, what a great place and then my kids went there; went there for classes. I have to admit, I haven't been in there for a little while. I think there was something – did the Historic Board Members – did we have to do something in there? They were doing an improvement or something?

Chair Bernstein: It was for the Lucie Stern Center. We looked at putting the utility box on the opposite side.

Board Member Kohler: Well, but I meant before that there was a – but I was – it was interesting the comments about why is the roof flat and that was sort of one of the things I was wondering about it. I kind of agree that it's – you look around, there are all the homes with – and it's felt a little out of place, on a park scene. It was more – just feels more industrial. So, we're just making comments or are we asking questions or what are we doing today?

Chair Bernstein: (Inaudible)

Board Member Kohler: No, I just was tending to agree with the comments about that maybe the roof shouldn't be flat because it kind of reminds me of the Industrial Park – Stanford Industrial Park. Because there are so many – even the school next door and it's – I sort of feel like – other than that, I mean it's an amazing layout and the access to the Zoo and everything is quite incredible. It's just the building seems to fall short of the rest of the result.

Chair Bernstein: I'm reading the ARB preliminary review comments and it seems to be addressing a similar kind of thing where it says, the architecture needs to address the context and purpose of the building and the building materials and colors should reflect the site, the neighborhood – your name again? I'm sorry.

Mr. McClure: Bret McClure.

Chair Bernstein: Bret, mentioned already about the – at least the color and some materials. For example, the Lucie Stern Center is white colored Stucco and they're proposing Stucco on some of the buildings. At least – you know, we're heading in that direction. Yeah, the roof forms, I agree with what Board Members have said so far is that the houses across the street and then also, the Lucie Stern Center itself. There's a gable roof system there so, that could add to more of the compatibility regarding the Secretary of Interior Standards. Other Board Members? Board Member Bower, you have your light on.

Board Member Bower: I'd like to say that – to start by saying, I think the – all of the site layout here, is an improvement. I should disclose, I went to the Junior Museum first, about 63-years ago, and I took my

children there and I was there last month with my grandson and I was astounded at the number of people that use the facility. This is way overdue this remodel. I also noted that when I was there that the building, as it exists today, has no resemblance to what was built; at least from my memory. I think the analysis that this building has no historic fabric that we should be saving, it accurate. We can have that conversation again or at a different time but I was – so, let me move on to the design. I thought the use of the materials on the outside of the building is appropriately clever because it's picking up the wood from the Girl Scout House and the Stucco but I share with my other colleagues on the Board, a concern about the fact that it looks like we have an industrial box and the gable – the tile roof on the Lucie Stern Center, for instance, has a softening effect. Even though tile is not soft but the appearance is softening and the fact that it does work with the neighborhood, which has gabled or sloped rooves and practically, every building surrounding this; I think is important. I like the entrance to the building because of that – it's very important having little kids running around, that there's a way to contain them and I thought that that archway was quite clever and it does a feature that Redwood Tree. I think this is a really nice compromise in a very hard design situation. My only other concern is the cut-through traffic on the parking lots. Which I have to say -- I'm guilty of -- when it was open because I live not too many blocks away from here and in our current traffic situation, it will only occur again, at the Art Center parking reconfiguration; that was done when the main library was remodeled. There is a kind of circuitous route from one parking area to the other and there are also ballads that can be raised and lowered. It's – that cut-off is very effective when there's a big group of people at the Art Center and it doesn't seem to be a problem on most other days but I would think, that if we're going to open that up, we ought to have some barrier that can be erected most permanently or raised and lowered so that on the really heavy traffic days, like the weekends, people can get in and out but I think weekdays, absolutely, do not want cars cutting through there. Those are my general comments.

Chair Bernstein: Bret, the drawing on page A1.1 says it's a fire access line so, can there be ballads in that or does that have to be accessible for a fire truck cut-through? Do you know?

Mr. McClure: Yes, it would have to be accessible for a fire truck to go through but there's a way to get around that. You can have a ballad that has a padlock on it that the fire truck could then, you know – it's like opening a gate.

Chair Bernstein: Ok, thanks for that. Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg: In listening to the ARB – the tape of the ARB, I was interested and concerned that the bus parking appears to be out on Middlefield and there was real concern about what about both that congestion on Middlefield and letting children out so close to a major artery in our City. I was wondering whether you had considered any kind of possible tunnel or semi-tunnel to get kids in, without having them (Inaudible)...

Mr. McClure: One of the – I'm sorry if I can clarify. I don't think we had fully and properly clarified that comment with the ARB in the short time that we had to present the project. What we have is -- it's kind of a multi-layered aspect to this job. As part of the Master Plan for the park, I think the City is looking at establishing and reinforcing a bus stop zone on Middlefield, however, the way the parking lot is designed with the turning radiuses, if a school bus wants to pull into the site, they can do that and then drop off right in front of the Museum and Zoo.

