



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: May 14, 2020

Virtual Teleconference Meeting
8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower, Vice Chair Shepherd, Board Member Makinen, Board Member Pease, Board Member Wimmer, Board Member Bernstein

Absent: Board Member Kohler

Chair Bower: Okay. To begin the meeting, I need to read this information into the record. So, pursuant to the provisions of California Governor's Executive Order Number N-29-20 issued on March 17, 2020, to prevent the spread of COVID-19, this meeting will be held by virtual teleconference only, with no physical locations. The meeting will be broadcast live on Cable TV Channel 26 and live on the Midpen Media Center at midpenmedia.org.

Members of the public who wish to participate may do so by email, phone or computer. To ensure participation in a particular item, we suggest calling in or connecting 15 minutes before the item you wish to speak on. For written communications, please send an email to hrb@cityofpaloalto.org. Spoken comments via computer will be accepted through the zoom teleconferencing meeting. To address the Board, go to [Zoom.us\join](https://zoom.us/join). The meeting ID number is 93521894451. You will be asked to enter an email address and name. We request that you identify yourself by name as this will be visible online and will be used to notify you that it is your turn to speak. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, click the raised hand at the bottom middle of your screen on Zoom. You will see by moving your cursor to the bottom middle of your screen, there will be a participant's tab. If you click on that, you will then be able to see the raised hand tab. The moderator will activate and unmute speakers in turn. When called, please limit your remarks to the time limit allotted. A timer will be shown on the computer to help track, keep track of your time.

Spoken public comments using a smart phone will be accepted through the Zoom teleconference meeting. To address the Board, download the Zoom app onto your phone from the Apple App Store or Google Play Store and enter the Meeting ID 93521894451. Please follow the previous steps that I have just described.

Spoken public comments using a phone call at 1-669-900-6833 and enter the Meeting ID 93521894451. When you wish to speak on an agenda item, hit *9 on your phone so we know that you wish to speak. You will be asked to provide your first and last name before addressing the Board. You will be advised how long you have to speak. When called, please limit your remarks to the agenda item and time limit allotted. You can also find this information on the last page of our agenda for today's meeting.

To better facilitate public comments, at the beginning of the meeting our host Vinh will identify each person with a raised hand by name or the last four digits of your phone number and request that you state your name and agenda item you wish to speak on. If you wish to speak under any item not on the agenda, please state your intent to speak under oral communications, which will be up next. When it's your time to speak during public comment, you will be identified and provided three minutes to speak. Any callers with blocked numbers will wait until the end of the speaker's port. The host will unmute them one at a time, and all will be asked to speak.

So, that's the public announcement. A couple of Zoom tricks. One, as Jodie told us earlier before the meeting began, if you would leave your mics muted so that background noise wherever you are will be minimized, you can then just hit the space bar and hold it to speak and then let go of it and it will put you back on mute. You can also use your cursor.

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: So, let's move to oral communications. This is an opportunity for any member of the public to speak on any item that is not on the agenda. There will be three minutes per speaker. Vinh, could you please explain the procedure you use again for us?

Vinh Nguyen: Yes, we will go through the speakers one by one, people who have raised their hand or people who have previously been identified to have public comments. So, right now I do see a member of the public with a hand raised. It is a caller with the last four digits 1000. I will unmute you now, so you can identify which agenda item you want to speak on.

Board Member Bernstein: Hello.

Mr. Nguyen: Hi, we can hear you.

Board Member Bernstein: Hello, Chair Bower. This is Martin Bernstein, Member of HRB and I've been present since 8:30. I pushed *9 when the meeting started. So, I am present.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, let me promote you to present.

Chair Bower: Great. Nice to have you hear Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: You're welcome.

Chair Bower: Vinh, do you see any other people that are asking to speak?

Mr. Nguyen: We have no other public comments at this time, but Martin, it looks like I can't promote you. It might be because...

Board Member Bernstein: I'm on my iPhone.

Mr. Nguyen: We'll leave you as an attendee but I'll keep you unmuted so you can still speak at any time.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, and with that Chair Bower, with no more public comments, we may proceed with the agenda.

Chair Bower: Good. Thank you Vinh.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: Let's move on to Agenda Changes, Additions or Deletions. I think we would like to make one change in the order of the Agenda. Amy, you and I talked about that.

Amy French: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay. So, so we need to move the entire comment section up, or can we just have this one comment?

Ms. French: Well, if you would like to give a report now and delay the other reports till after item three, that would be acceptable.

Chair Bower: Okay, I'd like to do that.

[Meeting moved to Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements]

City Official Reports

Chair Bower: Our next item is City Official Reports, Agenda Item number one, which is HRB scheduled meetings. Amy, you probably can speak to that.

Ms. French: Sure. So, this is our meeting for May. We have been limiting our meetings to once per month at most, just because the number of items that we get on the HRB are not as many as some other boards and commissions. So, looking at the schedule, the month of June, because of some absents, I'm targeting if we have an item, June 25. So far, we do not have an item. I'm looking at July, considering taking a break in July. It is summer and Council takes a break. For August, looking at the 13th as our one meeting. Again, we don't have an item just yet. Then September 10th would be the September meeting. We have two options for October, the I think 8th or the 22nd. One date for November that would work, which is November 12th and one date for December which is December 10th, due to the obvious holidays in those months.

Chair Bower: Okay, thank you. I think I'm going to be available for every single meeting this year because all of my trips have been cancelled, but I'll survive. Okay. Thank you for that, and I'm sure you'll let us know when the meetings are going to be scheduled.

Study Session

Chair Bower: Next up is Study Session. I don't think we have a study session planned for today.

Action Items

2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. Cardinal Hotel, 235 Hamilton Avenue [20PLN-00024]: Request for Historic Designation Reclassification, from a Local Historic Resource Category 3 to a Category 2, of the Cardinal Hotel located within the National Register of Historic Places' Ramona Street Architectural District. Environmental Assessment: No project under California Environmental Quality Act and CEQA Guideline per Section 21065. Zone District: CD-C (GF)(P) – Downtown Commercial with Ground Floor and Pedestrian Shopping Combining District. For more information contact Amy French, amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Bower: We can then move to Agenda item number two, which is... Wait a minute, 235 Hamilton, Cardinal Hotel. So, let me read the official description. This is a public hearing/quasi-judicial. The Cardinal Hotel at 235 Hamilton Avenue, which is 20PLN-00024. It is a request for Historic Designation Reclassification from a Local Historic Resource Category 3 to a Category 2 of the Cardinal Hotel located within the National Register of Historic Places' Ramona Street Architectural District. Environmental Assessment: there is no project under California Environmental Quality Act and CEQA Guidelines per Section 21065. The zoning district is CD-C (GF)(P) – Down Commercial with Ground Floor and Pedestrian Shopping Combined District. For more information you can contact Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Ms. French: Thank you David.

Chair Bower: Let me start before you begin, Amy. Are there any disclosures from Board Members? I will start by saying that I have visited the hotel many times, but not recently. Anyone else have any disclosures? I'm not seeing anybody. Oh, Michael.

Board Member Makinen: We had a tour of the hotel by the project people sometime in March I think it was. We went through the hotel site. Excuse me, that was the other hotel. Cancel that.

Chair Bower: Martin, I see your light.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes. Thank you, Chair Bower. So, I've been in the hotel. I've been given a tour of the hotel and I personally have given tours of the hotel. That's my disclosure. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Alright. I'm seeing other people shaking their heads no. So, Amy, why don't you begin with the Staff Report.

Ms. French: Okay. Well today we are, it's hotel day. We've got two hotels, the first being the Cardinal Hotel. This is Item Two. The hotel was built in 1924 and it is History Inventory Category 3 on our local inventory. It was put there in 1978 as a Category 3. Then in 1985 it was put as a Contributing Resource to the National District. That's when the National District at Ramona was put into that category. The Cardinal Hotel is the first building that was built in the Ramona Street District and per the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by Page & Turnbull in the fall of 2019, it is eligible as an Individual Resource under Criterion 1 and Criterion 3. It is designed by William Weeks in the Italian Renaissance Revival Style. Birge Clark was the supervising architect and it has been largely unaltered since 1944. It is just, with its existing Category, eligible for using the California Historical Building Code and energy standards, as well as Historic Preservation incentives in the City's Zoning Code. It is a Seismic Category II Building and alternations based on the seismic issues have been in discussion so far, but there is no application submitted. The Cardinal Hotel is in, and I'll say what these are, Commercial Downtown Ground-Floor Pedestrian Zone. That enables a building such as this with a 283 FAR to apply for historic bonus for use on site up to the 3 to 1, but the applicant has not indicated interest so far, and that the applicant has indicated interest in potentially transferring bonus floor area off the site following rehabilitation. So, this is in our code, Palo Alto Municipal Code Section 18.18.070 that allows the applicant to perform rehabilitation for both historic and seismic reasons and go through a process on that. But only the Council can approve on-site use of such bonuses, again, only up to the 3 to 1 FAR. The Cardinal Hotel, the reason it is eligible for California Register Individual Listing is for its role in Palo Alto's commercial development and its distinctive characteristics of a type, period or method of construction. These are considered significant. It also meets all seven of the aspects of integrity as noted. The Cardinal Hotel has some alterations to date. The ground floor commercial spaces, storefront doors and display windows, upper floor windows were replaced with original fenestration openings. The intact features include the ground floor bulkheads, windows and transoms, the window rhythms and all original decorative façade details. The hotel lobby is special. It has craftsmanship from the American Arts and Crafts Movement in the 1920s and you can see there are still the retained flooring, ceiling, fireplace and other items still intact. A stairway was clearly added at some point later, on the right there. So, we're looking to make the findings for the upgrade inventory classification on the City's inventory, the reasons being it's the first commercial anchor for the Ramona Street Historic District. It's meritorious work of the architect and his supervising architect. It retains many character-defining features, all seven integrity aspects and the original character is intact. Our consultant, Page & Turnbull, who is also a participant are watching the presentation today has determined that it exceeds the criterion set for Category 3 buildings, and more appropriately classified as a Local Inventory Category 2. So, this is tentatively on the Council agenda consent for June 22. I'll leave that slide up and turn it over to the applicant, who has images to share. Abha, are you participating?

