Appendix C

Historic Evaluations
INTRODUCTION

At the request of Anderson Architects, TreanorHL prepared this report to evaluate the proposed design at 4146 Mitzi Drive, San Jose, California (APN 29916001). The existing two-story residence on the subject parcel was evaluated for historic significance by Archives & Architecture in July 2018, and found eligible for San Jose City Landmark designation and for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources. Therefore, the building is considered a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines.

This report provides a project description and an analysis of the proposed design which consists of the onsite relocation and the renovation of the historic residence into six units, in addition to the construction of a new multi-unit residential building with an underground parking garage. TreanorHL staff has reviewed the proposed project for compliance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation, and proposed design recommendations for improving the project’s historic compatibility.
METHODOLOGY
TreonorHL conducted a site visit on July 12, 2019. Staff also reviewed the following documents: the July 2018 DPR form prepared by Archives & Architecture; the Memorandum from Rosalynn Hughey, Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, dated October 3, 2018; a set of design documents from Anderson Architects, Inc., dated June 17, 2019; and the preservation plan by John S. Tabuena-Frolli, dated March 12, 2019.

SIGNIFICANCE SUMMARY
The residence at 4146 Mitzi Drive is not currently listed on any local, state, or national survey of historic resources. However, the property was recently found eligible for the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 3 (Design and Construction), and as a San Jose City Landmark. Constructed in 1868 for Sylvester and Kate Graves, the house is associated with the early agricultural development of Santa Clara Valley from the Early American Period through World War II. The house is also a distinctive example of early Italianate residential architecture in the region.\(^1\) The property maintains sufficient integrity to exhibit the qualities that existed at the time of construction around 1868.

The house maintains its significant original location in West San Jose to the east of Saratoga Avenue, a historic thoroughfare. It remains within a large parcel that provides separation from the now densely suburban neighborhood of single and multi-family residential buildings nearby that were developed after World War II and has remaining historic trees that appear associated with the original ranch headquarters. The house and property continue to embody a rural nineteenth-century residential feeling and continue to illustrate the property’s associations with the Graves family ranch and settlement. Although the house has been expanded to the rear and rear side, and the front porch lost, these alterations are reversible, and the original house itself has significant integrity with its Italianate design. Its trim, although possibly renovated in the late 1970s, is intact and with the underlying structure and fenestration represents the era’s workmanship and use of materials, and its original character-defining materials have been preserved, including its siding, doors, windows, and trim. The property continues to embody an authentic historic resource.\(^2\)

Character-defining features of the property include the following:
- Two story, complex massing
- Wood-frame construction
- Steeply pitched cross gable roof with return eaves
- Block modillions at eaves
- Channel-rustic redwood siding with quoins
- Asymmetrical front (west) façade
- A wide offset porch
- Tall single- and/or double-hung windows with wide trimmed casings, bracketed sills, and deep hoods on the main wing
- Four-over-four second floor windows with arched upper sash and one with a pedimented hood
- A set of three window units set in a bay and capped with a decorative wood railing on the front façade
- Front door with arched panels and a two-part arched glass transom

\(^1\) Frank Maggi, Archives & Architecture, LLC, *Sylvester & Kate Graves House DPR Form*, July 9, 2019, page 10.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The propose project includes moving and converting the existing historic residence on site and constructing a new four-story apartment building at the east end of the parcel. The historic residence at 4146 Mitzi Drive will be relocated towards the intersection of Mitzi Drive and Ranchero Way and rotated slightly towards the southwest to face the intersection. The building will be converted into a multi-family building with six units. The one-story enclosed porch on the northeast, and the one-story addition on the east will be removed, a new foundation will be constructed in conjunction with the construction of the subterranean garage, and the building’s exterior will be rehabilitated. The non-historic one-story garage/storage structure will be demolished.

The underground garage will be constructed in phases to facilitate keeping the house on the site. This however does mean the historic house will first be relocated to the eastern side of the property while the garage is constructed on the western side of site. Once the garage construction is complete on the western side of the property, the building will be moved to its final location near the western property line and construction will be undertaken on the subterranean garage at the eastern side of the site.

The new apartment building will be positioned behind the historic residence along the north and east property lines. The four-story building will have 40 units over a subterranean garage. The proposed building will be irregular in plan and have a flat roof. The exterior walls will be clad in painted smooth stucco, horizontal composition wood siding/rain screen, horizontal fiber cement siding (to match the historic house), and stone veneer. The two-story tall section with windows/storefronts at the southwest corner will act as the main entrance to the building. The façades feature punched windows, sliding doors, and metal balcony guardrails. The underground garage would have access via ramp from the northwest portion of the property along Mitzi Drive.

Figure 2. The proposed project, perspective from corner of Mitzi Drive and Ranchero Way (Anderson Architects, 2019).
SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR’S STANDARDS ANALYSIS

As discussed above, 4146 Mitzi Drive appears individually eligible for listing in the CRHR under Criterion 1 (Events) and Criterion 3 (Design and Construction), and as a San Jose City Landmark. Therefore, the proposed project must comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation which establishes compatibility. The ten standards are evaluated below.

1. A property shall be used for its historic purpose or be placed in a new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building and its site and environment.
The proposed project will change the historic resource’s use as a single-family building to multi-family building. This reuse involves the relocation and rehabilitation of the historic building at 4146 Mitzi Drive, and on the parcel. The property’s use will remain residential which is still compatible with its surrounding. The proposed conversion of 4146 Mitzi Drive to a multi-family building does not require significant exterior alterations; the building’s character-defining features will remain unaltered.

The construction of the new multi-family building and entry to the subterranean parking garage will alter the site and environment of the historic house. Archive and Architecture found that under Criterion 1, and although only a remnant of the original site remains, that “given the age of the structure (140 years old), its prominence in an early publication of prominent sites in Santa Clara County (Thompson & West), and the +half-acre site that exists today with broad front and side setbacks that includes large trees that are likely associated with the early ranch headquarters, it appears that the property may be eligible for the California Register...” The proposed project would develop most of the site, diminish the broad front and side setbacks and removed the large trees. Therefore, the project only partially meets Standard 1.

2. **The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of historic materials or alterations of features and spaces that characterize a property shall be avoided.**

Overall, the project does not call for the removal of character-defining historic materials or features of the historic building. At the rear, the project will remove a porch which was enclosed in the 1970s. The enclosed porch is not a character-defining feature according to previous reports. The porch is on a side elevation that is not currently visible from public right-of-way. While it is likely the porch was enclosed with the materials that date pre-1970s – the siding and windows – the use of older materials for enclosing the porch does not elevate this modification to a level of having historic significance. After the relocation, this elevation will be partially hidden behind the garage ramp cover. The removal of the enclosed porch will not affect the historic character of the property.

