



# HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT EXCERPT MINUTES: September 24, 2020

Virtual Teleconference Meeting

8:30 A.M.

Item 2

## Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair David Bower, Vice Chair Deborah Shepherd, Board Members Martin Bernstein, Michael Makinen, Christian Pease, Margaret Wimmer, Roger Kohler

## Action Item 2

PUBLIC HEARING/ACTION ITEM 1310 Bryant Street, 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street [19PLN-00116]: Historic Resources Board Review of Castilleja School's Architectural Review Application; Project Alternative (Final EIR Alternative #4) Retains Castilleja's Two Emerson Street Homes With Reduced Garage And Disbursed Circulation. Phased Campus Redevelopment Proposal Associated With a Request for Conditional Use Permit (CUP) Amendment and Variance for Gross Floor Area (GFA) Replacement. Zone District: R-1(10,000). Environmental Review: A Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was Published July 29, 2020

Chair Bower: Okay. So let's move to Action Items, and this takes us to Item Number Two on the Agenda, which is a public hearing of 1310 Bryant Street, 1235 and 1263 Emerson Street. It's an Historic Resources Board Review of the Castilleja School's Architectural Review Application; Project Alternative (Final EIR Alternative #4) and it retains Castilleja's two Emerson Street homes with reduced garage and dispersed circulation. Phased Campus Redevelopment Proposal associated with a Request for a Conditional Use Permit Amendment and a Variance for Gross Floor Area Replacement. It is Zoned District R-1(10,000). Environmental Review: A final Environmental Impact Report was published on July 29, 2020. So, now that we've got the official word on that, Amy, would you like to present a staff report?

Ms. French: Yes, thank you. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. You'll have to bear with me for a moment, while I go to share screen.

Board Member Kohler: Hello?

Ms. French: Hello.

Board Member Kohler: Can you hear me?

Ms. French: Yes.

Board Member Kohler: I just wanted to disclose that a couple of years ago my daughter, Heather, was over doing work on, in that site we're talking about. She was doing something there, I don't remember now. But, anyway, so I walked in all that area then, a couple of years ago, so, just to let you know.

Chair Bower: Thanks Roger. I forgot to ask if there were any other disclosures from other Board Members before Amy gets started. I would like to disclose that Roger and I have worked on the Lockey House, Lockey I guess, back in 1986 when a former client of ours owned the building, we did some modest remodeling inside, bathroom, and then those clients exchanged that house with the house across

the street at 1310 Emerson and Roger designed and I built the house across the street from this. So, we have a slight or small history with the area, but not specifically with Castilleja. Anyone else? Okay, Amy.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, my disclosure please.

Chair Bower: Yeah, also Martin, assuming your disclosure earlier is now in the record.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay, thank you.

Chair Bower: Good, thanks, thanks for the reminder. Amy?

Ms. French: Yes, we'll make sure Martin's disclosure is reflected in any excerpt minutes for this item. Okay, and we are back. We saw each other, the HRB met in September of 2019 to get a glimpse of the draft EIR and provide some comments on that. We are back with a different set of circumstances. I'm going to minimize, I think. We don't want to see ourselves. There we go, better. It's a little awkward seeing oneself. Today's hearing on the Castilleja Project, we are going to hear the applicant presentation. They have their architects here to show the alternative four that has come through the EIR process and we are going to enable public testimony as well. We are seeking comments on the Gunn Building alternations in somewhat of an official capacity with the draft Architectural Review Finding 2B that reflects historic preservation as a part of that review. So, we do have that draft bullet points to get feedback from the HRB. And then, of course, if you are seeking to have, as you mentioned during the September 2019 meeting, seeking to have some input on details that come forward closer to the time of any modification to that building, then certainly having either a subcommittee or board look at those details is a condition that you might wish to suggest. We can review the Final EIR responses to comments. Hopefully, you've had a chance to do that, read the report that I have prepared, because this will eventually go to the City Council for them to certify the Final EIR. You can see here just a nice little image of the Gunn Building back in the day with its façade on this side, which will be receiving some modifications once the Rhodes Building is separated. So, let's see, why is this not forwarding. Okay, oh goodness. Something was wrong with my mouse for a moment. The Final EIR as noted, we provided page references in the HRB staff report for this segment that the HRB might wish to review. There was discussion about the Locket House. There was discussion about the potential for historic district and those were in response to the HRB's comments in September 2019. There were some Master Responses and responses to the comments made by the public during the meeting. And then just, I thought I would note, because I was looking at this drawing from 1934, of course, it is an illustration, but I noticed that there is a one-story building apparently added to the Gunn Administration Building back in 1934. So, that was interesting to me. My mouse is being winkey. Time to replace my battery, I guess. There it goes. Okay. The Gunn Building is a Category 3 building. It is a contributing building. There is no historic district currently, but it is considered a contributing building, and contributing buildings may have had extensive or permanent changes to the original design, and still retain their status as a Category 3 building. These are the alterations that Castilleja proposes once the Rhodes Building is separated from this façade. The EIR determined there would be no adverse effects to this building, as far as historic significance and integrity. The HRB is actually not required to review Category 3 alterations when they are outside of the downtown or historic districts, but here we are, we are in a CEQA process related to this discretionary Architectural Review, and so the finding 2B is out there as a potential for HRB comments to assist the ARB process. We did present this last September. These were the materials that were shown for the changes to this façade, with the painted metal railings, the brick seat walls, and the proposed doors here would be consistent with the window openings and enable egress from the building. This is, again, a little snippet of that illustration from 1910. Here, again, is a floor plan showing where the egress from the building is and that proposed staircase to enable the egress down to the ground floor. And here is the proposed academic building with that separation that is pretty significant. Here is the masonry. I think there was an error that I did in the staff report that looked at a possible change here, but this is unchanged from when you saw it in September, this proposed connecting fence with brick at the base. You can see here an image where the Gunn Building is compared to the academic building here and it continues over here with a connective lobby/gathering space and porch area that the applicant has recently brought forward to respond to the ARB comments. Here is a floor plan showing this new

academic building with the connector area. This shows that they have removed a portion of the second floor here on the Kellogg side, again in response to the ARB comments from August, and then this just shows their revision here, again breaking up the mass of the building, the roofline, the plate height and providing a connective piece with some proposed revised materials for the ARB to review. This is the Architectural Review finding 2B, and so this has, I prepared this based on the review from the EIR for feedback from the HRB. So, we can come back to this later, if you would like to consider word smithing or what have you. Just a couple more images. This one showing, again, the Lockett House next to the other house that Castilleja owns. In the Alternative Four, which is moving forward in the process, both of these homes are retained. There are seven points here about the Lockett House and why it's not really retaining sufficient integrity to be designated as an Historic Resource. So, we can come back to that, as well, if you'd like. Again, this is just a slide showing what the EIR said regarding the campus as far as, you know, whether it's an historic district itself, and it does lack sufficient integrity to be considered an historic district. So, then here we have the last slide on my end, which is to say that the ARB is scheduled to talk about this next Thursday with the revisions and the approach that the applicant has embarked upon in response to the ARB comments, and then the Planning and Transportation commission did continue their discussion of this project to October 14, which will enable public testimony and review of draft findings and conditions that are being prepared. That's it for me. I'm going to stop my sharing, so we can see everyone's faces.

Chair Bower: Great. Do we have anybody from the architect team that wants to speak to us today, Amy?

Ms. French: Yes, I think we have a presentation that they can provide. I gave a brief presentation. They may want to enhance that or just be available for questions. Let us know.

Chair Bower: Yeah, if it's acceptable to other Board Members, I think maybe we could hear from the architect and then come back to questions for either the architect's team and to Amy, if you have any. Is that acceptable?

Nanci Kauffman, Head of School: Am I unmuted? Can you hear me now? Yeah, this is Nanci Kauffman. I'm the Head of School. I have a little introduction, and then I was going to turn it over to Adam Woltag, our architect. Is that all right?

Chair Bower: Perfect, go ahead. Please begin.

