



Historic Preservation Board
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Tuesday, February 24, 2021 | 5:00 PM
Zoom Meeting

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Historic Preservation Board meeting of February 24, 2021, was called to order 5:30 p.m. (30 minutes late on account of a City Hall evacuation), via Zoom, by Chair Foulkes, and the following proceedings were had to wit.

ROLL CALL

HPB Members Present:

Michael Foulkes, Chair
Todd Walter, Vice Chair
Susan Blake
Laura Taylor Moore (arrived during Item 3)

HPB Members Absent

None

Staff Members Present:

Daniel Fama, Senior Planner
Corinne Shinn, Recording Secretary

AGENDA MODIFICATIONS OR POSTPONEMENTS

None

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Minutes of January 27, 2021.

Motion: Upon motion of Member Blake, seconded by Member Walter, the Historic Preservation Board approved the minutes of the meeting of January 27, 2021. (3-0-1; Member Moore was absent for this vote)

ORAL REQUESTS

None

BOARD AND STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chair Foulkes asked if there were any Board or Staff Announcements.

Member Blake:

- Advised that she had promoted the Historic App on Nextdoor and has received positive responses as well as having seen people walking around using it.
- Reported that she had inspected and cleaned all of the historic plaques and found all to be in good order.

2. 1940/1980 Hamilton Avenue – Application Materials *(Informational Only)*

The City has received an application for a Conditional Use Permit to relocate the Folk Victorian-style structure located at 1940 Hamilton Avenue to the neighboring property.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Reported that staff had previously included a report on the Victorian House being relocated off of 1940 Hamilton Avenue.
- Advised that this structure will be moved onto the adjacent church property. The application for that action has been submitted.

Member Blake:

- Stated that she was very pleased with this outcome.
- Pointed out that this structure is a part of the history of our city.
- Added that this action represents a good example of adaptive reuse. Well done.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Reported that staff had found a brass plaque inscribed for the Gilman House, which is at the corner of Grant Avenue and North First Street.
- Reminded that the building is occupied by a chiropractic office. He took the plaque and gave it to the chiropractor/property owner. It has since been installed.

Member Blake reported that she saw that it had been installed.

Chair Foulkes said he was glad they were able to use it.

Member Blake:

- Said that there is a lot of history on that house being moved from 1940 Hamilton to the neighboring property at 1980 Hamilton.
- Stated that the area used to be known as the Hamilton District.
- Advised that Member Moore has a lot of researched information.

Chair Foulkes asked staff what the potential is to update the Historic App with refreshed information as well as additional content. Could that topic be added to an HPB agenda?

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Reported to the Board that he has provided the two priority items of the HPB, including refreshing the app, to the Community Development Director who in turn will forward it on to the City Manager.
- Advised that it is up to the City Council to decide the work plan priorities for the City.

Member Blake said she spoke with Mayor Gibbons on Tuesday (February 23rd) and understands that there are considerable problems with the City's budget due to the Covid-19 pandemic.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. 20 Alice Avenue – Modification of an Historic Resource Alteration Permit *(Resolution/Roll Call Vote)*

Public Hearing to consider the application of Michele Babb for a Modification (PLN-2021-23) to a previously approved Tier 1 Historic Resource Alteration Permit (PLN-2020-12) to allow removal of existing siding to be replaced with stucco and/or use of stucco for an approved 800 square-foot rear addition to an Alice Avenue Historic District property commonly known as the Mary Fablinger House, located **at 20 Alice Avenue**. Staff is recommending that this project be deemed Categorically Exempt under CEQA.

