



City of Palo Alto

City Council Staff Report

(ID # 5208)

Report Type: Consent Calendar

Meeting Date: 11/10/2014

Summary Title: 3672 Middlefield PALL - Disapproval of Historic Designation Request

Title: Denial of a Historic Designation Request for the Palo Alto Little League Site located at 3672 Middlefield Rd.

From: City Manager

Lead Department: Planning and Community Environment

Recommendation

The Historic Resources Board (HRB) and City staff recommend that the City Council disapprove the request of Jason Yotopoulos to designate the existing recreational structure at 3672 Middlefield Avenue, known as the “Middlefield Ball Park”, to the Palo Alto Historical and Architectural Resources Report and Inventory (“City’s Historic Inventory”) on the grounds that it does not meet the Criteria for Designation of historic structures/sites in Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) Section 16.49.040(b).

Executive Summary

On September 29, 2014, Palo Alto resident Jason Yotopoulos submitted a request to the HRB to recommend the City Council designate the Little League ballpark as a historic structure/site pursuant to Palo Alto Municipal Code (PAMC) Section 16.49.040(b). PAMC Section 16.49.040(b) provides that any individual or group may propose designation of a property as a historic structure/site or district to be included in the City’s Historic Inventory. Such proposals shall be reviewed by the HRB for recommendation to the City Council, which makes the final decision.

On October 15, 2014, the HRB conducted a public hearing and recommended disapproval (on a 5-1-0-1 vote) of the proposed designation, finding that the subject property does not meet one or more of the criteria in PAMC Section 16.49.040(b), as reflected in the attached verbatim HRB meeting minutes (Attachment A). In their deliberations, the HRB received and reviewed materials from Mr. Yotopoulos, as well as two reports prepared by the City’s historic architecture consultant, Metropolitan Group (dated September 5 and October 14, 2014), and two reports prepared by EBI Consulting (dated July 14 and October 8, 2014), the historic architecture consultant retained by the Palo Alto Little League, the property owner. The link to the HRB report and attachments, including Mr. Yotopoulos’ proposal, the October 8, 2014 EBI Consulting Report and ARB verbatim meeting minutes, is as follows:

<https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/44234>. The second Metropolitan Group report, a peer review of the July 14, 2014 EBI Consulting report and review of the property's eligibility for the City's local historic inventory, was provided to the HRB via email and at places on October 15, 2014, and is provided as Attachment B to this report.

Background

On February 27, 2014, Verizon Wireless, a telecommunications carrier, on behalf of the property owner, Palo Alto Little League, submitted an application seeking Architectural Review and a Conditional Use Permit for a wireless telecommunications facility (WTF) project, which would replace an existing light pole with a new "stealth" antennae cell tower designed to resemble the existing light poles, and install a new at-grade enclosure with associated ground mounted equipment at the subject property.

At the meeting of September 18, 2014, the Architectural Review Board (ARB) considered Verizon's application and continued it to the October 16, 2014 meeting. On September 29, 2014, Jason Yotopoulos, a neighbor who is opposed to the Verizon project, submitted a request to the HRB to recommend the City Council designate the subject property as a historic structure/site pursuant to PAMC Section 16.49.040(b). At its meeting of October 15, 2014, the HRB reviewed Mr. Yotopoulos' designation request and additional materials and information pertinent to the request, and recommended that the City Council disapprove the request for designation, as discussed further below.

The ARB subsequently (October 16, 2014) recommended that the Director of Planning and Community Environment approve Verizon's Architectural Review application. On October 23, 2014, the Director approved the application and an associated Conditional Use Permit. The 14-day period within which a member of the general public may appeal the Director's decision on the Architectural Review to the City Council, and/or request that the Planning Commission hold a public hearing to review the Director's decision on the Conditional Use Permit, began on October 23 and ends on November 7, 2014. If a request for hearing and appeal are received, the Use Permit would be scheduled for hearing by the Planning and Transportation Commission on December 10, 2014, and the Use Permit and Architectural Review appeal will be placed on the City Council's consent agenda thereafter. Three Council members may ask that the item be removed from the consent agenda and scheduled for a public hearing.

Pursuant to PAMC Section 16.49.040(b), any individual or group may propose designation of a property as a historic structure/site or district to be included in the City's Historic Inventory. Such proposals shall be reviewed by the HRB, which will make its recommendation to the City Council, which makes the final decision. In order to qualify for inclusion in the City's Historic Inventory, a property must meet one or more of the following criteria for designation:

- 1) The structure or site is identified with the lives of historic people or with important events in the city, state or nation;

- 2) The structure or site is particularly representative of an architectural style or way of life important to the city, state or nation;
- 3) The structure or site is an example of a type of building which was once common, but is now rare;
- 4) The structure or site is connected with a business or use which was once common, but is now rare;
- 5) The architect or building was important;
- 6) The structure or site contains elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship.

Based on staff's research, this appears to be the first local inventory designation request that has been made by a third party, over the property owner's objection.

Discussion

The subject property is a Little League ball field originally constructed in 1952. It encompasses approximately 2.74 acres of land in an irregular polygon plan. It consists of a playing field, bleachers, and a concession stand/administrative building. Additional site features include light poles, retaining walls, fences, and landscaping. The property is located in the R-1 Single-Family Residential District.

Historic Structure/Site Evaluation

The subject property is not currently listed in the City's Historic Inventory, although it was previously identified as a "Study Priority 2" property in the *"Study Priority 1 and Study Priority 2 Properties: Preliminary Assessments of Eligibility for the National Register or California Register"* report completed by Dames & Moore, Inc. on January 22, 1999. Specifically, the property was identified as potentially eligible for listing in the California Register under Criterion 3, which applies to a property that "embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region or method of construction important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California or the nation." At the time, the property was not identified as potentially eligible for listing in the National Register under any criterion and was not evaluated according to the criteria for designation of historic structures/sites in PAMC Section 16.49.040(b). According to the 1999 report, the identification of the subject property as a "Study Priority 2" property appears to have been made based on visual observation only, also referred to as a non-intensive "windshield" survey, and no archival research appears to have been conducted at that time. The 1999 report was not adopted by the City Council and therefore its recommended findings of preliminary assessments of eligibility for the National Register and the California Register are non-binding and are informational only.

In July 2014, EBI Consulting, working as a consultant to Verizon, completed an evaluation of the subject property according to the National Register and California Register criteria and recorded the evaluation on a California Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Building, Structure, and Object Record (DPR 523B inventory form). The EBI evaluation concluded that the subject property does not appear to be eligible for listing in the National Register under any criterion, which is consistent with the previously completed 1999 preliminary assessment report. It also concluded that the subject property does not appear to be eligible for listing in the California Register under any criterion, including Criterion 3. Specifically, in relation to Criterion 3, the evaluation concluded that the subject property “does not convey any distinct architectural style and is utilitarian in design,” and that although the architect Morgan Stedman “was a fairly prominent architect in the Palo Alto area, he does not appear to be considered a master.”

In October 2014, at the request of City staff and in response to Mr. Yotopoulos’ designation request, EBI Consulting completed another evaluation of the subject property according to the Criteria for Designation of historic structures/sites in PAMC Section 16.49.040(b) (i.e. the City’s local criteria), which are similar to but distinct from the National Register and California Register criteria. The evaluation concluded that the subject property does not appear to be eligible for designation as a historic structure/site in the City’s Historic Inventory under any criterion listed in PAMC Section 16.49.040(b). Specifically, it was determined that the subject property is not known to have “clear, long-term, important ties” to historic people or important events; that it “does not exemplify the work of [architect] Morgan Stedman”; and that it is a typical, not outstanding, example of its property type, which is not rare. The evaluation also concluded that, while “the ball field appears to potentially possess significance... under Criterion (2) as representative of a way of life in Palo Alto in the 1950s/60s... the ability of the property to convey its historical association is impaired by a loss of integrity of design, setting, materials, workmanship and feeling” as a result of physical changes that have occurred since its original construction including: removal and replacement of the original scoreboard, bleachers, flagpole, and pitcher’s mound; modifications to the concessions stand/administrative building; and installation of new batting cages and light poles.

Historic Resources Board Review

At the meeting of October 15, 2014, the HRB conducted a public hearing to review the designation request and the supporting information submitted by Mr. Yotopoulos, and additional materials and information pertinent to the request, including the evaluations completed by EBI Consulting in 2014 and by the City’s historic architecture consultant, Metropolitan Group. After review and consideration of the available information, the HRB recommended (5-1-0-1, Board member Bunnenberg opposed, Board member Di Cicco absent) that the City Council disapprove the request for designation, finding that the subject property does not meet one or more of the Criteria for Designation of historic structures/sites in PAMC Section 16.49.040(b). Excerpt verbatim minutes of the HRB meeting are provided as Attachment A.

Property Owner Input

Attachment B to the HRB report of October 15, 2014, is the property owner's letter objecting to historic designation of the Middlefield ball field at this time. The property owner's letter can be found via this link: <https://www.cityofpaloalto.org/civicax/filebank/documents/44234>

Policy Implications

The Comprehensive Plan (Goal L-7) supports the preservation of historical buildings, sites, and districts and the City's Municipal Code contains criteria for designation. The HRB and the staff do not believe any of the designation criteria have been met by the Little League ballpark and are recommending denial of the request for designation.

Environmental Review

The proposed recommendation is not a project under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), per Section 21065.

Attachments:

- Attachment A: HRB verbatim minutes dated October 15, 2014 (DOC)
- Attachment B: Middlefield Ball Park Peer Review 10 14 14 (PDF)



HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD

Excerpt Minutes

October 15, 2014

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

New Business:

1. **3672 Middlefield Road:** Proposal by Jason Yotopoulos to nominate the Palo Alto Little League site for listing on the Palo Alto Historic Inventory. Zone District: R-1. This site was identified in the 1998 Study Priority 2 Preliminary Assessment of sites as Potentially Eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) under Criterion 3.

Chair Kohler: That brings us to item Number 2, proposal by Jason Yotopoulos, I’m sorry, to nominate the Palo Alto Little League site for listing on the Palo Alto Historic Inventory. Zone District: R-1. This site was identified in the 1998 Study Priority 2 Preliminary Assessment of sites as Potentially Eligible for the California Register of Historic Resources (CRHR) under Criterion 3. Staff? Disclosures, I guess we have disclosures. Go ahead.

Board Member Bunnenberg: I would like to disclose that in my work with the archives of Palo Alto Historical Association I received calls and inquiries from the applicant asking questions about how to approach historic recognition for the ballpark and I talked with him also about cultural landscape. I began asking questions of the staff about what form to use to apply for local Palo Alto designation and this took some time to sort out. Whether it was the ordinance provisions or the State DPR forms and I directed him to talk with staff about getting on the agenda. I did ask some procedural questions of staff on how this, how staff and the Board would respond to this. I visited the site of the Coming Together event that was just held in combination with Mitchell Park Library and got to sit in the outfield. So those are my disclosures.

Chair Kohler: Ok, Martin?

Board Member Bernstein: I’ll also disclose I visited the site a couple of times and walked through it and talked to some of the assistant coaches who were there about what I was looking at and thank you so much.

Chair Kohler: David?

Board Member Bower: I’d like to disclose I played baseball there. I was in the appropriate Little League age and I have both fond and not so fond memories of being there. The fond ones were playing baseball; the not fond ones were tryouts, which were not particularly enjoyable. But I’ve been there many times and drive by it all the time.

Chair Kohler: Margaret, do you have any?

1
2 Board Member Wimmer: I'll disclose that I have not actually attended any sporting events
3 there; however, I know where it is and I've driven by many times and it catches my eye every
4 time I go by.

5
6 Vice-Chair Makinen: No disclosures.

7
8 Chair Kohler: Well I guess I have to disclose that I played baseball there as a kid and my son
9 Matthew played two summers there. So it's quite a landmark in the area and I drive by almost
10 every day. So ok that [pause in audio] get the speaker. The order is staff, board member, ok.

11
12 Amy French, Chief Planning Official: Ok. Amy French, Chief Planning Official. Before you today
13 is the proposal by a local resident, Mr. Yotopoulos, who resides across from Middlefield ball
14 field, to nominate the ball field to the City's local Historic Inventory as a Category 1, Exceptional
15 building. The Dames and Moore study, as noted in the agenda, had identified the ball field as
16 potentially eligible for the State's Historic Register under Criterion 3 in 1998, when the ball field
17 was not yet 50 years old. The historic consultants who have provided reports do not believe
18 the site is eligible for state or national listing today under that, or any other, criteria.

19
20 The property owner does not support the proposal for local listing at this time, as per their
21 letter, Attachment B to your staff report. The owner supports an application filed by Verizon
22 for a wireless communications facility. This is for Director Approval via the Architectural Review
23 Board (ARB) and Conditional Use Permit (CUP) processes. A large set showing the site plan for
24 the Verizon project is posted on the wall here and allows the ARB, Historic Resources Board
25 (HRB), excuse me, to see where the equipment shed and the 65 foot tall monopole antenna/
26 light pole are proposed to be located, which is in the same place as the existing pole.

27
28 The Council is the decision point on any local historic listing proposal; the Council would receive
29 the HRB's recommendation. As in the report, your recommendation can be approval,
30 disapproval, or modification of the application for designation. The Council's decision is to be
31 made within 30 days of the HRB's recommendation. Excuse me. If the HRB offers a
32 recommendation today, the recommendation would need to appear before Council by
33 November 10th; however, per the Palo Alto Municipal Code Chapter 16.49, the HRB has 60 days
34 from the receipt of the proposal, from October 9th date of your packet, to consider the
35 proposal. December 3rd is therefore the HRB's recommendation deadline. Because the Verizon
36 project will not affect the exterior of a building on the site, and given the way that the Palo Alto
37 Municipal Code language reads on this point, it is staff's opinion that the HRB's
38 recommendation on the historic listing proposal does not need to be made within 20 days of
39 receiving the proposal.

