

488 E. ST. JOHN STREET URBAN
RESIDENTIAL PROJECT

File No. H20-007

Initial Study / Mitigated Negative Declaration

**RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS AND TEXT
CHANGES**

September 22, 2021

CEQA Lead Agency:



City of San José
Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement
200 East Santa Clara Street
San Jose, California 95113 Phone: (408) 535-3555

In Consultation with:

ESA
787 The Alameda
Suite 250
San Jose, CA 95126
408.660.4000
esassoc.com

Table of Contents

SECTION 1	SUMMARY OF COMMENTS	3
SECTION 2	AGENCIES AND PERSONS COMMENTING ON THE IS/MND	4
SECTION 3	RESPONSE TO COMMENTS.....	5
A.	RESPONSE TO VALLEY WATER	5
B.	RESPONSE TO PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY	7
C.	RESPONSE TO PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY	9
D.	RESPONSE TO PAC*SJ.....	10
E.	RESPONSE TO GLENN A. BROWN.....	13
SECTION 4	TEXT CHANGES TO THE IS/MND	14

Attachments

Attachment A – All Public Comments Received During Public Review Period on the IS/MND

SECTION 1 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

The 488 E. St. John Street Urban Residential Project Initial Study /Mitigation Negative Declaration (IS/MND) was circulated for public review for a 21-day review period, from August 2, 2021 to August 23, 2021. During the circulation period, the City of San José received the following five comment letters:

- A. Valley Water, Lisa Brancatelli
- B. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Plan Review Team / Land Management
- C. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Plan Review Team / Land Management
- D. PAC*SJ, Ben Leech
- E. Glenn A. Brown

The comments received on the draft IS/MND did not raise any new issues about the project's environmental impacts, or provide information indicating the project would result in new environmental impacts or impacts substantially greater in severity than disclosed in the IS/MND. CEQA does not require formal responses to comments on an IS/MND, only that the lead agency consider the comments received [CEQA Guidelines §15074(b)]. Nevertheless, responses to the comments are included in this document to provide a complete environmental record.

The following pages contain a list of the agencies and persons that submitted comments on the IS/MND and the City's responses to comments received on the IS/MND. The specific comments have been excerpted from the letter and are presented as "Comment" with each response directly following ("Response"). Copies of the correspondence submitted to the City of San José are attached to this document as **Attachment A**.

SECTION 2

AGENCIES AND PERSONS COMMENTING ON THE IS/MND

Comment Received From	Date of Letter	Response on Page
Regional and Local Agencies		
A. Valley Water, Lisa Brancatelli	August 16, 2021	5
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Plan Review Team / Land Management	August 4, 2021	7
C. Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Plan Review Team / Land Management	August 23, 2021	9
Organizations and Individuals		
D. PAC*SJ, Ben Leech	August 23, 2021	10
E. Glenn A. Brown	August 23, 2021	13

SECTION 3

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

This memo responds to comments on the IS/MND as they relate to the potential environmental impacts of the project under CEQA. Numbered responses correspond to comments in each comment letter, which are provided in Attachment A.

A. RESPONSE TO A - VALLEY WATER, LISA BRANCATELLI

COMMENT A1: Discussion Section (d) on Page 3-96 states the project location is within the dam inundation hazard zones of Lexington Dam and Anderson Dam; however, portions of the project site are located within both Anderson Dam and Coyote Dam failure inundation zones. This section should be revised accordingly.

RESPONSE A1: In response to the comment, text is added to the IS/MND to acknowledge that portions of the project site are located within the Anderson Dam and Coyote Dam failure inundate zones, supported by the Anderson-Coyote Dam Flood Inundation Maps, dated 2020, prepared by the Santa Clara Valley Water District (SCVWD, 2021). See modification shown in Section 4, *Text Changes to the IS/MND*, of this document.

COMMENT A2: Valley Water records do not show any wells on the project site (APN: 467-17-044, 467-17-045, and 467-17-046); however, it is always possible that a well exists that is not in Valley Water records. Abandoned or unused wells can provide a vertical conduit for contaminants to pollute groundwater. To avoid impacts to groundwater quality, any wells found on-site that will not be used must be properly destroyed in accordance with Ordinance 90-1, which requires the issuance of a well destruction permit or registered with Valley Water and protected during construction. Property owners or their representatives should call the Wells and Water Measurement Unit at (408) 630-2660 for more information regarding well permits and registration for the destruction of wells.

RESPONSE A2: This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND. It does concur with existing conditions stated in the IS/MND that no abandoned or unused wells, which could adversely affect groundwater quality, are observed on the project site. Rather, the comment identifies existing pre-construction requirements intended to avoid potential impacts to groundwater quality if unknown wells are encountered. This includes adherence to applicable Ordinance 90-1 and contacting Valley Water if any wells are found. Also, the IS/MND acknowledges the potential for the project to encounter abandoned or unused wells and heating oil tanks that could affected groundwater quality. The analysis also assumes that the proposed

project will comply with all regulatory requirements, including specifically those that pertain to groundwater quality and other environment effects prior to and during construction. This response proposes additional text to acknowledge the proposed project's regulatory compliance; see Section 4, *Text Changes to the IS/MND*, of this document). The added text does not constitute a substantial change to the analysis in the IS/MND nor suggest a prior inadequacy of the IS/MND or the CEQA analysis. To the extent this comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND, the City will take it into account prior to taking action on the project. No further response or environmental analysis is warranted.

B. RESPONSE TO B - PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, PLAN REVIEW TEAM / LAND MANAGEMENT

COMMENT B1: Thank you for submitting the 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project plans for our review. PG&E will review the submitted plans in relationship to any existing Gas and Electric facilities within the project area. If the proposed project is adjacent/or within PG&E owned property and/or easements, we will be working with you to ensure compatible uses and activities near our facilities.

Attached you will find information and requirements as it relates to Gas facilities (Attachment 1 [*to Comment B letter in Attachment A to this document*]) and Electric facilities (Attachment 2 [*to this Comment B letter in Attachment A to this document*]). Please review these in detail, as it is critical to ensure your safety and to protect PG&E's facilities and its existing rights.

