



**TOWN OF LOS GATOS
PLANNING COMMISSION
REPORT**

MEETING DATE: 03/08/2023

ITEM NO: 1

**DRAFT
MINUTES OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
JANUARY 11, 2023**

The Planning Commission of the Town of Los Gatos conducted a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, January 11, 2023, at 7:00 p.m.

This meeting was conducted utilizing teleconferencing and electronic means consistent with Government Code Section 54953, as Amended by Assembly Bill 361, in response to the state of emergency relating to COVID-19 and enabling teleconferencing accommodations by suspending or waiving specified provisions in the Ralph M. Brown Act (Government Code § 54950 et seq.). Consistent with AB 361 and Town of Los Gatos Resolution 2021-044, all planning commissioners and staff participated from remote locations and all voting was conducted via roll call vote.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 7:00 PM

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Jeffrey Barnett, Vice Chair Steve Raspe, Commissioner Susan Burnett, Commissioner Kylie Clark, Commissioner Melanie Hanssen, Commissioner Kathryn Janoff, and Commissioner Emily Thomas.

Absent: None.

VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

CONSENT ITEMS (TO BE ACTED UPON BY A SINGLE MOTION)

1. Approval of Minutes – December 14, 2022

MOTION: Motion by Commissioner Clark to approve adoption of the Consent Calendar. **Seconded** by Commissioner Thomas.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

2. 400 Surmont Drive

Architecture and Site Application S-21-004 and S-21-023

APN 527-20-003

Applicant: Bess Wiersema, Studio 3 Design

Property Owner: Sandra K. Anderson, TTE

Project Planner: Ryan Safty

Requesting approval for construction of a shared driveway, two new single-family residences to exceed the maximum height for visible homes in the hillsides, and site work requiring a Grading Permit on vacant property zoned HR-2½. Continued from the November 21, 2022 Planning Commission hearing.

Ryan Safty, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Opened Public Comment.

Bess Wiersema, Studio 3 Design, Architect/Applicant

- Whatever is built on this hillside would be visible, as there are no trees. This is designated Level 1 for lowest sensitivity in hillsides. We have followed the Hillside Design Guidelines with a winding or shared driveway, building parallel to the contours, stepping the building foundation with the natural slope, and detaching the garage. At the November 2022 Planning Commission hearing, it was somewhat agreed upon that no modifications were needed for the grading exceptions, and if we were required to strictly adhere to a lot of the grading components we would not comply with Fire or driveway turnarounds, nor would we be able to provide more extensive landscaping to shield the driveways and cuts along the hillside. We listened to the Planning Commission and made significant changes: *Parcel 1*. We brought down plate heights, eaves, ridge heights, and roof pitches, and suppressed some plate heights down to 7.5 feet, and from grade everything is at or under 18 feet. The area we are projecting into the 18-foot height limitation is in the middle of the mass and occupies only 11 percent of the entire roof mass. We provided significant additional landscape screening at the rear and downhill sides of both properties. Materials have been chosen to blend in with the exposed hillside, meet the LRV, and are designated to meet or shade into natural conditions. *Parcel 2*. There was more extensive work to entire portions of the roof plan to significantly reduce the mass, especially on the downhill side, and modifications took about 200 square feet of the FAR because of reduced attic space. Rooflines follow the topography. From 1 to 1.5-foot reduction in plates, and reduction in the overall pitch height to bring the ridge points down. The exception we ask for is only 12 percent of the overall roof mass. From grade we are at or under the 18-foot limit. Additional landscape screening is added. The color palette is meant to blend into the hillside.

Diane Michaelis

- Our three-acre parcel is close to the subject site, of which 1.75 acres is designated open space easement, and the newly proposed development is contiguous with that open space easement. When viewed from the valley these two houses will abruptly end the open rural hillside views. These two parcels should have been preserved as open space, as was mandated for us, and if the Town allows development on them it should at least enforce its own rules consistently and no exceptions should be made to allow for noncompliance with the Hillside Standards and Design Guidelines. We can see the story pole netting clearly from our back yard.

