1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3	Los Gatos Planning Commissioners:	Kathryn Janoff, Chair Kendra Burch, Vice Chair
4		Jeffrey Barnett Melanie Hanssen
5		Jeffrey Suzuki Reza Tavana
6		Emily Thomas
7	Town Manager:	Laurel Prevetti
8		
9	Community Development Director:	Joel Paulson
10	Town Attorney:	Robert Schultz
11		
12	Transcribed by:	Vicki L. Blandin (619) 541-3405
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

PROCEEDINGS:

CHAIR JANOFF: This item is a request to consider for approval a zone change from Residential 1D:LHP, Single-family Residential Downtown with a Landmark and Historic Preservation Overlay, to C-2:LHP, Central Business District with a Landmark and Historic Presentation Overlay, and a General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to Central Business District for property located at 4 Tait Avenue, APN 510-44-054. Zone Change Application is Z-20-002 and General Plan Amendment Application is GP-20-001. Property owner is the Town of Los Gatos and the Applicant is Mr. Jim Foley.

First, may I see a show of hands from

Commissioners who have visited this property? Thank you.

Are there any disclosures? I see none. Ms. Armer, I

understand you'll be giving the Staff Report tonight.

JENNIFER ARMER: Yes, good evening. Good evening, Chair, Vice Chair, Commissioners.

Before you tonight is a request for a General
Plan Amendment from Medium Density Residential to Central
Business District and the associated zone change from

Single Family Residential Downtown to Central Business
District. The Landmark and Historic Presentation Overlay
would be retained, and this is on 4 Tait Avenue.

In contrast to many projects reviewed by the Planning Commission, this proposal is just about changing the rules that apply to the property. There is no particular business that is proposed on the site at this time and no improvements are proposed to the site or the building. Also unusual, this is a property that is owned by the Town, so the Town has additional involvement when a specific subtenant is chosen.

The requested General Plan Amendment was reviewed by the General Plan Committee in January of this year. This committee forwards a recommendation of approval to the Planning Commission and to Town Council. The proposed General Plan Amendment and zone change would be consistent with the pattern of land use and zoning in the adjacent downtown commercial area. Additionally, the Applicant's letter explains how the best use of the existing historic building is a commercial use. For these reasons and the analysis provided in the Staff Report Staff does recommend that they make the required findings in Exhibit 2 and forward a recommendation of approval to Town Council of the

1	draft resolution in Exhibit 3 and draft ordinance in
2	Exhibit 4.
3	There was a Desk Item distributed today with some
4	comments and concerns from nearby neighbors.
5	This concludes Staff's presentation. I'd be happy
6	to answer any questions.
7	CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you, Ms. Armer. Do
8	Commissioners have questions for Staff? I don't see any
10	hands raised so at this time we will open the public
11	hearing and give the Applicant up to five minutes to
12	address the Commission.
13	DIRECTOR PAULSON: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to
14	allow the Applicant to speak. Mr. Foley, you can unmute
15	yourself and you have up to five minutes.
16	JIM FOLEY: Thank you, Mr. Paulson. Can you all
17	hear me?
18	CHAIR JANOFF: Yes, we can. Go ahead, Mr. Foley.
19	JIM FOLEY: Good evening, distinguished Planning
20	Commission. My name is Jim Foley representing Imwalle
21	Properties, Pennant Properties, and Tait Fire House LLC,
22	the Applicant. I'd just like to provide a bit of background
23 24	for you on the project.
25	The project is the result of an RFP process put
-~	out by the Town of Los Gatos several years ago to create a

public/private partnership with a qualified local real estate company to restore, renovate, reposition and ultimately lease and manage the two Town-owned museum properties located at 75 Church Street, which is Forbes Mill, and 4 Tait Avenue, which is the Tait Fire House on the corner there.

The RFP proposed a master lease structure whereby the private partner would enter into a long-term lease for the property from the Town and essentially take responsibility for the aforementioned activities, including the expenditure of significant dollars associated with improvements in return for an economic participation in the project. The details of this can be found in the two master leases entered into with the Town of Los Gatos last year.

Imwalle Properties was awarded the RFP and for two years went through an extensive process to craft and ultimately execute the two master leases for the properties with a tremendous amount of participation from Town Staff and significant oversight by the then Town Council who ultimately approved the leases and authorized the Town Manager and Town Attorney to execute lease documents last fall.

