



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: May 26, 2016

City Hall/City Council Chambers
250 Hamilton Avenue
8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Martin Bernstein, Vice Chair Margaret Wimmer, Board Members David Bower, Beth Bunnenberg, Roger Kohler

Absent: Board Member Pat DiCicco

Oral Communications

Yung Soon Bay: Hello, good morning. I am a Korean daily newsletter reporter (inaudible) very interesting for how can (inaudible) I introduce for my Korean newsletter. Thank you.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. As Yung Soon Bay [phonetic] mentioned, she's a reporter for the Korean daily newsletter. She expressed interest to come here today to observe how our community fosters cultural growth. Welcome and thank you.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

None.

City Official Reports

1. Meeting Schedule and Attendance

Amy French: A couple of days ago, Chair Bernstein and Matt Weintraub, the historic planner who is not able to be here today for reasons I'll say later, and I met regarding study sessions. It's a topic that at the last meeting, I believe it was, the Board had brought up and said that we should agendize this. We discussed agendizing. We discussed some pros and cons, some particular issues with the mechanics and logistics. We will be looking towards July 14th or July 28th, which are the next couple of meetings that we have agenda items for, to have that discussion. We will prepare a brief report from staff on our evaluation of the possibilities. We had discussed possibly getting this into the HRB Bylaws, so that would be part of the discussion. I don't know, Martin, if you want to add to that at this point.

Chair Bernstein: It was just part of that discussion also included how does an applicant become notified of the possibility of a study session, whether it's at the Development Center or whenever there's a first contact by an applicant to any position in the City to get notice to that applicant that that is available for them. That was it. Thank you so much.

Action Items

- 450 Bryant Street [16PLN-00092]:** Request by Lisa Hendrickson, on behalf of Avenidas, for Historic Review of Architectural Review application for the interior renovation of an existing historic building (1927) at 450 Bryant Street, demolition of an existing 2,592 square foot addition (1978) and replacement with a new 10,721 square foot addition, and site improvements on City-owned property in the Public Facilities (PF) zoning district. The net increase in floor area at the

property is 8,129 square feet. Environmental Review: Preparation of an Initial Study is underway. For more information, contact Amy French at amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Chair Bernstein: I'll read the topic, and then if Staff can explain the purpose of today's meeting. Welcome Vice Chair Wimmer. We know there was some traffic issues today. Welcome. We've just done Official Reports, and now we're just starting our first action item. Your timing is perfect. Welcome. Action item, 450 Bryant Street, request by Lisa Hendrickson on behalf of Avenidas for historic review of architectural review application for the interior renovation of an existing historic building, built in 1927, at 450 Bryant Street, demolition of an existing 2,592 square foot addition in 1978, and replacement with a new 10,721-square-foot addition, and site improvements on City-owned property in the Public Facilities (PF) zoning district. The net increase in floor area at the property is 8,129 square feet. Environmental review, preparation of an Initial Study is underway. If staff shall explain the purpose of today's meeting. Thank you.

Ms. French: Yes, thank you. I'm Amy French, Chief Planning Official. I just want to say this is not a study session. It is a formal application that's been filed for architectural review which comes with it, because of the historic status, HRB review. It's a first hearing on this design. Staff did not request formal recommendation today, because we are not ready for that from the HRB. It's a time for the HRB to learn about the project, to learn the site context, provide comments on the Historic Resource Evaluation that was prepared by the applicant's consultant, likewise the analysis and review of that by our City consultant that we've hired in lieu of having Matt be the reviewing person. Matt is not able to participate in this item because his residence is too close to the property, so he's conflicted. If you as the Historic Resources Board can weigh in on the context, the neighborhood, the block, is this a historic or unique situation that we want to pay attention to with respect to the Architectural Review Board findings. There's one in particular, Finding 4, that makes reference to whether the area is historic or unique. We'd like to hear from you on that. Of course, an opportunity as always to provide input on the plans, the design. You'll hear from the applicants about the program. Whether you need some additional studies or design details to understand what's going on there for this major addition. Of course, we will return to you following publication of the CEQA document. Under California Environmental Quality Act, we are preparing an environmental document because of the historic building, the size of the addition. It is not exempt from that State law. I wanted to just touch upon the Comprehensive Plan. It does acknowledge and promote a senior center. It's the central facility for seniors in Palo Alto. You'll hear from the applicant on that. We want to facilitate permits for these. We're doing our best to get it to you at an early time, and we'll continue to come forward as expeditiously as possible per our Comp Plan. The Comp Plan references the Downtown Urban Design Guide. This is not a mandatory set of guidelines, but it's intended to be very helpful for improvements in the Downtown. This particular part of town is called the cross axis, the civic cross axis. It goes from City Hall all the way over to Cogswell Plaza. In that area, it talks about the Mediterranean style of many buildings and that future development should support but not necessarily imitate this style. The direction there also talks about turning Cogswell Plaza into an outdoor room, an appealing space. I think there are several storied buildings, including the parking garage surrounding Cogswell Plaza, that is achieving that outdoor room with the taller buildings. This gives you a little bit of context here, a bird's eye view. It shows you Avenidas here of course, the Category 2 building. There are some Category 3 buildings on University here. There are a couple of potentially eligible buildings that have not gone through the full analysis about their historic status. There's of course this Category 4 building over here, and this is called the Tinney building where there is this mixed-use project that came along that's very successful as far as it's complete now and occupied. Of course, the parking garage. Here's Cogswell Plaza. This is the City parking lot, Lot C. The lease that the City has with Avenidas, which is just basically around the building, includes some nonexclusive parking spaces over in Lot C as well as some parking spaces along this alley. It's known as Paulsen Lane. Again, Avenidas is a major building. It's of regional importance. It's a California point of historical interest. The HRB uses the Secretary of Interior Standards, and we've been doing that since 1987. Your focus, of course, is the style, the design, the materials, etc. Again, as I mentioned, looking at this, what's the historical character? Is there one in this area so that the Architectural Review Board can render a finding, Number 4, if that is applicable? Basically, the Secretary of Interior Standards recommend placing a new addition on a non-character defining elevation and limiting the size and scale in relationship to the

