



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 7275)

Report Type: Study Session **Meeting Date:** 11/10/2016

Summary Title: Historic Resource Bulletin and Study Session Discussion

Title: The Historic Resources Review Board Will Review, Comment and, as Applicable, Provide Direction to Staff on the Updated Bulletin and Policy Guidance on Future Study Session Discussions.

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Historic Resources Board (HRB) take the following action:

1. Review and provide comments, as appropriate.

Background

This report follows up on two initiatives recently discussed with the HRB.

Historic Resources Bulletin

On October 11, 2016, the HRB reviewed the 'final version' of the bulletin and asked staff to forward modifications to the HRB prior to releasing the document to the public. Staff revised the bulletin and sent the bulletin to the HRB members via email on October 14, 2016. The final version is attached to this report (Attachment A) and has been uploaded to the City's website. No further action is required at this time.

HRB Study Sessions

On a pilot program basis, planning staff is now accepting applicant requests for Study Sessions before the HRB. Study Session discussions will be conducted with a quorum of the HRB as opposed to subcommittee review. Staff will devise application materials in order to ensure the HRB has sufficient information to provide comments and guidance. Initially, there will be no fee for Study Session requests; however, staff will evaluate the resource demand and may make future recommendations to the City Council to charge a fee, if warranted. A request for a Study Session is voluntary and non-binding on an applicant.

Report Author & Contact Information

Amy French, AICP, Chief Planning Official
(650) 329-2336

amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

HRB¹ Liaison & Contact Information

Amy French, AICP, Chief Planning Official
(650) 329-2336

amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Historic Resources Review Info Bulletin 10.13.16 (PDF)
- Attachment B: December 2015 Report to HRB on Work Program ID #6448 (PDF)
- Attachment C: HRB July 14, 2016 Report on Study Sessions ID # 7083 (PDF)
- Attachment D: HRB meeting minutes 07-14-16 HRB transcript (PDF)
- Attachment E: ARB Submittal Checklist for Prelim Review (PDF)

¹ Emails may be sent directly to the HRB using the following address: hrb@cityofpaloalto.org



Historic Resources & Permit Review Requirements



- Historic resources enrich the quality of life in Palo Alto. They include buildings, structures, sites, and areas of historical, architectural, and cultural significance. The Planning Department groups historic resources according to the development application review procedures that apply. Some development projects involving historic resources are subject to review under the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance (Municipal Code Chapter 16.49) and/or the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), as explained further below and on the reverse page.
- For information on a specific property, please review a Parcel Report for the subject property, available at the City's website at <http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/gov/depts/pln/parcel.asp>, or request a Parcel Report from City staff at: Development Services, 285 Hamilton Avenue; (650) 329-2496; planner@cityofpaloalto.org.

What is a "Group A" Historic Resource?

A "Group A" historic resource is an existing property that is listed in the Palo Alto Historic Inventory, and which is subject to Historic Resources Board (HRB) review under the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance. A "Group A" resource may also be subject to CEQA review as explained on the reverse page. "Group A" resources include historic properties that are **one or more of the following**:

- Listed in the City's Inventory as Historic Category 1-2; or
- Listed in the City's Inventory as Historic Category 3-4 and located in the Downtown Area; or
- Located in one of the City's locally designated historic districts, Professorville or Ramona Street.

What is a "Group B" Historic Resource?

A "Group B" historic resource is an existing property that was previously designated or formally evaluated, and which may be subject to CEQA review as explained on the reverse page. "Group B" resources are subject to HRB review if CEQA review indicates that a resource may be impacted. "Group B" resources include historic properties that are **one or more of the following**:

- Listed in the City's Inventory as Historic Category 3-4 and located outside of the Downtown Area and local historic districts; or
- Listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NR) or the California Register of Historical Resources (CR); or
- Listed in the Palo Alto Historic Survey Update (Dames & Moore, 1997-2000) as NR-eligible or CR-eligible; or
- Previously determined CR-eligible through a development application review procedure.

When Does a Property Require Evaluation as a Historic Resource?