The Forbes Mill property is already zoned for commercial uses contemplated by the master lease for that

particular property, however the Tait Fire House property is zoned for residential use and needs to undergo the proposed zone change and General Plan Amendment in order to accomplish the goals of the master lease.

Please note that the only residential use that has ever existed at the property is an ancillary use as a component of the old fire house and outside of that has always operated as a museum which was open to the public and attracted outside visitors to the site.

District and the neighbor to the east is currently zoned for commercial use. We want to be really clear that this project has restoration at its heart and it does not contemplate expansion or redevelopment. We understand the property is bordering the residential neighborhood and the nearby schools and church, and we've been in touch with both of the schools and the church and they were supportive of the rezoning effort as it is of utmost importance to get the property back into regular service and occupied in order to discourage vagrants and vandals that have entered the property from time to time over the past several years.

We've also heard from many residential owners in the residential neighborhood, most of whom are supportive, with a few having concerns that will hopefully be

alleviated as they watch the process unfold and a future project is ultimately brought forward.

You'll note that the General Plan Committee, whom some of you sit on, has recommended approval of the application and Town Staff also recommends the Planning Commission make a motion to recommend approval of the zone change and General Plan Amendment to the Town Council. As illustrated in our biography section, our team is highly qualified, ultra-local, and has a vested interest in the betterment of Los Gatos for several generations.

We'll be careful stewards of the property and are really excited to move this project forward through the process and we're here to answer any questions you may have. Thank you.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you, Mr. Foley. Do Commissioners have questions for the Applicant?

Commissioner Hanssen.

COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: I obviously was on the General Plan Committee when we heard this before, but I do remember the discussion and I wanted to ask and make sure I have it right, is that any potential applicant to take over the lease in the facility would have to be approved by Town Council, is that correct?

JIM FOLEY: That's my understanding. I don't know if Director Paulson...or it doesn't appear that the Town

Attorney is on this Zoom, but that is my understanding as to how the lease is written. That could be verified, I think, internally if you want to check.

COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: It was probably a better question for Staff, so thank you.

JIM FOLEY: Okay.

CHAIR JANOFF: Any other questions for the Applicant? Vice Chair Burch.

VICE CHAIR BURCH: I noted on the General Plan Committee notes that the committee members discouraged restaurant and personal service uses in this location. I was curious, with the proposed changes do you agree with that discouraging recommendation or do you find that the interest in this space may fall more in line with a restaurant or services?

JIM FOLEY: It's a really interesting question. Since we started this process a number of years ago a lot of things in the market have changed, not that that is a direct correlation to what is or is not appropriate here. I think that this particular property is very compatible with the C-2 and the Downtown Central Business District just because of its location and the neighboring properties. But

we are on the border. I mean, we realize we're right there; it is literally the edge of the residential neighborhood and the edge of the Central Business District, so we've seen some of the concerns and had some conversations with the neighbors about what the uses are.

I don't know, I think it just depends on the particular project. That's a very broad use. A food or personal service use is allowed in C-2, but within those designations there is a broad variety of how those things could be executed, so I think it's just a matter of finding something that's compatible. It's very likely that it's an office project, but we don't want to preclude something that could be really valuable to the community and to the immediate neighbors that might fall under one of those use categories.

The only other thing that I'll point out is I think it was maybe only one, and possible two, but one of the people that raised that issue at the General Plan Committee meeting—there were not more than that—that had that concern.

VICE CHAIR BURCH: All right, thank you.

CHAIR JANOFF: Commissioner Suzuki.

COMMISSIONER SUZUKI: You mentioned earlier that there was a preservation element in terms of history to changing the zoning laws. Could you elaborate?

clarify to you all that have a better understanding of it than most, but also to the neighbors. We're not talking about tearing these buildings down or redeveloping them or adding things to them. These are historical buildings in the Town; they're of significance. I think the architectural style of them is fine. Maybe there could be some refreshing done but it's not a project to try to increase any density or add any square footage; it's really to preserve these. The museums were doing that to a certain extent and the Town was the steward of that for many years, and they were keeping the buildings up and keeping them maintained, so I think we just want to take it to the next level. We want to touch up some of the exterior stuff, maybe provide some changes, maybe restore.

The fire house has some opportunities to restore it to maybe what it looked like I don't know how many decades ago, four or five or six decades ago.

Forbes Mill probably on the other hand has remained much how it looks now, and a lot of the improvements are going to be focused on tenant improvements

on the interior of the buildings rather than trying to modify anything.

