



# HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD MEETING

## MINUTES: June 22, 2023

Council Chamber & Virtual Zoom  
8:30 A.M.

### Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Chair Alisa Eagleston-Cieslewicz; Vice Chair Samantha Rohman; Board Members Gogo Heinrich, Christian Pease, Caroline Willis and Margaret Wimmer

Absent: Board Member Michael Makinen [planned absence]

### Public Comment

### Agenda Changes, Additions and Deletions

### City Official Reports

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

Ms. French noted that the July meetings of the 13<sup>th</sup> and the 27<sup>th</sup> will be cancelled. The retreat is planned for Friday evening, the 28<sup>th</sup>, to be held in the Community Meeting Room at 5:00. Dinner will be provided for the Board members. Agenda items will begin promptly at 5:30. The public will be welcome to offer oral communications. Ms. French shared that Board Member Makinen will be trying to attend the retreat. This date and time was agreeable to the Board members.

#### 2. Discussion and Refinement of Topics for HRB Retreat

Ms. French posted the previously-discussed suggestions for retreat topics. She added that an initial draft on the inventory update process was received the previous day. The four potential retreat topics previously discussed included status of the inventory update; Mills Act Program; updates to the review process Bulletin; and outreach. Regarding the Inventory Update, completion is planned for 2023. Starting in September there will be meetings which will involve this project, working towards getting cover letters together, and a fall community meeting. Of the 167 properties checked, 14 properties have been found to be demolished and two were altered enough to result in a loss of integrity and are no longer eligible. The remaining 147 properties were found to retain historic significance and integrity and their eligibility for listing. The HRB will be discussing categories for the Local Inventory and nominations and discussions with property owners.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited comments from the Board members.

Board Member Willis remarked that she is disturbed that inventory update discussions include only the property surveys from 2000. She felt it needed to be expanded to look at the last 20 years and to look at the original inventory to bring it in line with what they are hoping to accomplish going forward when adding properties to the inventory. She felt there is potential for misunderstanding if the assignment of categories in the original is not aligned with what they are looking at in the new properties. If new properties are being looked at as 1's and 2's, she said they should look at 3's and 4's in the existing inventory, many of which are more than 100 years old. She advocated for setting a timeframe or a plan for updating the current inventory in three ways. One, adding properties that have already been surveyed. Another is looking again at current inventory. She would also like to in see investigation into how to get this information online and more accessible. She felt they should look at properties that have become eligible in the last 23 years

since the previous survey was done. She hoped they could get a clearer grip on their work plan at the retreat and noted that these items are all critical to having a current historic inventory.

Board Member Wimmer commented that they were also going to look at their public outreach efforts and discuss the data collected in the first meeting.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz agreed they should discuss takeaways from the community meeting and how to use those communications going forward and how to better work with the community in talking about historic structures.

Board Member Willis wondered if they should invite someone from the PAST Board or the Historical Society, people that might be able to help them with public outreach.

Board Member Rohman agreed that they could bring resources in to help, and it would be important to partner with them going forward. She said she is doing an assessment of current outreach materials and suggested that they should talk about the previous public meeting in April and propose methods for community outreach, including partnering with PAST. From a subcommittee point of view she is not ready to engage with those partners until there is a plan or proposal for going forward; however, this is what she hopes to do once they have a clearer plan.

Board Member Heinrich proposed meeting with PAST after the retreat and said she is happy to reach out to them since she is on their Board as well.

Board Member Rohman noted that one of the things she hopes to learn at the retreat is which Board Members have contacts with which resources in order to corral all of their resources.

Board Member Heinrich thought they needed to engage the real estate community since they seem to be providing misinformation to owners. She said each time she's gone to an open house for an older home, they tell people that they are making sure the home is not on the historic register, and everyone is happy about this.

Board Member Rohman said this topic was discussed at the pre-meeting on Monday, about engaging the real estate community in responsible ways as much as possible. She noted that is fantastic that Ms. French had been invited to speak to them. She suggested perhaps tapping Lydia [Council Member Kou] to get her help and thoughts on partnering better with that community.

