



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 11197)

Report Type:**Meeting Date:** 4/9/2020**Summary Title:** HRB draft Minutes February 13, 2020**Title:** Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of February 13, 2020**From:** Jonathan Lait**Recommendation**

Staff recommends the Historic Resources Board (HRB) adopt the attached meeting minutes.

Background

Attached are minutes for the following meeting(s):

- February 13, 2020

Attachments:

- Attachment A: HRB Draft Minutes February 13, 2020 (DOCX)



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING DRAFT MINUTES: February 13, 2020

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

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Bower, Board Member Bernstein, Board Member Kohler, Board Member Makinen, Board Member Pease, Board Member Shepherd

Absent: Board Member Wimmer (came late)

Chair Bower: Good morning everyone. Thank you for coming. Thank you for the big audience response. Amy do you want to call roll? Vinh, someone call roll. Thank you. Before we get started, I would like to welcome Christian Pease to the Board. He is a long-time resident of Palo Alto, has a lot of experience here and he has also done some historic preservation work in Sonoma County. Welcome and we're glad you are willing to join us. I'd like to change the order of the agenda, since we have only one item that we need to review and we can the other stuff is housekeeping. I'd like to move Action Item Number Four up to Number One, and then we can just take the agenda as set. Is that okay?

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: While you're doing that, Amy, I'll as if there are any oral communications from anyone who wants to speak on anything other than our agendized items? Not yet, and there are no speakers here.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

[The Board moved to Item Number Four.]

Chair Bower: We will now go back to our agenda as listed and there was one change, and that's the agenda order. No other changes or additions to the agenda? No, okay.

Officer Election

1. Election of Vice Chair

Chair Bower: Let's move on the election of a Vice Chair. With the loss of Brandon Corey as our Vice Chair, we need to have somebody fill that chair. I'm open to suggestions and nominations.

NOMINATION

Board Member Makinen: I'd like to nominate Deborah.

Board Member Shepherd: I appreciate that. Margaret, you are the one who so often puts the motion forward and frames it well, and you seem to have a grasp of parliamentary procedure or whatever it is that we call it here. Do you have any interest in doing this? I feel I'm too new.

Board Member Wimmer: Well, actually I have already served as Vice President during one term, so I would be happy to allow someone else that golden opportunity to do so.

Board Member Shepherd: Okay, well I guess I do need some instruction or training, but I would be happy to do that.

Chair Bower: Okay, so, any other nominations? We can have more than one. I'm quite pleased if Debbie wants to step into that position. We need a second. Do I hear a second for Deborah, Debbie?

Board Member **Male**: I second that.

Chair Bower: Any further conversation Board? Not seeing any, all in favor of Debbie being the Vice Chair say aye. Any opposed. None opposed. I'm assuming it's unanimous.

BOARD MEMBER SHEPHERD WAS VOTED 7-0 TO BECOME VICE CHAIR

Chair Bower: Great, thank you. It's not a big job.

Board Member Wimmer: Just one question on that, what is the term for that? Is it for this year or?

Ms. French: I would just say it's at the pleasure of the Board basically, the Chair and the Board, because the HRB does not meet twice a month every month for a year. We have less meetings and so in the past the person has served beyond a year, just because of that fact, infrequent meetings.

Chair Bower: I would say that anyone who wants to take over the Chair's position, I would be happy to step aside. I have done it for two years now, and because of the small number of meetings we have, we have in the past extended. I'm happy to stay as Chair, but I'm willing to step aside because I've done it for a long time.

Board Member Wimmer: David, I think you're doing an excellent job and I think you should be our fearless leader from here on.

Chair Bower: Well, I appreciate that vote of confidence. But I just want to make it clear that anyone else who would like to step up, I'm certainly happy to step aside. Okay, thank you. We're done taking care of that.

City Official Reports

2. Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meetings and Assignments

Chair Bower: I have a number of meetings that I will miss because I will be traveling, sadly. I'm not sad I'm traveling but I'm sad I'm missing the meetings. I will not be here for the March 12th meeting, the April 9th meeting, May 14th, June 11th, August 13th and September 24th. I'll send this to Vinh and you, Amy, so you know. Any other Board Members that know they will be traveling on any of the dates should send that to Vinh and Amy so we are sure we have a quorum and, please, when Vinh sends out information asking about meetings, confirm that you're going to be there, so we know that we will have a quorum, because it is difficult. I mean, we don't have a lot of meetings and I want to be sure we get, if there is information that we need to review, that we're all available, or as many as possible.

Study Session

3. Review and Discussion of Annual Reports Including Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report and Comprehensive Plan Implementation Annual Report and Potential Topics for an HRB Retreat.

Chair Bower: City Official Reports.

Ms. French: First of all, we have our, we prepare our annual reports and one of them is the CLG Report, Certified Local Government Report, which as a certified local government, we are obligated to turn in a report every year that declares, go ahead.

Chair Bower: Can I interrupt? This is tab three in our booklet for Board Members. Sorry, I just wanted to make this clear.

Ms. French: Packet page seven. The Certified Local Government Annual Report summarizes what trainings the HRB members have undertaken during the reviewing period of October 2018 through September 2019. So, those of you who are here can report out what trainings you did and I will capture that in the report that I prepare and send. The deadline this year is much later than it was last year. Last year it was in February, I believe. This year it's in April, so we have a bit more time. So, I haven't yet packaged that report up to share with you because of that deadline delay. So, I'm thinking the March packet for the HRB will have the report completed. So, those of you who haven't turned in, we know what you've done as far as any kind of training related to architecture, such, please do send that in to Vinh or myself and I can capture that. I also report in this report what the general activities have been. Have we done any nominations, have we undertaken any studies? So, in this report it will declare that we received two awards for our Eichler Design Guidelines that had been packaged up the year before, in 2018. We'll also declare all of the Historic Resource Evaluations we've been doing since the Comp Plan was adopted at the end of 2017. We've done quite a number of Historic Resource Evaluations case by case as folks come in to either tear down an existing home or add on to an existing home that is potentially eligible for California Register. So, we've done a number of those. I'll also report out on the number of meetings we had, and anything else that's of interest in the world of historic preservation. I did include in your item three, tab three, everything that I received from the State starting with packet page ten, read this first it says. This is the how to that says when it's due and all of that. And then the following piece is the Annual Report template. So, this is what I will be filling out, this form and so you've seen these in past years and you'll see it again in next month's packet.

