



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING MINUTES: February 22, 2018

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

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower; Vice Chair Brandon Corey, Board Member Margaret Wimmer, Roger Kohler, Michael Makinen, Martin Bernstein

Absent:

Chair Bower: We have a quorum so we'll open the meeting. Would the staff please call roll?

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: Good, first up on our agenda is oral communications. Anyone that wants to speak to any item not on the agenda is welcome to do that right now. I don't have any cards for that.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: Let's move on to the next item which is agenda changes, announcements, additions, deletions.

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Just that I have one announcement as that we have a subcommittee item, 526 Waverley, that's going after today's meeting after we adjourn. So, we've already contacted the Board Members who are involved in that and they've said they are available. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. We actually have people here today which is a remarkable occurrence for us and I'm assuming that the bulk of the people here are here to talk about the Eichler Guidelines. So, we have one agenda item before that and I'd like Board Members, if they can, to be very concise in their comments about the Junior Museum which is first up on our agenda.

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Meeting Schedule and Assignments

Study Session

Action Items

New Business

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL: 1451 Middlefield Road [18PLN-00042]:** Modification to Roof Material for the New Junior Museum and Zoo Building Approved by City Council in December 2017. Zone District: Public Facilities.

Chair Bower: Staff report?

Ms. French: Yes, I'm going to keep it brief as well. We have our applicants here who will go through their PowerPoint. This will be going to the Architectural Review Board on March 1st. The Council approved this project and – back in December and this is just a minor change to address what the applicant is going to tell you about.

Ms. Sarah Vaccaro: Great and the material boards here. Good morning Board Members, thank you for having us today. Let me make this full size. I cannot read that. I think it's just off this – full screen, there we go. Great. Just a quick recap of the existing site conditions. The existing Junior Museum and Zoo sits here. Also, on the large City-owned parcel is the historic Category I Lucie Stern Community Center, as well as the eligible historic resource of the Lou Henry Hoover Girl Scout House. The Rinconada Park sits here, adjacent is the Walter Hayes Elementary School and then across the way is a residential neighborhood. In our proposed site plan, we're making big improvements to clarify site circulation for pedestrians, bikes, and vehicles. We're also reorganizing the JMZ to create a more civic presence for that institution and referring the Lucie Stern in a lot of the form and layout of the building. We were presented to the full HRB back in June of last year. This was the rendering that we brought forward at that point in time. In general, the Board was very favorable with the design. There were concerns about the color of the material – the metal roofing material that also turned onto the exterior walls in some locations so we worked with a subcommittee on a number of color variations. This was one of the interim variations that we studied upon comments from the HRB subcommittee, ARB, and the community. This was the ultimate design that we presented and was approved last year by City Council in December. It has a taupe colored standing metal seam roof with cement plaster siding on the walls and some areas of wood siding for accents. We are here today to present a roofing change to you so going from a standing metal seam roof to a composite shingle roof. While I understand that it's not part of the HRB's purview to review cost implications, this roofing change will save the project about almost half a million dollars which will allow us to stay in budget and keep very important, exciting visitor experience in the project. We are proposing, again going from a taupe colored standing metal seam roof to a composite asphalt single roof in a light sage green color. The durability of this roof is not quite as durable as the standing metal seam. However, we can get a warranty for – a full warranty for up to 20-years and then an extended warranty for 21-50-years beyond that. This is just a quick aesthetic image of the standing metal seam roof versus the composite shingles that we're presenting today. This is a rendering from Middlefield, you can see we've replaced the roofing with the composite shingle so it will be visible along Middlefield. From the main entrance in the parking lot, you can see the roofing in the distance but it's a pretty – there's not a lot of view to the roof from this perspective. Just to circle back to the surrounding context, the Lucie Stern complex has a clay tile roof with cement plaster walls. The Lou Henry Hoover Girl Scout House has composite single roof and vertical wood siding. The existing JMZ which will be demolished when our new building is built, it does have a wood shingle roof just as a point of reference. Then across Middlefield most – almost all of the residential houses have composite shingle roofing that's in direct context. One point of consideration, it's not part of the current project but we are planning in the next 5 to 10-years to add photovoltaic panels to the roof. It will cover almost half of the roof surface and that will allow us to generate energy onsite. So, the panels will be attached directly on top of the composite shingle roof like these images show. Then a longer-term consideration, again not part of the project we're proposing today, but in 10-20-years when the composite shingle roof starts to age, there's an opportunity with the extreme advances in photovoltaic roofing that the Friends and the City could opt to replace the roofing with a photovoltaic roofing. This is an example of the Tesla roofing tiles that will allow for site generation of energy, as well as a more comprehensive look for the roofing system. That's it for our presentation. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Can you just hold on for a second? Any question by the Board Members? I have a couple short ones. No questions. So, I'm pleased that we're saving money as a Palo Alto resident. Everyone here who is a resident is happy about that. I think that this a more appropriate material choice, I didn't like the standing seam roof. When you said that you could get an extended 21 to 50-year warranty, I'm assuming that's on the materials, correct?

Ms. Vaccaro: Correct. I believe so but I can verify that though.

Chair Bower: Just so the public who is watching this at home knows the material cost on any project – roofing project is a minor portion of the actual roof contract. So, while that helps, my understanding of the warranties, which is now 5-years back because I've been retired for 5-years, is that it could be prorated. Even if it was 100% of the cost, it would be minimal but do you know whether – do you know anything about the warranty at all? Is just for materials – it is just for materials?

Ms. Vaccaro: I have the documentation. I haven't memorized it so I could forward it for further reference.

Chair Bower: In the best case – ok, in the best case then it is as I suspect which is just the materials. It's a small amount but savings is savings so I think that was my only question. Alright, anybody else with a question? Roger.

Board Member Kohler: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: Well, if there is no other input on this, let's pull it back to the Board and then have a Board discussion. Thank you for that presentation. Alright, Board comments?

Board Member Kohler: I was just going to say I've had asphalt roofing on my house now for, I don't know, 12-year, 13-years and it still look brand new in a way. It's a higher quality and it looks great so I think it's a good choice practical and will probably last a lot longer than what you think. No problem for me.

Chair Bower: Any other – Martin – Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I was going to ask a quick question. So, the specification that you gave us, it's a cool roof – it's a cool roofing and I was wondering if you might just state for our education as to why would you go with a cool roofing solution as opposed to a traditional roof solution? I'm sure – it said that its less solar absorption on – in the material and it reflects heat – the heat.

Ms. Vaccaro: Correct. Should I respond now?

Chair Bower: Please.

Ms. Vaccaro: Yes, you're exactly right. Basically, it reduces the amount of heat that the roof will absorb which impacts how much energy we need to cool the building inside. The cool roof requirement is actually a California Green Building Code requirement so there are limited roofing types that meet that requirements. That's what the cool roof product information is in regards too. Then quickly how did you arrive at the color of the sage green color?

Ms. Vaccaro: In the product data you have there are only four-color options that fall into the cool roof category that meets the Green Building Code. We thought the sage green was a nice compliment to the white cement plaster and the wood accents that we're proposing.

Chair Bower: If I can jump in here before you leave? Do you know what the color of the Girl Scout building roof is?

Ms. Vaccaro: It's a brown – it's hard to tell in this image but it's brown. It's very similar to the vertical wood siding color.

Chair Bower: It is a composition -- it's a composition roof?

Ms. Vaccaro: Correct.

Chair Bower: Ok, thank you. Other comments? Michael.

Board Member Makinen: I think I actually favor this over the metal roof that we saw originally. I think it provides significant cost savings. I don't know what the cost of this roof is – the actual cost of it but if we saved...

Chair Bower: Half a million.

Board Member Makinen: ... half a million bucks, you know go for it.

Chair Bower: Brandon.

Vice Chair Corey: I'm going – I'm a little – I think contrary in here but I actually dislike the composite roof. I think the metal actually does look better. I think composite in general tends to be done because its cheap but I do understand cost savings. I must be in the wrong business if it's a half a million dollars delta to do a roof but I appreciate your thoughts on saving money anyway.

Chair Bower: Alright, Martin you're the only on that hasn't made a comment.

Board Member Bernstein: I agree with Board Member Kohler about the durability of it. I have a composition shingle room on my residence and it was installed in 1992 and it still looks new.

MOTION

Chair Bower: Alright, no other comments? I also forgot to acknowledge that Councilwomen Holman is here with this morning. Thank you for coming, as you always do. Would you—any comments you'd like to make? Alright, so I'm looking for a motion to move this forward. Well, I can craft a motion so I would – let's see. So, I think we need to say that this complies with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for a differentiated but complementary material for the roof because we have two historic buildings within sight of this building. I would – let see—and that this is an approved by the Historic Resources Board as being appropriate for this building. I'm open to any other suggestions. Alright, no – do we have a second?

Board Member Kohler: I'll second it if you...

Chair Bower: Alright. I don't see any other comments so I think we can probably move this forward to a vote so all in favor of approving this as appropriate meeting of the Secretary of Interior's Standards and being appropriate roof material and cover for the museum please say aye. None opposed.

Vice Chair Corey: No, I opposed.

Chair Bower: Oh, sorry. Brandon opposed, alright so we're 5-1.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-1

Chair Bower: I just didn't hear you.

Vice Chair Corey: It's ok. Well, I didn't say (inaudible).

Chair Bower: Thank you very much. I'm hoping this makes it through the ARB without modification and they'll hear that on March 2nd.

