

## **AMENDED**

### **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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 displince 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 was not easy for Commission Boehm to understand as the properties were listed addresses. He would have preferred to classify properties by historic classification, and to list properties by the projects proposal:*
    - a. *Those to be preserved*
    - b. *Those to be demolished*
    - c. *Those to be moved/relocated*
  - *Are the “Corney”, the “Hellwig” and the “Waterworks” the only three buildings to be preserved?*

- *Of the 38 properties that are listed in the HRI as being structures of merit or landmarks, only three are slated to be preserved. That equates to less than 10% of the properties being preserved.*
- *Homes dating from 1890 are located along West San Fernando Street- house numbers 398, 394, 436, 426, 420 and 416 should be preserved.*
- *The building at 60 Stockton seems to be historic*
  - *Sarah Hahn, Chief Historian, said that it was in the buffer area but was not evaluated*
  - *Buildings within 200 ft. of the project area were evaluated for potential impact to adjacency.*
- *Andy Wang confirmed that 38 properties are age eligible with the Google Project area.*
- *There is concern about the number of buildings slated for demolition. Smaller frame houses could be moved/relocated.*
- *The three buildings being preserved were built in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Please consider preserving houses from the 19<sup>th</sup> century.*
- *Commissioner Boehm advocated for the Diridon Station, although it is outside the Google Project area, it could be relocated and used or adaptively re-used as one of the buildings in the Google Project area.*
- *Ohlone and native Americans were known to live near the banks of the Guadalupe River, and remains were found near the Hyatt Place hotel near the project area. Consider building a demonstration shelter or even village of the Ohlones, or at least a statue or a sign to commemorate the Ohlones.*
- *West Julian houses (553, 559, 563, 567) were built in the 1800s. Please consider saving them.*
- *Downtown Design Guidelines cite heights and materials for historic areas. The glazing on the renderings is predominant. Please consider using stucco, stone, masonry, or wood facades.*
- *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*
  - *With only 3 properties to be preserved, it does not seem like a good utilization of historic resources.*
  - *Since this is an important historic area, history can be told by restoring and preserving buildings, adding signs (historical markers), creating a “history walk,” perhaps creating an Ohlone Village, or an Ohlone dwelling (replica) or a statue to the Ohlones. The Santa Clara Street, the Alameda has been thoroughfare since the 1790s. Consider placing a marker to commemorate the horse railway that was used in the 1860s, or a marker to commemorate Father Catala and Ohlones that planted willow trees on the border of the street in the 1790s.*
- *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.*