I think our hope is having been here a long time, and we have interests in a lot of other historical properties and commercial properties in town, I think that we understand maintaining character in town and that's sort of the goal here, as opposed to whatever somebody else's objective might be, to use these postage stamps of land and create something new or different. Our agenda is no, let's preserve them but figure out what we can do to make them revitalized on the interior and bring some life back into them and keep that going for the long term. I hope that answers your question.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for that. Commissioner Thomas.

that, Mr. Foley, you mentioned that you felt like the space and location would be attractive to maybe some small office space. Is there anything in any of the plans that would maybe make the space more attractive to some public use as long as that is something that the neighbors are happy with or comfortable with? Because like you said, it was a location that attracted public visitors and people could go and enjoy it, and as we know, living in California we don't

have a lot of historic buildings in town and it is sad to see it sitting there not being used and enjoyed by the people of the Town, so is there anything with these changes and any updates and renovations that could be done that could make it more accessible and enjoyed by the public?

7

1

3

4

5

6

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

23

24

25

JIM FOLEY: That's a really good point. I think it's too early to tell for this particular site, I mean honestly. There's some property there and there is a storage building kind of structure in the back that we don't really know what the future of that is. It's going to be particular to the project that we bring forward when we bring an actual tenant improvement project forward where we'll see, and if it's such that maybe not all of the space is needed—it has a parking lot and is self-parked for the size of the building, so short of reducing the size of the building and trying to creating something might be difficult-but maybe there is a way if the tenant doesn't require it that we could repurpose some of the area to do something, and I don't know what, but it would be interesting to collaborate.

The cool thing with this project is we're a public/private partnership with the Town, so everybody gets to be involved and gets to talk about it, and if there's an

idea that comes forward I'm sure we all want to entertain that.

Just editorially, Forbes Mill has a much larger opportunity for that to occur because the property there actually, you may not know if you've been down to the trail, but it extends significantly farther back than just the Forbes Mill annex building. I know we're probably not going to revisit that in this venue, but it's something that we've definitely had on our mind and would appreciate any feedback we can get on both of them as to what's creative that we can do to make it an asset to the Town for sure, so thank you for asking that and hopefully that answers.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS: And thank you for following up about Forbes Mill. I definitely can see how that site, it's a little easier to envision that just because of its location and accessibility in town and how it's slightly more isolated from a neighborhood.

I did have a follow up question with regard to the accessory structure, like the little storage area that you mentioned. Is that part of the historic structure of the property, or not? If you don't know, I can ask Staff later.

JIM FOLEY: Yeah, I don't know. I think Director Paulson might know better than I how that would be treated.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you. Any other questions from Commissioners? All right, seeing none, I will now move to the public comments. Members of the public may choose to state your name and/or address or to speak anonymously. Please understand that the meeting is being recorded for the public record. Do we have any members of the public who wish to speak on this item?

DIRECTOR PAULSON: We do have a hand raised, so the first person will be Kat.

KAT BATTAGLIA: Hi, my name is Kat Battaglia, my husband is Robert White, and we submitted a letter today—we're a little bit late to the party, I think.

Last year we purchased 300 West Main Street, which is on the corner of West Main and Tait, so we are directly across from 4 Tait. The whole side of our house looks out at and is across from that building, so it's kind of important to us what happens to it, particularly because when we bought this house our research told us and the Town told us that they were considering an old fire house museum, not this sort of a new... It was kind of a surprise to see this for lease sign go up, so we're concerned what happens there.

We agree that it needs some upgrades, but the view that we have over that building that's kind of cute and has potential was a consideration for purchasing this property and I'm very concerned about what happens there for traffic impact, for our views, for the foot traffic, for the amount of parking.

As it stands now, the parking lot has been used by young people for—at least during COVID times—kind of a gathering spot for impromptu parties, which are always broken up very quickly, but we've had some homeless street people, wanderers around there. It obviously needs upgrades.

We had actually offered to purchase the property out of concern for what it was or what might transpire there with the intention of upgrading it but preserving the aesthetic style, the roof lines, and I'm worried about roof heights and that sort of thing and a big change there would mean more congestion.

The other thing that was a big surprise to us is the traffic problem and I'm concerned about that dependent upon what type of business goes in there, so it's parking and more traffic coming in. It's actually kind of dangerous because there's such a gridlock pattern that we can't get out and emergency vehicles can't get in. I've actually had

people during those times get out of their car and take refuge under our birch trees for shade because they were stuck, not moving on Tait for so long that she thought her baby was going to perish; I've given water to people. So I'm a little bit concerned about what goes in there.