A property that has not yet been evaluated or designated may qualify as a historic resource for the purposes of CEQA review. In the case of a development application being filed for certain properties which have not yet been evaluated or designated, a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report to determine CR-eligibility may be required in order to complete a CEQA review. The City of Palo Alto may require an HRE report to be completed for an existing property if the property **meets all of the following conditions**:

- A "discretionary" development application proposes demolition, new construction, new addition, or other substantial exterior alterations; and
- The existing development on the property is more than 45 years old; and
- The existing property is not a single-family residence in a Single-Family Residential zone. (A single-family residence in any non-Single Family Residential zone, or a non-single family residence in any zone, is subject.)

See the reverse page for application review procedures.



**APPLICATION REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR HISTORIC RESOURCES
AND PROPERTIES THAT REQUIRE HISTORIC RESOURCE EVALUATION**



HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORDINANCE (PAMC 16.49) REVIEW PROCEDURES	CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) REVIEW PROCEDURES
<p>“GROUP A” HISTORIC RESOURCES</p> <p><i>See the reverse page for explanation of properties that qualify as “Group A” Historic Resources.</i></p>	
<p>Route any permit applications for exterior changes (including ministerial) to the Historic Resources Planner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Planner reviews the application for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* (“Standards”) and the Historic Preservation Ordinance. ➤ If the project is inconsistent with the Standards, or it exceeds the scope of a “minor exterior alteration” according to the Historic Preservation Ordinance, the Planner refers the application to the HRB. 	<p>Route discretionary development applications** for exterior changes to the Historic Resources Planner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Planner reviews the application for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* and potential impacts to a historic resource per CEQA. ➤ If CEQA analysis indicates that there may be a potential impact to a historic resource, the Planner refers the application to the HRB.
<p>“GROUP B” HISTORIC RESOURCES</p> <p><i>See the reverse page for explanation of properties that qualify as “Group B” Historic Resources.</i></p>	
<p>Not subject to the review procedures in the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance.</p> <p>(Only “Group A” properties are subject to review under the Historic Preservation Ordinance. For more information, see PAMC 16.49.050.)</p>	<p>Route discretionary development applications** for exterior changes to the Historic Resources Planner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Planner reviews the application for consistency with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation* and potential impacts to a historic resource per CEQA. ➤ If CEQA analysis indicates that there may be a potential impact to a historic resource, the Planner refers the application to the HRB.
<p>PROPERTIES THAT REQUIRE EVALUATION AS HISTORIC RESOURCES</p> <p><i>See the reverse page for explanation of when a property requires evaluation as a historic resource.</i></p>	
<p>Not subject to the review procedures in the City’s Historic Preservation Ordinance.</p> <p>(Only “Group A” properties are subject to review under the Historic Preservation Ordinance. For more information, see PAMC 16.49.050.)</p>	<p>Route discretionary development applications** for demolition, new construction, addition, or substantial exterior alterations to the Historic Resources Planner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The Planner determines if a Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) report is required in order to conduct and complete CEQA review. If a property is found to be eligible for the California Register of Historical Places, it is reviewed as a “Group B” historic resource.

*The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation are found on the National Park Service’s website at:

<https://www.nps.gov/tps/standards/rehabilitation.htm>.

**Discretionary development applications include: Architectural Review; Design Enhancement Exception; Home Improvement Exception; Neighborhood Preservation Exception; Single Family Individual Review; Site and Design Review; Variance.



City of Palo Alto Historic Resources Board Staff Report

(ID # 6448)

Report Type:**Meeting Date: 12/10/2015****Summary Title: Historic Preservation Work Program****Title: Historic Preservation Work Program****From: City Manager****Lead Department: Historic Resources Board**

Recommendation

Staff requests that the HRB review the attached recommended work program (see Attachment A) and provide any clarifications, corrections, and/or additions. Following review and comment by the HRB, staff will transmit the recommended work program to the City Council, and will seek Council's input on the program elements, as well as permission to proceed as staff resources allow.

Background

The City Council and the HRB conducted a Study Session on May 6, 2015. At the meeting, Council and HRB members provided comments and recommendations on matters related to Palo Alto's historic preservation work program and activities. No actions were taken. A recording can be found at <http://midpenmedia.org/city-council-special-meeting-3/>.

