



**MINUTES  
Thursday, February 4, 2016  
Regular Meeting – 7:00 P.M.**

Please refer to the Historical and Landmarks Commission Procedural Items guideline for information on all procedural matters. An audio recording of this meeting is available in the Planning Office for review or purchase the Friday following the meeting.

**ITEMS FOR COUNCIL ACTION**

The following items from this Historical and Landmarks Commission agenda will be scheduled for Council review following the conclusion of hearings and recommendations by the Historical and Landmarks Commission. Due to timing of notices for Council hearings and the preparation of Council agenda reports, these items will not necessarily be heard on the date the minutes from this meeting are forwarded to the Council. Please contact the Planning Division office for information on the schedule of hearings for these items:

- **Agenda Item No. 8.A.:** PLN2015-10980, PLN2015-10981, PLN2015-10982, and PLN2015-10983, CEQ2015-01188 / 575, 611, 625, 645, 675 Benton Street, 3330, 3350, 3390, 3410 The Alameda; 1188, 1250 Sherman Street; 602 Fremont Street
- **Agenda Item No. 8.B.:** PLN2015-11539 / 564 Jefferson Street
- **Agenda Item No. 8.C.:** PLN2015-11469 / 1627 Monroe Street
- **Agenda Item No. 8.E.:** PLN2015-11519 and PLN2015-11520 / 820 Civic Center Drive

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 7:11 p.m.

**2. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Brian Johns, Stephen Estes, Patricia Leung, Michael Hyams, Jeannie Mahan and J.L. "Spike" Standifer, Priya Cherukuru.

Commissioners Absent: None

Staff Present: Alexander Abbe, Assistant City Attorney Office, Katheryn Oehlschlager, Outside Council from Downey Brand, Shabnam Barati, Principal from Impact Sciences, Jeff Schwilk, AICP, Associate Planner and Yen Chen, Associate Planner

**3. DISTRIBUTION OF AGENDA AND STAFF REPORTS**

Copies of current agendas and staff reports for each of the items on the agenda are available from the Planning Division office on the Friday afternoon preceding the meeting and are available at the Commission meeting at the time of the hearing. Commissioner Johns reviewed this procedure.

**4. DECLARATION OF COMMISSION PROCEDURES**

Chair Johns reviewed the Historical and Landmarks Commission procedures for those present.

**5. REQUESTS FOR EXCEPTIONS, WITHDRAWALS AND CONTINUANCES**

- A. Withdrawals – The Commission received request via e-mail to continue Agenda Item 8.A. After a brief discussion, the Commission decided by consensus, to keep Item 8.A. on the Agenda.
- B. Continuances – None
- C. Exceptions – By Consensus of the Commission, as requested by applicant, moved Agenda Item 8.B. ahead of Agenda Item 8.A.

**6. ORAL PETITIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

- None

**7. CONSENT CALENDAR**

Consent Calendar items may be enacted, approved or adopted, based upon the findings prepared and provided in the written staff report, by one motion unless requested to be removed by anyone for discussion or explanation. If any member of the Historical and Landmarks Commission, staff, the applicant or a member of the public wishes to comment on a Consent Calendar item, or would like the item to be heard on the regular agenda, please notify Planning staff, or request this action at the Historical and Landmarks Commission meeting when the Chair calls for these requests during the Consent Calendar review.

**7.A.** Approval of Historical and Landmarks Commission Minutes for the meeting of January 7, 2016.

**Motion/Action:** Motion was made by Estes, seconded by Mahan to approve the Minutes of January 7, 2016 (6-0-1-0, Cherukuru abstain).

