

HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION

June 2, 2021

Action Minutes

WELCOME

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

ROLL CALL

Present: Commissioners Saum, Boehm, Arnold, Polcyn, Royer, and Raynsford

Absent: None

1. DEFERRALS

Any item scheduled for hearing this evening for which deferral is being requested will be taken out of order to be heard first on the matter of deferral. If you want to change any of the deferral dates recommended or speak to the question of deferring these or any other items, you should request to speak in the manner specified on p. 2 of this agenda.

No Items

Access the video, agenda, and related reports for this meeting by visiting the City's website at:
<https://www.sanjoseca.gov/your-government/departments/planning-building-code-enforcement/planning-division/commissions-and-hearings/historic-landmarks-commission>

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar items are considered to be routine and will be adopted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion of these items unless a request is made by a member of the Historic Landmarks Commission, staff or the public to have an item removed from the consent calendar and considered separately. If anyone wishes to speak on one of these items, please use the ‘raise hand’ feature in Zoom or contact 408-535-3505 to request to speak.

No Items

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

No Items

4. EARLY REFERRALS UNDER CITY COUNCIL POLICY

- a. **H20-040 & HP21-001**: The Project includes a Site Development Permit (H20-040) and Historic Preservation Permit (HP21-001) on a 9,375-gross square foot site located at 19 North Second Street to allow:
- The demolition of the existing 15,000 square foot building, retaining and integrating the street-facing two story façade and parapet;
 - The construction of a new 220-foot-high (to roof level and 240 feet to top of dome) 22-story mixed use building and one basement level, including 18,643 square feet of commercial space and 220 senior housing units; and
 - The application of the State Density Bonus for the provision of 100% affordable units, including incentives to eliminate the required parking and loading spaces and to reduce the required commercial space.

PROJECT MANAGER, LAURA MEINERS

Staff Recommendation: Provide comments on the North 2nd Street Affordable Senior Housing Project (H20-040 & HP21-001) located at 19 North Second Street, a designated City Landmark, under the “Early Referral” City Council Policy on the Preservation of Historic Landmarks.

Chairman Saum introduced the item by reading the project description and staff recommendation as outlined on the Historic Landmarks Commission (HLC) agenda. Dana Peak, Acting Historic Preservation Officer, provided a summary of the staff report and introduced the project architect, Kurt Anderson.

Mr. Anderson stated that the project was reviewed by the Design Review Subcommittee (DRC) of the HLC and the DRC comments were incorporated into the redesign of the building. He shared his screen and discussed the revisions made to the plans, including the building set back at the third and fourth floors (street façade and sides) and the exterior modifications. Mr. Anderson noted that some of the balconies were eliminated and some were made rectilinear, and the cornices and rotunda were simplified. He commented that the DRC comments and design responses were included in the staff report. Mr. Anderson commented that the revised design resulted in a more attractive and compatible building. He also noted that the height of the building was reduced from 27 stories to 20 stories of residential with 220 senior affordable housing units. He noted the first floor of the building is for commercial use, with a potential regional medical clinic to occupy the space. Mr. Anderson stated that he was available for questions.

Ben Leech, Executive Director, Preservation Action Council of San Jose (PAC SJ), repeated comments provided at the DRC meeting. He stated that comments should be focused on the proposed demolition of the City Landmark, rather than the design of the proposed new building. Mr. Leech commented that the City Landmark should maintain the appearance of a two-story building with a flat roof from the public right-of-way and the proposed minor setback does not accomplish that. He commented that the project still appears to be a skyscraper dwarfing a historic building and it does not appear to meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Mr. Leech acknowledged that there have been some changes to the new building design that responded to some of the comments of the DRC, but the project involves the demolition of a City Landmark and a massive addition on top that is not appropriately set back.*

Mike Sodergren, Vice President at PAC SJ, inquired what does it mean to have a City Landmark in San Jose? He commented that it was disappointing, as a City, that we have created standards for evaluating and designating landmarks, but then demolition is authorized. Mr. Sodergren inquired whether property owners have an obligation to preserve a City Landmark when they knowingly purchase one. He noted that the appearance of the proposed new building has been improved, and inquired what would be preserved inside the City Landmark that would retain the memory of what was there before.*