Below is additional information for your review:

1. This plan review process does not replace the application process for PG&E gas or electric service your project may require. For these requests, please continue to work with PG&E Service Planning: https://www.pge.com/en_US/business/services/buildingand-renovation/overview/overview.page.
2. If the project being submitted is part of a larger project, please include the entire scope of your project, and not just a portion of it. PG&E's facilities are to be incorporated within any CEQA document. PG&E needs to verify that the CEQA document will identify any required future PG&E services.
3. An engineering deposit may be required to review plans for a project depending on the size, scope, and location of the project and as it relates to any rearrangement or new installation of PG&E facilities.

Any proposed uses within the PG&E fee strip and/or easement, may include a California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) Section 851 filing. This requires the CPUC to render approval for a conveyance of rights for specific uses on PG&E's fee strip or easement. PG&E will advise if the necessity to incorporate a CPUC Section 851 filing is required.

This letter does not constitute PG&E's consent to use any portion of its easement for any purpose not previously conveyed. PG&E will provide a project specific response as required.

RESPONSE B1: This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND, but rather addresses PG&E activities; project applicant requirements and standards associated with plan review, permitting and construction activities relevant to the proposed project and PG&E owned property and/or easements. The analysis in the IS/MND assumes that the proposed project will comply with all regulatory requirements that pertain to utility infrastructure and services or other safety to the public and the environment. The project applicant will work with the City and PG&E to install utility service laterals for gas and electric to connect to existing PG&E

facilities (see page 2-15 of the IS/MND). To the extent this comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND, the City will take it into account prior to taking action on the project. No further response or environmental analysis is warranted.

C. RESPONSE TO C - PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY, PLAN REVIEW TEAM / LAND MANAGEMENT

COMMENT C1: Thank you for providing PG&E the opportunity to review your proposed plans for 488 E. St. John Urban Residential dated 8/2/2021. Our review indicates your proposed improvements do not appear to directly interfere with existing PG&E facilities or impact our easement rights.

RESPONSE C1: This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND, but rather confirms that the project would not conflict with existing facilities or easements under control of the commenting agency. The City will take this non-CEQA information into account prior to taking action on the project. No further response or environmental analysis is warranted.

COMMENT C2: Please note this is our preliminary review and PG&E reserves the right for additional future review as needed. This letter shall not in any way alter, modify, or terminate any provision of any existing easement rights. If there are subsequent modifications made to your design, we ask that you resubmit the plans to the email address listed below.

If you require PG&E gas or electrical service in the future, please continue to work with PG&E's Service Planning department: <https://www.pge.com/cco/>. As a reminder, before any digging or excavation occurs, please contact Underground Service Alert (USA) by dialing 811 a minimum of 2 working days prior to commencing any work. This free and independent service will ensure that all existing underground utilities are identified and marked on-site.

RESPONSE C2: This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND. Instead, the comment addresses pre-construction actions and actions required by the project applicant if future project modifications are proposed. As stated in Response B1, the analysis in the IS/MND assumes that the proposed project will comply with all regulatory requirements that pertain to utility infrastructure and services or other safety to the public and the environment. The City will take this non-CEQA information into account prior to taking action on the project. No further response or environmental analysis is warranted.

D. RESPONSE TO D – Preservation Action Council San Jose (PAC*SJ), BEN LEECH

COMMENT D1: PAC*SJ submits the following comments in response to the below-referenced project H20-007, which proposes the demolition of three existing residential buildings located at the southeast corner of North 11th and East St. John Streets.

As detailed in the project’s Historic Resource Evaluation, at least one of these buildings appears eligible for listing in the San Jose Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) as a Structure of Merit: 93-97 N.11th Street, designed by noted architects Wolfe & McKenzie and constructed in 1901. PAC*SJ acknowledges that HRI- and HRI-eligible properties alone do not qualify as eligible historic resources under CEQA, and are therefore not subject to CEQA-required mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts to cultural resources. As such, PAC*SJ does not challenge the proposed adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) as part of this project’s development review.

However, we request that the City provide further explanation regarding how this project conforms (or does not conform) to relevant Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Policies LU-14.4 and LU-14.6, and how PBCE staff did or did not take these policies into consideration during its project review. For reference, the full texts of these policies are included below, with relevant portions in bold:

- **LU-14.4 Discourage demolition of any building or structure listed on or eligible for the Historic Resources Inventory as a Structure of Merit by pursuing the alternatives of rehabilitation, re-use on the subject site, and/or relocation of the resource.**
- **LU-14.6 Consider preservation of Structures of Merit and Contributing Structures in Conservation Areas as a key consideration in the development review process. As development proposals are submitted, evaluate the significance of structures, complete non-Historic American Building Survey level of documentation, list qualifying structures on the Historic Resources Inventory, and consider the feasibility of incorporating structures into the development proposal, particularly those structures that contribute to the fabric of Conservation Areas.**

RESPONSE D1: As discussed in the IS/MND, Page & Turnbull historic resources consultants prepared a historic resource evaluation (HRE) (Appendix D to the IS/MND) that addresses the existing three residential buildings on the project site. The purpose of the HRE was to examine the buildings’ historic context; current historic status; and potential significance of the buildings’ individual eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, California Register of Historical Resources (California Register) and as a City Landmark according to the criteria of the City of San José.

The IS/MND incorporates HRE information and findings that pertain to the evaluation of the project under CEQA. The *Regulatory Setting of the Cultural Resources and*

Tribal Cultural Resource section of the IS/MND (Section E) discusses the Structures of Merit classification under the City’s Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) (IS/MND page 3-47). The HRE concludes that each of the three existing buildings on the project site “appears to be a good candidate for listing in the San José [HRI] as a Structure of Merit,” and recommends that each of the properties be considered for listing as such. The HRE further clarifies that the Structure of Merit status “does not confer status as a Historical Resource for the purposes of [the] CEQA.” (HRE page 47, Appendix D to the IS/MND)

The comment asks how this project conforms (or does not conform) to Policy LU-14.4 and LU-14.6, and how these policies were considered during project review. As proposed, the project would demolish the three existing buildings to accommodate development of a 46-unit apartment building. Since neither of the existing buildings qualify as a historical resource for CEQA, there is no requirement that any of the buildings be retained, rehabilitated, relocated, or incorporated into the development proposal to avoid a significant CEQA impact. The table of *Envision San José 2040 Policies Relevant to Cultural Resources - Historic Structures of Lesser Significance* (IS/MND page 3-49) includes Policy LU-14.4. Pursuant to Policy LU-14.4, the City and the project applicant are encouraged to consider the relocation, rehabilitation, or reuse of Structures of Merit as part of the development review process, unrelated to CEQA. Due to the site layout and proposed project density, rehabilitation and reuse of the structures on-site would be difficult. Additionally, the relocation of the buildings was not reviewed in the IS/MND as it was not proposed nor required for the Structure of Merit, as described above. Further, General Plan Policy LU-14.6, would not be applicable to the project as this policy relates to structures within Conservation Areas; the proposed project site is not located within a Conservation Area.

