



DATE: June 22, 2015

AGENDA ITEM #2

TO: Historical Commission
FROM: Sean K. Gallegos, Assistant Planner
SUBJECT: 15-H-01 – 500 University Avenue

RECOMMENDATION:

Approve a modification to Historic Alteration Permit 15-H-01 subject to the findings and conditions

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project is requesting approval for modifications to an existing Historical Alteration Permit for minor exterior alterations to a designated Historic Landmark property. Beyond the original approval, the scope of work includes the replacement of non-historic windows and doors along the front, right and rear elevation.

Along the front elevation, the applicant is requesting two second floor windows be replaced with windows of a similar size, location and style.

Along the right elevation, the applicant is requesting the ground floor windows, previously approved by the Commission, be revised to grid-patterned windows.

Along the first floor of the rear elevation, three double hung windows and one door will be replaced with a fixed window, two double hung windows and a new door for the kitchen. A French door with two side panel windows and door previously approved by the Commission will be replaced with one set of French doors and one door with new grid patterned windows. Four double hung windows and one door will be replaced with a four-panel glass door for the family room.

Along the second floor of the rear elevation, a fixed window and two double hung windows are proposed to replace the previously approved double hung windows for a hallway.

BACKGROUND

The property, the Paul Shoup house, is designated as a Historic Landmark and subject to the Mills Act. This historic structure is a Craftsman style house that was constructed in 1910 and associated with Paul Shoup, one of the founders of Los Altos. In 1995, this structure was designated as a Historic Landmark by City Council Resolution. Additional information regarding the historic significance of the structure can be found in the attached historic property evaluation (Attachment A).

On January 26, 2015, the Historical Commission approved a Historic Alteration permit for the replacement of two non-historical windows and three doors along the rear elevation and the replacement of one non-historical window on the right side elevation. Along the rear elevation, the two existing doors on the second floor will be replaced with a pair of double hung windows. On the ground floor of the rear elevation, one double hung window will be replaced with a single door for direct exterior access from the laundry room, and a double hung window and a single door will be replaced with pair of French doors with sidelights. Along the right elevation, a pair of double hung windows will be replaced with a triple window in the kitchen.

On April 29, 2015, the Building Division issued a Stop Work order due to the property owner replacing windows and doors along the front, right and rear elevation without a building permit. After further review, the Planning Division determined the scope of work exceeded the Historical Commission's original approval.

DISCUSSION

The Historical Commission must grant a Historic Alteration Permit for any exterior alteration to a Historic Landmark. In order to make the findings to approve the permit, the Commission must find that the work complies with the Historic Preservation Ordinance, does not adversely affect the physical integrity or the historic significance and is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

Due the Stop Work order, the property owner applied for modifications to a Historic Landmark Permit due to the expanded scope of work. Since the windows and doors being removed are not historically significant on this property, their replacement will not adversely affect the physical integrity or the historic significance of the house. Staff supports the proposed window and door modification due to the majority of the replacement windows and doors matching the existing materials and styles.

There is some concern regarding the contemporary style of the four-panel sliding glass door unit for the family room, which is inconsistent with the Craftsman architectural style of the structure. Grid patterned windows and French doors compliment the style of windows and doors along the ground floor of the house. The sliding door should complement the form, style and pattern of the window and door pattern that currently exists to be more consistent with the design of the rear elevation. Staff recommends that the Historical Commission provide feedback on the proposed changes as requested by the applicant.

CC: Walter Chapman, Applicant and Designer
Scott and Deanne Miller, Property Owners

Attachments:

- A. Historic Property Evaluation – 500 University Avenue
- B. Letter from Applicant
- C. Department of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation

FINDINGS

15-H-01 – 500 University Avenue

With regard to the Historic Alteration Permit for the project at 500 University Avenue, the Historical Commission finds the following in accordance with Section 12.44.150 of the Municipal Code:

1. The project complies with all provisions of the Historic Preservation Ordinance Chapter 12.44);
2. The project does not adversely affect the physical integrity or the historic significance of the subject property; and
3. The project is in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

CONDITIONS

15-H-01 – 500 University Avenue

1. The approval is based on the plans received on June 8, 2015 and the written application materials provided by the applicant, except as may be modified by these conditions.
2. **Prior to obtaining a building permit, plans shall contain/show:**
 - a. The conditions of approval shall be incorporated into the title page of the plans; and
 - b. The proposed windows and doors shall be architecturally compatible with the existing windows.