Commissioner Polcyn expressed appreciation to the architect for the presentation and to PAC SJ for the comments. He commented that he was conflicted about the project because the building has been underutilized for many years despite being renovated. Commissioner Polcyn appreciated the interest in activating the site, but also noted that a critical approach should be taken to a City Landmark. He discussed the information in the 1989 DPR form reviewed by the DRC and commented that the significance of the building is its architecture (façade). The discussion of the cultural significance of the building was limited. Commissioner Polcyn commented that the parts of the building that are 10-15 feet from the façade are unusable. He commented that in its current form, the design is appropriate, but from a historic preservation standpoint, we need to define what makes a building significant and how a higher use of the land can be considered. Commissioner Polcyn noted that the architect responded to the DRC's comments and the design is progressing in the right direction should the project move forward.*

Commissioner Royer stated that she had similar comments. She noted that a 100% affordable senior housing and medical use project would be beneficial, but the project also proposes the demolition of a designated City Landmark. Commissioner Royer did not see how the project could conform with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties because the percentage of new construction significantly outweighs the remaining historic fabric. She commented that if the project did move forward (disregarding the fact that the project proposes the demolition of a City Landmark), additional design work should be done on the proposed new tower to give some deference to what is supposed to remain of the historic building. Commissioner Royer commented that the setback from the City Landmark did not visually read that the new tower was set back far enough from the historic building. She commented there is not enough separation and the color palette is very similar and should be differentiated. The project reads as a single building, rather than a historic building and a new addition. Commissioner Royer commented that the cornice on the fourth level appears to historicize that level, when it is not part of the historic building; therefore, a clear transition is not made from the historic façade to the new construction. She noted her biggest concern was the proposal to demolish the City Landmark, and could not look beyond that to critique the new construction.

Commissioner Arnold inquired about the state density bonus and the incentives related to parking. Mr. Anderson stated the company the applicant is working with to develop the 100% senior affordable housing has advised that parking is not needed and does not work with their model. He noted that commercial development in downtown does not require parking. They were advised by the affordable housing developer that the medical use would create jobs and would be a benefit to downtown, and could be leveraged to waive some city requirements. Commissioner Arnold also stated she was conflicted about demolition and new development, and thought there was more work to be done to analyze the historic building.

Commissioner Raynsford commented that demolition or preservation is not absolute. He viewed the project as the preservation of the façade and the demolition of the interior. Commissioner Raynsford noted the project is not total demolition. He expressed concern that no information was provided about the interior of the building and requested more information on the appearance and integrity of the interior. Commissioner Raynsford inquired if the interior did have historic integrity, could the new construction be built with the preservation of the interior of the building. He noted the question is then, would the tall building compromise the integrity of the City Landmark? He related the question to the New York Grand Central Station court case. Commissioner Raynsford was uncertain whether such a strong argument could be made with this project. He was not completely opposed to constructing a tall building on the site because the purpose is a good one. Commissioner Raynsford commented that the design of the new building, including details and color scheme, is in many ways sensitive to the City Landmark and that the two-story historic building would be treated as a base to the new building. He inquired why there were so many changes in the new tower - four different sections with different design elements - and inquired if the interior program was dictating the design of the facades. Mr. Anderson commented that the intent was to create interest on the narrow, tall tower and stated he is open to modifications. Mr. Anderson shared the existing floor plans and commented that the interior has been remodeled and there are no historic features on the first floor. The second floor was office space and has skylights. He emphasized that the façade is the most important part of the building. Commissioner Raynsford commented that the building, including the interior, needs to be more

carefully documented (historic integrity). If the first 10 feet of the building is proposed to be retained, that should be shown. He commented that the new construction should be further simplified to draw the attention to the City Landmark because the current design distracts from the historic building. Commissioner Raynsford advised that the area between the base and the top of the building should be continuous - more of a unification of the middle stories.

Vice Chairman Boehm commented that the function of the HLC is to encourage and promote the preservation of landmarks. He noted that the consideration of the demolition of a landmark goes against the purpose of the commission. Vice Chairman Boehm referred to the Historic Resources Inventory (page 2) and noted that the condition of the building in 1992 was excellent. The commercial building was renovated in 1984. He commented that the Inventory noted private development as a threat to the site. Vice Chairman Boehm suggested that if demolition were allowed for this project, other City Landmarks be demolished as well and this could set a precedent. He stated his opposition to the project as currently conceived. Vice Chairman Boehm commented that if there were a way to reinforce the City Landmark and build on top of it, that could potentially be considered. He commented that Chairman Saum requested the illustration of streetscape context and inquired if that had been done for North Second Street. Mr. Anderson responded by showing the photographs on the plans of surrounding buildings and noted that structural reinforcement of the City Landmark would be extremely expensive. Vice Chairman Boehm noted that there was awareness the project involved a City Landmark and the responsibility that comes with it should be taken into consideration.