This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND. No further environmental analysis is warranted.

COMMENT D2: PAC*SJ is growing increasingly alarmed by the rate of demolition of HRI- and HRI-eligible properties across the city, and especially in neighborhoods where relatively few older and historic structures have ever been evaluated for historic significance. We are also growing increasingly concerned that long-promised comprehensive updates to the City’s Historic Resources Inventory will not be completed as part of the Survey San Jose project currently underway. For example, this project’s Historic Resources Evaluation identified at least twelve previously-surveyed properties within 200 feet of the project area that appear eligible for inclusion in the HRI (Page & Turnbull, Appendix D, pp. 23-32). Yet PAC*SJ is unaware of any systematic effort to formally add these properties to the Inventory as a result of this project-

initiated analysis. The same is unfortunately true for dozens of other recent CEQA-mandated environmental reviews that have identified hundreds of HRI-eligible structures in recent years, virtually none of which have been formally added to the HRI as a result. This appears to directly contradict both the spirit and the letter of Policy LU-14.6, as well as the spirit of City Council's officially-adopted Historic Survey Strategy (approved September 19, 2017).

In summary, while PAC*SJ does not seek to challenge the proposed adoption of a MND for this project under CEQA, the proposed demolition of an HRI-eligible historic resource nevertheless raises significant concerns that deserve further consideration and explanation. We appreciate the opportunity to share these concerns and look forward to your response.

RESPONSE D2: This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND, but rather states concern about the City's comprehensive update to the HRI and a formal process to add properties that appear eligible for listing in the HRI. As stated in Response D1, Policy LU-14.6 specifies possible actions that the City may implement, as part of project review, to add eligible properties to the HRI; the actions are not mandatory. Moreover, implementation of the actions in LU-14.6 are not required to mitigate environmental effects, and the existing building on the project site are not historical resources under CEQA based on the HRE findings. Candidate Structures of Merit and Structures of Merit listed in the Historic Resources Inventory are treated in the same fashion under CEQA and as part of the project review. As the comment acknowledges, its stated concern pertains to considerations outside the purview of CEQA. The City will take this non-CEQA information into account prior to taking action on the project. The City will continue to incrementally move forward with its Historic Preservation Program and the update of the HRI and appreciates PAC*SJ's support with these efforts. No further response or environmental analysis is warranted.

E. RESPONSE TO E – GLENN A. BROWN

COMMENT E1: I would regret not at least putting in my two cents regarding the 488 E. St. John Project. If it was my project I would be pushing the limits allowed by the height designations for this site. The height limits historically speaking are "Above 50' allowed? YES! Height Limits up to 120'.

Given the location of the site on THE major artery North to South in Downtown, 11th street is a unique opportunity to build a mixed use project that would have a very inviting pedestrian and bicycle venue, while providing open dining and coffee areas that would provide jobs, housing, improve the circulation in the area, and be a model for other future projects. Build with 2060 in mind, and as I would have said, "Grow Big or Go Home!"

RESPONSE E1: This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND, particularly regarding potential impacts resulting from the project's height. Instead, the comment describes and justifies his or her position on increase the project's proposed height limit. The City will take this non-CEQA information into account prior to taking action on the project. No further response or environmental analysis is warranted.

COMMENT E2: To Improve the Foot print I would acquire 83 N. 11th Street and add the square footage (literally) into the design, and at 480 E. St. John I would add a story underneath and one above making it a 3 story building while changing the setbacks on the 12 Story Mixed Use Design.

RESPONSE E2: This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND, particularly regarding potential impacts resulting from the project's design or configuration. Instead, the comment describes his or her idea for how he or she would develop expand the property and reconfigure the proposed structure. The City will take this non-CEQA information into account prior to taking action on the project. No further response or environmental analysis is warranted.

COMMENT E3: To improve the community and offer a way out for those that WANT a way out, I would model a program after the DeLancey Street Program in San Francisco in a percentage of the project.

RESPONSE E3: This comment does not address the sufficiency of the IS/MND or other considerations under CEQA. The City will take this non-CEQA information into account prior to taking action on the project. No further response or environmental analysis is warranted.

SECTION 4

TEXT CHANGES TO THE IS/MND

Page Number	Description of Change
3-83	<p>The following text is added to the end of the second full paragraph:</p> <p>Similarly, although also not observed on the project site, it is always possible that an abandoned or unused well that could provide a vertical conduit for contaminants to pollute groundwater exists on the property, although not shown on existing Valley Water records. During construction, the project will properly remove, protect or register any encountered wells, pursuant to a well destruction permit and in accordance with Valley Water Ordinance 90-1.</p>
3-92	<p>The following text is added under the <i>Regional and Local</i> and section of the <i>Regulatory Framework</i> for Hydrology and Water Quality:</p> <p>Ordinance 90-1. To protect Santa Clara County underground aquifers - the source of nearly 50 percent of the county's water needs, District Ordinance 90-1 requires permitting for any person digging, boring, drilling, deepening, refurbishing, or destroying a water well, cathodic protection well, observation well, monitoring well, exploratory boring (45 feet or deeper), or other deep excavation that intersects the groundwater aquifers of Santa Clara County. Anyone who plans such a project must first obtain a permit from the District's Wells and Water Production Unit.</p>
3-96	<p>The following text modification is added to the third paragraph under criterion "d" (flood hazard):</p> <p>However, the Project site is located within the Lexington Dam and Anderson Dam failure inundation hazard zone (Santa Clara Valley Water District, 2020a; Santa Clara Valley Water District, 2020b; California Department of Water Resources, 2020.</p>
4-3	<p>The following citation is added to the Bibliography:</p> <p>Tamien Nation (NM), 2021. <i>Formal Request for Tribal Consultation, TN-20210730-01</i>, signed Quirina Geary. August 29, 2021.</p>
4-3	<p>The following citation is added to the Bibliography:</p> <p>Santa Clara Valley Water District, 2021. <i>Anderson-Coyote Dam Inundation Map</i>, dated January 2020. Accessed September 2021.</p>

