

## **HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION**

August 5, 2020

Action Minutes

### **WELCOME**

*Meeting called to order at 6:31 p.m.*

### **ROLL CALL**

*Present: Commissioner Saum, Boehm, Arnold, Raynsford, Hirts*

*Absent: Commissioner Polcyn and Royer*

## **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**

## **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.

**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>

### 3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

---

- a. [HP19-007](#). Historic Preservation Permit to allow rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the Knox Goodrich building, a City Landmark.

Related Project: H19-041 & T19-035 Site Development Permit to allow demolition of an existing 5,870-square foot building, removal of an adjacent 7,355-square foot surface parking lot, and the construction of a 6-story, mixed-use building with commercial and office uses, and a rooftop bar; and a Tentative Map to combine 3 lots into 2 lots on an approximately 0.34-gross acre site located at east side of North 1st Street, approximately 270 feet south of East Santa Clara Street (26-34 South 1<sup>st</sup> Street) (UC Fountain Alley Owner LLC, Owner).

*PROJECT MANAGER, MAIRA BLANCO*

**Recommendation:** Recommend the Planning Director approve the Historic Preservation Permit.

*Chair Saum read full project description into record and asked staff to speak.*

*Maira Blanco, (staff) project manager and CEQA planner, introduced project and included brief history of the Commission's exposure to the project through the Design Review Committee and via the early referral process. Staff stated that the applicant had responded to comments through an iterative process and that HP Permit specifically would allow the adaptive reuse and rehabilitation of the Knox-Goodrich Building. Staff also acknowledged PAC\*SJ's letter received on 8/5 and made available to Commission and said she would take the opportunity to respond to concerns raised in letter after the applicant's presentation. Staff also recommended the HLC recommend approval of subject HP Permit to the Director.*

*Tim Woloshyn from Urban Catalyst (applicant) spoke on behalf of project. He stated Urban Catalyst is a San José-based developer and currently has seven projects in Downtown San José and are using the Opportunity Zoning designation to bring investment into San José and are excited to be able to preserve and incorporate the historic building into the project. The applicant also recognized staff for its ongoing work and reiterated that they had listened carefully to the Commission's comments and were happy to have support from History San José (who hold façade easement), the Fountain Alley parking lot property owner, and the Bank of Italy building owner. Mr. Woloshyn said the construction drawings were ready and that they were hoping to start construction early 2021 and asked the Commission to consider staff's recommendation to the Commission to recommend approval of the project. Mr. Woloshyn then introduced Jeff Current of Studio Current and turned the presentation over to Mr. Current.*

*Jeff Current, architect from Studio Current and part of design team, focused discussion on the Knox-Goodrich building. He stated that the historical building follows the Romanesque style and its namesake is Sarah L. Knox-Goodrich; the quarry stone is local. Mr. Current stated that the project includes two applications, the Historic Preservation Permit and a Site Development Permit, but that tonight's focus was on the HP Permit. Mr. Current requested to share his screen and provided a general description of the project and added that the Knox-Goodrich building would become the main entry*

*for the project. Mr. Current stated that the project had been presented at the DRC and again at the HLC for early referral and that the design had improved and resulted in the following changes to the project: brick proposed for the primary façade instead of originally proposed Corten steel, punched windows to better match District, addition of a step cornice molding at top of building. Mr. Current then discussed the historic uses of the Lido and Knox-Goodrich buildings and the extent of the rehabilitation and restoration of the historic building; no construction or removal of anything above storefront level, cleaning and restoration to occur per the Preservation Plan and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Mr. Current provided details on the proposed storefront – clear set of double doors, lightly framed glass to create transparency. Mr. Current explained that the proposed storefront/double door system would better handle the volume of traffic for the added project square footage. Mr. Current showed night-time lighting detail highlighting the historic building's texture, rusticated sandstone. Mr. Current concluded his presentation with an overview of the project schedule.*

*Chair Saum asked staff if anyone wished to speak or comment on the subject project.*

*Staff identified one speaker with a raised hand and directed them to unmute.*

*Benjamin Leech, PAC\*SJ, public comment, said he would save comments until after staff issued formal response to letter.*

*Chair Saum asked staff if she wanted to respond.*

*Staff asked if it was okay to trail response until after the Commissions' discussion on the project.*

*Chair Saum opened discussion to Commissioners.*

*Commissioner Arnold commented that she was interested in addressing public comments. Commissioner Arnold also stated that she was familiar with the project.*