Ms. Kauffman: Excellent. So, thank you for your time and for the care that you're putting in to reviewing this project. As a history teacher and a life-long history student myself, I too am invested in the historic preservation of our city, our neighborhood and our campus. For 23 years, I have owned a Craftsman style home just one block from Castilleja. It was built in 1903. My home, not unlike Castilleja, is almost as old as Palo Alto itself. My home and the school predate the zoning codes and I can imagine a time when nothing stood between the two. Over the past 113 years, Castilleja and the City have grown up together and are inextricably linked through a shared past, present and future. In keeping with the great educational opportunities available in Palo Alto, Castilleja has educated girls and young women for over 100 years, to fulfill their promises as leaders. The insight and conviction of these women is needed now more than ever. We are gratified that the EIR found our proposal to be 100 percent compliant with Palo Alto's Comprehensive Plan, the City's primary tool for preservation and development. We are proud of the historic architecture of our campus. We have, and we will continue to carefully maintain it. Gustav Laumeister's Gunn Administration Building was the original structure, and has always been the main entrance to the school. Its doors have welcomed thousands of students as they begin their Castilleja journey. On the walls of the Gunn Building our students can see the history of the school from the beginning through sepia-toned oval portraits of each student dating back to the earliest days. Our Chapel Theatre designed by Burge Clark and built in 1935 is the primary gathering space where our students and faculty meet as a community to celebrate and mark important milestones. In that space, generations of twelfth graders have delivered their senior speeches, a reflection before they graduate. Young women have built confidence as leaders, activists, singers, dancers, actors and debaters on that stage. As we reimagine our classrooms, we have preserved the circle, recognizing it as the (interference) of important

school traditions throughout Castilleja's long history. Our circle is a shared open space where friendships are forged and memories are made. All those connected to Castilleja from any era know the circle as the heart of the campus. We are pleased to have arrived at this moment, as we seek to replace the nonhistorical, outdated structures on campus with a sustainable ADA compliant building designed to sit more comfortably and compatibly in the surrounding neighborhood, while furthering our mission to prepare young women to become compassionate leaders who affect meaningful change in this world. In both design and purpose, the new building will reflect Castilleja's place in Palo Alto's history as an important part of an excellent educational system and as an icon in this historic city. Our plans will restore the Gunn Administration Building by separating it from Rhone's Hall along Bryant Street. The new silhouette will echo the building's earliest days. Our architects have worked to find ways to use materials that reflect our historic buildings and to use them in our Twenty-First Century sustainable learning places as we look toward the future. They have also taken a cue from the surrounding homes, selecting external materials that mirror and blend gently with the fabric of the neighborhood. Even as an Historic City, Palo Alto is known for its innovative spirit. Silicon Valley stands as a symbolic bridge to the future. Likewise, the new campus design allows Castilleja's students and teachers to join all the other schools in Palo Alto that have been updated in recent years, while at the same time, preserving and honoring the deep history of the school. Thank you for your careful and thoughtful review of this project that honors the school and the City, and positions them to thrive together for another century. With that, I would like to turn it over to Adam Woltag, who is with WRNS, our architectural firm and I am very excited for you to hear from him about our plans. Thank you.

Mr. Nguyen: Hi. Adam, before you begin, I just want to add that as part of the applicant's team, you will have ten minutes for your presentation. Thank you.

Adam Woltag: Good morning everybody. I am Adam Woltag, design partner with WRNS Studio. I am going to go ahead and start to share my screen. This is always the most terrifying part of a Zoom meeting, so let's see if we can get this to work perfectly here. Can everybody see the title slide? Thank you, Board Members. We really appreciate your time and we're looking forward to your questions and comments. We have a presentation, we'll try to keep it to ten minutes here, but we thought it would be important to update you a little bit on some of the changes to the site plan that have happened since we met over a year ago, and then we will kind of end on basically what we want to focus on today, which are the updates to the Gunn Building. So, I'll start with a site plan, and this is a site plan of the existing campus as it stands today. The area highlighted is the Gunn Administration Building and the Hughes Chapel Building. Before we discuss the proposed changes to the Gunn Building, we would like to update you on the development of the site plan. On the left is the original proposed campus plan that was presented to this Committee over a year ago and on the right is the Alternative #4 Campus Plan, and I would like to take a few moments to point out the five main changes that respond to primarily, you can see in blue the reduced below-grade garage footprint. The original is shown in a dashed line in orange. But the key thing to note is the reduced structure, the reduced below-grade parking structure has been shrunk by almost 13,000 square feet. Now the smaller garage footprint has allowed us to preserve the two houses along Emerson, both owned by the school, as well as reduce the impact to existing on-site trees. So, eleven fewer trees will need to be removed, and five fewer will need to be relocated. With some subtle shifts in the massing of the proposed buildings, and some interior replanning and the introduction of an additional campus pedestrian entry along Kellogg has allowed us to keep the existing Kellogg drop-off. It supports an overall distributed drop-off and pickup strategy. It is really important to note this approach mitigates the traffic impacts that have been identified in the DEIR. So, in summary, this approach, with its reduced below-grade parking structure, distributed drop-off strategy has opened up the opportunity to preserve the trees, the houses along Emerson and reduce the impact of surface parking along the perimeter edges of the campus. Now, let's revisit the proposed designs of the Gunn Building along the Bryant Street entry. These are images of the Gunn and Hughes Chapel Buildings as they look today. And from the air on the left, the existing condition with the concrete Rhode's Hall classroom building appended to the side of the Gunn Building. And on the right, the proposed design showing the new wood-clad campus library and arts building located across a new pedestrian campus entry, and the liberated east façade of the Gunn Building. So, the Gunn Family Administration Building was built in 1910 and is listed as a Category 3 building on the City's Historic Inventory. It's a Craftsman

style clad in wood shingles and pebble dash stucco, and the photo on the right is a view looking at that original eastern elevation. That little red triangle you see indicates where the original entry to the Gunn Building used to be. The Chapel Theatre building joined the campus in 1926 and is also listed as a Category building on the City's Historic Inventory, and like the Gunn, it too is designed in the Craftsman style. Originally designed as a stand-alone structure, the buildings were joined together in 2000. In 1967 Rhode's Hall the two-story cast-in-place concrete classroom building was added to the campus and was built right next to the Gunn Building, covering up that eastern façade. In 2000 campus renovations included the reconfiguration of the interiors of both the Gunn and Chapel Theatre buildings and the addition of basement spaces and a redefined connection between the Gunn and Chapel buildings that comprises the new entry. The proposed design demolishes the Rhode's Building and establishes a new pedestrian gated campus entry facing Bryant Street and locates a code-required exist from the newly liberated eastern façade of the Gunn Building. This slide shows the proposed design, and note the Bryant Street elevation on the upper right and the eastern campus elevated on the lower left. Zooming in a little bit closer to the Bryant Street elevation and the new pedestrian campus gateway design that continues the language of the existing campus fencing with brick pilasters and painted metal pickets. So, there were two options presented to this Body over a year ago. On the left, option one, and on the right, option two. Key to note the following intentions, option one takes a light and clearly contrasting stance to the existing Gunn Building, and option two takes a more robust and referential interpretive stance. So, looking at that eastern façade of the Gunn Building, the red indicates the extent of the demolition along that façade in order to get this option to work. The intent is that it would extend the same cladding material, the stucco as well as the shingle, as well as the color. But the design of the stair is really intended to create a contrast to the building's historic nature We think this design is light and also picks up and compliments the campus overall. It also references some of the newer designs around campus, so it is really a nice blend, we fee, of the new and the old. This is a view from the interior of the campus looking towards Bryant. You can start to see how the landscape planners engaged that stair. And this is a view over the campus entrance at Bryant, looking at the façade. So, option two takes a different stance, and the red indicates the extent of that demolition along that façade to get this option to work. Like option one, it extends the same materials around the eastern side of the building, but the design overall is more robust and a little bit more architecturally referential. It is a little heavier and makes a much larger statement to this ancillary entrance to the building. Again, a view from the interior of the campus looking towards the Bryant gateway looking towards the eastern side of the Gunn Building. I would like to end here on the material pallet. It's a very simple, natural, robust pallet we think, that compliments the campus overall. We're looking at cedar shingle siding to match, obviously, the same siding that comprises the Gunn Building. We're looking at brick that matches the campus brick as well as painted metal for those details. It's a dark, kind of rich green which we want to extend to the newer portions of the design and then where we have new windows, we are going to be using insulated glass unit, which has very superior qualities in terms of solar heat gain and insulation. So, with that, looking forward to hear your questions and comments. I'll stop sharing.

Chair Bower: Thank you Adam. I guess what I'd like to do is circle back with Board Members, any questions for Amy or Adam about either of those presentations? Martin, I see your box lit up. Do you have a comment or question?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes. Thank you, Chair Bower. This is for the architect, Adam. Hello.

Chair Bower: Go ahead, he's here.

