



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

CALL TO ORDER

The Regular Historic Preservation Board meeting of March 24, 2021, was called to order 5:00 p.m., 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

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 February 24, 2021.

Motion: Upon motion of Member Blake, seconded by Member Walter, the Historic Preservation Board approved the minutes of the meeting of February 24, 2021. (4-0)

ORAL REQUESTS

None

BOARD AND STAFF ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

Member Blake:

- Advised that the Campbell Historical Museum has asked her for copies of her stories on historic structures in Campbell to be digitized and archived.

NEW BUSINESS

2. **Certified Local Government Annual Report** (*Resolution/Roll Call Vote*): Review and approve the 2019-2020 Certified Local Government Annual Report.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Reported that the Board is asked to review the 2019-2020 Certified Local Government annual Report for approval and submission to the State to meet Campbell’s CLG reporting obligation.

Member Blake asked if the HPB survey done on the 4C’s neighborhood is applicable to be reported as a survey.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Advised that the time frame for this annual report is based on a federal calendar schedule.
- Added that reporting the survey prepared by HPB on the 4C’s neighborhood was captured in a previous submittal.

Motion: Upon motion of Vice Chair Walter, seconded by Member Blake, the Historic Preservation Board adopted Resolution 2021-03, authorizing the 2019-2020 Certified Local Government Annual Report to be submitted to the State, by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Blake, Foulkes, Moore, and Walter
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
Abstain: None

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. **119 Alice Avenue – Tier 1 Historic Resource Alteration Permit** (*Resolution/Roll Call Vote*)

Public Hearing to consider the application of Tony Rowe for a Tier 1 Historic Resource Alteration Permit (PLN-2020-17) to allow the construction of an approximately 989 square-foot addition, 884 square-foot basement expansion, and the removal of 254 square-feet from a detached accessory structure to an Alice Avenue Historic District property commonly known as the Robert/Holmes House, located at **119 Alice Avenue** in the R-1-6-H (Single-family Residential / Historic Overlay) Combining Zoning District. Staff is recommending that this project be

deemed Categorically Exempt under CEQA. *Project Planner: Stephen Rose, Senior Planner*

Planner Stephen Rose provided the staff report as follows:

- Advised that the subject property at 119 Alice Avenue is 13,275 square feet and zoned R-1-6. The home, known as the Robert Holmes House, is located within the Alice Avenue Historic District.
- Said that the original house has had a few additions over the year including the addition of a kitchen and porch in the 1950's and another addition/remodel in 2006.
- Stated that the applicant's request is for a 989 square foot addition, a new 884 square foot basement, and removal of 254 square feet from a detached structure on site.
- Reported that a third-party historic assessment was prepared by Mark Sandoval.
- Listed four points that staff suggests HPB consider in its review and decision for this property.
 1. Should new lapboard siding be better differentiated from the historic siding?
 2. Should an egress window be added to the side or rear of the new bedroom?
 3. Should any windows be preserved and reused on site?
 4. Should a third-party inspector be present on site during key construction activities?
- Stated that staff's recommendation is for the HPB to adopt a resolution recommending approval of a Tier 1 Historic Resource Alteration Permit (PLN-2020-17) for 119 Alice Avenue.

Chair Foulkes asked if there were Board questions for staff.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Referenced the four points of discussion provided by staff, asking specifically if it is staff's recommendation that siding on the new addition be allowed to directly match the original house in material and size.
- Asked if there is any reason that matching is proposed.

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Clarified that staff's recommendation is to differentiate siding material (wood versus composite) and size and/or installation pattern.
- Stated that the applicant is aware of that requirement as well.
- Said that staff is looking to HPB for guidance. For example, would it suffice to use the same paint but different boards? Would it be acceptable to use different paint but the same boards?

Vice Chair Walter:

- Said that the requirement for an egress window for emergency use is a Building Code requirement.
- Asked staff what standard trumps. Is it the Building Code or the consideration of the historic status and standards for both this home and street?