historic building. What we have here is an addition. Our consultant took a look at this project and the Historic Resource Evaluation and came to the conclusion that the placement of the addition does not appear to overpower or obscure the historic building and its character-defining features. For this reason, the rear addition there appears to conform to the standards. Of course, we want your opinion on that. I have some images here. This is the rear addition, placed here rather than at the front where the character-defining features of this front elevation are so important to the building. You can see the addition back here. It is taller than the existing building because it is three stories, but it is placed back from the main facade there. From the park, Cogswell Plaza as it's known as, this is the rear addition. Here it's really apparent that it's taller. As you can see, the existing trees here have a role in screening that addition significantly from the view of the park users. Again, we're looking at the HRE and seeing that there might be some improvements that can be made. The applicant's consultant is here and has received that report from the City's consultant. These are some items that have been identified. Again, the hearing process. Coming here today, getting your input, then we do have the opportunity to hear testimony. This is the first public hearing on the item. The applicant can tell you they are doing outreach, and there will be some meetings coming up they can tell you about for the public to come to Avenidas and hear directly from the applicant before you hear this again. We need some guidance, if you have some, on the additional materials that might be needed for the next time you hear this. If you could continue as a vote, that's the action today, to a date certain because this is the first formal hearing, and we want to continue it to a date uncertain—sorry, uncertain—because we don't have the date identified just yet. Down here, I have the next steps. It is going to go to the Architectural Review Board in a few weeks, then we are looking at the CEQA document, preparing that. We're having a study session with Council. The Council does not have a role in the ARB process. Of course, they're interested because it's City property, etc. We want to give them an opportunity to see the project. There will be some future actions on their part. That concludes staff's report.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. The next step for us is if Board Members have any disclosures to make about this agenda item. Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I visited the site when we last reviewed this project. Also, I'm a friend of one of the Avenidas Board Members.

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I have visited the site on a number of occasions including the time when we did it before. I'm not a member of Avenidas but have many friends that attend there.

Board Member Kohler: I went over there and toured the building when we first came before the Board and used to take my mother there quite a bit on and off. Thank you.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I toured the building with the project architect and had that nice orientation about a year, year and a half ago.

Board Member Makinen: I also toured the building about a year ago.

Chair Bernstein: So did I. Also, I'd like to announce that on January 22nd of this year I met with Lisa Hendrickson, Avenidas' past capital project manager, Amy Andonian, President and Chief Executive Officer, and also Kevin Jones, the architect. At that meeting, all that happened there was I just quoted the comments made at our July 23rd, 2015 HRB meeting. I also quoted them the ten Standards, and no decisions were made, and no new information is to report on that. With that, why don't we open the public hearing. I'd like to invite the applicant for presentation please. It's a 10-minute limitation or at the discretion of the Chair. Whenever you're technically ready for our presentation, we can go ahead. Welcome.

Kevin Jones: Good morning. I'm Kevin Jones with Kenneth Rodrigues & Partners architects. Pleasurable to be back in front of you. It's been a while since we were here last. We have a number of people

associated with Avenidas here today. Lisa Hendrickson and Amy and several of our Board Members are present as well as ARG, our historic resources group. What I'd like to do is to give you a little brief overview of what we've been doing over the course of the past year, and then largely some time hopefully that there will be any specific questions you have about the historic document, and then I will allow Charles or Sarah to come to the podium and address those items. With that, I'll kind of walk you through a little brief presentation. Much of what you know, the existing building is a Birge Clark building designed in 1926. I think it was constructed in 1927, served as the City of Palo Alto police and fire station for a number of years. In the '70s, Avenidas opened their operation at this site as the City of Palo Alto Senior Center, did basically an interior remodel at that time, removed any and all remaining historic fabric on the interior of the building, but the outside of the building has been maintained in very good shape and has not been really altered with the exception of an addition that was added. I'll talk to that in a moment. The diagram here relates to the elements of what the project consists of. The large volume there you'll see is the main Birge Clark building. There's a smaller, one-story shed building or carriage house building, whatever we want to call that facility. This is the part of this addition that was added onto the building in the '70s. Our proposed concept, similar to what we brought to you before, was the idea of introducing an addition that was related to the park, related to the parking lot, maintained components of the existing courtyard. As a result of the programmatic requirements for Avenidas and the square footage needs, we proposed a building that would be three stories. That facility addition resides here. I'll kind of break this mass down for you in a moment. The existing courtyard, a lot of it remains, yet we do take a part of that courtyard to create this entry/atrium element. The existing shed building stays, and then the Birge Clark original building is maintained as well. We propose no additions, modifications to the existing Birge Clark building. Our floor plan here and in quick concept. It's probably easier to look at it in this view. The Bryant Street entry here. This purple color is the actual original historic building as well as the shed building. This is the addition that was added on. The dining room was part of that. Our proposed project basically fills in this void with this connector element, this sort of glass connector piece that links the two buildings and tries to have a lighter connection to the building than some of our previous designs. This basically translates up as you go up to the second floor. A similar feature, the existing Birge Clark building, the connector which is a two-story element connecting the two-story Birge Clark building to the three-story proposed addition. The element only goes for two stories and basically stops underneath the eaves of the Birge Clark building. We do not remove those eaves which was a part of a previous presentation to you about a year ago. The blue representation of the proposed addition. The addition largely has a series of three large rooms that stack on top of each other. The ground-level room is a reconstruction of the dining hall. The second level is a wellness center, and then the third level is a fitness area. We have basically some building core elements. The idea that this building can kind of operate independent of the other one in terms of some of the programs, perhaps allowing for weekend use and a variety of other freedoms and flexibilities in terms of the offerings that Avenidas can provide. The very top of this, which is the third level, which would be only the new addition. There's no connection to the existing building at this level. Our roof plan. We've maintained the courtyard. At the third level, created an exterior deck that would look out over the parking lot and the park as well. Some of the points that I wanted to bring up today. As I said, I would to try to keep our comments kind of brief and take on some of the questions and commentary that we so appreciated from you last time. The height difference between the two buildings, you can see there. It's about 6 feet different. Our proposed building is a three-story building; the existing is a two-story building. We focused on commentary we heard before about how the buildings come together and connect. There's a glass connector which I'll show you a little bit more detail on. In terms of the building materials and compatibility, we've spent some time looking at a material palette. I think there's a color board/material board floating around the dais. Basically what we're looking at is predominantly using limestone which would be in a very tight joint pattern, probably a running bond pattern. This particular limestone doesn't have a lot of variation from piece to piece, so we would create a more monolithic look. We like that consistency with the existing building, which is really a concrete structure with a plaster finish on it. We really feel much more excited about using the limestone as a compatible product to plaster, but creating a monolithic look. Our concern for plaster is basically the wear of it over time and cracking and really feel that this will be a much more durable product and appealing and attractive product as well. The other elements are clear glass, aluminum window frames, flat clay roof tile in the same coloration of the existing barrel clay roof tile. I think that's on the board as well. Trying

