

From: [Hill, Shannon](#)
To: [Downtown West Project](#)
Subject: FW: Google ADEIR4 Roundtable Follow-Up
Date: Tuesday, August 18, 2020 12:54:12 PM

From: Peak, Dana
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 8:09 PM
To: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Re: Google ADEIR4 Roundtable Follow-Up

Hi Shannon,
The station seems to be far enough away from Montgomery St that compliance with the Downtown Design Guidelines is probably sufficient.

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: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 5:12 PM
To: Peak, Dana <Dana.Peak@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: RE: Google ADEIR4 Roundtable Follow-Up

Hi Dana,

Thank you! Sorry, I didn't realize you had a question until I went to forward your responses to ESA. Refer to the attached Conceptual Land Use Plan from ADEIR3 showing "D1," which has sense been removed from the project because these parcels are owned by Caltrain, and the applicant no longer plans to purchase them. The change is explained in the introduction for ADEIR4.

Thanks,

Shannon Hill, Planner
Planning, Building & Code Enforcement | Environmental Review Section
City of San José | 200 East Santa Clara Street
Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov | (408) 535 - 7872

From: Peak, Dana

Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 2:08 PM
To: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: Re: Google ADEIR4 Roundtable Follow-Up

Hi Shannon,

See attached and responses below.

1. Refer to the attached email from Karl. Please edit according to your understanding of the status of the referenced permits and email back to me.

See attached.

1. Is it possible to modify/modernize the Standard Condition of Approval (SCA) (aka: standard permit conditions) language regarding documentation (e.g., Compact Disks)? Note: I can ping the implementation team to determine if this would be an issue. However, you could provide suggested modifications to support that discussion.

These are our standard historic preservation conditions:

1. **Historic Mitigation. Prior to issuance of any demolition permit, the following mitigation measures shall be met to the satisfaction of the Planning Director:**
 1. **The Permittee shall advertise the building for relocation. A dollar amount equal to the estimated cost of demolition as certified by a licensed contractor and any associated Planning Permit fees for relocation shall be offered to the recipient of the building. The Permittee shall provide evidence to the Historic Preservation Officer that an advertisement has been placed in a newspaper of general circulation, posted on an appropriate website, and posted at the site for a period of no less than 30 days.**
 2. **Preservation organizations and other interested parties shall be contacted at least 30 days prior to demolition activities and given the opportunity to examine the building and salvage surplus elements not being incorporated in the project for possible re-use in the rehabilitation of the buildings of similar age and style. Documentation of the salvage offers shall be submitted to the City's Historic Preservation Officer.**
 3. **Preparation of a full photo-documentation of the building is required using the Secretary of Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Architectural and Engineering Documentation: HABS/HAER Standards, and shall be submitted to the City's Historic Preservation Officer. The photo-documentation shall be provided to the History Museum of San José.**

I think that the condition that was in the Draft EIR (which I can't find now) was the one for Structures of Merit, but those wouldn't be CEQA mitigation measures, they would be in the project approval conditions.

1. You suggested the applicant consider nominating 40 South Montgomery Street in order to commit to preservation. Has there been any progress made on this discussion?

No there hasn't. Landmark designation can only be initiated by the City Council, Landmarks Commission or the property owner. Google would need to lodge an application, it would

be too political for the HLC and CC.

1. Do you agree with the determinations made in the Downtown West Mixed-Use Plan—Historic Resource Move Feasibility memo (dated June 14, 2020) and the subsequent memo for 40 S. Montgomery?

Yes. Garden City has a long history of doing this type of thing in SJ. However the first feasibility memo says they were contracted by David J Powers. That should probably be changed. Also, it says not specific sites have been identified, yet there is the separate ARG memo RE sites. These two memos should appropriately reflect each other.

1. Are Contributing Sites (CS) CEQA Resources?

Yes and no. Please refer to the General Plan Historic Resources section (LU 13, LU14). Contributing Structures in a Conservation Area are not CEQA resources (LU14.6 under Historic Structures of Lesser Significance). Contributing Structures in a Landmark District are CEQA resources. If there are any Contributing Structures NOT related to any kind of district, those will not be treated as CEQA resources.

1. Review changes made to project description and Cultural Resources section for 150 S. Montgomery. Let me know if you have any concerns or comments.

Done.

1. Recent change that Block D1 will not be covered by the DWDSG. However, saying standards from DDG would still apply. Need to determine if compliance with DDG would be sufficient to address historic adjacency (Note: I'll be sending related questions to John Tu regarding incorporation into PD Zoning and GDP). Please let me know if you think DDG compliance is sufficient.

I don't see Block D1 on the attached Figure. Which area are we talking about?

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: Hill, Shannon <Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov>

Sent: Friday, August 14, 2020 11:34 AM

To: Peak, Dana <Dana.Peak@sanjoseca.gov>

Subject: Google ADEIR4 Roundtable Follow-Up

Hi Dana,

ESA's for resolving outstanding issues is Monday (8/17) by noon if at all possible, but I would say COB.

1. Refer to the attached email from Karl. Please edit according to your understanding of the status of the referenced permits and email back to me.
2. Is it possible to modify/modernize the Standard Condition of Approval (SCA) (aka: standard permit conditions) language regarding documentation (e.g., Compact Disks)? Note: I can ping the implementation team to determine if this would be an issue. However, you could provide suggested modifications to support that discussion.
3. You suggested the applicant consider nominating 40 South Montgomery Street in order to commit to preservation. Has there been any progress made on this discussion?
4. Do you agree with the determinations made in the Downtown West Mixed-Use Plan—Historic Resource Move Feasibility memo (dated June 14, 2020) and the subsequent memo for 40 S. Montgomery?
5. Are Contributing Sites (CS) CEQA Resources?
6. Review changes made to project description and Cultural Resources section for 150 S. Montgomery. Let me know if you have any concerns or comments.
7. Recent change that Block D1 will not be covered by the DWDSG. However, saying standards from DDG would still apply. Need to determine if compliance with DDG would be sufficient to address historic adjacency (Note: I'll be sending related questions to John Tu regarding incorporation into PD Zoning and GDP). Please let me know if you think DDG compliance is sufficient.

Thanks!

Shannon Hill, Planner

Planning, Building & Code Enforcement | Environmental Review Section

City of San José | 200 East Santa Clara Street

Shannon.Hill@sanjoseca.gov | (408) 535 - 7872