Planner Daniel Fama provided the staff report as follows:

- Advised that this applicant is seeking a Modification to a previously approved Tier 1 Historic Resource Alteration Permit, approved by HPB last year.
- Added that this addition is located at the rear of the property, along the existing building line as applicable within the guidelines.
- Reminded that the plans reviewed and approved showed siding that is wider for use on the addition than the siding the original portion of the house has in place. That difference is required to clearly delineate the addition from the original house.
- Reported that he had conducted a site visit where the applicant asked to be able to go from siding to stucco for the whole building, original and addition.
- Pointed out that this project must comply with the City's Historic Guidelines as well as the requirements of the Secretary of the Interior.
- Informed the Board that staff cannot make the findings to support this request and recommends denial.
- Added that he has provided a resolution for denial, but in order to give the Board some flexibility should they choose to go a different route and allow some form of modification, he has also provided an alternate resolution for approval.
- Explained that the applicant wants to insulate her house. That is one reason for this requested change.
- Reported that another option for this owner to consider would be to remove the siding, install the insulation, then return the original siding to the original parts of the house.
- Concluded that staff's recommendation remains denial.

Chair Foulkes said he hadn't realized that there were several resolution options.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, 20 Alice Avenue:

- Advised that she had previously submitted a letter listing her reasons for wanting to go with stucco rather than siding.
- Reported that her contractor suggested stucco over keeping the existing siding.
- Advised that her heating and cooling bills are about \$400 per month and that's for an 800 square foot home.
- Added that her contractor recommended the use of stucco on top of the existing siding to create additional insulation that should help improve heating and cooling efficiency.
- Reiterated that the siding would not be removed but rather would have a stucco layer installed on top of the siding.
- Stated that her second alternative is to go completely with stucco. That would involve removing all siding.
- Said that blown-in insulation costs tens-of-thousands of dollars.
- Added that the installation of blown-in insulation could result in damage to the interiors.
- Pointed out that she has kept the vintage features of the interior.
- Admitted that she is also worried about electrical and/or plumbing impacts resulting from the installation of blown in insulation. That could result in significant impact to the existing home.
- Reported that this house is located next to Winchester Boulevard. Next to the salon.
- Added that you can see her house from Winchester.
- Advised that the only wood siding found for this project is double wide and thicker than the original siding. It is double the size of the existing panel.
- Opined that use of siding that different would create an eyesore.
- Said another option might be custom siding but that would result in substantial costs.
- Admitted that she didn't know that the siding needed wouldn't be found. She didn't anticipate that problem.
- Added that this is the first residential addition she has ever done let alone on a 1939-era home.
- Stated that when she bought this home it had no insulation, appliances, furnace or air-conditioning in place. She also had to redo the electrical.
- Reported that for the last year and a half, they have not been living in the original portion of the house. They are a couple with four children currently living in a two-bedroom, one bath home.
- Stated the need for no additional delays or expense.
- Pointed out that she intends to keep the outside appearance the same including the shutters and the awning at the front of the house.
- Stated that covering the existing wood siding with stucco will help to increase energy efficiency and reduce heating and cooling costs for the home.
- Asked the Board to consider her request and her rationale for her requested change to the approved plan.
- Reminded that this project started in September 2019.

James McKenny:

- Stated that Alice is a beautiful street.
- Pointed out that there are a lot of stucco homes along Alice.

- Said that it would not be out of line for the street to allow them to use stucco on this home for the reasons stated.

Chair Foulkes:

- Stated the Board's appreciation for their explanation.
- Reported for the record that Board Member Moore has joined the meeting.
- Asked the Board if there are any questions for the applicant.

Member Blake:

- Stated that she cannot support replaced the original wood siding with stucco.
- Added that she can offer a potential solution to these owners.
- Reported that she too has a historic house with the same type of siding. She can advise them that there could be insulation installed that doesn't involve removing any of the original siding or damaging interior walls. Her home was built in the 1870's and she was able to successfully use that insulation.
- Explained that that holes are drilled into the siding in between the studs. Once the insulation is blown in, the holes are sealed up and are invisible.
- Added that the material used is blue jean material. It's installation significantly reduced noise from street traffic as heard from within her home.
- Identified her insulation contractor as Universal Insulation & Building, a Campbell company located on Dell Avenue.
- Stated that she is happy to talk to the owners about it and hopes they may find this a helpful solution.
- Assured that this process could save time, money, and the original appearance of the house itself.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, 20 Alice Avenue:

- Said the information is helpful.
- Added that another option is to have custom siding created for the addition that better compliments the original siding while still being different from it.