Chair Bower: I notice in that, on page ten of our packet down at the bottom, reminder number three, in order to compete for a 2021 CLG Grant you have to have submitted your annual report by no later than April. What about a grant? As you noted on page eight, we had talked about a **Modern Air Context** (phonetic) Grant to do that review and we've also got unfinished Mills Act work to do. Can we get that grant in?

Ms. French: Maybe this is the year, right? If there's a groundswell of support and bandwidth and all of that, depending on – I know this grant application we filled out before but didn't turn in, there were estimates on the amount of time it would take on Staff's end and a consultant. So, we can touch base again with a consultant and see, double check the resource there and speak with our Director about putting that on the work program if that's of interest to proceed.

Chair Bower: My recollection is this Board is very supportive of that endeavor and maybe it would be useful for you and me to meet with the Director. And if need be, we can go to the Council. I would be happy to talk to Council, go to a Council Meeting and talk this up. I think it's an important thing to do. It's a requirement, as I remember, to do every ten years, do some kind of survey and, of course, we haven't done one since 1998, so we're a little behind on that. We've done the application, if I remember correctly, so we're really talking about just moving it forward. I would imagine the amount of money we're saving by not hiring a permanent full-time planner can easily offset some of the costs of this. Let's you and I get together and move that forward.

Ms. French: Okay, that's fair. So, the other part of this tab three is to share with you the Comprehensive Plan Implementation Annual Report because there are items in there regarding historic preservation, so I'll go ahead and proceed with that. Last night the Planning and Transportation Commission heard from Staff regarding the progress that's been made on the Comprehensive Plan Programs and the Housing Elements Programs and where we are in that. So, I'll just skim through this information, but if you wanted to do a deeper dive there, you could go to the City's website and look at the Planning and

Transportation Commission Staff Report. I'll just give you a taste of that today. Basically, the Comprehensive Plan Annual Report has the Historic Preservation Programs. There are 410 programs all together in the Comprehensive Plan and we've reported out that 18 percent of those are completed or partially complete. We're just at the very beginning, basically the first two years of a Comprehensive Plan that goes till 2013, so we have a few more years to get these things accomplished. The Housing Element Report talks about the work, where we are towards our regional housing needs assessment numbers. You probably heard of those. This gives an overview of where we are. We're 62 percent of the way into the housing cycle. These are some other stats over here, 107 new housing units were added in 2019. We are getting quite a few more accessory dwelling units since we passed some regulations that eased up on some of these things.

Chair Bower: What does RHNA stand for?

Ms. French: Regional Housing Needs Assessment. So, this is something that comes out every several years about what's expected. We expect a new report coming out that will vastly increase the number of housing units that we're expected produce in the City, so that's coming up. So, here are some stats for you. Here is a summary of the Comp Plan. So, we do have, these are what's called elements. The required elements of a city's General Plan, we call it the Comprehensive Plan, this is how many elements that we have studied in this annual report. Some of these are required elements such as housing. Housing has a seven-year cycle, so every seven years we produce a housing element that will update everything. So, over here on this side of the screen we have the number of programs and so the land use, where there are 63 programs of the total of 410, those 63 include the Historic Preservation Programs that appear on the Comp Plan. This is again some states about the completion rate, where we are. I'm just going to present to you the ones that you're probably already aware of. Policy 7.2 was adopted at the tail end of that process was inserted and there wasn't a program definition in the Comprehensive Plan, just the policy. So, I've been reporting to you these last couple of years about how we've been implementing this policy, which was to do these Historic Resource Evaluations every time somebody comes in seeking to demolish a home or sometimes people are going to sell a property and they want to know, it says potentially historic, but is it really historic. So, we engage a consultant to prepare these Historic Resource Evaluations. So, the note here as far as what our progress is says just that. We began this implementation in January 2018 and we try to present a summary of these properties that we do evaluations of, so we're developing quite a list. As we go forward, we put notes on our GIST System that states that now we've determined that it is not California Register eligible or we have determined that it is California Register eligible. So, we'll make that change in our system so folks can see that in the community. Here's another couple of programs. This one is to update and maintain the City's Historic Resource Inventory and there it is in black and white. We have not updated the list. It would require Council action for us to do this. They haven't given us the go ahead. This is what I just finished saying, that when we do find they are California Register eligible we will make note in our system. Then this program here, 7.1.2 is to reassess the ordinance to ensure its effectiveness. I laugh because I'm sure its effectiveness is, maybe increase its effectiveness would be a better way of saying that. We haven't begun. The Comp Plan Policy, sorry, Program 7.8.1 is to promote and expand available incentives. So, this just gives some notes about what we accomplished. We did make those code changes that I reported out at our retreat last year that we added Categories 3 and 4 to the inventory categories that could avail themselves on our incentives, such as increased floor area and others. We also have this subdivision incentive for Historic Preservation, and we modified it just this year for the 874 Boyce Project which you all who were here got to see. So, the sister homes you might recall. So, we changed our zoning code and our subdivision code to enable a project when the front property is the one with the historic home. Because the way it had been written before, it was the rear property that was to have the historic home and, in this case, there wasn't a rear property. So, now that's available to folks. Then, here's another one that talks about salvage and reuse. We do have a Deconstruction Ordinance that is coming on line, is going to be effective in a few months from now, so we're no longer going to be saying demolition. It will all be deconstruction. Two more that talk about Historic Preservation specifically. This one here, 7.8.3 talks about innovative ways to apply current codes to older buildings using the State Historic Building Code and we did talk about this at our retreat in 2019. We had our Chief Building Official come and give a presentation on the Historic Building Code. Then this one, which is parking exceptions