Chairman Saum noted that the proposed construction is 33 feet lower than presented at the DRC meeting. He commented that the setback of the new building from the City Landmark is a step in the right direction and with such a big project, it is reasonable to expect further refinement. Chairman Saum suggested the plans incorporate street views, rather than separate photographs of surrounding buildings. 3D renderings could be inserted into a photograph of the streetscape or orthographic streetscape elevations could be prepared. He referred to the Herrold College development project, which involved a City Landmark and the retention of the building façade, and noted that there is potential for a middle ground with this project. Chairman Saum noted the need for additional documentation of the historic resource, including the interior and existing conditions. He commented that the basic form of the building (from property to property line), flat roof and two story façade appears to be of primary importance. The basic arrangement of the building for a certain portion of it could be maintained and the new construction set back. Chairman Saum agreed with Commissioner Raynsford that the shaft portion of the new construction should be simplified. Mr. Anderson noted that he appreciated the commission's input.

Commissioner Royer commented that the second-floor plan illustrates where the building steps down. She suggested that a cue could be taken from that change in height in the existing building or the column grid to inform where the setback of the new construction could begin. Commissioner Royer also reiterated that the façade of the new construction should be simplified and documentation of the historic resource should be provided. Mr. Anderson noted that the historic documentation is being prepared by TreanorHL. Ms. Peak noted that the analysis was delayed so the most recent design submittal could be evaluated. .

Commissioner Polcyn also noted the issue is the lack of a comprehensive historic report. He commented that of historic interest in the interior are the retail spaces on the ground floor which provide the concept of what retail spaces used to be. This would be the cultural value. Commissioner Polcyn emphasized the need to understand the big picture and what is going on in the project area, and recommended 3D elevations or axonometric drawings. He also emphasized the need to simplify the facades of the building.

Vice Chairman Boehm echoed the request for a comprehensive historic report for the building. He commented that it would be shortsighted of the HLC to approve demolition of a City Landmark.

No action was taken.

- b. **H20-038**: Site Development Permit (H20-038) to allow the demolition of an existing one-story restaurant building and two-story garage accessory building, construction of a mixed-use development comprised of a 29-story (292 feet) high rise with 520 residential units, amenities, and retail space, and construction of a four-level, below-grade parking garage accessible by a two-way driveway located on the northwest corner of the site leading into two loading bays on a 32,737-gross square foot site located at 409 South Second Street.

PROJECT MANAGER, ANGELA WANG

Staff Recommendation: Provide comments on the BoTown Residential Project (H20-038) located at 409 South Second Street under the “Early Referral” City Council Policy on the Preservation of Historic Landmarks.

*Chairman Saum introduced the item by reading the project description and staff recommendation as outlined on the HLC agenda. He disclosed for the record that he, Vice Chairman Boehm, and Brian Grayson (PAC*SJ) met with Ernie Yamane, Steinberg Hart Senior Vice President, , to discuss the BoTown Residential project. Angela Wang, Planning Project Manager, provided an overview of the project and staff report.*

Andrew Jacobson (Westbank and project applicant) thanked the HLC for the opportunity to present the project through the Early Referral process and provided background on Westbank’s commitment to heritage and related technical expertise. He briefly reviewed a series of projects that have been completed or under construction with a historic preservation component. Ernie Yamane, Steinberg Hart Senior Vice President, introduced himself and noted partner James KM Cheng Architects as the designer for the project. He provided a presentation of the project components and design, and proposal for the reconstruction of the existing BoTown restaurant, a Structure of Merit listed in the Historic Resources Inventory.

*Ben Leech (PAC*SJ) acknowledged that the Westbank team reached out to PAC*SJ early in the process with the desire to retain the existing BoTown restaurant in place and design the project around it. He commented that demolition and reconstruction is a reasonable approach for this project given the site constraints and conditions. Mr. Leech commented that San Jose needs more projects that demonstrate historic resources are an asset that add value. He added that projects can be improved if they work around and*

take cues from historic resources. Mr. Leech noted the building is not a City Landmark and commended the developer for taking on the reconstruction. He commented that there were many details to be reviewed, but highlighted that projects incorporating older elements into new buildings can be done and should be done more often.

