



**CITY OF SUNNYVALE
REPORT
Heritage Preservation Commission**

June 4, 2008

SUBJECT: **2008-0336:** Application for a property located at **1029 Ranere Court** (near Peekskill Dr.) in an R-0 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District. (APN: 201-03-005)

Motion Resource Alteration Permit to add a new two car, attached garage to be located in front of an existing Heritage Resource property.

REPORT IN BRIEF

Existing Site Conditions Single-Family Home (Heritage Resource)

Surrounding Land Uses

North Single-Family Residential

South Single-Family Residential


East Single-Family Residential

West Single-Family Residential

Issues Location of proposed garage and architecture.

Environmental Status The Heritage Preservation Commission will determine environmental status based on the final approved project design.

Staff Recommendation Denial of proposed location, alternative location recommended.



PROJECT DATA TABLE

	EXISTING	PROPOSED	REQUIRED/ PERMITTED
General Plan	Residential Low Density	Same	Same
Zoning District	R-0	Same	Same
Lot Size (s.f.)	14,693	Same	6,000 min.
Gross Floor Area (s.f.)	4,116	4,786	6,612
Lot Coverage (%)	22%	Same	40% max.
Garage Height (ft.)	N/A	7' 6" from the street	30' (exception for spires)
Setbacks			
• Front	67'	35'	20' min.
• Left Side	35'	Same	12' combined min. (4' on one side)
• Right Side	12'	4'	12' combined min. (4' on one side)
• Rear	20'	Same	20' min. (10' permitted for 25% encroachment of rear yard)
Parking			
Total No. of Spaces	0	4	4

Description of Proposed Project

The proposed project is for a new two-car garage located in front of an existing single-family home. The height of the garage is seven feet and six inches as measured from the public sidewalk. It has a total height of approximately nine feet with the driveway approach graded down two feet.

In addition, the applicant is proposing a 4-12 foot tall masonry wall/iron fence located in the front yard area of the home and a six foot tall wood fence located on the side property lines.

The home is a listed structure on the City's Heritage Resource Inventory and was designated as such on July 28, 1981. Sunnyvale's Municipal Code

requires review by the Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC) for any project that proposes construction, demolition, relocation or material changes to historic resources.

Background

The application was originally scheduled to be heard at the HPC's May 7, 2008 meeting. At the meeting the applicant requested a continuance to the June 4, 2008 meeting. After hearing testimony from the public the Commission granted a continuance to the June 4, 2008 meeting.

Previous Actions on the Site: The following table summarizes previous planning applications related to the subject site.

File Number	Brief Description	Hearing/Decision	Date
2006-0833	Addition of a two-car garage on the front of the home.	HPC and City Council/Denied	10/24/06
2006-0478	Parcel map to subdivide the lot into two lots	Administrative Hearing/Approved	6/14/06
2006-0112	Tree Removal for four trees	Staff/Split (Two trees approved & two trees denied)	2/13/06
2005-0799	Determination of historical significance for existing structures (to remove structures from the Heritage Resource list)	HPC/Denied	10/05/06

In October of 2005, the owner filed for a determination of the historical significance for existing structures on the site. A historic evaluation was conducted by Archives & Architecture Heritage Resource Partners in July 2005 and it was determined that the single-family home retained local historic significance while the accessory structures did not. The report also stated the home may be eligible for State listing (see Attachment D for details). The property owners have not pursued State listing.

In June 2006, a Parcel Map to subdivide the lot into two lots was approved by the Administrative Hearing Officer. A Condition of Approval of the Parcel Map was to provide covered parking through the construction a two-car garage on the newly created parcel facing Ranere Court prior to Final Map recordation.

On September 6, 2006, the project was reviewed by the HPC. At the public hearing, several neighbors spoke regarding the proposal. Concerns were raised regarding the proposed location and design of the new garage and fence as well as the possible impacts to existing trees on site. By a 4-1 vote, the HPC denied the applicant's request for a two-car garage located in front of the existing Heritage Resource and approved a location next to the home at the south side of the property (see HPC minutes in Attachment H). The applicant appealed this decision to the City Council on September 8, 2006.

On October 24, 2006, the project was reviewed by the City Council. At the public hearing, several neighbors and the applicant's attorney spoke on the appeal. By a 5-1 vote, the City Council denied the appeal and supported the decision by the HPC to deny a garage in front of the main Heritage Resource house (see Council minutes in Attachment I).

Environmental Review

If the Commission finds that the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, and approves the project as proposed, a Negative Declaration will be processed by staff in accordance with provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). If the Commission denies the project and directs the applicant to design a layout with a detached garage located at the north side of the site (not in front of the home), then a Class 3 Categorical Exemption relieves this project from CEQA provisions. Class 3 Categorical Exemptions include the construction of accessory structures such as garages.

Resource Alteration Permit

Site Layout/Design: The proposed garage structure would total approximately 670 square feet and would be placed in front of the home at the northeast side of the property. The new masonry wall and iron fence would be setback approximately 25 feet from the front property line and extend across the property. The new wood fences would be located on the side property lines (north and south). All setbacks and lot coverage requirements of the R-0 Zoning District would be met (see Site Plan in Attachment C).

The proposed design of the garage, its location, and its relationship to the existing home are different than the previous design reviewed in 2006, but not a substantially departure. The following is a summary of the proposed changes versus the previous 2006 design:

- The new design contains detailing of the windows and roofline that is more compatible with the Spanish-eclectic styling of the existing home.

- The new garage is attached to the existing home, rather than a detached garage in the front yard area. The previous design called for a small room to partially connect the garage and the home.
- The new design calls for the garage to be slightly submerged, as viewed from the street by approximately two feet. The intent is to fully retain the second level windows/balconies and keep them visible from the street since they are prominent features of the home.
- The hardscape turn-around area for the new garage has been reduced.

Staff acknowledges the proposed design and siting of the garage under the current proposal is much improved over the previous 2006 proposal, but also acknowledges that the primary issue, as stated by both the Heritage Preservation Commission and City Council, is the location of the garage between the home and the street. This issue, while lessened by the redesigned height and architecture of the garage, is still the main issue with this application.

Staff believes the new design will block the view of the Heritage Resource from the street and is therefore, an impact to the integrity of the resource. Staff has explored alternatives to the garage location in 2006 that would not block the view of the home, including locating the garage at the south end of the site where more open space currently exists. Staff still prefers this option over the applicant's layout as the visual impact of the main structure is minimized without a garage located directly in front of the home.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant has stated that the floor plan of the existing home and the desire not to interrupt the intended design of the home were the primary objectives for the proposed layout. The applicant has indicated that a garage or carport at the south end of the site adjacent to the home would require steps to access the structure and will block the more significant windows on the south side, which may be considered the true front of the home. The portion of the existing home (small windows to a large bonus room) that will be blocked by the proposed garage is the least significant portion of the residence from an architectural perspective. In addition, the applicant has stated the redesigned garage is significantly lower than the previous design (see Applicant's Letter of Justification in Attachment F).

Landscaping: The applicant is proposing to significantly enhance the existing landscaping throughout the property. The intent is to create a landscaping scheme that is reflective of the magnitude of the historic home. A significant sized oak tree in front of the proposed fence will remain. Two additional trees considered significant by City ordinances are located behind the home and are unaffected by this proposal.

The applicant has indicated that the driveway currently leading from the street to the rear yard area would be removed and replaced with lawn. If the driveway were to be removed, vehicular access to the rear of the home would be eliminated.

Wall/Fences: Positioned 25 feet back from the property, the proposed design and materials of the wall will match the existing home (stucco and wrought iron). Staff is not supporting the proposed wall and wrought iron fence in the front. Similar to the garage location, staff believes the proposed wall will significantly block the view of the Heritage Resource and is an impact to the quality and integrity of the resource. Staff has included a condition of approval stating the fence shall be lowered to a maximum of three feet in height, which is the standard height for fences in the City.

The applicant is also proposing a six foot wood fence on the side property lines. This fence does not require permits to construct and is only shown in the plans for the context of the project.

Architectural Evaluation: Any selective demolition, alteration, and rehabilitation of a historic structure must be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The following criteria have been analyzed with respect to this project:

1. "A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships."

Analysis: The proposed garage structure will not change the residential use of the historic resource. As proposed, minor modifications to the structure would be required to allow a connection to the new garage. The view to the main structure will be partially blocked.

2. "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided."

Analysis: The proposed project is not consistent with this standard. The proposed garage location, directly in front of the home, will alter the visual presentation of a Heritage Resource as seen from the street.

3. "Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken."

Analysis: The application does not introduce any new architectural elements to the home that create a false sense of historical development. The proposed garage is designed to be compatible with the main house.

4. "Changes to the property that have acquired historical significance in their own right will be retained and preserved."

Analysis: The only feature of the property that could be considered significant is the mature oak tree in the front yard area. This tree is proposed to remain.

5. "Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved."

Analysis: The proposal will incorporate features and construction materials consistent with the quality and craftsmanship of the existing structure. Similar architectural form and window detailing will be maintained with the new garage. The main building will be altered by a front addition; however, the configuration of the home will be retained.

6. "Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence."

Analysis: The project does not involve the replacement of deteriorated original features; the project proposed is solely an addition to the site. The applicant has indicated certain improvements to the home and landscaping are planned.

7. "Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used."

Analysis: No chemical or physical treatments are proposed in this project.

8. "Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken."

Analysis: Archeological resources are not evaluated in this report. The site is developed and was likely disturbed during the original construction. If a negative declaration is completed there is language for watching for archaeological evidence during construction.

9. "New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment."

Analysis: The proposed garage structure will match the existing home in architectural style, character, and quality. The building will utilize a similar painted stucco material and tile roof. Window form and detailing will also match the existing Heritage Resource as shown on the elevations. At approximately seven feet and six inches feet in height, the building will be visually subordinate to the main structure while utilizing a similar hipped roof presentation to the street; however, the proposed garage does affect the spatial relationship on the site as it will place a structure in front of an identified Heritage Resource that is currently and historically visible to the community from the front.

10. "New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

Analysis: The essential form and integrity of the historic structure would be maintained if the garage structure is removed. As currently proposed, a small portion of the home would need to be converted back to its current condition as some materials would need to be replaced in front of the house. If detached as proposed by staff, removal of the garage would not require any modification to the existing Heritage Resource.

Architectural Evaluation Report - 2008: The applicant has filed a new historic architectural evaluation report by Archives & Architecture Heritage Resource Partners. The report was focused on the proposed garage addition and its compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (same as staff's review above) and is attached in Attachment L. The report concludes the proposed project meets the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and suggests three minor modifications to the design.

The key points in the report are under Standards #2 and #9 where the historic architect states the addition of a garage will be compatible with the historic home and will not interrupt the home's original massing.

Fiscal Impact

No fiscal impacts other than normal fees and taxes are expected.

Public Contact

Staff has received several letters and oral comments from neighboring residents, noting concerns with the proposed garage location and proposed wall. The neighbors oppose the current proposal due to the visual and physical impacts that would be caused to the home. The letters can be referenced in Attachment G.

Notice of Public Hearing	Staff Report	Agenda
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Published in the <i>Sun</i> newspaper • Posted on the site • 37 notices mailed to the adjacent property owners of the project site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posted on the City of Sunnyvale's Website • Provided at the Reference Section of the City of Sunnyvale's Public Library 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posted on the City's official notice bulletin board • City of Sunnyvale's Website

Conclusion

Staff finds that the applicant's proposed garage location in front of the Heritage Resource house, while improved relative to the 2006 proposal, still does not meet all the criteria and Findings listed in the report; therefore, the project would have an adverse visual impact to the historic resource. The current application poses the same primary issue as the previous application that was reviewed and denied by the City Council in October 2006. Staff finds the alternative layout, which is recommended in this report, would be more appropriate.

In addition, the front yard masonry wall/wrought iron fence as proposed, will also have a significant impact on the home. Staff would be able to support a lower fence with an open design to allow visibility into the Heritage Resource.

Alternatives

1. Deny the Resource Alteration Permit as proposed by the applicant and direct the applicant to design a garage on the south side of the property to preserve visibility of the Heritage Resource and determine that these alternatives are categorically exempt from CEQA using Categorical Exemption #3.
2. Determine that the proposed garage location (north side) is not an environmental impact using the Secretary of the Interior Standards for

Rehabilitation; make the Findings in Attachment A to approve the Resource Alteration Permit with recommended Conditions of Approval in Attachment B; and direct staff to prepare a Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA.

3. Determine that the proposed garage location (north side) is not an environmental impact using the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation; make the Findings in Attachment A to approve the Resource Alteration Permit with modified Conditions of Approval; and direct staff to prepare a Negative Declaration in accordance with CEQA.

Recommendation

Alternative 1.

Prepared by:

Steve Lynch
Project Planner

Reviewed by:

Gerri Caruso
Principal Planner

Attachments:

- A. Recommended Findings
- B. Recommended Conditions
- C. Site and Architectural Plans
- D. Historical and Architectural Evaluation - 2005
- E. Cultural Resource Inventory – 1029 Ranere Court
- F. Applicant’s Letter of Justification
- G. Letters from Interested Parties
- H. Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes from September 6, 2006
- I. City Council Minutes from October 24, 2006
- J. Site Photos
- K. Draft Heritage Preservation Commission Minutes from May 7, 2008
- L. Historical and Architectural Evaluation - 2008

Recommended Findings – Resource Alteration Permit

In order to approve the Resource Alteration Permit, the proposed project must meet Finding #1 and at least one of the other Findings #2, #3, or #4.

Staff was not able to make Findings #1 or #2 and recommends denial of the Resource Alteration Permit.

1. The action proposed will be consistent with the purposes of the Heritage Preservation Ordinance.

The proposed project is not consistent with the Heritage Preservation Ordinance as the existing Heritage Resource would no longer maintain an appropriate setting and environment.

2. The action proposed will not be detrimental to a structure or feature of significance as a Heritage Resource; or

Staff finds that the location of the proposed garage location will have a detrimental visual impact to the main structure. Alternative location at the site would minimize the visual obstruction from the street and alterations to the front of the home. Staff also finds the design and location of the front yard masonry wall/wrought iron fence will be a visual obstruction from the street.

3. The applicant has demonstrated that the action proposed is necessary to correct an unsafe or dangerous condition on the property pursuant to Section 19.96.110; or
N/A

4. The applicant has demonstrated that denial of the application will result in immediate, undue, or substantial hardship pursuant to Section 19.96.120.
N/A

5. If all of the findings in subsections (f)(2) through (f)(4) of this section are not made, the permit shall be denied.
N/A

Recommended Conditions of Approval – Resource Alteration Permit

In addition to complying with all applicable City, County, State and Federal Statutes, Codes, Ordinances, Resolutions and Regulations, Permittee expressly accepts and agrees to comply with the following conditions of approval of this Permit:

1. The Resource Alteration Permit shall expire two years from the date of approval by the final review authority if not executed or if the use is discontinued.
2. The Conditions of Approval shall be reproduced on the front page of the building plans.
3. Any future modifications to the building shall be approved by the Heritage Preservation Commission, except that minor changes may be approved by the Director of Community Development.
4. Obtain all necessary Building Permits.
5. The new garage shall utilize a similar rolled-barrel tile roof material as found in the existing structure.
6. The front yard masonry wall/wrought iron fence shall be lowered to a maximum of three feet in height. The final design shall be approved by the Director of Community Development.
7. All landscaping, as proposed in the attached plans, shall be installed prior to final sign-off of the building permit.
8. The main driveway leading to the garage shall be made of brick, cement pavers, or other comparable material approved by the Director of Community Development.
9. The new curb side parking area on the southeast portion of the property shall be made of permeable pavers or other comparable material approved by the Director of Community Development.
10. The existing driveway leading along the southern property line shall be removed prior to issuance of a building permit.
11. The existing curb cut shall be removed and obtain an encroachment permit from the Department of Public Works for the new driveway curb cut at the north end of the site.

