



# HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: December 12, 2019

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

## Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower; Vice Chair Corey, Board Member Wimmer, Board Member Kohler, Board Member Shepherd, Board Member Bernstein

Absent:

Chair Bower: I think we should get going and Michael can catch up when he gets here. Welcome to the three people in the audience that are here, to our last Historic Resources Board Meeting of 2019. Would you call the roll, please?

Chair Bower: Good, thank you.

[Board moved to City Official Reports]

## Oral Communications

## Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

## City Official Reports

### 1. Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meetings and Assignments.

Chair Bower: Okay, so we have as our Number One Item, Meetings and Assignments. This, I think, is the last meeting of the year, and the schedule for 2020 meetings is here, but at this point the composition of the Board is not clear because three of us are up for reappointment or appointment. Three positions are open and so we will not know until the 16<sup>th</sup> of December who the Council selects. So, there is no real discussion of that.

[Board moved to Action Items]

## Study Session

## Action Items

- 2. PUBLIC HEARING/QUASI-JUDICIAL. 840 Kipling Street [18PLN-00185]: Request for Historic Resources Board Consideration of Proposed Additions and Modifications to a Residence Previously Determined by the HRB to be a Contributing Resource Within the Boundaries of the SOFA I Coordinated Area Plan. The Project Request Includes Individual Review and a Variance for the Construction of a Second Story Addition on a Substandard Lot. Environmental**

**Assessment: Exempt from the Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in Accordance with Guideline Section 15301 (Additions to existing structure). Zoning District: R-2 (Low-Density Residential). For more Information Contact the Project Planner Christy Fong at [ChristyImfong@gmail.com](mailto:ChristyImfong@gmail.com).**

Chair Bower: So, let's move on to Item Number Two, which is a Public Hearing of 840 Kipling Street. It's a request for Historic Resources Board consideration of proposed additions and modifications to a residence previously determined by the HRB to be a contributing resource within the boundaries of the South of Forest, what's the A part of that? Area, SOFA I Coordinated Area Plan. The project request includes individual review and a variance for the construction of a second story addition on a substandard lot. Environmental assessment is that it is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act in accordance with Guideline Section 15301 (additions to existing structures). Zoning is R-2 (low-density residential). So, would you like a member of Staff to start off our presentation.

Board Member Bernstein: Actually, Chair Bower?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: So, I will need to excuse myself from the dais on this project. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Will you be back to speak to the project?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, I guess I will be speaking to the project.

Chair Bower: So, can't Martin go to the audience?

Ms. Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Yes, I think because Martin is a sole proprietor we're making that announcement to be clear about why you're getting up from there and walking over there for the viewing public is that, as a sole proprietor, you are allowed to speak to the Board on this project, which is, you're representing the client.

Chair Bower: Yes, that is correct. Thank you.

Ms. French: I have here with me Christy Fong, who is back. She had been previously employed with the City of Palo Alto. She is back helping us as a consultant and with this and other projects having historic significance. So, I'll just turn it over to Christy.

Ms. Christy Fong: Thank you for the introduction and good morning Board Members. I am the project planner for the proposed project at 840 Kipling Street in the R-2 low-density residential zoning district. Just to provide you with an overview on the project history and its historic status, the property was previously determined by the HRB as a contributing resource within the SOFA CAP I area in 1998. On February 14 of this year the project was presented to the HRB in a study session to receive initial feedback on its consistency with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Since the last meeting, the applicant has revised the project. The current project includes first floor additions at the rear part of the building, a partial basement beneath the rear addition, and a second story addition to an existing single-story home with a detached garage on a substandard lot. Along with the addition, modifications to existing windows and door will be made to all elevations throughout the building. The proposed scope of work is summarized in the project discussion sections of the Staff Report in Packet Page nine to ten. To allow the construction of a second story addition on a substandard lot, the project will need to request for a variance and individual review. The variance request also includes an approximate six-foot extension to an existing non-compliant wall on the west elevation, which would extend 2.5 feet into the six-foot required side yard setback. The applicant proposed two additional minor changes to the project since report submission. The first change can be noted on the front and left elevations where there is a double entry door and a single French door under the front porch. The previous proposal is to maintain the location as they are and the current proposal is to swap these two doors. The second change is on the

left elevation where there are two existing historic windows under the gable. The previous proposal is to retain the larger window and to remove the smaller window to accommodate a new stairway. Due to construction difficulty, the current proposal is to remove the larger window and to relocate the smaller window that will center under the gable. The City has engaged Page + Turnbull Inc to conduct an SOI analysis on the project. It is determined that the current project with subsequent changes on November 20<sup>th</sup> is consistent with all ten SOI standards. The SOI analysis is included in the Staff Report and can be found on Packet Page twelve to sixteen. Since the advertisement of this hearing, Staff has received six neighbors' letters commenting on this project, one of which spoke against and the remaining five spoke in favor of the projects. A copy of these comment letters is made available for your consideration. To conclude Staff presentation, Staff would like the HRB to confirm the project consistency with the SOI Standard. Your determination will inform the direct consideration with the request individual review and variance applications for the second story addition on a substandard lot. Staff and applicants are here today to answer any questions you may have on the project.

Chair Bower: Thank you. I need to say at the outset that friends of mine owned this property twenty-five years ago. They do not own it now and I have no interest in the property, but I just feel it's important to let everyone know that I actually have been in the house and am familiar with it, although my memory isn't as good as it used to be. Alright, so that said, would the applicant...

Board Member Wimmer: I have a quick question for Staff, a Staff question. So, in the report it says that it's exempt from Provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, right? However, but then Page + Turnbull deemed that it was noncompliant with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Can you just talk about how those two things relate? If it's exempt on one side, but it needs to meet something on another side, just so we better understand that concept?

Ms. French: Sure. Exemption for single-family home additions is pretty common. When the revisions to an historic resource are deemed not consistent with Secretary of Interior Standards, then technically we could kick it out of exemption because it comes a SEQA Impact. So, that's why Page + Turnbull continued to review the project and the project plans changed, and I believe that's what Christy has presented this morning, further revisions that Page + Turnbull, our historic qualified consultant, reviewed to make sure that the changes now do result in Secretary of Interior Standards compliance. Therefore, it can continue to be exempt from CEQA project.

Board Member Wimmer: Okay, so it's only exempt if it meets the Secretary of Interior Standards?

Ms. French: Correct, in the case of an historic resource.