Discussion

Based on the matters discussed at the Study Session and at various HRB meetings, staff compiled the HRB's recommended multi-year historic preservation work program items as listed in Attachment A. This work program was developed using the HRB's expert knowledge of topics and issues relevant to historic preservation in Palo Alto, and on the previous direction that was provided by Council on May 6, 2015.

Prepared by: Matthew Weintraub, Planner

Reviewed by: Jodie Gerhardt, AICP, Current Planning Manager

Attachments:

- Attachment A: Historic Preservation Work Program 12.03.15 (PDF)

Recommended Historic Preservation Work Program
12/03/15

<i>Program Item</i>	<i>HRB's Proposed Activities</i>
1. Public Outreach and Education	Conduct outreach and education to property owners, architects and design professionals, land developers, and members of the general public, in order to facilitate and encourage input on historic preservation work program items and other preservation topics. Specific methods may include: HRB informational hearings and community workshops; preservation bulletins and hand-outs; publication of information and materials on the City's website; direct mailings to owners and/or organizations; presentations to owners, agencies and/or organizations; and partnerships with local preservation organizations.
2. Certified Local Government	Make full use of the benefits available to Palo Alto as a current Certified Local Government (CLG) by the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP), including: apply for CLG grants to implement selected preservation work program items; participate in preservation conferences, workshops, and trainings for Board members and staff; and seek technical advice and guidance from OHP staff on long range preservation work program items.
3. Professorville Historic Design Guidelines	Complete the Professorville Historic Design Guidelines in order to provide property owners, architects, HRB and staff with tools to evaluate proposed alterations and new construction. The multi-year project began at Council's direction in 2011. It is partially funded by a 2015-2016 CLG grant.
4. Modern Age Context Statement	Develop a Modern Age context statement for Palo Alto, in order to facilitate understanding and appreciation of "recent past" resources, such as Mid-Century Modern architecture and Silicon Valley history. The project may be eligible for a 2016-2017 CLG grant.
5. Survey Update	In coordination with the results of the Comprehensive Plan Update, develop a proposal for a multi-year survey update to address specific information needs in Palo Alto, which may include: "recent past"

**Recommended Historic Preservation Work Program
12/03/15**

<i>Program Item</i>	<i>HRB's Proposed Activities</i>
	resources; resources located in special planning areas; resources that may be affected by long range plans or programs; and resources of special interest to property owners and the community at large. Survey activities may be eligible for CLG grants.
6. Historic Inventory Update	Contact owners of properties in the Greenmeadow and Green Gables districts (which are listed in the National and California Registers, but which are not locally designated), to provide information and gauge interest in nominating the districts for inclusion in the City's Historic Inventory; and pursue nominations with owner support.
7. Code Update	Assist the Council, other Boards and Commissions, and City staff with the multi-year, multi-phase effort to update sections of the Municipal Code, in order to make clarifications, update procedures, and/or adjust review standards to the benefit of the community. Future code updates to be considered may include provisions of the Historic Preservation Ordinance (Chapter 16.49) and/or other code sections that relate to the disposition of historic properties.
8. Study Sessions	Develop procedures for providing and/or requiring HRB Study Sessions prior to formal review, in order to make available HRB advice to owners and applicants early in the design development process.
9. Preservation Incentives	Review existing local code incentives for preservation in Palo Alto, as well as those of other California communities, and develop proposals for making incentives more widely available to historic property owners, more beneficial to the general public, and more effective in preservation.



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 7083)

Report Type: Study Session **Meeting Date:** 7/14/2016

Summary Title: Discussion Regarding the Use of Study Sessions

Title: Discussion regarding Historic Resources Board Study Sessions allowing for preliminary comments on proposed designs early in the design and development process.

From: Jonathan Lait

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Historic Resources Board (HRB) take the following action:

1. Discuss potential implementation of Study Sessions.

Background

The topic of study sessions, and/or early review of project designs by the HRB, has been a recurring topic at City Council and HRB meetings. On March 14, 2011, the City Council directed the HRB and staff to work with the community toward early HRB review of project designs for homes within the Professorville Historic District. This resulted in an HRB recommendation to include HRB study sessions in a proposed new Guideline 6 for Single-Family Individual Review (IR). However, the proposed new Guideline 6 has not been adopted, and it is not currently proposed for adoption, due in part to its limited applicability to IR applications only. More recently on May 26th, 2016, the HRB requested that the topic of study sessions be placed on an upcoming agenda for discussion.