Board Member Bernstein: Can you hear me, Chair Bower?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: This is a question for Adam, the architect.

Chair Bower: Go ahead.

Board Member Bernstein: Adam, hello. Thank you for your presentation. I'm looking at the photo of the new proposed stair on the Gunn Building, the exterior stair, have you looked at any designs where the seven or nine posts are not as massive. The reason I'm asking that is, the Craftsman detail, there are some fine little details that show up on a typical Craftsman. You mentioned you're looking to have a contrast. My question is, have you thought about some of the detailing so it's not as contrasting, because those posts look, in my opinion from your presentation, very massive, and there are seven or nine of them. And I think it distracts from the fine detailing of the Gunn Building. Have you thought about detailing those massive posts so that they don't feel as massive?

Mr. Woltag: Martin, you're referring to option two, I think, right? Which is a little bit more of the historic and referential option as opposed to option one?

Board Member Bernstein: Let's see. Let me go back on my screen and look at that photo. Let me open this up here. I took a photo of that. I'm going back here. Let's see, I'm looking at the photo I took of that screen shot. Let me open that up and see if that says, let's see. On my screen I took a photo of that shot. Let's see, option two, yes.

Mr. Woltag: Martin, I completely agree with you. Those posts are very robust and we didn't look at lighter ones. You know, there is an actual stair at the, I guess it's the south side, I'm sorry, it's the west side of the Hughes Chapel Building and there's an entry there, and it's a small stair, but you know, we were basing this design in reference to that stair. And there are some very robust, you know, basically columns and rails that kind of define that stair. So, this is where we took our inspiration from for this. But if the question is, did we consider something lighter, and a little less robust, yes, we could definitely look at something that would be a little bit less than that.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Adam.

Chair Bower: So, Adam, let me follow up on that and then I'll ask other Board Members if they have questions. There are two options you presented. One was the lighter version, number one, and then the second version you were just speaking to with Martin. Are those both proposals, or do you, does the architecture team have a preference for which of those two you feel works best with the Gunn Building?

Mr. Woltag: They were both proposals that we presented a year ago to get, you know, your feedback and comment on it to help us kind of set a direction. I think a year ago we felt, and I thought we had heard that the Board was leaning towards option one, is what I recall. That was going to be the preferred approach. We like both approaches. We would never put something forward that, you know, we felt either one, depending on where it went, would be a bad idea or inappropriate. But we agree with the Board's initial kind of intent that option one, which was a lighter stair, presented a little more contrast, as well as it was a quiet move to a pretty subtle entry to the building, you know. This is not a main entry to the Gunn Building. In fact, it's really, to be quite frank, it's a code-required exit. And so, we thought something a little more demure and light and a little bit more referencing the new building right across the gateway felt appropriate. So, the light steel, a little more quiet just felt right to us, and I think the Board was feeling the same way a year ago.

Chair Bower: I'm sorry, pandemic brain that I'm suffering from, a year ago seems like a decade ago. In our email this morning, the Board Members received a request by a resident of Palo Alto that that stairway not be on the outside, so that prompted me to think about and look at the floor plans of the interior of the building. I'm assuming that, if I remember correctly, the second floor of that building was added in the 60s. Is that correct? It's an addition, it's not part of the original building, is that right?

Mr. Woltag: The second floor was added?

Chair Bower: No, to that's not the case. So, that's fine. Is the interior of the Gunn Building largely remodeled in its existence, or does it remain close to what it was when it was built?

Mr. Woltag: It's been remodeled over time, so it does not reflect the original layout.

Chair Bower: Okay I just wanted to explore that. I think that the best solution to this required exit is, in fact, on the outside of the building. I appreciate the sentiments that were included in that email sent to us this morning, and I would think that your option number one, which is lighter in feeling, because it doesn't have those very heavy corner elements probably minimizes it as much as you can. It has to be there. So, other Board Members, any comments or question for Adam or Amy on the staff report? I don't see any raised hands.

(audio interference)

Board Member Wimmer: David, so are we giving our opinions at this point, or is this what we're doing right now?

Chair Bower: I thought we'd have questions. If there are no questions for Adam or Amy, then we could move on to just a Board discussion.

Ms. French: There's also public testimony, don't forget that piece of it.

Chair Bower: Oh, absolutely. So, let's, if there are no questions at this point, let's open up the microphone to anyone who wants to speak on this. Vinh, can you tell me how many people are anxious to speak.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, a number of hands have been going up in the last couple of seconds. So far, we have five hands raised, but there might be some more in the next minute or so. In the meantime, Kaylen, can we please get the speaker timer displayed.

Chair Bower: Okay, so let's start with three minutes maximum for speakers, because we don't want to be here for a prolonged period of time, but we want to give everyone an opportunity to speak and if more people do raise their hands to speak, I may reduce the time to two minutes. But let's start with three and see how that goes. So, Vinh, go ahead and open up the microphone to the first person on your list.

Mr. Nguyen: Sure thing. We still just have five speakers and they will be called in the following order. We will start with Tricia followed by Joseph followed by Nelson followed by Andy and then Rob Lapinsky will be our final speaker if there are no more raised hands. If you want to speak and I did not call your hand, I mean if I did not call your name, please raise your hand now. Okay, so our first speaker will be Tricia. Tricia, if you're there can you please unmute yourself on your computer and you may speak.

Chair Bower: Vinh, before you start the meter, let me just make one other comment. We are here to review, as the Historic Resources Board does, the historic character of this particular, the Gunn Building and we don't really focus on the new buildings that are going to be added to this, except as they affect the Gunn Building. So, there are many different issues the community has discussed, but our focus here today is on Historic Resources and the appropriate relative impacts. So, please limit comments just to the historic part of this project. Thank you. Go ahead, Vinh.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, Lauren, if you're still there, please share us your comments. I mean, Tricia, if you're there please share your comments.

Tricia Suvari: Good morning and thank you for your time this morning. My name is Tricia Suvari. I live in Palo Alto and I want to add my voice in favor of Castilleja's proposal. As the body of people who are devoted to preserving and protecting the history of Palo Alto's architecture, you may understand even more than I do the important role that Castilleja has played in the history of Palo Alto. The school is only a few years younger than the City and they have grown up together, and have only become more important to each other over the past 113 years. I realize the preserving residential property is a goal in Palo Alto, and Castilleja's project alternative number four does that. Even though the home known as Lockey House did not qualify to be admitted to the Registry for Historic Homes, this plan now preserves

Lockey House and the other house the school owns on Emerson. I'm so happy that the school responded to neighbor concerns and your comments from the first hearing. Palo Alto as a city is a graceful and vibrant balance of old and new. The City values the importance of its past while always recognizing the promise of the future. Castilleja's plans mirror this, with preservation of the two homes and the historic buildings, including the Chapel Theatre and the Gunn Administration Building. In fact, the Gunn Building will be restored to its original façade, which will reverse time and bring down the scale of the buildings on Bryant to preserve the neighborhood feeling. I appreciate the care Castilleja has devoted to maintaining history while modernizing the campus. I hope you'll also be able to appreciate the hard work that Castilleja has put into responding to questions and making updates to the plans accordingly. This project removes the buildings that have outlived their lives and replaces them with structures that nod toward the past, while improving the environment for the future. At the same time, the homes and historical buildings on campus will be preserved and restored. Thank you again for your time that you devote to the past and to the future of Palo Alto.

Chair Bower: Thank you

Mr. Nguyen: Thank you, Patricia. Our next speaker will be Joseph. Joseph, if you are there, can you please unmute yourself and you may speak.

Joseph Haletky: Good morning and thank you. My name is Joseph Haletky and I've lived in Palo Alto for 46 years, and I am pleased to speak in favor of the proposal. In 1974 my wife and I were asked by the school's headmaster to live on the Castilleja campus as a resident family, along with our toddler son at the time, in the dorms. For two years we lived on the ground floor of the building in an area that is now the school's library. I have wonderful memories of the girls, acting as counselor and as activities planner for the boarding students. I am still friends with quite a few of my former students who are now seemingly pushing 60. In later years I visited Castilleja often as an alumni interviewer for Brown University, my college alma mater. I have been impressed by the high quality and maturity, both academic and social of all the students that I have met. I am still pleased to come full circle now and speak about the school's future. I fully support the school's plans to modernize the campus. I understand that classes are now taught in the rooms that I knew as dorm rooms, and that learning spaces have not been modernized since the 1960's. It's time for Castilleja to update their campus, just like all of the public schools in our City have done, including Palo Alto High School nearby. But I also appreciate that the school holds an important place in Palo Alto history that the school's plans preserve the historic buildings, the chapel Theatre. The beautiful Burge Clark structure will be beautifully preserved during construction, and the Gunn Administration Building will be separated from the adjacent building on Bryant Street, making it a stand-alone building, just as it was originally designed. I very much appreciate the attention to preservation, even while modernizing the campus for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. The Castilleja project is an important and amazing merging of old and new. The new is necessary to the school's survival, new flexible learning spaces and sustainable architecture, and the old in the Gunn Administration Building is being carefully restored so that the school's heritage is preserved. Thank you very much for your time and attention.