CITRARO RESIDENCE

TWO-CAR GARAGE ADDITION AND SITE IMPROVEMENT
 1029 RANERE COURT, SUNNYVALE, CA 95087



PROPOSED VIEW FROM RANERE COURT
 SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

RESOURCE ALTERATION PERMIT APPLICATION

PROJECT NO. 1029

gridley company
 DESIGN / BUILD / REMODEL
 1220 Chestnut City Park, San Jose, CA 95128
 408-414-0200 / Fax 408-414-0201 / Email: Lumen@gridley.com

PROPOSED VIEW FROM RANERE COURT

ATTACHMENT

REVISIONS

DATE

BY

APPROVED BY

DATE

BY

UNTIL THE ADJOURN OF THE REAR YARD LANDSCAPE IS INSTALLED, THE LANDSCAPE SHOULD REMAIN NEAR THE LEFT REAR CORNER OF THE EXISTING RESIDENCE

DRY-LAND STOPPING STORAGE IN THE NEW LAWN CAN PROVIDE ACCESS FROM THE FRONT DRIVEWAY TO THE REAR YARD SPACE

A NEW 6" WALL FROM 18" HIGH ON FINISH GRADE TO THE LEFT PROPERTY LINE WILL CREATE A DEFINED EDGE BETWEEN THE PROJECT SITE AND THE ADJACENT PROPERTY WHILE MAINTAINING PRIVATE AND VISUAL INTERVIEW BETWEEN THE TWO PROPERTIES

A 1/2" WOODEN FENCE WITH GATE CAN BE PLACED ALONG THE LEFT-SIDE PROPERTY LINE TO PROVIDE VISUAL AND PHYSICAL BARRIERS ADDING VISUAL INTERVIEW TO THE SIDE OF THE PROPERTY

A 6" WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A 1/2" TO 4" FALL TERRAZZO WOODEN DECK FROM THE NEW GARAGE WILL BE ADJACENT TO THE DRIVEWAY AND THE SIDE OF THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY

A NEW COMPRESSED GRANITE PATHWAY BETWEEN THE NEW PLANT BEDS WILL PROVIDE ACCESS TO THE NEW WALKWAY AND A WALKWAY THAT IS VISIBLY DISCREET

THE NEW FRONT ENTRY WALKWAY WILL BE CONCRETE TO MATCH THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY COLOR AND MATERIAL

A SMALL PLANTING BED AREA SO ADJACENT TO A VARIETY OF DECORATIVE ROCK PLANTINGS WILL PROVIDE A PRIVATE RETREAT SPACE AT THE END OF THE WALKWAY


A MATCHING DECORATIVE TWO-POST ARCH AND FLUTTERED LANTERN WILL MARK THE END OF THE WALKWAY AND PROVIDE A VISUAL TRAVEL FEATURE AT THE MAIN VISION ENTRANCE TO THE PROPERTY WHILE ALSO FRAMING VIEWS TOWARDS THE CENTRAL WATER FEATURE AREA

THE 4" FALL WOODEN PROPERTY LINE FENCE TRANSITION TO A 4" FALL BRICK STUCCO WALL CAN CREATE A VISUAL FEATURE THE NEW DRIVEWAY LANDING SPACE. A DOUBLE WOODEN WOODEN GATE AND STUCCO WALLS WITH AN ARCH ABOVE WILL MARK THE MAIN ENTRY ENTRANCE POINT FOR THE PROPERTY

A NEW CURB-CUT AREA GARDEN AND ENTRY WALKWAY WILL DEFINE A NEW ZONE FOR ACCESS TO THE MAIN DRIVEWAY. THE CURB-CUT AREA IS TO BE MADE OF CONCRETE PAVED THAT CAN BE PLANTED WITH GRASSES FOR A SOFTER LOOK

THE NEW STONE ENTRANCE LANDING, ALONG WITH NATURALLY PLACED BOLLARDS AND SURROUNDING PLANT MATERIAL WILL ENHANCE THE USER'S EXPERIENCE OF THE REAR YARD PROPERTY

SEVERAL TOLERANT CALIFORNIA NATIVE TREE PLANTINGS THAT CAN GIVE THE LANDSCAPE AND EXISTING CONDITIONS CREATED BY THE JARVIS ST CAN BE PLANTED BELOW THE TREES CANOPY. A 4" TO 6" TALL DOUBLE AND LIGHTLY COMPACTED COMPRESSED GRANITE AROUND THE BASE OF THE TREE WILL ENHANCE THE LANDSCAPE WITHOUT ADVERSELY AFFECTING THE MATERIAL TODAY



A 1/2" TO 4" FALL STUCCO WOODEN DECK BETWEEN THE EXISTING RESIDENCE AND THE NEW DRIVEWAY THAT PROVIDES EASY ACCESS FROM THE NEW DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY. A 1/2" TO 4" FALL STUCCO WOODEN DECK WILL BE PLACED BETWEEN THE DRIVEWAY AND THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY. A 1/2" TO 4" FALL STUCCO WOODEN DECK WILL BE PLACED BETWEEN THE DRIVEWAY AND THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY. A 1/2" TO 4" FALL STUCCO WOODEN DECK WILL BE PLACED BETWEEN THE DRIVEWAY AND THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY.

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

A NEW WOODEN BOARD AT THE EDGE OF THE ENTRY DRIVEWAY WILL BE AT THE LEVEL OF THE DRIVEWAY TO THE EXISTING RESIDENCE FRONT DOOR

GENERAL NOTES

1. THE ARCHITECT'S CONTRACTOR SHALL VERIFY THE SET AND BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EXISTING CONDITIONS PRIOR TO INSTALLING THE DRIVEWAY.
2. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY NECESSARY REMEDIATION OF THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY OR NEIGHBORING DRIVEWAYS WITH ALL NEIGHBORING PROPERTY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL NECESSARY REMEDIATION OF THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY AND NEIGHBORING DRIVEWAYS WITH ALL NEIGHBORING PROPERTY. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ALL NECESSARY REMEDIATION OF THE EXISTING DRIVEWAY AND NEIGHBORING DRIVEWAYS WITH ALL NEIGHBORING PROPERTY.
3. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK.
4. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK.
5. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK.
6. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK.
7. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK.
8. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK.
9. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK.
10. THE CONTRACTOR SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK AND SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF ALL NECESSARY WORK.

LEGEND

1. 4" Fall Stucco	11. 4" Fall Stucco	21. 4" Fall Stucco
2. 4" Fall Stucco	12. 4" Fall Stucco	22. 4" Fall Stucco
3. 4" Fall Stucco	13. 4" Fall Stucco	23. 4" Fall Stucco
4. 4" Fall Stucco	14. 4" Fall Stucco	24. 4" Fall Stucco
5. 4" Fall Stucco	15. 4" Fall Stucco	25. 4" Fall Stucco
6. 4" Fall Stucco	16. 4" Fall Stucco	26. 4" Fall Stucco
7. 4" Fall Stucco	17. 4" Fall Stucco	27. 4" Fall Stucco
8. 4" Fall Stucco	18. 4" Fall Stucco	28. 4" Fall Stucco
9. 4" Fall Stucco	19. 4" Fall Stucco	29. 4" Fall Stucco
10. 4" Fall Stucco	20. 4" Fall Stucco	30. 4" Fall Stucco

DRAWING NOTES

1. See plan for details.
2. See plan for details.
3. See plan for details.
4. See plan for details.
5. See plan for details.
6. See plan for details.
7. See plan for details.
8. See plan for details.
9. See plan for details.
10. See plan for details.


ATTACHMENT 1
 Page 1 of 1
 Citraro Residence
 1029 Ranere Court, Sunnyvale, CA
 A-02

Borzeka Associates
 ARCHITECTS
 1000 W. CALIFORNIA STREET
 SUITE 100
 SUNNYVALE, CA 94087
 TEL: 415-335-1111
 FAX: 415-335-1112

CITRARO RESIDENCE
 1029 Ranere Court, Sunnyvale, CA

CONCEPTUAL
 LANDSCAPE
 MASTER PLAN

A-02



PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN
SCALE: 1/8" = 1'-0"

ATTACHMENT
 Page *A* of *C*

RESIDENTIAL ADDITION AND REMODELING

118 COTTAGE RESIDENCE
 118 WILSON COURT
 HUNTSVILLE, AL 35897
 TEL: (256) 375-0778

DATE:	05.05.08
DESIGNER:	CHB
PROJECT:	118 WILSON
PROJECT NO.:	08
CLIENT:	W
FILE:	

A-14


PROPOSED
 SECOND FLOOR PLAN



gridley company
 DESIGN / BUILD / REMODEL

122 DOWEN DR. DR., CANTON, GA 30108
 404.374.0000, Fax 404.374.0001, (www.gridley.com)

47280	1




EXISTING EAST (FRONT) ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"




EXISTING SOUTH (LEFT SIDE) ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"

<p>gridley company DESIGN / BUILD / REMODEL 122 Colonial City Drive, Campbell, CA 95008 408.374.0900 / 408.374.0901, 408.374.0902</p>	<p>EXISTING ELEVATIONS</p>	<p>ARCHITECTURAL RENDERING AND MODELING ATTACHMENT 122 COLONIAL CITY DRIVE, CAMPBELL, CA 95008 408.374.0900 / 408.374.0901, 408.374.0902</p>
--	----------------------------	--



PROPOSED EAST (FRONT) ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"



PROPOSED SOUTH (LEFT SIDE) ELEVATION
SCALE: 1/4" = 1'-0"


gridley company
DESIGN / BUILD / REMODEL
122 Orchard City Drive, Carpinteria, CA 93008
805-374-0800 / Fax 805-374-0834 / E-mail: info@gridley.com

PROPOSED ELEVATIONS

RESIDENTIAL ADDITION AND REMODELING
ATTACHMENT
FOR PERMITTING PURPOSES
DATE: 08/14/06
TEL: 805-374-0800

A-06
OF 022





HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL EVALUATION
1029 Ranere Ct.

Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County, California
(APN 201-03-041)

Prepared for:
Mildred Citraro
1029 Ranere Ct.
Sunnyvale CA 94087

Prepared by:

ARCHIVES & ARCHITECTURE
Heritage Resource Partners

Franklin Maggi, *Architectural Historian*
Leslie A. G. Dill, *Architectural Historian*
with

Bonnie Montgomery, *Bay & Valley Publishers*

PO Box 1332 San Jose CA 95109-1332
408.369.5683
info@archivesandarchitecture.com

July 25, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION	3
1.1 Qualifications of the Consultants.....	3
1.2 Methodology.....	3
1.3 Survey Status.....	4
1.4 Summary of Findings.....	4
1.5 Area Map.....	5
1.6 Neighborhood Map (County Assessor).....	6
2.0 HISTORICAL INFORMATION.....	7
2.1 Early Development of the Area.....	7
2.2 Caviglia Ranch.....	8
2.3 Designer of the Caviglia House.....	9
3.0 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION.....	9
4.0 EVALUATION FOR SIGNIFICANCE.....	10
4.1 City of Sunnyvale Ordinances.....	10
4.2 National Register of Historic Places.....	12
4.3 California Register of Historical Resources.....	12
4.4 Determining Significance under the California Environmental Quality Act.....	13
4.5 Evaluation.....	14
4.6 Potential Impacts.....	15
5.0 SOURCES OF INFORMATION.....	16
5.1 Primary and Unpublished Sources.....	16
5.2 Miscellaneous Primary Sources.....	17
5.3 Newspaper Clippings.....	17
5.4 Secondary and Published Sources.....	17
6.0 APPENDICES.....	18
Photographs	
State Recordation Forms (DPR523)	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Historical and architectural research and evaluation for historic significance of the property located at 1029 Ranere Ct., Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County, California, was conducted in June and July 2005 by the firm of Archives & Architecture: Heritage Resource Partners of San Jose, California. Ranere Court is a short street off Peckskill Drive, to the northwest of the intersection of Hollenbeck Avenue and Remington Drive in southeastern Sunnyvale. On the USGS 7.5 minute Cupertino quadrangle, the vicinity is the southeast corner of Section 35, Township 6 South, Range 2 W, and the actual location is within the Transverse Mercator Grid (UTMG) is 584780mE/4135242mN. The property is presently identified by the Santa Clara County Assessor as APN 201-03-041.

The owner of the property, Mildred Citraro, is considering demolition of all or a portion of the extant buildings on this property as a part of a lot split and construction of new residential buildings.

The intent of the evaluation within this report is to clarify the historical status of the property that will be affected by this project as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and to determine whether demolition or alterations of the buildings and related ancillary structures would or would not have an adverse effect on the environment.

1.1 Qualifications of the Consultants

The principal author of this report and evaluator for significance was Franklin Maggi, Architectural Historian, who consults in the field of historic architecture and urban development. Mr. Maggi has a professional degree in architecture with an area of concentration in architectural history from the University of California, Berkeley. Leslie A. G. Dill, a partner with Franklin Maggi and Charlene Duval in the firm of Archives & Architecture, has a Master of Architecture with a certificate in Historic Preservation from the University of Virginia. Ms. Dill provided building descriptions and analysis for this report. Historian Bonnie Montgomery prepared the property history as a sub-consultant to the firm of Archives & Architecture. Ms. Montgomery has a Master of Arts degree and is owner of Bay and Valley Publishers, a firm specializing in local history books. Mr. Maggi and Ms. Dill are listed as architectural historians with the Northwest Information Center, Rohnert Park, which is operated under authority of the California State Office of Historic Preservation. Mr. Maggi and Ms. Dill meet the Secretary of the Interior's qualifications to perform identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment activities within the field of Architectural History in compliance with state and federal environmental laws. The Northwest Information Center utilizes the criteria of the National Park Service outlined in 36 CFR Part 61.

1.2 Methodology

This document is presented in a report format; attached as a supplement to the report are State of California DPR523 historic property recordation forms that provide detailed information in a format developed by the California State Office of Historic Preservation. These forms standardize the process of collecting information about historic resources statewide for eventual inclusion within the state Historic Property Data File. As a part of this reporting process, these forms are filed with the Northwest Information Center, Rohnert Park, for archival purposes.

The buildings and site that are within the scope of this report were examined in July 2005 by Franklin Maggi and Leslie Dill. Notes on the architecture, characteristic features of the buildings, and the neighborhood context were made. Photographs of the exterior of the buildings and the related setting were taken. Photographs within this report were taken digitally by Franklin Maggi during their July site visit. Architectural descriptions within this report were written based on these notes and photographs. Historical research was conducted by Bonnie Montgomery, and included visits to major repositories of local historical source material. These repositories included the California Room at the Martin Luther King Jr.

Joint Library and the Santa Clara County Recorder's and Surveyor's Offices. This report was prepared utilizing the methodology recommended by the National Park Service, as outlined in Preservation Briefs #17 - *Architectural Character: Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving Their Character* (1988), and #35 - *Understanding Old Buildings: The Process of Architectural Investigation* (1994).

1.3 Survey Status

The subject property is presently listed on the California State Historic Property Data File as Caviglia Ranch House, 1029 Ranere Ct (prop. #104266). The data file listing indicates a 1934 construction date, and that the property was included as a part of a historic survey; placed on the state inventory on 10/24/1996 with a National Register Status Code of "7R" (Identified in Reconnaissance Level-Survey: Not evaluated), and a Criterion listing of "A."


The City of Sunnyvale first conducted a survey of cultural resources within the city in 1979, and later adopted a Cultural Resources Inventory that recognizes properties which have architectural or historic significance, and adopted a subset of Heritage Landmarks which are now protected by regulations in Chapter 19.96 of the City of Sunnyvale Municipal Code. Under the present Sunnyvale Municipal Code, the Cultural Resources Inventory is now called the Heritage Resources Inventory. The subject property was added to the Cultural Resources Inventory on July 28, 1981.

1.4 Summary of Findings

For this report, the property was evaluated for significance under CEQA and for the project's compliance with City of Sunnyvale policies and regulations relative to historic resources. The 1934 Caviglia House at 1029 Ranere Ct. appears to meet the minimum criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C and the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion (3), due to its distinctive architectural character. The building also appears to be historically significant under the criteria of the Sunnyvale Municipal Code (Chapter 19.96).

The rear ancillary building, constructed in 1966 by the Caviglia family does not appear to be a contributor to the historic significance of the property. Demolition of the ancillary building on this site to accommodate a lot split and construction of a new residential building would not appear to have a significant effect on the environment in the context of historic resources as defined by CEQA, as this structure is not historically significant under any of the applicable criteria.


1.5 Area Map



Map based on TOPOI & ©2003 National Geographic. www.nationalgeographic.com/topo/

Cupertito 7.5 minute quadrangle / UGSG 1961 (1980 photo revised).

1.6 Neighborhood Map



Santa Clara County Assessor's Map (2005) showing the subject property

2.0 HISTORICAL INFORMATION

2.1 Early Development of the Area

The subject property is located within a 1960s single-family residential subdivision that is located at the northwest corner of Hollenbeck Avenue and Remington Drive. This area is near what was once the southern border of the historic nineteenth century *Rancho Pastoria de las Barregas*, established by Francisco Estrada and his wife Inez Castro under a land grant in 1842. Prior to 1846, the area that includes the subject property was part of lands owned by the Mexican government, had previously been associated with the Mission Santa Clara during the Spanish period of territorial control over Alta California.

Mexican independence from Spain in 1822 led to the secularization of the missions, and new land utilization and ownership patterns began to evolve locally. In 1824, Mexico passed a law for the settlement of vacant lands in an effort to stimulate further economic development. Individuals could petition the governor for a specific tract, and the grantee was responsible for building a house and utilizing the property for agricultural production.

During the Mexican period (1822-1846), lands in western Santa Clara Valley were either part of large rancho holdings granted to individuals by the Mexican territorial government, or considered to be a part of the earlier Mission lands that had been established under Spanish rule (1777-1821). At the beginning of the American period 1846-1848, some of the lands within the Santa Clara Valley that were not already claimed under the old rancho system were allocated initially by the *Junta* (or town council) of the town of San Jose. After statehood, distribution of lands west of Mission Santa Clara which were not within ranchos, is not clear in the historical record; however, by 1857 William Stover Hollenbeck had begun acquiring land in the subject area near the *Rancho Pastoria de las Barregas*.