to find ways to break the massing down in terms of having the sloped roof, but a little bit of a shallower sloped roof than the existing building. This large entry/atrium area, as you come in from the rear. One of the things that programmatically Avenidas has struggled with in the existing building is this sense of visibility and having the public understand what happens in the facility. As we look at this addition, a lot of the concepts that were talked about was making it more open and inviting, getting more light into the building and people having a sense of what really goes on here. The photo you see here is representative of the appearance of the building from the Bryant Street. All of this is existing, no changes really proposed here. We would like to freshen up some of the landscaping here, put some bike racks up in front here. You can sort of see the three-story addition in the backdrop. The view from the rear, the shed. Again, freshening up the landscaping, creating some climbing vine treatments, some espalier plants against the face of the building here. Here's the stone product as well as precast trim, creating a very light and glass, open feeling for the third floor to make the appearance and massing of the building read much more strongly as sort of a two-story element, trying to maintain that compatibility. A view into the main entry lobby where you can see this large two-story element, which would be our public art component, to be designed. At this point, we've sort of represented it in a very loose and free way as a tree. The next two plates represent what one might see from Cogswell Plaza with the very mature and tall existing tree grove that's there. Moving that away for the sake of clarity, seeing what the building actually does in terms of its architectural elements. This being the dining, this being the wellness center, this being the fitness area on the third floor, all of which would have a very exciting and dramatic view into that tree grove, which we're really excited about having this feeling of kind of being in the trees in some ways. The glass connector element, which is right here, serves as this transition between the existing historic building and the proposed new addition. A repurposed patio area with landscape features, fountain, kind of a coffee bar area, seating, and that all connects to the interior of the proposed new addition. Amy, can I get to the next documents please? I wanted to give you a little bit of a view of the animation that we worked on, to give you a feel for what the experience might be as someone would visit the center. I'll maybe run this through twice; it moves a little fast for me to really talk through. Coming into the main lobby, creating kind of an open experience. We have something called a tech lab, which you get a view of here. Coming in from the back, the approach on the building from the rear parking lot. That large two-story element, the art wall piece. Coming into the door, heading towards the courtyard. In the background you can see there is seating in the existing building wall, and that wall being a component in the new design. This is a view of people enjoying the patio area. Now, you're walking in on this connector, this glass connector, seeing from front through the back of it. I'll run it back one more time just for clarity here. The front of the building; the new addition, you really can't see it from this vantage point at all. All the existing interior is remodeled. This is our tech lab here. Approaching it from the parking lot, you can see the relationship between these massing, again trying to break down the massing and getting this sense of openness that was really important to us in seeing the activity that would be going on in the facility. Coming in, here you'd be approaching the—this is the existing rear wall of the Birge Clark building. There's an opening here that connects the circulation system off to the right, going into the patio. This wall is basically a part of that glass connector that we've been referring to. This would be an existing building wall here. Looking out, this glass component goes completely visually out to the park and creates this separation between the existing building and the new building. You come around again as if you're going back out, and you look into the first level, the dining room, as part of the new addition, and our stairs there to the other side. That just gives you a quick conceptual feel for the interior layout. Can I get to the next ... I just wanted to give you a feel for it coming the other way, to put in context the experience as you're walking down Bryant Street, particularly in terms of what you see of the new building. You can see to the right that fairly substantial grove of trees that are here. As this plays through, there's a small window in which you would see the addition in the back. It's starting to come around now. You can start to see it at this point. The rendering that's adjacent to Amy, at that point you'd see it in the background. As you move past it, you don't really experience that new addition from the primary Bryant Street focus. We've tried to take in the sensitivity that you expressed the last time we were here in a number of items in terms of the treatment, the aesthetic design and the elements that we focused on. With that, I'd like to just step aside and try to address any questions or comments you might have. If there are anything in particular that you have questions of our historic consultant, I'd like to invite them to the dais or anyone else in terms of the Avenidas family. We would greatly appreciate your comments. Thank you.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you, Kevin. Next, I'd like to invite the Board, if there are any questions for the applicant or staff. Beth.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I had some questions about the little connector. I remember last time we were concerned that the addition actually abutted closely and touched some historic features back on the back side of the building. For that little glass hyphen, you said that it would not actually touch the historic building. Is that correct?

Mr. Jones: There is a seismic separation joint between the existing building and the new. That glass connector does touch the building. In the previous versions of this, we had proposed cutting part of the eave back, and that's been rethought. If you look at our Sheet A5.4, there is the northwest elevation. It sort of gives you a view point of that glass connector where it tucks up under the eave of the existing building. That element is only a two-story component, but it does touch the building. The buildings are seismically separated; it allows for the existing building and the new building to move without damaging or affecting the other one.

Board Member Bunnenberg: It's the gentlest type of touch.

Mr. Jones: Yes, yes.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Does that glass hyphen have a clear roof or is there some—what is the covering of that roof?

Mr. Jones: The roof is a solid roof. If you're on the second floor and you look up, you don't look through it. It is solid.

Board Member Bunnenberg: It is solid. All right.

Mr. Jones: It would be single-ply roofing. It's a steel-frame construction; it has a metal deck to it and foam insulation, so it is solid. To give you a better feel for that, if you looked at A6.0, the section 2, you get a feel there for how that element tucks right up underneath the existing eave of the Birge Clark building. At the bottom of that sheet, the section 2, right there in the middle between the two buildings, that two-story connector element occurs there.

Board Member Bunnenberg: The tile roof extends over it but is not touched.

Mr. Jones: Yes, not touched.

Board Member Bunnenberg: That's a very important thing. What about the decorative fountain that exists there in the courtyard? It looked like in your presentation that there was maybe some kind of ...

Mr. Jones: The existing tile fountain that is in the courtyard today is proposed to be removed. It's not an original historic element, but we are taking it out. So many of our participants have liked that fountain element and the sounds that it creates. As you noted, particularly in the little bit of the video, we have proposed to put in a new fountain element.

Board Member Bunnenberg: A water feature (crosstalk).

Mr. Jones: There's a water feature there; there's a little coffee bar there, seating, new planting. We're really excited too for a component of our program called The Villages, which would be housed in the smaller shed building, which would open up ...

Board Member Bunnenberg: The garden room.

Mr. Jones: The garden room. Would open out into that area and really a very exciting and dynamic experience, different from what we have now.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I was pleased to see—I should disclose that when I talked with people as I was—clients—moving through the building, almost everyone said they liked the dining room. The dining room looking out on the plaza was their favorite room. It appears that your dining room does look out on Cogswell Plaza.

Mr. Jones: Yes, it does. Fundamentally, it's whole orientation focuses out to the Cogswell Plaza, the tree grove there. We would like to have a little more interaction between the interior of the building and the outside, the park. Due to some of the discussions about the lease lines and operations and the public park, we may be restricted in some ways. Clearly, visually it is much more focused on the park than now.

Board Member Bunnenberg: It's a good visual connection there. The other thing, that is really more of a comment. Your original plan had a great deal of glass on the back wall and, as a senior, I was thinking, "I think I might like a little more privacy." There was almost a fishbowl feeling, that people on the outside could look up and see what you were doing, whether it was exercise or whatever. It looks like this design is much more—those areas are ...