Board Member Wimmer: I see. Okay, thank you.

Chair Bower: Maybe at this point you could... Go ahead Brandon. I'll follow you.

Vice Chair Corey: Just one clarification, for the neighbor that's against it, it's the only one here on the notes that doesn't have an address. Is the address of the opposing one 836, or is it somewhere else?

Ms. Fong: So, the opposition is from 441 Channing Avenue.

Vice Chair Corey: 441 Channing. Okay, thank you.

Chair Bower: So, while you have this slide up, can you explain what's going on to the left of 840 Kipling? There's what looks like a single-story building there and then 441 Channing, is that all 441 Channing?

Ms. Fong: So, 441 Channing includes a two-story home and a single-story ADU, Accessory Dwelling Unit. So, the lower profile one is the ADU.

Chair Bower: I see. So, the garage... And so, on this view that large...

Ms. Fong: So, the garage for the subject property will be here, and also the ADU on 441 Channing will be here.

Chair Bower: And then the building to the left, what we cannot see, the complete footprint of 441 Channing is there?

Ms. Fong: Yes, so this is the second, this is the two-story building basically.

Chair Bower: Okay, so one of the issues here is that the existing, 840 Kipling, cannot use the entire building envelop because of the redwood trees, is that correct?

Ms. Fong: That's correct. There is a 35-foot tree protection zone from the diameter of the tree that needs to exclude some of the buildable area of the lot. So, that's the challenge that they have and the physical constraint they have on the site in order to make this project eligible to request for a variance.

Chair Bower: Right. Okay, so they don't, the owners don't have any opportunity to build. That's what the green arc is on this?

Ms. Fong: That's correct. The green dotted line outlines the tree protection zone.

Chair Bower: Okay. And this is a substandard lot, meaning that it's less than 5,000 square feet. Is that the metric, is that the volume that you have to achieve to be a standard one?

Ms. Fong: That's correct.

Chair Bower: Can you tell us offhand what the lot, I mean, what the square footage is?

Ms. French: Technically a substandard lot has, there is a formula that is based on lot size and lot width or depth even. So, there's a certain percentage of the lot width that's substandard and then the lot size, and I think that is in the Staff Report. Christy is checking that.

Ms. Fong: So, Packet Page twelve on the footnote, the subject lot is considered as substandard lot width that is less than fifty feet and the lot area is less than 4,980 square feet, which is 83 percent of the minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet and what is allowed under R-2 Zoning District.

Chair Bower: So, it's 107 square feet smaller than a standard lot.

Ms. Fong: That's correct.

Chair Bower: Okay. Alright, I think I have some more questions, but I think they're better answered by the applicant. I think, unless there are other questions of staff, let's hear from the applicant, Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair Bower and Christy and Amy, thank you, and Board Members. First of all, I'd just like to disclose that I received a written notification for the California Fair Political Practice Commission that as a sole proprietor, I'm allowed to present this project, represent the owners on this matter. So, that's why I'm able to present today. So, Christy, thank you for the summary and then there's some comments on the square footage of the property. If we can make some corrections of the square footages that are not making it a standard lot size. So, as Christy mentioned in her report, the main change from what we reviewed back in February was retaining the historic cross gable on the project. When we did that, then that required the proposed stairs to get to the proposed second floor to shift over, and then that became then the construction conflict with the existing window, and that's why we're requesting that the small window and the large windows be revised. For the small window, put it where the big window is, and that's what Christy mentioned. Then the other thing is that, as Christy mentioned, is the proposal on the front porch, to swap the historic doors across. The reason for that

simply is that as the floor plan changed from where the location was, is put the front door where the front entry is, and that's why you see that presentation there. We also, as Christy mentioned, we also did some rework of the design, the cross gable retaining. So, as I've mentioned on several projects where the individual process happens, and then the historic review process happens, we've taken great counsel from those consultants to create, we think, a better project. I'd also like to thank in particular, Board Member Wimmer's suggestion that for the quality-of-life issues in the building, that we consider adding dormers up on the second-floor level, and then that's visible on the west elevation. So, we incorporated that. And that also met all the requirements for the historic review. So, as you've seen in Page + Turnbull's recent report, that all ten of the conditions for Secretary of Interior Standards, they all have been met. So, we're pleased to have worked with the historic consultant and IR to coordinate all that, so that all ten can be met as in compliance. So, those are the basic comments I'd like to make. So, again, the revisions would be the revision of the window and then the switching of the entry doors. So, if you're able to find that those are also consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards, if that could be included in any motion that you propose. Again, you have letters in place where Page + Turnbull has endorsed the revisions of the swapping of the doors and that, so, we've pleased to answer any questions you have. And when appropriate too, I'd also like to introduce Stephen Reyna the property owner. He has some comments to make too, at your pleasure. Thank you.

Chair Bower: I'd like to point out to the audience that we have at our places this morning, email comments on this project that were not part of our packet. I don't know, five, six emails. Five are in favor of the project, one is opposed to the variance for a second floor. And these are available, I guess, in the back or on the website or will be. And, having looked at these very quickly this morning... I wonder, Martin, if you could talk, speak to the privacy issue that's raised by the one neighbor that does not support the project, and in particular, I think the trees that are screening or provide privacy between the houses are new trees. Is that correct?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes. So, again, we worked closely with the Individual Review consultant, **Marmarella** (phonetic) on the privacy issues. So, that's why all the windows on the second floor facing 441 Channing, those windowsills are all at five feet high and they're small, as you can see here, so that met the requirement for the privacy from the house point of view. Mr. Reyna would be able to speak for the landscape issues. So, when the SOFA I project from after **Pamft** (phonetic) sold the property to Summerhill, there was a requirement to keep or maintain forty-foot trees on the dividing property line. There were decisions made that there was a maintenance issue with those trees, so replacement trees were proposed to be planted to go up to a certain height, and Mr. Reyna can explain why those trees haven't gone to that height. But that would address, I think, your question.

Chair Bower: Okay. Go ahead. And then we'll have questions, Board Members can ask questions.

Mr. Stephen Reyna: Good morning Board Members. I have a residual cough from a cold, so if I pause, please forgive me.

Chair Bower: Say your name.