40
41 So now a little bit about the documents at places. I do hope that the copies I made last night
42 have arrived at places today. Diana I did put them on, I sent you an e-mail. I did put them on
43 the corner of the big table on the 5th floor, seven copies each. Sorry. I'm not sure what that is.
44 Got it. So let me basically rattle on about that while they make their way to the chambers. I
45 was busy last night. Over the long weekend, Mr. Yotopoulos e-mailed the HRB members a link
46 to a large document he refers to as the appendix package to his proposal. Not sure if you all

1 were able to open the link. Staff made copies of that document and they are on their way to
2 the chambers now. In the document Mr. Yotopoulos suggests the ball field be nominated as a
3 Palo Alto Historic Resource Category 1 Exceptional building, which is on Page 14 of the
4 document that's coming down, and names the cell tower as a threat to the historic site, giving
5 the following reason: that it would negatively affect the visual landscape of the historic site.
6

7 Also coming to your places is our consultants' peer review, which was prepared and delivered
8 yesterday evening as well, that staff has forwarded to the HRB members by e-mail I believe last
9 night. Lilly Bianco is the author. She's from M-Group our consultants. She only had sufficient
10 time to consider the original July 2014 Historic Resources evaluation prepared by EBI
11 Consulting. She did not incorporate supplementary information that EBI provided on October
12 8th last week. Our consultant noted via e-mail last night that the supplemental October 8th
13 report by EBI did a better job of characterizing the site as it initially existed and expanded the
14 discussion of the alterations over time. Those were the two key things that were in the October
15 14th peer review that you haven't seen yet, that were missing in the original EBI Consulting
16 report. So basically, our consultant has confirmed that those two concerns have been
17 addressed with the reviewed EBI report. Thank you, Diana.
18

19 The peer review being distributed now noted concurrence with EBI Consulting's conclusion that
20 the site does not meet eligibility criteria for national or state registers. She also concluded the
21 site does not retain sufficient integrity at this point to be considered a local Historic Resource
22 under Palo Alto's designation Criteria 2 given cumulative loss of integrity. Our consultant did
23 reference the letter provided by the President of the Little League Foundation, which is in your
24 packet as well as the report delivered in the packet, which included an outline of changes to the
25 park which were relevant for the integrity review.
26

27 So both the EBI Consulting reports, Attachment C of your report and Attachment D, were
28 provided and to you the Board. Consultant had previously evaluated the Verizon proposal
29 under the Secretary of Interiors Standards for Rehabilitation in the event the site were to
30 eventually be deemed historic, since the site had been listed as potentially eligible back in 1998
31 and that review was also provided to the HRB as Attachment E of your report.
32

33 Yesterday at close of business, staff received a spiral bound 69 page document prepared by
34 Kreines & Kreines for Clear Light Ventures. Apparently the document was delivered by this
35 messenger to the ARB members in advance of tomorrow's meeting. It was not intended for the
36 HRB, but I did see somebody hold up a spiral bound document. I wonder if... yes. I believe that
37 might be the Kreines & Kreines report that I mentioned. On first glance last night, it appears
38 the focus of the document is the requested CUP, but I'm not a speed reader so I don't know
39 everything. The CUP decision and action on the ARB application rests with the Director of
40 Planning and Community Environment, following the ARB's recommendation, and ultimately
41 with the City Council. The Director's decision on the CUP, which may occur as early as Tuesday,
42 October 21st, is expected to be challenged within the deadline of November 4th. We have a
43 very engaged public and Mr. Yotopoulos has been objecting to the Verizon Wireless facility for
44 some time. The ARB had reviewed this project, the Verizon project, on September 18th and
45 continued their review till tomorrow's meeting. We hope a representative of the HRB is able to

1 attend tomorrow's meeting beginning at 8:30, it's the first item, to summarize the HRB's
2 conversation today.

3
4 The ARB did not refer the application to the HRB; rather, the ARB continued the hearing in
5 order to allow the applicant to modify the proposed equipment structure to be more
6 compatible with the clubhouse structure, and to show a few options regarding the color of the
7 light pole that's replacing the existing pole. The project planner Russ Reich is here to answer
8 any questions you may have about the process and the revised project. The ARB was aware of
9 a draft September proposal for historic listing, and the members were curious as to the HRB's
10 recommendation on that. That proposal was later withdrawn, immediately replaced by the
11 current proposal. The ARB minutes were also attached to your report for your reading
12 enjoyment. That's all I have, and I would invite the applicant of the proposal, as well as the
13 owner of the property, the Palo Alto Little League and their representatives to speak. I would
14 suggest that allowances for speaking at the end of comments by the owner of the property be
15 allowed, given that it's private property. Thank you.

16
17 Chair Kohler: David.

18
19 Board Member Bower: Amy could you describe for us the significance of an owner who objects
20 to a historic designation of their property?

21
22 Ms. French: I can describe initially the state and national standard practice, which is that the
23 state and the federal historic agencies do not list historic properties on their registers over the
24 owner's objections. The City's Code Chapter 16.49, the Historic Preservation Ordinance, does
25 not state that the City Council will not list on the Historic Inventory over the... I hope I'm not
26 saying double negatives. It is not in any of our publications that I found that the Council can't
27 list a property if the owner objects. I think there are other reasons to not list this property on
28 the local inventory, but the code doesn't support this.

29
30 Board Member Bower: Ok so if I understand what you said, national/state historic registries will
31 not list a property if the owner objects. There's nothing in the Palo Alto Historic Preservation
32 Code documents that would prevent the City from listing a property over the objection of a
33 property owner. So let's assume and I'm, just so I understand this, that this Board and the City
34 Council did in fact list this project, this property. How would that affect the property owner in
35 the future? I mean their... this is not...I mean I suspect this won't be, can't be considered
36 Category 1, maybe Category 4. Again, that's...this is the hypothetical question: if it had some
37 designation like that, I don't remember there's any impact on the property at that level. Is that
38 correct?

39
40 Ms. French: So yes there would be an impact. The Category 3 and 4 is generally Contributing is
41 called Contributing structure. Typically it's contributing to a district such as Professorville. In
42 this case there is no historic district to contribute to at this point. If there is a ministerial
43 application, a building permit, there is certainly less consequence to a Category 3 and 4
44 designated local Historic Resource. If a discretionary planning entitlement application, such as
45 the one that's in front of us at the ARB, comes in then the property owner must go to the HRB
46 and must incorporate all of the recommendations of the HRB into the project. So if the HRB

1 were to say you need to remove all those structures there or what have you to make it, to
2 restore it to its original glory from the 1950's, I guess that would be a requirement for the
3 owner to do so.

4
5 Board Member Bernstein: Yeah, thank you Chair Kohler. I'm concerned for a property owner's
6 rights. If I understand it the, maybe this is a question for a City Attorney, if the HRB
7 recommends to the Council or Director that a property be listed on Historical Register and the
8 owner does not want that to happen could that have a negative impact on the property
9 owner's point of view and isn't that a legal question that can over the objection? That the City
10 can impose a Historic category?

11
12 Ms. French: Yeah, unfortunately I was hoping our City Attorney would be represented today
13 with staff. I am not in any way well versed in takings law; however, the perceived taking by
14 designation might be an issue.

15
16 Board Member Bernstein: I'm thinking I would say if a property owner is going through some
17 potential sale of a property/refinancing it could be perceived as perhaps an encumbrance on a
18 property from a property owner's perspective. That's... so that's fine. Maybe it's a real legal
19 issue here... so.

20
21 Ms. French: Maybe if there is more discussion on the legal aspect of it, I'm hoping that Cara
22 Silver does come here momentarily and maybe the other aspects can be looked at.

23
24 Board Member Bernstein: Sure, thank you.

25
26 Chair Kohler: Oh, I thought if you were asking that. Margaret? Anybody? Go ahead.

27
28 Vice-Chair Makinen: Is the property owner here today?

29
30 Ms. French: Yes.

31
32 Chair Kohler: Ok, we're just talking to staff at the moment, ok? Martin, go ahead.

33
34 Board Member Bernstein: One more question. In the event that if the HRB does vote to
35 recommend that a historical category be put on this property, I'm sorry, I'm going to change my
36 question. If the HRB elects to not include this property on any historic property does that just
37 end it or does it still have to go to the City Council to accept our recommendation of not putting
38 it on?

39
40 Ms. French: Yes, the answer is contained in the City's Code Chapter 16.49, the HRB's
41 recommendation, be it recommend designation or not recommend designation, would go to
42 the City Council to basically ratify that recommendation.

43
44 Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

1 Board Member Bunnenberg: Roger and I heard you mention the possibility of modifications of
2 the application. Would that also I mean obviously the ARB would hear that. Is that something
3 the City Council would hear at that point or?
4

5 Ms. French: Ok, so I'm going to answer the question about the application. The application is at
6 this moment the proposal for historic designation. So yes the HRB could for instance modify
7 say the suggested category from Category 1, as suggested by the proposer, to a Category 4,
8 let's say, and that is a modification of the proposal for nomination. That could happen. And
9 then whoever is speaking to the ARB about what transpired today can convey that to the ARB
10 for their information.
11

12 Board Member Bunnenberg: And if that was for sort of restructuring of the proposal that might
13 be more substantive?
14

15 Ms. French: And let me just ask a clarifying question. When you say restructuring the proposal,
16 do you mean the historic designation proposal or are you referring to the Verizon application
17 project?
18

19 Board Member Bunnenberg: No, I'm referring to the historic proposal; for instance would be to
20 designate the field house, the snack bar/office building rather than the entire setting.
21

22 Ms. French: That could be a recommendation, a Motion if you will, to single out one building as
23 eligible for local listing.
24

25 Board Member Bunnenberg: Thank you.
26

27 Chair Kohler: Ok, Margaret.
28

29 Board Member Wimmer: If a historic designation is not allowed without the owner's consent I
30 believe you did say that? Because... is that statement on this (interrupted)?
31

32 Ms. French: What I said is the local and (interrupted)
33

34 Board Member Wimmer: On the local and the state level.
35

36 Ms. French: No, I'm sorry, on the national and state level there, the websites that I researched
37 for those organizations, state that properties will not be listed on those registers over the
38 property owner's objections.
39

40 Board Member Wimmer: So I'm just looking at the bottom line. I mean if that's what the
41 ordinance says than why are we, I mean why are we being asked?
42

43 Ms. French: That's what the state and federal regulations, or websites, state. It's perhaps a
44 practice. Our local ordinance does not state that and we have not, because I don't think we've
45 had too many of these situations. I mean typically, we get a property owner who wants to be
46 designated to take advantage of the benefits of being a Category 1 or 2 for instance or they

1 elevate from a Category 3 or 4 to a Category 1 or 2. This is certainly the first I'm aware of a
2 property that's come forward against the owner's objection or against the owner's wishes.

3
4 Board Member Wimmer: So it makes it that's a difficult challenge for this Board given the fact
5 that there is a precedent for one I think and then also if, it doesn't seem likely, but if there was
6 some historic designation attached to this property would that automatically block a cell phone
7 tower?

8
9 Ms. French: No, in fact this is the reason why we commissioned an objective, outside
10 consultant's analysis of the proposed wireless telecommunications facility with respect to
11 Secretary of Interior Standards to ensure that the cell tower, which is replacing a light pole,
12 going five feet taller and a little wider, six inches thicker, and the equipment structure that
13 neither of those items would impact the historic resource if it were designated. We had them
14 analyzed per the Secretary of Interior Standards so that we could continue on our review under
15 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

16
17 Board Member Wimmer: And not that it's this is probably not an appropriate question, but who
18 pays for all of these expensive reports? I mean this seems... it seems sort of out of bounds. I
19 mean I'm not as familiar, I know that there have been some banners and things in the paper
20 that have been trying to address the cell phone issue, the cell phone tower issue. I'm this is the
21 most information that I've received about it, but I don't it just seems, it just seems like a lot of
22 pomp and circumstance and why don't we just look at the bottom line? I don't know.

23
24 Ms. French: So I'm going to answer the question about who pays, and the endeavor of the City
25 to educate the public about radio frequency emissions, for instance. We did spend quite a bit
26 of time and money over the years since we have had other cell tower applications. And most
27 recently the distributed antenna system (DAS) projects that came through, we did have
28 educational sessions in front of Council, in front of the public, and we had on our website
29 frequently asked questions (FAQ). We did hire consultants to come and speak in these
30 meetings, on the City's dime, and recently we did on the City's dime pay the consultant to
31 prepare the Secretary of Interior Standards review, to ensure that we were able to call the
32 application exempt from CEQA, that there wasn't an impact to the potentially historic resource.

33
34 Most recently, the M-Group report that's at places today was paid for; we asked Verizon to pay
35 the cost of this peer review of the EBI Consulting report that we received in July.

36
37 Chair Kohler: Martin.

38
39 Board Member Bernstein: Thank you Chair Kohler again. I've got a process question. If the HRB
40 votes on a Motion to recommend designation or recommend no designation it still has to go to
41 City Council. So if the HR, if the ARB is meeting tomorrow can they actually discuss this prior to
42 a City Council determination from the HRB's actions today?

43
44 Ms. French: They absolutely can. The ARB has the ability to provide a recommendation
45 regarding the project based on the ARB findings for approval, and that is their charge. The CUP
46 application, and the ARB's recommendation on the ARB component of the application, go to

1 the Director to make a decision. The Director is deciding on the CEQA determination, which is
2 where there is typically an effort to derail a project is in the CEQA area, and so this is a decision
3 point that then rises up to the level of Planning Commission and Council because we expect
4 that that will happen.

5
6 Board Member Bernstein: Ok, so the HRB process won't slow down the process for Verizon
7 moving ahead because the City Council still has to debate whatever HRB decides today and
8 that's by December whatever date was recommended. The ARB can approve a project before
9 City Council agrees with HRB.

10
11 Ms. French: If you were to delay your decision and not make a decision today as I said, you do
12 have more time in which to debate/consider this. If you act today we will, we're under the
13 ordinance, we're obligated to bring it forward to Council.

14
15 Board Member Bernstein: Thank you.

16
17 Chair Kohler: Ok, I have some questions, confusion time. Ok, so we've now talked first initially
18 about the Little League becoming an historic site or the buildings or whatever and now we're
19 talking about the cell tower. So I guess I have to disclose that my office is about 50 feet from a
20 cell tower. Has been there since 19... oh, about the year we moved in, 1994. And they have
21 been spending the last four or five weeks repairing it so we have no parking in some areas. So I
22 know about cell towers personally because I basically live there every day within 50 feet of
23 these things. So I just disclosed that because it is my option.

24
25 So I'm now really confused. So we're not really talking today about the cell tower. Our goal is
26 the historic issue of the site itself and the buildings there. Is that correct?

27
28 Ms. French: That is correct. The ARB did not refer this application to you to give a
29 recommendation to them on the project, again, as it's not a listed resource.

30
31 Chair Kohler: Ok, so in our sense then we're reviewing this process, the site with no real
32 concern about cell tower or no cell tower. Is that correct or is the cell tower impact the site?

33
34 Ms. French: Yeah. We have not advertised this meeting as a consideration of the wireless
35 communication facility project. This is strictly a meeting to discuss the proposal for historic
36 designation.

37
38 Chair Kohler: Well I guess the question is, as David just said, it's we don't have jurisdiction over
39 the cell tower, but I suppose you could say the cell tower has an impact on the site if it's a
40 historic site. If it were, ok. I know we're not there. I'm trying to clarify.