Born in the Mohawk Valley of New York State in 1807 or 1808, Hollenbeck was brought as a child to Illinois, and in August 1850 he arrived in San Francisco. He settled in the Santa Clara Valley in 1856 (Guinn 1904, p. 434). By 1876, Hollenbeck owned 639.5 acres in an area that is currently bounded on the north by El Camino Real, on the east by Hollenbeck Avenue, on the south by Remington Drive, and on the west by Stevens Creek (historically Cupertino Creek). The Hollenbeck house is shown on the 1876 Thompson & West Atlas to the northwest of the subject property, on the west side of present day Mary Avenue. Hollenbeck was among a group of early rural settlers of a part of present day Sunnyvale that was known during the 19th century as the Collins District, named for Lemuel P. Collins, who owned 160 acres south of Hollenbeck's ranch. Other nearby settlers included George Briggs (who married Hollenbeck's daughter Elsie) and William Wright, whose ca. 1860s house is now the oldest extant residence in the city of Sunnyvale (Ignoffo 1994).

Narcissa Hollenbeck was William's wife, and by the time of her death in 1881, William had granted her a 239-acre tract consisting of the eastern portion of his lands, bounded to the west by Mary Avenue. William Hollenbeck died the following year. In March 1885, Mrs. Hollenbeck's executor, Alexander Peers, had the tract surveyed into 8 lots of about 20 acres each, and one lot of 76 acres (Recorded Maps B:20, 5/1/1885). On September 15, 1885, Peers sold all of lot 8 and the south half of lot 7, thirty acres in total, to Charles Oscar Sloat (Deeds 81:130). The subject property is located within this thirty acre site.

The following year, Henry Brainard surveyed the Collins District and reported on Charles Sloat's recent arrival: "Mrs. And Mrs. Sloat came here last fall, lived under the shade of a tree till a temporary residence could be prepared." In a year's time, the Sloats had planted 10 acres of vineyards and 500 trees, mostly prunes, apricots, and peaches, and a variety of vegetable crops. The remainder of the land was kept in hay for their horses and cow, with plans to increase their vineyards and orchards the next year (Brainard 1886). Like William Hollenbeck, Charles O. Sloat was born in New York State and was brought to the Midwest as a child. He arrived in California in 1852, first running a general store in Amador County, then

relocating in the 1860s to Virginia City, Nevada. Sloat returned to California in 1881 and purchased a ranch near Saratoga before moving to his 30-acre ranch along Hollenbeck Avenue (Guinn 1904, pp. 1310-1311). In 1892, Charles Sloat granted the western 10 acres of his ranch to his son, William Keating Sloat (Deeds 148:430, 8/18/1892). By this time, William K. Sloat was an experienced rancher, having managed the Delmas ranch, the western portion of William Hollenbeck's estate, since 1887 (Guinn 1904).

In 1903, William K. Sloat sold his 10-acre ranch (Guinn 1904), and by 1916, the ranch was in the hands of Arthur E. and Edith Clement Davis (Deeds 437:579, 3/1/1916). Charles O. Sloat died on December 7, 1908, and by 1914, Myron A. Cain had purchased his 20-acre ranch (McMillan 1914). Both properties totaling 30 acres had been purchased by James Caviglia by 1920.

2.2 Caviglia Ranch

James (Giacomo) Caviglia purchased what had been William K. Sloat's 10 acres in 1916 and then purchased the remaining 20 acres of the original Sloat ranch in 1920 (Deeds 437:579, 3/1/1916; Deeds 521:160, 8/3/1920). James Caviglia was born near Genoa in 1888 and immigrated to the United States in 1902, following his older brother Bartolomeo, who had come the previous year (1930 U.S. Federal Census). James Caviglia purchased property in the Evergreen area of Santa Clara Valley in 1915 (Deeds 421:380, 1/18/1915) before permanently relocating to the Sunnyvale area the following year. In 1920, James Caviglia married Jennie DeVita, who emigrated from Sicily as a child in 1907. Their first child, Catherine (Rena), was born in 1921, followed by Albert (b. 1922), James, Jr. (b. 1923), and Maxine (b. 1929).

Before the Caviglias married, James lived in the farmhouse that William K. Sloat had built in the 1890s, which would have stood on what is now Persimmon Avenue. Later, the Caviglia family lived in what was probably the 1880s Charles O. Sloat farmhouse which was located at the site of the present main house at 1029 Ranere Ct. In 1934, when James Caviglia had the current extant house built, the Sloat farmhouse was moved west to where the rear ancillary building stands today; it was demolished when the structure was built in 1966 (Sunnyvale building permit 1966-1593; Maxine Freeborn 2005).

The Caviglias were orchardists and farmed this property along with other properties in Sunnyvale. By 1932, James and Jennie Caviglia had purchased another 20-acre ranch along Hollenbeck Avenue, on which their daughter Maxine lived for many years with her husband Robert Freeborn (school district maps; Freeborn 2005). The Caviglia family continued to expand their agricultural holdings which are presently known as Airdrome Orchards, a privately held company located on Gish Road in San Jose where corporate headquarter was established by 1964; the corporate history was not investigated as a part of this study.

Aggressive annexation policies of the City of Sunnyvale during the 1950s brought the horticultural era of the Collins District to a rapid close during the later half of the twentieth century. By 1960, the population of Sunnyvale had increased over five-fold over that of 1950, and about this time most of the orchard lands between Hollenbeck Avenue and future Route 85 right-of-way had been subdivided into residential tracts. Remington Drive was opened by 1962 with both sides now within the city limits, and in 1963 the Caviglia Ranch was one of a few number of unincorporated pockets within Sunnyvale's sphere of influence. With the relocation of Airdrome Orchards office and related facilities to San Jose by 1964, in the fall of 1965, the eastern 10 acres of the earlier Caviglia Ranch was subdivided as Tract No. 4024, St. Francis Estates and became a part of the City of Sunnyvale (Recorded Maps 201:38-39). Four lots were reserved for the Caviglia family. The first (the largest), a 0.833-acre lot, included the subject property. A 0.372-acre lot immediately to the south was reserved for Robert Sr. and Maxine Freeborn. They built the house at 1037 Ranere Ct. A half-acre lot, at 1035 Rangpur Court, was reserved for Albert and Dorothy Caviglia. A fourth lot of 0.352 acres was reserved at 710 Peckskill Drive.

In April 1966, the Caviglias applied for a permit to build a \$9000 cottage behind their house (Sunnyvale building permit 1966-1593). Mrs. Caviglia originally intended that the cottage be used as a recreation

room, but because the cabin where their hired man had been living for decades had been demolished to make the subdivision, it was initially used to house him (Freeborn 2005).

On July 1, 1969, the Caviglias recorded a map subdividing the 0.833-acre lot into two parcels (Recorded Maps 256:3). On the second parcel, they built a house at 1057 Prune Court, and Mr. and Mrs. Caviglia lived there for the rest of their lives. James Caviglia died in 1980, at the age of 91, and Jennie Caviglia died in 1996, at the age of 97. The subject property remained in the Caviglia family until after Mrs. Caviglia's death, when it was sold to Paul V. and Mildred M. Citraro on August 20, 1998 (doc no. 14345994).

2.3 Designer of the 1934 Caviglia House

The Caviglia house was apparently designed and built by brothers Alfred N. and Raymond W. "Bud" Truc, the second of three generations of Truc family builders in Mountain View. Their father, Newton Whitney Truc, was born in Maine in 1855. By 1880, he was 23 years old, working as a farmer's hired hand in San Joaquin County, California. He settled in Santa Clara County about 1882 (Great Register, 1890) and married Della Connell on December 22, 1886. Mr. and Mrs. Truc lived on Villa Street in Mountain View with their four children: Harriette (b. 1887), Alfred (b. 1889), Pearl (b. 1892), and Raymond (b. 1897). Newton Truc was a carpenter, and his two sons soon followed him into the trade. The Truc brothers continued to work after their father's death in 1927. Other projects that they worked on around the time the Caviglia house was built included the Sunnyvale Bakery in 1933, designed by architect Frank Moore; a two-story stucco residence for Charles Milani at the corner of View and Church Streets in Mountain View in 1933, designed by architect Ernest Reichel; and a remodel of the Mountain View Hardware Company in 1934, designed by architects Binder & Curtis (Goss 2005). Alfred Truc, who married later in life and had no children, died in 1947. Raymond "Bud" Truc and his wife Eleanor had two children, Harry and Virginia. Harry Whitney Truc would follow the family trade and become a building contractor, in addition to serving on the Mountain View City Council between 1958 and 1962 (Ignoffo 2002).

3.0 PROPERTY DESCRIPTION

The property at 1029 Ranere Court, Sunnyvale, includes two buildings, both facing east. A two-story, Spanish-eclectic-style house faces Ranere Court, and a one-story, late-twentieth-century residential ancillary building faces the front house. The property is set in a suburban neighborhood of contemporary houses on subdivision lots; however, the subject parcel is deeper than the surrounding parcels, spanning between two cul-de-sacs, Ranere Court to the east and Prune Court to the west. The property includes massive oak and avocado trees to the front and rear of the main house. The front yard is landscaped in a Modernist style, with long, low brick walls and aggregate concrete walkways in extended geometrical shapes and abstract patterns, likely from the 1960s. A driveway passes the front house to the south side; it leads to a central parking area and to the garage of the rear building. A small, recent greenhouse is near the southwest corner of the parcel.

The front house is representative of Spanish-eclectic-style residential architecture from the 1930s. Typical features of the style include the house's blocky, asymmetrical massing, its hipped, red-barrel-tile roof, its heavily textured stucco walls, and its wrought-iron grills and balconettes. Characteristic of the period of construction, as well as in keeping with its style, is its variety of fenestration, including arched windows, narrow, grilled, accent windows, and more standard casements, all fabricated of steel.

The front façade is tripartite in form. Toward the south side is a one-story entry portion of the house; it is raised on a high basement, and abuts a high, one-story square entry tower that is set back from the southeast corner of the house. The front steps and landing are edged by a stepped, stucco wall that terminates at the tower wall. The center portion of the house continues the main ridge line, but the wall is set back slightly, creating a high eave that frames tall, arched windows with wrought-iron balconettes. At the north end of the house, the floor levels and roofline are raised higher, creating a two-story wing.

The rear of the house also presents a split-level, tripartite massing, but it has simpler, more standard detailing across its width. The center section of the house is at the same floor height as the southern portion; on the rear façade, this area is recessed. What is a one-story portion of the house at the front is raised above a basement level. Concrete steps lead to a rear door at the main level. The basement level is more exposed on the rear façade, without foundation plantings; a pair of doors accesses this lower level from a steep ramp in the southern portion of the house. The basement and its access are typical of houses associated with Italian immigrants of this era, as large basement areas facilitated storage of home canned foods and wine.

The arched front door is recessed into a pattern of archways; it features heavy boards, iron strapping, and a small lite protected by a decorative grill. The entry tower has narrow windows with wrought-iron grills; the main level includes a series of French doors with balconettes, as well as more standard steel casements with horizontal lites. The arched transoms in the center of the front façade have steel fanlights. The windows are recessed into the stucco with curved jambs and simple sills. The windows in the northern wing and along the rear façade are stacked vertically.

The ancillary structure at the rear of the site, adjacent to Prune Court, is a Ranch-style building with Mediterranean-style detailing that was designed to blend with the front house. The building is stucco with a hipped, red Spanish-tile roof; however, it is configured in a traditional one-story, "L"-shaped, Ranch-style layout with an integral garage and a recessed corner entrance. The windows are aluminum sliders, and a sliding glass door to the left of the main door opens onto a small stoop covered by a recently constructed redwood arbor. Near the center of the roof is a massive, rectangular faux-adobe chimney. The rear of the garage projects slightly in plan and is clad with horizontal v-groove siding.

The historical materials and features have been changed very little over time and continue to represent the building's historic architectural design as per the National Register's seven principles of integrity. The resource maintains its historical integrity of association with its original owner and use as a generously sized residence of the 1930s. The exterior of the building provides an essentially unadulterated representation of its original residential scale, style, and feeling, Spanish-eclectic design, materials, and workmanship. The house maintains its integrity of location and the property includes mature plantings that preserve some of the immediate setting; however, the property's overall setting has been altered through the years by the encroachment of the surrounding neighborhood. The character-defining features provide an adequate framework for understanding the original building on its site.

4.0 EVALUATION FOR SIGNIFICANCE

This portion of the report constitutes an historical and architectural evaluation of the properties, based on a statement of historical significance according to the *Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act - Preliminary Review of Projects and Conduct of Initial Study*, to determine the potential significance of impacts to historical resources according to section 15064.5 of the California Code of Regulations.

More specifically, three sets of guidelines were used; the City of Sunnyvale codes related to historic properties (Chapter 19.96 of the City of Sunnyvale Municipal Code); the National Park Services requirements for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, and the California State Historic Resources Commission's requirements for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources.

4.1 City of Sunnyvale Ordinance

The City of Sunnyvale has adopted within their municipal code, Chapter 19.96 (Historic Preservation), regulations pertaining to the historic resources that reflect the character and history of the city in its

cultural, historical, and architectural heritage. The City of Sunnyvale states in its historic preservation ordinance that the "historical and cultural foundations of the city should be preserved as living parts of community life and development to build an understanding of the city's past so that future generations may have a genuine opportunity to appreciate, enjoy, and understand the rich heritage of the city." The city preservation programs and activities are intended to give maximum encouragement to agencies and individuals undertaking preservation of the city's unique architectural, historical, aesthetic, and cultural heritage.

The property at 1029 Ranere Ct. is listed on the City of Sunnyvale's Heritage Resource Inventory (also referred to as the Local Register of Heritage Resources). In submitting the local register to the State of California in 1998, the property at 1029 Ranere Ct. was identified as meeting Criterion A of the National Register (see National Register of Historic Places criteria in Section 4.2 following). By definition, the listing of the property on its local register, the Sunnyvale City Council has indicated that the property has been determined to be appropriate for preservation. The mere listing with the State of California however does not imply that the property has been recognized by the state or the nation to be historically significant.

The City of Sunnyvale recognizes three levels of significance of historic resources or districts: Local Landmarks, Designated Heritage Resources, and Heritage Resource (SMC Chapter 19.96.05a). The subject property at 1029 Ranere Ct. is not a Local Landmark Resource; however it is listed on the Heritage Resource Inventory. Designated Heritage Resources are those that have been designated by both the City of Sunnyvale and the State of California or federal government as historically significant. Because 1029 Ranere Ct. has not been designated by the State of California or federal government as historically significant, the property is not considered a Designated Heritage Resource (SMC Chapter 19.96.05b).

Under the regulations of the preservation ordinance, material changes to a Heritage Resource due to exterior appearance through alteration, construction, relocation, or demolition can only be done under a resource alteration permit issued by the heritage preservation commission unless the modification is minor (SMC Chapter 19.96.05d).

The process for alteration, construction, relocation, or demolition of a Heritage Resource such as the property at 1029 Ranere Ct. is to file an application with the City of Sunnyvale Department of Community Development which is then forwarded to the Heritage Preservation Commission. The commission first considers whether the resource is in fact historically or culturally significant based upon evidence submitted by the city staff and applicant. If the commission finds the resource is not culturally or historically significant, the application is returned to the department for processing in accordance with other relevant city procedures. If the commission finds the resource to be culturally or historically significant, it must hold a public hearing on the application (SMC Chapter 19.96.095).

In evaluating whether a Heritage Resource is culturally or historically significant, the commission considers scientific, aesthetic, education, political, social, cultural, architectural, and historical significance. The must use the following criteria for guidance, or the property must meet the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places (see section 4.2 following):

- (a) It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic engineering, architectural, or natural history;
- (b) It is identified with persons or events significant in local, state, or national history;
- (c) It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
- (d) It is representative of the work of a notable builder, designer, or architect;

- (e) It contributes to the significance of an historic area, being a geographically definable area possessing a concentration of historic or scenic properties or thematically related grouping of properties which contribute to each other and are unified aesthetically or by plan or physical development;
- (f) It has a unique location or singular physical characteristic or is a view or vista representing an established and familiar visual feature of a neighborhood, community, or the city of Sunnyvale;
- (g) It embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, or craftsmanship that represents a significant structural or architectural achievement or innovation;
- (h) It is similar to other distinctive properties, sites, areas, or objects based on a historic, cultural, or architectural motif;
- (i) It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth, particular transportation modes, or distinctive examples of park or community planning;
- (j) It is one of the few remaining examples in the city, region, state, or nation possessing distinguishing characteristics of an architectural or historic type or specimen;
- (k) With respect to a local landmark, it is significant in that the resource materially benefits the historical character of a neighborhood or area, or the resource in its location represents an established and familiar visual feature of the community or city.
- (l) With respect to a local landmark district, a collective high integrity of the district is essential to the sustained value of the separate individual resources;
- (m) With respect to a designated landmark and designated landmark district, the heritage resource shall meet Criteria of the National Register of Historical Places.

4.2 National Register of Historic Places

The National Park Services considers the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture that is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association when evaluating properties for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Following are the four criteria used in the evaluation process of historic properties:

- Criteria A it is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or
- Criteria B it is associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or
- Criteria C it embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represents the work of a master, or that possesses high artistic values, or that represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or
- Criteria D it has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

Properties that are listed on or formally determined eligible for the National Register are automatically listed on the California Register.