**ATTACHMENT A ALL PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING
PUBLIC REVIEW PERIOD ON THE IS/MND**

COMMENT A**RE: Public Review of Draft MND: 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project (File No. H20-007)**

Lisa Brancatelli <LBrancatelli@valleywater.org>

Mon 8/16/2021 9:42 AM

To: Van Der Zweep, Cassandra <Cassandra.VanDerZweep@sanjoseca.gov>

Cc: Colleen Haggerty <chaggerty@valleywater.org>

[External Email]

Hello Cassandra,

Valley Water has reviewed the Notice of Intent to Adopt an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) for the 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project, received by Valley Water on August 2, 2021.

The proposed development is not located adjacent or within any Valley Water facilities or right-of-way; therefore, in accordance with Valley Water's Water Resources Protection Ordinance, a Valley Water encroachment permit is not required for this project.

Valley Water has the following comments regarding the project:

1. Discussion Section (d) on Page 3-96 states the project location is within the dam inundation hazard zones of Lexington Dam and Anderson Dam; however, portions of the project site are located within both Anderson Dam and Coyote Dam failure inundation zones. This section should be revised accordingly.
2. Valley Water records do not show any wells on the project site (APN: 467-17-044, 467-17-045, and 467-17-046); however, it is always possible that a well exists that is not in Valley Water records. Abandoned or unused wells can provide a vertical conduit for contaminants to pollute groundwater. To avoid impacts to groundwater quality, any wells found on-site that will not be used must be properly destroyed in accordance with Ordinance 90-1, which requires the issuance of a well destruction permit or registered with Valley Water and protected during construction. Property owners or their representatives should call the Wells and Water Measurement Unit at (408) 630-2660 for more information regarding well permits and registration for the destruction of wells.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the document and would like to review future documents as they become available. If you have any questions, you may reach me at (408) 691-1247, or by email at LBrancatelli@valleywater.org. Please reference Valley Water File No. 34510 on further correspondence regarding this project.

Thank you,

LISA BRANCATELLI

ASSISTANT ENGINEER II (CIVIL)

Community Projects Review Unit

lbrancatelli@valleywater.org

Tel. (408) 630-2479 / Cell. (408) 691-1247

CPRU Hotline: (408) 630-2650

Santa Clara Valley Water District is now known as:



Clean Water • Healthy Environment • Flood Protection

5750 Almaden Expressway, San Jose CA 95118

www.valleywater.org

From: Van Der Zweep, Cassandra <Cassandra.VanDerZweep@sanjoseca.gov>

Sent: Monday, August 02, 2021 4:50 PM

Cc: Meiners, Laura <Laura.Meiners@sanjoseca.gov>; Kelly, Patrick (PBCE) <patrick.kelly@sanjoseca.gov>; glennbrownlegal@gmail.com; The Office of Mayor Sam Liccardo <TheOfficeofMayorSamLiccardo@sanjoseca.gov>; District1 <district1@sanjoseca.gov>; District2 <District2@sanjoseca.gov>; District3 <district3@sanjoseca.gov>; District4 <District4@sanjoseca.gov>; District5 <District5@sanjoseca.gov>; District 6 <district6@sanjoseca.gov>; District7 <District7@sanjoseca.gov>; District8 <district8@sanjoseca.gov>; District9 <district9@sanjoseca.gov>; District 10 <District10@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>; Manford, Robert <Robert.Manford@sanjoseca.gov>; Keyon, David <david.keyon@sanjoseca.gov>; Le, Thai-Chau <Thai-Chau.Le@sanjoseca.gov>; Van Der Zweep, Cassandra <Cassandra.VanDerZweep@sanjoseca.gov>; Do, Sylvia <sylvia.do@sanjoseca.gov>; Rood, Timothy <timothy.rood@sanjoseca.gov>; Peak, Dana <Dana.Peak@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 3 <PlanningCom3@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 4 <PlanningCom4@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 7 <PlanningCom7@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 6 <PlanningCom6@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 1 <PlanningCom1@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 2 <PlanningCom2@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 5 <PlanningCom5@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 8 <PlanningCom8@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 9 <PlanningCom9@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission 10 <PlanningCom10@sanjoseca.gov>; Planning Commission CW <PlanningComCW@sanjoseca.gov>; Historic Landmarks Commission 1 <HLC1@sanjoseca.gov>; Historic Landmarks Commission 2 <HLC2@sanjoseca.gov>; Historic Landmarks Commission 3 <HLC3@sanjoseca.gov>; Historic Landmarks Commission 4 <HLC4@sanjoseca.gov>; Historic Landmarks Commission 5 <HLC5@sanjoseca.gov>; Historic Landmarks Commission 6 <HLC6@sanjoseca.gov>; Historic Landmarks Commission 7 <HLC7@sanjoseca.gov>; plan.review <plan.review@vta.org>; Roads@CountyRoads.org; jbroadbent@baaqmd.gov; wallyc@abag.ca.gov; Kristin Garrison <Kristin.Garrison@wildlife.ca.gov>; sfbaynwrc@fws.gov; mediaoffice@energy.state.ca.us; cepacomm@calepa.ca.gov; ombcomm@arb.ca.gov; hhilken@baaqmd.gov; dorothy.e.talbo@rda.sccgov.org; ebugarin@bayareametro.gov; LDIGR-D4@dot.ca.gov; philip.crimmins@dot.ca.gov; Colleen Haggerty <CHaggerty@valleywater.org>; CPRU-Dropbox <CPRU@valleywater.org>; ben.aghegnehu@rda.sccgov.org; pgeplanreview@pge.com; Josephine Fong <jfong@baaqmd.gov>; Jake Walsh <jake.walsh@sjwater.com>; Tuttle, Bill <bill.tuttle@sjwater.com>; scvas@scvas.org; Sutherland, Kathy <kathysutherland@pacbell.net>; Knies, Scott <sknies@sjdowntown.com>; wtbrooks@brookshess.com; Erik Schoennauer <es@stanfordalumni.org>; mhophan@spur.org; ada.marquez@sjsu.edu