The one-story rear extension and the concrete ramp leading to the basement, both non-historic 1970s additions, will also be removed. These removals will not affect the historic character of the property as they were later additions to the building and are not considered character-defining features. Therefore, the project meets Standard 2.

3. **Each property shall be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken.**

No such changes are proposed for the historic resource or the new apartment building. The new building would be contemporary in character and will not create a false sense of historical development. The new front porch structure will be constructed to match original. This work will not create a false sense of historical development and will be guided by photographic and physical evidence. The DPR form includes an illustration from Thompson and West, *Historical Atlas of Santa Clara County* (1876) that depicts the Sylvester House. The form also notes that stored on site appear...
to be pieces of the former porch. These elements will be used to provide documentation helpful in recreating the porch. Therefore, the proposed project meets Standard 3.

4. *Most properties change over time; those changes that have acquired historic significance in their own right shall be retained and preserved.*

4146 Mitzi Drive has received some additions and alterations in the 1970s: the rear porch was enclosed, a one-story extension was added at the rear, a larger foundation/basement and a concrete ramp were added, the multi-lite windows on the rear wing were replaced. The garage/shop building was constructed in the mid-20th century. However, none of the changes have acquired historic significance. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 4.

5. *Distinctive features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.*

The distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize this property are found on the exterior façades. Most of the materials and exterior character-defining features will be preserved and repaired. If deteriorated beyond repair, they will be replaced in-kind to match the existing size, shape, and material. Therefore, the proposed project meets Standard 5.

6. *Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.*

The architectural drawings refer to the *Existing Condition & Preservation Plan* by Strata Design studio for all preservation details & notes. According to this document, the existing architectural features, such as roof eaves, gutters, doors, windows, railings, siding, and trim will be preserved and repaired in place when possible. If elements deteriorated beyond repair, it recommends replacing in-kind. As proposed, the project complies with Standard 6.

7. *Chemical or physical treatments, such as sandblasting, that cause damage to historic materials shall not be used. The surface cleaning of structures, if appropriate, shall be undertaken using the gentlest means possible.*

The architectural drawings refer to the *Existing Condition & Preservation Plan* by Strata Design studio for all preservation details & notes. The *Preservation Plan* does not recommend severe chemical or physical treatments. For removing or reducing lead, light scraping, and sanding was recommended to re-finishing historic materials as outlined in the National Park Service Preservation

---


Brief No. 37, “Appropriate Methods for Reducing Lead-Paint Hazards in Historic Housing.” As proposed, the project complies with Standard 7.

8. *Significant archeological resources affected by a project shall be protected and preserved. If such resources must be disturbed, mitigation measures shall be undertaken.*

There are no known archeological resources on the property. However, should any be encountered during the course of the project, a professional archeologist will be contacted and the resources documented. Therefore, the proposed project complies with Standard 8.

9. *New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment.*

The new four-story apartment building does not destroy historic materials that characterize the historic resource and the new work is clearly differentiated from the old. The proposed building will be generally compatible with the size and scale of the existing house.

The proposed façades the new building appear to be byproducts of the floor plan—the projections and recesses of the surfaces as well as the use of numerous materials result in lack of cohesion. The overall massing and façades appear busy, missing a unifying element.

In terms of compatibility of architectural features, the square-proportions of the proposed windows do not refer to the existing house. Neither the angled main entrance at the southwest corner nor the flat roof of the apartment building refer to the existing building or surrounding residential neighborhood.

The 11 feet tall ramp cover to the north of the historic residence will be painted concrete. The design of this structure appears visually too heavy and modern next to the Italianate house. The use of concrete adjacent to the historic structure is not compatible with historic structure.

See Design Recommendations below.

As proposed, the building does not fully comply with Standard 9.

10. *New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.*

The proposed four-story building and the garage ramp cover are standalone structures. These new buildings will not physically affect the character-defining features of the historic house. If new

---

construction were to be removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic building will be unimpaired, however the setting on the property will remain somewhat altered. Therefore, the proposed project partially complies with Standard 10.

DESIGN RECOMMENDATIONS

The Design Recommendations are based on review of the design documents from Anderson Architects, Inc., dated June 17, 2019 – no design revisions have been reviewed by TreanorHL to date – and the applicant has been working directly with the City to refine the proposed design. In cases of a substantial addition to an existing building or site, the Secretary’s Standards are applied to determine the compatibility of the proposed project with the character-defining features of the existing building. The proposed project retains but relocates the historic structure and proposes the construction of a new four-story apartment complex. The majority of the historic building’s character-defining features will be retained. However, since new construction adjacent to the historic building has the potential to impact the significance of the existing structure, recommendations to enhance the compatibility of the new construction are made below to help the proposed project comply with Standards 1, 9, and 10.

Recommendations to enhance the compatibility of the design:

- Simplify the façade configuration of the new apartment building. Modify the façade to have less undulation and fewer materials, this will allow the new construction to act as a backdrop to the historic residence. The proposed design has many varying planes which make the façade look busy; simplifying the changes in plane will help create a backdrop to highlight the historic structure. This might be achieved by using more cohesive forms and less variety of materials (i.e. using only stucco and horizontal wood siding).
- Investigate using window configurations that reference configurations found on the historic structure. Look at using more vertically-oriented openings, especially on the west (front) and south façades.
- The angled element at the entry to the apartment does not reference any element on the historic architecture or the new design. Consider architectural elements at the entry to the new apartment structure that reference and are compatible with the historic architecture on the site.
- Add vegetation and/or trellises to the ramp structure or consider using a different exterior cladding material to soften the impact of the new structure which is adjacent to the historic building.

Construction process recommendation to protect the building:

To facilitate the construction of the subterranean garage the historic house will be moved twice. During the various moves and during the construction of the garage, the Graves House should be adequately protected from and monitored for damage.

The follow mitigations are typical for avoiding a significant adverse impact when relocating a historic structure:
1. Prepare relocation plans and specifications.

Prior to relocation, a historic preservation architect and a structural engineer shall undertake an existing condition study of the building. The purpose of the study shall be to establish the baseline condition of the building prior to relocation. The documentation shall take the form of written descriptions and visual illustrations, including those physical characteristics of the resource that convey its historic significance and must be protected and preserved, and recommendations for any structural reinforcement, stabilization or protection before the move. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the City of San Jose Planning Division.

To protect the historic resource during its relocation, the project sponsor shall engage a building mover, who has experience moving similar historic structures. The structural engineer who produced the baseline study will review the moving plan and work with the moving company to ensure the building is reinforced/stabilized appropriately for the move.

Once moved to its temporary location, only authorized persons shall have access to the building. Protective fencing and other methods shall be used to protect the building from further damage and deterioration. If the historic preservation architect or structural engineer observe any new damage, an assessment shall be made of the severity of such damage and repairs undertaken if necessary. If the temporary location is on the construction site of the proposed project, protective barriers shall be constructed to further protect the building from potential damage by construction activities including the operation of construction equipment. Construction materials shall be stored away from the historic building. The project sponsor shall convey the importance of protecting the historic building to all construction workers and managers.