*Commissioner Raynsford stated he had comments and a question. He stated he appreciated the changes that had been made to the design since earlier meetings. Commissioner Raynsford also stated he had read PAC\*SJ's letter and did not agree with the objection to the proposed height. He added that the height seemed appropriate as it was an intermediate height between the two buildings flanking it. Regarding the storefront system, Commissioner Raynsford said he did still question the choice because it seemed to interject a different kind of vocabulary and was not compatible with the Knox-Goodrich building and wondered if the applicant would be open to other types of entrances (addition of substantial divisions, mullions).*

*Chair Saum asked Mr. Current from Current Studio if he cared to comment on the initial remarks.*

*Jeff Current, Studio Current, stated the storefront and entry design had changed based on staff's comments and had evolved to a French-door style and felt the transparency was appropriate but added that if the project were to create a frame on doors or a façade with a bit more of a frame on the doors that they would be open to a condition of approval.*

*Commissioner Hirst commended the applicant for paying attention to detail and other touches like the accent lighting. Regarding the glass doors, he agreed with Commissioner Raynsford and added that the glass doors did not look quite finished and that it would be nice to have a transition from sandstone to the glass material. Commissioner Hirst also thanked the applicant for the care to rehabilitate the historic building.*

*Commissioner Boehm recognized work on buildings and noted step down of building, replacement façade to brick and asked: 1) What percentage of the new building would be glass and; 2) What percentage of the new building would be made out of brick and other materials?*

*Jeff Current, Studio Current, in response to Commissioner Hirst and Commissioner Boehm, stated that the infill building is classified as a high-rise building because of the rooftop bar and thus had a different construction type. He also stated that the infill building has a different relationship from exterior wall to project line on all four sides and would estimate that 45% of façade that faces Fountain Alley (14 feet from centerline) would be glass glazing and 30% would be composed of brick and plaster.*

*Chair Saum stated that it was good to understand percentages for their reference in looking at Standards/Guidelines.*

*Commissioner Boehm commented on lobby display and whether the mural would be on east wall. He also asked if the O'Brien Candy store would be commemorated.*

*Jeff Current, Studio Current, said the display would be located in the Knox-Goodrich building lobby, but that the wall had not been selected yet and that they were looking to place the display near the project directory. Mr. Current also gave a nod to Jim Salada because materials had been identified for salvage and they had an agreement with History San José to display materials. He also mentioned that they could display photos from the archives or other objects such as historic gloves from that era to display.*

*Commissioner Boehm followed up by asking if objects could be viewed in some kind of case and again asked if a mural was being considered. Commissioner Boehm stated the reason he was asking is because he wanted to know if passersby could view the mural from the glass storefront and added that it would be a reason to vote in favor of the proposed glass storefront. He added that he understood there were many considerations for the architect to make but that O'Brien Candy was such an institution for San José and that it should be cherished. Commissioner Boehm asked if the applicant had looked into salvaging basement of Lido building.*

*Jeff Current, Studio Current, stated that a mural had not been decided on.*

*Tim Woloshyn, Urban Catalyst, applicant, commented that the basement is not remarkable and does not contain salvageable material. He stated that Jim Salada had looked over building and identified some historic material that would be donated. Mr. Woloshyn also commented on display and said it would reference historic uses such as the O'Brien Candy store and millinery store, and ghost signage would be photo-documented.*

*Commissioner Boehm commented that earlier in the presentation the architect had mentioned a step back. He asked applicant to confirm.*

*Jeff Current, Studio Current, stated on the southwest corner a terrace had been added and pulled back 10-15 feet, stepping of front façade to Knox Goodrich building.*

*Commissioner Boehm clarified question and said he was actually referring to FAB building step back from street.*

*Jeff Current, Studio Current, said the two lower floors had been set back for two reasons: 1) give prominence to Knox-Goodrich building; and 2) hoping the space would attract a world-class restaurant which would utilize an extra 8 feet for sidewalk dining.*

*Chair Saum thanked applicant and Jeff Current and said he would hope other projects follow suit and come in very early in the process. Chair Saum commented on location of FAB building saying that it lent itself to a pedestrian experience and that the stepback was a small gesture, but a positive one. Chair Saum added that the Commission emphasizes for applicants to show what the building is going to look like and understood the Commissioners mixed minds on the glass doors.*

*Chair Saum framed the Commission's role in its recommendation on the HP Permit. Chair Saum added that the applicant was responsive to comments and the respect shown to the Knox-Goodrich building substantial.*

*Chair Saum addressed PAC\* SJ's letter and said they raised valid questions, but a lot of them had been addressed.*

