



Historic Resources Board

Staff Report (ID # 11329)

Report Type: Approval of Minutes **Meeting Date:** 5/14/2020

Summary Title: HRB draft Minutes April 9, 2020

Title: Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of April 9, 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):

- April 9, 2020

Attachments:

- Attachment A: HRB Draft Minutes April 9, 2020 (DOCX)



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD
DRAFT MINUTES: April 9, 2020
 Virtual Teleconference Meeting
 8:30 A.M.

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair David Bower, Vice Chair Deborah Shepherd, Board Members Martin Bernstein, Michael Makinen, Christian Pease, and Margaret Wimmer

Absent: Board Member Roger Kohler

Oral Communications

Chair Bower: Our first item on the agenda is Oral Communications. I apologize for being repetitive here. Because this is a virtual meeting, there will be a lot of repetition of this particular paragraph. At this time, if you wish to speak on an item not on the agenda and you're using the Zoom application, you may raise your hand to indicate your desire to speak. The raised hand button is located at the bottom of your Zoom screen. On my screen, it's on the left, but it may be another place. If you're dialing in from a phone, you can raise your hand by pressing *9. This will create a queue. The meeting host will unmute each speaker, display the time allowed for comments and alert you to when you may begin. Vinh, are there any individuals interested in Oral Communications?

Vinh Nguyen: At this time, there are no raised hands. Let's give them a few seconds to see if anyone wants to raise their hand. Okay, seeing as there are no raised hands, we can proceed to the next item.

Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

Chair Bower: Okay. Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions, are there any, Amy?

Amy French: No changes.

City Official Reports

1. Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meetings and Assignments

Chair Bower: Let's move on to City Official Reports. The first item is the Historic Resources Board Schedule of Meetings and Assignments. Amy, do you have any discussion of this? I presume that we will be meeting virtually until the County Health Department lifts the stay-in-place order.

Ms. French: That is correct. We are not going to have the meeting of April 23, so that should be a cancel. The next meeting on our agenda is May 14, so we will give that a shot, assuming we have a quorum. If we don't have a quorum on the 14th, we'll try again for May 28th. If anyone cannot make it on May 14th, please let Vinh or myself know.

Chair Bower: Any Board Member questions for Amy? I don't see any. There is, at this point, another opportunity for public comments. Please raise your hand, use the raise your hand feature if you would like to make a comment. If you are dialing in from a phone, you can raise your hand by pressing *9. Three minutes would be allowed for any comment on this item.

Mr. Nguyen: At this time, there are no raised hands. Let's give them a few seconds to see if anyone wants to raise their hand. Seeing as there are no raised hands, we can proceed with the agenda items.

Study Session

2. PUBLIC HEARING / QUASI-JUDICIAL. 411 Lytton Avenue [19PLN-00384]: Historic Resources Board Study Session to Consider Hayes Group Architects' Request for a Preliminary Architectural Review of a Three-Unit Residential Project Which Adds Two Subterranean Housing Units to a Significant Building, Historic Inventory Category 2 Single-Family Residence, Including Exterior Changes, a Rear Addition and Expansion of the Existing Partial Basement. The Project Includes a Request for Bonus Floor Area (2,500 Square Feet) Following Successful Rehabilitation, and Transfer of the Bonus to an Eligible Downtown Receiver Site. Zoning District: Downtown Commercial (CD-C(P)). Environmental Assessment: Not a Project. For More Information, Contact the Project Planner Sheldon S. Ah Sing at Sahsing@m-group.us.

Chair Bower: Item Number 2 is the public hearing, quasi-judicial study session for 411 Lytton Avenue. Planning number is 19PLN-00348. It is an Historic Resources Board study session to consider Hayes Group Architects' request for a preliminary Architectural Review of the three-unit residential project, which adds two subterranean housing units to a significant building, Historic Category 2, a single-family residence including exterior changes, a rear addition, and expansion of the existing partial basement. The project includes a request for bonus floor area of 2,500 square feet following successful rehabilitation and transfer of the bonus to an eligible Downtown receiver site. The Zoning District is Downtown Commercial, CD/C(P). Environmental assessment is not a project. For more information, please contact Planner Sheldon Sing [sic] at sahsing@m-group.us. Staff report.

Ms. French: Thank you, Chair Bower. This is Amy French, Chief Planning Official. I will be introducing Sheldon Ah Sing, the project planner, who has a presentation. As well, we have an applicant presentation. Following those, we're enabled to take questions on the presentations. Sheldon.

Sheldon Ah Sing: Good morning. Thank you. I'll just get the presentation up here. I do have a presentation. The applicant, Ken Hayes, is also in attendance and has a PowerPoint presentation. I will upload that for him. As well, the consultant that conducted the peer review of the Historic Resource Evaluation is also available for questions on the call. This is a preliminary review of rehabilitation work as well as a 223-square-foot addition of an existing Cat 2 house as well as an addition of two units below the existing structure on a very small site, .06-acre site. The request eventually includes Major Architectural Review, offsite parking as well as bonus floor area. Since this is a preliminary review, no recommendation is sought at this time. The project is located near the intersection of Lytton and Waverley. The site is within the Downtown CD-C District, as mentioned previously. The site does include an 854-square-foot, single-story, single-family house designated as Category 2 in 2014. The proposal is for interior and exterior remodeling to rehabilitate the historic structure as well as new construction including a single-story addition at the rear of the house with two new subterranean units below the building's footprint. Within the surrounding, it's characterized by single, two, and three-story buildings. The HRE was conducted in 2002 [sic]. That helped established integrity and eligibility of the building. It was peer reviewed in 2020, including an updated review of the Secretary of Interior Standards for any proposed additions. The HRE did identify character-defining features as well as non-contributing features and did establish a rehabilitation work program. Some of those have already been completed since 2012. The applicant can go into more detail about that. The HRE did find that the character-defining features make it an outstanding example of a simplified Craftsman-style bungalow. The peer review also confirmed the findings in the HRE and provided special analysis on the Secretary of Interior Standards based on the new construction proposed today. Regarding the rehabilitation work, it's really to conduct a structural engineering assessment of the foundation of the front porch, to replace the foundation, removal of any non-historic front and rear stairs—there's some pipe railing that's included on the front; it's not historic—but also to rehabilitate the existing character-defining features of the primary facade. That's the front facade that you see here. Regarding the new construction, on the left is the footprint of the house. What's in red would be removed and demolished. On the right is what's being proposed. It's

a 223-square-foot, single-story addition to the rear as well as two units, very small units, kind of micro units in a way, below the existing house. This provides a little better view. On the top, you're looking front towards the street, so this is the back of the property that you'd see where you have to head down some stairs to get there, some steps. The second image, you're looking very similarly as the first one but now towards the building. You can see the rear addition to the house as well as the entry to the new units. The other imagery you see is the adjacent property, 437 Lytton, where you have the parking lot and looking down into the subject property. You see the rear addition, using some materials that are different, not the same as the ones on the historic structure. The imagery below, you get a little more feel of how all this comes together with the units below, the existing house, and then the addition. The cross-section really puts it all together where you can see that they're adding onto the basement below. There's a half basement now, so they're excavating. Why are we here? As part of the Architectural Review process and because the site is designated an historic resource, the HRB will review and provide some informal feedback. This will be whether the project retains the historic character of the existing structure. Parallel to this process, the ARB will informally evaluate the project based on the Architectural Review findings and input from the HRB. There will be a follow-up meeting with the ARB very similar to this, informal. The applicant will take those comments and include those into their formal application if they so decide to pursue that. I did want to provide a little bit of summary on some of the impacts to the structure based on the project. The south elevation is Lytton. There really wouldn't be any impact here, like positive impacts regarding making the project and the building more consistent with its historic character. The west elevation, you begin to see the rear addition, the use of the painted-wood siding. It has a flat roof, which the parapet is at the same height of the wall of the existing building. Then, you start to see an expansion of the basement, the use of the board-form concrete. The painted-wood windows are a little different but yet compatible. The north is really where you see the most impact because that's the rear addition to the house, but it's not visible from the street. The east is the opposite of the west, so it's very similar. You can see the same materials and the same type of impacts. Since they are doing some rehabilitation work as well as a new addition, the project is subject to the Secretary of Interior Standards, and the project was found to be consistent with those as described in the table in the staff report. The project continues the historic residential use. The materials of the original structure will be retained and preserved, except for a portion of the rear. New materials would be compatible but not copy the historic structure. The existing structure does not contain significant changes from the original construction. The materials, features, and finishes characterize the architectural integrity, and those will be retained. The rear addition could be removed without damaging the integrity of the structure. As mentioned previously, because of rehabilitation work, the Code does allow for potential floor area bonus. The project may be eligible for this in the amount of 2,500 square feet after completing the work. The owner does not intend to use the bonus onsite, but the floor area could be transferred to a non-historic receiver site. In conclusion, the project is consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards and does propose both rehabilitation and new construction. We are seeking some informal direction on the project to help with the Architectural Review and the formal submittal. This recommendation is to consider the proposed project and provide feedback on the project design to staff and the applicant. That concludes my presentation. I'll be happy to answer questions. As I mentioned, the consultant that peer reviewed the HRE is also available for questions. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Let me start, Sheldon, by asking some questions, and then I'll go around to Board Members and just ask you individually if you'd like to make comments. I note that, as I think all Board Members except maybe Christian and Debbie, will remember a similar project came to the HRB in March 2016. It was to join this property with the property next door. That project went all the way through Planning and went to the Council for approval, and the Council returned the project to the owners for redesign. Can you tell the Board what the Council's problem with the project was then?