Chair Bower: Thank you Joseph.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, our next speaker will be Nelson. Nelson, can you please unmute yourself.

Nelson: Hi. I'm actually using my husband's iPad, so this is Kimberly Wong.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, Kimberly. I believe you have a presentation for us, so I'll give you a second to put that up.

Ms. Wong: Hi. My name is Kimberly Wong and I was raised in Palo Alto. In fact, my grandfather moved here in 1900 to live and raise seven children in an historic Queen Ann Victorian house. He owned the first Chinese run restaurant in Palo Alto. This home with a deep-seeded past was moved to Palo Alto in the 80's and lovingly restored. So, I am relieved, after four years of debate, Castilleja finally decided to retain

the Lockey House, also 100 plus years old. Thank you HRB for asked for further evaluation on the home last year, and encouraging Castilleja to save it. In an August 18 Palo Alto Weekly article, ARB Board Chair, Peter Baltay was quoted "it's not enough our new campus to simply be superior to the dormitory buildings of the 60's, the City", he said, "should hold Castilleja to a higher standard. I think that the HRB should ask for a more compatible design." The newest design seems to be, the newest design of the building, the Kellogg side building and the Gunn Building stairs seem still to be a bit overbearing. The exterior staircase of the Gunn Building, I feel clashes with the classic structure and destroys its visual integrity. I have not seen this kind of external staircase on the Craftsman style building before. It seems more suitable for an industrial building, such as the Park Sherman garage in the Cal-Ave area as shown. Is there a way to bring this into the interior of the campus so that it is not visible from the street? Photo two please. I thank you for reviewing the plans and making suggestions to Castilleja on how they could achieve proper massing and style within an R-1 neighborhood, without jeopardizing the campus that Gustav Laumeister envisioned more than 100 years ago for Ms. Mary Lockey.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments and those photos.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, our next speaker will be Andy Reed. Andy, can you please unmute yourself.

Andie Reed: (phonetic) Yes, thank you. My name is Andie Reed and I live near Castilleja School. We appreciate the Historic Resources Board thoughtful review and consideration the last time we met, and that the two houses, including the 100-year-old Lockey House are off the chopping block today. Although for the last four years, neighbors had asked the school to retain the houses on our residential street, the EIR has mandated it, and determined the significant and unavoidable impacts it had caused demolishing the houses with the underground garage exit there, will be reduced by the alternative four. However, the traffic doesn't decrease, it merely gets dispersed. This meeting is one of the six Board and Commission meetings squeezed into eight weeks in order to push through a project based on an EIR that represents the applicant's highest aspiration for growth in student enrollment, as well as in build out. Surrounding residents have, since these plans were made public in June of 2016, protested the scope and extravagance of the increases, however, we totally support the school rebuilding, modernizing their school and upgrading their campus. The project you are reviewing represents the school's insistence on a 30 percent enrollment increase, 95 annual events per school year and a 40 percent increase in functional total gross square footage in a small residential neighborhood surrounded by narrow streets, and Embarcadero Road. Any requests for reducing this profile to be compatible with the older homes surrounding the school and lessen the impacts on the residents have had no hearing. An underground garage and a sprawling modern building are not the warm intimate vision Mary Lockey created over 100 years ago, when she founded Castilleja. The City of Palo Alto has not determined that they should amend the school's conditions of approval so they can achieve their new business model, to allow for 1477 car trips and increased enrollment that will not just bring 125 additional students to the school, but also parents, staff, volunteers, teachers, dramatically increasing the activity in a six-acre site, and impacting Palo Alto's main arterials, Embarcadero, and Alma and backups into El Camino. The project being presented for your review today offers a very limited array of choices, only those that satisfy the school's extreme new growth goals for this small site. Thank you for this opportunity.

Chair Bower: Thank you for joining us today. Next.

Mr. Nguyen: Our next and also our last speaker will be Rob. Rob if you are there can you please unmute yourself on your computer?

Rob Levitsky: Hello. This is Rob Levitsky. I have a house at 1215 Emerson, which is the corner house. The only part of the block that Castilleja doesn't own. I want to start off by saying that Amy French said the architects are there, but if you look at the drawings you'll see that many of the drawings having to do with the garage are done by an architect by the name of Archie Render, and Archie Render has never showed up at any of our meetings in four and one-half years They have been completely unavailable and the pretense that WRNS designed the garage or has anything to do with it is mistaken and is wrong. You guys talk about sustainable building. Well, how about the 900 kilograms of CO2 released for every ton of

cement. And if we're talking about the facing above the building, what color cement are we going to use, and how are we going to texture it? And how is this going to affect the value of my home, which is on the Historic Resources List at 1215 Emerson, to have an underground parking garage right next to it? Another question I'd like to point out is that the EIR has been certified by the PTC, but it is in serious conflict now with the Palo Alto Tree Ordinance, because there are several Oak trees which have no basis for being removed based on the Tree Ordinance, and only because Castilleja wants to put a new building there. So, here we are dumping CO<sub>2</sub>s-laden materials on the neighborhood and the City, which is supposedly trying to be green, and at the same time killing trees and badly damaging, probably, the redwoods. And all this time that the neighbors have been fighting this project for four and one-half years, the Planning Department has just been cheerleaders for this project, and it's only because the neighbors have spent four and one-half years trying to save the houses and trying to save the trees, that we've even gotten to this alternative chosen, alternative four. Also, the underground parking garage, how many spaces do you really need? And the number of spaces you need is based on the number of students you are going to be enrolling, and that hasn't been determined yet, so you don't really even know that you need an underground garage, because we've had 450 students there before without an underground garage, without serious neighbor problems. So, the Historic Resources Board should probably just say that the underground garage is not appropriate for this neighborhood. It will diminish the value of the historic nature of this neighborhood, and should be (interference) understood and looked at again. Thank you much.

Chair Bower: Great. Thank you, Rob, for that comment, those comments. Vinh, any other raised hands?

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Bower, that was our last public commenter, so that concludes public comments for this item.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. Amy, you have a comment?

Ms. French: Yes. I wondered if you are interested in hearing, there were some statements made and if you would like staff to respond to some statements, I'm happy to do so.

Chair Bower: Sure, if you would like to respond, that would be perfectly appropriate.

Ms. French: Okay. So, one thing I thought I would mention is, and thanks Ms. Reed for your comments today. We did receive your letter that went to the Planning and Transportation Commission, which did cite the 1,477 daily trips, which we are aware of, but just again to make sure everyone understands, there are 279 new daily trips and that's added to the existing trips to make that 1,477 daily trips. The project does not add all of those 1000 trips. In fact, with the mitigation measure 7A, this results in a net increase of daily trips to 114. So, this is not the peak hour trips, this is the daily trips we're talking about. One thing also I'd like to state is, with Levitsky, and thank you for your comments today, is that you noted that the Planning and Transportation Commission certified the EIR. That is the job of the City Council. The Planning and Transportation Commission weighed in on the adequacy of the EIR and recommended the Council, you know, also see the EIR as adequate to meet the rules. We are going back to the Planning and Transportation Commission, as I noted, on October 14, where the public can make those comments to the Planning Commission as well. And then the final thing I wanted to comment on was a misstatement that the number of parking spaces is based on the number of students. That is incorrect. The number of spaces is based on the number of classrooms, or teaching stations, as per the City's Municipal Code. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thanks Amy for those comments. I'd like to, excuse me, make one other comment about something that Mr. Levitsky said. It's my experience in building residential projects we often have several different companies that contribute to the overall design. The architects are the overall managers of those subcontractors, and that despite the fact that apparently the designer of the underground parking garage has not been at the meetings, I don't know if that is accurate or not. It is not relevant to me, or I think to this Board, but what is relevant is that the architectural firm that's managing this proposal is there, is answering questions and can relay them. I want to dispel the idea or the notion that because a

subcontractor of the architectural team doesn't show up, that somehow that's a failure on the part of the architect. I wanted to open up the, to the Board the discussion of the project, but I had a question that I wanted to go back to Adam with. On packet page 14 of our, and I'm doing this on my iPad, of our materials, there is a wall type and a gate type, and the wall type is solid. It is wall type one, and the gate type is C, it's open. And I'm confused because the renderings that we've seen, Adam, shows something different and I just wanted to know which of the two is the accurate proposal, is going to be submitted with the proposal? So, can you find that on page, it's page eight of the City Planning and Development Services Department.