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Said that while there may be some exceptions for a historic structure, Codes for life and safety cannot be overruled.
- Stated that staff recommends a properly egress-sized window be placed at the front or rear elevations of the home to serve the second bedroom being created out of the previous single bedroom on the second floor.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Asked whether staff's suggestion for a third-part inspector is intended to avoid over removal of historic materials from the home and to avoid changes being made during construction that are not consistent with the approved plan.
- Said such an inspector could avoid any after-the-fact changes.

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Said that the City does its own construction oversight that primarily includes building inspections.
- Added that the project planner does inspections at rough framing and prior to final occupancy sign off.
- Stated that those inspections are intended to make sure that the project is done in a sensitive manner to its historic status.
- Pointed out that there are often elements of a project that come up. Perhaps extensive termite damage is found. Without property supervision, perhaps a contractor is more likely to chose to simply repair and move forward without considering any other potential solutions.
- Stressed that the City does not have sufficient staffing to serve as a third-party inspector overseeing the historical elements of the home.

Vice Chair Walter asked if the 2003 addition was considered by the Board.

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Admitted he did not investigate that point but was happy to find that there was a permit for that work.

Vice Chair Walter asked Member Blake and Member Moore if they recalled whether this home was discussed at the time the 2003 addition was reviewed and permitted.

Planner Daniel Fama advised that at time, the HPB review of such applications was ore informal. He found that on February 26, 2003, the HPB did a preliminary building permit review. A brief report and plans were provided.

Vice Chair Walter asked if the siding used in 2003 matched the original house.

Planner Stephen Rose replied that the siding on the 2003 addition is distinct from the primary/original home. It is a different material. It is not wood. It is hardboard.

Jason Lee, Applicant/Property Owner, clarified that it is cement board.

Member Blake:

- Asked about the property's front (south facing) elevation and whether any of the original historic windows could be used instead of what is shown. Instead of new.

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Said the applicant is not removing the front façade.
- Added that from the west side, there are larger existing windows.
- Cautioned that the historic windows may not meet the needs of the rooms they will serve.
- Pointed out that the whole addition is located far back from the street.
- Deferred response about potential for original window use to the applicant when his turn to speak comes up.

Vice Chair Walter asked about second floor windows. He also said he does not see any guard rails.

Planner Stephen Rose advised that there is a guard rail depicted on the plan to serve the basement daylight window by preventing people from falling into that dugout area.

Chair Foulkes asked if the windows installed with the 2003 addition were historic.

Planner Stephen Rose replied no.

Chair Foulkes asked staff to elaborate on the suggestion for a third-party inspector. Is it to ensure the protection of the original structure?

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Said it would be to monitor sensitive tasks such as historic window removal, areas in which there will be digging done, and proper use of shoring and bracing to protect the historic home.
- Stated that the third-party inspector at those times would comment as necessary and protect the aspects that must be retained.
- Added that usually during the building plan review, steps are outlined to outline processes to prevent damage.

Chair Foulkes opened the Public Hearing for Item 3.

Jason Lee, Applicant and Property Owner, 119 Alice Ave:

- Said he is happy to provide answers to a lot of the HPB questions raised.
- Discussed window removal. There are two windows on the west elevation to be removed. Those are new aluminum dual-paned windows. They are not original or historic.
- Reported that just one very small original window, 12 inches by 12 inches, that is located in a small closed, will be removed.
- Clarified that there are only four to five historic windows on the home, and they are keeping all but the one small one in the closet.
- Described the windows from 2003 as being JenWeld.
- Assured that he will be keeping anything historic.