Abha Nehru: Yeah. Good morning. Yes, I wanted to have the screen... Vinh you want to...

Mr. Nguyen: I (not understood) Amy screen shared, so you can share your screen now. If you are unable to, I can also project it for you.

Ms. Nehru: Okay, alright. Let me check and then I will start. I will keep my video off because my internet here can be spotty, so thanks for understanding. Good morning Chair Bower, Vice Chair Shepherd, good morning to all board Members. I am Abha Nehru and I work with Carrasco and Associates. I would like to

first thank Amy and the City staff for their research and work on this project. I would also like to thank the Board and staff for working through the pandemic and for organizing this on-line hearing. We all really appreciate that. To start with, I would like to introduce Stephanie Wansek. She is the general manager of the Cardinal Hotel and is representing the owners. Vinh, could you unmute her? She just has a few lines that she would like to say.

Mr. Nguyen: Sure. Could you say, which name again?

Ms. Nehru: Stephanie Wansek. Stephanie, could you raise your hand?

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, I have unmuted you, but you have to unmute yourself as well.

Stephanie Wansek: Yes, good morning. Are people able to hear me?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Ms. Wansek: Good morning everyone. Thank you for your time again to echo Abha. I just wanted to read a few words. It has been my pleasure to manage the Cardinal Hotel for the past twenty years. During its proud history since 1924 the Cardinal Hotel has listed countless visitors to downtown Palo Alto. We proudly know the Cardinal to be a significant historic node since it was built. It was built to bring commercial development to Hamilton Street. It also became the scene of local community gatherings and dance events. The Cardinal Hotel continues its 95-year-old tradition to offer travelers visiting Palo Alto on business or leisure an experience noteworthy of remembrance. Global and domestic travelers visiting Palo Alto, Stanford and the San Francisco Bay Area experience the 1920s Revival Period while at the same time being part of today's Palo Alto. Guests who visit the Cardinal are constantly impressed with the thoughtful preservation of the hotel and the authentic experience of their stay. The Dahl Family has owned this historic hotel since 1944 and have through the generations continued to preserve and celebrate its history. We look forward to hearing your feedback today regarding our proposal. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Abha, do you want to continue?

Ms. Nehra: Yes, I can continue, thanks. So, on behalf of the Cardinal Hotel ownership we are requesting that the Cardinal Hotel be designated as a Category 2 building in the Palo Alto Historic Inventory listing. It is currently listed as a Category 3 building. So, it's a visual landmark anchored on the corner of Hamilton and Ramona. It is currently part of the Ramona Street Architectural District. It was built in 1924, designed in an Italian Renaissance Revival style by the prolific California architect William H. Weeks in collaboration with Birge Clark. It was the first hotel of its kind and the builders spared no expense to make the Cardinal Hotel the last word in hotel buildings at that time. The image on the right shows how the Cardinal Hotel is anchoring the Ramona Street Architectural District at the corner of Hamilton and Ramona. I'll just walk you through the existing and the 1924 plans to show that not much has been altered over the years. This is the basement plan. The basement they were primarily using it for storage, housekeeping, mechanical and utility rooms were there. At one time there was also a dance floor in the basement. Not much has changed since then except for the fact that there is no dancing happening there. We still have our utilities, server rooms and storage in the basement. This is the current basement plan from 2020. This slide shows the first-floor plan drawing from 1924. We just outlined the lobby and the main entrances from Ramona and Hamilton which was part of the main hotel reception and still is. Surrounding ground floor spaces are all retail and they were designed as retail earlier and they still are retail now. The shaded areas show the retail portions. We have an alley on the side, on the southwest side. The main entry being from Hamilton and the second entry is from Ramona side. The legend here shows a few changes that have happened over the years, and these primarily are glazing doors or windows that have been replaced or repaired over time. The second and third floor plans are the guest floors, and this is a u-shape on the second and third floors around the light well. The interior guest rooms get this light and air from this rectangular lightwell and it will be more clear on the next image. These rooms and these floors, both second and third floor have not been modified or altered over the years. There has not been much change except for upgrade to bathrooms, styles and plumbing. So, I'll just

breeze past these slides. These were just to show you that the second and third floor plans have remained intact. This is a roof plan, not much change, same as before. This is an elevation drawing of Hamilton Avenue from 1924 and the next image would show how this building looks like today, 2020 elevation. The notations here show that along Hamilton the windows and glazing have been changed or repaired over time. There has been some added signage and fabric awnings, but the building primarily looks the same as it did in 1924. The next slide will show a Ramona drawing. Similarly, only the windows and glazing along this façade have changed over time. The windows on the second and third floors have been replaced, but within the opening fenestration. This is the Ramona Street elevation from 2020. We have noted what has changed. There has been the addition of a neon sign which wasn't there in 1924, but we think it was still added around later in the 1920s because we see that in images from 1930 onwards. These are rare elevations. The only changes we see again are replacement windows which are noted here. This is the west alley elevation. Again, just the modification to windows, window replacement on the second and third guest floors and glazing replacement at the first-floor corner here where we have the Base Gallery right now. So, I just have a few more images to share with you. The hotel opened in December, but the formal opening of the hotel was on December 13. This was an article in San Jose Mercury (not understood) at the time announcing the grand opening of the hotel. This is how the building looked from the southeast corner from 1924 and if I take a black and white image now today, it would almost look the same. This is a view, southeast view from 2020. There has been some addition of a neon sign and the flag posts are not there any longer. The building looks the same. This is the Hamilton façade today. Here, this image shows the material palette of stucco, terra-cotta, wrought iron and we have clay tile at the top edge. There were shields designed in the spandrel panels between windows and this is typical along Hamilton and Ramona façade. Horizontal (not understood) reminiscent of those times was used to separate the first floor from the two upper levels. This is the main Hamilton entry. It has spiraled classical Corinthian columns at Hamilton entrance and a metal marquee over this entrance and it is similar at the Ramona entrance. You can also see the stained-glass transom window at the corner there next to the pilaster. The next image shows how the hotel lobby looked in 1924 and the hotel interior again has primarily stayed intact. If I were to take this image as a black and white image today, I probably would not be able to make out the difference, except that there was a stair added at some point, which goes to the mezzanine level. The last few images. This is the main stair; the left image shows the main stair from 1924 and we took the main stair image as a black and white for 2020. The difference being only that today's picture is a little sharper. My last slide, I just want to conclude that the Cardinal Hotel was the first building constructed to attract commercial development on Hamilton and Ramona Streets. It was followed by other contributing buildings that became part of the Ramona Street Architectural District. The character-defining features of the building are substantially retained. It represents distinctive characteristics of style, period and workmanship. The collaboration of William Weeks and Birge Clark shaped the path for the other buildings that followed in this district. Lastly and most importantly, the owners wish to preserve this history for the future generations. Thank you for your time and I will mute myself now and answer any questions that you may have.

Chair Bower: Okay. So, at this point thank you very much for that presentation. It's a beautiful building and it is remarkable how much of the original historic fabric is still there. I'd like to take, at this point, to have Board Members ask questions, just questions. We'll have a discussion after that. Any Board Members have questions? I'm going to start by calling on people, just to make it simpler. Christian, any questions?

Board Member Pease: Not at this time.

Chair Bower: Okay, Debbie?

Vice Chair Shephard: No, thank you.

Chair Bower: Okay. Mike?

Board Member Makinen: No questions.

Chair Bower: Okay. Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, I don't know if this is an appropriate question for this part of the meeting, but I'm just wondering why you, have you considered moving it to a Category 1? I just was, I think it's great that you're moving the category to a greater significance. I just was wondering why 2 and not go for a Category 1? Just out of curiosity.