Continued Business

3. PUBLIC HEARING: Historic Resources Board Recommendation of the Palo Alto Eichler Neighborhood Design Guidelines to the City Council

Chair Bower: Alright, we'll move to new business – I'm sorry, to our continued business which is a public hearing of the Eichler Neighborhood Design Guidelines. I'd like to remind anyone in the audience that if you'd like to speak to this item, please fill out one of these cards and give it to one of our staff members. Staff report?

Ms. French: Yes, hello. Coordinating so thank you for announcing that speaker cards are what we need to track who's speaking today. This application – this project has come before you initially in November, then December, then January and now today. We've been at this for about a year with many workshops and attended by not everybody but a core group and some others more recently that heard that there might be a potential for regulatory. Right now, that is not the case. We are looking at guidelines voluntary in nature and going to Council in April at this point. So, here we are today and here's the track. We have a website devoted to this project, we have ways that folks can get an email – e-blasts when they sign up, we recently blanketed all Eichler neighborhoods with notice cards and it was an undertaking. We don't have ready lists of Eichler folks but we did undertake that and we will do it again prior to the Council meeting. These are the Eichler neighborhoods in town. I've spoken with one Eichler tract that is interested in removing the single-story overlay but that's only one...

Board Member Kohler: What did you say?

Ms. French: I've spoken with one...

Board Member Kohler: Remove what?

Ms. French: Remove the single-story overlay zoning.

Board Member Kohler: Oh, ok.

Ms. French: It's an application process, only one tract. Just a quick recap, the staff report presented all of this. What's changed is you have a copy of both the annotated draft that shows the changes since you last saw these guidelines and the draft that is – has those changes incorporated. So, the one draft that shows in orange the changes and the draft that will go to City Council. So, overview quickly, FAQs have been incorporated in an early section hopefully to communicate to folks that this is voluntary. We've tried to hit that point several times; you know how will we use it? We would like to utilize these guidelines when we do individual review of two-story homes and second-floor additions. The Council would have to, of course, adopt an ordinance regarding that so that's not even happening in April. That would be after April if the Council so chooses to direct staff to come back. There are some key points of this, community values, that's been verified. The chapter on maintenance is now a later chapter, the new construction is now an earlier chapter, and Chapter 8 was modified to remove some of that language that was causing people to mistakenly believe that this was somehow regulatory. It is not regulatory, this is voluntary. I'll just say one more time, this is a voluntary set of guidelines that are being proposed. With that, I think we need to get to the public but if you have any questions or comments, staff would like to hear from you and as to the current set of guidelines.

Chair Bower: Just as a recap, Board Members have received two of these which is the proposed guidelines. The original that we have reviewed earlier at one of our meetings and also all of us have read and then a new annotated version which has orange changes. I will tell – because they are not available for the members of the public that are here, there are substantial changes that address a number of the comments that were made on the website or directly emailed to City staff. There are 236 comments that are in our package today. I've looked at all of them, they are pretty extensive and we'll get to a discussion of the whole – the guidelines and these comments later. Let's move to the public – hearing from the public because we have – I currently have eight cards, I'd like to limit this to three minutes. I request that if someone else has already spoken to an issue that you feel is important, simply note that

you concur with that rather than spend the time basically saying the same thing that's already been said. We want to – we have lots of work to do here so the first person on the list is Ken Bentley followed by Cynthia Ishimoto. Please state your name so that the...

Mr. Ken Bently: My name is Ken Bently, I live in an Eichler house near Gun High School in Maybell Gardens. A day and a half ago I got this and they gave me a day and a half to come up with a response. However, living in an Eichler, I've been there for a long time and I'd like to ask anyone of you if anyone of you ever owned or lived in an Eichler house? Good. Anyway, that questions been answered. The problem I see in this report – there are a number of them – one of them is they spent a lot of time on remodeling, doing things to existing Eichlers and we have a neighbor who had three additions on the roof of an Eichler and they are atrocious. It was done years ago before this was even a discussed issue. We now have three houses in our tract and there are six that have been torn down and that other types of architectural styles. My question to you and into this report is that if you'll note in one of the pages here, Page – get my glasses on – 78, adding a basement to an Eichler. Give me a break. I mean you tare the house down essentially so we build a new Eichler I peruse for a basement but it does say something in here very close. If a basement is added, residents should be aware that it may result in a house that is visibly higher than its neighbors. All the houses that are being built in Palo Alto now are in perimeter foundations. Nobody is building a slab house anymore like an Eichler so I might show to you that when this takes place -- this was on the cover of the 2000 – June 26, 2015, article on Eichler rising. I think some of you have seen it. Whoever the artist was that did it did the greatest extortion and it fits exactly what I'm trying to say. We'll show you later. Eichler house, two-story house. Eichler house – I mean two-story house sitting on a slab foundation, that is a joke. In here it says that – there's one article here – I have three-minutes so that's why I'm moving fast. In neighborhoods that are not in flood zones, in my case it isn't, residents – flood zone designs new residents so that the floor level heights conform to those of a surrounding Eichler residence. You can't do that. An Eichler is that high off the ground at best. You start out with the perimeter foundation, you're going like this; maybe higher. As you said in here, if you build a basement then you may have a higher one. Now with today's standards, no one wants an 8-foot high ceiling. They want a 9-foot plate one, they want something higher. I have one being built or there is one being built in our neighborhood so we're already starting with a foot and a half, maybe, at the basement or the floor level – foundation level, then you've got floor space, 9-foot ceiling, then you've got another floor and it's a goner for an Eichler. So, this privacy issue and people looking down on you, we have it. We have one a diagonal (inaudible) out of the backyard of our house, one was built there. We don't have a strong neighborhood organization like the so-called National Registration thing. My Eichler is a Jones and Emmons Eichler. It came even before the (inaudible) and as you know -- my problem with Eichlers is they build too many of them in Palo Alto but when they built them, there was a great and interesting intention why built them.

Chair Bower: You're three minutes....

Mr. Bently: It was an aesthetic...

Chair Bower: Could you summarize?

Mr. Bently: I'm going to summarize.

Chair Bower: Thanks.

Mr. Bently: Thank you. I'm very upset about the problem. I resent the fact that my house is not in a zone which has some privilege which the others evidently have in this so-called National Registration. I have a number of other things but thank you for your three minutes.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Mr. Bently. Cynthia Ishimoto, please. I'm sorry; I'm not very good at pronouncing names.

Ms. Cynthia Ishimoto: Ishimoto

Chair Bower: Ishimoto and Steve Lewis is next up.

Ms. Ishimoto: Let's see, I'm going to admit that I'm kind of clueless as far as what the guidelines are.

Chair Bower: Could you just say your name one more time.

Ms. Ishimoto: My name is Cynthia Ishimoto.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Ms. Ishimoto: I'm going to admit that I am clueless to what the guidelines are. I'm not able to get involved in this because – well, this is what I have. Let's see, I'm going to backtrack. Eichlers, for those of you who don't know it, is a mid-century modern house that has a lot of glass. I think one of the reasons why we have so many people going to the second level is because it has really poor storage. In my house, we have 5-foot closets for everybody and that's really not enough. The slanting roof means you have even less storage and glass walls, even less storage. The reason I am here is because I've tried – I inquired about putting in an extension that would fit within the look – the aesthetics of an Eichler and I was told that I could not do it because of privacy rules. Basically, there's a setback in my house, there are a garage, carport and a setback and I wanted to bring it forward. I was told I could not do it because of privacy reasons; even though I met the setback from the sidewalk, that was acceptable. So, I would like to find out what I can do and does the guidelines have anything that addresses what I want to do which is pull the one section of my house forward and have it aesthetically match my two neighbors? Is there anything that I can do to affect the guidelines or do I have an appeal process to figure out what I can do so that I can do more storage for my house? That's it.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. Steve Lewis and John Melnychuk?

Mr. John Melnychuk: (inaudible – spoke from the audience)

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Mr. Steve Lewis: Hi, my name is Steve Lewis and I'm here for my neighbor Pat Wayne. He and I have been talking about Eichlers for years and years. We moved in in '56 and '57. He basically found out and we looked at the research guideline. We like the guidelines as it was presented. We don't like to see it as a rule. There are so many Eichlers as you go down our streets that wouldn't match the rules as they are now with the guidelines. Now you have (inaudible) two-stories, I think three or four in our neighbor. You've got ones that have been modified with different garage doors, different siding, different plumbing, heating and air conditioning on the roof that looks obnoxious but that's the way they are. That's the beauty of an Eichler and the guidelines do address a lot of the shortcomings of the Eichler homes. We've all learned to put up with them and that's what makes them unique. It's probably what, as we in Eichler's like to believe, it is some of the best houses in the neighborhood. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you very much. John and then Diane Reckless.