*Chair Saum circled back to Benjamin Leech from PAC\*SJ.*

*Benjamin Leech, PAC\*SJ, public comment, said he was fine going a little out of order and re-raised comments. Mr. Leech said the comments were more procedural as they agree with overall comments that this is a well-designed building. He stated that there are clear design guidelines and they are clear with respect to height restrictions and would like to understand the logic for the height allowance and if it would apply to projects in the future. He ended remarks on height by asking if staff was giving up on height guideline or giving up on entire guidelines from consideration. Regarding minor points in letter, he wanted to know how the non-original faux stone was documented and wanted to know if it was indeed non-original and wanted confirmation/clarification that attachment points will not damage historic fabric. He concluded his comments by asking that in addition to photo-documenting ghost signage that applicant should find other ways to salvage signage (e.g. view windows).*

*Robert Manford, Deputy Director, responded generally and stated that the height allowance will not be a precedent-setting action. Mr. Manford commented that staff had reviewed height and looked at adjacency to the Bank of Italy building in the District and that the proposed height is a good transition from the very tall BOI building to the lower Knox-Goodrich building. Mr. Manford explained that there are thirteen guidelines and that height was but one guideline.*

*Maira Blanco, Project Manager and CEQA planner, spoke to its determination on substantial conformance and reiterated Robert Manford's points regarding the thirteen guidelines used for infill construction and agreed that the height guideline was very clear. Ms. Blanco further explained that staff looked at the context of the building location and the relationship to the BOI building and reiterated that the height allowance is specific to the subject project; decision would be on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Blanco repeated that the project's height was in substantial conformance with the Guidelines and that the proposed height conforms to the DC height standard (which is to meet FAA regulations) and that the guidelines were just one tool of several to review the project against. Regarding the storefront, Ms. Blanco stated that the historic analysis described alterations to a façade that had not acquired historic significance but could craft a condition that both parties could agree to today to take before Director.*

*Chair Saum opened discussion to additional comments/questions from Commission.*

*Commissioner Raynsford said he agreed with comment about adjacency and commented that the height does not violate the spirit and context of the Guidelines.*

*Commissioner Arnold had no other comments*

*Commissioner Boehm expressed that he appreciated the work that had been done and added that doors could add some kind of framing or embellish walls in a way that would make historic commemoration visible from street. He repeated that he appreciated work that had been done to commemorate the O'Brien Candy store and said he could support either case. He added that there are a lot of ways to go wrong when designing and restoring a historic building, but that by working with the HLC and DRC, the project had gotten a lot closer.*

*Chair Saum said underscored the question of the doors as the primary discussion point and added that procedurally, if there were no other questions, a motion could be made to close the public hearing.*

*Commissioner Arnold made a motion to close public hearing.*

*Chair Saum took a vote. All Commissioners voted to Approve.*

*Chair Saum posed matter to Commission: What would you like said motion to contain?*

*Commissioner Arnold commented that her concern is the nature of the historical documentation and the importance of the associated families to the history of San José; exhibits should ensure footprints are there.*

*Commissioner Hirst commented that he was not sure if it was important to note somewhere in the approval that the height allowance would not be a precedent-setting action.*

*Commissioner Raynsford said commemorative display should be visible form sidewalk and that transparent opening should be more articulated (mullions, some solid material)*

*Commissioner Boehm stated that commemoration of Sarah L. Knox-Goodrich should include a historic marker her for her role in women's issues, her history in San José; would love to see a mural for O'Brien's Candy store – if not a mural, then other obvious commemoration.*

*Chair Saum asked Commission if there was a motion.*

*Commissioner Arnold said she would summarize/group what she had heard: Architectural, historical, signage, impact (broad bullets) and offered a motion: I move that we approve HP19-007 to allow rehab and adaption with focus on acknowledgment of historic and architectural significance of the Lido/Knox-Goodrich buildings.*

*Chair Saum asked if there was a second on the motion.*

*Commissioner Raynsford asked to amend Commissioner Arnold's motion: Either a transparent glass wall would complement a mural-size display or we would ask for a smaller display with storefront design more consistent with District.*

*Commissioner Arnold accepted proposed amendment.*

*Commissioner Boehm agreed with motion and offered to further amend the motion: Instead of conjunction "or," use "and/or."*

*Commissioners Arnold and Raynsford agreed with amendment.*

*Commissioner Boehm seconded motion. Chair Saum took a final vote.*

*Voting Result: 5-0-2*

#### **4. EARLY REFERRALS UNDER CITY COUNCIL POLICY**

---

- a. [\*\*PDA18-045-01\*\*](#). Planned Development Permit Amendment to amend a previously approved Planned Development Permit (File No. PD18-045) to allow the construction of an approximately 376,250 square foot commercial office building with late night use on an approximately 4.77-gross acre site.

