



**HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION  
DESIGN REVIEW COMMITTEE (DRC) MEETING**

**ACTION MINUTES**

**WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 19, 2020**

**1:00 – 2:00 P.M.**

**City Hall Tower**

**200 East Santa Clara Street**

**ROOM T-332**

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

**Edward Saum, HLC Chair**

**Anthony Raynsford**

**Stephen Polcyn**

**Meeting Goal:** Discuss preliminary project design and provide comments to staff and applicants.

**Proposed Projects for Review:**

1. **HP19-002 & H19-008, Reed District.** Historic Preservation Permit and Site Development Permit to allow the conversion of a 3,647-square foot single-family residence to a 5,548-square foot duplex (basement addition), with an addition of 181 square feet to the rear second-story and attic, for a property listed on the City's Historic Resources Inventory as a Contributing Structure in the Reed City Landmark District and in the R-M Multiple Residence Zoning District, on a 0.14-gross acre site, located at 647 S. Sixth Street.

***PROJECT MANAGER, RINA SHAH***

**Attachments:**

1. Reduced Plan Set
2. Action Minutes from 12/4/19 HLC Hearing Meeting

*This project came before HLC earlier; deferral with comments.*

*Rina Shah, Project Manager, presented revised floor plans and stated that the front fence had been removed. There was discussion among the commissioners of the placement and number of bathrooms in the project. Egress was also discussed.*



*There was discussion regarding parking and occupancy. This project meets San Jose's parking requirements per number of bedrooms in each unit. There are 6 parking spaces required; 50 percent are provided as tandem parking as allowed per code. It was mentioned that any overflow parking would be on the street and it would be helpful if the developer is communicating with the neighbors.*

*The project zoning is R-M Multiple Residence and it is located within Reed City Landmark district. Both the site and structure are a historic resource.*

*Staff asked for direction on the revised plans as well as the existing accessory structure at the rear of the property. It is in a dilapidated state. The owner is flexible regarding restoration or removal. Commissioners agreed that it is okay to remove it as it is currently similar to an unpermitted ADU. It could be rebuilt, or the empty space could possibly provide additional parking.*

*Chair Saum stated that a lot of the discrepancies in the project have now been addressed. Commissioners noted that the discussion on this project is largely clarification of intent so that the HLC may be clear about what they're voting on. Project must meet code and zoning.*

*Chair Saum noted that it's appropriate to bring this project before the HLC again because of its landmark status of the district. He stressed the need for a complete and annotated plan set (existing and proposed) for the HLC meeting so that the changes are readily visible.*

*Juliet Arroyo, Historic Preservation Officer, stated that the project may come before the HLC several times. She would like to see a unanimous vote, not just a majority vote.*

*The property owner was advised to submit graphic representations that emphasize that in deference to the historic district there are few changes. Submit plans that show the accessory structure gone; reduction in perceived usage on the site is good.*

2. [\*\*AD19-716, 840 The Alameda.\*\*](#) Permit Adjustment to allow exterior façade upgrades by replacement of storefront windows, doors and decorative trim molding around the roofline identified in the Alameda Urban Village plan and found to qualify as a Structure of Merit.

**PROJECT MANAGER, JULIET ARROYO**

Attachments:

1. Project Plans
2. Historic Evaluation Letter



*Applicant and project team were present.*

*Juliet Arroyo, Historic Preservation Officer, explained that this applicant submitted a year ago with a remodel of the facade of this building, a 1935 industrial/commercial building. She further explained that The Alameda Urban Village Plan has goals and objectives for historic preservation. The block which contains this building has been identified as a block of interest. The building next door to this project, 848 The Alameda, is a San Jose City Landmark. There are historic adjacency issues with this subject.*

*San Jose City staff is neutral on this project and would like to hear from the applicant about design options. The subject building was found to be building as a Structure of Merit and would not qualify as a City or State landmark. City-wide policies regarding Structures of Merit would apply on this project. Staff concurs with memo.*

*Anthony Kirk, historical consultant on the project, detailed his work. He opined that the building has had numerous alterations and has clearly lost its historic integrity.*

*It was discussed that a DPR form was never completed for this building.*

*The 4-stepped roofline seen in older photographs has been demolished and is not in existence behind the current roofline.*

*Chair Saum opined that the key challenge is the name "Schurra's" rather than the building.*

*Juliet Arroyo, Historic Preservation Officer, explained that a Structure of Merit is a property of lesser significance than a City Landmark, but one that has important historic associations. The building is a single-story warehouse property type that was typical and important to San Jose's industrial/commercial heritage, particularly along The Alameda, during the pre- and post-war eras. The building was identified as a historic structure for preservation, but a full survey was not done to make that determination – which is why this meeting is necessary. The San Jose General Plan discourages demolition of Structures of Merit. There is no requirement for preservation in this case and the building is not a CEQA resource. Decision is to be made by the HLC and the applicant.*