41
42 Ms. French: This is why we had a consultant paid by the City to evaluate the wireless
43 communication facility as if the project were historic, to ensure that we are not making a grave
44 mistake in allowing replacement of the pole in its current location and an equipment enclosure.
45 And this is why the ARB is taking careful measures to make sure that the proposed equipment

1 structure is compatible with that clubhouse. They continued the meeting to make sure that
2 that building is going to be what it needs to be to fit in.
3
4 Chair Kohler: Yes, go ahead David.
5
6 Board Member Bower: So it's my recollection that we have as a Board reviewed cell towers
7 within Professorville a couple of times and that that has not been deemed to negatively impact
8 the district, which is similar to its own entity. So is that a correct recollection?
9
10 Ms. French: Yeah, I don't recall coming to the Board.
11
12 Chair Kohler: Let's move on you say. Ok.
13
14 Board Member Bunnenberg: So in effect (interrupted)
15
16 Chair Kohler: Let's not.
17
18 Board Member Bunnenberg: We have not two decisions, but one decision which is about the
19 historic status of the ballpark. But in reading the ARB minutes it appeared to me that they were
20 wondering about the visual effects of the cell tower and certainly visual aspects are part of
21 historic considerations. But it seems like I'm hearing you saying that we are not, will we get a
22 chance to see what the cell tower looks like today?
23
24 Ms. French: We didn't bring the plans. Again because the focus is not on the project, but there
25 is a site plan, there are images on the wall that show the proposed tower, and a site plan. Also
26 there was a link provided in your staff report that you can see all, the whole plan set, the
27 revised plan set. The revised plan set indicated because the ARB asked for different color
28 choices for the tower, the light pole: brown, green, grey. So those are being looked at.
29
30 Board Member Bunnenberg: May we at least see those photos and pass them down the line?
31
32 Ms. French: Of course. Yes. They are on the wall for...
33
34 Board Member Bunnenberg: But we should see what the public sees.
35
36 Chair Kohler: This is where we get the orchestra and make some music and we're time out for
37 discussion. Thank you, Martin. You're going to provide that? Ok. Martin's providing opera
38 while we're looking at that. Ok. [Pause while the Board looks at the photos].
39
40 Ok, can we move forward? Let's see, where's my sheet? So we're going to open the meeting
41 to public comment. I have a list of cards here. If anyone else wants to add to that just fill one
42 out. We'll start out with Mitchell Field. Oh, wait. Mitchell Field is not the name; I thought it
43 was his name. Do we hear from the applicant first? I guess we do, don't we? Yes. Ok, I'm
44 sorry. Would the applicant like to come forward and yes, thank you.
45

1 Jason Yotopoulos, Applicant: Thank you. And so I've got some slides. Good morning. And
2 hopefully can you hear me ok? Ok. I'll just get this set up. Hopefully everybody received the
3 60, 70 some odd page summary (interrupted)
4
5 Board Member Wimmer: Will you tell us who you are and introduce yourself?
6
7 Mr. Yotopoulos: Yes, thank you. Is that, is that better? Wonderful. Let me just... let me get this
8 set up first for a moment, thank you.
9
10 Ms. French: So I would just note that Cara Silver has arrived, if there is a question about the
11 legal aspect of nominating a property over the property owner's objection.
12
13 Board Member Bernstein: Hi, Ms. Silver is that it? Great. Oh, we have a public person.
14
15 Chair Kohler: We have a bit of a conflict here right now. The City Attorney is here and she's
16 going to make a statement.
17
18 Board Member Bernstein: Roger, yeah what? Who's first?
19
20 Chair Kohler: I'm trying to figure out there's so much... we'll have the City Attorney I think. It
21 might help us.
22
23 Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney: Hello, yes, Cara Silver, Senior Assistant City Attorney.
24 Why don't we hear from the member of the public and then if there are particular questions,
25 legal questions I can field them after the public speaker.
26
27 Chair Kohler: That sounds fine to me. Ok, you may continue.
28
29 Mr. Yotopoulos: Great, thank you very much. Can everybody hear me ok?
30
31 Chair Kohler: Yes.
32
33 Mr. Yotopoulos: Wonderful. I am Jason Yotopoulos and before I start I just wanted to make
34 sure that everybody received a physical copy over the weekend?
35
36 Chair Kohler: Yes.
37
38 Mr. Yotopoulos: Or was able to print?
39
40 Board Member Bernstein: I did not receive a copy. Is that this? That was just put at our places
41 now?
42
43 Mr. Yotopoulos: Yes, it is indeed the same.
44
45 Board Member Bernstein: It is 60 pages. I have not read it. It just got to me so perhaps what
46 you're going to discuss is in this book?

1
2 Mr. Yotopoulos: Indeed. I'll give you kind of the summary. Is anybody else without this? Ok.

3
4 Chair Kohler: I have an extra copy.

5
6 Mr. Yotopoulos: Great. So thank you for taking the time this morning. We're here to discuss
7 the nomination of the Little League ball park at 3672 Middlefield Road for the Palo Alto Historic
8 Inventory. Obviously there have been a lot of questions. Let me first introduce myself as
9 Margaret suggested. I am a long time local, was born here in the Bay Area, a son of a Stanford
10 professor, went to Stanford undergraduate engineering and then business school. I'm a father
11 of two: son 11, daughter 8. Married my college sweetheart and we all together have lived in
12 our home in Palo Alto, one of a few homes in Palo Alto since the mid-Nineties and obviously
13 given the Stanford affiliation much longer than that. I am a technology executive, 10 years as a
14 venture capitalist, and also most recently heading Global Research and Development at SAP
15 Corporation up in the Palo Alto foothills by old Xerox Park and managing 3,000 people across 32
16 countries up until recently.

17
18 So there's been a lot of question is this all about the cell tower and you had asked what does
19 the cell tower look like. It's up there on the screen. I will tell you that I am not a fan of the cell
20 tower. I think it's unsightly in this location and not the best place for a cell tower at ground
21 zero for our children in the neighborhood, but I am a fan of Little League baseball. When this
22 issue of a cell tower came up five years ago I and a number of other coaches and sponsors of
23 teams attended a ballpark board meeting and asked if in fact we could help alleviate any
24 financial pressure that was causing this. It's not about the financial pressure. So that is all I'm
25 going to say about the cell tower because I want this to be focused on the historic merits of this
26 property, which I think are significant.

27
28 And I am here today although this is a very time consuming effort because I believe it's
29 important for our City to follow due process even under duress and the threat of a lawsuit by
30 Verizon and in the absence of a Palo Alto Historic Officer with Dennis Backlund having left and
31 his boss as well. To me this means that the City's cultural heritage should not be determined by
32 "Verizon's historian" in the context of a cell tower application, but rather by our local experts,
33 which is you the HRB. So I, our local historian, and all remaining founders' relatives believe that
34 this site is truly historic and it and its founders deserve to be recognized. This is a highly
35 politicized issue and the timing is probably not the best as Steve has mentioned to me, but
36 nevertheless here we are for a couple of reasons I've been told by prior City Council members
37 that if there is a statement about the historic nature of the property by anyone in the file then
38 unless one raises opposing arguments history tends to rewrite itself and that is not something
39 that I'm comfortable with and I think probably you would not be either. I will focus on the
40 merits of the site, not the backdrop of a controversial cell tower application or the politics
41 around it. Ok?

42
43 So this nomination is for local Historic Inventory. It is not about California Register and it's not
44 about National Register as were evaluated by a Verizon's historian. It contemplates the design
45 landscape of a baseball arena, which has a two-story clubhouse. Ok, that's what we're talking
46 about. And so over many months I and others have conducted extensive secondary research

1 and primary research as well as checked the facts to make sure that I'm not wasting your time
2 today. And I take this very seriously, there aren't many opportunities to nominate a property
3 and I know that there are at least a couple 90 some odd year old founder family members that
4 are watching this on television (TV) today. So this is, I consider this to be a pretty significant
5 responsibility, which I take pretty seriously.
6

7 The secondary research has been online, the City's historic archives, the Secretary of State, the
8 County Recorder's Office, County Title, City of Palo Alto Planning and Building Departments,
9 Sanborn Maps although there were few admittedly on this property, old newspaper articles.
10 Uniquely and unlike any of the other historical documents that you've seen I've also conducted
11 primary research as much as was possible with all identifiable founder family members, all
12 house Gamage, Little League National Historian Lance Van Auken, Herschel Cobb who is here
13 today to talk about Ty's involvement, prior coaches and players, discussed with Steve Staiger of
14 the Palo Alto Historic Association, Michelle Messenger of the State Historic Preservation Office
15 (SHPO), and Jeff Brooke of the California Office of Historic Preservation to understand what
16 indeed are the implications because nobody's interested in negatively impacting the ability of
17 the ballpark to do what it does for the children. Ok? And they confirmed.
18

19 And given that I am not a historian I had the materials evaluated and reviewed by our local
20 historian and by Charles Chase at the Architectural Resources Group. Architectural Resources
21 Group is the City's historical consultant and they were recommended to me at Dennis
22 Backlund's suggestion. So specifically the overview of the property this design landscape was
23 built in 1952 as a rare sunken diamond ballpark stadium with period of significance '52 to '64, in
24 other words the fifty year cutoff. It was designed to be an exact replica of the Stanford Sunken
25 Diamond whose founders are honored for this accomplishment by the State of California in a
26 plaque that sits on the building issued in 2004. In addition, there is a two-story clubhouse with
27 boardroom/announcers booth on the top floor, concession stand and restrooms on the bottom
28 built in 1956. It was designed by local and famed architect Morgan Stedman. It was noted in
29 the Dames and Moore study as potentially California Register eligible for its architecture in
30 1998. The property and its 60 year history have never been formally evaluated for historic
31 significance until today I think to the chagrin of many of the founders.
32

33 This is the site of Little League Baseball of Palo Alto, a California corporation which was
34 incorporated January 16, 1952, and whose first games were played in spring of 1951 in Palo
35 Alto. Lance Van Auken the Little League historian who also runs the League's museum stated
36 three weeks ago when we spoke that the Palo Alto Little League appears to be the first league
37 in California in 1951 and this was after he and I had a rich discussion about San Bernardino
38 Jaycees and their participation 1951 World Series. The *Palo Alto Weekly* if you look at
39 documents says in their article in May '02 says the League was actually chartered in 1950. On
40 the basis of my discussion with Lance I think that's aggressive because the first teams didn't
41 come over until '50 or '51 west of Texas.
42

43 The site's development one year later appears to represent the following firsts: the first
44 dedicated Little League ballpark site in California. San Bernardino's came much later. Number
45 2, the first privately owned Little League ballpark site in California and Lance tells me perhaps
46 beyond. Number 3, it appears to be the first sunken diamond design Little League field in

1 California and perhaps beyond. There were comments, which I am prepared to discuss and
2 answer any questions frankly about the other reports. Howard J. Lamade came in 1959 and
3 according to Lance it's not a sunken stadium design. I can give you quotes from that on later
4 slides. Jean Caporizzo Field, which is stated in one of the other documents, actually does not
5 exist according to the Stamford, Connecticut historian.
6

7 So what is the significance of all of this which is what we're here to think about? The opening
8 dedication of the field in June 29, 1952, holds cultural significance to Palo Alto and California in
9 that it marks the movement of youth baseball west. Per Lance within Little League, which
10 happens to be the largest global organized youth program, our Palo Alto site is rare. Only five
11 percent of all Little League sites nationally remain private. So they've long since been coopted
12 to development and moved to public facilities. Frankly, this site is R-1 zoned and the same
13 could happen to this site at some point. This demonstrates tremendous foresight, creativity,
14 and resourcefulness by the site's founders to accomplish something that frankly would have
15 been impossible just years later given the growth of Palo Alto and the corresponding growth in
16 property prices. At the time it was the cost of a home I'm told and today this would be about
17 \$5 million to replicate. It's a shining example of the philanthropy and neighborhood
18 cooperation of the time to build out Palo Alto and this led to 62 plus years of uninterrupted
19 play at this site.
20

21 This is intentionally planned in a residential area. The site set up ended up being an anchor to
22 the community development of our growing university town as it pushed southeast in the
23 Fifties. And as this neighborhood social hub much revolved around it, to follow were Wilbur,
24 another is Jane Lathrop Stanford Middle School (JLS), Mitchell Park, and Mitchell Libraries. And
25 so this represents one of the most enduring youth programs in Palo Alto's history with Little
26 League then quickly spreading to Menlo Park, East Palo Alto, and Los Altos.
27

28 For a number of people historic significance of course associated. Ty Cobb, who the wife of
29 Walt Gamage recalls as an officer and commissioner of the Little League at the time, opened
30 the inaugural dedication ceremony and his relative Herschel is here today and Ty threw out the
31 first ball at the 50th. Mrs. Gamage recalls Walt sitting at the table with Ty deciding what to do
32 with which players, which characterizes quite a challenging discussion at times. Another of the
33 greatest sports legends ever, Pop Warner, who in 1951 was named to the Coaches Hall of Fame
34 as one of the most winning coaches was also in attendance.
35

36 Now for founders, Bill Alhouse, you recognize him as a Palo Alto Tall Tree Honoree for frankly a
37 large part this work. He was an ex-Dodger. He is National Little League Hall of Fame and
38 American Coaches Hall of Fame for his work at Stanford and elsewhere. John Hurlburt, the
39 ballpark founder, Vice-President of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA), famous
40 professor of law at Stanford University, he taught Rehnquist and O'Conner. Eichler, with whom
41 we're all familiar, also ballpark founder and prominent real estate developer of modern style
42 tract housing that we're all familiar with. John Arrillaga, not a founder, but much later also
43 contributed to the further build out of the property.
44

45 Numerous professional players coached kids and learned to play themselves on this field.
46 There is some question about that in the other documents or folks ask questions; you can see

1 the actual articles and citations in Appendix 18 and 19 and of course the architect Morgan
2 Stedman as the designer of the site with accolades of House Beautiful's Pacesetter House
3 Award and at least one local historic resource design home.

4
5 Let's talk about integrity. So the City's historic consultant architectural resources test is if a
6 player from that era walked onto the field today would you recognize it as the field he played
7 on? Ok. So with zero change in location or setting or association and a contiguous 62 year run
8 very unique as a Little League ballpark, Ty Cobb's heirs in attendance at the 50th and to this day,
9 Morgan Stedman's work remaining intact, it remains the feeling of a long lasting children's
10 ballpark. With some changes to the site over time like light poles, safety fencing, batting cages
11 all consistent with the site's purpose as a ball field even the design and materials across the site
12 remain at least moderate integrity.

13
14 Now let me address Planning's recommendation on the cover of your packet. It identifies a few
15 concerns: potential loss of integrity so the historic status is inconclusive, inconclusive, which is
16 unsatisfactory to me. The ARG's acid test is vis-à-vis integrity is again, could a player from that
17 era walk on the field and recognize it? It is ok to replace or repair, but taken as a whole is the
18 site intact? Some alterations even with newer materials is acceptable over the course of 60
19 plus years.

20
21 The second point, even if determined historic, wouldn't affect the cell tower application. I think
22 this misses the point of due process regarding independent historic evaluation and should not
23 be the focus of our conversation. And candidly having spoken with the authorities at the state
24 and national level that preside over this, the determination of significant impact on the site of a
25 cell tower is the sole discretion of a lady by the name of Michelle Messenger at SHPO who is
26 quite disturbed by these proceedings and the issuance of all these documents quite
27 prematurely.