4.3 California Register of Historical Resources

Properties in the City of Sunnyvale that are evaluated for significance within the development review process must also be considered under the criteria of the California Register of Historical Resources. The significance criteria are similar to those used by the National Register of Historic Places but oriented to document the unique history of California. The California Register includes properties listed in or formally declared eligible for the National Register, California State Landmarks above #770, certain Points of Historical Interest, and properties listed by application and acceptance by the California

Historical Resources Commission. The California Register is a guide used by state and local agencies, private groups and citizens to identify historical resources in the state, and is also used as a planning tool within the California Environmental Quality Act to help indicate what properties are to be protected, to the extent prudent and feasible, from substantial adverse change within government regulatory programs. [Public Resources Code Section 5024.1]

Under CEQA, an "historical resource" includes, but is not limited to, any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record or manuscript, which is historical or archaeologically significant, or is significant in the architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, education, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California." [Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(j)] The types of historical resources eligible for listing in the California Register include buildings, sites, structures, objects and historical districts. [California Code of Regulations Section 48542(a)]

The types of resources and the criteria for listing in the California Register are consistent with those developed by the National Park Service for listing historical resources in the National Register, but have been modified for state use in order to include a range of historical resources which better reflect the history of California. Under California Code of Regulation Section 4852(b) and Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, an historical resource generally must be greater than 50 years old and must be significant at the local, state, or national level under one or more of the following four criteria:

1. It is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of local or regional history, or the cultural heritage of California or the United States.
2. It is associated with the lives of persons important to local, California, or national history.
3. It embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of a master or important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values.
4. It has yielded, or has the potential to yield, information important to the prehistory or history of the local area, California, or the nation.

California Code of Regulations Section 4852(c) addresses the issue of "integrity" which is necessary for eligibility for the California Register. Integrity is defined as "the authenticity of an historical resource's physical identity evidenced by the survival of characteristics that existed during the resource's period of significance." Section 4852(c) provides that historical resources eligible for listing in the California Register must meet one of the criteria for significance defined by 4852(b)(1 through 4), and retain enough of their historic character of appearance to be recognizable as historical resources and to convey the reasons for their significance. Integrity is evaluated with regard to the retention of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association. It must also be judged with reference to the particular criteria under which a resource is proposed for eligibility. Alterations over time to a resource or historic changes in its use may themselves have historical, cultural, or architectural significance. It is possible that historical resources may not retain sufficient integrity to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register, but they may still be eligible for listing in the California Register. A resource that has lost its historic character or appearance may still have sufficient integrity for the California Register if it maintains the potential to yield significant scientific or historical information or specific data.

4.4 Determining Significance under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

A project with an effect that may cause substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment under CEQA. An "Historical Resource" includes those listed in or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, a resource included in a local register that meets the requirements for listing in the California Register, and any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which an agency such as the City of Sunnyvale determines to be historically significant or significant in the

architectural, engineering, scientific, economic, agricultural, education, social, political, military, or cultural annals of California, provided that the determination is supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record. Generally, the City of Sunnyvale is required to consider historical significance if a resource meets at least one criterion for listing on the California Register under the criteria previously stated. The fact that a resource is not listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register—or is not included in a local register or identified in an historical resources survey meeting the specified criteria—does not preclude an agency such as the City of Sunnyvale from determining that the resource may be an historical resource under CEQA.

4.5 Evaluation

The subject property and the associated buildings on the site are not "designated" on any federal, state registers, or local registers. The property however is listed on the Sunnyvale Heritage Resources Inventory. The main house on the property at 1029 Ranere Ct. is over 50 years old; however, the ancillary building is not as it was built in 1966 and is about 39 years old.

For the purposes of CEQA, the preparers of this report reviewed the property in light of potential future development at the site that may result in demolition, relocation, and/or rehabilitation of extant buildings to facilitate a lot split and construction of one or two new houses on the property. The properties were reviewed for potential listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, the National Register of Historic Places, and under the criteria for of the City of Sunnyvale for cultural and/or cultural significance.

The house at 1029 Ranere Ct. has been previously identified as having historical significance for its association with patterns of development in rural unincorporated Sunnyvale during its horticultural period which ranged from the 1870s to early 1960s. The house was the residence of James Sr. and Jennie Caviglia who founded Airdrome Orchards, an agricultural company which remained in Sunnyvale until the early 1960s when corporate operations were relocated to San Jose and the orchard property subdivided for housing tracts. The house was built by the Caviglia family and had a primary relationship to the ownership and operation of the agricultural operation at the Sunnyvale location. The extant ancillary structure at the rear of the property has only a tertiary relationship to this ranch, as it was constructed by the Caviglia family subsequent to the historic agricultural use of the property.

Although the City of Sunnyvale apparently listed the property at 1029 Ranere Ct. on its inventory due to its agricultural associations, the house would not appear to qualify for the National Register under Criterion A, or the California Register under Criterion (1) based on its association with the agricultural pattern of development in the Sunnyvale area, because the original setting of the house within the orchard property has been irreversibly altered with the construction of the housing subdivision. The house alone does not adequately represent the pattern of development that the City of Sunnyvale considers to be of historical importance. The original context for the house has been lost.

James Sr. and Jennie Caviglia were also considered for their contributions to local, state or national history to determine if the property meets the criteria of the California and National Registers due to its associations with them as individuals. Although they had founded Airdrome Orchards, which continues today as a large privately owned and operated statewide agricultural business, successful entrepreneurship is not in itself reason to consider historic personages important to our past. The Caviglias are not known for specific innovations or contributions to their area of business, or for activities within the local community for which they would be remembered in a significant way. The property would therefore not qualify for the National Register under Criterion B or the California Register under Criterion (2) for its association with historic personages.

The architectural character and features were assessed in the context of residential architecture of the period in which it was built. The style is Spanish Eclectic, with close associations with what could be called Mediterranean Revival - buildings closely linked to historic precedents from the Mediterranean region of Europe of both Spain and Italy. The Eclectic movement in residential architecture first began to appear in America in the 1890s, catalyzed by Chicago's Columbia Exposition of 1893. In California, the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego brought the use of Spanish prototypes to wide attention, and in the next two decades the richness of Spanish and other Mediterranean historic antecedents were fashionable in the West, particularly California. During the Depression construction slowed considerably, but the continued success of the Caviglias farming operations during this period allowed for the construction of a substantial house within the ranch. The massing and window pattern along the front facade is more reminiscent of the Caviglia home land of Italy than what would normally be found on Spanish Eclectic buildings of the period. While the house has not been associated with a designer of known reputation, the True Brothers constructed a unique residence that combines both distinctive architectural features while at the same time adapting the style to modern materials such as steel windows. Unlike much of the housing in nearby cities such as Sunnyvale, the house was designed to exploit the subterranean area for food storage; a feature associated with the self-sufficiency found on rural properties, but integrated in this house as a part of the design. The house would appear to qualify for both the National Register under Criterion C and California Register under Criterion (3) based upon its distinctive architectural design, a distinguished example of Depression era residential architecture that was specifically adapted to a rural agricultural setting. Although the ranch no longer exists, the house as a distinct entity retains enough of its yard to retain its historic setting. The period of significance for the house is 1934, and the historic period of use is 1934 to 1964. The ancillary building does not contain the same distinction of the main house, and was constructed outside the significant period of use of the property. It does not contribute to the significance of the house architecturally and would therefore not qualify for the National or California Registers based on its own merits.

The Sunnyvale Heritage Resource commission can consider the above analysis to help determine if the Caviglia Ranch house is significant under the local criteria adopted under the historic preservation ordinance. It appears that the house meets the following criteria:

- (a) It exemplifies or reflects special elements of the city's cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic engineering, architectural, or natural history;
- (c) It embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period, or method of construction, or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship;
- (i) It reflects significant geographical patterns, including those associated with different eras of settlement and growth

4.6 Potential Impacts

Under the California Environmental Quality Act, a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. Substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource means physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance of an historical resource would be materially impaired. The significance of an historical resource is materially impaired when a project demolishes or materially alters in an adverse manner those physical characteristics of an historical resource that convey its historical significance and that justify its inclusion in the California Register, or in a local register of historical resources as defined by Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k), or its identification in an historical resources survey meeting the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(g).

The main residential building at 1029 Ranere Ct. appears eligible for the California Register. Any selective demolition, alteration, and rehabilitation must be done in a way that is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation in order that the project not have an adverse effect on the environment. The ancillary building does not contribute to the historic resource, as it was constructed outside the period of significance for the house and is not individually distinctive for its architectural design. Demolition of the ancillary building would not appear to create an adverse effect on the environment as defined by CEQA.

5.0 SOURCES OF INFORMATION

5.1 Primary and unpublished sources

Brainard, H. C. Brainard's Atlas of Santa Clara County. Map No. 19, Collins and Mountain View, 1886. On file at the California Room, Martin Luther King Jr. Library, San José.

County of Santa Clara. Deeds, Miscellaneous Records, Maps, and Official Records. On file at the Clerk-Recorder's Office.

McMillan, J. G. Official Map of Santa Clara County, 1902-1903.

McMillan, J. G. Official Map of Santa Clara County, 1914.

State of California

Birth Index, 1905-1995.

Directory of Properties (Santa Clara County) in the Historic Property Data File, 2003.

Death Index, 1905-2000.

Santa Clara County School District Maps, c1950s. On file at the Office of the County Surveyor.

Santa Clara County *Great Register of Voters*, 1890. On file at the California Room, Martin Luther King Jr. Public Library, San José.

Sunnyvale building permit 1966-1593, 4/12/1966.

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce

Census of Population, 1880-1930.

United States Geological Survey, U.S. Department of the Interior

San José West Quadrangle map, 1899.

Cupertino (photo revised) map, 1980.

5.2 Miscellaneous Primary Sources

R. L. Polk & Co., San Jose City Directories and other local municipalities, 1870-1979.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Company. Maps of Sunnyvale.

5.3 Newspaper Clippings

"[Newton W. True death notice]," *San Jose Mercury Herald*, 10/9/1927.

5.4 Secondary and published sources

National Park Service. Preservation Brief #17 (Architectural Character: Identifying the Visual Aspects of Historic Buildings as an Aid to Preserving Their Character). Prepared by Lee H. Nelson, FAIA, 1988.

National Park Service. Preservation Brief #35 (Understanding Old Buildings: The Process of Architectural Investigation). Prepared by Travis C. McDonald, Jr., 1994.

Freeborn, Maxine. Oral interviews with Bonnie Montgomery, July 6-7, 2005.

Goss, Gary. Research files based on entries in the Pacific Daily Builder.

Guinn, G. M. *History of the State of California and Biographical Record of the Coast Counties*. Chicago: The Chapman Publishing Company, 1904.

Ignoffo, Mary Jo. *Sunnyvale: From the City of Destiny to the Heart of Silicon Valley*. Cupertino, CA: California History Center, 1994.

Ignoffo, Mary Jo. *Milestones: A History of Mountain View, California*. Cupertino, CA: California History Center, 2002.

Santa Clara County Marriage License File. On file at History San José.

Thompson and West. *Historical Atlas of Santa Clara County*. San Francisco: Thompson and West, 1876 [San José: Smith and McKay Printing Co., reprinted 1973].

Urban/Rural Conservation. *City of Sunnyvale Cultural Resources Inventory*, September 1979.


Historical and Architectural Evaluation
1029 Ranere Ct.
Sunnyvale, California

ATTACHMENT 1
Page 18 of 21


6.0 APPENDICES

PHOTOGRAPHS

Historical and Architectural Evaluation
1829 Ranere Ct.
Sunnyvale, California




Front elevation, view looking northwest




Entry and windows, view looking northeast

Historical and Architectural Evaluation
1029 Ranere Ct.
Sunnyvale, California



Chimney detail, view looking westerly




Window detail on south elevation, view looking north

Historical and Architectural Evaluation
1029 Rancho Ct.
Sunnyvale, California



Rear elevation, view looking easterly



Rear ancillary building, view looking northeasterly

Historical and Architectural Evaluation
1029 Ranere Ct.
Sunnyvale, California



Left side garage on rear ancillary building, view looking northeast



Back side of rear ancillary building, view looking east from Prune Ct.

Historical and Architectural Evaluation
1029 Ranch Ct.
Sunnyvale, California

ATTACHMENT D
Page: 23 of 31
Page 23

DPR523 FORMS

State of California - The Resources Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION PRIMARY RECORD	Primary HRI#
Other Listing Review Code	Tinomial NRHP Status Code
Reviewer	Date

Page 1 of 8 *Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder) Caviglia Ranch House

P1. Other Identifier: None

*P2. Location: Not for Publication Unrestricted *a. County Santa Clara

and (P2b and P2c or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

*b. USGS 7.5' Quad Cupertino Date 1961 photo revised 1980 T6S; R2W; Mount Diablo S.A.

c. Address 1029 Ranere Ct. City Sunnyvale Zip 94067

d. UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone 10S; 584780mE; 4136242mN

e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)

Assessor's Parcel Number: 201-03-041


West side of Ranere Ct. South of Peckskill Drive

*P3a. Description: (Describe resource and its major elements. Include design, materials, condition, alterations, size, setting, and boundaries)

The property at 1029 Ranere Court, Sunnyvale, includes two buildings, both facing east. A two-story Spanish-eclectic-style house faces Ranere Court, and a one-story, late-twentieth-century residential ancillary building faces the front house. The property is set in a suburban neighborhood of contemporary houses on subdivision lots; however, the subject parcel is deeper than the surrounding parcels, spanning between two cul-de-sacs, Ranere Court to the east and Prune Court to the west. The property includes massive oak and avocado trees to the front and rear of the main house. The front yard is landscaped in a Modernist style, with long, low brick walls and aggregate concrete walkways in extended geometrical shapes and abstract patterns, likely from the 1960s. A driveway passes the front house to the south side; it leads to a central parking area and to the garage of the rear building. A small, recent greenhouse is near the southwest corner of the parcel. (Continued on page 2, DPR523A)

*P3b. Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) HP2. Single family Property

*P4 Resources Present: Building Structure Object Site District Element of District Other (Isolates, etc.)



*P5b. Description of Photo: (View, date, accession #)

View looking northwest, 7/13/2005

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and Sources: Historic Prehistoric Both

1934, undocumented oral history

*P7. Owner and Address:

Mildred Citraro
1029 Ranere Ct.
Sunnyvale, CA 94067

*P8. Recorded by: (Name, affiliation, and address)

F. Maggi, L. Dill,
B. Montgomery
Archives & Architecture
PO Box 1332
San Jose CA 95109-1312

*P9. Date Recorded: 7/22/2005

*P10. Survey Type: (Describe)
Intensive

*P11. Report Citation: (Cite survey report and other sources, or enter "none")

Archives & Architecture: Historical and Architectural Evaluation of 1029 Ranere Ct., Sunnyvale, Santa Clara County, California, prepared for Mildred Citraro, July 22, 2005.

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Sketch Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure and Object Record Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Mining State Record Rock Art Record Artifact Record Photograph Record Other (List)

State of California - The Resources Agency
 DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
 CONTINUATION SHEET

Primary #
 HRI #
 Historical

Page 2 of 8

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Caviglia Ranch House

*Recorded by Franklin Maggi, Leslie Dill, & Bonnie Montgomery *Date 7/22/2005 Continuation Update

(Continued from previous page)

The front house is representative of Spanish-eclectic-style residential architecture with features associated with Mediterranean Revival architecture from the 1930s. Typical features of the style include the house's blocky, asymmetrical massing, its hipped, red-barrel-tile roof, its heavily textured stucco walls, and its wrought-iron grills and balconettes. Characteristic of the period of construction, as well as in keeping with its style, is its variety of fenestration, including arched windows, narrow, grilled, accent windows, and more standard casements, all fabricated of steel.


The front façade is tripartite in form. Toward the south side is a one-story entry portion of the house; it is raised on a high basement, and abuts a high, one-story square entry tower that is set back from the southeast corner of the house. The front steps and landing are edged by a stepped, stucco wall that terminates at the tower wall. The center portion of the house continues the main ridgeline, but the wall is set back slightly, creating a high eave that frames tall, arched windows with wrought-iron balconettes. At the north end of the house, the floor levels and roofline are raised higher, creating a two-story wing. The rear of the house also presents a split-level, tripartite massing, but it has simpler, more standard detailing across its width. The center section of the house is at the same floor height as the southern portion; on the rear façade, this area is recessed. What is a one-story portion of the house at the front is raised above a basement level. Concrete steps lead to a rear door at the main level. The basement level is more exposed on the rear façade, without foundation plantings; a pair of doors accesses this lower level from a steep ramp in the southern portion of the house. The basement and its access are typical of houses associated with Italian immigrants of this era, as large basements areas facilitated storage of home canned foods and wine.

The arched front door is recessed into a pattern of archways; it features heavy boards, iron strapping, and a small lite protected by a decorative grill. The entry tower has narrow windows with wrought-iron grills; the main level includes a series of French doors with balconettes, as well as more standard steel casements with horizontal lites. The arched transoms in the center of the front façade have steel faulights. The windows are recessed into the stucco with curved jambs and simple sills. The windows in the northern wing and along the rear façade are stacked vertically.

The ancillary structure at the rear of the site, adjacent to Prune Court, is a Ranch-style building with Mediterranean-style detailing that was designed to blend with the front house. The building is stucco with a hipped, red Spanish-tile roof; however, it is configured in a traditional one-story, "L"-shaped, Ranch-style layout with an integral garage and a recessed corner entrance. The windows are aluminum sliders, and a sliding glass door to the left of the main door opens onto a small stoop covered by a recently constructed redwood arbor. Near the center of the roof is a massive, rectangular faux-adobe chimney. The rear of the garage projects slightly in plan and is clad with horizontal v-groove siding..