Mr. Melnychuk: I'm John Melnychuk, I live in Fair Meadow, I have a home there since 2002. It's an original home built in 1952. I'm surrounded on either side by original owners from 1952, quite elderly people. I was involved in an ad hoc group in 2011 to get a single-story overlay for Fair Meadow and our effort failed. This was something that happened with David Toy and five other members or five other neighborhood members. We collected our petitions, we got the City to send a survey out and at the last moment Vice Chairmen Tuma who was Chair or Vice Chair of the Architectural Board at the time said single-handedly that he would prefer to have things go forward only if 80% of respondents support the idea of a single-story overlay. We couldn't understand this at the time, you can check the tapes. I was speaking a little more loudly than I am right now when I responded to that. We have a concern in our home in our neighborhood about slow emergent and creeping in of different architectural styles. Two-story houses, that destroys our privacy and that destroys our daylight planes. Any of you would be

welcome to come and visit our home to have a look for yourself to see what it feels like inside and you could very easily be able to see what would happen with a two-story home next door or on either side of us. We're glad that some guidelines are being developed here. For myself, I'm disappointed that we didn't achieve a single-story overlay. I'd still like to see that happen. I don't know – that's beyond the scope of what your discussion is today but I'm putting my two-sense in. Thank you so much for looking at this issue and I think that the Eichler's themselves are actually, as a group, valuable as historic elements in our City. We recognize that in our one neighborhood already and by attrition we're getting Spanish style homes, two-stories with stucco, with tile roofs and so on. That's diminishing the quality of the aesthetic in the neighborhood as far as I'm concerned. Thank you so much.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments. Michael Nuremburg will follow Diane Reckless.

Ms. Diane Reckless: Hi, I'm Diane Reckless and I've lived in an Eichler for almost 40-years now. This document was really well done. There was an awful lot of good stuff in it but there's a leaning towards a stand-alone ADU. I'll address just ADUs and the stand along versus attached. In particular, the one in the rear and for some reason the ones in the rear or the detached could be 900-square feet. It was part of the house it would have to be 600. If you take 900, most of our houses are about twice that so you're taking half the size of a current Eichler and sticking it in the backyard. Even beyond that, if its – the pictures make it look like a little playhouse, it's not, it's big. Let me take you on a walk in my neighborhood which is in a flood zone so if you put a standalone it has to start 3 or 4-feet up. If you tried to get there in the backyard, you either have to walk past every single bedroom where kids are likely to be sleeping to get there or you have to walk past three walls of glass or two walls of glass. Then you get to the backyard and you're sitting behind the master bedroom which is another wall of glass. This doesn't seem like it's going to be very nice. Those of you who haven't lived in an Eichler, please come spend some real quality time in an Eichler. Don't just walk through fast but imagine what it would be like. I think – I really favor ADUs but I hadn't conceived till the middle of the night how big 900-square feet is and think through moving them into the front, not separate units. I don't think – they wouldn't fit in our house – excuse me – our neighborhood at least but attached ones could go very nicely. Do – you'd have to move the setbacks in some cases but within reason that makes sense. Today's kids aren't there to play in the playground or play in the front yard. We're not allowed to water the grass so – or not allowed, we shouldn't so setbacks don't make as much sense as they did 60-years ago. Make them smaller, make the houses make sense and please, really make the back-yard ones not very logical in most neighborhoods. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Great, thank you for those comments. Alright, Marco – Mark – Michael Nuremburg. Ming Zhao will be following.

Mr. Michael Nuremburg: I'm Michael Nuremburg and I've lived in an Eichler for over 40-years. We've remodeled three times and put on a second story all (inaudible) with the neighborhoods ok, the design and basically kept it as an Eichler with those changes. So, I'm actually here altruistically and this doesn't apply to me anymore but I'm concerned because I really think the study and the process is tremendously flawed. There are 2,700 Eichlers in Palo Alto. The people who constructed the paperwork had basically interviewed a 150. Of the three meetings only 90 people have attended those and of – now I didn't see the latest emails but I reviewed every 233 emails prior to this, only 27 people sent those in so I don't think this adequate representation. By the way, I've spoken to major real estate people in Palo Alto who have never even heard what was going on so despite the fact that this has supposable been publicized I totally disagree. More importantly, I think freezing the Eichlers in time really can have a potential problem. As new materials come along, new looks and things, we might be missing out on siding, roofing, things that actually can make our homes better and not worse as we've done in our case. There's also a statement this is not about a single-story overlay and yet on page 90 – let's see 74, there's a picture of two Eichlers with a line going across and something above it on the structure which obviously is saying we are talking about a single-structure overlay so make no (inaudible) about it. We've also heard that this is voluntary at nauseam, it is not. There is a three-tiered process, in your notes, how this can actually become something that the City can mandate and dictate and I really think that's a problem. I'm not here to address second-story or single-story overlay but I will say there are many multi-

generational families that are now being prejudicially left out of these communities. They can't live in Eichlers and I do want to remind you there's something called the Anti-NIMBY law which I think was passed in California in 1982 where you can't discriminate against neighborhoods in terms of moving forward with development. It seems to me that this skirts that pretty closely and there have already been two suits, Lafayette and Berkley, that have been lost. So, I would like to see us put our money into other things rather than this and not be in court over these things if they do become regulations. My concern truly is I'm not sure there's been enough publicity and enough transparency. If the community truly wants to freeze Eichlers in time, I'm totally with that but I don't think that's the case. I also think that's wrong to do so thank you for listening.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments. Ming Zhao followed by Dr. Mandel. Pardon me for mispronouncing that.

Mr. Ming Zhao: Hi, my name is Ming Zhao and I live in an Eichler house. I like to concur with the previous – what the previous gentleman said. I don't think it's the right thing to freeze the Eichler in time. Especially – I mean I like certain design aspect of the Eichler house but I really don't like the certain choices made by Eichler. For example, the flat roof, it might be good in look but it doesn't really – it really costs a lot for long-term – long time maintenance because of lack of adequate space. For example, last year I had to do some remodeling for my house. I had to open the roof because there was no other way to run the electrical lines to add some lights and because the roof was open I had to reroof and because we have the pipe running on the roof because there was no other place to run the pipes other than digging in the ground. So, -- but the roofer told me that we had to remove the pipes before they applied the – before they can reroof and then after the roof is done they had to add the pipes back which cost me about \$5,000, while adding nothing to the house, just to reroof. It's an Eichler house and that's this kind of hidden cost that's kind of been inherited from this short card that was taken when the original house was made. I think this – I don't think we should try to mandate certain design choice just because some people like that or some people don't like that. Other than that, I don't have other additional opinions other than what the previous gentleman – Michael said. I really appreciate his comments. Thanks. Thanks for the effort.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Dr. Mandel followed by Sunita Verma.

Mr. Manis Mandel: Good morning everyone. My name is name is Manis Mandel, I'm a homeowner in Fair Meadow tract. I've been reading these guidelines since I think October (inaudible) and they seemed to have changed. On page 26 there's a big section called CC&Rs and this says this Eichler Neighborhood Guideline supports and expands upon Eichler tracts CC&Rs where appropriate.

Chair Bower: Excuse me – yeah, can you...

Mr. Mandel: Sorry.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Mr. Mandel: On page 26 of the document of the final draft it says the Eichler Neighborhood Design Guideline document supports and expands upon the Eichler tract CC&Rs where appropriate and in adherence to the current City planning code. In Appendix A, Turnbull and Page described in detail how they went through and found these Eichler tracts and they discussed the CC&Rs but these no evidence the CC&Rs even exist so I began digging into it and I asked Director French like do we have any CC&Rs on file. Director French told me that they are aware of at least three CC&Rs or of more than three CC&Rs and of course I believe her. I – when I bought my family house in 19 – in 2005, my title did not have a CC&Rs so I began digging into the CC&R. One of the previous gentlemen described the failed SSO from Fair Meadow and that documented (inaudible) referred to a 1951 CC&R but after a property search, I found a 1952 CC&R signed not by Director Holms but by the San Jose Abstract Entitle Company data 7, June 1952 stating the following. "It is expressly agreed that the said declaration of CC&Rs are terminated as to and do not apply to are in any way affect, Fair Meadow." There is no CC&R in Fair Meadow so for

66-years Fair Meadow has lived free and clear of any restrictions of any CC&Rs. After 66-years of freedom, suddenly there's a document which claims to put new guidelines, it doesn't make sense. The law has already given individual rights to the homeowners of Fair Meadow that they are free. These rules, even though voluntary, they need to stay voluntary. There should be no discussion, there should be not slide presented saying that there could be a three-step process. There should be no (inaudible) attempt at all and if only three CC&Rs or four CC&Rs exist, we should change this document and say that out of the 32 tracts only four of them should be using the guidelines. The rest of them, because they are free, should not be subject to any guidelines. Let the individuals have their rights. There is no point of having overlays. A new (inaudible) was added which states the following, this is on page – sorry I'm looking at it – page 14. It says that...

Chair Bower: Excuse me, we're at 3-minutes so please (inaudible)(crosstalk)

Mr. Mandel: It says the prior guidelines would be used by the planning staff. I think it's unnecessary. The (inaudible) staff does not need any extra information because these are voluntary. Why on earth should the (inaudible) staff – so please remove all the overreaching document statements from this document. There's just too much overage, it is unnecessary. Give us the freedom to live out lives. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for sharing that. Sunita Verma followed by Margaret Murphy.