*Mike Sodergren (PAC*SJ) noted that he attended San Jose State University and that BoTown was a late-night haunt. He expressed appreciation for the project concept and retaining the use of the building as a restaurant. Mr. Sodergren suggested that the applicant keep in mind the people of San Jose that want to live and thrive in downtown and broad hours of operation (24 hours).*

Commissioner Arnold commended the applicant for the incorporation of the BoTown restaurant into the project. She noted that she knew the building well and appreciated that it was part of the project because many people considered the building a landmark for many years with its prominent corner location.

Commissioner Raynsford echoed the previous comment and inquired about the replacement of the structure with concrete. He understood the need, but noted that there is a certain aspect of Googie architecture that demands an attention to materials. Commissioner Raynsford mentioned the original Googie coffee shop in Los Angeles designed by John Lautner, a student of Frank Lloyd Wright. He emphasized the importance of wood and wood surfaces. Commissioner Raynsford inquired if the applicant would consider adding some elements of wood into the reconstruction, even if the overall construction is reinforced concrete. Mr. Yamane noted that was possible and commented that James Cheng is also trying to bring wood into the lower levels of the tower. He noted that no final decisions have been made (code and technical issues to solve), but there is a desire to bring the warmth of the material into the building. Commissioner Raynsford also commented that wood detailing would fit into the project theme of trees and orchards.

Commissioner Polcyn expressed appreciation for the project presentation and commented that the reconstruction of the building is a great way to make a transition from what was on the site to the highrise behind. He commented on the larger context of South First Street and the height of the proposed 29-story tower. Commissioner Polcyn noted the scale of the project seemed out of place for the locality.

Commissioner Royer complimented the team for taking the inspiration for the project from the architectural resource on the site, highlighting it and committing to reconstructing the building.

Vice Chairman Boehm thanked the applicant for sharing the project with the HLC. He was impressed with the initiative to recreate the historic resource so it can continue into the future. Vice Chairman Boehm noted that the proposal also includes the demolition of a building constructed in 1920 that was used as residences (and garages), and inquired if the building could be restored or relocated. Andrew Jacobson responded that the building is in poor condition, is vacant and is a hazard. He noted that six to eight months ago someone broke into the building and a fire was started inside the structure. Mr. Jacobson stated that it is not possible to move the building due to its deteriorated condition. Vice Chairman Boehm noted that a historical marker had been discussed in the meeting with the applicant and inquired whether the early residential history of the site could be highlighted on the wall outside the restaurant. Mr. Yamane commented that the courtyard might be another location opportunity. Vice Chairman Boehm inquired if

the BoTown identification on the signage would be retained and suggested that be considered.

Chairman Saum noted that the site is iconic and people who went to San Jose State University are familiar with the BoTown restaurant and locality. He appreciated the voluntary effort to retain the reference to the iconic building. Chairman Saum appreciated the courtyard and the deferential treatment of the building. He inquired about the materials, texture and fenestration on the first floor of the proposed new building. Chairman Saum noted there is a lot of development proposed in the locality that provides context for the height of the project and that should be documented in the project presentation. He inquired about the next steps for the project. Dana Peak stated that the environmental documentation for the project, along with the historic report, will be brought to the HLC when the type of environmental clearance is determined by staff.

Commissioner Polcyn reiterated the importance of the buildings on South First Street, and commented that there is a lack of understanding about development in this area as a whole. He noted there is not a comprehensive view of the impact of individual projects in the area. Commissioner Polcyn suggested the provision of a graphic or diagram with 3D views showing the existing historic buildings and proposed towers. He noted the rough-cut stone that was used on the original building as an anchor at the entrance and appreciated that this aspect was being addressed in some manner. Commissioner Polcyn inquired about the articulated roof and whether it would be continued into the restaurant space. Mr. Yamane stated that it is currently proposed to be three dimensional, as it was originally.

Commissioner Raynsford echoed the remarks of Commissioner Polcyn and inquired about the City's vision for the SoFA district. He noted the picturesque playfulness of the original stone cladding contrasted with the machine, jet-age forms on the building. Commissioner Raynsford commented that the selection of the quality, color and shape of the stone will make a difference to the design.

Vice Chairman Boehm echoed the previous comments and expressed a desire to know more about the vision for downtown. He suggested that could be a topic for future HLC training. Vice Chairman Boehm appreciated Commissioner Raynsford's comment about the juxtaposition of the playfulness of the rocks and the lettering on the stone with the modern building composition.

