MINUTES OF THE HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMITTEE MEETING OCTOBER 23, 2024

The Historic Preservation Committee of the Town of Los Gatos conducted a regular meeting on October 23, 2024 at 4:00 p.m.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 4 PM

ROLL CALL

Present: Chair Susan Burnett, Vice Chair Lee Quintana, Planning Commissioner Jeffrey Barnett, Committee Member Barry Cheskin and Committee Member Martha Queiroz.

Absent: None

VERBAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

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

1. Approval of Minutes – July 24, 2024
2. Approval of Minutes – September 25, 2024

MOTION: **Motion** by **Vice Chair Lee Quintana** to approve the Consent Calendar. **Seconded** by **Committee Member Martha Queiroz**.

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.** Planning Commissioner Jeffrey Barnett recused on Item 1.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

3. 145 Tait Avenue
   Minor Residential Development Application MR-24-010

   Requesting Approval for Construction of a Second-Story Addition Exceeding 100 Square Feet and Exterior Alterations to an Existing Contributing Single-Family Residence Located in the Almond Grove Historic District on Property Zoned R-1D:LHP. Located on 145 Tait Avenue. APN 510-18-029. Exempt Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301: Existing Facilities.

Property Owner: Jennifer McNellis
Applicant: Eric Beckstrom
Project Planner: Erin Walters
Continued from September 11, 2024

Committee Member Queiroz recused themselves from Item 3, 145 Tait Avenue as their property is located within 1,000 feet of the subject property.

Erin Walters, Associate Planner, presented the staff report.

Opened Public Comment.

Applicant presented the project.

Jennifer McNellis, Owner, Paul, and Erik Beckstrom, Architect

- They received feedback from the Committee and consulting architect, Larry Cannon. They addressed his five points:
  1. They modified the plans to blend the roof ridge height with the current second-story addition that was done in 1996.
  2. Switched picture windows to Marvin windows with muntins and dividers.
  3. Both garage doors will be the same height.
  4. Will use Marvin style windows.
  5. Bay window will maintain a 12-inch setback.

Closed Public Comment.

Committee members discussed the matter.

MOTION: **Motion** by **Chair Burnett** to Forward a Recommendation to the Director on a Request for Approval for Construction of a Second-Story Addition Exceeding 100 Square Feet and Exterior Alterations to an Existing Contributing Single-Family Residence Located in the Almond Grove Historic District on Property Zoned R-1D:LHP. **Seconded** by **Barry Cheskin.**

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

Appeal rights read.

4. 200 Hernandez Avenue
   Request for Review Application PHST-24-018

   Requesting Approval for Exterior Alterations to a Pre-1941 Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1:12. APN 510-21-003. Exempt Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301: Existing Facilities.
   Property Owner/Applicant: Vaishali Singh-Sood
   Project Planner: Sean Mullin
   Continued from September 25, 2024

Sean Mullin, Planning Manager, presented the staff report.

Opened Public Comment.

Applicant presented the project.

Vaishali Singh-Sood, Owner

- Read written statement. As requested by the Committee, they provided documents, regarding weight differences between roof styles, pros and cons of a metal roof, and the fire benefits of a metal roof.
- They provided photos of standing seam roofs and samples of barrel roof and standing seam roof materials. The barrel style material can bend. There are seamless steel roof in the neighborhood.
- Provided a black standing seam roof. The prior owner added the red trim. They spoke to the former owner's daughter who said that the roof was originally black.

Committee members asked questions of the applicant.

Vaishali Singh-Sood, Owner

- They prefer black and not the traditional red because it was never red.
- Adding a barrel trim to the roof will need to be discussed with roofers
- Roofers said a tile roof could not be supported because there are no trusses.
- In the photo, the rafter tails under the roof will remain.
- The current red trim on the windows is not original. The red trim was painted in the 1990's by the prior homeowner. If they are allowed a standing seam roof, they would be willing to come to an agreed solution.

Committee Member

- Have they considered alternative materials? On the American Institute of Architects website there were two options to consider. There is a metal product that looks like a barrel roof and a lightweight concrete product that is lighter than tile. The weight of Spanish tile is 2.9 per square foot.

Vaishali Singh-Sood, Owner

- They are afraid of branches falling on the roof. If a steel metal barrel roof is dented it is costly to replace.
- They spoke to three roofers, but no structural engineers, who say that the roof cannot support the weight of tile which is 2.9 per square foot.
- They prefer and believe that a standing seam roof and not a barrel metal roof is more resistant to damage.

Closed Public Comment.

Committee members discussed the matter.