And again, we welcome the property being upgraded and updated. I'm concerned at this point, not knowing too much and only speaking to Jim through one email reply today, about what this will open up for the future.

DIRECTOR PAULSON: Time, Chair.

KAT GATTAGLIA: Oh, sorry. Is my time up?

CHAIR JANOFF: Yes, thank you for your comments.

Do any of the Commissioners have questions for the speaker?

I don't see any hands raised. Thank you very much. Do we have any other speakers?

DIRECTOR PAULSON: Not currently, but let's give it a couple seconds. Here we go. Ms. Quintana. Again I will have to more her to panelist to allow her to speak. So, Ms. Quintana, you go and unmute yourself and then you can speak.

LEE QUINTANA: Just a couple of comments. This was the first fire house in Los Gatos and a while back the first fire bell was moved from its spot on the Town plaza and moved back to what was then the Tait Museum with the

understanding when that move was approved that there was be a structure built to house the fire bell on that site.

My concern now is what will happen to the fire bell as part of any plans for the site and whether the fire bell somehow could be integrated into something that would be available for public use, like a tiny pocket park maybe, or something. That's one concern.

The other thing I would like to say is this. I was one of the General Plan Committee members who had concerns about the possible uses on the site since it is my understanding that all of those uses that could be allowed in the C-2 would be by-right uses and therefore it's not clear to me what control exactly that the Town Council would have over the use rather than just the architecture. Those are my comments.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for those. Do any
Commissioners have questions of Ms. Quintana? I don't see
any hand raised. Do we have any other speakers?

DIRECTOR PAULSON: One second. I have to get back to the other room and see if anyone else's hand is raised. The next is Jim Pappas.

JIM PAPPAS: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Jim Pappas. I live at 5 Tait Avenue here in Los Gatos.

Much like Kat I somewhat echo many of her comments. We've

actually had a chance to talk about it. It was not quite on the level of awareness of this level of the programming.

I guess my biggest concern would be much like Kat said, yes, would love to see something developed there because there is a lot of activity that occurs that's rather nefarious in nature. In fact, even this afternoon some high schoolers were parked there just exchanging whatever at the time.

My concern really would be from the ability for the Town to control what commercial is. Many towns or cities have the ability to have commercial versus retail versus office, and so the concern we would have as neighbors is if it turns into retail, if you look at downtown Los Gatos the likelihood of that retail changing hands on a rotating basis would be of great concern. The same thing with the restaurant. You're looking at in-and-out traffic. That would be of great concern for that location.

The other problem with a retail environment would be beach traffic. That retailer would have no chance whatsoever to survive because on Saturdays and Sundays they can't commit any business during those times. That's why our preference as neighbors, first would be residential; if

that's not possible it would be for more of an office nature.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A couple of us put that in writing to you today and yesterday to enumerate those concerns and really lay it out for you where we believe a professional type office-it could be an architect, it could be an engineer, it could be a financial advisor-something with low traffic but it maintains the architectural view that you have there without adding traffic to the area, because the reality is if you talk about four sides of that building, three of the four sides are residential, and I think that needs to come in because when people talk about it they say it's a commercial location. It's commercial on one side where you have kind of a hair shop and massage place. Everybody else on all other sides are all residential, so I'd like for you to keep that in mind when considering what control you have if you do make it commercial. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you very much. Are there any other questions for this speaker? Don't see any hands. Any other speakers?

DIRECTOR PAULSON: I don't currently see any other hands, Chair. Again, we'll give it a second here.

CHAIR JANOFF: All right, so at this time we
would like to hear from the Applicant again, who has up to
three minutes to add anything further. Does the Applicant
wish to speak again?

DIRECTOR PAULSON: Yes, Mr. Foley does. One second.

JIM FOLEY: I won't take too long, but I appreciate the comments by the neighbors and I was able to see some of their letters, and to both of them or anyone else listening, you received our letter reaching out and I'm happy that you're engaged in the project. We just want to make sure that everyone that's around there is on board.

We're excited that this is a project that we feel keeps everybody aligned together: the Town, us as managing the project, and the neighborhood. We're open to further comment. This particular part of the process is very technical; it's the rezoning and a General Plan Amendment.