Mr. Reyna: I'm Stephen Reyna. I'm the owner of 840 Kipling and the applicant here. With respect to the specific privacy questions, we bought the house in 1998. At that point the lot next to us was the **Pamft** (phonetic) staff parking lot, which was then subdivided as a part of the SOFA I Program. And Summerhill proposed DHS housing, which is much denser than R-2. It's like 0.65 FAR, where we're 0.45. There was a Director's Hearing with Ed **Goff** (phonetic) who was then Director of Planning back in 2000, 2001. And in that Director's Hearing, when we were talking about compatibility and privacy, Ed **Goff** (phonetic) made the decision that the existing four pine trees, which were forty-foot plus at that point, would be preserved as a condition of the property, as a condition of approval. And when Sondra **Gibbons** (phonetic) or the owners of 441 Channing, current owners, they purchased the house in 2007, the trees were there. In 2009, because of maintenance issues, they requested, they came to us and requested if they could remove the trees and replace them. We had some maintenance issues as well. We agreed to this, but it was a screening tree per screening tree agreement on our part. That was ten years ago. When the trees

were removed, we actually suffered privacy issues, because now their second-story windows were looking into our bedrooms and our bathroom and our living room, but we gave them time for the trees to come back and the trees have actually never really grown. And ten years later, we are still suffering privacy from them, actually. And I included this. One of the things that was put in front of you, actually very late, it was put in front of you this morning. It was our response to his letter. So, we have a point-by-point history and context and response to all of the issues that he brought up. So, and I'll just mention that his privacy is also our privacy. We don't want to be in our house and feel intruded upon in our personal comfort, so we have really tried to make privacy with respect to our neighbors a very key point of the project. So, as Martin pointed out, five-foot windowsills, small windows. It's mostly for light. But we're open to hear other suggestions or additional suggestions, if somebody thinks there is still a privacy issue.

Chair Bower: So, what trees were planted? What's the species of the new tree?

Mr. Reyna: I don't know the species.

Vice Chair Corey: Do you know how tall?

Mr. Reyna: My wife thinks it's Tristin.

Chair Bower: And I see on the plan that the trees are noted at about sixteen feet tall now. Okay. Just to give us some perspective, I'm guessing that this ceiling from our platform is about twenty feet, and so a forty-foot tree, I'm just guessing based on the height of the horizontal area.

Mr. Reyna: I think the top of the window there might be twenty feet.

Chair Bower: Well, it's a very... So, forty feet is a very tall tree.

Mr. Reyna: They were very tall.

Chair Bower: Very tall trees. And so, you have owned your property before Summerhill built those houses, which are much higher density than the rest of the Kipling, that portion of Kipling?

Mr. Reyna: That's correct.

Chair Bower: When they built, are the second-floor windows of 441 obscure or high as the code now requires? Do you know?

Mr. Reyna: Well, sorry?

Chair Bower: When Summerhill built those houses, did they provide the kind of privacy by raising the windowsills or...

Mr. Reyna: No, no no, they're regular windows, like two and a half feet windowsill. It was, the privacy was provided by the trees, not by any kind of window treatment.

Chair Bower: Okay. So, you're, as an established owner before the Summerhill project, the way in which you have the privacy maintained was the screen, which has now been removed.

Mr. Reyna: Yes.

Chair Bower: And replaced, but the trees have not yet grown to the forty-foot height.

Mr. Reyna: Ten years later they have not.

Chair Bower: Yeah, those trees... The pine trees that were there were planted, if I remember correctly, in the early, no mid-70's, I think. Because I remember when they were six, eight feet tall.

Mr. Reyna: Because you knew the previous owners.

Chair Bower: Because I live not far from there. Anyway, okay, I'm just trying to put into the record some context about privacy, because the project has to meet the current standards, privacy standards for second floors, which is high windowsills, or some kind of obscure glass, and obviously, Martin has done that as the architect. Alright, so those are my questions. Does anyone else have questions? Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I don't know if my, I have so much of a comment, I mean a question, but I have a comment. Should I wait for my comment or should I?

Chair Bower: Maybe we can have discussion after we finish the question period.

Mr. Reyna: Is it possible to kind of make my part, my presentation or some things I would like?

Chair Bower: Sure. I'm sorry, I thought... Go ahead.

Mr. Reyna: So, this, where do I start. We love our house. I mean, as I mentioned in the February study session, we hunted for over a year. We've been through physically more than 100 houses, looking for something. And as soon as we found this particular house, we walked in and we knew that this was, this felt home for the first time. And part of it was, a big part of it was actually the historic character, because we love old houses. And this has been our house for the last twenty years, and as we're working, we have a teenage son, we have aging parents. We're looking for a way to upgrade this house a little bit, modest expansion, addition, but what was always important to use from the beginning is to preserve and build upon the historic character of our house, and to fit in with our neighbors and our neighborhood. And with Martin's help, I mean, we picked Martin because of his historic architecture history and whatnot. We came before you. We got good comments from you. We got good comments from Staff and from Page + Turnbull and we have moved our project to where it is today, as you see it. We think that it's a better project for all of that. I'd like to talk a little bit about the property constraints, because that was a question that came up. The threshold, the area threshold for substandard is 4980. We're actually 83 square feet short of that; however, Christy, could you put the site plan up? So, you see that the left property line has a seventy-five-foot segment, it jogs left five feet and then continues. That seventy-five-foot segment, there's actually an easement, a perpetual exclusive use easement in our favor for that seventy-five feet, and it's one and one-half feet wide, the area of that is one hundred twelve square feet. So, and that is a continuous part of our property. If you look at our driveway, it's part of our driveway, and then the planting next to it that goes up to the fence. That was in the picture there. So, in terms of like zoning, which is the placement of volume and mass on a certain amount of property, we actually have the land that fits a conforming lot, but it's in two pieces. It's the land we own and it's the one hundred twelve square feet of the easement, perpetual exclusive use easement. So, we actually, in reality, have a standard lot, and it's part of the things that are contributing to our reasons for applying for a variance. And then the tree protection zone, yes, it occupies the bulk of our backyard. Staff, or the general guidelines is that they allow like a twenty-five percent intrusion into tree protection zones, but because of our garage, our neighbor's cottage, our back neighbors two garages and trenching that actually happened by our neighbors, our tree protection zone is impacted seventy-three percent, and with all of that, it occupies the bulk of the yard and it's already so impacted that additional intrusion is not supported by the Forestry Department here. And so, what we have then is a narrow, very constrained lot, very constrained building area, and our only option is to go up, and in going up, we tried very hard to stay in character, to expand on the historic character of our current house, and also to respect our neighbors, the privacy on all sides. And we completely fit within the daylight plane, the addition does not even have the eaves extending, protruding through the daylight plane. We have tried to protect our neighbor's light. We've worked with our neighbors. 836 Kipling, whose house is physically five and a half feet away from our house, we got them involved very early and all through our project, and

they fully support the plans that we have here. So, if there are any questions on any particular points, I'd be happy to further expand on that.