When the structure is moved to its final location, again the historic preservation architect or structural engineer will survey the building for any new damage. An assessment shall be made of the severity of such damage and repairs shall be undertaken if necessary. If new construction is still underway on the surrounding site, protective barriers shall be constructed to further protect the building from potential damage by construction activities and equipment. Construction materials shall be stored away from the historic building and the project sponsor shall convey the importance of protecting the historic building to all construction workers and managers.

2. Rehabilitate

Upon the final relocation the historic structure shall be repaired and rehabilitated in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. In particular, the character-defining features shall be restored in a manner that preserves the integrity of the features. Upon completion of the rehabilitation, the Planning Division, City of San Jose, shall review and confirm that the rehabilitation of the structure was completed in conformance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and submit a report to the Historic Landmarks Commission, City of San Jose.

Construction-related activities tied to the underground parking garage, likely could have the potential to produce ground borne vibrations resulting in potentially significant adverse impacts to the historic resource. These impacts can often be mitigated and avoided through the following measures:
1. A historic preservation architect and a structural engineer shall prepare an existing conditions survey to establish the baseline condition of the historic building prior to construction, including the location and extent of any visible cracks or spalls. The documentation shall take the form of written descriptions and photographs, and shall include those physical characteristics of the resources that convey their historic significance and that justify their inclusion on, or eligibility for inclusion on, the California Register of Historical Resources and local register. The documentation shall be reviewed and approved by the City of San Jose’s Historic Preservation Officer, or equivalent.

Any changes to existing conditions will be reported, including, but not limited to, expansion of existing cracks, new spalls, or other exterior deterioration. Monitoring reports shall be submitted to the City’s historic preservation officer, or equivalent on a periodic basis. The structural engineer shall consult with the historic preservation architect, especially if any problems with character defining features of a historic resource are discovered. If in the opinion of the structural engineer, in consultation with the historic preservation architect, substantial adverse impacts to historic resources related to construction activities are found during construction, the monitoring team shall so inform the project sponsor, or sponsor’s designated representative responsible for construction activities, as well as the city’s historic preservation officer, or equivalent. The project sponsor shall adhere to the monitoring team’s recommendations for corrective measures, including halting construction in situations where construction activities would imminently endanger historic resources. The historic preservation officer, or equivalent, shall establish the frequency of monitoring and reporting.

Site visit reports and documents associated with claims processing shall be provided to the City of San Jose’s Historic Preservation Officer, or equivalent.

2. A qualified geologist, or other professional with expertise in ground vibration and its effect on existing structures, shall prepare a study of the potential of vibrations caused by excavation and construction activities associated with the proposed project. Based on the results of the study, specifications regarding the restriction and monitoring of specific construction activities shall be incorporated into the contract. Initial construction activities shall be monitored and if vibrations are above threshold levels, modifications shall be made to reduce vibrations to below established levels. A copy of the study, contract specifications, and monitoring reports shall be provided to the City of San Jose’s Historic Preservation Officer, or equivalent.

3. The historic preservation architect shall establish a training program for construction workers involved in the project that emphasizes the importance of protecting historic resources. This program shall include information on recognizing historic fabric and materials, and directions on how to exercise care when working around and operating equipment near the historic structures, including storage of materials away from historic buildings. It shall also include information on means to reduce vibrations from construction, and monitoring and reporting any potential problems that could affect the historic resources in the area. A provision for establishing this training program shall be incorporated into the contract, and the contract provisions shall be reviewed and approved by the City of San Jose’s Historic Preservation Officer, or equivalent.
CONCLUSION

The project fully complies with Standards 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8; and partially complies with Standards 1, 9 and 10. As stated above, the majority of the character-defining features that contribute to the building’s individual historic integrity will be maintained. However, the proposed designs for the new apartment building and garage ramp cover could be refined to enhance the overall compatibility with the historic structure. With modifications the proposed designs could comply more fully with the Secretary’s Standards, as designed the proposed project is only partially compliant.

The proposed project will further reduce the existing open space around the historic structure. However, the integrity of setting was greatly diminished over previous decades with the subdividing and sell of portions of the original parcel of land. The loss of the open half-acre site and mature trees and the relocation of the building closer to the roads does alter the historic resource’s setting. While this loss may somewhat diminish the property’s integrity relative to its eligibility under Criterion 1, it would not significantly diminish or impact the property’s integrity under Criterion 3. The majority of the aspects of integrity would be retained and overall it is preferable for the building to remain on its original parcel near its original location than to be relocated completely off-site or demolished.
TO: HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

FROM: Rosalynn Hughey
Director of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement

SUBJECT: SPECIAL USE PERMIT (FILE NO. SP18-033)

DATE: October 3, 2018

COUNCIL DISTRICT: 1

RECOMMENDATION

Review the proposed Special Use Permit project plans; receive public comments; and provide recommendations regarding the scope of the analysis for the proposed project, historic analysis, and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review.

BACKGROUND

The proposed Special Use Permit would allow the onsite relocation and conversion of a historic residence (Graves Residence) into a multi-family building with 6 units, the removal of an accessory structure, and the construction a new 28,629 square foot 4-story apartment building with 44 units over a subterranean garage on a 0.6-gross acre site. The Graves Residence will be adaptively reused and rehabilitated to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines.

The property is not listed on any local, state, or national survey of historic resources but may be eligible as a City Landmark. The property was surveyed in late 1973 as a part of the “King Survey” of San Jose but was not included in the City’s listing of historic resources prepared in the late 1970s as it was found to not be located with the City limits at that time. The property was annexed to the City of San Jose in 1980. The attached historic report would support adding this property to the Historic Resources Inventory list as a Candidate City Landmark.

*Sylvester & Kate Graves House*

The house has built by and for Sylvester and Kate Graves in 1867-1868 according to an 1888 publication by biographer H. S. Foote. The property maintains most of its historic integrity pursuant to the National Register's seven aspects of integrity, and therefore continues to exhibit the qualities that existed at the time of construction around 1868. Additional documentation about the series of existing alterations is being prepared and more information will be provided by the applicant upon project revision through the Special Use Permit development permitting process. The house maintains its significant original location in West San Jose to the east of Saratoga Avenue, a historic thoroughfare. It remains within a large parcel that provides separation from the now densely suburban neighborhood of single and multi-family residential buildings nearby that were developed after World War II and has remaining historic trees that appear associated with the original ranch headquarters. The house and property continue to
embbody a rural nineteenth-century residential feeling and continue to illustrate the property’s associations with the Graves family ranch and settlement. Although the house has been expanded to the rear and rear side and the front porch was demolished, these alterations are reversible. The original house itself has significant integrity with its Italianate design. The trim is intact, and with the underlying structure and fenestration, represents the era’s workmanship and use of materials. Additionally, the original character-defining materials have been preserved, including its siding, doors, and windows.