Ms. French responded to this, stating that she will be speaking to SLVAR, Silicon Valley Association of Realtors. She welcomed anyone who would like to partner with her in presenting to them. She said they have a large part in communicating to buyers and need to have more accurate information to share with them.

Board Member Rohman was interested in partnering with Ms. French in presenting and stated that there is a real estate company out of L.A., a historically-minded agency that has great ideas, examples, resources. She would be happy to reach out to them as well in planning a presentation.

Board Member Willis said that she was willing to do some pre-work and organize information on the total picture of the inventory update, aside from the most recent survey.

Board Member Wimmer was willing to do some work on the Mills Act prior to the retreat.

Board Member Rohman said she would have some slides and an informal presentation to guide the discussion and invited anyone else to prepare something as well. She asked if there would be a screen available.

Ms. French responded that there were two big screens to share PowerPoints, et cetera.

Board Member Rohman noted that the updates to the Review Process Bulletin go along with outreach since it is community-facing.

Board Member Willis advocated for a general discussion of the meetings and noted, for example, she would like to hold the meetings to the Community Room as it seems like it would be a better venue.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz said she would appreciate some discussion about generalities, such as meeting time. She has wondered if incorporating evening meetings more frequently might engage members of the

community who aren't able to come during regular business hours, and would welcome some discussion to explore whether this might be desirable or feasible. She also wondered about having a certain amount of time devoted to an "open session," of people sharing ideas that may not fit well with the formal discussion topics.

### **Study Session**

#### **3. Study Session to Discuss Existing Permit Review Processes for Historic Resources Related to the Palo Alto Municipal Code and Comprehensive Plan Policies**

Ms. French presented the 2016 Bulletin, which was originally approved by the Historic Resources Board. It was published, and in December of 2017, the City Council adopted the Comprehensive Plan Update, which included a number of Historic Preservation policies, including Policy L7.2, which has been the reason, since 2018, that they have been individually assessing properties in which demolition is planned or a property is being sold. Staff has been involved in evaluating such properties based on Policy L7.2. The Bulletin became out of date and has not been updated, and it was withdrawn from the webpage due to some inaccuracies in it. Currently, as the Inventory Update is in progress, it is a good time to look at the policy and make some changes. Initially the conclusion was that there were Group A and Group B types of projects for review based on what needed to be reviewed and by what method.

Group A resources included Category 1's and 2's based on the Ordinance. Category 1's and 2's and Categories 3's and 4's in the Downtown, located in Historic Districts, Professorville or Ramona Street, not including the Eichler Districts. Group A resources would need to be reviewed pursuant to Secretary of the Interior standards. This includes discretionary applications such as individual review, two-story home review, variances, home improvements exceptions, et cetera, and architectural review if not a single-family home. If there are impacts from non-minor alterations that are not compatible with SOIS, then the application is referred to the HRB for review and comment. Ms. French shared the process of review. The planner reviews a property for consistency. If it is inconsistent or exceeds the scope of minor alteration, then it is referred to the HRB. Previous discussion involved the definition of minor and major alterations. There are FAQs on the webpage which answer these questions, such as when they need review by the HRB, or not.

Group B resources are listed as Categories 3 and 4, located outside of the Downtown and Professorville. Some are listed on the National and State registers. One question is whether there are some listed there that are not on the inventory. There are also those that have been listed as eligible. These are the 165 found eligible that were not covered by the Ordinance. The current project is to place them on the formal Local Inventory.

Ms. French shared the question of when to do the historic resource evaluations. This is something new since the Comprehensive Plan became based on Policy L7.2. Evaluations are not done for interested buyers, only for property owners, who have to pay for the evaluation, and staff deals directly with the consultant. Once a property is determined California Register eligible, it is then considered a Group B resource. If it is not determined eligible it is taken off of the system and it is not considered a resource.