Mr. Ah Sing: I did summarize that a little bit in the staff report at a very high level. It did make it all the way to the Council on appeal. The issue was for the adjacent property. There's a mixed-use building. They had a large outdoor patio. The concern of the neighbors was privacy. It wasn't having to do with the single-family house that is the subject today. It was really the part of the project that was on the other property.

Chair Bower: When the HRB reviewed this, the Board approved it 4-2. There were two dissenting votes on the approval of that project, but it still moved forward. The lot size is 2,843. What's the floor area ratio allowed for that lot? That's obviously a non-standard lot.

Mr. Ah Sing: It's 1:1 basically, so they can do up to 2,800 square feet essentially. They're under that amount.

Chair Bower: Thank you. The Historic Inventory Report, which was done back in 2012 by PAST, identifies, as your report does, that the single-lite, double-hung windows are a very significant feature. Those are wood windows, as I see them. I visited the site yesterday by car. I'm wondering why the staff report would consider aluminum windows to be a compatible material when the building has no aluminum windows in it at all.

Mr. Ah Sing: Maybe we can have the consultant, Richard Patenaude, weigh in on that issue.

Chair Bower: That's fine. I'm curious just how the staff got to that point. There's also another—in the staff report on packet page 13 under analysis, there is a paragraph that I don't think I have seen in any staff report and that I find confusing. Maybe you could help me with this. It's under analysis. It's the second paragraph, and I'll just read it for you. As noted in the Code, Planning staff may review and approve minor exterior alterations to historic structures. Minor exterior alterations are those "alterations which the Director of Planning and Development or his or her designee determines will not adversely affect the exterior architectural characteristics nor the historical or aesthetic value of the historic structure, its site or surroundings." The next line is what really puzzles me. The City considers projects that are evaluated and found to be consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards to meet the definition of a minor exterior alteration. That seems to me to be conflicting. This, I don't think, is a minor exterior alteration. What this suggests is that if this is considered minor, the staff would be able to make a decision about this, and the HRB Board Members would never see it. Can you help me understand this?

Ms. French: I'm not sure if Sheldon was planning to answer this, but I can say that, when it comes back for the formal, this is an HRB project, HRB review. The minor part is the Architectural Review Board part. The HRB would only review a project that is minor, that is, it's not an over 5,000-square-foot addition. Therefore, it doesn't have to go to the ARB, but it does have to go to the HRB because of the Secretary of Interior Standards review.

Chair Bower: I don't mean to belabor this point, but maybe that language for the HRB review should be removed from the staff report. As I read it and others that I've spoken to who are not on the Board read it, it would suggest that there's no HRB review here if it met the Secretary of Interior Standards. I have other questions for the applicant, but we can wait. Let me just move down the list alphabetically. Martin, you're there. Martin, do you have any comments, questions for staff?

Board Member Bernstein: Yeah. Thank you, Chair Bower. Amy, I think you just clarified. In the future, this project will come back to the HRB for a formal discussion and formal motion. Is that correct?

Ms. French: Yes, that is correct.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. I don't have that in front of me on my iPhone right now. Who prepared the HIE and who was the peer reviewer?

Mr. Ah Sing: The HRE was from PAST, a company, and that was in 2012. It was peer reviewed by a colleague of mine with M-Group. He's also available to speak on his peer review today.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. M-Group is from the City of Palo Alto. Is that correct?

Mr. Ah Sing: We are a consultant, and we were hired to assist the City (inaudible).

Board Member Bernstein: I have a question on the proposed parking agreement. The parking agreement is, in effect, or proposed for this project because of the adjacent property owner. Is that correct?

Mr. Ah Sing: The parking is not really a part of this review for the HRB but will be for the ARB. Yes, the project requires some parking that cannot be supplied onsite. The Code does allow offsite parking. In this case, the applicant is pursuing the parking at the adjacent site, 437 Lytton.

Board Member Bernstein: I understand from what I've been reading on this project is that both properties are currently owned by the same owner. Is that correct?

Mr. Ah Sing: That is correct, yes.

Board Member Bernstein: In the event that the other property owner—if that property gets sold to a different person, is this parking agreement in effect in perpetuity or does that parking agreement evaporate?

Mr. Ah Sing: It would be in effect in perpetuity. We would have a three-party agreement.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. When it comes time to talk about the project specifically, Chair Bower, I'll have questions about that when you're ready for that course or my questioning.

Chair Bower: Michael, you're next. Do you have any questions for staff?

Board Member Mackinen: I don't have any questions. I guess you're not taking comments right now. You're just taking questions.

Chair Bower: This is just questions for the staff report. We will get to a discussion of the project after the applicant makes their presentation.

Board Member Mackinen: I'll hold my comments until we get to my comments.

Chair Bower: Christian, any questions for staff?

Board Member Pease: Not specifically, but I just want to reinforce your surprise at the paragraph about the minor exterior changes. I also saw that was cited in the draft report for the Certified Local Government report. I was going to say I would be interested in—I don't know if this would be called a study session or not—learning more about this process and what constitutes a minor change, particularly in aggregate. I'm just thinking of situations where there might be many requested minor exterior changes that none of them individually is major, but taken together they might be. I don't know if it would be possible in the future with staff to meet over this particular policy.

Chair Bower: Maybe we can have that conversation when we get to the Certified Government report. We can have a little more conversation about that.

Board Member Pease: That would probably work better. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Debbie, any questions for staff?

Board Member Shepherd: I think most of my questions can wait. With the previous application as regards the house, is this new application the same? The design.

Chair Bower: My recollection is it's not because I don't think they had the two residential units in the basement. Sheldon would know better.

Mr. Ah Sing: That is correct. It is very different in that you have the two new units below. The applicant's presentation can provide a little more context on that as well.

Board Member Shepherd: Thank you.

Chair Bower: Margaret, how about you, any questions for staff?

Board Member Wimmer: Yes. I was wondering if you could quickly review the zoning for this project, which is CD-C(P). I was just looking up what that means, and it looks like it's the Commercial Downtown District with a subdistrict of P, which is pedestrian. I just thought it would be great for the staff to review that Zoning District and how having a residential use in that district impacts the project, if any. Also, if you could touch on the fact that the project is in Flood Zone X, and there's a basement proposed. Is there any FEMA impact or does Flood Zone X mean they can do a basement? Usually in a flood zone you can't do a basement. Those are my two clarification questions. I do have further comments later.

Mr. Ah Sing: I'm sharing a screen. I'm losing a little bit of resources in front of me. Sorry. If I lose audio (inaudible) question.