State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
LOCATION MAP
Primary #
HRT #
Title

Page 3 of 8 *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Caviglia Ranch House
*Map Name: USGS Cupertino Quadrangle *Scale: n.t.s. *Date of Map: 1961 photo revised 1980



Map overlaid with TOPOLIS data. National Geographic International Geographic Database

State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
BUILDING STRUCTURE AND OBJECT RECORD

Page 4 of 8 *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Caviglia Ranch House *NRHP Status Code JS

B1. Historic Name: Caviglia Ranch House
B2. Common Name: None
B3. Original use: Ranch B4. Present Use: Single family residential
*B5. Architectural Style: Spanish Eclectic / Mediterranean Revival
*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)
Constructed 1934. Rear ancillary structure constructed 1966.

*B7. Moved? No Yes Unknown Data: Original Location: n/a
*B8. Related Features:

Ancillary structure at rear, rock grotto at terminus of driveway, large tree at front property line.

B9a Architect: True Brothers b. Builder: True Brothers
*B10. Significance: Theme Agriculture / Residential Architecture Area Sunnyvale
Period of Significance 1934-1964 Property Type Residential Applicable Criteria (3)

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)
The subject property is located within a 1960s single-family residential subdivision that is located at the northwest corner of Hollenbeck Avenue and Remington Drive. This area is near what was once the southern border of the historic nineteenth century Rancho Pastoria de las Borregas, established by Francisco Estrada and his wife Inez Castro under a land grant in 1842. Prior to 1846, the area that includes the subject property was part of lands owned by the Mexican government, had previously been associated with the Mission Santa Clara.

After statehood, distribution of lands west of Mission Santa Clara which were not within ranchos, is not clear in the historical record; however, by 1857 William Stover Hollenbeck had began acquiring land in the subject area near the Rancho Pastoria de las Borregas.

Narcissa Hollenbeck was William's wife, and by the time of her death in 1881, William had granted her a 239-acre tract consisting of the eastern portion of his lands, bounded to the west by Mary Avenue. William Hollenbeck died the following year. In March 1885, Mrs. Hollenbeck's executor, Alexander Peers, had the tract surveyed into 8 lots of about 20 acres each, and one lot of 76 acres (Recorded Maps B:20, 5/1/1885). On September 15, 1885, Peers sold all of lot 8 and the south half of lot 7, thirty acres in total, to Charles Oscar Sloat (Deeds 81:130). The subject property is located within this thirty acre site. (Continued on page 5)

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) None

*B12. References:
See Continuation Sheet page 8

B13. Remarks: Proposed lot split & possible demolition
*B14. Evaluator: Franklin Maggi

*Date of Evaluation: 7/22/2005

(This space reserved for official comments.)



DPR 523B

State of California - The Resources Agency
 DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
 CONTINUATION SHEET

Priority #
 HRI #
 Trinchera

Page 5 of 8

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Caviglia Ranch House

*Recorded by Franklin Maggi, Leslie Dill, & Bonnie Montgomery *Date 7/22/2005 Continuation Update

(Continued from previous page)

The following year, Henry Brainard surveyed the Collins District and reported on Charles Sloat's recent arrival: "Mrs. And Mrs. Sloat came here last fall, lived under the shade of a tree till a temporary residence could be prepared." In a year's time, the Sloats had planted 10 acres of vineyards and 500 trees, mostly prunes, apricots, and peaches, and a variety of vegetable crops. The remainder of the land was kept in hay for their horses and cow, with plans to increase their vineyards and orchards the next year (Brainard 1886). Like William Hollenbeck, Charles O. Sloat was born in New York State and was brought to the Midwest as a child. He arrived in California in 1852, first running a general store in Amador County, then relocating in the 1860s to Virginia City, Nevada. Sloat returned to California in 1881 and purchased a ranch near Saratoga before moving to his 30-acre ranch along Hollenbeck Avenue (Guinn 1904, pp. 1310-1311). In 1892, Charles Sloat granted the western 10 acres of his ranch to his son, William Keating Sloat (Deeds 148:430, 8/18/1892). By this time, William K. Sloat was an experienced rancher, having managed the Delmas ranch, the western portion of William Hollenbeck's estate, since 1887 (Guinn 1904).

In 1903, William K. Sloat sold his 10-acre ranch (Guinn 1904), and by 1916, the ranch was in the hands of Arthur E. and Edith Clement Davis (Deeds 437:579, 3/1/1916). Charles O. Sloat died on December 7, 1908, and by 1914, Myron A. Cain had purchased his 20-acre ranch (McMillan 1914). Both properties totaling 30 acres had been purchased by James Caviglia by 1920.

Caviglia Ranch

James (Giacomo) Caviglia purchased what had been William K. Sloat's 10 acres in 1916 and then purchased the remaining 20 acres of the original Sloat ranch in 1920 (Deeds 437:579, 3/1/1916; Deeds 521:160, 8/3/1920). James Caviglia was born near Genoa in 1888 and immigrated to the United States in 1902, following his older brother Bartolomao. James Caviglia permanently relocated to the Sunnyvale area in 1916. In 1920, James Caviglia married Jennie DeVita, who emigrated from Sicily as a child in 1907. Before the Caviglias married, James lived in the farmhouse that William K. Sloat had built in the 1890s, which would have stood on what is now Persimmon Avenue. Later, the Caviglia family lived in what was probably the 1880s Charles O. Sloat farmhouse which was located at the site of the present main house at 1029 Ranere Ct. In 1934, when James Caviglia had the current extant house built, the Sloat farmhouse was moved west to where the rear ancillary building stands today; it was demolished when the structure was built in 1966 (Sunnyvale building permit 1966-1593; Maxine Freeborn 2005).

The Caviglias were orchardists and farmed this property along with other properties in Sunnyvale. By 1932, James and Jennie Caviglia had purchased another 20-acre ranch along Hollenbeck Avenue, on which their daughter Maxine lived for many years with her husband Robert Freeborn (school district maps; Freeborn 2005). The Caviglia family continued to expand their agricultural holdings which are presently known as Airdrome Orchards, a privately held company located on Gish Road in San Jose where corporate headquarter was established by 1964; the corporate history was not investigated as a part of this study.

Aggressive annexation policies of the City of Sunnyvale during the 1950s brought the horticultural era of the Collins District to a rapid close during the later half of the twentieth century. By 1960, the population of Sunnyvale had increased over five-fold over that of 1950, and about this time most of the orchard lands between Hollenbeck Avenue and future Route 85 right-of-way had been subdivided into residential tracts. Remington Drive was opened by 1962 with both sides now within the city limits, and in 1963 the Caviglia Ranch was one of a few number of unincorporated pockets within Sunnyvale's sphere of influence. With the relocation of Airdrome Orchards office and related facilities to San Jose by 1964, in the fall of 1965, the eastern 10 acres of the earlier Caviglia Ranch was subdivided as Tract No. 1024, St. Francis Estates and became a part of the City of Sunnyvale (Recorded Maps 201:38-39). Four lots were reserved for the Caviglia family. The first (the largest), a 0.833-acre lot, included the subject property. A 0.372-acre lot immediately to the south was reserved for Robert Sr. and Maxine Freeborn. They built the house at 1037 Ranere Ct. A half-acre lot, at 1035 Rangpur Court, was reserved for Albert and Dorothy Caviglia. A fourth lot of 0.352 acres was reserved at 710 Peakskill Drive. (Continued on page 6)

State of California - The Resources Agency
 DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
 CONTINUATION SHEET

Primary #
 HRI#
 Tridomial#

Page 6 of 8

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Caviglia Ranch House

*Recorded by Franklin Maggi, Leslie Dill, & Bonnie Montgomery *Date 7/22/2005 Continuation Update

(Continued from previous page)

In April 1966, the Caviglias applied for a permit to build a \$9000 cottage behind their house (Sunnyvale building permit 1966-1593). Mrs. Caviglia originally intended that the cottage be used as a recreation room, but because the cabin where their hired man had been living for decades had been demolished to make the subdivision, it was initially used to house him (Freeborn 2005).

On July 1, 1969, the Caviglias recorded a map subdividing the 0.833-acre lot into two parcels (Recorded Maps 256:3). On the second parcel, they built a house at 1057 Prune Court, and Mr. and Mrs. Caviglia lived there for the rest of their lives. James Caviglia died in 1980, at the age of 91, and Jennie Caviglia died in 1996, at the age of 97. The subject property remained in the Caviglia family until after Mrs. Caviglia's death, when it was sold to Paul V. and Mildred M. Citraro on August 20, 1998 (doc no. 14345994).

Designer of the 1934 Caviglia House

The Caviglia house was apparently designed and built by brothers Alfred N. and Raymond W. "Bud" True, the second of three generations of True family builders in Mountain View. Their father, Newton Whitney True, was born in Maine in 1855. By 1880, he was 23 years old, working as a farmer's hired hand in San Joaquin County, California. He settled in Santa Clara County about 1882 (Great Register, 1890) and married Della Connell on December 22, 1886. Mr. and Mrs. True lived on Villa Street in Mountain View with their four children: Harriette (b. 1887), Alfred (b. 1889), Pearl (b. 1892), and Raymond (b. 1897). Newton True was a carpenter, and his two sons soon followed him into the trade. The True brothers continued to work after their father's death in 1927. Other projects that they worked on around the time the Caviglia house was built included the Sunnyvale Bakery in 1933, designed by architect Frank Moore; a two-story stucco residence for Charles Milani at the corner of View and Church Streets in Mountain View in 1933, designed by architect Ernest Reichel; and a remodel of the Mountain View Hardware Company in 1934, designed by architects Binder & Curtis (Goss 2005). Alfred True, who married later in life and had no children, died in 1947. Raymond "Bud" True and his wife Eleanor had two children, Harry and Virginia. Harry Whitney True would follow the family trade and become a building contractor, in addition to serving on the Mountain View City Council between 1958 and 1962 (Ignoffo 2002).

Evaluation

The property at 1029 Ranere Ct. is listed on the City of Sunnyvale's Heritage Resource Inventory (also referred to as the Local Register of Heritage Resources). In submitting the local register to the State of California in 1998, the property at 1029 Ranere Ct. was identified as meeting Criterion A of the National Register (see National Register of Historic Places criteria in Section 4.2 following). By definition, the listing of the property on its local register, the Sunnyvale City Council has indicated that the property has been determined to be appropriate for preservation. The mere listing with the State of California however does not imply that the property has been recognized by the state or the nation to be historically significant.

The subject property and the associated buildings on the site are not "designated" on any federal, state registers, or local registers. The property however is listed on the Sunnyvale Heritage Resources Inventory. The main house on the property at 1029 Ranere Ct. is over 50 years old; however, the ancillary building is not as it was built in 1966 and is about 39 years old.

The house at 1029 Ranere Ct. has been previously identified as having historical significance for its association with patterns of development in rural unincorporated Sunnyvale during its horticultural period which ranged from the 1870s to early 1960s. The house was the residence of James Sr. and Jennie Caviglia who founded Airdrome Orchards, an agricultural company which remained in Sunnyvale until the early 1960s when corporate operations were relocated to San Jose and the orchard property subdivided for housing tracts. (Continued on page 7)

State of California - The Resource Agency DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION CONTINUATION SHEET	Priority # HRP# Tranomia	Page <u>30</u> of <u>31</u>
---	--------------------------------	-----------------------------

Page 7 of 9 *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Caviglia Ranch House

*Recorded by Franklin Maggi, Leslie Dill, & Bonnie Montgomery *Date 7/22/2005 Continuation Update

(Continued from previous page)

The house was built by the Caviglia family and had a primary relationship to the ownership and operation of the agricultural operation at the Sunnyvale location. The extant ancillary structure at the rear of the property has only a tertiary relationship to this ranch, as it was constructed by the Caviglia family subsequent to the historic agricultural use of the property.

Although the City of Sunnyvale apparently listed the property at 1029 Ranere Ct. on its inventory due to its agricultural associations, the house would not appear to qualify for the National Register under Criterion A, or the California Register under Criterion (1) based on its association with the agricultural pattern of development in the Sunnyvale area, because the original setting of the house within the orchard property has been irreversibly altered with the construction of the housing subdivision. The house alone does not adequately represent the pattern of development that the City of Sunnyvale considers to be of historical importance. The original context for the house has been lost.

James Sr. and Jennie Caviglia were also considered for their contributions to local, state or national history to determine if the property meets the criteria of the California and National Registers due to its associations with them as individuals. Although they had founded Airdrome Orchards, which continues today as a large privately owned and operated statewide agricultural business, successful entrepreneurship is not in itself reason to consider historic personages important to our past. The Caviglias are not known for specific innovations or contributions to their area of business, or for activities within the local community for which they would be remembered in a significant way. The property would therefore not qualify for the National Register under Criterion B or the California Register under Criterion (2) for its association with historic personages.

The architectural character and features were assessed in the context of residential architecture of the period in which it was built. The style is Spanish Eclectic, with close associations with what could be called Mediterranean Revival - buildings closely linked to historic precedents from the Mediterranean region of Europe of both Spain and Italy. The Eclectic movement in residential architecture first began to appear in America in the 1890s, catalyzed by Chicago's Columbia Exposition of 1893. In California, the 1915 Panama-California Exposition in San Diego brought the use of Spanish prototypes to wide attention, and in the next two decades the richness of Spanish and other Mediterranean historic antecedents were fashionable in the West, particularly California. During the Depression construction slowed considerably, but the continued success of the Caviglias farming operations during this period allowed for the construction of a substantial house within the ranch. The massing and window pattern along the front façade is more reminiscent of the Caviglia home land of Italy than what would normally be found on Spanish Eclectic buildings of the period. While the house has not been associated with a designer of known reputation, the True Brothers constructed a unique residence that combines both distinctive architectural features while at the same time adapting the style to modern materials such as steel windows. Unlike much of the housing in nearby cities such as Sunnyvale, the house was designed to exploit the subterranean area for food storage; a feature associated with the self-sufficiency found on rural properties, but integrated in this house as a part of the design. The house would appear to qualify for both the National Register under Criterion C and California Register under Criterion (3) based upon its distinctive architectural design, a distinguished example of Depression era residential architecture that was specifically adapted to a rural agricultural setting. Although the ranch no longer exists, the house as a distinct entity retains enough of its yard to retain its historic setting. The period of significance for the house is 1934, and the historic period of use is 1934 to 1964. The ancillary building does not contain the same distinction of the main house, and was constructed outside the significant period of use of the property. It does not contribute to the significance of the house architecturally and would therefore not qualify for the National or California Registers based on its own merits.

(Continued on page 8)

State of California - The Resources Agency
DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION
CONTINUATION SHEET

Primary #
HR #
Triennial

Page 8 of 8

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Caviglia Ranch House

*Recorded by Franklin Maggi, Leslie Dill, & Bonnie Montgomery Date 7/25/2005 Continuation Update

(Continued from previous page)

Integrity

The historical materials and features have been changed very little over time and continue to represent the building's historic architectural design as per the National Register's seven principles of integrity. The resource maintains its historical integrity of association with its original owner and use as a generously sized residence of the 1930s. The exterior of the building provides an essentially unadulterated representation of its original residential scale, style, and feeling, Spanish-eclectic design, materials, and workmanship. The house maintains its integrity of location and the property includes mature plantings that preserve some of the immediate setting; however, the property's overall setting has been altered through the years by the encroachment of the surrounding neighborhood. The character-defining features provide an adequate framework for understanding the original building on its site.

(Continued from page 5, DPR523b, 812)

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Brainard, H. C. Brainard's Atlas of Santa Clara County. Map No. 19, Collins and Mountain View, 1886. On file at the California Room, Martin Luther King Jr. Library, San José.

County of Santa Clara. Deeds, Miscellaneous Records, Maps, and Official Records. On file at the Clerk-Recorder's Office.

McMillan, J. G. Official Map of Santa Clara County, 1902-1903.

McMillan, J. G. Official Map of Santa Clara County, 1914.

State of California

Birth Index, 1905-1995.

Directory of Properties (Santa Clara County) in the Historic Property Data File, 2003.

Death Index, 1905-2000.

Santa Clara County School District Maps, c1950s. On file at the Office of the County Surveyor.

Santa Clara County Great Register of Voters, 1890. On file at the California Room, Martin Luther King Jr. Public Library, San José.

Sunnyvale building permit 1966-1593, 4/12/1966.

U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce

Census of Population, 1880-1930.

United States Geological Survey, U.S. Department of the Interior

San José West Quadrangle map, 1899.

Cupertino (photo revised) map, 1960.

Newspaper Clippings

"[Newton W. True death notice], " *San Jose Mercury Herald*, 10/9/1927.

Secondary and Published Sources

Freeborn, Maxine. Oral interviews with Bonnie Montgomery, July 6-7, 2005.

Goss, Gary. Research files based on entries in the Pacific Daily Builder.

Guinn, G. M. History of the State of California and Biographical Record of the Coast Counties. Chicago: The Chapman Publishing Company, 1904.

Ignoffo, Mary Jo. Sunnyvale: From the City of Destiny to the Heart of Silicon Valley. Cupertino, CA: California History Center, 1994.

Ignoffo, Mary Jo. Milestones: A History of Mountain View, California. Cupertino, CA: California History Center, 2002.