Paul Cosentino

- My family owns the property directly adjacent to this proposed development and asks the Planning Commission to deny this application. The sheer size and proximity of these homes along the hillside is causing disharmony throughout the neighborhood. The developers have misinformed the neighbors and submitted disingenuous facts and forms. The Planning Commission asked the applicants bring the house heights down to 18 feet, and they have not. The house on Parcel 1 would not have a generous setback with complete absence of nestling into the hillside terrain, and is 21 feet from our property. We can't ask for privacy screening because of the fire defensible space regulations making it impossible to plant any trees or bushes between Parcel 1 and our home. We are asking for the house on Parcel 1 to be moved at least 30 feet from our property line so trees and shrubs can be planted to protect our privacy.

Tina Cosentino

- Our driveway is only 12-15 feet away, and a 15-foot private driveway going up to the two parcels is proposed. If the property to the right is also developed there is potential for congestion in that area and I ask that it be looked into in terms of the intersection and the impact to safety and traffic flow. A storm drain is located in the middle of all that, and we request it be moved back to allow for more access for the roadways, with emergency vehicle access in mind. It is troubling that there were things submitted just today, especially on a sensitive subject such as the height of these buildings, because it doesn't give the public time to review.

Chris Tanimoto

- Just because the applicant did not receive responses back to their neighborhood outreach letter last December does not mean we accept what they propose. That letter did not say specifically how much the height was reduced, and I believe there is a problem with transparency here. The story poles should be installed again after the storm damage to designate which height so the neighbors can see it again.

Bess Wiersema, Studio 3 Design, Architect/Applicant

- The building site is over 500 feet from the back end of our parcel to the downhill neighbors at 303 Belgatos Road. With respect to Mr. Cosentino's comments, our house is at 20 feet on an angle at the tiniest point and that is the closest point, otherwise it sits anywhere from 63 feet to 94 feet from his property. If Mr. Cosentino would like more landscaping in this area we can work with our landscape architect to find something that works with the defensible space requirements to provide him additional screening. These houses were designed to not stare down on neighbors by being angled along the topography and staggered so that they do not loom over any neighbor below, as 200 Surmont does on its neighbors below. We have been very transparent, made extensive neighborhood outreach, and taken input into consideration and reduced both mass and height. The reason the Planning Commission received desk items today was not an effort to withhold information, rather it was additional clarification information, because the staff report issued last week contained errors and Mr. Safty was concerned that our project was being presented as larger than it actually is. We have stepped this single level home down on the hillside by staggering floor plans, changing roof plates, and adding additional layered retaining walls. Great efforts were made to bring both houses into conformance with the intent of the Hillside Design Guidelines.

Closed Public Comment.

Commissioners discussed the matter.

MOTION: **Motion by Commissioner Janoff** to approve Architecture and Site Applications for 400 Surmont Drive, with added conditions that the houses do not exceed 18 feet; non-reflective coating be added to the standing seam metal roofs if glare to the neighbors becomes a problem; landscape screening is incorporated to the north of Parcel 1 to the maximum extent possible; and that all trees used for screening purposes be non-deciduous species.

The Town Attorney Whelan requested the motion be amended to add language stating that a member of staff, perhaps the Planning Manager, would determine whether sufficient landscaping had been proposed.

The maker of the motion agreed to the amendment to the motion, and added that the Planning Manager would also be the arbiter on the 18-foot height.

Seconded by Commissioner Clark.

Commissioners discussed the matter.

Vice Chair Barnett requested the motion be amended to include language stating that non-deciduous trees be used for the privacy screening landscape.

The maker and seconder of the motion accepted the amendment to the motion.

VOTE: Motion passed 6-1 with Commissioner Burnett opposing.

3. 301-307 N. Santa Cruz Avenue

Request for Review PHST-22-020

APN 510-14-048

Property Owner/Applicant/Appellant: Mike Millen

Project Planner: Ryan Safty

Consider an appeal of the Historic Preservation Committee decision to deny the removal of a presumptive historic property (Pre-1941) from the Historic Resources Inventory on property zoned C-2.