28
29 Thirdly, the property owner objects. As we know and have heard a property in Palo Alto can be
30 recognized based on sound reasons and at the same time rejected by the applicant. This should
31 not affect and objective evaluation by the HRB today. Thirdly, no historic report was provided.
32 In several exchanges with staff regarding forms required and process, one of which Beth herself
33 alluded to, none was requested nor is one required by process. Having myself reviewed at least
34 three prior HRB applications before doing this one. And the last item, the property owner has
35 provided multiple reports in fact almost so many you wonder why. Verizon has commissioned
36 these reports from Verizon's historian and provided the reports in the context of a cell tower
37 application at the City's request and I think they need to be evaluated in such light.

38
39 So what is my recommendation on the basis of the work? I've identified the key Palo Alto
40 Historic Inventory criteria and the recommendation summary. The first Criteria 1, site is
41 associated with lives of historic people or events in the city, state, or nation. Indeed this
42 represents the first movement of Little League baseball west into California. Additionally it
43 represents the development of unique cultural amenities in a now prominent university town in
44 a very high growth phase helping to anchor its future development. It's a shining example of
45 local philanthropy and neighborhood cooperation of locally and nationally prominent Palo

1 Altoans in the creation of a private Little League field. Nationally recognized Ty Cobb as an
2 officer, additionally.

3
4 Criteria 2, the site was representative of an architectural style or way of life important to city,
5 state, or nation. Those who have lived through this definitively say for the children of our
6 community in that era and beyond this was the way of life. This ballpark was the social hub of
7 youth during this era. Quote unquote by one of our local experts “The only game in town quite
8 literally around which family schedules, news coverage, and meals revolved.”

9
10 Criteria 5, the architect or building was important. Morgan Stedman is Morgan Stedman
11 designed and it is a rare example within his body of work of a recreational building. Criteria 6,
12 the site contains elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural detail, design,
13 materials, or craftsmanship. It is indeed a unique sunken diamond little field design which as
14 you read takes a tremendous amount of detail and is definitely not the path of least effort.

15
16 The recommendation is for a Category 1 inclusion given the site’s state level importance. I’m
17 happy to discuss and answer any other questions. I have a set of slides that follow if of interest
18 (interrupted)

19
20 Chair Kohler: I think we need to kind of wrap up. Thank you.

21
22 Mr. Yotopoulos: Wonderful, great. So I’m happy to talk about any content disagreements
23 among the reports and the rationale, any of the character defining features, historic review
24 process (interrupted)

25
26 Chair Kohler: Ok, fine. Alright, I’ll bring it back to the Board.

27
28 Mr. Yotopoulos: Thank you for your time.

29
30 Chair Kohler: Ok, do you have any questions? This is appropriate for take questions of the
31 speaker, yeah. Right? Yes.

32
33 Ms. French: Yes, of course.

34
35 Chair Kohler: Thank you. Any questions for the speaker? Martin.

36
37 Board Member Bernstein: Jason, thanks for your great and thorough presentation. A lot of
38 research I could see.

39
40 Mr. Yotopoulos: Thank you.

41
42 Board Member Bernstein: You mentioned the fact checking. On your, one of the documents I
43 received, the Board received from you, it talks about current conditions and threats. Overall
44 the property has a high degree of integrity never having been moved or substantially altered
45 inside or outside with many of its original features still intact. And then we’re reading two
46 other reports from EBI and Metropolitan and it says construction history: replacement of

1 historic scoreboard, replacement of historic flagpole with three flagpoles and a retaining wall,
2 replacement of historic bleachers with aluminum bleachers, replacement of pitcher's mound
3 with artificial pitcher's mound. Seems like quite, if these reports are from the other consultants
4 are correct, it seems like many original features are not intact. So it seems like two different
5 statements and it's confusing to me what's intact.
6

7 Mr. Yotopoulos: So indeed the statement you just read is indeed correct. Over the course of a
8 60 year period there have indeed been such replacements. When you talk to ARG they focus
9 on the character defining features of the site starting from large and moving to smaller. In
10 order to take the whole perspective and then moving to smaller I would characterize and they
11 probably as well would characterize those as on the smaller end, whereas the larger are the
12 unique orientation of the planned field, the sunken diamond playing design, the two-story
13 clubhouse, the relationship between the clubhouse and the field, the visual landscape with the
14 eucalyptus view shed, and the field level dugouts. As you see there below, bleacher,
15 scoreboard, those also amount to the whole perspective on the property, but the bottom line
16 and the acid test as they characterize it is would a player recognize this is the field they had
17 played on and in its substantial entirety does it still remain intact?
18

19 Board Member Bernstein: Ok, thank you. Then I have a question for the City Attorney when
20 that time comes up, so.
21

22 Chair Kohler: Any other comments or questions of the applicant? Ok.
23

24 Board Member Wimmer: I was just going to say something really quick. I just wanted to say
25 that I just commend you for going through the depth of all the research and all of this
26 information and I think regardless of the outcome of this particular issue I think this is, this
27 information will be categorized and be in the Palo Alto records indefinitely, which is something
28 that in a historic sense we always look for that, that information. So thank you.
29

30 Mr. Yotopoulos: Yeah, thank you.
31

32 Chair Kohler: Any other questions of the applicant? Ok, thank you. We move on to speakers.
33

34 Mr. Yotopoulos: Great, thanks for your consideration.
35

36 Chair Kohler: Ok. The first speaker card I have is Herschel Cobb. If you give your name as you
37 begin it would be good.
38

39 Herschel Cobb: Good morning, my name is Herschel Cobb, pleasure to be here. I didn't get in
40 on the ground floor of the tangential disputes that seem to be in the background of this issue so
41 I have a kind of a like wow, a lot going on here that I don't know about. However, I would like
42 to relate that I had the pleasure in 2002 to attend and participate in rededication ceremonies at
43 Mitchell Field along with my wife and my son, his name is Ty. He is named after his great
44 grandfather and is a real baseball fan. Just finished college, was asked to play baseball there,
45 but his heart belongs to basketball so he enjoyed four years of varsity basketball at Occidental.

1 My wife Lynn, her maiden name is Jason, her family is I think four generations in this area,
2 Atherton. We live in Menlo Park.

3
4 So I know that my grandfather was a great supporter of youth baseball. I grew up in Santa
5 Maria, which now is a large town, but when I lived there it was 20,000. And coming into town
6 from the southern direction you could see a huge sign of Ty Cobb sliding into a base with a
7 proclamation that Santa Maria was the home of Little League baseball. Babe Ruth baseball kind
8 of prevailed and that's been a good thing because the Babe was one of Ty's great competitors
9 and in the end they became very, very good friends and had a lot of golf together for charity.

10
11 I kind of support the idea that a baseball diamond in itself is a site that can be historical without
12 getting into the details of how the benches are fixed or how they may have been improved or
13 this type of thing because over the years you kind of want that as new things that make for
14 creature comforts develop we want to adopt that. But the basic idea that you have a site there
15 that has been of historical significance to the members of the community is kind of
16 undoubtable and I want to just point out that your own membership has mentioned that they
17 not only played on this field, but their children have played on this field. Oh, there we go and I
18 think that from an observers point of view that kind of makes it look an important part of your
19 community that ought to retain some historical twang in all of us to say, wow, that should be
20 designated as a historical site just in itself because once these things disappear they are gone
21 forever.

22
23 You only have to open the *Chronical* this morning to see the arguments over the lack of who get
24 or the who gets to use soccer fields in San Francisco because there just frankly aren't enough
25 playgrounds for youngsters. And so I support the designation particularly listening to all the
26 arguments that even if it is designated as historical by the City of Palo Alto that that does not
27 really impact what an owner can do with the property, but it does give some recognition by a
28 city that as you drive by Middlefield and see Mitchell Field every day. If it disappeared you
29 would feel a real twinge in your heart to say, wow, another major historical site gone to the
30 ways just of like all other open space in our greater community.

31
32 And I did read this criteria I guess this is put forth by the Planning Department that does
33 indicate that a site that is identified with the lives of historic people, which I think we all are,
34 we've all lived in this community for years and years, not only us but our children and hopefully
35 their children with important events to the City. All those ballgames are really important
36 events to everything that makes a city vibrant and that's the people. Regardless of when I
37 attended you guys all remember Casey Jacobsen of Stanford? Pretty good point guard. He was
38 there too, he was 6'6", my son Ty was just a little youngster, oh my God how Ty wanted to be
39 6'6". He grew up to be 6'5", which he's very happy about. Anyway all of those kids who played
40 that's historic to them. That's what they carry around, that's one of the reasons they come
41 back to this area of the country ultimately to raise their own children and I think that that in
42 itself carries just a lot of historical significance.

43
44 Some of you who have been around the Palo Alto community for years may know of Shirley
45 Cobb Bookstore, used to be right next to the Varsity Theatre. That was my Aunt. Every
46 Christmas I received an age appropriate book instead of a gift from Aunt Shirley and many of

1 them were on sports and outdoor activities. I remember one in particular called *Barron of the*
2 *Bull Pen*. When I was playing Little League baseball and that was my Christmas present and it
3 meant a lot. She had a whole section in her store for youth, youth books and many, many,
4 many of them were baseball books because of course she knew who her father was and even
5 though I didn't recognize his prowess until I was a little bit later I certainly got a fill of youth
6 sports books in her bookstore. So the connections to the historic community that is Palo Alto is
7 significant. We're inundated by the changeover in many cities with chains coming in replacing
8 local shops, local shops are really necessary. Shirley Cobb's Bookstore is not there anymore
9 because (interrupted)

10
11 Chair Kohler: Could you kind of wrap up please?

12
13 Mr. Cobb: Yes sir.

14
15 Chair Kohler: Thank you.

16
17 Mr. Cobb: And I would really feel a loss in my heart if another ballpark disappeared or didn't
18 have some protection as a historical site. Thank you very much for your attention.

19
20 Chair Kohler: Thank you.

21
22 Mr. Cobb: Thanks.

23
24 Chair Kohler: I have a card from Ken Allen and you have three minutes.

25
26 Ken Allen: Good morning, my name is Ken Allen. I live on Grove Avenue in a home that was
27 built in 1947, probably the first home in the neighborhood of the Little League ballpark. I'm
28 also President of the Adobe Meadow Neighborhood Association, a member of the Cubberley
29 Community Advisory Commission, which considered the fate of Cubberley, and a member of
30 the Palo Alto Neighborhoods (PAN), the PAN group.

31
32 I'm speaking for myself at this time, but I have polled our community and have, can express
33 some of the opinions of the neighbors other than those who are opposing the cell tower. And I
34 do want to point out to you that this is very clearly an attempt to impede the development of
35 cell sites in our region. However, I think that the arguments that the Little League park should
36 be designated a historic location are a bit misplaced particularly as it relates to the cell tower
37 construction. I point out for example that the cell towers, that the light towers had already
38 been approved previously for at least one cell tower. Clearwire Communications received
39 approval from the City to place a cell antenna on top of the light pole closest to third base and
40 that the building, the shed was going to be used as a site for some of the transmission
41 equipment. Also I noticed in the Comprehensive Plan that there is a potential for putting 125
42 foot tower on the adjacent site, which is the substation for the electricity for the City of Palo
43 Alto. That would have a much more visual impact than anything related to what happens at the
44 Little League site.

1 So I would strongly recommend that you dismiss this petition to make this an historic site
2 recognizing that it is an effort to try to impede the development in our community. There's
3 really no historic value to the lights. They were installed long after the ballpark was placed and
4 so please don't hurt your own credibility by approving this nomination for a site. I think this is
5 an easy call for you. Thank you.

6
7 Chair Kohler: Thank you. I have a card from... make sure I get this correct, Kim Amsbaugh. And
8 that will be followed Chris Melvin.

9
10 Board Member Bower: You could explain that the yellow light in front of them will give them a
11 minute left.

12
13 Chair Kohler: Oh, I see. The yellow light that blinks that means that you have a minute left on
14 your three minute time period. Oh, as you're talking that little box there will (interrupted)

15
16 Kim Amsbaugh: Oh, yes. I know. Thank you. Sorry, I thought you were telling him he still had a
17 minute left. Ok, well now that I've wasted about 10 of my seconds.

18
19 Chair Kohler: No, we didn't start until you started. I'll restart it.

20
21 Ms. Amsbaugh: Alright, my name is Kim Amsbaugh and I'm on the Palo Alto Little League Board
22 and am in charge of sponsorships. As mentioned we are against Middlefield being designated a
23 historical site not because we're turning our backs on the history of the league, but because
24 this application is the tactic of one individual to take any action necessary to prevent a five foot
25 cellular antenna to be placed atop a light pole at the ballpark.

26
27 You have two reports submitted by EBI Consulting and a third peer review report by M-Group
28 that finds the field does not meet the necessary requirements to achieve historical designation.
29 I want to take this time to outline the misrepresentation of facts in the application pertaining to
30 Middlefield being modeled after Sunken Diamond, the uniqueness of the ballpark itself, and the
31 historical value of the architect that designed our clubhouse. Yes, Middlefield is inspired by
32 Sunken Diamond built in 1931, which ironically is sunken only because 10 years earlier a large
33 hole was created when dirt was taken from that area to build the Stanford football stadium. To
34 our knowledge Sunken Diamond is not on any historical registry so we question why such a
35 consideration should be given to Middlefield ballpark built 20 years later.

36
37 In regards to Middlefield ballpark being a sunken diamond the direction and specifications of
38 the field itself are also not unique. When a ballpark is created consideration must be given to
39 the rising and setting sun so as not to impact the batter or the pitcher when playing the game.
40 This is why Middlefield, Sunken Diamond, and most ballparks are built with home plate located
41 on the north side of the field. Its orientation is in no way unique.

42
43 Similarly, Middlefield is not unique in the way the field itself is constructed. National Little
44 League has strict requirements for all fields on which teams play. This includes distances
45 between bases, from the pitching mound to home plate, and the placement of the outfield

1 fences. Currently there are more than 6,500 Little League programs in 90 countries. They all
2 play on the exact same field configuration.

3
4 The applicant also claims that Middlefield deserves this distinction because of Morgan
5 Stedman. Yes, he built the clubhouse, but he is known and recognized for residential work that
6 incorporates unique fireplaces, wrought iron fixtures, and represents Spanish influences. Our
7 clubhouse is a simple rectangular structure made of concrete, cinder block, and wood.

8
9 Palo Alto Little League recognizes the role baseball has played in the history of the town;
10 however, although it's the hub we take advantage of other City parks and games and practices
11 are held at every elementary and middle school in town. Surely they play just as large of a role
12 in creating the League's rich history of memories, friendship, learning, and a love of baseball.