Mr. Jones: Yes. We've decreased the glazing amount in a significant way in this new design. In all honesty, I'm really excited about where we've come relative to the commentary that we've heard on the previous design. It is very clear this design is completely different in appearance than where we had been before and the concepts that we had before. I think that speaks to Avenidas' commitment to being responsive to the users, being responsive to the community, and trying to find a happy medium that addresses those concerns, but also creates some excitement, allows us to get some spaces that can be well lit naturally and create an environment that is appealing. We've heard those comments, and we've tried to take those, integrate them into a new design in a very new and exciting way, but still stick to the fundamentals that we feel people enjoy having, naturally lit spaces. Just looking out into that tree grove at the second, third level would just be an exciting component.

Board Member Bunnenberg: To me, at least the compatibility ...

Chair Bernstein: Let's see. Excuse me, Beth.

Board Member Bunnenberg: ... with the existing building is extremely important.

Chair Bernstein: (inaudible) continue with questions, and then we can make comments later. Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: I had just a couple questions regarding the lease arrangement. Maybe these are more properly addressed to Amy French. There's not much said in here about the lease arrangement right here, the terms of the lease, the duration of the lease and the responsibilities. I see the City had a—this is like a tenant improvement, it ends up being. Say Avenidas went out of business, the City has to take over that property. It becomes a City property. Could you elaborate on that?

Ms. French: I'm not well versed on finer points of the lease. I do know there is likely to be an adjustment to the lease, of course, because the building is supposed to be expanded. There will be more discussions on that. I cannot answer you today; I can come back at the next HRB meeting to answer that or research it and let you know.

Mr. Jones: Our group here intimately knows the details of the lease, if you're comfortable with us ...

Ms. French: There you go. (crosstalk) the wrong person.

Mr. Jones: ... expressing them.

Lisa Hendrickson: Hi, I'm Lisa Hendrickson. We recently, last year, signed a new 50-year lease with the City.

Board Member Makinen: How many?

Ms. Hendrickson: Fifty.

Board Member Makinen: Fifty.

Ms. Hendrickson: Under the terms of the lease, we are obligated to continue to operate as a provider of senior services in the property, and we have every intention of doing so for at least another 50 years. Yes, this would be considered TIs, and the lease does contemplate or anticipate that there would be improvements made to the building over the period. This is permitted within the terms of the lease.

Board Member Makinen: It's a 50-year lease with a renewable option for another 50 years?

Ms. Hendrickson: No, it's just 50 years.

Board Member Makinen: Fifty years.

Ms. Hendrickson: it's my understanding the City could not have added a renewable option under its Charter.

Board Member Makinen: At the end of the lease, it becomes a City-owned property ...

Ms. Hendrickson: Unless we re-up, which we expect we will.

Board Member Makinen: ... unless something is done.

Ms. Hendrickson: We have been in the building since 19—the original lease was dated 1976, and it was a 50-year lease. We replaced that with another 50-year lease just last year.

Board Member Makinen: Thank you.

Chair Bernstein: (inaudible) Board Members have questions? David.

Board Member Bower: I was somewhat shocked about the amount of money that Avenidas has to pay in in-lieu parking fees. I'm wondering if there's been an auto study.

Mr. Jones: I love it when Amy looks at me like that. Let me give you a little bit of background to this topic. When you look at the site plan, you realize there's a parking lot directly behind the project. One of the dilemmas that has come about is this distinction between the lease line rights and the parking lot and that degree of the park as well. When you go through the parking requirement here, we're required to provide a number of parking stalls. Through the past year since we were with you, the City has engaged with an outside consultant to study options to increase the amount of parking, as well as Avenidas has done those activities. The problem for Avenidas is we have no site to provide additional parking to since our lease line is defined by the footprint of the building. The City had explored an option to upgrade the back parking lot, creating some underground parking and then some surface parking. That resulted in a small gain in parking. At the end of it, indicated that it wasn't particularly a feasible option. There is some proposed City—I don't remember the program that the City has. It evaluates existing City parking lots, from their maintenance and upkeep and keeping them renewed relative to Code changes and access and those things. There's likely to be some minor level of upgrade that's not associated with this particular project, because we've looked at all the options available to us. The main

thing that we can do—the in-lieu dollar fee is an issue, but that is our only option that's available to us in order to meet the parking demand.

Board Member Bower: Do you know how many cars come to Avenidas in a day?

Mr. Jones: There are statistics for that. Unfortunately, I don't have them freely available at this time.

Board Member Bower: My inclination is there probably are fewer cars coming to Avenidas just because of the—maybe you can answer there.

Ms. Hendrickson: You're right. We did do a parking study. About 58 percent of the people that come every day drive their own cars. More than 40 percent get there any number of other ways. All of which, we've come to understand, doesn't matter. There's still a parking requirement that has to be met. It's a function of the net new square footage that we're building. Separately, we do have a transportation plan that we'll be implementing to further reduce the number of single occupancy cars that drive to the building. That is separate from our obligations to meet the parking requirement of the project.

Board Member Bower: Just a question. I guess that's all the questions I have. I have other comments.

Chair Bernstein: Any other Board Members with questions for the applicant or staff? Vice Chair Wimmer.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I wanted to ask—there's like a frieze band that is occurring above the glass atrium at the rear entry or that would be the (crosstalk).

Mr. Jones: You're on the exterior?

Vice Chair Wimmer: The Ramona Street—yeah, off of the parking lot view with the trees.

Chair Bernstein: HA4.9.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I just wanted you to speak a little bit about what your thoughts were on that material. I see that the ...

Mr. Jones: At the third level?

Vice Chair Wimmer: Yeah.

Mr. Jones: Let me see if I can ...

Vice Chair Wimmer: This area right here above the ...

Mr. Jones: Here?

Vice Chair Wimmer: It looks like a panel. It looks kind of like a—I also noticed that that same design element was incorporated above the windows facing Cogswell Plaza, off of the dining ...

Mr. Jones: Yes.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I just was curious about what that was. I think that's kind of a nice feature, and I like the fact that there looks to be like a balcony or a roof deck up there, which kind of probably makes up for the square footage that you might lose in the courtyard below. I thought that was kind of a nice thought, an element.

Mr. Jones: In the appearance, which you see here, of that treatment, it's at a 42-inch high height that creates basically the guardrail appearance of it. In lieu of creating what would be a much more

transparent or guardrail scenario, we wanted to create something that felt more integrated to the building element. That element became—it started at this elevation as a component that somewhat of a little bit of a decorative feel to it. It served as this guardrail, and you would basically create that on two sides of the balcony. People would have that experience of having that solid wall piece there, and then sort of from waist-height up you would see people up on the balcony. That does serve as another space for us, as an exterior space that we don't have now, and it helps to offset some loss of area in the courtyard. Then, that became just a decorative element on the other elevations of the park, that we thought was kind of nice. It was intended to be an integrated aluminum-frame system with all these elements unified and creating sort of a single aesthetic that tried to make it feel light and airy.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I like how you incorporated it into more than just one elevation. I thought that was nice. My second question was can you describe a little bit about what's happening on the eave of the new roof overhang. It looks to be more visible like when you look on A4.11. On that elevation, it seems like the eave is going to be more visible from the street level, because it's up so high. I was wondering what your thoughts were on treating that eave. It looks just like a flat—I don't know what the material is.