NRHP Status Code _____

Other Listings _____
 Review Code _____

Reviewer _____ Date _____

Page 1 of 3 *Resource Name or #: (Assigned by recorder) 500 University Avenue

P1. Other Identifier: HRI #:90; Paul Shoup House

*P2. Location: Not for Publication Unrestricted

*a. County Santa Clara and (P2c, P2e, and P2b or P2d. Attach a Location Map as necessary.)

*b. USGS 7.5' Quad _____ Date _____ T _____; R _____; _____ of _____ of Sec _____; _____ B.M.

c. Address 500 University Avenue City Los Altos Zip 94022

d. UTM: (Give more than one for large and/or linear resources) Zone _____, _____ mE/ _____ mN

e. Other Locational Data: (e.g., parcel #, directions to resource, elevation, etc., as appropriate)
175 13 052

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

500 University is a large two-story Craftsman residence built in 1910 for the Paul Shoup Family on a choice lot within the Los Altos Land Company's holding. The wood shingle-clad building originally occupied a large, trapezoidal lot that crossed Adobe Creek. Today the building sits on a roughly rectangular lot that retains its relationship with the creek but is surrounded by modern residential development in the historic Orange-University district of Los Altos, California. The Shoup House appears today as it did during the Shoup's period of ownership and retains many original wood windows and wood decorative features such as brackets, bell eaves, decorative vents, and a dramatic overall form. Landscape features, including terraced landscaping, stone steps, concrete retaining walls, and a stone grotto also remain.

500 University Avenue is a two-story, rectangular plan, Craftsman-style single-family residence with a dramatic double-gable roof ending in graceful bell-eaves. (See Continuation Sheet.)

*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:
 Primary Elevation _____

November 2010 _____

*P6. Date Constructed/Age and

Source: Historic Prehistoric

Both

1910 _____

NR Nomination _____

*P7. Owner and Address:

Wm. & Patricia B. Jennings Trustee

500 University Avenue Los Altos,

CA 94022

*P8. Recorded by:

Circa/Garavaglia Architecture, Inc.

582 Market Street, Suite 1800

San Francisco, CA 94104

*P9. Date Recorded: _____

July 2011 _____

*P10. Survey Type:

Intensive _____



*P11. Report Citation:

Los Altos Historic Resources Inventory Update Report (Circa: Historic Property Development, March 2012).

*Attachments: NONE Location Map Continuation Sheet Building, Structure, and Object Record

Archaeological Record District Record Linear Feature Record Milling Station Record Rock Art Record

Artifact Record Photograph Record Other (List): _____

BUILDING, STRUCTURE, AND OBJECT RECORD

*NRHP Status Code CA Reg. 1S, 5B

Page 2 of 3 *Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) 500 University Avenue

B1. Historic Name: Shoup House

B2. Common Name: _____

B3. Original Use: Residential B4. Present Use: Residential

*B5. Architectural Style: Craftsman

*B6. Construction History: (Construction date, alterations, and date of alterations)

Built 1910; c1925-Shoup family expands house,1945-Shoup Family
sells house

*B7. Moved? No Yes Unknown Date: _____ Original Location: _____

*B8. Related Features:

B9a. Architect: Wolfe & MacKenzie (unconfirmed) b. Builder: Unknown

*B10. Significance: Theme Association: People; Design, Development Area Los Altos

Period of Significance 1910-1945 Property Type Residential Applicable Criteria NR/CR/Local

(Discuss importance in terms of historical or architectural context as defined by theme, period, and geographic scope. Also address integrity.)

500 University Avenue

Paul and Rose Shoup purchased the subject property in the early days of Los Altos when the area still largely consisted of ranch lands and pasture. The lot at 500 University Avenue was one of the more sizeable lots available in the original Altos Land Company plat; it backed up to Adobe Creek and covered several acres. Its proximity to the fledgling downtown and the Southern Pacific depot made it an ideal choice. Shortly after construction in 1910, quarters for a Japanese gardener and his family were built in an area close to the creek. The 1926 Sanborn maps actually show two servant's dwellings as well as two small garages.

Paul listed the dwelling as his primary residence although his job kept him on the road, particularly in Los Angeles, a great deal of the time. His wife Rose lived in the house most of her adult life, eventually passing away in the house that she loved in 1945. She raised their three children, Carl, Jack, and Louise at 500 University, with the children attending local schools and eventually the local universities (Berkeley and Stanford). Rose was active in the women's social clubs and an avid supporter of the local arts. (See Continuation Sheet).

B11. Additional Resource Attributes: (List attributes and codes) _____

*B12. References:

500 University Avenue National Register Nomination, Garavaglia Architecture, Inc., January 2011.

B13. Remarks:

Historical background information and physical description quoted from the 500 University Avenue National Register Nomination prepared by Garavaglia Architecture, Inc., January 2011. Vicinity map provided by the City of Los Altos and amended by Circa: Historic Property Development.