**PROJECT MANAGER, ALEC ATIENZA**

**Recommendation:** Provide comments under the "Early Referral" Policy on the Preservation of Landmarks.

- *Alec Atienza*
  - *Allowed Development of Phase 2, construction a 300,000-square feet eight-story office building*
  - *Vesting T-Map to subdivide one lot into two lot*
  - *PDC Zoning, was approved Dec 2016*
  - *PD Permit approved in May 2019, allowed the phased development of the site and phase 1 which is north is currently under construction with 300,000-square foot office and above ground garage*

- *Phase 1 approved the demolition of Flames, Century 22 and 23 building*
- *Century 21 is a City Landmark of June 2014 and would remain part of the PDC*
- *Site is also adjacent to the Winchester Mystery House*
- *Referral, staff is asking for comments in with respect of the design next to the historic buildings*
- *Seth Bland*
  - *Have been 4 or 5 times before of the HLC on behalf of the Santana West*
- *Mark Pfenninger*
  - *Changes from the plan since it was presented to the HLC*
  - *Project would relocate the sign*
  - *Separation, at least 50 feet from the dome, the building is 200 feet and 600 feet from the mystery house*
  - *Select trees from the Mystery House and incorporate those trees to the site*
  - *Previous design had more heavy articulation, now design has soften*
  - *Simpler building as a backdrop*
- *PAC SJ – Public Comment*
  - *Winchester Mystery House is a National Landmark*
  - *Change layout/orientation of Building 2 to open up the space towards Century 21*
  - *Needs to do a better job of meeting the Historic Preservation Policies*
  - *In reference to 13.3 the project should not block the view of Century 21*
  - *Status of the report on Century 21 Mitigation Measures*
  - *Major concern for the Historic Landmarks with respect to traffic as the issues with the Winchester Ranch Project*
- *Seth Bland Response to PAC SJ*
  - *Orientation of Building – Olsen Drive would remain in its current location*
  - *The site needs to be developed and enlivened first, then they can bring the dome back to life and come up with an appropriate use*
  - *Comments are definitely noted and not new to them*
- *Commissioner Hirst*
  - *Made a lot of progress – newer articulation is lighter*
  - *Century 21 is a concern*
  - *Exploring the possibility to relocating adjacent to Winchester – that is a concern, highlighting the theater*
- *Commissioner Raynsford*
  - *Improvement, this building façade is a better background to the Winchester Mystery House*

- *The first several levels show the white grid, maybe a bit too strong, tone down the contrast*
- *The site itself – it is a difficult site. You are considering two historical landmarks from two different time periods*
- *Densification around Santana Row – all about creating a more pedestrian environment*
- *Hard to satisfy everything in this way*
- *Something has to be reimaged for the Century 21*
  - *Leave the structure intact but not the context*
- *Commissioner Arnold*
  - *Was not on the design committee, hold on to comments until further information*
- *Vice Chair Boehm*
  - *Winchester House is primarily 2 stories, Queen Anne, built in the 1880s, 90s*
  - *Garden surrounding the area was once 10 acres, Victorian Gardens*
  - *Using some of the same trees doesn't do justice to the Victorian Gardens*
  - *Because the Winchester House is a Landmark – City, State, National – it is not just a structure of Merit, but it brings in thousands of people*
  - *To build something that looks very modern next to it doesn't seem compatible*
  - *Page 35 of Citywide Design Guidelines*
  - *Needs to have the setting*
  - *Century 21 Theater – had parking lot in front, didn't want to compete with the Winchester Mystery House*
  - *An eight-story building will dwarf the prime jewel*
  - *The massing is not compatible with the Winchester House*
  - *Rectangular style does not pay homage to the turrets*
  - *Wants to advocate for the history, please look at the design again and conceptualize it so the Winchester House is not diminished*
- *Chair Saum*
  - *Acknowledged that Phase II would be more contentious as it got closer to two landmarks*
  - *Emphasize need to be careful*
  - *Phase II hadn't been formally presented so there weren't as many comments prior*
  - *Main concerns were covered by Vice Chair Behn*
  - *Main concern is Century 21. Afraid of the idea that they figuring out a use eventually*
  - *Need to remain a little more vigilante*
  - *Stripping skin might strip it of landmark status*

