



HISTORIC LANDMARKS COMMISSION AGENDA

Action Minutes

Wednesday, June 4, 2025

**Regular Meeting
Commencing at 6:30 p.m.**

City Hall Tower

Conference Room T-332
Third Floor, City Hall Tower
200 East Santa Clara Street
San José, California

Commission Members

**Paul Boehm, Chair
Rachel Royer, Vice Chair
Harriett Arnold
Himat Baniwal
Lawrence Camuso
Steve Cohen
Sara Ghalandari**

**Christopher Burton, Director
Department of Planning, Building & Code Enforcement**

AGENDA

ORDER OF BUSINESS

WELCOME

The meeting was called to order at 6:35 p.m.

ROLL CALL

PRESENT: *Chair Boehm, Vice Chair Royer, and Commissioners Camuso, Cohen and Ghalandari*

ABSENT: *Commissioners Arnold and Bainiwal*

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 say so at this time.

No Items

2. CONSENT CALENDAR

Notice to the public: There will be no separate discussion of individual Consent Calendar items as they are considered to be routine and will be adopted by one motion. If a member of the Commission requests debate, separate vote or recusal on a particular item, that item may be removed from the Consent Calendar by the Chair and considered separately. The public may comment on the entire Consent Calendar and any items removed from the Consent Calendar by the Chair. Staff will provide an update on the consent calendar. If anyone in the audience wishes to speak on one of these items, please make your request at this time.

No Items

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Generally, the Public Hearing items are considered by the Historic Landmarks Commission in the order in which they appear on the agenda. However, please be advised that the Commission may take items out of order to facilitate the agenda, such as to accommodate significant public testimony, or may defer discussion of items to later agendas for public hearing time management purposes. If anyone in the audience wishes to speak on one of these items, please make your request at this time.

No Items

4. PLANNING REFERRALS

No Items

5. GENERAL BUSINESS

a. [Eastside Alum Rock and Saratoga Urban Villages Historic Resources Surveys.](#)

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Commission receive the Eastside Alum Rock and Saratoga Urban Villages Historic Resource Survey final documents and presentation of findings by Architectural Resources Group.

Chair Boehm introduced the item.

Ms. Peak provided a brief background and introduction to the project and introduced Architectural Resources Group project consultant, Stacy Farr. Ms. Farr provided an overview of the project and presented the findings of the Eastside Alum Rock and Saratoga Urban Villages Historic Resource Surveys.

Chair Boehm called for commissioner questions.

Commissioner Ghalandari noted that some of the properties have associated architects and some do not and it was unclear whether they are significant as works of a master. Ms. Farr responded that none of the properties were found to be the work of a master because the significance criteria does not require that and includes eligibility for properties that are strong representatives of an architectural type or style. Commissioner Ghalandari commented that many of the properties in the Saratoga Urban Village survey seemed to be duplicative styles and inquired if that was taken into account in the evaluations. Ms. Farr responded that the properties have all the character-defining features of midcentury modern commercial strip architecture and in the Saratoga neighborhood those properties are the best examples of that style. She noted that they were developed early and were the start of commercial retail in the neighborhood type and were a new kind of architectural style when they were built.

Commissioner Cohen asked for clarification on the mapped reconnaissance level survey results and the number of properties included in the intensive-level survey. It was clarified that some of the parcels are small and grouped together but appear to be large and smaller in number. He inquired whether the oral history and email information was documented. Ms. Farr responded that the conversation were informal and not oral histories and did not reveal significant cultural associations. Commissioner Cohen inquired if the survey included signage. Ms. Farr responded that stand-alone signs were included and noted along with the strip mall properties.

Chairman Boehm opened public comment.

*Mike Sodergren, Preservation Action Council San Jose (PAC*SJ), commented that since urban villages are planned for densification, it is important to have historic resources surveys associated with urban village plans because they are helpful to signal clearly to the development community that there might be a higher level of review required. He commented that many Victorians were demolished in the 1950s because the architectural style was no longer in favor ("gaudy") and now many strip mall no longer exist but the ones that remain are vibrant active and vibrant. Mr. Sodergren comments that often buildings don't appear architecturally significant but they have cultural significance and express appreciate to Ms. Farr for reaching out the community and asking for their stories. He commented that PAC*SJ doesn't find any fault with the reports.*

Chairman Boehm closed public comment and called for commissioner comments.

