



**HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING**  
**MINUTES: February 14, 2019**  
City Hall/City Council Chambers  
250 Hamilton Avenue  
8:30 A.M.

**Call to Order/Roll Call**

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

Absent:

Chair Bower: [video started mid-sentence] ... 2019. Could you call roll, please?

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, Happy Valentine's Day.

Chair Bower: Oh, yes, thank you.

Ms. French: I believe our support staff will be calling roll.

Chair Bower: Thank you and to reiterate Happy Valentine's Day to everyone.

**Oral Communications**

Chair Bower: Next on our agenda is the oral communications, open to anyone to speak about anything other than agenda topics. I don't think we have any cards.

**Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions**

Chair Bower: We'll move onto agenda changes, additions, or deletions? I don't think there are any.

Ms. French: No changes.

**Selection of Chair and Vice Chair**

[The Board moved to City Official reports]

Ms. Robin Ellner: Excuse me, can I interject real quick? Underneath there's the selection of Chair and Vice Chair.

Chair Bower: Sorry, I can't hear you.

Ms. Ellner: Selection of Chair and Vice Chair under your changes, additions, and deletions. It's in the fine print.

Chair Bower: In the fine print. Where is it?

Board Member Corey: Right there, the Chair... (interrupted)

Chair Bower: Oh yeah, sorry, just moved right by that. We're going to entertain motions to nominate people to be Chair and Vice Chair. Any nominations?

Ms. French: I'm sorry, I'm getting distracted. Please repeat that.

Chair Bower: So, we're moving onto election of Chair and Vice Chair.

Ms. French: Thank you.

Chair Bower: So, I just asked for nominations for people. Ok, so we're not going to have a Chair or Vice Chair.

Board Member Wimmer: I think David and Brandon are doing a fabulous job and maybe they would like to continue for another year.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah and I'd also like to – we had such an abbreviated schedule last year, why don't we just continue on with what – where we are?

Board Member Kohler: Sounds good to me.

Chair Bower: I'd be happy to continue as Chair. Brandon... (interrupted)

Vice Chair Corey: I'd be happy to continue as Vice Chair as well.

Chair Bower: So, in order to formalize that we need a nomination. I think we do each separately. Amy can tell us that when she's done.

#### NOMINATION

Board Member Wimmer: I would like to nominate David Bower as Chair for the upcoming 2019 year.

Chair Bower: Amy, we need to do these separately presumably?

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Bower: Is there a second?

Board Member Makinen: I'll second it.

Chair Bower: Alright, any discussion? I think we already had the discussion. All in favor? Opposed? None.

#### **CHAIR BOWER WAS VOTED 7-0 TO BECOME CHAIR**

Chair Bower: I'll nominate Brandon as Vice Chair for next year. Second?

Board Member Makinen: Second.

Chair Bower: Ok, discussion? No, I don't see any. All in favor? Opposed? None. Ok, so housekeeping completed.

#### **VICE CHAIR COREY WAS VOTED 7-0 TO BECOME VICE CHAIR**

Vice Chair Corey: Congratulations, Chair Bower.

[The Board moved down to City Official Reports Number One]

## City Official Reports

### 1. Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Chair Bower: So, first item is the HRB meeting schedule and assignments, that's on Page 5 of our Packet.

[The Board moved back up to the selection of Chair and Vice Chair]

Chair Bower: Now let's move to meeting schedule and assignments. I think the only thing I'd like to say about that is it's important for our planning to know when people will not be here so that we can be sure we have a quorum for meetings. So, if you know of meeting dates that you will not be able to attend that are listed on this – on Page 5, could you please contact Robin and let her know so that she'll understand who is and is not coming.

### 2. City Official Reports: Update on Draft Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan and ITT Site Study.

Chair Bower: Next item is the update on the draft Baylands Comprehensive Conservation Plan and ITT Study. Amy, you have a report or some information for us.

Ms. French: Yes, ever so briefly. There's a one-and-a-half-page report in your packet and the chief reason to put that in your packet was to alert you to the fact that the City's website contains some documents that you might want to have a look at. They've reached out to Planning for feedback on these documents. So, if you, as members of the community and HRB Members, individually would like to make comment on that set of documents then feedback from the community is solicited. I don't have much more than that on that particular item.

Chair Bower: I have mentioned before, I went out to that site maybe 2-years ago? Maybe 3-years ago with Phil Bobel who's in Public Works to look at the buildings and discuss ways to clean up the site. It had been really abandoned without protections. The building that remains had most of the window glass broken and they have since protected the building better. They've got a fence up so that you can't get a car close to it or a vehicle. They've painted the building and I think they've actually covered all the glass. It's remarkably well preserved despite the fact that it was effectively abandoned and so I encouraged Phil to first, do a historic resources evaluation which sadly was not done prior to clean. This report describes the several features that were removed from the site that actually would have been significant and should have been preserved, in my opinion. At any rate, it is a space that is now stabilized and some of the more interesting features are still there. The building being a prominent one and there's even one of the Klystron tube power generators – signal generators that still pretty much intact. It would be a very interesting space to develop as community space, Baylands space. Not unlike the Sea Scout Building which was in equally bad shape before it was renovated and taken over by or leased – I think it's leased to a conservation group? Yeah. Anyway, it's worth noting that at least this – what remains of these buildings is stabilized. I'm hoping that in the Baylands Plan that they – that these buildings will remain and that they'll be refurbished and put into some use that will benefit all of us and also preserves some of our history. Roger, you have a – wanted to show people. That's a – I think this is Palo Alto Daily from June 2018?

Board Member Kohler: 2017, June.

Chair Bower: June 2017, it's an article with pictures. Most important, I think all of us have seen the picture of the transmission tower, which is over 600-feet tall, was removed years ago but it's – the anchors, these gigantic concrete anchors still remain there. It's pretty interesting to walk around the space and think of what that must have been like. I remember seeing it from Bay Shore and it was an impressive structure.

### 3. Review and Discussion of Potential Topics for an HRB Retreat and Annual Reports Including Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report and Comprehensive Plan Annual Update Report

Chair Bower: Let's move on to Item Three then, review and discussion of topics for an HRB retreat, annual reports including the Certified Local Government Annual Report and Comprehensive Plan Annual Update Report. Amy?