- *Main thing that needs to be done is the Traffic Analysis with two applicants – Winchester Ranch and Santana West*
- *Synchronize development between the two*
- *Keeping Olsen Drive in its right configuration is correct*
- *How can Century 21 be given prominence – but there is no specific use proposed so it is difficult to give design comments*
- *Harder to look at how Santana West II impacts it – Actively encourage for some kind of proposed use for Century 21*
- *Any proposal that comes back needs to include a proposed use.*
- *Compatibility is a loaded term – you cannot match materials with this project it is very different*
- *Embracing a potential use*
- *Seth Bland Response*
  - *Relocation was previously discussed*
  - *Century 21, 22, 23 – it was a floating idea and they were told to keep one of three*
  - *Century 21 is the first of the original domes, was the least revised*
  - *It is not lost on them that they are trying to replicate the Winchester House –*
  - *Try to soften the building along the Olsen Façade – try to not be something to be looked at – give that prominence to Winchester House*
  - *Try to be restrained and do the opposite*
  - *The Commercial Project is definitely in keeping with the General Plan Goals and Policies*
  - *Seth – He’s been around the block and knows how to bring historic buildings back to life*
  - *Not turning their back on this building – cannot conjure something from out of thin air on a 13 acre site.*
  - *It is a leap of faith but they have put points on the board over time.*
- *Chair Saum*
  - *Previous plans had Olsen Drive centered right now on Century 21*
  - *Access to Winchester Ranch would not have been possible in that case – Winchester Ranch required Olsen Drive*
- *Commissioner Raynsford*
  - *Agree with Chair Saum that it is very difficult to judge the renderings without the whole context – dealing with two developments*
  - *Is there environmental review that would encompass both projects together?*
  - *Integrity of Century 21 should not be undermined – even if for now it remains empty, it should be preserved.*
  - *What would activate that space and maintain its integrity – but this is very complex and it will take a lot of work*

- *Commissioner Hirst*
  - *Appreciate the applicant's comments and the efforts. Really effective design*
  - *What could they do to get more of a visual zone for Century 21 Theater*
- *Vice Chair Boehm*
  - *There is a planned grass area and landscaping – why wouldn't the grass area be on the southside of building 2?*
  - *It would give Century 21 and Winchester Mystery House More Space*
  - *Seth Response: Winchester is a bit of an inhospitable frontage – opens a view corridor towards the Century 21 Theater*
    - *People leaving the lobbies will be staring right at Century 21*
    - *Century 21 is being incorporated into the development – more than 630 feet from Winchester – Has Olsen Drive Prominence*
    - *Has prominence from Santana West Drive*
    - *Holding Urban Edge along Olsen is the right*
    - *Do not want grassy edge along the road, not very urban*
  - *Any consideration for making Century 21 a screen for visual tours of Winchester Mystery House*
  - *Providing more than 100 free parking spaces for Mystery House*
  - *In close contact with folks from Mystery House*
- *Chair Saum*
  - *There has been a consistent improvement in massing, siting, architecture*
  - *Vehicular circulation being proposed would bring folks towards Century 21, same with pedestrian circulation*
  - *The scale of the building may not be very prominent from Winchester Boulevard*
  - *Acknowledge that there is a leap of faith.*
  - *Acknowledged PACSJ Comments*
  - *Want some type of active use – this comment will be made until the applicant can come up with something*
  - *Hopes they can use technology to show what more than one project would look like together.*
  - *Show how all of the projects together interact. Provide a 3D Rendering of the whole area*

- b. **GP19-008 & H20-004.** General Plan Amendment (File No. GP19-008) to change the General Plan land use designation from Public/Quasi-Public to Downtown (DT), and a Site Development Permit (File No. H20-004) to allow the demolition of 16 existing single-family homes for the construction of two, 20-story, 297-foot tall, approximately 1.8-million-square-foot office towers with approximately 6,000-square feet of ground floor retail, four levels of below grade parking and four levels of above grade parking on

a 3.08-gross acre site

**PROJECT MANAGER, ANGELA WANG**

**Recommendation:** Provide comments under the “Early Referral” Policy on the Preservation of Landmarks.

*Angela Wang, project manager, provided the staff report and stated that a Supplement Environmental Impact Report to the Downtown Strategy 2040 EIR will be prepared for the project. A Notice of Preparation has been circulated for the EIR to get comments on the scope of the environmental analysis. The deadline to provide comments is August 12, 2020. Staff is requesting the Commission to provide any recommendations on the scope of the CEQA historic analysis, as well as any comments on the historic resource assessments, attached to the staff report, with regard to eligibility of the properties as historic resources.*

*Applicant, Mark Tersini from KT Urban, introduced the architect from C2k to give an overview of the project.*