As marketing proceeds and an actual project-level project comes into focus where we know what the use is going to be, we're going to have a lot more conversation with everybody and we're really going to be open to making sure that the immediate neighborhood isn't impacted and has a chance to provide their input. So, everyone feel free to contact us at any time with questions, concerns or updates

about what's going on and we want to make it really beneficial to everybody else. Any other questions we're here to field. Thank you.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you, Mr. Foley. Do

Commissioners have any additional questions for the

Applicant? Commissioner Barnett.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT: Yes, did you say that the master lease with the Town is already executed? If so, I have a follow up question.

process that we're going through because the master lease is kind of presupposed and had been supported by the previous council that this is where we're headed, but we still have to take this through the process, and there was a lot of debate about whether the Town could take it through the process itself or whether we as the master tenant take it through the process, so we're here now, doing it this way, and just hopeful that we still maintain everyone's support. Whatever your next question is, I'm happy to answer if I can.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT: The follow up question is whether you're aware in the lease itself whether there's any control over the use of the property, the subtenants?

JIM FOLEY: Yeah, my understanding is that the

Town of Los Gatos through the Town Council and supported by

your recommendations, and that the recommendations of Staff

and the Town Attorney has the final approval of any

subtenant that we have.

COMMISSIONER BARNETT: Okay, that's good to hear. Thank you.

CHAIR JANOFF: Commissioner Thomas.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS: I had a question for Mr. Foley about the timeline. If this zoning is changed do you have any perspective timeline of when renovations might begin to occur?

timeline but it's going to be triggered by tenant activity, and as one of the neighbors had mentioned we've had a marketing sign up there for a little while. We've had some interest and it's been really exciting to field all that interest through the middle of the pandemic where everyone... Generally speaking, I think that there's been more activity in Los Gatos than a lot of other places, but for this particular property, it's in a quieter part of the Business District so it may not be immediately the first property to go look at, so we have had some inquires but not a lot of activity.

23 24

25

22

As we go through the process and we emerge from the pandemic I'm hopeful that activity ramps up and we're able to field a lot of inquiry about what types of uses and who is ready to come collaborate and bring a project forward, so as that occurs let's call it the beginning of summer, the next three months or so we'll hopefully have more traction, but it could be a lot longer than that. Once we have the tenant or a suitable tenant in line, then we're in the middle of a tenant improvement project, so we'll be going through if there's a necessary permit process that takes several months. There is going to be a plan check process for a Building Permit and it's going to take several months, and there are going to be several months of construction, so even if everything went lightning fast I couldn't imagine anything getting in there faster than nine months from now. It would be more like the end of the year or the beginning of next year, unless there was something that just needed very minor improvements, that was very quick to be able to occupy, something could be in there more like Q3, but my crystal ball says no, it's still a ways out.

CHAIR JANOFF: All right, thank you for that. Do we have any other questions for the Applicant? I don't see any hand raised, so we will now close the public portion of

this hearing and ask if the Commissioners have any questions of Staff, wish to comment, or introduce a motion for consideration? Commissioner Suzuki.

COMMISSIONER SUZUKI: I do have a question to Staff. What was mentioned earlier was the property hasn't actually been used for housing. Is there any potential in the future that it could be used for housing?

DIRECTOR PAULSON: I can go ahead and answer, unless Ms. Armer wants to start, but I'm happy to jump in there.

There's always that opportunity. As was stated, the former Town Council has entered into a master lease agreement with this tenant, so it would take an action to modify that. The challenge gets to be utilizing the existing building, which is historic, it is in an historic district, whether or not that could be rehabbed or whether it would need to be significantly altered to make housing, whether that's market rate or affordable housing, to work on that site.

Those are always options. We are going down the path currently, as the Applicant mentioned. This is a necessary action that will ultimately need to be taken by the Town Council whether or not the General Plan and zoning designations get changed.

But could it ever be used for housing? There is a possibility that it could be used for housing. If these two applications move forward and it is changed, then it could either be changed back or we do actually allow residential in a number of our commercial zones with Conditional Use Permits. This doesn't negate the options for future residential use, and hopefully that answers your question.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for that. Any other questions for Staff, or discussion?

I did have one further question for Staff. It's been commented a couple of times, the control that Staff or the Town Council has over who will potentially occupy this site. There's been a lot of concern that was raised at the General Plan meeting regarding what don't we want in this space. So, if you could spend a minute just to help us understand what type of controls would typically be in place to make sure that the right fit for the neighbors and the Town were decided upon.

DIRECTOR PAULSON: Generally, and I believe the Town Attorney mentioned some of this at the General Plan Committee, and so I can start and if Ms. Armer has additional comments she would like to make.