Ms. French: Thank you. We'll go through these, I have a fairly long PowerPoint to help with this. Robin Ellner is upstairs making copies of the draft CLG Annual Report that I was busily preparing last night. I do still have some need for feedback from you all on the training that you have attended before tomorrow when I need to send it off. I'll be doing that first thing in the morning. This is just an overview for the public that might not know these things about Certified Local Government. Commission Members do have qualifications to do this type of work so I just threw that on there. This is one of the documents I have to provide for each member sayings, are you a professional in one of the disciplines here because I think we have to have a minimum number of members that do have these qualifications. This is some – these are some accomplishments that I look back on the year. The reporting period is October 2017 through September 2018 and as Board Member Shepherd noted she was – she had done some training before the – before she was put onto the Board. Back in May, she was appointed but the work that she has done, the training that she has been too during – can fall outside of the reporting period for the purpose of reporting in this report. The first thing I have here is an accomplishment is the Mills Act Program subcommittee work and we can talk about that at potentially the retreat. We have a couple of folks on the subcommittee. So that was something that happened during the reporting period. The Eichler Guidelines were adopted by City Council as voluntary but nevertheless, they were adopted. In that, we did quite a bit of outreach and the HRB was involved in coming to those outreach meetings and we had several meetings here in the Chambers on those guidelines. We had the May 2018 CPF Conference and HRB Members attended and supported and participated so that was something of note. We had the Comprehensive Plan was updated at the end of 2017 and I think we never talked about that much here at this Board but that happened. There were historic preservation policies that were in that Comp Plan update and added as a result of an Environmental Impact Report mitigation measure. You've – we've talked a little bit about Policy 7.2 and this is the policy that focuses on and that we're doing these historic resource evaluations for those properties that were not fully evaluated during the Dames and Moore Survey of 1998 and that hadn't gone fully to the state. I did have a presentation to the SILVAR, Silicon Valley Realty Association, back in – this last fall on Policy 7.2 to make sure the community is aware of what we're doing. Also, in 2018 we had updates to our Zoning Ordinance that added Category 3 and 4 resources from the historic resource inventory into the Home Improvement Exception language that allows for bonuses for these resources. Prior to that, it was only available to Categories 1 and 2. So this was a suggestion from the HRB and it came to pass so it's now an incentive for historic preservation of those Category 3 and 4 homes. The other change that happened this year was the ADU, Accessory Dwelling Units, Junior Accessory Dwelling Units, I'll talk about that next. This is a win when we do have a historic resource and there is an accessory dwelling unit, we do have this verbiage in our code that we look – the Director has the authority to look at the Secretary of Interior Standards related to these accessory dwelling units. So that's in our code, Chapter 18.42 and then the other one is related to Eichler neighborhoods. This is for accessory dwelling units in Eichler tracts, we are saying no taller than the primary residences for attached ADUs. Again, this came directly out of comments made by the HRB, so we listened, we put it in the code, consider your work important there in the past year. Here's another slide that talks about the goals and so these are things that I have put out there in the Annual Report. I don't know if you've got the copy but this is – so you don't have to look while we're sitting here. I'm trying to – the idea is that the HRB does have a public hearing about the Annual Report and so this is it because it's due tomorrow so I'm giving you the cliff notes. The 18.12 – one of the things that didn't go through when we took the Eichler Guidelines was we had made the suggestion that Council adopts – direct us to prepare an ordinance that says, we are going to use the Eichler Guidelines when there's a two-story house coming into an Eichler tract. They didn't, they adopted it as voluntary, so we're kind of left in this situation where we are – we know about the guidelines, we talk to people about the guidelines but even in a discretionary individual application they're not exactly bound – we are not exactly bound to follow the guidelines. There are some areas where the Individual Review Guidelines and the Eichler Guidelines have areas of conflict. I would like to have that resolved so that's just my wish list. I'm the hearing officer for individual reviews so it would be helpful to me to bring that forward again so this is my wish list. Draft an Eichler Zone Ordinance, so this was a direction the City Council gave

to Staff at the time they were adopting the Eichler Guidelines. Is to come back with an Eichler Zone that similar to the single-story overlay, that a neighborhood could opt in and impose upon themselves. Then follow the Eichler Guidelines and this could even be for single-story homes. So, this is something that's on our plate, when do we get to it, it may not be for a while but there it is. Then we do have an application on file that is requesting -- you may remember about the Subdivision Incentive for historic preservation which is complicated but it basically allows a new flag lot in the R-1 Zone only when there's a historic resource, in the inventory, on that flag lot to be created. Well, the language of the code doesn't include if the resources is in the front portion of that lot that would be split. So, it's -- there are situations out there that -- and we have one that's interested -- that would like the front home to be the historic home and have the rear parcel not have the historic home. So, this is something we're looking at and so here's some other ones. Basically, if you have comments on the ITT Building site for the Baylands Conservation Plan those are solicited. The Castilleja School project, I'm the Planner for that, and so that is getting ready with a draft Environmental Impact Report that we're looking to publish in March. We will be coming to the Board as a whole but just to give you the heads up and we'll be seeking comments on that. The next one is a carryover from last reporting period. We had -- Emily had put on there that we would like to have nomination of the Lou Henry Hoover House, the Girl Scout House, and we didn't. Emily left, we never managed to get into that so I'm hoping with a hire of a new Historic Planner we can pursue that. It involves working with the property owner. The City owns the land but then there's the property itself the building which is owned by the Girl Scouts. Then Policy 7.2 which is the one that says we should be studying to make sure before we issue a Demolition Permit that the home is not California Register eligible. So that's the policy coming from the Comp Plan that I have been dealing with this year or last year, 2018, and ongoing. Then there's the final one here that I thought you all might want to have on there is to forward the Council your subcommittee proposal of the Tailored Mills Act Program. This was from the work that Emily had done with the subcommittee last year that you might want to include in this goal for this coming year. This is just why do we do this CLG, Certified Local Government? We want to be in good standing because then we can apply for grants. The last time we did grants was the Professorville Guidelines. We didn't use a grant for the Eichler Guidelines, we found the money elsewhere. We have waiting at the ready a Mid-Century Context Statement grant proposal that Matt worked on, our past Historic Planner, and Emily. It's basically ready to submit for a grant. The next grant submittal period is in May and so we might want to talk about that at our retreat. Then the other -- I guess I'm a little long winded this morning but I thought I'd put some content here for you. The Comp Plan Implementation Update went to the Planning Commission last night. This is going to be a yearly update to say how are we doing with the programs that are in the Comp Plan that was adopted in the end of 2017. These are all the different elements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Land Use Element is where there are historic preservation programs and policies. This is just -- I borrowed two slides from last night's presentation so you can see there are 418 programs and we have 16 percent completed and 120 remaining pending programs in the Implementation Plan. Among those pending are -- this is a -- there's kind of a nomenclature about that. If anyone cares to look on this at some point that are -- that talk about hey, some of these are routine, some of these are in progress, some of these are short term, some of these are long term. This is the nomenclature and then in the Annual Report update, we have notations as to whether they're pending or they're complete or ongoing. We have preservation related policies and programs in the Implementation Plan and these are all the ones that are pending. So, they haven't been embarked upon yet and I can go back to these at some point. Then these are pending and ongoing so you can see there's two ongoing and one of them is this Policy 7.2 that we've been busily following. Then the other one is incentives to encourage salvage and reuse of discarded historic material so everything else is pending. Then I come to the last slide which is our next retreat, we usually have an annual retreat or we try too. March 14<sup>th</sup> is the next date that we're looking at for the Board meeting. If everyone's available on this date we can target a retreat and we can start working on that. The potential retreat topics I put on the screen just because we're talking about them today at least. The Mills Act subcommittee, the -- if you want to talk further about these policies and programs and the Comp Plan, get an overview and discussion. Then we have this potential for the grant if we want to pursue that and then you might have other topics. If you would like to discuss whether you are available for a retreat on March 14<sup>th</sup>, that would be great, and if not then we'll seek another date.

