



City of Sunnyvale

Meeting Minutes Heritage Preservation Commission

Thursday, January 23, 2025

7:00 PM

Online and Redwood Conference Room,
City Hall, 456 W. Olive Ave., Sunnyvale,
CA 94086

Public Participation

Accessibility/Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Notice

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Johnson called the meeting to order

SALUTE TO THE FLAG

Chair Johnson led the salute to the flag.

ROLL CALL

Present: 4 - Chair Sue-Ellen Johnson
Commissioner William Garrett
Commissioner Charles McManis
Commissioner Parthiv Rawal

Absent: 2 - Vice Chair Aaron Sofaer
Commissioner Ashmita Rajkumar

STUDY SESSION

1. [25-0210](#) **REPORT TO HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

SUBJECT

Receive the Public Review Draft of the Study to Update the Heritage Resource Inventory to Include Potential Resources Associated with Technological Innovation (Study Issue CDD 19-05)

File #: PLNG-2024-0298

Environmental Review: The action is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15306.

Project Planner: Momo Ishijima, (408) 730-7532,
mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov <<mailto:mishijima@sunnyvale.ca.gov>>

Consultants Sarah Hahn and Jon Rusch with the Architectural Resources Group presented and noted the recommendations they are seeking from this Commission

is to formally nominate the recommended properties as heritage resources, clarify the historic review requirements for heritage resources designated as “sites” due to their diminished physical integrity, and develop project review requirements tailored to technological properties.

Commissioner McManis discussed several ideas, noting that he found the report interesting to read and it would be useful to see if patent holders had an address in Sunnyvale and whether staff could see if inventions occurred at the Sunnyvale location. He shared that when Google introduced Google Maps, it placed the pin for "Silicon Valley" on his house. He noted that the virtual center of Silicon Valley has always landed in Sunnyvale.

Commissioner Garrett asked staff regarding the recommendations, particularly if the commission was looking at the suite within the building or the entire site. He noted Computer Literacy bookstore as an example. Senior Planner Momoko Ishijima noted that the entire site is typically listed.

He likes the site framework and that the place can be important without the structure being important, and would be good to create two categories in the inventory, one being the resource itself and the other would be the site. He noted that many of the sites have non-descript buildings and that any future development should acknowledge what happened there.

Commissioner Sharma thanked the consultants for the presentation and noted her enthusiasm of the study. She asked if there is a limit to the number of sites that could be listed and Ms. Ishijima responded no. She then asked about recognition tools, such as plaques and posting on the website. Ms. Hahn noted that she will take note to acknowledge the sites on the City web page. Ms. Ishijima responded regarding plaques that the Commission should recommend this to Council.

Chair Johnson noted that visitors of Sunnyvale tend to tie it to “Silicon Valley” and the City should give visitors a sense of Silicon Valley when they come to Sunnyvale. She noted that she likes public art to acknowledge resources associated with the technological innovation resources. She also suggested plaques specifically for tech resources. She then asked staff whether the listed properties could be modified in the future.

Commissioner Sharma asked whether the Commission's recommendation affects the project budget, and whether the final cost of the study be available to them and the public.

Commissioner Garrett noted that there should be a template for technological innovation resource plaques.

Commissioner Rawal noted that there may be both benefits and restrictions for property owners and asked what are the impacts if their property was on the Heritage Resource Inventory. He noted it may increase or decrease the property value.

Ms. Ishijima noted that any changes to a heritage resource in the future would need a Resource Alteration Permit for any exterior modifications. She noted that any property owners that would like to de register their property from the Heritage Resource Inventory would have to seek approval from the Heritage Preservation Commission.

MOTION:

Commissioner Sharma made a motion and Commissioner McManis to discuss the technological innovation resource recommendations for the Heritage Resource Inventory.

Yes: 5 - Chair Johnson
Commissioner Garrett
Commissioner McManis
Commissioner Rawal
Sharma

No: 0

Absent: 2 - Vice Chair Sofaer
Commissioner Rajkumar

Chair opened the public comment period.

Resident Sarosh Patel spoke about the study and noted page 77 of Attachment 3, where he noted that the former CEO of Tandem Computers used to live in his home and started his company in this location.

Commissioner Sharma noted comments and recommendations on the draft study should be made before the February 10 deadline.

Consultant Rusch noted that it's a good idea to determine which properties may need more stringent review.

Chair Johnson closed the public comment period.

Commissioner Garrett noted he has no objections and wanted to reiterate that updating the Municipal Code to make the distinction between a building and a site may be a good idea.

Commissioner Sharma asked staff what code restrictions apply to the Heritage Resources and Ms. Ishijima responded.