Member Blake reiterated the need to keep the existing original siding.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, 20 Alice Avenue:

- Reminded that the addition is 800 square feet and the siding found by her contractor is both wider and thicker than the original.
- Opined that it will look weird.
- Concluded that if they are required to go with costly custom siding, they have cost concerns.

Member Blake asked if they couldn't find a siding that is a little smaller than the original instead for the addition.

James McKenny said that what they have shown to the Board this evening is what their contractor has told them he could find for this project.

Member Walter:

- Stated he could not support replacing the existing original siding with stucco on this historic home.
- Pointed out that the other houses on Alice that are stucco where built with stucco and not changed later.
- Questioned the contractor's inability to locate siding material to better compliment the original siding of the home.
- Stressed that the Board does not want the siding for the addition to "match" the home exactly. Rather it needs to look different so as to clearly demonstrate what is the addition and what is the original home.
- Asked if the siding found is 12-inch width.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, said it is 8-inch width.

Planner Daniel Fama explained that the hand in the photo holding a piece of the sample siding up against the original front siding is his.

Member Walter asked if the sample is one panel with a groove or two panels abutting.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, displayed the panel sample to the Board.

James McKenny said it has a groove. It is one panel made to look like two panels.

Member Walter suggested one wide panel instead or try to find a panel that is smaller than the original siding for use on the addition.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, asked the Board if they would want it that different.

Member Walter:

- Reiterated that this is a historic home.
- Stressed that the Board doesn't want the addition to "match" the original exactly.
- Added that the intent of that difference is to have the addition look different but complimentary to the original home.
- Concluded that stucco would change the appearance of the entire home and addition.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, 20 Alice Avenue:

- Stated that under the historic rationale, she has done all that she could to keep her house.
- Admitted that she is embarrassed by the appearance difference between her home and others in the immediate neighborhood.

James McKenny:

- Pointed out that the house next door is a more modern looking home.
- Stated that it doesn't seem to be the original build.

Member Moore:

- Said she too has an old house with wide-board siding.

- Advised that she has found those boards at Economy Lumber when needed.
- Admitted she is surprised that the contractor didn't find anything closer.
- Concluded it is probably fine. Besides, who would even see it as the addition is at the back.

Member Blake added that the property is gated for privacy.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, said you can see the addition over the fence and from Winchester. This siding sample represents a significant difference from original siding and would look odd together on the same house.

Member Walter:

- Reiterated that the blown insulation requires very small holes be drilled into siding. Those holes are patched up after and won't be seen.
- Pointed out that a switch to stucco is a three-step process that accordingly takes longer to install.
- Advised that he is an architect. Stucco can experience settling resulting in cracking.
- Stated that use of blown insulation to achieve energy efficiency for this original portion of the home is a better solution. It will provide sound control and other advantages while retaining the home's original appearance.

Chair Foulkes closed the Public Hearing for Item 3.

Chair Foulkes asked if there is any further discussion by the Board.

Member Walter said he had nothing to add.

Member Blake said the same.

Member Moore asked Michele Babb why not find other material.

Michele Babb said that perhaps she could use some form of paneling in a material other than wood. She would prefer a different type of siding to match and not to be an eyesore.

Member Moore asked Member Walter what would be complimentary.

Member Walter:

- Replied, wood. He added that there are other types of wood siding available that don't have to be custom made so as to be cost effective.
- Advised he is not a big fan of stucco. While it can go on easy, it can look like a box with windows on it.
- Added stucco doesn't look very charming.
- Reiterated that the difference in materials, per the Secretary of the Interior, is that the addition to a historic structure should use materials that are complimentary but not the exact same size and shape to differentiate the addition from the original home.

Chair Foulkes:

- Stated his appreciation for Member Blake's recommendation for blown in insulation.
- Said he has had that done to a house he owns. It was a one-day job. It is actually more cost effective.
- Advised that this contractor may not be too familiar with material sourcing.
- Reported that he has two 1800's era homes.
- Supported the use of cost-effective board siding to require less labor.
- Reiterated that the addition cannot match the original house exactly. It must be complimentary but not perfectly matched.
- Reminded that when this Board originally approved this modification that requirement was discussed.

Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, said she may need to revisit materials with her contractor.

Chair Foulkes:

- Pointed out that some good solutions have been provided by the Board that would help this project to fulfill the guidelines for adding to a historic home.
- Added that the Board is sensitive to the costs of maintaining older historic homes.
- Stated that alternatives recommended would be both cost effective and quick to accomplish.
- Said he also owns a stucco home. It needs repair every couple of years because the stucco cracks. A wood sided house lasts for decades with paint as needed.
- Said he can appreciate Ms. Babb's time and the issues she has been going through to get this project completed for her family. The Board has offered solutions that may be better and cheaper. Some contractors may not be familiar with older historic homes.

Member Blake told Michele Babb, Applicant and Property Owner, that she is welcome to contact her regarding blown insulation.

Motion: Upon motion of Member Walter, seconded by Member Blake, the Historic Preservation Board adopted Resolution No. 2021-01 denying a requested Modification (PLN-2021-23) to a previously approved Tier 1 Historic Resource Alteration Permit (PLN-2020-12) to allow removal of existing siding to be replaced with stucco and/or use of stucco for an approved 800 square-foot rear addition to an Alice Avenue Historic District property commonly known as the Mary Fablinger House on property located at 20 Alice Avenue, after the HPB provided the applicant with a number of affordable material referrals that could help manage costs while keeping the existing siding on the old portion of the house and find an appropriate but differently sized siding for the exterior of the new addition, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Blake, Foulkes, Moore, and Walter

NOES: None

ABSENT: None

Abstain: None

OLD BUSINESS

4. Mills Act *ad hoc* Subcommittee Report and Program Update Discussion

The Subcommittee will provide a monthly update of its activities to the Board.

- Draft Mills Act FAQs
- Suggested Mills Act Additions
- Suggestions for a Revised List of Conditions for Approval

Member Walter:

- Pointed out that three documents from the Subcommittee have been provided including a draft FAQ, primary categories and suggested Mills Act additions.

Member Blake:

- Discussed the Draft FAQs.
- Pointed out that Member Walter's additions appear in italics.
- Listed out the questions from the draft.
 - Who may apply?
 - What is HRI?
 - How can a property owner get their property on the HRI?
 - What are the benefits of a Mills Act Contract?
 - How can an applicant find out how much in tax savings they will receive with a Mills Act Contract? (*Member Walter suggested this item be delayed for later as further calculations are required*)
 - When does a property owner apply for a Mills Act Contract? (the subcommittee is thinking once or twice per year)
 - How long does a Mills Act Contract last? (*the subcommittee is recommending two tiers*).

Chair Foulkes agreed that a couple of times per year is better than one at a time. That would create more competition/applications for properties that are the worthiest of a Mills Act Contract.

Planner Daniel Fama said that term-limited Mills Act Contracts can be accommodated by staff in terms of monitoring any imposed deadlines.

Member Blake said the intent of issuing Mills Act Contracts is to help save the HRI inventory in City of Campbell. It's not just 10 years.

Chair Foulkes:

- Stated that there are so few Mills Act Contracts, it is important to save as many HRI properties as possible by strategically issuing these contracts. We want to save more houses.
- Said that there may be more Mills Act Contracts issued for one-time huge expenses such as a shake shingle roof that is quite costly to meet modern safety regulations for wood-shake shingle roofs.

- Added that it doesn't seem logical to have a Mills Act Contract held just for routine maintenance that all homeowners must do as property owners.

Member Moore:

- Stated that there is no need for a limit.
- Pointed out that there are not many more potentials left.
- Reiterated the need to save our HRI inventory.
- Pointed out that she has changed the roof on her historic home.
- Added that she will likely have to do so again.
- Admitted that it is only thanks to Proposition 13 that she can do so, or she would need a Mills Act Contract herself.

Member Walter said the qualified uses of a Mills Act Contract, be it for a roof versus routine maintenance, leads to the question, "Who gets it?"