The Town is the landlord for this master lease agreement. There is language in there that we basically

have the ability to refuse a subtenant who might lease it from the Applicant. I don't have the specific language in front of me to know whether or not that's the Town Council and/or the Town Manager, but typically if we do come to a situation in moving forward is that becomes a situation and this obviously following the recommendation of the Planning Commission to the Council, further clarification will be provided.

I apologize for not mentioning earlier that the Town Attorney unfortunately wasn't able to join us this evening, but it's my understanding from his comments at the GPC that the Town does have basically a first right of refusal for subtenants that would lease from the Applicant and their group.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for that clarification.

I just wanted to point out that for those of us who were thinking about the parcel's proximity to the neighborhood, how tight Tait is, and the parking lot and its size relative to ingress and egress and opportunities, we were thinking hard about how to control that, and the fact as stated by Town Attorney and confirmed tonight by Director Paulson that the Town has quite a bit of control over deciding who comes into that space gave us a lot of comfort

to know that a good decision would be made if we were to change the zone code.

Any other comments? Commissioner Hanssen.

COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: I was just going to add on a little bit to what Chair Janoff said, because we all as well as Commissioner Burch at the time were members of the General Plan Committee when we heard this, and I think that there was quite a long discussion actually by the General Plan Committee and this is for a recommendation that was to come to us. I think the way that we got comfortable with it was exactly what Chair Janoff said, which is that the Applicant is the Town of Los Gatos and because the Applicant is the Town of Los Gatos there's going to be a lot of oversight as to what kind of tenant might be in that place.

That combined with the fact that the use has never really been residential since its inception, and I don't know to what extent the Applicant mentioned this but it's quite a bit more difficult for them not having the zoning aligned with the actual use in terms of making the lease happen, so putting all that stuff together.

Having said that, the General Plan Committee was concerned enough about the possibility to personal service or restaurants being in that location, being so close to

residential, that that was included in the recommendation that that shouldn't be considered. But again, it is just a recommendation.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for that, Commissioner
Hanssen. It's important to note that tonight we are making
a recommendation, or this motion will be a recommendation
to Town Council, and so if there are concepts that we would
like to see considered or not considered, now is the time
to put those ideas in place for their consideration.

I would just like to echo the comments of

Commissioner Thomas and perhaps elaborate a little bit. The

idea that this is a place of history is something that

really resonates for me, as it does I'm sure for those

members who are or were on Historic Preservation Committee—

thank you for the question, Commissioner Suzuki.

So, there's a real opportunity to do something special here in terms of the kind of placemaking I think that Commissioner Thomas is thinking of, and the notion that there is a bell that is the possible focus for that kind of opportunity for public enjoyment of this and its history is a very compelling one, so I hope that those comments go forward to the Town Council in terms of what Planning Commission would like to see for this particular location.

Any other comments? And yes, Commissioner Suzuki.

COMMISSIONER SUZUKI: Since this is essentially a recommendation in spirit to the Town Council I do want to bring up a concern that I can't help but have. I understand that there's been a lot of thought and deliberation placed into executing this private/public partnership, but I can't help but see that there is a pretty large opportunity cost to designating this land specifically for commercial use. I do understand that there could be a potential for Conditional Use Permits and that maybe people could live there, but in spirit, specifically in the use of commercial use, I don't know if I could endorse that.

The Town needs to meet state housing quotas and the Town is still struggling to meet those quotas by literally hundreds of houses, even with the North 40 in play, and if we don't the State of California, when they have the resources they probably will sue us again.

In our Housing Element, HOU-1, "Expand the choice of housing opportunities for all economic segments of the community by supporting the development of affordable housing in a variety of types and sizes, including a mixture of ownership and rental housing." HOU-3, "Preserving existing residential opportunities," which I

believe is actually in line here, "including the existing affordable housing stock."

After visiting the property personally I can't help but to think that the property was quite large with a lot of potential for housing development and specifically for commercial zoning. I don't really see what the clear benefits are here, and perhaps that's because a very clear picture of what exactly the property will be used for hasn't been made clear to me. Those are my thoughts.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for that. Commissioner Thomas.

of the same concerns as Commissioner Suzuki because I too know, I mean we all know, that we're facing a housing crisis in the State of California and Los Gatos is not immune from that, and so I do think that it is our job to be thorough and play devil's advocate and make sure that we are looking at all the potential best uses of different land space.