Chair Bower: So, thank you for describing the easement. Do you know what date that easement was?

Mr. Reyna: It was in 2001. It was Summerhill property, Summerhill homes, had to come to some kind of legal solution. When they surveyed the land for the lot, that's when both they and we discovered that the fence was not the property line, and that we were actually encroaching on that lot, and so we... They could not sell that house until this encroachment was resolved, and so we came to an agreement that we purchased the use of that land. So, we own the use of the land.

Chair Bower: So, the purpose of the easement probably was to provide you with a legal driveway?

Mr. Reyna: Yes. Actually, it is a narrow driveway. If that one and a half feet gets removed, we do not have a functional driveway.

Chair Bower: Right. And this house has been on that property for how many years?

Mr. Reyna: One hundred and seven.

Chair Bower: Right. So, as is not uncommon, that's a backwards way. Let me rephrase this. As is common on properties of that age, the actual property lines may not be, the buildings may not respect setbacks that we have today, because one hundred and some odd years ago, it was pretty loose. In fact, there wasn't even a requirement to have a building permit till 1956, I think, somewhere in there. So, the fact that you have a driveway, now you have this easement, as you pointed out, that would make your property not substandard, it would make it a standard conforming lot is, I think, significant. Thank you for sharing that. Okay, other questions? No other questions. So, maybe we'll bring this back to the Board. I wanted to make one comment, Martin, while we're still in the question phase. I see on the plans, or as I read our earlier study session of this project, there was a discussion about what the siding would be like. I see now that it's all going to be new 1 x 4 siding. Is that going to match what's on there now?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, that's correct.

Chair Bower: Okay, great. Because the issue when we first saw this was, how the new portions would be differentiated from the old.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, and then that information also was relayed then to Page + Turnbull and they supported that decision too. So, as you debate and discuss the project, if you come to any motions, if you could then include our request for the changing, the swapping of the doors and then the windows on the east side? Okay, thank you.

Chair Bower: That's my next question. So, on the handout that we had from you on this elevation, this says November 19, 2020.

Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

Chair Bower: Okay, so that's actually changed what we have in our packet, it's different than what's on the video monitor.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, you're looking at page two of Page + Turbull's report? I think that's what you were holding up.

Chair Bower: I'm looking at, yes, that's right. And so I see here that there was a single door with a sidelight, one sidelight, and that's now been changed to just the single door?



Board Member Bernstein: No. Page + Turnbull has approved the one on the right where it has the sidelight.

Chair Bower: I see. So...

Board Member Bernstein: Figure number four in Page + Turnbull's letter, that's the one they are approving.

Chair Bower: Okay, so what's up on the video is not the latest. I don't see that sidelight on that lower left. Is it there?

Mr. Reyna: If I may speak? So, actually in the February study session what we had presented to you was the single door on the right and the French doors on the front. We had swapped those already in the plan that you reviewed at that time. And then in working with Page + Turnbull, they asked us to go back to the original, and then after we, in bringing back the gables, we reset the staircase and we got into the issues of trying to resolve the windows with the staircase. We also kept coming back to the French doors at the entry. It's just very difficult to work with, so we again asked, can we put the original front door in the location of the current entrance and can we take the existing French doors and move them into the position where the front door was. So, we're preserving the two doors. We're just asking to move them. In doing that, in proposing that we take the single door and moving it into the location of the French doors, we were trying to retain the frame size of the original French doors so that we still kept our connection to the original construction. And so we proposed two ways to do that. One was the single front door with a sidelight that matched the divided light structure and filled in the original outline of the French doors, or the single front door and a panel. So, that was in our handout and they agreed that these could be swapped and they preferred the single door with the sidelight that matched the divided light. So, that was...

Chair Bower: What was their preference there?

Mr. Reyna: I think their...

Chair Bower: I mean, since what you are asking to do is just take the doors and, the same doors and relocate them, why wasn't that acceptable? Since that's the least intrusive architectural change, and uses the original materials?

Mr. Reyna: I can't answer to that. I can speculate.

Chair Bower: Okay, fine.

Mr. Reyna: My speculation is that the divided light glass in the end result was similar to the original French door divided light volume or area. So, that's my speculation.

Ms. Fong: So, to your questions, Page + Turnbull did review the proposal and recommended to have the single French door with a sidelight because it will retain the original frame for the double entry door that was there before, and it will also not show or demonstrate some sense of history because there will be a new siding to it, building it up with the existing material. So, that's their recommendation.

Chair Bower: Roger, where is that?

Mr. Reyna: So, actually, I said panel. It wasn't meant to be paneled. We would fill in that space, but we would use historic siding that's being removed from the back of the house, we would move it to the front of the house, preserve materials and fill in the space between that.

Chair Bower: Okay, I see now on the drawing that the single sidelight and a 3 x 4 entry door creates four horizontal light, which is what the existing or the original French doors, they were too wide, they were

probably five high, not four. The point is that you still have four across, even though there is... Okay, just wanted to point that out and clarify it. Alright. Debbie, do you have?

Board Member Shepherd: I just wanted to ask a question. Somehow I thought I remembered reading that what you're describing is an original door as French doors was not actually original. It was just a very early addition or change?

Mr. Reyna: Well, actually, I've done a lot of forensic analysis of my house. I went through the basement. I went through the attic. I have lots of pictures, actually I presented it to Staff and to Page + Turnbull. Our house was built in 1912 and I can document at least two stages of expansion that were complete before the 1924 Sanborn Maps. So, in 1924 Sanborn chose our house in its current configuration. The original door actually is between the dining room and the living room. The living room did not exist at that point and the bedroom to the left did not exist in the original house. And then the first construction expansion was to add the left-hand bedroom, but the entrance was still where the dining room, living room and it faces on the right, and I can see the staircase in the basement, the former staircase. And then when the second phase of construction, or the second phase that I can determine, is when they added the livingroom and they added the porch and they added the awning at that point. And it was at that point that the French doors got added. So, the front door from the living room onto the porch and the French doors from the front bedroom onto the porch were added at the same time as a part of the same modification of the house.