Chair Bower: Well, that's a lot of information, thank you for all of that. Can I ask a question about the Lou Henry Hoover House? That's the President's house at Stanford, isn't it?

Ms. French: No, the Lou Henry Hoover House is the Girl Scout House over at – near the Junior Museum and Zoo.

Chair Bower: Oh, ok, right.

Ms. French: You had seen this last year when we came through with the Junior Museum and Zoo. Those of you who were on the Board last year saw the work there.

Chair Bower: Ok because there is the Hoover House on Stanford and I was confused.

Ms. French: Well there's Hoover the guy and the president and there's Lou Henry. She was the founder of the Girl Scouts here... (interrupted)

Chair Bower: Right, just clarifying. You managed to hit all the topics I had on my list for the retreat. I think we might want to – well, it's an overwhelming list really when you look at the amount of... (interrupted)

Ms. French: Oh, the goals list?

Chair Bower: Yeah, well – right but I think that Mills Act subcommittee Report is close to being done with. I think we have another meeting and we certainly can talk about that. The Comp Plan -- I'm most interested in the Mid-Century Context Grant – Statement Grant because that's a once a year opportunity. That's mostly done, it's my understanding, and I think we want to make sure we can make that application deadline. So maybe we should talk about what Board actions we need to take and then put that on our next meeting agenda. So, we can move that forward because I know that it's not just our decision, it's a City decision.

Ms. French: Yes, it's Council decision. Also, we have to look into budget -- you know in a year where we're concerned about budget it's not always something that is an immediate yes. We usually offer in-kind services as part of our contribution to match the funding but there's other expenses we need to look carefully at that.

Chair Bower: So, did anyone else on the Board have other topic suggestions? Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I did. I think it would be really informative and interesting if we could take a look at the Historic Building Code. I mean the State of California has the California Residential Code, the Electrical Code, the Plumbing Code, and Mechanical Code but they also have a Historic Building Code. The code section is only about – it's not very long and I have a copy of it. Not with me but I think it would be a really great exercise just to – I can make copies for everyone so that we should each have a copy of it. I mean I've been meaning to do that for a while but maybe we could even look through it ourselves, just review it ourselves. I don't know if we – I mean maybe Martin could lead us or Roger could lead us in moving through the code issues and discussing certain topics. I know that the Historic Building Code should allow some kind of concessions when doing preservation work and it would be neat for us to recognize what those concessions are.

Chair Bower: It's a pretty powerful tool in historic renovation because it allows non-compliant features to remain. The one that I can think of that's most significant is handrail height which now is what, 42-inches?

Board Member Wimmer: Now we're required to have 3-feet 6-inches but... (interrupted)

Chair Bower: Right, 40... (interrupted)

Board Member Wimmer: ...the Historic Building Code might differ from that.

Chair Bower: Right, well it allows the building official to make the determination. My understanding is they can make the determination that if it's less than the current codes but still deemed to be safe then it can

remain because that's a big deal in theaters. It's actually in the – both my daughter's homes have non-compliant rails.

Board Member Wimmer: I think also maybe there's some energy allowances because a lot of historic houses have single-glazed wood windows. Then they don't want the double-glazed wood windows or double-glazed new windows because it really takes away from the historic look. I think it would be an interesting topic.

Chair Bower: Well, we can add it to the list.

Board Member Wimmer: Maybe too much to combined with all this in one day but I definitely think it's worth us going through just for self-education.

Chair Bower: Well, if we don't set it as a goal, there's no opportunity to achieve it so I would just add that to the list.

Ms. French: I was going to say; the window issue definitely comes up quite a bit. I have an on-going conversation with Page and Turnbull, our consultant, and those folks that are coming through the process how best to deal with windows. So, I think that would be a good one, I can even ask Page and Turnbull to come and be apart of a conversation. Then I was thinking also, I could see if our Chief Building Official is available for a retreat to come and have a dialog.

Board Member Makinen: I had one further suggestion under other topics. I think we should probably look at community outreach to a more aggressive community outreach program that we currently have. Looking at places like Pasadena, I think they are more actively involved with the community and I think there's a lot we could do to improve our community outreach program here. To get them educated and sensitives to historic properties, historic preservation in general.

Chair Bower: Absolutely. I completely agree, especially considering how much misinformation exists about historic preservation. So that's an equally good topic, we can add that.

Board Member Makinen: I think Pasadena is one of the gold standards for outreach on community involvement. I think we should look at that and see what we can learn from their programs.

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Tagging off Chair Bower's comments about some of the powerful tools available for historic... (interrupted)

Chair Bower: Building Code.

Board Member Bernstein: ... Building Code is that the use of archaic building materials. So, for example, if there's some interior plaster walls that actually have some sheer value and the Historic Building Code actually allows some of those archaic materials that would not meet code today to actually remain. That could help in terms of if there's any proposed changes to an outside – to the exterior of a building that from a historical point of view you can still keep it structurally and then, therefore, helps also maintain historic character and historic facades.

Chair Bower: Right. Three years ago, at the California Preservation Foundation Conference in San Francisco at the Presidio, several of us saw a demonstration of reinforcing brick walls. So that they have sheer value of a new wall by applying an epoxy and carbon fiber mesh to the face of the wall. It (inaudible) them, holds them together, and allows those walls to stay in place without having it be either replaced or a new sheer wall built inside. It was a remarkable technologic advance for these old buildings that are primarily brick. There were all kinds of them on the Presidio so lots of that.

Board Member Bernstein: Brief question, does any Board Member or Staff knows does the Historic Building Code apply to any historic structure or it must be Category 1? It has to be a listed structure, I think. I'm not exactly sure where it applies.

Ms. French: I believe it's anything on our inventory as well as a National Register which we have some that aren't on our inventory. National Register eligible and California Register eligible but we can delve into those details in the retreat if we want to have that as the topic.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, thanks.

Vice Chair Corey: I guess my only – I would like to follow up on the Mills, we already have this on the list. Are there too many items on our list at this point?

Chari Bower: Well, we always, in my experience, my short 13-years' experience on this Board have too many items on the list. I think we could prioritize the list but I think it's important just to have as many things our list as we want to consider and then we will get to them as we can. I think the Mills Act subcommittee report is going to eventually come before the Board. So that's probably not the highest priority because that's the furthest along so we can certainly touch on it. We can, I hope by that time, publicize this so let's set the date because I think that will be important. If March 14<sup>th</sup> works for Board Members then I would say that's – sooner the better. Martin, does that work?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes.