Preliminary Reviews

Currently, the City's zoning code and the Planning and Community Environment (PCE) Department's fee schedule include "Preliminary Review" by the Architectural Review Board (ARB) as an application type. This application type allows private property owners to pay a fee of \$1,247 for early review of major projects by the ARB in a public hearing prior to the submittal of a formal, actionable application. Zoning Code Section 18.76.020 (c) sets forth the ARB Preliminary Review process as follows:

- (c) Preliminary Review

For the purpose of securing the advice of the architectural review board prior to making an application for the board's recommendation on a project, an applicant, upon paying a preliminary application fee, as set forth in the municipal fee schedule, may bring a design before the board for preliminary review. If the applicant wishes to proceed with the project, he or she must then file an application and pay a regular application fee. The comments of the architectural review board members during a preliminary review shall not be binding on their formal recommendation.

For applications subject to HRB review, there is currently no similar code section or application fee for an HRB preliminary review process.

Committee Reviews

For many years, the ARB has had a two-member "standing" committee which conducts reviews of projects to determine compliance with adopted conditions of approval as recommended by the ARB during the formal review process, and to assist staff in its review of Architectural Review applications which are not subject to review by the full ARB. The sub-committee reviews occur at the end of the ARB meetings, and they are published on the agenda and open to public attendance.

There is not currently an HRB standing committee which conducts similar reviews to assist staff in determining compliance with HRB recommended conditions of approval and/or to assist staff in conducting administrative reviews. In the past, the HRB has appointed ad hoc committees to conduct these kinds of reviews on a case-by-case basis.

Discussion

Currently, any request for an HRB study session and/or other type of preliminary review is not addressed in the City's codes or application review procedures, as discussed above. In order for HRB study sessions and/or other types of preliminary reviews to occur in the future, these items are required to be addressed, as discussed further below.

City Code

Preliminary Reviews by the ARB are currently authorized as an application type by the City's zoning code, as discussed above. In order for the HRB to conduct similar preliminary reviews, staff has determined that a similar new code provision may be needed. Code amendments require City Council approval.

However, according to the current HRB Rules and Regulations and By-laws, Section 4.0, the Chairperson shall appoint special committees as they may be desired or required. Business to be conducted by an HRB committee may include preliminary design review and comment on proposed work as requested by a prospective applicant, prior to formal review and consideration by the HRB and/or staff.

Application Review Fees

Application review fees are required for formal application items such as ARB Preliminary Reviews. In order for the HRB to conduct similar formal preliminary reviews, staff recommends that a new fee would need to be calculated and established. Establishment of new fees requires City Council approval.

However, application review fees would not necessarily be required for informal reviews of proposed development applications by a non-quorum HRB committee. If no fee is collected, staff would not conduct a formal analysis or prepare a report.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the HRB establish a standing committee of three (3) HRB members to conduct HRB study sessions. The purpose of the study sessions would be for the HRB committee members to review and provide preliminary comments on proposed designs involving historic resources, at the request of prospective applicants and prior to submittal of formal development applications. If a formal application review process is already underway, a study session may occur if it does not cause a violation of the Permit Streamlining Act or other codified time constraint. Currently, the City's codes do not authorize the HRB or staff to require study sessions as an additional mandatory review procedure either prior to or after a formal application submittal. Therefore, HRB study sessions would be optional for applicants and prospective applicants.

Staff recommends that study sessions occur at the end of HRB meetings, similar to the current ARB sub-committee arrangement. Project addresses and project descriptions for study sessions would be included on HRB meeting agendas. An HRB quorum would not be required for study sessions, because no formal actions would occur.

Staff proposes that interested parties may submit materials to staff for HRB study session review up to 10 days before the meeting date, which allows time for staff to confirm that the materials are reviewable and to list an item on the agenda. Typical materials required for study session review would include, but may not be limited to: a written project description; property photographs; building elevation drawings; and a site plan. Staff proposes to forward complete study session materials to HRB members "as is"; staff would not conduct a review or prepare a report. Staff would participate in the study session review.

