

From: [Keyon, David](#)
To: [Downtown West Project](#)
Subject: Fw: HPO comments on ARG technical report.
Date: Friday, August 21, 2020 11:22:04 AM

David Keyon

Principal Planner, Environmental Review
City of San Jose
(408) 535-7898 david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov

From: Becky Urbano <BUrbano@esassoc.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 2:00 PM
To: Arroyo, Juliet <Juliet.Arroyo@sanjoseca.gov>; 'Sarah Hahn' <S.Hahn@ARGSF.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]

One other item, Juliet. You mentioned that 160 North Montgomery is already identified as a CCL. The information that we have been using states that it has been identified as an Identified Structure. Is there a recent evaluation that has been done and if so, can that be sent to ESA and ARG for inclusion in the reports?

Thanks.

Becky Urbano

Senior Architectural Historian

-

510.393.9274 mobile

burbano@esassoc.com

NEW! www.esassoc.com

From: Becky Urbano
Sent: Tuesday, March 3, 2020 1:42 PM
To: 'Arroyo, Juliet' <Juliet.Arroyo@sanjoseca.gov>; 'Sarah Hahn' <S.Hahn@ARGSF.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.

Thank you, Juliet.

For clarification, the potential CCL District on Autumn – are you referring the residences on the west side of North Autumn OR are you referring to the residences on the east side of North Autumn/Autumn Court?

Thanks, again.

Becky Urbano

Senior Architectural Historian

-
510.393.9274 mobile

burbano@esassoc.com

NEW! www.esassoc.com

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

Sent: Monday, March 2, 2020 5:42 PM

To: 'Sarah Hahn' <S.Hahn@ARGSF.com>; 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.

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.

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