Commissioner Ghalandari expressed thanks for all the hard work that went into the survey project, that it is a big undertaking to go through documenting all the properties and she appreciated the oral history. She expressed concern about the eligibility findings and what they would mean in relation to future development. Commissioner Ghalandari commented that what seem like common examples of a strip mall, nothing architecturally distinct and cookie cutter throughout the city, is going to have to potentially go through a CEQA process to redevelop. She commented that she believes the job of the Historic Landmarks Commission is to balance preserving properties worthy of preservation with the fact that we're in a housing crisis and need housing. Commissioner Ghalandari commented that some of the properties do not warrant or seem borderline for eligibility

and she made this clear in her ad hoc committee comments. She commented that we owe it to our city to think through the eligibility of these types of properties because they do have a big impact because the finding puts them in a different category for implementation of development that might deter people from redeveloping. Commissioner Ghalandari posed the question of what are we trying to retain. Ms. Peak Edwards responded that the question of what should be preserved would be the job of the urban village plan in consultation with the community, but the CEQA aspect can't be avoided and it is better to know ahead of time what developers might expect. She noted that is the objective of the City Council with the historic resources survey policy and advanced identification simplifies the process from a procedural standpoint. Commissioner Ghalandari commented that just because a property has characteristics of a time period she does not believe that every property is worthy of preservation. She suggested taking a second look at some of the properties to see if they really do meet the significance criteria. Ms. Peak Edwards responded that this was an important topic of conversation with the consultant and the Urban Village team following Commissioner Ghalandari's ad hoc committee comments about whether some properties could be downgraded to Structures of Merit; however the findings are about an application of significance criteria and not about whether we want to preserve the building. She noted it's possible a second opinion could be obtained when development is proposed, but there was significant time spent taking a second look.

Commissioner Cohen commented that he had similar concerns that the start of the presentation but he does not believe that we should tear down the city because there is a housing crisis and we cannot build our way out of it, no city ever has. He inquired if through the urban village plan process if we do want to develop our neighborhood and there are five strip malls that have been determined eligible and would it be possible to cut it down to one. Ms. Peak Edwards responded that the eligibility finding would remain and that doesn't mean that property couldn't be rezoned for higher density development. She noted that urban village plans consider allocation of housing units and commercial development and eligible properties would still be part of that planning process but individually proposed projects would still need to be analyzed under CEQA.

Commissioner Ghalandari inquired whether the environmental impact report (EIR) for the urban villages will be analyzing the redevelopment of these sites. Ms. Peak Edwards responded that would be the case. Commissioner Ghalandari commented that there would be a significant impact for historical resources that would be part of the EIR. Ms. Peak Edwards responded that the EIR would be programmatic and was uncertain whether the analysis would be that in-depth. She stated that there may be the need for project-specific EIRs. Commissioner Ghalandari commented that it would be helpful if the urban village EIR did analyze the historical resources issue. Ms. Peak Edwards responded that it is a resources issue and the allocated funds are lacking for that level of analysis. Manira Sandhir, Planning Director, commented that the environmental analysis would certainly look at the impacts programmatically if there are historical resources on a site and standard mitigation measures that would apply. She commented that depending on site-specific analysis there are things that could be done as mitigation but a statement of overriding considerations might still be required for some projects so the analysis would be on a case by case basis. Ms. Peak Edwards stated that on a case by case basis alternatives would be analyzed for specific proposed projects and the standard mitigation measures from the programmatic EIR would be applied, as is the case for downtown. She noted that the process is facilitated with the historic resources survey. Ms. Sandhir highlighted that these are 22 properties out 300 so there is still a lot of development potential that exists within the urban villages.

Vice Chair Royer commented from a development standpoint that we're a couple of steps ahead because we have the analysis. She commented that it does not mean that they are undevelopable parcels but that the approach is with eyes wide open so developers are informed about what to expect. Vice Chair Royer comments that it's good to provide that documentation so it does not come up as a surprise later.

Commissioner Camuso commented that he supported the consideration of properties like this (strip malls). He commented that we need to start acknowledging architecture from the recent past and plan for their consideration in the future. Commissioner Camuso commented that the focus of the Historic Landmarks Commission is historic preservation and the report is exhaustive.

Ms. Peak Edwards commented that there is no action proposed to be taken by the commission with regard to adding properties to the Historic Resources Inventory. She noted that would be done at a later date

Chair Boehm commented that he grew up in the area and noted that Maple Leaf music was important to his family and even though the property is a strip mall it is significant to him and probably to the community. He commented that the commission often talks about working class commercial districts and the eligible strip mall is an early one and should be recognized. Chair Boehm noted that three properties are strip malls but the other properties are not. He commented that he had his first bank account at the Salinas Valley Savings and Loan and is an important place for him and the community because they didn't have to go downtown. Chair Boehm concurred with the Candidate City Landmark findings.