Board Member Shepherd: That's very helpful. So, I'm sorry, what did you say was the year of the house originally?

Mr. Reyna: According to County of Santa Clara the construction date for the house was 1912.

Board Member Shepherd: Okay, so I think, I could be wrong about this because I'm not an architectural historian, but I think French doors or a door with a sidelight are 1924, but they are not, they wouldn't have been in the original house. It would have been one door and just personally, for that reason, I prefer the suggestion that you had that you infill the siding and have just the door, but I guess I defer to Page + Turnbull. I'm surprised, frankly, that they made that choice.

Mr. Reyna: Well, we offered them both and we're open to both.

Chair Bower: Okay, other comments? Roger anything? Alright, Margaret. Well wait, any questions, I'm sorry. Alright, so seeing no questions, thank you very much for clarifying those items. Let's bring it back to the Board and discuss how to graft a motion whether we want to support this or not. So, Brandon, do you want to start comments, or not?

Vice Chair Corey: Let's let Margaret go first.

Chair Bower: Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: I just have some observations and some comments. So, regarding the two issues that are kind of the questions that they want us to respond to, first of all the front door. I'm more in support of keeping the existing opening and filling it in with the sidelight and a door, because if you're trying to amend an existing siding by taking historic siding off the back, are you, you're going to have a seam where you're filling it in. So, then they're going to take off all of the existing siding on the left and probably either stagger it or something, because you don't want this very obvious seam seen. All that existing siding was probably painted with lead paint, so it just opens up another can of worms. So, personally, I think keep the opening. Keep it simple, keep the opening as the existing width and fill it in with the door and sidelight. That makes perfect sense to me. The door on the side, that's fine. I think the double door actually looks nice. It will bring more light into the room. What I have more of an issue with is the window on the side at the stair. So, I understand keeping the cross gable. I don't understand why Page + Turnbull would even recommend putting a window under a stair. Historically that would never

happen. So, I know that you're trying to achieve an historic look on the side. Yes there are windows there. Okay, let's keep that spirit that there were windows there, but to drop a window and hide it in a stair, under a stair, makes absolutely no sense to me. It looks awkward to me. It doesn't look historic to me and historically you'd never put a window under a stair. I mean, so anyway, I'm arguing that obviously. I like the charming little existing window. Why wouldn't you put that in the bathroom? Because right now your bathroom that's next to the stair has no window. So, I mean, you have to accommodate and think about how you're going to actually use this house today. It makes sense that you would put the small cute window in the bathroom because by code you need eight percent light and four percent ventilation of every livable space. How are you going to achieve that by not putting a window in there? It kind of begs the question, let's put the cute little window in the bathroom, and putting a window under... I mean, I'll argue that historically, I mean, that's not an historic use of a window. I mean, I know you're trying to get the façade right, but it's like the tail is wagging the dog here. Let's just be honest, that just doesn't make sense to me, and it looks awkward when you drop it in order to create, to allow it to even exist there. So, I am not in support of what Page + Turnbull is suggesting on the side. I think you, Martin, as a brilliant architect, he should be able to incorporate a small window that is of the essence of what was there and put it in. I think the bathroom is a logical place to put it. And let's just have confidence in the professional that's handling this project. So, the front, I've given you my opinions, but the side, I don't support that at all.

Chair Bower: Thank you Margaret. Brandon.

Vice Chair Corey: Sorry?

Chair Bower: Any comments, discussion?

Vice Chair Corey: Most of my views are in line with Margaret. We talked about this, I mean for the new issues. I also agree that, I mean I think, the side window is fine for the front door. It seems to make sense to me. It doesn't look out of place and you're going to have, you could hide seams but again, you know, as Margaret indicated, you're going to have paint issues there. I'm also, it's again not clear to my why there is a window here and the window underneath the staircase just seems really out of place. I don't understand it. So, but I think, otherwise I think, you know, all the concerns we discussed in February were addressed and I think you did a great job here. So, I'm generally in support of these changes minus this window.

Chair Bower: Start at the other end. Debbie.

Board Member Shepherd: I think Margaret's idea is an excellent one. I live in a 1904 house and I have a number of these small windows, and they're in bathrooms or in circulation areas, and they are never low. I think they line up with the larger fenestration pattern. They float and you know, no one notices them one way or another.

Chair Bower: Thank you Debbie. Roger, any comments.

Board Member Kohler: That's on. Okay. It's been awhile since we've used these machines. Anyway, I generally agree with just a few comments that have already been made. I was going to say something, I'm trying to remember. Anyway, I like the proposals made by our two agents right here, so pass on that.

Chair Bower: Okay. I guess I too have the same feeling about that window, the small window. I actually thought, I thought it was awkward but I thought maybe the purpose of that window was to get light into the laundry room. That somehow because the stairs, that second flight of stairs is high, you might be able to get something in there. And as I'm looking at the floorplan, it looks like on the second floor that the upper window, which is a smaller window is actually in that stair, that third flight as you go up. And I hadn't noticed that there's no bathroom window. So, I would feel more comfortable, you know, again if that window were, the small window was put in the bathroom, although I do see that's over the bathtub or in the shower, whatever that's going to be, and that will be somewhat problematic. And I can

understand how you wouldn't want to have a window in a shower or even a bath. So, that said, I think we're, and also, I'm comfortable with the single sidelight and the door at the front. I think that makes sense, consistent with the style of the house and it's differentiated so I think that that is a win win on both if those issues, which are important. Debbie.

Board Member Shepherd. If it is a problem, if it has to be in the shower and I know there are issues with that, should they consider eliminating that window entirely?

Chair Bower: I think our consensus, the five of us who are discussing this, is that the window underneath the stair is awkward because it's below the head height of the windows on either side. And so the solution is not to have it down there and how, I'm confident that Martin can solve this, or just either get it up, maybe... Let me say this a different way, that if the window, the header height of the window was consistent with the other windows, then that's really what bothers me and I think the rest of the Board. So, if you can solve that problem, then I think the window is okay, but it's the fact that it's down and small.

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, that's correct. So, to conform with Page + Turnbull's requirement for keeping the gable, and then that meant the stairs had to do a certain thing, so that's why that existing window would have been interfering with that. Board Member Wimmer's suggestion about getting natural light into the bathroom, that would be great. I mean, it improves the quality and we can handle all the waterproff issues and stuff like that. Again, the advice from Page + Turnbull was keep that window underneath that, keep that location there, but I agree with you that no, let's make sure that the dog is wagging the tail.