Mr. Woltag: David, I'm trying to find that document. Is it possible that someone has that and can share that, so we can look at that and I can speak to that?

Chair Bower: Amy, you in our premeeting review, you actually showed this page to us. So, it's, I don't know if you can see this, but – no it doesn't work. I can't show you what it looks like. So, it's on page 14 of packet page 14 of the Castilleja review. And what it shows is a solid wall with 1 x 4 horizontal boards with a steel frame, reclaimed cedar with half-inch spacing, solid concrete wall behind and the gate is double, is the double pedestrian gate. Yes, that's it. Thank you.

Mr. Woltag: Yes, this is actually not accurate to what we're talking about at that moment in the Bryant Street entry. This is actually showing a different portion of the site. So, I apologize for that. What we're proposing at the Bryant Street entry is what I showed a little bit earlier in our presentation, which is the brick pilasters and the steel rails and pickets.

Ms. French: My apologies. I think I mentioned in my presentation that I had made an error in the staff report. I had confused this wall type with, I had originally thought when I wrote this report, there had been a change, but there hadn't.

Chair Bower: No problem. I just wanted to be clear about what this particular illustration represents. I actually like the, if the visuals that you provided that we saw with the stair addition to the Gunn Building are accurate, that seemed to me (interference). I don't mean to take all the time up for the Board, but the other question I had was, is brick a material that was used with the original Gunn Building back in the early 1900's?

Mr. Woltag: That's a great question. I might want to all up one of our consultants who has been really working on the historic nature of the Gunn Building, if that's okay? She might be able to address that.

Chair Bower: Yeah, and let me just say my question comes from my experience that brick was added to early 1900 buildings in Palo Alto buildings often if the 1960's. We did a lot of really inappropriate, in my opinion, inappropriate architectural additions to 50-year-old buildings in the 1960's and adding brick to everything was one of them, whether they were columns or they were steps or patios. So, please.

Mr. Woltag: I think you're right. You know, the brick that is on the campus today, if you look at it closely, it really is comprised of the perimeter fencing that faces the Embarcadero and wraps around to Bryant, so you see brick there. You do see brick in some of the newer buildings, the gymnasium building, but it is a different type of brick. So, I think you're probably right. I don't know the extent of brick use in the original Gunn and the Hughes Building, but maybe if I could call on – is that something you would be able to address?

Kim: I'm Kim Butt with TreanorH. We've done some consulting and review of these projects. To my knowledge, I don't think there was any brick on the Gunn Building. I think it's always been shingle style or just clad in shingle Craftsman. Ishon (phonetic) is double checking that for me right now, but it certainly doesn't go with the style of the building as it was constructed.

Chair Bower: So, your use of that motif or that particular design element material is basically a follow on to the, what was it, 90's you know playing field expansion where they bordered the field with that brick and iron fence?

Mr. Woltag: Yeah, we decided that we wanted to carry on the same nature only in the fencing. No use brick on the building itself. And so, if you look at the proposed design, it's not a part of the architecture of the building itself, but what it does is about it and it forms kind of the base of the planters as well, so we kind of carried that material into the gateways and, again, into the planters, but not on the façade of the building. We tried to keep the façade with really the two primary materials, which is the pebble dash finish and the plaster stucco and the shingles.

Chair Bower: Okay, I've been sort of filibustering here. I don't mean to. I can't see Martin, but I can see all the other Board Members. Any other Board Members would like to comment at this time? I'm seeing a lot of nos. Martin, do you have any comments you'd like to make?

Board Member Bernstein: None.

Chair Bower: Okay, that said, do we want to, as a Board, suggest a preference for the stair design? We've done that a year ago. Is that something Board wants to either reiterate or just leave standing? Anyone? Yeah, Margaret, to ahead. And then Debbie next.

Board Member Wimmer: It sounds like what we're trying to do today is just to address the one elevation that's been presented before us with the option one and option two. So, is this what we need to be commenting on right now?

Chair Bower: That and anything else that you – this I presume will be our last opportunity to make comments on the project, because it's going to move forward, I think, to the Council soon.

Board Member Wimmer: Well, I'm ready to offer my comments, if this is the appropriate time.

Chair Bower: It is. Please do.

Board Member Wimmer: Okay, so I know that the stair option one had been presented to us last year in that meeting and I appreciate the stair option two that was presented to us today. In my opinion, I feel like stair option two, the more roust stair, door entry, I think is a much more architecturally pleasing presentation of that elevation. I mean, option one that was given to us before, I think it was, maybe it's probably closer to what's existing, but I do feel like that elevation is still a significant and important elevation. The option one makes it feel like it's unimportant, and it doesn't really address the symmetry of the Craftsman style of the building. And it looks more like an elevation that you would see maybe to a back alley, that just has a single door and a fire escape. So, I think this option two is really much more attractive. I think it gives more balance. It is more robust. I do agree with Martin's earlier comment that the stair looks a little too heavy. I like it being heavier than option one because option one makes it look like it's a fire escape stair that's just tacked onto the side of the building, which is, I think, not appropriate in this application. So, giving the stair a little bit more robustness, more prominence I think makes it feel like it has more integrity and it doesn't look like a fire escape. But I do think that maybe the detailing of it in the currently presented option two is a little too heavy. So, I vote for option two, but to lighten the stair, that's all, the heaviness of the stair posts.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. Debbie, you had a comment.

Vice Chair Shepherd: I'm sorry that we can't see what that might look like, Margaret, because it could make all the difference. To me, as the architect acknowledged, it's really just there for egress, and so I still, you know, given the two that we can see today, I still prefer option one because it doesn't pretend to be anything other than what it is. And I find that it kind of disappears visually and doesn't – I like that it is more contemporary, more contrasting. I think that's more appropriate to the integrity that everybody is trying so hard to recapture for this structure. Thanks.

Board Member Wimmer: Is there any way that we can put on the screen option one next to option two? I think that would be great during this discussion, so we can visually see it. But I think, can you Adam, clarify, is this strictly for egress? Like is this only going to be used if the fire alarm goes off and all the students are going to exit that way? I would imagine that they would enter the building. I mean, it's an integral part of that circulation of that building. I would think that they would use it just to access the building, not just for emergency escape. Is that correct?

Mr. Woltag: It is going to be primarily an egress stair. I don't think the intent of the school was to have it as a primary entry or exit to the building. That's actually located a little bit farther inboard. There is a beautiful oak tree right about yards past that stair into the campus, around a beautiful little small courtyard. That is really the main entry and exit through the Gunn Building. So, this is really to, I think, primarily address egress. Can it be used throughout the day if staff want to access that part of the site? Absolutely, but the intent was, it's not a primary access.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, it would be helpful if we could, oh perfect.

Mr. Woltag: I'm sharing my screen and see – I think this one is pretty good here to show that.

Chair Bower: So, my – I'm not seeing anybody else raising their hand, but I'm sort of halfway between Margaret and Debbie. I'm inclined to think that this ought to be lighter and it ought to be less significant, so option two, because it has very heavy vertical elements actually seems overwhelming to me, overwhelms the building and so it doesn't appeal as much. I think it takes too prominent a role, plays too prominent a role on that façade. Also, I notice in option two, there's a much bigger opening in the Gunn Building than option one and I don't know if that's intended to be part of the stair design, but it does sort of add to the, how I feel it overwhelms the building. So, I would be inclined to want to see something that was less massive, I guess that's the phrase I see. I think what we might need to do here, Board, is to create a subcommittee to look at this design down the line, when it's finalized so that it resolves these issues, because I don't see how we're going to resolve this today, unless the Board feels we should just make a decision. Because I think Adam has suggested that this option two could be modified, then we ought to take him up on that modification offer and then look at it later. Martin, I can't see you. If you'd like to make a comment, please do. Margaret, since your hand was up first, then Debbie.

