



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 7281)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 9/8/2016

Summary Title: Minutes Approval

Title: Approval of July 28, 2016 Historic Resources Board Meeting Minutes

From: Hillary Gitelman

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Historic Resources Board (HRB) approve the attached Minutes.



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: July 28, 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 Beth Bunnenberg, Patricia Di Cicco, Roger Kohler

Absent: Board Members David Bower and Michael Makinen

Oral Communications

None.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

None.

City Official Reports

1. Meeting Schedule and Attendance

Matthew Weintraub reported no items were scheduled for the August 11, 2016 meeting and one item was scheduled for the August 25, 2016 meeting.

Action Items

2. **Draft Professorville Historic District Design Guidelines** - Informational Presentation to the Historic Resources Board. Board members and the public may provide comments on the draft guidelines. Final guidelines will be proposed for adoption at a future hearing. For additional information contact the planner, matthew.weintraub@cityofpaloalto.org.

Mr. Weintraub advised that staff and the consultant team incorporated comments from the HRB, staff and the public into the Guidelines.

Jonathan Rusch, Page and Turnbull, reviewed objectives for revising the Guidelines. Generally revisions expressed preferences while acknowledging the need for flexibility on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Rusch provided the rationale for changes to text and illustrations.

Mr. Weintraub remarked regarding comments that were received but not necessarily addressed in the Guidelines.

Board Member Bunnenberg requested Staff discuss cumulative effects and exemptions from CEQA. Mr. Weintraub clarified that the Guidelines were recommendations to the property owner, architect, the Board and staff on how to achieve compliance with Standards. Any project could comply with Standards and still have a minimal effect or change. Tracking potential cumulative effects was beyond the scope of the Guidelines. Board Member Bunnenberg inquired whether the Board could request monitoring of projects. Mr. Weintraub replied yes. The Board could recommend conditions of approval that would

involve monitoring. Board Member Bunnenberg commented that the Board's determination whether moving a structure within a lot was needed or wanted was subjective. Mr. Weintraub noted the Guidelines provided parameters for moving or lifting buildings as appropriate.

Board Member Di Cicco felt the Guidelines provided direction as well as flexibility for projects.

Vice Chair Wimmer suggested creating a companion document that highlighted salient points of the Guidelines. Mr. Weintraub explained that an index was added to the Guidelines to address this issue. The scope of the project did not include development of another document. Board Member Kohler noted the index was quite good in listing individual components and topics.

Chair Bernstein inquired whether a City ordinance required approval of plans for new construction prior to demolition of an existing structure (Guidelines page 89, paragraph 6.1.3). Mr. Weintraub reported a Development Center policy stated building permits for demolition should not be issued prior to approval of new development plans.

Rob Steinberg felt the Guidelines were sensitive to Professorville, yet provided direction and flexibility. A companion document was not necessary. He suggested Appendix B include explanations of categories and the Guidelines discuss placing new ancillary buildings at locations other than the rear of the property.

Council Member Holman commented regarding paragraphs 7.1.5, 6.1 and 4.1.1; the drawing on page 91; and the omission of incentives. Mr. Weintraub explained that the Guidelines could not cover every possible situation with certainty. The City's Codes did not prohibit demolition. The Guidelines were designed as recommendations to the individuals making decisions. The Guidelines were not intended to promote preservation incentives.

Mr. Steinberg suggested the Board give additional thought to the impact of raising houses. He preferred the Guidelines clearly state expectations for projects.

Board Member Bunnenberg believed the Guidelines would be helpful to the public. A handout regarding historic fabric would be valuable for architects and construction workers.

Board Member Di Cicco remarked that prohibitions could require revisions to the Municipal Code, which could be complicated.

Chair Bernstein questioned whether "subordination" or "subordinate" was used in the Guidelines. Mr. Weintraub answered yes. Chair Bernstein suggested including a photograph of more substantial landscaping on page 13. The selection of specialty glass was probably a subjective decision of the applicant and HRB. Additions to the rear of historic buildings could be approved if done sensitively. Chair Bernstein concurred with including definitions of historic categories. Mr. Weintraub advised a discussion of historic designations was contained at the beginning of the document. The Guidelines did not distinguish between category buildings and non-category buildings. The categories were not the point of the Guidelines.

The Board discussed raising historic structures, reasons for doing so, and prohibitions. Board Members generally felt the Guidelines implied raising a historic structure was acceptable and discussed revisions to the language of paragraph 4.4.1.

Mr. Weintraub noted the Council was scheduled to consider approval of the Guidelines on September 12, 2016. The Guidelines needed to be completed and adopted by September 30, 2016 in order to receive federal funding. The Board, staff and Council Member Holman discussed the effects on the timeline should the Board and/or the Council make revisions to the Guidelines.

Mr. Weintraub reviewed recommendations to (1) explain or define historic categories; (2) address vehicular access, parking and equipment at the front of lots; (3) add language regarding demolition for

redevelopment; (4) replace the photo of landscaping; (5) add page numbers to the index; (6) modify paragraph 4.4.1; and (7) enlarge the type font used in the document.

MOTION:

Chair Bernstein moved, seconded by Board Member Bunnenberg, that the Historic Resources Board recommend adoption of the proposed Professorville Historic Design Guidelines including the modifications to which the Board agreed.

MOTION PASSED: 5-0, Bower and Makinen absent

Mr. Weintraub reported the Board potentially could review and comment on the proposed revisions at the August 11 or 25, 2016 meeting.

Study Session

None.

Approval of Minutes July 14, 2016

MOTION:

Board Member Kohler moved, seconded by Board Member Bunnenberg, to approve the Minutes of July 14, 2016.

MOTION PASSED: 4-0 Di Cicco abstaining, Bower and Makinen absent

Subcommittee Items

None.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

None.

Adjournment