Chair Bower: Okay, so do we agree with, are we comfortable as a Board having that window move up at the same header height and move over into the bathroom? The location of the window is not as big an issue for me.

Vice Chair Corey: To me, I think if the header height matches and it slides over into the bathroom or some other place, I'd be supportive of that and I think I'm not supportive of where that is today. And if it means moving the window to the bathroom at the same header height, or if it means removing the window entirely, either one of those, I'm okay with either one of those.

Chair Bower: I'm looking at the existing elevation on page A-five and I don't see a reason to keep that window under the stairs. If it were, the elevation is totally changing. You know, the new elevation, I think, is actually a good solution. Keeping the gable, just move it.

Board Member Wimmer: And I think maybe to simplify it, because we don't want to just leave sort of a big grey area in terms of, because we're supposed to craft a motion right? So, if you do look on the elevation on page A-five, the existing east elevation, which is that side of the house, so there is an existing, a little window, right? We see that, it's clear, it's documented, so if I were to start thinking of how we could craft a motion, I would say let's allow a small window to be placed in the zone of the bathroom of that size. Because the size that's shown, the size under the stair, that one does look kind of a little bit big to put in a shower. Maybe we just say, this is a great size. Yeah, it's a little low but, I mean, maybe they can put frosted glass or make it out of a material that's not water sensitive, whatever. We'll let them deal with that, but I think, say a window of this dimension in the zone of that bathroom and eliminate the large window under the stair. I think that's specific enough.

(crosstalk)

Vice Chair Corey: Also, the header height.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, well this has a consistent header height with the other, so, yeah. You would want the shower window up high, not low for obvious reasons.

Chair Bower: So, let's craft a motion and we can move on. We have an important field trip today. Who would like to take a crack at the motion? So, let me just say I think the two things we want to make sure the motion addresses. The first one is this window and its apparently the header height and maybe location. And the second issue is the front door sidelight being acceptable to the Board and in compliance with the Secretary of Interior Standards. And then the overall project approval as being compliant. Those are the three things that I think we're being asked to address. Margaret.

Board Member Wimmer: Do you want me to give it a shot?

Chair Bower: Sure.

## **MOTION**

Board Member Wimmer: Okay. I move to accept the double French door entry to the living room as proposed. Secondly, item number two on the motion would be to, at the front door, to allow the applicant to fill in the existing opening with an operable door and a smaller, narrower sidelight as illustrated in one of the two options. And lastly, I move to eliminate the need of having an awkward window under the stair and instead, allow the applicant to replicate an existing small east-facing window, and we can reference this on sheet A-five, replicate this small existing window and locate it in the zone of the proposed new bathroom on the first floor. So, it has kind of three bullet points in the motion.

Chair Bower: Okay, and then does one of those bullet points address the Secretary of Interior Standards? This project, do we now feel it's acceptable?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes, and we feel this project is acceptable to the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Chair Bower: So, if I could paraphrase what you're saying, it is the last, so there are three items, specific details that we are asking be modified, and the fourth item would be that if those three items are modified, that we then feel that the project is compliant with the Secretary of Interior Standards. Is that a fair paraphrase?

(off mic)

Chair Bower: Okay. Alright, discussion, any discussion? Probably not because we've been discussing it all morning. I apologize for making this so long, but there were lots of little issues here that I felt we needed to address. So, if there is no discussion, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor of Margaret, wait, sorry. We need a second.

Vice Chair Corey: I'll second.

Chair Bower: Alright, Corey seconded it. Now, we have a motion and a second and no discussion so all in favor of supporting this project as Margaret has articulated it say aye. Any opposed? No, so it's unanimous.

## **MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 5-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER MAKINEN ABSENT.**

Chair Bower: Thank you for all of your efforts, difficult project, difficult site. Look forward to seeing the completed project.

## **Study Session**

### **3. Informational Report: Processes for Nominations to the City's Historic Resources Inventory, Inventory Category Upgrades, and Implementation of the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan Policies for Historic Preservation.**

Chair Bower: Alright, so we now are in a study session. It's an informal report from Amy, I think, about the processes for nominations to the City's Historic Resources Inventory, Inventory Category Updates and Implementation of the Palo Alto Comprehensive Plan for Policies of Historic Preservation. Martin is rejoining us, since he no longer has a conflict.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair.

Chair Bower: Amy.

Ms. Amy French: Yes, thank you and thanks to Christy Fong as well. She had helped me with a tracking document that is in your packet that shows the extensive number of Historic Resource Evaluations that we have been preparing since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Policy 7.2. You know, I'll get to that in a minute, but I just wanted to acknowledge her work on that. So, we've heard from some members of the public interest in what's the nomination process? What's the process to upgrade from one category to another on our Historic Resources Inventory? So, I just took the opportunity to prepare an informational report. There's no action requested today, just an opportunity to make sure that it's known to members of the public, as well as an opportunity for the HRB to ask questions or make comments on the process that we have for this. We have some real live examples that are coming through the pipeline, one of them being that 526 Waverly, which the HRB had recommended to upgrade to a Category Two, so they have completed their work there and are going to be coming back to get it actually designated as a Category Two by Council in the near future. So, that's just one example. So, on the screen I've put the kind of, we've talked about this, that what we have been doing to implement Policy 7.2 is to see those properties that are shown as potentially eligible that came through the Dames and Moore Process, study lists, that didn't go beyond that to, you know, a final conclusion when we have projects coming through, Individual Review, two-story homes, what have you, second-story additions, that we have our consultant take a look, prepare an evaluation and make that determination, whether it's California Register Eligible or not. But just a note that the public may not understand, so just we'll say it is that, being California Register Eligible does not equate to placement on the City's Inventory as a Category One through Four, which is referenced in the Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 16.49. So, just a bit about nominations and upgrades, here's the language directly from the Code. So, any person, any individual or group can request to place an historic structure or site on the City's Inventory. That's a local inventory that we have. The HRB would be, of course, involved in that process to review the proposal. There are documents that would be submitted by the person who is interested in having the property nominated that would give evidence of some sort, ideally an Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by a qualified professional so that the HRB could then make a recommendation on that. The Code does set forth what's needed for such a nomination application. And this is consistent...

Chair Bower: Sorry to interrupt. What is GIST?

Ms. French: Okay, so the next...

Chair Bower: Because I don't see that reported here and somebody...