The question of what minor changes are is one of the FAQs on the webpage. The webpages were updated during the time when there was a qualified professional on staff, Emily Vance, and they have not been changed since then. Ms. French said this is a gray area – the extent to which a historic resource can be modified and still call it minor versus major. There is the activity of reviewing for Secretary of the Interior standards compliance. On-call consultants are used to help staff make these determinations.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited public comment on Ms. French's presentation.

Dennis Backlund addressed the Board, stating that he was the Historic Preservation Planner for the Planning Department from 2000 to 2014. He said he did the staff report for all of the projects and concluded the reports by presenting to the Historic Resources Board recommended findings on how the details of the project, particularly any changes to be made to the property, complied with the Secretary of the Interior standards. Mr. Backlund said he was always concerned to be fully detailed on exactly why something did or did not comply with the standards so that the Board would be assisted in knowing how to proceed with the project. Mr. Backlund referenced a meeting held on May 14, 2020. The subject was proposed changes to one of Palo Alto's most important and dramatic historic resources, the President Hotel on University

Avenue. This was the largest building, the largest design, ever done by iconic architect, Birge Clark. The building has survived more or less intact. Mr. Backlund said that the HRB, when conducting the meeting May 14, 2020, did very good things. Board Member Wimmer brought up the question of preserving the historic tile at the base of the building which he believes was instrumental in getting it preserved because the applicant was thinking of replacing all of it to make it match the sidewalk. Mr. Backlund said that Birge Clark presented variety rather than uniformity. He said that he has been grateful to Board Member Wimmer for preservation of the tile. He presented a booklet to be given to the Board. One page has a picture of the President Hotel with the most dramatic historic feature on the façade, the upper balcony. It is stained a brown stained wood. The applicant had proposed to change that, yet it was in original condition. According to the Secretary's standards a historic feature that has not been altered should not be changed. There was a moment in the meeting when something occurred, when the applicant said that they proposed to enhance the stained brown balcony by painting it a shade of black, which was a major change. This was never painted. The applicant decided since the brand color of their company, AJ Capitol, is navy blue that they would like to stamp their brand color on the President. They proposed navy blue for all wood elements on the building. It was brought back to a Board subcommittee, and it was approved. Mr. Backlund stated that the final motion by the HRB was that the changes were found to be compliant with the Secretary's standards. There was no comment in the motion on how the project and changes being made complied with the standards, simply the statement that they did. There was never any comment when the applicant stated they wanted to change the colors. Mr. Backlund's recommendation for Board processes is that first it is clearly identified what style is being dealt with, and what the character-defining features are. That style is gone from the Hotel, and he received comments from a number people who were disappointed and felt that it was no longer truly a Spanish Colonial Revival building. He recommended that the Board discuss how to prevent something like this from happening again.

Board Member Willis expressed that it was nice to see him and thanked him for his comments.

Board Member Wimmer acknowledged Mr. Backlund and all his years of time and effort. She said he was missed in the Chamber, along with his knowledge and the tremendous job he did on the Board. She missed his stories and remembrance of history. Regarding the project that he referenced, she thought that the review had gone, though she personally had a problem with changing the colors. She remembered meeting the applicant onsite and not liking the color scheme at all and that more appropriate colors were recommended. She remembered Board Member Heinrich recommending that they keep the color mahogany. The applicant did not listen to their advice because they are a discretionary board and can't mandate that their recommendations be followed. Board Member Wimmer said this is a problem for the Board. Since they are discretionary, she wondered how can they be impactful enough that applicants will follow their recommendations, since they cannot legally enforce them. She agreed that they should discuss ways in which the Board can be more impactful. She recalled that the subcommittee had met the applicant onsite and there was no documentation of the discussion or minutes recorded.

With no other comments to be heard, Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz moved on to discussion of the Bulletin.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz initiated discussion of revisions to the Bulletin. She felt it would be important to include some language about the Eichler Historic Districts, since they fall into an interesting category unto themselves.