\*\*\*\*\*END OF CONSENT CALENDAR\*\*\*\*\*

**8. PUBLIC MEETNG ITEMS**

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| <b>8.A.</b>      | <b>Project title: Mission Town Center Project</b>   |
| File No.(s):     | <b>PLN2015-10980, PLN2015-10981, PLN2015-10982, and PLN2015-10983, CEQ2015-01188</b>  |
| Location:        | 575, 611, 625, 645, 675 Benton Street, 3330, 3350, 3390, 3410 The Alameda; 1188, 1250 Sherman Street; 602 Fremont Street, a 5.7-acre site located at the intersection of Benton Street and El Camino Real; APNs: 230-07-002, 004, 009, 010, 013, 029, 031, 034, 038, 053, 059, and 060; property is zoned Light Industrial (ML), Single Family (R1-6L), Duplex (R2-7L), and Thoroughfare Commercial (CT)  |
| Applicant/Owner: | Irvine Company  |
| Request:         | <b>Review of an Environmental Impact Report and Statement of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program; General Plan Amendment to change the land use designation on the project site to Very High Density Residential (51-90 du/acre). The General Plan Amendment proposes to add text to define this land use designation and to add a policy allowing limited neighborhood commercial in the Santa Clara Station Very High Density Residential land use designation; Rezone from Light Industrial (ML), Single Family (R1-6L), Duplex (R2-7L), and Thoroughfare Commercial (CT) to Planned Development (PD), Vesting Tentative Parcel Map, and Development Agreement to allow construction of residential/mixed use development comprised of up to 385 apartment units, approximately 10,000 gsf of conditioned amenity and leasing space, and three distinct private open space areas. The project includes a Street Vacation of a portion of Fremont Street east of The Alameda and a portion of Sherman Street north of Benton Street. The proposed project also includes approximately 27,000 gsf of ground floor retail. The residential portion of the project would have an overall density of approximately 67 dwelling units per acre. The proposed project consists of a three- to five-story structure and that would range in height from approximately 48 to 80 feet.</b> |

Parking is provided in a five-story above-grade parking structure. The parking structure is proposed in the center of the project site and wrapped by the residential and retail uses. Access to the parking structure would be provided from Benton Street and El Camino Real. Other infrastructure improvements (i.e., sewer, water, and storm drainage) needed to serve the proposed project would also be constructed.

CEQA Determination: Environmental Impact Report (SCH#2015032076)

Project Planner: Yen Han Chen, Associate Planner

**Staff Recommendation: Recommend City Council approval, subject to conditions**

**Notice:** The notice of public meeting for this item was posted within 500 feet of the site and was mailed to property owners within 500 feet. Individuals on the interest list were also noticed.

**Discussion:** Mr. Chen introduced the project. He noted that on December 3, 2015, the proposed project was presented to the Historical and Landmarks Commission. He noted after public comment, that the Commission requested to review comments and responses on the EIR. Mr. Chen noted that the Commission, on January 7, 2016 continued the project to allow the City to respond to comments on the Draft EIR and complete the Final EIR. Carlene Matchniff from the Irvine Company gave a presentation and answered question from the Commission.

Commissioner Mahan noted that she was opposed to the project. She commented that there were no changes to the architecture, density and height of the building. Commissioner Mahan noted that on Benton Street the building is 5 stories in height. She noted concerns over possible impacts to the Woman's Adobe. She also noted that Patricia Mahan's comments were not formally addressed. She commented that the project will overshadow the Old Quad and Downtown, and closing streets is unacceptable. Commissioner Mahan disagreed with the recommendation that the Commission amend and/or delete the Motions set forth at the December 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting. Commissioner Standifer commented on possible impact to historical and cultural resources. Commissioner Leung stated that the project was not consistent with the existing General Plan. Commissioner Estes stated that this was the wrong plan for the project area.

Chair Johns opened up the item for public comment. Two members of the public spoke in favor of the project based on the proximity to transit, removal of the mini-storage units, and providing needed housing. It was also noted that the project is good for the neighborhood in that the project will reduce the calls for police service due to homeless and criminal activities within the project area.