Board Member Wimmer: Okay, sure. Going back to Adam, an additional question. Adam, is there an elevation of the option two, a two-dimensional straight elevation that we can see the fenestration of the door? And then, can you offer some further explanation as to, obviously there is a door, but to the left of the door it looks like you're suggesting windows, but the windows look like they are painted in the same color green. Are those truly windows, or is that just some kind of a paneling detail?

Mr. Woltag: That's a great question. You hit it spot on. The idea here was that that doorway lines up with the hallway. You know, it's kind of centered in the hallway with the right accessibility issues around it, so it's off centered from the middle of the building slightly. In order to get a little more balance into the façade, we wanted to provide something that was more centered, and so we extended the thresholds, and widened them to kind of center that opening. Because we couldn't center that door into that hallway, just because the hallway itself is not aligned. And so those would be like a painted wood panel, it would be almost like the broken lights of a doorway. The fine lights of a doorway, but those would be painted wood panels. So, it was about trying to capture an overall, a balanced entry that also worked with the egress requirements that we're trying to achieve.

Board Member Wimmer: I see.

Chair Bower: Well, that brings me back to my feeling that that begins to overwhelm the façade of that building, and that's a whole new design element that I don't think we were anticipating seeing today as a Board. Kimberly, did you want to make a comment? Hold on, Martin.

Ms. Butt: Yeah, I was just going to speak to the two designs. We did review them both for the applicant in terms of compliance to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. In our opinion, the design option number one really is the preferred option in terms of respecting the preservation aspects of the building. Our concerns with option two are that it contains details and somewhat mimics historic details in a way that might confuse people in the future as to whether that was original or not, whereas with the option one, it is clearly contemporary and separate from the historic building and kind of a lighter touch to it. So, in terms of compliance to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards we really would recommend option one in going with the wider posts and not including any conjectural features, such as the faux windows. I mean, we can see from historic documentation how the original windows were, at least from some fuzzy photos, and they were more balanced to look like punch windows on either side, and so there is clearly no attempt to, this isn't a lot of reconstruction. It just wants to be very, it's preferred to be very clear about what is new and what is historic. So, certainly if you're looking at a hybrid, I would definitely encourage you to go with lighter posts and just to attempt not to mimic any of the historic details.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. That's helpful. Debbie, you had a comment and then Martin, I'll call on you next.

Vice Chair Shepherd: I just wanted to say that I agree with you David. I think it's interesting, the door in option two is an interesting and clever solution under normal circumstances, but it goes in a whole new direction in terms of compromising the historic nature of that particular façade. So, I think it deserves more consideration. Maybe we could do that in a subcommittee. I'd actually also like to see, although I know it's not in our purview, but I'm curious about how that works inside to make that kind of change.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay. Martin, you had a comment.

Board Member Bernstein: Hello, yeah. Can you hear me Chair Bower?

Chair Bower: Yes, we can. Go ahead.

Board Member Bernstein: I'd like to tag off of Board Member Wimmer's comment about option two and then the mass and the detail, and then plus your suggestion of a subcommittee, which I would like to volunteer for if one gets formed. So, the Board has seen projects Craftsman style where, for example on stairways, it's common that there is a massive newel post. So, if we look at the posts on this proposed option two, my suggestion that if it becomes a subcommittee discussion, is there might be some just fine little detail, for example maybe at the top of these, I'll call them newel posts, just some little gesture towards the Craftsman detail. As we all know, for the standards we need compatibility and differentiation. I think with the genius of the architect or the architect's team, and then in coordination with the subcommittee, there could be just some little fine detail on those newel posts so that it's still differentiated from the 100-year-old structure, but some compatibility, just a fine little detail is all that's necessary, and that way, again to Board Member Wimmer's point, is that it's just not a tertiary fire exit, but make it look something substantial. So, there will be an elegant solution and it can be something very simple that has the compatibility yet differentiation between old and new. So, I think as a subcommittee, again if a subcommittee gets formed, I think that could be a good discussion for that, just for the fine tuning. I think there is some simple, elegant solution I believe. Thank you.

Board Member Pease: This is Christian speaking. I've been trying to use the raised hand function, but I guess that's not working.

Chair Bower: Oh, I did see – go ahead Christian.

Board Member Pease: I just don't think this is something that will be settled today. I agree with your idea there should be a subcommittee.

Chair Bower: Good. I think so too. Michael, any comments? There you go. Yeah, Mike, we hear you

Board Member Makinen: Yes, there were some interesting comments there. The differentiation and the compatibility are the two critical issues right here. I tend to agree with both those issues and I think that we need a, the second alternative is much more robust and what I would characterize as California park-like, that you would see in some of the National Parks. It may not differentiate sufficiently which would favor option number one, but I think maybe a hybrid between the two was what I would recommend.

Chair Bower: I actually feel the same way.

Board Member Makinen: Further, a subcommittee might be able to refine this down to a hybrid between the two.

Chair Bower: All right. Roger, I see you want, Roger you need to unmute.

Board Member Kohler: Am I unmuted?

Chair Bower: You are unmuted. Go ahead.

Board Member Kohler: Okay. No, I'm just saying somewhere in between the two of those is a program to work. I mean, the first one is kind of too simple in a way and the other one is too heavy, but an in between I think will work out fine. It's just it's big, thick, kind of overwhelming. The other one is too plain, so somewhere in between could be an easy thing to do.

Chair Bower: I think we've now basically expressed our, the entire Board has expressed the desire to see the final design of this again, but it can be done with a subcommittee, that's three people and it could be done quickly and I think, doesn't need to block the project moving forward with other boards and the Council. So, just so we can have a numeric, I guess a vote, really, I would ask if there are any Board Members that object to a subcommittee to deal with the final design?

Board Member Wimmer: David, sorry to interrupt. Can I just ask another quick question? So, when we're saying we like something in between one and two, are we talking about just the railings or are we talking about the door fenestration. And Adam, can you go back to the two-dimensional view of, sorry. Okay. So, I guess upon better understanding of what, that those are paneling, those are panels and not windows, they certainly look like windows to me, but because those wouldn't be, because they are just a false panel, I'm now retracting. I think the option number one is better. I'm just kind of confused as when we say something in between the two, because there's kind of two issues here. There's the door and the fenestration is different between option one and two, and the railings are different between options one and two.

Chair Bower: Excellent, excellent observation. I had been assuming that after Kimberly recommended option one and not adding another, adding the rest of that design feature to center, to create a better centered approach to the doors, that that had gone away. I would not support any part of that larger building modification in design number two.

Board Member Wimmer: I just want to clarify that. So, the doors of option one is what we're leaning towards?

Chair Bower: I think that, yeah. My opinion is that those doors are there. Well, they're needed for a code requirement, and that they shouldn't, you know, be expanded to alter the exterior elevation of the building any more than they need to be. So, my thought and my request that the Board verify is that the subcommittee will work with the architect team, the team of architects to provide a modified version of these two stair approaches to the building, and not deal with anything more than that. And if that's agreeable to the Board, then I think we'll take a quick vote on that. So, all in favor of that approach raise your hand. Roger (unintelligible). And Christian?

Board Member Pease: I agree.

Chair Bower: Okay. Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes.

Chair Bower: You agree?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes.

Chair Bower: Okay, good. I think we are unanimous in asking that this project come back to a subcommittee of the Board just for this particular design element, the stairs, the access egress stairs on the end of the Gunn Building. Amy.

Ms. French: Hi. Yes, I'm going to suggest, I'm going to share my screen, oh, I can't. If we're done, I'm going to share my screen because I would like to capture your vote, which let's see, is anyone able to see this?

Chair Bower: Yeah, I can see it.

Ms. French: Okay. So, I have been typing here with, you know, the action today. I have two requests with respect to the Architecture Review finding 2B, which I would then share with the Architectural Review Board next Thursday that there are bullets here that can be incorporated or some of them, into a finding that references the Gunn Building as part of the project, you know. And then (crosstalk) text there to reflect what was happening right now with this conversation. So, maybe you could...

Chair Bower: I think that captures what, yeah, I think that captures the discussion we just had. So, we want the building, thank you for actually highlighting the exterior finishes which we were talking about but not specifically focusing on. Anyway, Board Members, does that fairly summarize our discussion? I think it does.

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Bower, I just want to add that I think someone should make a formal motion.

Ms. French: Yes. I just wanted to have the motion, if we're going to talk about the project in totality, I understand this is a subcommittee formation right now for this particular detail, but I also want to make sure that we're going to return to a more complete motion on other things.