Ms. Nehra: I think we asked Page & Turnbull to review this building. At that time the methodology and the criteria they used, they thought it would fit the Category 2 instead of Category 1. That it would not meet the criteria set by the HRB Board. So, they made that call, and maybe Christina can address that. She is here attending the meeting.

Chair Bower: Christina, can you respond if you want.

Board Member Wimmer: I was just to interject. I mean, the difference between the Category 1 and Category 2, the Category 1 is an exceptional building, a Category 2 is a major building. I mean, because this building hasn't had a lot of alterations, it's largely intact, it keeps its character. I mean, for me it's kind of an exceptional building, so I just, I'm just thinking since you're going through this effort to move it up. Maybe just the Category 1 would obligate you to things that you don't want to be obligated to. Because in that sense, you could become a national level recognized building, which I think, I mean I would be in support of that just because I think it's such a landmark.

Ms. French: So, Vinh, Christina is on the attendee side, so she needs to be unmuted.

Christina (no last name): Hi, can you hear me?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Christina: I'm actually, so I wasn't the author of the Historic Resource Evaluation and I did review it but I didn't see that we opined about category level. We were evaluating for the California Register, so I'm not sure if this was a separate conversation that my colleague had perhaps with Amy. Amy might have more information about that, but I don't actually have anything to contribute about this. I'm sorry.

Chair Bower: Okay. Amy, you have a comment.

Ms. French: Yeah. I didn't recall a conversation suggesting that Category 2 is the appropriate category. I mean, we have our Palo Alto Municipal Code, Chapter 16.49 that has, you know, the findings or the categories and, yes, exceptional building is one of them, Category 1. As a comparison, the President Hotel is also a Category 2, not a Category 1. We're seeing that later today. I think because there are rehabilitation features that could happen on this building, then the question would be, after those happened is it then eligible for Category 1. That would be a kind of a question that I would have. You know, Category 1, how many Category 1 buildings do we have in Palo Alto. That's a question I have and what differentiates them from the Category 2s and I don't have an answer.

Chair Bower: Okay. So, I'd like to suggest that for today, let's just consider the change from Category 3 to Category 2, but I'm very interested in Margaret's suggestion and it would be worth having another, looking at this issue at a different meeting. Not that the applicant needs to come, but we as a Board could look at the definitions, look at the list of buildings that are Category 1 and Category 2, and then maybe think about changing the designation at that meeting. But for today, let's just focus on this change from 3 to 2.

Board Member Wimmer: I just wanted to say one last thing. The Board has discussed that at length before, but we've never made any changes to the Categories 1 through 4. We were considering saying historic, nonhistoric, just having one category. I mean, I still think that there is, having 4 categories is good and I think we should maybe have a workshop to take a look at the definitions.

Chair Bower: Okay, great. Thanks Margaret. Martin, do you have any questions?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes. Am I unmuted?

Chair Bower: You are.

Board Member Bernstein: My question would be to the owner or owner representative, has the owner or owner representative considered raising it to Category 1?

Ms. Nehru: We had not considered it but we can look into it. We would have to talk with the owners.

Chair Bower: Is that a no.

Ms. Nehru: No, I'm, I haven't talked to them and this didn't come up at our meetings at all, so...

Chair Bower: I understand. I'm not saying you are not interested in it. I'm just verifying that you hadn't considered it. That's all. So, everybody has spoken. I have a couple of questions about, just detail questions. Do you happen to know the age of that stair, when that stairway in the lobby was installed? Do you have any idea when that came?

Ms. Nehru: No, off the top of my head I do not, but it has been there now for a long time. Maybe Stephanie, the manager of the hotel knows when it was put in.

Chair Bower: I'm asking because if it's over fifty years, it then becomes significant fabric. I think it's over fifty years because I remember it there when I was in high school. So...

Ms. Nehru: Let me meanwhile check with her if she knows this.

Chair Bower: It's just something to consider. It's not really part of this. The next question I have is, I noticed that the building has extraordinary symmetry in its architecture and that the awnings for Osteria, a favorite restaurant of mine, really obscures those upper windows. I'm assuming those windows are still there. Is that the case? I think they are.

Ms. Nehru: Yes, that's correct. They are still there. We peeked inside to check.

Chair Bower: So, I'm wondering if at some point in the future you might consider removing that awning which obscures that important symmetric design. It's half of that Hamilton façade on the first floor, and that maybe there would be another opportunity for signage. Osteria has been there a very long time. It's clearly recognizable and known in the community. I hope it remains there in this difficult time. But it's something I'm just suggesting that at a further or future date might consider unmasking the windows.

Ms. Nehru: Thanks for that comment and yes, we are looking at that.

Chair Bower: Okay, great. Thank you. Those are all my questions. I guess if there are no further Board Member questions, I'll bring this back to the Board for discussion. We will need to create a motion to move this forward and vote on it. So, what we're being asked to do is to recommend that the building be reclassified from a Contributing Building Category 3 to a Major Building Category 2 resource on the History Inventory. So, comments or discussion by Board Members? Let's see, I started with Christian last time. Let me start with Martin this time, since you were at the end. Martin, any discussion?

Board Member Bernstein: Not at this point.

Chair Bower: Okay. Let's see, how do we go through, Margaret, I guess you are up next. Any discussion?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes. I mean, I'm just going to go back to my original comment about I think this is an exceptional building. I think it's the cornerstone of the Ramona Street District. I think that Palo Alto doesn't have a lot of Category 1 buildings. I think this is an opportunity for us to have, it's an exceptional building. And I don't know strategically if Category 2 gives them more or Category 1 limits them what they can do in the future, but I mean, I'm in support of it being moved up. I would also be in support or encourage them to investigate becoming a Category 1. I mean, we, that could be a feather in Palo Alto's cap, having more historic buildings. I think this is a perfect, it's almost 100 years old, right. It was built in 1924. We're four years away from it being a 100-year-old building. I think it's time for Palo Alto to recognize that and to celebrate that and I think it's an exceptional building. I would encourage the applicant to not settle for Category 2, because I clearly think it's a candidate for a Category 1.

Chair Bower: That's a good point, Margaret. I think that for today's consideration we need to stay with the move from 3 to 2, because I think, as I just mentioned, there is, I think there is further investigation before we do that. I'm in support of looking at that and doing that.

Board Member Wimmer: But if we have a motion and we all agree to move it up to a 2, I mean, is this just lost then, or is there... Can we just, I guess when we craft our motion, we can encourage them to investigate a Category 1 in our motion, I guess.

Chair Bower: Amy, do you have a comment on that?

Ms. French: I would just say, you know, let's stay the course as you suggested a Category 2. That gets them into the floor area bonus territory where they can, you know, hopefully get some benefit to make some additional improvements to the building that would bring it into further compliance at the storefront level, because they're interested in doing some of those things. And then we can return with whatever they plan to do with the building, be it seismic or historic rehab at the storefront level, and have that discussion again. And if they want to delay going to Council with the upgrade to have those conversations, we can certainly do that. But I wouldn't want to delay them because we do have a tentative date of June 22 for this category.

Chair Bower: Sure. I think my feeling is that before we move up to Category 1, we would need to look at the awning and some other minor architectural changes that would make a difference. So, I think it's up to the applicant if they want to postpone it, we can certainly figure out a way to put this back on our agenda to move it up to a Category 1. I don't see that the action we take today will preclude another hearing to change the category again from 2 to 1. (crosstalk)

Ms. French: David, can I just say before you take a vote that we need to make sure the public is invited to comment if there is anyone to comment on this item. Did we get any requests?

Chair Bower: Oh, thank you. I had that on my list after the Board discussion. So, Vinh, you can look and see if anyone, any public member would like to speak, if they could use the raise your hand feature. After we have this discussion, we will have those comments. So, Debbie, do you have any comments or discussion?

Vice Chair Shepherd: No, I don't at this time.

Chair Bower: Okay. Mike, how about you?

Board Member Makinen: I pretty much agree with Margaret's comments that we should look further at a Category 1. I think the motion should contain some wording that the Board strongly recommends further consideration for a higher upgrade or Category 1. I think that should be in the motion.

Chair Bower: Okay. Christian, any discussion?

Board Member Pease: I agree with Mike's suggestion.

Chair Bower: Okay, I can't see Martin, but Martin, do you have any further comments?

Board Member Bernstein: No further comment.

Chair Bower: Okay, Vinh, do we have any members of the public who would like to speak to us on this item?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, we do. We have one raised hand from John. If there is anyone else who wants to speak on this item, please raise your hand now. The raise hand button is at the bottom of your Zoom screen. If you're calling in from a phone, you can raise your hand by pressing *9. John, I will unmute you now so you can speak.

John: Thank you Vinh. Can you hear me?

Chair Bower: Yes. Welcome John.