13
14 Chair Kohler: Thank you. Chris Melvin followed by Kristin Foss. Oh, I have one more here.

15
16 Chris Melvin: Hi, good morning. My name's Chris Melvin, I'm a longtime Palo Alto resident. I
17 actually was born here, played Little League baseball here, I now coach and I'm on the Board.
18 My father was a Board Member back in the Seventies. I was going to speak specifically to a
19 single point. My position on the Board is I'm in charge of field so I four or five times a week am
20 taking care of the ballpark and so I'm very familiar with it and how it's changed.

21
22 I have some pictures, unfortunately I don't have slides. In the EBI report there's a picture, I'm
23 sorry, there's a picture of opening day that shows what the ballpark looked like then and
24 immediately adjacent to that is a picture of how it looks now. The piece I'm filling in there is I
25 pulled out this morning on my way here a photograph that is roughly the same view as those
26 two photographs from opening day and today from 1979. So we've got approximately every 20
27 years' worth of photos. And you can see that the three pictures in some ways could be
28 different ballparks. When I first saw that picture in the EBI report I did not recognize it as the
29 ball field that I played on. Yes, the one in the middle, the black and white one there in the
30 middle... it was almost unrecognizable to me. I mean everything from the large mound of dirt
31 that was on the Middlefield side parking lot area where that is today to the open dugouts to the
32 backstop, which is probably the single most unique thing in any ballpark is the backstop. You
33 can't change many other things.

34
35 The part I wanted to point out specifically is that in the Seventies and for a long period of time
36 till I guess the mid-Eighties or into 1990 there was a completely different configuration for the
37 backstop and that's the picture that is in, that Board Member Bower is holding right now. We
38 had a backstop that was on what is now the playing field. There was an area behind it where
39 hitters would warm up back in the days when they had on deck hitters equipment was stored
40 there. There was a low fence for people to stand on, so it was a very different visual effect and
41 in a lot of ways as I said I didn't recognize it as the same ballpark. So I think the litmus test
42 there fails at least from my point of view as someone who played on it during that era and who
43 now participates on it.

44
45 So that's really all I had to say is that I think that the significant changes have taken place over
46 time and I hope you take that into consideration. Obviously I'm truly in favor of it as a resource

1 for the community, but I don't think a historic designation would do anything for its purpose as
2 a ballpark for youth. Thank you.

3
4 Chair Kohler: Thank you. Kristin Foss.

5
6 Kristin Foss: So should I go last as the property owner or? Because you said 10 minutes for the
7 property owner and I don't know whether...

8
9 Chair Kohler: If you're the property owner we should let (interrupted)

10
11 Ms. Foss: I'm sorry what?

12
13 Chair Kohler: If you're the property owner you could speak last. So we'll hear (interrupted)

14
15 Ms. Foss: Ok. So Mark speak last as the property owner.

16
17 Chair Kohler: Mark Priestley and then Kristin Foss. Is that ok? Yeah, ok.

18
19 Mark Priestley: So the light on now? Ok, Mark Priestley, Secretary of Palo Alto Little League. So
20 as you've heard before we're opposed to the application, but I don't want people to think we're
21 opposed to our history. In fact we honor our history greatly. We have plaques on our
22 clubhouse. We have teams that are named after founders. Next month we're meeting with
23 Crystal Gamage and the Alhouse family essentially to receive a plaque in honor of her father.
24 We care greatly about our history and past. We've been a Little League focused on youth
25 baseball as our mission 62 years. We stand on the shoulders of all the people who come before
26 us, the Members of the Board, and you can tell people keep coming back from playing to
27 coaching to being on the Board, but I don't think that's the issue here as partly the issue is
28 we're an active and living community and as Chris said the site that we have today is very
29 different than the site that Bill Alhouse and his peers created in '52.

30
31 We have a mission to bring youth baseball. The project that we're proposing with Verizon will
32 help us continue that mission. It will help fund improvements to the site to help our mission.
33 Baseball has changed a lot and that's why we've had to change over time. If you look at the
34 changes we've made it's only the beginning of what we need to do to be relevant to the youth
35 who want to play baseball in our community. We can't be a stagnant, we can't be a museum,
36 we need to be able to evolve, which is what we've done. That's why I think the historical
37 reports that you have before you from two different organizations validate that the historical
38 integrity of our site has been compromised because we've changed essentially everything. You
39 could look at every significant element and it's different. And if you go back to those photos I
40 think that was probably the most evident thing to me when I pulled those out of our archives to
41 look at what it looked like in '52 and you look at what it looks like now you could not and I
42 looked at several other views, I mean there was nothing there. There was no library, there was
43 no Mitchell Park, there was no elementary schools, there's nothing around. This was the only
44 thing in the area. So the views are just so much different you would think you were in another
45 part of the country.

46

1 So I wanted to emphasize we were caught a bit by surprise with this application. We didn't
2 hear about it until we had got to the ARB meeting a month ago. Jason never bothered to come
3 to us or mention that he intended to apply for historical registry for our site. He's never talked
4 to the Board or the property owner or any of us relative to this. I really do believe this is sort of
5 a sham relative to what his goal is, which is to try to block our improvements to the site. I think
6 you guys should see it is what it is. He's very eloquent in speaking about his concern, but we've
7 never seen him active in our Board, in our League. He's only involvement has been to oppose
8 the Verizon project so from our perspective he really is not interested in the history and this is
9 not what this is about.

10
11 Chair Kohler: [Unintelligible]

12
13 Mr. Priestley: Now he mentions there was a number of players and people of significance who
14 have come to the site including Ty Cobb, which it is an honor to meet someone who is from the
15 family because as a fan of baseball I mean you almost can't think of a player who more
16 represents baseball. We were very lucky that he came to opening day ceremony, but I've
17 looked at all the records in our clubhouse. He was not a part of our Board, he was not a part of
18 our organization, he was an honored speaker just like Pop Warner was. I don't think the fact
19 that someone who has great fame makes us a historical site. We've had Steve Young come and
20 speak at our site as well, but I don't believe it makes us historical and I think you guys can see
21 through that.

22
23 We've had a lot of players who continue to play baseball after Little League. That does not
24 make them the fact that they've continued to play baseball none of them that we know of have
25 gone into the hall of fame, but we still honor as our mission the fact that we're about baseball
26 (interrupted)

27
28 Chair Kohler: Ok, could you wrap up please?

29
30 Mr. Priestley: Sure.

31
32 Chair Kohler: Thank you.

33
34 Mr. Priestley: So I think I'd like to emphasize EBI and the M-Group, two different reports have
35 said that we're not historical. We don't have significant integrity of the site, we don't meet
36 your local ordinances for Palo Alto so you should vote against making us a historical site or
37 putting us on the registry.

38
39 Chair Kohler: Thank you. Kristin Foss.

40
41 Ms. Foss: Hi, I'm Kristin Foss, the President of Palo Alto Little League. On behalf of the
42 hundreds of families and over 1,000 children who are part of our program I urge you to reject
43 the application in front of you. Palo Alto Little League is proud of our rich history and our key
44 role in building community here. We especially love Middlefield ballpark. I think I've broken
45 your microphone... is this better? It's a beautiful site and anyone whose kids have played PCL
46 or Majors have spent countless hours at that park. Every time I'm there, which is several times

1 a week during the season I see younger kids who can't wait to be old enough to play there and I
2 see older kids watching their younger brothers or sisters or are there to umpire that fondly
3 remember their playing days there. My own family like most Palo Alto Little League families
4 cherishes memories of everything from extra inning nail biter city championship games to
5 postgame whiffle ball derby's where all the teams get together and play like neither one of
6 them just won or lost a game.

7
8 But let's be clear that's not at all what this application is about. This application was submitted
9 by Mr. Yotopoulos who has never played on Middlefield Park. His children have never played
10 on Middlefield Park. He has never coached or managed a team that's played on this ballpark.
11 He's never raked the field or lined it for an upcoming game. He's never participated in our
12 annual workdays to do maintenance on the field. He's never contributed to our more
13 significant improvements like replacing the pitching mound or resurfacing the batting cages. So
14 I'm here to represent the hundreds of people in Palo Alto who have done those things and a lot
15 more.

16
17 You heard from Mark the other thing Mr. Yotopoulos has never done is contact any one of us
18 about whether this ballpark should be a historic landmark or what that impact would have on a
19 100 percent volunteer organization many of whom are taking time out from work to do this and
20 also take time out from work to coach kids, maintain our field, and we're trying to ease the
21 burden on the next board and the board after that so they don't have to come to you every
22 time they want to make a change, cover a batting cage, put shades on the dugout or something
23 like that.

24
25 This is clearly as you've heard from other people about the cell tower. Mr. Yotopoulos
26 vehemently opposes that, but there's a process for that and it's not this. One member of the
27 close group of, the small group that he is closely associated with has personally told me in the
28 ballpark of Middlefield, in the parking lot of Middlefield that they will shut us down if we allow
29 Verizon to proceed. And this is just one of the attempts to do that.

30
31 Palo Alto Little League is against this designation not because we're turning our back on our
32 history. We embrace our history, we consider ourselves just one little segment in a long line of
33 history. And every day that we go out there and we coach kids and we teach them how to play
34 baseball and how to be teammates and how to be members of this community we contribute
35 to that history. We're against this designation not because we have anything against history,
36 but because we need to evolve just like baseball has evolved. There are aluminum bats,
37 specialty gloves, safety gear, there are all kinds of changes coming including a new league,
38 which is called 50/70 and it has longer base paths and a slightly deeper outfield fence. I'd like
39 to make those changes to our ballpark. I'd like to cover the dugouts if I can raise the money
40 because the kids in there including our challenger league just bake on a sunny afternoon. In
41 fact, as a parent I'd like to cover the bleachers, but that's a that's a capital improvement I may
42 have to wait for. I want to be able to do all of that or I want the next board to be able to do all
43 of those things without having to bring every change in front of this Board because I hope that
44 the 60 years that we've spent maintaining baseball in Palo Alto has proven to you that we do
45 honor baseball and we honor its place in the City and that you'll trust us to make the right
46 decisions and the right evolutions on our site to enhance baseball in Palo Alto. Thank you.

1
2 Chair Kohler: Thank you. According to my schedule the applicant has a three minute closing
3 statement if you like. If not that's ok.

4
5 Mr. Yotopoulos: Yes, thank you.

6
7 Chair Kohler: Go ahead.

8
9 Mr. Yotopoulos: So this is a as you can tell by 60 some odd pages and numerous interactions
10 over the course of many months this is not something that someone has no interest in the
11 history of this ballpark would undertake if they were in their sane mind. This has been a
12 tremendous endeavor and I think you can see the detail that's gone into it. I feel a tremendous
13 obligation for the founders and frankly for the protection of this historic site, which is why I've
14 done it with the assistance of many others who were listed.

15
16 But importantly I also firmly believe that we need to follow due process in our City. So the ARB
17 will decide what it decides on the cell tower, but that does not mean that we can divest our
18 decisions, critical decisions around our cultural heritage to a corporation that is coming in from
19 the outside and paying contractors to feed us recommendations. I believe that it is the onus of
20 people that have lived in this community, grown up in this community, and recognize these
21 various elements to make these decisions, which is why we're in front of you today. I think it's
22 our obligation and responsibility to make independent objective decisions and the implications
23 of those will be handled by the ARB, they will be handled by the City Council, but as I
24 understand it the job of this HRB is to take a look at the facts consistent with the way that you
25 look at all the other facts with any particular application the one that proceeded it and in
26 previous months and to make the call.

27
28 I think it's particularly important right now especially when our City is somewhat under duress
29 with an onslaught of development and the threat of a legal suit. We at this time cannot bypass
30 due process, right? And I also believe that it's particularly important to follow in a sense the
31 steps that are stipulated within our City's guidelines. So I thank you very much for the attention
32 to due process and for listening to the argument in favor of the nomination for the Palo Alto
33 Little League today as a Historic Inventory item in Palo Alto.

34
35 Chair Kohler: Thank you very much. That concludes the public portion of the meeting today.
36 This seems awfully loud. Next on the agenda would be... what's that? I can't hear you. Please
37 speak into the microphone so I can...

38
39 Board Member Bunnenberg: I was asking what about the City Attorney?

40
41 Chair Kohler: City Attorney is sitting her for questions if we have any questions of her.

42
43 Board Member Bunnenberg: Ok, so [unintelligible]

44

1 Chair Kohler: That's the, we're now into the discussion, yes, Board discussion. So we have
2 closed the public hearing and we are now into the discussion with the staff and our
3 recommendations.

4
5 Ms. French: Can I?

6
7 Chair Kohler: Sure.

8
9 Ms. French: May I? I just wanted to alert the Board that the consultant EBI Consulting is here in
10 the event that the HRB has questions of the consultant. Our consultant, M-Group, who
11 prepared the two reports is not here.

12
13 Chair Kohler: Ok. So we have discussion, Motions...

14
15 Board Member Bernstein: I have a question for the City Attorney. Yeah. Cara Silver, thank you
16 for attending our meeting. My question is based on so the City of Palo Alto's Historic
17 Preservation Ordinance is voluntary compliance, correct?

18
19 Ms. Silver: To some extent, it depends on whether the property is designated or not.

20
21 Board Member Bernstein: Correct.

22
23 Ms. Silver: If the property is designated there are some additional requirements.

24
25 Board Member Bernstein: Correct, so currently this property is not designated. I'm concerned
26 about property rights that if a property owner wishes not to be considered on the Historical
27 Register shouldn't that end it? why does the City Council need to if we decide, if the HRB
28 makes a Motion and decides not to designate it it still has to go to the City Council for them to
29 debate that and agendize that? And if the Council says yes it should be designated where's the
30 voluntary action on a non-registered property? That seems almost, that could be harmful for a
31 property owner.

32
33 Ms. Silver: Yes, Boarmember Bernstein, that's an excellent question and I think it's a very
34 significant policy question for this Board and for Council. As I understand the history of the
35 Historic Preservation Ordinance those were issues that were heavily debated at the time and
36 the current ordinance does permit a interested party to seek designation over the property
37 owner's objection, which is very different than the state and federal of course laws. And while
38 the ordinance does permit an interested party to designate, to seek designation it is a policy call
39 for this Board and the Council to designate in light of property owner's suggestion and I do
40 think that we've done a little bit of research in this area and it does not appear, we weren't able
41 to find other precedents where this Board has recommended a designation over the property
42 owner's objections. And I think that that is something that staff would want to do more
43 research on because I think that the whole Historic Preservation Ordinance does contemplate
44 as you say this voluntary compliance and there was a buy in from the entire community in a
45 policy discussion about this at the time the ordinance was adopted and these are very
46 significant policy discussions and could be a significant departure from past practice.