Ms. French commented on the two Eichler Districts. One, the Green Meadow District, has a single-story overlay zoning on it, which they do not see the individual review discretionary process for the entire large district. Discretionary review projects do not come through the City. Projects that require someone's approval on following the Guidelines and making findings is the one way they have access to talk with people about historic preservation and the Eichler Guidelines. They can talk with people at the building permit process, but that process is a ministerial process, and they cannot put conditions on them. As long as they meet the zoning development standards, such as height, setback, et cetera, they can be approved at a building permit level.

Ms. French said staff is helped in the Green Meadow area because they have Architectural Control Committee with a couple of architects that people are supposed to talk with when they plan to change their home or build a new home. She said the Green Gables Eichler District, which is a National Register District, does not have a similar committee so there has been some erosion there, more so than in Green Meadow.

She remarked that the Eichler District has contributors and non-contributors. Contributors are those that really make it a historic district and add significance. This is also true in Professorville. There are many Eichler tracts in Palo Alto, with 2,500 Eichler homes – the largest concentration anywhere. But there are only two historic districts. For the rest of them, use of the Eichler Guidelines is encouraged but there isn't a special level of protection.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if there is a special level of protection for a contributor within an Eichler District as things are currently written.

Ms. French responded that this is correct because people are not coming through with discretionary permits, and there is not a lot of protection for the homes if there is no discretionary review.

Board Member Willis asked if the Eichler Districts are considered Group A or Group B.

Ms. French replied that the two historic Eichler Districts are considered Group B. This group is listed on the National Register.

Board Member Willis asked about the wording, "located in one of the city's locally designated historic districts."

Ms. French clarified that it is not locally designated.

Board Member Willis thought this was too subtle for some. She wondered about moving "listed on the National Register of Historic Places," to refer to Category A.

Ms. French thought it would come down to evaluating each home individually. She suggested putting this topic on the retreat agenda to discuss further.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz noted that there seem to be some misalignments between Local District designations and National Register designations, and there are some Eichler neighborhoods that are National Register designated but not locally designated. There is also the inverse of that in Professorville, where some properties are on the Local Register but are not within the boundaries of the National District.

Ms. French responded that there are two sections of Professorville, one on the National Register and one on the Local District.

Board Member Willis asked what kind of information they should have before having a discussion on this.

Ms. French said the only information they have for the two National Districts are the nomination forms which are not highly detailed. They were prepared by volunteers as opposed to a City effort.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if the specific boundaries of the districts are available somewhere.

Ms. French thought that they probably were, and she will check on it.

Board Member Willis felt that at a minimum when talking about Group B resources they should distinguish between properties on the National Register individually and districts on the National Register, as it does not read well as it currently is. She thought if they just identified National Register Districts it would be clearer because it is highly unlikely that there are National Register properties that aren't on their Inventory. She felt that individual properties that are on the National Register should definitely be Group A and that they then should distinguish between the districts and the individual properties.

Board Member Rohman asked if changes they made to the Bulletin would have to be approved by the City Council.

Ms. French responded that the City Council did not approve the document. It was approved for the HRB for staff use and for the public, so to the extent that there are changes that would make a change to the ordinance then it would have to be through proposed changes to the City's Historic Ordinance. The Bulletin has to be accurate with respect to the Code, Chapter 16.49 of the Municipal Code. It can offer advice and guidance as well, based on the Eichler and Professorville Guidelines, best practices, but it cannot depart from what the Code allows.

Board Member Rohman asked if the Group A and Group B designations are part of the Code or not.

Ms. French said this was conceived of to help steer people into which review process to go into based on other factors.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz stated that the purpose of the Bulletin is to explain the rules to someone who might like to make an alteration.

Board Member Willis suggested mimicking the language in Group A, "Located in the City's locally-designated historic districts – Professorville or Ramona Street – and Group B, where it says, "Nationally registered historic districts," and identify Green Meadows and Green Gables.

Ms. French drafted these changes and noted there would be additional changes that would have to happen along with that, because of Professorville having both Local and National Registry, but Board Member Willis' suggested changes were doable.

Board Member Willis felt if Green Meadows and Green Gables are identified as Nationally Registered Historic Districts it would be clear.

Ms. French commented that this is the type of work that needs to be done to improve the Bulletin. In its current form it is too generic and does not capture the precision that is needed.