- Want the barrel edging.
- Want the edging color to match the red window trim color.
- The roof slope is slight. If they have a barrel edging, the standing seam roof is not very visible.
- A black standing seam roof looks too modern and sets a precedent.
- Like to see a barrel trim, if feasible.
- If no barrel roof, then would like to see a calculation.
- A standing seam metal roof doesn't match the style of the house and the neighborhood.
- Roof appears very prominent and visible from the street. It would be a large expanse of black metal.
- Owning a historic home requires maintenance.
- Need to research other materials that includes metal.
- Not convinced that a barrel style metal roof is more prone to damage.
- Concerned about not using the color of clay tiles which is more authentic.

MOTION: **Motion** by **Chair Burnett** to request that the applicant return with more information, including how much weight the roof can accommodate. Investigate more materials such as presented by a committee member, confer with the Town's Building Official, and a structural engineer to determine the weight threshold. **Seconded** by **Committee Member Queiroz.**

Friendly Amendment by **Commissioner Barnett**.
Present it to the Town's Building Official first, and if not opined, present it to a CA licensed structural engineer. Letter from a Structural engineer that it cannot support a tile roof and what it can support.

Comment by **Committee Member Cheskin**
To Refine the Friendly amendment, what is the weight threshold?

Motion withdrawn by **Chair Burnett**.

New MOTION: **Motion** by **Chair Burnett** to request that the applicant return with information presented by a structural engineer whether the house can bear the lightweight concrete or steel roofing examples presented by Committee Member Queiroz. Applicant will return with barrel style shapes on the eaves or on the entire roof. **Seconded** by **Commissioner Barnett**.

Friendly Amendment by **Committee Member Cheskin**.
To clarify to the applicant that the committee wants and expects that the trim or entire roof have the appearance of a barrel roof.

Friendly amendment accepted by **Chair Burnett** and **Commissioner Barnett**.

Friendly Amendment by **Committee Member Cheskin**.
To clarify what is the threshold. How many pounds per square foot?

Friendly amendment accepted by **Chair Burnett** and **Commissioner Barnett**.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

5. 52 Ashler Avenue
   Minor Residential Development Application MR-24-009

   Requesting Approval for Construction of a Second-Story Addition Exceeding 100 Square Feet and Exterior Alterations to an Existing Pre-1941 Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1D. APN 410-14-048. Exempt Pursuant to CEQA Section 15301: Existing Facilities.
   Property Owner: Joseph Ervin
   Applicant: Ramin Zohoor
   Project Planner: Maria Chavarin

Maria Chavarin, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Opened Public Comment.

Applicant was not present.

Closed Public Comment.

Committee members discussed the matter.

- Design looks much improved from the original plans with the addition of the shed dormer.
- The mass is still big in the front elevation, the floor plan looks good.
- Prefer a larger center gable dormer instead of two on the sides.
- The applicant fulfilled the requirement by meeting with the architect.
- This is an improvement to the existing house design which was very awkward.
- They responded to the architect's recommendations.

MOTION: **Motion** by **Vice Chair Quintana** to forward a recommendation of approval to the Community Development Director on the plans as modified per the recommendation of the Town's Consulting Architect for Construction on 52 Ashler Avenue. Make the finding that the pre-1941 structure will neither adversely affect the exterior architecture characteristic or other features of the property which is the subject of the application. **Seconded** by **Committee Member Queiroz.**

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

6. 352 W. Main Street
   Minor Development in a Historic District Application HS-24-054

   Requesting Approval for Construction of Exterior Alteration (Window Replacement) to a Non-Contributing Multi-Family Residential Development in the Broadway Historic District on Property Zoned R-1D:LHP. APN 510-45-033. Exempt Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15301: Existing Facilities.
   Property Owner: West Main Partners LLC.
   Applicant: Byron Brown
   Project Planner: Suray Nathan

Suray Nathan, Assistant Planner, presented the staff report.

Opened Public Comment.

Applicant presented the project.

Byron Brown, Applicant, Ralph Cavanna, and Timothy Vago, Applicants

- Their intention is to upgrade the existing windows. The original build date was listed as 1930, but it is actually 1953. The are four addresses (346, 348, 350 and 352) on the same APN, but historic information stopped at 325. The buildings next door and across the street have white vinyl windows. When they applied for the Building Permit they were instructed to come before the HPC. The existing windows are a mix of materials including vinyl, aluminum and wood. They wanted to make the windows consistent. The windows have already been bought and created.

Committee members asked questions of the applicant and made comments.