1
2 Board Member Bernstein: Thank you. Is it required that today that the HRB actually make a
3 Motion and vote to designate this historic or vote to not designate it? Are we required to even
4 make a Motion today and vote on this?
5

6 Ms. French: You're asked to make a Motion and it could be to render a recommendation, it
7 could be to continue the public hearing. Those are the basically the two options.
8

9 Board Member Bernstein: Ok, so no matter what the HRB then votes and moves and votes on
10 it's going to go to City Council at a certain period of time. ARB is meeting tomorrow so ARB can
11 approve the proposed project tomorrow and then that's a done deal, subject to any appeal,
12 right?
13

14 Ms. French: So the ARB is recommending to the Director, who would then decide on the ARB
15 component of the application as well as the CUP component of the application, and along with
16 the CEQA determination. And then that is appealable to the Council. The CUP is actually a
17 hearing request to the Planning Commission if that is, assuming that request comes in. The
18 Planning and Transportation Commission (PTC) is the body that considers, in a public hearing
19 setting, the CUP and can debate the use prior to it going to the Council.
20

21 Board Member Bernstein: Alright, ok. Alright, thank you for those clarifications.
22

23 Board Member Bunnenberg: Question. Would it be within the realm of possibility to have a
24 study session for the HRB and the Board of the Little League to talk some more about what the
25 ramifications are? I see a lot of fear and sometimes misunderstandings about some of the
26 ramifications and maybe not as many of the values of having historic designation. Could you
27 speak to that?
28

29 Ms. Silver: Yes, thank you. That is I think a very good suggestion. You might want to couch the
30 study session more broadly to inform the public on what the ramifications are of historic
31 designation. I do think that that's an area where there is some uncertainty from a public
32 perspective and it would be very helpful to do that.
33

34 Board Member Bunnenberg: And let's see... if we should delay our decision is it my
35 understanding that we need to do something by what is it? December the third? Is that
36 correct that we could?
37

38 Ms. French: Yes, I've done the math and the deadline basically the first meeting of December
39 regular HRB meeting date of December 3rd is the last moment at which the HRB can make the
40 recommendation, correct.
41

42 Board Member Bunnenberg: Thank you.
43

44 Chair Kohler: Martin.
45

1 Board Member Bernstein: Since the public hearing is closed I guess we're free to make
2 comments too, right? Ok. The in fact it kind of relates to the slide that's up there right now for
3 the public's view too where it talks about character defining features since we're making
4 comments now. The photograph that Chris brought showing 1952 and 2014, excellent piece of
5 evidence here about character defining features the seven aspects of integrity that are
6 important for HRB to review: setting, location, materials, design, workmanship, feeling, and
7 association; important criteria to looking at any potential historic designation. This photograph
8 clearly shows to me that materials, design, workmanship, feeling have been altered so much
9 that the character defining features for any potential historical are altered beyond historic
10 quality and that's going to be my vote if that ever comes up. Thank you.

11
12 Chair Kohler: Beth one more time on you. This is your last chance.

13
14 Board Member Bunnenberg: I would like to follow up on Martin's comments on integrity. The
15 location is clearly the same, the character defining features have had some changes made, but
16 they are the kind of changes that have gone on, on most every stadium or ballpark that you can
17 think of. These are things that the field apparently has gotten longer. Some of the aerial views
18 suggested well the field's not even quite the same shape anymore. Well, one of the factors is
19 that early article said it was 180 feet from the batter's position to the far outfield and now it's
20 200 because Little League has changed that and was required to do that, but it was not even a
21 choice of the Board of the Little League. When you think about many in fact all the changes
22 that have been made could be reversed, but this would be a highly unlikely kind of thing
23 because they put in high fences to keep the balls from ending up out in Middlefield because the
24 bats have changed, they use aluminum bats now and kids can really hit them a long distance
25 and so and some of the changes to the snack bar were things that needed to be done for health
26 regulations. So there are a number of factors that play into these kinds of changes and I think
27 that there still is that clear feeling of you'd recognize it as a baseball stadium or a baseball field.

28
29 In terms of the setting I wanted to talk a little bit more about that because one of the
30 consultants talked about oh, it really is only important the thing that the visitor is all focused on
31 the game, so it doesn't really matter so much what is out there, but in terms of Palo Alto what
32 is out there actually is part of the story and part of the real setting of the ballpark and this was
33 referred to by some, now then there was a statement that there was not an elementary school
34 it turns out that Fairmeadow opened in 1951. So it was there. The church, the Covenant
35 Presbyterian Church, made an application at almost exactly the same time that Little League did
36 to start building their church. The fire station was a little bit later about 1953. And so all of this
37 was going on and in terms of the housing, housing was being built down there. Stern and Price
38 put in 23 homes and so it was this and of course the Mitchell Park park itself, which is one of
39 the biggest bounding neighbors, City bought that land in '52 and Mitchell Park opened in '55.
40 So this is a part of that effort by the City to build immediately or as soon as possible the services
41 that are needed for all this new section. So I have some and of course the trees have grown.
42 There were not a whole lot of trees down there because it was a ranch and a farm and a
43 meadow was called for that rancher's name, but it didn't go over very well as people tried to
44 sell property.

45

1 In terms of the materials a number of things have changed, but they still are in very close
2 proximity to what was there. Workmanship the significant thing there was that so much of it
3 was donated and many of the names of the early people were companies that had bulldozers
4 and equipment to bring in and help with the site. The feeling is intact and the association is
5 intact so that I would submit that possibly it has more integrity than has been stated.
6

7 Chair Kohler: I was just going to check on the far end over there. Do you have any comments
8 or? We'll work our way toward the middle.
9

10 Board Member Wimmer: I don't necessarily have any questions so much, but as an opinion. It
11 seems like the motivation of this application is clouded with the apparent opposition of the
12 pending cell phone tower installation and it's not purely for purposes of historic preservation. I
13 think that the City has done due, their due diligence with preparing reports and on behalf of the
14 applicant has given us invaluable information and research of historic value and all that. I think
15 in reviewing some of the reports that were professionally prepared it tells us that the site is at
16 this time not a good candidate for historic designation and I think without the property owner's
17 consent it makes it very difficult to support the application. I think if the tower wasn't an issue
18 and if the owners were on board with an outside applicant maybe they would be interested and
19 maybe in the future they might be interested in designating it as a historic site. I think it is a
20 potential future candidate for that, but I think at the moment I think there's some obvious just
21 clouded with some other issues. So.
22

23 Vice-Chair Makinen: Ok, the way I look at this I kind of visualize this as a cultural landscape that
24 may have importance to the City of Palo Alto and you gentleman who have played on this field
25 over the years probably can better attest to that than I can, but it certainly is a cultural
26 landscape has the impression to me that it does convey importance as a cultural landscape and
27 the criterion that it would hang its hat on is that particularly representative of a way of life
28 important to the City and from what I've heard from some of the gentleman who have played
29 on it, it does appear to have importance in the past. So from the standpoint of being what I
30 would consider a cultural landscape, an urban-scape of importance it does have merit. I have
31 to weigh that against the other aspects in the report where the owner is not endorsing the
32 designation of being historic and some of the other aspects of questionable integrity, but I think
33 on the whole it does have merit as a cultural landscape.
34

35 Board Member Bower: I first of all I want to thank Mr. Yotopoulos for spending an
36 extraordinary amount of time researching this. I played on that field. I was two when the
37 property was purchased, but I knew all the players: Maurice Lagoin, Walt Gamage, Bob Barr
38 was another was... all those people were family friends and I knew them personally and they
39 got together to create this ballpark so that all of us could play Little League. Now if you were to
40 ask my sister whether this was a social gathering place she would absolutely disagree because
41 girls were not part of it. So this was clearly a male, a specifically male thing. It's changed today,
42 my daughters played softball.
43

44 So when I first saw this I thought it was a very interesting application and then of course I went
45 back to all of the seminars that I've attended in the nine years I've been on this board and I hit
46 an absolute roadblock when I started looking at the 9th actually in this, this is a revised report,

1 the Metropolitan report that we got last night, which I read. There were nine major
2 characteristics. Only two actually exist and that is the fact that one of them is that it's a
3 ballpark and that it's sunken. And as these pictures demonstrate all of the major characteristics
4 of this site, which is what it is, it's not a building, I mean it's not just a building really have been
5 changed beyond recognition. And according to the Category 3 and 4 description in the Palo
6 Alto Municipal Code a contributing building, now this is a 3 or 4 Category building is any
7 building which is a good example of an architectural style, which this would probably qualify
8 for, but and a contributing building can have extensive permanent changes made to original
9 design even in appropriate additions, but I can't even see this property fitting into that
10 category. And both the professional staff reports, I mean the people who were hired by the
11 City agree with that and sadly I couldn't support this being designated as a historic structure.

12
13 Oddly in this Board I usually represent the side that says look, you can make a major change to
14 a building, you can change the historic glass to get insulated glass. This is a tension Beth and I
15 have had the entire time we've been on the Board and I was absolutely astounded when Beth
16 was saying oh, this is all these changes they're not really significant. So I felt like we had
17 switched positions. I also couldn't support any application that did not have the support of the
18 property owners although I should say that the Little League Board ought to reconsider or to
19 think differently about historic designation. It's not as constrictive as you think. While I think
20 it's not going to happen here, I don't think it's appropriate, historic designation has benefits
21 and they are financial benefits so I don't think that I hope you view this in a more open-minded
22 way in the future.

23
24 I guess finally I would say I am deeply troubled by the fact that Mr. Yotopoulos has a strong
25 problem with the cell tower and that it's very clear in our documents that that probably drives a
26 large majority of his energy to getting this project, this property designated as a historic site. I
27 think that's totally inappropriate and basically I couldn't have supported this even if it did
28 qualify because I think it's too personal and obviously very single-mindedly not part of our
29 jurisdiction. As I said earlier we have had cell towers in historic places and the cell tower I think
30 just from my perspective would be accepted here and not a problem. So sadly while I'm, I'm
31 really encouraged that somebody would spend this enormous amount of time providing us with
32 history that I think probably wouldn't be available to us in the future, it is now, I can't really
33 support this application and I think it was inappropriate in its beginning.

34
35 Chair Kohler: Ok. So it's back to me, the old man on the Board. It was interesting to hear Beth's
36 comments about various things like Mitchell Park. When I was a fourth grader at Fairmeadow I
37 watched the bulldozers go by and create Mitchell Park so I know all about that. As a kid I
38 played on the Little League team, actually I didn't play, I was always I can't remember what my
39 role was. My son played there a lot so I remember that as well and I actually remember from
40 high school playing pick-up baseball at the Little League ballpark because when we were in high
41 school we could hit the ball out of the park, which was kind of fun. And as a Cubberley
42 graduate I saw pictures at our 50 year reunion a year ago where you could stand out in front of
43 Cubberley and see the Little League ballpark because there was nothing between Cubberley
44 and the Little League ballpark, no trees, it was just open space. And now of course you can't
45 see anywhere, any wide that distance, so I grew and then Covenant Church was where I was
46 married and my mother continued on active in that church till she passed away. So it's a very

1 important place to me. So I know that neighborhood pretty well and I think I lost my train of
2 thought, but I would like to at some point I think the ballpark should get some sort of
3 recognition of its historic value and as Martin mentioned cultural landscape I think that might
4 be something of value to pursue, not that it would impact the work that's going on at that
5 ballpark, but I think some notification of its historic value to Palo Alto would be appropriate if
6 there's some way to have that come about.

7
8 I read the report last night that came to us at I think it was 8:00 at night or something. I finally
9 read it at 10:30 or 11:00 so it took a while and then we read the other reports and there's just
10 as David has mentioned here, there doesn't seem to be enough evidence that it's right now
11 ready for a category of Palo Alto's historic listing. I was thinking maybe a Category 4 might be
12 possible because it's, it obviously has a lot of value culturally to our town and our City.
13 Everyone has, has lived here for any length of time knows about the Little League ballpark. So I
14 think some sort of designation of some sort at some point would be really a good thing to
15 happen. Right now there's no fear of it being sold and condominiums being put there, but the
16 future you never know. So that's my sort of agreeing with David at the moment we don't have
17 enough to category it at this instant in time. Beth, you want to add something?

18
19 Board Member Bunnenberg: I would like to also point out that we received information so late
20 and Martin Bernstein apparently didn't receive it at all that it would be a rush to decision to
21 make a final judgment that this property is not historic. I'd like to see us be able to continue
22 that to further study and perhaps think about the cultural landscape, some way that this might
23 be an application that could be reconfigured.

24
25 Chair Kohler: I think you can make a Motion and see how far that will go.

26
27 Board Member Bunnenberg: Pardon?

28
29 Chair Kohler: You have to make a Motion and the Board will vote on whether they want to do
30 something like that.

31
32 Board Member Bunnenberg: Alright, are we ready for a Motion?

33
34 Vice-Chair Makinen: Can I add one thing to that that you may want to include in your Motion?
35 And there's been some discussion alluded to here that perhaps some designation other than
36 Category 1, some lessor level might be more amenable to the Board than a Category 1 if the
37 applicant would care to consider that.

38
39 Chair Kohler: I don't think it matters.

40
41 Board Member Bunnenberg: As a part of the Motion to delay that to?

42
43 Vice-Chair Makinen: If the Motion maker desires to incorporate my thought.

44
45 Board Member Bunnenberg: Alright.

46

1 Chair Kohler: Well for one thing there hasn't been a Motion made yet. So if you want to make a
2 Motion you should...

3
4 MOTION

5
6 Board Member Bunnenberg: If I make a Motion I would like to make a Motion due to the
7 lateness of some of the material that we delay our decision to a time on or before December
8 the 3rd and that we make some consideration of whether this should be as suggested a
9 Category 1 or one of the other categories provided for in our inventory.

10
11 Chair Kohler: Ok, there's been a Motion made. Is there a second to that Motion?

12
13 SECOND

14
15 Vice-Chair Makinen: I'll second that.

16
17 Chair Kohler: Oh. So it's been a Motion that we postpone final decision on this project I think is
18 one way to put it to a later date when there's more data and we can speak to the Motion.

19
20 Board Member Bernstein: If the, if this Motion passes what does it do to the ARB scheduled
21 meeting tomorrow?

22
23 Ms. French: Nothing. The ARB is going to continue, continued its meeting to tomorrow. It's on
24 the agenda as first up so it will proceed.

25
26 Board Member Bernstein: Ok, thank you.

27
28 Board Member Bower: My comment about this Motion is I did get an opportunity to read, I
29 spent most of the weekend reading this. This is a lot of material to plow though. And as I got
30 into it I actually got more and more interested in it for because in part of my experience at the
31 ballpark. I don't see any additional information in the material we got last night that wasn't
32 really covered in the earlier material. While the specific response by Metropolitan in their
33 October 14th memo had some small detail changes I think that the information we got both
34 from their September 5th memo and from the EBI memo is basically clear and I don't see that
35 postponing this is going to help. I think it creates the impression that we will possibly find that
36 this property would fit into a Category 3 or 4 and I still think that without property owner's
37 consent that's questionable. So I couldn't support this Motion.