Ms. Sunita Verma: Hi, my name is Sunita Verma, I live on Ross Road in a two-story Eichler house since 2004 and like the gentleman said, we haven't had enough – I got this on Tuesday night and the meeting is this morning. I don't know – you can see how many people are not here who would like to speak, that's not very much notice. We need – if you want impute from the citizens, you need to give us more notice. We can't just show up and – from work and come show up here 8:30 in the morning. There should be different meetings at different times and the notice should be at least 2-week if not longer and like as mentioned I live on Ross Road. There's a lot of stuff going on there that we were never notified but that's different. What I want to say is if there are already guidelines that exist – I live right next door to a one-story single house and I've talked to my neighbors and we have no privacy issues. Our house is two-story, the one next to us is two-story and on the other side, they are not. So, if there are guidelines that are existing to protect those for privacy and another thing, why do we need to spend more money from the City to make more guidelines if they already exist? Let's take that money and use it for something else that we need for our City. For our teenagers or the youth who need some place to go hang out. There's nothing for the youth to hang out. There are no places for them to go hang out except the mall or the down (inaudible). Let's save our money for the other issues that are more important than spending money on something that already exists. That's all I have to say, thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for that comment. Margaret Murphy and I think there's one other – is there – are there any more cards there?

Ms. Margaret Murphy: My name is Margaret Murphy, I received this notice yesterday and I would like to say that I live in an Eichler on Lewis Road. I would like to say that I concur with the comment regarding notice. This is an issue that is very important to me, it is very important to my neighbors and we were not given due notice. Please provide more notice and of course we will provide comments in email and in other forms. I do not believe this was correct. I would like to concur with Michaela and the others who have said that the study perhaps was not broad enough. Did not include enough examples. There are so many Eichlers, so many different experiences in this City. I think that you have a unique opportunity to do more in this area. I concur with my colleague who just spoke about the use of time and use of money. However, I disagree, I do think that this affects many, many people in this City in many different ways and I encourage you to look for solutions that include homeowners who have been here for a very long time and like their neighborhoods the way that they are. As well as newer homeowners and their concerns. I ask you to look at this seriously and not abandon this and I think that you've made some steps in the right direction but I encourage you to continue and to get broader input. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments. The last card that I have is from Sheila Chang.

Ms. Sheila Chang: My name is Sheila Chang, I've lived in my Eichler home for 30-years. Faced Asian Blue Shopping Center more and I would say -- I came here to just listen and now I have some comments. The first one that I'd like to say is the mention about CC&R. My house as two-stories and they built the second story in 1964. My house was built in 1954, the tract says that area is 1956, actually mine is '54. So, 1964 they built the second story by the previous owner and we bought that and it has been already 30-years. So, that means what's a CC&R? A couple years ago, many -- I can't remember -- (inaudible) would team up again Asian Blue Shopping Center's new owner because of a couple of reasons. The first because they built a low-income housing and a big market and (inaudible) school doesn't want more low-income kids. So, they said well we're overfull and then my neighbor, they have a or (inaudible) say oh, this Eichler. Oh, (inaudible) going to flood into our area so see we better sign so I signed. I had them over to my place given this drink and I signed the paper. We do a lot of (inaudible) and try against to damage an Eichler but actually, I'm glad we don't have this (inaudible) like overlay and you can build a second-story in that area. Eichler is very old, the structure is not very stable for two-story and also not very good for (inaudible) like termites or something like that. You ask me do I like Eichler? Yes. Do I appreciate this? I would say yes because I follow Sunny Vale when I say oh, awesome they have guidelines. Palo Alto has no guidelines. We have guidelines, that's wonderful but I'm not saying I stab it and say don't do anything. You have to keep this one with the worst foundation and a lot of things are not insulated properly. I wanted to say thank you very much to make this a guideline option and also don't believe a CC&R. Everybody followed that because they really want to keep that style, keep everything as is. We abuse old CC&R back to the day Eichler or the builder made that. That's just my experience, 30-years. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you for those comments and thank all of you who have come today. We hardly ever have an audience and I think all of the input that you have provided is useful. Let's take this back to the Board for discussion and I guess we'll close the public hearing portion of this. We can reopen it again if we need too. Board Members, comments, questions? Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Bower. I would like first of all to thank Amy and her staff for the email blast that have been going out to the neighborhoods so thanks for that. I know there have been requests from the neighbors to say what's going on and so thanks for your good response on that. I appreciate it. There have been a couple members of the public who spoke about getting a notice only one or two days earlier but I think you -- things were sent out more than one or two days ago, is that correct?

Ms. French: Correct. We -- this is the first time that we've sent notice to all of the Eichler addresses in the City. So, to that extent, yes, we have not been sending them out for the last year to every single Eichler address so this is the first time. We were able to get the work behind that to get all the addresses and sent that out but it wasn't two days ago. Perhaps the holidays...

Female: (inaudible -- off mic)

Ms. French: It's not a requirement, it's a courtesy flyer that we've sent out. Again, these are not voluntary -- these are voluntary, not mandatory so there's no obligation to send out. We've done what we could.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok well thank you for that response. Board and Chair Bower, I have -- I went through all the -- in the orange mark up one, I went page by page and I had comments on the different pages and each comment will result in also a question for staff.

Chair Bower: Ok, go through, that's what we're here for.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you so much. I'm just going to go each -- I went through the orange markup page and then -- because those -- that's new wording. I'll just start with the question here and I'm just going to go right through the sequence here. I'll say the page numbers for reference so on page

number 13 on the right-hand side it says the guidelines are designed to help the City of Palo Alto Planning and Community Environment staff and review bodies in determining the appropriateness of the proposed work. My question where about determining appropriateness. Does that mean if the Planning Department decided that it's not appropriate, does that mean an applicant then could not proceed with a building permit?

Ms. French: This is a general statement and – where a National Register District or single-story overlay district, it is imposed or it is already placed on one of these tracts. It could be a conversation but no, there's no – nothing mandatory about this. It's a broad statement and it's not intended to be punitive or mandatory.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, ok thank you for that. Then -- let's see – then on the next page, 14, on the right – on the left-hand side it says the guidelines are currently voluntary, just ask you mentioned also. Then it also says on that left-hand side, so the purpose of this is to offer advice and that's a great thing. Education is fantastic. The middle it does say – the question says my home is not an Eichler but I live across the street with an Eichler. Will I be subject to design guidelines and the author of this document says possibly. So, that still leaves some question and some doubt for an applicant who's trying to make concrete decisions. It goes on to say, however, while your home may not be an Eichler, it may be within – so, there – so the fact that things are voluntary I think is – when things say possibly and may, again it's from someone who's trying to say well, am I affect it or not? The language of this may be not so clear.

Ms. French: Yes, actually I – Martin, thank you for that. I am looking this as well and seeing that on the first part about the – about are they mandatory? It does say the guidelines will be used concurrently with the Individual Review Guidelines. That could not take place unless – until the Council adopts an ordinance that connects these guidelines to the Individual Review process for two-story homes. So, we will need to change these before these go to Council to clarify that they only – in every case, only by Council adoption of an ordinance will these be in anyway utilized by staff for review.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, thank you. Page 18, the right-hand side it talks about – it says, for example, residents and homeowners and properties in Greenmeadow, Gables National Register Historic Districts may consider a stricter interpretation of the guidance. That would take a property owner initiative for that to become a stricter interpretation. For it to become – because right now it's not mandatory so a property owner initiative is required before any of these things become more strict. Just a comment.

Ms. French: Right so in the event that there are CC&Rs and the neighborhood is – does have an Architectural Control Committee, I'm only aware of two of those in the City, they could choose, it's voluntary again, to utilize these guidelines for those neighborhoods.

Board Member Bernstein: Great, thank you for that. On page 21 it talks about Individual Review process and the ordinance says that's only involved in second story additions of a certain scope. The IR also focuses on privacy, scale, massing, and streetscape and that's fine. That's a good process for that. When I read the 132 or 232 comments, it seemed like the dominant theme was the idea of privacy so Individual Review I think already addresses that issue so that's already taken care of I believe, the idea of privacy. One of the members of the public mentioned about a one-story and the idea – the question of privacy. I'm imaging say if the floor level has to be raised to 3-feet because of flood zone requirements. So, that puts someone eyes at 8-feet above the ground and for privacy, you can have a 6-foot fence and then you can still do a 24-inch decorative thing above that. So, actually you can have a fence that's also at 8-feet high so for one story, I hear issues of privacy but one-story, the privacy is already solved by a fence I believe because you can only – if the eye level is at 8-feet. I think privacy is already addressed so I just heard a lot of those comments from the public so just my comment that I think privacy is already addressed in the ordinance.

Male: Not for the second-levels.

Board Member Bernstein: So, IR actually involves – speaking through the Chair, the IR does address privacy issues already and window locations and all that so I think privacy is already through the ordinances. Next is page 27 on the left-hand side, it talks about properties eligible for listing in the National Register. My three questions are – let's see – the question I wrote down was are any Eichler homes shown on page 25, those are all the Eichler tracts, are any of those a listed historic resource? Are any – ok. I think the answer is no. There's no...

Ms. French: No.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah so there's no historic resource so there for any protection of or regulation that may involve the Historic Resources Board or the Historic Preservation Ordinance. That ordinance will not apply to any of these buildings because none of them are listed as individuals (inaudible)...

Ms. French: Correct. The HRB and historic review process does not apply to National Register Eichler Districts in the City because they are not listed on our local inventory.

Board Member Bernstein: So, the HRB would never ever see any proposal that comes – any change to a historic building – any change to an Eichler building would never come to the Historic Resources Board.

Ms. French: It just so happens – I'll just say this – that the two National Register Districts are both single-story overlays so there's never going to be a Discretionary Review for a two-story home proposed in one of those districts.