Santa Clara County Marriage License File. On file at History San José.

Thompson and West. Historical Atlas of Santa Clara County. San Francisco: Thompson and West, 1876 [San José: Smith and McKay Printing Co., reprinted 1973].

HISTORIC RESOURCES INVENTORY

~~ATTACHMENT E~~
11/24/16

DATE: _____ YEAR: _____

DTM: A _____ B _____
C _____ D _____

IDENTIFICATION


1. Common name: James and Jennie Caviglia
2. Historic name: Caviglia Ranch
3. Street or rural address: 1029 Ranera Ct.
City Sunnyvale Zip 94087 County Santa Clara
4. Parcel number: _____
5. Present Owner: Jannie Caviglia Address: 1057 Frune Ct.
City Sunnyvale Zip 94087 Ownership is: Public _____ Private
6. Present Use: residential Original use: residential

DESCRIPTION

- 7a. Architectural style: Mediterranean style
- 7b. Briefly describe the present physical description of the site or structure and describe any major alterations from its original condition:

This home was designed and built in 1934 by the True Brothers. It is situated in a cul-de-sac in a well-kept area. It has red roof tiles and beige stucco exterior. Wrought iron is used for balcony and railing on windows.

This 2-story eight room home has a full basement and rampus room adjoining utility rooms at foot of stairway. Its large rooms have cathedral ceilings in living and dining rooms. The fireplace has travertine inset and cast iron mantel from SF. There is oak plank flooring and solid oak front door. Arch ways throughout house. Arched windows have contoured wrought iron rods for draperies. Kitchen is re-modeled with modern ceramic stoneware counter tiles.



8. Construction date: Estimated _____ Factual 1934
9. Architect True Brothers
Bill True
10. Builder True Brothers
11. Approx. property size (in feet)
Frontage _____ Depth _____
or approx. acreage _____
12. Date(s) of enclosed photograph(s)

13. Condition: Excellent Good Fair Deteriorated No longer in existence Page 2 of 2

14. Alterations: Kitchen interior
15. Surroundings: (Check more than one if necessary) Open land Scattered buildings Density built-up
Residential Industrial Commercial Other:
16. Threats to site: None known Private development Zoning Vandalism
Public Works project Other:
17. Is the structure: On its original site? Yes Moved? Unknown?
18. Related features:

SIGNIFICANCE

19. Briefly state historical and/or architectural importance (include dates, events, and persons associated with the site.)

James Caviglia bought 10 acres in 1913. Later bought 20 acres from Mr. Cain making it a 30 acre cherry orchard.

James and Jennie Caviglia had 4 children, Albert, James Jr, Catherine and Maxine who lived in this home. At the present time a granddaughter lives in the home. Jennie is a sister to Sam Devita, Sunside Potato Chips and Frank Devita of Copper Kettle Donuts. James died Feb. 2, 1980 at age 92. Jennie is now 82 and was married to James for 60 years.

All of Jennie's son and daughters are in the fruit business in other areas. She has 14 grand children and 15 great grandchildren.

20. Main theme of the historic resource: (If more than one is checked, number in order of importance.)


Architecture Arts & Leisure
Economic/Industrial Exploration/Settlement
Government Military
Religion Social/Education

21. Sources (List books, documents, surveys, personal interviews and their dates). Interview with Jennie Caviglia
A. Wilhelmy Nov. 10, 1980

Interview with Jennie Caviglia on May 1,
1981. A. Wilhelmy
D. Beezley Heritage Preservation
Commissioners

22. Data form prepared
By (name) Alillian Wilhelmy
Organization Heritage Preservation Commission
Address: 520 S. Frances St.
City San Mateo, Calif. Zip 94086
Phone: (408) 736-3772

Locational sketch map (draw and label site and surrounding streets, roads, and prominent landmarks):



March 27, 2008

City of Sunnyvale
Community Development Department
Planning Division
460 W. Olive Avenue
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

ATTACHMENT

Page 1 of 7

RE: 1029 Ranere Court, Resource Alteration Permit Application

Project Description

The proposed project is for a new two-car garage addition to an existing single-family residence, located at 1029 Ranere Court. This existing residence was built in 1934, and listed in Sunnyvale Cultural Resources Inventory List (added on July 28, 1981).

The existing building is an identical copy of a building constructed earlier in Mountain View (Located at the intersection of Church Street and View Street). When the building was constructed in the Sunnyvale, first floor layout was modified, and instead of the garage, a family room was added. This was done because at the time of construction, this new house was constructed next to an existing house that had a garage, and there was no need to have an additional garage on the same property.

The existing prototype house located in Mountain View has street address from the Church Street with the main elevation also facing Church Street (Main elevation defined by the location of the main entrance door, overlooking Church Street).

When the Sunnyvale house was built on the property, its main elevation also overlooked a main local road, which was not Ranere Court. This was located at the south side of the house, at the place of existing private driveway. Later, when Ranere Court was established, the property was given a street address on Ranere Court. That is how an original side elevation became a street elevation along Ranere Court, and, at the same time, an original main elevation of the house now overlooking the neighbor's property at the south. That is why an existing entrance door, and exterior stairs leading to the entrance, cannot not be seen from Ranere Court.

The intent of the proposed addition is to locate a new two-car garage at the first floor wall, where the original garage entrance was situated in accordance with the original floor plans.

A feasibility study showed that this location is the most rational:

1. Previously proposed location of the partially detached two-car garage in the area between the existing house and Ranere Court, will block the view on the



historically designated second floor balconies, and create a visual impact to the cultural resource. Garage doors, if facing south, will create necessity of an oversized driveway, and would lead to minimized landscaping, which might create a possible environmental impact.

2. The proposed option for the garage location at the south side of the house will actually necessitate the removal or modification of an existing first floor historical balcony, which is identical to the second floor balconies located on the east side of the house, overlooking Ranere Court. The new structure would most probably create a visual imbalance of the original main elevation and disturb the period design of the house, which was built in the rural period for this area.
3. Another proposed option for the garage location at the front southeast area of the lot would impair the aesthetic significance of the lot, lead to a possible change of the average setbacks outline at Ranere Court, and obstruct the view from the neighbor's front yard to the street.

To prevent an obstruction of the designated second floor balconies with the new roof, floor level of the proposed addition lowered for an approximately one foot and eight inches in relation to the an existing average lot grade and ground level of the house. This feature of the proposed addition creates a visual balance with the existing structure versus a full height garage built on the property. An existing structure still has a visual superiority over the addition and lot itself.

Proposed roofline was designed the way preventing a high slopped surfaces interfere with the miniature details of the original structure. Combined height of the garage space and roof is only approximately seven feet and six inches above the existing average front lot grade. This gives a possibility to create a space between the lowest point of the balconies support elements and the top of the roof. Proposed garage doors, centered with the existing balconies, secure their location on the elevation.


Proposed garage doors are facing Ranere Court, which makes it possible to minimize an area of a hardscape. An entire turn-around space in front of the proposed garage is located lower than the existing average front yard grade. This proposed turn-around space, instead of a traditional wide driveway, allowed having only ten feet wide driveway from a Ranere Court.

In the exterior architecture of the addition architectural elements and finishes of the Spanish-eclectic style of the existing house are widely used: recessed entrance doors, arched tops of the windows, narrow accent windows with a wrought-iron grills, unique iron gutters and downspouts, light fixtures, stucco bands and texture of the exterior walls, red roof tiles, and another elements matching historical style and existing house.

An entire front area of the property proposed to be changed. Modernist style landscape, with long, low brick walls and aggregate concrete walkways would be changed to a landscape, with a new areas of a lawn, soft lines of the narrow walkways with a stone landings leading to a house. Proposed site improvement implements other Spanish style elements, such as water feature and arbors.

New fence, located along the Ranere court, behind the front setback, distinguish a front yard. A combination of the stucco walls with a matching house texture, wrought-iron grills, used for the fence, and a new Spanish-eclectic style main pedestrian entrance gates make a significant statement to a proposed site improvement.

All this makes a proposed addition an integrated part of the existing structure, emphasizes its historical significance, and contributes to the Ranere Court neighborhood value.



Alex Moore,
Project Architect



Steve Lynch - 1029 Ranere Court

From: <ebmchenry@comcast.net>
To: <slynch@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us>
Date: 5/28/2008 6:58 PM
Subject: 1029 Ranere Court

It is my understanding the the matter of the garage addition and wall/enclosure of the old Caviligia Ranch House at 1029 Ranere Court was continued to a meeting scheduled for June 4, 2008.

I wish to again voice my objections to the proposals as I stated in my previous e-mail sent prior to the May meeting and included in the documentation for that meeting. I will be out of town and unable to be present for the meeting next week but wish to be sure that my voice is heard. The alterations to the property are not in keeping with the historical design of the home nor with the present character of the neighborhood.

Thank you,

Ellen McHenry
1030 Rangpur Court
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
ebmchenry@comcast.net

From: PlanDiv AP
To: Kuchenig, Ryan; Lynch, Steve
Date: 5/29/2008 8:24 AM
Subject: Fwd: Re:Heritage Commission, 1029 Ranere Court Garage

Hi,

This came in through the answerpoint and pertains to your upcoming Heritage Preservation Comm. meeting.

FYI

Thank you.

Debbie Gorman

>>> "Skidmore, Nancy" <nancy.skidmore@lmco.com> 5/29/2008 7:03 AM >>>

I might not be able to make the meeting on June 4 when the Heritage Commission will be discussing the addition of a garage to the front of the Sunnyvale heritage house at 1029 Ranere Court, but please know that I am concerned about the preservation of the house's status as a heritage resource. And I am not convinced that the proposed modifications would not adversely impact it's current status.

Nancy Skidmore
Publications & Services
408/756-6396

From: hill joan w <jwhill@ix.netcom.com>
To: hill joan w <jwhill@ix.netcom.com>
Date: 5/29/2008 11:28 AM
Subject: Comments re 1029 Ranere Court

TO: Heritage Preservation Commission; Mr. Steve Lynch
RE: Public Notice File #2008-0336
LOCATION: 1029 Ranere Court

FROM: Mrs. Joan Hill
LOCATION: 1043 Ranere Court
PHONE: 408/739-1043 email: jwhill@ix.netcom.com

Dear Commission Members and Mr. Lynch:

I am again submitting my comments regarding the proposed garage addition to the above property. Unfortunately, I will not be present at the June 4 review. I am presenting my current opinions and concerns on this matter. As a member of the National Trust for Historic Preservation, I am totally committed to retaining this Heritage home in its current state.

Pride of ownership goes along with owning, taking care of and preserving a Heritage property. The owner is the caretaker of the property and it is his/her responsibility to retain the physical and historical attributes of this property. Reconstruction or reorientation of the original style should not even be considered an option. Any plan to do so must not impact the original appearance of the property.

Ranere Court is a very compact area with only five homes entirely within the Court. It is necessary to keep in mind the cohesiveness of the area in visual appearance so as not to jeopardize the integrity of the neighborhood. This consideration pertains to the ground landscaping, fences, trees and maintenance. The Heritage property must take precedence over any plan for future development on the Prune Court side of the property at 1029 Ranere Court.

Four of Ranere Court's residents have owned and occupied their property for more than thirty-five years. Hence, they are in total agreement regarding the inappropriateness of the planned addition of a large garage which covers at least half of the facade of this Heritage property. Many other nearby residents heartily agree.

I ask your consideration for the concerns of the court families and neighbors in making a decision on this matter. I hope the property owners will soon come to the realization that they must develop or rethink their plans for this project which includes both Ranere and Prune Courts.

Cordially,
Mrs. Joan Hill
May 29, 2008

Steve Lynch - 1029 Ranere Court


From: <ebmchenry@comcast.net>
To: <slynch@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us>
Date: 4/29/2008 8:48 PM
Subject: 1029 Ranere Court

It is my understanding that the proposed changes to the historical property at 1029 Ranere Court will be under review by the Heritage Preservation Commission on Wednesday, May 7, 2008. I am a 29+ year resident of this neighborhood. I have strong objections to the proposal. While the proposed plans mimic the historic architecture, the attached garage addition is inappropriate to a house of this design and vintage, more in keeping with a modern ranch style. Allowing this modern addition will greatly decrease the historic value of the home.

In addition, the home never had a large gate and entry of the style proposed. It is not in keeping with the historical home itself or the present surrounding neighborhood.

We don't have many opportunities left in Sunnyvale and the greater Silicon Valley to save the historical buildings of the ranching/farming era. This is a wonderful old home and worthy of its historic integrity being maintained.

Ellen McHenry
1030 Rangpur Court
Sunnyvale, CA 94087
408-245-4704
ebmchenry@comcast.net



Steve Lynch - 1029 Ranere Ct.

From: Robert W Hanel <mudcat2@pacbell.net>
To: <slynch@ci.sunnyvale.ca.us>
Date: 5/1/2008 9:36 AM
Subject: 1029 Ranere Ct.

The present owners of subject property have been attempting to ascetically alter the house since they bought it. This should not be allowed. I have seen the present plans and am appalled. I ask you not to approve this latest attempt to degrade this beautiful heritage property. My wife & I enjoy being able to see this house when ever we are in front of our house. we would not enjoy seeing a huge garage with 5 or 6 vehicles sitting in the driveway.

Steve Lynch - Re: Fw: 2008-0336: Pls fwd to Steve Lynch/Heritage Preservation Commission

From: Steve Lynch
To: skidmore, nancy
Subject: Re: Fw: 2008-0336: Pls fwd to Steve Lynch/Heritage Preservation Commission

Mr. Lynch,

This regards the proposed addition of an attached two-car garage to the heritage-resource-listed home at 1029 Ranere Court (2008-0336, APN-201-03-041).

I fear that breaching the wall of the main structure to attach the garage will cause the house to weaken or lose its heritage status, and therefore its protection from demolition.

If the structure is breached, and the heritage status is lost, the house could be razed by future owners to make way for multiple houses to be built on the site.

This would be a sad day for Sunnyvale as this house is such a wonderful and beautiful reminder of our past.

Please consider the future heritage status of the house when making your decision regarding the proposed plans.

Thank you,
Nancy Skidmore
1057 Prune Court
408/736-9451

Be a better friend, newshound, and know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now.

Be a better friend, newshound, and know-it-all with Yahoo! Mobile. Try it now.

Received via Email: 5-5-2008

Dear Councilmembers,

As interested and concerned members of the community, we are writing about a historically significant property in Sunnyvale.

Thanks to the local community and your support, this home (1029 Renere Court) was saved as a historical property several years ago. We believe we need your support again to ensure that a solid plan is put in place to prioritize the maintenance of this historical property.

We understand that the property owners are seeking council approval on development plans for the property which would keep the current historical house but add other structures. We understand and appreciate the owners need to develop the property in a reasonable manner, but we are concerned about the commitment to the integrity of this beautiful historical property. Development of new structures seems to be the priority of the owners, not the upkeep or land surrounding the property. Over the past years, we have observed a lack of property upkeep, and the desire of the owners to build an addition to the property without first addressing the maintenance issues of the current structure leads us to wonder if the historical home may fall into disrepair.

We would request the council's continued support to require that prior to any additions, the owners must develop and execute a plan that first addresses the structural integrity and restoration of the historical home and land (in keeping with the historical nature of this property).

We are unable to attend the city council hearing on May 7th, but we request your support. Please ensure this home and property is maintained and restored before granting further development. If attention is not taken to the restoration and basic upkeep, we are concerned that the property will fall into a state of disrepair which will be eventually un-salvageable.

Thank you for your consideration,
Todd and Reid Myers



ATTACHMENT #
Page 1 of 1

Minutes

SUNNYVALE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Wednesday, September 6, 2006 at 7:00 P.M.
West Conference Room, Sunnyvale City Hall
456 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale

CALL TO ORDER

Present: Chair Kausek; Comm. Fussell; Comm. Verma; Comm. Tafel; Vice Chair Hopkins

Absent: Jeanine Stanek

Staff: Robert Walker, Assistant City Manager; Steve Lynch, Senior Planner; Joey Mariano, Staff Office Assistant

Members of the Public: Mrs. Joan W. Hill; Mrs. Susie Kato; Alta Rau; Philip E. Meritt

ROLL CALL

SCHEDULED PRESENTATION

Welcome to Commissioner Betty Fussell

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS (Speakers are limited to 3 minutes for announcements of related Board/Commission events, programs, resignations, recognitions, acknowledgments)

CONSENT CALENDAR


A) Approval of July 5, 2006 Draft Minutes

Comm. Tafel approved the Minutes of July 5, 2006. Chair Kausek seconded. Motion carried 2-0 with Comm. Verma and Comm. Fussell abstaining.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

None

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS



A) 2006-0833 – Mildred M. Citraro [Applicant]: Application for a Resource Alteration Permit on a 25,900 square foot site to allow a new two-car garage and six-foot solid fence located in front of an existing heritage resource. The property is located at 1029 Ranere Court (near Peekskill Dr.) in an R-0 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District. (APN: 201-03-041) RK

Mr. Lynch presented the proposed application from the staff report. He briefly explained that staff is not recommending approval as stated in the report. He then described the analysis from the report which resulted in staff's recommendation for denying the application.

Comm. Tafel asked staff regarding the design of the proposed fence. Staff responded that, if approved, the applicant will need to work with staff on the specific design of the fence. Comm. Tafel noted the present design of the fence may fit the façade of the home, but may look inappropriate with the overall neighborhood.