38
39 SUBSTITUTE MOTION

40
41 Board Member Wimmer: I agree with David. I think that we have been presented an enormous
42 amount of information. I think due to the lack of the owner's support, the legal issues, I think
43 as a Board we should just stop it here and make a decision and I would like to move that we
44 recommend that the listing, excuse me, I move to not recommend. I'd like to make a Motion to
45 move to not recommend the listing on the historic resource (interrupted)

46

1 Chair Kohler: Excuse me, I think we have to resolve our (interrupted)
2
3 Ms. French: Ok, that can be a Substitute Motion.
4
5 Chair Kohler: [Unintelligible]
6
7 Board Member Wimmer: Excuse me, I'm out of turn. I apologize, but I just wanted to agree
8 with David. I think that we have a plethora of information and I think we need to make a
9 decision.
10
11 Chair Kohler: So we're calling here a Substitute Motion and then what's the legal way you do
12 Motions [per] Motion?
13
14 Ms. French: When you make a Substitute Motion as you have just done, then the Board acts on
15 the Substitute Motion first.
16
17 Chair Kohler: Ok.
18
19 Ms. French: And then gets back to the main Motion if the Substitute Motion does not pass.
20
21 SUBSTITUTE MOTION SECONDED
22
23 Board Member Bower: So I'll second the Substitute Motion.
24
25 Chair Kohler: Ok, so there's been a Substitute Motion and a second to the Substitute Motion,
26 which essentially why don't you repeat it again because I interrupted you.
27
28 Board Member Wimmer: Sorry and I'm the new one on the Board so I don't know all the...
29
30 Chair Kohler: I've been on the Board 20 years and I don't (interrupted)
31
32 Board Member Wimmer: The protocol, the proper way of doing it. But I would like to make a
33 Substitute Motion to not recommend the listing on the Palo Alto Historic Inventory. So it's
34 simple enough.
35
36 Ms. French: Or could it be phrased as, I think this is what you're saying is, that you recommend
37 that Council not place the site on the City's local inventory of Historic Resources.
38
39 Board Member Wimmer: Yes, what she said sounds good.
40
41 Chair Kohler: And David Bower has seconded that Motion.
42
43 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT TO SUBSTITUTE MOTION
44
45 Board Member Bunnenberg: Oh, I was going to suggest a not place it on the inventory "at this
46 time." Would that be acceptable to the maker of the Motion?

1
2 Board Member Wimmer: Yes, “at this time.” That would be perfect. And if another application
3 in the future comes up I think without clouded ulterior issues I think then we can address it at
4 that time.

5
6 Chair Kohler: Go ahead Martin.

7
8 Board Member Bernstein: Maybe the City Attorney can clarify this; I don’t think it’s necessary
9 to say “at this time” because “at this time” only refers to a future action. So I don’t think it’s
10 necessary to say “at this time.” It’s always, you can always do it at any time, so I don’t think
11 that’s appropriate, I think it could be misleading to use the words “at this time.” It adds some
12 confusion I think. So I think it should be eliminated from the Motion “at this time.”

13
14 Chair Kohler: I [unintelligible]

15
16 Board Member Bernstein: [Unintelligible] City Attorney.

17
18 Ms. Silver: Yes, the words “at this time” are not required. They also can be added if you want to
19 give sort of the indication to the public that you would be willing to reconsider this at a
20 different point in time.

21
22 Board Member Bernstein: I don’t think the words need to be used.

23
24 FRIENDLY AMENDMENT NOT ACCEPTED

25
26 Board Member Bower: I would say as second, as a second to this Motion that wouldn’t be
27 acceptable to me then, that language just for the reasons you just stated. I don’t accept that as
28 a Friendly Amendment.

29
30 Chair Kohler: Go ahead Martin you’re (interrupted)

31
32 Board Member Bernstein: And the reason I will be supporting that, I will be supporting this
33 Motion and the photograph again that Chris brought I think it just really makes it very clear the
34 before and after. It clarifies it for me very clearly. Thank you.

35
36 Chair Kohler: Any other discussions? Beth.

37
38 Board Member Bunnenberg: And I respectfully disagree. I feel that (interrupted)

39
40 Chair Kohler: You need to talk into the microphone.

41
42 Board Member Bunnenberg: I respectfully disagree because I feel that without that wording it
43 would give the sense that we’ve closed the door.

44
45 Chair Kohler: I don’t think that closes the door on anything. It can always come up again. Yeah,
46 there’s no limit on, we’ve had people come by over the years. There was one fella that came in

1 here about every six months at one point. And so I don't see a hindrance in that. Any other
2 discussions? There's been a Motion to accept the staff's recommendation that this proposal be
3 denied. Is that one way to say it or?
4

5 Ms. French: I think the Motion's been stated as agreed to the clarification.
6

7 Chair Kohler: Margaret has stated. All those in favor say, wait, what?
8

9 Board Member Bernstein: No it's not necessary, it's been stated. It's already [unintelligible]
10

11 VOTE
12

13 Chair Kohler: [Unintelligible] record. All those in favor say aye (Aye). Opposed?
14

15 Board Member Bunnenberg: No.
16

17 Chair Kohler: That passes then by a count of five to one. Thank you very much everybody and
18 we'll move forward here.
19

20 SUBSTITUTE MOTION PASSED (5-1-1, Board Member DiCicco absent)
21



October 14, 2014

City of Palo Alto
Attn: Mrs. Amy French
250 Hamilton Avenue
5th Floor City Hall
Palo Alto, CA 94301

RE: Historic Resource Evaluation Peer Review
Middlefield Ball Park, 3672 Middlefield Road
Palo Alto, CA

INTRODUCTION:

The City of Palo Alto has contracted with M-Group to perform a Peer Review of the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared by EBI Consulting for the Middlefield Ball Park, located at 3672 Middlefield Road in Palo Alto, California.

M-Group's peer review of the HRE for Middlefield Ball Park included consideration of whether the evaluation followed standard industry practice to inform methodology and whether appropriate sources of data, records, and documentation were utilized to fully capture available information necessary for an informed and comprehensive evaluation. M-Group verified information and considered the validity of conclusions and resulting determination of significance for the Middlefield Ball Park site. M-Group also performed limited supplementary research in those areas we believe warranted further consideration. As a supplementary task M-Group was asked to evaluate the Ball Park under the Local Register Criteria; the evaluation is located at the end of the report.

The following memorandum describes the findings of our review which are organized to follow the progression of the EBI Report to promote ease of reference. M-Group's review concludes with a summary of findings.

METHODOLOGY:

M-Group performed a systematic review of the Historic Resource Evaluation prepared for the Middlefield Ball Park, 3672 Middlefield Road, Palo Alto by EBI Consulting on July 9, 2014. M-Group's review focused on the adequacy of research and soundness of conclusions drawn by the author. Additional information necessary to supplement the existing report and verify findings was obtained from Palo Alto Historical Society, Little League Baseball online resources and review of correspondence drafted by the Palo Alto Little League Board of Directors. The review was supported by a site visit performed by M-Group staff on October 10, 2014.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

National and State Eligibility Criteria

The National Register of Historic Places, maintained by the National Park Service, serves as the master inventory of historic resources important in the history, architectural history, archaeology, engineering and culture of the United States at the national, state and local levels. A historic resource can be a building, structure, object, site or district that is 50 years or older or is of an age where sufficient time has passed necessary to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events or individuals associated with the resource. Historic resources are considered eligible if they meet at least one of the following criteria as listed under column one (1) in the table below.

The California Register of Historic Resources

The California Register of Historic Resources is administered by the State Historical Resources Commission. The California Register encourages recognition of the State’s historical resources and provides a modicum of protection under the California Environmental Quality Act. Buildings, structures, objects, sites and districts are eligible for listing on the register. For properties to be eligible for listing on the register they must have reached 50 years a sufficient amount of time must have passed necessary to obtain a scholarly perspective on the events of individuals associated with the resource. To be listed, a property must display significance at the local, state, or national level under one or more or more of the following criterion listed under column two (2) in the table below:

NATIONAL REGISTER	CALIFORNIA REGISTER	SIGNIFICANCE CRITERION
Criterion A	Criterion 1	Associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history.
Criterion B	Criterion 2	Associated with the lives of persons significant in our past.
Criterion C	Criterion 3	Displays distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, work of a master, high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction.
Criterion D	Criterion 4	Yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Local Eligibility Criteria

The Palo Alto municipal code 16.69.040 outlines criteria for listing on the City’s Local Register as:

Criterion 1	The structure or site is identified with the lives of historic people or with important events in the city, state or nation;
Criterion 2	The structure or site is particularly representative of an architectural style or way of life important to the city, state or nation;
Criterion 3	The structure or site is an example of a type of building which was once common, but is now rare;

Criterion 4	The structure or site is connected with a business or use which was once common, but is now rare;
Criterion 5	The architect or building was important
Criterion 6	The structure or site contains elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship.

Historic Resources deemed to be significant must also be able to convey their historic significance. The ability to do this is judged by how well the resource meets the seven aspects of integrity: Location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association. To retain integrity it is often agreed that a property should meet *most* of the seven aspects. However, the individual nature of the property and its particular significance may result in certain aspects holding more weight than others. The typical test for integrity is whether a historical contemporary would recognize the property as it exists today.

PEER REVIEW

The following review evaluates the content and conclusions of each section of the HRE completed by EBI.

P3a.Resource Description: The resource description provides a thorough description of how the site exists today, but provides very little information as to the original design of the Ball Park. M-Group recommends adding a thorough description of how the site appeared in 1952 in order to provide a more robust understanding of how changes discussed in subsequent sections impact the site. Historic images and aerial photos would be valuable to supplement the best resource for setting the historic context of the resource.

P4.Resources Present: The HRE characterizes Middlefield Ballpark as a structure. However, upon review, M- Group recommends that a more appropriate characterization of the Ball Park would be as a “site or district” based on the fact that it is a designed landscape comprised of various elements that when taken together imbue the site with its significance. A historic designed landscape, which falls under the category of “site or district ” for the purposes of listing on the National or California Register is defined as “a landscape that was consciously designed or laid out by a landscape architect, master gardener, architect, or horticulturist according to design principles, or an amateur gardener working in a recognized style or tradition. Examples include: estate grounds; botanical and zoological parks; church yards and cemeteries; campus and institutional grounds; fair and exhibition grounds, parks (local, state and national) and campgrounds, and parkways, drives and trails.” This definition is a more appropriate classification for the Little League Ball Park than “structure” which refers to functional constructions made for purposes other than creating human shelter.

By characterizing the resource as simply a “structure”, the evaluation remains overly simplified and narrow in scope and the understanding of character defining features may be skewed. Typically components of a designed landscape (or site, or district) should be considered in terms of their relationship to the totality of the landscape. The components of the Ball Park, including the field, dugout, bleachers, concession stand, spatial organization, viewshed, materials, orientation, and configuration are all arranged in such a way that individually, they lack meaning, but together they are reflective of a Little League Ball park. Therefore, we suggest reconsidering what type of resource the Middlefield Ball Park is characterized as.

B5.Architectural Style: The discussion of the architectural style appears adequate.

B6.Construction History: The construction timeline would benefit from a more detailed discussion. While the construction history seems to provide a thorough description of the more recent alterations (c.2004) the description of the original design, materials and configuration is lacking such that, as a reader it is difficult to discern what the original park looked like and what was the original design intent of the architect. An expanded description either under “property description” or “construction history” would be prudent in order to understand how the original design was or was not altered by subsequent changes and additions. Furthermore, there is little discussion of whether or not materials were replaced in kind. While it can be assumed that the replacement materials were of modern origin it is difficult to discern the extent to which those material changes altered the site. For instance, how different is the new scoreboard from the old? Is it in the same location? Was there always a chain link fence around the site or was that a recent addition? An expanded discussion is recommended for this section.

In a letter composed by the Palo Alto Little League president, Kristen Foss, on behalf of the Palo Alto Little League Board the president outlines the following known changes that have taken place since the Ball Parks construction in 1952:

- replacing walls and all flooring on first and second level of clubhouse
- replacing wooden bleachers for modern metal bleachers
- the addition of modern lighting along the outfield fence line
- the replacement of one flag pole for three modern flag poles
- the addition of batting cages
- the addition of bull pens and backstops along the right and left field lines
- the replacement of cubby holes in dugouts that had previously replaced the originals
- the replacement of a natural pitching mound for a modern, artificial mound
- the replacement of the scoreboard (replaced at least twice since the 1950s)
- Reconfiguration of first level of clubhouse to meet city health requirements and the needs of the snack shack, including the addition of a doorway and serving window
- New windows on backside of clubhouse facing Middlefield Road
- Replacement of windows facing ball field with metal screens
- Replacement of backstop that extends along first and third base lines
- Parking lot resurfaced
- Complete replacement of dugouts
- Replacement of fencing for chain link fencing
- Addition of picnic tables and BBQs placed beyond Center Field
- Placement of foul line poles

A greater level of consultation with the Palo Alto Little League Board would provide a higher level of accuracy and understanding of the sites evolution over time needed to make an informed evaluation of integrity.

B10.Period of Significance: The period of significance identified by the author appears to be justified as it includes the Ball Park's initial construction and takes into account the continued use of the site as was originally intended.

B10.Historic Context (labeled as Significance in HRE): The evaluation prepared by EBI provides an abbreviated context. The context, while it provides a good general overview, does not provide the detail needed to thoroughly consider potentially historic Little League ball parks. There is little information related to the relevancy of the site being modeled after Stanford's sunken diamond field. The report states that it is only nominally similar because the sunken diamond at Middlefield Ball Park is only 3-4 feet below grade, however no further information as to the depth of the Stanford sunken diamond is provided. It is also unclear as to what the relevancy of this comparison is —are sunken diamonds common or relatively rare?

There is also little information provided related to the architecture and design of the stadium and its components. An expanded discussion of the sites relative importance would be helpful. With little context of how the Ball Park does or does not compare to other Little League Ball Parks of that time it is not possible to discern whether it is a good example of a type, or, rather typical and not of elevated significance. As mentioned above, the absence of a discussion of the original design of the Ball Park makes it difficult to establish a baseline through which to consider alterations that have taken place over the past 62 years.

Integrity: The author of the HRE evaluated the property against the seven aspects of integrity inclusive of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. The HRE notes that the Ball Park retains integrity of location, feeling and association as it has not moved, continues to be used a Little League Ball Park, and its configuration has not changed so substantially that it has lost its associative value. However, the evaluation concludes that the site no longer retains integrity of design, materials or workmanship largely as a result of the renovations that took place in 2004.