Board Member Bernstein: Fine, good, ok. Alright, thank you. Going back to one of the other comment that I think two members of the public made about the idea of historic preservation and I think the phrase was frozen in time. We do have at least one project or one building in Palo Alto that is frozen in time that the community has certainly embraced it to be frozen in time. That's the Hewlett Packard garage and it's down to -- the original nails are still there. So, there's an example of a historic preservation where it's frozen in time so that's certainly appropriate. The – a couple members of the public mentioned about not having their Eichler homes be considered frozen in time. I just want to make one quick comment about what is historic about some of these neighborhoods and I think one of the historic issues is from a social point of view. From say the 1950s, it was common to have extended families living in these homes. Meaning you needed square footage so any restrictions to say a house can – has to be frozen in time is – can become pretty restrictive. Again, we've heard many applicants come before our Board that the reason we want to expand any house is that for multi-generational. So, not having it frozen in time, I support that idea of not having that – not having an Eichler house be frozen in time. Thank you for that. A few more – I apologize but again we just got this information also.

Chair Bower: Should I set the three-minute timer?

Board Member Bernstein: Page 28 talks about preservation incentives. As you've you heard me speak publicly, I'm in huge favor of preservation incentives. There's also talk about the Historic Building Code so can a house not listed in the local register use the California Historic – so all these homes that are in National Register Districts. Can they use the California Historic Building Code? I don't know the answer to that. Alright, the – page 29, it says – my question that I wrote here was – oh, before – I guess that's continuing that same question. Before – awe, it says on page 29 on the left-hand side that a building may qualify as a historic resource if it falls within one of these categories. Again, I guess that's the requirement of the property owner to actually apply for historic statues before any historic benefits can accrue. We've already today that there's no Eichler building is on the Historical Register. Almost done here. I already made the comment about the Individual Review process in response to privacy. One of the guidelines on page 67 does show horizontal or vertical siding so that's good that there's flexibility on that. Getting toward the end. Page 73, is there any prohibition on an Eichler house being demolished? So, once a say building permits for replacement building is – is there any prohibition on an Eichler house being demolished? I don't think there is.

Ms. French: No, again because one none of our Eichlers, even those in the National Register District, are on our inventory locally so there for demolition is allowed. We do have a rule in Palo Alto that you have to have a replacement home because we don't want to have the disappearing of our housing stock and for other reasons, so maximum lot size etc.

Board Member Bernstein: Sure, great, thank you for that. Page 74, I see the word -- on the left-hand side, there's a word perceived height. I'm a huge proponent of that idea that it's not so much how high something is but what's the perception and that's where the IR process can get involved in. Three more comments here. Page 107, special considerations for National Historic District, we've heard (inaudible) representative of the Architectural Control Committees for the different neighborhoods. I – my hats off to them. I think they do a pretty fantastic job in helping speak to and educate and hear different points of view about what is deemed by that Committee and perhaps in other neighbor representatives on what's appropriate for that neighborhood? So, it sounds like there is some architectural control already in effect. I know the City of Palo Alto does not get involved in those private conversations but it looks like there is some good care put into those Architectural Control Committees. So, that's a good way for them plus any of these voluntary design guidelines, I think that's a good educational aspect here. Page 109, I'm glad to see the comment about the doorknobs being put in. If accessibility is a concern, consider a level – a lever handle with a simple unornamental contemporary look. I'm glad for that clarification. I do see on page 110 and this will be my last comment about on the right-hand side is say the two existing National Register Districts, Greenmeadow and Greenmeadows also have a single-story overlay statue. It says; however, second-story additions are not encouraged in any historic district that may be designated in the future as a measure to retain the integrity of the district. I will suggest that two-story – a second story, there probably are designs that could be added and still maintain the integrity of the district. I would need to be obviously very sensitive addition. Again, we have the IR process and other reviews that can be done for that. Those are my comments based on the comments we received in orange. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Martin, for doing a detailed review of this document. Roger, you have any comments?

Board Member Kohler: Not yet, no.

Chair Bower: Oh, Emily, please.

Ms. Emily Vance, Historic Planner: Yes, thank you. Good morning everyone. Just to speak to your earlier comment Chair member Bernstein about the California Historic Building Code. Just to clarify in that the California Historic Building Code is – provides alternative building regulations when dealing with qualified historic resources. A qualified historic resource is any existing or future resource listed on a Local, State or National Register. So, the contributing resources within those two National Registered Districts would certainly be considered qualified historic resources so they could take advantage of the Historic Building Code. The only thing to note is that since they are not on the Local Register which we discussed – the Local Inventory, that they could not take advantage of other incentives offered.

Chair Bower: So, following up on that, we have discussed whether or not – we have discussed the floodplain issue as it relates to historic properties and could you just for – put into the record here how that applies? I think if I remember correctly the flood zone – if the building is a recognized historic building, then the flood zone regulations are suspended or don't apply?

Ms. Vance: Yes, it's something along those lines dealing with FEMA and federal flood insurance program where historic resources could be exempted from certain restrictions on basements in flood zones.

Chair Bower: Just a – it's clear as I understand this if you have a historic resource – if your building is designated or recognized as a historic resource, the need to comply with a raised first-floor elevation above floor plane would not apply. Is that correct?

Ms. Vance: I believe that's the interpretation but again, like we said, just for qualified historic resources so that wouldn't be true for all Eichlers. It would just be for the ones in the two National Register Districts.

Chair Bower: The reason I bring this up is if for the two Nationally Recognized Districts where they to be added to the City's inventory which I have said publicly many times I think that they should be added. Then the floor plane issues which relate directly to the privacy issues that many people have spoken to both today and in public comments are somewhat mitigated because you're not going to have those differentiated elevations. Ok.

Ms. Vance: Yeah, that's true.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Alright, I'm just going to go across the Board here. Margaret, any comments?

Board Member Wimmer: I was just listening very carefully to all the public comments and trying to really understand some of your sentiments and thoughts. It sounded like there was a mix of people who were in support and some people who were maybe not. Maybe feeling a little threatened by the guidelines and that maybe would preempt them from doing something that they would ultimately want to do. I think – especially responding to the ADU comments, I think there are some cases where the City puts out these guidelines for instance for the ADU new ordinance that we have. Sometimes those regulations or those parameters might not be applicable to for instance an Eichler house that you feel like the 900-square feet is too big for the backyard. I think those people who own Eichler properties, they would have to find a balance themselves in what's appropriate for their unique site, their unique property, their unique situation and adapt those available ADU ordinances for them. I think putting an ADU in the front yard would probably be disruptive of the overall neighborhood character so I think – I guess what I am trying to say is that there are these ordinances that are out there that may not specifically apply to your unique individual property. I think it's up to the property owners to interrupt what is appropriate for their own wellbeing for they own property. I think also in terms of the CC&Rs, I hadn't really – I wasn't really aware of a lot of the CC&Rs that might have existed when these Eichler neighborhoods originated but I think that these guidelines – they're not necessarily a replacement or they're not necessarily meant to be a new CC&R. These guidelines are in response to the fact that these Eichler neighborhoods are becoming historic because of their age and because they've been around for a significant amount of time. That the City wants to preserve that mid-century modern architectural style that is prevalent in Palo Alto so these guidelines are an effort to preserve and to guide preservation of these neighborhoods. Not necessarily meant as a replacement or a new CC&R that is suddenly imposed upon you. So, those are my two comments.

Chair Bower: Thank you. Michael, any additions?

Board Member Makinen: Well, there was – I can't recall which page it's on but there was some discussion about if this goes to Council a three-tier approach. I think that...

Chair Bower: It's coming up.

Board Member Makinen: Yeah.

Chair Bower: I want to discuss that after we made comments.

Board Member Makinen: I think that has a lot of people concerned that this is becoming a requirement and it's not. It's just a voluntary type activity that we're promoting so I think there are some real concerns for the public when they see that. Is that yeah, we're calling it voluntary but is it really voluntary? I think there's a feeling of – I won't call it a threat but some feeling that they may be more than what we advertised as voluntary.

Chair Bower: You – any comments? Roger.

Board Member Kohler: Well, I'd just like to comment that the group of folks here today and there were a lot of different comments expressed by all the different people. That's what towns are made of, a whole bunch of different people so where some that spoke today that are very adamant about they want it a certain way, others didn't care, others were annoyed that they would have to worry about this and so it's very interesting group. We on the Board just try to do the best we can within what we hear from homeowners and staff and ourselves. It's – in fact, I'm just curious if you could just maybe state the purpose of today's meeting, just out of my – so I can readjust my – what I've heard and what we're...

Ms. French: Sure. The purpose of today's meeting is to receive a recommendation from the HRB on these guidelines. This is – we've been at this for a little while, you have – you continued this from January 25th to this date so that you could see the modifications done by our consultant following the comments you made on January 25th, following the comments made at the public workshop on January 18th, the emails we received through our Eichler inbox that you have all received At Places on January 25th and in this staff report. The goal is to finish with the HRB, then we start the existing process of re-notifying the neighborhood and seeing which agenda this will land on with the Council. Currently, we've targeted April 2nd and we'll see what happens with emails to Council on all of this. Once it gets closer to Council, then people really come out of the woodwork. Even if we've been at it for a year.

Board Member Kohler: This is kind of the – what we're talking about, this booklet which becomes the guiding light for everybody when talking about Eichler neighborhoods. I say there are neighborhoods because there's several – all kinds of groups of Eichlers around town, right?

Ms. French: There's a map inside the guidelines that shows all of the Eichler tracts.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, ok. It's not just the big one on Alma, it's...

Chair Bower: No.