Chair Bower: Roger? (inaudible)

Vice Chair Corey: It works for me.

Chair Bower: I see lots of heads – in fact, everybody seems to think that's a good date so let's set that for now. We won't have a meeting in two weeks, correct? So that will be our next meeting and we'll just advertise that as the retreat and we'll determine where it will be. In here in the Council Chambers?

Ms. French: I mean the easy place is here because we already have it reserved but I could certainly have it – the room in the back we could have some treats and (interrupted)

Chair Bower: Sure, although it kind of liked the community room out in the lobby...

Ms. French: There's that.

Chair Bower: ... because it's a little less formal and I think it's more inviting for a retreat environment if that's possible...

Ms. French: Let me see if it's available.

Chair Bower: ... we could see but this is fine. Alright, so March 14<sup>th</sup>. Any other comments on all of the material that Amy (interrupted)

Ms. French: I guess if you want to make comments now about the – I know you have it just at your places now but I kind of breezed through the Annual Report for the Certified Local Government. If there's something in there that you see that you want to get back to me today on, you want to read that more at your leisure today and let me know if there's something that is horribly missed. Also, if you have not gotten back to me about – or Robin, about your – the training during this period, we would want to know about those. I can go back and look. I mean I have gone back as you'll see and I have stated that for each and every one of you, you went to the Palo Alto Conference. Some of you told me three days and some I just wrote two days but you know, let me know if I'm wrong on that. I mean that's (interrupted)



Chair Bower: That's a critical element in this report.

Ms. French: Yeah, I think that's just to be able to say yes, we have a critical number of folks who have been doing their training. If you didn't, that's fine too, I think.

Chair Bower: I mean that's two days over three days at that conference is well beyond the minimum. I think it's a single training session, isn't it?

Ms. French: Yeah, it's a pretty low bar.

Chair Bower: Ok so Board Members please check that and just confirm – actually, you don't need to confirm if there's misinformation in here. Make sure Amy knows about that or Robin.

Ms. French: I will be attaching resumes. I mean if you look at this thing it requires documentation so that's what I'll be working on today, is getting that documentation.

Chair Bower: Oh, I should then – yeah.

Ms. French: I might have – for some – for many for you who've been on the Board, that there's probably something that Emily used in the past that I can still use. Unless you want to update your resume or something that's happened in the intervening time.

Chair Bower: Mine is updated so I'll send it to you. Alright, anything else about this? This has to go in (interrupted)

Ms. French: I'm going to put it into the mail tomorrow because it's due tomorrow so I can have it postmarked.

Chair Bower: I'm glad we're not just coming right up to the deadline.

Ms. French: Just in time.

Chair Bower: Well we want to capture as much information as possible. Alright, any other comments about this section segment? Ok, thank you.

## **Study Session**

- 4. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 840 Kipling Street [18PLN00185]: Study Session for Historic Resources Board Consideration of Proposed Modifications to a Craftsman Bungalow Previously Determined by the HRB to be a Contributing Resource Within the Boundaries of the SOFA I Coordinated Area Plan. Environmental Assessment: No Formal Action is Requested At This Time; Therefore, No Formal Review in Accordance With The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Has Been Completed. Prior to Any Formal Decision, The Project Will be Assessed in Accordance With CEQA. Zoning District: R-1 (Low Density Residential). For More Information Contact the Project Planner Claire Hodgkins at [Claire.Hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org](mailto:Claire.Hodgkins@cityofpaloalto.org)**

Chair Bower: Move onto the study session, public hearing about 840 Kipling. It's a study session so we will not be making any determinations today. It allows us to hear about the design plans and provide our input to the – excuse me – the architect who happens to be our colleague Martin. Martin, you probably have something to say about that.

Board Member Martin: Yes, thank you, Chair Bower. Yes, so I'm the architect for this project for the study session so I'll be stepping down from the HRB Board for this item. Thank you. I will be making a presentation though.

Chair Bower: Right and that's – because you've done this before it's allowed by – because you're a sole proprietor. Ok, just so everyone understands that.

Vice Chair Corey: (inaudible – off mic)

Ms. French: I'd like to introduce Claire Hodgkins. I think maybe some of you haven't met her but she's one of our Planners and will be the Project Planner and present the project.

Chair Bower: So, before you start, excuse me, I just wanted to disclose that very good friend of mine own this building back in the 80's. I can't really remember the interior of it but I do remember the somewhat unique character of this building as it's representative of a type of building that was built in Palo Alto at the time. My friends don't own it anymore so I don't have any conflict as far as I know and I have visited the site, Monday, to look at the – to see what it looks like now. Anyone else have any disclosures like that? Ok, please proceed.

Ms. Claire Hodgkins, Project Planner: Good morning Board Members, Claire Hodgkins, I'm the Project Planner for this project. The proposed project is located at 840 Kipling, it's in the R-2 Zoning and under the SOFA I Cap as the land use designation under our Comprehensive Plan. There are a couple things requested as part of this project. A variance to allow construction of a second story on a substandard lot, Individual Review for the new second story addition, and a Home Improvement Acceptation to allow for the extension of a non-complying wall at the rear of the property. This did come to the HRB, I believe it was 1990 as noted in the Staff report, a historic evaluation was done and analyzed and documented in that Staff report and the HRB determined at that time that the home had historic merit. So, in order to move forward and make the findings for a variance, part of those findings would be that the house is historic. In which case, all additions and modifications to the house must be consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. The recommended motion is just as you noted, this was just a study session so no formal action is requested. Staff is just interested in HRB's initial feedback on these proposed modifications as they relate to the character of the existing structure. I do just want to note one additional item which is that the home – because they are requesting a Home Improvement Exception, if they choose to move forward with that request, 25 – more than – 75 percent or more of the home on the exterior walls must be maintained. I do want to note that in Staff's initial review of this plan set, the current plan set in front of you, it appeared that more than 75 percent of the exterior wall or sorry, more than 25 percent of the exterior walls were being revised. There may need to be some modifications in order to meet that requirement under code. With that, key considerations today are just the proposed modifications and how they align with the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. Particularly the character-defining features outlines in the previous historic evaluation which were outlined in the Staff report. If you guys want them, I do have each of the elevations, the existing and the proposed next to each other. With that, I'll turn it back to you and recommend that you hear a brief presentation from the applicant as well.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. Good context to start. Martin, please proceed.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Bower. Just for members of the public, so I am on the Historic Resources Board and yet I did receive a ruling from the California Fair Political Practice Commission that as a sole proprietor without employees I'm allowed to represent the project to the Board. I do have some drawings to submit to the Board. I also have copies of those for Staff, I'll hand these out. These are Staff – copies for Staff and each of these goes to each Board Member, thank you. I'll give you a chance to take a look at those. The – with me today is also the owner, Stephen Reyna, he's the owner of the home. You've owned the home for how long now, sir?

Mr. Stephen Reyna: 1998.