Subject: Public Review of Draft MND: 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project (File No. H20-007)

PUBLIC NOTICE INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

CITY OF SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA

Project Name: 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project

File No.: H20-007

Description: The Project proposes demolition of the three (3) existing residential buildings and construction of a 46-unit apartment building. The new building would be up to four (4) stories above ground with one (1) level of underground parking garage with 30 vehicle parking spaces and 8 bicycle parking lockers. Ground-floor spaces would include residential units and other tenant-serving uses (including, but not limited to, a leasing office, community room, and 4 bicycle racks). A rooftop garden is proposed on a portion of the new building. Seven (7) existing ordinance-size trees are proposed for removal.

Location: 488 E. St. John Street, San Jose, CA (southwest corner of E. St. John Street and N. 11th Street)

Assessor's Parcel Nos.: 237-03-044 **Council District:** 3

Applicant Contact Information: Wilson Tan, Satorivy Properties LLC, 488 E. St. John Street, San José, CA 95112; (408) 832-3302

The City has performed an environmental review of the project. The environmental review examines the nature and extent of any adverse effects on the environment that could occur if the project is approved and implemented. Based on the review, the City has prepared a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for this project. A MND is a statement by the City that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment because the project will include mitigation measures that will reduce identified project impacts to a less than significant level. The project site is not listed on a hazardous waste site or list pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code.

The public is welcome to review and comment on the Draft MND. The public comment period for this Draft MND begins on August 2, 2021 and ends on August 23, 2021. The Draft MND, Initial Study, and reference documents are available online at: www.sanjoseca.gov/negativedeclarations.

In response to the COVID-19 and Shelter-in-Place policy, hard copies are no longer available at the typical locations such as the City of San José Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, located at City Hall, 200 East Santa Clara Street; and at the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Main Library, located at 150 E. San Fernando Street. Therefore, if requested, a hard copy will be mailed to you. Please allow time for printing and delivery. For additional information, please contact Thai-Chau Le at (408) 535-7659, or by e-mail at Cassandra.vanderZweep@sanjoseca.gov.

Cassandra van der Zweep

Supervising Planner | Planning, Building & Code Enforcement

City of San José | 200 East Santa Clara Street

Email: cassandra.vanderzweep@sanjoseca.gov | Phone: (408)-535-7659

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

COMMENT B

August 4, 2021

Cassandra van der Zweep
City of San Jose
200 East Santa Clara Street
San Jose, CA 95113

Ref: Gas and Electric Transmission and Distribution

Dear Cassandra,

Thank you for submitting the 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project plans for our review. PG&E will review the submitted plans in relationship to any existing Gas and Electric facilities within the project area. If the proposed project is adjacent/or within PG&E owned property and/or easements, we will be working with you to ensure compatible uses and activities near our facilities.

Attached you will find information and requirements as it relates to Gas facilities (Attachment 1) and Electric facilities (Attachment 2). Please review these in detail, as it is critical to ensure your safety and to protect PG&E's facilities and its existing rights.

Below is additional information for your review:

1. This plan review process does not replace the application process for PG&E gas or electric service your project may require. For these requests, please continue to work with PG&E Service Planning: https://www.pge.com/en_US/business/services/building-and-renovation/overview/overview.page.
2. If the project being submitted is part of a larger project, please include the entire scope of your project, and not just a portion of it. PG&E's facilities are to be incorporated within any CEQA document. PG&E needs to verify that the CEQA document will identify any required future PG&E services.
3. An engineering deposit may be required to review plans for a project depending on the size, scope, and location of the project and as it relates to any rearrangement or new installation of PG&E facilities.

Any proposed uses within the PG&E fee strip and/or easement, may include a California Public Utility Commission (CPUC) Section 851 filing. This requires the CPUC to render approval for a conveyance of rights for specific uses on PG&E's fee strip or easement. PG&E will advise if the necessity to incorporate a CPUC Section 851 filing is required.

This letter does not constitute PG&E's consent to use any portion of its easement for any purpose not previously conveyed. PG&E will provide a project specific response as required.

Sincerely,

Plan Review Team
Land Management

Attachment 1 – Gas Facilities

There could be gas transmission pipelines in this area which would be considered critical facilities for PG&E and a high priority subsurface installation under California law. Care must be taken to ensure safety and accessibility. So, please ensure that if PG&E approves work near gas transmission pipelines it is done in adherence with the below stipulations. Additionally, the following link provides additional information regarding legal requirements under California excavation laws: <https://www.usanorth811.org/images/pdfs/CA-LAW-2018.pdf>

1. **Standby Inspection:** A PG&E Gas Transmission Standby Inspector must be present during any demolition or construction activity that comes within 10 feet of the gas pipeline. This includes all grading, trenching, substructure depth verifications (potholes), asphalt or concrete demolition/removal, removal of trees, signs, light poles, etc. This inspection can be coordinated through the Underground Service Alert (USA) service at 811. A minimum notice of 48 hours is required. Ensure the USA markings and notifications are maintained throughout the duration of your work.
2. **Access:** At any time, PG&E may need to access, excavate, and perform work on the gas pipeline. Any construction equipment, materials, or spoils may need to be removed upon notice. Any temporary construction fencing installed within PG&E's easement would also need to be capable of being removed at any time upon notice. Any plans to cut temporary slopes exceeding a 1:4 grade within 10 feet of a gas transmission pipeline need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.
3. **Wheel Loads:** To prevent damage to the buried gas pipeline, there are weight limits that must be enforced whenever any equipment gets within 10 feet of traversing the pipe.