John: Thank you Chair Bower and HRB. Thank you, guys, for looking at this. I'm a big fan and a big supporter of the Cardinal Hotel. I'm so grateful that, like many other owners, but like the Thoits family, the Dahls have just been great caretakers of this asset for so many decades and I applaud and support their application today to move to a Category 2. I understand ya'lls interest and support of even going to a 1. It is a fantastic asset for the downtown. I just want to point out that these kinds of moves and such have lots of implications and issues and costs that the owners need to figure out and to not do anything that's going to tie their hands, you know, especially in today's economy and COVID-19 and they're a hotel and all of these things. You know, I would hope, and I don't know exactly what I'm speaking to. Amy would be the guru, but really, I would just hope ya'll would approve this so it opens up their avenue for some financing vehicles to help them continue to maintain and analyze projects to enhance the building in the years to come. I just want to voice a very strong level of support. The Thoits family owns buildings across the street as well as throughout the downtown, and it was fun by the way, to see in the historic analysis some of the Thoits family members mentioned for their contributions and activities on neighboring buildings there on Ramona. Oh, I don't know, 100 years ago. But anyway, I think it's fantastic and I applaud Stephanie as their manager on the asset to undertake this and explore it, because it's a great step toward preserving our downtown. I thank ya'll there and hope you vote yes. Thanks.

Chair Bower: Thank John for sharing and spending time with us today. Of we have no further public comments Vinh?

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Bower, that concludes the public comments for this item.

Chair Bower: Okay, well, let's move on to crafting a motion. I don't think it has to be complicated. Anyone want to step up to that. Wow, don't raise your hands all at once.

MOTION

Chair Bower: Well, I can start and then you can tell me, you can let me know if there are things I'm missing. I would say that I move that we recommend that the Council reclassify the building from a Category 3 to a Category 2 building on the Palo Alto Historic Resource Inventory and would encourage the building's owners to consider a further request at a future date to change from a Category 2 to a Category 1, but that is not contingent on this particular approval. How's that Amy? Do you think that's clear?

Ms. French: Yes, I think that works. Certainly, you know, I hear the motion and I think there is something we can do to take a look at the Ramona District and see, you know, how many of those

buildings are Category 1 versus Category 2 individually, and I can get a report back to the HRB to help the Board with their deliberation for next steps, if the applicant wishes to go with Category 1.

Chair Bower: I want to be very clear for the minutes, in the minutes that it's an encouragement to change from Category 2 to Category 1. It is not a requirement and is not, I don't want the owners to feel like they are being pushed to do something they are uncomfortable with. Because as John just mentioned, there are many implications of changing categories. Okay. Do I have a second?

Board Member Makinen: I'll second it.

Chair Bower: Okay, Mike, your second. Is there any further discussion or are we ready to vote? I don't see any further discussion so I'll just go right down the line and ask people to vote yes in favor or no, not in favor. Christian?

Board Member Pease: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay. Mike?

Board Member Makinen: Yes.

Chair Bower: Debbie?

Vice Chair Shepherd: Yes.

Chair Bower: Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes.

Chair Bower: Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay, and I'm also a yes so that's a unanimous six votes for changing this.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.

Chair Bower: I want to thank all the people who have participated in this, staff and of course, the applicants and the applicant's consultants. It was a very thorough review and when you see me looking down, I'm actually looking on my iPad at the very long 100-page reports. I'm not reading my phone. But it helps to be able to see that. I can't do that on my computer. Okay, thank you for that. Thank you for all who have participated.

3. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. Hotel President, 488 University Avenue [19PLN-00038]: Review of Proposed Building Modifications for Compliance with Secretary of Interior's Standards; Architectural Review Application to Modify a Local Inventory Category 2 Resource, Including Interior and Exterior Renovations, to Convert Residentially Used Spaces to Hotel Use. The Building is Considered a Legal non-Complying Facility and is Eligible for Listing on the California Register of Historic Resources. Environmental Assessment: California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Exempt per Guidelines 15301 for Existing Structures, 15302 for Reconstruction and 15331 for Restoration of Historic Resource. For more Information, Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Bower: Let's move on to Item number 3 and I will read, this is 488 University Avenue, the Hotel President. So, this is a public hearing/quasi-judicial. The Hotel President at 488 University Avenue [19PLN-00038]. It's a review of proposed building modifications for compliance with Secretary of Interior

Standards. It's architectural review application to modify a Local Category 2 Resource, including interior and exterior renovations to convert residentially used spaces to hotel use. The building is considered a legal non-complying facility and is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historic Resources. Environmental assessment: California Environmental Quality Act exempt per Guidelines 15301 for existing structures, 15302 for reconstruction and 15331 for restoration of Historic Resource. For more information, contact the Project Planner Sheldon Ah Sing at sahsing@m-group.us. Let me just stop there. Amy, is that correct directions for people who want more information about the project?

Ms. French: At this time we are transitioning from our consultants due to budget concerns, so I would just say if you have questions you can email them to me, amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org. Jodie and I are working with transitioning to another staff member.

Chair Bower: Okay. Thanks for that clarification. I wanted to say at this juncture that the Historic Resources Board is only evaluating the changes to an historic property. This is a controversial project. We are not, our purview does not include the change from a residential structure to a commercial structure. That's not what we're here to talk about and I'd appreciate it if the public did not focus on that or discuss that. We're here and willing and interested in listening to all public comments about the historic resources that this particular building possesses and the changes that are discussed. So, let's start with disclosures. I will say I have toured the building with the project architect and the owner and the local project manager in, I don't know, the last six months. Christian?

Board Member Pease: I also had a tour, as you have, of the property.

Chair Bower: Debbie?

Vice Chair Shepherd: I also had a tour.

Chair Bower: Okay, Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: No, sadly, I didn't participate in the tour. But I did go to a presentation that was at the Ilfrinio (**phonetic**) Courtyard about a good year ago.

Chair Bower: Okay, Martin, any disclosure? You're muted. I presume Martin has no disclosures, since he's not speaking up, and Mike is currently out of the room. I'll circle back around and ask him afterwards. Alright, let's just move on to the staff report. Amy or whomever?

Ms. French: Yes, I'll be giving the report. So, the President Hotel or Hotel President was built in 1930 as the largest and most modern hotel in Palo Alto at the time. It's an existing Local Resource Inventory Category 2 as a major building in the Spanish Colonial Revival style. Our consultant, Page & Turnbull has evaluated this and found it to be eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources under Criterion 1 (events) and Criterion 3, (architecture). Of course, the master architect for Palo Alto, Birge Clark designed this building and it was associated with President Hoover back then and it did extend University Avenue. It was an early mixed-use building at the time. Those are the reasons it's eligible for California Register. As well the character-defining features conveying the historic identity are evident in the building today. We have some lovely older photos here showing the older cars, etc. So fun to see these photos. The lobby in the President Hotel back in the 1930s and 40s is showing in these images and the lobby is still there today. The noncompliant features are the height of the building exceeds the City's fifty-foot maximum and the maximum for the zone, the CD-GFP, and the FAR, floor area ratio also exceed the maximum for the district at 50,540 square feet. That's part of the project. The University Avenue area, the basement does protrude into the right-of-way on University Avenue below grade, below the sidewalk nine feet and the marquee entry also protrudes into that University Avenue right-of-way and as well, the sixth-floor balcony comes out just a bit at two feet seven inches. There's a beautiful entrance details shown on the right that are still existent. The President Hotel plans to convert 75 dwelling units to 100 hotel rooms and it did start its life out as a hotel, but now we have a Council decision that would make that decision for reasons I could get into later if requested. The project does reduce the floor area ratio

from 5.42 to 5.36. The garage that's proposed to handle some of the parking there would employ tandem spaces and would use a valet system. The elevator that's proposed would reach a height of 90 feet to enable public use of the rooftop, which is currently there and was there back in the 40s as you can see on the image to the right. And then there are the interior and exterior renovations which are proposed. I list them here, but the applicant will probably, will be presenting more thoroughly on these. So, they're a combination of preservation, rehabilitation and restoration. The code that is applicable to the exempt floor area which is proposed is 18.18.060(e) and I have that later after the presentation if anyone wants to see that in writing. The California Register eligibility for this is great because it allows use of the State Historic Building Code. I believe it has already been able to be used and this could come in handy. Packet Page 110 to 113 presents the Secretary of Interior Standards compliance analysis for this project that is proposed with the architectural review application and it describes why the property retains five of the seven aspects of integrity and I note them here, settings, materials and then conveying the significance under those period of significance features. So, just one note, there is a discussion in the Staff Report about the lobby. There are some openings proposed in the lobby wall which do not fully comply with Standards two and nine but because those are reversible, you know, opening a wall can be closed at some point it's reversible and, therefore can be determined consistent with Standard ten. So that was one note. So, we come to the recommendation and next steps. The HRB is requested to confirm the building's eligibility for Individual Resource listing on the California Register and we had a peer review to check, that reviewed Page & Turnbull's work on that. Also, for the HRB to confirm the project's consistency with the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation, also confirmed through our consultant. And we do believe that this project does not result in a CEQA impact to the Historic Resource. So, then the next steps would be Council would consider a waiver under this code section noted to convert the residential units over to nonresidential hotel rooms. The Council will also consider the HRB's recommendation on the Architectural Review application and this is the downtown part of the code in Chapter 16.49 that has these projects going to the HRB for recommendation. And then the Council will also consider the conditional use permit for the elevator access for the public and then service of alcohol. I think that concludes the presentation. So, thank you and I know the applicant wishes to present their application.