Chairman Saum noted the font originally used on the restaurant is evocative of the time and supported Commissioner Raynsford's comment on the stone and playful quality.

No Action was taken.

5. GENERAL BUSINESS

No Items

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.

Mike Sodergren commented on the two out-going commissioners - Commissioners Saum and Polcyn. He thanked staff for recruiting such wonderful commissioners. Mr. Sodergren commented that Commissioner Polcyn is an independent thinker who seeks logical solutions with heart. He commented that he could not do justice to all the work and sacrifice the commissioners made in representing the interests of the citizens of San Jose. Mr. Sodergren described Commissioner Saum as smart, patient, heart for people, clearly loves his city, gift for empathy, and accepting of other's ideas and absorbs them into recommendations. He suggested Commissioner Saum's most important quality is that developers and preservationists alike trust him. Mr. Sodergren thanked Chairman Saum for his leadership and Commissioner Polcyn for everything he brought to the HLC. On behalf of the PAC SJ board, thank you for your service.*

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

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

- i. Future Agenda Items: HL21-001 landmark designation application for 285 S. 12th Street, H21-012 Site Development Permit for 300 S. 1st Street (Valley Title)
- ii. Summary of communications received by the Historic Landmarks Commission.
- iii. [Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman](#)

Chairman Saum opened the floor for nominations for the position of Chairman. Commissioner Raynsford nominated Commissioner Boehm as Chairman and the motion was seconded by Commissioner Royer. Chairman Saum called for any other nominations for Chairman, there were none. Commissioner Raynsford made a motion

to elect Commission Bohem as Chair. Commissioner Royer seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0)

Chairman Saum opened the floor for nominations for the position of Vice Chairman. Commissioner Polcyn made a motion to elect Commissioner Raynsford as Vice Chairman. The motion was seconded by Commissioners Royer and Arnold. The Commission voted unanimously (6-0).

iv. Election of Design Review Subcommittee members

Chair Saum inquired whether it was possible to change the time and date of the DRC meeting to accommodate commissioner availability. Ms. Peak noted that the DRC schedule has been established for the calendar year. Robert Manford, Deputy Director for Planning, stated that a change to the date and time could be done by motion of the HLC.

Chairman Saum opened the floor for two nominations to replace Commissioners Saum and Polcyn's positions on the DRC. Commissioners Royer and Boehm expressed interest. Commissioner Boehm requested a change in date, but was willing to make accommodations. Commissioner Raynsford (current DRC member) stated that the time will not work for him starting in August due to a conflict (not available 12:30-1:45pm that Wednesday). Commissioner Arnold has a standing meeting at that time. Commissioner Saum suggested retaining the date, but changing the time. Commissioner Boehm suggested 11:00am or 3:00pm on the same date. Ms. Peak noted that the City calendar would need to be consulted. Rene Ortega, Senior Deputy City Attorney, noted that in July or August the meetings may be held at City Hall and room availability could impact the date and time. Chairman Saum suggested that the July meeting remain at the same time and staff work with DRC members to coordinate a new time for August and the remainder of the calendar year. Commissioner Royer stated that she will be out of town in July and could participate remotely, but not at City Hall.

v. There will be no Historic Landmarks Committee meeting in July 2021. Next Meeting is August 4, 2021 in San Jose City Hall, City Council Chambers.

Rene Ortega noted that the location in City Hall is tentative, though staff is planning for a return to City Hall in August.

b. **Report from Committees**

i. Design Review Subcommittee: The June 16, 2021 meeting has been cancelled. Next meeting on July 21, 2021.

Chairman Saum reported the DRC met on May 19, 2021 to discuss a development project located at 17-21 East Santa Clara Street and 29-31 East Santa Clara Street. The project site contains a property listed in the Historic Resource Inventory and is located across the street from the Bank of Italy. The DRC discussed historic adjacency issues and the Downtown Design Guidelines and Standards, and the potential to retain the Art Deco façade of 17-21 East Santa Clara Street. Chairman Saum noted the applicant was receptive and emphasized the need for information on the site context along Santa Clara Street. Commissioner Polcyn noted that the historic context is what makes the street humanizing. Commissioner Raynsford confirmed DRC members emphasized the importance of the Art Deco façade and the detailing above the building's entrance, and also reinforced the need for contextual information.

c. **Approval of Action Minutes**

- i. **Recommendation:** Approval of Action Minutes for the Historic Landmarks Commission Meeting of [May 5, 2021](#).