Board Member Wimmer: I just quickly looked up what the CD-C(P) meant. I can read what I pulled up. CD means Commercial Downtown District, and then the subdistrict—the dash C means community. In parentheses, P means pedestrian shopping. It's Commercial Downtown-Community, Pedestrian, which is the general zoning and then the sub-zoning. I just thought maybe we could talk for a moment about what that means and if it has any impact or any considerations that we should take, considering the fact that it's a residential project in a Commercial Downtown zone.

Mr. Ah Sing: I know the Downtown does allow for a mix of uses. In this case, you're looking at a historic structure, which you don't really want to change the front of it too much and the integrity of it. Certainly, for new projects there are certain factors and design criteria, such as the Downtown Urban Design Guide, that we take into consideration to make it consistent with the pedestrian commercial overlay. With historic structures, it's a little bit different in that you have to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Board Member Wimmer: Any comments about it being in Flood Zone X?

Mr. Ah Sing: Certainly, the project was reviewed by Public Works Engineering, and it does have to follow all the requirements for dewatering and excavation and be consistent with the FEMA Guidelines. That will come. We did do an informal review of that, and nothing came up that was negative and that would prohibit them from doing something. As we go forward with the formal project, we'll get more insight on that.

Board Member Wimmer: I guess Flood Zone X allows the addition of basements. In a lot of areas where a project is in a flood zone in R-1 District areas, a basement is absolutely not allowed. X might be the flood zone that's not as impacted or not as at-risk, but it's pretty close to that creek back there.

Mr. Ah Sing: Flood Zone X is the good flood zone. That's the one where (inaudible) are okay. It's the other (crosstalk).

Board Member Wimmer: I think that's right. I just thought I'd mention that.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Sheldon. If there are no other questions, let's move onto the applicant presentation.

Board Member Shepherd: David, I'm sorry. Could I ask one more question?

Chair Bower: Certainly.

Board Member Shepherd: Is it every appropriate for the HRB to comment regarding fencing?

Chair Bower: After the applicant presentation, you can comment on any portion of the project that would affect the historic resource.

Board Member Shepherd: Thank you.

Chair Bower: Vinh, applicant presentation.

Ken Hayes: Good morning, everyone. Thank you so much for continuing the work of the City during this crisis, appreciated by all, your commitment. My name's Ken Hayes, and I'll be doing the presentation on behalf of my client, Brad Ehikian. Brad has also joined onto this Zoom meeting, so he's probably just going to listen. If there are ever any questions for the owner, he is part of the meeting. I'd like to thank Sheldon for helping us get the application to this point. I have a brief presentation that Sheldon's going to control the slides. The first slide is—I'm just going to put my image up there because I'm in a place where my internet connection is very slow. I'm afraid if I have video on, it's going to be a problem. I didn't realize that until after I hooked up. I have a nice shirt on and everything, but I'm in my pajamas. The site is indicated here. It's a mid-block site on Lytton, between Kipling and Waverley. As Sheldon pointed out, it's a small site, 2,843 square feet. It is zoned CD-C(P). P is the pedestrian overlay part of it. The site is indicated in yellow, 411 Lytton. The surrounding properties to the rear are mostly residential. It's the RM-D Zone, but of course 411 is part of the Commercial Downtown District with the pedestrian overlay. You can see that indicated on the Zoning Map. The next slide, please, shows some existing views of the existing property. This is from the 437 Lytton side. This is the side of 411 Lytton where the other property is, that is owned by Mr. Ehikian. This is what we're calling the east side of the building. This is the rear. At the rear of the building, you can see that stair. It has a handrail, railing that's already been replaced. It's not original, but the landing below is the contributing portion that's going to be removed. The door at the landing and the window to the left would also be part of the removal to effect the addition to the rear. The existing cottage was built in 1901, and it is a Category 2. Mr. Ehikian raised it to a Category 2 in 2014. It is actually part of the first residential subdivision, you might have read, in Palo Alto. This is 437 Lytton. I'm just trying to give you the context. This is the other corner. We sit between two commercial buildings essentially. That slide is one that Sheldon had in his presentation as well. You can see the parking lot and the cottage. The next slide gives you our program. There are five points I wanted to make. We want to add two living units to increase the number of units to three. The reason for this is a single-family use is a noncomplying use, a nonconforming use in the CD-C. The only way to add onto this building is to make it—the owner under the previous application wanted to add a bedroom. After that application was defeated, the owner came back and said, "I want to add a bedroom still." The Planning Department said, "You can't expand a nonconforming use." That was the impetus of part of this project, how do we expand the existing single-family use, a noncomplying use, in this zone. The only way to do that is to make it a complying use. Adding two units below reclassifies this building or the use as multifamily, and multifamily is in fact a permitted use in the CD-C(P). Point 2, as a conforming use we'd expand the existing house by adding about 225 or 223 square feet for a bedroom and a bathroom and a little laundry area. We would develop the two studios in the basement. We wanted to create some outdoor landscaped areas that would be associated with all three living units. We'll show you how we've accomplished that for the subterranean living units. We want to respect the historic integrity and comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation, which goes without saying. We think this is a very sympathetic way of achieving that, given all the constraints that we have on the property. We wanted to figure out a way to free up the front of the building, so we wouldn't be blocked by cars, which makes it also more pedestrian friendly. Because Mr. Ehikian owns the property next door, it gives us this opportunity to enter into an agreement that would provide the parking for this small housing. These three parking spaces are what's required. We can achieve that next door. The next slide is architectural precedents. On the left-hand side, you get an idea of the aesthetic that we're working in to differentiate from the shingle siding but still use a wood product but oriented vertically instead of horizontally to, again, differentiate itself. The next two slides in this main slide are examples of living just below grade and how interesting it could be to have the living unit open up to an outdoor courtyard. The slide he's already passed over was images of the materials.

The shingles on the right-hand side would be reminiscent of what's there today. Board-form concrete is what we're working with. Obviously, foundations in that time and era were often created with board-form concrete. On the left-hand side is the vertical wood siding. This is imagery of what we envision for the garden. The space on the right is kind of a subterranean space that has a living area that opens onto it. I think it's a wonderfully beautiful space. The slides on the left give you an idea of some of the vegetation that we're thinking of below grade. This is the footprint of the 853-square-foot existing building with what's happening on the inside. We are going to be making some modifications on the inside. The next slide is the site plan that you saw in Sheldon's presentation. Next slide shows a setback. There's a 10-foot residential setback. When you're working with residential uses in the CD-C(P), there's no setbacks except at the rear. That is a 10-foot setback. Our addition has to comply with that. Fortunately, the deeper side of the site allows for an addition, freeing up the western or southwestern side of the site for solar exposure. It could be a warm, sun-filled space at certain times of the day. We're anticipating three different access points that could lead into the site. The existing in the center, obviously to the main front porch. Off to the left could be a visitor parking space, but it would also serve as a way into the units that are below grade. You'd walk in there and then go down the stair. On the right-hand side is another pathway that would lead to the rear of the site. That's set up so that if the unit on the left or the unit on the right, if we wanted to have independent access into them, it could be achieved this way. The next slide shows the parking in the lot next door. We would actually create a gate at the back of the site that would link the parking area to the area. All three tenants could have a parking space located there at the rear. The next slide shows you the addition in tan. That's the interior addition. There's a deck off the back. That's the light blue that you see appended to the tan area. Again, the two stairs that come down into the outdoor space below. The outdoor space in front would be available to everybody, but it's the front yard still for the main house, thinking that the rear deck would be more of a private outdoor space for the existing home itself. Let me just point out, in this slide you can see the changes on the inside. We're going to keep the two bedrooms on the left, reconfigure the bathroom that exists between them right now, and then the living room becomes conjoined with a little bit larger kitchen. You can see behind the kitchen is a small bathroom with a stacked laundry washer/dryer. You step down into the master bedroom addition at the rear where we have just enough space for the bedroom and a closet, and the door leads out to the deck. In case you're interested, we've got to provide trash and recycling. On the left-hand side, highlighted in lavender is where we would have a refuse/recycling enclosure so that you wouldn't be looking at garbage cans like you do today. This is the below-grade area. There are two small units. The one on the left is about 478 square feet, definitely a micro unit. The one on the right is a little bit bigger at just under 700 square feet, but they're both studios. They both have access to light and air, and their entries come off the rear sunken garden. We felt it's important to have light and ventilation to be able to move through the building. At the front, there's a couple of light wells that we would have a window into that light well that becomes another way out, perhaps, of the units for escape. It also provides a place where we can put a compressor for the mechanical system. The bathrooms, you can see, are located in the back. They form a core bathroom/dressing area. They're nice units. The one on the right has lots of storage and a little bit bigger kitchen. This is an elevation. At the top, the west elevation shows the stair as it descends to the courtyard, and sliding doors would provide entry into each of the units. We're trying to preserve the integrity of the historic hipped roof, which is a main feature of this square style cottage. By keeping the addition roof lower and flat, it essentially just becomes a wall or a fence that is added to the existing building. The prior application from 2014 actually had a roof on top of the addition which, in my mind, upon later study cluttered up the original hipped roof of the historic house. Really, no change to the front of the building. This is the east side at the top. That faces the parking lot. There's going to be a fence and a hedge along that side. By and large, we're rehabilitating that facade of the building, which I would say is visible from the parking lot. You can see at the back of that is where we would have the addition. To the very rear of that addition, it steps down and becomes the deck. The elevation below would be the north elevation. That's from the courtyard, looking back at the building. The existing window and the shingle wall is the one on the right. The hipped roof, obviously, is the existing. The board-form concrete would be reminiscent of a foundation from that era, and that forms the walls of the courtyard. It could be really wonderful, and it picks up the horizontality, in my opinion, of the shingle siding and gives the building something firm to rest on. A cross-section through the building. The one at the top is a cross-section through the front porch, if you will, kind of through the building and into the