Ms. French: Yeah, it's Geographical Information System T, I don't know what the T stands for, sorry.

Chair Bower: So, this is a City data base?

Ms. French: It's a City Application basically that is where we put all of our information that we have on properties. It's a very complicated thing to describe, but...

Chair Bower: Okay, that's all I...

Ms. French: It's where we have information that leads to these parcel reports that are very helpful to the public to find out if a property is, you know, potentially eligible, because those are noted on there, or if

it's been determined to be eligible for California Register or if it's a Category One through Four on our inventory.

Chair Bower: Excuse me for interrupting, thank you.

Ms. French: That's alright. So, the next, I was just going to say on the last item, you can see that other communities in California do allow just anyone to nominate a property. It doesn't have to be the property owner to nominate to the City's Inventory. For California Register, it's a bit different, but for a City Inventory, it's just based on their, each city's Municipal Code. So, The next piece here is just that once the process that we've been doing since January of 2018 is, once we have received a report, an Historic Resource Evaluation from our consultant that says the property is eligible for California Register, we, you know, talk with the property owner who has commissioned this report through the City, and let them know, and then we proceed with whatever is next. If they wanted to submit an application or if they already had, we work with them. And then we eventually change that on our GIST System so that the public can see that now we have a California Register Eligible property. Same goes for if we have learned through this process that the property is not eligible for California Register, we put that on our GIST System to say that it's been found to be not eligible for California Register. We haven't been systematically bringing these to the HRB. It's not a requirement to do so, but this is why I'm bringing it to you today, just because it's been two years now basically of doing these evaluations, so it's maybe of interest to see. So, we've determined through this process that there are four single-family properties and five non-single family residential properties that we have determined, through this process found that they're California Register Eligible. Then there's 22 single-family properties and four non-single family residential properties that were found not eligible for the California Register. So, again we're reflecting this on our GIST System for the world to see. I just have more on here. This is in the Staff Report. You know, eventually some of these that were determined California Register eligible, if an owner wanted to then also have it put on our inventory, they could come forward. A process is available to do so. And then it would be a conversation with the Board as to which of the categories it fits in, one, two, three or four. I mean, you would think it would be one or two if it's eligible for the California Register, one of those two categories. I just put this, this is also in the Staff Report, the designation procedure, so we can come back to that if anyone has questions. And then, again, more stuff from the Code. This is the process, HRB recommends, Council and approve, disapprove, modify or recommend for designation. This is the designation criteria. So, I just put these here, not to talk about them so much, but if there's questions about that. And then just one thing that I didn't put in the report was regarding new State law that's been adopted. It doesn't go into effect until January of 2021, but there is a new tax credit in California that's going to go into effect. We already have a Federal Tax Credit for rehabilitation, but we now have, a year from now basically, January 2021, the ability for homeowners to also seek the California Tax Credit. I wasn't sure if the Board had seen... This is the features of this, SB451. There's the twenty percent Tax Credit, five percent bonus for certain projects, etc.

Board Member Wimmer: Can I ask a quick question on that? So, I mean, that's why people who wanted to participate in the Mill's Act, right, to get a reduction of their property tax, but this is...

Chair Bower: This is State Income Tax. So, you could get both theoretically.

Board Member Wimmer: What, wow.

Ms. French: Well, so you don't need to have a Mill's Act Property to participate in California. If you have a designated, I guess, California Register Eligible or California Resource on the list, actually.

Board Member Wimmer: But, a twenty percent discount on your income taxes?

(crosstalk)

Vice Chair Corey: You don't get a discount. It's any work you do to preserve it.

Board Member Wimmer: So, basically you get, it reduces your income by twenty percent.

(crosstalk)

Chair Bower: No, your tax cost. If it's a tax credit, that offsets your tax. If it's a deduction, that offsets your income.

(crosstalk)

Vice Chair Corey: So, if you spent \$10,000, you would get a \$2,000 credit on your income tax.

Chair Bower: Is that right, Amy?

Ms. French: I'm not versed on this actually. I just saw this flying through an email on Friday. (crosstalk) Yeah, the California Preservation Foundation was, I know, lobbying for this, and they were very excited about getting it and sent out an email about it. So, you can have a look.

Board Member Wimmer: So, how do you think that will impact us in terms of people wanting to scramble and get on the inventory? It sounds like it's likely. (crosstalk) People have been wanting that for a while, right?

Ms. French: It's more likely now, I would say, because you know, we have kind of thwarted, some people have come forward and said, oh, can I be on the Mill's, can I get a Mill's Act contract. It's been a little bit challenging without (crosstalk).

Board Member Wimmer: Well, interesting.

Ms. French: Yeah, so I think that could have an effect.

Chair Bower: So, I'd like to point out on the screen here that there is a maximum of \$50 million credit. That's probably Statewide, and there is a \$10 million set aside, it says, for residential and smaller projects. And down at the very bottom this program starts in January of 2021 and sunsets five years later. So, this is going to be a limited, it's limited by the total dollar offset and also by the duration. It, presumably, will be revisited near the end of its sunset date. Okay. I'd like to...

Board Member Shepherd: I'm sorry, could I just ask?

Chair Bower: Sure, Debbie, go ahead.

Board Member Shepherd: For further clarification, can you tell us a little bit about the type of work. Is it only on the exteriors, since that's what's protected? Can interior work, does it have to be, I mean, is another historic bathroom an upgrade?

Ms. French: You know, I just threw this up there, throwing caution to the wind about, you know, my ignorance, just to get it in front of you so you're aware of it, and then can start asking such questions, and then perhaps we can have, you know, our consultant maybe is boning up on this as well, and can come and give a presentation about this in the new year.

Chair Bower: I think that would be great. Also, because it doesn't start for another year, they're probably fleshing out the requirements to apply and so I'm sure we'll hear more about this. I just want to note that 340 Portage Avenue is listed on your list and there's no update. It says here...

Ms. French: Because that reflects that we haven't changed the GIST quite yet.

Chair Bower: Presumably, our hearing would cause that to be updated?



Ms. French: So, we don't have right now an application on file. You know, so if there is an application filed and there have been some other developments on the NVCAP front, as far as funding, etc. for studies. So, I guess, stay tuned. We haven't done anything with GIST just yet, but yes HRB should be...

Chair Bower: The HRE was done.

Ms. French: Yeah.

Chair Bower: Good, okay. So, the process is that until a project is submitted, that information that we've already gathered is there but just not in the system.