Chair Bower: Okay, so I think we've just basically voted to create a subcommittee.

Mr. Nguyen: Well, there wasn't a formal motion or a second, so we would have to do that. And I just want to add that Board Member Pease has his hand raised.

Chair Bower: Christian, I can't see you, but go ahead and speak.

Ms. French: I'm going to stop sharing. There we go.

Chair Bower: Christian, do you want to make a comment? There you go. Christian, a comment? You're muted again. Love Zoom.

Ms. French: Unmuted.

Chair Bower: Christian.

Board Member Pease: That was an error that I raised my hand. (crosstalk)

## **MOTION**

Chair Bower: Okay, stay tuned. So, I'm going to move that we create a subcommittee to review the design details of the egress stairway. Is there a second?

Board Member Makinen: I'll second it.

Chair Bower: Okay. Just to be clear, the previous discussion that we've had, this is a very brief summary of our previous discussion, and I presume, Amy, that's adequate to document what we intend to do with the subcommittee? All right, shaking your head. Any other comments? I don't see any. Let's vote on this. All in favor of creating a subcommittee, please raise your hand, either physically or...

Mr. Nguyen: For the record we should take a vocal vote, and I can do that.

Chair Bower: Fine, please do.

Mr. Nguyen: Yes, going down the list, Board Member Bernstein?

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah.

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Bower?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Board Member Kohler?

Board Member Kohler: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Board Member Makinen?

Board Member Makinen: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Board Member Pease?

Board Member Pease: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Vice Chair Shepherd?

Vice Chair Shepherd: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Board Member Wimmer?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: The motion carries 7-0.

**MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 7-0.**

Chair Bower: Okay, Amy, if you can pull that back up and share your screen with us, let's consider a motion to um, I guess, adopt those bullet points. Is that the...

Ms. French: Yes, my preference would be if you see something here that you don't agree with, that you voice your objections. If you have some wordsmithing that you think would be better than this, I welcome you to send those to me. You know, this is in the formation of findings to share with the Architectural Review in the packet that goes out this week.

Chair Bower: Okay, there is one item that I saw in an earlier, as part of the earlier discussion, and that is the stucco finish on the existing building, I think Adam described as a pebble dash finish which I'm familiar with. Is that the finish that would be applied to the new buildings?

Mr. Woltag: To answer the question, no. The new buildings actually don't incorporate stucco. They do have the shingles, wood shingles, wood siding, but no stucco.

Chair Bower: Okay, so I just want to be clear about that because I wouldn't want new stucco to be identical to the old, but since that's not an issue, that's great. Anyone else see anything in this particular, in these one, two, three, four, five bullet points that we would like to expand upon? Any other Board Members have comments about that? I don't see or hear any comments. So, I'd entertain a motion to adopt these, this description.

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Bower, I just want to add that I think Mindy Romanowsky has a rebuttal to deliver if you would like to allow her.

Chair Bower: Of course.

Mr. Nguyen: Mindy, if you're there, go ahead.

Mindie Romanowsky: Yeah, I'm here. Can you hear me? I'm trying to turn on my video. Here we go. Hi, good morning Members of the HRB. My name is Mindie Romanowsky and I am a land use attorney assisting Castilleja with this application. I actually don't have a rebuttal. I just really wanted to thank you for your service and your time and appreciate you for the thoughtful comments you've made today on option one and option two. We are very amenable to your feedback and respect it. I do think that our historic architects (unintelligible) who commented on the merits of option one in following the Secretary of the Interior's Standards really are worthy of thought and thank you for taking it under consideration with your subcommittee to determine how best to treat the stair rail. We welcome that feedback and I guess, I just want to understand, you know, a bit of how that feedback will be delivered. If you could give us a bit more direction today on what it is you would like to see so we can be responsive and be responsive in short order, so that we don't, you know, you hear from us soon and you're able to respond accordingly. We would like to be able to bring it to the ARB as well, based upon your sound recommendations. So, you know, the more direction you are able to provide in short order, we would greatly appreciate. So, thank you.

Chair Bower: Sure. Typically, a subcommittee formed for this type of consideration, it actually looks at something after the building is under construction, and it's not intended, the whole subcommittee approach is intended to allow the project to move forward. In this case, because this particular aspect of the design is specific to the historic portion of this project, the ARB would have no purview over that. They don't have training, they don't have the experience to make a decision about that, and so the HRB's subcommittee would be dealing with this compatibility differentiation thing, and it's really going to, as I imagine it, going to be a mix of those two designs, and I think Adam, or whoever is going to carry this forward, would be able to make a couple of suggestions and then it will happen very quickly. We've done this on a number of projects. And again, it's happened during construction, not, we don't mean to hold up, we don't want to hold up construction, but the point of this is to keep the project moving. So, I think the major portions of our discussion today were not to have that new element added to the end of the building, try to get a less heavy or massive stair on the side, and I just have a feeling that, again Adam will be able to, you know, present something that the Board, the subcommittee would be able to move through quickly. Isn't that the case, Amy? This doesn't have to happen before it goes to the ARB, as far as I'm concerned?

Ms. French: Correct. Yes, that's correct. Again, the expertise of the HRB is certainly this differentiation and compatibility equation, and you know, we're used to making conditions of approval requiring return to a subcommittee. That would not then have to go to the ARB afterwards. But certainly, if the applicant

is interested in coming up with something, you know, before this gets to Council, we're happy to convene the subcommittee to have a look.

Chair Bower: Right. I just don't see this as being a make or break deal for the Council. I think the Council has been able to accept this kind of condition in the past with comfort. So, I'm only saying this so you don't feel like this is another bump in the road, because I don't think any of us on the HRB feel that at all. Does that answer your question, Mindie?

Ms. Romanowsky: Yes, thank you. That's very helpful and again we welcome the feedback, you know, when it comes.

Chair Bower: Adam?

Mr. Woltag: And really quickly, I just want to thank everyone for the comments and just so we're really clear, what we heard today was a lighter approach, I think, than option two, abiding to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards is important. We don't want to mimic, we don't want to copy, you know, we don't want to degrade that façade. It's an important façade, even though it's a campus façade, it doesn't face the street, this Committee is saying, no this is an important façade, so think about the details. That's what I've heard. I don't think I've heard a strong direction either or, I've heard a hybrid, and so I think what I'm going to take away from this is, we're going to meet with our team, we're going to look at details, because I think that's what you're asking for, is how does it feel when you're holding the handrail, how does it look. Right now, we're showing some pretty, you know, conceptual ideas, and I think what the Committee is saying, the Board is saying, we want to understand that even though you may go with a contrasting approach, it's beautiful, it's appropriate and it's something that's going to compliment this really important building. And so that's what I'm taking away from this meeting.

Chair Bower: That's what we do on the HRB. It's almost always about compatibility and differentiation. Those are almost exact opposites, so it's, it's kind of a fine line to walk. Anyway, let's go back. Vinh, we want you on motions for, to accept this – do we need to make a statement, Amy, about conditioning the acceptance based on the subcommittee approval?

Ms. French: I've heard that this is a condition and I have it in a draft, you know, in that yellow text that I was showing that I can put into the draft conditions of approval that I would show to the Planning and Transportation Commission on October 14, unless something happens in the meantime to resolve this with the subcommittee, that's the plan. I would like two things. I would like the HRB to, again, look at that finding 2B so I can share that with the ARB next week and make sure I've got that right, as far as verbiage, if possible. The other thing is that you did review the Draft EIR in September. The Final EIR has been out since July 29 and 30. You've had the opportunity, I've provided page numbers, etc. If anybody on the HRB thinks that there is something inadequate about the Final EIR as far as providing that additional information that you requested, I mean, these are comments the HRB made that our CEQA consultant responded to and we published. So, I would like to hear from the HRB of the adequacy of the Final EIR would be helpful as well. So, those two things. I can put the screen back up to show those finding bullets, if you'd like.

Chair Bower: Yeah, that probably is appropriate. Martin, did you want to make a comment? I saw your...

Board Member Bernstein: No, I was just getting myself unmuted, but no comment at this point.

Chair Bower: Okay. So, Michael, go ahead.

Board Member Makinen: Thank you Chair. Yeah, I had just one quick comment relating back to the potential for historic district combination. There was a master response 2.9.2 and I'm not sure if they looked at any of the people that have been to Castilleja that were, have historic significance in their careers that might qualify that area as being an historic district based upon personas.