Vice Chair Royer commented that protecting some of these more vernacular representations of architecture is important from an anthropological background standpoint and overall documentation of the area. She noted that from the standpoint of someone not from California, she finds the buildings very interesting and different from other parts of the country and they tell an interesting story when exploring the city.

The commission received the final survey documents and presentation of findings by Architectural Resources Group. No action was taken.

b. Modifications to the San José Historic Resource Inventory.

PROJECT MANAGER, DANA PEAK EDWARDS

Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Historic Landmarks Commission add the following eligible properties to the City of San José Historic Resources Inventory:

Eligible for National Register (ENR), Eligible for California Register (ECR) and Candidate City Landmark (CCL)

1. 490 Park Avenue (APN 259-47-083)
2. Perimeter Road (APN 706-54-003)

Chair Boehm introduced the item.

Ms. Peak provided a brief background and overview of the two properties proposed for listing on the Historic Resources Inventory that were documented and evaluated as part of the environmental review process for past development projects and retained on site. She reported that she spoke with representatives of the Park Avenue property about the listing that morning and noted that a representative from the Home Owners Association (HOA) of the Perimeter Road multifamily development was present at the meeting.

Chair Boehm called for commissioner questions.

Commissioner Camuso inquired about the location of the stable on the townhouse development site that is bound by West San Carlos Street, Josefa Street, Park Avenue and Gifford Avenue. Ms. Peak Edwards shared an aerial map of the area with the commission. She noted that the stable used to be located at the rear of a house on West San Carlos Street that was demolished as part of the project.

Commissioner Ghalandari inquired if the stable still retained its historic integrity and remains a historical resource despite its relocation. Ms. Peak responded that the building has been well maintained and used for storage.

Commissioner Cohen inquired what is being done to protect the buildings from potential fire damage. Ms. Peak Edwards responded that the Perimeter Road building is secured with fencing and responsibility of the owner. A representative from the HOA of the Perimeter Road multifamily development commented that it is a matter of discussion between the builder and the HOA. Ms. Peak Edwards noted the maintenance responsibility is a civil matter between the two properties and that the San José Municipal Code requires all property owners to maintain their property and vacant and abandoned buildings are under the purview of the Code Enforcement department.

Chair Boehm inquired about the salvage requirement that was part of Great Oaks Mixed Use Project environmental review and whether salvage is being actively considered. Ms. Peak Edwards responded that there is no current project and clarified that the 2014 analysis relates to the constructed project.

Chairman Boehm opened public comment.

*Mike Sodergren, PAC*SJ, commented that many times when developed property that was subject to conditions of approval and mitigation measures when the project was carried out is then transferred to a new owner without monitoring. He inquired how it can be ensured that these sites are activated, instead of being mothballed because then the chance that the building could be destroyed is reduced. Mr. Sodergren commented the properties are good additions to the Historic Resources Inventory.*

Chairman Boehm closed public comment and called for commissioner comments.

Vice Chair Royer commented supported the addition of new resources to the Historic Resources Inventory.

Chair Boehm reiterated the conclusion in the historic resource evaluation for the stable – compared with other extant examples, the stable ranks among the most significant buildings of its property type in the city and appears to qualify as a Candidate City Landmark and listing on the National Register and California Register. He concurred with the conclusion of the evaluation.

Commissioner Cohen made a motion to add 490 Park Avenue (APN 259-47-083) and Perimeter Road (APN 706-54-003) to the City of San José Historic Resources Inventory as Eligible for National Register (ENR), Eligible for California Register (ECR) and Candidate City Landmark (CCL). The motion was seconded by Commissioner Camuso and the motion was approved (5-0-2, Commissioners Arnold and Bainiwal absent).

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. Each member of the public may fill out a speaker's card and has up to two minutes to address the Commission.

*Mike Sodergren, PAC*SJ, commented that PAC*SJ received a grant from the County of Santa Clara to document Temple Laundry/IBM Plant #5 building and the findings were incredible. He commented that the buildings are in great shape and decisions have been made based on bad information. Mr. Sodergren commented that the windows in the 1928 addition work, there are monitors on the buildings for ventilation and the design is incredible. He commented that a housing project on the site came before the commission and PAC*SJ wants to make sure that the City is on top of any requests for design changes and that there is not an assertion that the buildings cannot be preserved. Mr. Sodergren recommended that the commission go look at buildings and not take somebody's word for the circumstances.*

Chair Boehm announced that there was a positive preservation article in the San Jose Mercury News highlighting Historic Preservation Month.

8. GOOD AND WELFARE

a. **Demonstration by Preservation Action Council San Jose of their webpage highlighting City Landmarks.**

*The commission received a demonstration from Mike Sodergren of the PAC*SJ website highlighting City Landmarks.*

b. **Election of Chairman and Vice Chairman**

Vice Chair Royer volunteered to serve as Chair. The motion was approved (5-0-2, Commissioners Arnold and Bainiwal absent).

