



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 9302)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 6/14/2018

Summary Title: HRB Draft Minutes for Approval

Title: Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes for Approval for February 8, February 22, and April 26, 2018

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

Staff recommends the Historic Resources Board (HRB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

Background

Attached are minutes for the following meeting(s):

- February 8, February 22, and April 26, 2018

Attachments:

- Attachment A: HRB Draft Minutes of February 8, 2018 (PDF)
- Attachment B: HRB Draft Minutes of February 22, 2018 (PDF)
- Attachment C: HRB Draft Minutes of April 26, 2018 (PDF)



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: February 8, 2018

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

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower; Vice Chair Brandon Corey; Board Member Roger Kohler, Michael Makinen, Martin Bernstein, Margaret Wimmer

Absent:

Chair Bower: Ok, as soon as the lights go on, we can begin. Alright so I'll call the meeting to order, would staff please call roll? Great, thank you.

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: First off on our agenda is oral communications. I don't see anyone here to speak to anything other than our agenda items. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Beth Bunnenberg who was on this Committee for I think 17-years or more. She provided an invaluable service at every single meeting by providing us – excuse me – with either newspaper articles, historic photos, Sandborn maps or other visual aids that we would use as a Board to help – it would help us make a decision about projects. I'm going to miss her, I sat next to her for the first 8-years I was on this Board and she always had a perspective that made me think differently about projects. I think we'll all miss her contribution and I'd just like to thank her as I'm sure all Board Members do for their service here. Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, I'd also like to continue with those thoughts of appreciations for Beth. The two things that stuck in my mind was one when she would bring like you say a historic photograph of the cupola on top of the Hoover Hospital and then that got rebuilt and installed which was a fun landmark remembering her. Also, the fact that she would bring up the idea of women in the kitchen, the freedom they had once we had the technology of dishwashers and it always brought a great kind of grandmotherly view of historic family life so I always appreciated that from her.

Chair Bower: So, you want to say something Roger?

Board Member Kohler: Get this to work. I've sat next to her for a number of years and she always had articles and something she brought to us to pass around. It was a really – she was a huge bonus, I mean she had – knew a lot about everything in the historic world. It was just really a loss for us I think so good luck. I hope she's doing ok.

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: We—I might just weigh in to say we did a note from Beth Bunnenberg to let us know she is – she's doing fine so I just wanted to pass that along. She's having a bunch of stuff to deal with but she's fine so she's still with us very much so and I wanted to make that statement.

Chair Bower: Good. Michael.

Board Member Makinen: I'll echo the comments from my fellow Board Members. She obviously was a great asset to the Historic Resources Board. She'll be greatly missed and her historic perspectives are unequalled.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Board Members. I think we'll follow up with some kind of proclamation maybe after the meeting to think about that.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: Let's move on to agenda changes, additions, deletions, and are there any?

Ms. French: None.

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Chair Bower: So, official City reports, Historic Resources Board schedule and assignments. I think those are the same as they were the last time we were here.

Ms. French: Just a note that we are having a second meeting in February, it's rare for this Board to have two meetings in a month but we are doing it and because we did continue the Eichler Guidelines to the meeting of February 22nd. So, we're hoping all-hands-on-deck for that meeting.

Chair Bower: Ok, I'd like to remind Board Members, of course the ones that are here don't need this reminder but if you're not going to be at the meeting, please contact Emily or Amy or any – or Robin I suppose is the appropriate – another appropriate person to let them know so we will know if we have a quorum.

Study Session

2. Historic Resources Board Retreat Discussion Items

Chair Bower: Let's move onto Historic Resources -- I'm sorry, the Historic Board retreat discussion items which you will find on Page 2 of our Board packet. So, we have a staff presentation?

Ms. Emily Vance, Historic Planner: Alright, good morning Board Members so these – we are going to do kind of a quick overview of some of the topics and we can get into more detail as the Board wishes. These are the topics that were chosen at previous HRB meetings for the retreat which is happening right now. I found this – I wanted to share this picture with every one of the yo-yo demonstrations from 1953. When I'm doing research for a building or for a project, I often use the PAHA Archives and sometimes I stumble across really delightful images and I wanted to share this one with everyone today. It's pretty fun since today is a fun day, this is our retreat. Oops,

Board Member Bernstein: Is that Roger (inaudible)

Ms. Vance: Is that Roger in there.

Board Member Bernstein: I had not moved here yet. We moved from New Jersey in 1954 to Palo Alto.

Chair Bower: I was a little too young to participate but I remember them and did...

Ms. Vance: So, none of you are in this picture. So, we'll start with the CLG Annual Report overview so this was submitted to the state on January or January 13th, January 22nd was the due date and just to – I sent out a draft to everyone and I didn't receive any comments but if you have anything to say about it

now, we can. The CLG Report covers our ordinance updates and Comp. Plan updates, any new local designations or listings, the review responsibilities of the HRB and staff, HRB membership which include the statement of qualification forms that you all submitted as well as the training you attended. I wanted to remind everyone that you have to attend one training workshop seminar lecture, something to an effect, a year in order to maintain the status – the CLG status and HR – the HRB status. It also – the report also included an updates survey and inventory that we did so that included, for example, the JMZ, Rinconada Park survey they did where we talked about the Girl Scout House and that report. We talked about public education and outreach with covered our Eichler walking tour and the Eichler community outreach events that we've been doing. We also talked about our one remaining Mills Act property and just a summary of the local preservation program. These were the particular questions that I would love to have Board response on. These were the pertinent questions at the end of the report, how can we do better? What's working and what isn't? So, if anyone had any comments on these now, I would greatly appreciate it. You can always send them to me in email as well because we have to do this every year but these are really good things to just kind of think about how we can approach our preservation program here in the City. Would anybody like to speak to any of these?

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, thank you, Chair Bower and thank you, Emily. It's still – I still get questions – it's mostly getting questions from real estate agents and real estate professionals of can I tear this house down? It still seems to be a question for several people in the community so if there's – if I get that question, I guess having some guidance on how to answer it.

Ms. Vance: I think we're going to discussing demolition and the updated Comp. Plan momentarily so that's a great thing to bring up.

Chair Bower: I'd like to for the record points out that Brandon and Margaret are here so we are a full Board. We've just started, we got started late so we are on study session topics, Page 2. Anybody have any comments for Emily? Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: One other question would be to -- in response to when people ask me questions about a building are what regulations are binding and which ones are arbitrary or voluntary I should say. Yeah, voluntary or binding, that seems to be a question I get a lot.

Chair Bower: We don't have any arbitrary regulations. I would like to – I think we've talked about this as a Board but I'd like to see further discussion and maybe Board action on Individual Review for all historic properties. We don't have that now if the property is outside of either Professorville or Downtown District, is that correct?

Ms. French: Individual Review Program for two-story homes applies Citywide. What I think you might be eluding to is we have not single-story review...

Chair Bower: Right.

Ms. French: ... in – for historic homes. Not Discretionary Review, just building permits.

Chair Bower: Right so I think ...

Ms. French: Except for I's and II's – Categories I's and II's...

Ms. Vance: Then Professorville...

Ms. French: All Citywide and then Professorville is all four Categories and downtown is all four categories.

Chair Bower: I would like to expand that to all categories first of all so I to IV and make sure that single or two-story development would still be reviewed in the same manner if the building isn't historic – has historic value. That's an expansion and that's a code or I mean an ordinance change.

Ms. French: It would absolutely be a code ordinance and it would have to go to the Planning Commission because Individual Review has only been for two-stories. So, it would have to be a new set of guidelines and ordinance.

Chair Bower: Yeah and I think that ties in with your – with a topic we're going to discuss after this about demolition and deconstruction. Anyone else have comments? Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Continuing on the note that Chair Bower just mentioned about a review of historic structures. The – it has to be a listed historic structure before that gets reviewed. So, for example, in the Eichler neighborhoods, say even in the historic districts, the individual houses are not listed, is that correct?

Ms. French: That is correct.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah.

Ms. French: We have National Register listing which is not referenced in our historic ordinance, only local historic districts are subject to our historic ordinance.

Board Member Bernstein: Right so an individual home in a historic district such as an Eichler historic district, unless that house is specifically listed it doesn't fall under the historic preservation, is that correct?

Ms. French: It does not fall under the ordinance that applies to our review process and yeah, I'll just say that. When – if someone, where to apply for a variance, says, that's a discretionary review that allows us to look at the California Environmental Quality Act with respect to that discretionary action.

Board Member Bernstein: Right and then would the Secretary of Interior's Standards apply to that building?

Ms. French: For a listed historic building we would use the Secretary of Interior's Standards for our review.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah and right now in the historic districts of Eichler, none of those are listed as a historic structure. Is that correct?

Ms. French: The list that their – the Eichler districts are on is the National Register list and there are contributors within those districts and non-contributors but yes, we have not a local inventory of any of those homes.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, thank you.

Ms. Vance: I'll say one thing to that to kind of piggyback off that. If you were to put an ADU in Green Meadow or Green Gables, for example, those – that new construction does have to adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. So, we do have control over new ADUs in those two National Register districts, as well as elsewhere.

Ms. French: So, to the extent -- just to pile on that, to the extent that accessory dwelling units are not discretionary in terms of a review process like the Individual Review Process for two-story homes. We do have the ability to look at what's proposed in association with the building permit process. It's kind of --

it's awkward, it's not technically discretionary entitlement, it's building permit review but we do have – give it a look.

Chair Bower: It seems to me that a clearer statement by – in the City ordinance as to exactly what applies and doesn't might help residents understand that complex discussion that we just had about what applies when it applies when it doesn't. Anyone else have comments about this?

Vice Chair Corey: Can you re-clarify – I'm sorry, the ADU? I thought I got it because we had talked about it for a couple hours but I'm still not – I don't think I am clear.

Ms. French: Any time you have a workaround of – so, our Accessory Dwelling Unit Ordinance allows for the Director of Planning and Community Environment to look at the proposed accessory dwelling unit for compliance with the Secretary of Interior's Standards and that's it. Look at it and then there's a building permit and coax them to – towards compliance with Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Vice Chair Corey: It if does not comply with it, it's – what happens then?

Ms. French: We haven't received one yet so – but it's not clear as to the process of that. It's a building permit.

Vice Chair Corey: But would it be binding or any decisions or is it—I don't want to reuse the term arbitrary but is it – is there any enforcement or is it just...

Ms. French: Voluntary...

Vice Chair Corey: ...recommendation...

Ms. French: Voluntary is the word you're looking for.

Vice Chair Corey: It's voluntary? Voluntary is the word I'm looking for so it's voluntary that they comply, is that what...

Ms. French: Yeah, I mean I would like it to the projects that come before this Board, where we give them really good advice but it's just a building permit. If it is not in the National Register or local designated Professorville district, there's some – it's just a building permit so we do our best.

Vice Chair Corey: If it is locally registered in a district, let's just say it's a Category II in Professorville, then does that change that?

Ms. French: Yes, being that it's – yeah, under our ordinance it's referred to in our historic ordinance, Chapter 1649.

Vice Chair Corey: Right, ok, thanks.

Chair Bower: Alright so looking at this list that's in front of us, I wonder if the Office of Historic Preservation could help with either funding or grant funding probably of mid-century review of houses. We haven't done a – I can't – now I'm blocking on the term but it's an assessment of buildings for...

Female: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: Yeah, we haven't – we talked last year about upgrading – updating our survey – local survey and I don't think we – I think we're overdue, way overdue. Is that something they can help us with or is that something we have proactively go after?

Ms. Vance: That is something that I think we would have to get some kind of direction on and I think – right, from maybe staff or Council, Director but that exists. There is a grant application that my predecessor Mathew had started and we've kind of tweaked it and it's more or less ready to go. So, there is an application ready for a mid-century kind of survey and inventory of from I think the 40s up to late 60s. Yeah, like a context statement but we have not submitted it nor is there – necessarily are going to this year. The deadline for grants submittals to OHP is in May.

Chair Bower: Is there a reason why we wouldn't do that? I mean...

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Bower: ... is it a funding issue?

Ms. French: In the past when we had previously prepared this draft application, there was a look at our workload so we had Professorville going at the time. We've just been through and are nearly at the end of hopefully the Eichler Guidelines which does address mid-century. I think when we start talking about commercial properties, you know non-single family, you know that's definitely of interest and we've heard that from the Board. I think the effort wouldn't be to go out and see what the individual designations of individual Eichlers, let's say. Their significant is more related to the group, the tract, the neighborhood rather than looking specifically for which Eicher, for instance, is notable. I hope that clarifies...

Chair Bower: I'm also reminded of all of the properties that are eligible for listing that have not been listed and if I understand the sequencing, we could apply for a local survey grant to fund a local survey in May. It seems to me then you would have a year to complete that? So, I'm hoping by May you'll be pretty much finished with the Eichler Guidelines; maybe but I mean it will clearer be a downside. It will take – and if – it will take the state some time to process the grant so we're really talking about maybe a September to September workload for this and that's still not doable?

Ms. French: I didn't say it wasn't doable, I was just giving the reason why in the past we didn't do it because we had some other projects on the burner and we had some staff change over. You know, going forward if we're – if it's a successful submittal and we have support for that, I think if the focus is particularly on non-residential, I think that might help as far as the 1950s, 60s because then we're getting into the 70s now I think with 50-years.

Chair Bower: Even applying in May, we're not going to do this work probably until 2019 and that's assuming that we're successful in getting the grant. So I -- if we don't start this cycle this year and especially – which is possible because the grant application is more or less complete, it probably needs to be updated slightly. Then we're waiting until next year and we're doing this in 2020. I know that you don't sit around in your office looking for things to do but I do think that it might be useful since this work was done 2-years ago. I mean the bulk of the work was done by preparing the grant and that we ought to move it forward. If that's a topic for Board discussion then let's agendize it.

Ms. French: I think we can agendize that and then just keeping in mind any time we submit a grant there's a quid pro quo that we have to give our resources in kind at least and any capital investment would have to be carefully looked at. We have a lot of capital projects that need funding so just be aware of that.

Chair Bower: Ok well maybe we could have an off – a discussion about this just so I'm clear about what the parameters are to move forward. Alright, yes, Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Along with this discussion and pertinent to that, there are also some National Register eligible properties that have not been added to the inventory. It seems like that would be a really simple thing to do that requires I would think not much staff resource.

Chair Bower: It's on my list. Alright, any other comments? Martin – Michael.

Board Member Makinen: Yes, we talked about it in the past about doing a survey of industrial sites that may not have been captured as being historic – having historic merit. That might be something we could approach the OHP for some grant money to do a survey on the remaining industrial sites to see what has historic integrity and what might be eligible to list. I think that's a big gap in our historic properties considerations right here. We haven't really addressed that and I mean this is Silicon Valley, there have got to be a few sites that are still around.

Board Member Wimmer: David?

Chair Bower: Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: When we say survey, what does that specifically – what would that entail? We're talking about a survey of certain things and is that just a professional that we hire driving around and looking at things and identifying what properties we would – could be potentially eligible? Then I also – I don't know if this is the right time to touch base on but back in 78', I think it was, when the – on a lot of our parcel reports we have under the listings of the residential properties, sometimes it will ask if it's historic. Then it will say it was deemed eligible in 79' – 80 or something like that so someone did some work back then but I don't think it was – I don't know. Maybe that – I think it would be interesting to have a discussion about that and how – who did that work and what was the criteria for that and is that what we're talking about in terms of the survey?

Ms. French: I think – if I can just respond to that? You're referring to actually the Dames and Moore survey that was done. That was the company that the City hired back in 1998 actually and then in the end in 2000, we had the list of eligible – deemed eligible that went to the state OHP and they have it on file. The potentially eligible properties, that was a windshield survey and then from there, more work was done on some but not all of those. So, we still have a number of potentially eligible properties that there wasn't a lot of effort put into at that time and seeing if there was somebody notable that had lived there or what have you for those properties. So, more work could be done on the potentially eligible properties.

Board Member Wimmer: I mean I would think that looking back since that work was started but maybe not fully completed and then it was just sort of let go for the reason I'm not sure. Wouldn't it be wise of us to look back at that and continue that effort?

Ms. Vance: That's a great question, Margaret. We're going to talk about potentially eligible resources I think in the next slide or so. So, we're going to cover that but that – yes, that's something that we need to address and then to get back to your question about surveys in general. There are a couple different kinds, you could do a windshield survey which is what they did for Dames and Moore when they picked the potentially eligible. That's exactly what it sounds like, you drive down a street, you look around you notice buildings that could have significance, that have integrity, something that stands out or you could do something a little more intensive. There's an intensive level of surveying, there were constant surveys like your windshield which is kind of a brief overview. You essentially pick your boundaries, you pick your area and then you do a grid-like kind of sweep over it. It could be on foot, it could be in a car, it could be thematic like with the industrial sites which I really like that idea a lot or it could be modern in like we're looking at a specific time period. The whole reason you do a survey is how can you protect the resources if you don't know what you have? If you don't know what's actually out there so the point of the survey is to essentially gather information and then to help in the whys, use, and planning in the future. You could do a survey plus inventories so that would be actually listing some of them but a survey doesn't in and of itself list resources necessarily. It usually just identifies resources that merit further evaluation or that you can easily look at and say oh my gosh, how did we miss this? That merits protection but it doesn't actually go as far as to list them. That's kind of the next step. If that kind of clears up what a survey is and does.

Chair Bower: Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: To refer perhaps to what you were mentioning like the sheet that talks about the single-story or excuse me, the single-family homes in that. Those are called DPR forms and I think Emily – we're so lucky to have Emily I think – she gave a great description of what the surveys are like. Just to be absolutely clear, when there's a windshield survey, just to support what she said, that's not the last say. Nothing gets listed because it's been identified in a windshield survey; just to be perfectly clear. I have a question actually and I don't mean to get into great detail and maybe this is a question for later but I'll throw it out. So, I also like what Michael suggested and what Emily support in terms of the industrial projects. I go by the former Addison Antique building quite a bit and the SOFA area had identified that there was like a lot of automotive work that had gone on there. I thought – I had supposed that building would be preserved in some nature but they removed all the automotive roll-up doors and I would have thought those would have been a character-defining aspect of that building but they've all been removed. So, it's more of a question than anything else right now but as we're talking about industrial building, I was rather surprised to see those removed and maybe you can update us on that at some point.

Chair Bower: Is that even – does removing those doors even require a building permit? I don't even think there's any – that there's any local action unless they are changing the structure. You know that was done on Morris Auto Parts which was in the anthropology building which – and that building has been totally undone. There's almost nothing left of the original character of that building and then I think the – Roger, you can help me with this. The Addison Antiques building was that – was an auto repair shop.

Male: Yeah, Union Auto.

Chair Bower: Yeah, Union, right.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, it was an auto – my – just to let you know my wife was there as an antique store for 10 or 12-years and then just sort of got bumped out because the owner wanted to – he had people requesting who was going to do some sort of computer work of some sort. That didn't meet the requirement for the zoning ordinance and that it's a retail building and I see now they are working on it.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I saw it too but I think that's probably a lost opportunity sadly. Alright, anybody else has any comments about the information up here on the screen? We can move onto the next slide. Oh, wait, Brandon has ...

Vice Chair Corey: I'm sorry....

Chair Bower: ... a comment.

Vice Chair Corey: Going back to the survey so do – how big is the list of the drive-by from last time that we would have to follow up on because it seems to me that the only benefit of doing a new survey would be covering properties from the 50s to 70s that where not in from last time. I'm just trying to make sure that I understand that was it a cursory survey so that there could actually be a lot of stuff they missed or do we actually have a large list to start from as it is?

Ms. Vance: I mean I think they did a really thorough job and they did go up to the 40s. So, the mid-century context that we're looking at would pick up where Dames and Moore left off and carry us up through the late 60s-70s. The number of potentially eligible resources that were identified in the Dames and Moore research was around 2000. Since that time many, many, many have been demolished and I would say that number is closer to 1,500-1,700 now. I know in the past decade we've lost over a hundred and that was 20-years ago so maybe another 200 but those are the ones that I just can easily find. We've definitely lost quite a few of those (inaudible).

Vice Chair Corey: So, is it – those numbers, those are the potentially eligible and not the ones – right, ok. So, then – go ahead.

Ms. Vance: The eligible ones – so what they did is they went through and they identified thousands of homes that could be potentially eligible and then picked I think 400 that they thought had the most chance – most likely to be or the ones that were more interesting. They found 165 to be eligible for the California and maybe some for the National Register and the rest were deemed ineligible. So, when you're looking at those parcel reports, you'll see deemed not eligible for the California Register in 1998. That was one of the few that where they actually did a DPR Form for and then you'll see the ones that say deemed eligible and those are the ones that – they maybe have been a part of the Dames and Moore survey. Things can get deemed eligible and ineligible all the time but that's probably – if it says 1998, that means it was apart of the Dames and Moore survey.

Vice Chair Corey: So, one thought is depending on who's actually doing the survey and taking them from deemed eligible and eligible. Is if we're now talking about doing a full survey where we would effectively add more potentially deemed eligible from the 50s and 60s and just have – and make that list bigger but not actually make any properties...

Ms. Vance: I would recommend in the future to never use the term potentially eligible again. A lot of [shupos] in many states are – Arizona, somewhere on the east coast because I was – it's not a term that we like to use. It's confusing and it essentially means its unevaluated and just needs more research so I would not recommend that we add to the potentially eligible list. I say either make a determination or you say needs further research because it's pretty confusing.

Vice Chair Corey: If we had to choose between the two, would we actually go and take the existing – I'm going to call them PI to avoid the term but go look through that list of 2000 or actually do a new survey and make new determinations? It seems we already have a lot of the information and then has a survey company go out and get stuff. Well, there's value there for the 50s and 70s....

Ms. Vance: Right because none of those between the 40s and '68, none of those resources have been more or less -- I can't say none but for the most part there has not been a mid-century survey. So, those are all...

Vice Chair Corey: '48-'68, is that right?

Ms. Vance: I think it ended in 1940 –40? 1940?

Vice Chair Corey: That was '48, yeah. (crosstalk)

Ms. Vance: Oh, it went to '48?

Vice Chair Corey: '48 right because it was '98.

Ms. Vance: So, this one would be from '48 to '68, capturing that mid-century stuff. We're going to talk about the potentially eligible in more detail. Let's get to the next slide and we're going to circle back to this because it is, this is a great topic.

Chair Bower: Roger and then Martin.

Board Member Kohler: I just wanted to – when I first got on this Board I remember 1998 I think was the year that we went through all the potentially eligible and we had public hearings in the little room over here is where we met. We didn't meet in here and that room was packed, we had people lined up in the hallway and we went through every single home that was on one list. I'm not sure which list, I'm not sure which list it was but I may have it in my – somewhere in the office but it was a huge, huge undertaking and a lot of unhappy people. I mean they were really unhappy, they would -- they – a couple folks were – they just stood up and yelled at us, what in the world are you doing? This is my house and that kind of thing so it was kind of scary actually.

Chair Bower: Alright. Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Just as – this is a public meeting, what's DPR? Just for everyone to know what that is.

Ms. Vance: Oh, DPR stands for the Department of Parks and Recreation and there are certain forms, I think its 523A if anyone is interested, that are the inventory forms for when you are documenting a historic resource. So, there are a few different forms and that's what gets sent to the state for eligibility to the California Register. I think David would be very familiar with them as he scanned a lot of them for us in the past.

Board Member Bernstein: The Department of Parks and...

Ms. Vance: Hate to bring up a sore memory.

Board Member Bernstein: The Department of Parks and Recreation?

Ms. Vance: Yeah.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, thank you.

Ms. Vance: So, they are the primary records for the historic resources and they can be – again, they are not just for buildings. They can be for sites or areological sites or linear feature, all sorts of things.

Board Member Bernstein: Right.

Ms. Vance: They are kind of the catch-all.

Board Member Bernstein: That's a state or federal form?

Ms. Vance: That's a state thing.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

Board Member Wimmer: I just have one quick question; would it be better – a better use of our resources to return to 1998 and continue that survey or would it be wise to start a whole new mid-century? I mean where should we invest our resources? It feels to me like we started a great thing, for some reason it got halted and now 20-years later do we start a whole new thing or do we go back and finish that original project? I would vote for going back, revisiting that and then after we feel like we've made some progress with that or got that to a phase that we feel comfortable we can use that as a tool. Then we start this new survey of the new mid-century, that is just a comment but that's my thought.

Vice Chair Corey: I agree.

Ms. Vance: Yeah, that's a great point and I think that merits further discussion about where we should put our time and resources. There is essentially a hierarchy of needs and so which one would be more pressing so I would agree with that as well.

Chair Bower: So, to move the meeting on, you know obviously there's great interest by the Board in this and I think that might warrant a discussion at another meeting about how to move it forward and so we can define perimeters. Alright, next slide.

Ms. Vance: Moving on, one of the issues that are brought up over and over is the demolition and deconstruction of our historic resources. So, here's a little bit of information for you regarding what I have found, just some numbers, about – like I said about a hundred potentially historic buildings since

2010 and I only went back that far as that was our [Gist] which is our internal GIS data. At that point, they had switched over to a new system so that's as far back as the information that I trust. So, it's about at least once a month, 13 in last year and one eligible got deconstructed and we'll talk about that. Not demolished, deconstructed and the last listed property I could find was in 2012 and I'm sure some of you are familiar with that one because that was in Professorville. Oops, sorry. So, maybe – let's see (inaudible) – we have – there are two kinds of – we have an updated Comp. Plan and then we have that new ordinance change. What is that for the...

Ms. French: ADUs?

Ms. Vance: For the deconstruction and demolition...

Ms. French: Oh, yes.

Ms. Vance: Do you want to talk to that one?

Ms. French: Yeah.

Ms. Vance: Ok, I'm going to pass it over to Amy to speak a little bit more on our deconstruction/demolish issue and the difference between the two and how people can kind of get around demos.

Ms. French: Not that I want to give a prescription out for that but we do – we had for years a loophole that we're hoping – we call it the lope hole – that we're hoping to close. I don't think there's been a high level of abuse of this loophole. It just – it exists and so we're trying to address it. I believe Council Member Holman had brought it up previously and we hustled to get it into the current ordinance that's going through the process of the Planning Commission review and Council. I believe it's going to Council in March, if not before.

Council Member Holman: Maybe March, (inaudible) sounds right.

Ms. French: Maybe March and so basically on the screen here and I believe I showed this at an earlier – previous meeting as well. What we're thinking would be helpful is to – should there be an intent to avoid having scrutiny of the quality of the resource and somebody says their going to build a one-story house, comes in and demolishes the home for a one-story resource. Then never builds the resource – sorry, the one-story home and instead come back the next day with a two-story home. We want to avoid that unfortunate circumstance so that they wouldn't be able to come in for a number of years with a two-story home. So, this would kind of avoid the speculative use of property out there to avoid the attention on whether it's historic or not.

Chair Bower: Is this – this language in red, it is...

Ms. French: Correct.

Chair Bower: ...has been presented and reviewed by Planning and Transportation Committee?

Ms. French: I believe so and the next step is the Council. I don't believe that the Planning Commission has modified the language. I will find out in the – once the reports written, I can make sure what the language – if there were any tweaking of that language.

Chair Bower: I'm – the only reason I'm asking is 5-years seems to short. Why not 10-years? I mean let's make this a very serious issue. If you're trying to game the system, it seems to me that ought to have a fairly serious penalty. I don't want people – I don't want the neighbors to have to look at a vacant lot for 5-years or every 10-years. The other – my other question as I'm reading this is so I get a permit to build a one-story house and then come back and want to add a second-story, that's still a – that's a 5-year delay?

