

From: [Peak, Dana](#)
To: [Severino, Lori](#)
Cc: [Downtown West Project](#)
Subject: Re: Prep for Thurs Internal Coordination meeting on Downtown West
Date: Tuesday, December 22, 2020 6:46:42 AM
Attachments: [114HLCATIONMINUTES.pdf](#)
[11520HLCATIONMINUTES.pdf](#)

Lori,

Also wanted to provide the Historic Landmarks minutes from November 4, 2020 (Item 5a) and January 15, 2020 (Item 3a) for the public comment record for Downtown West.

Dana Peak Edwards

Historic Preservation Review Planner | Planning Division | City of San Jose

200 E. Santa Clara Street, 3rd floor

<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning>

From: Peak, Dana <Dana.Peak@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2020 8:26 AM
To: Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>
Cc: Downtown West Project <downtownwest@esassoc.com>
Subject: Re: Prep for Thurs Internal Coordination meeting on Downtown West

Hi Lori,

Attached are 2 public comment letters received for the HLC meeting on November 4th for Downtown West.

Dana Peak Edwards

Historic Preservation Review Planner | Planning Division | City of San Jose

200 E. Santa Clara Street, 3rd floor

<http://www.sanjoseca.gov/planning>

From: Severino, Lori <Lori.Severino@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2020 3:13 PM
To: Rood, Timothy <timothy.rood@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Manford, Robert <Robert.Manford@sanjoseca.gov>; Han, James <James.Han@sanjoseca.gov>; Tu, John <john.tu@sanjoseca.gov>; Ruano, Jose <Jose.Ruano@sanjoseca.gov>; Clements, Kristen <Kristen.Clements@sanjoseca.gov>; VanderVeen, Rachel <Rachel.VanderVeen@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Eidlin, Eric <eric.eidlin@sanjoseca.gov>; Zenk, Jessica <Jessica.Zenk@sanjoseca.gov>; Burnham, Nicolle <nicolle.burnham@sanjoseca.gov>; Sanderfer, Larissa <Larissa.Sanderfer@sanjoseca.gov>; Walesh, Kim <Kim.Walesh@sanjoseca.gov>; Ekern, Bill <Bill.Ekern@sanjoseca.gov>; Wessling, Cheryl <Cheryl.Wessling@sanjoseca.gov>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>; Handler, Elisabeth <elisabeth.handler@sanjoseca.gov>; Phan, Johnny <Johnny.Phan@sanjoseca.gov>; Benabente, Julie <Julie.Benabente@sanjoseca.gov>; Ogilvie,

Michael <michael.ogilvie@sanjoseca.gov>; Klein, Nanci <Nanci.Klein@sanjoseca.gov>; Do, Ryan <ryan.do@sanjoseca.gov>; Zsuttu, Yves <Yves.Zsuttu@sanjoseca.gov>; Mendez, Zacharias <Zacharias.Mendez@sanjoseca.gov>; Adams-Hapner, Kerry <Kerry.Adams-Hapner@sanjoseca.gov>; Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>; O'Connor, Kevin <Kevin.Oconnor@sanjoseca.gov>; Banwait, Manjit <Manjit.Banwait@sanjoseca.gov>; Lapustea, Florin <Florin.Lapustea@sanjoseca.gov>; Tom, Vivian <Vivian.Tom@sanjoseca.gov>; Breslin, Emily <Emily.Breslin@sanjoseca.gov>; Tam, Wilson <wilson.tam@sanjoseca.gov>; Peak, Dana <Dana.Peak@sanjoseca.gov>; Chima, Vicrim <Vicrim.Chima@sanjoseca.gov>; Dave Javid <dave@plantoplace.com>; dianab <diana@raimiassociates.com>; 'Suhaila Sikand' <suhaila@plantoplace.com>; 'Matthew Raimi' <matt@raimiassociates.com>

Cc: Downtown West Project <downtownwest@esassoc.com>

Subject: RE: Prep for Thurs Internal Coordination meeting on Downtown West

Additional summaries to add to the list:

- [Nov 21st Artist Community Workshop \(including 8 key themes\)](#)
- [Emailed comments/questions from the public sent or forwarded to me between Oct 7 and Dec 7 \(please forward me other comment letters/emails not included here\)](#)

Reminder that tomorrow's meeting will focus on Downtown West. DSAP/AHIP reflection workshops will be scheduled for January.

Thanks!

Lori

From: Severino, Lori

Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 4:42 PM

To: Rood, Timothy <timothy.rood@sanjoseca.gov>; Hughey, Rosalynn <Rosalynn.Hughey@sanjoseca.gov>; Manford, Robert <Robert.Manford@sanjoseca.gov>; Han, James <James.Han@sanjoseca.gov>; Tu, John <john.tu@sanjoseca.gov>; Jose Ruano (Jose.Ruano@sanjoseca.gov) <Jose.Ruano@sanjoseca.gov>; Kristen Clements (Kristen.Clements@sanjoseca.gov) <Kristen.Clements@sanjoseca.gov>; VanderVeen, Rachel <Rachel.VanderVeen@sanjoseca.gov>; Morales-Ferrand, Jacky <Jacky.Morales-Ferrand@sanjoseca.gov>; Eidlin, Eric <eric.eidlin@sanjoseca.gov>; Jessica Zenk (Jessica.Zenk@sanjoseca.gov) <Jessica.Zenk@sanjoseca.gov>; Burnham, Nicolle <nicolle.burnham@sanjoseca.gov>; Sanderfer, Larissa <Larissa.Sanderfer@sanjoseca.gov>; Walesh, Kim <Kim.Walesh@sanjoseca.gov>; Ekern, Bill <Bill.Ekern@sanjoseca.gov>; Wessling, Cheryl <Cheryl.Wessling@sanjoseca.gov>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>; Handler, Elisabeth <elisabeth.handler@sanjoseca.gov>; Phan, Johnny <Johnny.Phan@sanjoseca.gov>; Benabente, Julie <Julie.Benabente@sanjoseca.gov>; Ogilvie, Michael <michael.ogilvie@sanjoseca.gov>; Klein, Nanci <Nanci.Klein@sanjoseca.gov>; Do, Ryan <ryan.do@sanjoseca.gov>; Zsuttu, Yves <Yves.Zsuttu@sanjoseca.gov>; Mendez, Zacharias <Zacharias.Mendez@sanjoseca.gov>; Adams-Hapner, Kerry <Kerry.Adams-Hapner@sanjoseca.gov>; Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>; O'Connor, Kevin <Kevin.Oconnor@sanjoseca.gov>; Banwait, Manjit <Manjit.Banwait@sanjoseca.gov>; Lapustea, Florin <Florin.Lapustea@sanjoseca.gov>; Tom, Vivian <Vivian.Tom@sanjoseca.gov>; Breslin, Emily <Emily.Breslin@sanjoseca.gov>; Wilson Tam

(wilson.tam@sanjoseca.gov) <wilson.tam@sanjoseca.gov>; Peak, Dana <Dana.Peak@sanjoseca.gov>; Chima, Vicrim <Vicrim.Chima@sanjoseca.gov>; Dave Javid <dave@plantoplace.com>; Diana Benitez <diana@raimiassociates.com>; Suhaila Sikand <suhaila@plantoplace.com>; Matthew Raimi <matt@raimiassociates.com>

Cc: Downtown West Project <downtownwest@esassoc.com>

Subject: Prep for Thurs Internal Coordination meeting on Downtown West

Hi team,

The purpose of the Internal Coordination meeting this Thursday at 1:00 will be to **reflect on the public input received on the Downtown West project this fall and identify key themes**, determine any issues that may need additional work, and discuss any additional comments to provide to the applicant (either this week or another time) resulting from the community feedback. In addition to informing all of your work, the product from this meeting will help us prepare report-back documents for the public. I know you all have been considering the input along the way, so this is an opportunity to share with each other, brainstorm together, and document key take-aways in a systematic way.