courtyard behind. It shows the smaller studio below. The drawing below is a cross-section the other way, that looks back at the historic building towards Lytton, and it shows the new bedroom, which is associated with the historic house above, and then the new studio below. We just have some slides of imagery that we can walk through. We've got the historic siding and the wood trim. We've not decided on paint color yet, so please don't—I'd be happy to hear your comments on paint color, but we do plan on painting it after we restore any rot and the shingles and the wood siding. We will be changing the front porch and the handrails. We need handrails, but we don't like the pipe rails that are there. The brick porch appears to not be historic, so we'd restore that in a fashion that would be consistent. We have clues from a house around the corner that was also part of this property at one time. It has a wood porch, so we'd like to put a wood porch back onto this. Just a view of the front. We would be getting rid of the picket fence across the front of the building. We're not showing the hedge, but there's going to be a landscaped hedge that will go there and define a bit of a front yard, so people don't just walk onto the property. From the other side. You can see the light wells on the side. Those will be covered with a grate, so you could actually walk on top of them if you had to, but it's an open grate for light and air. Next slide is an overall aerial looking down to give you some perspective. The next slide shows you the basement outdoor courtyard. We're not including the rendering of the landscaping, but envision this with landscaping. You have a landscape plan conceptual plan in the plan set in front of you, that shows what we're thinking there. The next slide would show the outdoor space associated with the smaller unit. That's the stair there that runs up to Lytton Avenue, the board-form concrete on both sides. The next slide gets into what our historic preservation is going to be at the bottom are the existing elevations today. The row right above that shows a comparison of before and after, if you will. I probably don't need to dwell on that too much. The proposed alterations are replace the foundation. It's an old brick foundation that's falling apart. Remove the non-historic front stair. The rear stair is historic, but it's just contributing. There will be a partial demolition of the rear facade wall with a new entrance and construction of the rear bedroom. We'd rehabilitate the historic character-defining features on the primary facades. Really, there's going to be three facades that are essentially untouched, which is just wonderful about the proposal. There's the main hipped roof and the dormer, which are iconic for this style, the symmetrical one-over-one double-hung wood windows on either side. The temporary carport will be removed. That little picket fence is non-historic. That'll be removed. You can't really see the brick porch, but you see the pipe rails that stick up above the picket fence. That will also be removed. The next slide shows the wood-shingle siding. Where they're rotted, we'll have to replace. By and large, we'll be restoring them and then putting a finish coat of paint on them. The hipped roof actually has already been re-shingled, and that has probably gone to a more traditional wood shingle roof as opposed to an asphalt shingle roof. The owner elected to do that a few years ago after the prior proposal was defeated for the building next door. We will restore the rafter tails, the overhangs that do need a lot of work. The next slide shows the front porch and the Colonial Revival style, simple columns. The wood cap in the porch is listing. We're going to have to get in and put a new foundation most likely under that and then do the restorative work needed at that point. The next one just shows the one-over-one double-hung windows. You can see them going down the side of the building, so obviously all those will be touched upon and restored as part of this work. The last slide is the opposite slide from one of the first slides, that gives you an overview of the composition of the stairs and the sunken garden and the addition at the rear. Thank you for your time. I'm happy to answer any questions and look forward to those.

Chair Bower: Board Members, let's ask any questions you have, and we'll have a discussion after the question session. Let's do this in reverse order, so Margaret doesn't always have to be last. Margaret, any questions for Ken?

Board Member Wimmer: I had a couple of quick questions. In regard to the front-facing light wells—again, I always go back to my knowledge of the different zoning neighborhoods. I know that this is a residential project in a Commercial Zoning District. In the typical R-1 zone, we wouldn't be allowed to have light wells in the front yard. I don't know if having the two light wells in the front yard triggers the necessity to have a variance or if that's allowed in this zone. I just don't know.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you for the question, Board Member Wimmer. The setback for this zoning district is zero at the front, so technically there is no front yard. There's no issue with the light wells being there.

Board Member Wimmer: Thank you for clarifying that you're proposing to put flat grates over the light wells because those would have been required to have a guardrail around them if they were open, which would impact the historic front elevation. If there's a flat grate over it, are those considered egress light wells or just for light?

Mr. Hayes: They're just really for light. They're not required for egress. They're for light and ventilation. I don't want to go back to the plan because I'm not controlling this. We want to be able to draw air through the units. There is a window that would be operable, like a big casement door that would allow the resident to open and walk into that light well if they needed to. Primarily for being able to open that and get ventilation through the unit. They could open their sliding door and then open that rear ventilation casement window, if you will, that is into that light well. It'll allow air to come through.

Board Member Wimmer: In terms of the relationship of the size of that window to the light well, the light well's quite a bit bigger than the window itself. I'm sure you've considered that. The light wells are to the corner of the building, so they're quite wide. I just wanted to point that out. If you look at the basement floor plan in the back where the stair's coming down for that back basement unit, at first glance I saw this unidentified rectangular space that looked like it could almost be in the future—that's actually what the view on the screen is, the perfect view of that. See how there's the back unit, the stairs come down on your very left, and then there's a deck above this foundation. On the floor plan, you see that that's a whole space under there, but that's in the setback. How does ...

Mr. Hayes: That's not a space. It would be a retained—there's a retaining wall under the deck coplanar with the back of the master bedroom. We can't go into the setback. That's why that's like that.

Board Member Wimmer: That's just a foundation.

Mr. Hayes: That's right.

Board Member Wimmer: I see. In terms of—this always happens to me—utilities, you have to have water heaters and you have to have furnaces. I know that you'll incorporate that in somehow, but those always take space. I don't know if you've made any provisions. That's not under our purview, but I always look for that because I always think, "Where is all that going to go?" You've got such a nice plan that I just mention that.

Mr. Hayes: Because we're dealing with such a small site and a sensitive structure on that site, we obviously want to hide what we can and incorporate mechanical systems in areas that are still accessible but not necessarily prominent. It's also a very small project, so that's good. The mechanical equipment will likewise be very small. The original house has a nice attic space, so that attic space will be ideal for a horizontal furnace unit. We're probably going to put in an on-demand water heater that'll be associated with the new bathroom/laundry room addition. The units below, that equipment will be in the light well. There will be a small compressor in there, and then just a little fan coil inside each of the two units. We haven't decided where the on-demand water heaters are going to go. If those are gas, which might be a problem now, they would need a flue. It looks like everything's going electric anyway, so we wouldn't have to worry about the flues. Those will most likely be in the unit, more of a European approach.

Board Member Wimmer: Thank you for the clarification. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thanks, Margaret. Debbie, any questions?