for historic buildings, we haven't begun that program. Then two more, expanding, I've already said this. There's one more. Okay, so these are other policies that I think the HRB is interested in. We have an ARB Awards, and some of you may not know this, but this is the year, 2020 is our every five years we give out the Architectural Review awards, so it's the ARB that does the work to come up with five or more projects that the ARB has reviewed. In the past there have been projects that the HRB also reviewed that made it to the top of the list. One of those was the Rinconada Library that did an addition that was very compatible. So, it's possible that there will be some projects that rise to the top of that list that will have an historic component. Those are in the ARB Bylaws. I know that HRB has maybe in the past expressed an interest for some kind of awards. We can talk about that, perhaps, at our retreat if we want to embark upon that. Maybe a different type of set of awards. Another one that the HRB has expressed interest in is the Fry's, the old cannery that was found to be California Registry eligible this year, in 2019. So, this is one of these programs, to prepare a coordinated area plan for the North Ventura Area. So, that's in progress and you might be following that. Finally, there is another one that perked my interest and that was the Cal Ave area. There is a program that talks about create regulations to encourage retention and rehabilitation of smaller buildings. We were just talking about rehabilitation. So, we don't really have a program going right now on this. Again, if somebody were to come in Cal Ave and there was a building that was an older building and they wanted to demolish it or deconstruct it, we would do the same thing we're doing elsewhere in town, which is to have an Historic Resource Evaluation done to see if it was worthy of California Register listing. I think that concludes all of that as far as the Comp Plan. I have some more stats here about the housing activity and the building permits issued. So, again, our RHNA allocations is pretty high. You know, we have a lot of units to go to get to our prior RHNA allocation. This kind of shows where we've accomplished. Because we have accomplished above moderate housing units at the rate of 72 percent, we are okay as far as the SB-35 which you might have heard about. This gets into weeds that the HRB purview doesn't really cover, so I'll just gloss over this. I think that pretty much sums up the other annual reports that I thought HRB might have interest in. Does anybody have any questions regarding at least the Historic Preservation Programs that I've gone through?

Chair Bower: So, I had sent in information about the training I've done for the last year and should other Board Members do the same? Send it to him and he can...

Ms. French: Yes, to Vinh or myself, yes, please.

Chair Bower: All right. This is an aside, because Debbie and I and Christian were newly appointed, the City Clerk reminded us that we have to, we are required to have ethics training, because that's required every two years, fill out Schedule 700, which all Board Members should have received an email from the City Clerk about. I'm just bringing that up because we're required to do those things, as part of our, I think it's part of our activity as a City of Palo Alto Board. So, just a reminder. The Ethics Program is now a fascinating two-hour read on-line and it's two hours.

Board Member Makinen: When's the due date on that?

Chair Bower: Well, the last time I had done this was January of 2018, and I did it here. The City, provided ethics training and Brown Act training. So, that's how I knew, but because we were reappointed, they just made us do it as part of our reappointment. So, if you haven't done ethics training in a while. Thank you, Amy, for that.

Vice Chair Shepherd: Could I just clarify so I'm sure I understand it and everyone understands? I think you have to do the Form 700 every year.

Chair Bower: Correct.

Vice Chair Shepherd: Okay.

Ms. French: Yes, it is.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: I think the City Clerk's Office tracks that, because that's where I got the email from, but that was part of our reappointment or appointment. And that's a very easy thing to do because they've now got it all on line and they keep your prior history there, so you can just update it or it doesn't change. Okay, thank you. Do we want to talk about, at this point, about Board Retreat topics, because that's part of this?

Ms. French: Yes. It was a potential topic and you know, when do we want to have that retreat. I do have, I believe I'll have an item for the end of March, the CLG Report, as I mentioned, but there might be another actual project item. We might have another nomination of, we have an exciting proposal for another, sorry, upgrade, Category upgrade. So, that may be coming at the end of March. So, we could look maybe towards April as a potential retreat, a month.

Chair Bower: Or do we want to set a date and then talk about topics, or?

Ms. French: Yes. If you set a date first or a month, then we can consider what might be of interest between now and then that we would want to pull together items on.

Chair Bower: So, I missed the second item in our agenda, which is Meetings Schedules and Assignments, so maybe while we're looking at dates, lets go through this.

[Board moved to Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions]

Chair Bower: Okay, so, maybe the 26th of March is the date you think you'll think you'll have something for us? So, we could do April 23rd for a retreat?

Ms. French: Are there others who know they will not be here on that? Because for the retreats we definitely, I think, want to have the entire full Board.

Chair Bower: Exactly.

Board Member Bernstein: I'm still formulating my travel plans to Italy. It will be probably in April, but nothings confirmed yet.

(crosstalk)

Ms. French: Certainly, there's no trouble targeting the May retreat, but if we wanted to do grants... We don't have to have a retreat to move forward with that grant, if we're concerned about that. There can be other things we do on that.

Chair Bower: I think we dealt with that last year. I mean, there was strong Board support last year for that, so I think we could move forward. It would be nice to talk about it at a retreat, but better to put the grant in. Anyone else have any dates problematic dates?

Vice Chair Shepherd: So, April 23rd? I can come, but it's very difficult for me, so if anyone else has a problem, maybe we could consider a different date.

Chair Bower: May 28th?

(off mic)

Chair Bower: You wouldn't be there.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: The only two dates in March and April that I have are the 26th of March and the 23rd of April, and that's difficult for... Do we have to do it on a Thursday?

Ms. French: No, we can choose another day. It's just that, you know, we have these dates all set up in the system and we have the room and, I mean, we don't have to even have it here. We can have it in a more special location, a retreatful place. In past retreats, we have enjoyed having them in the Community Room or one time it was at a member's house that's an historic home.