Board Member Bernstein: Since 1998, 20-years. I'd like to just start off by introduction that the goal for Steve and his wife, Aysen, is just to create a modest addition and then keep everything compatible with the neighborhood character and then also the historic character. I just want to make a note that the house

is not on the City's Master List of Historic Structures on the Historic Inventory but because we are in SOFA, that's why this contributing structure is required to come before the HRB. I'd like to talk just briefly about why we are proposing a second story. This is an R-2 lot, it's 87-square feet below the size of a lot needed to be a standard lot and hence that is why we have to apply for a variance for a second floor. Variances - on a substandard lot maximum height is 17-feet and only one habitable floor. So, because we're just 87-square feet, we need to apply for a variance for that additional second floor and additional height. As you may have seen in the drawings, we're essentially at the maximum lot coverage and therefore any additional square footage needs to be then therefore on the second floor then hence—now hence the variance. There's another reason for the not extending the first floor further than what we're proposing is that you can – perhaps you've seen on the drawings there are two major Redwood Trees and Palo Alto has the Tree Protection Zone. What is critically important about maintaining these Tree Protection Zones, if you see on the photo, I sent you of this tree at the next-door neighbor. In fact, you can see Steph and Aysen's house in that photo, this is from their rear yard, 63-inch diameter Redwood Tree. The neighbor's house was within that Tree Protection Zone and the City's Planning Arborist issued a demolition permit for that tree. Not only did the – to protect any historic structure, we need to be away from these – the Redwood Trees that are on Steph and Aysen's property. As you can see in the diagrams, we're right up to that Tree Protection Zone and again, we just don't want the history of having structures being damaged and then a City Planning Arborist issuing demolitions for significant trees so again, those are just another reason. We've got the – we're at the maximum basically lot coverage essentially and then the Tree Protection Zones so that's again, another reason just to go up rather than getting closer to those trees. There was a hybrid development on this house. The original house was, in the rear portion, it was – there was a kitchen, a one-bedroom and a dining room. Over the years then the front living room was developed, the front porches developed and there's also a flat section of the existing front portion of the house that's actually defective. It's a flat roof, we actually have photos of it, of the ceiling caving in. Anyway, our goal is for the existing historic – now historic living room and the historic porch, we want to maintain that street facing character. That flat roof we want to make that correct with the compatibility of the existing front of the house and that's what brings us to these renderings that you have in front of you. I'll hold my example up here and for members of the public. That rendering and all three of those renderings are showing then the historic front gable of the front now living room and then the existing historic porch.

Chair Bower: Excuse me, Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah?

Chair Bower: Can you show that again because I don't see that in (interrupted)

Board Member Bernstein: Oh, you don't have a copy of it?

Chair Bower: No, we don't have a copy of that.

Board Member Bernstein: Oh, did I not (interrupted)

Chair Bower: I mean we have the plan views but...

Ms. French: (inaudible – off mic)

Chair Bower: Oh, alright, thank you.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok thank you, Amy.

Chair Bower: Go ahead.

Board Member Bernstein: Just make sure everybody has it. Does everybody have...

Chair Bower: Ok, now we're ready.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, thanks, good. So, the renderings are now showing the front street facing façade of the historic living and its existing fenestration and then the existing front porch in those views here. The – as we all know we have many tools for creating compatibility and I'm just going to quickly read those here. Thanks for the moment. Well I do have them right here, I'm sorry. We all worked on the Professorville Historic Guidelines but the emphasis I want to make is, because this applies to all historic properties, is the idea of how do we get compatibility with new versus old. So, I'll just reading some of the criteria, locate new addition at the rear of the residences whenever possible. So, as you see on some of the other drawings the second floor is definitely set back. I think its setback about 18-feet from the front so that's the purpose of these renderings that you saw. To minimize additional bulk, just use some sloping roofs and that's in some of the guidelines. Avoid building a rear addition that is wider than the front of the house. Employ compatible massing and roof forms and you've seen that we've done that. Make the roof forms similar to the historic structures, we did the sloping roofs. Respect the existing residence by using cladding and roofing materials that are compatible. Construct new window materials that are similar in style but different so we're using aluminum clad and we got simulated divided lights. Design window patterns that are similar to the existing which we have done. So, differentiation would be probably the most important principle that we want to employ. Then you can see on one of your other handouts that hopefully you've received, it shows then all the new addition work and, in the back, it has horizontal siding. The existing siding on the house is actually 1 x 12s but it's brought up so it looks like its 1 x 4 but's its one piece of 1 x 12 that's sculpted. We're proposing on the new addition for differentiation to be 1 x 6 lap siding. Very similar to the existing but a different dimension and again that's outlined also in the Professorville Design Guidelines for differentiation. Alright so those are some of the differentiations but the main point is again, the subordination of the second floor. That's important so again the step back, we did that, and then also on the second floor the plate heights. So, for technical reasons, for member of the public, plate heights is the height from the floor to the start of the exterior wall before sloping up. We dropped that down to 7 foot 6 inches, still habitual heights but at least we can lower it a little bit here. Again, that was the main point of these elevations that you have is just to show how it is subordinate from the house there. Good. Look at my notes. Those are the main points and I'd be open to questions. I'd also like to introduce the owner, Stephen Reyna. Would you like to make any comments?

Mr. Reyna: Good morning Board Members. If I should break into a coughing fit please forgive me. I just went through a bad flu last week and my wife is at home. She wanted to be here but she's at home right now suffering from what I went through last week. Back in 1997-1998 we were looking for a house and we counted, we probably went through -- physically went through about 100 different homes looking for something we thought would fit. We were actually looking originally for a three-bedroom, two bathrooms so that we could have some space to grow in because we were looking for a family. Then when we walked into 840 Kipling, this was home. This was the first home we'd walked into that just grabbed us and said this is where we want to live. You know it's smaller than we wanted but the beauty of it, the charm of it just made our decision when we walked in. We bought it that weekend, two days after we found out about it. We love old houses, we love historic character of our house both the interior and the exterior. The porch with the open beams inside that we can sit and have our coffee. The picture window and the divided light paneling above and below. Inside, if Mr. Bower remembers, there a craftsman like fireplace with built in bookcases on the left and the right. We've got divided light pocket doors between the living room and the dining room and there's a built-in hutch in the dining room. I mean all of these just have the characters that just called to us and as we're coming up with – these are the things, both interior and exterior that we want to preserve and build on in a compatible way. Now, we've been there 20-years. We now have a teenage son, we have two aging moms that want to visit and take of as best we can and this two in one is just not working. We actually – because we are a substandard lot, we have more FAR available then we can build on the first floor and so our solution was to find a way to add a historic, compatible structure on the second floor. Our goal is always modest. We're not here to build an elephant house. We don't want an elephant house but we do want is something that reflects and expands on the historical character that called to us when we first saw this house and chose it as our home. So, our fundamental goal, even when we were interviewing the architects, find somebody who understands historic homes. That was our first criteria and we have this design in front of you, a modest addition on top of a beautiful first story, 1912