Board Member Rohman noted a discrepancy in the Bulletin noted on packet page 15. Historic categories are listed as Category 1, 2, 3 or 4. Category 1 is exceptional. Category 2 is major; 3 or 4 are contributing. But in bullet C, Historic District, the last sentence says that "all structures and sites within a historic district are categorized as significant on the Historic Inventory." But in categories 1, 2, 3 and 4, "significant" is not a category.

Ms. French pointed to packet page 16 where it says, the definition of "significant building," item F, means "any building, group of buildings or site categorized on the Historic Inventory as number 1 or 2, and all structures within historic districts."

Board Member Willis said this is another problem with "historic districts." She assumed this pre-dated having a local district and the "historic districts" refer to Professorville and Downtown, not Green Meadows and Green Gables. Therefore, an ordinance update is needed.

Board Member Rohman commented that it is very confusing and if she were trying to figure it out as a member of the public, it would be a mess.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz thought the confusion was because there are National Registered districts that are not on the local inventory. Then, outside of the Bulletin there's the separate question of whether aligning the districts locally and nationally makes sense, but that seems to be beyond the scope of what the Bulletin is actually able to cover currently.

Ms. French thought there was a need to take a look at the Eichler Guidelines in concert because there is a bit of preamble there that could be drawn from because it was a professional study prepared by Page and Turnbull.

Board Member Willis reiterated her opinion that the ordinance itself is out of date, not just the Bulletin, when historic districts are addressed, but not local or national.

Ms. French said the Historic Ordinance has not been updated since it was written other than perhaps some changes in the 70's which was an effort to update it in concert with the last survey. One of the goals in the HRB's work plan and in the Comprehensive Plan is to review the Historic Preservation Ordinance for its effectiveness. It is on their work plan to study the Historic Ordinance and see if it is effective and their discussion was indicating that it is not effective.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz said it also seems like the ordinance in general leans quite heavily on CEQA as the root through which properties are identified.

Board Member Rohman said she noticed this as well, that CEQA seems to be the forcing function so that review arises when people decide they want to demolish a property, which is a little backward.

Ms. French thought it relates to past demolitions in Professorville where there had to be an EIR, which is what drove getting the Process Bulletin together as guidelines for staff, to address what to do when there's

a CEQA impact. She agreed that the Bulletin is focused on whether staff has discretion or not and how to tease out where to send people. She acknowledged that is confusing for everyone.

Board Member Pease commented that the objective of the Bulletin when it was written was to provide a key for various points of view to follow a path and determine the historic context of a property. He asked if that was for more than one audience. Was it for owner/applicants? Builders? The real estate people who are conveying information? He wanted to understand who all of the audience were. He said there was obviously a lot of effort put in to make the document compact and more consumable, but based on comments and his own experience, it actually has the reverse effect because it puts the onus on the presumably low understanding reader to work through all of the threads.

Ms. French responded that the intent was to have a concise, relatively easy document for anyone to look at and know what to do, because it identified which group they were in.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz said it is better than having to sift through the Code on your own. Having an updated Bulletin available to people is a useful thing, but if the underlying ordinance is confusing it limits what the Bulletin can do.

Board Member Rohman said she didn't find a lot of glaring problems except for the National Register versus Local Register points with the document on pages 12 and 13. She thought this was fairly straightforward. As a member of the public you would identify which group you are in, then go to the flow chart to see what that means for you. She thought it was more the actual ordinance that is confusing and out of date. She wanted to clarify that when talking about the Bulletin they're referring to packet pages 12 and 13. She asked where the Historic Preservation Ordinance, Chapter 16.49, is available to the public.

Ms. French noted that it is online and in the Development Center.

Board Member Rohman asked if the Bulletin information is based off of the Historic Preservation Ordinance.

Ms. French said this is correct.

Board Member Willis asked about page 18, referring to timelines being made within 20 days of receipt of the proposal.

Ms. French replied that this page is referring to when someone wants to designate their site.