- Added that discussion on the best option for siding is open for further discussion.
- Cautioned that there are already multiple types and installation styles for the siding on this home So many different siding types.
- Asked what the HPB proposes he do.
- Advised that he will have a geotechnical engineer on site obtaining soil samples.
- Admitted he would be open to having a third-party inspector.
- Informed that he would operate this project in a manner that is OSHA compliant. More towards commercial construction.
- Stated that the third story windows will be replaced with retrofit windows.
- Said that a couple of ideas have been offered including use of two windows instead of three.
- Reported that at one time the upstairs consisted of two bedrooms. He turned that into one bedroom serving as the master bedroom. He proposes to use the same opening.
- Said that he is removing square footage from a structure at the back of the property in order to added square footage to the main house.

Chair Foulkes asked if there are Board questions for the applicant.

Member Blake:

- Suggested the inclusion of routinely used language in the approving resolution leaving final decisions on some details/aspects to the discretion of the Community Development Director.
- Agreed that there are already so many types of siding on this home. It seems counterproductive.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Applauded the owner for his thoroughness. He is going above and beyond typical practices for a home addition.
- Told the applicant that he, speaking as an architect, feels that the applicant will be protected by his proposed project standards.
- Suggested the applicant speak with staff about the third-party inspector. It may well not be required. Especially with the documents that will be provided with the building permit submittal to both Building and Planning.

Jason Lee, Applicant and Property Owner:

- Said he would carefully engineer his basement.
- Reported that he is in commercial construction himself.
- Agreed that he can submit supporting materials as part of his building submittal.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Pointed out that cities often require a letter from a soils engineer.
- Asked staff whether Campbell's Building Department requires Geotech report and letter indicating that plans have been followed.

Planner Stephen Rose said that they do require soils report. It is included in the Building permit package.

Vice Chair Walter asked if the shoring package would need a third-party inspection.

Planner Stephen Rose said that is part of the Building Permit plan check.

Vice Chair Walter referenced the fact that there are three to four different types and sizes of siding used on this home.

Jason Lee, Applicant and Property Owner:

- Explained that there are two different spacing standards.
- Added that the original siding was wood. The addition siding was composite.
- Stated his proposal is to have this new addition tie into the composite.
- Said that he prefers to match the spacing with the current matching materials.

Chair Foulkes asked why the existing original small window is being removed from the closet.

Jason Lee, Applicant and Property Owner:

- Said that it is pushing out towards the west.
- Pointed out that it is a 100-year-old casement window that was put in to light up a closet.

Chair Foulkes:

- Agreed that there are a whole lot of different materials.
- Questioned the possibility of using the exact same siding spacing but using different materials.
- Asked Mr. Lee what materials are on the first and second floor and which he is proposing to change.

Jason Lee, Applicant and Property Owner:

- Said he is proposing use of composite siding.

Chair Foulkes asked, no wood siding?

Jason Lee, Applicant and Property Owner:

- Replied no.
- Reiterated his desire to use composite to match the previous non-historic additions.
- Assured that the existing original wood siding would remain.

Chair Foulkes closed the Public Hearing for Item 3.

Chair Foulkes:

- Said he is still confused.
- Asked what the architectural review guidance is on windows and doors.
- Reminded that the applicant says those are not historic.

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Said that the applicant's description is more accurate.

- Added that a house begins to be considered possibly historic when it is 50 years old.
- Stated that this home has additions from the 1950's and 1980's and then the one from 2003. The question can be raised, which might be considered historic? Which not?
- Concluded that determination is up to the HPB.

Chair Foulkes:

- Said that it is important that it can be easily differentiated between what is historic and what is not.
- Added that material changes between original and addition should be different such as wood versus composite (non-wood).

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Said that the provided pictures do it justice.
- Stated that staff questions for the Board include:
 - Is use of composite siding enough of a difference?
 - Should the 2003 addition, which was done wrong, be repaired to match the original part of the home?

Member Moore:

- Stated that the purpose of the guidelines is to be able to differentiate between old and new.
- Agreed that this home has undergone quite a few remodel projects.
- Admitted that it is fine with her for the use between wood and composite.
- Added that she takes confidence in the intentions of this owner.

Chair Foulkes asked if that means the HPB might be willing to allow use of new wood?

