



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 9716)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 10/11/2018

Summary Title: Draft Minutes of September 27, 2018

Title: Draft Minutes the Historic Resources Board Meeting of September 27, 2018 for Approval

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):

- September 27, 2018

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Draft Minutes HRB September 27, 2018 (PDF)



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: September 27, 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 Robert Kohler, Board Member Makinen, Board Member Deborah Shepherd, Board Member Margaret Wimmer, Board Member Martin Bernstein

Chair Bower: I'd like to open the meeting with roll call please. Thank you. Imagine, it's the fourth time, the fifth time we've met this year, and we're at the end of September. I'd like to Welcome Debby Shepherd as our new member. We're finally back to a full capacity and we look forward to her contributions.

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: Let's move quickly to oral communications. David Carnahan.

David Carnahan: Thank you Chair Bower, Board Members. David Carnahan of the City Clerk's Office. I am here to share with you the City's current recruitment for Boards and Commissions. We're currently looking to fill three positions on the Architectural Review Board, three positions on the Parks and Recreation Commission and two on the Planning and Transportation Commission. As you know from your service here or Debby, as you're going to learn, these are great ways to give back to your community and help make an impact on the Palo Alto Community. The positions are all for three years, except for the Planning Commission, that has a four-year term. Applications are due October 17th, and 4:30 PM. Applications can be found on the City's website, cityofpaloalto.org/clerk. So, again, Architectural Review Board, Parks and Recreation Commission and Planning and Transportation Commission, and Board Members, your homework is to reach out to at least two community members that you think might be a good fit for one of these bodies and encourage them to apply. Thank you very much.

Chair Bower: Thank you David.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: I don't think there are any changes, additions or deletions?

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: None.

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Chair Bower: Okay. Looking at the schedule of future meetings, as I mentioned we've only had four this year. It looks like there are only three more that we will have possibly, and I'm just wondering if there is anything in the pipeline?

Ms. French: There are no applications that are due to come to the HRB other than today's application, that I am aware of.

Chair Bower: So, possible, since I know you have all kinds of free time, we could, we have some pending things that Mills Act, if you can find the information that Emily Vance worked up, developed with Margaret and Brendon and myself, that's a possibility. And I'd like to get the ITT site on an agenda, not necessarily this year, but certainly in January.

Ms. French: Okay.

Chair Bower: Okay. I'd like to try to move this forward as quickly as we can. I have to leave at 10:00, but I think we can, in an hour and 15 minutes we can get through the rest of our agenda.

Study Session

Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 1107 Cowper Street. [18PLN-00202]:** Request for Review of an Individual Review Application for Consistency with the Professorville Historic District Design Guidelines. The Project Includes the Demolition of an Existing Two-Story home and Construction of a New Two-Story Home. Environmental Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance with Guideline Section 15303 (New Construction). Zoning District: R-1 (Single-Family Residential). For more information Contact the Project Planner Graham Owen at graham.owen@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Bower: The first action item, and the only action item on our agenda is 1107 Cowper Street. It's a request for review of an individual review application for consistency with the Professorville Historic District Design Guidelines. Project includes the demolition of an existing two-story home and construction of a new two-story home. Environmental Assessment is that it is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with Guideline Section 15303 (new construction). Zoning District is R-1 (single-family residential). Planner is Graham Owen, who is here today is the project manager. So, Graham you're up.

Graham Owen: Thank you Chair Bower. As you mentioned...

Chair Bower: Excuse me, I'm sorry to interrupt. Just a reminder to turn off cell phones, so we're not interrupted by the public. Martin.

Board Member Martin Bernstein: Chair Bower, I see that this is listed as a quasi-judicial, so perhaps it would be good to every Board Member to see if there is any issue with that.

Chair Bower: Any conflict.

Board Member Martin Bernstein: Correct.

Chair Bower: I don't. Does anyone have a conflict? I you'd live closest to it.

Ms. French: Conflicts or disclosures.

Chair Bower: Oh, conflicts or disclosures.

Ms. French: Maybe having met with an applicant.

Chair Bower: Well, I'll disclose that I did, I have walked by the building for the last Study Session, and did again walk by it again t his week to look at the site, and look at the surrounding buildings.

Board Member Kohler: I guess I drove by originally when we were working on it.

Board Member Shepherd: Okay, I road my bicycle by the house this week.

Board Member Makinen: I've driven my car past the house.

Board Member Bernstein: I've been in the neighborhood many times.

Chair Bower: All right, so all of us appear to have been in the neighborhood and taken a look...

Board Member Kohler: Well, actually it came before our Board at one point, so we all saw it.

Chair Bower: Okay, disclosures done. Sorry to interrupt you Graham.