Vice Chair Royer nominated Commissioner Ghalandari for the position of Vice Chair. The motion was approved (5-0-2, Commissioners Arnold and Bainiwal absent).

The commission thanked Chair Boehm for his service as Chair.

c. **Report from Secretary, Planning Commission, and City Council**

No Items

d. **Report from Committees**

- i. Design Review Subcommittee: No meeting held on May 15, 2025. No regular meeting in June.

e. **Approval of Action Minutes**

- i. **Recommendation:** [Approval of Action Minutes for the Historic Landmarks Commission Meeting of May 7, 2025.](#)

Vice Chair Royer made a motion to approve the May 7, 2025 action minutes. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Camuso and approved (5-0-2, Commissioners Arnold and Bainiwal absent).

f. **Status of Circulating Environmental Documents**

No Items

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

CITY OF SAN JOSÉ CODE OF CONDUCT FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS AND COMMITTEE ROOMS

The Code of Conduct is intended to promote open meetings that welcome debate of public policy issues being discussed by the City Council, Redevelopment Agency Board, their Committees, and City Boards and Commissions in an atmosphere of fairness, courtesy, and respect for differing points of view.

1. Public Meeting Decorum:

- a) Persons in the audience will refrain from behavior which will disrupt the public meeting. This will include making loud noises, clapping, shouting, booing, hissing or engaging in any other activity in a manner that disturbs, disrupts or impedes the orderly conduct of the meeting.
- b) Persons in the audience will refrain from creating, provoking or participating in any type of disturbance involving unwelcome physical contact.
- c) Persons in the audience will refrain from using cellular phones and/or pagers while the meeting is in session.
- d) Appropriate attire, including shoes and shirts are required in the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms at all times.
- e) Persons in the audience will not place their feet on the seats in front of them.
- f) No food, drink (other than bottled water with a cap), or chewing gum will be allowed in the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms, except as otherwise pre-approved by City staff.
- g) All persons entering the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms, including their bags, purses, briefcases and similar belongings, may be subject to search for weapons and other dangerous materials.

2. Signs, Objects or Symbolic Material:

- a) Objects and symbolic materials, such as signs or banners, will be allowed in the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms, with the following restrictions:
 - No objects will be larger than 2 feet by 3 feet.
 - No sticks, posts, poles or other such items will be attached to the signs or other symbolic materials.
 - The items cannot create a building maintenance problem or a fire or safety hazard.
- b) Persons with objects and symbolic materials such as signs must remain seated when displaying them and must not raise the items above shoulder level, obstruct the view or passage of other attendees, or otherwise disturb the business of the meeting.
- c) Objects that are deemed a threat to persons at the meeting or the facility infrastructure are not allowed. City staff is authorized to remove items and/or individuals from the Council Chambers and Committee Rooms if a threat exists or is perceived to exist. Prohibited items include, but are not limited to: firearms (including replicas and antiques), toy guns, explosive

material, and ammunition; knives and other edged weapons; illegal drugs and drug paraphernalia; laser pointers, scissors, razors, scalpels, box cutting knives, and other cutting tools; letter openers, corkscrews, can openers with points, knitting needles, and hooks; hairspray, pepper spray, and aerosol containers; tools; glass containers; and large backpacks and suitcases that contain items unrelated to the meeting.

3. Addressing the Council, Redevelopment Agency Board, Committee, Board or Commission:

- a) Persons wishing to speak on an agenda item or during open forum are requested to complete a speaker card and submit the card to the City Clerk or other administrative staff at the meeting.
- b) Meeting attendees are usually given two (2) minutes to speak on any agenda item and/or during open forum; the time limit is in the discretion of the Chair of the meeting and may be limited when appropriate. Applicants and appellants in land use matters are usually given more time to speak.
- c) Speakers should discuss topics related to City business on the agenda, unless they are speaking during open forum.
- d) Speakers' comments should be addressed to the full body. Requests to engage the Mayor, Council Members, Board Members, Commissioners or Staff in conversation will not be honored. Abusive language is inappropriate.
- e) Speakers will not bring to the podium any items other than a prepared written statement, writing materials, or objects that have been inspected by security staff.
- f) If an individual wishes to submit written information, he or she may give it to the City Clerk or other administrative staff at the meeting.
- g) Speakers and any other members of the public will not approach the dais at any time without prior consent from the Chair of the meeting.

Failure to comply with this Code of Conduct which will disturb, disrupt or impede the orderly conduct of the meeting may result in removal from the meeting and/or possible arrest.