*Architect, Steven Ohlhaber from C2K, presented the project. Mr. Ohlhaber described the project location and the site area and pointed out that currently there are 16 single-family homes within the project boundary. These homes are proposed to be demolished. The applicant is trying to acquire the seventeenth home to the project area. Once it is acquired, the house will be proposed to be demolished as well to facility the proposed project. Mr. Ohlhaber then describe the details of the project design.*

*Ben Leech, a member of the public on behalf of PAC\* SJ, stated that they have submitted a comment letter relating to the EIR scoping. Mr. Leech commented that in a crisis of affordable housing, we cannot just dispose the existing homes at good conditions without serious discussion about the feasibility of retaining some existing homes on site or relocating some or all to an appropriate location given that some homes are on the HRI. And this discussion should be a major component of the EIR. Mr. Leech also encouraged the Commission to weigh in on this. Mr. Leech concluded that not addressing the historic preservation concerns to maintain the existing historic fabric is problematic.*

*Chair Saum closed the hearing. Chair Saum emphasized that the purpose of this early referral is to discuss the scope of the EIR and if there are any items need to be included in the EIR relating to historic resources and historic analysis.*

*Commissioner Arnold stated that she would like to know the plan for the historic homes and properties.*

*Chair Saum pointed out that six(five) of the 16 homes to be demolished are on the HRI and the one remaining is also on the HRI.*

*Commissioner Hirst asked staff the differentiation between Downtown land use designation and Public/Quasi-public land use designation. Staff responded that the Downtown land use designation encourages high intensity developments and a variety of uses such as residential, office, retail, entertainment, and mixed use, and Public/Quasi-public land use designation allows the institutional uses like schools and libraries etc.*

*Commissioner Hirst stated that he concerned about the six or seven homes that are on the HRI to be demolished. He also stated that he considered the site as a unique historic aspect of San Jose and he would like to see the historic analysis of the site in the EIR and maybe some project alternatives. He commented that the project itself is attractive and practical. However, he is very concerned about the residential buildings to be demolished. He stated that he is also curious about what other interest groups would say about the Downtown land use designation.*

*Commissioner Raynsford concurred the issues and concerns raised by Commissioner Arnold and Commissioner Hirst and also concurred the concerns raised by PAC \*SJ about the loss of housing. He stated that in addition to the historic buildings to be demolished, he also concerned about the loss of the historic fabric. He would like to see relocation of these historic houses. He encouraged the applicant work with the City to find a suitable empty lot for relocating those houses. He commented that the remaining house being surrounding by the proposed contemporary office towers is interesting and could be a good “reminder” of the history of the site. Hence, he suggested keep the house.*

*Vice Chair Boehm concurred the issue raised by Commissioner Hirst regarding the loss of the historic downtown. He also concerned about the loss of the historic houses with beautiful architecture styles. He commented that the project design is fine however the project does not “reflect” any history of San Jose. Therefore, he strongly suggested considering ways to salvage these homes.*

*Chair Saum stated that the analysis of the feasibility of the relocation of all six houses together is very important to be included in the EIR.*

*Chair Saum then asked staff the estimate EIR circulation date. Staff responded that at this point there is no schedule of when to complete the EIR for circulation and stated that the deadline to submit comments on the NOP is August 12, 2020. Mr. Manford, the Deputy Director, stated that the Commissioners would have the opportunity to provide comments during the EIR public circulation period.*

*Chair Saum asked if there were additional comments. Commissioner Raynsford and Commissioner Arnold responded no. Commissioner Hirst stated that the relocation does not quite mitigate the loss of the unique character of this area and suggested careful discussion should be held as moved forward. Vice Chair Boehm concurred Commissioner’s comments and suggested a further discussion to consider the possibility of preserving the existing homes and developing the office buildings at another location, or, if not possible, consider at least preserving those six homes in place, given the gateway location of the site.*

## 5. GENERAL BUSINESS

---

- a. **Proposed Citywide Design Guidelines.** The proposed San José Citywide Design Standards and Guidelines (Citywide DSG) will update and consolidate residential, commercial, and industrial design guidelines into one document. The proposed Citywide DSG will work in conjunction with other City documents and regulations to ensure that buildings throughout San José have high-quality design and are appropriate for their site, function, and neighborhood. Compliance with the proposed Citywide DSG will be mandatory in the design review process for all applicable developments.

The proposed Citywide DSG will apply to the area within San José's Urban Growth boundary, excluding:

- Single-family residences;
- Rehabilitation, modification, or adaptive reuse of historic buildings; and
- Downtown San José and the Diridon Station Area (these are subject to the Downtown Design Guidelines and Standards).