Mr. Owen: Quite all right. My fault. It's okay. So, as I mentioned, my name is Graham Owen. I'm with the current Planning Staff. I've been working with the applicants on the house that's before you today. So, this is 1107 Cowper Street. It is an Individual Review Application and I know that Individual Review Applications don't come before the Board very often, so I'll just give a, just kind of a brief overview of this type of discretionary application. Any, generally any two-story house that's in an R-1 zoning district in the City goes through the individual review process. This is a discretionary process by which the City looks at the potential impacts of a house on the surrounding properties. So, it's only for two-story homes, not, we don't send one-story homes through this process, but we have individual review guidelines that we use to evaluate massing, scale, neighborhoods, streetscape appearance and privacy, in particular, as well as landscaping. So, we look at the application in light of the guidelines as well as the, or standard R-1 zoning regulations, and then the Director makes the decision on the application. This project is unique in the sense that it's located in the Professorville Historic District, and it proposes to demolish an existing house that was constructed in 1997. So, the house is not considered a contributor to the district, given that it was constructed outside of the period of significance; however, new homes that are proposed within Professorville are evaluated against the Professorville Historic District Design Guidelines, which were recently adopted. And so, those among other things, have guidelines that are specific to this type of application, which is a new residence. So, hence why it is here before you today. So, the application, as many of you remember, was previously reviewed before it was actually considered a formal application, in April of this year and a non-binding study session provided feedback on the application. So, as I mentioned, the house is not considered a contributor to the district; however, new homes need to be compatible with the district, hence why it's coming before you today. So, the role of the HRB is to make a recommendation to the Director as to whether or not the house as designed would be compatible with the district, and not have an adverse impact it the district. This is the streetscape frontage at the front of the house at 1107 Cowper Street. The lot is nearly an acre in size, so it's a relatively large lot. The building was constructed in 1997. Zoning district is R-1 which is the standard zoning district throughout the City for single family, and the Comprehensive Plan use designation is single family as well. Here is a parcel report showing the lot in relation to its surroundings. It's located midblock between Lincoln Avenue and Kingsley on Cowper Street, right across the street from the Presbyterian Church. There is a – its shape is unique, as you can see. Most of the frontage is on Cowper Street, but then it does have this little flag that sticks out onto Lincoln Avenue. So, the existing home and the accessory structures that are on the site, the pool for example, those are slated for demolition and replacement with a new single-family house, as well as accessory structures, ADU, a detached garage and another accessory structure as well. This is the house that's proposed. It follows a, it's got a double gabled façade, as well as a longer section down the middle that runs parallel to the street. Materials, shiplap as well as shingle siding on the upper floors. We have a number of features, here you have the dual chimneys as well as shed dormers and front-facing gables that add articulation to the façade. These are the east and north elevations just kind of showing the wrap of the building all the way around. So, we did have M-Group, which is one of our consultants, prepare an evaluation of the project relative to the Professorville Guidelines, so I have included that report in the staff report for your review. In general, the application is, we would say consistent with the guidelines. There is one important one where it's certainly not consistent, which is that the guideline, one of the guidelines says that we should avoid the demolition of existing buildings.

Obviously, the demolition is proposed; however, it's for a 1997 construction building. So, it's outside of the period of significance. The building that's there currently is generally consistent with kind of the character of Professorville though, so there is kind of a question about that. However, the other guidelines that seek to ensure that new residences are compatible with Professorville in terms of its landscaping, in terms of its materials, scale, massing, staff feels and concurs with M-Group's determination that it is consistent with the guidelines. So, with that, I'll leave it at that. I know the applicant has a presentation as well, but we are recommending that the HRB determine that there are no adverse impacts on the district with this application and find that the project is, therefore, exempt from CEQA under Guideline Section 303.

Chair Bower: Thank you Graham.

Mr. Owen: Sorry, if you have any questions, for me, I'm happy to answer.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I was just going to ask if there are any questions at this point for staff? No. So applicant presentation.

Kristen Lomax: Hi. My name is Kristen Lomax. I'm with Fergus Garber Young Architects and I'm also here with my colleagues, Nick and Catharine and we comprise the architectural team for this project. We're here today to present to you 1107 Cowper Street, which is a new single-family house in Professorville. We want to take you through sort of how we got to where we are with the design and the history of the site.

Chair Bower: Excuse me for interrupting. Could you move the mic a little closer to you?

Ms. Lomax: Sorry. Can you hear me?

Chair Bower: That's much better. Thank you.

Ms. Lomax: Okay, so one of the first things we did on the project was to do a little bit of research on the original site. This is a picture of the carriage barn that was there in kind of the early 1900's. And then a brief history, jeez, I cannot read that. Just give me one second. Okay, a brief history of the site. In 1905 there were three lots that were purchased by a Stanford professor. He built a house in the 1920's, which is, those photos are shown. The original house is in a shingle style. Unfortunately, in 1959 that house burned down and then from the 1950's to 1996 that lot actually remained vacant and was used as a community garden. Then in 1997 the house that's currently there was built by the Stevens Family. So, one of the next things that we did when we were working on this project was we researched Professorville pretty intensely. Our firm has been pretty fortunate. We've done a couple of projects, but we wanted to take kind of a deep dive into Professorville. So, this is one of the diagrams from the Design Guidelines that shows when various houses were built. So, you can see, our house is labeled in kind of the dark blue color, which is one of the later periods, so from 1980 to 2013, and then if you go to this next diagram, you can see again in dark blue, the style of those houses tends to be in the neo-eclectic, neo-traditional or contemporary styles, which is kind of a minority. If you review the neighborhood, the majority of the houses are the dark green color, which are shingle style, colonial revival, Queen Anne, craftsman or prairie. So, we kind of came to the conclusion that, although our house does sort of fit in with the neighborhood, it's a minority in the style, so one of the things that was really important to our clients was that it fit in with the neighborhood. So, this is the existing house at 1107 built in 1996-1997. So, when we first started the project with the owners, we looked at either doing a remodel or doing a new house, and kind of weighed the pros and cons of those. So, one of the things about the existing house is that it has a partial basement with kind of small light wells, and the new owners really want to have a full basement for their family with light, bright light wells, with egress requirements, all that kind of stuff. So, that was one issue. So, if we wanted to keep this house, we'd actually have to lift up the house and put in a new basement. A second thing that we looked at was the second floor. So, this is the existing second floor. It's kind of hard to see from this diagram, but these rooms right here, these L-shaped rooms, they're labeled as storage, but they're actually bedrooms. So,