The house is associated with the early agricultural development of Santa Clara Valley from the Early American Period through World War II. Although the ranch lands and ancillary buildings that were a part of this ranch are now gone, the building and site continue to signify and provide a visual sense of this important early period of development when Sylvester and Kate built their large agricultural operation at the site and raised their large family in this farmhouse.

**Site Context and Architecture**

The Graves House is set back on a relatively large parcel of land relative to urban single family residential lots, and within a residential neighborhood of single and multifamily buildings. Other than the Graves Residence itself, no other historic properties or groupings were found in the project vicinity. To the north is the side property line of the two-story Southwinds Apartments, and to the east is the parking area of Rancho Palms Apartments. To the south across Rancho Drive is the large two-story Charter Court Apartments, and to the west across Mitzi Drive is the Hollywood Park Subdivision of single family homes that were built in the 1950s. The south property line at the Rancho Way frontage as well as that at the Mitzi Drive frontage have prefabricated masonry walls that frame a gated entry. The frontages are unimproved. Italianate houses were built locally until the early 1880s, when early Victorian-era design became popular with the advent of platform-frame construction. Large estate farmhouses and many prominent city houses of this era (1860s to 1880s) commonly had two-story front wings and a one or two-story rear wing. The rear section of the Graves House was built at two stories as profiled in the 1876 Thompson & West Atlas of Santa Clara County. This rear wing remains intact today, although expanded to the rear with a one-story addition built in the late 1970s. The
outdoor porch to the side of the original two-story wing was enclosed during this recent remodeling. Both modifications were executed in a way that attempted to mimic the original design but did not destroy parts of the original structure.

Front Elevation  Partial Rear Elevation

Proposed Project

The proposed project is a Special Use Permit to allow an alternative parking arrangement (mechanical parking lifts), the demolition of an accessory structure, the onsite relocation and conversion of a historic residence into a multi-family building with 6 units, the construction of an approximately 28,629 square foot 4-story apartment building with 44 units over a subterranean garage, and the removal of one ordinance-size tree on a 0.6-gross acre site. The historic residence has been identified for restoration and staff has requested additional information from the applicant to identify all original materials, reconstructed areas, along with all proposed materials.

As currently proposed, the historic residence would be relocated towards the intersection of Mitzi Drive and Ranchero Way and the new residential building would be positioned behind the historic residence along the north and east property lines. The underground garage would have access from the northwest portion of the property along Mitzi Drive.

Proposed Elevation  Proposed Site Plan
EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-UP
A historic report has been prepared to evaluate the property (see Attachment 1) including, City Landmark Eligibility, and the historic significance of the Graves Residence. An additional analysis will be prepared to fully evaluate the project’s impact on the resources.

The subject Special Use Permit was filed on June 28, 2018 and various City staff are currently reviewing the proposed project.

The City Council’s Preservation of Historic Landmarks Policy (see Attachment 2) requires that the Historic Landmarks Commission hold a public meeting for a recommendation on proposals to alter designated or candidate City Landmark Structures early in the project review process.

Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the applicant is required to submit an Initial Study, including technical reports, to identify potential environmental impacts of the proposed project. A Scope of Work for a draft Initial Study was submitted and accepted by environmental planning staff. Staff is currently waiting to retrieve the draft Initial Study to start review. Staff plans to bring this property back to the Commission to consider including it on the Historic Resources Inventory as part of an Inventory update at a future meeting.

ROSALYNN HUGHEY, DIRECTOR
Planning, Building, and Code Enforcement

For questions please contact Juliet Arroyo, Historic Preservation Officer, at (408) 535-7847.

Attachments:
1. Historic Resource Assessment for 4145 Mitzi Drive (Graves Residence) by Archives and Architecture, July 11, 2018
2. City Council Policy on Preservation of Historic Landmarks
3. Project Plan Set
Juliet Arroyo, Historic Preservation Officer  
City of San Jose Department of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement  
200 East Santa Clara St., Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

RE: 4145 Mitzi Dr., San Jose (APN #299-16-001)

Dear Juliet:

Please find attached documents comprising a historic report prepared for the property located at 4145 Mitzi Dr. in San José. This report, prepared for inclusion with environmental documents for a proposed residential project at this site consists of this letter, DPR523 forms, and related rating sheets.

The applicant for this project is Anderson Architects, Inc. representing the owner Pine Investment Group, LLC of PO box 3941 Los Altos, Ca 94022. The project has apparently been filed or is in the process of being filed with the Planning Division in early July, 2018, but at the time of this letter is not listed on the City’s www.sjpermit.org website. The proposed project as understood consists of a new 44 unit residential building and underground parking garage. The proposed project will include relocation of the building on the subject site.

The DPR523 recording forms that are attached to this cover letter outline the history, record the property characteristics, and evaluate the property's potential for historical significance. Also, attached to this cover letter is an Historic Evaluation Rating Sheet prepared according to San Jose’s Guidelines for Historic Reports (as amended in 2010). A copy of the 1973 survey form is also included at the end of this report for informational purposes.

A bibliography, which meets the City's requirement for a checklist of sources consulted, is embedded in the DPR523 forms. A full range of digital photographs of the exterior of the building and property is included, as also required in the Guidelines. These are to help to visually define the character-defining features of the property.

Below is a summary of this investigation and findings:

The property, consisting of one parcel, is not listed on the San José Historic Resources Inventory. It was surveyed in 1973 as a part of the City’s first historic resource survey (King Survey), but was not evaluated nor later added to the Historic Resources Inventory, as at the time of the survey it was determined that the property was not located within the San Jose city limits. The property was annexed to the City of San Jose in 1980.

The attached DPR523 forms dated July 9, 2018, which I prepared, documents the historical and architectural aspects of the property. The house was built by and for Sylvester and Kate Graves in 1967-1968 according to an 1888 publication by biographer H. S. Foote. The Graves family owned
and lived in the house which was a part of their large agricultural operation until the mid-1890s, and the ranch remained active until after World War II.

I indicate in the DPR523 forms that the property appears to qualify for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, and the building also appears to be eligible for San José City Landmark designation when considered under the qualitative criteria of the City's Historic Preservation Ordinance.

The evaluation performed per the City of San José rating system resulted in a point score of 71 points, which is above the threshold of 33 point for listing on the San José Historic Resources Inventory.

The area in which the property is located has not been identified as a potential historic district. The residential area near the subject property is diverse in both building type and architecture, most development occurring in the 1950s and 1960s.