Board Member Bernstein: Chair, I know I'm available in March.

(off mic)

Board Member Bernstein: I am available for retreat in March.

Board Member Pease: March 26th I can't do.

Vice Chair Shepherd: I can't do March 26th either.

Chair Bower: Is there, so, I'm out of the country from the 11th to the 21st, but I can pretty much do anything else in March. So, that's the first Thursday, I mean the second Thursday, which is the 12th I won't be here, but if we want to do a different day...

Board Member Pease: And the May 23 date didn't work?

(off mic)

Chair Bower: May works, that works for me.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: May 28th. No, Michael won't be here.

Board Member Wimmer: What happened to April, the April dates? We've got the 9th and the 23rd.

Chair Bower: The 9th and the 23rd I'll be out of town on the 9th.

Board Member Wimmer: Oh, you said you were out, okay.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: I'm here but that's difficult for Debbie.

Vice Chair Shepherd: I would come.

Board Member Wimmer: It seems like it's better to start doing it in the spring, because in summer everyone is really gone.

Chair Bower: Yeah, it's really tough in the summer.

Board Member Wimmer: Or May 28th is also a possible date. It looks like April 23rd or May 28th.

Chair Bower: Christian, you can't do April 23rd? Is that what you said, I'm sorry.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: Does April 23rd work?

Board Member Wimmer: I think it's May 28th, isn't it?

Chair Bower: Martin, you don't know yet.

Board Member Bernstein: I don't know yet. But, again, we don't need a – there can be six out of seven.

Chair Bower: Oh, but we would miss you. Should we target the 23rd of April and then circle back of somebody – I mean, Martin may be here. Let's try that because

(off mic)

Chair Bower: I know. That's no choice. Okay, let's tentatively set it for the 23rd of April and please keep in touch with Amy and Vinh if that changes. Actually, Martin, you could confirm when you know.

Board Member **Male**: Is that typically a full day?

Chair Bower: No, we meet for what, two hours. It depends on how much we have to talk about.

Ms. French: You can choose more or less and meaty or less meaty topics for your retreat, and thereby regulate how long you're here.

Chair Bower: Yeah, okay. Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Amy, do you know from any Board Member who is not present in Palo Alto, can they participate this way on an HRB retreat, do you know? Or is that a question I need to ask some other department?

Ms. French: There has been participation, and I know in the past by skype for Council meetings, somebody participating remotely that they have to, you know, if you were in a hotel in Italy, it has to be a public place that people can come into, so I don't know, if you open your hotel room and put a sign on the door.

Chair Bower: Go sit in the coffee shop.

Board Member Bernstein: How about Piazza della Signoria?

Ms. French: That could work. We'd be happy to be virtually there with you, if it turned out that way.

Chair Bower: Actually, I'd be happy to be there with you. So, let's all go to...

Board Member Bernstein: Board Member Pease was asking, now where is that meeting going to be?

Chair Bower: Okay. Not to prolong this, because some people actually have to work. So, I think that takes care of Item Number Two and Item Number Three.

Ms. French: I should say then, on that retreat, because we haven't talked about potential retreat topics, we could defer that discussion because of the retreat date being in April, we could talk about that in March, as far as retreat topics for April.

Chair Bower: Good Idea. Let's put that on the agenda.

Board Member Wimmer: Well, does anyone have any ideas? Let's just poll everyone and see if anyone has any ideas for the retreat.

Chair Bower: The three that I just jotted down. We should consider HRB nominations to the ARB for a recognition award. We should discuss midcentury modern surveys, as we have previously. Just get that back on the record. We ought to do, also reiterate our support for Mills Act, finishing the Mills Act Program. Martin, any?

Board Member Bernstein: I agree with your last.

Chair Bower: Any other suggestions?

Board Member Makinen: Wasn't there some interest in accessory dwelling units again, to get some further clarification on that?

Board Member Kohler: What do you want to know? I mean, I'm working on two or three of them, so if you have any questions, I can.

Ms. French: Michael, are you feeling you would like to have a presentation on what the regulations now are and what the City is reviewing and how many are coming forward?

Board Member Makinen: Some type of an update.

Ms. French: Okay, updates. We can do that. Also, today we had a property and talking about a certain code section and Martin, Board Member Bernstein commented something about being interested in learning more about that.

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, I just read that code section. It looks like there is some topic for debate on that. It's Section 18.

Chair Bower: What's the title of it or what's the focus?

Board Member Bernstein: The focus is what to do with an addition that is considered nonhabitable, but it helps with egress and it might affect historic restoration. That's what that paragraph talks about.

Chair Bower: We could put that on there too. Anything else? No. Okay.

Ms. French: Any of these programs here? We talked about this last year, but there's, you know, these Comp Plan Programs related to historic preservation, if there's any interest in discussing any of these, learning more or whatever.

Board Member Wimmer: I think, yes, that the inventory, update and maintain the City Historic Resource Inventory. I think that should be on the top of our list. However, I'm not sure how much we can accomplish in a retreat versus is this really a Staff required job? I don't know. I mean, the two things that stand out in my mind are pushing the Mill's Act forward and updating our inventory, because we've been talking about those for a long time.

Board Member Kohler: We have been getting requests for these living units that are, what, 800 square feet and there's no rule about them. We're now working on two where the, this house is part of the whole structure, but you can't, there's no connection between the two. A lot of them, the homes are in the back or in the old garage. I mean, it's going to change the look of a lot of the homes in Palo Alto because there's going to be two units there in all these homes. There are a lot of people out there building them, so it's going to have an impact on historic homes, I think, fairly soon. Just to let you know it's coming. Because it's turning out to be a very popular item to do.

Ms. French: So, I have that on the list of potential topics to do an overview of the accessory dwelling units at the retreat. We can further winnow this down at the March meeting if you like, as a Board.

Chair Bower: Let's get together and talk. Okay.