Town Attorney Whelan recommended that Planning Commissioners who participated in a decision regarding the subject property as members of the Historic Preservation Committee recuse themselves from this appeal of those decisions, based on due process concerns to ensure the Appellants get a fair hearing.

Commissioners Raspe, Clark, and Burnett recused themselves and left the meeting, as they are members of the Historic Preservation Committee (HPC) and had participated in the decision being appealed.

Ryan Safty, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Opened Public Comment.

Mike Millen, Property Owner/Applicant/Appellant

- Exhibit 7, page 1 shows that in 1928 there is a 301, 305, and 307 North Santa Cruz Avenue, but 303 did not exist. Then 301, the tearoom and the corner building, was torn down and a huge structure with windows was built in 1952, and the HPC has excluded it from the Historic Resources Inventory. That took care of the space between the old tearoom at 301 and 305. At some unknown point the old 305 was renamed to 303, so when I talk about 303 I mean the old 305. There is a 20-foot space between the old buildings at 307 and the old 305, now called 303. That is where they built what today is called 305. HPC's comment that this does not have historic integrity was correct, because it didn't exist and was built far later. 303 no longer has left and right walls or the overhang, and has been raised up with a table and chairs where there used to be just sidewalk. The changes that have happened to 303 are so significant that it no longer has any structural integrity. 307 no longer has a left wall and the right wall was completely boarded up during or after the 1960s, so overall there is no or little historic integrity. If the Commission makes Finding 5

that the integrity has been so compromised the structure no longer has the potential to convey significance, it doesn't matter what else it finds, and I think both 303 and 307 fulfill that. If the Commission cannot make Finding 5, I believe Findings 1-4 are met. The site is not associated with any events or significant persons, and what is distinctive about this particular building and the structure does not yield any Town history information. I ask the Planning Commission to find that the entire property, 303, 305, 307, and 301 should be removed from the Historic Resources Inventory.

Lee Quintana

- I disagree with the Town Attorney's recommendation that those who served on the HPC and made the decision to deny the property's removal from the Historic Resources Inventory are required to recuse themselves, because this is a de novo hearing, a totally new hearing. Applying that reasoning, should members of the Planning Commission who also serve on the Housing Element Advisory Board recuse themselves when that item comes up later on in this meeting? I request the Planning Commission consider continuing the item until it is possible for the Town Attorney to check with the State attorney general on recusal of previous reviewing body members. This site is significant enough that there should be a professional, historical architect looking at it, not just the applicant's own research.

Catherine Somers

- I am the Executive Director of the Los Gatos Chamber of Commerce. I encourage the Planning Commission to allow the property owner some leeway as to what he can do with this very valuable piece of property. Merchants and restaurants at that end of the boulevard continually ask me how to make that end of town more vibrant. That whole corner could completely change the vibrancy at that end of Town, and I do not think the Town can continue to restrict a property owner to stay within the realm of keeping it historic, because he can't rent that property because of the restrictions placed on it. When changing the landscape of the street that corner has to be considered, because it could set the stage for what Los Gatos could and should look like in five to ten years.

Mike Millen, Property Owner/Applicant/Appellant

- Some people believe neighboring municipalities like Campbell are moving ahead of Los Gatos because their rules are different than ours. This is an area that is open to a lot of discretion. Ms. Somers' comments put the Planning Commission in a perfect position to say that these structures don't have the potential to convey significance so we can make Los Gatos vibrant on this particular corner.

Closed Public Comment.

Commissioners discussed the matter.

MOTION: **Motion by Commissioner Thomas** to grant an appeal of an Historic Preservation Committee for 301-307 North Santa Cruz Avenue and approve the removal of the presumptive historic property (Pre-1941) from the Historic Resources Inventory. **Seconded by Commissioner Janoff.**

VOTE: **Motion passed 4-0.**

Commissioners Raspe and Clark returned to the meeting. Commissioner Burnett recused herself from participating in Item 4 as she is a member of the HPC and participated in the decision being appealed.