An impacts analysis of this project was not conducted as a part of this initial historic report and evaluation for historical significance. However, because the building appears eligible as a historic resource under the California Environmental Quality Act, the project impacts upon this building should be assessed as a part of the entitlement process if deemed a historic resource by the City of San Jose.

If the building is to remain as a part of the future development of this site, and is considered a historic resource under CEQA, a more detailed analysis of the building in the form of a historic structures report/preservation plan would be appropriate prior to any work that would affect the building.

Respectfully submitted for review,

[Signature]

Franklin Maggi, Architectural Historian*

*Franklin Maggi meets the Secretary of the Interior’s qualifications to perform identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment activities within the field of architectural history in compliance with state and federal environmental laws, as outlined in the criteria under 36 CFR Part 61.
The house at 4145 Mitzi Dr. is a rare local example of an Italianate-styled residential building from San Jose’s Early American Period. The two-story house features a vertical composition and asymmetrical plan associated with large farmhouses of the period. Its original wood framing with channel rustic redwood siding, rear two-story wing, single and double-hung windows, and other intact historic elements combine to create a distinctive entity within a modern suburban setting.

Italianate style houses were first built in the region starting in the mid-1860s when the availability of large framing lumber allowed for tall balloon-framed buildings. New lumbermill technology at that time enabled the production of wide finished drop siding in mass quantities.

(Continued on next page, DPR523L)
Italianate houses were built locally until the early 1880s, when early Victorian-era design became popular with the advent of platform-frame construction. Large estate farmhouses and many prominent city houses of this era (1860s-1880s) commonly had two-story front wings and a one or two-story rear wing. The rear section of the Graves house was built at two stories as profiled in the 1876 Thompson & West Atlas of Santa Clara County. This rear wing remains intact today, although expanded to the rear with a one-story addition built in the late 1970s. The outdoor porch to the side of the original two-story wing was enclosed during this recent remodeling. Both modifications were executed in a way that attempted to mimic the original design but did not destroy parts of the original structure.

The two-story main L-shaped core of the house features an asymmetrical front (west) façade, with a centered entrance, a wide porch offset to the right, and protruding front offset wing to the left that is front and rear gabled with outside returns. The roof is steeply pitched and includes a side-gabled main roof to the right. Typical of early wood structures in the region, the house has the historic proportions of a balloon-frame building, including the simple vertical unsegmented walls and the high eaves. The front porch sits outside the main building shape and was once topped by a walk-out porch that is said to have collapsed in the 1906 Earthquake and is no long extant. The porch itself lacks a frame or balustrade, but what appear to be historic pieces of this architectural element exist in storage on the site.

At the rear of the house is a two-story wing with roof gabled at the rear. The roof is set slightly below the eaves of the main roof. The rear wing extends to the east and has a side entry on the south side as well a one-story shed-shaped room notched into the building. The north side of this wing once had an open porch that was likely accessible from the building, but was enclosed during the late 1970s. The remodeling also included the addition of a one-story extension at the rear of the building. Both new additions were designed to mimic the architecture of the original building and we enhanced with Victorian-styled windows.

The house is set fairly close to grade with two-steps up to the main floor level. At least portions if not all of the building was set on a concrete and/or masonry foundation in recent times, with a larger basement area created that is accessed by a wide concrete ramp located on the south side of the building.

The house is clad in nine-inch California channel-rustic siding with quoins trimming the corners. Commensurate with the age of the house, there are no water tables or belly bands.

The eaves are shallow and boxed above a plain board frieze; the eaves feature narrow ogee trim at the outer fascia, flat-board soffits, and the frieze areas are populated by closely space corbels. While the 1876 Thompson & West illustration of this building shows a generous amount of corbeling on this building, it is not certain that all of the current corbels are original, or if the building was enhanced during a 1970s remodeling. The actual historic configuration can be revealed by a more detailed investigation of the building elements, their material and finish characteristics, and other forms of physical analysis. The new additions were embellished with architectural details to match the historic building, and in some locations may have historic architectural elements that were transferred to new locations as a part of the remodeling project.

Fenestration at the main wing appears to be original and consists of tall single and/or double hung sash with wide trimmed casings, bracketed sills, and deep hoods at the headers. Upper windows at the front and sides have arched upper sash, and the windows are all four-pane units – typical of 1860s buildings in the region. The front protruding wing has a set of three window units set in a bay. These windows are separated and framed by rounded corner-trim with turned top and bottom trim that set within block panels that finish the solid sections of the bay element. Other windows on the house need further investigation. The multi-lite windows on the rear wing do not appear to be original, and other windows on this section may have been replace. The window at the front porch appears to have original framing but the glazing has been replaced.

The front door is original as are the double doors above that once led to the upper deck of the front porch. The door has arched panels, characteristic of Italianate houses of the era, and is topped by a two-part arched glass transom with an outer section that drops to the side of and flanks the door. This arched door and glass combination is reflected by a recessed arched entryway and outer trim with engaged columns that support the wide trimmed arch.
The Graves House is set back on a relatively large parcel of land relative to urban single-family residential lots, and within a residential neighborhood of mixed single and multi-family buildings. To the north is the side property line of the two-story Southwinds Apartments, and to the east is the parking area of Rancho Palms Apartments. To the south across Rancho Drive is the large two-story Charter Court Apartments, and to the west across Mitzi Drive is the Hollywood Park Subdivision of single family homes that were built in the 1950s. The south property line at the Rancho Way frontage as well as that at the Mitzi Drive frontage have prefabricated masonry walls that frame a gated entry. The frontages are unimproved.

The Thompson & West Atlas lithograph of the Grave House in 1876 shows the beginning of the extensive landscaping of the parcel. Some of the specimen trees on the parcel today were likely planted by the Graves, although a detailed analysis is necessarily to determine the age and potential association of those trees with the Graves era of ownership. These trees add to the unique character of the historical setting of the property. The small open area at the north side and rear is not landscaped.

There are no historic-era ancillary buildings on the site. The garage/shop building at the east property line is of contemporary origin.

The house and property exhibit a high level of deferred maintenance. The house has deteriorated elements, including the front porch, as well as wall damage to the 1970s one-story addition to the north side.
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*Resource Name or # (Assigned by recorder) Sylvester & Kate Graves House

*Map Name: USGS San Jose West  *Scale: n.t.s.  *Date of Map: 1980 photorevised

SITE

DPR523J  * Required information
The house at 4146 Mitzi Dr. in West San Jose is a significant remnant and reminder of Santa Clara Valley farm homesteads from the Early American Period. It is associated with ranching and horticultural operations from the time of its construction around 1868 until after the Interwar Period at mid-twentieth century. Its distinctive architectural qualities remain intact, although mostly hidden from public view within a suburban residential setting that was created after World War II. The parcel is now only 0.628 acres in size, but large enough to provide a sense of historical development, with some large trees remaining from the early settlement of at this site.