*B14. Evaluator: Circa: Historic Property Development

*Date of Evaluation: July 2011

(This space reserved for official comments.)



Page 3 of 3

*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) 500 University Avenue

*Recorded by: Circa: Historic Property Development

*Date July 2011

Continuation Update

*P3a. Description (Cont.):

Decorative wood brackets appear to support the deep eaves while smaller brackets are used to accentuate the many slight recesses and projections of the front (west) and side wall planes. Several shed dormers extend from the lofty central ridge and lend to the side elevations a more vertical, and symmetrical appearance. Typical of the style, the rafter tails are exposed along the horizontal edges of the roof plane, at the north and south elevations. Wood shingles cover the exterior wall surfaces and flat sawn wood trim surrounds all window and door openings. Two shingle-clad chimneys pierce the roof plane, on either side of the main gable peak. Many of the original wood windows have been retained and primarily include eight- or twelve-over-one windows and one-over-one double hungs with ogee lugs. Several original leaded wood casement windows are extant on the second floor and on the south wall of the dining room. A large percentage of these windows also retain the original wavy-glass panes. Several new true divided light wood windows have been installed on the side and rear elevations.

B10. Significance (cont.)

Part of the park that the Shoup family and other early residents deeded to Los Altos in 1955 (Shoup Park) is named for her (Rose Wilson Shoup Garden). The Shoup family is responsible for commissioning the design of 500 University Avenue and for the major addition to the south in the 1920s. The house was one of the largest constructed in these early years and influenced subsequent architectural design in the area by establishing a level of quality, scale, and refinement by which new construction would be judged. Indeed, through the Altos Land Company, Paul insisted that homes built in the new town meet at least a minimum value threshold of \$1000, a sizable sum for the time.

It was during the 35 years that they lived at 500 University Avenue that Paul rose to the meteoric heights within the Southern Pacific Corporation. It was also during this time that he shaped both the local community and national policy through his many business ventures and political connections. He straddled two worlds – national policy maker and small-town community supporter. At the local level, he put in place the mechanisms for the town to survive and entrusted and enabled his family and friends to complete the task of building a place worth settling in for life. No matter how far he had to travel or how important his friends may have been, he always came back to his home at 500 University Avenue in Los Altos.

500 University Avenue is significant at the local level under Criterion B for its association with Paul Shoup. Shoup was a lifelong railroad man who started as a ticket agent with Southern Pacific in 1891 and rose to become its President in 1929. He was in charge of rebuilding Southern Pacific's interests in the San Francisco Bay Area following the devastating earthquake and fire of 1906. It was in this capacity that he came to be considered the founding father of Los Altos, California because of his tremendous influence in the early development of the town starting in 1907. Shoup and several business associates, including well-known local real estate developer Walter A. Clark, formed the Altos Land Company and purchased the original townsite from Southern Pacific. They platted a town with the purpose of developing a residential enclave of commuters that would have high architectural standards and a strong sense of community. He provided financial backing and business guidance to the development while also building his own home at 500 University Avenue in 1910 and enticing his brothers Guy and Fred, his mother Sarah, and his sister Faith, to settle there. When a subsequent development company, the Union Trust, lost financial backing in 1913, he personally purchased nearly 50% of the outstanding bonds and again gathered his influential friends to form the Los Altos Company. He was a founding boardmember of the Altos Building & Loan Association, as well as the Los Altos Water Company and the University Land Company, in addition to his continuing roles with the Altos Land Company. Shoup's direct influence through his involvement with these entities, and his indirect influence through his many business and social connections, shaped Los Altos into the town that exists today. His family was a critical part of this indirect influence as they championed, supported and directed the social organization of the early town during their 35-year residency at 500 University Avenue.

500 University Avenue, Character Defining Features: two-story form; double-gable roof ending in bell-eaves; decorative wood brackets at deep eaves; smaller brackets on front (west) and side wall planes; shed dormers; exposed rafter tails; wood shingle siding; flat sawn wood trim around window and door openings; shingle-clad chimneys; original wood windows including eight- or twelve-over-one windows, one-over-one double hungs with ogee lugs; and several leaded wood casement windows (many of which retain the original wavy-glass panes).

The building retains a high degree of integrity and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and therefore listed in the California Register. It is also listed on the local register and is a potential contributor to the potential Orange/University historic district. Therefore, it is assigned the California Register Status Codes 1S: "Individual property listed in NR by Keeper. Listed in CR." and 5B: "Locally significant both individually (listed, eligible, or appears eligible) and as a contributor to a district that is locally listed, designated, determined eligible or appears eligible through survey evaluation."