Board Member Kohler: Are you having a secret meeting? Is that what you said?

Chair Bower: Yeah, very secret. That's why I said it so quietly. I know the microphone I'm sure didn't pick that up. Let's move on, unless there are other comments. That's already a big list, so we'll try to winnow it down a little bit.

Action Items

4. Report Documenting the Completed Façade Restoration/Rehabilitation Project as Compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Affirming HRB's 2018 Recommendation for Reclassification of 526 Waverley Street to Historic Inventory Category 2 from Category 3

Chair Bower: All right, so Item Number Four is a Report Documenting the Completed Façade Restoration/Rehabilitation Project as Compliant with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Affirming the HRB's 2018 Recommendation for Reclassification of 526 Waverley Street to Historic Inventory Category 2 from Category 3. Amy, do you want to...

Amy French: Good morning. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. This report transmits the historic structure's report that the applicant provided resources for the City to have retained or prepared by Page & Turnbull serving as the City's on-call consultant for items like this. So, what happened while two of you were not on the Board, notably Member Pease and Member Shepherd, was, I believe Shepherd was not yet on our Board in 2018, when this project came forward. This project being the rehabilitation and restoration of 526 Waverley, formerly the Toy and Sport World, I believe is the name of the business that was there for many, many decades. And, of course, the owner is here represented in the audience, so is available for questions, those of you who are not as familiar with the project, but those others, four of you who were familiar with the project back in 2018 when the Board considered the project and provided a support for a recommendation to upgrade the building from a Category 3 to a Category 2. So, the upshot is, the work has been done according to the plans that were approved through our architectural review process with HRB input and recommendation. We are here now today to reconfirm that recommendation so that we can then proceed to the City Council. So, on the screen I put a slide. Basically, what we're doing is confirming the HRB's 2018 recommendation and we have four votes to do that. Those of you who have studied this can also vote now, I think, and then these are the two things that the historic structure report did, which was document the completed improvements and also looked at the rear addition that was put on after the Birge Clark building was built and the mezzanine to allow consideration for a future potential project, which has not come in as a project. With that, I'll say that again, the owner is in the audience if anyone has questions about the project or question of me, please.

Chair Bower: I have just one procedural question. I presume that what we should do at the conclusion of our discussion is to create a motion that verifies what you have just described, what the Page & Turnbull report describes, so that the Council can see that we support this change in category? Is that right?

Ms. French: That would be helpful and also if you want to commit as Chair to being available to attend the City Council hearing on this, it's a Consent Calendar item, so it won't be a hearing necessarily, but it will be on the Consent Agenda. So, you know, we can work together on dates, but we're looking to a March date with Council. I don't know if there is availability there, but sometimes this (crosstalk).

Chair Bower: I can talk to you about that afterwards.

Ms. French: Yeah.

Chair Bower: Okay. John, if you would like to say something, it's not required because we've got a record, but we would be happy to hear from you.

John Shenk: Sure. Good morning. John Shenk representing Thoits Brothers, and I won't be long. We'll all keep going, but I wanted to thank you all for the work that you do. I thank Staff. Amy has been absolutely fantastic helping to guide me through this process. It's the first time that we've taken on a project like this, first time for me and first time for the Thoits Brothers in a few decades. As owners of lots of properties in the downtown, the Thoits family has a few pictures on the back wall and has been here for about 120 some odd years in ownership, and we do care deeply about the broad health of the community in the downtown, and part of that is the historic fabric that is a meaningful part of our community. For that reason, we are motivated to take over ownership from the Hoffacker family, the original developers of the building and to see through this rehabilitation. We're really excited about it. I may have shared before, but there are many times, and currently I'll go out there and stand in front of the building thinking what's next, how are we going to do this, what would the right tenant be. People can probably tell that I have something to do with the building, and they will stop and often say, thank you, it's beautiful, these sorts of things. I think there is some personal reward in that, but it's really important to us to have this happen in the community over and over. So, we are currently analyzing our own portfolio, and we own some other very old buildings, where can we do this? And I think it's neat that the ordinance, the codes have these sections that we're going through now where there is - in a way that we align ourselves, because it's a costly, time-consuming process, but because it's a win-win, there is this process to win a TVR if you will, sort of thing that helps align us. So, there's not a burden on the owner to take it on all by themselves in a way, and I really do appreciate that piece that the community I think all holds hands around. The last thing I'll leave you with is something, and I don't know if it will be the right venue for this, but as we went through this process, there's a piece of the code that I think is worth exploring. Maybe it will be with you guys, maybe it will be Staff and the City Attorney's Office sort of thing, trying to riddle it out. It's in 181806, E1, and I think the way we had looked at it is it's an opportunity for us to further align around properties that are historic where something has been added onto it. The addition is not historic and takes away from the historic value of the building. My reading of it says that, hey, if you remove that area to restore the historic, it becomes I think technically except area or something where you're able to move it. You don't just lose part of your building to restore the historic piece, you could move that square footage, again following all the historic regulations and everything else to the degree that we're even possible, but it gives you that opportunity. There are some who are interpreting the language to not say that, and I think that becomes a disalignment around, we're trying to find ways to restore these historic buildings. So, I mentioned it. Maybe you guys peek at it on your own time. It's something I'm exploring with Amy and will continue down the path, because I just think it's - I truly believe within the community there's lots of rifts and different perspectives on things, but I think around restoring historic buildings, I think we're all on the same page. I think those words might need clarification either way, but I think we would all agree that it ought to go towards the let's restore the entirety of the historic building where possible. Anyway, that's it. I think you all for your time and your assistance, as well, as we went through the 526 Waverley Project. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Martin, question for John?

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you John. Can you repeat that code section again?

Mr. Shenk: Sure, 181806, E1.

Chair Bower: Thank you.

Mr. Shenk: You bet. Thank you all.

Chair Bower: Hold on, don't go away. Anyone have questions for John? Okay, one question I have is, the addition on the back, I know is a secondary addition. Do you know what the date of that is?

