



# HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING

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 10<sup>th</sup> of May, so that's going to be cancelled. So, the next meeting after today's meeting will be May 24<sup>th</sup>. 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 24<sup>th</sup>.

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.

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 though 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 Kohler: We're going to have some problems coming up at some point.

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 Corey: 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 this 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?

Mr. Brennan: 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.

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?

Herb Borock: 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 24<sup>th</sup>, I think. Yeah. May 24<sup>th</sup>.

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 24<sup>th</sup> 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 14<sup>th</sup> is the next regular meeting that would happen after the 24<sup>th</sup>. I'm not here on May 10<sup>th</sup>. 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 14<sup>th</sup>, would somebody like to move and second that?

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

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 14<sup>th</sup>, 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 14<sup>th</sup>, so that we have a quorum, because Margaret can't be here on the 24<sup>th</sup>.

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

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

Vice Chair Corey: Sound okay? So, we move to recontinue this, or to continue this on the 14<sup>th</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup>, 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**