The proposed meeting format is to go category by category, filling out the table below. I plan to ask the PMs to start the conversation for each category (John, Larissa, Eric), then open it up for the group’s discussion. Please think about and share the most common questions/points of confusion, concerns, popular features, and suggestions for improvement that we heard this fall (below are summaries to help you refresh).

Discussion table for each category

Community Input Theme – Fall 2020	Needs further work/ exploration? (y/n)	Add to applicant comment letter? (y/n)	Add a response to the FAQs? (y/n)	Other notes
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				

Tentative agenda:

1. Introductions, meeting purpose, confirm discussion format (5 min)
2. Discussions on these categories:
 - a. Land use, design, historic, planning process (20 min)
 - b. Parks, open space, creek, community spaces (25 min)
 - c. Mobility, parking, transit (20 min)
 - d. Infrastructure, utilities, other environmental issues not already discussed (10 min)
 - e. *(I propose holding these topics for discussion in January: Affordable Housing, Jobs/Education, DA/Community Benefits, Small Business, Art)*
3. Summary (5 min)
 - a. Next steps

Here are summaries of the feedback from some of the events and public meetings held this fall (I'll send more as they are ready). **Please review these summaries in advance, if you can.**

- [Nov 9th SAAG meeting summary](#)
- [Oct 19th Downtown West Community Meeting – list of questions and comments](#)
- [Oct 21st Vietnamese Community Workshop \(Catalyze SV and VAR\) meeting summary with 9 themes](#)
- [Downtown West Online Feedback Form responses \(as of 12/14/20\)](#)
- [Downtown West DEIR public comments](#)
- [Nov 4th Historic Landmarks Commission \(Downtown West Draft EIR\) meeting minutes](#)
- [Nov 18th Parks and Recreation Commission meeting minutes](#)
- [Sept 25th AACSA Diridon Presentation and Q&A – poll results](#)

Let me know if you have any questions or suggestions.

Thanks!

Lori

Lori Severino

Diridon Program Manager

(408) 535-3537

www.diridonsj.org

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

November 4, 2020

Action Minutes

WELCOME

Meeting called to order at 6:32 p.m.

ROLL CALL

*Present: Commissioner Saum, Boehm, Arnold, Royer, and Raynsford.
Commissioner Polcyn arrived at 6:34 p.m.*

Absent: None

1. DEFERRALS

Any item scheduled for hearing this evening for which deferral is being requested will be taken out of order to be heard first on the matter of deferral. If you want to change any of the deferral dates recommended or speak to the question of deferring these or any other items, you should request to speak in the manner specified on p. 2 of this agenda.

No Items

Access the video, agenda, and related reports for this meeting by visiting the City's website at:
<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments/planning-building-code-enforcement/planning-division/commissions-and-hearings/historic-landmarks-commission>

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar items are considered to be routine and will be adopted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a request is made by a member of the Historic Landmarks Commission, staff or the public to have an item removed from the consent calendar and considered separately. If anyone wishes to speak on one of these items, please use the ‘raise hand’ feature in Zoom or contact 408-535-3505 to request to speak.

- a. [HL20-003 & MA20-001](#). City Landmark designation for a single-family residence (Somavia House) on an approximately 0.14-gross acre site and Historical Property Contract (California Mills Act contract) between the City of San José and the owners of the subject property located 546 South 3rd Street (Steve Cohen, Owner). Council District 3. CEQA. Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15331 for Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation.

Project Manager, Rina Shah

Recommendation: Recommend that the City Council approve the City Landmark Designation and Historical Property Contract.

PULLED FROM CONSENT AND HEARD UNDER PUBLIC HEARING

On November 4, 2020, the Historic Landmarks Commission held a Public Hearing on the proposed Landmark Designation and Historical Property Contract (California Mills Act) for “The Somavia-Andersen House” located at 546 S. Third Street. The Historic Landmarks Commission recommended approval of the City Landmark designation to the City Council. The item had been placed on the Consent Calendar of the Historic Landmarks Commission Agenda but public comment concerning its association with the Mills Act prompted its removal from the Consent Calendar. Tessa Woodmansee and “TaxPayer” requested that the HL20-003 and MA 20-001 be placed under Public Hearing to accept public comments, consider, and record them.

Staff provided a brief history of “The Somavia-Andersen House” that the integrity of the single-family residence had been maintained. The one-story residence was built in 1909 and was a distinctive example of the Craftsman Bungalow style built in Downtown San José. The Craftsman style of architecture was prevalent during the early twentieth century and its architectural characteristics add to the rich architectural history and culture of the City of San José. The single-family residence was a strong candidate for engaging in a Historical Property Contract due to the conversation character-defining features. The Mills Act Contract is a ten-year plan which diverts state property taxes to property owners who qualify and are contractually obligated to spend those tax savings on material improvements which preserve, restore, rehabilitate, or construct the historic resource. Planning staff therefore recommended that the Historic Landmarks Commission recommend approval of the City Landmark designation and the Historical Property Contract to the City Council.

Public Testimony

The property owner, Steve Cohen, gave a brief presentation on the architectural history of the house and the purpose of his interest in preservation and maintenance of the single-family residence as a City Landmark based on the fact that John Y. Somavia was a descendant of early Spanish pioneers and was known to have built the house in 1909. However, between 1943 and 1963, the house was owned and occupied by Selvan Anderson until her death, and therefore he requested that the surname "Andersen" be added to Somavia resulting in the "the Somavia-Andersen House." He added that he loved preservation of older homes and the subject single-family residence would be an asset if properly preserved. He had preserved three other homes in the area and was aware of how the Mills Act Contract program worked. The money spent on restoring the house would be much more than what is received back as tax incentives. He had carefully worked out the Mills Act program to help preserve the house and structurally stabilize the home. He would also be preserving the natural river rock materials as well as the 8'x12' atrium in the center of the home, which is unique to that period of construction.

Several member comments on the origins and mechanism of the Mills Act and there appeared a number of misconceptions. One member of the public wanted to know why the house merited Landmark status. He also thought the house would take tax-payer's money for restoration and he did not think that was appropriate. A second member of the public also inquired about how the Landmark designation and the City's Mills Act program worked and whether it involved tax dollars. A third member of the public commented on wanting the HLC to be live streamed on YouTube. A fourth member of the public wanted to know the architect's name and was curious on how the Mills Act program worked. She also corrected city staff's comment by stating the subject house was actually adjacent to apartment buildings and not to other single-family homes and therefore wanted to know if the area would qualify as historic. Historic Preservation Officer Vicrim Chima explained that although thematic similarities in housing styles, scale, site design, orientation, and materials do support districts, it a distinct could embrace a longer period of significant and by comprised with various types of institutional, manufacture, multi-family, and single family houses.

*The property owner stated his intentions were purely to restore the house and to make it his permanent residence. He was also interested in determining who designed the house, but because of COVID-19, couldn't access the California Room at the Martin Luther King Public Library. He also suggested the members of public should contact PAC*SJ for more information on preservation and the Mills act program. Ben Leech of PAC*SJ spoke next stating that they would welcome any inquiry on information on preservation of homes as Landmark structures and associated Mills Act programs. He added that not every state offers such a tax savings program which serves as an incentive to preserve homes. He went on to add that more homeowners like Mr. Cohen should think of preserving their homes through the Landmark designation process.*

Staff explained that the house represented the early Arts and Craft movement in San José and met three of the eight criteria for City Landmark designation. Additionally, the Mills Act Contract would help preserve and rehabilitate the house.