Commissioner Polcyn made a motion to approve the minutes as presented. Vice Chairman Boehm seconded the motion. The Commission voted unanimously in favor of the motion (6-0) to approve the minutes.

d. **Status of Citywide Survey Projects**

- i. N. 1st St. Urban Village Phase III
ii. Downtown Historic Context
iii. Citywide Historic Context Update

Dana Peak provided an overview of three survey projects the city is currently conducting: North First Street Urban Village Phase III, Downtown Historic Context and Citywide Historic Context Update.

The North First Street Urban Village survey is the last phase of a three phase project. The area is roughly bounded by North Second Street on the east, Highway 880 on the north, North San Pedro Street on Julian Street on the south. The first phase of the project was a reconnaissance survey of 142 properties. The second phase was an intensive-level survey of 20 of the 142 properties that were the most architecturally significant and could be the most effected by demolition and redevelopment. The evaluation concluded that all 20 properties were eligible for City Landmark designation under one or more criteria. The properties are largely located on North First Street. The last phase of the project will survey the remaining properties. 55 of the properties will be individually surveyed and the other properties will be evaluated as part of three potential historic districts. The service order with Michael Baker International is being finalized and the project is anticipated to be completed this fall.

The Downtown Historic Context will establish a historic context for downtown. The document is based on the 2004 draft Downtown Historic District Design Guidelines and incorporates all other historic contexts statements (neighborhoods, mid-century modern, etc.), historic reports, and historic district evaluations that have been prepared for downtown San Jose. The project also includes a reconnaissance-level survey that updates the style information that is currently part of the 2004 draft Downtown Historic District Design Guidelines. The project is nearing completion (June 30, 2021) and is currently being edited. It was partially funded by a grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation.

The Citywide Historic Context Update will update San Jose's existing historic context statement prepared in 1992. The purpose is to identify historic patterns and themes not previously discussed. Past studies and reports overlooked important aspects of San Jose's social and economic life, particularly related to under-represented communities. The goal is to connect the new themes with the existing built environment by identifying new properties that more fully represent the depth of San Jose's history. The City retained Archives and Architecture to facilitate the project and prepare the update to the historic context statement. A community meeting will tentatively be held on Zoom in mid-July 2021 and a website will be established to solicit community input focused on diversity. The project is partially funded by a

grant from the State Office of Historic Preservation and must be completed by September 30, 2021.

e. **Status of Circulating Environmental Documents**

i. [Notice of Preparation of a Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the San Jose Fountain Alley Mixed-Use Project for Fountain Alley](#)

Dana Peak stated that the Notice of Preparation of the Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the San Jose Fountain Alley Mixed-Use Project is attached to the HLC agenda and additional information is available on the City's website. A joint community meeting and environmental scoping meeting on Zoom will be held on June 14, 2021 at 6:00p.m.

f. **Acknowledgement of Service for Commissioner Saum and Commissioner Polcyn**

Vice Chairman Boehm inquired about the status of the Historic Landmarks Commissioner and Historic Preservation Officer searches. Ms. Peak responded that advertisement of the vacant position held by Commissioner Hirst has been circulated through social media, including Facebook and NextDoor, and she encouraged commissioners to share the information with others. There will be two additional HLC vacancies starting July 1, 2021. Vice Chairman Boehm inquired whether applicants are required to be a resident of the City of San Jose (within the City boundaries) because the language says, unless otherwise authorized. Dr. Manford added that it might be possible to request a waiver from City Council.

Dr. Manford reported that Dana Peak is in the acting position of Historic Preservation Officer. He noted there is a hiring freeze and the department has asked Human Resources (HR) to look at the list from the past recruitment to see if someone can be hired from that existing list because it has been less than a year since the recruitment occurred. Dr. Manford commented that HR has reached out to the candidates on that list. He reported that the department is waiting for approval to make a selection.

Vice Chairman Boehm read certificates of commendation for Commissioners Saum and Boehm. HLC members and staff thanked the commissioners for their service and contributions to the HLC, and all shared their personal experiences with the commissioners

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Polcyn motioned to adjourn the Historic Landmarks Commission meeting of June 2, 2021. Commissioner Royer seconded the motion.

The Commission voted unanimously (6-0) in favor of a motion to adjourn the meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 9: 38 p.m.