



# City of Sunnyvale

## Meeting Minutes - Final Heritage Preservation Commission

---

Wednesday, May 3, 2023

7:00 PM

Online and Bay Conference Room  
(Room 145), City Hall,  
456 W. Olive Ave.,  
Sunnyvale, CA 94086

---

### Regular Meeting - 7 PM

#### CALL TO ORDER

Chair Sharma called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

#### ROLL CALL

Commissioner Rajkumar was excused in light of her email to staff prior to the meeting.

- Present:** 6 - Chair Pamela Sharma  
Vice Chair Sarosh Patel  
Commissioner Jenny Bratton  
Commissioner Steve Caroompas  
Commissioner Dawn Hopkins  
Commissioner Sue-Ellen Johnson
- Absent:** 1 - Commissioner Ashmita Rajkumar

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

2. [23-0521](#) **Proposed Project:**  
**RESOURCE ALTERATION PERMIT:** to remove 148 Crescent Avenue from the Heritage Resource Inventory and consider the impacts of an 18-unit townhouse development (#2021-7826) and minor exterior improvements for the house at 156 Crescent Avenue.  
**Location:** 148 and 156 Crescent Avenue (APNs: 211-35-008 and 211-35-009)  
**File #:** 2021-7265  
**Zoning:** R-3/PD (Medium Density Residential / Planned Development)  
**Applicant / Owner:** Samir Sharma (applicant) / Crescent Ave LLC (owner)  
**Environmental Review:** A Class 32 categorical exemption relieves this project from California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) provisions.  
**Project Planner:** Momo Ishijima, (408) 730-7532,

mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov

Ms. Ishijima noted that the townhouse proposal will be going to the Planning Commission for review on May 22, 2023 and said that the Heritage Preservation Commission's role is to make the decision on the removal of the 148 Crescent Avenue from the City's Heritage Resource Inventory list and consider the impacts of the townhouse project on the heritage resource to remain at 156 Crescent Avenue. She noted that the area was mapped out as part of the Easter Gable subdivision in the 1920's and was a poultry farm owned by the Parish family for over 80 years. She also said that the design would not impact the historic integrity of the original house at 156 Crescent Avenue.

Chair Sharma asked staff of the possibility of adding another heritage resource in its place and Principal Planner George Schroeder replied that a new Heritage Resource Inventory listing would be a future study separate from tonight's Proposal and that there is a larger study issue for consideration (Study Issue CDD 18-02) to do a comprehensive update of the Heritage Resource Inventory.

Vice Chair Patel discussed the concern that the historical aspect of the area is already lost because part of the significance was the poultry farm and not the home. The poultry farm and its associated accessory structures should have been addressed further in the historic evaluation. Mr. Schroeder responded that this consideration is part of the decision the Commission needs to make.

Commissioner Caroompas said that the warehouse in the rear is being used as car storage and the public can't enjoy the property in its current state and is an eyesore. He asked if there were any signs of the former egg farm. Ms. Ishijima noted that there is a mural (noted on page 6 and 7 of the report) in the rear that depicts the Parish Family Egg Farm and Mr. Caroompas asked staff if the Parish family is considered historically significance to the City's history. Ms. Ishijima said they were not and that the Commission's decision tonight may include a condition to memorialize the historical significance of the home, such as a plaque.

Commissioner Johnson noted that she has been studying this property for years as she is a member of the Sunnyvale Heritage Park Museum and that she was able to tour the property with the Parish family. She noted that the mural was part of the egg farm retail store in the rear. She also suggested installation of a plaque onsite. Ms. Ishijima noted that it is in the Commission's purview to include a requirement for a plaque.

Commissioner Hopkins noted that the property may be eligible for the state and national register, in which the owner may apply for this. She noted that the City's Plaque Program may be good to reference in the plaque design.

Chair Sharma opened the public hearing.

Samir Sharma, applicant, delivered a slide presentation.

Chair Sharma asked Mr. Sharma what 156 Crescent Avenue will be used as and Mr. Sharma replied that it will be a residential home.

Commissioner Caroompas asked if a solar study has been completed and Mr. Sharma replied yes.

Commissioner Caroompas asked Mr. Sharma if there are any artifacts that may be worth saving and whether they would be opposed to keeping the mural. Mr. Sharma responded they would take it under consideration.

Chair Sharma discussed the possibility of adding a plaque to commemorate the historical significance and Mr. Sharma noted that he can consider that idea as long as the privacy of the residents will not be impacted.

Vice Chair Patel noted that a plaque in the front of the house may add value to the home and Mr. Sharma replied that it may cause unwanted foot traffic to the owners.

Commissioner Caroompas agreed that a historic plaque to commemorate the historical significance at a proper location is a good idea.

Commissioner Bratton asked Mr. Sharma whether there is a name for the development and asked him if they would include the Parish family in the name of the development.

Lisa Prather, neighbor northwest of the project site, did not attend the previous community outreach meeting. She asked about the proposed project's construction, traffic, and noise may affect the neighborhood. There are currently traffic impacts. She asked if any studies were made in regard to traffic and noise impacts and Ms. Ishijima noted that a noise impact study was done and that the development portion of this project is scheduled for the May 22, 2023 Planning Commission hearing.

Commissioner Caroompas commented that the proposed townhouse project should be more compatible with the original home to remain at 156 Crescent Avenue. Mr. Sharma noted that their historical consultant was not pleased with the initial design because it matched too much. They believe they have achieved a balance of a difference in architecture and compatibility with the existing home.

Commissioner Hopkins noted that a historic building should differentiate from the surrounding structures.

Chair Sharma closed the public hearing.

Mr. Schroeder reminded the Commissioners that the proposed townhome project design is not in this Commission's purview (it is the Planning Commission), although they may certainly comment on the proposed design.

**MOTION:**

Chair Sharma moved and Commissioner Hopkins seconded the motion to approve Alternative 2: Approve the Resource Alteration Permit with modified conditions to include a plaque.

**HISTORICAL PLAQUE:** A plaque honoring the heritage resource and the significance of the agricultural heritage of the site shall be placed prior to final occupancy of the townhome project. Location, size and language of the plaque shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Community Development prior to issuance of building permits.

**FRIENDLY AMENDMENT:** Commissioner Caroompas proposed a friendly amendment to include the preservation of the mural along with adding a historical plaque.

The friendly amendment was not accepted by Chair Sharma. Commissioner Caroompas rescinded his friendly amendment.

The original motion carried by the following vote:

**Yes: 6 -** Chair Sharma  
Vice Chair Patel  
Commissioner Bratton  
Commissioner Caroompas  
Commissioner Hopkins  
Commissioner Johnson

**No: 0**

**Absent: 1 -** Commissioner Rajkumar