Board Member Willis said there are also other short-term timelines included. Item 2, "within 20 days of receipt of the proposal," she wondered if this has fallen by the wayside. She felt there was enough to make a case for updating the ordinance to be functional.

Ms. French noted, the reference to Item 2, when they are in the process of being designated and they are proposing to modify the structure is when the 20 days is relevant. They don't have that situation in her experience because people do not come forward to say they want to designate their property.

Board Member Willis wondered if this might ever happen if they added the additional 140-some properties.

Ms. French said that after the community meeting and outreach and hearing from the property owners themselves, they can check to see if there are permits on file for them and have conversations with them. The HRB can then nominate and provide recommendations to Council, and Council makes the decision.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz thought in theory that section could be triggered by the current inventory project depending on what is already in the pipeline for some of the properties.

Ms. French said once there comes a proposal for designation that is not just the consultant's report. It is when the HRB makes a nomination and recommends to City Council. If there is also a realization that there is a project underway that is going to significantly impact the resource, then that particular property would be sent to the Council within 20 days presumably.

Board Member Willis questioned the statement, packet page 17, Section 4, "This inventory is maintained in the Department of Planning, Community Environment," and asked what kind of state their inventory is in, what their maintenance level is.

Ms. French said they have binders that they maintain in their physical spaces which are available if anyone asks. There is also the system that has the Parcel Report so that people can independently online query an

address and it will inform them as to which category the property is, whether it is found eligible, potentially eligible, et cetera.

Board Member Willis noted that the original inventory is not online except for a list of those properties.

Ms. French said the inventory list of addresses is online and a link to PAST, which maintains color pictures and individual pages that have the entire contents of the inventory form.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz invited additional comments about the Bulletin. She summarized that there are two sets of thoughts, one about the Bulletin itself and its clarity and also a question of how well the ordinance is working. Some of those things are outside of the scope of the Bulletin as it is written.

Board Member Rohman pointed to packet page 10, has the ordinance been updated since it was put into place? It says the current version of it is from 1980, so it's probably due for an update. She doesn't find as much problem with the Bulletin itself as with the Ordinance itself.

Ms. French noted on page 11, there was a paragraph about the last time an attempt was made to update the ordinance. There was an interim ordinance that was in effect at the same time as the survey, then there was a proposal for a permanent change to the ordinance that seemed to be changing the key piece. In the current ordinance, it is permitted to designate properties without the consent of the owner; whereas, in this ordinance back around 1998 it indicated that only the property owner could nominate a home to the Register. This is a big difference that bears discussing. Right now they are in a process in which the HRB could nominate and the owner could refuse, and it is up to the Council to decide.

Board Member Willis asked if there is information on the last recommendations for the ordinance update.

Ms. French said she has not found or sent the report that had a recommendation for changes. She found the discussion about what happened with the proposed update in a staff file describing that time period. She offered to hunt and find out more about the draft ordinance.

Board Member Willis advocated for finding these proposals as a starting point for them to look at modifying the ordinance.

Board Member Pease felt there was instability and that ordinances do not change very rapidly, and they have to work with what they have. He said a key and an explanation works for most people. He suggested it would be good for buyers, real estate agents and others to at least pinpoint what area they are in in a simple way and go and find the basic information to narrow down the amount of work they have to do get to where they have questions and can get responses to them. It would be helpful if information like that could be handed out by real estate agents. If you're in a historic district where there's inconsistencies, what are they? It would narrow down the anxiety level and the lack of clarity and facilitate things a little more quickly.

Board Member Wimmer commented that just because they have an online parcel report system which tells things like if you're in a flood zone, establishes your FAR, your lot coverage, etc., it does also have a line about whether the property is historic or not. Perhaps that is where some of this information could be included. For each property it could say, "You're a Category A resource."

Ms. French agreed that it does tell which category the property is in and says "deemed eligible" if it is one of the 165, and it does say "potentially eligible" if it appeared on a windshield survey from 1998 and did not go any further.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if the data states if a property is found to be ineligible.