Board Member Shepherd: Yes. We're going to do comments later.

Chair Bower: That's correct.

Board Member Shepherd: I think I'll just wait.

Chair Bower: All right. Christian, any questions for Ken?

Board Member Pease: No, thank you.

Chair Bower: Michael?

Board Member Makinen: Yeah, I have one question. The front porch of the house is deemed to be non-historic. Can you give me some idea of how old that porch is? Sometimes these additions, you might call it, or changes acquire historic integrity because they've been there for a long time. That's the crux of my question. Has it been a sufficiently long period of time to acquire historic integrity?

Mr. Hayes: The HRE identified the railings as being non-historic. When I say the porch, I'm not referring to anything that is wood. The porch right outside the door, obviously, is all part of the original. The walls that surround it are part of the original, along with the columns and the roof. There's a brick addition that comes off—it looks like it's slammed up against the former wood shingles. That has the pipe railing mounted to it. That's what we're assuming is not historic and will be removed.

Board Member Makinen: The pipe railings are your main thought there as far as changing.

Mr. Hayes: The pipe railings will be removed. We have not got to the point of the design of the new railing. We're just showing right now a conceptual rail. The stairs are over 30 inches at the top above grade, so anything over 30 inches requires a guard. The new railings are probably going to have to be some kind of picket rail. I'll probably go around the corner and look at the sister house to this house and see what that one has, if that's still original.

Board Member Makinen: The basic porch has been there for a long time. It's part of the original structure then.

Mr. Hayes: That stays. It's like four steps that are made out of brick that's not part of the period. I don't know when it was done, though. Only the railing was addressed. It looks like the railings attach to that brick, so we're making an assumption that they were done at the same time.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Michael. Martin, if you're still there, your turn if you have questions.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair. My discussion will probably request Ken to respond to my comments. Should I wait until you get to that portion of our discussion?

Chair Bower: Yeah, I think that's fine. Ken, I wanted to applaud your use of board-form concrete in the foundation and also adding the housing units. It's a good design characteristic that actually mimics the original house but won't be confused as being part of the original project.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you.

Chair Bower: I'm wondering if you know where the bonus FAR square footage is going to go.

Mr. Hayes: I do not.

Chair Bower: Is the lower outdoor space a community or a condo area or is that just for the lower two-unit residents?

Mr. Hayes: Good question. I think we would like to make it just available to the lower units because the upstairs occupants have the deck at the back and the front yard. We haven't talked through that enough with my client. These will be condominiums, by the way. We've not proposed the condo map yet just

because this is all preliminary. We really want to get feedback before we take the next step. We think it's a great way to add units and make the use conforming.

Chair Bower: You've got aluminum windows in all of the new addition, but the building has wood windows, double hung. I can see having wood casement windows, but I'm having some trouble understanding why aluminum would be considered compatible. I do understand the differentiation part, but I'm having trouble getting to the compatibility part.

Mr. Hayes: I'd be hard pressed to look at a window from 15-20 feet away and say whether it was a painted-wood window or a painted-aluminum window if there's a sash and a frame. I would envision that these sliding doors would have—they'll be sash units. I don't envision these anodized aluminum. We're going to pick probably a dark paint color and have these Kynar-coated most likely. What's important would be the dimension of the sash. I think 20 feet away you're not going to be able to tell. Obviously, the aluminum would be a much more lasting product than the wood. I've got to say these wood windows have been on this house for 115 years.

Chair Bowers: Wood windows tend to last a long time if you paint them.

Mr. Hayes: I would disagree with that. I've already replaced the wood windows on my house that I built in 1987 because they ... These redwood windows, you're right.

Chair Bower: Thanks, Ken. This is a very thorough presentation. Now, we are going to move to public comments. Please use the raise your hand feature to indicate you have a public comment. The raise your hand button is located at the bottom of your Zoom screen. If you're dialing from a phone, you can press *9. Comments will be limited to three minutes. Vinh, do you see any raised hands?

Mr. Nguyen: At this time, there are currently no raised hands. Let's give the attendees a couple of seconds to raise their hand if they want to. Seeing as how there are still no raised hands, we can proceed with the agenda. I just want to point out that Debbie has her hand raised.

Board Member Shepherd: I have some comments. I want to commend the architect for spending time looking at 385 Waverley. It's really a rare opportunity to have a pair of houses extant. That house, built at the same time, appears to have been lovingly cared for. It's fresh and intact from what I can tell and is painted in the same way as this property at 411 Lytton is currently. One difference is the Waverley does not have shingles. It has horizontal, narrow boards cladding it. That brings me to a reservation overall. I'm struggling with horizontality versus verticality in your addition. I liked what you said about the board-form concrete. I agree with David. I think it's very nice. You said you felt it reflected the horizontality in the shingles. I'm surprised that you've chosen to go with such a vertical cladding on the addition. Possibly what is coloring my view is the images we're working with. I'm so glad you said you haven't made it to final decision about paint. Between the stark contrasting color and the extreme verticality, I find it very jarring. I realize that the intention is not to mimic the historic features of the structure. I find this incompatible. It is in our purview to talk about color. I looked up the guidelines for treatment under rehabilitation. I guess we'll revisit this when you've made a decision about color, when we see this the final time. I would express now reservations that I have about going with this very dark gray or dark brown that has been so popular and, I believe, is losing favor. I feel like it's starting to seem like a very dated and stylistic approach in everything, interior design, fashion, exterior paint color. The fencing I have the same issues with. Just looking at these images presented today, I feel like it's—I don't know—a sanitized approach to integrate the whole thing. I feel like the historic house has been lost in it. What does everyone else think?

Mr. Hayes: It's my understanding that—I don't normally participate during the discussion. Is this contrary to your understanding?

Chair Bower: No. Ken, it's fine if you want to make a comment. Because this is a study session, we only need to make comments like yours, Debbie. Presumably the final project, when it comes back to the

Board, will have a materials palette and colors for all of us to work with. I don't think we need to spend any time on that. Did you have any other comments?

Board Member Shepherd: No, but should we spend time on the question of horizontal versus vertical? Maybe I'm the only one that's troubled by that in the addition.

Chair Bower: Let me ask all of the Board Members to comment, and then we can discuss after we get a complete sense of what the issues might be. We're going to go back into alphabetical order. Martin, comments?

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you, Chair Bower. Hello, Ken, and hi, Brad. Martin Bernstein, HRB Member. You always do great, stellar presentations, Ken. Thank you for another one today. Looking at the drawing, on my screen it's the aerial view from northeast. I think it's image number 22 on my screen and then page 23 view from patio looking northeast. Are those available to other Board Members plus Ken?

Mr. Hayes: I have it.

Board Member Bernstein: I also have the same concern that Board Member Debbie mentioned about the horizontality and the verticality. Ken, you mentioned horizontality. I totally love the horizontal board-form concrete for the foundation serving as a plinth, you might say. When I look at the aerial view from northeast, my very first, immediate reaction was I see the differentiation because of the verticality but not the compatibility. If the horizontal feeling of the shingles plus the board-form can be continued on your new and upper-floor addition, above-grade addition, if that can be horizontal boards, you've got the compatibility plus the differentiation. That was pretty jarring to me. As proposed, I don't see any compatibility between the new and the old. If you just change that horizontal siding, then I think that meets the Secretary of Interior Standards for compatibility and differentiation. Thank you.

Chair Bower: Thanks, Martin. Michael, any discussion?

Board Member Makinen: Thank you, Chair Bower. I also have some concerns about the issue of compatibility that Board Member Bernstein brings up. This is always a constant battle between being compatible and also differentiating additions on historic properties. The thing that stands out most strongly to my eye is the fact that the flat roof on the addition is not compatible with the general shape of the roof of the main house. Some type of hipped roof would make it more compatible. You have enough elements in the addition that differentiate it without having to go to a flat roof. That would be my biggest comment, the visual appearance looks like it's something that's been stuck on there, and it's not very appealing from a historic standpoint with the original structure. I would encourage you to modify the flat roof into something that's more of a hipped roof that's compatible with the original structure. There's plenty of elements in your project that differentiate it so that nobody's going to be confused that it's part of an original structure.