Chair Bower: Good, so that's just what I was going to come to next. Vinh, can you facilitate the applicant's access?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, so is it going to be Alex or a different person?

Chair Bower: While we're waiting, Mike, before I asked the Board if there were any disclosures and you weren't available to answer.

Board Member Makinen: Yes, I have a disclosure. I did receive a tour by the project applicant sometime in March, I can't remember the exact date. They took us completely through the building at that time.

Chair Bower: Right, thank you. Okay, Vinh do we have the applicant up?

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, Alex you are unmuted.

Alex Stanford: Yes, can you guys hear me?

Chair Bower: Yes, we can. Please go ahead.

Mr. Stanford: Okay, great. And Vinh I don't know if you're controlling the PDF but I'm going to speak to the first three slides and turn it over to Geno, who will finish the presentation.

Jodie Gerhardt: So, this is Jodie and I will be controlling the slides. Can you see the first one now?

Mr. Stanford: Yeah, thanks. Hey, good morning Jodie. Perfect. Can we go to slide two? Perfect, thank you. Good morning Chairman Bower and HRB Members. I'm Alex Stanford and on behalf of my

colleagues in A. J. Capital and project team joining today's virtual hearing including Geno Yun, Principal at ELS Architecture, Christina Dikas, Associate Principal and Senior Architectural Historian at Page & Turnbull, and Steve Emslie, Partner at Lighthouse Public Affairs. We are excited to present our restoration rehabilitation plan for the Hotel President. Jodie, if you don't mind just going to slide three. Great. As Amy mentioned, designed by the renowned Birge Clark, the iconic Spanish Colonial Revival Style building established the commercial corridor of University Avenue when it first opened to guests in 1930. Unfortunately, as many of you witnessed during tours earlier this year, the building has suffered from decades of deferred maintenance and is urgent need of restoration and upgrades to critical infrastructure, including a seismic retrofit, installation of sprinkler and fire alarm systems and accessibility improvements. Our design team has worked to integrate the code-required life safety modernization without compromising the rehabilitation and preservation of the building's character-defining features, which Geno will now highlight. Geno.

Mr. Vinh: Please give me one second to put Geno on the line. Okay, Geno, if you could unmute yourself, you may speak.

Geno Yun: Okay, I believe I'm unmuted. Can you hear me?

Chair Bower: You are Geno. Please go ahead.

Mr. Yun: Alright, thank you and good morning Board Members and staff. As Alex mentioned, there are three items of importance that are critical on the scope of the project that I need to sort of mention and elaborate on that are not necessarily historic, but nonetheless improves the accessibility and safety of the project, one being the voluntary seismic upgrade of the entire structure. That also enhances the historic asset lifetime and usability of the building, so that is a very important item to mention for this Historic Asset as well as the fully fire sprinkling of the building that would help prevent the spread of any sort of devastating fires in the building. So, that's an improvement that the owners are voluntarily inserting into the project. The last being the accessible and gurney-sized elevator that we are installing in addition to preserving the historic elevators. So, this new elevator is going to provide access from the basement all the way up to the roof garden that is being preserved. Jodie, next slide please. So, there are a number of historic key character-defining features in the project and I'll just kind of mention them here, but elaborate in the next few slides. Being a Birge Clark building, we are thrilled to be part of this project. It's a classic example of a Birge Clark structure and design. The stucco building is a character-defining feature that we're going to be preserving and enhancing with both façade improvements for repairs on the exterior as well as paint color scheme that will enhance the overall composition of the building. We're preserving the wood gallery at the top floor, the sixth floor, which are actual functioning balconies that face University Avenue. A classic example of how to draw interest to the top of the building and yet enhance the proportions of the overall mass. All the steel sash windows we're preserving, repairing and painting. The Juliette balconies that are on the second floor at the end of the buildings we're preserving and repairing as necessary. The storefronts on the ground floor, there are a number of storefronts that are not historically correct, and so we are proposing to replace those to match the ones that are correct, and I'll show you a little bit more on that later. On the inside of the building, there is what was formerly the Pluto's restaurant and kitchen, that space is going to be converted into a registration lobby and connected to the main hall entrance that we will be preserving as well, and as mentioned earlier by Amy, the item of how we open up to that space I'll touch on a little bit later. And then the kitchen of Pluto's is the former lounge that was part of the lobby that was actually shown in the earlier image a couple of slides previous that is a beautiful space, wood beam ceilings, fireplace. We're proposing to remove the kitchen and expose the wood beam ceilings which we have investigated as being still intact. Unfortunately, the fireplace is no longer there, but for the most part we will try to preserve the spirit of what that lounge used to be. And then finally, rehabilitate the rooftop garden, have access to it and preserve the ability to go up there for enjoying the views. Next slide please. So, this slide sort of goes into the details of what we're proposing in terms of color scheme, keeping a light body, cream body color for the paint on the stucco, enhancing the wood features with the darker color that you see there. I cannot read that, but I think its blacktop is the name of the paint. And then anything steel we're proposing to use a little bit lighter color called southern vine, and so the combination of the darker and

lighter colors helps enhance the definition of the features as well as bringing interest to the elements and enhancing the light body of the stucco building. Next slide please. So, here we get into a little bit more detail of the storefront improvements. You can see we have identified three bays of storefronts that are nonhistoric and being proposed to be removed and replaced with more historically correct storefronts, bulkheads, ceramic tile mosaics. We have identified the maker of the original tiles and so we'll be looking to contact them. I think the company is Stone Light Tile in San Jose. So, we'll be going to the original supplier for the tile. Based on this Birge Clark detail of the entrance doors, we're proposing to rebuild the metalwork, the steel grates and scrollwork in the doors and sidelights and transom to then bring back the original intent of the entrance doors. Next slide please. So, this image here kind of highlights what we're proposing to do with the storefronts. The image on the left, the existing nonconforming or nonhistoric storefronts to be replaced with something like the image on the right, the tile pony walls, the metal and wood storefront and clear glass. Next slide. So, in terms of the ground floor improvements, that hatched area A is the former Pluto's kitchen area. We're going to turn that into a lounge bar area, expose the ceiling, create some more historic enhancements that would be consistent with the character of the time and the design. Item B is the historic elevator which has some beautiful front door and cage elements that have been maintained superbly and work quite well today. And then the cab itself has some beautiful leather embossed paneling that will be cleaned and again, enhanced to continue its life. Behind it you can see the new elevator being proposed and that's the larger gurney-sized accessible elevator that will go from the basement to the roof garden. And then Item C is a central stair currently connecting the ground floor lobby to the mezzanine to level two and then from level two up to the roof we're proposing to open up the stair to bring back to life the central stair connecting capabilities from floor to floor. As mentioned earlier, the opening between the main entrance hall and the previous Pluto space, that wall will be opened up to allow for programmatically connecting the entrance to the registration lounge area, but we see the value in preserving the original nature of the hall entrance and the ceiling beam work that is currently existing there will be preserved and we will also highlight the individual nature of the two spaces, but we do want to be able to have that connectivity between once you enter and going to the registration desk. So, the wall itself will be opened up and as Amy mentioned earlier, if in the future it needed to be restored to an independent hall space, that could be closed up quite easily. Next slide. And then finally, up on the roof, the rooftop garden we're enhancing the usability with pavers and plants and planters, adding some bathrooms and exit circulation and mechanical systems up there. So, again, preserving and bringing back to life the rooftop garden that was there originally. I think that concludes my presentation. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Bower: Thank you Geno. If you'll hand on with us for a few minutes, I think I'd like to see if any of the public would like to comment on this project at this point. After that we can come back to the Board, the Board can ask questions of the applicant and then we can move forward with our deliberations. Vinh, any public members? Actually, let me just say any members of the public that would like to speak, please use the raise-your-hand feature down at the center bottom of your screen.

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Bower, we don't have any raised hands at the moment. Let's give it maybe ten seconds to see if anyone wants to raise their hand.

Chair Bower: Well, let's do this. Let's move on to Board questions for the applicant and then I'll come back to the public comments after we finish that.

Mr. Nguyen: Sure.