house. We believe our architect Martin has done a great job of achieving the goals we set out to achieve and we look forward to your comments. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Board Member Bernstein: I have one more comment, if I may? I'd like to just make a brief comment about our proposed Home Improvement Acceptation. The ordinance reads that, as Planner Claire mentioned, to retain 75 percent of the existing walls. Where we're proposing the rear addition on the first floor, so those existing rear walls obviously are being removed. The ordinance, we didn't see it written about what about the existing walls – the side walls to remain. One of the interruptions that the City has been using is even if on that existing wall, if you move a window over a little bit, that's considered not retaining that area of the existing wall. I've seen some other applications that were responding to that issue. If you move a stud to replace – that's considered not maintaining so anyway, it just becomes maybe something to consider is that what is meant by existing wall to remain? Anyway, there's an HIE to allow the additional square footage but how – what's considered an existing wall to remain? It gets pretty technical and I don't know maybe that seems to discourage – anyway it becomes a challenge. So, I just wanted to make – anyway, that's the issue with the – how the HIE is – how the regulation is implemented. As Steve mentioned – here's the existing character of the street facing façade as you can see but again, we did take actually good counsel from Planner Claire Hodgkins and also then the good counsel from Arnold Mammarella about making sure that the proposed second floor is subordinate. That's why I did the plate height and then we moved it back, I think it's something like 18-feet back from the street facing façade just to keep everything subordinate. Then all the differentiation issues as I mentioned so again, we have a lot of good tools for differentiation so we tried to apply all those things. Again, so as I mentioned I think on previous projects is the good counsel received from Planning Staff and then the IR consultant. I do think these things – those advices to make good – better projects and I'm grateful for the City to offer those things to us. Anyway, so we're hear to answer any questions or respond to any comments. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Do you have questions? Ok, Brandon.

Vice Chair Corey: Maybe this is also a question for the Planner. I'm trying to understand this 75 percent/25 percent. Is it – I think you probably confused me more Martin in some of the details there but is it the existing – are the only exterior walls that are changing the back walls on the rear? That's what I'm trying to understand.

Ms. Hodgkins: The way that we analyze – that Staff analyzes that is just looking at the façade of each side and where changes are being made to the façade, whether it's moving a window, removing a window, or adding windows or doors or changing the wall entirely. Any areas of change is what we look at.

Vice Chair Corey: But it's exterior walls, right?

Ms. Hodgkins: Of the exterior walls, yes.

Vice Chair Corey: So, what – so then it sounds to me then there's portions of the front of the existing house that are changing in subtle ways that I'm not following on the plans?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah, so I can show you really quickly.

Vice Chair Corey: Perfect.

Ms. Hodgkins: Where's the – can I have this?

Ms. French: (inaudible – off mic)

Ms. Hodgkins: I'll look at each elevation kind of just to briefly go over so the area of change on the front would be this front door is being revised and the windows being added. We don't count new area, we're

looking at just the existing façade. So, all this is being retained, there's some changes happening here. On the east façade you can see that there's a significant number of changes. You're looking at the change of the rear here, you're looking at all of the windows being revised on the entire façade, and some changes to the wall. On the rear it's basically most of the façade is being changed and on the west side there's only a small change at the rear. You can see these three windows are being retained and then this one is being revised for the addition.

Vice Chair Corey: Thanks, that was – thank you. So, Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, thank you Brandon for asking that question. If you look on Page A4.0 please. So, you can see my calculations for existing wall to remain and existing walls to be removed. The diagonal indicated walls, that was my diagram for walls to be removed, and that's then less than 75 percent. Claire's bringing up an interesting and good point about yes, we are changing windows on the left side there. To the point from a historic and compatibility issue from the street facing façade, if you look at the porch, Clair is correct. We are modifying the front doors to the bedroom on Page A4.0 and we are modifying the door to the living room. Those are historic doors there, we are just switching locations of those because now the entry is where the bedroom is. That's becoming the new front entry so we are keeping the historic doors, we're just switching the location of those two.

Vice Chair Corey: Got it.

Board Member Bernstein: My comment is, if you look at from the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation is there's no change in the massing, there's no change in the locations of the doors, there's no change in the historical character, we're salvaging materials, we're not throwing it away. Anyway, so it's just how is that HIE defined as changing exterior walls. That could be a subject of a future conversation but currently the City is saying if you make that change, you're not retaining that existing wall. So, let's talk about historic character and what harm is being done by doing that and anyways, that's a comment.

Chair Bower: How close are you to the 75 percent number?

Board Member Bernstein: Let's see, we are...

Vice Chair Corey: 74.5

Board Member Bernstein: ... 70...

Vice Chair Corey: It says 74.5.

Ms. Hodgkins: So, we're not though, (crosstalk) I mean it's clear that it's not calculated the way that Staff calculates it.

Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

Ms. Hodgkins: So, we're not – I'm not saying that there's not a solution, I just wanted to point it out because it may mean that some changes might be made to ensure that they are meeting the 25 percent. I don't know at this point in time exactly how much they are changing when that calculation is done but it seems to be more than 25 percent right now. So, it would probably require some revisions to meet that code requirement or some changes might be required and they don't move forward with the HIE but the variance still moves forward. So, there's a couple different options but we just wanted to call that out for attention as you analyze it.

Chair Bower: If I can jump in here. It seems to me as Martin points out, the purpose of this particular calculation is to prevent basically massive destruction of the exterior surface which is what we're really protecting with our Historic Ordinance or historic designations. We want to maintain that, we're not really talking about the inside, and I would have to agree with Martin that adding a window in a wall, flipping

those doors around is – well moving the French door from the living room to the current existing bedroom number one might remove some siding but the rest of it would remain unchanged. You wouldn't take the siding off and add new siding so it's really a modest thing. I think the calculation could hopefully be more elastic when we're talking about taking existing materials and simply putting them in a different location. If it turns out that that's not the way planning decides to calculate it, it seems to me that it's possible that you could just leave the front porch alone. While that might not be ideal, at least then you retain those two walls and maybe that gets you closer to 25 percent. I mean I would say that I think that most of the materials stay as it is currently sided so the siding wouldn't be removed. That's the purpose of this particular requirement.

Vice Chair Corey: I guess my question on that is how do you – if you look at even, I guess the side walls, it feels like you'd have to cut out a lot of material. You'd have to reuse a lot of material around the windows but you'd also have to redo – you're not going to cut and leave siding half way across. So, you're going to have replace the entire line of siding across the back of the house. So naturally it feels to me like if you look at this west elevation, does this mean a third of the siding is being replaced along the entire length or how does that – you know what I mean? You don't patch up pieces of siding.

Chair Bower: Right.

Vice Chair Corey: So, this is a specific thing on the front, just in general to that house there could be a lot of patchwork. I do like the idea of preserving the doors on the front. I mean it's a neat idea, just...

Chair Bower: It's an option.

Vice Chair Corey: ...yeah, it's an option.