Next Steps

The HRB may take the following courses of action:

- The HRB may concur with staff's recommendation to have a rotational subcommittee of three HRB members to conduct study sessions, which would be noted at the end of HRB agendas (posted at least 72 hours prior to the hearing), and open to the public.
- The HRB may request that the City Council amend the City's codes in order to provide for HRB Preliminary Review as a formal application type (similar to the existing ARB Preliminary Review), in addition to or as an alternative to HRB committee study sessions.
- The HRB may take another course of action as deemed appropriate by the HRB.

Report Author & Contact Information

Matthew Weintraub, Historic Planner
(650) 329-2247

matthew.weintraub@cityofpaloalto.org

HRB¹ Liaison & Contact Information

Amy French, AICP, Chief Planning Official
(650) 329-2336

amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org

¹ Emails may be sent directly to the HRB using the following address: hrb@cityofpaloalto.org



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: July 14, 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, Michael Makinen

Absent: Board Member Patricia DiCicco

Oral Communications

None.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

None.

Minutes Approval June 9, 2016.

Chair Bernstein corrected the Minutes, page 3, from "the ordinance required a first floor be more than 3 feet" to "the ordinance required a first floor be no more than 3 feet."

MOTION:

Chair Bernstein moved, seconded by Board Member Bower, to approve the Minutes of June 9, 2016 as amended.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0 DiCicco absent

Public Hearing

- 1. Discussion regarding Historic Resources Board Study Sessions allowing for preliminary comments on proposed designs early in the design and development process.** For additional information, contact amy.french@cityofpaloalto.org.

Amy French recalled the HRB requested an agenda item regarding Study Sessions. She explained the process for Architectural Review Board Study Sessions. Staff recommended the HRB utilize the same process.

Matthew Weintraub noted the two procedures available to the ARB were Preliminary Review and Committee Review. Staff analyzed those two processes and recommended the Committee Review for the HRB as it could be implemented immediately.

Board Member Bower inquired whether the ARB or staff participated in a Preliminary Review. Mr. Weintraub responded the ARB provided input to an applicant through a Preliminary Review prior to a formal Application Review. Ms. French added that in a Preliminary Review staff provided public notice

and a formal staff report and circulated plans with some analysis to the ARB. The Committee Review did not include a staff report. Board Members and staff discussed whether Board Members not participating as members of the subcommittee could attend the subcommittee meeting as part of the audience; whether comments from the subcommittee would be binding; the Permit Streamlining Act; whether the applicant should submit plans more than 10 days prior to the scheduled hearing; naming an alternate member for the subcommittee; documents applicants should submit for a Study Session; costs for a Study Session; differences between the existing practice and the proposed practice; and ways to notify the public of the availability of Study Sessions.

Board Member Makinen favored holding Study Sessions, but did not favor the Committee Review process. He suggested the full HRB participate in a Study Session. Any fees associated with Study Sessions should be minimal or nonexistent. Ms. French advised full Board participation could indicate to the applicant how the Board might vote on the project. Full Board participation was an acceptable approach; however, it would require amending the Zoning Code. Board Member Kohler agreed that it would be more efficient for the full Board to participate in a Study Session. Mr. Weintraub suggested the Board discuss participation and provide direction to staff. Vice Chair Wimmer suggested applicants not provide plans or pay a fee and limiting the time for each applicant. Staff recommended some prescreening of materials to ensure sufficient information was provided for review. Not requiring a fee would eliminate staff reports and staff analysis of projects. Staff would only review materials to ensure they were sufficient for review. Board Member Bower understood the advantages of both subcommittee and full Board Study Sessions. He suggested subcommittee members be selected at the meetings. Mr. Weintraub suggested the first Study Session for a project be comprised of the full Board. If that review indicated the project would benefit from intensive review and comment, then the Chair could appoint a subcommittee for that specific project. The subcommittee could report to the full Board at a future meeting. Board Member Bower did not believe two meetings would be efficient. Mr. Weintraub clarified details of the subcommittee process.