Mr. Shenk: It's in the report. I believe it's in the 40's. I forget the exact date.

Chair Bower: It doesn't represent an historic – according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, because it's been there for 50 years, even though it wasn't part of the original building, it does get some consideration as an historic addition. Now, what you do with that and how you move forward with the next phase, I just wanted to be sure you're aware that that, even though that portion of the building is not part of the original building, it has some of its own, it has standing on its own. It's actually not attractive and isn't seen from the street, but just be aware of it, that's all.

Mr. Shenk: Very fair. And just so you know, Chair Bower, is as I bring this up, that was the issue that was in our brains. We looked at it. But I really think whether that happens or it doesn't, just more globally if it were only 20 years old, and I don't think that's the issue that we're struggling with. It's being able to remove this area and it becomes where you can move it to restore the historic. I appreciate the nuance of the age of that addition.

Chair Bower: I think, Martin and other Board Members, that's an accurate statement about the addition. After 50 years it becomes significant on its own.

Board Member Bernstein: It does add some level of significance because of its age, right.

Mr. Shenk: It will be an interesting one to explore another day. I think we even had asked Page Y Turnbull, maybe not, I forget what's in the report, to kind of look at that piece. And then we've got some, how do you weight the balance of historic significance - there is a neat piece, the back as Birge Clark has on many of the buildings where we can find similar, almost identical details on some various buildings used in different ways. The rear of the building. I just, literally a couple of months ago was walking down the back alley behind, where are we here, the Caldwell Banker Building now, the back of that two-story building with the metal sash windows of two stories. It is the back of 526 Waverley's original back, and I just thought, wow, being able to restore – as much as it's at the back of the building. But it's, you know, maybe someday it's a big city public parking lot or maybe it's something. But I think the back can be neat to look at as well. But I did think it was funny to walk by and see, wait, that's the back of Waverley, well, originally.

Chair Bower: And the front of that building is almost identical in its style of having three, what appear to be three separate storefronts, even though they're all one interior space.

Mr. Shenk: That's right, that's right.

Chair Bower: So, clearly Birge Clark had a style.

Mr. Shenk: It did.

Chair Bower: All right. Martin, you had?

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah. To your point about that code section, we have on our agenda today is put together suggestions for our retreat, and so maybe our Board, when we come to that agenda and we can discuss if we want to put that on the retreat.

Chair Bower: Good idea.

Mr. Shenk: But only do it if you really want to have a fun time on the retreat, because looking at code sections is so fun.

Chair Bower: It's what we do. Any other questions for John while we are still in the influence phase? Good morning Margaret. Glad you could make it.

(off mic)

Chair Bower: I think we'll close the discussion period and bring it back to the Board and have a discussion about the issues here. Michael.

Board Member Makinen: Thank you Chair Bower. It's somewhat of a rarity that we see a project that's classified as a restoration here. Most of our projects are rehabilitations and I'm quite pleased to see that. I don't know, I can't think of another one that was a restoration that we've entered into here. I don't know how the Board feels about it, but maybe we should look at the categorizing of this as a restoration rather than a restoration/rehabilitation. I don't know how the rest of the Board feels about that, but it might give a stronger case for moving it up to a Category 2 from a Category 3.

Chair Bower: That's what we're doing today. We're actually moving it up to a Category 2.

Board Member Makinen: I know we are, but I think it would make the case stronger when it goes to Council if we're calling it a restoration. How does the rest of the Board feel about that?

Chair Bower: Well, I don't know. Any other Board Members want to weigh in on that?

Board Member Bernstein: Is the definition of the categories in our packet today?

Board Member Makinen: We're calling it a restoration/rehabilitation, which is kind of a locally made-up type of definition. I don't know if the Secretary of the Interior's Standards really recognized the dual status.

Ms. French: May I jump in and call your attention to the Historic Resource Evaluation. It's packet page 24. If we want to start considering definitions or what have you. On that page in the first paragraph, at least Page & Turnbull is saying the subject property underwent a façade rehabilitation to return it to its original design. So, that's a firm that is well qualified that uses the word rehabilitation. In the Staff Report I referred to it with, in both tenses because the types of things that were done to the façade, I think, may have included both types of construction.

Board Member Makinen: When I read through the report, I recall that when Emily Vance analyzed this, she categorized it as a rehabilitation, at least in one paragraph that I read of her report, her analysis.

Chair Bower: You know, it might be useful to know the difference between the definition of those two words. I think it qualifies on both levels and I have no strong feelings about using both, or using one. It seems to me that restoration would suggest restoring what was there and rehabilitation would suggest that you are adding back what was there. So, I think you can either do one or the other.

Board Member Makinen: Rehabilitation, in my understanding, is bring an historic property back into use for modern times and still preserving the character-defining features, the essentials of it.

Chair Bower: I'm happy to adopt your suggestion, if the Board feels that's appropriate. I don't think there's a wrong way to do this, and maybe your suggesting that we use just one term will simplify the Council consideration.

Chair Bower: Anyone else? Christian?

Board Member Pease: I support that idea.

Chair Bower: Debbie? Okay, Debbie supports it. Margaret, any opinions.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, I think those two terms are used so closely together, and a lot of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards guideline or Standard points fall under both of those categories most commonly. So, I think it's a really interesting topic of discussion to really pinpoint which is which. But I do think that it feels like this is more of a restoration.

Chair Bower: Fine. So, Roger, any feelings on this? Okay, I think the Board agrees with your suggestion, so let's just move forward calling this a restoration and simplify things. Is that okay?

Ms. French: Sure, yeah. You know, I would always just go to a source document to see how our – this expert firm that we have refers to it. There is another, packet page 34 also refers to restoration of the original French doors on the second floor due to the fact that the windows would be mostly concealed behind restored iron balconies. Anyways, that's a restoration according to Page & Turnbull. They elsewhere used rehabilitation. So, I think it's fair to be able to call it both.