you can see sort of from the front elevation this little dormer here, the volumes actually create these very low ceilings that aren't that usable as bedrooms. So, again, if we wanted to keep this house, we would have to completely remove the second floor and the roof, build a new second floor in order to get actually usable bedrooms. So, these are a couple of photos from the second floor. The right-hand side is the long hallway that kind of connects all the bedrooms, and then the left one is one of those L-shaped bedrooms, and you can see the window is quite small and the ceiling is quite low. So, after that we kind of came to the conclusion that doing a new construction was the better approach because it would actually take us a longer construction period to make all those changes to the existing house, rather than just doing a new construction. So, that's sort of beneficial to the neighbors to do a shorter construction time. So, this is a front rendering of our proposed design. We want to take you through some of the design elements on this and in the preceding slides I'm going to show precedent images of houses in Professorville. So, it would be really helpful if you turn to A 0.1 so you can compare our design to these precedent images as we go through. So, after our study session in April, we actually hired Page and Turnbull to help us make sure that our design matched with the Professorville neighborhood and sort of analyze our elevations and give us suggestions. So, in each one of these slides there are actually quotes from the memo they provided to us. So, Page and Turnbull noted that many of the houses in this neighborhood have wide gabled roof forms, projecting bays and are two story in height, and our proposed building roof form references forms found elsewhere in the neighborhood and is sized to complement the building's proportions, which is demonstrated in this house on Melville. So, both our house and this other example draws upon the architectural influence of the first bay tradition, which is blended elements of the stick, Queen Anne and shingle styles. Through the use of shingles and siding, the combination intersecting gabled volumes, modest molded wood details and textural variation, the design incorporates compatible architectural features and materials, which remaining differentiated from historic buildings in the district. And these are all quotes directly from Page and Turnbull. The proposed wood exterior trim and details provide modest interpretations of classically referenced architectural details. These materials recall the common usage of natural exterior materials which inform the overall design of numerous contributing buildings within Professorville. The proposed building's floor levels, eaves and upper roofline are consistent with those of neighboring buildings. The muntin configuration chosen and the window dimensions are proportional to the proposed building's scale while forming a balance of solid to void, which represents design precedence of contributing buildings within the district. And then in reference to our front entryway, the proposed arch entrance and paneled wood door with sidelights respond to features of precedent buildings in the district, particularly those designed in the colonial revival style and are clearly modern interpretations, which avoid false historicism. So, then, Page and Turnbull did an analysis of the existing residence roof. I don't want to read this entire thing for you, but I'll kind of summarize. They basically said that the existing building is not removing a contributing building, and it does not reflect the development patterns or architectural trends associated with the early development of Professorville. It was designed prior to the creation of the design guidelines, which Page and Turnbull were actually the ones who created those design guidelines. And they said the residence's design, footprint, massing, fenestration and architectural style are not particularly compatible with the Professorville Historic District. Then, when they were reviewing our proposed design, they wrote the following. "The proposed structure's general massing characteristics, fenestration featuring clad wood sash windows and exterior cladding are modeled upon with very common architectural styles in Professorville. The building provides a modern interpretation of these styles while remaining clearly differentiated from the District's contributing residents. This avoids false historicism or conjectural design and enables the building to complement the District's architectural character more than the existing building." So, the top image is the image that we presented to you in our April study session, and then the bottom image is what we're presenting to you today. So, we've taken feedback from you and then we've also taken feedback from Page and Turnbull and we've made the following changes. We eliminated the brick wainscot which was around the home and instead, changed to a wood belt course. We lowered and further refined the arched entry porch and detailed it a little bit further. We updated the dormer over the front porch to have windows which are more consistent with the rest of the façade. We also reconfigured some of the first-floor windows and changed the configurations. We refined the chimney design, and then finally, we weren't completely clear on what the wood material was going to be and we're now sure it's going to be a wood shingled roof, which fits in with the Professorville neighborhood. And then finally, as Graham mentioned, the City hired M-Group to do a study and they wrote the

following: "It is the opinion of M-Group that there would be design benefits with replacement with the proposed residence, as it would provide simpler, less complex architectural elements, but are most consistent with the existing historic architectural styles within the District, and with the design guidelines which were not in place when the existing residence was built. So, thank you for listening to our presentation, and let me know if you have any questions.

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Kristen. Can you go back to page 15, please, of that report? Thanks. Page 15, thanks.

Ms. Lomax: Yes, this one?

Chair Bower: Page 15 of our packet?

Board Member Bernstein: No, she has it on the screen right now. Great.

Chair Bower: Oh, okay.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, thank you.

Chair Bower: Did you have a comment Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: No, I just wanted to make a copy of it.

Chair Bower: Oh, all right. So, I have a question for you. Do you know the date that this property was purchased by the current owner?

Ms. Lomax: Recently, but no, I don't know the exact date.

Chair Bower: Was that before the Professorville Design Guidelines were established?

Ms. Lomax: When the new owners bought it? No, it was after.

Chair Bower: Okay. I'm going to ask a couple more questions while my colleagues gather theirs together. I notice on the front, page A-0.00, The dormer that's over the front door on the second floor is...

Ms. Lomax: Sorry, I just want to look at the same thing you're looking at.

Chair Bower: So, in this view it looks like there is a relatively substantial detailing around the top right above the windows, and yet on your elevation A-3.00 it looks like it is significantly different. Are these developed, I mean, I'm not quite sure what's going on there. I understand this is a very reduced set of drawings, and it's early.

Ms. Lomax: I think you're referring to like the dentals and the wood trim that's happening?

Chair Bower: Right. I don't know if it's dental because, at this 30,000-foot level it's very difficult to determine what's going on there, but I'm just wondering if you could describe which of these drawings is the, depicts what...

Ms. Lomax: What's happening.

Chair Bower: Yeah, thank you.

Ms. Lomax: So, the one on A-3.00 is correct. The one that you're looking at on the screen is maybe a little bit different. We've added a couple more pieces of wood trim, but for the most part it's the same. And the pieces that are underneath the eaves, that is kind of a wide, white wood trim and then it's got dentals underneath that, which, if you look at this image, this precedent image, it's a very similar detail to that house.

Chair Bower: Okay. Let me ask a different question now. I notice that the accessory buildings at the rear of the property are very close to the property lines, and yet this building has, I mean this site, is almost an acre. In fact, I think the pool house encroaches on the rear setback, and I'm presumed that's allowed by zoning.

Ms. Lomax: Yes, that's allowed.

Chair Bower: Is there a reason why these have to be so close to the side yards, and especially the entertain room, I think that's the term you used on the drawing. The one on the right rear.

Ms. Lomax: The accessory building, yes.

Chair Bower: Right, which I would imagine would generate some significant noise, if you're entertaining.

Ms. Lomax: Can I speak one thing about that? So, there's a very large oak tree which is on the site, if you look at the site plan, it's shown with this kind of large dotted line. So, we needed to be very careful not to disturb any of the roots, so that really drove...

Chair Bower: What page would we look on?

Ms. Lomax: If you look on A-1.11 would be a good example. So, you see the tree on the rear half of the lot with the dotted line. So, that really drove putting those two structures sort of in the corners in order to avoid the root structure.

