

From: [Arroyo, Juliet](#)
To: ["Sarah Hahn"](#); [Becky Urbano](#); [Charles Chase](#)
Cc: [Hill, Shannon](#); [Keyon, David](#)
Subject: RE: HPO comments on ARG technical report.
Date: Monday, March 2, 2020 5:41:55 PM

Hello

1. I did a site visit this weekend, and the three properties I questioned HRI eligibility, I would agree with the Historic report that those three properties are not eligible for the HRI.
2. I reviewed the 200-foot properties list and did a site visit and found:
 - 338 Royal, would qualify for HRI as a Structure of Merit, due to loss of setting, it would not qualify as CCL, but it has good craftsmanship integrity
 - 334 Royal, would not qualify for the HRI, due to lacking in style, features, integrity, and associations
 - 564/562 West San Carlos, would qualify for HRI due to early modern style and industrial/commercial context, classification to be determined
 - 550 W San Carlos, would not qualify for HRI, out of context for commercial/industrial in area, WWII era, and not enough context for mid-century citywide
 - 541 W Julian, continued eligibility for HRI, has historic associations against contexts and integrity.
 - 60 Stockton, would not be eligible for the HRI due to integrity issues.
 - 101 Delmas, likely eligible for the HRI as a Structure of Merit, context=citywide neighborhood corner markets
 - 345 N Autumn, not eligible for HRI due to lack of integrity.
 - 199 & 195 N Autumn, likely eligible for the HRI as a CCL
 - 151 N Autumn, likely eligible for the HRI as a Structure of Merit, due to one story warehouse property type and good integrity and associations
 - 160 N Montgomery, already identified as a CCL
 - 190 N Montgomery, outside period, lack of associations, would not qualify under Modernism context
 - 210 & 270 N Montgomery, likely qualifies as a Structure of Merit, due to lack of integrity for CCL
 - 263, 211& 255 N Autumn, likely Structures of Merit, alterations
 - 203 N Autumn, likely CCL
 - 533 W San Carlos, not enough style definition and features to qualify for the HRI

Yes, I would agree that the collection of residential homes along Autumn, and vicinity, would qualify as a City Landmark District, and I believe this was identified in earlier surveys. It would include all CCL in the immediate area, and includes all Structures of Merit as contributors.

Thanks Juliet

Juliet M. Arroyo
Historic Preservation Officer
City of San Jose
408-535-7847

From: Sarah Hahn <S.Hahn@ARGSF.com>

Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 11:22 AM

To: Arroyo, Juliet <Juliet.Arroyo@sanjoseca.gov>; 'Becky Urbano' <BUrbano@esassoc.com>; Charles Chase <C.Chase@ARGSF.com>

Cc: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: RE: HPO comments on ARG technical report.

[External Email]

Received, thank you.

Sarah Hahn, Senior Associate

Architectural Historian & Preservation Planner

ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES GROUP

415.421.1680 x245

www.argsf.com | [Facebook](#) | [LinkedIn](#) | [Twitter](#) | [Instagram](#)

From: Arroyo, Juliet <Juliet.Arroyo@sanjoseca.gov>

Sent: Thursday, February 27, 2020 3:56 PM

To: 'Becky Urbano' <BUrbano@esassoc.com>; Charles Chase <C.Chase@ARGSF.com>; Sarah Hahn <S.Hahn@ARGSF.com>

Cc: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: [BLOCKED] HPO comments on ARG technical report.

Hello – here are my comments on the technical historic report. Feel free to call or email with any questions. Or send responses back in track changes to this document.

I am still working on the 200 foot buffer survey area and hope to get that to you tomorrow.

Thanks Juliet

Juliet M. Arroyo

Historic Preservation Officer

City of San Jose

408-535-7847

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.