Chair Bower: John has something.

Ms. French: I will read aloud what our owner has provided as well, just before you vote maybe on that. Rehabilitation, according to the Secretary of Interior's Standards acknowledges the need to alter or add to an historic property to meet continuing or changing uses while retaining the property's historic character. Restoration depicts a property at a particular period of time in its history, while removing evidence of other periods.

Chair Bower: So, actually I think restoration would be a more accurate description, because the project removed a lot of unsightly and inappropriate...

Board Member Makinen: And if you do a categorization as a restoration, you do have to be very clear on the period of significance.

Chair Bower: Yeah, but I think the period of significance would be, what, the 20's when the building was constructed, originally constructed?

Board Member Makinen: It's in the report somewhere.

Chair Bower: So, I don't know, maybe we're getting too far down in the weeds here. Maybe we should use both terms.

Board Member Wimmer: The only thing I can find is that with the word rehabilitation, it can include some kind of modification from what it was originally, whereas restoration is clearly maintaining what was there originally. But with rehabilitation it can also include some modification and I guess that's the question, has it been modified from its original. I know that you were playing around with the arches and the location of the door and what have you, so that if there is a modification from what is absolutely original as documented by the original drawings, then it would also include the rehabilitation work, I think.

Chair Bower: Right. So, the one thing I noticed on the project is the ironwork, which is true to the style and the drawings, but is not detailed anywhere by Birge Clark. This simply doesn't – there's no detailing it exists with dimensions. The ironwork is slightly larger than what is apparent on other Birge Clark projects. In other words, the ironwork on 527 has one-inch corner posts. This is so insignificant in terms of the fabric of this building, but I notice it because as a builder, because it's a little bit different. And that, I'm perfectly comfortable with that being a differentiation, compatible but differentiation from the original. We don't have any originals, but we have other buildings. My point here is that I think you're right. There have been very small changes, so we're not really restoring what's there because a lot of what was there was removed. We're putting back what was in kind, creating the same stylistic feeling of the façade. That's, I guess, how I would describe it. And so, it is both restoration of what was there and refurbishment in terms of bringing something new but slightly different. Is that a fair...

Ms. French: And I have one more packet page to steer you to, just in case you want more source data. Page & Turnbull did tackle this. Packet page 38, 39 says Emily Vance's review from the proposed changes would meet the Standards for restoration. While the project was reviewed as a restoration undertaking and viewed favorably at the time, the completed project is more applicable to the Standards for

rehabilitation due to its use of some new components in a similar, but not exact appearance to the original design. So, that'...

Chair Bower: All right. So, I think your...

(off mic)

Board Member Makinen: Rehabilitation is probably the more correct interpretation of what was being done here, rather than – somebody could say you didn't really restore it because you didn't bring back everything exactly the way it was.

Chair Bower: Okay, I'm comfortable with that. Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: I'm smiling with familiarity about the topic of restoration. The example of restoration is that when the Doge's of Venice repair the **Palazzo Seroci** (phonetic), that's a restoration, where it's unchanged and it's just repaired. But if there are any changes to any kind of detailing, that's rehabilitation and well supported and I think the Board will agree this is a good project.

Chair Bower: Any other comments? So, are we agreed we can put this into the motion, but we'll use the term restoration not, I'm sorry, rehabilitation to describe the project? Okay, other comments? Any other comments? I would like to just note part of Page & Turnbull's analysis here, because I thought they did an excellent job of first discussing eligibility for the California Register for Historic Resources, and of the four criteria that they evaluated, Criteria One, which is events, Criteria Two, persons, Criteria Three, architecture, and Criteria Four is information potential, that is Criteria One and Three they meet the requirements. Four doesn't really apply and Criteria Two does not meet significance, but that's a very strong evidence that this is, indeed, California Registry eligible. Then the second thing I wanted to just put into the record, which of course, is there but reiterate, is that the Standards for Rehabilitation which we deal with all the time, starting in page 39 of our packet. Rehabilitation Standard One is the property's use for its historic purpose. Two, the historic character of the property will be retained. Three, each property is recognized as a physical record of its time. Four, even though properties change over time, those changes have acquired historic significance of their own right, thus the addition in the back may be captured by this. Five, the distinctive features, finishes and techniques are preserved. Standard Six is deteriorated historic features doesn't really apply. Standard Seven, chemical or physical treatments were not used, that doesn't apply. Standard Nine, new additions or alterations shall not destroy the historic character. We don't have that issue here. And Ten, we don't have any archeological features. So, of the ten, this project meets six, I think, of these and the others don't apply. That's another very strong statement about why this project and why this recategorization is not only appropriate, but should be moved forward by Council. So, having said that, if there are no other questions or statements, can I have a motion to approve this renovation, reaffirm our earlier – so first of all, it's that the evidence and the project outcome now qualifies this building to be categorized as a Category 2 building on our Register instead of Category 3. Is that appropriate? Anybody want to make that motion? Michael?

MOTION

Board Member Makinen: I make a motion that we approve the project moving it from a Category 3 to a Category 2. It does meet the Secretary of Interior's Standards for rehabilitation as evidenced by the reports from Page & Turnbull and other analyses that were performed.

Chair Bower: Great. A second?

Board Member Shepherd: I second it.

Chair Bower: Any further discussion? Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair. I just want to comment to the ownership representative, Mr. Shenk and the Architect, Mr. Popp. I think under the stewardship of you and your team, excellent job.

Chair Bower: Okay, no further comments? All in favor of the motion say aye. Any opposed.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 7-0. IT'S UNANIMOUS.

Chair Bower: Thank you John. Nice job.

[The Board moved to Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions]

Approval of Minutes

5. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of December 12, 2019.