4. 253 W. Main Street

Minor Development in a Historic District Application HS-22-051

APN 510-45-006

Applicant: Bess Wiersema, Studio Three Design

Property Owner/Appellant: Mike and Kim Wasserman

Project Planner: Sean Mullin

Consider an appeal of a Historic Preservation Committee decision to deny a request to modify the previously approved front door on a new single-family residence located in the Broadway Historic District on property zoned R-1D:LHP.

Sean Mullin, Senior Planner, presented the staff report.

Opened Public Comment.

Mike Wasserman, Property Owner/Appellant

- There are two-dozen letters of support for our door, and 65 neighbors have signed a petition in support, including everyone on our street. What is more appropriate in an historic district, an historic wooden door that goes well with the design, or a new aluminum-clad glass door? We are in the Historic District, so why should we be forced to use a new door that provides no safety or privacy, and certainly adds no historical significance to the property? Upon review of the HPC meeting, three erroneous statements were made that likely resulted in the decision of the two members who voted against our request in a 2-1 vote. On page 2 of 8 of the staff report, under Findings, staff says our project complies with the Residential Design Guidelines, and there are none of the adverse effects listed in Section 29.80.290, which means our appeal should be granted. Both the home to our left and the one across the street have solid wood front doors, as do 50 other homes of various styles in our neighborhood. Our door adds interest and history to our home. A glass door provides little to no privacy or safety, which is a great concern given our proximity to the commercial district.

Jonathan Knowles

- I'm here tonight to ask the Planning Commission's consideration in allowing the Appellants to have this very special, beautiful piece of history and allow it to be a part of our Town.

Steve McGrath

- I live directly adjacent to the Appellants and I can think of no better way to have this brand new building complement the historic surroundings than to allow the Appellants to use their historic door on their new property as opposed to the ultra-modern, aluminum-clad standard door.

Kira Fields

- I am speaking to ask that you approve the appeal for the Appellants' antique wood door. The door is not offensive, fits in well with the style of their new home, and adds value to the surrounding neighborhood.

Erin O'Brien

- I am in strong support of the Appellants being able to use their wooden front doors. I have seen these doors and they are spectacular and completely in keeping with the integrity and beauty of the Historic District, and they have multi-generational importance to the Appellants' family.

Robert McCartney

- Having looked at these doors and spoken with the Appellants, it seems these doors evoke a number of historical aspects of Los Gatos, and they bring a historical context to the building that simply wouldn't be addressed by generic doors. I support the appeal and I hope the Planning Commission will also.

Ray Robidoux

- My wife and I fully appreciate and enjoy the historical character of Los Gatos and many homes in the Town. We have seen this beautiful door and think it goes very well with the design of the home, and believe it is compatible and complementary to the historical nature of the neighborhood and the homes in the area.

Claire LeClair

- I am in favor of the Appellants using the hand-carved, historic wooden door as their front door in the Town's Historic District. There are a lot of memories attached to that door, and it is absolutely beautiful.

Joanne Talesfore

- I chaired the Planning Commission in 2008 and my colleagues and I, along with Staff, crafted and edited the Residential Design Guidelines, which included the Historic Design Guidelines, and it is important to note that we crafted guidelines, not directives. The guidelines allow residents room for creative expression, open to uniqueness in design

features, while staying within the neighborhood compatibility. I have read all materials related to this project and I support the appeal by the Appellants to keep a 300-year-old family door as the front door of their designated non-historic house. This heritage door builds on the owner's history and imparts a unique and diverse character to the home, which is encouraged by the historic guidelines. This family door is a contributing feature to a non-historic house in an historic overlay zone, again, something the guidelines encourage. In my opinion, and following the design guidelines, the door neither detracts or adversely affects the character, architecture, or aesthetic interest in Los Gatos, and in fact brings a diversity, visual richness, and individual character to this historic neighborhood overlay zone and strengthens the Town's historic, Hispanic components. I strongly encourage the Planning Commission to approve the addition of the door as it adds history, diversity, and falls under the freedom of creative expression intent in keeping with the design guidelines.