The house was built by Sylvester & Catherine (Kate) Graves, early California pioneers. Sylvester and his wife Kate lived and operated a ranch on this property until the 1890s. Sylvester and his older brother Jacob had settled in the vicinity during the 1850s prior to the time that title of the Quito Rancho was perfected by the United States Land Commission. When patented to Manual Alviso on May 14, 1867, Alviso had already sold this portion of the rancho to José Ramón Argüello. That same year (1867) Argüello formally transferred a number of parcels within Rancho Lot 5 to Sylvester and Jacob. With title cleared that year by the Land Commission, Sylvester and Kate, who had just married, were able to build their permanent residence.

(Continued on next page, DPR523L)
Quito had been established in 1841 when then Mexican governor Juan Bautista Alvarado granted its 13,310 acres to two Hijar colonists José Noriega and José Zenon Fernández. The rancho ranged from the current village of Saratoga to San Tomás Aquino Creek. Both colonists quickly became prominent leaders in the San José pueblo late in the Mexican Period but sold the rancho to Manual Alviso in mid-1844. The patent later went to Alviso and the heirs of Fernandez, although Manual and his wife María Luisa Peralta de Alviso sold their portion in 1859 to José Ramón Argüello and two others. Argüello established Quito Farm on a portion of his acquisition that later became renowned for its olive orchard. Olive trees from the Quito Olive Farm were transported to San Francisco’s Treasure Island for landscaping the 1939-1940 world’s Fair site.

Sylvester Graves (1831-1910) came to California in 1853, following his brothers Jacob and Sampson. All born in Tennessee, older brother Jacob had come to California in 1849 during the Gold Rush, but by the end of 1849 had settled in Santa Clara Valley. Jacob first acquired land in the Quito around 1853 in partnership with Sylvester soon after Sylvester’s arrival, and built a house fronting Bubb Road (now Prospect Road) west of Saratoga Avenue near Campbell Creek. In 1862, the brothers bought 190 acres on the east side of Saratoga Avenue between what is now Williams Road and Payne Avenue where the subject property is located. Following this 1862 expansion of their holdings, the two brothers split their ownership, with Sylvester taking sole ownership of the land east of Saratoga Avenue, likely around the time of his marriage in 1867 to Catherine Toney. Catherine had come to California from Iowa during the 1860s with her parents Jesse and Anna Toney, who settled on a farm in the Redwood District (Los Gatos/Saratoga). During her marriage to Sylvester she was consistently referred to as Kate Graves. During the next ten years or so, Sylvester and Kate expanded their holdings to over 350 acres, including a large parcel north of Williams Road and a smaller 34-acre parcel west of Saratoga Avenue. By 1888, they had reduced the ranch to 265 acres by selling off some of their holdings north of Williams Road, and by 1890 had sold the remaining property north of Williams Road and west of Saratoga Avenue.

In 1876, Thompson and West published their Historical Atlas Map of Santa Clara County, showing property ownership throughout the county and notable buildings worthy of publication. A full-page graphic rendition of the residence of Silvester(sic) Graves is displayed on page 95 of that book, showing the distinctive Italianate house that exists today as well as six outbuildings and lush landscaped grounds around the homestead.

From Thompson and West, Historical Atlas of Santa Clara County, 1876
In 1888, H. C. Foote noted in his *Pen Pictures of the Garden of the World* that Sylvester Graves had built his house in 1868 at a cost of $6,000 (excluding Sylvester’s labor). This aligns with the formal transfer of the lands from Argüello to the Graves in late 1867 following the patent of the rancho by the Lands Commission and Sylvester’s marriage to Catherine Toney that same year. Foote wrote biographical sketches for both Sylvester and Jacob in his book and included full-page hand-drawn portraits of both.

Catherine Toney was born in Iowa in 1848. Sylvester and Kate had ten children while living at the subject property, of which seven were living at the time of Foote’s biographical sketch: Ernest, Walter, Clara, Jesse, Ivy, Nettie, and Beulah.

The larger portions of the ranch were devoted to general farming, and Foote noted that around 60 acres were devoted to horticulture use, including prunes, apricots, and peaches. Henry Brainard described the ranch in more detail in No. 12 of his series “Practical Horticulture And Viticulture” in *The Pacific Tree and Vine* (for the associated map, see next page).

S. Graves-334 acres in three places, 34 acres on the west side of the avenue and 300 acres on the east side, divided in two parcels of 110 and 190 acres, by the Williams Road. The 34 acres are all planted except 7 acres, and there are approximately 850 French prunes, 375 apricots, 275 peaches, 200 Silver prunes, 25 pears and 30 cherries, with one acre of vines, all from 2 to 5 years old. The 190 acres has a family orchard and 400 vines, and is devoted to stock and grain, as is also the 110 acres.

Foote also described in his sketch that “the house was surrounded by beautiful grounds, and approached from Saratoga Avenue by a shaded avenue 300 yards in length.” By the end of World War II, the ranch was still intact, covered by orchards, and the entry driveway still existed, although flanked by only a few large trees. The homestead at that time appears to have still had a number of large trees and structures. (The large barn shown in the 1876 Atlas had been destroyed by fire in 1880 according to a July 19, 1880 article in the *San Francisco Bulletin*.) The construction of Unit 2 of the Hollywood Park subdivision (Tract 924) in 1953 eliminated this entry driveway, clipping off the front portion of the ranch to where Mitzi Drive curves northward to a dead end at Piper Drive. By the mid-1950s, the remaining orchard lands had been subdivided and were soon developed with a mix of single-family residential tracts and apartment complexes.
Henry Brainard’s 1888 map of the Graves properties and immediate area known as Gubserville.

In 1890 Sylvester’s brother Jacob died. Soon after, Sylvester and Kate sold their remaining property on Saratoga Avenue to Randolph Hersey, who subdivided the 190 acres on November 9, 1893 (Book F Page 21 of Maps). This subdivision reserved a little over 60 acres as the Hersey property containing the ranch homestead. Little is known about Randolph Hersey. He was listed in local directories as an orchardist in the vicinity of the Graves ranch by the early 1890s, but Sylvester Graves continued to live at his ranch at least until 1896 according to the voting registration records. The Graves moved to Rucker near Gilroy by the late 1890s and were living in San Jose at 340 North Twelfth St. when Sylvester died on February 22, 1910. Kate died two years later on April 16, 1912.
Hersey appears to have left the area by the late 1890s, and the next known owners were Harry A. E. and Laura Rowlands. Both of the Rowlands had immigrated to the United States in 1901. Harry had been born in England, and Laura in Canada. They had two children with them while living and working at the subject property. By 1920, the Rowlands had left the area for Riverside.