Mr. Jones: The best place to sort of see a feel for this is on A6.3, the detail 5 there. Basically we have the flat tile roof coming to a gutter. We're not using copper; this would all be sheet metal, pre-painted, pre-finished material. We have a metal soffit that returns back to the glass. One of the things we talked about and studied was this idea of how much level of articulation are we wanting to see. If you look at the existing building, you see some of the wood beams that are associated there. This is still in some ways a fairly modern aesthetic but trying to pick up on some of the elements that are of historic nature. We just felt that it was nicer to have a cleaner soffit element, because the third floor, we're really trying to create this illusion of transparency by having the clear glass, having this clean soffit, and having it sort of float up there so that the feeling of a three-story building is diminished.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I was just thinking—I don't know—to pull in some of the historic. I know it's just a balance between the new and the historic. I think it might be kind of neat to see some kind of a detail of a rafter tail. Maybe you can pull it off the window mullions that are occurring up at that level. I think that would give it a little bit more of a texture interest.

Chair Bernstein: We're still in the phase of asking questions for the applicant, and then we'll have comments after we hear from the public in a second. Any other questions for the staff or applicant before we move to questions for the public? Seeing none. I do have one speaker card from a member of the public, David Hirsch. Welcome. We usually limit the time for public comments for 5 minutes per speaker. Welcome.

David Hirsch: Good morning, Mr. Chairman, members of the HRB. I'm an architect with many years experience in New York City, during which I worked as principal on a number of significant historic projects. I'm a recent member of this community. My comments here result from seeing the earlier Avenidas illustrations in the newspaper, meeting with planning staff, attending earlier ARB meeting, studying the historic documents, meeting with Lisa Hendrickson to tour the Birge Clark building, and examining the most recent presentation. If this were a matter of just one architect's taste versus another's, I wouldn't be here making this presentation. My opinion is that there has been a serious error of interpreting the Secretary of Interior Standards of Rehabilitation, which directly causes this proposal to be unacceptable. There's a minimal evidence in the Historic Resource Evaluation report accepted by the Planning Department to justify the retention of the garage structure at the rear of the 450 Bryant Street building. It is likely that this minimal structure was considered by Birge Clark as an insignificant addition and an afterthought based on a change in the program after the main building was designed and constructed. In the historic report's list of exterior character-defining features, this accessory building is the last feature out of the 14 listed, certainly less important than two-story height, symmetrical facade on Bryant Street, open eaves with decorative rafter tails, arched openings at ground level, balconies at upper floor, ironwork including balcony railings, grills, and light fixtures. None of these significant features are characteristic of this one-story, ancillary garage structure. Any attribution of historic

authenticity to this garage cannot be justified by the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation as having distinctive features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that are characterized by a property to be preserved. The only reason to consider its importance is that Birge Clark perhaps had a hand in its creation since it dates back to the same timeframe. It has no significance relative to the historic use which merits its retention today. What is much more important to any significant new addition to an historic structure is the ninth standard of historic preservation. "That the new addition shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, architectural features to protect the integrity of the property and its environment." Everyone recognizes the importance of the Avenidas expansion program. Of that, there is no question. However, Avenidas and their architects have been severely constrained by the historic report's recommendation regarding this one-story garage element. Once the historic consultants determined that the garage should be retained, and this Board and the ARB and the Planning Department accepts this ruling as historically sacrosanct, the die is cast. No matter what is proposed, it will necessarily violate common sense design principles and damage the historic integrity of the Birge Clark building. You should certainly carefully review the impact of this new construction. At three stories, it blocks out a significant portion of the historic building's roofline, designed to project on all sides of the original, rectangular perimeter. At three stories, it overwhelms the one-story garage as viewed from the parking lot creating a ridiculous Mutt and Jeff relationship of scale and discontinuity. Although, shown in one illustration from across Cogswell Park, it is as though it is okay to be so prominent because it will be completely hidden from view behind a thicket of trees. The truth is it pokes out prominently beyond the Bryant Street view, overwhelming the scale of the original building, a disturbing intrusion relative to the lower scale Birge Clark facade. It is inconceivable to me how the Historic Resources Evaluation report can opine that the historic materials, features, size, proportion and massing of the new addition are compatible with that of historic police and fire building. Your acceptance of this statement would be a mistake in judgment. None of this is necessary. If the garage is removed, the new construction could accommodate the entire Avenidas program and a two-story structure entirely behind the Birge Clark building, scaled so that it will emphasize the importance of this historic building rather than detract from it. You must reject the recommendation of the Historic Resource Evaluation report to retain the garage and ask Avenidas to submit a revised scheme without this limitation and more compatible with the scale of the historic Palo Alto building. Would that we could have Birge Clark here to give credence to this critical evaluation. Thank you very much.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you, Mr. Hirsch. That's the only other speaker card I have received. Seeing none, we'll bring it back to the Board. I'm going to leave the public hearing open, in case there are any questions or comments from the applicant. Bringing it back to the Board. Comments or any other discussion items? Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I'd like to compliment the architectural team for responding to a number of our concerns when you were here last. I actually think this is a much better project than the first one we saw, but I still have a couple of issues with the design. As the last speaker just discussed, I'm a little concerned about the height and the compatibility of the new addition to the existing building. In particular, the Secretary of Interior Standard Number 9, which says that the new work shall be compatible with massing, size, scale and architectural features. It's 6 feet taller, and that's a problem for me. I understand the need for more space. I certainly support the expansion, but I do have some trouble with that. In addition, as I look at the elevations of the new addition, I'm troubled by the fact that it looks like the roof is floating above the building, because the connection between the building and the roof at the third floor is an all glass one. I understand architecturally why that would be interesting and desirable. To me, it kind of looks like the roof is popped off and is hovering. I cannot see that design being complementary or compatible to the existing building, which clearly as that building moves from the first story to the second, the second story gets smaller and the roof becomes kind of a dominant feature. As Board Member Wimmer has pointed out, I was a little concerned as well about the railing on the third-floor balcony. The balcony is a nice space, as I see it, but solid railings are not consistent with the open ironwork that's on the front of the building. Maybe that could be rethought. I actually don't like that motif; that's not relevant. My personal taste is not part of this discussion. I don't see that, as it moves around to the side of the building, don't understand that as an architectural feature. In addition, the window treatment of the new building is large pieces of glass. The existing building has multi-paned