Ensure a list of the axle weights of all equipment being used is available for PG&E's Standby Inspector. To confirm the depth of cover, the pipeline may need to be potholed by hand in a few areas.

Due to the complex variability of tracked equipment, vibratory compaction equipment, and cranes, PG&E must evaluate those items on a case-by-case basis prior to use over the gas pipeline (provide a list of any proposed equipment of this type noting model numbers and specific attachments).

No equipment may be set up over the gas pipeline while operating. Ensure crane outriggers are at least 10 feet from the centerline of the gas pipeline. Transport trucks must not be parked over the gas pipeline while being loaded or unloaded.

4. **Grading:** PG&E requires a minimum of 36 inches of cover over gas pipelines (or existing grade if less) and a maximum of 7 feet of cover at all locations. The graded surface cannot exceed a cross slope of 1:4.
5. **Excavating:** Any digging within 2 feet of a gas pipeline must be dug by hand. Note that while the minimum clearance is only 12 inches, any excavation work within 24 inches of the edge of a pipeline must be done with hand tools. So to avoid having to dig a trench entirely with hand tools, the edge of the trench must be over 24 inches away. (Doing the math for a 24 inch

wide trench being dug along a 36 inch pipeline, the centerline of the trench would need to be at least 54 inches [$24/2 + 24 + 36/2 = 54$] away, or be entirely dug by hand.)

Water jetting to assist vacuum excavating must be limited to 1000 psig and directed at a 40° angle to the pipe. All pile driving must be kept a minimum of 3 feet away.

Any plans to expose and support a PG&E gas transmission pipeline across an open excavation need to be approved by PG&E Pipeline Services in writing PRIOR to performing the work.

6. Boring/Trenchless Installations: PG&E Pipeline Services must review and approve all plans to bore across or parallel to (within 10 feet) a gas transmission pipeline. There are stringent criteria to pothole the gas transmission facility at regular intervals for all parallel bore installations.

For bore paths that cross gas transmission pipelines perpendicularly, the pipeline must be potholed a minimum of 2 feet in the horizontal direction of the bore path and a minimum of 12 inches in the vertical direction from the bottom of the pipe with minimum clearances measured from the edge of the pipe in both directions. Standby personnel must watch the locator trace (and every ream pass) the path of the bore as it approaches the pipeline and visually monitor the pothole (with the exposed transmission pipe) as the bore traverses the pipeline to ensure adequate clearance with the pipeline. The pothole width must account for the inaccuracy of the locating equipment.

7. Substructures: All utility crossings of a gas pipeline should be made as close to perpendicular as feasible ($90^\circ \pm 15^\circ$). All utility lines crossing the gas pipeline must have a minimum of 12 inches of separation from the gas pipeline. Parallel utilities, pole bases, water line 'kicker blocks', storm drain inlets, water meters, valves, back pressure devices or other utility substructures are not allowed in the PG&E gas pipeline easement.

If previously retired PG&E facilities are in conflict with proposed substructures, PG&E must verify they are safe prior to removal. This includes verification testing of the contents of the facilities, as well as environmental testing of the coating and internal surfaces. Timelines for PG&E completion of this verification will vary depending on the type and location of facilities in conflict.

8. Structures: No structures are to be built within the PG&E gas pipeline easement. This includes buildings, retaining walls, fences, decks, patios, carports, septic tanks, storage sheds, tanks, loading ramps, or any structure that could limit PG&E's ability to access its facilities.

9. Fencing: Permanent fencing is not allowed within PG&E easements except for perpendicular crossings which must include a 16 foot wide gate for vehicular access. Gates will be secured with PG&E corporation locks.

10. Landscaping: Landscaping must be designed to allow PG&E to access the pipeline for maintenance and not interfere with pipeline coatings or other cathodic protection systems. No trees, shrubs, brush, vines, and other vegetation may be planted within the easement area. Only those plants, ground covers, grasses, flowers, and low-growing plants that grow unsupported to a maximum of four feet (4') in height at maturity may be planted within the easement area.

11. Cathodic Protection: PG&E pipelines are protected from corrosion with an “Impressed Current” cathodic protection system. Any proposed facilities, such as metal conduit, pipes, service lines, ground rods, anodes, wires, etc. that might affect the pipeline cathodic protection system must be reviewed and approved by PG&E Corrosion Engineering.

12. Pipeline Marker Signs: PG&E needs to maintain pipeline marker signs for gas transmission pipelines in order to ensure public awareness of the presence of the pipelines. With prior written approval from PG&E Pipeline Services, an existing PG&E pipeline marker sign that is in direct conflict with proposed developments may be temporarily relocated to accommodate construction work. The pipeline marker must be moved back once construction is complete.

13. PG&E is also the provider of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E’s facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs which may endanger the safe operation of its facilities.

Attachment 2 – Electric Facilities

It is PG&E's policy to permit certain uses on a case by case basis within its electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) provided such uses and manner in which they are exercised, will not interfere with PG&E's rights or endanger its facilities. Some examples/restrictions are as follows:

1. Buildings and Other Structures: No buildings or other structures including the foot print and eave of any buildings, swimming pools, wells or similar structures will be permitted within fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) areas. PG&E's transmission easement shall be designated on subdivision/parcel maps as **"RESTRICTED USE AREA – NO BUILDING."**
2. Grading: Cuts, trenches or excavations may not be made within 25 feet of our towers. Developers must submit grading plans and site development plans (including geotechnical reports if applicable), signed and dated, for PG&E's review. PG&E engineers must review grade changes in the vicinity of our towers. No fills will be allowed which would impair ground-to-conductor clearances. Towers shall not be left on mounds without adequate road access to base of tower or structure.
3. Fences: Walls, fences, and other structures must be installed at locations that do not affect the safe operation of PG&E's facilities. Heavy equipment access to our facilities must be maintained at all times. Metal fences are to be grounded to PG&E specifications. No wall, fence or other like structure is to be installed within 10 feet of tower footings and unrestricted access must be maintained from a tower structure to the nearest street. Walls, fences and other structures proposed along or within the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) will require PG&E review; submit plans to PG&E Centralized Review Team for review and comment.
4. Landscaping: Vegetation may be allowed; subject to review of plans. On overhead electric transmission fee strip(s) and/or easement(s), trees and shrubs are limited to those varieties that do not exceed 15 feet in height at maturity. PG&E must have access to its facilities at all times, including access by heavy equipment. No planting is to occur within the footprint of the tower legs. Greenbelts are encouraged.
5. Reservoirs, Sumps, Drainage Basins, and Ponds: Prohibited within PG&E's fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) for electric transmission lines.
6. Automobile Parking: Short term parking of movable passenger vehicles and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) is allowed. The lighting within these parking areas will need to be reviewed by PG&E; approval will be on a case by case basis. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications. Blocked-up vehicles are not allowed. Carports, canopies, or awnings are not allowed.
7. Storage of Flammable, Explosive or Corrosive Materials: There shall be no storage of fuel or combustibles and no fueling of vehicles within PG&E's easement. No trash bins or incinerators are allowed.