Board Member Kohler: It's very rare for someone to do a one-story home and not go up to the maximum allowed floor area.

Chair Bower: Well, if they have this penalty there, I mean that's why I'm asking the question. Could they then finish the home and then immediately apply for a second-story?

Ms. French: That's a good question that you raise that would be worth talking about. I mean I think when people come through with a one-story home and there is this prohibition, they might very well propose a basement to maximize the livable area under that scenario. If they are interested to build a one-story home that maximizes living area but yeah, there is no provisions, there's – it was a quick let's write this up, let's get it into the system for the Planning Commission. That wasn't part of the discussion.

Chair Bower: I just – the reason I'm bringing this up – one second.

Vice Chair Corey: Sure.

Chair Bower: ... is that sequencing in construction in a flood zones is very important because if you don't do that then you have to basically tear the entire house down and meet the current flood zoning issues. So, I'm thinking why not use the same strategy to maximize a building by sequencing first the first floor which then get's you underneath the radar on this or makes it compliant. Then coming back immediately offering the same. Now, as I'm reading this, it could be interrupted to say no Individual Review...

Ms. French: Right, I think that's the intent.

Chair Bower: ...for 5-years and if you wanted to add a second-story, you would have to wait 5-years.

Ms. French: Yeah, no, I believe that's (inaudible) in sayings it's Individual Review because that applies to two-stories. I guess the only difference is our Individual Review applies to – I was – when you were saying that I was thinking something less than 150-square feet because our Individual Review applies to 150-square feet of second-floor addition or more. So, somebody could come in with 149-square feet, you know I'm giving them the prescription.

Chair Bower: By the way – well, that's a 10 by 15-foot room so you might have people who would be interested in doing that. In San Mateo, I'm familiar with their ordinance, it's 50-square feet and anything over 50-square feet on a second-floor gets Individual Review or their equivalent. So, I don't know why we have 150? Anyway, Brandon, you had a comment.

Vice Chair Corey: I have two comments so my first was just -- was to add on to what you said about the 5-years. I know people in San Francisco who take – who buy buildings and they – I forget the Act but you can effectively evict all your tenants and you cannot re-rent the building for 5-year to get around rent control and it's done all the time. So, if people really want, 5-years really is a short period, I mean they literally do that today. Now maybe there's different economics on the rent side but it happens on a regular basis. The second comment is and I know – I feel like I'm beating up this intent to try to do better but this discussion about the building official deeming it eligible that it's dangerous and cannot be repaired or rehabilitated. I don't see any situation where you couldn't repair or rehabilitate a house. I mean maybe there's a – maybe there's a cost involved and what have you but there's the question of this is this effectively – how is that determination made because it's easy to get somebody to say this is...

Ms. Vance: I think that's a pretty extreme situation and in my experience with that clause regarding historic resources, it usually involved fire.

Vice Chair Corey: Usually what?

Ms. Vance: Involved fire, like if there's extreme fire damage to the home, that's typically when I've seen it applied.

Chair Bower: Also, (inaudible) 89 after the Loma (inaudible) earthquake, unreinforced masonry building that actually I tore down and replaced with a new house because there was no rehabilitation of that hollow tile wall – those hollow tile walls. In fact, the building collapsed when we were – during the process of demolition on its own.

Vice Chair Corey: My question was more around are there ways to – for people to game that system by...

Ms. Vance: No, we – or at least no that I can think of right now. You can't just come in and say oh, this wood is a little rotten. I don't like my home anymore. It has to be...

Vice Chair Corey: That's a justification people commonly use right so.

Ms. Vance: This is a dangerous building has something – I think it has to be something pretty spectacular like a fire or earthquake damage or something beyond repair and it's not just – I don't think that can be easily convincing.

Vice Chair Corey: The building official has to be someone from the City I take it? Ok.

Chair Bower: Alright, other comments?

Ms. Vance: I had one more comment so the one eligible resource that was demolished – deconstructed last year in June, utilized this loophole. They came in with a one-story, this was the Plank House out on Cowper that was deconstructed and then they never built the one-story and now they are coming through with a two-story. So, this was – there's one from last year that we're trying to stop so examples like that.

Chair Bower: One second. Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Are we talking – the one I'm thinking of that happened was a handful of years ago was at Waverley and – yeah, it was at Waverley and that was demolished and that property – that piece of property is still empty. There was one deconstructed at Lincoln and Emerson that – then there was a single-story house built and that's in Professorville. Lincoln and Emerson, the northeast corner, perhaps Brandon remembers that because it's near to you.

Chair Bower: (crosstalk) I'm trying to think of it.

Council Member Holman: I don't remember the address. I don't think it could have been – no it would be 405.

Ms. French: Ok, that was the big one then (inaudible).

Chair Bower: No.

Council Member Holman: Yeah, it wouldn't be 405. No, no, (crosstalk) it was not 405. So, two things, one is I would love to have the slides – you know the presentation that you're giving. Going back to the previous one, there's something that I've raised a lot and this Boards talked about it a little bit but a definition of demolition because we have buildings that are basically demolished and it's not considered a demolition. From a preservation standpoint, I see houses in Professorville even that are – there's nothing left that was original and yet it was not considered a demolition. It's something that we continue to not address so I think that's pretty critical. From a CLG standpoint, I don't know how they would feel about what we're allowing to happen but – and I'm not quite sure why and I'm still not sure that our Building Department makes accessible the (inaudible) Work Building Code either.

Chair Bower: Michael.

Board Member Makinen: I have – it's part of a question of maybe a recommendation but I'm not sure if you apply for a demolition permit, is it required to have a photograph of what you're demolishing on record? I think it...

Ms. French: No, there's no requirement and I don't know if you are referring to the [HABS]. It's a – we had one of these done for the Mortuary...

Ms. Vance: No, just – yeah but just for the demo permit.

Ms. French: Oh, just – the requirements for what you're submitting? They don't require a photograph to be submitted.

Board Member Makinen: I think that's a complete miscarriage of planning if we don't require a photograph of what you're demolishing just for the record so we can have that on file what existed.

Ms. French: We do require a – the image photograph of when somebodies coming through the planning entitlement process for a two-story home. They do have to show the existing streetscape and the existing home but when it's a one-story, we do not have...

Board Member Makinen: I mean for any demolition permit I think you should require a photograph of what you're proposing to demolish. It might not be part of the planning -- the Historic Resources Board's purview but I think somewhere in the system that should be a mandate that is required to see what was removed.

Chair Bower: Ok, other comments? Roger.

Board Member Kohler: I don't know if it's relevant but many years ago I was hired to look at a house that was on Waverley across the street from Steve Job's home. So, I went in and took pictures of this home and everything and I guess I was supposed to design a house but then the people sold the property. I actually haven't been by there but I think there's a new home on there but that was just what we were talking about. We took photos and the owner was going to build a new home and that's what we – I don't know if I ever gave the photos to the City or anything. I don't quite know what happens to all that. I mean I have them somewhere in my files but I'll take a look and see.

Chair Bower: If we're done with – any other comments about demolition? Deconstruction?

Ms. Vance: Ok, we'll move on. Here's the updated Comp. Plan that was adopted by Council on November 13th and the – here you'll see the relevant new language regarding historic resources. The one that is probably of most interest to this Board will be Policy L-7.2. This says that before we issue alteration or demo. permits that would substantially affect the exterior, we much consider whether properties are eligible for State or National Register and whether minor changes will affect the architectural integrity of potentially historic buildings; emphasis is ours.

Chair Bower: That's actually a significant change.

Ms. Vance: It's...

Chair Bower: That's actually...

Ms. Vance: ...big.

Chair Bower: ... has some planning power.

Ms. French: With having said that, that's a policy and there's no ordinance yet written but it is giving us some new protocols that we're dealing with now since the effective date of the Comp. Plan which was December 15th.

Chair Bower: It's a start. Ok, next slide.

Ms. Vance: Ok, we'll move on. Oh, here's just more Comp. Plan images. Now let's move onto the CPF Conference and training opportunities. Like I mentioned earlier, all HRB members are supposed to attend at least one training seminar/lecture over the course of a year. Alright, way to go. I think it would be – you know if you attend the conference in any fashion, that would absolutely be your training for the year. So, again, those dates for the conference are May 17th through the 20th. I know we wanted to talk about HRB's participation in the conference. We don't have a meeting on that Thursday, May 17th, just to let you know. We were planning on doing an architectural scavenger hunt, as well as participating in other ways but mostly behind the scenes. There's also – upcoming there's a webinar on the Standards in March if anyone is interested, let me know and we can get you signed up for that. The other thing that we were talking about regarding HRB's participation was this idea of training for Council and other City Boards. If anyone has any comments about our upcoming CPF Conference.

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Let's see, let me know if this is appropriate to bring this up about for training for Council and it may be a question for the public too. For a project – for a building or resource to be listed as a historic resource on the inventory, that takes City Council approval correct?

Ms. French: It requires a Historic Resources Board...

Board Member Bernstein: Recommendation.

Ms. French: ... let's go nomination and/or affirmation because we have an application process that somebody can do. We do talk to people about their interest in this to come forward so they might get the benefits of being a historic resource but it's a process.

Board Member Bernstein: So, for a house that's in a district but if it's not individually listed and then – and not approved by City Council to be on that list, then the Historic Preservation Ordinance has no effect on that project.

Ms. French: Even if it's listed as a Category III or IV, it wouldn't be affected by the Historic Preservation Ordinance if it's outside of the downtown.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, thank you. I have more questions on Council training when you're ready. That was – it was discussed during our joint HRB/City Council meeting about having a discussion of the – and training session for members of the public, Council Members, other Board Members of other Commissions and Boards education about differentiation and compatibilities; specifically, Standard Number Nine. That's a big topic and I know for a lot of projects that I've heard from the City Council level, this discussion was – is something done in a compatible way with the district or the neighborhood or neighboring buildings or adjacent buildings or not compatible. So, some of that training could happen during this week.

Chair Bower: Alright, any other comments?

Board Member Bernstein: As far as just expanding on that then I guess maybe we or staff can discuss well, is that just a one-hour class session somehow that's advertised somehow. How do we make that happen? I heard some Council Members wanting to have something like that and then it would include other Boards and Commissions too.

Chair Bower: Has California Preservation Foundation established what seminars they're going to present at the meeting?

Ms. Vance: So, there is a schedule more or less made for the entirety, you know the Thursday through Sunday so it might be a good idea to do this on the Wednesday before just so it doesn't conflict with – they have a lot of evening programs and the days are booked solid. Then people are on study tours and off visiting sites so I think would recommend the Wednesday before as it would really be beneficial mostly just to people in Palo Alto, the people who are on Boards here, the people – the public here. I mean I love this idea, I would love for HRB to be involved with an educational learning opportunity. I guess I would recommend either we figure out a time that would be best for everyone. I think the Standards is a good route to go as Martin was talking about and the idea of compatibility. I think that's a very relevant topic and it could just be a general – even a general overview of what preservation is and does as there's a lot of misinformation kind of galloping around out there. I guess my question then would be what would that look like? Would that be a panel of several HRB Members and staff? Would we do it here? Does evening work better than a day? Those sorts of logistical questions and I also don't know if we need to get direction or approval of this first before we kind of push for it but I know I would be in strong favor of HRB participating. I mean the CPF is holding the conference here in your backyard, I think we'd like to have you guys in the spotlight a little bit.

Board Member Bernstein: I know I'd like to be involved in that training session.

Chair Bower: If you'd like to take the lead, that's fine.

Board Member Bernstein: I would.

Chair Bower: Ok.

Ms. Vance: So, then maybe Martin, you and I can work out a good time and maybe we can come back to the Board and see what we think would be ideal.

Board Member Bernstein: Great.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Martin. Alright, Emily, any additional...

Ms. Vance: Here was another topic that we wanted to discuss and just to let everyone know, we have about 45-minutes left until 10:30 at which point we were going to adjourn to give us enough time to go to our field trip which is the Girl Scout House at 11. We wanted to talk about listing properties and how that process works. We haven't listed anything since I've been here so if anyone wanted to talk about any potential projects, things that they would like to see moved forward or how we could formalize this process or if there's anything that you'd like to talk about listing properties.

Chair Bower: I don't think we've listed anything since I've been on this Board and I've been on the Board 11-years. So, I'm – I'd have to look to...

Board Member Kohler: I don't remember (inaudible).

Chair Bower: Roger, you don't remember listing a property? You've been on here 20-years. So, maybe you could -- show how would we start – so since there's no institutional memory on this side of the table...

Ms. French: I have a small memory from my 20-years here of upgrades from one category to another. Again, because our ordinance favors the I's and II's or gives incentives to the I's and II's...

Chair Bower: We just did that in our last meeting. We started that process with the building...

Ms. French: For 526 Waverley.

Chair Bower: Exactly so maybe that's the way we should start a discussion of how to do this. That particular project is driven – was driven or is being driven by the owners for financial benefit. I mean they need to have a different category on that building in order to be able to do renovations and expansion. I think that is really what drives it so I'm not sure how we would, as a Board, start the process if an owner didn't want it or wasn't interested in having it. In fact, I think state law prevents us from listing a building if the owner doesn't want it. No? Is that right?

Council Member Holman: Listing on a local inventory does not require owner consent.

Chair Bower: Inventory, right but it's...

Council Member Holman: On a local inventory it doesn't require local consent.

Ms. Vance: It should though, it should require owner consent for the local inventory. That's where we have the most incentives, as well as the most control over rehabilitation and demolitions. So, I would encourage that we do require owner consent and California and National Register, you don't – it does not require owner consent but it cannot be listed over the objection of the owner.

Council Member Holman: I'm not saying what's best practice, I'm just saying what our rules are now.

Chair Bower: Yeah, there is a difference isn't there. How would you suggest we move this forward or show we agendize this on – for a future meeting and have time to think about it?

Ms. Vance: Sure, it's a big topic and I know it was just brought up for a couple of reasons here and there. I know people had been asking about how you actually list something or why would you even do that. I guess one of the reasons it was brought up was because we have been talking about the Girl Scout House and the ITT building. Both of those are not – they are not listed resources, they absolutely should be, they are actually kind of two prized buildings here in Palo Alto that are – well, the Girl Scout House is certainly not under threat. I would say the ITT building is and we're kind of tip-toeing around it. I know I would like to see those both get listed, get some protection, get some research done on them, as well as a little bit of celebration on their significance to the City. I think that was one of the reasons why we brought up this topic in the first place is because what do we do with these two buildings? I think we wanted to really explore the listing of the Girl Scout House because that's – I think we own the land – there's some issue. We own the land, they own the building but it's kind of a no-brainer there. It's a point of pride and that would be a really kind of exciting project to see that listed soon at some point. Especially considering all of the attention that that area is getting right now due to the JMZ – the zoo and Rinconada Park getting its overhaul. That's one of the reasons why we are talking about this in the first place.

Board Member Bernstein: Can you remind us who the architect was of the Girl Scout House?

Chair Bower: It was [Julian Morrian], wasn't it?

Board Member Bernstein: Who was the architect for the Girl Scout...

Ms. French: Birge Clark.

Chair Bower: Was that? Oh.

Ms. Vance: Birge Clark.

Board Member Bernstein: Birge Clark, thank you.

Chair Bower: Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I just wanted to – I was just brainstorming about how we're talking about how difficult it is to identify properties that we want to list. Then obviously in a commercial atmosphere, people are (inaudible) to list their properties because they get TDR benefits or whatever their benefits are. That just prompted me to think about that we always talk about incentives and instead of us doing these windshield surveys searching for potentially eligible houses, wouldn't it be great if we had all these people applying to make their house eligible? So, how can we make that happen? Let's make that happen. I think it's easy, give them benefits, give them a bonus – a 500-square foot bonus for their floor area.

Ms. Vance: That's – that is...

Board Member Wimmer: What's wrong with that?

Ms. Vance: That is exactly how it should be.

Board Member Wimmer: People...

Ms. Vance: They should be coming to us...

Board Member Wimmer: ... should come to us and say I want me to house on the Local Register, please. I beg you, please put my house on it.

Ms. Vance: Absolutely.

Board Member Wimmer: I'm sure we could make that happen if we just figure out a way. Benefits, incentives, square footage, I think we should just rethink the way we're approaching this problem. I really do.

Chair Bower: It occurs to me that we would – it might be useful to hear from our building inspector on how the historic code is applied or how he or she makes the decision to apply it because at this point, even though I've worked for 40-years as a contractor, I have no idea what the current – how the current process works. There wasn't a California Historic Building Code when I was working. There might have been but I never worked under it. At any rate, it would be useful to hear from him or her. I don't even know who the building – chief building inspector is now.

Ms. French: George Hoyt is the Chief Building Official is his title.

Chair Bower: Building official, right.

Board Member Wimmer: I don't think there are any outstanding – I have a copy of the Historic Building Code and I've been meaning to make a copy for everyone because everyone – we should all – it's a very small document but I don't think there are any incentives in the Historic Building Code. I mean maybe you don't have to change your windows to double glazed glass or there are some minor things but it's not enough for someone to want...

Chair Bower: I think stairs are...

Board Member Wimmer: ... to pay the extra money to preserve their windows. I mean...

Chair Bower: No but I think the one critical thing that I encountered was the handrails and guardrails on buildings because both my daughters have historic buildings that have non-compliant handrails and to change them would destroy an important part of the character of those buildings. Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: A huge benefit of the Historic Building Code is that you can use archaic methods for seismic issues. So, let the existing stucco has – that has some seismic resistance and if you can show that's – you can use archaic – it's called archaic methods of analysis. So, there is a way of preserving a building using the HR – Historic Building Code. I also understand that if an applicant says I want – if it's a listed historic structure, that the applicant can say this is – I want to use that code and that's not discretionary, I've heard that. Well, I think from one of our conferences they said that.

Chair Bower: Alright. Ok, other...

Ms. Vance: I'll also mention, I believe that there's going to be a presentation on the Historic Building Code at the conference. I believe that's in the works so that would be a great one for our Board to attend. I'll double check on that, I'm not positive but I feel like I remember that happening. Also, another way – just to go back to your point Margaret – about sweetening the pot and having people come to us for listing. The Mills Act Program would be absolutely the way to do that, that would be another...

Chair Bower: I'm sorry, say that...

Ms. Vance: The Mills Act.

Chair Bower: Mills Act.

Ms. Vance: Having a Mills Act implemented, that would certainly – I feel people would clammer because now everyone wants a historic house. I think there certainly are ways or methods to explore, certainly.

Chair Bower: Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: I think – I mean there are quite a number of incentives that already exist, even for single-family homes and I think we don't lead with those enough. One of them does include some extra floor area ratio as a part of an HIE process. I think it's 150-feet.

Ms. Vance: That sounds right.

Council Member Holman: Is that right, 150-feet?

Board Member Bernstein: (inaudible)

Ms. French: 250, yeah.

Council Member Holman: Is it 250-feet?

Ms. French: (Inaudible -off mic) Category I and II.

Board Member Bernstein: (off mic) For a Category I and II.

Council Member Holman: Thank you very much.

Board Member Bernstein: (inaudible – off mic)

Council Member Holman: Thank you and then there's a third building and I apologize to former Vice Mayor Greg Schmidt profusely. I can never remember the name of it or the address, I bet you Michael does. Its down just off Charleston and San Antonio Road (crosstalk), on Fabian I do believe, yeah.

Ms. French: Fairchild building.

Chair Bower: That's the Fairchild...

Council Member Holman: The Fairchild – yes, the Fairchild building and that's a third one that ought to be added to this list. (crosstalk) Yeah, Greg speaks to it much more articulately...

Board Member Wimmer: There's a plaque in front of it, right? Someone put a plaque.

Council Member Holman: ... but it's not listed on our inventory even.

Ms. Vance: No, I -- it's a state landmark or it's a state point of interest. It's something like that but it's not locally listed.

Council Member Holman: So, I suggest that third (crosstalk)...

Board Member Wimmer: (inaudible)...

Council Member Holman: ... place should be added...

Board Member Wimmer: ...automatically be local and on our list. We should just make that...

Ms. French: Our ordinance, as you know, doesn't recognize other ways of listing such as state or national.

Council Member Holman: Oh, and by the way just – I believe Emily is correct that there is a State Historic Building Code session that's going to be during the CPF Conference and particularly invited to that session will be the Building Department.

Chair Bower: Alright, any other comments? Additions to the list? Emily, you are very thorough after our meetings and summarizing them, could you figure out what that Fabian Way building address is? Put it on the list because I'd like to go see it. I didn't realize that the building – there was a building down on Fabian Way. There's also the building on Charleston that's got the plaque or the original (inaudible)...

Ms. Vance: The integrated...

Chair Bower: But that's on Charleston, (crosstalk)...

Ms. Vance: The first integrated silicon chip.

Chair Bower: That's not on Fabian.

Ms. Vance: Is that not the building that we're talking about?

Chair Bower: Is that what we're talking about?

Board Member Wimmer: I think it is.

Chair Bower: The (inaudible)?

Board Member Wimmer: Fairchild (inaudible – off mic).

Board Member Kohler: I see it every weekend because I go down...

Chair Bower: Yeah, I drive by it. I mean they've totally renovated the building. They tried to tear it down and did not do that which is fortunate.

Ms. Vance: It's still very much intact on the front.

Chair Bower: Right but they've changed all the windows out. Any rate, if that's the building then I know exactly what you're talking about. We should definitely get that on the register.

Board Member Makinen: Well, if there's a...

Council Member Holman: This says it's 844 E. Charleston.

Chair Bower: Sorry?

Council Member Holman: Just a quick Google search says its 844 E. Charleston.

Chair Bower: Yeah, east Charleston, right. So, ok, that is the one I was thinking of but when we said Fabian Way, I was trying to remember what would be down there.

Board Member Bernstein: (inaudible – off mic)

Chair Bower: It's at the -- near the intersection.

Board Member Makinen: Well, I think there's a – it used to be called Fort Aero Space at Boko Ford. They did a lot of satellite work right there and I don't know if that's the same building as the Fairchild building but I think they have a whole complex there. I've actually...

Chair Bower: Most – some of those – the buildings down on Fabian Way near 101 where Fabian turns I think, those are all original 60s buildings and they haven't been torn down.

Board Member Makinen: They did a lot of the (inaudible) satellite development that was very significant.

Chair Bower: Exactly.

Board Member Makinen: Communication satellites. It's not even recognized here.

Board Member Kohler: It's not on the map.

Chair Bower: Yeah, interesting, ok so maybe we should look into that too. Any other comments? No other comments. Slides? Oh, here we are.

Ms. Vance: That's you. I think this was – I think this is the final – yeah, the final slide we wanted to – just a general conversation with our – with the HRB and staff about what's working and what isn't? If anyone has anything to say.

Board Member Makinen: Well, what isn't working is the Mills Act.

Chair Bower: That's coming before the Board -- the Mills Act presentation is...

Ms. Vance: So, the subcommittee has – we've done a lot of work regarding the tailored Mills Act Program. I think we're probably ready to present it to the rest of the Board Members and kind of get an idea where we are. It's not perfectly flushed out and ready to go but it's – I think we're ready to present so I think we just have to pick a date that would work best with our schedule and maybe not overlap with any Eichler stuff and we could certainly present it.

Chair Bower: Speaking of the Mills Act, it occurs to me that we ought to try to reach out to the real estate community and get them here or go to them and talk about historic preservation issues. I think that as we have all experienced, there's a great deal of misinformation or no information and those are – the real

estate agents are the first line in really preservation. If they can talk to their clients about what is important to preserve, then that helps everybody in the community avoid unpleasant experiences.

Board Member Wimmer: Is there – excuse me for interrupting, is there some kind of document or just maybe a one-page statement that we could prepare that says maybe something like if you are considering purchasing a historic property, bullet points, this is what – so it comes from the City as opposed to coming through the mouth of a real estate agent. Real estate agents always want to make like oh yeah you can do this or you can do that, it's no big deal because they want to make the transaction. Then I – then you get – that's when we get called and they say I thought I could do all this stuff. I just got a call like that a week ago.

Ms. Vance: We do have...

Board Member Wimmer: Then all of sudden they are getting totally different – but because of the City changes, the ordinance changes, our policies change and I mean it's really the burden I think of the real estate agents to seek out that proper information. They should be telling a potential buy incorrect information so I guess that's not really our job to put that information out there. It's their job to seek the information, due diligence right?

Ms. Vance: I – yes, I would agree with that but we do have some flyers and informational handouts. The main one being our bulletin which kind of explains what you can – well, not what you can and can't do but the level of review depending on your historic house. We also have a little hand out of the incentives offered and with the updated website, a lot of that is really clearly available and accessible now. I'm hoping that information is getting out but we have – we also have talked about reaching out to the realtors in particular and just having a general update on where we are and trying to combat this misinformation that is, unfortunately, making the rounds.

Board Member Wimmer: Is that something that Martin might be putting together for the day before the conference? Is that something that you could invite the realtors too? You'd have an audience I'm sure. I'll come.

Board Member Bernstein: That's a great idea.

Board Member Wimmer: Why not and then hey, it's preservation week and I bet you get a ton of realtors if it's after hours.

Ms. French: I would pile on to the reach out to realtor's concept. We are – with the Eichler updates we had a member of the public – I think you have At Places, comment on has there been enough outreach on Eichler Guidelines. So, I do recall in the past going out with the Chief Building Official to a realtor group and they had these monthly meetings or something. We've done that from time to time when there are some critical ordinances coming through to give a heads up to the realtor community. I think it's worthy of, again to make sure there no misinformation about what this document is or isn't. I think it might be important to reach out to them...

Board Member Wimmer: Maybe at that time having some handouts, just some basic one-page handouts or something that doesn't cost a lot of money to the product but is something that's available and even has a reference of for more information, go to the website – go to the Palo Alto website.

Ms. French: So, I'm looking to do this in March or even sooner if I can to – because there's – we're leading up to Council review of the Eichler Guidelines. So, if there's somebody that wants to partner with us here from the HRB, we'd be happy to pull you in.

Chair Bower: We certainly should invite them to our Mills Act review. That's something that would be, I think, of great use to them. Martin, you had a question? Comments?

Board Member Bernstein: Going to the slide that Emily is showing about what's working and what isn't, I have a comment on that. That question came up during the recent City Council HRB applicant questions and that was one of the questions. My response to that question when I was asked that was I gave the example of – in San Francisco. I've done about six or seven projects in San Francisco now and the first step is a historic review. We've had a project where it's almost like the last step and we've had buildings, especially commercial buildings, come before us with completely designed floor plans, where the kitchen sinks are, where the refrigerators are and then it comes to HRB, hey guys, what do you think? My comment during that interview was that no way will a developer say oh sure, I'll put that third-story on this side over here where all the engineering and everything has been done. San Francisco is you can't even go to the next step until you have a historic review so that would be my question from historic preservation. It's really effective, that's the first step, not last. I don't know, for that to happen does that require an ordinance change for that process or is it just a change in procedure? I don't know.

Ms. French: I would ask Martin, in San Francisco are these listed resources?

Chair Bower: No.

Board Member Bernstein: No but the – they are potential. They...

Ms. French: Ok so there's been some kind of windshield survey where they've been identified as cute or something...

Board Member Bernstein: Correct, yes, that's it.

Ms. French: ... and needing further study?

Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

Chair Bower: Martin and I have both have had this experience. The San Francisco has a ministerial process, it is assumed every building is historic and you have to demonstrate it's not.

Board Member Bernstein: I agree.

Chair Bower: I actually last year brought to a meeting the application and shared it with the Board. It's a very simple process in San Francisco because you can go to the San Francisco Historic Library which is in the main library building in the Civic Center and you just look up – they have all these resources. You look up your property and create some kind of narrative. In most cases, the buildings aren't historic and that takes you out of the loop but you have to do a little bit of legwork and what it does is it preserves their historic buildings. In case – in my experience, my daughter's building is in the Liberty Hill Historic District and that automatically puts it into a different category. It's an original building, it's a Victorian and in that district, all the facades are protected. So, you understand that before you even begin the design process, what you have to do in order to have a successful application.

Board Member Bernstein: Chair Bower?

Chair Bower: Go ahead.

Board Member Bernstein: Chair Bower is pointing out something really significant. So, in San Francisco the cultural view is presumed to be historic, prove that it's not and here it's well, do we really need (inaudible). So, it almost addresses Board Member Wimmer's comment about maybe having such an incentive where people just want to apply, it's presumed to be and then – so that's another approach. It's presumed to be historic, prove that it's not is another approach.

Chair Bower: Michael, did you have a comment?

Board Member Makinen: No. Excuse me.

Board Member Wimmer: Are we going to discuss the – so I think since January there's a new rule or a new ordinance where if your parcel report says you're deemed eligible, then you have to go through – is that true? That – So, I got – I just got a call from someone who said I have this house, I wasn't even sure where the house was but – and I wanted to do all these remodelings. I went through an IR with Arnold, it was pretty much approved but then Emily came in and said I had to have this historic evaluation report done. It's going to cost me \$7,000 blah blah blah. I was like – I mean I don't mean to – but this was where – why I – I just want to become more informed about is there a new policy since January and so maybe if – is that something we can discuss or is that on our agenda today?

Ms. Vance: That was the Comp. Plan update (crosstalk)...

Board Member Wimmer: (inaudible)

Ms. Vance: ... L-7.2 where we must consider whether properties are eligible for state or national register and whether minor changes will affect the architecture of potentially historic buildings. So, this is where we – excuse me – this is where we are in that – in implementing this new policy. We get several a week, particularly if one goes on the market and now suddenly everyone is calling about this potentially eligible designation. Our – the way that we've been approaching this so far – we actually have a meeting later today about this very topic and I think one next week with the attorneys about how to best approach the issues coming – arising from this. In the past, a potentially eligible designation did not really stop you from much. It didn't stop you from demoing, it didn't stop you from altering and you didn't even need historic approval, that's changing now. So, for some of them I can – for some of the ones that have come through already, this is not how we're going to do it in the future but I'm undertaking the assessment of the building which I've spent a few days over at the archives and I'm pulling together information to make an educated determination of eligibility. That takes time, it takes a lot of time and it takes – its kind of a strain on our limited resources already so in the future we want to have a clear path for applicants whether it's a DPR Form, HRE, whatever it is, that's where that \$7,000 number came from. In the past HREs for a residential one-story, that's what it cost...

Ms. French: That includes our overhead.

Ms. Vance: ...and that includes our overhead which is a lot and...

Ms. French: (inaudible – off mic) 25%.

Ms. Vance: Yeah, the overhead is 25% which is what we tack onto it which we don't want – we don't really want to pursue this avenue of making everyone at the last minute pay an extra – huge amount of money and when it comes back not eligible, fine. They can continue with their project with no further historic review. If it comes back as eligible, now we have another conversation. We don't have – we have not perfectly hammered how we're implementing this new policy.

Chair Bower: Any other comments? We – I think we are near the end of this portion of the agenda since you are on the last – you were on your last slide before we jump back?

Ms. Vance: This is the last slide, there's nothing – that's just a picture of...

Ms. French: (inaudible – off mic) going next.

Ms. Vance: This is where we are going next so we have until 10:30.

Ms. French: If anyone has a car like that, we could...

Ms. Vance: There are the girl scouts...

Chair Bower: You've hired an antique car? Classic car to take us over there. Brandon, you could walk home and get yours. Alright so if we're done with this portion, there's not much left on our...

Action Items

Approval of Minutes

Ms. French: There are no minutes to...

Chair Bower: There are no minutes.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: There are no subcommittee items or are there? No.

Ms. Vance: No, the Mills Act subcommittee, we can probably confirm at a time to present and maybe if we wanted to meet one more time prior, that would be ideal.

Chair Bower: Sure, just to look at the revisions...

Ms. Vance: Yeah, to kind of look over...

Chair Bower: ...that we talked – last talked about.

Ms. Vance: What I've done is I've incorporated all of the comments from our last conversation and we kind of have this nice tailored program outlined. I imagine the further comments we get from the Board would be much appreciated.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: So, Board Member question? I – (inaudible)?

Board Member Bernstein: I was wondering if staff wants to make any comment or do any Board Members have any comment on the letter received from the public?

Ms. French: Yes, the letter At Places from Mr. or [Dr. Nierenberg], I did respond to [Dr. Nierenberg] and that was I believe transmitted to the Council Members but they also – he did also send it to the Historic Resources Board. Mr. Nierenberg, I believe he was in attendance at the Mitchell Park community meeting on the 18th and raised this concern about only 150 have made comments on the Eichler Guidelines. So, I have responded to him and we are expanding our outreach and we've had, let's see, how many meetings? November 9th, we had – October 12th we had a report about it, the whole process and then -- for the HRB. Then we had on November 9th, it was on the agenda and that's when we distributed the public review draft. We had a meeting on December 14th and then January 25th and we have not had a high attendance but that is not unusual for the HRB meetings. We're going to ramp up our outreach with plastering all 2,700 homes Eichler tracts with a bright green flyer saying hey, guess what we've got here and you're welcome to come to the HRB meeting on the 22nd. Then, of course, when it goes to Council, we will do something similar with maybe an even brighter color just to make sure that we aren't – we are heard. In addition, I mentioned the realtor outreach so we're working on those next steps. We do have this website that we keep updated – Emily keeps updated weekly with where we are so – and I think you'll be pleased with the changes to the guidelines that are coming to you on the 22nd. That is about that.

Board Member Bernstein: I spoke to a real estate agent about five days ago and I asked her about it. She said she had no knowledge about any Eichler Guideline discussion so yeah, outreach somehow to the real estate.

Board Member Wimmer: Has there been any effort for the Palo Alto Weekly or the Daily to write an article about it? I mean...

Ms. French: That's the other outreach to proactively ask (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: I think they would be interested in writing an article about it.

Ms. French: Yeah, it would be – I mean we did have and as noted in on our website, we've had KOED, Rachel Miro actually did an interview, put it on a podcast and I spoke with her for that. We've had Michael – gosh, David Weinstein? Has done two blogs on it and he was in attendance at the community meeting on the 18th and has uploaded blogs. So, the Eichler Design network is it – so people that are focused on Eichlers through that method are – may be seeing those. You know people are busy.

Board Member Wimmer: I think it would make a really great front-page article for the Weekly. Someone makes it sound really controversial and maybe if someone calls them and says hey, this is a great idea for an article (inaudible).

Ms. French: Yeah, I don't know if it should be you know definitely controversial...

Board Member Wimmer: Well, I say that (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Ms. French: ... because these are voluntary guidelines but...

Board Member Wimmer: ... because it makes the paper more interested in making a...

Ms. French: I mean if the post wants to sell newspapers, you know if they are listening, they could – they do a good job of that.

Vice Chair Corey: I mean...

Chair Bower: Karen, you had a comment?

Council Member Holman: I was just going to say I think staff deserves an awful lot of credit for how much outreach they have done and how many community meetings they've had and quite frankly, for 150 residents to be interviewed and contacted regarding this is a lot. I mean if you look at – you can have a meeting about – pick a topic and if you get 50 people to get engaged, it's a lot. So, I'm somebody who's always like make things public, transparent, you know get the community engaged but I think you've done a tremendous job. I really do.

Ms. French: I would add to that, that I'm not a resident of Palo Alto, Emily is not a resident of Palo Alto but many of you are. I've had to go to extreme measures such as go visit my parents and look at their computer Next Door to see what's being said about all of the Eichler Guidelines. Mr. Nierenberg was posting there and there are other people, Penny Ellison, posted. I provided some information to another person in Green Meadow that posted correct factual information so that's always an avenue for folks to post factual information on places like Next Door or what have you. I agree that the Weekly, Palo Alto Online would be an appropriate place to drum up interest and participation conversation and controversy if that's what we're looking for. I'm not looking for that.

Chair Bower: So, it's 10:15 and we're supposed to be over at the Girl Scout House at 10:30?

Ms. Vance: We're meeting Karen at 11.

Chair Bower: At 11, ok.

Ms. Vance: So, I figured if we wrapped up by 10:30 we'd have plenty of time.

Chair Bower: One question I have that's going to come up is Brown Act training. I think that it's been 2-years since I've had it and the City has had the Brown Act training and we all have to do that every 2-years. So, could you check just...

Ms. Vance: Yeah, we'll look into that and I can – when I send the summary of the meeting out, I can mention something about if there's a training coming up?

Chair Bower: It's much better to do that training in this room than it is online and I can tell you from experience. Alright, any other comments? Questions? Contributions?

Ms. French: Does everyone have a ride over to the facility there because we are going to be borrowing a City carpool car if anyone would like a ride?

Chair Bower: I need a ride.

Ms. French: Ok. We have two?

Chair Bower: Alright, if there are no other comments we're adjourned.

Adjournment



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: February 22, 2018

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

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower; Vice Chair Brandon Corey, Board Member Margaret Wimmer, Roger Kohler, Michael Makinen, Martin Bernstein

Absent:

Chair Bower: We have a quorum so we'll open the meeting. Would the staff please call roll?

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: Good, first up on our agenda is oral communications. Anyone that wants to speak to any item not on the agenda is welcome to do that right now. I don't have any cards for that.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: Let's move on to the next item which is agenda changes, announcements, additions, deletions.

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Just that I have one announcement as that we have a subcommittee item, 526 Waverley, that's going after today's meeting after we adjourn. So, we've already contacted the Board Members who are involved in that and they've said they are available. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. We actually have people here today which is a remarkable occurrence for us and I'm assuming that the bulk of the people here are here to talk about the Eichler Guidelines. So, we have one agenda item before that and I'd like Board Members, if they can, to be very concise in their comments about the Junior Museum which is first up on our agenda.

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Study Session

Action Items

New Business

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL: 1451 Middlefield Road [18PLN-00042]:** Modification to Roof Material for the New Junior Museum and Zoo Building Approved by City Council in December 2017. Zone District: Public Facilities.

Chair Bower: Staff report?

Ms. French: Yes, I'm going to keep it brief as well. We have our applicants here who will go through their PowerPoint. This will be going to the Architectural Review Board on March 1st. The Council approved this project and – back in December and this is just a minor change to address what the applicant is going to tell you about.

Ms. Sarah Vaccaro: Great and the material boards here. Good morning Board Members, thank you for having us today. Let me make this full size. I cannot read that. I think it's just off this – full screen, there we go. Great. Just a quick recap of the existing site conditions. The existing Junior Museum and Zoo sits here. Also, on the large City-owned parcel is the historic Category I Lucie Stern Community Center, as well as the eligible historic resource of the Lou Henry Hoover Girl Scout House. The Rinconada Park sits here, adjacent is the Walter Hayes Elementary School and then across the way is a residential neighborhood. In our proposed site plan, we're making big improvements to clarify site circulation for pedestrians, bikes, and vehicles. We're also reorganizing the JMZ to create a more civic presence for that institution and referring the Lucie Stern in a lot of the form and layout of the building. We were presented to the full HRB back in June of last year. This was the rendering that we brought forward at that point in time. In general, the Board was very favorable with the design. There were concerns about the color of the material – the metal roofing material that also turned onto the exterior walls in some locations so we worked with a subcommittee on a number of color variations. This was one of the interim variations that we studied upon comments from the HRB subcommittee, ARB, and the community. This was the ultimate design that we presented and was approved last year by City Council in December. It has a taupe colored standing metal seam roof with cement plaster siding on the walls and some areas of wood siding for accents. We are here today to present a roofing change to you so going from a standing metal seam roof to a composite shingle roof. While I understand that it's not part of the HRB's purview to review cost implications, this roofing change will save the project about almost half a million dollars which will allow us to stay in budget and keep very important, exciting visitor experience in the project. We are proposing, again going from a taupe colored standing metal seam roof to a composite asphalt single roof in a light sage green color. The durability of this roof is not quite as durable as the standing metal seam. However, we can get a warranty for – a full warranty for up to 20-years and then an extended warranty for 21-50-years beyond that. This is just a quick aesthetic image of the standing metal seam roof versus the composite shingles that we're presenting today. This is a rendering from Middlefield, you can see we've replaced the roofing with the composite shingle so it will be visible along Middlefield. From the main entrance in the parking lot, you can see the roofing in the distance but it's a pretty – there's not a lot of view to the roof from this perspective. Just to circle back to the surrounding context, the Lucie Stern complex has a clay tile roof with cement plaster walls. The Lou Henry Hoover Girl Scout House has composite single roof and vertical wood siding. The existing JMZ which will be demolished when our new building is built, it does have a wood shingle roof just as a point of reference. Then across Middlefield most – almost all of the residential houses have composite shingle roofing that's in direct context. One point of consideration, it's not part of the current project but we are planning in the next 5 to 10-years to add photovoltaic panels to the roof. It will cover almost half of the roof surface and that will allow us to generate energy onsite. So, the panels will be attached directly on top of the composite shingle roof like these images show. Then a longer-term consideration, again not part of the project we're proposing today, but in 10-20-years when the composite shingle roof starts to age, there's an opportunity with the extreme advances in photovoltaic roofing that the Friends and the City could opt to replace the roofing with a photovoltaic roofing. This is an example of the Tesla roofing tiles that will allow for site generation of energy, as well as a more comprehensive look for the roofing system. That's it for our presentation. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Can you just hold on for a second? Any question by the Board Members? I have a couple short ones. No questions. So, I'm pleased that we're saving money as a Palo Alto resident. Everyone here who is a resident is happy about that. I think that this a more appropriate material choice, I didn't like the standing seam roof. When you said that you could get an extended 21 to 50-year warranty, I'm assuming that's on the materials, correct?

Ms. Vaccaro: Correct. I believe so but I can verify that though.

Chair Bower: Just so the public who is watching this at home knows the material cost on any project – roofing project is a minor portion of the actual roof contract. So, while that helps, my understanding of the warranties, which is now 5-years back because I've been retired for 5-years, is that it could be prorated. Even if it was 100% of the cost, it would be minimal but do you know whether – do you know anything about the warranty at all? Is just for materials – it is just for materials?

Ms. Vaccaro: I have the documentation. I haven't memorized it so I could forward it for further reference.

Chair Bower: In the best case – ok, in the best case then it is as I suspect which is just the materials. It's a small amount but savings is savings so I think that was my only question. Alright, anybody else with a question? Roger.

Board Member Kohler: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: Well, if there is no other input on this, let's pull it back to the Board and then have a Board discussion. Thank you for that presentation. Alright, Board comments?

Board Member Kohler: I was just going to say I've had asphalt roofing on my house now for, I don't know, 12-year, 13-years and it still look brand new in a way. It's a higher quality and it looks great so I think it's a good choice practical and will probably last a lot longer than what you think. No problem for me.

Chair Bower: Any other – Martin – Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I was going to ask a quick question. So, the specification that you gave us, it's a cool roof – it's a cool roofing and I was wondering if you might just state for our education as to why would you go with a cool roofing solution as opposed to a traditional roof solution? I'm sure – it said that its less solar absorption on – in the material and it reflects heat – the heat.

Ms. Vaccaro: Correct. Should I respond now?

Chair Bower: Please.

Ms. Vaccaro: Yes, you're exactly right. Basically, it reduces the amount of heat that the roof will absorb which impacts how much energy we need to cool the building inside. The cool roof requirement is actually a California Green Building Code requirement so there are limited roofing types that meet that requirements. That's what the cool roof product information is in regards too. Then quickly how did you arrive at the color of the sage green color?

Ms. Vaccaro: In the product data you have there are only four-color options that fall into the cool roof category that meets the Green Building Code. We thought the sage green was a nice compliment to the white cement plaster and the wood accents that we're proposing.

Chair Bower: If I can jump in here before you leave? Do you know what the color of the Girl Scout building roof is?

Ms. Vaccaro: It's a brown – it's hard to tell in this image but it's brown. It's very similar to the vertical wood siding color.

Chair Bower: It is a composition -- it's a composition roof?

Ms. Vaccaro: Correct.

Chair Bower: Ok, thank you. Other comments? Michael.

Board Member Makinen: I think I actually favor this over the metal roof that we saw originally. I think it provides significant cost savings. I don't know what the cost of this roof is – the actual cost of it but if we saved...

Chair Bower: Half a million.

Board Member Makinen: ... half a million bucks, you know go for it.

Chair Bower: Brandon.

Vice Chair Corey: I'm going – I'm a little – I think contrary in here but I actually dislike the composite roof. I think the metal actually does look better. I think composite in general tends to be done because its cheap but I do understand cost savings. I must be in the wrong business if it's a half a million dollars delta to do a roof but I appreciate your thoughts on saving money anyway.

Chair Bower: Alright, Martin you're the only on that hasn't made a comment.

Board Member Bernstein: I agree with Board Member Kohler about the durability of it. I have a composition shingle room on my residence and it was installed in 1992 and it still looks new.

MOTION

Chair Bower: Alright, no other comments? I also forgot to acknowledge that Councilwomen Holman is here with this morning. Thank you for coming, as you always do. Would you—any comments you'd like to make? Alright, so I'm looking for a motion to move this forward. Well, I can craft a motion so I would – let's see. So, I think we need to say that this complies with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for a differentiated but complementary material for the roof because we have two historic buildings within sight of this building. I would – let see—and that this is an approved by the Historic Resources Board as being appropriate for this building. I'm open to any other suggestions. Alright, no – do we have a second?

Board Member Kohler: I'll second it if you...

Chair Bower: Alright. I don't see any other comments so I think we can probably move this forward to a vote so all in favor of approving this as appropriate meeting of the Secretary of Interior's Standards and being appropriate roof material and cover for the museum please say aye. None opposed.

Vice Chair Corey: No, I opposed.

Chair Bower: Oh, sorry. Brandon opposed, alright so we're 5-1.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-1

Chair Bower: I just didn't hear you.

Vice Chair Corey: It's ok. Well, I didn't say (inaudible).

Chair Bower: Thank you very much. I'm hoping this makes it through the ARB without modification and they'll hear that on March 2nd.

Continued Business

3. PUBLIC HEARING: Historic Resources Board Recommendation of the Palo Alto Eichler Neighborhood Design Guidelines to the City Council

Chair Bower: Alright, we'll move to new business – I'm sorry, to our continued business which is a public hearing of the Eichler Neighborhood Design Guidelines. I'd like to remind anyone in the audience that if you'd like to speak to this item, please fill out one of these cards and give it to one of our staff members. Staff report?

Ms. French: Yes, hello. Coordinating so thank you for announcing that speaker cards are what we need to track who's speaking today. This application – this project has come before you initially in November, then December, then January and now today. We've been at this for about a year with many workshops and attended by not everybody but a core group and some others more recently that heard that there might be a potential for regulatory. Right now, that is not the case. We are looking at guidelines voluntary in nature and going to Council in April at this point. So, here we are today and here's the track. We have a website devoted to this project, we have ways that folks can get an email – e-blasts when they sign up, we recently blanketed all Eichler neighborhoods with notice cards and it was an undertaking. We don't have ready lists of Eichler folks but we did undertake that and we will do it again prior to the Council meeting. These are the Eichler neighborhoods in town. I've spoken with one Eichler tract that is interested in removing the single-story overlay but that's only one...

Board Member Kohler: What did you say?

Ms. French: I've spoken with one...

Board Member Kohler: Remove what?

Ms. French: Remove the single-story overlay zoning.

Board Member Kohler: Oh, ok.

Ms. French: It's an application process, only one tract. Just a quick recap, the staff report presented all of this. What's changed is you have a copy of both the annotated draft that shows the changes since you last saw these guidelines and the draft that is – has those changes incorporated. So, the one draft that shows in orange the changes and the draft that will go to City Council. So, overview quickly, FAQs have been incorporated in an early section hopefully to communicate to folks that this is voluntary. We've tried to hit that point several times; you know how will we use it? We would like to utilize these guidelines when we do individual review of two-story homes and second-floor additions. The Council would have to, of course, adopt an ordinance regarding that so that's not even happening in April. That would be after April if the Council so chooses to direct staff to come back. There are some key points of this, community values, that's been verified. The chapter on maintenance is now a later chapter, the new construction is now an earlier chapter, and Chapter 8 was modified to remove some of that language that was causing people to mistakenly believe that this was somehow regulatory. It is not regulatory, this is voluntary. I'll just say one more time, this is a voluntary set of guidelines that are being proposed. With that, I think we need to get to the public but if you have any questions or comments, staff would like to hear from you and as to the current set of guidelines.

Chair Bower: Just as a recap, Board Members have received two of these which is the proposed guidelines. The original that we have reviewed earlier at one of our meetings and also all of us have read and then a new annotated version which has orange changes. I will tell – because they are not available for the member of the public that are here, there are substantial changes that address a number of the comments that were made on the website or directly emailed to City staff. There are 236 comments that are in our package today. I've looked at all of them, they are pretty extensive and we'll get to a discussion of the whole – the guidelines and these comments later. Let's move to the public – hearing from the public because we have – I currently have eight cards, I'd like to limit this to three minutes. I request that if someone else has already spoken to an issue that you feel is important, simply note that

you concur with that rather than spending the time basically saying the same thing that's already been said. We want to – we have lots of work to do here so the first person on the list is Ken Vently followed by Cynthia [phonetics][Ishimoto]. Please state your name so that the...

Mr. Ken Vently: My name is Ken Vently, I live in an Eichler house near Gun High School in Maybell Gardens. A day and a half ago I got this and they gave me a day and a half to come up with a response. However, living in an Eichler, I've been there for a long time and I'd like to ask anyone of you if anyone of you ever owned or lived in an Eichler house? Good. Anyway, that questions been answered. The problem I see in this report – there are a number of them – one of them is they spent a lot of time on remodeling, doing things to existing Eichlers and we have a neighbor who had three additions on the roof of an Eichler and they are atrocious. Is was done years ago before this was even a discussed issue. We now have three houses in our tract and there are six that have been torn down and that other types of architectural styles. My question to you and into this report is that if you'll note in one of the pages here, Page – get my glasses on – 78, adding a basement to an Eichler. Give me a break. I mean you tare the house down essentially so we build a new Eichler I peruse for a basement but it does say something in here very close. If a basement is added, residents should be aware that it may result in a house that is visibly higher than its neighbors. All the houses that are being built in Palo Alto now are in perimeter foundations. Nobody is building a slab house anymore like an Eichler so I might show to you that when this takes place -- this was on the cover of the 2000 – June 26, 2015, article on Eichler rising. I think some of you have seen it. Whoever the artist was that did it did the greatest extortion and it fits exactly what I'm trying to say. We'll show you later. Eichler house, two-story house. Eichler house – I mean two-story house sitting on a slab foundation, that is a joke. In here it says that – there's one article here – I have three-minutes so that's why I'm moving fast. In neighborhoods that are not in flood zones, in my case it isn't, residents – flood zone designs new residents so that the floor level heights conform to those of a surrounding Eichler residence. You can't do that. An Eichler is that high off the ground at best. You start out with the perimeter foundation, you're going like this; maybe higher. As you said in here, if you build a basement then you may have a higher one. Now with today's standards, no one wants an 8-foot high ceiling. They want a 9-foot plate one, they want something higher. I have one being built or there is one being built in our neighborhood so we're already starting with a foot and a half, maybe, at the basement or the floor level – foundation level, then you've got floor space, 9-foot ceiling, then you've got another floor and it's a goner for an Eichler. So, this privacy issue and people looking down on you, we have it. We have one a diagonal (inaudible) out of the backyard of our house, one was built there. We don't have a strong neighborhood organization like the so-called National Registration thing. My Eichler is a Jones and Emmons Eichler. It came even before the (inaudible) and as you know -- my problem with Eichlers is they build too many of them in Palo Alto but when they built them, there was a great and interesting intention why built them.

Chair Bower: You're three minutes....

Mr. Vently: It was an aesthetic...

Chair Bower: Could you summarize?

Mr. Vently: I'm going to summarize.

Chair Bower: Thanks.

Mr. Vently: Thank you. I'm very upset about the problem. I resent the fact that my house is not in a zone which has some privilege which the others evidently have in this so-called National Registration. I have a number of other things but thank you for your three minutes.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Mr. Vently. Cynthia [Ishimoto], please. I'm sorry, I'm not very good at pronouncing names.

Ms. Cynthia [Ishimoto]: [Ishimoto]

Chair Bower: [Ishimoto] and Steve Lewis is next up.

Ms. Ishimoto: Let's see, I'm going to admit that I'm kind of clueless as far as what the guidelines are.

Chair Bower: Could you just say your name one more time.

Ms. Ishimoto: My name is Cynthia Ishimoto.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Ms. Ishimoto: I'm going to admit that I am clueless to what the guidelines are. I'm not able to get involved in this because – well, this is what I have. Let's see, I'm going to backtrack. Eichlers, for those of you who don't know it, is a mid-century modern house that has a lot of glass. I think one of the reasons why we have so many people going to the second level is because it has really poor storage. In my house, we have 5-foot closets for everybody and that's really not enough. The slanting roof means you have even less storage and glass walls, even less storage. The reason I am here is because I've tried – I inquired about putting in an extension that would fit within the look – the aesthetics of an Eichler and I was told that I could not do it because of privacy rules. Basically, there's a setback in my house, there are a garage, carport and a setback and I wanted to bring it forward. I was told I could not do it because of privacy reasons; even though I met the setback from the sidewalk, that was acceptable. So, I would like to find out what I can do and does the guidelines have anything that addresses what I want to do which is pull the one section of my house forward and have it aesthetically match my two neighbors? Is there anything that I can do to affect the guidelines or do I have an appeal process to figure out what I can do so that I can do more storage for my house? That's it.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. Steve Lewis and John Melnychuk?

Mr. John Melnychuk: (inaudible – spoke from the audience)

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Mr. Steve Lewis: Hi, my name is Steve Lewis and I'm here for my neighbor Pat Wayne. He and I have been talking about Eichlers for years and years. We moved in in '56 and '57. He basically found out and we looked at the research guideline. We like the guidelines as it was presented. We don't like to see it as a rule. There are so many Eichlers as you go down our streets that wouldn't match the rules as they are now with the guidelines. Now you have (inaudible) two-stories, I think three or four in our neighbor. You've got ones that have been modified with different garage doors, different siding, different plumbing, heating and air conditioning on the roof that looks obnoxious but that's the way they are. That's the beauty of an Eichler and the guidelines do address a lot of the shortcomings of the Eichler homes. We've all learned to put up with them and that's what makes them unique. It's probably what, as we in Eichler's like to believe, it is some of the best houses in the neighborhood. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you very much. John and then Diane Reckless.