We were provided with the existing floor plan of the property. Looking at it I thought could this be divided into multiple smaller units? One of the reasons I asked, which I did want to ask Staff about if they could follow up

on that, but is the accessory structure part of the historical designation or could that be removed?

Both Commissioner Suzuki and I are jumping into this a little bit later than some of you because so many of us are on that General Plan Committee, so I did have the same questions initially looking at this. Has it really been thoroughly looked at if this could be used for people to live? Especially because it's so walkable to downtown and this is a space where people could not need a car to live, which is great. Providing housing in places like this is just something that we're not only required to do by the state but we want to do in the rewriting of the General Plan.

Like I said, I love the idea of having it be a placemaking situation. I do think you can provide that in addition to allowing people to live there, right?

Especially if there is like a small courtyard with a bell and some signage, incorporating some park or space where people can sit. So anyway, that is one of my concerns. I did have the question about the accessory structure and if there's any historical significance to that.

My other question is if a General Plan update would affect this at all, or the lease, or if it would be grandfathered in because of that situation that's more of

just like a technical question, I guess, for Commissioner Hanssen maybe, or Chair Janoff; I don't know if you'd be able to answer that.

CHAIR JANOFF: Let's start with the first question regarding the accessory structure. Does Staff have any idea whether that's... I have an opinion. Based on the cinderblock structure I have an opinion about whether it's historic, but I'll defer to Staff.

JENNIFER ARMER: I don't actually have any specific information about the detached structure. Often on historic sights it is the primary structure that we are focused on, and as you said, the cinderblock nature does indicate it might be more recent.

CHAIR JANOFF: Yeah, it's a tell. And

Commissioner Thomas or Suzuki, or for anybody else

interested in whether or not structures on a property are

considered historic, I would encourage you to visit the

library and take a look at the Sanborn Maps—and if you

don't know what they are, ask one of the librarians and

they'll show you—but you can look at these specific parcels

and see the structures that existed from 1895 through 1949,

I believe, or 1950, so there's a lot of information there

and I'm sure a quick look at this parcel would indicate

whether it existed in an historic timeframe.

Regarding whether the change in zone would impact the General Plan Advisory Committee work, I'll defer to Chair Hanssen.

COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: Yes, we do have a very large housing target, but this one property isn't going to make a difference one way or the other. When we had this discussion at the General Plan Committee, because we're all well aware of the huge housing target that we do have, again, this is a property that's owned by the Town of Los Gatos, who is also very aware of the housing target that we have and the growth that's expected, and they are proceeding forward with wanting to change this to the General Plan zoning as well as the underlying zoning to commercial use because that property has never been done as such.

So that was how the General Plan Committee got comfortable with it. I don't think it's going to have any impact on the work of the Committee. We'll be starting the Housing Element later this year, and I sat on the Housing Element last time, and yes, as Commissioner Suzuki pointed out, we have had a tough time getting there, primarily because we can only plan for housing but we can't force developers to build it, so we do have ongoing issues but it

don't think this one property is going to swing things one way or the other.

DIRECTOR PAULSON: I would just add a couple things, Chair.

We're not anticipating the General Plan update process changing a whole bunch of General Plan designations, so the General Plan update wouldn't affect that portion.

The other is that the Town Council, we will be doing verbatim minutes, so they'll get verbatim minutes of everything that's been said on this item as it moves forward to them.

The housing is interesting. The Town has not to my knowledge been a landlord for residential, and so what I image would happen if folks wanted it to go down a residential path is the Town would look at selling. We don't develop property. Even our below market price properties are owned by individuals and/or property management for the rental size, so we're not in that business. There are some jurisdictions who do do that. The Town just hasn't been one of those jurisdictions yet, but I just wanted to make sure that everyone knows that all of these thoughts and ideas will be forwarded to the Town Council following this evening's meeting.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for that, and I did want to comment.

I've been in this structure many, many times as a former volunteer and associate of the museum that was there. It could be subdivided potentially into three units, very, very small, a couple of them, but one of the concerns that I would have if the Town decided to sell it is that we really have no control over what develops as a residential structure, and from what we're hearing the appetite for developing low-income housing in the downtown area in an historic neighborhood, I'm going to say it's probably pretty low, and so we might desire that outcome, and I think it's an excellent point if there was a way to incentivize someone to do it.