Chair Bower: Okay, so Board Members, in any order, questions. Margaret, I see you raised your hand.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, hi. I just wanted to ask about the historic tile, because the historic tile is certainly a character-defining feature of the project, both on the inside and the outside and in a past project where the Palo Alto toy store had tile there was a subcommittee that really studied and approved the historic tile that was just, there was just a small amount of it in comparison to this project. I just wanted to learn more from the applicant how, are you removing all of the tile? Because it's on the interior floor, there's shaped tile as baseboards throughout the project. I kind of wanted for you to speak

more about your intent on what, are you removing all of the tile, are you removing some of the tile? And I know that, I just looked up Stone Light and I think that's a great manufacturer that can make replicate tiles, but I just wanted to understand better what your proposals are for how much are you removing and can you just speak a little bit more to that.

Mr. Yun: Sure, I can answer that question. First of all, we're not proposing to remove any tile. Anything that's on the floor currently or on the walls, we're proposing to leave. We're still in the process of evaluating the impact of the structural upgrades and if there is a wall surface that needs structural enhancement that happens to have tile on it today, we would replace it with new tile once the structural enhancement is complete. But as of right now we don't foresee that being necessary. The only tile that should be clear in our package that we're proposing to add is where we are replacing the nonhistoric storefronts with ones to replicate the historic. So, that's where I'm talking about installing new tile in a new storefront.

Chair Bower: Okay. Thank you, Geno. Christian, do you have any questions?

Board Member Pease: I do not.

Chair Bower: Okay, thank you. Mike?

Board Member Makinen: I have a question regarding the seismic rehab that you plan on doing. What are the impacts of the seismic rehab as far as intruding into the historic fabric of the building? At times these things end up being a lot of beam work that ends up being installed in some of these historic buildings that does tend to compromise some of the original historic fabric. So, could you comment on that please?

Mr. Yun: Sure, and as I'm looking at the drawings that we had submitted, I'm afraid we were neglect in showing or fully representing where the impacts are for the seismic upgrades in the storefronts on the ground floor. So, I'll try to describe them verbally for you. If you go to our drawings, the elevation of the entire building on the University Avenue, Amy or Jodie.

Ms. French: Oh, Jodie is operating those.

Mr. Yun: Can we bring up that elevation?

Ms. Gerhardt: Yeah, it will take me a minute to pull those up.

Mr. Yun: Okay. Basically, there's going to be quite a bit of concrete work, both in the sheer wall that surrounds the new elevator core and then some overlay work on the existing concrete in the building. So, the entire perimeter envelope of the building is concrete, and so we'll thicken up some of that concrete going up the building. On the ground floor though, in the storefronts we're going to be inserting a couple of steel brace frames, so where you'll see that is on the corner of Cowper Street and University, that elevation, that storefront bay you will see a couple of steel angle braces in the storefront, as well as in the western-most storefront, the existing tobacconist tenant will have a steel brace frame in their storefront as well. So, in those cases you will see a bit of structure behind the glass. Other than that, it shouldn't be impacting the existing perimeter of the building as far as what you see from the outside.

Board Member Makinen: I had just another question. You talked about sheer wall additions. Are you planning on using like shotcrete and then reinforcing rebar to get the sheer wall?

Mr. Yun: That's correct. For the perimeter of the building with the existing concrete we'll be adding shotcrete with rebar. For the new elevator core, we'll have a new concrete sheer wall. So, Jodie, if you go to A301. There you go. So, if you can zoom in on that top elevation there, you can see the angle braces that are dashed in the storefronts, both on the left bay and the right bay.

Board Member Makinen: So, those are quite intrusive into the façade of the first floor then.

Mr. Yun: They're behind the glass, so they're not part of the façade, but they will be visible.

Chair Bower: Any other questions, Mike?

Board Member Makinen: Not at the present time, but I'm taking it all in and I'm thinking about it.

Chair Bower: Okay, well we can come back. Debbie, how about you, questions?

Vice Chair Shepherd: Is it appropriate to comment here or?

Chair Bower: Let's comment in our discussion.

Vice Chair Shepherd: Thank you.

Chair Bower: Okay, no questions then? Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: Are you calling on me?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Board member Wimmer: Yeah, I actually had a subsequent question. I wanted to, maybe it's not a question but just a comment. I hope that you are taking into consideration all the HVAC requirements that a building like this will have. Like, a lot of times buildings have to have rooftop, you know, big steel boxes for chillers and coolers and compressors and things like that, and I just wanted to... I know that on the existing building in the corner restaurant space, and there's a photo on the Page & Turnbull, packet page 128 that I'm looking at, and there seems to be two window style AC units that are up in the transom. I mean, I'm sure you're going to remove those, but just the fact that I just wanted to point out, sometimes there are some consequences to having to introduce the HVAC system in these buildings. So, hopefully, you're being mindful of where these necessary components occur and I'm sure you're going to take those out of there.

Mr. Yun: Yes.

Chair Bower: Alright, let' see, Martin I see you're unmuted. Do you have any questions for the applicant?

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah. First, I'd like to disclose that I was given a tour of the building from Alex Stanford and Pablo David. That was on February 21 and nothing was discussed with any decision making. It was just a tour of the existing. Geno, hello Geno, can you hear me?

Mr. Yun: Yes, I can.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, thank you Geno. Martin Bernstein, Member of Historic Resources Board. Have you considered reinstalling the Hotel President rooftop sign?

Mr. Yun: Oh, wouldn't that be great. We would love to.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, so I would like to see that, if that's a possibility to include in your project. Another question would be the, you mentioned the ground floor but then the floor plans call the ground floor first floor. Is the first floor the what is above the ground floor or is first floor ground floor? Because I heard you mention ground floor and then the building plans call it first floor.

Mr. Yun: Sorry for any confusion. The first floor and ground floor are the same. It's the same level as what you would enter off University Avenue.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay. Thank you for that. Because I know on City Hall ground floor is the ground floor and then up above is the first floor. Alright, thank you for that. The other question is, you mentioned the glass storefronts where there is existing nonhistoric windows there that would be reframed. My next question refers to Board Member Wimmer's comment, we had several Birge Clark projects in downtown Palo Alto where there is new tile put into place. You may be familiar with the Secretary of Interior Standards that we need to review today's project with about the idea of compatibility and differentiation so that someone knows what was original and what is not original. That will be coming up probably during our discussion about compatibility and differentiation of new tile that gets installed on a project. My other comment would be, on the I guess we'll call it the sixth floor, the upper floor with the wood little balusters up there, that's the sixth floor, is that right, yeah, sixth floor. Let's see, I think those, the guards up there, the wood guards are below the current 42-inch high requirement. I didn't see any details on the ELS plans to do some detail so that you meet the 42-inch high guard. I didn't see that on the plans, so if that's going to be modified to meet that safety issue, because you mentioned safety several times. I'm glad you're saying that. So, that would be street facing façade, so the HRB would need to review that detail. I didn't see it on the ELS drawings, so that would be something else to be discussed when we get into the discussion. Those are my comments for now. Thank you, Geno.

Mr. Yun: Thank you.

Chair Bower: Okay. Geno, I'll pick this up with just a couple of additional questions. Remind me how the new elevator fits into the building. It doesn't, it's in some space that currently is not, doesn't have significant historic fabric?

Mr. Yun: That's correct. It sits behind the existing historic elevator. It's, I believe it's going into what is currently Pluto's space.

Chair Bower: So, you can think about that. As it travels up, I just can't remember, actually Jodie if you could get us to a floor plan. I don't know what page in the drawings that would be. Actually, just wait right here. Let me talk about something, the storefronts, since we're right at this page and then we can maybe look at that or not. My next question was on the storefronts, it looks like those wood spindles, I presume they are wood spindles that are in the, kind of covering the transom are all original. Is that your understanding?

Mr. Yun: That's what we believe as well.

Chair Bower: Yeah, okay. Now the next issue about the recessed storefronts which we have as a Board reviewed a number of times, is that in the modernization of the downtown area, as you can see on this picture, it's not, because this is a black and white picture in your plan, but on page 125 of the packet you can see pictures of the storefronts. In some places the concrete sidewalk moves right to the base of the tiled recesses and others, at the corner of Cowper and University Avenue they pulled that off a brick pattern which they put in in the 70s right up to the building. So, across the front of the building there are different materials that are actually part of the public sidewalk going into the private property of the building. I'm just wondering, and so the reason I'm bringing this up is that when we reviewed the Palo Alto Sport and Toy World building on University Avenue, I'm sorry, Waverly Avenue, we actually asked them to put in a tile from the property line back to the recessed door front, so it would be quite clear that the City right-of-way ended at the face of the building, and then the tiled areas would be private, and when I walked the downtown area, the few buildings that are unchanged that Birge Clark designed had tile in those spaces, on the walking space between the property line and the recessed front. So, I'm sorry to be so long-winded about this, but I think at some point you might want to consider how you're going to address that, especially if you have to take... I don't know, do you have a basement underneath the sidewalk in this building?