Board Member Bunnenberg: That's very important. I also, very much feel that that modern Museum techniques do involve some things like time tunnels and this sort of thing and they seem to be fascinating to kids. Keep that as a possibility.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. Vice Chair Wimmer.

Vice Chair Wimmer: Yeah, I was wondering if you could change the slide back to one of the exteriors front elevation so we can kind of take a second look at that. In my – I mean, I – my comments are very in kind of keeping with what the Board has already mentioned is that – I mean, I just feel like this is part

of the Community Center. It's a part of – it's an extension of Lucie Stern and I would like to see some kind of a nod or response to the architecture of Lucie Stern but still make it of today. Which now things are becoming very modern, very sleek, very boxy. I think if you could balance that, it could be very exciting. It could be very interesting because this is – it's almost a little to streamline, to square, too boxy and you have this – the building that's closest to Middlefield, the one – and on your materials page, it's a cement plaster exterior which is kind of similar to what Lucie Stern has. I mean, maybe you could take a look at putting a gable roof over that and maybe put some Spanish roof tiles and maybe that's your opportunity to pull a little bit of Lucie Stern over to this but still make it modern. Still, make it of today and exciting in that sense. I think about what – where that just has recently been done, is Palo Alto High School. I mean, Palo Alto High School has that Spanish/Colonial original buildings and then now, they have a new theater and gyms that's – I don't think that that's like a wow. I can see how they are trying to pull that – those elements into those new buildings and yes, they succeeded in doing that but it's that – I think you have an opportunity to pull those elements over and make those elements more correct but mix it with some modern lines. I think it's a great opportunity to do something really cool but I really do think that it needs to respond to Lucie Stern. It needs to feel like it's a part of that and this feels like it's trying to be something totally different and deny the fact that it's part of the Community Center. I think that would be my strongest opinion.

Chair Bernstein: I would share those comments too about the – if there was a way to introduce a gable or gables but still that – using the genius of the architect to keep it contemporary and also keep it subordinate to the dominant Category 1 Lucie Stern. I know your office is very capable of that. When I first saw the renderings, I was actually quite excited to see something very fresh. I'm there about once a week on that property and yeah, the existing building – it looks tired and it's time to do something different. I think something in the modern direction and a very contemporary direction as your illustrating and again, as other Board Members have mentioned, a nod to the gable. Keep it – not a replication of historicism but I think – yeah, I see that you agree. The other comment I had and thank you for bringing it up, on page A-1.1 site plan, shows new parking stalls within a few feet or inches to the existing Girl Scout building. Page A-1.1 – yeah. If there can be a – when you – as you proceed with your review process and refinements, to see if there's a proposal that doesn't have a car right next to that building there because again, it's not listed on the Historic Register yet but if it does go through a review, it's – because of its age and architect, its use in history, you'll probably get some level of historic designation I would imagine. Then – don't let those cars come so close. That would be my suggestion. Any other discussion. Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: I was looking at page Z-21 and I really like that, the mesh that goes over the top of it. We were in Hong Kong a few years ago, and there's an Avery in downtown Hong Kong that as a similar treatment and it's really quite effective. You can walk along little catwalks and walkways. I don't know if you're familiar with that but this kind of reminds me of it. I think that will be a very strong point but I do concern with the other comments about the form of the building. It would probably be more compatible if it was – did have some similarities to the Lucie Stern Center. It's kind of a boxy type look right now when you look at it. That's it.

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Di Cicco.

Board Member Di Cicco: The Zoo looks like it's going to be amazing. Oh, I thought I had done that, sorry. The Zoo does look amazing. Is – how – is that being enlarged by in what size compared to the original?

Mr. McClure: It's increased in size by – I don't have my cheat sheet in front of me but by 5,000-square feet.

Board Member Di Cicco: It looks like it's going to be an amazing place for children. I know it's Phase 2 and Phase 1 hasn't actually occurred but the fact of putting in a tree house and – sounds also very amazing and I don't know anything children don't like better than tree houses. Where would that be in respect to the Zoo and what's in place and what tree has that been designated?