window openings, so there are a lot of small pieces of glass. Typically in my limited experience, we would see some kind of—on the new addition, something that mimics but doesn't reproduce that multiunit motif on the original building, maybe larger panes of glass that were divided. As we see on the screen, there's a horizontal line sort of two-thirds of the way up those windows on the second floor. Maybe there's a (inaudible) line, but it just doesn't seem to me to be enough of a—it's too different for me. I'm also concerned about the separation between the garage and the addition. The previous speaker brings up an interesting point of whether or not that building retains enough of its original character to be considered historic. If it was a garage, it doesn't have any garage doors on it. It's obviously been considerably remodeled and repurposed. Maybe that is a consideration. I think at this point in time, it's probably not a consideration. Too much money and too difficult. If it's going to remain, it seems to me that glass atrium ought to have some space. I wouldn't think a lot, but it looks to me like the atrium comes right up to the edge of that building. I think it should have a little more separation. Finally, I'm pleased to see that we had a much better historic report both in terms of ARG's presentation this week than we had in our previous meeting, which was really horrible. I particularly liked the report by Dudek, where they brought up again the issue, on the second page of their review, about whether the new addition is compatible with the existing building in terms of height. Their conclusion is it's not necessarily—it's fair to say, I'll quote them, that the new addition does not fall into the category of something that's not recommended. This is on page 94 of our packet. Those are my concerns about this project. Obviously, as I said, I'm in support of this expansion. I think this is kind of tinkering around the edges. Thank you for bringing back a project to us that, I think, is more compatible with our previous comments.

Chair Bernstein: Other Board Members? Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: I guess one thing that jumps out to me is your proposal for the limestone running bond surface treatment on one of the major buildings. In my opinion, it's contextually incompatible with the historic fabric. I would suggest that you come up with a better idea. The other suggestion I would have is it might be worthwhile to invest in a model of this whole project, so we can see the interrelationships of the historic property with the proposed new project. I know this is not commonly done, but we do see it on complicated projects where there's interactions that occur and the effect upon historic properties. That would be a second recommendation I would have for you.

Chair Bernstein: Regarding the material of the limestone, what qualities of the limestone, do you think, makes it incompatible?

Board Member Makinen: If we take a look at Diagrams A5.2, 5.3, you can see it really jumps out as something severely different. In my opinion, it looks like a prison. Everybody has their own interpretation, but I think it looks like an old time prison.

Chair Bernstein: I understand your comment, and I've also had to explain as an architect to clients a lot. Perhaps Mr. Jones will appreciate the same comment too. Whenever there is a technical drawing showing joints, obviously the joints are shown in black ink, and then the limestone is shown in the color of the water paper. As the applicant mentioned, that's not the intent of the design to have a black and white grid system there. I think your idea of either a model or the photographs that the applicant has seen, then we won't see the black and white that is shown in (crosstalk).

Board Member Makinen: Perhaps a piece of the material so we can look at it in more detail.

Chair Bernstein: I think we have it right here. It would be—here it is.

Board Member Makinen: I mean a piece put together with several segments of the running bond.

Chair Bernstein: There is it, right there.

Board Member Makinen: I would put them together, though, so we can get a better idea. Maybe you won't see the joints. As Martin's pointed out, that might be the case. We need to be educated if that be the case.

Chair Bernstein: Board Member ...

Board Member Bower: I too had the same concern until I saw the example that was brought in this morning. I'm particularly sensitive to this because the building at High Street and Hamilton, that's just gone up, had a limestone exterior. I find it a shocking change from what we were presented. It looks to me like it has a big fur coat on the outside of the building. It's very rough. This limestone, I think, is different. I'm assuming it's like 2x3 or pretty big units. (inaudible) 12x24.

Chair Bernstein: The sample is smooth, I think. It's a smooth sample.

Board Member Bower: It's an absolutely smooth sample.

Board Member Makinen: What's wrong with just a stucco surface like the rest of the building? Let's not get fancy.

Board Member Bower: Does this have an eased edge? You see a little bit of the joint. Probably on a building that size, you wouldn't see much. I just wanted to add that comment.

Chair Bernstein: Other Board Members' comments or discussion?

Board Member Kohler: I think this is really a very nice presentation. As I look at the features that have been done, I'm not quite sure I could say there was anything that's really negative. I like the garage staying, for one thing. As you can see in the picture that's up there right now, you see the two people here in the parking lot looking over there. From that view right there, you see almost the whole half of the original building that's behind the tree there, such that all four sides of the original building can be seen. From the front, both sides and in the back, you see at least about half of it. The garage provides kind of a private patio area behind it, between the existing building and where the garage is now. I like the line work that runs around the different levels of the building, the glass entry with the tree in there, whatever is going to be in there. I think it's a quite well done project. It really works a lot better than the original project. I think having the stucco—this building's going to be with the stone exterior—that is really a nice exterior that we seldom see, not too often. Most of it's always stucco, painted stucco. To me, it's a huge, huge dramatic improvement. From the front and on both sides, you're going to see the existing building, and then in the back will be this addition, which will obviously be an addition. It's not trying to duplicate the building in the front, but it has lines that relate to the existing building. I'm going to vote for it, that it's very good, myself. Thank you.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I was thinking about the garage. Yes, it certainly is not as finished a design as all of the other parts. It was a response to the need of the automobile, which was definitely becoming an item at that point in history. Doesn't it serve as the place—there's always a need for a place to put the garbage cans, the GreenWaste, the recyclables. Is that where those are placed or do we know? Board Members are saying no, not there.

Board Member Kohler: 4.2 shows ...

Board Member Bower: (inaudible) potentially interior space.

Chair Bernstein: it sounds like, Beth, you're comment is to—you're in favor of retaining that existing structure. Correct?

Board Member Bunnenberg: I would think about retaining it as important. I do feel that it is basically compatible with the Secretary of Interior Standards. In terms of the comments about the little windows there on the second floor of the back of the building, I'm not sure whether recessing those windows a little bit more could give a little different treatment to that and perhaps more window (crosstalk).

Chair Bernstein: That's a comment to the applicant.

Board Member Bunnenberg: Those are my thoughts. Basically I feel like it's a muchly improved design, and I'm delighted to see it.

Chair Bernstein: Any other Board Members? Vice Chair Wimmer.