Eleven members of the public spoke against the project. The speakers noted concerns over the ownership of the land, ground lease and wanted clarification on reassessment of the property taxes. Opponents noted that the existing General Plan did not contemplate the high density housing and the area needed to maintain the existing grid pattern found in the Old Quad. They noted the proposed project at 5 stories in height did not provide the proper transition to the existing residential neighborhood. The opposition stated the project will not preserve the history nor protect historic resources. Members of the public requested that the density be reduced and the higher density should be provided on the east side of the Station Area which is on the other side of the railroad. The comments included following the current General Plan density and intensity of use, by lowering the height and reducing the units, provide and maintain the grid pattern. The residents noted that the grid pattern allowed better access to the transit station. Other members of the public noted that development proposals in the Old Quad will reduce the historical area and change the feel, ambiance of the area, and destroy historical resources. Concerns over lack of parking including the concept of unbundled parking spaces for the residential units was brought up. They noted that the height of the proposals should be reduced to 2-3 stories to protect the old town feel. The public noted that this was the entrance way into their neighborhood. The need for affordable and student housing was also mentioned by the speakers. One member suggested that the site be donated to the City and made into a park.

Ms. Matchniff noted that the project does provide the necessary on-site parking and unbundled parking will reduce the demand. She noted that the two historical houses at 3370 and 3410 The Alameda will be located within the Old Quad. The public comment period was then closed.

Commissioner Cherukuru stated that the project should be redesigned and consideration for the “No Project/Planned Development” for the site. She commented on the impacts identified in the EIR. She noted that the density should be lowered to about 289 units. Commissioner Estes concurred with comments from Cherukuru. Commissioner Hyams noted concerns over the streets pattern. Commissioner Standifer noted that a redesign would be more sensible approach. Commissioners Leung and Johns commented on the General Plan Amendment, size of development, vacation of the streets and loss of the grid pattern.

**Motion/Action:**

Motion was made by Cherukuru, seconded by Estes that the project be redesigned; that the proposal is not consistent with the existing General Plan with regards to massing, height, density, and is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood; that the existing street grid is a character defining feature and is especially important due to the scale of the project; that the existing blocks of Fremont and Sherman Streets be preserved if possible, at least as pedestrian easements and walkways; that the City Council adopt Alternative 2 of the EIR, the “No Project/Planned Development” Alternative, as the project; and that concerns over the potential demolition of the two historic homes, were alleviated when the Developer agreed to a condition of approval that would prohibit such demolition (6-0-0-1, Mahan).

Motion was made by Estes, seconded by Cherukuru that the existing street grid is a character defining feature and is especially important due to the scale of the project, and therefore recommend that the existing blocks of Fremont and Sherman Streets be preserved if possible at least as pedestrian easements and walkways (6-0-0-1, Mahan absent).

Motion was made by Estes, seconded by Cherukuru that the project is not consistent with the existing General Plan with regards to massing, height, density, and is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood, and therefore recommends redesign of the project (6-0-0-1, Mahan absent).

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>8.B. File No.(s):</b>     | <b>PLN2015-11539</b>   |
| Location:                    | 564 Jefferson Street, a 8,580 square foot parcel located on the west side of Jefferson Street approximately 100 feet south of Market Street, APN: 269-35-034; property is zoned Single Family Residential (R1-6L)  |
| Applicant:                   | Salvatore Caruso   |
| Owner:                       | Kurt and Kim Chrestenson   |
| Request:                     | <b>Design Review</b> to allow 108 square foot addition to existing 1,983 square foot single story residence resulting into a 2,091 square foot living area with a potential for 3 bedrooms. The addition expands the master bedroom and new porch along the northern façade of the existing residence. The property is located in the Old Quad and has a Historic Preservation Agreement (Mills Act Contract). |
| CEQA Determination:          | Categorically Exempt per CEQA section 15331, Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation  |
| Project Planner:             | Gregory Qwan, Planning Intern II   |
| <b>Staff Recommendation:</b> | <b>Recommend City Council approval, subject to conditions</b>  |

**Notice:** The notice of public meeting for this item was posted within 300 feet of the site and was mailed to property owners within 300 feet.

**Discussion:** Mr. Chen provided a brief presentation on the proposed project. The applicant was present for the discussion and noted that the addition will differentiate the materials from the historical main house. The Commission had questions on the integrity discussion on page 6 of the historic survey. Mr. Chen noted the evaluator will be asked to clarify the discussion in the report. No comments were received from the public during public comment period.