Mr. McClure: The Phase 2 – I'm going to jump – so, if we – I think the diagram is probably will help illustrate it best. If this is the building shape here, this 'U' shape that then rotates and then this is the Pecan Tree. You know this is an enclosed open air courtyard, that we're calling a Science Court Yard. This is internal to the complex and then opens up and you can go into the Zoo. The netting goes around this green zone. There will be a tree like structure out in the Zoo as part of Phase 1 but with Phase 2, what the plan is, is that there would be at the ground floor. We would add a small modest building – not part of this application today but to just sort of show, the sort of long-term plan is that there would be an education classroom on the ground floor. Then, a Zoo exhibit space – initially there's been talk about a butterfly room, lots of really fun and you know, interesting ideas. That then could link up with a catwalk bridge -- such as Mr. Makinen was talking about from Hong Kong – it could then link up and connect with the tree fort. You know, one of the goals was to get this over and under experience so, when you're out with the animals, you know, you're up in the trees, you're down below and as we've looked at the constraints of the modern finances of this project. You know, some of those things have been moved to this Phase 2.

Board Member Di Cicco: Well, thank you.

Mr. McClure: Sure.

Board Member Di Cicco: Sounds amazing.

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Kohler. Ok. Yeah, Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: One comment that I'd like to make about the exterior materials is I think about how this new building will relate to the buildings on the site. I think that this building really relates to the Lucie Stern Center more than the Girl Scout House. Girl Scout House is kind of screened by the trees and it's off in its corner. Obviously, extending the parking lot makes a difference but I think that really, the face of the Museum should reflect the materials and the style of Lucie Stern and maybe the wall that faces the Girl Scout House is the wood material that you've used. I'm not being critical of your architecture. Just suggesting that you might explore that.

Board Member Kohler: I have one final question. How is former Historic Resources Board Member [Monty Anderson] doing since he started his company and everything?

Mr. McClure: Monty Anderson is enjoying retirement or his next phase immensely up in – full time up in Cedar Ranch as the moment.

Board Member Kohler: At Cedar Ranch, I didn't know (Crosstalk)

Mr. McClure: Yeah. Well, pass it along.

Chair Bernstein: Alright, so this was a Study Session and does the applicant – do you have any questions for us? Good. (Inaudible) Ok, good. Alright. Any other items on this subject? Amy, anything else or [Mr. Akin], any comments?

Mr. Akin: One thing I wanted to point out about the parking lot challenge with the Girl Scout House. One of the reasons the parking lot was sort of shifted towards the Girl Scout is to actually give Lucie Stern a little bit more breath and put some landscape on that side. We kind of recognized that there was a little bit of a dilemma here, to respect one side of the lot or the other but we'll look at – take these comments and look at it again.

Chair Bernstein: Is there – Amy, is it appropriate for the HRB to request that a Historic Restructure Report be done on the Lou Henry Hoover Girl Scout building or does the Board even think that's necessary to do at this point?

Vice Chair Wimmer: (Inaudible)

Board Member Bunnenberg: I would certainly favor that kind of thing. If we have to wait till our retreat to suggest it but I think that it is very overdue and one of these structures that are so easy to overlook when you're doing a City-wide survey as the Dames and Moore. I would strongly agree that this was a major step in women's rights movement, to bring in the Girl Scouts.

Chair Bernstein: The reason why I am asking this question if it's appropriate that this is done and soon, is that when we get the formal application for this project and if that parking structure – I mean if the parking spots are like very close to the historic building. The HRB may have a little stronger voice in its comment about not allowing parking to be – new parking to be so close to it. If we could have that – our position backed up by saying, hey, this is a significant historic structure. I think that could give a little bit more emphasis for the HRB's comment about the parking. Yeah, please, Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I'm mindful of the expense of a Historic Structure Report and since the applicant would probably have to bear that expense, that just takes money away from the project. If we want to have a Historic Report on the Hoover building, it seems to me, we don't need it for this project. We ought to have it – the City ought to have it but I don't want to burden the applicant with this. I mean, they don't have enough money probably, to do what they want to do and that just takes more away. I think we can make our determination about the appropriateness of the space between the Hoover House and the parking lot without that. I'm not discouraging the report to be done. I just don't want to – I don't think we have to have it for this application.

Board Member Kohler: I agree with David.

Chair Bernstein: Ok, right. No action on that. Ok. Right, anything else before we move onto the next agenda item? Alright, thank you very much. Yes, thank you. Thank you Mr. Aikin.

Action Items

Chair Bernstein: Alright, next on our Agenda is Action Items. I'm seeing none listed underneath there.

Approval of Minutes

4. Draft Minutes from December 8, 2016, meeting

Chair Bernstein: Next, is approval of minutes from December 8th. Any motion to approve or amend?

MOTION

Board Member Bower: I'll move to approve the minutes.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I second that.

Chair Bernstein: Second. Any discussion? Ok. All approve, signal by saying aye.

Chair Bernstein, Vice Chair Wimmer, Board Member Bower, Board Member Bunnenberg, Board Member Di Cicco, Board Member Kohler, Board Member Makinen: Aye.

Chair Bernstein: It was approved unanimously.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY 7-0.