Chair Bower: Thank you, Michael. Christian, do you have anything you'd like to add?

Board Member Pease: Yeah. I concur with the comments about the vertical lines on the addition in the back. I share those concerns.

Chair Bower: Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: These are all very interesting comments. I am wondering if instead of having the vertical siding, if it's paint grade, painting it the same color as the shingles would make it blend a little bit more. It looks as though the wood siding is meant to be natural wood material, and it wouldn't be painted. That's what this presentation is indicating.

Mr. Hayes: Correct.

Board Member Wimmer: If that was a paint-grade material and it was painted the same color as the shingles, maybe that would allow it to blend a little bit more. I agree that we're always looking for the differentiation. This project is a great example of differentiation. However, Martin brings up the interesting question, is it compatible. Also, Michael's comment about—I don't know if Ken has considered having a low hipped roof. That might make it seem a little bit more compatible. I think that's worth taking a look at, at least. The vertical doesn't really bother me too much, but I understand the rest of the Board Members' concern. Maybe when it comes back, we could see some variations on the siding. In terms of color, obviously we're going to maybe review that at a later date. I like darker colors. It makes it pop out a little bit more. This tiny little cottage, you walk by it, and you don't really notice it. The color can have an impact on the street noticeability of it. It's so small, it could compete better with what else is going on. One side note, which has nothing to do with this, I hate that low wall that's concealing the parking, the entrance to the parking lot. It looks like now they've stucco-ed over them. In some of these photographs, you see when they used to be that blue tile. I've always hated that. I know that's not on this property.

Mr. Hayes: The building next door.

Board Member Wimmer: Doesn't that same guy own it? At least, they could square it off or put some vines on it or make it an art installation. I've always hated that. Sorry. That's on a tangent. Strike that. I take that back. That's my input. Thanks.

Chair Bower: Thanks, Margaret. I would take a wild guess here that that blue tile wall will be coming down. It wasn't in the last presentation when the bigger project was submitted in March. I share the same feelings that other Board Members have expressed about vertical siding as opposed to horizontal. I also share concern about the fact that the addition has a flat roof. That certainly is differentiated, but again I'm not sure how compatible that is. Typically, what we have seen in additions to Category 2 houses or buildings in Professorville is the material used to differentiate an addition from the original building would be the same. If it was wood shingles, it would be wood, but you'd have a different profile. It would be wood siding or in some cases if you had a specific shingle style on the original house, you just differentiated the shingle style on the addition. The Peninsula Art League that came before the Board several years ago, an addition to that building, the building had a very heavy dash plaster finish. The new building also had plaster, but it was smooth. We had a compatible material because they were the same, but the finish differentiated the old and the new. The other thing that I brought up earlier about the windows at least on the above-grade windows what distinguishes the double-hung windows is the way in which they are framed on the outside by the exterior trim and the interior as well, but we're not concerned with that. Again, I see these two windows on that addition as being stark and not compatible with the style of the rest of the building. Those are my strongest concerns about the building. I'm assuming and I like the idea that this is going to be a condominium project. That lower area will then become a joint-use space, and I think that it needs it because there's no other space on this property where you can actually get off the street. Ken, when this project comes back, I assume the fencing materials would be detailed.

Mr. Hayes: Yes. What we're thinking is it would be natural wood siding. Not siding, natural boards that would define the boundary of the property.

Chair Bower: We're looking forward to seeing this. Any other comments that any Board Members would like to make? I'm not seeing any raised hands. This does not require a vote because it's a study session. With that, we will move onto Item 4. Thank you, Ken, for spending time with us today and explaining the project.

Mr. Hayes: Thank you. You're welcome. Thanks for all your comments.

3. Receive Certified Local Government (CLG) Annual Report for the 2018-2019 Reporting Period.

Chair Bower: Moving onto Item 3, it's the review of the Certified Local Government Annual Report for the 2018-2019 period. Amy, do you have a staff perspective you'd like to share?

Ms. French: I do. Can you give me a minute? I'm going to upload my screen.

Chair Bower: That's fine.

Ms. French: Thank you.

Chair Bower: While Amy is loading this, following her comments, we will have a period where the public can also comment, and then we can discuss the report. Typically, we have not voted on this report. If Board Members feel we need to do that, I would be open to a motion to do so. Amy, are you ready?

Ms. French: Yes. Can you see my screen? I've shared my screen.

Board Member Pease: Yes, we can.

Ms. French: The one note is this is the first page of the report that I would be sending by April 17th to the Office of Historic Preservation. You probably see the date of the Board review is incorrect. It says March 26th. That's because I had originally planned to bring this to you on March 26th, but COVID-19 happened. I will make a change to that date to say April 9th, today's date. That's one change I'm planning to make. I have a cover letter that goes with this. It talks about the two awards we received for the Eichler Neighborhood Guidelines that we produced and got approved by Council in 2018. The awards we got during this reporting period were the California Preservation Foundation award and the Docomomo award. That's feathers in our cap. Item 2 is about implementing our Comprehensive Plan policies for historic preservation. We've been talking about that over the past year. We've been implementing Policy 7.2. We've done 32 resource evaluations now, 22 of these were found ineligible for California Register, but we did find four single-family residential properties to be California Register eligible. We found six commercial or nonresidential properties were eligible for California Register. We talk about that in the report. We have an inventory upgrade, 526 Waverley. That was the Sport Shop and Toy World property. A note about outreach we did to the realtor community about that new program related to Policy 7.2. We also have a slide here about the Certified Local Government, which Palo Alto is a Certified Local Government, and we're in good standing. Because we're in good standing, we file these reports each year. We are able to submit an application for grant funding through the Office of Historic Preservation. We did that in the past for the Professorville Guidelines. We didn't do it with the Eichler Guidelines. Those were on us. We have in reserve an application to submit for this mid-century era context statement. We've had issues with staffing in the past. We still have that issue. We were considering submitting it in May this year, but COVID-19 happened. We've been struggling with other efforts. It might be unlikely given the economy to rely on taking something on with a consultant's assistance, but we'll put a pin in that for the moment. The report includes an attachment, which is where we are with our Comp Plan preservation policies. We're doing pretty well with 7.2 and some other items that we're processing. Salvage and reuse is going along. Some future year Comp Plan goals for historic preservation are on the screen. We've talked about those. We're not looking to take those up this year, but that's future years. The goals that I had in the report are holdovers from last year's report. Some of these things we began, and some we didn't. Here are the four goals that I am thinking to send for this year. You can weigh in on those if you'd like. Continuing to do evaluations for California Register in accordance with Policy 7.2 and working with folks who want to upgrade their properties' category in the Inventory as well as any property owners who wish to become nominated for the National Register or California Register. There are now tax benefits available from the State for properties that are on the California Register. Hopefully, moving forward with the HRB subcommittee proposal for a tailored Mills Act program. That's something that was begun a while back. There's one more. I intend to review the report to reflect these four goals. There is a fifth goal that I can also list. I had started looking at the demolitions of the potentially eligible homes and properties that the Dames and Moore report covered in 1988 and looking at cleaning up some of that data. There's a little bit of confusion on numbers and also seeing about the demolitions. We're doing better now because we have a Comp Plan policy that

addresses having a look and evaluating before allowing demolition. This is a snapshot of time from 2004 to 2020, how many of these properties have been retained. This list reflects—I don't really have a full conversation of this today, but we could put this on a future agenda to discuss, if you'd like. I thought this certainly counts as a fifth goal of tracking the demolitions that we could put on our report for this year. I'll end there and let folks comment on the Board, if we have any comments from the public. David, do you have any requests or suggestions?

Chair Bower: Let's move to public comment access. If there are any people who are participating and want to make a comment, please raise your hand using the Zoom feature. If you are calling in on a phone, press *9 to let us know that you'd like to make a comment. We'll wait for a minute or two to see if anybody is interested in commenting. Vinh, if you don't see anything, just let us know.

Mr. Nguyen: There are currently no attendees, but let's give them a couple of seconds to see if maybe one wants to join.

Ms. French: Just like any HRB meeting, we don't have a lot of attendees.

Mr. Nguyen: Seeing as how there's still no attendees, we can proceed with the agenda.