Comm. Fussell explained that the façade of the house looks awkward with the fence.

Chair Kausek opened the public hearing

Paul Citraro, on behalf of the applicant (Mildred Citraro), he presented the proposal for the garage and fence. He mentioned that the general concept is a mini estate. He noted the several vehicular entrances and exits.

Chair Kausek asked the applicant if the fence is a separate permit or if it is included with this application. Mr. Citraro mentioned that Ryan Kuchenig, Project Planner recommended to apply for fence design includes a wrought iron gate with stucco material.

Comm. Fussell asked Mr. Citraro where the garage would be in relation to the windows and doors of the main house. Mr. Citraro presented several photographs of the existing home and described where the garage entrance would be located from the house. Comm. Fussell then noted that the existing fence is about three feet tall where the proposal shows a design of a fence up to six feet tall.

Mr. Citraro noted they are willing to work with staff regarding the specific design of the fence and garage. He noted that the renderings presented this evening are conceptual.

Comm. Tafel asked what the main intention is and asked the applicant to explain the subdivision. Mr. Citraro explained their plan was to reside in the main house while his

mother resides in a new single story home in order to accommodate her more efficiently.

Mr. Citraro explained that the main intention is to restore the home as they are planning to reside there.

Comm. Fussell asked Mr. Citraro about the schematics of the site plans and renderings of the façade and fence. He explained the conceptual design, and that they are willing to work with the Commission on any concerns.

Mrs. Joan W. Hill lives directly across the street and mentioned that she had written a letter, which is an attachment to the report which stated concern about the Heritage tree. She wanted clarification of the design of front of the property, as the tree is located in the area.

Sudak Uramen, lives across the street and asked about the proposed garage. He also noted that he does not agree with the fence design.

Nancy Skidmore, also a neighbor, is concerned with the design which may disturb the Oak Tree. She suggested moving the garage to the rear yard which is already paved to properly minimize the impact to the tree's roots.

Mildred Citraro, property owner/applicant, noted that she is willing to work with all concerns. She noted the garage cannot be located in the rear due to setback regulations. She also noted they plan to use permeable surfaces in order to accommodate the Oak Tree. She noted that the asphalt is being removed in place of a garden. She then noted there are plans to preserve the garden.

Philippe Meritt, noted that the proposed plans need to be confirmed prior to an approval by the Commission. He asked the Commission if a step is missing in the permit process, since final plans have not been drawn and that a decision is to be made.

Monet, resident on the corner of Peekskill, asked the Commission if any trees are being removed. Staff replied that an Avocado tree was permitted to be removed through a Tree Removal Permit.

Chair Kausek asked if there are any other speakers.

Mr. Citraro further explained that the window that faces the proposed garage may be opened and converted into a doorway to connect to the garage. He mentioned that the home was not built with a garage. He stated that a garage is needed at this time in order for it to be a practical home. He noted that they never intended to demolish the home and that they would like to rehabilitate the home in order for the family to use it as a residence.

Comm. Fussell asked staff about numbers two and nine of the analysis in the report, which addressed the removal of the Avocado Tree. She then asked about the design of the permeable driveway.

Mr. Lynch reminded the Commission that the proposed plans for the fence they see tonight are not confirmed and, if they approve this, they should add any Condition of Approvals to their motion to specify materials and designs.

Chair asked staff about the garage and its relation to the house. She asked the applicant if the garage is at all attached to the home.

Mr. Citraro noted that the proposed design represents an existing window in the house facing the garage that will be turned into a door to connect the garage to the house via a new laundry room. He then points to the site plan regarding other options. He noted that the Planning Division's Project Planner's recommendation is not a feasible idea in order to enjoy the home.

Comm. Tafel asked staff about the size of the garage. Mr. Lynch noted that the plans in the report is fairly accurate as far as location and size.

Mr. Lynch also noted that the Avocado Tree is not shown in the newly proposed plans as it was approved by a Tree Approval Permit to be removed.

Chair Kausek asked Mr. Citraro about the dining area.

Chair Kausek closed the public hearing.

Chair Kausek noted alternatives one and two of the staff report.

Vice Chair Hopkins made a motion for Alternative 1 and agrees with staff's recommendation to deny the proposal. Comm. Tafel seconded. Motion carried 4-1.

Staff noted that there is a 15 day appeal period.

B) Consideration of Revisions to Council Policy Governing Boards and Commissions

Robert Walker, Assistant City Manager, presented his report about revising a few aspects of the City Charter to be consistent with a measure passed by the Sunnyvale voters in November 2005.

Mr. Walker noted differences between the City Charter and the language in the measure. He stated that the revised language in the Council Charter was basically an administrative error, and a few statements from the City Charter were not included.

Comm. Fussell noted that if the Charter language is what was approved, then the Charter should be consistent.

Comm. Tafel made a motion to approve Alternative 1 of the report; accept this report's finding that the existing charter prohibits board and commission members from being appointed to a different board or commission prior to completing the full term to which they were originally appointed. Cease any practice not in compliance with such an interpretation. Revise Council policy 7.2.10 to support that position. Vice Chair Hopkins seconded. Motion carried unanimously 5-0.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

A) Discussion of Potential Study Issues for 2007

Mr. Lynch noted that there are no items from the Heritage Preservation Commission as potential study issues for 2007. He noted two of last year's study issues from this Commission is now in the Study Issue Calendar of 2007.

Chair Kausek noted that she is delighted to see last years study issue proposals approved.

Mr. Lynch noted that any ideas for new study issues for submission this year must be created this evening.

Comm. Tafel noted that Heritage Trees may be a good idea as a study issue. She gave an example of her neighbor's tree.

Mr. Lynch noted, for the new Commissioners, that there are trees as a Heritage Resource which are protected and that the Commission could suggest a new Heritage Resource at any time.

Vice Chair Hopkins noted a new study issue to study significant technology achievements in Sunnyvale's history.

The Commission initiated a possible study issue to research technological achievements by Sunnyvale businesses.


ATTACHMENT #

Page 7 of 6

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted by:


FOR
Steve Lynch, Senior Planner



Council Meetings > 2006 > 2006October > Minutes > October 24, 2006

**APPROVED MINUTES
SUNNYVALE CITY COUNCIL
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 24, 2006**

The City Council of the City of Sunnyvale adjourned from a 6:00 p.m. Closed Session pertaining to: Public Employee Formal Performance Evaluation, City Attorney, Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957 and met in Regular Session at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers, 456 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale, California with Mayor Swegles presiding.

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Mayor Swegles led the Salute to the Flag

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Mayor Ron Swegles
Vice Mayor Otto Lee
Councilmember John Howe
Councilmember Dean J. Chu
Councilmember Anthony Spitaleri
Councilmember Christopher Moylan

ABSENT: Councilmember Melinda Hamilton (Excused)

STAFF PRESENT: Amy Chan, City Manager
Robert Walker, Assistant City Manager
David Kahn, City Attorney
Robert Paternoster, Director of Community Development
Mary Bradley, Finance Director
Ryan Kuchenig, Associate Planner
Mark Bowers, Solid Waste Program Manager,
Andrew Miner, Principal Planner
Yvette Agredano, Intergovernmental Relations Officer
Katherine Bradshaw Chappellear, City Clerk

SPECIAL ORDER OF THE DAY

Mayor Swegles presented Certificates of Recognition to Sunnyvale Schools (West Valley, Cumberland, Stocklemeir, Cherry Chase and Braly Elementary Schools) for their participation in Walk to School Activities. October is National Walk to School Month.

CLOSED SESSION REPORT

Vice Mayor Lee reported that City Council met in Closed Session earlier this evening regarding: Public Employee Formal Performance Evaluation, City Attorney, Pursuant to Government Code Section 54957.

Vice Mayor Lee reported that direction was given, but no action was taken.

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS

ATTACHMENT

Page 4 of 4

Councilmember Howe verified that Green Team/Zanker and the Teamsters have accepted this Settlement Agreement.

Councilmember Spitaleri verified with City Attorney Kahn that if Council accepts this Settlement Agreement (as satisfactory performance by Green Team/Zanker of its obligations to the City under prevailing wage provision in the contract), then the notice of breach (related to the prevailing wage issue) would be withdrawn.

Mayor Swegles opened the Public Hearing at 8:14 p.m.

Assemblywoman Sally Lieber spoke in favor of the Settlement Agreement. She applauded the efforts of Council and City staff on this issue.

Todd Storti, General Manager of Green Team/Zanker, stated his company is in full support of the Settlement Agreement.

Larry Daugherty, President of Teamsters Local 350 (representing workers at the Smart Station), requested that Council accept the Settlement Agreement reached with Green Team Zanker. He stated the agreement was unanimously accepted by all members who attended the ratification meeting.

No one else wished to speak and Mayor Swegles closed the Public Hearing at 8:17 p.m.

MOTION: Councilmember Howe moved and Councilmember Chu seconded to approve Alternative No. 1: Council accepts the Settlement Agreement between GreenTeam/Zanker and Teamsters Local 350 as satisfactory performance by Green Team/Zanker of its obligations to the City under the prevailing wage requirement set forth in Section 3.10 of the SMART Station operating agreement for the remaining life of the operating agreement.

VOTE: 6-0 (Councilmember Hamilton absent)

4. **RTC 06-316 Appeal of a decision of the Heritage Preservation Commission to deny a Resource Alteration Permit to allow a new two-car garage to be located in front of an existing Heritage Resource located at 1029 Ranere Court**

Mayor Swegles asked if Council had any disclosures regarding this item. Councilmember Chu disclosed that he visited the site to review the property and layout. Mayor Swegles disclosed that he had visited the property and viewed the area proposed for the new garage.

Associate Planner Kuchenig presented the staff report.

Mayor Swegles noted that the staff report indicates that the proposed garage location will significantly block the view to the Heritage Resource, but that when he visited the site it did not appear that the garage would totally block the home. Associate Planner Kuchenig stated that was correct, only a portion of the view of the home would be blocked; however, nothing would be blocked by the alternate location proposed by staff. Mayor Swegles verified that one location proposed by staff would require a curb cut and rerouting of the driveway to the garage.

Mayor Swegles asked if the garage (as proposed by staff) would block the front



ATTACHMENT

entrance of the home and Associate Planner Kuchenig stated that staff's proposal for the garage could be positioned beyond the entrance with some slight modifications to the side of the home. Mayor Swegles questioned the ability to make modifications to the home due to its historical significance. Associate Planner Kuchenig defined the historical significance associated with the front of the home and its visual presentation to the street, but not the side of the home.

Councilmember Moylan referred to Attachment I on page 2 (letter from appellant's attorney) which stated, "...Federal standards are in use by the City and are the controlling authority in this matter." He asked City Attorney Kahn, to explain the relevance of this reference. City Attorney Kahn stated he would have to take a look at the provisions in order to offer an opinion on their applicability; however, his initial opinion is that federal standards would not take precedence over the City's authority in this matter.

Mayor Swegles opened the Public Hearing at 8:27 p.m.

Doron Ohel, Attorney for Mildred Citraro, stated three issues for Council to consider:

1. The appellant states the City's proposal has a greater visual impact than the appellant's side garage proposal;
2. The City's garage proposal includes a few stair steps to the residence; whereas, the appellant's proposal does not have stair steps which are a concern to the appellant for health reasons; and
3. The house is not designated under any registry and this matter is really about concerns over appearance.

Joan Hill, neighbor, spoke against the appeal. She prefers grass to pavers in the front yard.

Maxine Freeborn, original resident of 1029 Ranere Court, opposed the appeal. She stated Mrs. Citraro (appellant) will not be living in the home so the garage stairs would not be an issue. She thinks that the entire front yard will be covered with pavers and all grass would be removed. Councilmember Chu stated the plan calls for pavers from the driveway to the garage, but does not encompass the entire front yard.

Mike and Nancy Skidmore, neighbors, urged Council to deny the appeal. They are concerned that cars will be stored in front of the house once the garage is built, obscuring the view of the home. Mayor Swegles confirmed that Mr. and Mrs. Skidmore would approve of the appeal if a condition were included to prohibit cars parked in front of the garage; however, they do not believe the appellant would adhere to this condition.

P.E. Merritt stated his concerns over changes to this Historical Resource and is against the appeal. Mayor Swegles confirmed that Mr. Merritt would approve of the appeal if the appellant kept any changes or additions within Historical Resource Guidelines.

Gene Meunier stated concerns over enforcing conditions on the appellant and is against approval of the appeal.

Mr. Ohel gave closing arguments. He suggested that the remaining Councilmembers visit the property prior to making a decision. He directed Council to the exhibits (proposed garage site) included with his October 16, 2006 letter to Council.



Councilmember Moylan disclosed that he visited this property a year ago when it came before the Planning Commission with an appeal to remove it from the Heritage Resource List.

Councilmember Moylan questioned Mr. Ohel's letter of September 8, 2006, which indicated that a driveway garage would be an invitation for auto theft because the garage could be seen from the street. He stated a garage in the front of the house would also be visible from the street and asked Mr. Ohel if he believed that all cars parked in front of houses are subject to auto theft; therefore, leaving the entire community at risk. Mr. Ohel stated the concern is the location of the cars. The garage proposed by the appellant would allow for the cars to be stored inside the garage. He stated the cars are very valuable and more prone to theft than the average vehicle.

Councilmember Moylan asked Mr. Ohel (based on September 8, 2006 letter) why a garage in the back of the home would cause cars to congregate around the entrance to the home, and a garage built in the front would not. Mr. Ohel stated there are currently vehicles in the back of the house and placing the garage in the back would require that those cars be moved to the front of the home.

Councilmember Spitaleri asked Mr. Ohel about his contention that the home is not historical and asked why he did not first pursue that issue. Mr. Ohel stated the Historical and Architectural Evaluation (page 14 of attachment D) states, "The subject building and the associated buildings on the site are not designated on any federal state registers, or local registers." He stated this is different than a municipal historical resource.

Councilmember Chu verified with Mr. Ohel that the area in front of the fence would be landscaped.

Councilmember Chu asked Mr. Ohel about the alternative proposed by staff to have the garage face the street from the south side of the lot with a curb cut for a new driveway. Mr. Ohel stated having the garage face the street is not a preferred alternative for the appellant. Councilmember Chu asked what the specific objections are to the garage location as proposed by staff. Mr. Ohel stated the location/orientation of the garage would create a visual nuisance; a nuisance for neighbors; and using stair steps to and from the garage would be debilitating and painful for the appellant.

Mayor Swegles stated that when he visited the site he noticed a covered square in the ground which could be an old well or septic tank. He stated building something to the side of it would not be conducive to having heavy traffic on that area. Mr. Ohel stated there is an assumption that it is an old well or septic tank but he does not have any data pertaining to that area.

Mayor Swegles closed the Public Hearing at 9:06 p.m.

Councilmember Spitaleri asked if staff's proposal would require any changes to the existing house, such as removing a balcony. Associate Planner Kuchenig stated that he was not sure if removal of a balcony would be required. Alternatives proposed by staff could lead to a plan with a detached garage or a garage area attached at the side of the home. Associate Planner Kuchenig stated slight modifications to the side of the home would not be considered a significant change to the historic value of the home per the Historical and Architectural Evaluation (attachment D).



Councilmember Chu asked staff if there is adequate room to put the garage on the side of the home in addition to the laundry room. Associate Planner Kuchenig stated an oversized garage at this location is possible, but the garage and laundry room would require a different layout than proposed by the appellant.

Mayor Swegles stated that when he visited the site, he noted that the balcony would definitely have to be removed in order to fit the garage into that space. He asked why it is allowable to modify the home on the side by removing a balcony; whereas, no modifications are allowed to the front of the home. Associate Planner Kuchenig stated it was staff's determination that any modification to the front would be considered a significant change to the Historical Resource, but that staff could consider a modification to the side as noted in the Historical and Architectural Evaluation (attachment D). Robert Paternoster, Director of Community Development, verified the historical evaluation placed emphasis on the front of the home.

Mayor Swegles verified the garage would be built with similar materials as the home with the same roof slope and design.

Councilmember Chu stated he had not heard anything that would persuade him to vote differently than the Heritage Preservation Commission.

MOTION: Councilmember Chu moved and Councilmember Moylan seconded to approve Alternative No. 1: Council denies the appeal and upholds the decision of the Heritage Preservation Commission to deny the Resource Alteration Permit and directs appellant to design a garage on the south side of the property to preserve visibility of the Heritage Resource and determine that these alternatives are categorically exempt from CEQA using Categorical Exemption #3.

Councilmember Spitaleri stated the report talks about the balcony as part of the history of the unique design. The side of the house and front of the house are historical and if the appellant attempts to put the garage on the side as proposed by staff, they may still raise historical concerns.

Mayor Swegles stated he had similar concerns as Councilmember Spitaleri. He stated nothing would be disturbed by placing the garage in the front of the home as proposed by the appellant. He stated Council could impose conditions to alleviate any concerns and Neighborhood Preservation would enforce any violations.

VOTE: 5-1 (Mayor Swegles dissented and Councilmember Hamilton absent)

- 5. ORDINANCE 2006-0752 -- Samuel Arthur [Applicant & Co-Owner]
RTC 06-315 William J and Myong N Ferguson Trustee [Former
Owner]: Application to convert an existing triplex to
three separate ownership units at 1280 Poplar Avenue
(near E El Camino Real) in an R-2/PD (Low Medium
Density Residential/Planned Development) Zoning
District**

Mayor Swegles asked if Council had any disclosures regarding this item. Councilmember Howe stated he met with an agent of the property owner and briefly discussed the project.

