

RECEIVED

Attn: Joel Paulson  
Community Development  
Community Development Director

APR 03 2024

March 29, 2024

TOWN OF LOS GATOS  
PLANNING DIVISION

Dear Mr. Paulson,

The matter of my request to remove 32 Euclid Avenue Los Gatos Ca 95030 from the historic list has been in front of the Historic Preservation Committee twice since November 2023. I believe in the importance of this process, maintaining the historical value of Los Gatos is a worthwhile mission for the Planning Department. However it is my belief that after exhaustive research, the case for removal of 32 Euclid Ave. from historic designation has not only been presented as fair and legitimate by Town of Los Gatos criteria, but by state and federal standards, too. Particularly in the second hearing on March 27th, 2024, the project was evaluated by members of the Historic Preservation Committee that demonstrated bias while operating outside of the jurisdiction of their roles. At minute 26:50 of the audio recording a committee member that opposed the removal from historic designation states that, **"It is part of our role to maintain and retain structures like this."** Please see below *Sec. 29.80.227. Powers and duties of the Historic Preservation Committee.*

The recording of the hearing on March 27th, 2024 will demonstrate that two Historic Preservation Committee members broke from the structure of the meeting several times, ranting with comments during times they were supposed to be investigative and asking questions of my team, specifically the third party Architectural Historian, Andrew Bursan. Planning Manager Jennifer Armer on more than one occasion had to course correct the conduct of two of the HPC members. Excessive gesturing, eye rolling, and laughter was the viewpoint from our side of the table while we presented information that was carefully researched for months. It was clear they arrived at the hearing with their minds made up about a structure they do not know well. Their desire to keep it on the list is biased nostalgia at best and we did not receive a fair hearing.

One of the committee members on more than one occasion referenced "historical books" that she had likely "lent out to a friend" that would have supported her case, "if she could only find them." That committee member continued, referencing a failed trip to the Los Gatos museum outside of their hours of operation but claiming she might have successfully learned more information. Additionally this individual stated as a matter of fact that the findings of our Architectural Historian, Andrew Bursan, were inaccurate. Please see the attached documents providing evidence to support Andrew Bursan's confirmed findings. The HPC committee member's critique of the facts surrounding Peter Johnson were incorrect. Furthermore the committee member advocated that the individual identified to have lived, not in the barn, but the since-demolished house to which the barn served, was a member of town council, rendering him a significant historical figure. I disagree with this opinion as did another member of the committee. I am interested in understanding the planning department's criteria for determining a person of historical significance.

EXHIBIT 9

A second committee member, oddly enough, continued to focus on her interpretation of the structure being a barn, adamant that regardless of its conversion to a primary residence well after the 1941 cut-off date for historical designation, what she sees is clearly a barn, not a house. Interestingly, the November 2023 Historical Preservation Committee hearing began with the question as to whether HPC even has the jurisdiction over 32 Euclid Ave. due to its history as a barn and not a residence. The finding was that due to its conversion to a primary residence, the HPC has jurisdiction. The recording of the November hearing will confirm this. The barn vs. residence debate is not one I would have chosen to evaluate historical significance, but the dichotomy presented itself through the viewpoints of the committee members, in which this individual claimed to be familiar with this agenda item from its previous hearing. At minute 26:50 of the audio recording a committee member that opposed removal of the house states that **"it is part of our role to maintain and retain structures like this"**. That statement is in contradiction to the powers and duties of the historic preservation committee, and instead shows a deliberate agenda of the individual committee member. The committee was formulated, according to the Town Code, to review applications and make recommendations based on evidence; their duty is not to force property owners to "maintain and retain structures" that clearly have no significance as proven in a report prepared by qualified historians.

The rest of the details surrounding the reasons 32 Euclid Ave. should be removed from the historical designation are details you will certainly find in your report. But most notably are as follows:

1. The barn served as a primary residence to a home that has since been demolished and replaced by an approx. 4,000 sq. ft. home. The barn was converted to a home in the early 1970's. There are no components that haven't been replaced or expanded upon.
2. From 1978 to 1997, 32 Euclid Ave. was modified by the addition of a second story, an enclosed front porch, the addition of the laundry room, kitchen expansion, all aluminum windows and the home currently has 6 different types of siding. Additionally, a substantial percentage of the front facing elevation (above 25%) has been altered in the late 1970's, rendering this a technical demolition according to my understanding.
3. The five criteria for historical designation according to the Town of Los Gatos are very similar to the state and federal requirements. None of which apply to this house as reported by state certified Architectural Historian Andrew Bursan.