Chair Bower: Okay, but you have a substantial porch, deck or something. Even if that's not an impermeable surface, it certainly could be smaller and the building could be moved away from the side yard. I'm thinking about the impact that these buildings have on the neighbors.

Ms. Lomax: I understand. We did hire an arborist and we also had the City arborist come out and we were trying to determine exactly where that building could be located, and they almost pinpointed to the foot where we could put building. So, the deck that you're looking at is not going to affect that root structure, because it's going to be on sort of a pier situation, so we can't move the building any closer to that tree.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you Okay, Martin, let's start at your end. Do you have any questions?

Board Member Bernstein: I don't have any questions for Kristen.

Chair Bower: Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: I don't necessarily have questions. I might have comments.

Chair Bower: I think that would be part of discussions. Brandon, questions?

Board Member Corey: Yeah. Last time you were here I had asked about the delta between the shiplap siding on the first floor and the shingles on the second and asked to see some examples of that. I walked around the neighborhood and still didn't see any. I live a couple blocks from here. Did you, and I didn't see any on these images, were you able to find any? I actually think both materials individually could be

consistent, it's just that the delta between the two, it was specifically mentioned that that shows up in other places so?

Ms. Lomax: So, I believe that these examples do have, I'm sorry, it's kind of hard for me to see from here, but I think this one and this one both have shingles on the second floor and siding on the first floor.

Board Member Corey: So, this is new, so I don't know that one.

Ms. Lomax: I know, it's kind of hard to see with the plantings, but yeah these (crosstalk)

Board member Corey: ...on 363? Okay. Yeah, that was it. Thanks.

Chair Bower: Robert?

Board Member Kohler: I have a modest question. When you look on A-3, it's the front of the house, yeah, 3.00, somehow in my world I, when you have a long house like this that's got a hip roof all the way across, so at each end of this home it's a serious block. So, when I make the ends a hip roof, and it reflects the shape of the dormers in the roof here, tends to me kind of finish ending, the house is done. Where when you have hip roofs like this, you're never sure it it's done or not, because you could just add onto this home very easily. There's no end in the house.

Ms. Lomax: Are you saying we have a gabled roof currently, and you're suggesting a hipped roof?

Board Member Kohler: Yes. I mean that's just kind of my thought when I work on the homes in that neighborhood, we usually try to – I don't know, to me it looks like it's never ending, but when you put the hip on the end, that's the end and that's it. Just my own weird kind of thing.

Ms. Lomax: Okay.

Board Member Kohler: That's all I'm commenting on.

Ms. Lomax: Thank you.

Chair Bower: Michael?

Board Member Makinen: Are we just on questions right now?

Board Member Kohler: Yeah.

Chair Bower: Questions.

Board Member Kohler: Comments, well, I made comments. Sorry. And they're laughing at me next door.

Board Member Makinen: Are they? Shame on them. I guess a question would be more, I'll blend my comment into a question. On the front entry, on 3.00, the way that the house kinds of sits on the ground right here, in most of these older homes in the Professorville District, have a porch, they have steps leading up to a porch and it's elevated. This is kind of squatting and setting right on the ground.

Ms. Lomax: We do have steps leading up to a porch. There are two steps up to the porch in the center.

Board Member Makinen: But it's not elevated. The whole façade, to me, the image is it's just kind of sitting on the ground rather than being elevated with a few steps up to a porch, which gives a more consistency with what, the other historic homes I see in Professorville. I think, in my eye it would be more compatible if it rose a little bit off the ground.

Ms. Lomax: Higher than it is shown, yeah.

Board Member Makinen: And perhaps the windows that went into the basement, they gave you that elevation. Do you kind of follow?

Ms. Lomax: No, I do follow. The only thing I can speak to is the height restrictions are always tricky, so you're always kind of balancing between raising the house up too high versus hitting the daylight plane, that sort of thing, so.

Board Member Makinen: It just looks to me like it was sort of truncated prematurely. It should rise with some steps going up to a porch and more consistent with the rest of the Professorville. A question blended into a comment.

Chair Bower: And I'm sure we'll get back there. Anything else?

Board Member Makinen: No, that's it.

Chair Bower: Debbie, do you have a comment, a question?

Board Member Shepherd: I have two questions. They're very brief. I wasn't at the study session, but I can see that you have altered the arched roof over the porch. In your research, did you ever find an example of a porch roof like that in Professorville?

Ms. Lomax: So, we found arched features in Professorville, but not an arched roof exactly like that. So, it's sort of a modern interpretation.

Board Member Shepherd: So, in the guidelines, the overarching theme is that your design should be compatible, yet differentiated, and I think you've done a really nice job and Page and Turnbull has done with you to explain how you think this is compatible. What do you see as the most significant differentiation you've made as an architect today?

Ms. Lomax: On this project?

Board Member Shepherd: On this house.

Ms. Lomax: I would say the arched roof. You've hit on one of them. It fits in, but it's definitely clearly differentiated. We're using very similar materials to the existing houses, but maybe in a little bit of a different way. We're also using a little bit more modern windows. I mean, the windows in Professorville tend to be all wood, and we're using clad, so it's a little bit more modern that way. I would say that covers it.

Board Member Shepherd: Thank you.

Chair Bower: I have one follow-up question about the front façade. I find A-3.00 to be a more helpful view of the house than the rendering on the front page, in part because on the front page, your rendering has eliminated the view of the lower portion of the building, but what I was noticing on that page is that on the right-hand side of the building, there seems to be a wide band that travels at a smaller scale across the front porch, but then on the left-hand dormer that disappears. Could you talk to me about what the design idea is there?

Ms. Lomax: So, between when we submitted for IR, which was about two months ago, and today, we've actually changed that, so that wide band actually goes all the way across. We kind of recognized that there was no reason for it not to, and it creates a more consistent look. So, the same wide trim band that you see on the right gable is also now on the left gable.

Chair Bower: Okay, thank you. If there are no other questions, then I think we'll bring this back to the Board and have a discussion and then create a motion. Actually, I have one question to staff. I noticed that the height limit is 30 feet, and then there is a third-floor equivalent, and that's not the top of the roof. What is that? Can you explain why we're not seeing what the height is? I realize we're under the height limit, but can you talk about?