Byron Brown, Applicant, Ralph Cavanna, and Timothy Vago, Applicants

- They chose vinyl to improve insulation and waterproofing. Choosing vinyl is a major cost savings. They have many windows to replace for their tenants.
- The windows are also fire-tempered because the building is in a wildfire zone. One pane must be tempered for fire safety.
- They already have the windows.
- They brought photos of the existing windows and a sample of the proposed windows.

Committee member made a comment.

- Residential Design Guidelines say that windows must be compatible with the project. The vinyl should look like wood.

Byron Brown, Applicant, Ralph Cavanna, and Timothy Vago, Applicants

- Would it be acceptable if the vinyl was painted a different color like wood?
- Vinyl is paintable. Now, they have UV paint for vinyl.
- Job has been postponed until resolved.
- They would hate to throw away the windows. They have 58 windows.

Committee member made a comment.

- How do we prevent this situation from happening?

Staff

- Most people come in and check at the beginning.
- The Design Guidelines in Chapter 4.84 says that windows should be constructed of real glass, window frames should be constructed of real wood not vinyl, metal or plastic. Wood sashes may be vinyl or metal clad if consistent with the historic design context.

Byron Brown, Applicant, Ralph Cavanna, and Timothy Vago, Applicants

- Trim around all the existing windows is wood. Some have shutters

Committee member made a comment.

- If not in a historic district, no permits are needed if replaced within existing window openings. Is the permit required?

Staff

- Permits are not uncommon.

Committee member made a comment.

- Troubled that it doesn't meet the Design guidelines even though they already bought the windows.

Open Public Comment

Committee members asked questions of the applicant.

Byron Brown, Applicant, Ralph Cavanna, and Timothy Vago, Applicants

- They were in the permit process when they measured and ordered the windows.

Closed Public Comment

Committee members discussed the matter.

- The 58 windows are prominent.
- It would be a huge improvement if all the windows were matching.
- If painted and not white that could be recommended.
- Use of vinyl is a direct violation. White is very stark,
- The windows clearly need to be replaced.
- Is white the concern? We have made exceptions.
- Vinyl is not acceptable.
- The house is not historic but is in a historic district.
- Seems to be a waste of materials and the tenants may not get new windows due to higher costs.

Committee members asked questions of the applicant.

Byron Brown, Applicant, Ralph Cavanna, and Timothy Vago, Applicants

- Speaking on behalf of the owner, the preference would be to paint the vinyl a wood color.
- The project is expensive at $60,000. It is at the top of their budget.
- They want to complete the project before winter.
- They can bring in a painted sample.
- They have been doing business in Los Gatos for the last 30 years and have followed the permitting process. In this case, they learned about the historic component at the last stage.
- They cannot get a manufacture's credit because the windows are not standard. They were made to fit each window opening.

Committee member made a comment.

- Do not want to set a precedent for use of vinyl windows.

Staff:

- This does not set a precedent. Each project is considered case by case.

MOTION: **Motion** by **Committee Member Cheskin** to continue to the next meeting. The applicant will bring back samples of painted vinyl windows to show the quality and effect of the paint and that it appears less like vinyl. **Seconded** by **Committee Member Queiroz**

Friendly Amendment by **Vice Chair Quintana**
We should not choose the color.

Friendly Amendment by **Vice Chair Quintana**
To clarify it would be to see the quality and effect of the paint. That it appears less like vinyl.

Friendly Amendment accepted by **Committee Member Cheskin** and **Committee Member Queiroz**.

VOTE: **Motion passed unanimously.**

7. 55 Ellenwood Avenue
   Request for Review PHST-24-020

   Consider a Request to Remove a Pre-1941 Property from the Historic Resources Inventory for Property Zoned R-1:8. APN 510-19-010. Exempt Pursuant to CEQA Section 15061(b)(3).
   Property Owner: Pooja Goel
   Applicant: Melina Padilla
   Project Planner: Sean Mullin

Committee Member Cheskin recused themselves from Item 7, 55 Ellenwood Avenue, as their property is located within 1,000 feet of the subject property.

Sean Mullin, Planning Manager, presented the staff report.

Committee members asked questions of the Project Planner.

Opened Public Comment.

Applicant presented the project.

Pooja Goel, Owner. Rashel, husband

- They have lived there for six years. There are many maintenance issues regarding plumbing, pest control, and electrical. They can only use one bathroom. They need to repair the roof and siding. They have not lived there for the last 3 months.
- There are no plans to demolish.
- They want to make the house liveable for their family and parents.
- Two of the three doors don't work.
- The siding is rotting. They clean out gutters every year. But there are still leaks.
- The roof too old for solar panels.
- Multiple revisions were done to the house over the years.
- Additions were done in 1994 and 1998.

Committee members asked questions of the applicant.