8. Streets and Roads: Access to facilities must be maintained at all times. Street lights may be allowed in the fee strip(s) and/or easement(s) but in all cases must be reviewed by PG&E for proper clearance. Roads and utilities should cross the transmission easement as nearly at right angles as possible. Road intersections will not be allowed within the transmission easement.

9. Pipelines: Pipelines may be allowed provided crossings are held to a minimum and to be as nearly perpendicular as possible. Pipelines within 25 feet of PG&E structures require review by PG&E. Sprinklers systems may be allowed; subject to review. Leach fields and septic tanks are not allowed. Construction plans must be submitted to PG&E for review and approval prior to the commencement of any construction.

10. Signs: Signs are not allowed except in rare cases subject to individual review by PG&E.

11. Recreation Areas: Playgrounds, parks, tennis courts, basketball courts, barbecue and light trucks (pickups, vans, etc.) may be allowed; subject to review of plans. Heavy equipment access to PG&E facilities is to be maintained at all times. Parking is to clear PG&E structures by at least 10 feet. Protection of PG&E facilities from vehicular traffic is to be provided at developer's expense AND to PG&E specifications.

12. Construction Activity: Since construction activity will take place near PG&E's overhead electric lines, please be advised it is the contractor's responsibility to be aware of, and observe the minimum clearances for both workers and equipment operating near high voltage electric lines set out in the High-Voltage Electrical Safety Orders of the California Division of Industrial Safety (<https://www.dir.ca.gov/Title8/sb5g2.html>), as well as any other safety regulations. Contractors shall comply with California Public Utilities Commission General Order 95 (http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/gos/GO95/go_95_startup_page.html) and all other safety rules. No construction may occur within 25 feet of PG&E's towers. All excavation activities may only commence after 811 protocols has been followed.

Contractor shall ensure the protection of PG&E's towers and poles from vehicular damage by (installing protective barriers) Plans for protection barriers must be approved by PG&E prior to construction.

13. PG&E is also the owner of distribution facilities throughout many of the areas within the state of California. Therefore, any plans that impact PG&E's facilities must be reviewed and approved by PG&E to ensure that no impact occurs that may endanger the safe and reliable operation of its facilities.

COMMENT C

August 23, 2021

Cassandra van der Zweep
City of San Jose
200 East Santa Clara Street
San Jose, CA 95113

Re: 488 E. St. John Urban Residential
488 E. St. John Street, San José

Dear Cassandra:

Thank you for providing PG&E the opportunity to review your proposed plans for 488 E. St. John Urban Residential dated 8/2/2021. Our review indicates your proposed improvements do not appear to directly interfere with existing PG&E facilities or impact our easement rights.

Please note this is our preliminary review and PG&E reserves the right for additional future review as needed. This letter shall not in any way alter, modify, or terminate any provision of any existing easement rights. If there are subsequent modifications made to your design, we ask that you resubmit the plans to the email address listed below.

If you require PG&E gas or electrical service in the future, please continue to work with PG&E's Service Planning department: <https://www.pge.com/cco/>.

As a reminder, before any digging or excavation occurs, please contact Underground Service Alert (USA) by dialing 811 a minimum of 2 working days prior to commencing any work. This free and independent service will ensure that all existing underground utilities are identified and marked on-site.

If you have any questions regarding our response, please contact the PG&E Plan Review Team at (877) 259-8314 or pgeplanreview@pge.com.

Sincerely,

PG&E Plan Review Team
Land Management

Re: Public Review of MND: 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project**COMMENT D**

Ben Leech <ben@preservation.org>

Mon 8/23/2021 6:18 PM

To: Van Der Zweep, Cassandra <Cassandra.VanDerZweep@sanjoseca.gov>; Le, Thai-Chau <Thai-Chau.Le@sanjoseca.gov>**Cc:** Peak, Dana <Dana.Peak@sanjoseca.gov>; Manford, Robert <Robert.Manford@sanjoseca.gov>; Burton, Chris <Christopher.Burton@sanjoseca.gov>

[External Email]

PAC*SJ submits the following comments in response to the below-referenced project H20-007, which proposes the demolition of three existing residential buildings located at the southeast corner of North 11th and East St. John Streets.

As detailed in the project's Historic Resource Evaluation, at least one of these buildings appears eligible for listing in the San Jose Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) as a Structure of Merit: 93-97 N. 11th Street, designed by noted architects Wolfe & McKenzie and constructed in 1901. PAC*SJ acknowledges that HRI- and HRI-eligible properties alone do not qualify as eligible historic resources under CEQA, and are therefore not subject to CEQA-required mitigation measures to avoid or reduce impacts to cultural resources. As such, PAC*SJ does not challenge the proposed adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) as part of this project's development review.

However, we request that the City provide further explanation regarding how this project conforms (or does not conform) to relevant Envision San Jose 2040 General Plan Policies LU-14.4 and LU-14.6, and how PBCE staff did or did not take these policies into consideration during its project review. For reference, the full texts of these policies are included below, with relevant portions in bold:

LU-14.4 Discourage demolition of any building or structure listed on or eligible for the Historic Resources Inventory as a Structure of Merit by pursuing the alternatives of rehabilitation, re-use on the subject site, and/or relocation of the resource.