The HRE finds that the Ball Parks character defining features are the baseball diamond, fencing, dugout, pitcher's mound, bleachers, flagpoles, scoreboard and snack bar/office building. Historical records and buildings permits consulted during the evaluation indicate that the following alterations were performed on or after 2004: wood bleachers replaced with aluminum bleachers; pitcher's mound replaced with synthetic mound; replacement of flagpoles with new flagpoles; replacement of original scoreboard with new scoreboard; replacement of chain link fence. The HRE concludes that based on the alterations performed during the 2004 renovation, the Ball Park no longer retains sufficient integrity with which to convey its significance.

M-Group Evaluation:

M-group ultimately agrees with EBI's conclusion that the site does not retain sufficient integrity to communicate significance. However, the path that led us to that conclusion is slightly different than the methodology outlined in the EBI HRE. The EBI evaluation emphasizes the importance of the original materials and when considering character defining features (essential features) does not identify the spatial organization, topography, site design, architectural design, or viewshed as character defining features such that their alteration or reconfiguration would constitute a significant impact to integrity.

As a Little League Ball Park that is defined because it adheres to those design requirements prescribed by the National Little League Organization M-Group believes that more emphasis should have been placed on the design and spatial organization and less on materials— which while important, are perhaps not the most important elements needed to convey the site’s significance. Despite the different methodology, M-Group did reach similar conclusions as EBI Consulting. See M-Group’s evaluation of integrity below.

1. Location: M-Group staff agrees that as the site remains in the same historic geographical position it retains integrity of location.
2. Design: Design refers to the organization of space, proportion, scale, technology, ornamentation and materials used. Design is reflective of function, technology and aesthetic trends of a respective time period. In order for integrity of design to be retained the resource should retain the original structural systems, massing, spatial arrangement, texture and color of materials, detailing and arrangement and type of vegetation or, at the least, a majority of those elements. It is understood that since 1952, the Baseball Park has undergone alterations that include slight changes to the configuration and topography of the field, introduction of chain link fencing, expansion of the backstop, and replacement of materials in addition to those outlined in the letter from the Palo Alto Little League President (see above). The cumulative impact of all of these changes has resulted in a loss of integrity. Had the changes been limited to replacement of some materials, it is not expected that the site would see a complete loss of integrity but these changes, taken together, have altered the original design intent to such an extent that the integrity was lost.
3. Setting: Setting refers to the character of the place in which the property played its historical role. Setting often reflects the basic physical conditions under which a property was built and the functions it was intended to serve. Like many other Little League Ball Parks, the Middlefield Ball Park was built in a suburban environment and intended to serve the surrounding community. While development has continued to increase and the adjacent neighborhoods have become denser the overall setting of suburban land uses of single family homes and associated uses continues. Since the basic land uses and environment has not significantly departed from what it was in 1951, the property retains integrity of setting
4. Material: Materials are the physical elements that were combined in a particular pattern or configuration to form a historic property. The choice and combination of materials reveal the preferences of those who created the property and indicate the availability of particular types of materials and technologies. In order to retain integrity a property should retain the key exterior materials dating to the period of significance. The importance of materials may vary by resource type. For instance, it is M-Group’s opinion that as a designed landscape, the “essential elements” or “character defining features” include design, spatial organization, and association; the importance of materials is secondary. Nevertheless, loss of historic materials does have a deleterious effect on the sites ability to convey its significance. The renovation of the Ball Park that took place in 2004 changed many of the historic materials, and according to the letter from the President of the Palo Alto Little League, many changes preceding 2004 did the same. The

many material replacements undertaken, including the replacement of bleachers with aluminum bleachers, replacement of the pitcher's mound with synthetic mound and replacement of the scoreboard removed "key" exterior materials and therefore, the site does not retain integrity of materials.

5. **Workmanship:** Workmanship is important because it can furnish evidence of the technology of a craft, illustrate the aesthetic principles of a historic or prehistoric period, and reveal individual, local, regional, or national applications of both technological practices and aesthetic principles. The sunken diamond, in addition to the structural and architectural components of the site, all reflect workmanship. However, as stated above, the cumulative effect of alterations to the design and materials and the introduction of unoriginal features have impacted the site to the extent that the aesthetic principles portrayed by the original workmanship are not easily interpreted in the present day. Therefore, the site does not appear to retain integrity of workmanship.
6. **Feeling:** Feeling is a property's expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time. It results from the presence of physical features that, taken together, convey the property's historic character. The introduction of new materials and site elements, extension of the chain link fence, extension of batters cage, replacement of bleachers have substantially altered the feeling of the site. The new amenities and introduction/ expansion of fencing in addition to the other site alterations identified by the Palo Alto Little League have altered the property to such an extent that it no longer strongly conveys the feeling of a 1950s Little League Ball Park as it would have during its earlier iteration. The property lacks integrity of feeling.
7. **Association:** Association is the direct link between an important historic event or person and a historic property. A property retains association if it is the place where the event or activity occurred and is sufficiently intact to convey that relationship to an observer. The ballpark continues to serve as a Little League Ball Park and gathering place and therefore retains integrity of association.

M-Groups Finding of Integrity:

A property that has lost some historic materials or details can be eligible if it retains the majority of the features that illustrate its style in terms of the massing, spatial relationships, proportion, pattern of windows and doors, texture of materials, and ornamentation. However, because the site no longer retains the majority of essential features that characterized the site including the original design, spatial arrangement, topography, original small scale features, and materials, it can be concluded that the site does not retain overall integrity. Therefore, M-Group concurs with EBI's conclusion that the site does not retain integrity.

National Register Eligibility/ California Register Eligibility

Criterion A/1: *Contribution to broad patterns of history/ associated with the broad patterns or with events that have made a significant contribution to the local or regional history or the cultural heritage of California.*

The HRE acknowledges that the Ball Park was constructed at a time when Little League baseball was growing in popularity. However, it is noted that the Middlefield Little League Ball Park is not the oldest Little League Ball Park in the United States or California and therefore concluded that the property does not meet the eligibility criteria to be significant under Criterion A of the National Register or Criterion 1 of the California Register.

M-Group's evaluation:

To determine whether a potential resource is in fact eligible under NR Criterion A or California Register Criterion A, the property must not only have an obvious nexus to broad patterns of history, but must also show one or more of the following: it is one of the first of its type, it is of a model that influenced other properties; it is of a design that introduced a new concept; or it is distinctive from other similar types. The reasoning outlined in the EBI report highlights the fact that this property, as valuable as it may be to the community, is not so distinct such that it is eligible under Criterion A/1. The Ball Park was not the first Little League Ball Park, did not clearly influence other properties, and did not introduce a new concept. Therefore, M-group staff concurs with the findings that the Middlefield Ball Park is ineligible under Criterion 1/A

Criterion B/2: *Association with a person important in National History or associated with the lives of persons important to local, state, or national history.*

The HRE finds that no important persons were associated with the baseball to such an extent as to deem it significant based on that association. The ballpark was deemed not eligible under Criterion B of the National Register and Criterion 2 of the California Register

M-Group Evaluation:

M-Group staff concurs with the HRE finding that no important figure exhibited such a strong association connection with the site so as to deem it significant under Criterion B/2. Staff agrees that visitation to the site by important figures does not constitute a strong association.

Criterion C/3: *Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, method of construction or style of architecture, or represents the works of a master or represents a distinguishable entity under whose components have individual distinction.*

The significance evaluation indicates that the Ball Park is of utilitarian design and conforms to the measures prescribed by the National Little League Association as the bases are located approximately 60 feet apart and the distance from home plate to the pitcher's mound is approximately 46 feet. It is noted that the Ball Park was designed by Morgan Steadman and inspired by Stanford's Sunken Diamond Field. Today it appears that the field is approximately 3-4 feet below grade which clearly gives a nod to the Stanford Sunken Diamond Stadium, but the extent to which it is sunken makes it appear not to be an

exact replica. It is further noted that the Middlefield Ball Park is not the only Little League ball field incorporating this design element as the Henry J Lamade Stadium in Pennsylvania also incorporated this measure into the design of the stadium.

M-Group Evaluation:

M-Group concurs with EBI's finding that the property is not eligible for listing on the National or California Register based on architectural merit. It is agreed that while the site embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, due to the many alterations, it does not serve as an especially good example of its type relative to other examples. Furthermore, we concur that the architect, while notable for his work on residential architecture in California, is not well-known for his recreational architecture or landscape design so as to be considered a master. M-Group concurs with the HRE's conclusion that the site is not eligible under NR Criterion C or CR Criterion 3.

Criterion D/4

The HRE concludes that "the building" or site, is not expected to yield information important to prehistory or history. The HRE notes that in order for a potential resource to be considered eligible under Criterion D/4 it must be shown that they "are, or must have been, the principal sources of information." It is concluded that such a statement does not apply to the site in question.

M-Group Evaluation:

M-Group concurs that the above conclusion is correct in assuming that the Middlefield Baseball Park does not exhibit significance based on its ability to yield information. The support for this conclusion is not readily discussed in the HRE, however, it can be discerned that this is based on the fact that there are so many like examples; the Middlefield Ball Park is not singular in its ability to tell the story of Little League Baseball. M-Group therefore, concurs with the conclusion drawn in the HRE.

Local Register Criteria:

The original HRE did not consider the Baseball Park against the Local Criteria as described in the Palo Alto Municipal Code 16.69.040. Per the City's request M-Group has performed an abbreviated evaluation of the resource under the Local Register Criteria. For those items where the intent of the criterion is essentially the same as those listed under the National Register and California Register the discussion may reference the earlier discussion to avoid redundancy. Please find the evaluation below:

1. The structure or site is identified with the lives of historic people or with important events in the city, state or nation.

It is understood that the site has played host to professional baseball players including Ty Cobb. However, the mere fact that an important figure visited the site and/or attended an event on site would not qualify the site a historic resource based on the fleeting association it had with an important figure. To qualify as significant under this criterion it would have to be shown that there was a stronger nexus between an important figure and the site. The Middlefield Ball Park does not appear to be eligible under Criterion 1.

2. The structure or site is particularly representative of an architectural style or way of life important to the city, state or nation.

The Middlefield Ball Park as mentioned earlier is representative of a Little League ball field. Records indicate that in 1952 when the ball field was constructed there were approximately 1500 other Little League Ball Parks constructed at the same time. On a larger scale, the baseball park is not unique and not particularly representative of a style or way of life on a national or regional scale. Locally, the Ball Park could be considered representative of an architectural style or way of life important to the City had it not been for the cumulative loss of integrity resulting from the alterations made over the previous 64 years. Based on the lack of integrity, the site does not appear to be eligible under Criterion 2.

3. The structure or site is an example of a type of building which was once common, but is now rare.

The Little League Ball Park is not a rare example of a type based on the fact that it is very similar to approximately 6500 other Little League Ball Parks located throughout the United States. The site does not appear eligible under Criterion 3.

4. The structure or site is connected with business or use which was once common but is now rare.

Little League baseball remains a thriving recreational pursuit and would not be considered rare. The property is not considered significant under Criterion 4.

5. The architect or building was important.

The architect, while notable for his work on residential architecture in California, is not well-known for his recreational architecture or landscape design so as to be considered a master. It does not appear that the site is eligible based on its association with Morgan Stedman.

6. The structure or site contains elements demonstrating outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials or craftsmanship.

The Site adheres to the measures prescribed by the Little League organization and does not exhibit outstanding attention to architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship. Further, the site lacks sufficient integrity to convey original attention to detail, design etc. The site does not appear eligible under Criterion 6.

For the reasons stated above, M-Group finds that the Middle Field Ball Park is not eligible for listing on the Local Register of Historic Resources.

Conclusion

M-Group concurs with EBI Consulting's findings that the Middlefield Ball Park does not meet the eligibility criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Places. Arguably, the Middlefield Ball Park is associated with broad patterns of National, State and local history as a manifestation of the growth of Little League Baseball. However, this in and of itself does not mean that the property is eligible for listing on the National or State register. It must further be determined that the property is one of the first of its type; of a design that influenced other like developments (ball parks); of a design that introduced a new concept; and/or distinctive from other similar types. The Middlefield Ball Park, while associated with the growth of little league baseball, does

not exhibit singular importance relative to the other ball parks dating to that period and therefore is found to be ineligible for listing on either the NRHP or CRHR. Furthermore, review of the site against the Local Designation Criteria indicate that, of the 6 criteria, the most applicable criterion would be number 2, which requires that the site be particularly representative of an architectural style or way of life important to the city, state or nation. While it could be argued that the site is eligible based on its importance to the local way of life, the site does not retain sufficient integrity at this point to be considered under this criterion due to the cumulative loss of integrity.

M-Group is in agreement with EBI's findings that the Ball Park no longer retains sufficient integrity through which to convey its significance. The extent of alteration that has taken place since initial construction in 1951 has significantly degraded the level of integrity. The basic test for integrity is whether a historical contemporary would recognize the property as it exists today. Based on the alterations to existing site components and introduction of new site features including the chain link fence, expanded dugout, and bleachers amongst others, it is not expected that someone familiar with the site in 1951 would be able to easily recognize the property in the present. Therefore, M-Group agrees with EBI's finding that the Middle Field Ball Park is not eligible for listing on the National or California Register. M-Groups supplementary review further indicates that the property is not eligible for listing on the Local Register as it fails to retain sufficient integrity necessary to communicate its significance.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

M-Group concurs with the conclusions drawn by EBI Consulting, but has the following concerns related to the evaluation:

- The characterization of the resource as a structure is incorrect as it should be considered a district or site.
- The evaluation does not clearly state the "essential elements" of the property which are necessary to inform the significance evaluation
- The evaluation does not adequately describe the site as it initially existed which makes it difficult to discern how subsequent alterations may or may not have impacted the integrity.
- The significance discussion should precede the integrity discussion as a finding of significance will determine the most important aspects of integrity as they relate to the property and will generally inform the integrity discussion.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns related to the review.

Sincerely,

Lilly Bianco, MHP

M-Group | Preservation Specialist

1303 Jefferson St. Suite 100-B

Napa, California 94559

P: 707-259-1790

SOURCES REFERENCED

Phone Conversation with Steve Saiger of Palo Alto Historical Society, October 9, 2014.

Letter from Kristin Foss, President, Palo Alto Little League on behalf of the Palo Alto Little Board to Palo Alto Historic Resources Board, October 2014.

Little League Baseball.2014. <http://www.littleleague.org/learn/about/historyandmission.htm>. Accessed October 10, 2014.

"Oh Mom! Can I go out to play ball?" SF Chronicle Sporting Green, June 6, 1953, page 6H.

Appendix A. Site Photos



Figure 1 Clubhouse/ Concession Stand viewed from east



Figure 2 Clubhouse Concession Stand viewed from North



Figure 3 Field viewed from south



Figure 4 Bleachers viewed from southeast



Figure 5 Dugout viewed from southeast



Figure 6 Image showing site topography "sunken field"



Figure 7 View of field as seen from east bleachers



Figure 8 View as seen from western bleachers



Figure 9 Signage located on Clubhouse