Margaret Smith

- I served on the Historic Preservation Committee under Len Pacheco and his 600-page books of architectural styles. I was surprised when I learned the Appellants' application to install this historic front door on their new home had been denied by a sparsely attended HPC. I've seen the door and wonder if in one of Len's architectural books we wouldn't learn that a solid wood door is common in a stucco modified Tudor, which is the style of home the Appellants have built. We in Los Gatos pride ourselves on our efforts to reuse and recycle, yet these appellants have been told that a door with a half-century provenance of gracing the entrance of another Los Gatos home does not deserve to be reused in their home in the Broadway Historic District. The door is in compliance with Section 29.80.290 of the Residential Design Guidelines. The door enhances not only the property, but also the historic district within which the property is located.

Kat Battaglia

- My husband and I live across the street from the Appellants' new home. We have viewed and considered their hand carved hardwood entry door, and feel it's congruent to the house design and the neighborhood. The front entry is set back from the street and the door is not immediately visible to passersby. Solid wood doors provide more security and safety, as well as sound and weather insulation. The door is agreeable to us as the immediate neighbors.

Susan Burnett, Historic Preservation Committee Member

- A letter from the Appellant characterizes my comment as an HPC member as incorrect, but I was correct in my findings. The door is visible coming down Tait Avenue. Design Guidelines page 29, section 3.6.2, clearly states most architectural styles have a distinct unique entry type and to avoid using an entry type that is not part of the style. The Design Guidelines, page 47, section 4.8, describes construction of a historic resource in a historic location, namely the Broadway Historic District, as at a higher standard for building and design sensitivity to a surrounding neighborhood. The quote by the Appellant was

misquoted. Clearly on page 55, not 54, 4.10 applies to new construction in one of the Town's designated historic districts where six or more of the 15 design guidelines would apply and were ignored. This project is not a remodel; it is a new construction. The findings in Section 29.80.290, number 2, of the Town's Historic Preservation Overlay Zone would definitely not allow this appeal to be granted. The recommendation of the Community Development Director to deny the appeal and uphold the HPC decision should be honored.

Marilyn

- This takes me back to "Talbot's Door," which you are all too young to remember. This is ridiculous. We love that door, and it should be here, and it should be in the Historic District. I recommend that the HPC rewrite their guide to our district and have it available for the many people who walk through Broadway, Almond Grove, and the historic districts that this Town has.

Joanne

- The Planning Commission's job is to uphold the integrity and beauty of Los Gatos as it grows, and when I heard about the door debate, I checked it out myself and discovered a stunning example of architectural woodwork, and original pieces with a rich history and personal legacy that is attached to the homeowners. Those doors hold a pedigree and a provenance that you will not find elsewhere, exactly what makes our town special, unique, and beautiful, and the Planning Commission is here tonight to ensure that these values and aesthetics are upheld and encouraged.

Ed Stall

- It seems ridiculous to me that we're spending this time telling the Appellants that they can't install a door that suits their house, when we ought to approve it and move on.

Marc Dubresson

- We moved here for the character of Los Gatos and the Broadway neighborhood. One reason we love the neighborhood is every house has a particularity; ours is French. We saw the door and found it adds character to the house and could be a real talking point to those walking around the neighborhood.

Cameron Hunter

- We are neighbors to the Appellants. Recently the Appellant talked about the history of this door with my children and me, and I don't see anything more historic than passing along a story to the next generation. The wood door provides better safety and privacy, and simply looks more aesthetically pleasing than what was on the original plans.

Frank Dealobos

- I'm speaking in support of the Appellants' appeal to have this front door approved. I frequently drive by the subject site and have seen and learned about the history of the

door, being imported from Mexico and having so much personal meaning to them. One of my first impressions was that the door without a doubt complements the historic character of the neighborhood but looking deeper I welcome it as a symbol of diversity and connection, and approving this door would be a reflection of our values of liberty and tolerance.

Phil Knopf

- It's wonderful that the Appellants were able to salvage and repurpose these doors in their new home. The building across the street from the Appellants, the old firehouse that became the museum, has a rustic wood door on it, so this door does fit the neighborhood and is much more energy efficient.

Tom Rizol

- When I saw the Appellants' new door a few weeks ago I thought it looked really nice. It's the artwork, it's solid wood, it absolutely fits with the trim, color, and stucco of the house. As I was leaving a woman on the street commented that it is a nice door, and isn't that what we want, people walking around the neighborhood and seeing something they like.