The Town could break the lease and then they could sell the property and a lot of ifs fell into place, but I agree with Commissioner Hanssen that the General Plan in its update is attempting to identify a far larger and probably more buildable set of affordable housing within Los Gatos. So, I see better targets for development than this, but I think it's an interesting point to forward to the Town Council. Commissioner Thomas and then Suzuki.

COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Thank you for pointing that out because I do think that it is important, but based on

the comments just for this project and what could potentially go in there neighbors have opinions and strong feelings about that, and we would not want to make assumptions but I do think that it is difficult to get low-income housing passed in certain neighborhoods and I appreciate that you pointed that out, so thank you.

I do think that if verbatim minutes are going to the Town Council I would be interested to see if as part of solving our housing crisis here we could become a jurisdiction that does manage property and propose and build and rent it. I don't know what the ramifications are of that, but that might be a creative way that we can move forward with dealing with our housing issues.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for that comment.

Commissioner Suzuki and then Vice Chair Burch.

COMMISSIONER SUZUKI: Thank you for explaining the political barriers to constructing additional housing units; I very much appreciate that.

Along with Commissioner Thomas on including certain statements for things in the verbatim minutes, I want to address the idea that specific parcels of land are not going to impact things one way or another or they're not going to meet our quota unilaterally. I can't help but to feel that we can say that about pretty much literally

any piece of land. Like, no individual parcel of land is going to meet those state requirements. That requires a pretty holistic change in our philosophy as a planning commission, as a town, pretty much across the board.

In this specific case that's the reason why I said in my first comment after the Applicant finished that in terms of spirit I am opposed to the property being used commercially. Does that mean that I think that it would be bad for the property to be used commercially? No, but I think that the Town should very much prioritize the construction of housing above not practically everything else, but it should be really up there, probably above commercial development specifically.

CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for those comments. Vice Chair Birch.

VICE CHAIR BURCH: I want to commend everybody. I think that this is a great conversation, but I want to bring us back to the application in front of us, and I was prepared to attempt a motion if that's all right with the Chair.

CHAIR JANOFF: Yes, please go ahead.

VICE CHAIR BURCH: Great. All right. I am going to move that we approve the request for a zone change from R-1D:LHP to C-2:LHP, and a General Plan Amendment to change

1	the land use designation from Medium Density Residential to	
2	Central Business District for property located at 4 Tait	
3	Avenue. I can find the required findings for CEQA; this is	
4	non-exempt. I can find the requirements that the proposal	
5	is consistent with the Town's General Plan, that it is	
6	internally consistent with the existing goals and policies	
7	of the General Plan and its corresponding elements, and	
8	that the proposed zone change is consistent with the	
10	General Plan and its elements in that the proposed zoning	
11	is consistent with the proposed General Plan land use	
12	designation. I believe that was all the findings.	
13	CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you for that. Do we have a	
14	second? Commissioner Hanssen.	
15	COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: I second the motion.	
16	CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you. Any comments on the	
17	motion? Questions for Staff. Do we need to incorporate	
18	Exhibit 3 and/or Exhibit A as part of the motion?	
19	DIRECTOR PAULSON: As I understand it, the motion	
20	includes the resolution for the General Plan Amendment and	
21	the ordinance for the zone change with any attachments is	
22	how I understood the motion.	
23	CHAIR JANOFF: Thank you.	
24		

VICE CHAIR BURCH: That's correct.

25

1	CHAIR JANOFF: All right, seeing no other hands		
2	then, I'll call the question. Commissioner Hanssen.		
3	COMMISSIONER HANSSEN: Yes.		
4	CHAIR JANOFF: Commissioner Tavana.		
5	COMMISSIONER TAVANA: Yes.		
6	CHAIR JANOFF: Commissioner Barnett.		
7	COMMISSIONER BARNETT: Yes.		
8	CHAIR JANOFF: Commissioner Thomas.		
9			
10	COMMISSIONER THOMAS: Yes.		
11	CHAIR JANOFF: Commissioner Suzuki.		
12	COMMISSIONER SUZUKI: No.		
13	CHAIR JANOFF: Vice Chair Burch.		
14	VICE CHAIR BURCH: Yes.		
15	CHAIR JANOFF: And I vote yes, so the motion		
16	carries 6-1, and since this is a recommendation to Town		
17	Council I'm assuming there's no appeal or other		
18	considerations.		
19	DIRECTOR PAULSON: That's correct. It's a		
20	recommendation to the Town Council so there are no appeal		
21	rights.		
22			
23	CHAIR JANOFF: All right, thank you.		
24			
25			

This Page Intentionally Left Blank