Mr. Owen: So, it comes, third-floor equivalency is kind of this wonky term, but basically, it's this term that we use for describing additional floor area under a certain limit. So, once you reach a height of 26 feet above finished floor, then in most circumstances you're going to be counting that area, even if it's just additional roof space towards your gross floor area a third time. So, they've, the project includes some areas that are considered third-floor equivalencies.

Chair Bower: Okay, great. Thank you. All right, so, Martin would you like to begin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, thanks. Kristen, you mentioned, I know it's coming back to the Board, but I just have one more for Kristen for interaction. I didn't look too quickly at everything. Are you at the maximum FAR right now?

Ms. Lomax: We're close, but we're not completely...

Board Member Bernstein: Responding to one of the other suggestions of, if the house was raised up higher, then you end up getting more second and third floor equivalency and that might blow the floorplan here.

Ms. Lomax: Yes, you've nailed it, yeah.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, so one idea I think can respond to Board Member Makinen's idea about, if it looks like it is sitting on the ground, there's an architectural term of plinth. Are people familiar with plinth? Yeah. So, you started to have a suggestion of a plinth detail on here. You've got the shingles up above and then the horizontal boards on the first floor. And then right below that band there's about 30 inches or so, something like that. So, if that detail got more clearly differentiated between the wall above that molding. You're familiar with what I'm talking about, right?

Ms. Lomax: Yes, I am.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, so if maybe that water table detail or whatever we're going to call that detail, if that became more pronounced and that might help differentiate between the wall above and the then some indication of being a plinth, that might address Board Member Makinen's idea that it looks like this building is just sitting on the ground. So, that just might be a detail clarification when you actually submit for building permit.

Ms. Lomax: Okay.

Board Member Bernstein: And then if, the other suggestion you heard from a Board Member or comment about putting on hip roofs on the end. That would introduce then a third type of roof shape here. So, right now you've got the shed dormer in the front and then gables. If there was a shed, gable and then a hip, maybe it starts adding a little bit more visual confusion of like, what is the structure of this. So, that's why I would support the gable ends as you presented.

Ms. Lomax: Okay, thank you.

Chair Bower: Okay, no other questions. Thank you for the presentation. We'll probably want to ask you other questions as we get into our discussion.

Ms. Lomax: Do you want me to stay here?

Chair Bower: Please have a seat.

Ms. Lomax: Okay.

Chair Bower: You don't have to stand up. Thank you. It was very informative. Okay, coming back to the Board, so discussion. Martin would you like to start, or do we jump around.

Board Member Bernstein: Well, I'm prepared to make a motion, but I'll hear other comments first, or I can start with a motion, if you like. Maybe there are other Board Member comments first.

Chair Bower: Anybody have a comment? Margaret, your light's on.

Board Member Wimmer: Sure, I'll make a comment. So, I mean I think this is definitely further developed than when they presented it the first time, and I really appreciate the fact that they went to Page and Turnbull and had, it looks like, a very good observation that was summarized in a report. I wish we could have had a copy of that, because I think that would have been kind of an interesting report to be able to have as part of their application, but they clearly listened to what our comments were during the study session, and they certainly applied a lot of, took note and applied a lot of our comments and incorporated them into their design. I guess the first time that we, that they presented I think we kind of stumbled over the fact that they were going to tear down a house, which is against the Professorville Guidelines and it's not a sustainable approach, but I think in the end, if we viewed the two, the existing house and the proposed application, which is more suitable for Professorville, and I do believe that the proposed new project is more compatible with the existing nature of the architecture in Professorville. So, I think that tilts us to a, you know a positive reaction. I'm just sitting here and really appreciating a lot of the details that they incorporated into the revised design, like the diamond glass windows up in the gables, and when they have the upper level that has the shingle siding, how it has that bowed – I know there's an architectural term for it, because I've had a project with it, but how it kind of bows out, and then there's a nice molding underneath it and then it goes to the horizontal siding. I'm appreciating that. The only thing about, the arch in the front, I just feel like it, it just seems like, just for me, just my reaction to the composition of it, it just seems like it's maybe too flat and too broad. So, there's some kind of, probably a correct dimension of what that needs to be. It just seems like if you could lift up that arch 12 inches, it would announce itself more as, I'm an arch, instead of, well, I'm kind of flat and I'm trying to be an arch, but I'm – I don't know. You know what I'm saying? I think it would be nice if we could lift that arch up a little bit, so that it reads a little bit more clear that it's an arch. I think in this slide that's now, it just seems too flat. It doesn't really have the prominence, because that's your, that's your focal point. And then the other thing, I'm not super crazy about the shape of the chimneys, just how it goes up to, you know, it goes up to the roofline and then it curves in. Usually I see that kind of chimney style where it's wide and then it narrows before the roofline, and then it's narrowed up to the roofline. So, I think, it looks like you're using brick for that chimney. I think maybe if you could take another look at – there's some great examples of really beautiful chimneys and how they're very simple, but at the top the brick coursing kind of steps up and down, and even if you went straight up with it, make it prominent, make it really cool and use that aged brick. I mean, I think that could be an improvement. And then I just had one other comment. It's not really historic related, but on the garage, I'm just looking briefly, I was looking at the garage and the roofline of the garage. It looks like you have a double gable that faces the house, between the house and the garage there's two gables. You have a valley with water, you're going to have a lot of water that's going to be pouring between the house and the garage, and I was looking on the grading and drainage plan. It doesn't look like there was any provisions for taking care of that water and maybe, I was thinking maybe you could either flip the roofline of the garage and have the water going away, you know, on the side of the house. Maybe you could have a rainwater collection system. That would be kind of cool. But I know that's not historic, but I just, I was worried about the water. And I think that's pretty much it.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Brandon.