Pooja Goel, Owner. Rashel, husband.

- They are not planning to demolish.
- They request removal from the Historic Inventory because they may want to extend the house in the future.
- They plan to paint the house, repair the roof, repair the skylight leakages, change the doors, and make vents in the house so that they can get solar and AC.
- You cannot see much of the house from the street.
- The structure in the back has a bathroom that doesn't work. The plumber wasn't able to fix it.

Closed Public Comment.

MOTION: **Motion** by **Chair Burnett** to extend the meeting past 2 hours by 15 minutes. **Seconded** by **Vice Chair Quintana.**

VOTE: **Motion passed 4-0, Committee Member Cheskin recused.**

Committee members discussed the matter.

- The appearance and style of the house hasn't changed over the years
- Even with the additions, it still looks historic and is surrounded by historic homes.
- Have the five criteria been met?

Committee members asked questions of the applicant.

Pooja Goel, Owner. Rashel, husband

- They know the prior owners who lived there for 35 years.
- They did lots of historical research.
- Little is left of the original house.

Closed Public Comment.

Committee members discussed the matter.

- Are pre-1941 houses being judged by state or federal standards.
- It is premature to take it off the inventory.
- The house has the look and there are distinctive features of a time and place still present.
- Can the 5th finding be made?

MOTION: **Motion** by **Chair Burnett** to deny the request as it still represents a time and place. And that the finding number 3 cannot be made. **Seconded** by **Committee Member Queiroz.**

VOTE: **Motion passed 4-0, Committee Member Cheskin recused.**

MOTION: **Motion** by **Chair Burnett** to extend the meeting past the two hours from 6:00 to 6:30 PM. **Seconded** by **Commissioner Barnett.**

VOTE: **Motion passed 4-0, Committee Member Cheskin recused.**

Friendly Amendment by **Vice Chair Quintana**
That the integrity of the structure has not been lost. It is still recognizable.

Friendly amendment accepted by **Chair Burnett** and **Committee Member Queiroz**.

VOTE: **Motion passed 4-0, Committee Member Cheskin recused.**

Appeal rights read

8. 50 Hernandez Avenue
   Request for Review Application PHST-24-002

   Requesting Approval for Modification (Siding Replacement) of a Previously Approved Project on an Existing Pre-1941 Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1:8. APN 510-20-003. Exempt Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15301: Existing Facilities.
   Property Owner: Richard Archuleta and Chrissy Klander
   Applicant: Jay Plett, Architect
   Project Planner: Sean Mullin

Chair Burnett and Committee Member Cheskin recused themselves from Item 8, 50 Hernandez Avenue, as their properties are located within 1,000 feet of the subject property.

Vice Chair Quintana remains by random selection to retain quorum.

Sean Mullin, Planning Manager, presented the staff report

Opened public comment.

Applicant presented the project.

Jay Plett, Applicant

- Currently there is a mix of siding throughout the house and additions. Some repairs in the past were patched over and filled with Bondo. They'd like to retore with three lap wood siding to be consistent. An addition in the back has been approved.

Committee members asked questions of the applicant.

Jay Plett, Applicant

- Currently there is a mix of siding throughout the house and additions.
- Until actual construction began, they couldn't see the patching.
- It is a Technical Demolition. Request to be exempt that allows when something is not reparable.
- The appropriate siding is cedar or redwood. Old growth redwood is cost prohibitive now. Original siding was done in 1903. Now they use treated pine.
- The owner chose that profile because it matches the existing three lap siding on the home.

Closed public comment.

Committee members discussed the matter.

- Replacement with matching siding is an improvement over the existing hodge podge.

MOTION: **Motion** by **Committee Member Barnett** to Recommend Approval to the Community Development Director for Modification (Siding Replacement) of a Previously Approved Project on an Existing Pre-1941 Single-Family Residence on Property Zoned R-1:8. APN 510-20-003. **Seconded** by **Committee Member Queiroz.**

VOTE: **Motion passed 3-0, Chair Burnett and Committee Member Cheskin are recused.**

REPORT FROM THE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

- Director's decisions all aligned with the recommendations of the Committee.
- Appeal received for 228 Bachman Avenue and is scheduled for the Planning Commission on November 13, 2024.

OTHER BUSINESS *(Up to three minutes may be allotted to each speaker on any of the following items.)*

- Next HPC Special meeting is November 20. Due to the holiday and meets at 4:00 PM

COMMITTEE MATTERS
None.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:29 p.m.

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of the October 23, 2024 meeting as approved by the Historic Preservation Committee.

_____
/s/ Sean Mullin, AICP, Planning Manager

This Page
Intentionally
Left Blank