



## Historic Preservation Advisory Commission Meeting Minutes

February 11, 2026, 8:00 AM

Town Hall | Council Chambers | 10183 Truckee Airport Road, Truckee, CA

---

- 1. Call to Order and Roll Call- 8:00 AM** Chair Gove, Vice Chair Mortier, Commissioner Kenny, Commissioner Brooks. Commissioner Sesko is absent due to recusal of item 5.1.

**Staff and Applicants Present:** Laura Dabe, Senior Planner; Adam Petersen, Senior Planner; Kayley Metroka, Administrative Technician. Paul Ferro, Applicant.

- 2. Public Comment:**

None.

- 3. Approval of Minutes**

- 3.1 January 14, 2026 Draft Minutes**

Chair Gove made a motion that was seconded by Vice Chair Mortier to approve the January 14, 2026, Minutes as submitted. The motion passed and carried the following vote:

**Ayes:** Chair Gove, Vice Chair Mortier, Commissioner Brooks

**Noes:** None

**Abstain:** Commissioner Kenny

**Absent:** Commissioner Sesko

- 4. Minor Review Minutes**

- 5. Major Review Items**

- 5.1 Planning Application 2025-0000084/HDR (Ferro Residence Historic Design Review); 10383 High Street (APN 19-080-015); Owner/Applicant: Paul Ferro, Ascend Architecture**

**Requested Action:** That the Historic Preservation Advisory Commission (HPAC) review the proposed "Ferro Residence" project for consistency with the Downtown Truckee Plan, including the Historic Design Guidelines, and take the following actions: Forward a recommendation to the Community Development Director on whether to approve the requested land use entitlements for the project as follows: **Historic Design Review** to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for new construction within the Historic Preservation Overlay District.

**Project Description:** The applicant is requesting approval of a Historic Design Review to grant a Certificate of Appropriateness for the construction of a new single-family home and accessory dwelling unit (ADU) on a vacant parcel located at 10383 High Street (APN 019-080-015) in the McGlashan Addition Character Area.

**Applicant Presentation given by Applicant, Paul Ferro.**

### **Clarifying Questions for Applicant:**

- This limits our ability to require any subjective design standards. People love downtown Truckee. I would like to appeal to you architect to architect – is this doing the historic downtown right?
  - I think it is. I would have made it much more modern if I could have. I am combating the Development Code.
- I would argue there is a more subtle way of doing that.
  - The buildings next to this one are large.
- I would have looked to orient the gables in the east-west direction. This is better than the last proposal. I feel like there is so much more opportunity from a design perspective that can be implemented. The ADU appears to have 13-foot plate heights. Could that middle section be dropped down?
  - I dropped it down as far as I can.
- There is nothing to me that shows the entryway being highlighted. I think that could help break it up.
  - There's a lot going on because I am trying to fit in two entryways and two garages.
- It feels like there is more opportunity, and I am trying to appeal to you as a citizen. When this gets built, is Truckee going to be proud of it? I think there is an opportunity to drop the plate heights down so it is a tiered gable form and might help the massing.
- Why did we lose the diagonal braces on the rear back?
  - It seemed like there was too much going on with the new roof lines.
- The turn down roof – form follows function. What happens when snow sheds off these roofs and the window is open? This design doesn't seem to work with the weather we get here in Truckee.
  - I wouldn't open those windows if it were snowing.
- These windows are for the second unit – there seems to be a potential liability if the person staying in that unit chooses to open the window.
- I urge you again to look at this project and other homes in the area and question if this it what compliments its neighbors.

### **Clarifying Questions for Staff:**

None.

### **Public Comment:**

None.

### **Deliberation:**

- This design is superior to the original proposal. Anything I have to say would be subjective.
- The extruded gable roof design sets a precedent that modern styles are acceptable in the historic district.
- It doesn't reflect the McGlashan area and goes against the building forms.
- I understand what the applicant is trying to do and see the difficulties with designing on such a steep lot, but I think it could be broken up into elevation. This looks like more of a stamp mill and condos from the front, not a home.
- The gables are so alike that it isn't like driving through the McGlashan area. This is the gateway to Truckee, and it is going to be hard not to see it as a development or condos.
- The modern gable doesn't fit. The modern gable goes against the guidelines and sets a bad precedent of downtown if we want to compliment the historic buildings that are here.
- I am okay with it. I don't think there is any danger of it dominating anything. I wouldn't mind if it were smaller though.

- I agree because this is in the middle of residences that are overwhelming.
- The larger neighboring properties are not residential.
- Do I miss the smaller houses, yes. But I do not see that this is going to be a problem. The changes he made, in my opinion, make this approvable.
- We are not supposed to compare; we are supposed to see what is compatible.
- Mr. McGlashan's vision was more modern. I do not think he would have an issue with it or the way the area has developed.
- The massing could be less intrusive with some modifications. We are setting a precedence by allowing this gable roof form in the historic district. It can be considered trendy. It doesn't reflect the nature of the architecture downtown. It doesn't make sense to me.
- It is not consistent with the historic design guidelines. Regarding the scale and the mass – we are stuck with this very small envelope of building on a lot. Personally I have flexibility on that part but do see opportunities for it to fit in better.
- This does not align with the historic design guidelines or the scale.
- I don't think there is any adverse effect on the area.
- I am so shocked right now; how does it support the historic district?
- It fits in with the two properties it is between.
- Although those properties are large, they were designed to be more compatible with the historic district.
- I see no similarity with roof forms, massing, materiality to the historic district in this proposal.
- Massing could be addressed through adjustments to floor plate heights, particularly the 13 ft. floor plate height for the ADU.
- I think it is important to protect the sanctity of the certificate of appropriateness.
- If SB330 was out of the conversation, would you have the same response regarding it fitting downtown?
- Yes.
- I am surprised you feel this fits, especially the roof form.
- Most of the buildings currently there do not fit.
- There is not a single house in this area that has a roof line like this. This will be the dominate building from the street.
- The neighboring properties are large, but they have similar roof pitches with stepped down massing. Although it is a large house – they are single story to ground it on the hillside. Or there is materiality that grounds it into the hillside. The massing and material help make it feel part of the hillside and not so overpowering. I do not think this successfully does that.
- None of the buildings on that part of the street fit historically. We went past the guidelines a long time ago. Asking if it fits in with the character? We lost that a long time ago.
- So, you're giving up?
- I gave up a long time ago. I've got to compare to what is up there now.
- Regarding Chapter 19 – I think these could be simple changes. As of now, it doesn't reflect the McGlashan area character.

**A motion was made by Chair Gove and was seconded by Commissioner Brooks to recommend denial of Application 2025-0000084, Ferro Residence Historic Design Review due to it not meeting the Historic Design Guidelines. The motion passed and carried the following vote:**

**Ayes:** Chair Gove, Vice Chair Mortier, Commissioner Brooks

**Noes:** Commissioner Kenny

**Abstain:** None

**Absent:** Commissioner Sesko

## **6. Information Items**

None.

**7. Commission Member Reports**

None.

**8. Adjournment: 9:11 AM** To the next commission meeting on March 11, 2026.

Kayley Metroka