Board Member Corey: Yeah, just a couple comments. First of all, in general I tend to like the flow also, kind of the design and the existing roofline as along with what Martin said. I think that the hips would be too many roofs on this project. I also want to second or third the idea of a plinth or some sort of investigation into that sitting above grade, because that is obviously really common and it does definitely look very flat to the ground. And my only other comment is the, I do like the diamond pattern on the windows. The windows look a little bit small to me on the attic windows. They were bigger last time, and I actually liked them being a bit bigger. I think now they look kind of almost silly, so to speak, because they're so small, but maybe it's just the way it looks here. But you might want to, you know, look at that because I think, again, it's common to have bigger windows to let in more light in attics in the area. But other than that, I also agree with Margaret. I think, in my view, the teardown on this property, or this proposal does fit in more with the neighborhood, and give that the existing house wasn't a historic house, I'm okay proposing or going for it with the demolition and the plan. Thank.

Chair Bower: Okay, Roger, comments?

Board Member Kohler: I have – there was a discussion earlier of the arched top as you come in. I think they have it, I should have asked them, but does arched tops after 12 feet count as floor area, so that's probably why that's down low where it is, and I think if you thicken it and leave it at the height, it's probably going to look okay. But, that's the problem, because that whole porch area gets counted. Other than that, I mean, it's an interesting house. It's going to look – one reason I suggested the hip roofs at the end is that, this is huge. It's going to look like a very large home and putting the hip roofs at the ends I think would lessen that impact. It may even emphasize more the middle of the house and the entry rather than the large gable roofs at each end. That's pretty much it. I don't know quite how you solve the 12-foot high and not counting, but it's up to them.

Chair Bower: Michael.

Board Member Makinen: (TAPE SKIPPED not understood) under the pros and cons, the conclusion pretty much is a tossup, the way I read it. They considered the benefits of retaining an existing structure can be, demolition can be disruptive to an historic streetscape, but then in the following paragraph, they said that the proposed design is more consistent with the existing historic architectural styles within this district. So, they give it to you both ways, and I think in my reading of this thing, I think the current proposed design is more consistent with the existing historic styles of the historic district, so I would go with the last paragraph on page 18 as being what is more appropriate, which is what is being presented here. And a second comment I would have is that I see no reason why you couldn't shingle side the whole house, rather than having the top half in shingles and the bottom half in some other style. But that would be my take. It would be more consistent with what you see in the historic district. And the third comment that I already talked about was the fact that in my view, the house looks like it's squatty and sitting on the ground, and should be elevated a few feet, maybe incorporating some windows that look into the basement. That would give you the benefit of additional light into the basement, and you could have a modest porch up there that, if you take perhaps three steps up to a porch, it would be more in keeping with the Professorville designs. So, I think that's my three comments.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Board Member Shepherd: (TAPE SKIPPED inaudible) the first one is going back to the arched roof. It says very specifically that the roof form of the porch should relate to the roof of the overall residence. I don't want you to, you know, go too far in your historicism, but everyone seems a little uncertain about how that arch has been resolved. I just, in general I feel like if you're going to do this, this house has to be a lot better than the one that's there. And it should be an important statement about how you can build a modern house in an historic district. I mean, this is a real opportunity. It's precedent setting possibly for Palo Alto. So, I'm not really concluding one way or the other what you should do about it, but that's why I was interested that you feel that this is the thing that differentiates the house. The other issue that the guidelines address very specifically have to do with hierarchy of windows, and with fenestration in general, so when you changed this design, you really shrunk the windows on the lower left. First of all,

the guidelines say to avoid randomly assigned size and type. I don't know that you have to have, you know, complete balance here, but at first glance it seems rather random. These were bible styles, harp backed and in the beginning your most important rooms would have been on the ground floor at the front. What you now have, I think these windows actually speak to the functions in the house, and that's something that we have to all sort of get our arms around today. The most important rooms apparently in this house are two bathrooms and a home office, and in the 18th Century actually you did have your home office in that front room there, and it's kind of cool that you, to me that's what differentiates it is the way that's treated, and I do think bringing it across, I'm glad you pointed out that you've changed that, but we didn't see that. I think that will help. But it's strange to have two little windows underneath, and the two little windows on the top on the right are kind of strange. That's a guestroom. You could actually make them three across, but then you've really got to beef up what's going on, on the lower left. So, basically the guidelines just say that hierarchy from top to bottom in terms of type and size, you know, working up from the base, is important and I think that's revisiting. Thank you.

Chair Bower: I basically share almost all of the comments made by my colleagues. I have been troubled since this first came to us that there are three roof styles. I can't understand why the arch is on the front. I like the rest of the building, but I don't, I just don't understand why it's there, and as Debbie just pointed out, it's not in conformance with the guidelines. I would like to have seen the details on the front façade, the dental molding and all of that, because I think that could have a huge impact on what this building will look like. So, I'm sorry we don't have that today, and it makes it difficult for me to make a positive decision about this. Also, I would like to say that raising the finished floor more than a foot above grade, I think, will improve, as my colleague Michael pointed out, it will improve the front façade. There's lots of room in this building to have another couple of steps, get that up, because there are very, very tall ceilings on the first and second floor. And, again, fireplaces, I understand that there are fireplaces on both floors, but the first thing that my eye caught was the mass of those fireplaces which, by the way, on the rendering, you can't see the one on the left. It's best seen on the page A-3.0. Finally, what troubles me most about this project is that there is a clear guideline that says, "existing buildings, even if they don't contribute in Professorville, in the Historic District, should not be torn down". And while I understand the description that has been presented and I do think this building looks better, I just do not like the fact that people, after the guidelines have been published and we worked very hard on them, that somebody comes in, buys a property and immediately wants to tear down an existing building. That's exactly what the guidelines say you're not supposed to do, and that is very troubling to me. So, let's, on that note, I'll entertain motions?