Mr. Melnychuk: I'm John Melnychuk, I live in Fair Meadow, I have a home there since 2002. It's an original home built in 1952. I'm surrounded on either side by original owners from 1952, quite elderly people. I was involved in an ad hoc group in 2011 to get a single-story overlay for Fair Meadow and our effort failed. This was something that happened with David Toy and five other members or five other neighborhood members. We collected our petitions, we got the City to send a survey out and at the last moment Vice Chairmen Tuma who was Chair or Vice Chair of the Architectural Board at the time said single-handedly that he would prefer to have things go forward only if 80% of respondents support the idea of a single-story overlay. We couldn't understand this at the time, you can check the tapes. I was speaking a little more loudly than I am right now when I responded to that. We have a concern in our home in our neighborhood about slow emergent and creeping in of different architectural styles. Two-story houses, that destroys our privacy and that destroys our daylight planes. Any of you would be

welcome to come and visit our home to have a look for yourself to see what it feels like inside and you could very easily be able to see what would happen with a two-story home next door or on either side of us. We're glad that some guidelines are being developed here. For myself, I'm disappointed that we didn't achieve a single-story overlay. I'd still like to see that happen. I don't know – that's beyond the scope of what your discussion is today but I'm putting my two-sense in. Thank you so much for looking at this issue and I think that the Eichler's themselves are actually, as a group, valuable as historic elements in our City. We recognize that in our one neighborhood already and by attrition we're getting Spanish style homes, two-stories with stucco, with tile roofs and so on. That's diminishing the quality of the aesthetic in the neighborhood as far as I'm concerned. Thank you so much.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments. Michael Nuremburg will follow Diane Reckless.

Ms. Diane Reckless: Hi, I'm Diane Reckless and I've lived in an Eichler for almost 40-years now. This document was really well done. There was an awful lot of good stuff in it but there's a leaning towards a stand-alone ADU. I'll address just ADUs and the stand along versus attached. In particular, the one in the rear and for some reason the ones in the rear or the detached could be 900-square feet. It was part of the house it would have to be 600. If you take 900, most of our houses are about twice that so you're taking half the size of a current Eichler and sticking it in the backyard. Even beyond that, if its – the pictures make it look like a little playhouse, it's not, it's big. Let me take you on a walk in my neighborhood which is in a flood zone so if you put a standalone it has to start 3 or 4-feet up. If you tried to get there in the backyard, you either have to walk past every single bedroom where kids are likely to be sleeping to get there or you have to walk past three walls of glass or two walls of glass. Then you get to the backyard and you're sitting behind the master bedroom which is another wall of glass. This doesn't seem like it's going to be very nice. Those of you who haven't lived in an Eichler, please come spend some real quality time in an Eichler. Don't just walk through fast but imagine what it would be like. I think – I really favor ADUs but I hadn't conceived till the middle of the night how big 900-square feet is and think through moving them into the front, not separate units. I don't think – they wouldn't fit in our house – excuse me – our neighborhood at least but attached ones could go very nicely. Do – you'd have to move the setbacks in some cases but within reason that makes sense. Today's kids aren't there to play in the playground or play in the front yard. We're not allowed to water the grass so – or not allowed, we shouldn't so setbacks don't make as much sense as they did 60-years ago. Make them smaller, make the houses make sense and please, really make the back-yard ones not very logical in most neighborhoods. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you for those comments. Alright, Marco – Mark – Michael [Nuremburg]. Ming Zhao will be following.

Mr. Michael Nuremburg: I'm Michael [Nuremburg] and I've lived in an Eichler for over 40-years. We've remodeled three times and put on a second story all (inaudible) with the neighborhoods ok, the design and basically kept it as an Eichler with those changes. So, I'm actually here altruistically and this doesn't apply to me anymore but I'm concerned because I really think the study and the process is tremendously flawed. There are 2,700 Eichlers in Palo Alto. The people who constructed the paperwork had basically interviewed a 150. Of the three meetings only 90 people have attended those and of – now I didn't see the latest emails but I reviewed every 233 emails prior to this, only 27 people sent those in so I don't think this adequate representation. By the way, I've spoken to major real estate people in Palo Alto who have never even heard what was going on so despite the fact that this has supposable been publicized I totally disagree. More importantly, I think freezing the Eichlers in time really can have a potential problem. As new materials come along, new looks and things, we might be missing out on siding, roofing, things that actually can make our homes better and not worse as we've done in our case. There's also a statement this is not about a single-story overlay and yet on page 90 – let's see 74, there's a picture of two Eichlers with a line going across and something above it on the structure which obviously is saying we are talking about a single-structure overlay so make no (inaudible) about it. We've also heard that this is voluntary at nauseam, it is not. There is a three-tiered process, in your notes, how this can actually become something that the City can mandate and dictate and I really think that's a problem. I'm not here to address second-story or single-story overlay but I will say there are many multi-

generational families that are now being prejudicially left out of these communities. They can't live in Eichlers and I do want to remind you there's something called the Anti-NIMBY law which I think was passed in California in 1982 where you can't discriminate against neighborhoods in terms of moving forward with development. It seems to me that this skirts that pretty closely and there have already been two suits, Lafayette and Berkley, that have been lost. So, I would like to see us put our money into other things rather than this and not be in court over these things if they do become regulations. My concern truly is I'm not sure there's been enough publicity and enough transparency. If the community truly wants to freeze Eichlers in time, I'm totally with that but I don't think that's the case. I also think that's wrong to do so thank you for listening.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments. Ming Zhao followed by [Dr. Mandel]. Pardon me for mispronouncing that.

Mr. Ming Zhao: Hi, my name is Ming Zhao and I live in an Eichler house. I like to concur with the previous – what the previous gentleman said. I don't think it's the right thing to freeze the Eichler in time. Especially – I mean I like certain design aspect of the Eichler house but I really don't like the certain choices made by Eichler. For example, the flat roof, it might be good in look but it doesn't really – it really costs a lot for long-term – long time maintenance because of lack of adequate space. For example, last year I had to do some remodeling for my house. I had to open the roof because there was no other way to run the electrical lines to add some lights and because the roof was open I had to reroof and because we have the pipe running on the roof because there was no other place to run the pipes other than digging in the ground. So, -- but the roofer told me that we had to remove the pipes before they applied the – before they can reroof and then after the roof is done they had to add the pipes back which cost me about \$5,000, while adding nothing to the house, just to reroof. It's an Eichler house and that's this kind of hidden cost that's kind of been inherited from this short card that was taken when the original house was made. I think this – I don't think we should try to mandate certain design choice just because some people like that or some people don't like that. Other than that, I don't have other additional opinions other than what the previous gentleman – Michael said. I really appreciate his comments. Thanks. Thanks for the effort.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Dr. Mandel followed by Sunita Verma.

Mr. Manis Mandel: Good morning everyone. My name is name is Manis Mandel, I'm a homeowner in Fair Meadow tract. I've been reading these guidelines since I think October (inaudible) and they seemed to have changed. On page 26 there's a big section called CC&Rs and this says this Eichler Neighborhood Guideline supports and expands upon Eichler tracts CC&Rs where appropriate.

Chair Bower: Excuse me – yeah, can you...

Mr. Mandel: Sorry.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Mr. Mandel: On page 26 of the document of the final draft it says the Eichler Neighborhood Design Guideline document supports and expands upon the Eichler tract CC&Rs where appropriate and in adherence to the current City planning code. In Appendix A, Turnbull and Page described in detail how they went through and found these Eichler tracts and they discussed the CC&Rs but these no evidence the CC&Rs even exist so I began digging into it and I asked Director French like do we have any CC&Rs on file. Director French told me that they are aware of at least three CC&Rs or of more than three CC&Rs and of course I believe her. I – when I bought my family house in 19 – in 2005, my title did not have a CC&Rs so I began digging into the CC&R. One of the previous gentlemen described the failed SSO from Fair Meadow and that documented (inaudible) referred to a 1951 CC&R but after a property search, I found a 1952 CC&R signed not by Director Holms but by the San Jose Abstract Entitle Company data 7, June 1952 stating the following. "It is expressly agreed that the said declaration of CC&Rs are terminated as to and do not apply to are in any way affect, Fair Meadow." There is no CC&R in Fair Meadow so for

66-years Fair Meadow has lived free and clear of any restrictions of any CC&Rs. After 66-years of freedom, suddenly there's a document which claims to put new guidelines, it doesn't make sense. The law has already given individual rights to the homeowners of Fair Meadow that they are free. These rules, even though voluntary, they need to stay voluntary. There should be no discussion, there should be not slide presented saying that there could be a three-step process. There should be no (inaudible) attempt at all and if only three CC&Rs or four CC&Rs exist, we should change this document and say that out of the 32 tracts only four of them should be using the guidelines. The rest of them, because they are free, should not be subject to any guidelines. Let the individuals have their rights. There is no point of having overlays. A new (inaudible) was added which states the following, this is on page – sorry I'm looking at it – page 14. It says that...

Chair Bower: Excuse me, we're at 3-minutes so please (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Mr. Mandel: It says the prior guidelines would be used by the planning staff. I think it's unnecessary. The (inaudible) staff does not need any extra information because these are voluntary. Why on earth should the (inaudible) staff – so please remove all the overreaching document statements from this document. There's just too much overage, it is unnecessary. Give us the freedom to live out lives. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for sharing that. [Sunita Verma] followed by Margaret Murphy.

Ms. Sunita Verma: Hi, my name is Sunita Verma, I live on Ross Road in a two-story Eichler house since 2004 and like the gentleman said, we haven't had enough – I got this on Tuesday night and the meeting is this morning. I don't know – you can see how many people are not here who would like to speak, that's not very much notice. We need – if you want impute from the citizens, you need to give us more notice. We can't just show up and – from work and come show up here 8:30 in the morning. There should be different meetings at different times and the notice should be at least 2-week if not longer and like as mentioned I live on Ross Road. There's a lot of stuff going on there that we were never notified but that's different. What I want to say is if there are already guidelines that exist – I live right next door to a one-story single house and I've talked to my neighbors and we have no privacy issues. Our house is two-story, the one next to us is two-story and on the other side, they are not. So, if there are guidelines that are existing to protect those for privacy and another thing, why do we need to spend more money from the City to make more guidelines if they already exist? Let's take that money and use it for something else that we need for our City. For our teenagers or the youth who need some place to go hang out. There's nothing for the youth to hang out. There are no places for them to go hang out except the mall or the down (inaudible). Let's save our money for the other issues that are more important than spending money on something that already exists. That's all I have to say, thank you.

Chair Bower: Than you for that comment. Margaret Murphy and I think there's one other – is there – are there any more cards there?

Ms. Margaret Murphy: My name is Margaret Murphy, I received this notice yesterday and I would like to say that I live in an Eichler on Lewis Road. I would like to say that I concur with the comment regarding notice. This is an issue that is very important to me, it is very important to my neighbors and we were not given due notice. Please provide more notice and of course we will provide comments in email and in other forms. I do not believe this was correct. I would like to concur with Michaela and the others who have said that the study perhaps was not broad enough. Did not include enough examples. There are so many Eichlers, so many different experiences in this City. I think that you have a unique opportunity to do more in this area. I concur with my colleague who just spoke about the use of time and use of money. However, I disagree, I do think that this affects many, many people in this City in many different ways and I encourage you to look for solutions that include homeowners who have been here for a very long time and like their neighborhoods the way that they are. As well as newer homeowners and their concerns. I ask you to look at this seriously and not abandon this and I think that you've made some steps in the right direction but I encourage you to continue and to get broader input. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments. The last card that I have is from Sheila Chang.

Ms. Sheila Chang: My name is Sheila Chang, I've lived in my Eichler home for 30-years. Faced Asian Blue Shopping Center more and I would say -- I came here to just listen and now I have some comments. The first one that I'd like to say is the mention about CC&R. My house as two-stories and they built the second story in 1964. My house was built in 1954, the tract says that area is 1956, actually mine is '54. So, 1964 they built the second story by the previous owner and we bought that and it has been already 30-years. So, that means what's a CC&R? A couple years ago, many -- I can't remember -- (inaudible) would team up again Asian Blue Shopping Center's new owner because of a couple of reasons. The first because they built a low-income housing and a big market and (inaudible) school doesn't want more low-income kids. So, they said well we're overfull and then my neighbor, they have a or (inaudible) say oh, this Eichler. Oh, (inaudible) going to flood into our area so see we better sign so I signed. I had them over to my place given this drink and I signed the paper. We do a lot of (inaudible) and try against to damage an Eichler but actually, I'm glad we don't have this (inaudible) like overlay and you can build a second-story in that area. Eichler is very old, the structure is not very stable for two-story and also not very good for (inaudible) like termites or something like that. You ask me do I like Eichler? Yes. Do I appreciate this? I would say yes because I follow Sunny Vale when I say oh, awesome they have guidelines. Palo Alto has no guidelines. We have guidelines, that's wonderful but I'm not saying I stab it and say don't do anything. You have to keep this one with the worst foundation and a lot of things are not insulated properly. I wanted to say thank you very much to make this a guideline option and also don't believe a CC&R. Everybody followed that because they really want to keep that style, keep everything as is. We abuse old CC&R back to the day Eichler or the builder made that. That's just my experience, 30-years. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments and thank all of you who have come today. We hardly ever have an audience and I think all of the input that you have provided is useful. Let's take this back to the Board for discussion and I guess we'll close the public hearing portion of this. We can reopen it again if we need too. Board Members, comments, questions? Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Bower. I would like first of all to thank Amy and her staff for the email blast that have been going out to the neighborhoods so thanks for that. I know there have been requests from the neighbors to say what's going on and so thanks for your good response on that. I appreciate it. There have been a couple members of the public who spoke about getting a notice only one or two days earlier but I think you -- things were sent out more than one or two days ago, is that correct?

Ms. French: Correct. We -- this is the first time that we've sent notice to all of the Eichler addresses in the City. So, to that extent, yes, we have not been sending them out for the last year to every single Eichler address so this is the first time. We were able to get the work behind that to get all the addresses and sent that out but it wasn't two days ago. Perhaps the holidays...

Female: (inaudible -- off mic)

Ms. French: It's not a requirement, it's a courtesy flyer that we've sent out. Again, these are not voluntary -- these are voluntary, not mandatory so there's no obligation to send out. We've done what we could.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok well thank you for that response. Board and Chair Bower, I have -- I went through all the -- in the orange mark up one, I went page by page and I had comments on the different pages and each comment will result in also a question for staff.

Chair Bower: Ok, go through, that's what we're here for.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you so much. I'm just going to go each -- I went through the orange mark up page and then -- because those -- that's new wording. I'll just start with the question here and I'm just going to go right through the sequence here. I'll say the page numbers for reference so on page

number 13 on the right-hand side it says the guidelines are designed to help the City of Palo Alto Planning and Community Environment staff and review bodies in determining the appropriateness of the proposed work. My question where about determining appropriateness. Does that mean if the Planning Department decided that it's not appropriate, does that mean an applicant then could not proceed with a building permit?

Ms. French: This is a general statement and – where a National Register District or single-story overlay district, it is imposed or it is already placed on one of these tracts. It could be a conversation but no, there's no – nothing mandatory about this. It's a broad statement and it's not intended to be punitive or mandatory.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, ok thank you for that. Then -- let's see – then on the next page, 14, on the right – on the left-hand side it says the guidelines are currently voluntary, just ask you mentioned also. Then it also says on that left-hand side, so the purpose of this is to offer advice and that's a great thing. Education is fantastic. The middle it does say – the question says my home is not an Eichler but I live across the street with an Eichler. Will I be subject to design guidelines and the author of this document says possibly. So, that still leaves some question and some doubt for an applicant who's trying to make concrete decisions. It goes on to say, however, while your home may not be an Eichler, it may be within – so, there – so the fact that things are voluntary I think is – when things say possibly and may, again it's from someone who's trying to say well, am I affect it or not? The language of this may be not so clear.

Ms. French: Yes, actually I – Martin, thank you for that. I am looking this as well and seeing that on the first part about the – about are they mandatory? It does say the guidelines will be used concurrently with the Individual Review Guidelines. That could not take place unless – until the Council adopts an ordinance that connects these guidelines to the Individual Review process for two-story homes. So, we will need to change these before these go to Council to clarify that they only – in every case, only by Council adoption of an ordinance will these be in anyway utilized by staff for review.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, thank you. Page 18, the right-hand side it talks about – it says, for example, residents and homeowners and properties in Greenmeadow, Gables National Register Historic Districts may consider a stricter interpretation of the guidance. That would take a property owner initiative for that to become a stricter interpretation. For it to become – because right now it's not mandatory so a property owner initiative is required before any of these things become more strict. Just a comment.

Ms. French: Right so in the event that there are CC&Rs and the neighborhood is – does have an Architectural Control Committee, I'm only aware of two of those in the City, they could choose, it's voluntary again, to utilize these guidelines for those neighborhoods.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, thank you for that. On page 21 it talks about Individual Review process and the ordinance says that's only involved in second story additions of a certain scope. The IR also focuses on privacy, scale, massing, and streetscape and that's fine. That's a good process for that. When I read the 132 or 232 comments, it seemed like the dominant theme was the idea of privacy so Individual Review I think already addresses that issue so that's already taken care of I believe, the idea of privacy. One of the members of the public mentioned about a one-story and the idea – the question of privacy. I'm imaging say if the floor level has to be raised to 3-feet because of flood zone requirements. So, that puts someone eyes at 8-feet above the ground and for privacy, you can have a 6-foot fence and then you can still do a 24-inch decorative thing above that. So, actually you can have a fence that's also at 8-feet high so for one story, I hear issues of privacy but one-story, the privacy is already solved by a fence I believe because you can only – if the eye level is at 8-feet. I think privacy is already addressed so I just heard a lot of those comments from the public so just my comment that I think privacy is already addressed in the ordinance.

Male: Not for the second-levels.

Board Member Bernstein: So, IR actually involves – speaking through the Chair, the IR does address privacy issues already and window locations and all that so I think privacy is already through the ordinances. Next is page 27 on the left-hand side, it talks about properties eligible for listing in the National Register. My three questions are – let's see – the question I wrote down was are any Eichler homes shown on page 25, those are all the Eichler tracts, are any of those a listed historic resource? Are any – ok. I think the answer is no. There's no...

Ms. French: No.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah so there's no historic resource so there for any protection of or regulation that may involve the Historic Resources Board or the Historic Preservation Ordinance. That ordinance will not apply to any of these buildings because none of them are listed as individuals (inaudible)...

Ms. French: Correct. The HRB and historic review process does not apply to National Register Eichler Districts in the City because they are not listed on our local inventory.

Board Member Bernstein: So, the HRB would never ever see any proposal that comes – any change to a historic building – any change to an Eichler building would never come to the Historic Resources Board.

Ms. French: It just so happens – I'll just say this – that the two National Register Districts are both single-story overlays so there's never going to be a Discretionary Review for a two-story home proposed in one of those districts.

Board Member Bernstein: Fine, good, ok. Alright, thank you. Going back to one of the other comment that I think two members of the public made about the idea of historic preservation and I think the phrase was frozen in time. We do have at least one project or one building in Palo Alto that is frozen in time that the community has certainly embraced it to be frozen in time. That's the Hewlett Packard garage and it's down to -- the original nails are still there. So, there's an example of a historic preservation where it's frozen in time so that's certainly appropriate. The – a couple members of the public mentioned about not having their Eichler homes be considered frozen in time. I just want to make one quick comment about what is historic about some of these neighborhoods and I think one of the historic issues is from a social point of view. From say the 1950s, it was common to have extended families living in these homes. Meaning you needed square footage so any restrictions to say a house can – has to be frozen in time is – can become pretty restrictive. Again, we've heard many applicants come before our Board that the reason we want to expand any house is that for multi-generational. So, not having it frozen in time, I support that idea of not having that – not having an Eichler house be frozen in time. Thank you for that. A few more – I apologize but again we just got this information also.

Chair Bower: Should I set the three-minute timer?

Board Member Bernstein: Page 28 talks about preservation incentives. As you've you heard me speak publicly, I'm in huge favor of preservation incentives. There's also talk about the Historic Building Code so can a house not listed in the local register use the California Historic – so all these homes that are in National Register Districts. Can they use the California Historic Building Code? I don't know the answer to that. Alright, the – page 29, it says – my question that I wrote here was – oh, before – I guess that's continuing that same question. Before – awe, it says on page 29 on the left-hand side that a building may qualify as a historic resource if it falls within one of these categories. Again, I guess that's the requirement of the property owner to actually apply for historic statues before any historic benefits can accrue. We've already today that there's no Eichler building is on the Historical Register. Almost done here. I already made the comment about the Individual Review process in response to privacy. One of the guidelines on page 67 does show horizontal or vertical siding so that's good that there's flexibility on that. Getting toward the end. Page 73, is there any prohibition on an Eichler house being demolished? So, once a say building permits for replacement building is – is there any prohibition on an Eichler house being demolished? I don't think there is.

Ms. French: No, again because one none of our Eichlers, even those in the National Register District, are on our inventory locally so there for demolition is allowed. We do have a rule in Palo Alto that you have to have a replacement home because we don't want to have the disappearing of our housing stock and for other reasons, so maximum lot size etc.

Board Member Bernstein: Sure, great, thank you for that. Page 74, I see the word -- on the left-hand side, there's a word perceived height. I'm a huge proponent of that idea that it's not so much how high something is but what's the perception and that's where the IR process can get involved in. Three more comments here. Page 107, special considerations for National Historic District, we've heard (inaudible) representative of the Architectural Control Committees for the different neighborhoods. I – my hats off to them. I think they do a pretty fantastic job in helping speak to and educate and hear different points of view about what is deemed by that Committee and perhaps in other neighbor representatives on what's appropriate for that neighborhood? So, it sounds like there is some architectural control already in effect. I know the City of Palo Alto does not get involved in those private conversations but it looks like there is some good care put into those Architectural Control Committees. So, that's a good way for them plus any of these voluntary design guidelines, I think that's a good educational aspect here. Page 109, I'm glad to see the comment about the doorknobs being put in. If accessibility is a concern, consider a level – a lever handle with a simple unornamental contemporary look. I'm glad for that clarification. I do see on page 110 and this will be my last comment about on the right-hand side is say the two existing National Register Districts, Greenmeadow and Greenmeadows (Green Gables?), also have a single-story overlay statue. It says; however, second-story additions are not encouraged in any historic district that may be designated in the future as a measure to retain the integrity of the district. I will suggest that two-story – a second story, there probably are designs that could be added and still maintain the integrity of the district. I would need to be obviously very sensitive addition. Again, we have the IR process and other reviews that can be done for that. Those are my comments based on the comments we received in orange. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Martin, for doing a detailed review of this document. Roger, you have any comments?

Board Member Kohler: Not yet, no.

Chair Bower: Oh, Emily, please.

Ms. Emily Vance, Historic Planner: Yes, thank you. Good morning everyone. Just to speak to your earlier comment Chair member Bernstein about the California Historic Building Code. Just to clarify in that the California Historic Building Code is – provides alternative building regulations when dealing with qualified historic resources. A qualified historic resource is any existing or future resource listed on a Local, State or National Register. So, the contributing resources within those two National Registered Districts would certainly be considered qualified historic resources so they could take advantage of the Historic Building Code. The only thing to note is that since they are not on the Local Register which we discussed – the Local Inventory, that they could not take advantage of other incentives offered.

Chair Bower: So, following up on that, we have discussed whether or not – we have discussed the floodplain issue as it relates to historic properties and could you just for – put into the record here how that applies? I think if I remember correctly the flood zone – if the building is a recognized historic building, then the flood zone regulations are suspended or don't apply?

Ms. Vance: Yes, it's something along those lines dealing with FEMA and federal flood insurance program where historic resources could be exempted from certain restrictions on basements in flood zones.

Chair Bower: Just a – it's clear as I understand this if you have a historic resource – if your building is designated or recognized as a historic resource, the need to comply with a raised first-floor elevation above floor plane would not apply. Is that correct?

Ms. Vance: I believe that's the interpretation but again, like we said, just for qualified historic resources so that wouldn't be true for all Eichlers. It would just be for the ones in the two National Register Districts.

Chair Bower: The reason I bring this up is if for the two Nationally Recognized Districts where they to be added to the City's inventory which I have said publicly many times I think that they should be added. Then the floor plane issues which relate directly to the privacy issues that many people have spoken to both today and in public comments are somewhat mitigated because you're not going to have those differentiated elevations. Ok.

Ms. Vance: Yeah, that's true.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Alright, I'm just going to go across the Board here. Margaret, any comments?

Board Member Wimmer: I was just listening very carefully to all the public comments and trying to really understand some of your sentiments and thoughts. It sounded like there was a mix of people who were in support and some people who were maybe not. Maybe feeling a little threatened by the guidelines and that maybe would preempt them from doing something that they would ultimately want to do. I think – especially responding to the ADU comments, I think there are some cases where the City puts out these guidelines for instance for the ADU new ordinance that we have. Sometimes those regulations or those parameters might not be applicable to for instance an Eichler house that you feel like the 900-square feet is too big for the backyard. I think those people who own Eichler properties, they would have to find a balance themselves in what's appropriate for their unique site, their unique property, their unique situation and adapt those available ADU ordinances for them. I think putting an ADU in the front yard would probably be disruptive of the overall neighborhood character so I think – I guess what I am trying to say is that there are these ordinances that are out there that may not specifically apply to your unique individual property. I think it's up to the property owners to interrupt what is appropriate for their own well being for they own property. I think also in terms of the CC&Rs, I hadn't really – I wasn't really aware of a lot of the CC&Rs that might have existed when these Eichler neighborhoods originated but I think that these guidelines – they're not necessarily a replacement or they're not necessarily meant to be a new CC&R. These guidelines are in response to the fact that these Eichler neighborhoods are becoming historic because of their age and because they've been around for a significant amount of time. That the City wants to preserve that mid-century modern architectural style that is prevalent in Palo Alto so these guidelines are an effort to preserve and to guide preservation of these neighborhoods. Not necessarily meant as a replacement or a new CC&R that is suddenly imposed upon you. So, those are my two comments.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Michael, any additions?

Board Member Makinen: Well, there was – I can't recall which page it's on but there was some discussion about if this goes to Council a three-tier approach. I think that...

Chair Bower: It's coming up.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah.

Chair Bower: I want to discuss that after we made comments.

Board Member Makinen: I think that has a lot of people concerned that this is becoming a requirement and it's not. It's just a voluntary type activity that we're promoting so I think there are some real concerns for the public when they see that. Is that yeah, we're calling it voluntary but is it really voluntary? I think there's a feeling of – I won't call it a threat but some feeling that they may be more than what we advertised as voluntary.

Chair Bower: You – any comments? Roger.

Board Member Kohler: Well, I'd just like to comment that the group of folks here today and there were a lot of different comments expressed by all the different people. That's what towns are made of, a whole bunch of different people so where some that spoke today that are very adamant about they want it a certain way, others didn't care, others were annoyed that they would have to worry about this and so it's very interesting group. We on the Board just try to do the best we can within what we hear from homeowners and staff and ourselves. It's – in fact, I'm just curious if you could just maybe state the purpose of today's meeting, just out of my – so I can readjust my – what I've heard and what we're...