The City's Historic Preservation Officer, Vicrim Chima, also commented that the Mills Act contract served as an economic incentive for the restoration and preservation of qualified historic buildings by private property owners. The Mills Act Program itself was administered and implemented by the local government and offered up to 35 percent to 65 percent in tax savings.

He added that the Mills Act was a State Law which allowed cities to enter into contracts with the owners of historic structures. Such contracts required reduction of the owner's property tax using a formula in exchange for the conservation of the property.

Staff and Historic Landmarks Commission Discussion

The Commission noted that "The Somavia-Andersen House" is a good example of Craftsman Bungalow style architecture. The Commissioners agreed that it needs ongoing special maintenance and care as it does have a unique architectural style which merits preservation. The Commissioners appreciated the research on the property's history and agreed that that Mills Act contract was indeed an incentive that helped preserve such unique architectural styles in San José. They were aware that the owner was dedicated to preservation of such homes and commended him for pursuing Landmark status and committing to the preservation and rehabilitation of the house using the Mills Act Contract tax incentive. Commissioner Royer suggested conducting an informational training on Mills Act Contract at a future meeting. Commissioner Polcyn suggested that the ten-year work program should be displayed for comments.

The Historic Landmarks Commission voted unanimously to approve Staff recommendation that the City Council designate the single-family residence as a City Landmark and approve the Mills Act Contract.

Commissioner Royer made a motion to approve staff recommendation. Commissioner Polcyn seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously (6-0).

- b. [HL20-002](#). City Landmark Designation for a single-family residence (George A. Fleming House) on a 1.07-gross acre site located at 1516 Newport Avenue (Larry A. Blitz and Lori Andersen Trustee, Owner). Council District: 6. CEQA: Exempt pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15331 for Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation.
Project Manager, Rina Shah

Recommendation: Recommend that the City Council approve the application for City Landmark designation.

Commissioner Royer made a motion to approve staff recommendation. Commissioner Boehm seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously (6-0).

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

No Items

4. EARLY REFERRALS UNDER CITY COUNCIL POLICY

No Items

5. GENERAL BUSINESS

a. [GP19-009, PDC19-039, PD19-029, HL20-004, HL20-005, HP20-002, & PT20-027.](#)

The project site is generally bounded by Lenzen Avenue and the Union Pacific Railroad tracks to the north; North Montgomery Street, Los Gatos Creek, the Guadalupe River, South Autumn Street, and Royal Avenue to the east; Auzerais Avenue to the south; and Diridon Station and the Caltrain rail line to the west. The project also includes the area bounded by Los Gatos Creek to the west, West San Fernando Street to the south, the Guadalupe River to the east, and West Santa Clara Street to the north.

The project is proposing a mixed-use development on approximately 81 acres mostly within the boundaries of the Diridon Station Area Plan (DSAP). The project involves a Planned Development Rezoning, Planned Development Permit, General Plan Amendments, amendments to the historic landmark boundaries of the Southern Pacific Depot and San José Water Company, Historic Preservation Permit for the San Jose Water Company site, and a Vesting Tentative Map, Development Agreement, and other land use related approvals for the development of up to 5,900 residential units; up to 7,300,000 gross square feet (GSF) of office space; up to 500,000 GSF of active uses such as retail, cultural, arts, etc.; up to 300 hotel rooms; up to 800 rooms of limited-term corporate accommodations; up to two event and conference centers totaling up to 100,000 GSF; up to two central utility plants totaling approximately 130,000 GSF; logistics/warehouse(s) totaling approximately 100,000 GSF; and approximately 15 acres of open space, all on approximately 81 acres. The project also proposes infrastructure, transportation, and public realm improvements

PROJECT MANAGER, JAMES HAN

Recommendation: Provide comments to staff on the historic preservation component of the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Downtown West Mixed-Use Project (Associated File Nos. PDC19-039, PD19-029, GP19-009, HL20-004, HL20-005, HP20-002, & PT20-027).

Oral Staff Report (James)

- *The boundary includes two landmarks and next historic district*
- *DEIR has been out since Oct 7, 2020, looking for comments on the historic cultural*

Applicant Team

- *Bhavesh Director of Real-estate Development*
 - *Was last with HLC in Jan 2020*
 - *Project Overview - what will in those spaces between those offices*
 - *Shown an illustrated of the buildings, density, land uses*
 - *Create connection between historic resources*
- *DWDSG Anthony Fiorvanti (District Design Lead)*
 - *Hybrid process, high level process bring that specify*
 - *Conforming review, when all those control bring forth to Director*
 - *Design controls and creating the place*
 - *Framework plan*
 - *Response to historic resources and context - massing, façade articulation, material, and program*
 - *San Jose Water building, 150 S. Montgomery, 40 S. Montgomery, Creekside walk at Autumn Street*
 - *Creekside walk at S. Autumn Street. Nature meets built*
- *Historic Resources Treatment*
 - *Feasibility in retaining resources*
 - *Creates breaks in contiguity of plan*
 - *Results in inefficiently shaped new buildings*
 - *Impact program yield*
 - *Challenges with physical relocation*
 - *Anomalous in the urban context*
 - *Limited adaptive reuse application*
 - *Response to context*
 - *Response to existing building, response to historic neighborhood like lakehouse district and the Diridon Depot*
 - *Case study*
 - *E2 and E3, residential uses across the lake house district*
 - *San Jose Water Company*
 - *Rehabilitation of Historic SJWC*
 - *40 S. Montgomery*
 - *Changing of the street, cornice articulation, curbless street*
 - *150 S. Montgomery*
 - *Hellwig Ironworks*

- *Next Steps*
 - *Will be back in Feb to HLC for a recommendation*

Public Comments

- *Ben Leech- PacSJ*
 - *Continuing the review of the DEIR*
 - *Developing their formal comments at the end of the comment period*
 - *Want to offer some scope to EIR and preservation strategy*
 - *Support retain and reuse the structure, disappointment, and trouble by the number of historic buildings are currently proposed for demolition and there are far more potential and creative approach to integrate*
 - *Structures of merit are proposed to be demolition*
 - *Creekside walk area, as potential relocation for historic resources, they can accommodate on site instead of a third party*
 - *Sunlight Baking building*
- *Tessa*
 - *City has not been helpful in reviewing this project*
 - *Reaching out to the community and helping them understand*
 - *City and Google has not been available*
 - *Concern about the car and infrastructure of the site, cars is not really suitability, needs to be car free*
 - *Nature part, the most historic part of mother earth, 615 Stockton land, wants Google to purchase it to make it a garden and have a community center to live without fossil fuels*
- *Roland*
 - *To request historic depot be landmarked to be part of this plan, to protect the depot from VTA from relocating the railway*
 - *Google has assembled team with more rail and design than the VTA, Caltrain combines*
 - *Presentation added to the website*
- *Meredith Muller*
 - *Thank you for the detail, hopefully on the level of green spaces, and ecological suitability*
 - *Meat market sign, what will they do it*