**PROJECT MANAGER, LEILA HAKIMIZADEH**

**Recommendation:** No recommendation. Provide comments on the draft San Jose Citywide Design Standards and Guidelines.

*Chair Saum introduced the item and noted that Leila Hakimizadeh presented the project to the Design Review Committee of the HLC (July 15, 2020). Project manager Leila Hakimizadeh presented a short summary of the draft update to the Citywide Design Standards Guidelines project. She noted that the presentation is the same as that provided to the Design Review Committee and a shorter version of the community meeting presentations to accommodate time constraints.*

*PAC\*SJ (Mike) complimented the City on the project development and commented that because there is a lack of historic design guidelines that apply to the areas outside of downtown, more language should be included in the introduction honoring San Jose's history. This would set the stage for smaller developers that may not have a design consultant to guide them and changes could have been made that paid more deference to historic resources had they been aware. It was recommended to include in the Values and Guiding Principles section at a reference to preserving San Jose's fabric and culture. It was excellent to see an entire section included on historic adjacency (Section 3.1.3). PAC\*SJ recommended including a reference to the Downtown Historic Guidelines in the document.*

*Commissioner Arnold was pleased that the Design Review Committee was able to provide specific, detailed comments on Section 3.1.3.*

*Commissioner Hirst inquired where the metrics for the document have come from. Leila Hakimizadeh stated that the guidelines are based on practices, institutional knowledge about what works best for San Jose, consultant expertise and lessons learned. The existing citywide design guidelines (residential, commercial, industrial) do not reference historic resources so this would be an improvement to the document. Tim Rood added that the consultant is a practicing architecture firm that has been doing urban infill development in the Bay Area for over 30 years and brings a practical mind set and*

*awareness of best practices. Commissioner Hirst mentioned the 50% of buildings either fully or partially within 200 ft is a good minimum and perhaps could be expanded and the buildings protected.*

*Commissioner Raynsford commented that the document was a great template and liked the cross referencing of the related subsections because there are so many factors to consider in when dealing with context. No additional comments since he commented in detail at the Design Review Subcommittee meeting.*

*Vice Chair Boehm suggested on p7 that a sentence be added to the first paragraph - "it has been inhabited for thousands of years by indigenous people and it was the first pueblo of the Spaniards who arrived in 1777 to found the town." He suggested another sentence discussing how we are at the cusp of the twenty-first century and all the technology that makes Silicon Valley of such an important place to give people an understanding of the breadth of what Silicon Valley means and a background and purpose to design standards. Vice Chair Boehm wanted to see a change on p37 to S4 and recommended an increase in the percentage of materials from 10% to 45-50% so the facades of new buildings can be more fully compatible. He inquired whether open space is required in the guidelines. Leila Hakimizadeh explained that communal open space would be addressed in a zoning ordinance update and cannot be required on private property because the guidelines do not regulate land use. If open spaces are already required, the guidelines address how to implement them.*

*Chair Saum added that the Design Review Committee discussed the secondary façade was also important on some projects and should have a materials percentage as well, and that the percentage of materials on the primary façade should be greater. Chair Saum inquired about next steps for the project. Leila Hakimizadeh stated that comments received will be reviewed, provided to the consultant and changes made to the document. The guidelines would then be taken to Planning Commission and City Council for public hearings. Chair Saum reiterated the importance of citing related subsections in the Historic Adjacency section. He agreed with Vice Chair Boehm about adding to the purpose the breadth of the history and context of San Jose. Chair Saum emphasized the importance of the specificity of the document and its consistency.*

*Commissioner Raynsford agreed that the percentage of materials on the primary façade should be increased from 10% and recommended the inclusion of color in the context of permanent materials and the overall building in another subsection.*

*Commissioner Hirst appreciated the work and presentation and thought the document would add leverage to the protection of historic resources citywide. He reiterated protecting the zone around historic buildings through the 200 ft adjacency or an expanded area.*

*Commissioner Arnold thanked staff for the project work and was pleased to hear that historical context is included as part of the citywide guidelines and concurs with the addition of language to the statement of purpose regarding the breadth of the city's history.*

*Vice Chair Boehm pointed to Henry Adams Street in San Francisco as a good example of the blending of historic buildings and modern buildings in a compatible manner. He noted that the amount of glazing is reduced which helps put the buildings in context and that the amount of original materials (like brick) is the majority. Vice Chair Boehm supported the addition of requiring a percentage of materials on the secondary façade to be compatible as well.*