LU-14.6 Consider preservation of Structures of Merit and Contributing Structures in Conservation Areas **as a key consideration in the development review process. As development proposals are submitted**, evaluate the significance of structures, complete non-Historic American Building Survey level of documentation, **list qualifying structures on the Historic Resources Inventory, and consider the feasibility of incorporating structures into the development proposal**, particularly those structures that contribute to the fabric of Conservation Areas.

PAC*SJ is growing increasingly alarmed by the rate of demolition of HRI- and HRI-eligible properties across the city, and especially in neighborhoods where relatively few older and historic structures have ever been evaluated for historic significance. We are also growing increasingly concerned that long-promised comprehensive updates to the City's Historic Resources Inventory will not be completed as part of the Survey San Jose project currently underway. For example, this project's Historic Resources Evaluation identified at least twelve previously-unsurveyed properties within 200 feet of the project area that appear eligible for inclusion in the HRI (Page & Turnbull, Appendix D, pp. 23-32). Yet PAC*SJ is unaware of any systematic effort to formally add these properties to the Inventory as a result of this

project-initiated analysis. The same is unfortunately true for dozens of other recent CEQA-mandated environmental reviews that have identified hundreds of HRI-eligible structures in recent years, virtually none of which have been formally added to the HRI as a result. This appears to directly contradict both the spirit and the letter of Policy LU-14.6, as well as the spirit of City Council's officially-adopted Historic Survey Strategy (approved September 19, 2017).

In summary, while PAC*sj does not seek to challenge the proposed adoption of a MND for this project under CEQA, the proposed demolition of an HRI-eligible historic resource nevertheless raises significant concerns that deserve further consideration and explanation. We appreciate the opportunity to share these concerns and look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

Ben Leech
Executive Director
Preservation Action Council of San Jose

Begin forwarded message:

From: "City of San Jose" <webrequests@sanjoseca.gov>
Subject: **Public Review of MND: 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project**
Date: August 3, 2021 at 12:01:47 AM PDT
To: ben@preservation.org
Reply-To: webrequests@sanjoseca.gov

Public Review of MND: 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project

*The Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration for the 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project is available online.
The public review period starts August 2, 2021 and ends on August 23, 2021*

Post Date: 08/02/2021 4:00 PM

**PUBLIC NOTICE INTENT TO ADOPT A MITIGATED NEGATIVE
DECLARATION**

CITY OF SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA

Project Name: 488 E. St. John Urban Residential Project

File No.: H20-007

Description: The Project proposes demolition of the three (3) existing residential buildings and construction of a 46-unit apartment building. The new building would be up to four (4) stories above ground with one (1) level of underground parking garage with 30 vehicle parking spaces and 8 bicycle parking lockers. Ground-floor spaces would include residential units and other tenant-serving uses (including, but not limited to, a leasing office, community room, and 4 bicycle racks). A rooftop garden is proposed on a portion of the new building. Seven (7)

existing ordinance-size trees are proposed for removal.

Location: 488 E. St. John Street, San Jose, CA (southwest corner of E. St. John Street and N. 11th Street)

Assessor's Parcel Nos.: 237-03-044 **Council District:** 3

Applicant Contact Information: Wilson Tan, Satorivy Properties LLC, 488 E. St. John Street, San José, CA 95112; (408) 832-3302

The City has performed an environmental review of the project. The environmental review examines the nature and extent of any adverse effects on the environment that could occur if the project is approved and implemented. Based on the review, the City has prepared a Draft Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for this project. A MND is a statement by the City that the project will not have a significant effect on the environment because the project will include mitigation measures that will reduce identified project impacts to a less than significant level. The project site is not listed on a hazardous waste site or list pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code.

The public is welcome to review and comment on the Draft MND. The public comment period for this Draft MND begins on **August 2, 2021 and ends on August 23, 2021**. The Draft MND, Initial Study, and reference documents are available online at: www.sanjoseca.gov/negativedeclarations.

In response to the COVID-19 and Shelter-in-Place policy, hard copies are no longer available at the typical locations such as the City of San José Department of Planning, Building and Code Enforcement, located at City Hall, 200 East Santa Clara Street; and at the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Main Library, located at 150 E. San Fernando Street. Therefore, if requested, a hard copy will be mailed to you. Please allow time for printing and delivery. For additional information, please contact Thai-Chau Le at (408) 535-7659, or by e-mail at Cassandra.vanderZweep@sanjoseca.gov.

Having trouble viewing this email? [View on the website instead.](#)

[Change your eNotification preference.](#)

[Unsubscribe from all City of San Jose eNotifications.](#)

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.

Urban Development 2060!

COMMENT E

Glenn Brown <glennaaronbrown@gmail.com>

Mon 8/23/2021 10:37 PM

To: Van Der Zweep, Cassandra <Cassandra.VanDerZweep@sanjoseca.gov>; Peter Ko <design@koarch.com>

You don't often get email from glennaaronbrown@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

[External Email]

To whom it may concern,

I would regret not at least putting in my two cents regarding the 488 E. St. John Project. If it was my project I would be pushing the limits allowed by the height designations for this site. The height limits historically speaking are "Above 50' allowed? YES! Height Limits upto 120'.

Given the location of the site on THE major artery North to South in Downtown, 11th street is a unique opportunity to build a mixed use project that would have a very inviting pedestrian and bicycle venue, while providing open dining and coffee areas that would provide jobs, housing, improve the circulation in the area, and be a model for other future projects. Build with 2060 in mind, and as I would have said, "Grow Big or Go Home!".

To Improve the Foot print I would acquire 83 N. 11th Street and add the square footage (literally) into the design, and at 480 E. St. John I would add a story underneath and one above making it a 3 story building while changing the setbacks on the 12 Story Mixed Use Design.

To improve the community and offer a way out for those that WANT a way out, I would model a program after the [DeLancey Street Program](#) in San Francisco in a percentage of the project.

Thank you for your time and consideration on the development potential of San Jose!

Glenn A. Brown



Original House
± 8 du/ac / 0.3 FAR



Additional Unit Above
± 16 du/ac / 0.6 FAR



Additional Units Above and Below
± 24 du/ac / 0.9 FAR

This message is from outside the City email system. Do not open links or attachments from untrusted sources.