**Motion/Action:**

Motion was made by Estes, seconded by Cherukuru recommend approval of the proposed project (7-0-0-0), subject to the conditions:

1. The two existing windows along the north elevations shall be reused and retained, along with the accompanying trim.
2. The proposed addition shall be clad in 9" wood horizontal siding in order to differentiate new work from the old.

**8.C. File No.(s):** **PLN2015-11469**  
 Location: 1627 Monroe Street, a 10,965 square foot vacant parcel located on the east side of Monroe Street, 125 feet north of Civic Center Drive, APN: 224-26-062; Property is zoned Single Family Residential (R1-6L)  
 Applicant: Samir Sharma  
 Owner: 1627 Monroe LLC  
 Request: **Design Review** of a Planned Development. The property will be rezoned to allow the construction of three two-story residences. The existing vacant parcel will be subdivided into 3 lots.  
 CEQA Determination: Categorically Exempt per CEQA Section 15332 – In-Fill Development Projects  
 Project Planner: Jeff Schwilk, AICP, Associate Planner  
**Staff Recommendation: Recommend City Council approval, subject to conditions**

**Notice:** The notice of public meeting for this item was posted within 300 feet of the site and was mailed to property owners within 300 feet.

**Discussion:** Mr. Schwilk presented the project. He noted that 1662 Jackson Street, historic resource, is directly behind the subject property. The Commission discussed the location and noted the separation from the main building by the accessory unit and garage.

Chair Johns opened up the item for public comment. The property owner of 1662 Jackson Street expressed concern about the potential shade impacts of the proposed two-story building, upon recently installed solar panels on the west slope of the rear detached garage and accessory unit structure on his property. He requested that the building be designed to avoid any impacts on his solar equipment. Public comment was closed.

**Motion/Action:**

Motion was made by Estes, seconded by Hyams that the Commission does not object to the project on historical grounds as it does not impact the nearby historic resource, subject to the applicant demonstrating that the proposal does not overshadow the solar panels on 1662 Jackson Street. (6-0-0-1, Mahan absent).

**8.D. File No.(s):** **PLN2015-11473**  
 Location: 1127 Chapel Drive, a 5,775 square foot lot, located on the east side of Chapel Drive, 65 feet north of Benton Street, APN: 269-11-016; property is zoned Single Family Residential (R1-6L)  
 Applicant: 3 Point Construction  
 Owner: Peter Facione  
 Request: **Design Review** of proposed 600 square foot ground floor and 992 square foot second floor additions to an existing 1,158 square foot three-bedroom, one-bathroom residence, resulting in a five-bedroom, three-bathroom home.  
 CEQA Determination: Categorical Exemption per CEQA Section 15303 - New Construction or Conversion of Small Structures  
 Project Planner: Jeff Schwilk, AICP, Associate Planner  
**Staff Recommendation: Recommend approval, subject to conditions**

**Notice:** The notice of public meeting for this item was posted within 500 feet of the site and was mailed to property owners within 300 feet.

**Discussion:** Mr. Schwilk provided an overview of the project to the Commission. Representatives from 3 Point construction introduced the project and answered questions from the Commission.

Chair Johns opened up the item for public comment. Four members of the public spoke on the project. One neighbor spoke on the chimney looked out of place with the proposed second story addition. The rear neighbor noted privacy concerns from the second story deck onto their pool. Another neighbor noted that the sides of the second story should be setback from the first floor. The neighbor facing the project noted support for the project. Public comment was closed.

Mr. Chen provided reasons that the home was not Minimal Traditional architectural style. He noted the homes within the subdivision were built within different time periods after 1945. The project did not have the gable roof found on the front of the Minimal Traditional homes across the street.

**Motion/Action:**

Motion was made by Estes, seconded by Cherukuru that the Commission does not object to the project on historical grounds as it does not impact the nearby historic resource (5-1-0-1, Hyams Opposed, Mahan absent).