Chair Bower: The last item is minutes. Approval of Minutes from December 12, 2019 meeting. I had found one item, Amy, a name that is spelled wrong or is not the right name. On page 68 of the packet, it's way in the back. The second to the last paragraph under Chair Bower, it says, Hartford day school, and it's actually, I think, Harker day school. It used to be Harker, there used to be a Harker, I think it was boys' academy, but I know it's not Harford, so I think it's Harker. Do you remember that, Christian? Is that the right? (crosstalk) Yeah, it was demolished and Eichler housing, Eichler style housing was built on that space. That's the only thing I would ask to be corrected. Anybody else have any corrections, additions, deletions? Okay, seeing no further response, a motion to approve.

MOTION

Board Member Wimmer: I move to approve the minutes that include the comments that Chair Bower just mentioned.

Chair Bower: Okay, second?

Board Member Shepherd: I second.

Chair Bower: All right, any further discussion? Not seeing any, all in favor of approving the minutes say aye. All opposed. Okay, unanimous.

MOTION PASSED WITH A VOTE OF 7-0.

Ms. French: Can I add something about that? Not about the minutes themselves, but those minutes happened to be about 840 Kipling. That item has been called up for hearing on the variance request, so it's going to the Planning and Transportation Commission, as well as the individual review hearing request. So, we can let you know as that progresses, because eventually the variance request does appear on the Council agenda.

Chair Bower: Right. Would it be worthwhile for me or any other Board Member to appear before the Planning hearing?

Ms. French: I'm not sure, it might be, I'm not sure. I have to review what the request was about. If it had something to do with historic, certainly the variance findings for that had to do with, I mean the findings may have some discussion about the historic benefit of saving the home. I can't recall off the top of my head. Just to let you know about that.

Chair Bower: Martin might know something about this. It is a complicated project because of the redwood trees and because there is a lot line offset which...

Ms. French: We probably should be talking about it too much because of the, yeah, we don't want to.

Chair Bower: All right, well, let's catch up with this at our other meeting.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: So, we're down to Subcommittee Items. There are none, since the only subcommittee that still is in existence or was in existence, was the 527 Waverley subcommittee for the tile work, and that project is over. There is still the Mill's Act subcommittee, but nothing going on there.

Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements

Chair Bower: Any Board Member Questions, Comments and Announcements? There is next week, two weeks from now there is a California Preservation Foundation seminar in Mountain View, which is pretty good.

Board Member Shepherd: I'm planning on going to that.

Chair Bower: I think I'll go because I was going to be out of town, but now I'm not, or not traveling on Thursday, the 20th? Yeah, good. So, maybe we'll see each other. Michael.

Board Member Makinen: I sat in on the webinar yesterday put on by California Preservation Foundation on Secretary of the Interior's Standards 45 years later. I don't know if anybody else did. I thought it was a pretty good seminar. Kind of complimentary to the one on the 20th, I think.

Chair Bower: If you had the time, they also had a webinar on contextual infill, which I watched in December, I think. It was really fascinating and it talks about the impact of building new projects next to historic properties.

Board Member Makinen: Right, that was similar to this.

Chair Bower: It's work it. It's very short, I think it's two hours.

Board Member Makinen: Is the opening, or the position for Preservation Planner, is that still something the City is seeking, because I was approached by a person who might be interested in it?

Ms. French: It's not an advertised position at this time. We're kind of continuing our practice of using our consultant.

Board Member Makinen: So, I can refer this person to you, Amy?

Ms. French: If they want to come forward and have a conversation, I'd be happy to do so.

Board Member Makinen: Okay.

Chair Bower: Any other comments? I'd like to say that some of us went to the Junior Museum after our last meeting and it was really a fabulous, it is a fabulous space. It's going to be an amazing addition to Palo Alto's cultural opportunities. Really impressive. So, I'm hoping when it's all done, we'll all be invited to come to the opening, to the dedication ceremony. I'm sure we will because we weighed in on it. Anyway, if there are no other comments or announcements.

Board Member Wimmer: I wanted to mention because you mentioned that, I got an email from the President Hotel. Did you guys all get that email about having a tour. Maybe, is that something we would do together or separate? I glanced at it. I didn't really read about it, but it's the people who have taken

over the President Hotel and they're remodeling it, and they invited – maybe they invited me because I went to an open house thing they had there.

Board Member Kohler: I got a note about it too.

Board Member Wimmer: Should I share that with everyone, or how?

Ms. French: Yeah, they had reached out to get everybody's contact information, so it sounds like what they're doing is reaching out individually. We would be – this project is going to come to the Board, their proposals for that building, so it's up to you what you want to do. But if there was interest in a group tour, we could certainly agendize that and post it and all of that.

Chair Bower: Or let's do it in less than quorum numbers, as we've done in the past. Just do three and three or two and two or three. Yeah, I'd like to see the building. I think it would be helpful to tour it. We did that with the Varsity Theatre renovations five years ago, the second version. We went in two different groups.

Board Member Wimmer: Did anyone not get that email?

Chair Bower: I didn't get it.

Board Member Wimmer: Oh. So, maybe I'll forward it to all of you individually.

Chair Bower: Good idea. Let's do that.

Board Member Wimmer: I wouldn't mind going as a group. I think...

Chair Bower: Well then, if we all go together (crosstalk)

Board Member Wimmer: Is that a problem. I know we have to advertise it.

Chair Bower: It's a public meeting.

Board Member Wimmer: Is that a problem?

Ms. French: It's not a problem. I think I'd want to come too. And the planner would probably want to come too.

Board Member Wimmer: Yeah, I think it's good to go as a group, because then we all hear the same information.

Chair Bower: That's find. It's just a little more complicated, the notice.

Board Member Makinen: We could do it on retreat day, a field trip.

Board Member Wimmer: We could.

Chair Bower: Okay, Margaret, would you like to coordinate that with Amy?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes, I would.

Chair Bower: Okay, and then we'll hear from you or Vinh. All right, if there are no other announcements or comments, I'll adjourn the meeting. Thank you for coming. I appreciate having you all here.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 AM