Ms. French responded that it will say, "found ineligible" when Page and Turnbull recently did a study. Reports of "found ineligible" are not brought to the HRB every time because people are making decisions about buying a property. However, every year in the CLG report a list of "found eligible" or "found ineligible" is included.

Board Member Wimmer noted that they do at least have a safety net in terms of people being able to look up a property if they know they're on a potential list, so it is really up to the buyer or the current homeowner to further investigate what that means for their specific and unique property.



Board Member Pease asked if that is the best, most robust, most up-to-date, and accessible source to figure this out if someone has the parcel number.

Ms. French said it is the source that people who are either owners, buyers or realtors can go in and find out if they can add any square footage, what is the square footage, what is the site size, is it in a flood zone, is it historic?

Board Member Pease said he didn't want to have more than one Bulletin, but it seemed like if there was just a two-page instruction about how to do that it would help people figure out more quickly whether they have any issue.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz suggested that perhaps the Bulletin could point people to the resource where they could look up their home. "If you would like to look up your property, please go to..."

Board Member Pease said especially if they had a very simple pointer to it with the steps of what to look for and a summary of what it might mean. Not providing specific property information but giving people the context that they want.

Board Member Rohman pointed out that the top of the Bulletin does say, "For information on the specific property, please review the parcel report." She agreed that that was a good place for realtors and homeowners to begin. She said the parcel report should not be foreign to anyone in real estate. So when realtors act surprised, she wonders if they did the research.

Ms. French stated that the most common question she gets is from a realtor or a buyer asking, "What does this mean, potentially eligible?" so they've opened up the parcel report, seen that it's potentially eligible and they want to know what that means. The Bulletin, which was done before the Comprehensive Plan change, potentially eligible properties were just gone, basically. Now there is something that they have because of the Comprehensive Plan policy to study those.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz asked if she sees the Bulletin as something that might be helpful to just send to people if it includes a discussion of potentially eligible, since that's what people see on the parcel report,

Ms. French said yes, they have an email that they have to write. The email can be something that talks about the 7.2 policy that requires that they study this if they're thinking of demolishing it, and this is the process. They ask their consultant to give an estimate of time and cost. They prepare an invoice and send it to the property owner, and then they come back and pay, or not.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz said it sounded like they have suggested a few modifications to the Bulletin and she wondered if staff could create draft.

Ms. French said her intent was to bring to the retreat a report and strike and underline suggestions for the Board to discuss one by one. She felt they would probably not spend a lot of time on the Bulletin, because of the large number of items for the retreat.

### **Approval of Minutes**

4. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of May 11, 2023.

Motion by Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz to approve the May 11, 2023 minutes as corrected. Seconded by Board Member Pease, the motion carried, (5-0-1).

5. Approval of Historic Resources Board Draft Minutes of May 25, 2023

Motion by Board Member Willis to approve the minutes of the May 25, 2023. Seconded by Board Member Heinrich, the motion carried unanimously.

### **Board Member Questions, Comments, Announcements or Future Meetings and Agendas**

Board Member Heinrich reported that there was no PAST meeting in June. There will be a meeting in July. The walking tours will resume in the fall.

Board Member Willis asked if staff would put together an agenda for the retreat, or if they needed any help putting together an agenda.

Ms. French responded that it will be what was posted with the changes.

Board Member Willis asked that the page be emailed to the Board Members so that they can focus on their presentation pieces.

Ms. French said it will be published with the packet for July 28<sup>th</sup>, and she will send the slide prepared today, modified as discussed. She invited Board Members to send her any comments individually.

Board Member Pease wondered if they could allocate time to the items since there are quite a few of them.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz thought that was a good idea.

Board Member Willis wondered if they should talk about it briefly.

Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz advocated taking a guess at it before circulating the agenda.

Ms. French asked that they email her individually with any comments, ideas or concerns after the slide is circulated.

Board Member Willis asked that Ms. French send out the ordinance proposal when she finds it.

### **Adjournment**

Motion by Chair Eagleston-Cieslewicz to adjourn. Seconded by Board Member Willis, the motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 a.m.