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
| <b>8.E. File No.(s):</b>     | <b>PLN2015-11519 and PLN2015-11520</b>  |
| Location:                    | 820 Civic Center Drive, a 0.36-acre parcel located at the southwest corner of Civic Center Drive and Alviso Street, APN: 224-29-022; Project site is zoned PD (Planned Development)                             |
| Applicant/Owner:             | Michael Fisher  |
| Request:                     | <b>Design Review</b> of proposed PD Rezone Amendment of a 0.36 acre site for the preservation of an existing house and the construction of three additional two-story single family homes and a detached garage |
| CEQA Determination:          | Categorically Exempt per CEQA Section 15332 – In-Fill Development Projects  |
| Project Planner:             | Jeff Schwilk, AICP, Associate Planner   |
| <b>Staff Recommendation:</b> | <b>Recommend City Council approval, subject to conditions</b>   |

**Notice:** The notice of public meeting for this item was posted within 300 feet of the site and was mailed to property owners within 300 feet.

**Discussion:** Mr. Schwilk provided a brief presentation on the project history and of the proposed project as modified. The applicant was present for the discussion. No comments were received from the public during public comment period.

**Motion/Action:**

Motion was made by Cherukuru, seconded by Estes to recommend approval of the project (6-0-0-1, Mahan absent), subject to the condition of approval in the staff report pertaining to enhancement of the proposed detached parking structure for the existing house, and subject to recommending the City Council forgo the 10-foot property dedication requirement so the spaciousness of the property's Alviso Street side yard and an existing mature redwood tree in this side yard can be maintained.

**9. OTHER BUSINESS**

**9.A. Commission Procedures and Staff Communications**


**i. Announcements/Other Items**

- Correspondence received for HLC
- Election of Commission Officers
  - Continued to February meeting
- Commission/ Board Liaison Assignments

- Continued to February meeting
- Update on the Bell Award (verbal update)
  - Mr. Chen gave an overview of the Bell Award program. The program awarded a plaque for the best restored residence. The Commission discussed the time and expense necessary to run the program. It was suggested that an outside group should sponsor the program. The cost for the plaque can be considered by the City when a proposal is developed.
- Monthly Report on HT properties: Residential reversions (verbal update)
- ii. Report of the Liaison from the Planning and Inspection Department**
  - City Council and Planning Commission Actions (verbal update)
- iii. Commission/ Board Liaison and Committee Reports**
  - Santa Clara Arts and Historic Consortium (Standifer/Cherukuru as alternate)  
[Fourth Monday of each month at 7:15 p.m. - Headen-Inman House]
  - Historic Preservation Society of Santa Clara (Mahan/Johns as alternate)  
[Second Friday of each month at 10:00 a.m. - Harris Lass Preserve]
  - Old Quad Residents Association (Hyams/Mahan as alternate)
  - Architectural Committee (Mahan / Johns as alternate)
  - Agnews Historic Cemetery Museum Committee (Standifer/Hyams as alternate)
  - BART/ High Speed Rail/ VTA BRT Committee (Johns/Cherukuru as alternate)
  - Zoning Ordinance Update (Johns/Hyams Alternate)
  - Review of Mills Act Contracts Ad-hoc Committee (Johns, Hyams and Estes)
  - Review of Publications, CAMP and Technical Briefs Ad-hoc Committee (Cherukuru, Mahan and Estes)
- iv. Commission Activities**
  - Commissioner Travel and Training Reports
- v. Upcoming Agenda Items**
  - Month of May Historic Preservation month Activities – March
  - Walking Tour – April
  - City Hall East Wing Display Case - April
  - Review of Public Information Handouts and Brochures – TBD
  - Review of Publications, CAMP and Technical Briefs - TBD
  - Review of Mills Act Contracts - TBD
  - Projects not requiring HLC Review- TBD
  - Review of Street Name List – TBD

**ADJOURNMENT**

In memory of Jerry McKee (longtime Santa Clara resident, HLC Commissioner), the meeting was adjourned at 11:05 p.m. The next regular Historical and Landmarks Commission meeting will be held on Thursday, March 3, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in the City Council Chambers.

Prepared by:   
 Yen Han Chen  
 Associate Planner

Approved:   
 Gloria Sciara, AICP  
 Development Review Officer

I:\PLANNING\2016\HLC 2016\02.04.2016\HLC Minutes 02.04.16.doc