Board Member Kohler: ... (inaudible).

Chair Bower: I'd like to make a few comments and then we'll move towards crafting a motion. As I – first of all, I went to the first public meeting. I couldn't attend the other two but it was pretty clear that the community members that did go to those meetings had two primary concerns and reviewing the 236 comments that are part of our package today. Those concerns popped up to the top and the number one concern is the issue of privacy with additions that would provide a direct line of sight into other – from a new project into an existing house. That ties in with the second most commented on an issue which is second-story additions. They are really one in the same issue. I think that these guidelines, as in this final form that we have here today -- and I don't, by the way, mean to suggest that this is the last time these guidelines are going to be addressed because guidelines are, I think, of guidelines as dynamic and they do change. So, while I don't think these are the perfect approach, I think these are a good start and as we saw from Professorville Guidelines, those guidelines helped inform these guidelines in ways that I think make both of them better. The next item that was of concern to people who wrote is how these guidelines will be enforced and those concerns are focused on property values, on the flexibility of design changes, how new property – new development will impact their existing houses. My experience in the seminars that I have attended that actually apply directly to this have informed me that formation of historic districts actually increases the value of the property. Los Angeles did a 10-year study of this and developed a very comprehensive ordinance much more thorough and restrictive I think in a sense than our guidelines. They found that in every case the property values in those areas increased. The thing that they discovered was that if you are in a district like an Eichler district -- Los Angeles has different districts -- and some developer came in and bought a property next to you, tore down a house that conforms to the district style and then built something totally different. The property values next door to those on either side and across the street all went down because of the new development. They were frankly surprised at that and surprised that when these overlays went into effect in Los Angeles, they raised the values of the properties. I'm not – obviously everything in California is now more expensive but what

really was significant was they demonstrated that was a real value. So, I think these have – these guidelines – and again, these are guidelines which are intended to set expectations about development. They don't demand a certain style but they inform the designers who are going to be working in this neighborhood -- they are different neighborhoods -- about what is expected to – in the new designs to conform or to compliment – there are lots of other historic preservation words that we use but basically to compliment what's already there. I'm – my colleagues on the Board who are architects and designers I'm sure would never want to design a project that wasn't conforming to and complementary to a historic district. This is an attempt to really help both the new development ideas and the existing architecture to live in some harmony. I think its important for the community to understand that historic district designation again provides a lot of benefits. People I think are afraid of that, that sort of designation because they think it limits their options. I think from a 40-year career as a building contractor in this community, that had I known about the historic – if we had the Historic Building Code, that is would have been much easier to do a number of projects that I built but they were – it wasn't available so there are incentives in this document that help us move I think the conversation away from limiting property values but instead enhancing them and enhancing community. By the way, Eichlers, as all buildings are, they are a living document of our history and people who live in them don't necessarily – I think they live in them because they like the design, maybe it's affordable but most important they are preserving what Palo Alto was 50-60-years ago. Just like we're preserving the Hewlett Packard garage because that's something that was very important to our development here. Almost done. I think this – I'm hoping this – these guidelines are our step in helping to inform the community and I fully expect that there will be a vigorous discussion at Council because there always is when these kinds of things are adopted. I want the Board to turn to page 56 in our packet which has the four – I'm sorry we don't have this up on the screen so members in the audience can participate. This is Attachment B in our packet, it is the regulatory – it is a path forward – yeah, it's 56, down on the right-hand corner of our packet. It's attachment B. I don't know if you can get to that. Well, Amy can get it up on the screen so that everyone – there is it, I see it. I'd like the Board to focus on how we – when we create a motion, how we can direct Council or not direct them but simply inform them about how we feel they should move forward. There are four options in Tier 0, 1, 2, and 3 and just to review them. Zero is nothing, do nothing. Tier One is an Individual Review integration and privacy guidelines and you can see that that's adopting ordinances and using this in tandem with IR Review. Tier Two is a voluntary Eichler overlay district as this is described here as EO which is Eichler overlay. So, you create a district similar to single-story overlay districts and then you'd use it entire document – this entire document or a portion of it and applying it to new homes or secondary additions. Also, address erosion of support for single-story overlay in the Eichler thing. Then the Tier Three option is regulatory options which is develop standards enhance for privacy, height, size, setbacks, second stories, give legal certainty with maximums for discretionary applications and then for use for other regulatory discretion process. I'd like the Board to move – to actually include one or more of these tiers in our recommendation to the Council. Is there discussion? Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Bower. I'd like to tag onto your comment about the historic districts and the value that has been to property owners. Do any members of the public who have said they are concerned about a replacement house being non-Eichler compatible building. So, there is now – in the IR Guidelines, there's no requirement of style. It's only for massing and scale and privacy issues. Tagging onto Chair Bower's comment about districts, just as neighborhoods – two neighborhoods have gotten together enough support to apply for and get granted a National Historic District. That's, I think, a great step toward any regulations tied with incentives of what to do for modifying or building a new house. We've seen great success in Professorville District for example where property values are pretty incredible there. There are – for many of the homes there, there's like I think about eleven different incentives that property owners can employ to actually do things that bottom line actually increase the value of the property and still maintain a district. I would encourage any Eichler neighborhoods, if they are concerned about well what's the design sense of the neighborhood, to consider applying for National Districts too. Then the incentives then can – it's a lot easier for incentives to be applied so that's a good way for neighborhood preservation. That is my comment to support that idea.

Chair Bower: Sorry, let me ask staff, there is a resolution – a draft resolution, should we be commenting on that? Page 53 in our packet.

Ms. French: Yes, it's prepared so that you can weigh in on the wording there. This is coming to the Council to describe – I mean basically it gives a little history and the fact that were directed to do this by Council. They decided to spend their money on it over a year ago, almost two years ago now. Well, December of 2016 they authorized us to proceed with a contract to do exactly what we've done. It then gives a bit of a history, it talks about the Comprehensive Plan policies there in that Section H which are findings basically to talk about policy L-1.1 for instance. Ensure that new or remodeled structures are compatible with the neighborhood and adjacent structures. That's an existing Comprehensive Plan policy and there are at least seven more policy referenced. This is the new Comprehensive Plan that was adopted by Council in November and became effective in December. Then there's a finding there about being consistent and compatible with applicable purposes of the R-1 zone so there are three bullets there. So, if you want to take a moment to read those and let us know if there's any issue with those statements related to what we're doing here that would be great.

Board Member Bernstein: Chair, I forgot one question. Does this – not a proclamation – resolution – proposed resolution, does it tie into any of the Tier 0, 1, 2, or 3? Do you know?

Ms. French: It does not. It is designed to be specifically about the guidelines alone as a document – as a voluntary document. What would go to Council, we're targeting April 2nd at this point, would be again this same chart that you're seeing here to give a flavor of options, Tier 0-3. There would be no ordinance going to Council in April. They would have to direct staff to go and write an ordinance to come back to make it effectively useful with the Individual Review for two-story homes or any other potential options. If they want us to come back with an Eichler overlay option for people in neighborhoods – those neighborhoods to volunteer to be – to get together and elect themselves – select themselves, then that would happen at that point. So, that another year in the making I think.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

Chair Bower: I'd like to do two – I'm going to split these up. I want to consider...

Council Member Holman: David?

Chair Bower: Oh, I'm sorry. Council Member Holman.

Council Member Holman: Hi, I just want to say a couple of things for the public. Going back to the genesis of these guidelines, how it came about wasn't because staff or the Council were looking for more work. These came about because a good number of people got together who live in Eichler neighborhoods and wanted some guidance and some assist by the City to help preserve their neighborhoods. It wasn't about – to borrow somebodys term – it wasn't about freezing anything in time but it was concerned about the kinds of development additions and new construction that was happening in their Eichler neighborhoods. So, this came out – this was a grassroots effort that brought this to the Council's attention that caused this effort to happen. So, that's the springboard from which this came. The other thing, as I've been on the Council now for this is my 9th year and on Planning Commission for 8 ½-years before that, I hope people will look at this with two minds. There are people who are very supportive of these and they're not perfect. I don't agree with everything in them. Nobody is going to be 100% satisfied but look at these with two minds. These could be very helpful in precluding – the reason I mentioned the 17-years I've been doing this is because there are appeals that come out of people not having guidance like this in front of them and provided. So, we have neighbors fighting neighbors and neighbors and neighbors fighting neighbors and neighbors because of new construction additions and such in these Eichler neighborhoods. I see these as a resource to help abate those appeals and those battles within neighborhoods. They are – I don't know what the Council – full Council is going to do about some aspect of this being an ordinance or all voluntary. At this point in time, they're all voluntary, Council will weigh in on that, the community will weigh in on that but I hope people will look at these like

I say with two minds. Of like trying to help neighborhoods stay neighborhoods and I don't mean that just architecturally, I mean it also in terms of relationships. Again, I'm hoping people can hold two minds with this and understand the genesis of this was from people who live in Eichler neighborhoods. I think it also would be helpful if staff could provide in conjunction with this to the public is what the information is that – because I think it is documented, the information that Chair Bower was providing about the value of historic neighborhoods. What it means to be in a historic neighborhood and it isn't a no change situations. It's being the respectful situation and providing guidance and also to provide what the incentives are that the City has for historic properties should any of these districts want to become – be added to the inventory or if other neighborhoods want to be considered for addition. I think the options and alternatives need to be provided from the various perspectives and I appreciate very much the Chair's comments. I hope that's helpful to the public hopefully.