Chair Bower: Way back when I was a newly graduated collage graduate and I started my business, it was very difficult to find someone who would make – you couldn't buy – this is called three lap siding in the trades. You couldn't find it and so we painstakingly removed the siding for areas where we needed to patch. Now that's something that doesn't exist in 100-foot long pieces. It's all pieced on that building and it's pieced at random ways and then painted. You don't see the – were each piece stops and you can take the old siding off and you can patch it in in other places. Now, of course, you can hire – you can get that siding reproduces exactly as it is for about \$100 set up fee plus the cost of material. It wasn't available then so it's possible to take it off and piece it back and really retains it. Some of it will break but you know that's a more expensive and painstaking way of doing it but it can be done. I just wanted to interject that that's a possibly and I think that is done on other historic buildings.

Board Member Bernstein: That's a good point, Chair Bower. We've got 38-linear feet of wall by 9-feet high of this – what was your reference to it as? Three...

Chair Bower: It's three lap siding.

Board Member Bernstein: Three lap siding.

Chair Bower: They're probably originally 16-foot lengths. That was pretty standard (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah so these are one – basically it's 1-inch by 12-inch piece at scale.

Chair Bower: Exactly.

Board Member Bernstein: We've got 38-linear feet of that around the back of the building that we're removing. Again, as part – as you all know and Staff knows, part of the Comprehensive Plan is salvage not recycle.

Chair Bower: I'm only – let me just say one more thing. I think the eastern side here is most likely – because there's so much work to be done on that side with the second story addition, I would envision that side would be all new material of some sort. Other parts of the façade which have fewer penetrations – new penetrations of removing or moving windows probably could use original siding. That's just a...

Vice Chair Corey: I guess I'm not trying to belabor the point, I guess my question is if in theory to do these windows, all the siding on that was replaced. How is that factored in to the 75 percent area because in theory you could say I'm touching a window on each side but I'll replace all the siding in like kind. That's what I'm trying to understand. I'm not saying that's the intent, I just want to understand.

Ms. Hodgkins: We do count all of that if it's being removed. That is actually something that we're finding in the field. So, when we calculate we actually do require them to calculate slightly beyond what the change in window is and stuff because once you start cutting a window you're not stopping at exactly where the window is. The whole point of that section of the Home Improvement Exception is simply to try and discourage complete façade remodels. It's not to stop you from doing a single change on a door or a window or anything. It's simple to – if we are going to allow for a non-complying wall to be extended in this case, we want the façade to be maintained because the whole point is to maintain the existing structure to the extent feasible. We put that in because we're finding that a lot of structures where you know we were doing this Home Improvement Exception with the intent to keep the house but the entire façade was being changed. So, they're not really keeping the house in the end.

Chair Bower: There's a building on Channing between Webster and Middlefield that had three lap siding on it and sadly, it stayed there for most of the renovation. Then near the end they ripped all the siding off and put 1 x 6 siding on it. Totally different look, kind of destroyed the look of the building. Not relevant to this discussion but I understand what drives this particular requirement.

Board Member Bernstein: I agree with Claire. It's a – for preservation, let's put some regulations that discourage or prohibit so it's a fair regulation.

Chair Bower: Although if you came to the Building Department and said I have dry rot in my siding and I need to replace it and I want to replace it in kind. There wouldn't be any issue so this is where these requirements with important objectives can actually become more difficult and maybe not achieve what is intended.

Board Member Bernstein: Just one other comment, if I may please? Just again, part of our goal today is just to hear the Board's comments about for compatibility for the existing structure, meeting – conforming with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Again, because of the risk of building too close to a tree, I just didn't want another tree permit on our property to be granted approval. So then also the historic structure can stay in perpetuity -- so hearing -- in support of our variance. So, hearing from the Board that agreement that the proposal meets the Secretary of Interior Standards for subordination, setback, a lower plate height for the upper level. Enough differentiation that it meets these standards that would be our goal for today.

Ms. French: I would just interrupt to say that this is a study session and there's no biding comments. We aren't prepared – we haven't – we have our Page and Turnbull, that is our expert help, and we would have to come back with that analysis.

Chair Bower: Sure. Roger.

Board Member Kohler: Staff, if you look on the page here that says new north and new south and you see the daylight plane and it comes really close to the gutter. You know where it says new north and new south, see here the gutters are and the daylight plane? We're being told now that – from Staff that you can't be that close. You have to be 1 to 2-feet away from the gutter with the daylight plane.

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah so, this project is still being analyzed under the IR Guidelines. I will note that we ask anything adjacent, single story residences to be below the daylight plane. This one is not next to a single-



story residence on that side. That's not to say that what they're doing is going to be approved. This is still going to be reviewed under the IR Guidelines for analysis.

Board Member Kohler: So that relies on adjacent homes, whether – how close you can get?

Ms. Hodgkins: Yeah so, we look for everything to be...(interrupted)

Commissioner Kohler: Is that written down anywhere?

Ms. Hodgkins: Well, it's shown in the IR Guidelines. We look at the diagrams that they show and we're looking to provide space when it's adjacent to a single-story residence. In this case they look to design to try and push away from the adjacent single-family residences on the right side. It's still being reviewed by our consulting architect for consistency with the IR Guidelines.

Chair Bower: Anyone else? Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I drove by the project today and it looks like there's also an application for that right-side house at 836. I would assume their doing a second-story addition there too. Oh, well...

Board Member Bernstein: No, they're not doing a second-story floor addition.

Board Member Wimmer: Oh, ok. Well I just thought maybe there would be some impact there. I mean I think also what Martin's done is I think it's very complementary to what's existing. The only thing I want to ask about is the existing front gable and then there's the new upper gable. I'm wondering if on that west side elevation that you would want to connect that upper roof with the existing lower roof so you don't have an interruption? You could go from the lower roof plane and connect it in one plane instead of having that skip. I don't know if that would... (interrupted)

Board Member Bernstein: I think...

Board Member Wimmer: ... prevent water...

Board Member Bernstein: One of the – I'm sorry, what was your last comment?

Board Member Wimmer: I was just saying that that's – I would – I was wondering if you'd consider doing that? Just having a continuous roof on that side. Also, I believe you could have some kind of a dormer or a shed dormer window in that bedroom three that can violate the daylight plane for a certain width; like 15-feet or something. So that might help your bedroom three to allow you to have another window that's facing that west side but that might add square footage.

Board Member Bernstein: We did – I think one of the earlier drawings we had those planes lining up and my thought on that is that now you're starting to perhaps offer some confusions. Say well what's the historic gable, what's the new gable and again, because of the Secretary we really wanted to emphasize and be clear here's historic, here's new. I think that my comments about that.

Board Member Wimmer: That makes sense.

Board Member Bernstein: As far as – we had – again, we did some dormers but now we're going to start – as you can see in the diagram on A5.1, we start interrupting that daylight plane. There's an existing one-story house very nearby and we just didn't want to start violating those daylight planes.