Member Moore replied no. It would not sufficiently differentiate between the addition and the original house.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Said you are not going to get that variation just with use of composite materials.
- Stated that they also need some variation in their installation pattern.
- Concluded that from a materials standpoint it is going to look the same.

Member Moore:

- Asked whether the intention to have old and new easily differentiated, is that as one drives by or more so to provide obvious understanding of a building and its history when standing near/beside that structure.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Replied both.
- Added that he has no problem with use of composite siding material on the addition.

Chair Foulkes:

- Stressed the need for the HPB to be consistent.
- Stated that when one drives by, he wants to see the difference between old and new.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Said he is fine with the proposed addition itself.
- Added that the question remains, how best to handle the use of siding between old and new.
- Stated to do differently would be contrary to what we have done over the last 10 years.

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Pointed out that the 2003 addition matches the original siding.
- Said that the new addition will be mid-span between the original house and the 2003 addition.
- Stated this is a large addition here detouring on new construction.
- Suggested keeping the historic wood siding on the original house and requiring new siding on the rest of the home. Unfortunately, that would be an added cost to the project.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Stated that the 2003 approval of the addition was a mistake in how it was handled.
- Supported composite siding for this newest addition to this historic home.
- Stressed that the new addition needs to be a different material.

Member Moore:

- Agreed with the need to make this new addition's siding clearly different.
- Said that whether that requirement should be applied to the 2003 addition as well she is not so sure.
- Admitted she can understand the conflict.

Chair Foulkes:

- Admitted that he still would like to see the small original window preserved rather than just thrown away.
- Asked if the Board has any questions for the applicant.

Vice Chair Walter suggested that Chair Foulkes invite the applicant to join us.

Jason Lee, Applicant and Property Owner, 119 Alice Avenue:

- Said he understands the concerns raised.
- Stated he is okay with changing the spacing of the siding on this newest addition.
- Asked for clarification on just how much difference would be acceptable.
- Suggested that it not be obvious to someone just driving by but rather a middle ground given this addition is located 35 feet back on the house. I
- Said that the difference should be obvious to a guest on the property and/or to the homeowner. A slight difference in spacing of the new siding.

Kristine Lee, Applicant and Property Owner, 119 Alice Avenue:

- Stated that she is so thankful to move forward on this project.
- Thanked the HPB and told everyone to be safe.

Chair Foulkes asked if there was any further discussion or a motion.

Vice Chair Walter said it seems the requirements sought by HPB is the retention of the 12 by 12 original window for use elsewhere on the property and some differentiation in how the new composite siding is installed so as to appear obvious/different from the original house.

Member Blake added that the question remains as to whether the HPB wants to require the use of a third-party inspector to oversee any demolition to ensure retention of all historic aspects of the home during construction.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Said he would defer to the City to determine if a third-party inspector is needed.
- Admitted that he personally does not think that a third-party inspector is necessary.
- Stated that he can see that this owner has put a lot in place to be sure his addition is built properly and safely.
- Suggested that the specific siding material and installation be identified specifically and/or leave that decision up to the applicant working with the City.

Member Blake said the simpler the better. She supported having this applicant work with staff.

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Said that the last of four issues to decide upon is the need for an egress window on the second floor to serve the new second bedroom being created from the original master bedroom that occupied that floor.
- Suggested the requirement for a compliant egress window be stipulated for that second bedroom be stipulated in the conditions.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Said he is fine with requiring an egress window to serve the bedroom on the west side.
- Added that the existing windows up there are not original or historic.

Planner Stephen Rose:

- Said it appears the HPB has reached a general consensus on the use of different material differently spaced.
- Said that flexible language can be added to the resolution.
- Suggested adding that the 2003 addition be allowed to be modified to match this new addition's siding. They would not be so compelled to do so but would be allowed to do so should they choose to.