Ownership and operation of the remaining 60+-acres ranch during the 1920s and 1930s is unclear. James and Sue Stanfield were owners during this period, but little is known of them. On April 21, 1943 the Stanfield sold the property, then reduced to 50+ acres, to Philip and Olga Williamson (OR 1137:387). The Williamson family sold portions of the property in the 1950s for the development of the Hollywood Park subdivisions developed by Maud Lantz. These subdivisions were part of San Jose’s rapid expansion period during the 1950s as the City administration attempted to extend development to the western foothills. The subject property however remained within an unincorporated pocket that extended to San Tomas Aquino Creek until 1980.

In the late 1960s, the property, now reduced to the small parcel that exists today, was acquired by David and Johanna Baker. Following their divorce, in 1971 it was deeded to Johanna, and three years later she sold it to Gary and Janice Sherwood who resold it to Fredrick Kenneth Kelly a little over a year later.

Johanna Baker was interviewed by representatives from the City’s first historic survey project (the King Survey) in late 1973 while she was selling the property, and she provided some anecdotal history of the property. She told of Graves being active in local government and San Jose State University (Normal School) current affairs. Having lost money in gold mining, she said he sold the property and moved to Morgan Hill (Rucker). She also had heard the house was used as a French gambling and sporting house at the turn of the century. It was noted in the recording form that Clyde Arbuckle (City Historian) had many pictures of house. As a part of the current study, archivists at History San Jose and the California Room at the San Jose Public Library were contacted about possible photographs, but none were located.

Although surveyed in 1973, the property was not included nor listed in subsequent surveys conducted in the late 1970s that included formal evaluations for historical significance as the property was found to be in an unincorporated area. At the time of annexation on August 1, 1980 under Boynton No.62, the initial resource listings of properties to be used in establishing the City’s first Historic Resources Inventory had been completed. In 1980, the property became a part of the City of San Jose and had been pre-zoned by that time for Multi-family use (R-M).

Survey Status

The property is not listed on any local, state, or national survey of historic resources. As noted in the narrative above, the property was surveyed in late 1973 as a part of the “King Survey” of San Jose but was not included in the City’s listing of historic resources prepared in the late 1970s as it was found to not be located with the City limits at that time.

Integrity

The property maintains most of its historic integrity as per the National Register's seven aspects of integrity, and therefore continues to exhibit the qualities that existed at the time of construction around 1868. The house maintains its significant original location in West San Jose to the east of Saratoga Avenue, a historic thoroughfare. It remains within a large parcel that provides separation from the now densely suburban neighborhood of single and multi-family residential buildings nearby that were developed after World War II and has remaining historic trees that appear associated with the original ranch headquarters. The house and property continue to embody a rural nineteenth-century residential feeling and continue to illustrate the property's associations with the Graves family ranch and settlement. Although the house has been expanded to the rear and rear side, and the front porch lost, these alterations are reversible, and the original house itself has significant integrity with its Italianate design. Its trim, although possibly renovated in the late 1970s, is intact and with the underlying structure and fenestration represents the era's workmanship and use of materials, and its original character-defining materials have been preserved, including its siding, doors, windows, and trim. The property continues to embody an authentic historic resource.
Evaluation

The Graves House has long been locally identified as an early farmhouse from the Early American Period of Santa Clara Valley, and was appreciated for its distinctive Italianate architectural character. While identified in 1973 as a part of San Jose’s first survey of historic resources, it was not formally listed in the City’s Historic Resources Inventory as it was outside the City limits at that time.

The house is associated with the early agricultural development of Santa Clara Valley from the Early American Period through World War II, and although the ranch lands and ancillary buildings that were a part of this farm are now gone, the building and site continue to signify and provide a visual sense of this important early period of development when Sylvester and Kate built their large agricultural operation at the site and raised their large family in this farmhouse. While in most situations the loss of the associated ranch lands and agricultural buildings would limit the ability of a small remnant site such as this from eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources under Criterion (1) (events and patterns), given the age of the structure (140 years old), its prominence in an early publication of prominent sites in Santa Clara County (Thompson & West), and the half-acre site that exists today with broad front and side setbacks that includes large trees that are likely associated with the early ranch headquarters, it appears that the property may be eligible for the California Register under this Criterion, (1).

Sylvester and Kate Graves were prosperous agriculturalists during the Period of Horticultural Development in Santa Clara Valley. While anecdotal history indicates that they were active in civic and educational affairs, a review of historical literature did not result in any findings to confirm their activity/influence within the local community. Success in business is not sufficient in itself for making a determination of historical significance. Consequently, the property would not be eligible for the California Register under Criterion (2) (historic personages). A review of the later owners/operators of the ranch has not uncovered any other persons of significance associated with the property.

The Sylvester and Kate Graves House is a distinguished entity in West San Jose, although somewhat hidden from public view due to fencing, foliage, and its location on a minor neighborhood street. The house is a distinctive example of early Italianate residential architecture in the region and maintains a fairly high level of historic integrity to its original form and historic materials. The property appears eligible for the California Register under Criterion (3) (Architecture).

In reviewing the property under the City of San Jose landmark designation criteria which is used to consider historical significance for properties within the local San Jose city jurisdiction (Municipal Code Chapter 13, Section 13.48.110), the property appears eligible for designation as a San Jose City Landmark. This potential eligibility is based upon the finding that this property has special historical, architectural and aesthetic interest and value, and that its designation as a landmark would conform with the goals and policies of the Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan. The property:

- has character, interest and value as a part of local heritage;
- it exemplifies the early economic and historic heritage of an area of the city in West San Jose that was within its sphere of influence during the nineteenth century;
- it portrays the environment of early agriculturalists characterized by distinctive farmhouse buildings;
- it embodies distinguishing characteristics of the Italianate style in local residential architecture; and
- it embodies elements of architectural design, detail, materials, and craftsmanship which represents a significant architectural innovation that took place locally in the 1860s and which this example remains fairly unique today in greater San Jose.
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View from gated entry at Mitzi Drive, viewed facing northeast.
Front setback, viewed facing northeast.

Front setback, viewed facing north.
South side setback at adjacent Rancho Way, viewed facing east.

Front elevation, viewed facing east.
Front elevation, viewed facing northeast.

Rear and north side elevations, viewed facing southwest.
Detail view of rear addition, viewed facing southwest.

South elevation at rear wing, viewed facing northwest.
New basement entry at south elevation, viewed facing north.