- *How Google deals with future historic status before this project is approved or after it is approved, considering the HLC has not had activity*
- *Sunlight Bakery*
- *D5 on the foundry buildings, any envelopes about the green spaces for the building*
- *Mike Sacgram PACSJ*
 - *Mitigation 3.2 of DEIR, encourage broader vision of preservation*
 - *Environmental impacts will be unavoidable*
 - *Shrinking of the historic fabric, sheer massing of the buildings additional impact outside the projects*
 - *PACSJ is seeking more than demolition, setbacks, proposed mitigation have perspective more preservation and digital realm, hopefully will be a partner will help identify and harden SJ historic resources*
- *Lisa Ruder PACSJ*
 - *Diridon Station, in regards to DSAP and DWDSG, the City has been very vague on the SJ Jewel*
 - *Other than acknowledge it within 200 feet of the project*
 - *Do not want to add to historic lost to SJ*
- *Phone number ending in 140 (would not disclose name)*
 - *How long will it take, construction, traffic it will create, nuisance and station*
 - *High density house, office and public transit are dead issue because of Covid*
- *Kay Gutknecht*
 - *Resident just north of the project*
 - *Two historic subdivision*
 - *Interesting in the part of the technical report*
 - *Eligible Candidate landmarks, 3 months, what are the plans for those properties, they have a lot in their neighborhood*
- *Michael Riepe and Nancy*
 - *Sheelie neighborhood, there is a corner lot, zoned for light industrial, surrounded by the historic homes, that site sticks out like sore thumb*
 - *Some of those historic building, would be nice to relocate, receivership 615 Stockton*
- *Susan Watanabe*
 - *Live three houses down on corner of Schiele and Stockton*
 - *Would receive of this property and becoming of historic district*

Commissioners

- *Polcyn*
 - *EIR and design - looking for comments for both?*
 - *Dana - commenting on the EIR, adequacy (mitigation, alternative) in regards to the design guidelines to historic resources, are the resources going to be impacted by the project in relationship design guidelines DWDSG, adjacency references and how to treat historic resources*
 - *Really appreciate the presentation, very thorough, helpful to understand the project, wish if they had the presentation before he read the EIR*
 - *3D views are helpful in understanding the impact on the historic resources*
 - *History walk would be nice, and can extend further across Santa Clara to the park*
 - *Is the autumn intended to be pedestrians or also through traffic with vehicles*
 - *Bavesh autumn street is for vehicles and the autumn walk is for pedestrians*
 - *Korney Powder building, there are so many layers of which period of significant, it would be good to know what is inside*
 - *Hellwig Ironwalk, agree in keeping that, adaptive re-use, not against it, but needs more discussion*
 - *Ben from PACSJ, mention the number of buildings of structure of merit to be removed, spent hours going through the EIR and the project all the history of the project, sidebar all the structure of merit, is it a concern, it is not as clear in the EIR and how it is being impacted*
 - *Design the attention of detail with the height and scale, he appreciates it and there is a sensitivity to that*
 - *List of buildings in the EIR and his thoughts*
 - *Not enough attention to the prehistory of this site, specifically the Ohlone, number of burials and spiritual site, because where two rivers comes together, would get a lot of response of the importance of this site*
 - *None of is visible to the eyes, but it could be underground*
 - *Early SJ, integration of some of the industrial building, but there is a lot more there, fruit industry and the railway and the packing, industrial history in this space*
 - *Interactive display in the area?*
 - *Mitigation measures - all the buildings are affected, should be documented, even if they not being removed but are significant*
 - *Building, three small residential on Julian Street, strongly believe these should be relocated, in good condition, some public comments about places to relocate it, adjacent or nearby*
 - *Disappointment on relocation, it puts the burden on others, pay demolition, 60 days to claim it and 120 days to take it, Google should be more proactive and moving those residential are achievable*

- *Moving buildings like Little Italy and Historic*
- *343, 345 N. Montgomery, 30s, would like integration, understand the challenge, but not recommend demolition*
- *580 Lorraine, mid century, designation by demolition, it is in the way and underutilized, he likes the building, likes to see it stay, are losing a lot of the midcentury building, in SJ*
- *145 S. Montgomery, sunlight baking company, really architecturally a nice building, great history, understand it is difficult to move, not a good candidate to move, really can do adaptive re-use*
- *150 Montgomery, earmarked for adaptive reuse and it is a sensitive response to the building*
- *40 S. Mont and S. Autumn building, made the connection from the presentation*
- *Amendment to S. Depot and SJWC - it was arbitrary when they made the boundary, the adjustment does not bother him, as long as the design of the larger building is done sensitively*
- *Royer*
 - *Did receive an email, if they would like an HLC introduction and she decline*
 - *Do appreciate the adaptive re-use, DWDSG, she is trying to provide deference setback and height, looking forward to see how it gets to full swing and before the commission*
 - *Would like to see more of the structures and relocating some of those residential property*
 - *It would be helpful to get that level of information on some of the other structure and how they would be impacted and how they would be impacted*
 - *Also curious, how this project will interact with the Diridon Station, needs to be look at holistically, don't want that building to be lost in the shuffle*
- *Raynsford*
 - *Did receive the email, did not respond*
 - *Agree with all the comments from the other commissioners*
 - *Three kinds of impact, the demolition of the building, adjacency, and consideration of the boundaries*
 - *Do believe many of the historic resources should be preserved or moved, will come back to those when it comes back to them*
 - *Some of them seems like small frame houses, it should be moved, Google should take the responsibility, there should be more proactive*
 - *Clearly other builds not wood, that would be harder or not moved, maybe preserving piece, façade or walls, we are the early stage, thinking of the concept, what frag of the building can be integrated*

- *Some attention needs to be paid to the massing of these building, appreciate the setback, looking at the rendering, trying to deal with a complex site with many history, which layer should be prominent*
 - *Confusing vague idea of nature and be helpful urbanist*
- *Streets, landscape, building*
- *Diridon Station and SJWC building, what is the larger context, which is Santa Clara street, what is the street going to be like in relates to the site, important for transit, and historic resources within the streetscape, what are the less formal elements in the landscape*
- *A little bit of chaos in the images, giant mega structure, being blocked by these temporary structures, what is that plaza like and relate to that building*
- *Going to honor the resources*
- *Less clear about the buffer zone and what it is doing, in terms of boundary*
- *Appreciate the ecology and plant life, this discussion need more displace historic and urban design*
- *Arnold*
 - *Did receive an email, did not respond to invitation for brief*
 - *This presentation is a lot, pleased to see the historic reference, concern about SJWC, pleased to see a central building, except it was disappearing in the background in one page*
 - *Wayfinding signage, signage in relationship historic background, thoughts were there, slides wayfinding*
 - *Physical relocation instead of demolition*
 - *Structure of merit, she will visit those sites*
 - *What about the documentation of some of the historic structures, how will documenting and those and their movements?*
 - *What will Diridon Station and Google project, where does it come together*
- *Boehm*
 - *Offered a briefing from Google and did attend that briefing, also attended a community meeting October 19*
 - *Had a hard time reading the historic resources chapter, it wasn't easy for him to access, many of the properties were listed together, but not listed in any order he understand, he understand what is CEQA and not*
 - *Is it correct, three Corney, Hellwig and Waterworks, are those three buildings going to keep and the meat sign*
 - *There are 38 properties were evaluate, less than 10% are being preserved*
 - *The HLC listed those resources*
 - *9 were determined to be historic resources*