*Commissioner Polcyn commented that the current building creates part of the feeling of the continuous streetscape and is still original in that regard. In terms of design, the preferred exterior has no context, no relationship to the original building or the buildings on either side. The currently approved design is a good starting point. The other design is a complete deviation.*



*The property owner opined on the rights of property owners. He described other new mixed-use buildings on The Alameda that were built after existing buildings were demolished. He believes it unfair to be held to an unknown standard. There have been a lot of changes to this building. He wants to modernize the building; believes the entire area is being modernized, e.g., next to Whole Foods. He spoke of the problems with the current building – rotted wood, unreinforced masonry.*

*Kelly, a member of the property owner’s design team, spoke about the perception that the building is historic. She opined that a lot of the development in the area has gone in a much more modern direction. They are aware of being part of an industrial/warehouse district. The owner wants the interior to be a creative industrial space; give it new life.*

*Chair Saum commented that this portion of The Alameda is not activated, unfortunately. Having something viable in this space is important. He opined that countering misinformation about the facade and relationship to other buildings is a challenge.*

*Commissioner Raynsford suggested giving consideration to the historical building next door in the context of the street frontage.*

*There was discussion about juxtaposition of historic and modern architecture.*

*Kelly, a member of the property owner’s design team, explained that the owner and architect are not excited about the approved design. Would like a modern lively glass storefront that allows passersby to see into the interior, which will be restored.*

*Chair Saum commented that the adjacency to a city landmark is at the heart of the discussion.*

*Commissioner Raynsford opined that the approved design is an abstraction of the current facade and asked why it’s necessary to change it in this way other than preference. The approved design doesn’t add anything to the streetscape and is distracting to the neighboring building.*

*Chair Saum commented that the relationship between the project building and the City Landmark building needs to be the primary focus. It feels like it’s being designed in a vacuum. He suggested that the design team provide a color-rendered streetscape to show context. There is precedence on the street – The Packard Building and One Medical.*

*Commissioner Raynsford commented that we’ve had this discussion in many parts of San Jose – First Street, Fountain Alley. There is a rich history in thinking about adjacency in current architecture.*



*Juliet Arroyo, Historic Preservation Officer, commented about a loss in historic environment and advised the team to design a good historic adjacent infill. Objective is to get something that the applicant and the staff can both agree on. She explained that this meeting is voluntary. Design team can come back to DRC with streetscape rendering or staff can review it in house to determine if it reflects the comments of the DRC.*

*Mark, a member of the property owner's construction team, commented on construction issues and the large amount of money the owner is spending on this project.*

*Chair Saum suggested that the property owner approach The Alameda Business Association; they would support activating this space.*

3. [HPA16-004-01](#). Historic Preservation Permit Amendment to reduce and reconfigure the legal boundaries for the relocated Smith House (a Historic City Landmark #HL86-31), and the associated tank house, pump house, and aviary, on a new smaller 0.44-gross acre parcel and to allow a six foot high concrete retaining wall to run along the new lot line at the rear, with a five-foot setback. The current City Landmark legal boundary is on a 4.42-gross acre site.

***PROJECT MANAGER, RINA SHAH***

1. Project Plans
2. Wall Photographs
3. Draft Historical Rehabilitation Summary Report, February 7, 2020

*Rina Shah, Project Manager, explained that staff is currently reviewing Tentative Map approval of this property. Staff requested the original HP permit be amended because the Smith House is now going to be located on a smaller parcel. The lot will be split and a residential care facility will be on the larger parcel. A solid stucco wall has already been constructed to separate the two properties. The whole site was designated as historic. Staff is seeking direction on the wall and the smaller lot size to bring it before the Historic Landmarks Commission.*

*Commissioner Raynsford commented that the wall reminded him a little bit of the Berlin Wall.*

*John Frolli, applicant, explained that he has worked on restoring and rehabilitating the house. The house and ancillary buildings have been maintained together as a cluster in a rural, agricultural setting; historic context.*

*In the course of construction, the wall was approved in its location during the permitting process. Owners were asked to move the wall; they are not willing or in a position to move*



*the wall. Not an ideal situation, but a less than significant impact on the historical resource. The wall can be landscaped.*

*Andre Luthard, on behalf of PAC\*SJ, opined that it's great that the house was moved and an enclave was created. It's unfortunate that a wall was built; a permeable fence would have strengthened the rural environment.*

*Discussion of ideas regarding wall – wrought iron fence, slat wood fence, landscape to soften wall.*

*Chair Saum commented that there seemed to be no attempt to relate the wall to the house.*

*John Frolli opined that sensitive discussions before the wall was built would have been good.*

*Chair Saum commented that the wall is not an appropriate wall for restoring a million-dollar landmark and undercuts the investment the property owner made.*

*Juliet Arroyo, Historic Preservation Officer, explained that conditions can be placed on a historic preservation permit.*

**Meeting adjourned at 2:51 p.m.**