Nancy Pearson

- I state my support for the approval of the Appellants' front door upgrade. I have seen the door in person; it is a beautiful, hand-carved, antique door that happens to be a family heirloom. I can see no rational reason for this to not be approved.

Howard and Jill Labe

- We walk down Main Street multiple times a week and have walked by the Appellants' house many times and did not notice the door, because it is set back and doesn't stand out. But on one occasion we did notice and commented to each other how cool the door is, and the Appellant was in the yard and told us the history of the door and let us see it up close. In my opinion the door fits with the house, and it's a great looking door. The Almond Grove has a crime problem, and having a solid wood door makes sense, and we both are in favor of the Appellants' appeal.

Ed Reginelli

- My wife and I live next door to the Appellants, and the improvements they have made to that plot of land is amazing and appropriate for the historic community. The door they are proposing to use is a beautiful, historic wood door and in our opinion would be very appropriate to use in this neighborhood.

Jim Fuller

- My wife and I have been neighbors of the Appellants for 22 years. I believe HPC Member Burnett's comments were a bit disingenuous when she implied that anyone could see the door driving down Tait, because the door itself is perpendicular to the direction of traffic, so all anyone driving down Tait would see is the edge of the door. I was a student of Frank

Lloyd Wright and his main philosophy was using natural elements, and this door is exactly that, and it is handcrafted and awesome. The fact that we're spending all this time and the Town's resources on this subject is ludicrous.

David Cox

- I fully support the Appellants' appeal to have this beautiful, unique door put in. Los Gatos promotes the identity of uniqueness, and that is what this door provides. It will add beauty and significance to the community and neighborhood and will not detract from anything.

Nora Comee

- I live a few doors down from the Appellants. With everything said tonight I think the Planning Commission understands how much we support this incredible family heirloom that adds nothing but quality and safety and is a unique addition to a beautiful neighborhood and an incredible home.

Chris Morgan

- I am third generation professional woodworker of 20 years. It brings me great joy to see their historic art piece when I walk my dog. This door is likely one of the most locally historic artifacts currently existing in this Town. While the preservationist in me feels it should be in a glass case in a museum, I feel that the art and fine craftsmanship should be shared with the public. This door absolutely belongs proudly displayed with a family that loves it and shares its history. The fact that so many neighbors are awake at almost 11:00pm on a Wednesday speaking in support of this door says all you need to know.

Lee Quintana

- When I look at this door, it is a beautiful, historic door in the sense that it came from Mexico, is 300 years old, and was installed in another house not in the Historic District. What we are looking at tonight is not whether this door is better than the door originally approved. The door approved in the original proposal was not consistent with the Tudor architecture, however, that doesn't mean the only other option is to approve this door. The door is not historic to the neighborhood, and it is not being preserved in the house where it was originally built. There are many similar wood doors in the Broadway neighborhood, but there is no door like this one. There are many doors that would be consistent with the Tudor style of the home, and that needs to be considered. My conclusion is based on the criteria in the Residential Design Guidelines for Homes in Historic Districts.

Shah

- My wife and I walk on Main Street frequently and I appreciate the door. Los Gatos is a historic and gorgeous town. What does historic mean? Is it technical data or guidelines in books? People like me love it when we walk around the historic downtown, and this door adds to it.

Mike Wasserman, Property Owner/Appellant

- I respectfully disagree with HPC Member Burnett's comments; everything I said was recorded. I ask the Commissioners to look at code section 29.80.290, of which the door meets all the qualifications and doesn't do anything adverse to the neighborhood or the house or style. Also see 29.80.215 as a second section to quote. I respectfully ask the Planning Commission to grant our appeal based on these facts and information.