- *Lake house, those homes are valuable late 1890, did entail an frontage to those houses, relocated those houses along w San Fernando, it would be nice to have a historic row*
- *60 Stockton, seems like a historic building*
 - *Sarah Hahn - chief historian - in the buffer area, did look at them but not evaluate*
 - *Look buildings within 200 feet and recognize locally and potential impact to the adjacency*
 - *Andy Wang - 38 properties are age eligible within the boundary*
- *Concern about the number of building slated for demo, smaller frame house could be move and relocated*
- *Three buildings are being preservation, they are all 20th century, there several 19th century to preserve at least some of them*
- *Advocated the Diridon Station, know is outside the project, is concern that transit agency is not going to use the building, that building could be useful and suggest to use as part of the project, even adaptive re-use*
- *Ohlone and native american, they were known to live near the banks of Guadalupe River and find remains of the indians*
- *Save those buildings on Julien for the 19th century*
- *Downtown Design Guidelines, heights to adjacent to building, materials tends to get ignored, saw a lot glass and glazing building, those are renderings, give some thoughts to the material, a specially when they front the historic resources that will save*
- *Chair Saum*
 - *Also receive the email, I waited to respond and decline the request, to avoid potential meeting*
 - *Saum is also vice president of neighborhood association representative on the SAAG, this is not a lot of new information, he has not spoken as chair of the HLC*
 - *When the City extend the downtown and OEI, this is what making this project possible*
 - *We have specific downtown design guidelines and historic guidelines*
 - *If this is part of Downtown and Historic Guidelines*
 - *Within the greater DSAP and 34 structures on the historic inventory list, adjacency are important*
 - *When adjacent to the historic resources whether within the project boundary, needs to be a primarily concern*
 - *June 2018 historic resources for SAAG presentation*
 - *Feasibility of maintaining resources, this is a hybrid process, therefore it is not just one project or small scale, we need to aim a bit higher, no continuity in general in downtown, disingenuous to say there is no continuity bc downtown is already not continuity*

- *Google can think outside the box, adaptive re-use or relocation is wholly consistency and to green technology*
- *Google should be more creative with adaptive, relocation and documentation*
- *Challenges to physicals relocation is not a good enough reason*
- *Water company, there is a lot going on there, when it was Trammel Crow project, revived there was supposed to be a lot of plaza and public space from the previous project.*
- *Landmark commission has deal with receiver site, it shows a commitment from the applicant to the City and HLC*
- *Moving those Julian building to stocking is a perfect opportunity*
- *Diridon Station, national registry, agency, the DISC process is outside Google control, but each of those process are treating the station differently, more as an after thought, consider relocating and moving Diridon Station*
- *DISC document is proposing to remove the Diridon Station*
- *Because the project is 81 acres, the adjacent should be more inclusive*
- *Extraordinary opportunity to invest, significant benefit instead of significant unavoidable*
- *3D documentation of entire site would be super important and Google as the ability, in a virtual forum*
- *This is not your typical EIR, extending the comment period at least 15 days*
- *Some of the resources mid century are slotted for demolition*
- *Opportunity to set the standard for historic preservation given the size of the project, look for the best not the minimum*
- *Raynsford*
 - *Visualization, looking at Google street view, it would be useful simulation into something like street view*
 - *Plaza SJWC, wanting to activate these spaces, the architecture and design needs to stand on it, with or without people, it would be nice physical relationship*
- *Polcyn*
 - *Struggling there is a lot information, the EIR to boil down to 9 properties, at large this thing is not really sorted out and trying to get the head around and impact on all the resources*
 - *Second the extension on the comment period*
 - *With this EIR, do they need to take some action on the mitigation, what are the alternative, would like more time to review it and properties*
 - *Desire adaptive reuse some of the larger properties*
 - *3D representation are useful, would like to see more being design and movements and how it would be used*
 - *Light and wood frame that can be and often are relocated*

- *Royer*
 - *Additional time to dig into those documents would be helpful*
 - *It feels like 81 acres, preserving 3 structures is not enough, with the presentation, there are some good idea of adaptive re-use, it would be helpful to get more information, whether those other buildings would work, it needs to be look at further*
 - *Preservation needs to be a bigger consideration*
 - *Create really interesting spaces, but they are removing some really interesting building, into their place making is very important*
 - *Miss opportunity*
- *Vice Chair Boehm*
 - *The number of properties to be preserved, it does not seem like a good utilization of resources*
 - *Since his is important historic area, it should be more made use of it*
 - *311 and 312 N. Montgomery, 1895 Queen ann, would be a great addition to a historic district*
 - *Historic Markets in historic places within the project*
 - *Santa Clara street dates back to 1700s, but the report does not mention that, how about a historic monument there*
- *Chair Saum*
 - *Alameda right of away is a historic district, therefore there is an adjacency*

6. REFERRALS FROM CITY COUNCIL, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, OR OTHER AGENCIES

No Items

7. OPEN FORUM

Members of the public are invited to speak on any item that does not appear on today's Agenda and that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. The Commission cannot engage in any substantive discussion or take any formal action in response to the public comment. The Commission can only ask questions or respond to statements to the extent necessary to determine whether to: (1) refer the matter to staff for follow-up; (2) request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or (3) direct staff to place the item on a future agenda. If anyone wishes to speak, please connect to the meeting either by Zoom or by telephone using the instructions on page 2 of this agenda.

Robert Manford – Respond to the timelines and the request to extend the public comment period of the draft EIR

Carol – Address Google Project, Stockton Avenue location is an ideal location for relocation of potentially historic structures

Mike Sondergram – Mitigation Measures, can there be an in-lieu fund when resources can't be saved to encourage preservation in other areas on other scales – Request as part of a submittal packet, a 3-D Digital Contextual Model

Roland – Can you live stream on You Tube? Live stream audio is insufficient to understand the project scopes.

Tessa Woodmansee – Garden Alameda Neighborhood, working to create an historic district

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

a. Report from Secretary, Planning Commission, and City Council

Deputy Director Dr. Robert Manford – Introduction of New Historic Preservation Officer, Vicrim Chima

i. Future Agenda Items: Bank of Italy HP Permit

Chair Saum asked when this would be heard. Dana Peak responded with the possibility of a January special session or the normal February meeting.

ii. Summary of communications received by the Historic Landmarks Commission.

No items

b. Report from Committees

i. Design Review Subcommittee: October 21, 2020. Next meeting on November 18, 2020.

Chair Saum summarized recommendations made during the Design Review Commission held on October 21, 2020. Those action minutes can be found here: <https://www.sanjoseca.gov/Home/ShowDocument?id=66213>

c. **Approval of Action Minutes**

- i. **Recommendation:** Approval of Action Minutes for the Historic Landmarks Commission Meeting of October 7, 2020.

Commissioner Polcyn motioned to approve the action minutes for the Historic Landmarks Meeting of October 7, 2020. Commissioner Royer seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0).

d. **Status of Circulating Environmental Documents**

- i. [San Jose Flea Market Planned Development Rezoning Project Draft Environmental Impact Report](#)

Deadline for comment is November 16, 2020. Dana Peak explained that this project was not brought to HLC via the Early Referral so this will be presented as new material.

ADJOURNMENT

The commission voted unanimously (6-0) in favor of a motion to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:47 p.m.



HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

ACTION MINUTES

January 15, 2020

Regular Meeting

6:30 p.m.