Mr. Yun: We do.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I don't know what Public Works will do with that. They generally don't like it, but if you're doing work, I think it would be appropriate to have that differentiated line between the public right-of-way and the private property. (crosstalk) I think from a picture in the packet on, yeah, it's on packet page 129 it looks to me like the Pluto's restaurant kitchen space has relatively large windows in that area that look to me, from your picture in the top right-hand corner, page 129 of our packet, are original and I presume those would be retained or just refurbished as needed?

Mr. Yun: Are you talking about windows on the alley side or on the University Avenue side?

Chair Bower: No, on the alley side.

Mr. Yun: Yeah, we're not proposing to change anything on that side in terms of removal of any windows. We're proposing to insert a door from the new bar lounge area into the alley and then access from the kitchen into alley, but we're not proposing to take out any windows.

Chair Bower: I think you're converting the kitchen into public space in the hotel and that's your proposal. The reason I'm bringing that up is you have natural light, even though it is alley light. There it is on the, I guess on the left-hand side of this page A304. It looks like there are windows there. Anyway, I just wanted to mention that. And then, I guess that's it. That's all of my questions. So, unless there are other Board Members have questions. Mike?

Board Member Makinen: Chair Bower, this is Mike again. Can we go back to the slide A301? Okay, my comment and question relate to the structural work that's being done on the two end storefronts. You can see one on the west side and one on the north side. My question and request would be, if your structural engineer can redesign those diagonal braces with moment frames so we do not see the structure from the window?

Mr. Yun: Yeah, we've taken a very deep dive look into various options for supporting this building and because it is almost a top-heavy soft story condition where you can imagine this exterior wall is all cast-in-place concrete, so in the elevation there are punch windows at the guest room floor, but the ground floor is all glass with the exception of the columns. So, a moment frame would not work in this location. It does require something much beefier and stiffer, therefore the brace frames are the only thing that actually does work.

Board Member Makinen: Well, then my other comment would be if it turns out the brace frames are the only way you can go, is there any way you can use to disguise those somewhat, so they're not so aesthetically obvious?

Mr. Yun: My approach was going to be that we were going to paint them dark in color so that what happens is it recedes into the depths of the space and the light colored body of the plaster is really what your eye notices with the openings of each of the bays storefront glass presumably would have a darker level of illumination, so you don't really notice it as much. I think if it were a light color, it would really pop. So, that's our approach is, you know, it's not unusual to see steel braces in older buildings and some are more obvious than others and this is our attempt and best effort to diminish its impact on the overall building.

Board Member Makinen: Okay, but you have done a detailed analysis and you believe the moment frame will not be sufficient?

Mr. Yun: That's correct.

Board Member Makinen: Okay, thank you.

Chair Bower: Okay, not seeing any other questions from Board Members, let's go back to see if we have any public comments on this project. If you want to, if any member of the public would like to make a

comment, please use the Zoom raise-your-hand function, and that's at the bottom of your screen, in the middle, it will way participants. Click on that and then there's an opportunity to raise your hand. Vinh, do you see anyone?

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Bower, we still have no raised hands, so I think we can proceed with...

Chair Bower: Okay. So, with that, I think we'll close the public hearing and bring this back to the Board for discussion and creation of a motion. Martin, go ahead.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, another question for Geno. I see on sheets A201 and 401 the wall that's being removed between the lobby and the adjacent space, that wall will include two new arches. Is that correct?

Mr. Yun: It will include two new openings. We're not quite sure what the exact shape is yet because that was shown as a place holder. We understand, you know, in terms of the existing historic personality of the building, both on the inside and the outside, there aren't a lot of arches per se, so we need to study that further, but there will be two openings.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay, the reason I mention that is on the Historic Resources report on standards for compatibility, it does mention that for Standard Number two it says the proposed improvement retains the dividing wall substantially, includes arched openings that are consistent with the architectural theme of the building. But as you just mentioned, there aren't many arches. I guess the HRB will see what detail you propose to eventually build, correct?

Mr. Yun: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. Thank you, David.

Chair Bower: Sure Martin. Any other comments before we close the public meeting?

Board Member Makinen: One further comment. This is Mike again.

Chair Bower: Go ahead.

Board Member Makinen: What are your plans for the original elevator? Are you going to modernize the controls or the whole elevator? Can you elaborate on that?

Mr. Yun: The current functioning elevator has been beautifully maintained, so there's nothing mechanically wrong with it. Everything works. Specifically, I think we would just clean up things that needed to be cleaned or repaired, but as of right now we're not proposing any changes.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, it's got a nice historic ambiance when you get into it. You feel like you're back in the 20s.

Mr. Yun: Yes.

Chair Bower: Debbie, did you have a question?

Vice Chair Shepherd: I just had a comment. I just wanted to step back for a moment and just for the record say that I think we are so fortunate. This particular development and hotel management company is unique, I believe, in its emphasis on going into the University communities and restoring historic properties. They have a strong track record in doing this in the United States and I believe now also in England, and particularly in light of the downturn that we're looking at. I think that this opportunity to showcase a building as important as this one, and to use it to generate street traffic to support retail, to support restaurants, to support gems, I think we are very fortunate. Thank you.

Chair Bower: That's a very good point. We're not clear, I don't think any of us are clear what we're going to be looking at in the future as we try to climb out of this pandemic, but we hope, I mean this is a really significant effort by this company to not only preserve a building that is largely untouched. In need of renovations, certainly, but it has not been stripped like many buildings of its age have been. Thanks for that comment. Alright, I'm going to close public hearing how and let's discuss as a Board how to craft a motion to move this project forward. Anyone want to lead off?

Board Member Wimmer: I wanted to share something that when Martin was mentioning the rooftop sign, it reminded me that I have this, I bought this painting. I'm going to try to show it to you.

Chair Bower: Oh yeah.

Board Member Wimmer: This is a painting, a watercolor that I bought at like, I think it was like an estate sale or a garage sale, but it's, sorry it's reflecting, but it's a picture of the President Hotel. I don't know if you can see the rooftop sign. It says hotel and then it says PR. I mean there's no absolute verification that this is, in fact, the President Hotel, but I just thought that was kind of a neat thing I had. I just wanted to share that. I don't know how well you can see that.

Chair Bower: Well, we can see part, the hotel in reverse and then you can see the PR on the other...

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah. I just thought, I mean, I just thought that was a neat thing I wanted to share that. Sorry about all the reflections.

Board Member Makinen: Very nice.

Chair Bower: Yeah, thank you.

Board Member Bernstein: Chair Bower?

Chair Bower: Yeah, go ahead Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: So, Amy, will this project come back to the HRB as the project moves ahead?

Ms. French: This is the formal hearing before the HRB, so it would not unless there is a condition that, you know, unless the Council refers this back to the HRB for further study or there is a condition that's placed to return such as we did with the toy and sport world to look at the paving tiles or such, to have a subcommittee or come back to the HRB for something like that.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay, Chair Bower, I'm ready to make a motion, unless you want to have other HRB Members give comments first.

Chair Bower: Debbie has a comment, and then I'll call on you again, Martin. Debbie?

Board Member Shepherd: I just wanted to follow on that because I would very much like to see this come back to the HRB around the issue of the tile on the façade and on the sidewalk.

Chair Bower: Okay. I was going to suggest we form a subcommittee for those recessed spaces in the tile, both on the façade and the sidewalk just so we could look at it. That can be a subcommittee, I think, like Amy said, like we did at the sport and toy world. I can't remember the address, sorry. But that will allow the project to move forward and then they can just check back with the subcommittee. And we can put into that subcommittee anything that the Board Member feel we should be looking at in the future. I think we ought to be looking at what that arch or opening is and the form of it in the entrance. We could add that to this so we could see it. So, I think we would want to look at the tile in the recessed entries and maybe that. Anything else somebody thinks we should be looking at?

Board Member Wimmer: Do you think maybe just taking a glance at the colors. I know they are suggesting colors, but maybe do a brush out and have the Board be able to look at colors? And colors will also need to be in consideration of the tile, because that's all exterior color palate.

Chair Bower: Sure, we could do that. I think that color tends to be a less important issue for us, but it could easily I think, and quickly be done all together. I just don't want to add a lot of things to this so that the project can't more forward should this meet other hurdles that they have to overcome. So, I'm open to that if the Board feels that is appropriate. So, let's go back to Martin. Martin, would you like to make a motion?

Ms. Gerhardt: Chair Bower, if I may.

Chair Bower: Hold on Martin. Jodie.

Ms. Gerhardt: We do have a raised hand on the attendee's side.

Chair Bower: Oh, okay. Then Vinh if you can make, connect that person for us, it's a public comment I presume.

Ms. French: I think you closed the hearing the public comment portion, so you would have to reopen that maybe.

Chair Bower: Okay, so yeah. I'll reopen it so we can hear the comment.

Mr. Nguyen: Pablo I see you actually lowered your hand, but I want to unmute you anyway to see if you had any public comments.

Chair Bower: Pablo.