Motion: Upon motion of Vice Chair Walter, seconded by Member Blake, the Historic Preservation Board adopted Resolution No. 2021-04, recommending approval of a Tier 1 Historic Resource Alteration Permit (PLN-2020-17) to allow the construction of an approximately 989 square-foot addition, 884 square-foot basement expansion, the removal of 254 square-feet from a detached accessory structure to an

Alice Avenue Historic District Property commonly known as the Robert/Holmes House, on property located at 119 Alice Avenue, with the following changes:

- **That the 12 x 12 historic window be removed from the west elevation and reused elsewhere on the project.**
- **That the siding on the new addition be of a differing style and shape than the original wood siding of the home.**
- **That a third-party inspector was determined not to be required for this project.**
- **That there be a conforming egress window in place to serve the new second bedroom on the second floor.**
- **Granting the property owner, the flexibility to change the existing siding on the 2003 addition in the future to match the 2021 siding to be installed, if he so chooses to do so;**

by the following roll call vote:

AYES: Blake, Foulkes, Moore, and Walter
NOES: None
ABSENT: None
Abstain: None

Chair Foulkes advised the applicants that their project has been approved.

Jason Lee, Applicant and Property Owner:

- Thanked the HPB and Planners Stephen Rose and Daniel Fama for their assistance with this project.
- Stated that his family is looking forward to doing this house justice.

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. Staff will also discuss the process for reviewing pending Mills Act applications.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Admitted that with a busy work schedule, he was unable to complete any updates and as such has nothing to report this meeting.

Member Blake:

- Stated she had nothing at this point.
- Suggested that it would be most helpful to get the spreadsheet developed for use in comparing the proposed Mills Act applications.

Vice Chair Walter said he would make a point of working to format that needed spreadsheet.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Advised the HPB that there are currently three Mills Act applications submitted and in review.
- Informed that the Planning Department has lost its Permit Tech so are down two planning positions which will impact workflow.
- Suggested looking at the three applications collectively to develop a sense on how best to evaluate each for worthiness of one of the two available Mills Act Contracts.
- Said that Director Kermoyan had suggested processing the applications in the order received.

Chair Foulkes said that it is HPB's preference to review all three applications at the same time.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Stated that could be possible.
- Cautioned that the Mills Act Program update has not yet been codified as a work plan item.
- Said that as Director Kermoyan is retiring effective on April 2nd, a new Director will be hired and will have input on how best to proceed.

Chair Foulkes:

- Said he hates the idea of saying no to the best project submitted.
- Added he instead wants to see all three submittals to review at the same time to get some sense of what we are comparing.

Member Blake:

- Advised that she and Vice Chair Walter were going to review the two that they were aware of. The third was not known.
- Said that she went by the two, 73 S. First Street and 51 Alice Avenue.

Planner Daniel Fama said that the third application is for 204 Alice Avenue.

Member Blake asked when that third application was filed.

Planner Daniel Fama replied nine days ago.

Chair Foulkes asked if the review of the three could occur at the next HPG meeting.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said that there are three new applications for Tier 1 Historic Resource Alteration Permits.
- Added he was planning to bring two of the three to the next HPB meeting.
- Stated that further work on the Mills Act would not occur until the May meeting, at which time these three submittals can be looked at.

Vice Chair Walter:

- Said that it is imperative to get the priority consideration worksheet ready.

- Added that first apply, first serve, is not a priority concept for evaluating and issuing Mills Act contracts.
- Stated that if we get 50 applications, we will look at all 50 and rank them for the two contracts available.

Planner Daniel Fama:

- Said he would block off some time next week to get the submittal packages assembled and emailed to the two Mills Act Ad Hoc Subcommittee members.
- Stressed the need to review each submittal for completeness. It is important to limit the consideration to the actual merits of each one rather than on discussing missing information and/or incomplete information.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjourned at 6:48 p.m. to the next Regular Historic Preservation Board meeting scheduled for **April 28, 2021**, at 5:00 PM, using Zoom.

PREPARED BY:

Corinne Shinn, Recording Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Michael Foulkes, Chair

ATTEST:

Daniel Fama, HPB Staff Liaison