Ms. French: Sure. The purpose of today's meeting is to receive a recommendation from the HRB on these guidelines. This is – we've been at this for a little while, you have – you continued this from January 25th to this date so that you could see the modifications done by our consultant following the comments you made on January 25th, following the comments made at the public workshop on January 18th, the emails we received through our Eichler inbox that you have all received At Places on January 25th and in this staff report. The goal is to finish with the HRB, then we start the existing process of re-notifying the neighborhood and seeing which agenda this will land on with the Council. Currently, we've targeted April 2nd and we'll see what happens with emails to Council on all of this. Once it gets closer to Council, then people really come out of the woodwork. Even if we've been at it for a year.

Board Member Kohler: This is kind of the – what we're talking about, this booklet which becomes the guiding light for everybody when talking about Eichler neighborhoods. I say there are neighborhoods because there's several – all kinds of groups of Eichlers around town, right?

Ms. French: There's a map inside the guidelines that shows all of the Eichler tracts.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, ok. It's not just the big one on Alma, it's...

Chair Bower: No.

Board Member Kohler: ... (inaudible).

Chair Bower: I'd like to make a few comments and then we'll move towards crafting a motion. As I – first of all, I went to the first public meeting. I couldn't attend the other two but it was pretty clear that the community members that did go to those meetings had two primary concerns and reviewing the 236 comments that are part of our package today. Those concerns popped up to the top and the number one concern is the issue of privacy with additions that would provide a direct line of sight into other – from a new project into an existing house. That ties in with the second most commented on an issue which is second-story additions. They are really one in the same issue. I think that these guidelines, as in this final form that we have here today -- and I don't, by the way, mean to suggest that this is the last time these guidelines are going to be addressed because guidelines are, I think, of guidelines as dynamic and they do change. So, while I don't think these are the perfect approach, I think these are a good start and as we saw from Professorville Guidelines, those guidelines helped inform these guidelines in ways that I think make both of them better. The next item that was of concern to people who wrote is how these guidelines will be enforced and those concerns are focused on property values, on the flexibility of design changes, how new property – new development will impact their existing houses. My experience in the seminars that I have attended that actually apply directly to this have informed me that formation of historic districts actually increases the value of the property. Los Angeles did a 10-year study of this and developed a very comprehensive ordinance much more thorough and restrictive I think in a sense than our guidelines. They found that in every case the property values in those areas increased. The thing that they discovered was that if you are in a district like an Eichler district -- Los Angeles has different districts -- and some developer came in and bought a property next to you, tore down a house that conforms to the district style and then built something totally different. The property values next door to those on either side and across the street all went down because of the new development. They were frankly surprised at that and surprised that when these overlays went into effect in Los Angeles, they raised the values of the properties. I'm not – obviously everything in California is now more expensive but what

really was significant was they demonstrated that was a real value. So, I think these have – these guidelines – and again, these are guidelines which are intended to set expectations about development. They don't demand a certain style but they inform the designers who are going to be working in this neighborhood -- they are different neighborhoods -- about what is expected to – in the new designs to conform or to compliment – there are lots of other historic preservation words that we use but basically to compliment what's already there. I'm – my colleagues on the Board who are architects and designers I'm sure would never want to design a project that wasn't conforming to and complementary to a historic district. This is an attempt to really help both the new development ideas and the existing architecture to live in some harmony. I think its important for the community to understand that historic district designation again provides a lot of benefits. People I think are afraid of that, that sort of designation because they think it limits their options. I think from a 40-year career as a building contractor in this community, that had I known about the historic – if we had the Historic Building Code, that is would have been much easier to do a number of projects that I built but they were – it wasn't available so there are incentives in this document that help us move I think the conversation away from limiting property values but instead enhancing them and enhancing community. By the way, Eichlers, as all buildings are, they are a living document of our history and people who live in them don't necessarily – I think they live in them because they like the design, maybe it's affordable but most important they are preserving what Palo Alto was 50-60-years ago. Just like we're preserving the Hewlett Packard garage because that's something that was very important to our development here. Almost done. I think this – I'm hoping this – these guidelines are our step in helping to inform the community and I fully expect that there will be a vigorous discussion at Council because there always is when these kinds of things are adopted. I want the Board to turn to page 56 in our packet which has the four – I'm sorry we don't have this up on the screen so members in the audience can participate. This is Attachment B in our packet, it is the regulatory – it is a path forward – yeah, it's 56, down on the right-hand corner of our packet. It's attachment B. I don't know if you can get to that. Well, Amy can get it up on the screen so that everyone – there is it, I see it. I'd like the Board to focus on how we – when we create a motion, how we can direct Council or not direct them but simply inform them about how we feel they should move forward. There are four options in Tier 0, 1, 2, and 3 and just to review them. Zero is nothing, do nothing. Tier One is an Individual Review integration and privacy guidelines and you can see that that's adopting ordinances and using this in tandem with IR Review. Tier Two is a voluntary Eichler overlay district as this is described here as EO which is Eichler overlay. So, you create a district similar to single-story overlay districts and then you'd use it entire document – this entire document or a portion of it and applying it to new homes or secondary additions. Also, address erosion of support for single-story overlay in the Eichler thing. Then the Tier Three option is regulatory options which is develop standards enhance for privacy, height, size, setbacks, second stories, give legal certainty with maximums for discretionary applications and then for use for other regulatory discretion process. I'd like the Board to move – to actually include one or more of these tiers in our recommendation to the Council. Is there discussion? Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Bower. I'd like to tag onto your comment about the historic districts and the value that has been to property owners. Do any members of the public who have said they are concerned about a replacement house being non-Eichler compatible building. So, there is now – in the IR Guidelines, there's no requirement of style. It's only for massing and scale and privacy issues. Tagging onto Chair Bower's comment about districts, just as neighborhoods – two neighborhoods have gotten together enough support to apply for and get granted a National Historic District. That's, I think, a great step toward any regulations tied with incentives of what to do for modifying or building a new house. We've seen great success in Professorville District for example where property values are pretty incredible there. There are – for many of the homes there, there's like I think about eleven different incentives that property owners can employ to actually do things that bottom line actually increase the value of the property and still maintain a district. I would encourage any Eichler neighborhoods, if they are concerned about well what's the design sense of the neighborhood, to consider applying for National Districts too. Then the incentives then can – it's a lot easier for incentives to be applied so that's a good way for neighborhood preservation. That is my comment to support that idea.

Chair Bower: Sorry, let me ask staff, there is a resolution – a draft resolution, should we be commenting on that? Page 53 in our packet.

Ms. French: Yes, it's prepared so that you can weigh in on the wording there. This is coming to the Council to describe – I mean basically it gives a little history and the fact that were directed to do this by Council. They decided to spend their money on it over a year ago, almost two years ago now. Well, December of 2016 they authorized us to proceed with a contract to do exactly what we've done. It then gives a bit of a history, it talks about the Comprehensive Plan policies there in that Section H which are findings basically to talk about policy L-1.1 for instance. Ensure that new or remodeled structures are compatible with the neighborhood and adjacent structures. That's an existing Comprehensive Plan policy and there are at least seven more policy referenced. This is the new Comprehensive Plan that was adopted by Council in November and became effective in December. Then there's a finding there about being consistent and compatible with applicable purposes of the R-1 zone so there are three bullets there. So, if you want to take a moment to read those and let us know if there's any issue with those statements related to what we're doing here that would be great.

Board Member Bernstein: Chair, I forgot one question. Does this – not a proclamation – resolution – proposed resolution, does it tie into any of the Tier 0, 1, 2, or 3? Do you know?

Ms. French: It does not. It is designed to be specifically about the guidelines alone as a document – as a voluntary document. What would go to Council, we're targeting April 2nd at this point, would be again this same chart that you're seeing here to give a flavor of options, Tier 0-3. There would be no ordinance going to Council in April. They would have to direct staff to go and write an ordinance to come back to make it effectively useful with the Individual Review for two-story homes or any other potential options. If they want us to come back with an Eichler overlay option for people in neighborhoods – those neighborhoods to volunteer to be – to get together and elect themselves – select themselves, then that would happen at that point. So, that another year in the making I think.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

Chair Bower: I'd like to do two – I'm going to split these up. I want to consider...

Council Member Holman: David?

Chair Bower: Oh, I'm sorry. Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Hi, I just want to say a couple of things for the public. Going back to the genesis of these guidelines, how it came about wasn't because staff or the Council were looking for more work. These came about because a good number of people got together who live in Eichler neighborhoods and wanted some guidance and some assist by the City to help preserve their neighborhoods. It wasn't about – to borrow somebodys term – it wasn't about freezing anything in time but it was concerned about the kinds of development additions and new construction that was happening in their Eichler neighborhoods. So, this came out – this was a grassroots effort that brought this to the Council's attention that caused this effort to happen. So, that's the springboard from which this came. The other thing, as I've been on the Council now for this is my 9th year and on Planning Commission for 8 ½-years before that, I hope people will look at this with two minds. There are people who are very supportive of these and they're not perfect. I don't agree with everything in them. Nobody is going to be 100% satisfied but look at these with two minds. These could be very helpful in precluding – the reason I mentioned the 17-years I've been doing this is because there are appeals that come out of people not having guidance like this in front of them and provided. So, we have neighbors fighting neighbors and neighbors and neighbors fighting neighbors and neighbors because of new construction additions and such in these Eichler neighborhoods. I see these as a resource to help abate those appeals and those battles within neighborhoods. They are – I don't know what the Council – full Council is going to do about some aspect of this being an ordinance or all voluntary. At this point in time, they're all voluntary, Council will weigh in on that, the community will weigh in on that but I hope people will look at these like

I say with two minds. Of like trying to help neighborhoods stay neighborhoods and I don't mean that just architecturally, I mean it also in terms of relationships. Again, I'm hoping people can hold two minds with this and understand the genesis of this was from people who live in Eichler neighborhoods. I think it also would be helpful if staff could provide in conjunction with this to the public is what the information is that – because I think it is documented, the information that Chair Bower was providing about the value of historic neighborhoods. What it means to be in a historic neighborhood and it isn't a no change situations. It's being the respectful situation and providing guidance and also to provide what the incentives are that the City has for historic properties should any of these districts want to become – be added to the inventory or if other neighborhoods want to be considered for addition. I think the options and alternatives need to be provided from the various perspectives and I appreciate very much the Chair's comments. I hope that's helpful to the public hopefully.

Chair Bower: Well, I think we all hope it's helpful for the public. Thank you for that comment. I'd like to make one other comment just so that the homeowners who are here get a sense of perspective. I own a building in the Liberty Hills Historic District in San Francisco. That's a Victorian district and our – the value of that property in the 10-years we've owned it has skyrocketed not just because it's in San Francisco in the Mission but because the entire district is protected. So, when builders – actually developers buy the buildings and several of them very close to us have been purchased, they can't tear down the Victorians. They maintain the facades which is really what – we're talking here about a façade issue. None of these guidelines do – address anything that goes on inside the building. They don't, frankly, really regulate anything that goes – any alterations that would occur on the outside of the side yard and the rear yards with the exception of ADUs and that's a whole different issue. So, what we're talking about here is trying to maintain the front façade of these neighborhoods. I mean obviously with additions and so my Victorian building is not frozen in time. It is – has been modernized to the maximum extent possible but we've retained all of the features that made it attractive to us when we bought it and made the historic district a recognized space. I'm not just sitting up here as the Chair of the Committee saying we ought to do this stuff to my neighbors because I don't understand what goes on. I have a really good understanding of what a historic district does and the benefits and they are substantial. So, that said, I'd like to talk – I'd like the Board to consider – by the way, I'm not the only person on this Board that has – owns historic building. Michael does, Martin does and Beth Bunnenberg who was on the Board also in a building that could be considered historic and Corey does so we all have different personal relationships with properties that have designations. I want to talk about this Attachment B because I'd like the Board to consider this as one motion and I'd to recommend a pathway for the Council. I think that's what we – we can help the Council evaluate their – and do their job if we can give them direction based on our experience here. I don't want to -- we're at 10:10. I would like to try to move this along quickly so we can go back to work. Any comments? Let's – I'm going to just start at this end and come back. Michael? No comments?

Board Member Makinen: Not right now.

Chair Bower: Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: Well, I definitely think that we wouldn't have gone through all of this effort and just had a Tier 0. I would think that we would want for this to be – I mean not just go through all this work and this very educational and helpful document and just put it on the shelf. I think that it should be an interactive tool so I think that we should at least have some step along the way where people have to respond or have to read or have to engage with this document while their considering making any alterations or doing any modifications to their house. Maybe – I mean I think – I always feel like you fall somewhere in the middle. You don't want to make it into an ordinance where it has to be followed to a tee which might be the Tier Three. I think somewhere in the middle where at least we're using it as a tool and a very valid useful tool. So, I think somewhere in the middle is where we need to guide them.

Chair Bower: Roger.

Board Member Kohler: Well, I think the – I'm not sure how to start this but over the years having been architecting here in Palo Alto over 40-years and worked on 400-500 houses in Palo Alto. This is pretty – I think a very important area. When I was in fourth grade we moved here from New Jersey and then we moved but a lot of my friends lived in Eichlers because we were down on East Meadow – West Meadow Road. I got close – spending many nights that varying homes that are Eichlers and I kinda got used to how they were and they're a special breed. They have a lot of neat features and some annoying ones as well and so I think it's a well worthwhile goal to try to keep what we've got going and maintaining it and improving it but not necessarily limiting everything to be the exact Eichler program. That you're not interrupting what's there now and that we're increasing or improving the neighboring homes. This is basically goals for the exterior of the home as seen from the street as far as what you've been telling us. Most folks who end up living in Eichlers like the inside of Eichlers, that's one reason they bought the house because they really have a neat feature. I'm hoping we could get this – I agree that we don't want to go with Tier 0 and then we have 1, 2, 3 options, is that what we're...

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, that's correct.

Board Member Kohler: What David? What...

Chair Bower: Sorry, we could also suggest a modification of these tiers.

Board Member Kohler: Ok.

Chair Bower: I don't think we have to adopt 1, 2, or 3.

Ms. French: I want to jump in to clarify. Again, you are not to – we have not flushed these out in a way that's recommendable at this time.

Board Member Kohler: Oh, I see.

Ms. French: I would like the Board to focus on the guidelines themselves which are voluntary and any changes there too so we can take that specifically to the Council. This possibility can be discussed but let's not lose focus of what we're doing today which is the guidelines adoption.

Board Member Kohler: I think Martin did quite a good job on his little checklist and other comments so I'm comfortable with whatever we're approving. I'm still not sure.

Ms. French: We're recommending...

Board Member Kohler: Recommending, ok.

Ms. French: ... the guidelines to the City Council and there's a resolution that can be tweaked if you would care to look at that.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, ok. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, I looked at the resolution and on page – packet page 54, Policy L-6.2, I'll just read it for the public record. If a proposed project would substantially affect the exterior of a potential historic resource that has not been evaluated for inclusion into the Cities Historic Resources Inventory. City staff shall consider whether it is eligible for inclusion in state or federal registers prior to the issuance of a demolition or alteration permit. Again, this is a good resolution statement that is in support of historic neighborhood character which would encourage then neighborhoods who are concerned about that to apply for a historic district designation. I totally agree with Chair Bower about the boy, the cultural value and by the way, the financial value of historic districts and the preservations.

I've done about twelve homes in Professorville where we use these incentives and really expanded the market value for one way and also maintain the character of the district. So, any neighborhoods that are caring about their neighborhood character, well I think a historic designation is a good way to go so I would encourage owners to think about that. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Alright so I don't want to make this Attachment B the primary focus but I'm not hearing any Board Member suggest that these guidelines as they've been presented today shouldn't be forward to the Council for adoption, in some way, into our City ordinance. The reason I wanted to focus on this attachment is that I think as Margaret has said, Tier One no action is certainly not what this...

Board Member Bernstein: It's Tier 0.

Chair Bower: Tier 0, pardon me. We are not – we haven't been working on this for a year and a half because as Councilwomen Holman said the staff had nothing else to do. This came – this is before us because there was a strong desire by people who own Eichlers to protect them I think is a good way of saying it. I'd like to suggest to the Board that we recommend to the Council a combination of Tier 1 and Tier 2. I don't – there's very little difference, the only thing that I'm not sure about in Tier 2 and that would be my preference is the – addressing the erosion of support of single-story overlay. I think it would be a very positive thing for the Council to create a way in which we can have an Eichler overlay in every one of these individually identified neighborhoods in our design guidelines. We haven't really talked about that but I think that this document moves us in that direction. I would like to suggest that we adopt the Tier 2 approach. Encourage the Council to move forward with a Tier 2 approach and if maybe clarify what this – what an erosion of support of a single-story overlay might suggest.

Ms. French: If I can jump in? Tier – you had first said recommend Tier 1 and Tier 2 so I think Tier 1 is, if anything, is requested. I mean that's what we've heard at the workshop etc. and that's what I think staff would like to have is Tier 1. So, that we can proceed with our Individual Review of two-story homes with a tool such as this that connects them. That would be I think – now if you jumped to Tier 2 and not do Tier 1 then we're not using the guidelines with the IR program. Now what you're doing is suggesting that we allow a method through an ordinance for Eichler tracts to self-select – come forward with 70% of the neighbors – of the owners saying they want this to be imposed upon their neighborhood. Just the single-story overlay is now, that's a process where if you have the CC&Rs 60% is required and if you don't 70% is required to come forward with an application to impose a zone on overlay. Just creating the enabling ordinance to allow tracts to come forward is not imposing the Eichler district on any neighborhoods. It's allowing a method whereby they could come forward. When we talk about erosion of support, that was with the single-story overlay processee. We had several that came through that initially they had the minimum level of support to submit the application for rezoning but during the process, people decided to change their minds and they didn't want to be – have that overlay and so those didn't get passed through that process. So, with an Eichler overlay, we would want to, of course, take some direction that would allow consideration of what happens when that happens during that process.

Chair Bower: Thank you for that clarification. I think in that in hearing that, I think what I would like – I'm hoping the Board will do is adopt Tier 1 and support the – sorry, I've got to get the right page here.

Board Member Bernstein: Page 53.

Chair Bower: I'm sorry...

Ms. French: I have to jump in again. Can we please not use the word adopt, could we please – just cautionary – to say explore whether it's worthwhile or not to explore Tire 1 further and recommend that the Council consider directing staff basically.

Chair Bower: I was thinking but did not say adopting an approach so an approach is what – obviously what we do is evaluate ideas and then make a suggestion to the Council. The Council makes a final decision but it's their decision, not ours. I think we can do this in one motion now. I'm not hearing any

problems with the proposed, yet not adopted, resolution on our pages. I think it provides an inclusion of the design guidelines as a tool in helping inform the alterations and additions to Eichler properties and neighborhoods. I guess I'd like to hear a motion to inform the Council of our – what we think their approach should be to move forward. Martin.

MOTION #1

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Bower. I'd like to make a motion that the City at the City Historic Resources Board move to recommend to the Council that they adopt the resolution shown on our packet page 53. In referring to the – your comment Chair Bower about the different tiers, would that be a separate motion?

Chair Bower: No, I think we should do it in one because the tiers are ideas about how to move forward.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, yeah. Also, including in my motion then to include the idea included in – written in Tier 1 which is using in tandem the IR Guidelines for two-story, second floor home review and enhance IR privacy for Eichlers. By enhance, again that's not an ordinance that we're suggesting but that would be just exploring that comment. Part of Tier 1 also includes in this diagram the idea of an ordinance adopting the guidelines. My motion is that – my wording right now is not to recommend any ordinance adopting the guidelines. I'll hear what the Board Members have about that but – because it's just going to be I think just – oh, yeah, please go ahead.

Ms. French: I'm sorry. I know this is really hard to manage. We – what you are – I think your motion is to recommend to adopt the resolution to – for the Council to adopt the guidelines as voluntary. You have a second and it would be nice to have a vote on that just alone. Then proceed with the second one is my request. The second piece would be to discuss an ordinance that would connect it to the individual review guidelines as a part of Tier 1. So, if we could just get to the finish line on the guidelines and then the next discussion.

Chair Bower: So, let's just – you want to do the motion in both or one?

Board Member Bernstein: Well, let's just start with the motion with the – the first motion is to adopt the proposed resolution that's on our packet page 53.

Chair Bower: Which incorporates the proposed guidelines – voluntary guidelines as part of our review process.

Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

Chair Bower: Alright, do we have a second?

Board Member Wimmer: I'll second that.

Chair Bower: Alright, any discussion? I think we've probably talked about this...

Board Member Kohler: I vote yes.

Chair Bower: We haven't voted yet. Alright, if there is no discussion would you like to rephrase the motion just so that we have it clear for the record.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, move that the Historic Resources Board recommend to the City Council that they adopt the resolution shown on our packet page 53.

Chair Bower: Alright and that's been seconded by Margaret so all in favor say aye. Opposed? No.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR COREY ABSENT.

Chair Bower: Now let's

Ms. French: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: Brandon, yeah, he had to leave. Let's talk about our recommendations as regards to Tier 1, 2, or 3 on page 56.

Board Member Wimmer: Can I ask a question? I'm sorry, I – as I'm looking through this, this is now referencing an Eichler overlay so is there – maybe I just didn't notice it in the guidelines. Does it discuss an Eichler overlay in the guidelines? I know it mentions all the – and identifies all the tracts so is that basically saying that each tract would be an Eichler overlay.

Ms. French: No.

Board Member Wimmer: I mean how are those – I missed that. I'm sorry.

Ms. French: Sorry, I need to jump in again. What you have in front of you and on the screen are ideas without any exploration. The exploration that would occur related to Tier 2 would be if Council were to direct us, staff, to embark upon a process that would many months and probably a year to explore an ordinance that would enable – just like the SSO Ordinance process that would enable tracts to volunteer – voluntarily come forward and (crosstalk) self-select themselves with a minimum percentage of support from the owners to become an Eichler overlay. What the Eichler overlay would be is variable as well. It could be...

Board Member Wimmer: Is to be defined because we haven't defined what that is yet.

Ms. French: We haven't defined whether the entirety of the guidelines would apply or one chapter or...

Board Member Wimmer: I think that's what I was missing, that reference (crosstalk) to Eichler overlay but there was no definition of it so ok. I was trying to figure that, I wasn't sure.

Chair Bower: Michael.

Board Member Makinen: I think that's very appropriate that we endorse the concept of an Eichler overlay district. At least the Council can consider that as an action that we can take. I think definitely should state something along those lines.

Chair Bower: Alright, Roger any comments?

Board Member Kohler: I'm looking here at this and there's 0 – Tier 0, Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 so are we voting on one of those tiers? No, we trying...

Ms. French: No, there's no...

Board Member Kohler: Ok, yeah, that's what I'm trying to say.

Ms. French: What I think might best, I'm trying to help and I realize this is difficult...

Board Member Kohler: I think we just...

Ms. French: If you're not inclined – if anyone – you could say straw poll if Tier 0 voluntary is your opinion of the best way to move forward. You could take a tier straw poll to say if Tire 1 makes sense for staff to

put in the report or it's in the minutes from the HRB meeting that the Council will see. I think taking each one individually, not either or, would be a better approach.

Board Member Kohler: Well, I mean it seems to me we're the Historic Resources Board, I don't think we want to 0. That's – we're trying to help to guide everybody. I'm not sure why we have to – there's an overlay between all of these. Why don't we just come up with some sort of suggestion of a combination for Tier 1 and 2? I don't know about 3.

Board Member Wimmer: Is there a way that we can just make a motion that we reviewed this potential Attachment B and our motion is to take the time to further develop it so -- because we're kind of stumbling over it obviously.

Chair Bower: So, I'd like to...

Board Member Wimmer: So, instead of continuing stumbling, can we just have a motion to accept it as an idea and the motion would be to further investigate it?

MOTION #2

Chair Bower: I'd like to try to short-circuit this what seems to be a circular discussion. I'd like to move that the Historic Resources Board encourage the City Council to recreate an ordinance that adopts the guidelines and that is used in tandem with the Individual Review Guidelines for second story and second floor home review and that enhances the Individual Review privacy for Eichlers. I'd like that to have an emphasis on neighborhood control and neighborhood guidance because I think local is – as local as you can get is best.

Board Member Bernstein: I thought...

Chair Bower: My motion.

Board Member Bernstein: I second that motion.

Chair Bower: Now a discussion of it? This is a motion to encourage the Council to move forward with these ideas. Essentially, they are the ones that are summarized in Tier 1. I would imagine that in this review an Eichler overlay might also come out of it so I don't want to put that as part of the motion but I think that could be a logical – something that would logically be included.

Board Member Bernstein: The reason why I seconded Chair Bower's motion is the idea of a local control. We've seen great success in Professorville Historic District for example. We have two National Listed Historic Districts for Eichlers and that's all neighborhood local control. Boy, I think that's the best administrative way there is. The majority of homeowners in different districts saying here's what we want and then do their now application process so that's why I supported Chair Bower's motion.

Chair Bower: Staff opinion?

Ms. French: I don't want to offer my opinion but what I do want to say is just for the public, I sense restlessness and I hope we don't get to hissing again. What I'd like to say is any ordinance that would connect these guidelines to the Individual Review program and the process would first have to go to the Planning and Transportation Commission in a public hearing with notice cards sent to everybody all over again in much ahead of the meeting. Because it's an ordinance it has some teeth to it and that would have to go after the Council directs us to pursue that option because again that is staff resources to be spent on a process. Hopefully, that's clear to the public.

Chair Bower: Right, this is a recommendation for a path forward and that's all it is and it's – that means we would just start a second ordinance crafting process. Correct?

Ms. French: It would be the first ordinance because what this is, is a resolution. Resolutions do not have any power to change ordinances. Only to acknowledge the existence of these as a useful tool – voluntary tool.

Chair Bower: Any other comments on the motion?

Board Member Wimmer: I just – I'm sorry, sometimes I backtrack. So, there is a potential that each individual tract could follow a different tier. I mean we're not saying that – I know I just want...

Chair Bower: Let me interrupt. I don't want to have to actually get into weeds in this. This is a direction...

Board Member Wimmer: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: This is a direction and the Council...

Board Member Wimmer: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: ...has to move – they have to make the decision about how they want us to move. I'd like to focus this on just the direction that we want Council to take, not on the individual specifics which, of course, will be discussed in great detail. Is that ok?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes.

Chair Bower: I don't mean to cut off your thoughts, they are legitimate and valuable but that's – we're at the 30,000-foot level here I think.

Board Member Wimmer: Right.

Chair Bower: Other comments? Alright, if there are no further comments let's vote on the measure. All in favor say aye. Opposed? None.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR COREY ABSENT

Chair Bower: I think that concludes the public hearing on the Eichler Design Guidelines.

Approval of Minutes

4. Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of January 25, 2018

Chair Bower: We move to the last item in our agenda – on our agenda which is approval of minutes from the January 25th meeting. Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: I'd just like to thank members of the public who have...

Chair Bower: Absolutely.

Board Member Bernstein: ... joined us this morning. It's – I know it's taking valuable time out of your day today and again, this is a very important subject that we're discussing today. So, thank you for members of the public for coming in.

Chair Bower: I'd also like to follow that with an appreciative – with my appreciation that people will or did take the time to come out, expressed a lot of differing views and it helps to inform our decisions. It will certainly help to inform the Council's decisions. So, even if we didn't reach a conclusion you wanted us to, it – all of the comments are valuable so thank you for coming. Alright, minutes. Any issues?

Ms. French: (inaudible – off mic)

Chair Bower: I don't hear any Board comments on minutes.

MOTION

Board Member Wimmer: I move to approve the minutes.

Chair Bower: Alright we have a motion to approve minutes. A second?