Pablo (no last name): Can you hear me?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Pablo: It was more a point of information. I'm part of the applicant group and so this wouldn't preclude us from moving forward, correct, this subcommittee?

Chair Bower: No, it wouldn't, although you would not be able to move forward on the actual finishes that the subcommittee would look at. You would certainly be able to move the project forward. The way that the subcommittee has worked in the past is, it looks at when you get ready to do like color brush outs, you would present those on the building. We would look at them and say yeah this looks okay, this is consistent, whatever. Tiles the same way. This is differentiated but compatible. So, it's way into the project. You could do it earlier, but typically it's actually during construction.

Pablo: Understood. Thank you so much for the clarification Chairman.

Chair Bower: Vinh, are there any other comments?

Mr. Nguyen: There are no more comments for this item.

Chair Bower: Okay, closing the public hearing, bringing it back to Martin, if you want to make a motion.

MOTION

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, thank you Chair Bower. I'd like to move that the HRB confirms that the project as presented is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation and that the HRB form a subcommittee that when it's appropriate for the project, to present to HRB subcommittee the proposed new tile that gets installed on the University Avenue façade. That the HRB also be presented with any proposed changes or modifications to the sixth-floor guard to comply with the safety issue of the 42-inch high guard rail. And that the HRB also be presented with any color pain brush outs and then also to encourage the applicant to consider reinstalling are replica of the Hotel President sign. That would be my motion as I'm thinking about it right now.

Chair Bower: Okay, thank you Martin. Amy, do you have all those subcommittee items written down?

Ms. French: I do, but I wanted to take the opportunity to say there were two things, another that you mentioned about if we could have the arch opening penetrations in that lobby wall as part of some sort of look.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, I would like to include that in also a subcommittee to look at that detail, yes. Thank you, Amy.

Ms. French: You're welcome. And then the final opportunity I would say is to, after this piece of it is to confirm, concur if you will as a Board with the California Register eligible piece of this, because that would be nice to note.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, as part of my motion is that HRB agrees it meets the California Register requirement.

Chair Bower: Okay, good. Do I have a second? (crosstalk) Okay, so Mike and Debbie both offered. I'll let Debbie give second because Mike you have already done the second.

Board Member Makinen: Okay.

Chair Bower: So, Debbie has seconded this. Is there any discussion, further discussion the Board wants to have about this particular motion? So, I would like to say that I am very pleased that we are able to review a project like this, which will rehabilitate and give a significant extension of the life of this building and the public access to this building at a really difficult time in this country economically. So, I hope this project moves forward and I hope we have been helpful as a Board in encouraging the Council to move this forward from the Historic Resources perspective. Okay, so let's go around, I'll just go around the screen and ask for those if you agree and support this it's a yes, if you don't it's a no. Let's start with Christian, you're first.

Board Member Pease: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay, Christian says yes. Mike?

Board Member Makinen: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay. Debbie?

Vice Chair Shephard: Yes.

Chair Bower: Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes.

Chair Bower: Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay, and I also am a yes, so that is a unanimous Board and I wish the applicants well in moving this forward and hope it still works for them financially.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0.

Study Session

Approval of Minutes

Chair Bower: Okay, we now move to the end of the meeting. I think we can do this relatively quickly. Next item up is approval of minutes, so Amy?

Ms. French: Oh, sure. Just, I know we already dealt with the reports from officials. I wanted to have a note about training opportunities maybe after the minutes.

Chair Bower: Yeah, I have something to say in the Announcements and Comments Section about that.

Ms. French: Great, thank you.

Chair Bower: Okay, so approval of minutes. There I an opportunity for the public to comment on this. Vinh, any member of the public would like to comment on the approval of the minutes, please us the raise-your-hand part of the Zoom application. Vinh, do you see anyone.

Mr. Nguyen: We have no speakers for this item.

Chair Bower: Okay, let's move on. Any changes or additions or deletions to the minutes for what is it, what's the date Amy, on the minutes? I'm sorry, I don't have them in front of me.

Ms. French: April 9

Chair Bower: Oh, that's right, April 9 meeting. Any changes or deletions or additions? Seeing none, do I have a motion to approve?

MOTION

Board Member Makinen: I'll make a motion we approve the minutes as so stated.

Chair Bower: Okay, Mike has moved to approve them. Second?

Board Member Wimmer: I'll second that.

Chair Bower: Okay, Margaret seconds. I don't think there's any other comment. We do the same routine again, Christian, yes approve, no?

Board Member Pease: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay. Mike?

Board Member Makinen: yes,

Chair Bower: Debbie?

Vice Chair Shepherd: Yes.

Chair Bower: Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes.

Chair Bower: And Martin? Martin, are you there? He's muted right now. I'll vote yes as well while we're waiting. Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay, yes. Alright so it's unanimous.

MOTION PASSED WIT A VOTE OF 6-0.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: Okay, let's move on to the next item. There are no subcommittee items, so I'll move to Announcements and Comments.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: What I'd like to do is recognize a very important Historic Preservationist in Palo Alto's history and Debbie, can you talk a little bit about Millie Mario?

Vice Chair Shepherd: Yes. So, we just wanted acknowledge the passing of Millie Mario. She died in Florida on April 17. She served as Chair of the HRB for eight years in the 1990s. I learned in the Palo Alto Weekly, because I didn't have the pleasure of knowing her, that she came here with her husband Ernie in 1993 and they are probably most widely known because they purchased the John Adams Squire House, which would become Millie's most ambitious and successful restoration project. A 1904 Classical Revival landmark once owned by the City, and the subject of fierce political battles for decades. The house avoided the wrecking ball more than twice. Millie's award-winning transformation of that supposed white elephant into one of the City's most beautiful private residences led to her appointment to the HRB. She also served on the Board of Palo Alto Stanford Heritage and Palo Alto Historical Association. Most interestingly, she joined the Board of the California Preservation Foundation. That's the statewide historic preservation advocacy and educational organization and she eventually served as its president. Anyway, I hope this acknowledgement gets to many in the community who remember her, and also to her family. Thank you.

Chair Bower: And we extend our sympathies to the family and just wanted to recognize how important Millie was to the historic preservation in Palo Alto. So, now we'll go back to our Agenda.

[Meeting returned to City Official Reports]

Chair Bower: I would like to congratulate Debbie, who has been appointed as one of nine members of the Community Stakeholder Group for the San Juan Residential District Historic Survey and Development Standard Study. The committee is going to review the residential properties on Stanford Campus. There are only nine members and I'm pleased that Debbie is going to be on that committee representing all of Santa Clara County with the other eight members. I wanted to also point out that next week, well, let me start by saying May is Historic Preservation Month, and when I googled that I saw a number of really interesting opportunities to celebrate historic preservation across the country on line because of the pandemic stay-at-home orders. It is a wonderful opportunity, if you have the time and you're staying at home to enjoy the many, many examples of historic preservation in the country. Along that line, next week the California Preservation Foundation will conduct its annual conference entirely on line. It is, there is a reduced rate of \$150 for the whole program for any member. As I think all of know, there are lots of

opportunities to hear from experts on historic preservation, so I would encourage you to take advantage of that reduced price and no travel. Amy, do you want to add something to that?

M. French: Just, I will see you there. Nicole Loriella (**phonetic**) who is training up to help us on the historic program, she and I are both attending, and I know a couple of other Board Members are already signed up for that. You do have to register, but it is a good deal and as you said, no hotel stay is required.

Chair Bower: No travel. So, anyone who wants information about the annual conference you go to Californiapreservation.org. You get to their website and then just follow their tabs for registration. So, any Board Members have anything else they would like to add? Debbie?

Board Member Shepherd: Yeah. I just wanted to add a little detail about the Community Stakeholder Group. I thought it might be helpful to let you know who else is participating in it. So, I'm being joined by College Terrace resident Pria Graves, who serves on the Stanford Community Resources Group already. And then the additional members are, there is one from Stanford, the Director of Architecture Sapna Marfatia and then all of the others come from the neighborhoods themselves, from San Juan, Pine Hill and Frenchman Hill. The neighbors have been notified. The group will hold their meetings virtually starting in about three weeks and there will also be a series of public meetings and neighbors will be notified well in advance of that. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Good. Congratulations to all those people. It's a really important survey, I think, for the Stanford Campus. I spent a lot of time in my youth over there in those housing units. There are three very distinct development eras in the San Juan Hill and the Pine Hill one and two. Okay, anybody else have a comment? I'm not seeing any, so I will with that, thank all of you for spending the time this morning. It's pretty hard to do this remotely. I mean it's much more difficult than it is when we're in the Council Chambers, but thank you very much for your participation and all the hard work. Stay safe. See you at the next meeting.

Board Member Makinen: David, I want to thank you for your leadership too.

Chair Bower: You're welcome. I'm pleased to be able to do this at this tough time. Alright. Nice to see all of you. Thank you, staff, all the staff that's in the background.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 10:32 AM