Chair Bower: Well, I think we all hope it's helpful for the public. Thank you for that comment. I'd like to make one other comment just so that the homeowners who are here get a sense of perspective. I own a building in the Liberty Hills Historic District in San Francisco. That's a Victorian district and our – the value of that property in the 10-years we've owned it has skyrocketed not just because it's in San Francisco in the Mission but because the entire district is protected. So, when builders – actually developers buy the buildings and several of them very close to us have been purchased, they can't tear down the Victorians. They maintain the facades which is really what – we're talking here about a façade issue. None of these guidelines do – address anything that goes on inside the building. They don't, frankly, really regulate anything that goes – any alterations that would occur on the outside of the side yard and the rear yards with the exception of ADUs and that's a whole different issue. So, what we're talking about here is trying to maintain the front façade of these neighborhoods. I mean obviously with additions and so my Victorian building is not frozen in time. It is – has been modernized to the maximum extent possible but we've retained all of the features that made it attractive to us when we bought it and made the historic district a recognized space. I'm not just sitting up here as the Chair of the Committee saying we ought to do this stuff to my neighbors because I don't understand what goes on. I have a really good understanding of what a historic district does and the benefits and they are substantial. So, that said, I'd like to talk – I'd like the Board to consider – by the way, I'm not the only person on this Board that has – owns historic building. Michael does, Martin does and Beth Bunnenberg who was on the Board also in a building that could be considered historic and Corey does so we all have different personal relationships with properties that have designations. I want to talk about this Attachment B because I'd like the Board to consider this as one motion and I'd to recommend a pathway for the Council. I think that's what we – we can help the Council evaluate their – and do their job if we can give them direction based on our experience here. I don't want to -- we're at 10:10. I would like to try to move this along quickly so we can go back to work. Any comments? Let's – I'm going to just start at this end and come back. Michael? No comments?

Board Member Makinen: Not right now.

Chair Bower: Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: Well, I definitely think that we wouldn't have gone through all of this effort and just had a Tier 0. I would think that we would want for this to be – I mean not just go through all this work and this very educational and helpful document and just put it on the shelf. I think that it should be an interactive tool so I think that we should at least have some step along the way where people have to respond or have to read or have to engage with this document while their considering making any alterations or doing any modifications to their house. Maybe – I mean I think – I always feel like you fall somewhere in the middle. You don't want to make it into an ordinance where it has to be followed to a tee which might be the Tier Three. I think somewhere in the middle where at least we're using it as a tool and a very valid useful tool. So, I think somewhere in the middle is where we need to guide them.

Chair Bower: Roger.

Board Member Kohler: Well, I think the – I'm not sure how to start this but over the years having been architecting here in Palo Alto over 40-years and worked on 400-500 houses in Palo Alto. This is pretty – I think a very important area. When I was in fourth grade we moved here from New Jersey and then we moved but a lot of my friends lived in Eichlers because we were down on East Meadow – West Meadow Road. I got close – spending many nights that varying homes that are Eichlers and I kinda got used to how they were and they're a special breed. They have a lot of neat features and some annoying ones as well and so I think it's a well worthwhile goal to try to keep what we've got going and maintaining it and improving it but not necessarily limiting everything to be the exact Eichler program. That you're not interrupting what's there now and that we're increasing or improving the neighboring homes. This is basically goals for the exterior of the home as seen from the street as far as what you've been telling us. Most folks who end up living in Eichlers like the inside of Eichlers, that's one reason they bought the house because they really have a neat feature. I'm hoping we could get this – I agree that we don't want to go with Tier 0 and then we have 1, 2, 3 options, is that what we're...

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, that's correct.

Board Member Kohler: What David? What...

Chair Bower: Sorry, we could also suggest a modification of these tiers.

Board Member Kohler: Ok.

Chair Bower: I don't think we have to adopt 1, 2, or 3.

Ms. French: I want to jump in to clarify. Again, you are not to – we have not flushed these out in a way that's recommendable at this time.

Board Member Kohler: Oh, I see.

Ms. French: I would like the Board to focus on the guidelines themselves which are voluntary and any changes there too so we can take that specifically to the Council. This possibility can be discussed but let's not lose focus of what we're doing today which is the guidelines adoption.

Board Member Kohler: I think Martin did quite a good job on his little checklist and other comments so I'm comfortable with whatever we're approving. I'm still not sure.

Ms. French: We're recommending...

Board Member Kohler: Recommending, ok.

Ms. French: ... the guidelines to the City Council and there's a resolution that can be tweaked if you would care to look at that.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, ok. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, I looked at the resolution and on page – packet page 54, Policy L-6.2, I'll just read it for the public record. If a proposed project would substantially affect the exterior of a potential historic resource that has not been evaluated for inclusion into the Cities Historic Resources Inventory. City staff shall consider whether it is eligible for inclusion in state or federal registers prior to the issuance of a demolition or alteration permit. Again, this is a good resolution statement that is in support of historic neighborhood character which would encourage then neighborhoods who are concerned about that to apply for a historic district designation. I totally agree with Chair Bower about the boy, the cultural value and by the way, the financial value of historic districts and the preservations.

I've done about twelve homes in Professorville where we use these incentives and really expanded the market value for one way and also maintain the character of the district. So, any neighborhoods that are caring about their neighborhood character, well I think a historic designation is a good way to go so I would encourage owners to think about that. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Alright so I don't want to make this Attachment B the primary focus but I'm not hearing any Board Member suggest that these guidelines as they've been presented today shouldn't be forward to the Council for adoption, in some way, into our City ordinance. The reason I wanted to focus on this attachment is that I think as Margaret has said, Tier One no action is certainly not what this...

Board Member Bernstein: It's Tier 0.

Chair Bower: Tier 0, pardon me. We are not – we haven't been working on this for a year and a half because as Councilwomen Holman said the staff had nothing else to do. This came – this is before us because there was a strong desire by people who own Eichlers to protect them I think is a good way of saying it. I'd like to suggest to the Board that we recommend to the Council a combination of Tier 1 and Tier 2. I don't – there's very little difference, the only thing that I'm not sure about in Tier 2 and that would be my preference is the – addressing the erosion of support of single-story overlay. I think it would be a very positive thing for the Council to create a way in which we can have an Eichler overlay in every one of these individually identified neighborhoods in our design guidelines. We haven't really talked about that but I think that this document moves us in that direction. I would like to suggest that we adopt the Tier 2 approach. Encourage the Council to move forward with a Tier 2 approach and if maybe clarify what this – what an erosion of support of a single-story overlay might suggest.

Ms. French: If I can jump in? Tier – you had first said recommend Tier 1 and Tier 2 so I think Tier 1 is, if anything, is requested. I mean that's what we've heard at the workshop etc. and that's what I think staff would like to have is Tier 1. So, that we can proceed with our Individual Review of two-story homes with a tool such as this that connects them. That would be I think – now if you jumped to Tier 2 and not do Tier 1 then we're not using the guidelines with the IR program. Now what you're doing is suggesting that we allow a method through an ordinance for Eichler tracts to self-select – come forward with 70% of the neighbors – of the owners saying they want this to be imposed upon their neighborhood. Just the single-story overlay is now, that's a process where if you have the CC&Rs 60% is required and if you don't 70% is required to come forward with an application to impose a zone on overlay. Just creating the enabling ordinance to allow tracts to come forward is not imposing the Eichler district on any neighborhoods. It's allowing a method whereby they could come forward. When we talk about erosion of support, that was with the single-story overlay processee. We had several that came through that initially they had the minimum level of support to submit the application for rezoning but during the process, people decided to change their minds and they didn't want to be – have that overlay and so those didn't get passed through that process. So, with an Eichler overlay, we would want to, of course, take some direction that would allow consideration of what happens when that happens during that process.

Chair Bower: Thank you for that clarification. I think in that in hearing that, I think what I would like – I'm hoping the Board will do is adopt Tier 1 and support the – sorry, I've got to get the right page here.

Board Member Bernstein: Page 53.

Chair Bower: I'm sorry...

Ms. French: I have to jump in again. Can we please not use the word adopt, could we please – just cautionary – to say explore whether it's worthwhile or not to explore Tire 1 further and recommend that the Council consider directing staff basically.

Chair Bower: I was thinking but did not say adopting an approach so an approach is what – obviously what we do is evaluate ideas and then make a suggestion to the Council. The Council makes a final decision but it's their decision, not ours. I think we can do this in one motion now. I'm not hearing any

problems with the proposed, yet not adopted, resolution on our pages. I think it provides an inclusion of the design guidelines as a tool in helping inform the alterations and additions to Eichler properties and neighborhoods. I guess I'd like to hear a motion to inform the Council of our – what we think their approach should be to move forward. Martin.

MOTION #1

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Bower. I'd like to make a motion that the City at the City Historic Resources Board move to recommend to the Council that they adopt the resolution shown on our packet page 53. In referring to the – your comment Chair Bower about the different tiers, would that be a separate motion?

Chair Bower: No, I think we should do it in one because the tiers are ideas about how to move forward.

Board Member Bernstein: Ok, yeah. Also, including in my motion then to include the idea included in – written in Tier 1 which is using in tandem the IR Guidelines for two-story, second floor home review and enhance IR privacy for Eichlers. By enhance, again that's not an ordinance that we're suggesting but that would be just exploring that comment. Part of Tier 1 also includes in this diagram the idea of an ordinance adopting the guidelines. My motion is that – my wording right now is not to recommend any ordinance adopting the guidelines. I'll hear what the Board Members have about that but – because it's just going to be I think just – oh, yeah, please go ahead.