ATTACHMENT B

June 8, 2015

The Copeland Family
500 University Ave
Los Altos, CA 94022



To the Historical Commission,

After our initial meeting back in January, my husband and I spent more time deciding how we would best live in our new home. It is our feeling that one of the most appealing aspects of the home, beyond its Historical Significance, is its connection to nature as well as the homes location on the creek. We wanted to let in as much light as we could and make the backyard a focal point of the interior of the home.

We also wanted to create new ways to invite friends and family outside to enjoy the spectacular setting which led us to the decision to replace the family room doors as well. The door unit would provide a more modern retractable function while still retaining a traditional appearance. Having become sensitive to the importance of historical integrity we were careful to pick new windows/ doors that blended architecturally but did not distract from the original ones in the home.

Please see the following plans for your review.

Thank you,

The Copeland Family
Patrick, Courtney, William (10), Molly (7) and Kate (4)

Secretary of the Interior Regulations - 36 CFR 67

Section 67.7 Standards for Rehabilitation

- (a) The following Standards for Rehabilitation are the criteria used to determine if a rehabilitation project qualifies as a certified rehabilitation. The intent of the Standards is to assist the long-term preservation of a property's significance through the preservation of historic materials and features. The Standards pertain to historic buildings of all materials, construction types, sizes, and occupancy and encompass the exterior and the interior of historic buildings. The Standards also encompass related landscape features and the building's site and environment, as well as attached, adjacent, or related new construction. To be certified, a rehabilitation project must be determined by the Secretary to be consistent with the historic character of the structure(s) and, where applicable, the district in which it is located.
- (b) The following Standards are to be applied to specific rehabilitation projects in a reasonable manner, taking into consideration economic and technical feasibility. (The application of these Standards to rehabilitation projects is to be the same as under the previous version so that a project previously acceptable would continue to be acceptable under these Standards.)
1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
 2. The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alteration of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.
 3. Each property shall 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 buildings, shall not be undertaken.
 4. Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.
 5. Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a historic property shall be preserved.
 6. Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.
 7. Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.
 8. Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.
 9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.

10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall 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.
- (c) The quality of materials and craftsmanship used in a rehabilitation project must be commensurate with the quality of materials and craftsmanship of the historic building in question. Certain treatments, if improperly applied, or certain materials by their physical properties, may cause or accelerate physical deterioration of historic buildings. Inappropriate physical treatments include, but are not limited to: improper repointing techniques; improper exterior masonry cleaning methods; or improper introduction of insulation where damage to historic fabric would result. In almost all situations, use of these materials and treatments will result in denial of certification. Similarly, exterior additions that duplicate the form, material, and detailing of the structure to the extent that they compromise the historic character of the structure will result in denial of certification. For further information on appropriate and inappropriate rehabilitation treatments, owners are to consult the Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings published by the NPS. "Preservation Briefs" and additional technical information to help property owners formulate plans for the rehabilitation, preservation, and continued use of historic properties consistent with the intent of the Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation are available from the SHPOs and NPS regional offices. Owners are responsible for procuring this material as part of property planning for a certified rehabilitation.
- (d) In certain limited cases, it may be necessary to dismantle and rebuild portions of a certified historic structure to stabilize and repair weakened structural members and systems. In such cases, the Secretary will consider such extreme intervention as part of a certified rehabilitation if:
1. The necessity for dismantling is justified in supporting documentation;
 2. Significant architectural features and overall design are retained; and
 3. Adequate historic materials are retained to maintain the architectural and historic integrity of the overall structure. Section 48(g) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 exempts certified historic structures from meeting the physical test for retention of external walls and internal structural framework specified therein for other rehabilitated buildings. Nevertheless, owners are cautioned that the Standards for Rehabilitation require retention of distinguishing historic materials of external and internal walls as well as structural systems. In limited instances, rehabilitations involving removal of existing external walls, i.e., external walls that detract from the historic character of the structure such as in the case of a nonsignificant later addition or walls that have lost their structural integrity due to deterioration, may be certified as meeting the Standards for Rehabilitation.
- (e) Prior approval of a project by Federal, State, and local agencies and organizations does not ensure certification by the Secretary for Federal tax purposes. The Secretary's Standards for Rehabilitation take precedence over other regulations and codes in determining whether the rehabilitation project is consistent with the historic character of the property and, where applicable, the district in which it is located.
- (f) The qualities of a property and its environment which qualify it as a certified historic structure are determined taking into account all available information, including information derived from the physical and architectural attributes of the building; such determinations are not limited to information contained in National Register or related documentation.