Ancillary building at east property line, viewed facing southeast.
HISTORIC EVALUATION SHEET

Historic Resource Name: 4145 Mitzi Dr. - Sylvester and Kate Graves House

A. VISUAL QUALITY / DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>EXTERIOR</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>STYLE</td>
<td>Especially fine</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>DESIGNER</td>
<td>Especially fine</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>Especially fine</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>SUPPORTIVE ELEMENTS</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. HISTORY / ASSOCIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>PERSON / ORGANIZATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>EVENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>PATTERNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>AGE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. ENVIRONMENTAL / CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>CONTINUITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>SETTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>FAMILIARITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. INTEGRITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>CONDITION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>STRUCTURAL REMOVALS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>SITE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. REVERSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Justification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>EXTERIOR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REVIEWED BY: Franklin Maggi
DATE: 07/09/18
Historic Resource Name: 4145 Mitzi Dr. - Sylvester and Kate Graves House

A. VISUAL QUALITY / DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
<th>Cumulative sub-total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. EXTERIOR</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. STYLE</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. DESIGNER</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. SUPPORTIVE ELEMENTS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. HISTORY / ASSOCIATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. PERSON / ORGANIZATION</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EVENT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. PATTERNS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. AGE</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. ENVIRONMENTAL / CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
<th>Cumulative sub-total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. CONTINUITY</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. SETTING</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. FAMILIARITY</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[(SUM \ OF \ A+C) = 50\]

D. INTEGRITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Sub-total</th>
<th>Cumulative sub-total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13. CONDITION</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.05 x 75</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>0.05 x 50</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>0.03 x 25</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. STRUCTURAL REMOVALS</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>0 x 50</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>0 x 25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. SITE</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>0 x 25</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ADJUSTED \ SUB-TOTAL: (Preliminary total minus Integrity Deductions) = 68\]

E. REVERSIBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>FP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. EXTERIOR</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[EVALUATION TOTAL: (Adjusted subtotal) = 71.00\]
**Visual Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Sites**

San Jose, California

1. Planning area: West Valley I
2. Name of site: MITZI DRIVE
3. Date or period: 1867

- **Street No.**: 146
- **Original owner**: Sylvester Stevens
- **Original use**: Orchard Home
- **Present owner**: JOANNA BAKER
- **Present use**: Orchard Home

4. Notable features, historical significance, description:
- **Arches** - Brought house 4,500 over Spanish land
- **Territory** - Owned land from Payne Ave., Williams-Santa
- **Hillside** - Active in local government, SSU, civic
- **Hill**
- **French Gothic, Spanish, House, Turn of Century**
- **California native shrubs, palm trees**
- **Original marble fire place, redwood paneling, stained glass**
- **Etched glass transom over front door**

5. Physical condition: Endangered

6. Location map:

7. Picture:
- **Photographer**: TEDDY DILL
- **Frame No.**: 1547, 1661, 17, 118
- **Date**: 12/9, 1974

8. Published sources, interviews, records, photos, etc.

Owner
PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC LANDMARKS

PURPOSE/INTENT STATEMENT
Historically and architecturally significant structures, sites, and districts provide an irreplaceable link to the City’s past, enrich the present and future with their rich tradition and diversity, and add inestimable character and interest to the City’s image. Preservation of structures, sites, and districts is a part of the San Jose General Plan Urban Conservation/Preservation Major Strategy. At a strategic level, preservation activities contribute visual evidence to a sense of community identity that grows out of the historical roots of San Jose’s past.

It is the policy of the City of San Jose that candidate or designated landmark structures, sites, or districts be preserved wherever possible. Proposals to alter such structures, sites, or districts must include a thorough and comprehensive evaluation of the historic and architectural significance of the structure, site, or district and the economic and structural feasibility of preservation and/or adaptive reuse. Every effort should be made to incorporate candidate or designated landmark structures into the future plans for their site and the surrounding area and to preserve the integrity of landmark districts.

APPLICABILITY
This policy affects any designated City Landmark structure, Contributing Structure in a City Landmark Historic District, structure listed on the National Register of Historic Places and/or the California Register of Historical Resources, a Contributing Structure in a National Register Historic District, or a structure that qualifies for any of the above (candidate), based on the applicable City, State, or National qualification criteria. (hereafter “landmark structure”). This policy also affects new construction within designated City, State, and National Landmark districts for purposes of district integrity.

REQUIREMENTS
1. Early Public Notification of Proposals to Alter or Demolish a Candidate or Designated Landmark Structure, or to Impact the Integrity of a Historic District. In order to allow greater public input into decisions affecting historic landmarks, early public notification should be initiated in response to either of the following: 1) receipt by the City of a development application for a project proposing to alter the original character of a candidate or designated landmark structure or to potentially impact the integrity of a landmark district, or 2) prior to action by the City Council or Redevelopment Agency Board of Directors to commit public funding or other assistance to such a project or for acquisition of property containing a candidate or designated landmark structure or potentially impacting the integrity of a landmark district. Such notification shall be provided to the City Council, Historic Landmarks Commission and representatives of the historic preservation community.

2. Public Input and City Council Review. As soon after the public notification as possible, public meetings on the proposed project shall be scheduled, as follows. In the case of a private development project with no City or Redevelopment Agency funding involved, the Historic Landmarks Commission shall hold a public meeting on the proposed project, to receive public comment and provide recommendations regarding information to be included in the analysis of the proposed project. In the case of a project incorporating City or Redevelopment Agency funding or other assistance, or acquisition of property containing a candidate or designated landmark structure or a structure or site located within a landmark district, the City Council shall agendize
discussion of the project to receive public comment and provide early direction to the appropriate staff that either: 1) the project should continue forward through the appropriate review process, or 2) the Council does not support the proposed project and further staff work shall be discontinued.

3. **Preparation of Complete information regarding Opportunities for Preservation of the Landmark Structure, and/or the Integrity of the Landmark District.** The analysis of a proposed project which will alter the original character of a candidate or designated landmark structure or potentially impact the integrity of a landmark district shall include complete historic, architectural, and cultural documentation of the significance of the candidate or designated landmark structure, site, district, or compatibility of new construction within a landmark district, a comprehensive evaluation of the economic and structural feasibility of preservation and/or adaptive reuse of the structure, and an analysis of potential funding sources for preservation. This information shall be carefully reviewed and then be given strong consideration in the decision-making process for a project proposing to alter a candidate or designated landmark structure or the integrity of a district. Every effort should be made to preserve and incorporate existing landmark structures into the future plans for a site and the surrounding area, and to preserve the integrity of landmark districts.

4. **Findings Justifying Alteration or Demolition of a Landmark Structure, or Impact to the Integrity of a Landmark District.** Final decisions to alter or demolish a candidate or designated landmark structure or to impact the integrity of a landmark district, must be accompanied by findings which either 1) document that it is not reasonably feasible for any interested party to retain the candidate or designated landmark structure or the integrity of the district, or 2) which record the overriding considerations which warrant the loss of the candidate or designated landmark structure or district integrity. The financial profile and/or preferences of a particular developer should not, by themselves, be considered a sufficient rationale for making irreversible decisions regarding the survival of the City’s historic resources.

5. **Financial Resources for Preservation.** The City and Redevelopment Agency should identify City, State, and Federal funding resources to support and encourage the preservation and adaptive reuse of candidate or designated landmark structures, sites, or districts.
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