Chair Bower: Kimberly, are you still on?

Ms. Butt: Yes, I'm still here. Again, we did review and speak to the Historic Resource evaluation. We did not prepare it. But in this situation, I do know that there was not a district found, that there was not a finding for any significant persons to lead to an historic finding. Typically, when something is based on that criterion B, that it is, the building is significant due to its relation to a person. It has to be significantly tied to that person. Either they discovered something important within that building or they lived within that building, though most of the time, if it's just kind of a tertiary relationship, that they were in the building for a brief period of time or at school there, it typically does not provide a substantial, enough substantial significance unless there was a substantial tie to the building. But there was nothing, there was no historically significant person found in the HRE to substantiate a district.

Board Member Makinen: Okay, so you did do that study on the personas?

Ms. Butt: We peer reviewed the study and we did a bit more extra research and background into it, and we did not find anything additional.

Board Member Makinen: Okay. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Debbie, you have some comment? Mute, you're muted.

Vice Chair Shepherd: Kimberly, I might have missed something you said there in terms of all of things you might take into consideration. Could there not have been consideration for a theme rather than a person, a theme about the education of women and the relationship between the school and Stanford, because I think it was really a complex and important relationship historically that continues today.

Ms. Butt: Yes, I think that would be another contextual theme that would be a different historical context. It would be different from looking at an association between one specific person. Again, we peer reviewed it. We did not do the initial study, so I am seeing if Ishom (phonetic) recalls any, my colleague, any additional context within that. And are we, we are talking about the school itself, or the larger historic district? I mean not historic district, potential.

Vice Chair Shepherd: As we'd all said before, we don't want to slow this down. I really just want to go on the record as saying I think the community around the school, I mean, even as we heard from the Director who lives close by, those houses were all occupied by families who came to Stanford, in many cases, to educate their daughters, which was, you know, really an extraordinary thing, and that's how the school came to be, and a lot of those women actually ended up going to Stanford, even though James Stanford ultimately put a cap on how many women could go there. But, and the you know, faculty were there and, anyway, I don't know. I think it's an important theme and I'm sure the school will be interpreting it and I hope that we find other ways in Palo Alto to tell that story about that neighborhood.

Ms. Butt: Yeah, that's very interesting. I know that specifically in the study when they, looking at the campus itself as an historic district, there was a lack of integrity and sufficient amount of buildings. And then my understanding was then looking out to the larger neighborhood, it really got beyond the purview of the scope of work, and that is something, an interesting theme that I think, you know, perhaps you all as a Board could encourage the City to perhaps get an historic context done or reviewed in the future. I think it's a very interesting topic.

Vice Chair Shepherd: Thank you.

Chair Bower: Okay. Other comments? Thank you, Kimberly. I think we can now, Amy, go back to the, if you can share that bullet point screen, I'd like to craft a motion that will adopt or support this particular set of statements, which as I read them are accurate and represent our consideration. Do you want to add onto this, Amy, something about the Final EIR, let's see, alterations? They're not alterations, but they are amendments. Is that the correct way to describe?

Ms. French: Oh, the Final EIR incorporates a revised or updated Draft EIR that included all that additional information that was responsive to the HRB's request. So, you know, we have a separate kind of resolution that relates to the Council's certification of the EIR that's being prepared that will reflect the HRB's statements about the EIR, if you choose to make statements about its adequacy in dealing with the cultural resources on the site.

Chair Bower: If it's helpful to the Council, we can do that. I think that those comments we made a year ago in our hearing are more for information and since those questions were followed up and didn't result in any, how do I say this, they didn't result in the discovery, for instance, of an historic district or did not provide verification that the Lockey House was historic, then I don't know that we need to make a statement about that. I'm pleased that modified project has maintained those two houses on Emerson and does, in fact, maintain a more residential character on that, on Emerson. So, I think that's basically all the HRB would be able to add to the conversation. Since we haven't found anything else that represents a, I don't know, an historic resource that we need to preserve or highlight. I'm sorry to be so – I'm trying to think of ways that I can incorporate all of the things that we have considered even though some of them are not, you know, they didn't result in a finding that we would need to act on.

Ms. French: Right. So, basically your questions from last year about the Draft EIR and including the one that said "we know this is not part of the project or the applicant's request or the school's request, is there something about an historic district?" The Draft EIR was then updated in the Final EIR process to discuss that whole concept of an historic district. Again, you know, I would say that that's an adequate response to the comments and requests for information, so that continues to the Council with that improvement to the EIR with those responses.

Chair Bower: Okay, I think that's exactly the kind of response we asked for and we received. We weren't asking for the creation of an historic district, we were asking for the investigation of the potential for an historic district. The same with the Lockey House. All right, I'm sensitive about how much time we've now spent.

## **MOTION**

Chair Bower: We've been here two hours, and we're still on Item one, so I think we are ready to move forward with a motion to adopt the statements that Amy has shown us. It's Architectural Review finding 2B and I'm not going to review the whole thing because it's on our screen. So, I would move that we adopt this as a Board and will look for a second.

(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: Martin, was that you or Michael?

Board Member Pease: It was Christian. I second it.

Chair Bower: Oh, Christian, thank you. Sorry, the screen is a little weird right now. All right, so there is a motion and a second to adopt this as, at this meeting. If there's no further conversation, anybody want to make a comment? No comments. Okay, all in favor of this, let's see, Vinh, you need to poll the Board, correct? Yes, let's do a voice vote for the record. So, now starting with Board Member Bernstein?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Chair Bower?

Chair Bower: I support this.

Mr. Nguyen: Board Member Kohler?

Board Member Kohler: Yes, I support.

Mr. Nguyen: Board Member Makinen?

Board Member Makinen: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Board Member Pease?

Board Member Pease: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Vice Chair Shepherd?

Vice Chair Shepherd: Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: And Board Member Wimmer?

Chair Bower: Margaret?

Mr. Nguyen: Board Member Wimmer?

Chair Bower: You're muted.

Board Member Wimmer: Sorry, I lost you for a minute. Yes.

Mr. Nguyen: Okay, the motion carries 7-0, and before we proceed, I just want to let you guys know that I have to leave now for a medical appointment, but we have our very lovely Veronica Dao here who will take over for me.

**MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 7-0.**

Chair Bower: Welcome Veronica. So, I think that takes, finishes Item Two. Thank you, Adam and Kimberly and all the other people who have come to see us, today. We appreciate all of your input. It makes us possible for us to reach a more comprehensive decision about how to move forward. Good luck with this and we will create the subcommittee quickly. We will do it today, and then Amy will be in touch with you to move this along. Thanks again, all of you. All right, Board Members, before you go, I want to take a break, but before we take a break, let's create the subcommittee. Martin, you requested to be on that subcommittee, is that correct?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes.

Chair Bower: Other, anybody else, other people interested in participating? We need two more.

Board Member Pease: I would be interested. This is Christian.

Chair Bower: Okay, Christian, fine. Anyone else?

Vice Chair Shepherd: I'm happy to do it if no one else does.

Chair Bower: Okay. I'm not going to offer to do it because I'm actually busy, oddly enough. Okay, so it's going to be Debbie and Christian and Martin.

Board Member Makinen: I'd like to nominate Margaret for that committee.

Ms. French: We can only have three.

Chair Bower: We're at three.

Ms. French: So, it's not a quorum.

Board Member Pease: I would give up my spot for Margaret. This is Christian.

Vice Chair Shepherd: Yeah, I would too.

Board Member Wimmer: Oh, I'm happy to participate, sure.

Chair Bower: I guess you don't have a choice, Margaret.

Vice Chair Shepherd: Okay, so I withdraw.

Chair Bower: Okay, well, yeah that's actually – thanks Debbie for doing that. It's nice to have Christian in a subcommittee. He's a new member, and this will help him actually participate in something we don't normally do as a group. So, Christian, Martin and Margaret will do that. Okay, let's take a break, so we can get up and stretch. Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: David, so I have a flight at noon, so I might not be able to last for the second item. I think I need to wrap up by 11 to pull myself together and get to airport. So, I'm sorry if that's a conflict, but yeah.

Chair Bower: Well, we could make it a five-minute break. I understand.

Board Member Wimmer: I mean, I'll last as long as I can, but I might not last until the end, so – but you still have a quorum.

Chair Bower: Yeah, we have a quorum, so that's true.

Board Member Wimmer: Okay, thanks.

Chair Bower: Let's take a brief five-minute break. I'm going to find my other things, and then we'll be right back.