Bess Wiersema, Studio 3 Design, Architect/Applicant

- I wanted to address comments that the door does not specifically meet a Tudor or Tudor Revival style. While the door does have a Mexican heritage, so does Los Gatos. I wanted to address the overall character and aesthetic material, and hand carved quality of the door. All of those points absolutely meet the requirements of being harmonious with the Tudor door style. When we go to HPC and work on designs, nothing becomes so expressly specific, especially on a new build in a historic district, because there isn't anything on a house that we're trying to actually preserve, mimic, or rebuild. The home's rafter tails, gutter detail, window mullions, all are in keeping with the intent of the desired architectural style while not specific historically to perfection of the style. We have to look at intent and understand that we have to be able, as a community and as a Commission, to be able to move architecture forward in the spirit of the intent rather than whether it is actually from the Tudor era of Great Britain.

Closed Public Comment.

Commissioners discussed the matter.

MOTION: **Motion by Commissioner Thomas** to grant an appeal of a Historic Preservation Committee decision and grant the request to modify the previously approved front door on a new single-family residence located in the Broadway Historic District at 253 W. Main Street. **Seconded by Commissioner Clark.**

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

MOTION: **Motion by Commissioner Janoff** to continue the meeting past 11:30pm until the agenda is complete. **Seconded by Commissioner Burnett.**

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

5. Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element

General Plan Amendment Application GP-22-003

Location: Town-wide

Consider and make a recommendation to the Town Council on the Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element.

Erin Walters, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Opened Public Comment.

Rigo Gallardo

- I am a representative from Carpenters Local #405 for Santa Clara County and am here to speak on area labor standards that include a livable wage, healthcare, apprenticeships, and local hire. A livable wage, along with local hiring, allows workers to live in the communities they work in. Apprenticeships guarantee continued trained and skilled workers. Healthcare is a necessity for families. What is being done to implement these area labor standards in upcoming projects?

Lee Quintana

- The Implementation section has over 60 implementation programs. At least eight items are subject to the use of BMP funds, five items have to do with rehabilitation and repair, and other items have to do with outreach to the public and development community. I advise revising the organization of the Implementation section to focus on areas of common concern rather than having rehabilitation issues spread throughout the document. I also advise that before the Town Council specifically mention Habitat for Humanity (HFH) that they verify that HFH is willing to participate in rehabilitation and repair programs in Los Gatos, because my understanding is they will not do any projects in Los Gatos as a result of their participation in the Dittos Lane project.

Closed Public Comment.

Commissioners discussed the matter.

MOTION: **Motion by Commissioner Raspe** to recommend Town Council adopt the Draft 2023-2031 Housing Element, with revised Sites Inventory Analysis and revised Sites Inventory Form. **Seconded by Commissioner Janoff.**

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

OTHER BUSINESS

6. Election of Chair and Vice Chair

MOTION: **Motion** by **Chair Hanssen** to nominate **Vice Chair Barnett** for Chair of the Planning Commission. **Seconded** by **Commissioner Janoff**.

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

MOTION: **Motion** by **Chair Barnett** to nominate **Commissioner Raspe** for Vice Chair of the Planning Commission. **Seconded** by **Commissioner Burnett**.

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Jennifer Armer, Planning Manager

- The Town Council will hold special meeting on January 24, 2023 to discuss strategic priorities for the next two years.
- The Town Council will hold a special meeting on January 30, 2023 to discuss the Housing Element.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS/COMMISSION MATTERS

Commission Matters

Chair Barnett

- The Chair thanked former Chair Hanssen for her service to the Planning Commission for eight years, and congratulated her on her appointment to another four-year term.
- The Chair welcomed Commissioner Burnett to the Planning Commission.
- The Chair thanked returning Planning Commissioners for their contributions to the Planning Commission.
- The Chair thanked members of staff for their hard work and professionalism.
- The Chair announced committee assignments for 2023:
 - o Commissioners Raspe and Burnett to the Historic Preservation Committee.
 - o Commissioners Hanssen, Janoff, and Thomas to the Housing Element Advisory Board and General Plan Committee.
 - o Commissioners Janoff and Clark and Chair Barnett to the Conceptual Development Advisory Committee.

Commissioner Hanssen

- Commissioner Hanssen thanked her fellow Planning Commission members and members of staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:17 a.m.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the January 11, 2023 meeting as approved by the Planning Commission.

/s/ Vicki Blandin