Board Member Kohler: I second.

Chair Bower: Roger seconds. Any changes and deletions? Alright, all in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed? (crosstalk) We're just approving the minutes.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR COREY ABSENT

Ms. French: Did they get approved?

Chair Bower: Yes. Margaret moved to approve the minutes and Roger seconded.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: Alright, Board Member comment – oh, subcommittee will meet after this meeting.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: Any other Board Member comments or announcements? I see none so with that – oh, Emily.

Ms. Vance: Yeah, the subcommittee for 526 Waverley will be meeting just to make sure that's clear.

Chair Bower: I'm sorry where?

Ms. Vance: The 526 Waverley façade restoration will be meeting, not any other subcommittee.

Chair Bower: Right, it's 526 and where will we meet?

Ms. Vance: We'll meet right here.

Chair Bower: Right here, fine. With no other information and no other comments, the meeting is adjourned.

Adjournment



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: April 26, 2018

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

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower; Vice Chair Brandon Corey, Board Member Margaret Wimmer, Roger Kohler, Michael Makinen, Martin Bernstein

Absent:

Chair Bower: We will go ahead and start. We have two more members that are on their way in traffic, apparently. So, would staff call the roll please?

Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. We'll move on to oral communications. Anyone who would like to speak on any topic not on the agenda fill out one of these cards. This is your opportunity. I don't have any cards, but don't be shy. Okay, I guess we will move on to City Reports.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments for 2018

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, so, in your packet we are showing the schedule for HRB meetings for 2018. We have been lacking a Historic Preservation Planner. The good news is we're getting towards getting some applicants and we will begin that process. Meanwhile, one meeting a month is about all I can handle. So, we will continue with that schedule. I think, yeah, I will not be here on the 10th of May, so that's going to be cancelled. So, the next meeting after today's meeting will be May 24th. And then after that we will see where we are in the world with staffing.

Board Member Wimmer: I already know that I won't be available on the 24th.

Ms. French: Okay, that's great. If you do know, let us know. Anyone else?

Chair Bower: If anyone else discovers they are unavailable, please email Amy and Robin so that we are assured of a quorum.

Ms. French: Thank you.

Study Session

2. 565 Hamilton Avenue [18PLN-00067]: Historic Resources Board Study Session to Discuss a Preliminary Architectural Review Application for a Mixed Use Building to Replace Existing

Residential Structures on Three Separate Parcels Determined Ineligible for Listing as Historic Resources.

Chair Bower: Thank you. So, on our schedule today we have two study sessions and another review. Roger has arrived. Sorry you got stuck in traffic. Let's start with 565 Hamilton. Again, this is a study session to discuss the preliminary design of a mixed-use building to replace the existing residential structures on three parcels determined ineligible for listing as historic resources and Michael has arrived, so we now have the full complement of our Board members here. So, Amy you have a report for us?

Ms. French: Yes, thank you. We have three study sessions today. You described the first, 565 Hamilton. There's actually more addresses than that involved. That's the file address, our Building I System that people can look up the project. And then we have two other study sessions after this, and we'll get to that later. So, this shows a bird's eye view of the site, which involves these three, sorry, is it four buildings, these four buildings. The building, so these are the addresses, the four addresses based on the four existing buildings. It's a mixed-use building that is going to replace three residential buildings and the garages. This building here will not be – this is the adjoining property that will not be touched, and this has Historic Resource value. This shows some images of the existing buildings to be demolished. I should say this is a Preliminary Architectural Review Application. This is not a formal application at this time. It will be in the prevue of the ARB, Architectural Review Board. What the HRB focus here is on the Downtown Urban Design Guidelines that look to transitions from commercial to residential in streetscape designs. We have an Architectural Review Finding, Finding 2B, that references historic resources. So, the project is next to this garden apartment that is National Register and California Register eligible. This is the image; however, just being next to this eligible resource does not require formal Historic Resources Board review. So, really, this is our opportunity in the Preliminary Review to give some feedback to help the ARB. This is not the right one – okay, so I'll just leave this out – I'll take this out and we'll get the presentation. Did you want to add something while I'm...?

Haleigh King, Project Planner: I just wanted to add, the applicant is here, so they will be doing a brief presentation as well so we can get into that. Okay, I'm having a hard time finding that.

Chair Bower: So, Amy, can I ask you a question? The building that you said was eligible, the one on Webster Street next to this parcel, or proposed development, am I correct in remembering that that was the first Palo Alto Hospital, that building? I think somewhere around there.

Ms. French: Well, I believe we have, I think we included in the packet the DPR Form that was prepared, did we not? Let me look through it.

Chair Bower: That's okay, I'll go over it. I just wanted to know. If you don't know that off the top of your head, let's move on and we'll follow it up later.

Ms. French: I don't know it right off the top of my head.

Chair Bower: Alright, so, please tell us about your project.

Brandy Bridges: Good morning. My name is Brandy Bridges and I'm with the developer, Wilson Meany, and we're representing the family that would own the proposed project. And I'm here today, I just wanted to, first of all, thank you for the opportunity to be here today. We're really looking forward to getting your input on the project at this preliminary stage. I just wanted to introduce our team. We have Chris Meany with Wilson Meany here today, and the we also have, with Aidlin Darling Design, Josh Aidlin, and Josh will be making our presentation this morning. Our project architect, Roslyn Cole, unfortunately, was unable to be here today. She came down with a high fever, but hopefully, I think between the three of us we will be able to answer any questions that you might have about the proposed project. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Josh.

Josh Aidlin: Good morning. Thank you for getting here through all your traffic struggles. We are very pleased to be presenting this project to you. I think it's a very unique site and a very unique opportunity for Palo Alto to create a truly valuable resource, both commercial and residential mix. So, by the way, you said your screens were blurry. Can you see that very clearly? Because I'm going to be pointing to specific items.

Chair Bower: We can see it. It's at an angle, but we'll survive.

Mr. Aidlin: I'm hoping it's not lost in just verbiage. Here you see, in the center of the diagram, this blue rectangle is the site in question, and it's uniquely positioned at the end of this ochre-colored band here, which is the Commercial District, and it dead ends into the green avenues which create the residential neighborhood. So, we have this unique opportunity to transition from commercial to residential and kind of weave those two typologies together. And how do I switch images? Just roll it? Okay, perfect. And in this process, we are trying to achieve five goals. Obviously, the first I mentioned, which is this opportunity to transition seamlessly from the commercial to the residential in a very thoughtful manner. The second is creating respectful design, which is a very paramount ethos in our design studio. How do you study the adjoining massing of the existing neighborhood and truly respect the historic building 530 Webster in a very thoughtful way with our building? And then also the integration of biophilic design which, for those of you who may not be familiar with the term, it's the integration of nature into architecture, and it's very scientifically based, just the reality that nature and its psychological effects on the human mind and body are incredible. And so, we have based this whole design around integrating nature within and around the structure, and this sense of permanence we feel is eminently important. This idea of creating timeless architecture that will last well beyond all of our lifetimes and in that, the choice of materiality is also critical. We have very intentionally and strategically chosen materials which are contextual to the neighborhood. They are honest, they are natural and very intentionally broken down texturally to create a human scale to the building. So, starting with the first floor, ground floor plan, you can see the building is a courtyard building. The heart of the entire project is this beautiful courtyard in the center. Surrounding it in setbacks off of Webster, we actually have pulled the building beyond the typical 17-foot setback and we've actually created a 20-foot setback to align with the adjoining building to the north along Webster, the historic building here. To the south, again, we have an ample 17-foot setback. Both of these will allow for a tremendous amount of planting and landscape. Along the north, between 530 Webster and our building, again, a 10-foot setback which we would integrate additional planting, and we actually have created court, intermediate courtyards surrounding the commercial space that you see here. So, imagine coming down Hamilton, you have commercial buildings that our commercial space will adjoin, and literally surrounding it to the east and to the north are additional courtyards. Again, anyone would want to work in this space, because you're surrounded by nature. Additionally, we have created an outdoor terrace, breaking down the scale. To the north we've located the one automobile entry to a below-grade parking garage well off the corner for safety, and well away from our adjoining neighbor by another additional 30 feet. We have also created – this is the lobby entry to the residences and we've spaced that with a good 15-foot courtyard here and then we have two additional residential unit, or three additional residential units, which make up that floor. Rising to the second floor, again, the intent is to create this oasis of garden in the center surrounded by trees around the perimeter. We have residences on these three sides here, and then the office nestled in the southwest corner here. Rising up one floor, we went to great lengths to create a raised trellised courtyard here on the eastern facade and it serves multiple purposes. One, it creates an exterior venue for the occupants again, to get out into nature, but also it breaks down the scale of this facade, which you will see from the elevations and perspectives. So, jumping right into the chosen materials, we have, starting at the ground floor, this central image right here. It is hard to see from your perspective, I imagine. What we are showing is a board formed concrete wall and a plaster wall, and the idea is to create this very permanent, very stout base to the building in concrete, but giving it texture and scale, and complementing that to a much smoother integral color plaster that you will see on the elevations as well. Moving up a floor, or actually before moving up, one of the important points with creating portals, view portals from the sidewalk and automobile adjacency into the central courtyard, breaking down the scale, again, providing views into nature that you see with this lush courtyard that we will be creating. Moving up to the second floor, we will be integrating a fiber panel siding. One of the things that we have always

pushed in all of our architecture is architecture which ages gracefully, and this site gets an ample amount of southern sun exposure, so the cladding or the siding of the building needs to withstand the heat and the sun that it's going to be getting, and so what we've done is we've integrated this fiber panel, concrete fiber panel, which is basically bomb proof and the feel of it is like a stucco of the adjoining buildings, but it has additional jointing. Moving up to the third level, we will be integrating cedar siding and eaves. Again, a natural material, one that ages gracefully, is rot resistant, but it gives the building warmth. You can see how that dialogue between the warmth of the cedar and the fiber panel can work quite elegantly. So, from a larger context, this is the elevation along Hamilton. So, starting with these more generic commercial buildings, which are 50 feet high, we have specifically chosen to actually lower our building, even though this quadrant, this commercial quadrant, could be 10 feet taller, we have lowered it to 40, and kept that consistent. So, we have a 40-foot high building, which then steps up to 70 feet at the First Methodist Unified Church. So, we're trying to create a very modest, but very well-articulated mixed-use building. The elevation along Webster, again, this is a prime example of this seamless transition that we're trying to achieve. So, here on the right you see our historic structure, 530 Webster, stepping up in scale to our building, and then stepping up even higher to the commercial building across the street. So, we are the transition zone, but how you do that is where the art comes in. So, you can start to see how the datum of the top of the building aligns with the datum of - and I'll get into this more specifically in the elevations - datum of our mid massing, so it's very thoughtful and intentional. But you will also see that this is basically an A with a courtyard and an A in proportion. So, it's a U-shaped building that we are actually taking cues from typologically, and our top floor is exactly that. You have these flanking wings with a courtyard in between, just like the neighboring building. So, diving in a bit more closely on the Hamilton elevation, again, the ground floor is the board form textured concrete, which is a perfect base for planting, to sponsor planting, but it also creates this beautiful portal into the intermediate courtyard through the lobby. Here you see the commercial elevation articulated a bit more finely with the brise soleil mitigating solar heat gain from the south, and then you have this mid band here with punched openings for the residences for the windows and the fenestration, but again, this is, ichnographically is similar to the stucco facades around it. So, you have base, middle and then top, you have a very crystalline top floor with a very articulated cornice at the top of the building. Along Webster, again similarly, very stout concrete winged walls, which actually takes its cue from the church across the street. But here you start to see again, the alignment of the massing of the neighboring building to the north. We, again, wrapped the building with the cement paneling, fiberboard paneling, and then very, very intentionally tried to create a much lighter third floor, both in glazing and in the courtyard and in the trellis that you will be able to see through from the street. So, in perspective, one of the things that I give Chris Meany great credit for is, he came to us with the task of not creating a flat, kind of artificial building, but one which has great depth and articulation and sculptural quality. And so, you can see how we're three dimensionally playing with the façade here, whether you pull out a balcony and then you recess the view corridors into the courtyard, or crystalline commercial space, and then these punched openings, as I spoke of, in a very light top with an extending eave. Again, that mid band wraps around the corner, addressing the corner, again, base, middle and top, where you start to get views into this upper courtyard and the trellis within. And then this is a great view of how we are again picking up on the massing of our adjoining and adjacent neighbor to the north, and then not replicating, but playing off of the courtyard typology on that third floor as well. So, on that note, if you have any questions, we will be happy to take them.

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair Bower and Josh, thank you for your poetic - I have a few questions - and thank you for your poetic description of the project. Your second goal that you listed was for respectful design, and then privacy for the residential use of the possible historic structure. If you could look on page 5.1, A5.1, that's the existing east, I mean, that's your proposed east elevational perspective.

Mr. Aidlin: I don't have that.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay, it's here, right here.

Mr. Aidlin: Sorry. Thank you. Sure.

Board Member Bernstein: I'll let you turn to it. So, it's the bottom right rendering.

Mr. Aidlin: Sure.

Board Member Bernstein: So, one of your goals is respectful design and privacy for the residential. When I look at that drawing, I see a residential unit, all glass, facing the existing windows of the 542 Webster Street. How will you achieve your goal of privacy with that?

Mr. Aidlin: That actually has more – you mean 530?

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, 530, yeah.

Mr. Aidlin: When you, if you look at this façade here, what we're doing is, on the lower level, which would be the second level, you have punched openings, not unlike the punched openings you have on the building at 530, and then on the ground floor we're going to have a 10-foot band of vegetation. So, the ground floor provides the privacy between the two buildings. The second floor, we're basically using a similar language as the existing building, it is not continuous glass. Where you have a much more glazed articulation is on the third floor. So, is that the floor that you are concerned with?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, I am.

Mr. Aidlin: Okay. The hope in that case is that you're looking over the building.

Board Member Bernstein: So, people would not be looking down, you're saying?

Mr. Aidlin: Well, obviously you can look through glass in either case.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, I agree.

Mr. Aidlin: In any residential condition, obviously, I would think you would have windows, I mean by code. So, is the question that you're having, would you prefer to have those be more punched windows, in which case you're still looking out, or no windows?

Board Member Bernstein: My other question is, if you look on page A0.2, that's your site constraints diagram 4, I was just concerned about the privacy issue, because that was one of your goals here. So, my next question is, on the upper left plan on A8.2, it says landscape buffer. So, it doesn't show any trees on that diagram. Will there be – it says landscape buffer right there, between the historic structure and your structure.

Mr. Aidlin: Yeah, that's – I don't think there's room for trees, although we can consult with our landscape architect, but we are definitely assuming a tall landscape hedge, sort of speak.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay. The reason I brought that up is on your A2.2 it shows no landscaping there. So, that's plan levels 2 and 3. I'm just concerned about the privacy issue.

Mr. Aidlin: I agree. I think it's a great question. I'm wondering if we can again, work with our landscape architect to provide more vertical expression of the landscape. It could potentially end up two to three stories tall. I think it's a great opportunity.

Board Member Bernstein: Perhaps these notes will be transferred when the ARB reviews it. That would be part of their issue there. And then the other question I have about that is, looking on page – I've done a lot of projects for this transition between commercial and residential, and that's why I'm familiar with

these issues here. Going back to page A5.1, east elevation perspective, lower right rendering. One of the ways for transition between commercial and residential use is to incorporate some of the issues of daylight playing that we have between residential uses, and when I look at a diagram, my initial, my first question for planner Haleigh, is there a requirement for any daylight plane issues when there is a transition from commercial to residential? I thought there was some gesture toward that. I don't know if it's a specific code.

Female: Yeah, let me pull it up here.

Mr. Aidlin: You're worried about shading onto?

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, because that's, the residential is southwest of your proposed three-story structure.

Ms. King: Yeah, so because the lot is 70 feet and greater in width, for side and rear lot lines abutting RM-30 or RM-40 districts, there is no daylight plane required.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay. Thank you for that. Alright, going back to your goal of privacy and respect for historic – that's my comment, again, maybe perhaps ARB will focus on that too. And then the other thing for privacy, I'll just mention this. Again, ARB is going to be listening to, or seeing our minutes, there is a requirement for exterior light fixtures to be shielded so that the lights go up, but there's no requirement for ceiling lights. So, with all this glass, if there are just bulb fixtures, that could then intrude into the residential use there. So, I know in other projects where I've – developers have agreed to specify light fixtures where either the light fixture goes up and then bounces down, or there is a shielded fixture, just to that when that light is on, the third floor, your residential use up there, that the light's not coming in. Those are my comments. Thank you.

Mr. Aidlin: Thank you.

Chair Bower: Any other comments from the Board.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, I have a question.

Chair Bower: Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I just wanted you to summarize the equivalency of what's existing in terms of how many residential units there are existing, and what the, kind of the office square footage is versus what you're proposing, just to give us an idea. Obviously, you're increasing in both, but I just thought it would be interesting to know in terms of equivalencies like...

Mr. Aidlin: Square footage wise?

Board Member Wimmer: Or just housing units or potential residents, I guess, that are there now and how many could potentially be there.

Ms. Bridges: I believe we had a summary of this in our project description, so let me just flip to the correct page. On the office square footage, it would be up to approximately 7,450 square feet. And then on the residential, in terms of the proposed project, and then it would be 19 residential units. And then on the existing it would be 9 existing residential units and if I can just flip to the right page, I can give you the square footages. This is a big package you guys got here. Alright, here we go.

Chair Bower: Lots of trees being felled.

Ms. Bridges: Okay, here we go. So, the existing square footage is 8,780. I would point out though that we are significantly below the lot coverage that's allowed, and so even though it's an upsizing, it's still well below the FAR that's allowed for the area.

Board Member Wimmer: Okay, thank you. And then I just had one quick question for the architect. On your Hamilton Avenue elevation, on the very left side, I'm sorry, on page A5.1, as you about the adjacent property on the left there's a pretty significant concrete wing wall that goes all the way from the sidewalk up to the roof eave. I just was wondering – and then when you look at that on the...

Mr. Aidlin: Actually, that's plaster.

Board Member Wimmer: Oh, plaster, yeah. But it's just a solid wall. I was wondering, is that – because that, on the floor plan, that wing wall comes as forward, I guess, to the setback line, as forward as possible. I was just – and it comes beyond the face of that left adjacent building. I was just questioning is that for fire rating or – I mean, I think that wall might be subject to a lot of just people bumping into it or, it seems like it extends out. I just was wondering what, just the thought process of that would be.

Mr. Aidlin: You're talking about this right here?

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, so that's the far-left wing wall.

Mr. Aidlin: Yeah, that's a low landscape wall. I think, if it's a concern of – we can work with you on that easily enough.

Board Member Wimmer: And I'm just looking at kind of your perspective on A5.1, the self-elevation perspective, it just seems like it could – and I just thought maybe it was for fire rated, could possibly be a, you know, a fire wall or something, but I was just wondering why it protrudes out as far as it does.

Mr. Aidlin: I think it's really just about capturing the landscape, to be quite honest.

Board Member Wimmer: Okay, thank you.

Chair Bower: Other comments? Brandon?

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah.

Chair Bower: Roger next.

Vice Chair Corey: Two, one is back to what Martin was talking about, for the windows. You had also mentioned earlier on the use of the fiberboard material, you know, holding up on the sun on the south elevation. So, I actually kind of like the design of the top floor and that openness, but maybe thinking both from the privacy perspective and the sun perspective, the fiberboard would hold up, but the people on that south side would probably fry, in that office on the top floor as well. So, maybe...

Mr. Aidlin: Just to be clear, the top is residential here, and the office is below.

Vice Chair Corey: Sorry, I misspoke, I meant the residents. So, I guess what I was suggesting is maybe thinking about handling that from both sides, and doing something different. Would, you know, having less windows on both sides would kind of solve both of those issues. Maybe making it – I guess I was saying maybe making it more of a pairing versus a one off on one side. Just a thought, you know, for what that's worth. And the other question I had is on A5.3, on the bottom left, the Hamilton looking east.

Mr. Aidlin: Bottom left or right, sorry?

Vice Chair Corey: Yes, the bottom left.

Mr. Aidlin: Okay.

Vice Chair Corey: Is that roof coming down on an angle, or is that straight and just an artifact?

Mr. Aidlin: The roof cornice is straight out.

Vice Chair Corey: Okay. It looked like it was angled from here, which kind of looked neat, I was just thinking. Alright, thanks.

Chair Bower: Thank you Brandon. And Roger.

Board Member Kohler: A quick question. Have you designed any below-grade parking lots before?

Mr. Aidlin: (inaudible) yeah.

Board Member Kohler: Okay. Because I'm looking at the thickness of the wall in the basement, which the exterior walls, which looks when I scale it is only like a foot. So, that, you're going to lose space and don't know how it impacts your parking, because those walls end up being 18 to 2 feet thick, depending on depths and all that. There is a building two blocks from here that we did, I did 20 years ago, maybe 15 years ago, and if I remember that was one of the first ones I worked on. So, you should check that out with your structural engineer, because if you're losing – say it's two feet, well, then all the parking areas get mixed up and everything, so. Other than that, I think it's quite an interesting house, it's not a house, it's somebodies house.

Mr. Aidlin: I like the fact that you call it a house, because that's how we feel.

Board Member Kohler: It's a big house.

Mr. Aidlin: With lots of...

Board Member Kohler: They have lots of relatives.

Mr. Aidlin: A lot of sons and daughters.

Board Member Kohler: So, it has an interesting juxtaposition between the home, the home, geeze, I do too many houses. The building on, looking on Webster that's been there for a long time. It's a big concrete kind of looking thing, and then you have this very light, lots of windows and everything next to it. It's kind of a neat juxtaposition and it could be quite nice. I just wonder when people live in, move in and they put all the awnings, I mean the curtains up, all these beautiful glass windows are going to be, you know, covered with curtains. Because, especially when you face - I guess that's the morning sun. You get the afternoon sun on the other side. As Board Members, what's our role here on this kind of building? It's a brand-new project and we're here because of the historic building next door, is that it?

Ms. French: Yes. This is a voluntary session, and the applicant thought it was a good idea, as did we, to have input from the HRB. It is in the Downtown. It is – and some of the buildings in the area are historic. The 530 Webster, which I did have a chance to look, and it was not used in the DPR form for a hospital. It was a residential building. It has been filed with the State. So, when the formal application comes through, there will be an environmental review and that environmental review will, you know, have a cultural resources section, and that will note that the buildings to be demolished are not historic. Were determined not to be eligible for listing on the California Register, and it will have a comment on the adjacent historic resource at 530 Webster as part of the context. And so, I mean, I think your role is really to comment on that adjacency of that resource and assist with staff and the ARB's review of the replacement building as it relates to that resource adjacent, you know, compatibility and the streetscape.

Chair Bower: Michael, you had a comment?

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, thank you Chair. (crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Michael, hold on. Okay.

Council Member Holman: Could I just add one thing too, in addition to what Amy said? This is the Historic Resources Board. I haven't heard any comments yet, except for an initial comment by the Chair, on the adequacy or agreement or not of the historic evaluations, and it seems to me that would be a primary, in addition to the other comments that have been made, a primary goal and responsibility of this Board. Just to add to what Amy said.

Chair Bower: Yeah, those comments are coming. Sorry. You need your mic.

Board Member Makinen: I had it on for a minute, and then it disappeared. Yes, the Historic Resource, certainly the setting has disappeared with the construction of all the more modern structures along Hamilton, so I would – the contextuality with what used to be there no longer exists. So, I would say that the integrity of the Historic Resource has been lost as far as the setting goes. I agree with your analysis on that. I had one question, on page A0.1, regarding the parking, down on the bottom. You recapped that there is a requirement for 58 parking spaces and you're providing 39 parking spaces. Can you comment on where the additional parking is going to come from?

Mr. Aidlin: We're parking on the roof. No, just kidding.

Ms. Bridges: Hi, I can make comment on that. Because the parcel where the office is sitting is CDC, it is allowed to park off site by paying an in-lieu fee that would go into building future City parking garages. We are not fulling parking the office off site. Of our stalls provided on site, we can fully park the residential, and then in addition, I believe we have seven parking stalls that would be allocated to the office users. And then the remainder would be parked off site via payment of the in-lieu fee.

Chair Bower: So, do you know – excuse me for interrupting Michael – do you know what that in-lieu fee is, what the dollar amount is?

Ms. Bridges: I'll give you an approximate figure. I believe it's approximately \$75,000 or less per stall. It's, I think they size it – I should let staff speak to this, but I think they look at the last garage they built, figure out how much it costs per stall, and so, I know you've recently built a garage and you may be updating the numbers, so we've just penciled in for now \$75,000-ish per stall.

Chair Bower: And you're doing 19, I think I remember, in-lieu parking spaces, something like that?

Ms. Bridges: Approximately.

Chair Bower: Well, there's a \$30 million infrastructure deficit right now, so that's a little bit towards that deficit, and part of that infrastructure of spending is, of course, in the Downtown Parking Garage, but I'm wondering whether people who are going to work and live in this building are going to be willing to walk three long blocks, actually four blocks, so they can park in a garage and pay for it.

Ms. Bridges: Well, I would hope so, because it would certainly be good for them. But the people who live, I do just want to make the point again, that the people who live there, the residents, they have to park on site I mean, that's just essential. If you're living somewhere you want to be able to park, bring your groceries up, and so we've made sure that 100% of the residents can park on site, and it's fully parked to the City's required ratios.

Chair Bower: I actually don't think the residents are the problem. As you, I'm sure know, in this City there is a huge issue about the impact of more commercial development, and what that does to our – what

that's done to our traffic, which is made it intolerable. So, this is in effect saying, well, we're going to allow the people who live here to park underneath the building, but all that new square footage for office space is just another impact on the traffic pattern. So, it's not our jurisdiction here, but you ought to be prepared for that. Michael, I didn't want to interrupt, but I wanted to...

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, it just didn't seem like it matched up with the needs, what was existing there are being provided.

Chair Bower: Any other comments?

Board Member Makinen: No.

Chair Bower: Okay, so I'm going to follow up on...

Board Member Kohler: To follow up on that, in your – on page A2.1 you have parking spaces and bicycle spaces. Maybe that should be increased to show what would be, where are the – how many spaces are going to be, have to be off site is what I guess I'm saying. That should be on this list. I think staff should be requiring that. All these projects should so everybody knows what's being lost or gained.

Ms. French: It's not the time for that. This is a study session. The ARB formal application will have all of the details for that sequel analysis and, you know, parking analysis. I'll just say, just to end the conversation about parking, hopefully, is that, you know, we do require TDM, Transportation Demand Management plans. There's a lot going on as far as the parking, but I think the focus of the HRB should not be on parking today. Thank you.

Board Member Kohler: No, only that it's an impact of the building, which may be (crosstalk) the way it looks and things like that.

Ms. French: I understand you have opinions, but you know, I think we should get to the part that the HRB purview is focused on.

Board Member Kohler: I guess my point is, when parking isn't there and you have to change the building to make the parking work, that has an impact on what it looks like, but, okay.