Chair Bower: Thanks. Any comments from Board Members? Let me start by saying it would be very interesting for us to look at the last piece of information you provided about demolitions maybe when we're back in Council Chambers in 2022.

Ms. French: Can we hope for sooner than that?

Chair Bower: Some of us are in the high-risk category on this Board.

Board Member Pease: You might lose a lot of structures in the interim.

Chair Bower: Exactly. I'm being facetious. I think that would be useful. I think the rest of the report is pretty straightforward. Any other comments by Board Members? Christian, go ahead.

Board Member Pease: I did want to return to this issue of minor exterior alterations you brought up. I was also mystified that it was in the study around the project we just discussed because it's irrelevant to that project. I wondered why it was there and so much copy space was devoted to it. Then, I found it in this report. I just think it's something I'd like to better understand. I understand that there is an ordinance that this quicker process can be invoked. Again, I would like to understand better some definitions here. I could foresee a situation where somebody comes in with many, many minor changes, each one of them insignificant on its own but taken as a whole might lead to major impacts. Would this be a path that would bypass us under this process?

Ms. French: Let me try to explain. I was worried a little bit in the last item that I might have confused the issue. Whenever there's a three-unit residential project, it has to go to the Architectural Review Board. That's considered a major project. If that had been a two-unit project, then it wouldn't have to go to the ARB. It would only have to go to the HRB because it's in the Downtown, because it's listed on our Historic Inventory through Palo Alto. In addition, it's a California Register-eligible property. Because of those reasons, let's say it was a two-unit project. It would only be going to the HRB and then not the ARB. Hopefully, that's clear now on that project. As far as cumulative impacts, that's a CEQA situation. Being a California Register-eligible property, we have to look at the California Environmental Quality Act potential impacts of a project. If a number of minor changes to a historic resource are cumulative enough to become a major impact, then that's an impact to a resource, and that's a CEQA impact. There would have to be mitigation measures looked at. If there was a desire to do a Statement of Overriding Considerations because the project was so important, the Council would have to take that on. In this case, we are hoping that that project with the changes they will make and submit for their formal application we would be able to find it does meet the Secretary of Interior Standards and is not a CEQA

impact. As far as projects that are outside the Downtown and even some that are in the Downtown, if there are minor changes that don't really rise to the level of the HRB, that we can handle with our consultant who is a qualified consultant, we have done some of those at a staff level and not brought those to the HRB. Anything in Professorville we do bring to the HRB. Most of the Downtown stuff we do bring to the HRB. I don't know if I'm helping with that understanding. Certainly, we have the opportunity, Christian, for a retreat. We do a retreat every year. We had been looking at April for a retreat, but that's postponed at the moment. We will hopefully do one in the fall. I'm hoping that we'll be able to come back together this fall for a retreat and get to talk about some of these topics at length.

Chair Bower: Amy, I'd like to suggest that we add that item to a retreat topic list. I think Christian brings up a very important point. This sequential chipping away of an historic resource is a potential as the City begins to implement this no gas connection to projects. I think we're going to see a lot more projects that are going to be incrementally remodeled so that the gas line can stay. Large commercial projects and large residential projects, they won't care. They'll just comply. It's the single-family or duplex residences that we will see that happening. We ought to have a policy in the Planning Department that makes these so-called small changes just that, and that means small. Moving a window a foot from its approved location is a small change. Removing the window is not a small change. We need to have some kind of public discussion about this and a sense of the Board that the Council can use and the Planning Department can use when making these decisions.

Ms. French: Great idea.

Chair Bower: Martin, do you want to make any comments?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, I do. Thank you, Chair Bower. One, the one that Christian just mentioned about these minor changes. If a minor change is at a staff level, does that staff level include consulting with the City of Palo Alto's historic consultant to discuss if it is in fact a minor alteration?

Ms. French: We have an on-call consultant relationship with Page and Turnbull for projects. Most projects we are using Page and Turnbull. In this case, we have M-Group as our consultant, and they have historic preservation expertise on staff. That was Richard Patenaude, who I believe was participating in the call this morning in this meeting. It's less common that we have a different firm handling our reviews. Definitely building permits that come through for historic resources, we engage Page and Turnbull, our qualified professional historic preservation consultant.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. As far as the accomplishments for 2018-2019, it talks about adoption of Code changes. I know there were things where only Categories 1 and 2 can apply for some exceptions or other provisions. Now, it's Categories 1, 2, 3 and 4 that can use all those potential incentives. Is that correct?

Ms. French: Yes. We claimed that in the reporting period for 2017-2018. That was an accomplishment during that reporting period. What we do claim in this period is the subdivision incentive that we did associated with 874 Boyce, the sister homes on Boyce. That is a change that did happen during this review period from 2018 to 2019. We are claiming that as an accomplishment.

Board Member Bernstein: Do you recall the changes that included Categories 1, 2, 3 and 4? Is that Chapter 18?

Ms. French: Yes. That was related to home improvement exceptions in particular.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. I love the fact that you mentioned the Mills Act subcommittee. I encourage the Mills Act subcommittee, HRB subcommittee to continue working on that when that's available to be worked on. Amy, you mentioned something in your report about tax benefits for—what kind of properties did you suggest?

Ms. French: With the new California law that passed in the fall that we reported out in an earlier HRB meeting, this enables properties that are actually listed on the California Register to be eligible for tax benefits for improvements to the—I believe it's income tax for the cost of improvements to those resources. That's why I say we stand ready for anyone who wants to get their property actually on the Register. We stand ready to help with that.

Board Member Bernstein: That includes these non-income-producing residential properties?

Ms. French: Correct.

Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. Wonderful information. Thank you so much. Those are the only comments I have at this time. Thank you, Amy, and thank you, Chair Bower.

Chair Bower: Any other comments from Board Members, Margaret, Debbie, Christian?

Board Member Pease: Just glancing back through the draft report, did I remember correctly about a nascent initiative about reusing historic elements that are taken out of houses that are modified or other structures that are modified? Is that in here?

Chair Bower: I think that's part of the Public Works Department's initiative that Phil Bobel came before the Board and described. I think that was before ...

Board Member Pease: I thought I read it in this draft, something about it in this draft.

Ms. French: I think I might have noted the salvage component. That is something the Public Works Department is (crosstalk) on.

Board Member Pease: That's somewhere else, okay. Thank you. I just thought it was really interesting and something that should be pursued. Thanks.

Chair Bower: Again, we haven't voted on this in the past. Unless there's a change in heart here, I think we can just move onto the next item.

Ms. French: Sure. If anyone has any edits that they see that they would like me to capture, for instance the training for each member or anything else, just send me an email. I have one more week to fix this up and send it off.

Board Member Wimmer: On that note, Amy—sorry. Can I interject?

Chair Bower: Certainly.

Board Member Wimmer: On that note, I see that I don't have anything reported under my name. We are required as Board Members to do at least one training per year. Right?

Chair Bower: Yes.

Ms. French: Yes. It doesn't have to be directly related to historic, if it's about architecture in general. I know as a designer, Margaret, you probably have something to share.

Board Member Wimmer: I'll have to look back and see. I know I've done a few things. I'll do that.

Ms. French: It got a little awkward because May 2018 was our preservation conference in Palo Alto, but that was the prior reporting period.

Chair Bower: Martin, did you want to say something?

Board Member Bernstein: Yes, Chair Bower. Amy, I'm looking on your report here. I don't see the names including mine of my reportable action for the training. I just have seven pages of your report. I sent into Vinh my two activities. Is my name listed as ...

Ms. French: I captured your trainings on the report. I'm not sure what you're looking at right now. The report I'm showing on the screen is just a PowerPoint, not the report itself.

Board Member Bernstein: Okay. I just have the PowerPoint.

Ms. French: We have the packet online, and you can look there to see. Also, I believe Vinh sent out the packet by email last Friday. You can find it there as well.

Board Member Bernstein: It's showing that I met the training requirement. Is that correct?

Ms. French: Yes.

Board Member Bernstein: Good, thank you. That's all. Thank you.

Chair Bower: All Board Members, Martin excluded, should look at the report and make sure that your training is in fact on there before next week so that we get an accurate view.