Member Moore:

- Said that the maintenance of an historic home is on-going.
- Stated it is constant.
- Added it is a multitude of projects.

Member Blake said another FAQ is whether there are any drawbacks to a Mills Act Contract?

Member Moore suggested that the State's Mills Act Contract person be invited to come to Campbell once a year.

Member Blake said she has a contact in Sacramento who has indicated a willingness to come down to Campbell.

Member Moore suggested that someone come from Sacramento once a year to conduct meeting(s) with Campbell's holders of Mills Act Contracts. At those meetings, the contract holders can share resources and contacts with one another.

Member Blake read the next FAQ which is, "What is the cost to apply for a Mills Act Contract? (She added that the current application fee is \$1,500).

Member Walter agreed that \$1,500 is the current fee but the Subcommittee has not decided yet if it would remain that or change.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Reported that a comprehensive fee analysis for all of the City's application types was done.
- Advised that the process of determining fees is to take into consideration the resources required to perform the service(s). That includes staff time and cost.

Member Walter suggested perhaps not including a specific amount on the FAQ but rather suggest those interested check with the City.

Chair Foulkes:

- Stated he wants the FAQs to get people excited about applying for a Mills Act Contract.
- Added the FAQs should include the fee.

Member Blake:

- The next FAQ question, what work would be qualified?
 - Asked if additions should be qualified under the Mills Act Contract. (No)
 - What about solar? (No)
 - Stressed the need to clarify what qualifies. Is it mostly various exterior maintenance and replacement?
- The next FAQ question, how is the Mills Act Contract monitored?
 - There are yearly reports due to the City and to the County Tax Assessor.
- Asked Chair Foulkes if that is enough information.

Chair Foulkes responded yes.

Member Walter said that the FAQs draft is not final. He asked if there are any additional questions to add to the FAQs.

There were none offered.

Member Walter:

- Said the next item for review and feedback is the Suggested Revised Conditions of Approval.
- Said that there are two primary categories:
 - Structural Integrity
 - Exterior Architectural Integrity
- Added that the specifics of what is included in secondary category/ies
 - Heating and air conditioning
 - Protected trees

Chair Foulkes advised that he pays as much for maintenance of the heritage trees as building maintenance.

Planner Daniel Fama said that if the Ordinance included landscaping that might be possible, but it doesn't. Tree maintenance is too far outside maintenance of the structure itself.

Member Moore recounted how a 200-year-old Laurel tree was butchered. It was a travesty.

Member Walter agreed that right now landscaping is not included.

Member Moore said she is looking at heritage trees only.

Member Walter said that per the Secretary of the Interior, trees might be considered if they are constituting life-safety-security concerns. It would be on a case-by-case basis.

Member Moore agreed that some properties are unique and could be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Member Walter said that all properties are unique and can be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Member Walter:

- Listed the suggested Mills Act Contract additions as follows:
 - Fees – yes
 - Application Deadline – twice per year
 - FAQ (just went over)
 - Contract Duration (limited duration, sunset date, continued)
 - HRI – yes
 - Approval Process – yes, to include a pre-submittal inspection.
 - Approval
 - Maintenance Plan
 - Priority Consideration
 - Oversight – yes, pre inspection, annual documentation, five years as minimum contract
 - What Covered? Add heritage trees if there are life-safety issues
 - Interior Report? If selected, but not before.
 - Maximum Number of Contracts – Defer to the City Council
 - Pre-Application Workshop? Not necessary.
 - Electronic Submittal? Yes
 - Checklist
 - Attachments
 - Potential Costs and Savings
- Said that further work is required in calculating the tax saving benefits of a Mills Act Contract.
- Stated that the question remaining now is, “Do we move forward and work up each section?”
- Perhaps that question needs to be reviewed with Council and/or legal Counsel.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said that in the broader context, work on the Mills Act Contract needs to go forward to the City Council for consideration when establishing the next Work Plan.
- Added there still needs to be an audit completed using the existing materials secured for the existing contracts.
- Stated with that financial research completed, we can go to Council with an update on the Mills Act program. At that time HPB can seek authorization to create a more comprehensive Mills Act Contract.
- Cautioned that right now, the Council is busy with budgetary issues and planning.