[video seemed to fast forward here]

Board Member Bernstein: The arch is somewhat compatible in detail to the rest of the detailing of the house, and when I look on the renderings, it looks like that's probably the thinnest member and yet it's the front entry or orientation of the house. So, if there's some way that detail can be, have a little more mass to it, rather than being, what I'm perceiving to be the thinnest element of that, I think that will be more integral with the house design. I'm also taking good counsel from the comment from Board Member Wimmer on the chimney. If you look at the presentation on, up on the screen right now, the upper drawing shows the same dimension of the chimney going all the way up. One of the architectural analysis is that this is combining some of the different styles, including shingle-style influence. There was reference to the book of the American Guidelines history, similar title to that. There is also another book called, specifically about the shingle style and what's common of all the fireplaces in that guideline, in that booklet shows the chimney similar to your top rendering up here, where it's the same dimension all the way up, rather than adding your proposed shape of the chimney. So, those are actually revisions to this design that I would recommend. I don't know if you can interact with the homeowner or the architect about that point, but those are my comments in sympathy with Board Member Wimmer's comments.

Chair Bower: The way we could handle those comments is to incorporate them into our motion, whatever motion that is.

Board Member Bernstein: Did Board Member Wimmer have a comment?

[video fast forwarded]

Board Member Wimmer: ...the entire width of the front elevation. If you incorporated that porch beam thickness and you went from where the top of the arch, or excuse me, the top of the column meets that porch beam, if you take that point and strike it out to the current underside of the arch, which is probably your maximum height, I think that alone, it would raise the height of the arch. It just raises it with the width, I think that would make a huge difference, because you're working within the parameters. I think that's what's missing and I think if they did that, I think that, and with that white, that white painted trim, I think that would be beautiful, and it would lift up the arch, the radius of the arch. I think that would be an improvement.

Chair Bower: Roger.

[video fast forwarded]

Chair Bower: ...and seven, yeah, it's a ten-foot...

Board Member Kohler: No, that's the floor area, it's ten feet.

[video fast forwarded]

MOTION

Board Member Bernstein: ...wants to comment, but I'll propose a motion that the house design is approved subject to the alteration of the thickness of the entry arch and the shape of the top of the chimney agrees with the top rendering on the screen here, so it's a consistent dimension all the way up, rather than having it get narrower as the chimney rises, and with those conditions, that the house be compatible with the guidelines for Professorville. I would also like to include in the motion that the detailing to emphasize a plinth is more visible, more pronounced.

Chair Bower: Okay. I want to be clear what your proposal is about the placing (crosstalk) it's the top...

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, it's the same dimension all the way up.

Mr. Owen: So, for clarity, the one that was on the top was...

[video fast forwarded]

Board Member Wimmer: ... the architect is very talented.

Chair Bower: Let me interrupt here. We don't have a second. [video fast forwarded]

Board Member Wimmer: I second. Is it on? I wanted to make a friendly amendment. [video fast forwarded] ...brickwork detailing that would make those, the top of those chimneys really remarkable and complement their design.

[video fast forwarded]

Board Member Bernstein: ...not distract from the overall form of the house, yeah, yeah

Mr. Owen: ...just a little more specificity about, you know, for the applicant.

[video fast forwarded]

Chair Bower: ... One, the chimneys be modified. (garbled) to make this doable for all the other people that have to do this, could I suggest that these details come back to the Board on a Consent Calendar? [video blacked out] ...see what we're not seeing today, and then it's not, I find it's a little ambiguous what we're trying to do here, and it would you add that to your motion then, that these details would come back to the Board?

[video fast forwarded]

Chair Bower: ... think Margaret as a second. All right.

Board Member Makinen: [video fast forwarded]

Board Member Bernstein: ...if it gets elevated, I heard from the applicant that that would trigger [video fast forwarded]

Board Member Wimmer: ...can I interject? Couldn't that just, couldn't they just raise the basement ceiling height, and then I think the basement doesn't count if it's three feet above grade?

Mr. Owen: The question though is, if you're increasing the height of the basement, you can increase the height of the basement up to three feet above grade. The measurement of third-floor equivalency is from finished floor, so, you're allowed 26 feet above finished floor before you have the third-floor equivalency.

Board Member Wimmer: And they could also – I guess we're just raising the floor. We're not raising – we're just raising the floor, so the basement ceiling is either getting taller or we're pulling the building out of the ground a little bit more. So, it shouldn't change the FAR, raising the house up?

Mr. Owen: So, the third floor is not measured from, third floor equivalency is not measured from grade, it's measured from finished floor.

Board Member Wimmer: Interior finished floor, yeah.

Mr. Owen: So, theoretically yes.

Board Member Wimmer: So, all that will stay the same. We're just pulling it out of the ground a little bit more, raising the basement ceiling height, which could be nice. But it makes more steps up and down.

(inaudible)

Chair Bower: Sorry, can you come up to the mic? Thank you.

Ms. Lomax: So, if we make that suggestion, we would be decreasing ceiling heights in order to achieve all that. So, if we bring the floor of the basement up, the ceiling height of the first floor will decrease due to that.

(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: ...staff said that if you bring the first floor, finished floor elevation up, it's that finished floor that develops the third-floor equivalency. Is that correct?

Ms. Lomax: So, you're suggesting to increase the height of the overall building, then.

Mr. Owen: Right. So, I think there's two assumptions. One, if you do increase the finished floor elevation, the assumption has been that you would increase the total height of the building. So, everything above

finished floor would go up by a foot, or so. The other assumption is that you shrink down the plate heights by that equivalent amount to keep the overall height of the building essentially the same.

Chair Bower: Well, the overall height is four feet under the allowable limit, and even though, the buildings I built never got close to the allowable height. I think there's room to raise the building, especially on a property this large, without a detrimental impact to the neighbors.

Mr. Owen: There is one other thing to think though. You come back to this question about the 12 feet that's permitted for the front porch, so that's measured from grade as opposed to from finished floor. So, we're dealing with a constraint there in terms of that feature, and the impact of that could potentially start to squish things in a logical manner.

Chair Bower: Well, from my perspective, loosing that arch would provide a solution to that, so that your front porch doesn't end up generating more finished floor area and then go through your allowable limit, and it would improve the look of the building. But, that's now, I think our issue here. I mean, I think what the Board is trying to do is to modify the building design, if I'm understanding the comments made, so that the building actually looks, is more in character with the Professorville guidelines, and if I'm mistaken in that, please let me know.

Board Member Bernstein: Can the staff answer, what is the, or the applicant, what is the height of that arch above grade. I don't see it on my drawings I'm looking at. I mean, is it less than 12 feet?