Chair Bower: Point made. So, I want to actually pull it back to our purview. We are, and since every has made comments, as an Historic Resources Board, we focus on, in a project like this, on compatibility, differentiation, and those things are really described as massing, scale, form and materials. So, as I looked at this project, I thought you got a really big plus, because the building on the other side of the street is one of the worst examples of architecture from the 60's. On the other hand, you have a building next door, which is eligible for Historic Register, you have the church, the Methodist Church across the street, which has a very unique architectural style and is mid-century, so it's about to be eligible and probably might be eligible for listing now. And then on the other corner you have an intact series of 1920's cottages not well addressed in the historic report, and that's a pretty tough requirement to try to find a building that is compatible with all those, except for the one 60's building, with the other three adjoining projects, so I'm wondering when you look at your – well, actually let's look at the picture just up on the screen. What you can see is the church, which is a very unique architectural design, and so I'm going to ask a question and ask another, and then you can respond. And I'm having trouble seeing this architecture as being complementary, compatible based on those characteristics I just described. If you go to A5.1, which is the elevation from the east showing, if you could put that up on the screen. There it is, that's fine. So, when you look at this elevation, you can see in pretty stark contrast that the historic building at 530 has tile detailing for the roof façade. It's a stucco material on the outside. It has round arched windows typical of that. And then I see your building, which is a massive horizontal structure that towers, you can't see it as well on this, but it's actually a full story above this and it is right next to it, and the privacy issues that have already been addressed seem to me to be a serious problem.

Mr. Aidlin: If I can get control of the, somehow the – oh, here we go. I just want to go to the context view.

Chair Bower: Right. That's actually an even better shot. So, I guess my question to you is, and I'm sorry to make this so convoluted, but how is it that you would describe your architectural design as compatible with those three other, the three other areas, leaving the 60's building aside?

Mr. Aidlin: Well, you very articulately brought up the point that they are all completely different.

Chair Bower: Right.

Mr. Aidlin: And the last thing we want to do, if we're designing to the Architectural Interior Standards is to replicate any one of them.

Chair Bower: Absolutely differentiation.

Mr. Aidlin: Differentiation. So, our intent in massing is very strategic in that we're – you know, you have a building here which is two stories below the building on the other side, right. So, we're trying to transition and weave them together by creating a monolithic band on the second floor which aligns with the monolithic top of the adjoining historic building. You have punched windows, who that we would want to replicate the arched, you know, arcade typology, but to create punched windows, just like you have here on that first two floors, right. And then very intentionally, it's like we have to transition up, so by transitioning up we're trying to create a progressive, but thoughtful articulation by, in contrast to this monolith this is air above. This is more transparent and we're actually removing the architecture in the middle, and then very intentionally creating a clue from the massing where you have two wings flanking a courtyard. So, you have two wings flanking the courtyard. And I think it very strategically addresses how one would transition from a 50-foot height commercial to the lower 40-foot, and then breaking that scale down, you know, as thoughtfully as we can by picking up on that ridge top. So, you're absolutely right. It's a challenging corner, given the differences, but I think what we're trying not to do is to create a truly, like aggressive foreground building. We're trying to pull back and be well articulated and elegantly articulated in, obviously, a modern language and we're trying to design within the context to our progressive day.

Chair Bower: So, sorry. I hear that description and I appreciate it. I think that the people who are living at 530 Webster would not find that statement very comforting when all of their light is going to be blocked by your building, and there is a virtual three-story wall on their side of the space. Privacy is one thing, but it will look monolithic to them, and you might consider – actually, you're going to have to go through this with the ARB and they will be much tougher on you than we will, we are, but you might consider pulling that third story back so you get a stepped effect. That's frequently what we see in the seminars we attend and also in the projects that come in. Or, pull the whole building back. I think it's great that you pulled the front back 17 feet. That's a nice concession that you did not have to make, but I just worry about the other, the 530 building, again being overwhelmed by another new building in the Downtown area. So, it's not a criticism. It's a comment that I hope you can somehow incorporate in your design.

Ms. Bridges: If I might, I would just like to speak about the daylight plane for a moment. With regards to the daylight plane, as our planner, Haleigh, was describing, there is no applicable daylight plane requirement; however, we think it's important to, we don't want to be this massive building looming over our neighbor. And so, to that end, thank you -so, to that end what we did do is we pulled back that full 10 feet, and then their building is also pulled back, so we think that with that pull back we won't, even thought it's not a requirement, we went ahead and did it anyway because our intent is exactly on line with what you're describing, is to not overwhelm or overshadow this building.

Chair Bower: So, this conversation reminds me of 429 University Avenue project that came before us two, three times, and went through a number of design alterations, and had the same, there were the

same concerns there. So, look at the history of that building. You won't come back to us again, but I think those concerns, because that building was directly adjacent to a series of buildings that had Historic Resource potential, they had to address the same issue that I'm bringing up here for you. Any other comments, Board Members?

Board Member Kohler: Just a quick comment on this, is that if you look on page A5.1, you can see the semi-3D drawing, and you can see that the, part of the building that's next to this home we were talking about, the building, the housing unit, the overhang of the roof comes out 5, 6, 7 feet, which they put a shadow there and that's, that alone is kind of overwhelming the relationship of the two buildings, I guess is what I'm trying to say. Anyway, I don't know how you would work that.

Mr. Aidlin: We were trying to pick up on a cornice and not have just a generic box, which I hope you can appreciate. You know...

Board Member Kohler: I think the building looks great. We're just talking about relationships to the other surrounding homes, buildings.

Chair Bower: Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair Bower. When I first learned about this project through newspaper advertisements and our packets, I walked past the structures at 565 Hamilton and 571 Hamilton. 565 was built in 1899, 571 Hamilton was built around 1922, 1923, and I have always admired these structures, and so when I saw that you were going to – there had been a proposal for this, I was curious how you were going to integrate these buildings. I'm surprised that they are not, I checked the historic inventory, I'm surprised they are not on there. An 1899 Queen Anne Victorian, it's pretty amazing, a bungalow, but it's not on the Register. As far as the Historic Resource evaluation, question for staff, who paid for the evaluation?

Ms. French: The applicant.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay. And then the HRE Historic, was that the consultant, is that a City consultant? I mean, what's the relation between the report and the City of Palo Alto?

Ms. French: The applicant, this was several years ago, you know, retained, when Matt Weintraub was their planner, I believe, retained Page and Turnbull to prepare an Historic Resource Evaluation. The results of the evaluation that were prepared on all of the buildings were reviewed by Emily Vance while she was still here, and she agreed with the findings, as did Matt, for I think, for the first building was prepared several years ago, the HRE, the two buildings. The applicant can say more about when those were prepared, but...

Board Member Bernstein: Okay, so as I understand, so the applicant hired Page and Turnbull and paid for that directly, right?

Ms. French: Correct.

Board Member Bernstein: Alright. My question is, I mean, I'm surprised that these buildings are not historically significant. Is there, when there has been a debate about that, I think on previous properties there has been like a peer review saying, okay, yeah, these are eligible for demolition. Has there already been a discussion on peer review? So, the City hires a reviewer saying, yeah, we agree that these have no historic value?

Ms. French: More recently we do have that separation where we hire, we take the money from the applicant and we go and retain and have that relationship with the consultant. In this case we had a staff person who was trained in historic preservation, Emily Vance. She was, you know, very much involved in reviewing these HRE's and concurred with the findings.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay.

Ms. French: And I should say, we're not at the point of a CEQA document, so that is certainly something that would be prepared and could be commented upon as far as the findings with respect to cultural resources.

Board Member Bernstein: I'm concerned that we're losing some cultural resources here, but again, they're not formally listed on the Historic Register, so I was just surprised that there's no Category I, II, III or IV. And let's see, as I recall, perhaps planner Haleigh may know this, if you do, is there any eligibility at all for the 1899 and 1922 structures?

Ms. French: I'll address that. So, Dames and Moore, who did the study back in – you know, and it was historic in 1997 as well, when they began these studies, 1998, they did not find this – I mean, they called out 530 Webster and that made its way to the State and is a Resource now, 530 Webster. The others, they had the opportunity to, you know, to call those out and they studied those, as did Page and Turnbull now, so that's really two preservation experts, or those with expertise in researching them. So, you have the opportunity to have a look at the Historic Resource Evaluations and make comments on those, if you would like, if you looked at those.

Board Member Bernstein: I'm curious if any of the Board Members share my concerns about the loss of these structures. Thank you.

Board Member Wimmer: I do think it's kind of curious, if we look at the small images of the old Sanborn maps how...

Board Member Bernstein: What packet page?

Chair Bower: Page 111.

Board Member Wimmer: They have some little graphics of the old Sanborn – I think, I was trying to find, there is another page where there's four of them. I think there are four references to the evolution of the Sanborn Maps. It's also on page 76. But it appears that the buildings on the subject site were all documented in 1924, whereas, in 1949 the potentially historic apartment building on Webster appeared, but the Webster building is potentially historic, where all three buildings that are older than that one are not potentially historic. I think that is a curious question. If we're looking at age and how old these buildings are, the buildings on the subject site are older than the potentially historic building that we're trying to be sensitive to. Also, I just was wondering, is there any way that you could offer to relocate the buildings on the subject site? I mean, especially the one on Hamilton, the little, I don't know the exact address, but it's the little brown shingle one. It seems like sometimes...

Chair Bower: It's 565.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah. Sometimes, you know, people are interested in salvaging these things. I know that relocating a building is quite expensive, but I remember not too long ago in, I think it was Oakland or something, where there were three or four historic buildings that they were giving them away. They just wanted to preserve them. They wanted someone to come and resite them. I don't know if there's any opportunity to do that. I know that's a very expensive endeavor. You have to find someone who is willing to pay an awful lot of money to do that. But, is there any way of offering these resources to someone who might be able to better, to resite them? I don't know.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, continuing my comments about the historic value of properties, yeah, we have ordinances and historic lists and buildings are on it or not. That's one measure of the historic value of a structure. There are some odd characterizations few have in Palo Alto for historic categories. For

example, the former University Art Building, do you know which building I'm talking about? It's right across the street.

Chair Bower: It's on the corner of Verona and Hamilton.

Board Member Bernstein: Hamilton and – anyway, that's a Category III, and yet it's one of the most significant historic structures in Palo Alto. So, categories, whether it's on the list or not, may not be accurate to its true historicism. Anyway, I'm very surprised that there's not any historic, as far as we know right now, no historic preservation regulations we can apply to these structures that you're proposing to demolish.

Board Member Wimmer: But I think also that's the City's burden, that's our burden to establish our inventory and put our label on, and in this case, this is a classic case of, gosh, I guess we should have been doing that. And I think we realize that this is something we need to focus on. So, this is just to maybe, just a reminder that we need to continue to focus on and determine what our resources are and identify them and document those. So, in these cases we have more leverage, more information on our side. So, I think that's maybe the message that we should get out of this.

Chair Bower: Okay. I'm going to wrap this up. I'd like to point out, by the way, that, Brandon, one second, that the age of a building is just the first threshold, and that there are many other tests. That's the easy one. So, I too share the concern about losing this building, as we have lost many other buildings in Downtown Palo Alto to a larger mixed-use project. But, Brandon?

Vice Chair Corey: I was just going to comment on the age, but confirm that it was reviewed by the, by Emily and Matt, so...

Chair Bower: Okay. So, thank you for sharing that with us. If this has a CEQA review, I think you're going to have some issues with 530 Webster. So, I don't know whether that's going to happen. Martin. Last comment.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah. And picking up on Board Member Wimmer's comment about if there is – and maybe the question for staff too, is there anything, and maybe this is all relying on the ARB to make these comments, about instead of – I mean, one option is that the properties get demolished. Then there is construction and debris recycling. Those would be requirements. But if there is any opportunity for, in our minutes, to show that if there can be something about deconstruction somehow, so materials, materials in the buildings, you know, wood flooring or whatever, some deconstruction just from an environmental point of view. Just my suggestion. I've done projects where we've done deconstruction and it ends up being a tax credit for the property owner, like tens of thousands of dollars of tax credit. So, there is certainly value in that. Anyway, just comments. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Anyway, thank you for coming. Good luck with the ARB and your project. Alright, let's move on to – oh, Karen, you had a comment?

Council Member Holman: Because I don't want to interrupt the next item, I have a 10:30 meeting I also need to make, so if you see me disappear it's because I have to make my way to that. Thank you all for your comments and there were several comments made about daylight plane. It is one of the ARB findings which would be appropriate to also consider with historic context is, ARB finding 2D which says, provide harmonious transitions in scale, mass and character to adjacent land uses, land use designations. It seems like that would also be applicable to an historic context, But, anyway, I just wanted to let you know I will have to excuse myself early today. Thank you.

- 3. 864 Boyce Avenue [19PLN-00030]:** Historic Resources Board Study Session Review to Discuss a Preliminary Parcel Map with Exception for Subdivision of the Property at 874 Boyce Avenue into Two Parcels and Addition of a One-Story Dwelling on the Proposed rear Parcel. The

single-family residence at 874 is listed not the Local Historic Resources Inventory as a Category 4 Building.

Chair Bower: Okay. And speaking of excusing one's self, we are going to go on to Item #3. I have a conflict because I live within 500 feet of that building, so I will excuse myself and Roger?

Board Member Kohler: Yeah. I have a project that's three lots down, 150 feet. Is that too far? What's the number?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: If you want to look up on the screen, the project that you have at 850 Boyce, you can see the distance is not very far. It's three doors, or three or four doors down.

Chair Bower: It's 150 feet.

Ms. French: Yeah. It's within 500 feet, Roger, so I think you're right to recuse yourself.

Board Member Bernstein: We're going to have some problems coming up (crosstalk)

Chair Bower: I'm going to hand it over to Brandon and the rest of the Board. We will be back for Item #4.

Vice Chair: Thanks David. So, for our next topic, we will move on to the Study Session for 864 Boyce.

Ms. French: Thank you. I believe our planner is here for that project. I will give a brief presentation. So, this is actually a filed application, a formal application for a preliminary parcel map. We have the need for an exception for that because, well, so it's a little complex. Let's just start with what is your purview here. So, your purview with the HRB is, you know, I would say, to consider supporting this, the intent of this map. We have in our codes the subdivision incentive for historic preservation. This was done on the adjacent sister home at 872, where there was a subdivision that you know, because there were two homes and there was one historic, and there's a covenant on this home that would ensure its preservation into the future. So, this project is the sister home here, 874, would involve having a covenant on the home as a part of a lot split. So, right now, currently there is no home on the back. There used to be a home. I'll just say here, I wrote down the names, the sisters for the sister homes were Frances and Mathilda, so Frances's home is the sister that we're talking about here. It's fun, history is so fun. The proposed lot would be here at the rear of the former 880 Boyce. So, that wasn't a home in existence, apparently, before the sister homes came onto these two properties. You can see it here. This was 1926, this was 1931, and at some point you can see the little paste over here, 880 Boyce was demolished, but it used to be there. Here's Frances's home at 874 Boyce, which is the subject property, and it faces, this façade faces this façade of 872, Mathilda's home. And here is the proposal for, and here's the existing home again, 874. Here's the proposal to put a lot line and build a new home at 880 Boyce, a one-story home. You'll see here on the screen, 872 Boyce was the parcel map that was done before. Actually, the rear lot in this case was larger than, it was not a small lot, the new flag lot that was created, and so you can see there was an easement here. The easement is not particularly wide. It's a 10-foot wide easement with a 7-foot wide, I believe, driveway, but currently these homes are using an easement that exists across 874. In any case, this is all not really your purview. I'm just giving some background. I guess that's for the Planning and Transportation Commission. It's a 15-foot wide easement here that's proposed on the subject property, 874 Boyce, yeah. Let's just say Mathilda's home. So, this 15-foot wide easement would add to the 7-foot wide easement on Frances's property and result in this 22-foot wide street. Because there are four properties, it kind of starts to become a private street now, because his driveway is now service 1, 2, 3, 4 properties. So, that gives the background. I don't know if the applicants have any images they want. Are they here?

(Male): I don't see them.

Ms. French: Oops. Okay. So, really what we're about here is a study session, and the intent would be to hear from you. You know, we have some images. I thought maybe they would show the images of their one-story home that they're looking to place back here. So really, again, like the last item, we have a home here, we have a sister home, and they're going to propose a one-story home at the back. And so, they're intending to have that be compatible. This is the study session to give feedback on the compatibility, but I don't know if you have – let's see, I guess there's plans inside your packet, perhaps.

Vice Chair Corey: I did not see plans.

Board Member Bernstein: No plans in our packet for the proposed structure back there.

Ms. French: No plans, and the applicant is not here.

Board Member Bernstein: Are those plans we see right there?

Ms. French: Perhaps you can pass those around. Sorry. We struggled to get this turned around in a quick process to get these to you, the report and the discussion.

Board Member Wimmer: Can I just ask a quick question? Excuse me. Because this project is called 864 Boyce, so where does the 864?

Ms. French: 874, where was it 864?

Board Member Wimmer: On our packets it's all, it's 864.

Ms. French: Oh, oops.

Board Member Wimmer: And I was looking, where is 864? (crosstalk)

Ms. French: On the front page of the report, first title says 874. There is a typo.

Board Member Wimmer: In our packets, because it says so on the front page of our packets.

Ms. French: The summary title is correct. The second title is not, 874.

Board Member Wimmer: Okay. I was confused. Sorry.

Ms. French: So, then later in that same paragraph it does say 874 Boyce, so we had, again, a hurried packet. So sorry.

(off mic)

Ms. French: Again, I'll just sum up by saying, you know, there's a long history about having a subdivision incentive for historic preservation. I'll just give a quick background. We started this process of having this method with a PC and then we came back with an ordinance that allowed for the creation of flag lots, which we don't otherwise allow in the R1 Zone. We only allow them for historic, when there is an historic home. Now the way that we wrote that ordinance had in mind a property that had a historic home at the rear, and so it was written in such a way that it, that that was the anticipated condition on the site. So, what's weird with this one is, it's a parcel map with exception because there actually is no home on the rear lot right now. There is a home desired to be on the rear lot. So, that requires an exception from the way the Code is written. Then it gets a little more complicated, because if we're doing a private street, it's no longer a flag lot technically. In any case, I guess you don't have to concern yourselves with that, those mechanics. I guess the concern would be just to perhaps continue this, because we don't have an applicant and have some discussion about the actual rear building that would be proposed. I'm sorry.

Vice Chair Corey: Yeah, I was going to suggest, I mean, continuing. It would be nice to have the applicant here, but also you know, we don't really have a context with the existing house and the new house. We have plans that no one has seen for the new house, and no reference to what it looks like at all with the existing, so I don't see how we could, how we could be expected to really do much. I do have one question, though. I don't know if the rest of the Board does, on the covenant and the enforcement of that from what we normally do in that. Just for reference.

Ms. French: Yeah, it's interesting, right? So, I did include in the packet, yeah, we got something in there. So, it was the covenant and the covenant for 872, Frances's house, shows you the format of a covenant, and it would be similar to the covenant that would be put in place for 874 Boyce.

Vice Chair Corey: So, can someone revoke a covenant? What is the process to revoke, because it's pretty clear what it provides.

Ms. French: Yeah. It's recorded at the County and it's typically done, again for this subdivision incentive, creating a flag lot, it's part of the condition of approval of that. So, they need – that's in perpetuity.

Vice Chair Corey: Got it.

Ms. French: It's a little messier when we're starting to talk about a private street and not a flag lot, because now that's not a requirement, but I think the Planning Commission would have the ability to impose that condition, to have a covenant in that scenario. It's complex.

Vice Chair Corey: So, once it is split into two lots with the private driveway, then effectively after that point there's no connection between the two properties anymore, so – I'm just trying to understand from a legal perspective, if somebody can go later and just remove the covenant from that house in five years and hope people have forgotten about it?

Ms. French: Yeah, I mean, I think that's, those are good questions, and I think those would be looked at with the Planning Commission. Because, I could imagine scenarios where the Planning and Transportation Commission could say, well, to have an exception, an approval of an exception, our support for an approval, which would be a Council-level decision, that – I probably should speculate too much, we have a Council Member here.

Vice Chair Corey: Do you have any thoughts on this, Karen?

Ms. French: But there could be conditions of approval related to covenants for both of the sites, you know, the new site to be created, because what they're proposing is a one-story home, that could be a covenant that says, it shall be a one-story home. Because it's kind of like the flag lot where we limit homes to one story. They're proposing a one-story home, but you know, a covenant could do something like that, restrict it to stay a one-story. A covenant on the front would restrict it to, you know, you can't demo this, kind of like the 872 Boyce, Frances's house, that one for that property. So, I can imagine several scenarios there for covenants. And, you know, in perpetuity. That's why they are recorded at the title, at the County covenants as restricted development on the property.

Vice Chair Corey: Okay.

Ms. French: The restrictive covenants.

Council Member Wimmer: Can I ask you a quick question? So, this triggered because, in response to the fact that it has an historic – is it the house that was removed was the historic house?

Ms. French: No. The house on the front is the historic house.

Council Member Wimmer: I see.

Ms. French: So, by removing a portion of the lot that the historic home sits on, it's affecting the historic property, Mathilda's house property. So, if you – so that's something you could comment on today. You know, does removing a portion of that lot and putting a house in the back that's a one-story house, is that a potential impact, you know, Secretary of Interior Standard's concern, that we're removing some of that lot. I would say, you know, just my opinion, looking at the fact that there used to be a home there, I think it's, in a way, restoring a condition of having, you know, kind of, it's almost like a cottage cluster. You have a home here. You have, you know, a proposed home here where it used to be, and these two homes here. I keep looking for the applicant.

Phillip Brennan, Project Planner. Hi, I'm Phillip Brennan. I'm the project planner for the associated subdivision map that's going to be filed with this. If it hasn't been made clear already, I think what we're trying to do is allow the applicant to develop the lot with the intention – one of the primary intentions of maintaining the historic property at 874. So, I just wanted to make that clear. I know this has a lot of moving parts, so that's really the intention. I know the applicant has stated and put it on the table that, you know, one of their options is to, if they're not able to build this additional home in the rear and subdivide the lot, is to, one of the options on the table is to, you know, remove the existing historic home and develop the lot as a whole.

Vice Chair Corey: Karen, you have a comment?

Council Member Holman: Yeah. This is, the ordinance that you have, I mean I didn't write the ordinance, but this concept is actually my invention. And the reason for it was because I know a couple of people that had the situations where they had, you know, parcels with, you know, a couple of historic homes on them and both were going to be selling, and the likelihood was that it was all going to be scrapped. And so, when this went through, Amy's memory is exactly right, it first went through for the first person that I know, and it went through and I recused myself on all of the dealings, but, and reviews. But it went through as a PC and went through the HRB, the Planning Commission, the City Council unanimously on every occasion. And at the Council they said, nobody should have to go through a PC process, why don't we just make this an ordinance. And that's why this ordinance was concocted. Amy's memory is exactly right, that, and records are right, that there wasn't a requirement, or wasn't an allowance for not having a second building in the back. The reasons this came up was not only because of the demolition that was likely if something like this wasn't allowed. We would lose Historic Resources and the street scape would change and we would lose the opportunity of having two smaller, less expensive homes to maintain some diversity in the community and have one much larger home. And you just heard the planner here say that if this can't be accomplished, then one of the options on the table is to remove this Historic Resource. And the last thing I want to say is the covenants, yeah, the County holds the record, but the covenant, the record of the covenant is at the County, but the covenant also is monitored, I guess you could say, by either the City or Palo Alto Stanford Heritage, and that's happened on the occasions of this kind of situation and also on other covenants I'm aware of. I think that's what I can offer.

Ms. French: So, we need to open the public hearing, even without the applicant, since we're here.

Vice Chair Corey: Yes. We have one speaker from the public. Would you like to speak on this? Herb?

(Male): No, I would not like to speak on this. You started off by saying you're going to continue it. You don't have the applicant, nobody has seen the plans before the meeting. So, you're either going to have a substantive discussion with all the materials you're supposed to have, or you're going to continue it. But, once one person started talking, it seemed everybody thought they were supposed to talk, and that often happens. Everyone thinks they are entitled to talk if someone else talks. So, I suggest, if you're going to continue it, continue it, and stop talking. All this other information can be dealt with at the Planning and Transportation Commission, which is their purview for the questions you've been asking. They are interesting questions and you might get some things on the record now that otherwise wouldn't get there, but I think, if you can continue it, continue it. If you want to go without the applicant and without the plans, then you can do that as well. Thank you.

Vice Chair Corey: Thanks for your comment.

Ms. French: I'll weigh in on that as well. I mean, this is a study session. Again, it's not your, it's not, there's no action requested today. So, talk is fine, even without plans. It's just not very helpful that you don't have plans and, if you'd like to continue, you're welcome to do that. And, if we wanted to continue it to a date certain, we could pick that second date that Margaret can't be at, the May 24th, I think. Yeah. May 24th.

Vice Chair Corey: So, unless anyone – Mike, you have a comment?

Board Member Makinen: Yes. Thank you, Brandon. Yeah, I think we're pretty handicapped without seeing the full disclosure of the plans. We can't see how big it is, if it's dominant on the property lot. It looks like the plot plan right here, it looks like it covers most of the lot, just from the plan I see on page 142 here. So, it leads me to the suspicion that this structure is considerably larger than the parent structure, right here, which leads me to have concerns about dominance. Is it more dominant than the original historic structure? Is it going to have issues on it? We can't see any elevations on it. So, I don't think we can make any real comments on it until we see further information on it. I haven't seen these plans over here, so I'd say...

(crosstalk)

Ms. French: It was a mistake not to send them. So sorry.

Vice Chair Corey: So, should we do a move to continue this to the next session?

Board Member Makinen: It's way too early to have us weigh in on any meaningful comments. Do you want to entertain a motion to continue?

Vice Chair Corey: Yes. I'll move to continue this.

Board Member Bernstein: I'll second that motion.

Vice Chair Corey: All in favor?

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 4-0 WITH CHAIR BOWER AND BOARD MEMBER KOHLER ABSENT.

Vice Chair Corey: (no mic) move the last item to continue to another date, because on the 24th Margaret and Mike are not going to be here, and we need the quorum. So, what would be the next available calendar date where we have enough people here?

Ms. French: Well, that's another question. (no mic) next calendar date, and then we can have that conversation. So, June 14th is the next regular meeting that would happen after the 24th. I'm not here on May 10th. Conceivably you could have a meeting without me, but...

Vice Chair Corey: No, we couldn't.

Ms. French: That's too soon. That's two weeks from now. So, June 14th, would somebody like to move and second that?

Vice Chair Corey: Let's move to do it on the 14th.

Ms. French: Wait, wait, but we're still missing our...

Vice Chair Corey: Mike?

Ms. French: Yeah. I saw him downstairs. So...

(inaudible)

Ms. French: No, I say him, I asked him, I saw him come back in the building. He's on A level. He's probably that person, yeah.

Vice Chair Corey: So, let's, should we assume – oh, here he is.

Ms. French: We're going to play the Jeopardy music, or whatever,

Vice Chair Corey: Mike, are you free on the 14th, of June?

Ms. French: Okay, maybe reconvene the...

Vice Chair Corey: Reconvene again. We're back officially.

Ms. French: So, we're looking, Mike, we're looking to reopen that hearing that we just had to continue, simply to continue it to June 14th, so that we have a quorum, because Margaret can't be here on the 24th.

Vice Chair Corey: And you can't either, as you said. Are you available on the 14th?

Ms. French: June 14th. Schools out, we're still here, okay?

Vice Chair Corey: Sound okay? So, we move to recontinue this, or to continue this on the 14th instead of the date we had.

Chair Bower: I second it.

Vice Chair Corey: All those?

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.