Member Blake asked staff when the work plan items are finalized.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said that work plans are a part of the budget process so perhaps by May.
- Reported that Director Paul Kermoyan is retiring on April 1st. The recruitment for candidates for that position ended on Friday, February 19th. The new director will have a say in this process.

Member Walter asked if the Board should put this on hold and come back to do audit review.

Planner Daniel Fama agreed that the audit review is the holdup.

Chair Foulkes said it will be complicated to unwind that information. It would be good for Planner Fama to have help with that.

Member Walter:

- Said the Subcommittee would update the docs with the feedback from tonight's meeting.
- Stated that after that, the Subcommittee could turn to the audit and determine how they can help staff with that.
- Concluded that they will follow Daniel's lead on how they can best help him on the way.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said that creating a standardized format would benefit in creating an excel sheet for each property including dates and costs for specific expenses.
- Added that research can include looking at permit records to determine cost for any work done that required permits.
- Stated that the next big step would be site inspections. They had been previously anticipated, but Covid-19 put a stop to that task.

Member Walter:

- Pointed out that Yvonne Kendall's application packet was well done. We can look at that.
- Offered to help develop the excel spreadsheet on that property and then we can use that for reviewing other houses.
- Added that he would volunteer to set up the spreadsheet with the help of his CPA brother.

Member Blake:

- Reported that one of the four homes she was assigned for is on Catalpa.
- Advised that she assisted that property owner with putting together his financial report for his Mills Act Contract.
- Stated that paperwork was well done as well.
- Added that she did a walk-thru of that home.

Planner Daniel Fama asked if she had taken any pictures during the tour of the Catalpa home.

Member Blake replied no, it would have been overstepping to do so. She assured that she has no doubts with what she saw during her tour of that home.

Member Walter:

- Said that the City can ask for photos since we currently cannot do on-site inspections.
- Stated those pictures would be most helpful.
- Advised he would email a excel format that will include the topics wanted in spreadsheet format.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said that offer sounds good.
- Reported that we currently have two pending Mills Act applications.
 - 51 Alice Ave – submitted and fees paid
 - 73 S. First St – originally submitted and withdrawn. Recently resubmitted with fee payment pending.
- Stated that reviewing those two applications will have to review under the context of what we have in place today.
- Added that the Board is not bound by past decisions in evaluating these two new applications.
- Asked for Subcommittee assistance in reviewing the application materials as he is not an expert on historic structures.

Both Member Blake and Walter agreed to provide that assistance.

Chair Foulkes:

- Pointed out that Los Angeles County has “teeth” in their Mills Act Ordinance.
- Stated that there can be penalties (12 ½ percent) of the tax benefit if the contract is not met.

Member Walter said that provision is already in the contract.

Member Blake stated that if a property has Proposition 13, they don’t need a Mills Act Contract.

Chair Foulkes agreed that there is no benefit for a Mills Act Contract for a property that already has Proposition 13.

Member Walter pointed out that Proposition 13 is still in effect.

Planner Daniel Fama added that after 10 to 15 years, a Mills Act Contract is no longer helpful or valuable to the holder.

Chair Foulkes thanked the Mills Act ad hoc Subcommittee members for their work. It was a lot of work and we’ve made great progress.

Member Moore suggested an historic plaque for the Zaring-Hamilton structure with the history research gathered included. Kerry with the Campbell Historical Museum would like information included there as well.

Member Blake said she wants to know when the Victorian structure will be moved from its lot onto the adjacent church property. She wants to watch that house move.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 7:24 p.m. to the next Regular Historic Preservation Board meeting scheduled for **March 24, 2021**, at 5:00 PM, using Zoom.

PREPARED BY: _____
Corinne Shinn, Recording Secretary

APPROVED BY: _____
Michael Foulkes, Chair

ATTEST: _____
Daniel Fama, HPB Staff Liaison