Wing Room 119 & 120

200 East Santa Clara Street

San José, CA 95113

Commission Members

Edward Saum, Chair

Paul Boehm, Vice Chair

Harriett Arnold

Anthony Raynsford

Stephen Polcyn

Rachel Royer

Eric Hirst

Rosalynn Hughey, Director

Department of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement

Note

To request an accommodation for City-sponsored meetings or events or an alternative format for printed materials, please call Support Staff at 408-535-3505 or 408-294-9337 (TTY) as soon as possible, but at least three business days before any meeting or event. If you requested such an accommodation, please identify yourself to the technician seated at the staff table. If you did not call in advance and do now need assistance, please see the technician.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC

If you want to address the Commission, **fill out a speaker card (located at the technician's station), and give the completed card to the technician. Please include the agenda item number for reference.**

The procedure for public hearings is as follows:

- After the staff report, *applicants may make a five-minute presentation.*
- Anyone wishing to speak in favor of the proposal should prepare to come forward. After the proponents speak, anyone wishing to speak in opposition should prepare to come forward. *Each speaker will have two minutes.*
- Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. These questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance.
- The Commission will then close the public hearing.
- *The Historic Landmarks Commission will take action on the item.*

The procedure for referrals is as follows:

- Anyone wishing to speak on a referral should prepare to come forward. *Each speaker will have two minutes.*
- Commissioners may ask questions of the speakers. These questions will not reduce the speaker's time allowance.
- *The Historic Landmarks Commission will comment on the referral item.*

If a Commissioner would like a topic to be addressed under one of the Good and Welfare items, please contact Planning staff in advance of the Commission meeting.

An agenda and a copy of all staff reports have been placed on the table for your convenience. All public records relating to an open session item on this agenda, which are not exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Public Records Act, that are distributed to a majority of the legislative body will be available for public inspection at the Planning, Building and Code Enforcement at San José City Hall, 200 E. Santa Clara Street, 3rd Floor Tower, San José, CA 95113 at the same time that the public records are distributed or made available to the legislative body.

AGENDA
ORDER OF BUSINESS

WELCOME

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioner Saum, Boehm, Polcyn, Raynsford, Arnold, and Royer

Absent: Commissioner Hirst

1. DEFERRALS

Any item scheduled for hearing this evening for which deferral is being requested will be taken out of order to be heard first on the matter of deferral. If you want to change any of the deferral dates recommended or speak to the question of deferring these or any other items, you should say so at this time.

No Items

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar items are considered to be routine and will be adopted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a request is made by a member of the Historic Landmarks Commission, staff or the public to have an item removed from the consent calendar and considered separately. If anyone in the audience wishes to speak on one of these items, please make your request at this time

No Items

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- a. [GP19-009, PDC19-039 & PD19-029](#). General Plan Amendment, Planned Development Rezoning, and Planned Development Permit for the development of up to 5,900 residential units; up to 7,300,000 gross square feet of office space; up to 500,000 gross square feet of active uses such as retail, cultural, arts, etc.; up to 300 hotel rooms; up to 800 rooms of limited-term corporate accommodations; an approximately 100,000 gross square feet event center; up to two central utilities plants totaling approximately 115,000 gross square feet; and a logistics warehouse(s) of approximately 100,000 gross square feet; all on approximately 84 acres. The proposal also includes conceptual infrastructure, transportation, and public open space plans. The project is known as the Google project, or the Downtown West Mixed-Use Rezoning and Development Plan project.

PROJECT MANAGER, James Han

Recommendation: No recommendation. Provide comments under the “Early Referral” Policy on the Preservation of Landmarks.

- *James Han (project planner) provided staff report*
- *Applicant (Bhavesh P. with Google, Riccardo,)*
 - *Building on a decade of engagement and planning, started 2009 with the Google Neighborhood Committee*
 - *Google is about 30% of the DSAP area*
 - *Reached out to about 3,000 people for feedback*
 - *Submittal of application in Oct 2019, triggers the NOP and EIR*
 - *Scoping meeting Nov and community meeting in Dec*
 - *Of 84 acres, 60 acres is developable*
 - *Uses are in alignment with DSAP plan*
 - *Large portion is used for surface parking and industrial area*
 - *About a mile distance from the north to south boundary*
 - *Wants to create a variety of character zone*
 - *Core near the Diridon Station*
 - *North more industrial*
 - *South more of the neighborhood feel and access to nature*
- *Consultant (Charles Chase, Principal, Architectural Resources Group)*
 - *Soliciting for comments from the public*
 - *CEQA review, a project listed eligible and is on the existing historic resources list, then both the project area and area adjacent to 200 feet of the project area, requires a survey*
 - *Initiated the field survey in Sept 2019 has complete the archival work, working on a conceptual statement*
 - *Study area composed or mixed use, combination of large vacant parcels*
 - *Project mixed use in late 19 century*

Public Comments:

- *Andre Luthard with PAC*SJ,*
 - *Submitted comments during the scoping period*
 - *Curious if Julian Street is part of the scope of work, not from an age but architectural*
- *Jose*
 - *Silicon Valley Debug*
 - *Concerned about the document as seen along with re-development of King and Story Road with small development, cultural and art impact after that time*

- *10 to 15 murals have gone down since then approximately 2002*
- *This had a city impact*
- *With Development this size, but concern not just that area but historic and cultural impact of the entire size*
- *San Jose has such rich cultural and historic, largest population of Raza and Vietnamese*
- *Buildings and Sign and people, rent rates will impact people*
- *Concern about a project this size, there should be tough robust protection of these resources, need policies change to protect those things*
- *Paul Soto*
 - *That area is called the horseshoe*
 - *His mother taught at Garner, went to Washington, went to Lee*
 - *To hear such a forensic analysis*
 - *There is a death that is happening*
 - *There is no moral conscious*
 - *Cannery, his family worked there and built this City*
 - *He represents a gang of Chicano*
- *Liz Gonzales*
 - *From East SJ*
 - *You want this project to be integrated, but that is counter to Google's culture*
 - *Consultant who are paying you and who do you represent*
 - *Colonizing the City*
 - *They are representing of hundreds of thousands of families*
 - *This campus would be place of San Jose, if San Jose will not be here anymore*
 - *There are no details, hope there is an answer*
 - *They understand of this commission, but the people are the greatest assets and you never mention people or how you talk about this project*
- *Celgian*
 - *Have been in this area for a long time, you are tearing up this city*
 - *You have no compassion, the City does not represent us*
 - *The City is allowing them to buy San Jose*
 - *They will fight this project*
 - *All this area, have lived and worked in this area*

- *Olga*
 - *Runs a small business in SJ*
 - *As a business woman and engineer*
 - *She needs Google, need business, not crime and tagging on her walls*
 - *Needs a normal community*
 - *Wants business here, needs the community overall propensity and it can happen*
 - *Progress comes with changes and it could be hard for people*
- *Brian Jesus*
 - *Concern about the history*
 - *From Orange County*
 - *Impressed with SJ of Latin*
 - *A lot of people don't have time to speak here*
 - *You worry about building Google, it will be fake and ugly building, will be in the middle of a historic City*
 - *San Jose has been doing great without Google*
 - *San Jose and its Culture is beautiful, and Google won't help*
- *John Mitchell*
 - *PAC*SJ*
 - *Situation of document of the historic resources*
 - *Digital scanning of building*
 - *Like the commission, the City adopt a policy that any type of development of historic building*
 - *Diridon Station itself, a few months ago at a VTA meeting how they will treat it with BART, elevate the track over Santa Clara, add four tracks east, which necessitate the movement of the Diridon Station*
 - *Going east from the Station is where the Google plans on having an office*
- *Eliberto Quamcho*
 - *Comudad*
 - *John Lick and grew up on the east side and have seen all these dramatic changes because of tech companies*
 - *Tech companies are making profit off culture, will cost all the residents, students feel like they can't live here*
 - *Trying to teach, the money they make as teacher, won't be able to afford to live here*
 - *Companies like Google, Adobe are driving rent and driving out people, it's a slap in the face*

- *There is a whole population of homeless people, will get arrested*
- *Their culture and history should not be displaced by corporation*

Commissioner Discussion:

- *Commissioner Raynsford*
 - *This is a huge project*
 - *There is a larger discussion about Silicon Valley in general*
 - *Focus on narrowing on history and memory*
 - *Christopher building, transition housing*
 - *An architectural landmark, not old enough, but related to housing*
 - *All the different kinds of people and labor struggle, have some kind of a memory, that will be transformed with this project*
 - *There are a lot of empty vacant parcels, building new things will create new memory*
- *Commissioner Royer*
 - *Survey uses 45 years instead of 50*
 - *Through the survey are you including murals and signs*
 - *They have observed signs and murals in this area*
 - *There is one sign*
 - *There are many vacant lots and surface parking, for opportunity for redevelopment*
 - *When you redevelop those vacant parcels, massing and height should consider adjacent historic resources*
 - *Does not want Diridon Station to be dwarfed by the new development*
- *Ricardo (Google)*
 - *There are some newer murals*
- *Commissioner Arnold*
 - *San Jose Water Company building*
 - *Bhavesh, there was a HP permit, want to do some work on it for community first use from the existing entitlement*
 - *Relocation in the future, poor house bistro, there are some residents, and their relocation*
 - *Chase, have only done the architectural review, no formal recommendation on properties of those sites; the work is independent of the applicant's project, they are here to objectively evaluate the project under CEQA*

- *Concerns about the people who are residents of those properties listed on HRI*
- *As you plan for the future, preservation of history and culture should be considered and not just new buildings*
 - *Ricardo is working with tenant, most of occupant were tenant owners and there are two tenants they are helping*
- *Commissioner Polcyn*
 - *This is a huge development project, multiple maps showing different information, trying to digest everything, and filter down what is the expectation of commission*
 - *Commission empathizes with the public*
 - *Our role is important as some of this is culturally important, so how do you translate the cultural part of history?*
 - *Looking at the size of the project,*
 - *What would be helpful is to break the project down in phases and have different meetings to review each of those areas*
 - *This is a 20-year process, but might be longer than that, it would be nice to know what the intent of the phased development built out would be.*
 - *Concept of height should be noted and how it affects local neighborhood, Lake House Historic District, Diridon and Water company buildings*
 - *Commission has lost most of the battle regarding height adjacent to City Landmark buildings.*
 - *Future towers would diminish the value of historic resources*
 - *Tribal Resources*
 - *This area was first inhabited by the Ohlone Indians and the cultural history should be considered.*
- *Commissioner Boehm*
 - *Did read studies that will be taking place, there is some assurance due to those studies*
 - *It is a land with a lot of history with Ohlone Indians*
 - *Consider how to honor those people, as well as Spanish and Mexican*
 - *The town was the first Puebla, 1777, which is 200+ years of history*
 - *History started close to Cesar Chavez*
 - *Santa Clara which turns into Alameda is the road that they walked, how do you mark and honor that (statue or marker)*
 - *There are artists in the audience who could be recruited with high value of murals, so have mural art as part of the proposed building design*

- *Will the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)*
 - *Analyze the architecture of the buildings?*
 - *It talks about overall design and impacts on historic resources*
- *Would like to see the architectural identity of existing historic buildings*
- *Will the years built be included in the historic evaluation to identify age of properties?*
- *Will the Historic significance be recognized when adjacent to City Landmark buildings?*
- *Size and massing will be an important consideration*
- *Number of historic organizations in San Jose, PAC*SJ, California Pioneer of Santa Clara Count are active organizations who would be interested in finding out more about this project*
- *When building housing*
 - *Will it be open to Google employees only or to public?*
 - *The housing is not for Google and affordable housing*
- *Applicant response: The Station is not within the Google project boundary and the applicant has been coordinating with that group to understand the details*
- *Commission concerns about the Landmark Station is noted*
- *Compatibility*
 - *Project looks at height, if there is a historic landmark, the new building will be compatible*
- *Commissioner Saum*
 - *Unlike other public hearing, they are not being asked for a recommendation, meeting is just to provide additional comments*
 - *Most of the questions and comments will be addressed in the EIR scope*
 - *For the last three years I have chaired this Commission and am now vice president of the neighborhood association, west of the project, 3/4 miles away, have been a renter for 11 years in the area and therefore am focused around this area*
 - *There is an opportunity for a historic analysis*
 - *Glad that murals and signs are given more historic consideration*
 - *34 structures are on Historic Resources Inventory in the project site area*
 - *They will develop a Master Planed design for the project which will be developed in phases and hopefully those buildings will go before the HLC for adjacency to the historic resources*
 - *We should emphasize design criteria and analyze in terms of compatibility*

- *When adjacent to historic resources, the scale and mass needs to match*
- *Important to consider maximum height and infill development*
- *Work with existing buildings, structures and cultures*
- *I also represent SAGG and know that the analysis is in the EIR and DISC*
- *Diridon and DISC needs to be addressed in this project*
- *In the Development of Design Guidelines, historic design guidelines should get incorporated; the downtown historic guidelines should be extended as well*
- *Lakehouse City Landmark District should be considered*
- *There is a lot of historic context in this area, diligent analysis helps the City embrace the cultural resources and can only improve the project.*
- *This project would go before HLC*
- *Early referral helps them to provide comments sooner rather than later*

Chair Saum requested ending comments from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Polcyn*
 - *Are there Design Guidelines? – Got a response stating “yes there are DSAP, in the process of an update.”*
 - *Diagram, only has the maximum allowance height, there are some high buildings, this concern them, would like to specifically what are the plans and proposal?*
- *Commissioner Arnold*
 - *Break this up the development in phases, a lot of information right now*
- *Commissioner Royer*
 - *Suggest, viewing this as an infill instead of a redevelopment project to bring in the existing culture and what is currently in this area*
- *Commissioner Raynsford*
 - *Not sure if infill is correct, because so little to fill*
 - *Needs to be careful urban design in relates to the urban fabric, especially with the Diridon Station*
 - *Google's rendering has the station as the axis, but depends on the height of the buildings*
 - *Someone needs to fill in the dialogue between Google and DISC*
 - *Might need to push back against engineer with multiple Tract maps*
 - *Likes the idea of cultural places near parks*
 - *What is the general sense of the urban design*
 - *Seems like hotel near SAP off to the side, shouldn't it be the urban center*
 - *Integration of the park required as there is a lot of opportunity to tie those together, not just build a giant glass building next to the park*

- *Commissioner Boehm*
 - *Height is a criteria factor, maximum height based on TERPS*
 - *Will seek variety, won't be a solid plane*
 - *Page 7, has listed some structures, for example 56 Autumn Street, that will be analyzed*

- b. **Annual Work Plan.** Discuss the annual historic preservation Work Plan. Review the prior year Certified Local Government (CLG) work plans.

PROJECT MANAGER, JULIET ARROYO, HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Commission review last year's CLG Report and discuss this year's Work Plan.

Attachment: [Draft Work Plan 2020, dated 1-6-2020](#)

The Commission overall liked the work plan.

Staff (Juliet Arroyo, HPO) presented draft work plan and stated that the annual CLG report was due on April 17th. It will be brought before the HLC in February and March for comments.

She further stated that staff is working with an intern to update HRI and will work on technical bulletins next for interactive HRI as well as Guidelines for historic reports. Focus in 2020 would be to get citywide survey-depending on funding by Council.

Commissioner Raynsford:

Citywide survey should include survey of 1st street and extend to all properties south of I-280. We could take help of students and others to help with surveys. We could even request Google to help with those.

Commissioner Polcyn:

Identify the Conservation areas which have potential significant historic resources and work with Code Enforcement to prevent them from being damaged or destroyed.