Ms. French: Well, one of the things that could happen, aside from a project coming forward is somebody could decide to, you know, nominate that property to the City's Inventory, so if that happened, then you would see it. I'm saying that would be another way the HRB would have involvement with that, if that happened, even without a project. So, so far that's not happened.

Chair Bower: Okay, thank you very much for that information. Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: One question for Amy. On the Process for Nominating a Property, it says by individual or group. What if the individual or group is not a property owner of the property that's being... Does the owner have to agree to being put on the California Register?

Ms. French: Yes, the owner has to agree to be put on the California Register. The owner does not have to agree to being brought forward for nomination to the City's local inventory.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. So, does that mean is someone wants to nominate a property beyond the local register, the property owner still needs to approve that?

Ms. French: Yes, it's my understanding that the property owner needs to be involved with the California Register, getting on the register actually.

Vice Chair Corey: Anyone can nominate, but the homeowner has to be involved.

(crosstalk)

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

Board Member Shepherd: But just for further clarification, but for Palo Alto Inventory, for example, if you're concerned that a property in your immediate neighborhood is going to be significantly altered, you can nominate it for the local inventory without the permission of the owner.

Ms. French: Yes. I'm going to read this statement from the Code directly. Any individual or group may propose designation as a historic structure/site or district. Such proposal shall be reviewed by the HRB, which makes its recommendation to Council. Designation must be approved by the City Council. It doesn't say designation must be approved by the property owner.

Board Member Bernstein: So, that's a great question. It sounds like then, if the owner doesn't want it, but it could still be put on the local register.

Chair Bower: He's going to try to put it on the local register. Whether the Council would then put a building on the local register over the objection of the homeowner is, in my opinion, probably unlikely.

Vice Chair Corey: Right.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

Chair Bower: For a variety of reasons.

## **Approval of Minutes**

### **4. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes from September 12, 2019.**

Chair Bower: Anyway, let's move on to our last Action Item, and that's the approval of minutes from September 12<sup>th</sup>. I have one very small change in the minutes. It's on Packet Page 90, right in the middle, I said "it is really important to always tell Vinh our new aide". I think that that's not an appropriate title for Vinh and so, whatever his title is, which would be HRB...

Ms. French: Board support staff. He supports all of the Planning Boards, Planning Commission.

Chair Bower: He's not an aide. I'm sure I used that term, but as I reread this, I felt that that diminished his stature. So, if you could put the appropriate title in there for him, that's the only change I have, I would request. And if that is acceptable to the rest of the Board, I would hope to hear a motion to approve. September 12<sup>th</sup>, HRB Draft Minutes, September 12, 2019. It's under the fourth tab on our...

## **MOTION**

Vice Chair Corey: I'll move to approve the Minutes with your changes, suggested changes.

Chair Bower: Second?

Board Member Shepherd: I second it.

Chair Bower: Any discussion, further discussion. Okay, all in favor? Opposed?

## **MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 6-0 WITH BOARD MEMBER MAKINEN ABSENT.**

## **Subcommittee Items**

Chair Bower: We are at Subcommittee Items. There are no Subcommittee Items.

## **Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements**

Chair Bower: Board Member Questions, Comments. Roger.

Board Member Kohler: I just wanted to let you know I was going through a lot of things and I discovered these panels, and I had them enlarged and it's kind of a neat collection of varying, you know, what's gone on in Palo Alto. So, it looked pretty neat so I brought them in today.

Chair Bower: Lots of pictures of Palo Alto then, not now.

Board Member Kohler: Yeah, that's true.

Chair Bower: Hartford day school is there. That was demolished and infilled in the late 60's maybe, with Eichler's, our most, the largest number of... How would you describe that, the architectural style most represented in Palo Alto. Alright, no further comments. We can look at this for a minute and then we're going to go on to our field trip.

[Board moved to Reconvene for Field Trip]

Chair Bower: So, on that note, I'd like to thank you, Amy, and all the Staff that helps us be successful. We've had a, I think, a pretty good year here, and thank you Board Members for all the work you do. I know this is, you know, your primary job so I appreciate you're doing it and we'll have a pay increase next year.

Ms. French: What you will have is an email from me soon about what your activity has been, because every year, as you know, I have to prepare a CLG Report. So, think back on your, anything you might have attended that, the CPF Conference from May of 2018 is kind of in our rearview now. There's on-line opportunities and this kind of think, webinars if you so choose to delve into more training, let me know.

Chair Bower: Well, Happy Holidays everyone, and for that we'll adjourn the meeting and go over to the Junior Museum. Thank you.

### **Reconvene for Field Trip**

- 5. Historic Resources Board Field Trip to Junior Museum and Zoo (JMZ) Project Site Under Construction. The City Council Approved the JMZ Project at the Conclusion of the Architectural Review Process. The tour will begin at Lucie Stern Community Center's Service Desk (1305 Middlefield Road) at approximately 10:45 AM after adjournment of the regular public hearing items in the Council Chambers. Appropriate apparel for active construction site required, including closed-toe shoes.**

Ms. French: So, in the agenda we said we were going to meet at 10:45, I believe that's what I had posted in there. So, I did rent a van, but we do have our Holiday Part also at the Lucie Stern, so I wouldn't be driving that van back for a while, if I did drive it. Does everyone have a ride to the Lucie Stern? Is everyone going to this field trip?

(of mic)

Vice Chair Corey: I cannot go either.

Ms. French: Oh, okay. So, then the question though is, because I'm planning to stay at my Holiday Party, you'll walk back, okay.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: We'll get you back Martin.

(crosstalk)

Ms. French: The last time I rented this van for this group, we went up to San Francisco. I don't know if it was other folks, but for one of these award ceremonies. That was fond memory. So, I rented it again just in case. I'll probably turn it over to the Staff in the Planning Department to use.

Chair Bower: Where should we meet.

Ms. French: So, we're going to meet, and I think we can gather. I told John Aiken it would be around 10:45, if you want to gather before that in the lobby of the Lucie Stern Center. It's the Service Desk. So, then we can walk over from there. Because we're not taking any action, this is not a project that's an active project, it's a constructed project, but not any decisions to be made by the HRB, I think it's okay if we gather a bit early. As long as we're not tying up projects that are currently active, we're fine. And I do have some extra hard hats. I think they have enough for seven, but if anyone wanted to bring a friend or anybody else, they may have that capacity.

[Board moved back to Questions, Comments or Announcements]

## **Adjournment**