Chair Bower: It's not dimension.

Ms. Lomax: We maxed it.

Board Member Bernstein: What?

Ms. Lomax: We maxed it. If that's...

Board Member Bernstein: Oh, it's at 12 feet, Okay. So, then that would, yeah so you heard the condition, the proposed condition of the motion is that the arch gets a thicker band on it here. And then working on that plinth detail. So, if the building goes raised up, then that arch would have to be counted toward additional FAR, yeah.

Chair Bower: Okay. I have to leave in 12 minutes, and I think we're circling back here. Roger, a quick comment.

Board Member Kohler: I just have one. We have 10 to 15 new homes underway with basements in Palo Alto, and basically all the basements, the floor ends up being 18 to 20 inches above grade, if that much, because the higher you get, you're in the height limit, you have daylight plane issues, so I'm not in favor of encouraging to raise the first floor up, if that's what you're trying to do, because it's just not going to work.

(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Is that going to be part of your motion, Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, if we can see those details, and then we can vote on that.

Chair Bower: Including raising the finished floor?

Board Member Bernstein: If you raise the finished floor, then we have the 12-foot arch detail problem, right?

(Male): It sounds like it doesn't work.

Chair Bower: It's not our issue, it's the client's issue and their design team. I want to be clear about that. If that's not part of your motion, fine, let's move to the next phase.

Board Member Bernstein: Well, part of the motion would be to get that arch not to be a thin detail but a thicker detail.

Chair Bower: I'm still trying to get at whether or not you're including raising the finished floor.

Board Member Bernstein: I would say I'll propose not raising the finished floor because of the FAR.

Chair Bower: Okay, so we're looking at modifying the details on the arch, the chimney details and the dental molding. That's the substance of your conditions. (crosstalk) One second. I'm trying to get the motion so that when we can move to amendments.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, as long as that plinth detail is pretty well pronounced, then I'm satisfied with the height.

Chair Bower: Okay, I'm going to take that as the three conditions. Now, Debbie, you had...

Board Member Shepherd: Since they're going to come back to us, okay, would you consider asking them to look again at the randomness and hierarchy of the windows on the façade? I'd like to see them consider going to three windows that match on the right-hand side at the top and beefing up the two windows on the left below.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Debbie. Are you referring to page A-3.00?

Board Member Shepherd: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay. So, I understand the two main gables, three on one side and two on the left, or two on the right, and then what were the other two windows you were mentioning?

Board Member Shepherd: If you do that, then the two windows on the bottom left, the volume of them I think can be increased. And I think those two changes could be made without altering the design within those rooms.

Board Member Bernstein: All right. Since the applicant is here, would that affect, on the lower left of that page A-3.00, if those windows got larger would that affect the function or your intention for the building?

Ms. Lomax: Well, you can see on the top when we presented to you at the study session, we did have a bigger window at that time. Our only intent was to make the windows more consistent, so we had less window types. That's why we changed it.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay, I'll accept Board Member, what's your last name, Shepherd's recommendation for modifying or reviewing those window patterns.

Chair Bower: Okay, is that acceptable to you, Margaret, as the seconder?

Board Member Shepherd: Yes, it is.

Chair Bower: All right. Any other comments? Do we have any need to discuss this further?

Board Member Bernstein: Is there a date when this would come back to us?

Ms. French: I think when we get the plans then we can advertise. It's not that short of a turnaround. We have now a new newspaper that we post in that doesn't have the same deadlines.

Chair Bower: Okay, if there is no further discussion, I think we all understand the motion. All in favor? Opposed? Okay, so it's 6 to 1 vote. I'm not supporting this motion because I do not like the fact that there's, the demolition that's involved. I have no problem with the rest of it. I simply don't accept, if we have a guideline, we ought to ask that people who buy, have properties, abide by them. So, that's why I'm opposing this memo.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-1.

Chair Bower: All right. Thank you very much for your presentation. A lot of work, improvement. We'll see this project again.

Ms. Lomax: Thank you.

Approval of Minutes

3. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes February 8th, 22nd, April 26th and June 14th, 2018.

Chair Bower: So, going back to our agenda, I want to move through this as quickly as we can. The next portion is approval of minutes, and I spent several days going through the minutes. I have a number of small changes to the minutes that I think would make them read more coherently, because some words are left out and I'm just wondering if I could just give them to you, or do we need to actually talk about all of them?

Board Member Corey: I'm okay with your changes.

Chair Bower: I mean, they're really small things like adding a word that, like shipo for instance. That's not clear to people who don't know what shipo is, so I think it should be spelled out, and they're not many. So, if no one else has changes to the minutes, can I have a motion to approve?

MOTION

Board Member Bernstein: I move to approve the minutes of February 8th, 22nd, April 26th and June 14th.

Chair Bower: All right. Second?

Board Member Corey: Second.

Chair Bower: All right. All in favor?

Board Member Shepherd: I'm going to abstain because I wasn't in attendance at those meetings.

Chair Bower: Fine. Okay.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0 WITH 1 ABSTENTION

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: There are no subcommittee items. I'd like to have subcommittee items, but we don't have any.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: Any comments or announcements by Board Members? Debbie you had one?

Board Member Shepherd: I just wanted to mention that there's a National Trust Meeting, called Past Forward. It's taking place in San Francisco November 13th through 16th. So, you can go on line and look at the programs that are offered. But, I think some of them seem relevant possibly, and they certainly seem interesting, so I registered. Robert helped me and the City very generously covered those expenses. So, I encourage anyone else who would like to join me to do so. It's called Past Forward, and it's sponsored by the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

Chair Bower: Yeah, the California Foundation is also participating.

Board Member Shepherd. They are probably participating, yeah.

Chair Bower: You can see it on their website I think.

Board Member Bernstein: I also responded to that and will be attending. That will help satisfy our required annual training also.

Chair Bower: I think many of us were at the May presentation and that probably works, but anybody who hasn't done one of those, needs to before the end of the year, I think. Any additions? Good, all right, if there are no other comments, I'll adjourn the meeting. Thank you.

Adjournment