Staff (Juliet Arroyo): Yes, I am working on getting an eligibility list as once listed on HRI the identified properties receive a higher level of scrutiny. We will identify areas which are significant.

Polcyn: Website could be upgraded to reflect the areas

Staff JA: Early referral station area will be brought to HLC in March meeting. Design Guidelines to be prepared for the proposed amendment to the Diridon Station Area Plan will be brought before HLC. Google Master Planned Development will follow best design practices, which is separate from the Diridon Station Area Plan.

Commissioner Chair Saum:

The Google master plan and survey to be put in an accessible format. Mayor Ricardo conveyed to Chair Saum to provide a scope of what was needed, and they will make it happen. Make HLC more interactive. AB 900 will streamline approval of permits for Google but not without historical repercussions. Shorten local approval authority, San Carlos area has already been incorporated.

Staff: Need more data to backup certified by HLC for authenticity and quality of work. Promote historic preservation and minimize local control.

Commissioner Saum: Just like the City's ADU Amnesty program and ADU allies, we could advocate for Historic Preservation, Landmark designations and Mills Act Contracts and provide email and contact numbers of people who could provide all the information so that the people don't go seeking around for answers.

For City's non-historic properties, code enforcement sits too long.

Commissioner Raynsford: I would like to find an easy way to notify them of properties. For example, 546 West Julian Street.

Commissioner Polcyn: Looking to Google for help and support by digitizing all the properties on the HRI list.

4. REFERRALS FROM CITY COUNCIL, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS, OR OTHER AGENCIES

No Items

5. OPEN FORUM

Members of the public are invited to speak on any item that does not appear on today's Agenda and that is within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Commission. The Commission cannot engage in any substantive discussion or take any formal action in response to the public comment. The Commission can only ask questions or respond to statements to the extent necessary to determine whether to: (1) refer the matter to staff for follow-up; (2) request staff to report back on a matter at a subsequent meeting; or (3) direct staff to place the item on a future agenda. Each member of the public may fill out a speaker's card and has up to two minutes to address the Commission.

Chris Giangreco addressed the Commission regarding the Century 21 Theater reuse plans. He suggested that the Commission could go out and get a tour of the building. He was working on successfully repurposing the theater building. He added that it is an iconic Historic Landmark Structure and they are working on getting it back to function as a movie theater.

6. GOOD AND WELFARE

a. Report from Secretary, Planning Commission, and City Council

- i. Past Agenda Items: Winchester Ranch project; Almaden Corner Hotel project; Tribute Hotel project
- ii. Future Potential Agenda Items: Station Area Plan
- iii. Summary of communications received by the Historic Landmarks Commission.

b. Technical Preservation Bulletins: Plan for Bulletin No. 1, Guidelines for Historic Reports

c. Report from Committees

- i. Design Review Subcommittee: Next meeting February 19, 2020.

d. Approval of Action Minutes

- i. **Recommendation:** [Approval of Action Minutes for the Historic Landmarks Commission Meeting of December 4, 2019.](#)

The Commission unanimously approved the action minutes, as amended, for the December 4, 2019 HLC meeting.

Discussion on Amended Action Minutes stated below:

Project File Nos. HP19-002 & H19-009: Chair Saum stated that the minutes should be corrected on page 4 to state that the project plans did not provide any egress windows for potential bedrooms with 3 to 4 bathrooms shown in the attic. Also, individual plan sheets showed a six-foot tall fence in the front yard, whereas oral presentation said otherwise. So, there was discrepancy which should be clarified as there was misrepresentation of the submitted plans. The impact to the historic resource with potential increase in the number of bedrooms and occupancy per the 17 or so bathrooms provided was emphasized repeatedly by the commissioners. Lack of egress windows in the attic and potential blocking of the historic resource due to six-foot tall fence in the front yard were addressed by the Commission and should be added to the amended minutes.

e. Status of Circulating Environmental Documents

No Items

ADJOURNMENT

CITY OF SAN JOSÉ CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND COMMITTEE ROOMS

The Code of Conduct is intended to promote open meetings that welcome debate of public policy issues being discussed by the City Council, Redevelopment Agency Board, their Committees, and City Boards and Commissions in an atmosphere of fairness, courtesy, and respect for differing points of view.

1. Public Meeting Decorum:

- a) Persons in the audience will refrain from behavior which will disrupt the public meeting. This will include making loud noises, clapping, shouting, booing, hissing or engaging in any other activity in a manner that disturbs, disrupts or impedes the orderly conduct of the meeting.
- b) Persons in the audience will refrain from creating, provoking or participating in any type of disturbance involving unwelcome physical contact.
- c) Persons in the audience will refrain from using cellular phones and/or pagers while the meeting is in session.
- d) Appropriate attire, including shoes and shirts are required in the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms at all times.
- e) Persons in the audience will not place their feet on the seats in front of them.
- f) No food, drink (other than bottled water with a cap), or chewing gum will be allowed in the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms, except as otherwise pre-approved by City staff.
- g) All persons entering the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms, including their bags, purses, briefcases and similar belongings, may be subject to search for weapons and other dangerous materials.

2. Signs, Objects or Symbolic Material:

- a) Objects and symbolic materials, such as signs or banners, will be allowed in the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms, with the following restrictions:
 - No objects will be larger than 2 feet by 3 feet.
 - No sticks, posts, poles or other such items will be attached to the signs or other symbolic materials.
 - The items cannot create a building maintenance problem or a fire or safety hazard.
- b) Persons with objects and symbolic materials such as signs must remain seated when displaying them and must not raise the items above shoulder level, obstruct the view or passage of other attendees, or otherwise disturb the business of the meeting.
- c) Objects that are deemed a threat to persons at the meeting or the facility infrastructure are not allowed. City staff is authorized to remove items and/or individuals from the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms if a threat exists or is perceived to exist. Prohibited items include, but are not limited to: firearms (including replicas and antiques), toy guns, explosive material, and ammunition; knives and other edged weapons; illegal drugs and drug paraphernalia; laser pointers, scissors, razors, scalpels, box cutting knives, and other cutting tools; letter openers, corkscrews, can openers with points, knitting needles, and hooks; hairspray, pepper spray, and aerosol containers; tools; glass containers; and large backpacks and suitcases that contain items unrelated to the meeting.

CITY OF SAN JOSÉ CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND COMMITTEE ROOMS (CONT'D)

3. Addressing the Council, Redevelopment Agency Board, Committee, Board or Commission:
 - a) Persons wishing to speak on an agenda item or during open forum are requested to complete a speaker card and submit the card to the City Clerk or other administrative staff at the meeting.
 - b) Meeting attendees are usually given two (2) minutes to speak on any agenda item and/or during open forum; the time limit is in the discretion of the Chair of the meeting and may be limited when appropriate. Applicants and appellants in land use matters are usually given more time to speak.
 - c) Speakers should discuss topics related to City business on the agenda, unless they are speaking during open forum.
 - d) Speakers' comments should be addressed to the full body. Requests to engage the Mayor, Council Members, Board Members, Commissioners or Staff in conversation will not be honored. Abusive language is inappropriate.
 - e) Speakers will not bring to the podium any items other than a prepared written statement, writing materials, or objects that have been inspected by security staff.
 - f) If an individual wishes to submit written information, he or she may give it to the City Clerk or other administrative staff at the meeting.
 - g) Speakers and any other members of the public will not approach the dais at any time without prior consent from the Chair of the meeting.

Failure to comply with this Code of Conduct which will disturb, disrupt or impede the orderly conduct of the meeting may result in removal from the meeting and/or possible arrest.