Board Member Bower commented that the consensus seemed to be full Board participation in Study Sessions. Applicant submissions should include a property description, photographs, elevation drawings, a site plan and other materials the applicant wished to provide. Study Sessions should be held at the end of HRB meetings with public notice. Board Member Makinen suggested the applicant's materials include a general statement of historic characteristics that may be sensitive for the specific project or neighborhood that the project resides in. Chair Bernstein suggested the applicant also submit a floor plan. He felt the statement would be intimidating for an applicant. The HRB would comment on historic characteristics during the Study Session. Board Member Bower suggested applicants should read the Secretary of the Interior Standards prior to attending a Study Session. Board Member Bower believed Study Sessions should be encouraged prior to a formal application. Board Members discussed the materials to be submitted for a Study Session.

MOTION:

Board Member Bower moved, seconded by Chair Bernstein, to continue the item to a date uncertain.

MOTION PASSED: 6-0 DiCicco absent

Board/Staff Announcements

Board Member Bower attended a discussion of the Mills Act and provided a summary of the discussion. He suggested the Chair appoint a committee to develop a process for Mills Act properties. Chair Bernstein requested staff agendaize an item on this topic.

Mr. Weintraub reported the Professorville Design Guidelines were scheduled for the July 28 HRB meeting. They were scheduled for presentation to the Council on September 12th.

Ms. French indicated an audit report of the IR program would be presented to the Planning and Transportation Commission on August 10th.

Adjournment



CHECKLIST

ARB Submittal for PRELIMINARY REVIEW

Please provide the following items for the City of Palo Alto to review.
Incomplete application packages may not be accepted

1. An appointment is required to submit all applications. Appointments can be made in person at the Development Center, 285 Hamilton Avenue, or by calling the Planning Division at (650) 329-2441.
2. Planning Application Form
 Items 1-5 completed
 Property Owner's signature (Written authorization from Stanford University if located on Stanford land)
3. **Written Project Description:** Provide a statement of the desired focus of the preliminary review. It is recommended that the applicant provide an explanation of what they would like the Board to focus their attention on - massing, context, site planning, style, materials, etc. A summary of the project proposal should include such things as the project proposal, the design concept, the relationship to existing conditions on and off the site, and existing and proposed uses.
4. **Photographic Display [Optional]:** Photographs showing the relationship of the proposed project to adjacent buildings and to the neighborhood.
5. **Sketches/Plans** (Bound and Folded) The following items are suggested. Information must be consistent on all sheets. Plans shall be no larger than 24" x 36"
 - A. **Plan Sets:**
 16 sets for ARB review (8 full-size and 8 half-size sets)
 10 additional half-size sets for HRB review if site is on the Historic Inventory
 - B. **Vicinity Map:**
 Small schematic map showing the location of the site within the City
 - C. **Project Information,** provide the following project data on cover sheet and site plan
 Lot Area
 Existing Lot Coverage
 Proposed Lot Coverage
 Existing Floor Area (FAR)
 Proposed Floor Area (FAR)
 Required Parking
 Residential Density, if applicable
 - D. **Site Sketches:** show existing conditions and proposed changes
 Scale
 North arrow (orient all sheets in the same direction)
 Dimensioned property lines
 Footprint of all buildings and structures on the site
 Parking area, driveways, sidewalks, and other hardscape areas
 Zoning setback lines (including Stanford setback lines if applicable)
 Any easements or encumbrances across the property
 Creeks or waterways on or adjacent to the property (indicate 'top of bank')

E. **Building Study:**

- ___ Conceptual Building elevations
- ___ Sketches to convey proposed architectural character and massing
- ___ Neighborhood context sketch with new building/s shown

6. **Fee Schedule**

Note: Please do not include the following items unless specific feedback on these items is desired:

- A. Detailed apartment unit floor plans
- B. Irrigation, grading and drainage plans

If there are any questions regarding submittal requirements, please contact city staff.

<http://www.cityofpaloalto.org/arb>

Development Center, 285 Hamilton Ave., Palo Alto, Ca 94301

[Planning: \(650\) 329-2441](tel:6503292441)

[Building: \(650\) 329-2496](tel:6503292496)

[Fire: \(650\) 329-2135](tel:6503292135)

[Public Works: \(650\) 329-2151](tel:6503292151)