## **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.

*PAC\*SJ (Mike) suggested there might be an inability for connection to occur between developers, the City, and people representing historic preservation interests to access ideas on how we can find common ground for the treatment of historic resources in projects and suggested it might be beneficial to have a way to facilitate a meeting of minds. This could be a place where ideas could be brought to the table in a corporative way at the front end of a project and inquired if commissioners had any ideas.*

*PAC\*SJ (Andre) submitted written comments to the County of Santa Clara on the Notice of Preparation of an environmental impact report for the proposed demolition of the former San Jose City Hall. It was recommended that the building be designated a City Landmark as it is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources. PAC\*SJ commented that San Jose has lost a significant number of mid-century modern buildings recently and very few buildings built between 1935-1975 have been designated City Landmarks. PAC\*SJ suggested an update to the city's mid-century modern historic context and survey should be a priority.*

## **8. GOOD AND WELFARE**

---

### **a. Report from Secretary, Planning Commission, and City Council**

- i. Future Agenda Items: None at this time.

*No items*

ii. [Summary of communications received by the Historic Landmarks Commission.](#)

*Chair Saum generally summarized the topics of correspondence received.*

*Chair Saum generally commented on the letters received regarding Opportunity Housing. He mentioned the General Plan Task Force received quite a few comments at their last meeting regarding the Historic Resource Inventory, designated conservation areas and potential impacts Opportunity Housing may have on these resources. Chair Saum understood that with a few exceptions, the proposal would allow the demolition of single-family houses in designated conservation areas.*

*In relation to Opportunity Housing, PAC\*SJ (Andre) commented on the state of the Historic Resources Inventory and reference written correspondence to the commission which included a comparison of the number historic preservation staff in the top ten largest cities in the US (San Jose is #10). PAC\*SJ felt that if the Opportunity Housing proposal results in increased development review proposals, the City should look at the adequacy of its staffing levels for historic preservation.*

*Robert Manford stated that Opportunity Housing could be agendized at a future meeting and staff could provide feedback on the proposal in relation to historic resources.*

*Chair Saum mentioned the draft letter prepared by Vice Chair Boehm regarding the important of the Historic Preservation Officer position. He stated that the item could be agendized for a subsequent Historic Landmark Commission meeting.*

*Rosalynn Hughey stated that the position announcement has been out for the past three weeks and the application period closes August 12, 2020. She looked forward to receiving a good pool of candidates and reported that the City would like to have a member of the Historic Landmarks Commission or historic preservation community on the interview panel.*

*The schedule for agendizing items on the Historic Landmarks Commission agenda was discussed and the internal calendar will be email to commissioners.*

**b. Commissioner attendance for Historic Landmarks Commission meetings and Design Review Subcommittee meetings**

*Chair Saum explained that there was a last-minute scramble to verify who would be in attendance at the last Design Review Committee. He felt that not everyone was regularly checking their city provided commission email accounts. Chair Saum noted that the settings allow commissions to set up the account so commissioners can receive a text message that an email has been received. Chair Saum encouraged commissioners to let staff know ahead of time whether or not they will be able to attend, and with the Design Review Committee, to check email in case alternate members are asked to attend in the 72 hours leading up to the meeting.*

*Commissioner Arnold shared that she had a problem with the email for over a year and had to come to City Hall twice to resolve the issue. She commented that sometimes it is a technical issue with systems not wanting to interface and it would be desire to ensure that the technology works.*

c. **Report from Committees**

- i. Design Review Subcommittee: Last Meeting Wednesday, July 15, 2020. Next meeting on August 19, 2020 may be postponed.

*Chair Saum reported that the Design Review Committee met on July 15, 2020. Because the draft Citywide Design Guidelines and Standards were discussed at the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting, no report was needed.*

*It is anticipated that the August 19 Design Review Committee will be cancelled because there are no agenda items to date.*

d. **Approval of Action Minutes**

- i. **Recommendation:** [Approval of Action Minutes for the Historic Landmarks Commission Meeting of June 3, 2020.](#)

*The Commission voted unanimously (5-0) in favor of a motion to approve the action minutes for the Historic Landmarks Commission Meeting of June 3, 2020.*

e. **Status of Circulating Environmental Documents**

- i. [Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report for the Former San Jose City Hall Project \(County of Santa Clara\)](#)

*County of Santa Clara on the Notice of Preparation of an environmental impact report for the proposed demolition of the former San Jose City Hall. No comments were provided by commissioners.*

## ADJOURNMENT

*Chair Saum thanked Jennifer Provedor and Danielle Buscher for their expertise in running the Historic Landmarks Commission virtually.*

*The commission voted unanimously (5-0) in favor of a motion to adjourn the meeting.*

*The meeting was adjourned at 10:13 p.m.*