ATTACHMENT

Page _____ of _____



1029 RAVERE CT., SUMNER



DRAFT MINUTES

SUNNYVALE HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Wednesday, May 7, 2008 at 7:00 P.M.
West Conference Room, Sunnyvale City Hall
456 West Olive Avenue, Sunnyvale

CALL TO ORDER/SALUTE TO THE FLAG

ROLL CALL

Chair Rose Kausek; Comm. Jeanine Stanek; Comm. Nancy McDonough; Comm. Nirmala Vaidyanathan; Comm. Amrit Verma

Absent: Vice Chair Betty Fussell

Chair Kausek noted that Vice Chair Fussell contacted her via email regarding her planned absence. Motion to excuse Vice Chair Fussell carried 5-0 with Vice Chair Fussell absent.

Staff: Steve Lynch, Senior Planner; Ryan Kuchenig, Associated Planner; Joey Mariano, Staff Office Assistant

SCHEDULED PRESENTATION

None

PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENTS

CONSENT CALENDAR

A) Approval of March 5, 2008 Draft Minutes

Chair Kausek motioned to approve the March 5, 2008 Draft Minutes at the next scheduled meeting as it was not included in the packet for review. Comm. Vaidyanathan seconded. Motion carried 5-0 with Vice Chair Fussell absent.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

A) 2008-0336: Application for a Resource Alteration Permit to add a new two car, attached garage to be located in front of an existing Heritage Resource property. The property is located at **1029 Ranere Court** (near Peekskill Dr.) in an R-0 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District.

Steve Lynch, Project Planner, noted that the applicant has requested continuance to the June 4, 2008 meeting. He stated that the applicant hired Leslie A. Dill, historic architectural consultant, and the applicant would like to include her report as part of the Commission's review.

He further noted that the Commission has the discretion to either continue this item to a date certain or hear it tonight.

Comm. McDonough made a motion to continue the item to the next meeting on June 4, 2008. Comm. Vaidyanathan seconded. Comm. Stanek made a friendly amendment to allow public comments tonight and on the June 4, 2008 meeting. Motion carried 5-0 with Vice Chair Fussell absent.

Roger Smith, resident on Ranere Court, asked staff and the Commission if they themselves conducted a site visit of the property. He noted that artistic liberty was taken in the photo simulations by the applicant and the renderings are not depict what actual occurs on the site.

Mike Skidmore, on Prune Court, noted that the applicant's letter refers to a "main road" and that this no longer exists, and that the only road is Ranere Court. He then noted there is substantial historical significance to this property and is concerned that the property would fall off the City's Heritage Resource inventory.

Philip Merritt, Ranere Ct, is also is concerned that the property would be removed from the City's Heritage Resource inventory. He noted that the successor of the original owner, Mr. Caviglia moved into the home during the agricultural era. He noted that the property represents their personal successes of the owner during the agricultural era of Santa Clara Valley. He believes that their generation has an obligation to preserve its historical significance. He further noted that the Commission is directed by the City to preserve historic sites.

Gene Mevner, Peekskill Dr., asked how many heritage homes are designated Historical. Staff responded that there are about 100 historical sites in its inventory. Staff responded that there is a heritage inventory list available to the public which can be forwarded to them or found on the City's web site.

Kristen Evans, Prune Ct., noted that Mrs. Caviglia had many fruit trees and that there are many trees around the area that she would like to have preserved.

Sylvia Mevnier, Peekskill Drive, asked what is the compelling interest to remove the historic resource? She stated that if we cannot save something that is of historic interest, then all these meetings are a waist of time.

Maxine Freeborn, Ranere, noted that she was five years old when her parents built the home on 1029 Ranere Court. She noted that Alex Moore, architect, has given wrong information in his report. She noted the report states that the house was constructed next to an existing house with a garage. She noted that the old house was exactly in the same location. She further said that when the new house was built, the old home was moved to the rear of the lot, which had a barn, but not a garage, She mentioned that, in the 1940's, her mom wanted a garage and that's when they built the detached garage that exists in the rear yard today. Then, in the 1960's her dad put in the additional living are next to the garage. She passed out photographs of the house during the 1940's. She noted her disapproval of the proposal, which will affect the home from its heritage status and may lead to future destruction of the resource.

Alex Moore, project architect, noted his apologies about any wrong statements regarding the barn being a garage. He also noted that they are trying to preserve the property. Their intention is to preserve the significance of the property and to keep it on the historical resource inventory. He noted their plans are in conjunction with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Mr. Lynch noted that he will make sure that everyone gets a copy of the Secretary of the Interiors Standard's review.

Philip Merritt asked what it takes to de-list the property. Mr. Lynch gave clarification of the process in regards to de-listing a property under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Chair Kausek closed the public Hearing.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

A) 2008-0336: Application for a Resource Alteration Permit to add a new two car, attached garage to be located in front of an existing Heritage Resource property. The property is located at 1029 Ranere Court (near Peekskill Dr.) in an R-0 (Low Density Residential) Zoning District.

Steve Lynch, Project Planner, noted that the applicant has requested continuance to the June 4, 2008 meeting. He stated that the applicant hired Leslie A. Dill, historic architectural consultant, and the applicant would like to include her report as part of the Commission's review.

He further noted that the Commission has the discretion to either continue this item to a date certain or hear it tonight.

Comm. McDonough made a motion to continue the item to the next meeting on June 4, 2008. Comm. Vaidyanathan seconded. Comm. Stanek made a friendly amendment to allow public comments tonight and on the June 4, 2008 meeting. Motion carried 5-0 with Vice Chair Fussell absent.

Roger Smith, resident on Ranere Court, asked staff and the Commission if they themselves conducted a site visit of the property. He noted that artistic liberty was taken in the photo simulations by the applicant and the renderings are not depict what actual occurs on the site.

Mike Skidmore, on Prune Court, noted that the applicant's letter refers to a "main road" and that this no longer exists, and that the only road is Ranere Court. He then noted there is substantial historical significance to this property and is concerned that the property would fall off the City's Heritage Resource inventory.

Philip Merritt, Ranere Ct, is also is concerned that the property would be removed from the City's Heritage Resource inventory. He noted that the successor of the original owner, Mr. Caviglia moved into the home during the agricultural era. He noted that the property represents their personal successes of the owner during the agricultural era of Santa Clara Valley. He believes that their generation has an obligation to preserve its historical significance. He further noted that the Commission is directed by the City to preserve historic sites.

Gene Mevnier, Peekskill Dr., asked how many heritage homes are designated Historical. Staff responded that there are about 100 historical sites in its inventory. Staff responded that there is a heritage inventory list available to the public which can be forwarded to them or found on the City's web site.

Kristen Evans, Prune Ct., noted that Mrs. Caviglia had many fruit trees and that there are many trees around the area that she would like to have preserved.

Sylvia Mevner, Peekskill Drive, asked what is the compelling interest to remove the historic resource? She stated that if we cannot save something that is of historic interest, then all these meetings are a waist of time.

Maxine Freeborn, Ranere, noted that she was five years old when her parents built the home on 1029 Ranere Court. She noted that Alex Moore, architect, has given wrong information in his report. She noted the report states that the house was constructed next to an existing house with a garage. She noted that the old house was exactly in the same location. She further said that when the new house was built, the old home was moved to the rear of the lot, which had a barn, but not a garage. She mentioned that, in the 1940's, her mom wanted a garage and that's when they built the detached garage that exists in the rear yard today. Then, in the 1960's her dad put in the additional living are next to the garage. She passed out photographs of the house during the 1940's. She noted her disapproval of the proposal, which will affect the home from its heritage status and may lead to future destruction of the resource.

Alex Moore, project architect, noted his apologies about any wrong statements regarding the barn being a garage. He also noted that they are trying to preserve the property. Their intention is to preserve the significance of the property and to keep it on the historical resource inventory. He noted their plans are in conjunction with the Secretary of Interior's Standards.

Mr. Lynch noted that he will make sure that everyone gets a copy of the Secretary of the Interiors Standard's review.

Philip Merritt asked what it takes to de-list the property. Mr. Lynch gave clarification of the process in regards to de-listing a property under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Chair Kausek closed the public Hearing.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS AND COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S STANDARDS REVIEW

**PROPOSED ADDITION PROJECT
at the
HISTORIC CAVIGLIA RANCH HOUSE**

1029 Ranere Court
Sunnyvale, CA
Parcel Number 201-03-041
(Santa Clara County)
California

For:
Mildred Citraro
1029 Ranere Ct.
Sunnyvale, CA 94067
c/o Alexander Moore, AIA
Gridley Company, Campbell, CA

Prepared by:
**ARCHIVES & ARCHITECTURE:
HERITAGE RESOURCE PARTNERS**
PO Box 1332
San Jose, CA 95109
408.369.5683 Vox
408.228.0762 Fax

Leslie A. G. Dill, Partner and Historic Architect

May 7, 2008

INTRODUCTION

Executive Summary

With three recommended changes and one recommended clarification, the proposed project meets the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation of Historic Properties* (Standards). The following items are explained more fully within the body of the report:

- It is recommended that the materials be specified during the review process. It is the understanding of this design review that the windows will be wood, single-glazed, with a standard wood stucco molding and a wrought-iron grill, the walls will be stucco with a sand finish, and the garage doors will be wood. (See Review Methodology)
- It is recommended that the new windows in the addition not have arched transoms and they not be recessed with textured stucco panels; instead the windows should be smaller, narrow accent units, similar to the front entry windows, and the proportion of stucco surface should be increased at the garage walls to create a stronger visual base for the original house beyond. (See Standard 9 analysis)
- It is recommended that the front ziggurat surrounds at the garage doors be modified slightly to reduce their relatively strong visual impact. (See Standard 9 analysis)
- It is recommended that the top of the front gate have a red-tile roof (e.g., a gable) to be more compatible with the house's Spanish-Eclectic design vocabulary. (See Standard 9 analysis)

Report Intent

Archives & Architecture: Heritage Resource Partners (A&A) was retained by Mildred Citraro to conduct a Historic Resource project in compliance with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation* (Standards). Design Review of a proposed residential addition project at the historic residence at 1029 Rancre Court, CA. Archives & Architecture was asked to review the exterior elevations and site plan of the project to determine if the proposed project meets the Standards. The Standards are understood to be a common set of guidelines for the review of historic buildings and are used by many communities during the environmental review process to determine the potential impact of a project on an identified resource.

Qualifications

Leslie A. G. Dill, Partner of the firm Archives & Architecture, has a Master of Architecture with a certificate in Historic Preservation from the University of Virginia. She is licensed in California as an architect. Ms. Dill is listed with the Northwest Information Center of the California State Office of Historic Preservation as meeting the requirements to perform identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment activities within the professions of Historic Architect and Architectural Historian in compliance with state and federal environmental laws. The Northwest Information Center utilizes the criteria of the National Park Service.

Review Methodology

For this report Leslie Dill reviewed the report and recordation forms prepared by A&A in July 2005 to identify the previously documented character-defining features and overall design of the existing historic resource. Ms. Dill then evaluated, according to the Standards, the proposed design submitted on six progress prints dated March 25, 2008 and numerous photographs and renderings, from Gridley Company Design/Build/Remodel. The north side elevation was not shown in the drawings, but the plan shows three narrow windows, and the architect reported verbally that the windows would match the south-side units. The architect also identified the materials as follows: windows will be wood, single-glazed, with a standard wood stucco molding and a wrought-iron grill; the walls will be stucco with a sand finish, and the garage doors will be wood.

Disclaimers

The design for this project is currently in the development phase, and the final construction documents should be reviewed for consistency with this initial review. This report addresses the project plans in terms of historically compatible design. The consultant has not undertaken and will not undertake an evaluation or report on the structural conditions or other related safety hazards that might or might not exist at the site and building, and will not review the proposed project for structural soundness or other safety concerns. The consultant has not undertaken analysis of the site to evaluate the potential for subsurface resources. The design review is generally limited to the exterior of the building.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Character of the Existing Resource:

Archives & Architecture evaluated the architectural significance of the property at 1029 Ranere Court in a DPR form recorded in July 2005. The property is described as significant "...based upon its distinctive architectural design, a distinguished example of Depression-era residential architecture..." and as an "...unadulterated representation of its original residential scale, style, and feeling, Spanish-eclectic design, materials, and workmanship."

Summary of the Proposed Project:

The proposed project, as presented in the current set of architectural drawings noted above, includes the addition of a two-car attached garage, facing Ranere Court (east) at the northeast corner of the existing front facade. The addition will be one story in height, sunken into grade slightly to minimize its impact on the primary features of the historic resource. The addition in the application is proposed to have arched focal windows similar to others found on the residence; it is shown with a tile roof and stucco to match the original house materials.

SECRETARY'S STANDARD'S REVIEW:

The *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation*, originally published in 1977 and revised in 1990, include ten standards that present a recommended approach to repair, while preserving those portions or features that convey a resource's historical, cultural, or architectural values. Following is a summary of the review with a list of the Standards and associated analysis for this project:

Analysis

1. "A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships."

Analysis:

The use of the house and its setting does not change for this project.

2. "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided."

Analysis:

The proposed project is consistent with this Standard. In particular, the original massing, tile roof form, front porch design, square turret, focal windows, accent windows, wrought-iron balconets, and the majority of the fenestration and wall surfaces will be preserved, as well as the overall sense of an open residential setting. The portion of the existing house that is proposed for encapsulation includes a wall segment that has historically been devoid of ornament, and has only

a few original, simple windows in an uncharacteristic pattern; there are no focal windows or applied details that characterize the property within this wall area—see also the analysis for Standard 9.

3. **“Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.”**

Analysis:

Although some of the proposed materials and details are specified to match the original building and are inspired by features found within the original design, the form and materials are subtly and adequately differentiated from the historic building fabric and will not create a false sense of historical development—see also the analysis for Standard 9.

4. **“Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.”**

Analysis:

No previous changes have been identified as acquiring historic significance in their own right.

5. **“Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.”**

Analysis:

The features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize the property are preserved in this proposal.

6. **“Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.”**

Analysis:

The project plans do not include work on the historic fabric of the building.

7. **“Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials will not be used.”**

Analysis:

No chemical or physical treatments are shown to be proposed in this project at this point.

8. **“Archeological resources will be protected and preserved in place. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures will be undertaken.”**

Analysis:

Archeological resources are not evaluated in this report.

9. **“New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.”**

Analysis:

The size and massing of the proposed front addition is compatible with the historic massing of the house. In particular, the main house is split-level and its hipped roofs step up and down in height along the front façade—the addition is compatible with this pattern by having a hipped roofline that is similar in overall size to the rest of the residence’s roofs. The addition roof is both compatible and differentiated from the original house by being lower (i.e., not aligned) with the original rooflines.

Because the garage projects forward, it allows the continued understanding of the original building massing and provides a varied front composition that accentuates the original second story balconies at the north end of the house. The center recess and split roof between the paired garage doors makes the garage wing have a more vertical orientation, in keeping with the somewhat taller forms inherent in the original design. The mass of the garage appears somewhat squat and horizontal in some of the current architectural drawings because the base of the exterior elevations are truncated at the existing lawn height; however, the face of the front garage wall and the outer corners will be full height, so the garage will have a three-dimensional massing that can be perceived as being in proportion with the rest of the residence.

The garage doors have a neo-Spanish-Eclectic character that is in keeping with the overall design of the house while being clearly of the twenty-first century in their installation method and detailing; however, the door surrounds are relatively bold in comparison to the simplicity of the historic house. It is recommended that the front ziggurat surrounds at the garage doors be modified slightly to reduce their impact; the strong, repetitive patterns draw one’s attention to a service area of new construction and away from the original house design. The proportions could be altered or the number of reveals reduced to achieve a more subtle front garage façade.

Most of the original house windows—specifically the character-defining windows—are proposed on the drawings for preservation. The new windows in the addition are shown as being narrow with arched transoms above a wide stucco recess. This is not recommended, as it would emphasize the low, one-story proportions of the garage wing. The new addition would be more compatible with the original house if the windows were limited to narrow, accent windows, similar to those at the front entry, so it is recommended that the addition windows not have arched transoms or textured stucco panels; instead the windows should be smaller, narrow accent units, similar to the front entry windows, and the proportion of stucco surface should be increased at the garage walls to create a stronger visual base for the original house beyond. The fenestration and trim will be wood, creating a subtle differentiation between the original house and the new addition.

The front gate is proposed as a Mission-style arch. This ornamental form calls attention away from the more severe lines of the Spanish-Eclectic house. It is recommended that the top of the gate have a red-tile roof (for example, a gable) to be more compatible with the original design vocabulary. The stepped interior of the opening is a strong design statement, mimicking the front entry doorway of the house; in this location, it seems appropriate. The rest of the fence, with its less ornamental combination of wrought metal and stucco walls, is compatible with the historic house design. The proposed retaining walls within the landscape plan are also in keeping with the original design.

10. "New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired."

Analysis:

Although part of the original exterior wall plane would need to be reestablished if the new construction were removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property would be maintained in this project. The fence is completely reversible.