- 4. 1107 Cowper Street [Application Not yet Filed]:** Historic Resources Board Study Session to Discuss Preliminary Plans for Replacement of a Professorville Historic District Two-Story Home Built in 1997 with a New Two-Story Home.

Chair Bower: Okay, let's come back to Item #4. Roger and I are back. We don't have any conflicts with this, that I know of. So, this is a new residence at 1107 Cowper. It replaces a current, the current building which was built in 1997, and this is a study session, so Amy, do you want to start off?

Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Sure. I just have a few slides, and I know the applicant has more, so I'll go quickly through my slides. This is just kind of an overview showing the existing home and the proposed home. So, they have much better slides, and I'm going to get out of my, oh, I'm sorry, you don't. Okay. I strike that. I'm going to keep those images on the screen. So, what we're dealing with is replacement of a Professorville Historic District home. The home itself is not historic.

Chair Bower: Correct me if I'm wrong, but because this is in Professorville, this will come back to the Board for approval when the final project is done.

Ms. French: Well, when the project is submitted. We do not have an application on file at present.

Chair Bower: If an application is made, then it will come back again?

Ms. French: Correct. So, this is because the HRB collectively in past study or retreats has indicated the desire to have study sessions early on, as early as possible. We had the opportunity, I had the opportunity to meet the applicants who are here, the architect, in a preliminary individual review meeting, where it was revealed that a two-story home would be replacing this home, and I mentioned, well, it's Professorville, so we have to go through all of that. So, you know, evaluating a 1997 home as a contributor to a district is kind of interesting. Evaluating the proposed home as a contributor to the district is also, I guess, interesting, and that's your purview to do that. But for now, it's just early opportunity to comment on the proposed removal and replacement. If I can ask the applicants to come and...

Chair Bower: Does the applicant want to make any comments?

Ms. French: Come up and – you do have the plans for this, correct?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Ms. French: Contained in the packet, year.

Chair Bower: That's what I was just unfolding. That's why it's such – I mean, we have a lot of material in this packet.

Chair Bower: Welcome.

Catharine: Hi, I'm Catharine. So, a little history on this property. Originally there was a house that was built in 1906 or 07 by Dr. [Newsome] and we had the opportunity to do a fair amount of research, trying to look into the history of the house, because our client was curious about it. And it was a shingle house. Unfortunately, we didn't find any photos of it, other than some interiors in one shot of the last family that lived in the house, up on the front porch of it. It burned down in 1959 or 60 and then was an empty lot for a while and a renowned gardener, Barbara Werle, has rose gardens there. And then a family built this house in 1997. So, our understanding with Amy was, first step was for you all to look at the potential historic value of this 1997 house. So, here we are to ask permission to take this house down, to potentially build a replacement home.

Chair Bower: Your architect isn't here?

Catharine: We are the architects.

Chair Bower: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. So, obviously a house that is 21 years old is not close to approaching the first hurdle to become an historic resource, although 26 years more, no, 29 years and it could be. So, I guess the review we would want to make is how the proposed house will complement the neighborhood of structures in the neighborhood, because this is an historic district. And so, I think you are probably here for our first study session when I said, what we evaluate is compatibility and differentiation, which is mass, scale, form, materials and so forth. And there is a rather distinctive house right to the right, or south of this, which is from the outside virtually unchanged, very well maintained. So, that's I think, the direction the conversation might take, and if you could address that. That's going to be more important and more helpful to you in developing, going to the next step, which is actually developing final design to come back to the Board for approval.

Catharine: Yeah, we understood there's two parts, that we had to first get permission to take down this home, and sort of wanted to get an indication that that would be acceptable, because our clients are about to spend lots of money with us to design a new home. So, it's a bit of a two-part piece, but we have begun the design of the new structure and we're taking cues from primarily the Victorian shingle homes in the neighborhood as a precedent for us, that we have an elevation of our preliminary design on page 3 of your packet. We are not matching, the house next door is a three-story tall home, so we are

certainly not matching it in scale by any means. Ours is set back the same distance as that house and is similar in, the cues that we're taking for our design are about the same time period as the house next door. It's a Victorian Queen Anne shingle house.

Chair Bower: Margaret, do you have...

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah. So, one of the Professorville Historic District guideline criteria is, which you conveniently have in your packet, Item 6.1, New Construction Should Avoid Demolition of Existing Buildings. And I see that this is, you are responding to some of these questions. It says avoid demolishing later residences that are complimentary to the District. So, I guess maybe one of the first questions we should entertain is, does the existing, is the existing house complimentary to the Professorville District? And your response was, we feel that the current house completed in 1997 is not an exemplary example of compatibility within the neighborhood and, thus, a candidate for deconstruction and replacement. Additionally, as per Section 5.4, the existing structure does not have any individual historic significance, which obviously, we have established that it doesn't. But, the question is, does the existing house, is it compatible in the neighborhood? So, I guess my question is, how is the new proposed house more compatible in the neighborhood as opposed to the current house? And, I'm sure you considered all of the possibilities, but obviously, you could remodel the exterior and make it look more like a shingle style house, maybe remove some of the neoclassical elements and tone it down, but I guess my main question is, how is the proposed house more compatible with the Professorville guidelines than the existing house?

Catharine: First, just briefly just a little bit more about the existing house and why the clients didn't want to remodel it. They actually like the front façade of it. It was more the configuration and actually partially the deterioration of the house. There's a lot of dry rot inside, but primarily it was the interior configuration, which had, especially on the second floor, a dark center hall and very few windows for bedrooms. There's some nice windows in the front section here, and also facing the rear directly behind the master bedroom, and then the side wings had fairly small, tight bedroom spaces. So, the massing was problematic for them, as well as the issues of the dry rot on the back side of the house. As far as why they chose the style they did, a big piece was the materials of having a shingle, clapboard house was something that appealed to them, more so than the stone on the stone and stucco. And secondly, having a big front porch was a primary desire of the client and an appropriate look for the neighborhood. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Brandon.

Vice Chair Corey: I can't – I was trying to look on this. I thought I had seen them before. Where is the new house? I see the existing house in relations to the setbacks and the distance from the surrounding houses. I can't find it for some reason.

(inaudible)

Vice Chair Corey: No, that's the existing. 1.10 is the existing, but I can't find the new – I see all the detail plans, I just can't find the site layout.

Kristen: If you go to A1.11, it's the proposed site plan. Oh, sorry, A1.11.

Chair Bower: Can you introduce yourself.

Kristen: Hi, Kristen with Fergus Garber Young Architects.

Chair Bower: Okay, thanks.

Kristen: So, that shows where the proposed house is on the site.

Vice Chair Corey: Well, maybe another way to ask this is, because I'm having trouble reading these numbers. The existing one seems to have more detail. Is it the exact same setback as the existing, same?

Catharine: No, if you see there are two bumps out. They project out about 8 or 10 feet in front of the existing house. And our house now currently aligns with the front porch of the neighboring three-story house to the right at Kingsley and Cowper. So, it's about 60 feet back. (crosstalk) You can see the adjoining houses to the left and right. We've added their footprints onto the drawing on A11. (crosstalk) I'm sorry, A1.11. So, that shows both the house to the left, which is at the corner of Cowper and Webster, and then to the right is the house at the corner of Cowper and Kingsley.

Chair Bower: So, it looks to me like the existing setback is 62 feet and the new one is 50, according to these two drawings. It looks like 50.

Catharine: Sorry, I misspoke.

Kristen: It's around 50, yeah.

Chair Bower: Yeah, a little more than 50.

Vice Chair Corey: Is the distance approximately the same? Sorry, from the side.

Kristen: From the side, yes.

Vice Chair Corey: It looks it, but again it's...

Kristen: It is approximately the same, within about 2 feet or so.

Chair Bower: So, it's a little bit difficult from our elevations to see what your material selections are. Can you go through those on the front of the house, the exterior of the house?

Kristen: Yeah, if you look at A3.0 for the front elevation. So, at the base is going to probably be a brick material, and then the first story is clapboard siding, and the second story is singles, and sort of the gable ends will also be a shingled material too.

Chair Bower: And then you said the brick, is there a brick wainscoting or is that?

Kristen: Yeah, that low brick wainscot at the bottom.

Chair Bower: That's on the house, that's not a wall or something?

Kristen: No.

Chair Bower: So, I'm curious now why you selected an arched top entry form. Where does that come from in this architectural style, which is mostly consistent with the Professorville brown shingle houses?

Kristen: That was largely client driven. She really wanted to sort of open up that front door towards the public, so by doing an arch it just creates a more welcoming front.

Chair Bower: Roger.

Board Member Kohler: If you look on page 172, packet 171, 172, and then I just pulled out A3.0, which is the front of the house. I'm actually sort of, when I look at the photograph of the existing house and, my memory doesn't work too well, but I think something on this house came before the Board in my ancient days, 12 or 15 years ago or more. But anyway, so I look at the existing photo of the home and it

has a really nice feel to it, consistent throughout, and then I look at this sketch and I say, what is going on? I mean, there is this big box and one end of the house has no windows. It's just got this tall chimney. The other end has little windows on the second floor and big grid windows down on the first floor. I think the whole façade just isn't working. I mean, the materials and everything, just not selected well. And that arch just mentioned here, it just looks totally out of keeping it, it either needs to be bigger or narrower. Then you look around there, there's that one little door and each side of that is all solid wall. It's a very un-, it doesn't look very friendly to me, and I just, the blank wall, when you compare the two here, it's just, the older home just has a really great feel to it, and this one just looks incomplete. I'm not sure what to say. I mean, you're welcome to build it, but I think it doesn't look very good.

Catharine: Roger, I'll speak to that. This is Catharine. This was a preliminary massing model that we showed to Arnold about a month ago, so we have been developing it a good bit since then, with window studies and refining the details. There are windows on the left, we do have more windows on the front porch. The two sides look a little bit more similar. So, this was an in-progress massing model for that meeting to test location on the site and massing, you know, sort of the big issues for pre-IR. And we just thought it was best, since that's what Amy had seen at that meeting, that we consistently show where we were at that point, as opposed to a progress drawing. And, again, I'm sorry, because we understood that this was primarily about getting permission to demolish the other house, so we did not come with progress set of what we're working on.

Ms. French: Well, yeah, it's a study session. It's not actionable today, but it's just an opportunity to discuss the fact of removal of something in Professorville that isn't historic. Yeah, and then next steps.

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Amy, so when the formal application, we'll be seeing this formally, right? Thank you. Picking up on Board Member Wimmer's comment about Professorville Historic Design Guidelines, avoid demolishing later residences that are complimentary to the District. I share Board Member Wimmer's comment. What's, I think the existing house is complimentary to the District, and an environmentally conscious question, why demolish this existing building? You mentioned a program from the client, but we have the Historic District Guidelines, avoid demolishing later residences that are complimentary. So, it's complimentary. Do you agree that the existing house is complimentary to the District? That's my question. If it's not complimentary, then it's okay, but anyway, that's my comment. Then Kristen you say, yeah, Kristen mentioned the arch was client driven. I think architects have a good voice on compatibility, so I'm an architect, I've got clients who request certain things, but as their architect I need to respond to guidelines and stylistic things, so I share the comment about, if the arch is incompatible with the proposed design. Permission to demolish, that's not an HRB decision. Is that correct? I don't know if that's our purview to question, but it's the idea of our guideline is, avoid demolishing later residences that are complimentary, and Board Member Wimmer's comment is, what's not complimentary about the existing structure?

Chair Bower: So, I would answer your question in a more general way. It's not that we would necessarily provide an approval to demolish, but we would need to be convinced that the removal of the existing building somehow didn't meet the guidelines, and I think at this point, you're going to have to work harder than you have in making that case. So, that's the first step. And then the reason, and I share Martin and Margaret's concern about that, as a member of the Professorville Guidelines Committee or, because I participated in the development of those guidelines, the purpose of that particular paragraph was to avoid removing buildings that were clearly not yet historic resources, as defined by the Federal and State requirements, but that were complimentary. So, you know, that's a tough hurdle for you to get over here, I think. And also, I have some problem wondering why, I can't imagine the amount of dry rot that you would need on a building that was 21 years old, that would require the total demolition of the building. I understand in Palo Alto that financial considerations no longer really apply to a lot of homeowners. It's just a different City than the one I grew up in, but still, you need to get over that first hurdle, and then, you know, convince us that this really needs to be demolished. That's something you'll come back – that will be part of your application when you get back. Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: So, I think we're clearly responding to the move to demolish what we see as a perfectly fine, expensively built resource, but, so I'm trying to look at it from a different angle. So, if we look at this photograph, the photograph of the existing house, and then we pull out the last of their elevation, so I have these two side-by-side. I'm looking at the shingle style proposed front elevation and I'm looking at the existing photograph. Let's just say for a moment that this existing house didn't exist and we were looking at this, someone wanted to build a house in Professorville, and they said, well, we could either do this neoclassical or we could do the shingle style. Which one would we probably say belongs in Professorville? I don't know. I'm kind of thinking – I mean, I'm trying to angle my thoughts in a way that responds to what they are trying to do. I mean, I think it's sad that you would tear that down, but you know, I'm not your client so I don't have that background. But, I'm kind of being sensitive to, if you're just taking it purely for aesthetic front elevation design, which one belongs in Professorville, this neoclassical or the shingle style. Clearly, I mean, I think the shingle style is kind of more compatible, because it's, the guidelines are always asking for historic references, and I think historically this is more referenced and this is a new, sort of mc mansion-looking design that a lot of people probably didn't like that when they came through the Board. A lot of people probably thought the massing is too big, it's too insensitive, but we're so – it's been there for 20 years, we're used to looking at it. Now it's becoming part of the fabric and we've accepted it. So, I think we're just trying to, we're responding to, I think, tearing something down that we see as valuable, but at the same time, I mean, it just depends on how you look at it.

Chair Bower: So, probably enough said on the demolition part of this. My impression of the design that you proposed here on page 3.0 is that it's a little busy. Three different materials on the front of the house. They're all in Professorville, but I can't remember a building off the top of my head that has brick wainscoting, horizontal siding on the first floor, and then another material on the second. Most of them are all shingles. So, you might consider simplifying that.

Kristen: Can I say one thing about that?

Chair Bower: Sure.

Kristen: We did look at precedents for that material, and there are buildings in Professorville that do have those three materials.

Chair Bower: I'm sure there are, but as I look at this, it just looks busy to me, as I see it built. The other thing is the window arrangements are, again, I think too busy and if you wanted to use diamond, a diamond motif in the windows as kind of a transom I don't think you'd typically see then a multi-divided light on a double hung below with a single light. I mean, that's just odd, frankly. I mean, one or the other would be typical, although multi-divided lights might be a little later in the iteration. At any rate, those are might thoughts about the materials and it would be nice to see this, I understand you didn't have this developed, didn't come here today with the understanding that this was going to be developed, but having more detail on that kind of, those selections would be helpful. Other comments? Brandon.

Vice Chair Corey: Where did the other houses that you saw, I'd like to take a look at them when I have time, but with the clapboard and the shingle, or the multi material. You said you saw some other ones in Professorville. Do you have those or do you know where those are?

Catharine: We would be happy to send some addresses.

(crosstalk)

Vice Chair Corey: That would be great, yeah.

Chair Bower: Roger?

Board Member Kohler: I don't think that's so unusual. I kind of remember seeing it several times. I couldn't tell you where. I'm more interested, when I look here, the varying windows. The first floor has the grid windows and the upper one it's...

Catharine: Again, please don't focus on this. This is a passing, massing model.

Board Member Kohler: Okay.

Catharine: I don't want to say passing. It does still have a, not this plane, it does still have an arched entry porch, but much subtler.

Board Member Kohler: If there's a little more oomph to the construction of the arch, it might help. Right now, it's so wimpy and thin, it doesn't, it looks like you went to the – well, it's not enough to really – well, never mind.

Chair Bower: Alright, Michael?

Board Member Makinen: Thank you Chair Bower. I'm looking at page 172, on the rendering of the proposed project. To me it looks like it's, from about the second story up is one style, and the first floor is a different style. It's like two different houses, Like you've superimposed a more traditional shingle-sided house on the upper part, and the bottom is an entirely different style. Am I reading it wrong?

Board Member Kohler: I don't think that's that unusual myself.

Board Member Makinen: It's like two different houses that are kind of glued together, the styles. Stylistically it doesn't seem to be harmonious.

Chair Bower: Alright. I don't want to keep circling back on this. Brandon, you have another thought, a new one?

Vice Chair Corey: I was just going – well, no probably not. I was just going to circle back on, isn't this, what we really should be focusing on the demolition here, the existing, right, versus anything else? We do circle back.

Chair Bower: If anybody wants to go back to the demolition issues. I think we've probably covered the concerns, unless someone has a concern, another concern that hasn't been expressed? I don't see that. And also, considering how late it is, any other – let's wrap this up.

Catharine: May I ask a point of clarification? Are we in our next meeting to prove that our house is more compatible than what's being proposed to take down, or what is our goal relative to having permission to put a new house on the site?

Chair Bower: Well, that's an interesting question. I would say the way you would proceed is to address the guidelines, demonstrate that you're complying with the guidelines, and if you are going to remove that building, demonstrate why that would be preferable to retaining it, when the guidelines say to retain it. That's the hurdle you have to get over first. And then the second review would be the design that you propose. And, while the first hurdle is the demolition question, it's also going to be, the replacement building, I think, will also tie back to that. So, the replacement building would have to, I think, would have to be almost more compatible. I don't know if that's the right term to use, but I think that's really the issue here.

Catharine: So, back to Margaret's point, that if we're taking this down, we're providing something that's more compatible to the guidelines than what is currently there?

Chair Bower: Yeah, the guidelines in the District, the overall District characteristics. Does that express the Board's view? Okay.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, and maybe just pair it with some photographs and some images of some existing houses that are, maybe you're trying to emulate, some detailing, I mean improve upon, but emulate – just have the historic references of houses in the District that have some characteristics that you're trying to incorporate. That might be helpful, and I think that might be easy, because I think there's a lot of this around.

Catharine: Yes, and we have gathered some, and I would apologize, because we didn't realize we were to have those materials for this go around.

Chair Bower: Okay, any other comments on this? No, alright. Well, thank you. We look forward to seeing you again.

Action Items

Chair Bower: We're at Action Items. I don't think we have any Action Items, do we?

(inaudible)

Approval of Minutes

5. Historic Resources Board Draft Meeting Minutes of February 8 and February 22, 2018.

Chair Bower: Yeah, well, I'm just down at the bottom. I would like to suggest that we review minutes at our next meeting. This was a long enough meeting preparation, that I didn't get a chance to go over the minutes, unless the Board wants to move forward with that? I would suggest we just pick it up, pick these up at our next meeting. Any objections to that? I don't see any.

Board Member Wimmer: I don't object to just approving them without reading them.

Ms. French: And they are verbatim minutes, so I mean, they are transcriptionist's interpretation of what was heard.

Chair Bower: I know, but I would like to read them, but if somebody, if the Board would like to move forward and approve them, then I will entertain a motion. Alright, not hearing one, we will put that off until our next meeting.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: There are no subcommittee items.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: I would like to bring to the Board's attention the, that the City Council has approved the Eichler Design Guidelines and a resolution of approval is in our packet. There is a paragraph in this resolution that I think the Board ought to look at and that is on page, it's section 1, page 3, and it's, just so you can see it, it's on this page, the one that has all these little dots. Alright, let me just read the paragraph to you, because this was a paragraph that was first published on the Agenda with different language, and then it was, I don't know how you would describe this. It was modified on the night of the Council meeting. But it says, the individual Eichler homes, this is section 1, paragraph 3, individual Eichler homes in Palo Alto are not considered Historical Resources pursuant to Government Code 21084.1, that's a State code, unless they contribute to the significance of a locally designated historic district or an historic district that has been deemed eligible for, or listed on California Register of Historic Resources or

the National Register of Historic Places. I bring this to your attention, because when I read section 21084.1, it seems to be that this particular paragraph contradicts that section of State Code, and it was somewhat controversial at the City Council meeting, and I didn't have a sense, when I was there of the reason why this particular paragraph was written in this manner, but I think it's worth our attention and to maybe get the City Attorney who, I think, wrote this, I don't know who wrote it, but the City Attorney defended it as defensible and appropriate, but I think it, my understanding of CEQA, it's confusing and that's not good for the City to put into a code that then opens an opportunity for somebody to come back and challenge it. So, I ask you all to look at this. Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you David. On the Eichler Guidelines, page 115, if you take a look, it talks about process, improvements, suggestions, it's the middle of the page, the lower paragraph in the middle. I'll just read it. Historic Preservation Ordinance should be revised to be consistent with the terminology of the ADU Ordinance for properties listed in the Palo Alto Historic Inventory, California Register of Places, National Register of Places, or considered historic after completion of an Historic Resource Evaluation, compliance with the appropriate standards shall be required as determined by the Planning Director. So, it says Historic Preservation Ordinance should be revised. If the HRB decides we want to revise the Ordinance, does that need to be an Agenda conversation for first recommend to Council to do that?

Ms. French: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay. What is the process for getting that on some future Agenda?

Chair Bower: Are we talking about the ordinance that will be generated from this resolution, because I think that's the next step, isn't it?

Ms. French: Yeah. I think we're departing from – I mean, we're not departing from the Eichler Guidelines, because you saw it in the Eichler Guidelines. I think that's another conversation is to what's next, and I would be happy to enlighten you. I didn't realize that you had these, I don't have what you're looking at. So, to parse that out, should the HRB wish to put something on its agenda, that is a possibility. If it's to put, revise the Historic Ordinance on the agenda, it would probably be best to be very specific about, you know, we're touching that thing, why are we touching it. It's going to raise concerns. The realtor community is already highly concerned about the policy that was put into the Comprehensive Plan about don't demolish, you know, resources that might be eligible for California. So, I'm just saying, we have to tread lightly at this point as far as whether we embark upon that, and probably not soon.

Chair Bower: Sure. Maybe we'll think about that and revisit it later. So, in terms of my question, this resolution then is transformed by staff into ordinance language or now? Is this it?

Ms. French: No. So, the Council on April 2nd, I probably should have put this as an agenda item, but we're talking about something that happened, the Council adopted, for voluntary use, the Eichler Guidelines. They did not take up the staff recommendation, which was to come back with an ordinance that said, we will use these in our Individual Review Program for reviewing new two-story homes in Eichler neighborhoods. What they said was, we direct staff to come back with, along with a fix to the single-story overlay problems, that I'm not going to go into, is that we come back with an option for people to self-select as Eichler overlay districts. And with that, you know, they would need to use the guidelines or a portion thereof for new homes for changes. So, that's going to be a whole another thing, an outreach, hearings, what have you. It's not happening this month or next month.

Chair Bower: No, that's a longer-term program that's, if you remember Board, we evaluated various steps forward when we reviewed, the last time we reviewed the Eichler guidelines, and that was the second, that was like a second option after the adoption of these. Alright, anyway, we'll figure out a time to get this paragraph on the agenda, so we can look at it more closely and make sure it's fully understood by the Palo Alto residents, and by the Board members.

Board Member Wimmer: Maybe that could be a retreat item for our next retreat.

Chair Bower: Well, our next retreat is what, nine months away, many months away.

Ms. French: There's no restriction, if you want to have another retreat, I mean, you don't have to only have them once a year. You can have them...

(inaudible)

Ms. French: Yeah, I mean, I wouldn't have it before I have a new planner, but maybe when I have a new planner, that would be the time that would be convened for discussion.

Chair Bower: Well, we'll get together and figure out an appropriate time to do that. Any other, Roger?

Board Member Kohler: Well, I just was going through this magic book here, this is a...

Chair Bower: You're referring to the...

Board Member Kohler: Page 11.

Chair Bower: It's the Comprehensive Plan you're referring to.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, a long, long time ago.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair Bower. The comment I have is, in the paper they are showing some proposed solar panels on El Camino Real in front of the Palo Alto High School, 50 Embarcadero. It's an administration building. It's a Category II structure. There have been comments in the paper about, if you put solar panels on El Camino it will obscure the view of the administration building, a Category II historic structure on our inventory. Is that something that might be coming before HRB? Does staff know?

Ms. French: Any Palo Alto Unified School District property is not subject to local jurisdiction.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay.

Chair Bower: Schools and hospitals are entirely under the purview of the State administration. I too saw this issue and inquired about an environmental impact report because of the historic structure. It's not been done. The consultant that's managing this for the school district said they're working on it, even though they have a contract to start construction in June. I think a member of the public who contacted me is writing a letter to the State Office of, SHPO, State Office of Historic Preservation to ask for a copy of the EIR, and I don't think they can move forward without an EIR in a case like this. It's a State issue, but at least I think that's moving, somebody is moving to make the State aware of it.

Board Member Bernstein: So, a Category II, that's a City of Palo Alto designation, but if the school is exempt from historic, the historic category doesn't have any...

Chair Bower: Well, they're not exempt from CEQA review. That's a State law and I actually had that verified by a person that has long-term experience with CEQA.

Ms. French: I would just say, I would ask whether, whatever building you're speaking about, if that is actually listed as a California Register of Historic Resources, you know, register building.

Chair Bower: It's on Palo Alto's.

Ms. French: Right, but that's not the same as being listed on the State's Register, so that would be a question I would have for anyone who is looking into it.

Chair Bower: Well, the language that was forwarded to me said that it could be local, state or federal. So, it didn't have to be state. I could be any of the three, and it would then be, SEQA review would be required. Now, that was (crosstalk).

Board Member Kohler: I guess that I should disclose that I talked to that lady on the phone and forwarded various things, and she was saying they were going to put the solar panels out in front of the school, under the oak trees, which I thought...

Chair Bower: No, they're taking the trees down.

Board Member Kohler: They're taking the trees down, oh my.

Chair Bower: Not oak trees, but it's quickly planned and maybe not completely considered approach to this. I'm totally in support of solar arrays on schools, and they just built two huge new buildings on that campus, the gymnasium and they didn't prep them for this, and those building could easily be covered with panels. You know, it's a difficult issue to get any clarity on, because there seems to be several different managers of this project.

Vice Chair Corey: So, I exchanged e-mails, I don't know if this is appropriate for this, but with Terry on the Board and I guess she had said as of last week they had talked to the chief business official, I guess Cathy Mack, and they were going to now propose to remove all the arrays adjacent to El Camino because of all the outreach. So, they're trying to actually make that change right now with the projects. They still think they can meet their goals with having the solar panels, but to actually get rid of the ones adjacent to the buildings. So, for what that's worth.

Chair Bower: Any other Board comments? I don't see any. I would...

Board Member Kohler: A quick question. This is for us to keep and look at?

Ms. French: Did you all receive the Comprehensive Plan? Okay. I wasn't...

Chair Bower: We're supposed to memorize them and we'll have a test at our next meeting.

Ms. French: So, this is the Comprehensive Plan that has new policies with respect to Historic Resources. So, it would be good for you to familiarize yourself with just that piece of it in the land use section, Policy 7.2 is the one. Because you as ambassadors in the community about all things historic, you should be aware that that policy exists. It was put in place as a result of an environmental impact report associated with this document, and it has implications for us to return with a change to the bulletin that we all use. We're still using that bulletin right now, though there is a policy. We have some time to implement that policy and that is this year, so we will have further discussions this year about that.

Chair Bower: Okay, alright, please let Amy and Robin know of any meetings through the rest of this year you will miss, so we have quorums. And with that, I think we can adjourn.

Adjournment