Vice Chair Wimmer: I agree. I think this presentation took into account all of our concerns for the first review. I think it's a lot more sensitive to the existing historic building. I think it's a much more interesting, inviting, attractive building. I still think that third level with the frieze of all glass is a little—I think that's going a little too modern, in my opinion. I would like to see some real windows up there. Maybe the window space 8 inches apart, and giving yourself an opportunity to come up with some kind of a wood rafter tail detail between the windows. That might, for me, make it a little less modern, a little bit more complementary. I think that balcony up there—I agree that I would feel more secure if that was a solid railing instead of an open iron railing, just for security reasons. I'm feeling positive about the application.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you. I'd like to comment on one of the statements made by the applicant in the applicant's printed page, that's our packet page 84. I'll just read it. It says, "Interior renovations are being designed to make this space feel open and inviting. We want visitors to be able to walk through the building and see what's going on and to be enticed to join in." I circled here. "Small spaces will combine into larger spaces. We also want pedestrians walking by on Bryant Street sidewalk to be able to look in and see what's going on." If you can turn to the proposed first-floor plan on page A4.2 of your drawings, I'll make a comment in response to the goal of the applicant. Looking on the right-hand side of that page, it's the Bryant Street there. We see the multipurpose room, the lobby and then the age laboratory there. Certainly more visibility from Bryant Street. My question is, if you look further in the floor plan, just below the space of the kitchen, it looks like that's an existing corridor right there. There's no name for that space there. My question is to emphasize even more what the applicant's statement made about the visibility. I do see between the dining room and the hallway leading to the back stairs; that's a glass partition according to your legend. If this little space immediately below the kitchen space, that's a former hallway right now. My question is can that space not be defined by walls. Can that be eliminated? What I'm leading to is that from Bryant Street and then if the risers on that back stair are transparent in some way to get actually a view from Bryant Street all the way through the entire structure back toward Ramona Street, would that be a possibility of a way to get even more transparency into the building? That's just a question of what is that space, because it's undefined. Thank you.

Mr. Jones: The area you're referring to is intended to be a part of the kitchen expansion area. The kitchen currently is out of date in some ways and needs to be remodeled. We haven't finalized all the interior arrangements, but I appreciate your comments. That's something we can definitely look at. At this stage, it was thought to be a part of the kitchen, actually a dish washing area to accommodate a more functional kitchen.

Chair Bernstein: That's what I thought. I've done a number of commercial kitchens, and sometimes the kitchens are the biggest spaces in the whole facility. You can then just consider the idea if those stair risers are somehow transparent, then we would complete a view all the way through. Just a suggestion. As everyone in the public and applicant's heard, on our July 23, 2015 comment about how the new addition is to be subordinate to the historic building, definitely this proposal that we're seeing today, I think, is definitely heading in that direction. If you look again on drawing on page A4.9, that's the rear view. The reason that I'm in support of this project compared to what we looked at last year, about the idea of the massing, is the third floor is just a glazed wall rather than anything solid. I did provide to the

public and staff just a little rendering about that. Maybe the architect can take a look at it too. What I'm looking at—if you look at A4.9 and also the molding detail on page A6.3, it's detail 9. Because this is a review session, you can see how the architect put on it—it says "conceptual exterior details, not final here." What I've done with this little rendering is showing the proposed conceptual cornice molding detail of about 14 inches roughly. There's no dimension but something like that. What this little rendering, that I provided for the public and the applicant and Board Members, is showing is even a stronger detail of that cornice molding as another comment to actually reduce the perceived mass and height of the three-story structure, so to emphasize even more that this is a two-story structure that has some glazing on an upper level. If you look on page A4.8, the previous page, you will see a very similar kind of cornice detail on a neighboring property. Look on the left-hand side of page A4.8; there's a very major cornice detail there. On A4.9, on the back, that was the genesis of the sketch that I provided for the public, the staff and the HRB and the applicant, showing a heavier detail there to really emphasize even more what the drawing on A4.9 is starting to suggest, like this is a two-story structure in perception. I use the word perception because, I think, what the world sees is what we perceive it to be. In other words, people aren't counting this is 48.87 inches or something tall; what's it visually look like? The idea of having the cornice and molding details, as the drawings are starting to head in that direction, this is just an idea to even make that even a stronger idea. The main point I want to make, I think, on a lot of the comments that we're hearing about the aesthetics and other issues is that—it's certainly my comment—there's no reduction in square footage, no change in floor plan, no change in functionality of the building. There's just aesthetic issues to address some of the visual aspects. I want to make that point. If it's perceived to be less massive, then that starts addressing the idea of compatibility with the neighborhood in terms of massing and scale. I have another comment. Was there any specific energy goals for this project? Any LEED rating or is there any goal for that project?

Ms. French: The City's regulations for nonresidential buildings here in town is CalGreen. We have some energy REACH requirements these days. It seems to be a reasonable application to the new portion of the building to use those standards as opposed to the LEED Silver certification process. The City's been looking at this. For City buildings, we typically require the LEED Silver certification, which is kind of an equivalency to what we're requiring today. I think what we're requiring should maybe be more stringent than those standards. Because it is a long-term lease, we are looking at their request favorably to not have to go and certify with the U.S. Green Building Council. Yes, there will be energy requirements and all of that for the new addition.

Chair Bernstein: That might tie into Board Member Bunnenberg's comment about the windows up on the second floor facing Ramona Street of the inset. You get a little more shading on the glass, for example. I also have a comment, again, on page A4.9, the rendering. It's referring to the decorative panels on the top of the glass area there. I did see that you had the similar kind of detail on the Cogswell Plaza facade. My initial comment—I circled it on that drawing—was either delete those features or significantly reduce the visual impact of it. My thought was are they really contributing to the compatibility with the historic structure or do they start introducing a new element that doesn't exist anywhere on the historic structure. I just either said delete or significantly reduce the visual impact of those. That was just a comment when I saw those here. Also on that other comment I circled here on A4.9 was to help reduce the apparent height of the building or the mass of the building is with the glazed window system up on the third floor, if whatever detailing or coloration could be done to minimize that. Also, just to conclude my other comment about the rendering is emphasizing the second-floor cornice detail and minimizing the third-floor roof overhang. Just to kind of keep the building mass lower, to get that perception that it's not a three-story building, but it's a two-story structure visually speaking. Those are my comments to date. Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I have one question for the architect. I'm just noting that on page A5.2, the elevation of the addition shows the windows as being down on the—let's see. This is the northwest elevation. It shows three windows wide, three high on the first floor. When I go over to page A6.3, suddenly, I think—I don't know where those windows are. I see. The southeast elevation has a different window profile than the northwest. I saw that they're more divided, which actually is, I think, more compatible. I'm wondering why that motif doesn't actually move through the elevations. The southeast

seems to me to look more like the original building, and yet the northwest seems to be more modern, open, large pieces of glass.

Chair Bernstein: Does the Board have any—Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: Just one more question that popped up here. On drawing A4.9, way in the top near the roofline, am I looking at another building in the background or is that an elevator shaft?

Chair Bernstein: That's the parking structure across the street.

Board Member Makinen: That explains it.

Chair Bernstein: That explains it, good. Board Members have any comment on the historic evaluation or the peer review historic evaluation? Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg. Just in general, I found the peer review very, very appropriate. I think that they managed to find the significant features. Just as a comment for the previous bit, I too think I like those smaller windows that were on the—not on the back side of the second floor, but more adjacent to the building. I did not find any difficulties with the reports that we ...