Action Items

Approval of Minutes

4. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of February 13, 2020

Chair Bower: Let's move onto Item Number 4, which is approval of the minutes of the Historic Resources Board, draft minutes for February 13, 2020 meeting. Public comment is permitted during this review. Let's start with any Board Member changes or additions to the draft minutes. Are there any? I'm not seeing any hands raised. I'm using that facetiously, but I don't see anybody stepping up. Martin, did you want to make any comments?

Board Member Bernstein: I'm scrolling through my emails looking for that website. I'm just scrolling through my emails looking for an email from Vinh. I'm looking through all my emails right here.

Chair Bower: It's April 3rd that Vinh sent out the agenda package. I think it was at the end of that package. It's a separate document.

Board Member Bernstein: I'm going to April 3rd. Still looking. Here we are, April 3rd, and here's the packet. Let me open up that email. I see April 3rd. Clicked on it. Opening up, here we are. There are five attachments. I'll start with the last one and see if that's the minutes. Scrolling down, one of 20 pages.

Chair Bower: While you're doing that, Martin, let me note that we will be taking a roll call vote on this after we hear from any members of the public that want to comment. I'll just call the roll alphabetically. You either say yea or nay for yes or no. Martin, are you ...

Board Member Bernstein: I'm downloading right now the minutes.

Chair Bower: Amy, would it be appropriate to see if there are public comments that people can make?

Ms. French: Yes.

Chair Bower: Vinh, again this is the same protocol we've used earlier. Please raise your hand, use the raise your hand feature. It indicates you have a public comment. It's located at the bottom of the Zoom screen. If you're dialing in, press *9. Comment will be limited to three minutes. We'll take a moment to let anyone use those devices.

Mr. Nguyen: We currently have no attendees in the meeting right now, so we may proceed with the agenda item.

Chair Bower: Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: I have it right now. I'm looking at the minutes. Let me take a look here.

Chair Bower: Michael, Martin is looking at the minutes to see if he has any changes or additions. I gave an opportunity for the public to comment, but we have no public currently attending the virtual meeting. When Martin has finished his review, we'll ...

Board Member Bernstein: I don't see that I would have any comments or corrections.

Chair Bower: If no one else has any additions or corrections, I'll entertain a motion for approval.

Board Member Mackinen: I'll second it.

Chair Bower: We have to have the first, the motion.

Board Member Pease: I make a motion for approval.

Chair Bower: Christian moves to approve the minutes. Michael, you second?

Board Member Makinen: I second it, yeah.

Chair Bower: In alphabetical order, please say yea or nay for approval or disapproval. Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: I do see on the minutes is that project that I represented, so I can't vote on that portion of the minutes that includes my presentation to the HRB. I have to recuse myself from participating on that. I guess I'll have to—I can't vote on ...

Ms. French: You can abstain. You don't have to recuse. You can just abstain.

Board Member Bernstein: I'll abstain because of my client's project that I represented to the HRB. I can't vote on the minutes.

Chair Bower: Let me amend my statement a minute ago. Yea for yes, nay for no or abstain for not voting. Martin has abstained.

Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

Chair Bower: Michael?

Board Member Makinen: Yea.

Chair Bower: Christian?

Board Member Pease: Yea.

Chair Bower: Debbie?

Board Member Shepherd: Yea.

Chair Bower: Margaret?

Board Member Wimmer: Yea.

Chair Bower: I'm voting yea as well. That's five yeas and one abstention.

Subcommittee Items

Chair Bower: We are at the last part of our meeting, Subcommittee Items. There are no subcommittee items I know of, and there's only one subcommittee that needs to be reconstituted, and that's the Mills Act subcommittee. Margaret and I were on that with Brandon when he was on the Board. Other Board Members who would be interested in participating in that subcommittee could email me or Amy. Just don't email all of us. We can reconstitute that. I think it's very close to being done. I'd like to move it out of the HRB and get onto the rest of the process.

Board Member Wimmer: On that item, I feel like it would be good for us—because I was on that committee. Also Emily Vance was on it as well, right?

Chair Bower: She was the planner when we were working on that.

Board Member Wimmer: Right. She did such great documentation. It seems like it would be nice, at least, for us to revisit where we left off. It's been so long.

Chair Bower: Amy sent me the files, and I looked through my files. We're not starting over. I think we're at the last 10 percent, which is where we define certain issues.

Board Member Wimmer: I have very little track record besides meetings and my cryptic notes. That's great.

Chair Bower: We need one person on that subcommittee. We can only have three. If one of you, besides Margaret, would like to be on that with us, then let me know, and we'll try to move that forward.

Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements

Chair Bower: Board Member Questions, Comments or Announcements. Are there any? Martin.

Board Member Bernstein: How does the Board feel about if we have meetings like this all the time instead of meeting in person?

Chair Bower: That's an interesting question. I personally prefer meeting in the Council. I'd like to be able to share the space. It's of value to be in the same place, but with COVID-19 that's going to be difficult until there's a vaccine for those of us in the high-risk category.

Board Member Bernstein: That's my off-the-cuff comment. Maybe study sessions, where we're not taking any formal actions, we can all work remotely. When it comes to formal times for motions, maybe just meet. Just a query. That's all.

Board Member Pease: As a follow on to that, as far as a retreat goes, I would rather not have to wait until late in the year to do that as a new member. I would be willing to do that or interested in doing that even if we have to do it via a session like this one.

Ms. French: We can look towards perhaps June. We'll look and see what the availability of the members is because we like to have everybody available for retreats. Look at the calendar of regular meeting

dates and send in if you have issues with any of those dates. We can start looking sooner than September. It takes a little bit of an army to make these meetings run successfully. Of course, this is the first one that we've dealt with, so we had more people in the background helping. It seems like it went fairly well. We can try again in May.

Chair Bower: I think this has gone better than I anticipated. I want to thank staff for having practice runs for Board Members.

Ms. French: That helped.

Chair Bower: It does help. The more you use this particular software tool, the easier it is to become comfortable with all of its features. I think we should consider a virtual retreat. Mostly, Amy, that's your work. It is discussion. We can make it open to the public; that's not difficult, I don't think. At any rate, I would like to do final approval of projects like the one that we reviewed today as a study session in person if we can. Again, I don't know how fast they'll turn that around. Any other comments?

Board Member Makinen: I think the only comment I would make is it's a little more difficult to engage the public with this type of meeting. A regular meeting offers some benefits that we can't achieve through the virtual meetings here.

Board Member Pease: I would follow that up and say I agree with that. I don't think there's any substitute for an in-person meeting from time to time. There are a lot of indicators that this is going to become the new normal. We ought to get used to it. If we could have a retreat sooner based on using the technology, we ought to look at that seriously. If it's proper, we ought to talk about how to structure that before staff goes to a lot of work to put it together. They did an excellent job today. Thank you very much for that. I don't see it as running Zoom continuously through a whole day. There might be ways of breaking it up or making it more humane in a way and being able to move forward. I don't think this is going away any time soon.

Chair Bower: I agree with all of what Christian has just said. Maybe the way we could do a retreat is actually have it in discrete parts. It could be Parts A, B and C. We just do two hours max, and that would be enough.

Board Member Pease: Yeah. If we delay to bat that around informally or have a little subcommittee look at that, I think it's worthwhile doing. I'm new to this, so I feel like I would lose a lot of time in becoming effective as part of this group if that retreat winds up being in the fall.

Ms. French: So noted. We'll work on it, and I'll reach out to David with topics. We can communicate with David on what date seems like a good idea based on availability.

Board Member Pease: Thank you.

Chair Bower: If there are no other comments or announcements or questions, that's the end of our agenda. That would be the end of our meeting. I'd like to say a very big thank you to staff for making this move seamlessly. For the first try on this, this was pretty good. I watched the Council meeting on Monday night, and frankly I think we did better.

Board Member Pease: We ought to give staff a big hand together.

Chair Bower: Congratulations. Thank you all for being here. I'm sorry Roger wasn't able to join us. He may be able to join us at a future meeting. Everybody stay safe, stay well. We'll look forward to seeing you all at the next meeting, whether it be in person or virtual.

Adjournment