Lastly, a petition of all the surrounding neighbors has been signed in support of the removal of 32 Euclid Ave. from the historical inventory, specifically to demolish the structure, as well as support for the intended future project.

I appreciate your time and attention to this matter. I greatly value the Planning Departments role in protecting the historical significance in Los Gatos but hope that it is clear 32 Euclid Ave. does not meet any of the criteria. A fair and curious committee would have agreed.

Best Regards,

Alex Anderson

**Sec. 29.80.227. Powers and duties of the Historic Preservation Committee.**

The Historic Preservation Committee shall:

- (1) Regularly review and make recommendations to the Planning Commission concerning the determination of all matters pertaining to historic preservation which comes before the Planning Commission.
- (2) Review and make recommendations to the Planning Director concerning the determination of a minor residential development permit for properties with a LHP overlay zone or structures which were built prior to 1941.
- (3) Determine and issue approval for minor residential and commercial exterior alterations not covered under the architecture and site approval process or the minor residential development permit, for designated properties with a LHP overlay zone pursuant to subsection 29.20.485.
- (4) Upon request of the Planning Director, review pending or proposed building permits dealing with historic structures when it is questionable that the work proposed meets the guidelines for pre-1941 structures.
- (5) May, on request of the property owner, advise with respect to any proposed work requiring or not requiring a Town permit on any historic structure, a designated landmark site or in a designated historic district. Examples of the work referred to are additions, demolitions, painting and repainting of exterior surfaces, roofing, fencing, landscaping, glazing, and installation of lighting fixtures. In advising, the Historic Preservation Committee shall be guided by the purposes and standards specified in this division and other applicable ordinances and/or development standards. This subsection does not impose regulations or controls on any property.

**From:** Jeremy Adams <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 28, 2024 3:36 PM  
**To:** Kurt Anderson <[REDACTED]>; Andy Bursan <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Alex Anderson <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** RE: 32 Euclid - Historic Preservation Committee comments

Thanks Kurt. Also, if you appeal to the Planning Commission, you might point out that the Historic Preservation Committee may be operating beyond their reach of powers and duties set forth in Sect. 29.80.227 of the Los Gatos Town Code. The town code clearly identifies 5 points that are the responsibility of the Historic Preservation Commission. I've copied them below for reference.

I listened to the preservation committee meeting (audio is available on the Los Gatos Town website under meeting minutes/agenda's). At minute 26:50 of the audio recording the committee member that opposed this barns removal states that "it is part of our role to maintain and retain structures like this". That statement is in contradiction to the powers and duties of the historic preservation committee, and instead shows a deliberate agenda of the individual committee member. The committee was formulated, according to the Town Code, to review applications and make recommendations based on evidence; their duty is NOT to force property owners to "maintain and retain structures" that clearly have no significance as proven in a report prepared by qualified historians.

### Sec. 29.80.227. Powers and duties of the Historic Preservation Committee.

The Historic Preservation Committee shall:

- (1) Regularly review and make recommendations to the Planning Commission concerning the determination of all matters pertaining to historic preservation which comes before the Planning Commission.
- (2) Review and make recommendations to the Planning Director concerning the determination of a minor residential development permit for properties with a LHP overlay zone or structures which were built prior to 1941.
- (3) Determine and issue approval for minor residential and commercial exterior alterations not covered under the architecture and site approval process or the minor residential development permit, for designated properties with a LHP overlay zone pursuant to subsection [29.20.485](#).
- (4) Upon request of the Planning Director, review pending or proposed building permits dealing with historic structures when it is questionable that the work proposed meets the guidelines for pre-1941 structures.
- (5) May, on request of the property owner, advise with respect to any proposed work requiring or not requiring a Town permit on any historic structure, a designated landmark site or in a designated historic district.

Examples of the work referred to are additions, demolitions, painting and repainting of exterior surfaces, roofing, fencing, landscaping, glazing, and installation of lighting fixtures. In advising, the Historic Preservation Committee shall be guided by the purposes and standards specified in this division and other applicable ordinances and/or development standards. This subsection does not impose regulations or controls on any property.