Board Member Bower: I would like to say and I'm assuming Board Members also share this, that the literal translation of our proceeding is not the most attractive. I liked [Dennis Backlands] version of

listening to it a hundred times and getting the context right. I think we all speak better than those minutes reflect.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Additional comment on that. I think that we had wanted to make sure that it was not just a – talked about it, moved, approved but to get some of the different thoughts that went into the decision because sometimes later, people think, oh, I think so and so really was against that and now I see why. I think that hopefully, there's some compromise in there but you're right, it's very long and it's like making sausage. Making legislation is sometimes not pretty.

Board Member Makinen: I would also like to thank you for bringing your display today. I've enjoyed sitting here looking at them. It would be nice to have them here every meeting but it's just nice to be able to look at them and not have to look at the people in the audience all the time.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Also, a comment. I'm sure that you have checked with the archives of the City with Steven Stieger down in Case 7. There are some files but my memory is that people from your group have mined that collection pretty well. (Inaudible)

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bernstein: Subcommittee items? I see none.

Ms. French: None.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bernstein: Board member questions, comments, and announcements? I think we've just done it. Go ahead, Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I'd like to share with you the fact that I've joined the Palo Alto Stanford Heritage Board and that effective last – this month, with a number of other stellar former Staff and HRB Members. I wanted to share also there – they have two events coming up on February 25th. They have their Member appreciation event. It will be at Rinconada Library. Last year at that event, Board Member Kohler was honored as one of the most architects that had a significant impact on Palo Alto architecture. This year, Michael Garavaglia – I think that's the right way to pronounce his name – will be a speaker. Dan Garber will also talk and the other event that they have is on May 7th. It's the – May is preservation month and they will be celebrating – Past will be celebrating 30-years in existence and they're will be more information about that. That will be a bigger program. Rinconada, 2-4 PM, February 25th. It was pretty interesting last year.

Board Member Bunnenberg: It's open to the public?

Board Member Bower: Absolutely, but it is limited to 100 people because of the room size. You probably have to contact the Palo Alto Stanford Heritage. Look on the website. There will be an R.S.V.P key probably so that you can get a place.

Chair Bernstein: Any other announcements before we adjourn? Go ahead.

Ms. French: No announcement, but I just had a quick question for Historic Preservation Month of May. I don't know if the Board has ever discussed this before but is there anything – I mean this sounds like a good activity. Is there anything the HRB is interested in doing? I know, for instance – you know – there use to be some walking tours – this kind of related thing – related to architecture month and I don't know if there are activities in that regard.

Board Member Bower: PAST has walking tours as part of it. Watch their website because they have – they will do walking tours as part of that – as part of this month. Also, can I ask a question about fire station 3? The one on the site; has that design been finalized yet?

Ms. French: It has not. The ARB saw the meeting – last week and you have it. I forwarded you, this morning, the full minutes of that meeting last week with the ARB so you can see what they were talking about. Yeah, it was continued to March 2nd. That's the final ARB hearing on this project.

Board Member Bower: Is the building design – has it been finalized?

Ms. French: No, they're working on modifying it to respond to the ARB comments.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Who will report to the ARB? Will someone from (Inaudible)

Ms. French: I – as the project planner, I'm going to all the meetings and reporting on it.

Board Member Bower: You go to every meeting, right?

Ms. French: Basically, yeah. I know that we've had forwarded the minutes of the meeting that the HRB had. The study session about – you know, the preferences about the roof pitch and this kind of thing. The ARB took up conversations regarding that. Those concerns and conservation so, you know, they've been putting them through their paces to come and show different things. In the end, they are not doing a pitched roof. They showed studies of that but they are looking at other – you know, they have incorporated some materials and modified, you know, the fence around the property and this kind of thing.

Board Member Bower: So, it's still going to look like a bunker?

Ms. French: No, they've changed materials on the outside of the building from the Alucobond that was there before to a Zinc material. They are still exploring shades. They've incorporated additional wood. There're several things that are – if you'd like, I can forward you the link to the plans so, you can see what it currently looks like if the Board is interested? The other thing, as long as we're talking about a project that the HRB looked at – a major project that the – I think the last time that we were together at the December 8th, the Avenidas project was going to appeal on Monday, the 12th but it was withdrawn – the appeal was withdrawn. You probably read about it in the paper. Just to put a final statement on that.

Board Member Bower: Is the addition to the Green Gables – is that – what we saw...

Ms. French: Yeah, the Green Meadow pool? They haven't come back in, that I'm aware with the modified – but I'll look into it because there is a planner that is assigned to that one.

Board Member Bower: Great. Thank you.

Chair Bernstein: That we are adjourned.

Adjournment