Board Member Wimmer: I think you're allowed – with a dormer I think a dormer can protrude into the daylight plane for a certain width. That might allow you to have an additional window in that bedroom but in the rear bedroom you already have windows on two elevations so that should be fine. Just a thought.

Chair Bower: Thanks Margaret. Michael?

Board Member Makinen: Yes, I think we should keep in mind the overall goal in a rehabilitation of a historic property and that is to make it suitable for moderate living but still retain the historic flavor and character of the house. I think that's the overwriting principle we should be paying attention to right now. Clearly the house, as originally constructed, is not suitable for modern family living and here the homeowner is making every attempt to preserve the character of the house and fit within the guidelines of what rehabilitation is. So, I would encourage to accept the changes here because I believe that the historic character is retained and the sides of the house are essentially not visible from the street. So, the façade is the only thing that is of real importance as far as the historic character goes. I think if we kind of take a more general view of this, what is trying to be achieved right here, and not try to nitpick every little thing right here will go a long ways towards maintaining the proper perspective.

Chair Bower: Thank you Michael. I think you're spot on there. Debbi, did you have any comments you want to make?

Board Member Shepherd: No.

Chair Bower: Ok. I have a couple comments. It seems to me that a variance for this property is exactly the right vehicle to take and so this project is constrained by history. To Michael's point, the development of the property – the property to the, I think it's the east, those properties were all built when the Palo Alto Medical Foundation moved.

Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

Chair Bower: Those are far denser and much closer than anything we would allow now but that's was I guess a planned development decision. As Michael points out this building is not visible from the street except on the front facades. That's probably our focus, we're required to analyze all these things we've been talking about but I think it's relatively insignificant. One of the questions that I think you might want to answer before you move forward is or as you move forward is whether you've thought about putting a basement under the entire building and not adding a second story? You're not in the flood zone and I realize that's difficult to do but Roger and I – Roger designed and I built a basement under a property on Emerson in Professorville. Suspending the building and putting an entire half a house underneath the house. Probably more expensive now than it was then but it's something that somebody might ask. Well why do you have to go up when you could go down? Economics are an issue. I don't – I'm not asking you to answer that but I just think that's something to think of. The only other thing I'm having a little trouble with the 1 x 6 siding as opposed to three lap siding. I understand the differentiation issue, I'm just – again, it won't be seen so it probably doesn't matter but I'm just – as I envision it, it seems to me to be a little disjointed. I know exactly why you're doing it, I'm not being critical of it, and I can't offer a better solution.

Vice Chair Corey: I was thinking about that too. Another possibility might be to do something in between on the siding because I get the idea, you're trying to differential but is there something – is there a 1 x 8 or something that may look more different but maybe not as disjointed? That might be an idea.

Chair Bower: We had a project in Professorville maybe 5-years ago that had the same siding, three lap siding, and then extended the building out back. I cannot remember what we did – what was proposed there. Frankly, there's nothing wrong with 1 x 6 siding. I'd rather see 1 x 6 than 1 x 8 but I think there was a – if I remember any of this correctly, there was a vision or a dividing line between old and new that allowed a material that was almost the same as what was on the building to go forward.

Board Member Bernstein: We can explore those things. Again, I'm in total support of differentiation and then now – however, if it goes through the process, we can show some alternatives features but the differentiation is important so we want to keep it. Other things that we are doing for differentiation in addition to the simulated divided lights versus a tree divided light, we're going to go – we're proposing aluminum clad windows (inaudible). Other things we're doing is on the front gables underneath the barge

board, technical term, there is a profiled molding underneath that barge board. What I'll be proposing on the construction drawings is that – and future planning drawings is the molding underneath the barge board on the front gables will be a more simple profile. So again, we're just looking at ways to get different so that – yeah, here are the differences. So, for our trained eyes we can see the difference but still have the compatibility.

Chair Bower: One of the most interesting things that I heard at a seminar given by the California Historic Historian I think was a comment about differentiation of these types of details we're talking about. He said basically only architects and builders are ever going to see these.

Board Member Bernstein: True or historians.

Chair Bower: I mean the general public doesn't understand that one molding is different than another so it's the attempt to make it clear to a trained professional eye where the existing building stopped and the new building starts. I think you've done a good job of addressing those issues.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, thanks.

Chair Bower: Alright, any other comments? Well good luck, I hope we will see this back.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, thank you.

### **Action Items**

Chair Bower: Ok, move onto Action Items. I don't think we have any action items, do we?

Ms. French: Approval of minutes.

### **Approval of Minutes**

#### **5. Approval of Excerpt Minutes of January 10, 2019, of the Joint Meeting of the Historic Resources Board and Architectural Review Board and minutes of the November 8, 2018, Historic Resources Board Meeting**

Chair Bower: Right so let's do approval of minutes. I'll have to say Board Members, I'm exhausted reading these minutes, especially on these long meetings. I'm willing to let the artificial intelligence just do what it does with it. So, do I have a – I didn't see any gross errors. Anybody else see anything? If not, do I have a motion to approve?

### **MOTION**

Vice Chair Corey: I give a motion to approve the minutes.

Chair Bower: Alright, do we have a second?

Board Member Kohler: I'll second.

Chair Bower: Roger, second? Alright. Any discussion? I don't think we have any discussion.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, sorry, I won't be able to vote on those because I was – I did not participate in the issues regarding the railroad.

Board Member Wimmer: I was also absent from those two meeting, sorry.

Chair Bower: Well, you can still vote to approve them. I tend to abstain when I don't attend because I don't see how you can approve something that you didn't hear. So, with that said, all in favor? All not in favor?

Board Member Bernstein: I'm not voting.

Chair Bower: Or any abstentions?

Board Member Bernstein: Abstain.

Chair Bower: So, one abstention. Margaret, you voted yes? Ok.

### **MOTION PASSED 6-0, 1 ABSTAIN**

Chair Bower: Alright, well that was tough.

### **Subcommittee Items**

Chair Bower: Subcommittee items, I think the only subcommittee we have is the Mills Act and we'll probably try to meet as quickly as possibly for I think one final time so we can get this to the Board.

### **Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements**

Chair Bower: Let's move to Board Member questions and comments and announcements and then we'll adjourn. Debbi.

Board Member Shepherd: I wanted to announce that at the next meeting of the Santa Clara County Historical Heritage Commission they are going to be discussing and taking public comment regarding Stanford's new General Use Permit Application which includes an important section about historic resources. They really need more community engagement, public comment, and interest taken perhaps on departed people on our Board as well. That meeting is at 70 W. Heading Street on the 21<sup>st</sup> at 6:30 in San Jose. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Anyone else?

Board Member Kohler: 6:30 in the morning?

Chair Bower: Night, 6:30 in the evening. That's even to early for me. Alright, if there are no other comments or announcements, I think we are adjourned. Thank you all for coming. It's great we had all seven of us here today.

### **Adjournment**