--Jeremy

**Jeremy Adams**  
**Assistant Operations Manager/NorCal Cultural Resources Manager**  
**ECORP Consulting, Inc.**  
***A Federal Small Business***

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

**From:** Andy Bursan <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 28, 2024 3:15 PM  
**To:** Kurt Anderson <[REDACTED]>  
**Cc:** Jeremy Adams <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** 32 Euclid - Historic Preservation Committee comments

Hi Kurt,

Thanks again for everything yesterday. I wanted to get back to you regarding what the Historic Preservation Committee stated about a historically important individual being associated with the property and why we believe some of these statements are inaccurate. They said the property shares an association with Peter Johnson. While Peter Johnson was an important community member of Los Gatos our research found no direct connection between him and the property/barn. Johnson owned large portions of the area around Los Gatos from as early as 1874, but no records indicate he has any direct association with the barn itself. Even if a connection was to be found between him and the barn, he owned hundreds of acres in town and built many buildings throughout the community including his residence which is on a local walking tour and other earlier buildings that still exist and represent his life. There is a walking tour in town that includes his home and six other buildings he constructed, which again are far better and earlier examples than the barn (see attached walking tour and Johnson museum article). Since we found no evidence Peter Johnson was directly connected to the property, we didn't discuss him in our report because he didn't have clear association or relevance for the building. We also found no evidence that Ernest Johnson who farmed the property in the early 20th century, was an important individual. Jeremy and I believe the member of the public that originally referenced Peter Johnson did so without having any evidence that actually associated him with the barn, and the council member didn't verify either way. The fact that our report didn't mention Johnson was not due to inadequate or insufficient research, but rather the research we did sufficiently proved there was no significant association for that barn and any past important individual.

Besides that, a member of the committee stated that ECORP incorrectly reported that Mr. and Mrs. Roy Johnson moved to 28 Euclid from Bakersfield in the 1940s. We have attached an article from 1971 proving that Mr. and Mrs. Roy Johnson did live at the property and were from Bakersfield. In other words, this article proves the committee member was wrong and ECORPs report was thoroughly researched and correct.

Having reviewed our reports discussion of people associated with the property once again, we don't see any gross inaccuracies regarding former residents/owners and we dispute the claims made by the committee which calls into questions the accuracy of our report. We believe the committee made uniformed and unproven claims, especially with regards to Peter Johnson having some important association with the barn. I hope this helps clarify the question for you and feel free to reach out any time if you have questions.

Thank you,  
Andrew

*Andrew Bursan, MCRP*



*Architectural Historian*  
ECORP Consulting, Inc.

*Federal Small Business*  
*California Small Business for Public Works (SB-PW)*



Tranquility in the San Joaquin Valley to see Mrs.

for the weekend before going home with his family.

## Housewarming and reunion

A planned house warming turned out to be a surprise reunion for the Johnson family of 28 Euclid Ave., long time Los Gatos residents. Mr. and Mrs. Roy Johnson who have lived at the old Robinson ranch house there since 1944 recently completed and moved into a new home on the property, where they hosted a party for 35.

Most of the six Johnson children were graduated from Los Gatos Union High School and all but one still live in the area. Son Norman has recently moved to Illinois. The rest of the family planned a housewarming party that was attended by all of the Johnson family, wives and children and some close friends and relatives.

Gene, the eldest son, and his wife Doris came from their Watsonville home with their two children. Marvin lives in Los Gatos and was

there with two of his children. Mrs. Velma Martin brought her husband, Gene, and their six children from San Jose; Norman and his wife Bobbie were enroute from Illinois to Honolulu and were able to attend. Mrs. Loetta Burrows, still of Los Gatos, was there with her fiance and family of four, and Jim, the youngest member came with his wife Diane and four children from their Santa Clara home.

Mr. and Mrs. Johnson came to this area in 1941 from Bakersfield to work in defense and stayed. Both are retired and enjoying their home in the foothills. When asked why they didn't sell their property and take advantage of the inflationary prices Mrs. Johnson said,

"We thought about that but where could we go that is more beautiful and that has as much to offer in good living?"



3/22/24

Petition for the removal of 32 Euclid Ave. from historic designation

We, the undersigned, have met in person with Alex Anderson and have reviewed the proposed project at 32 Euclid Court and are in total support of the demolition of the existing structure and also support that the structure is not a structure of merit nor does it have any historical significance to the Town or the neighborhood.

We are fully in favor of the proposed architecture on the new project and encourage the Historic Preservation Committee to make the findings to remove the existing structure from any historical list in the town of Los Gatos.

NAME	SIGNATURE	ADDRESS
KEVIN FORBES	Kevin C. Forbes	
PAT CANNING	Pat Canning	
Tracy Scharpf	Tracy Scharpf	
Jason Scharpf	Jason Scharpf	
Ronan Hinson	Ronan Hinson	
Kim Harris	Kim Harris	
Elizabeth Acomb	Elizabeth Acomb	
Steve Gong	Steve Gong	
Harumi Gong	Harumi Gong	
Peggy Fang	Peggy Fang	
Eiman Zolfaghari	Eiman Zolfaghari	
Parin Setiy	Parin Setiy	

***This Page  
Intentionally  
Left Blank***