Ms. French: I'm sorry. I know this is really hard to manage. We – what you are – I think your motion is to recommend to adopt the resolution to – for the Council to adopt the guidelines as voluntary. You have a second and it would be nice to have a vote on that just alone. Then proceed with the second one is my request. The second piece would be to discuss an ordinance that would connect it to the individual review guidelines as a part of Tier 1. So, if we could just get to the finish line on the guidelines and then the next discussion.

Chair Bower: So, let's just – you want to do the motion in both or one?

Board Member Bernstein: Well, let's just start with the motion with the – the first motion is to adopt the proposed resolution that's on our packet page 53.

Chair Bower: Which incorporates the proposed guidelines – voluntary guidelines as part of our review process.

Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

Chair Bower: Alright, do we have a second?

Board Member Wimmer: I'll second that.

Chair Bower: Alright, any discussion? I think we've probably talked about this...

Board Member Kohler: I vote yes.

Chair Bower: We haven't voted yet. Alright, if there is no discussion would you like to rephrase the motion just so that we have it clear for the record.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, move that the Historic Resources Board recommend to the City Council that they adopt the resolution shown on our packet page 53.

Chair Bower: Alright and that's been seconded by Margaret so all in favor say aye. Opposed? No.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR COREY ABSENT.

Chair Bower: Now let's

Ms. French: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: Brandon, yeah, he had to leave. Let's talk about our recommendations as regards to Tier 1, 2, or 3 on page 56.

Board Member Wimmer: Can I ask a question? I'm sorry, I – as I'm looking through this, this is now referencing an Eichler overlay so is there – maybe I just didn't notice it in the guidelines. Does it discuss an Eichler overlay in the guidelines? I know it mentions all the – and identifies all the tracts so is that basically saying that each tract would be an Eichler overlay.

Ms. French: No.

Board Member Wimmer: I mean how are those – I missed that. I'm sorry.

Ms. French: Sorry, I need to jump in again. What you have in front of you and on the screen are ideas without any exploration. The exploration that would occur related to Tier 2 would be if Council were to direct us, staff, to embark upon a process that would many months and probably a year to explore an ordinance that would enable – just like the SSO Ordinance process that would enable tracts to volunteer – voluntarily come forward and (crosstalk) self-select themselves with a minimum percentage of support from the owners to become an Eichler overlay. What the Eichler overlay would be is variable as well. It could be...

Board Member Wimmer: Is to be defined because we haven't defined what that is yet.

Ms. French: We haven't defined whether the entirety of the guidelines would apply or one chapter or...

Board Member Wimmer: I think that's what I was missing, that reference (crosstalk) to Eichler overlay but there was no definition of it so ok. I was trying to figure that, I wasn't sure.

Chair Bower: Michael.

Board Member Makinen: I think that's very appropriate that we endorse the concept of an Eichler overlay district. At least the Council can consider that as an action that we can take. I think definitely should state something along those lines.

Chair Bower: Alright, Roger any comments?

Board Member Kohler: I'm looking here at this and there's 0 – Tier 0, Tier 1, Tier 2, Tier 3 so are we voting on one of those tiers? No, we trying...

Ms. French: No, there's no...

Board Member Kohler: Ok, yeah, that's what I'm trying to say.

Ms. French: What I think might best, I'm trying to help and I realize this is difficult...

Board Member Kohler: I think we just...

Ms. French: If you're not inclined – if anyone – you could say straw poll if Tier 0 voluntary is your opinion of the best way to move forward. You could take a tier straw poll to say if Tire 1 makes sense for staff to

put in the report or it's in the minutes from the HRB meeting that the Council will see. I think taking each one individually, not either or, would be a better approach.

Board Member Kohler: Well, I mean it seems to me we're the Historic Resources Board, I don't think we want to 0. That's – we're trying to help to guide everybody. I'm not sure why we have to – there's an overlay between all of these. Why don't we just come up with some sort of suggestion of a combination for Tier 1 and 2? I don't know about 3.

Board Member Wimmer: Is there a way that we can just make a motion that we reviewed this potential Attachment B and our motion is to take the time to further develop it so -- because we're kind of stumbling over it obviously.

Chair Bower: So, I'd like to...

Board Member Wimmer: So, instead of continuing stumbling, can we just have a motion to accept it as an idea and the motion would be to further investigate it?

MOTION #2

Chair Bower: I'd like to try to short-circuit this what seems to be a circular discussion. I'd like to move that the Historic Resources Board encourage the City Council to recreate an ordinance that adopts the guidelines and that is used in tandem with the Individual Review Guidelines for second story and second floor home review and that enhances the Individual Review privacy for Eichlers. I'd like that to have an emphasis on neighborhood control and neighborhood guidance because I think local is – as local as you can get is best.

Board Member Bernstein: I thought...

Chair Bower: My motion.

Board Member Bernstein: I second that motion.

Chair Bower: Now a discussion of it? This is a motion to encourage the Council to move forward with these ideas. Essentially, they are the ones that are summarized in Tier 1. I would imagine that in this review an Eichler overlay might also come out of it so I don't want to put that as part of the motion but I think that could be a logical – something that would logically be included.

Board Member Bernstein: The reason why I seconded Chair Bower's motion is the idea of a local control. We've seen great success in Professorville Historic District for example. We have two National Listed Historic Districts for Eichlers and that's all neighborhood local control. Boy, I think that's the best administrative way there is. The majority of homeowners in different districts saying here's what we want and then do their now application process so that's why I supported Chair Bower's motion.

Chair Bower: Staff opinion?

Ms. French: I don't want to offer my opinion but what I do want to say is just for the public, I sense restlessness and I hope we don't get to hissing again. What I'd like to say is any ordinance that would connect these guidelines to the Individual Review program and the process would first have to go to the Planning and Transportation Commission in a public hearing with notice cards sent to everybody all over again in much ahead of the meeting. Because it's an ordinance it has some teeth to it and that would have to go after the Council directs us to pursue that option because again that is staff resources to be spent on a process. Hopefully, that's clear to the public.

Chair Bower: Right, this is a recommendation for a path forward and that's all it is and it's – that means we would just start a second ordinance crafting process. Correct?

Ms. French: It would be the first ordinance because what this is, is a resolution. Resolutions do not have any power to change ordinances. Only to acknowledge the existence of these as a useful tool – voluntary tool.

Chair Bower: Any other comments on the motion?

Board Member Wimmer: I just – I'm sorry, sometimes I backtrack. So, there is a potential that each individual tract could follow a different tier. I mean we're not saying that – I know I just want...

Chair Bower: Let me interrupt. I don't want to have to actually get into weeds in this. This is a direction...

Board Member Wimmer: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: This is a direction and the Council...

Board Member Wimmer: (inaudible)

Chair Bower: ...has to move – they have to make the decision about how they want us to move. I'd like to focus this on just the direction that we want Council to take, not on the individual specifics which, of course, will be discussed in great detail. Is that ok?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes.

Chair Bower: I don't mean to cut off your thoughts, they are legitimate and valuable but that's – we're at the 30,000-foot level here I think.

Board Member Wimmer: Right.

Chair Bower: Other comments? Alright, if there are no further comments let's vote on the measure. All in favor say aye. Opposed? None.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR COREY ABSENT

Chair Bower: I think that concludes the public hearing on the Eichler Design Guidelines.

Approval of Minutes

4. Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of January 25, 2018

Chair Bower: We move to the last item in our agenda – on our agenda which is approval of minutes from the January 25th meeting. Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: I'd just like to thank members of the public who have...

Chair Bower: Absolutely.

Board Member Bernstein: ... joined us this morning. It's – I know it's taking valuable time out of your day today and again, this is a very important subject that we're discussing today. So, thank you for members of the public for coming in.

Chair Bower: I'd also like to follow that with an appreciative – with my appreciation that people will or did take the time to come out, expressed a lot of differing views and it helps to inform our decisions. It will certainly help to inform the Council's decisions. So, even if we didn't reach a conclusion you wanted us to, it – all of the comments are valuable so thank you for coming. Alright, minutes. Any issues?

Ms. French: (inaudible – off mic)

Chair Bower: I don't hear any Board comments on minutes.

MOTION

Board Member Wimmer: I move to approve the minutes.

Chair Bower: Alright we have a motion to approve minutes. A second?

Board Member Kohler: I second.

Chair Bower: Roger seconds. Any changes and deletions? Alright, all in favor of approving the minutes say aye. Opposed? (crosstalk) We're just approving the minutes.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0 WITH VICE CHAIR COREY ABSENT

Ms. French: Did they get approved?

Chair Bower: Yes. Margaret moved to approve the minutes and Roger seconded.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: Alright, Board Member comment – oh, subcommittee will meet after this meeting.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: Any other Board Member comments or announcements? I see none so with that – oh, Emily.

Ms. Vance: Yeah, the subcommittee for 526 Waverley will be meeting just to make sure that's clear.

Chair Bower: I'm sorry where?

Ms. Vance: The 526 Waverley façade restoration will be meeting, not any other subcommittee.

Chair Bower: Right, it's 526 and where will we meet?

Ms. Vance: We'll meet right here.

Chair Bower: Right here, fine. With no other information and no other comments, the meeting is adjourned.

Adjournment