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: Just one additional to congratulate the author, on page 41, for the very explicit definition of the character-defining features of 450 Bryant Street, which sometimes we do not see the character-defining features, but here they're clearly outlined. I think that's a good example to follow for other future projects.

Chair Bernstein: Any other comments? We'll bring it back to the applicant to see if the applicant—invite the applicant if he'd like to make any closing comments; you're welcome to do so if you'd like to.

Mr. Jones: I'd just like to thank the Board today for your comments. You've been helpful, when we were before you last time. Today you've done us a good service in terms of giving us your feedback and commentary. Our group looks forward to finding a way that we synthesize these comments into a framework that will gain your approval in the future. Thank you very much.

Chair Bernstein: You're welcome. Staff, do you have any comments or questions or requests from the Board?

Ms. French: The logistical request would be if you could do me the favor of, at the end of this, motion, second and continue to a date uncertain, that would be helpful. This is the first hearing for this project. If there was any discussion the Board would want to have about how we feel this area might be a historic area or unique, then I can help the ARB through that part. Obviously the first meeting that they're going to have is on the 16th. We're not going to come forward with findings, because it's their first meeting as well. We won't be asking them to provide a recommendation or discuss the findings. To that end, if you could maybe think about that, if you're not ready to say anything about that or think about it now as to whether that type of concern exists on the block and in the overall area, given the context.

Chair Bernstein: Any Board Members like to—Board Member Bunnenberg.

Board Member Bunnenberg: That's an extremely important point. Thank you very much. This to me is an area of surrounding architectural structures that are also historic. It is very important to maintain that whole axis and area of historic structures. This is something that sometimes gets missed and has recently caused some difficulties, because of lack of considering of the nearby structures. I think that's a very important point to stress. Certainly to move to a date uncertain appears to me to be ...

Chair Bernstein: Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: Amy, in the Dudek report, in their summary of review, page 94, they raise the question about whether this building should be considered—the characteristics—I'm sorry. We shouldn't have a conversation about whether this building is eligible for the National Registry of Historic Buildings. I wonder if that's a consideration for a future hearing or at what point would that be appropriate. They're referring to some language in the ARG report, which hints at that but doesn't really resolve it.

Ms. French: Let's say for our environmental review process, to make sure that these things are addressed fully in that analysis, so that we are doing our due diligence on our environmental review. I'm not really sure to (inaudible).

Chair Bernstein: Regarding the peer review of the Historic Resource Evaluation, on our packet page 93, Section 8.4, I think this is really important to be part of our record regarding the recommendation by the peer reviewer that the construction protection plan be part of the final construction drawings. That's the first bullet of 8.4. Whenever things are going to be decided during construction, that there be a comment on how are those things reviewed and decided upon. The main thing on 8.4, which is on packet page 93, is that in the final construction drawings a construction protection plan of the historic resource be a requirement for those drawings. A question for Amy. For this recommendation, would that require a motion and a second and a vote? Is that okay to do?

Ms. French: Sure. Again, it's not a date certain, so we are going to re-advertise. That is just helpful to the process. Thank you.

MOTION

Chair Bernstein: I'd like to move that the HRB—I'll just read the recommendation and see if that's agreed to. It is recommended that the Historic Resources Board take the following actions: review and provide input on the attached Historic Resource Evaluation and plans for the Avenidas project, which we have just completed; and that we continue the hearing to a date uncertain. Is that agreed by the Board? All those in favor, say aye. That passes; we agree to that. Anything else that the Staff needs from us on this agenda item?

Ms. French: No, this is great. Thank you so much for your efforts on this.

Chair Bernstein: The Avenidas team, thank you very much for your very wonderful presentation. I think we're moving in a good direction. With that, this agenda item is completed. Thank you very much. Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: Just a comment. I want to compliment the staff on this presentation of the materials. It's bound, it's indexed, it's numbered by each page. It is a lot easier for us, I think, as we are discussing this to be able to refer to a page. It's all in one place. We're not losing all the different things. I would encourage this in the future.

Chair Bernstein: Thank you for that.

Study Session

None.

Minutes Approval: May 12, 2016

Chair Bernstein: Next on our agenda item is approval of minutes of May 12, 2016. Any motion to approve or amend? Board Member Bower.

Board Member Bower: I've reviewed the minutes. We had a lively discussion with the applicant. The minutes, I think, reflect that discussion, but in some cases I thought that the minutes actually could have been streamlined maybe so that the grammar was better.

Chair Bernstein: It's on page 97, Roger.

Board Member Bower: This is really not a criticism, but it looked to me like somebody, maybe an automated service, just took the recording and transcribed it.

Chair Bernstein: As far as our action to do on these minutes, either we can make some proposed amendments and vote on those or ...

MOTION

Board Member Bower: I guess I would move to accept them with the understanding that I don't think this is a verbatim. The minutes convey the information we discussed with the clients, but I think it's not entirely accurate.

Chair Bernstein: There's a motion to accept these. Is there a second?

Board Member Bunnenberg: I would like to make a comment before deciding. We have in the past also said that sometimes the sense minutes got so brief that they didn't capture the individual opinions that were expressed. We were not always unanimous in what we were saying. I would caution that I don't want to go back to seeing the Board heard it, moved and seconded this motion, and that's it. The sense minutes began to look that way. I ...

Chair Bernstein: We still have a motion that doesn't have a second yet to approve the minutes.

Board Member Kohler: I'll second.

Chair Bernstein: It's been seconded. Any discussion before we vote? All in favor say aye. That passes unanimously. Thank you.

Board Member Bunnenberg: No.

Chair Bernstein: I'm sorry. I misspoke. Board Member Bower, Kohler, Wimmer, Bernstein and Makinen voted yes. Board Member Bunnenberg voted no on the approval of the minutes. That does pass. Thank you.

Subcommittee Item

Chair Bernstein: Next on our agenda is Subcommittee Items. I see none.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Chair Bernstein: Board Member questions, comments and announcements? Board Member Makinen.

Board Member Makinen: Are we scheduled for a meeting on the 9th?

Ms. French: No, we are not scheduled for a meeting on the 9th. I'm sorry I don't have in front of me the upcoming schedule. I know we're canceling June 23rd. I'm going to have to send an email out. I don't want to say it in the public hearing that it's canceled because it may very well have been advertised, and I'm just not aware.

Board Member Makinen: None for the 23rd, but ...

Ms. French: Yeah, we're canceling the 23rd. I know we're meeting in July. I'm kind of that far ahead. I'll verify and send an email out to the entire Board as to the status of that meeting.

Chair Bernstein: Any other comments, questions, announcements by the Board? Seeing none, we are adjourned. Thank you.

Adjournment