Commissioner McManis noted technological innovation resources should include the single family homes which where a significant technological event took place.

Commissioner Sharma agreed with Commissioner Garrett's comment that a code review may be needed.

Rawal asked the consultants for clarification of what they are seeking from this Commission and staff responded that they are seeking comments.

Commissioner McManis asked the Commission to make a motion to merit the historical significance in the report.

Ms. Ishijima noted that this study session item is to present the findings from the report and seek comments, she noted that a motion is not necessary.

Council Liaison Sell discussed the direction that Commissioner McManis is asking and noted that the Commission may make statements regarding the study and come to a consensus for the consultants to take in account.

Commissioner McManis found all the properties recommended are historically significant and Chair Johnson agreed. Comm. Sharma dissented, noting that the list of properties need to be categorized for each current situation (demolished, existing, etc.) and for residential and commercial. She asked for the consultants to come back with recommended residential properties.

Comm. Garrett agreed the list of properties are significant, however some may have more significance than others. He further suggested having a secondary list with a lower threshold.

Comm. Rawal agreed with Commissioner Sharma and Commissioner Garrett that more study is needed regarding how the Municipal Code will affect the properties.

Comm. McManis asked staff about the process and concluded that the

Commission is only making recommendations to City Council for approval.

Council Liaison Sell clarified the process for approval or denial with staff, where Ms. Ishijima discussed a final report will be sent to this Commission for a formal recommendation to City Council for approval. Councilmember Sell noted to the Commission that the final draft will be more difficult to make any changes. Recommendations should be stated tonight to give time for the consultants to apply any revisions.

Commissioner Sharma asked for clarification of how the current code applies and Mr. Schroeder discussed how the code may apply to these properties.

Commissioner Sharma noted that plaques are a good way for recognition, asking for a more comprehensive list.

Commissioner Rawal said that he wouldn't want to see these homes limited in development due to any restrictions of a heritage resource property.

Commissioner Sharma asked for a matrix of which owners submitted their approval to be listed.

ORAL COMMUNICATIONS

None.

CONSENT CALENDAR

2. [25-0209](#) Approve the Draft Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes of December 4, 2024

MOTION:

Commissioner Garrett motioned and Commissioner Sharma seconded to approve the Draft Heritage Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes of December 4, 2024, as submitted.

The motion carried as follows:

Yes: 5 - Chair Johnson
 Commissioner Garrett
 Commissioner McManis
 Commissioner Rawal
 Sharma

No: 0

Absent: 2 - Vice Chair Sofaer
Commissioner Rajkumar

PUBLIC HEARINGS/GENERAL BUSINESS

3. [25-0056](#) Selection and Ranking of Study Issues

Chair Johnson asked whether it matters if a study issue costs 10x more than another study issue.

Commissioner Garrett asked why CDD 18-02: Update and Review of the Heritage Resource Inventory should be dropped.

Commissioner Sharma asked the Commission to think thoughtfully about dropping or deferring a study issue.

MOTION:

Commissioner McManis motioned to defer CDD 25-04: Expanding the Role of the Heritage Preservation Commission.

The motion failed for a lack of a second.

MOTION:

Commissioner Sharma motioned to defer OCM 25-01: Explore Establishing a Japanese American Incarceration Memorial in Sunnyvale.

The motion failed for a lack of a second.

Commissioner McManis ranked the study issue by the priority order of CDD 18-02 first, OCM 25-01 second, and CDD 25-04 third.

Commissioner Johnson ranked the study issue by the priority order of CDD 25-04 first, CDD 18-02 second, and OCM 25-01 third.

Commissioner Sharma ranked the study issue by the priority order of CDD 25-04 first, CDD 18-02 second, and OCM 25-01 third.

Commissioner Garrett ranked the study issue by the priority order of CDD 25-04 first, OCM 25-01 second, and CDD 18-02 third.

Commissioner Rawal ranked the study issue by the priority order of CDD 25-04 first, CDD 18-02 second, and OCM 25-01 third.

MOTION:

Commissioner Garrett motioned and Commissioner Sharma seconded to accept the commission's overall ranking of CDD 25-04 first, CDD 18-02 second, and OCM 25-01 third.

The motion carried by the following vote:

Yes: 4 - Chair Johnson
Commissioner Garrett
Commissioner Rawal
Sharma

No: 1 - Commissioner McManis

Absent: 2 - Vice Chair Sofaer
Commissioner Rajkumar

STANDING ITEM: CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL STUDY ISSUES

None.

NON-AGENDA ITEMS & COMMENTS

-Commissioner Comments

Commissioner Sharma asked staff regarding the plaque at Redwood Square and Ms. Ishijima responded that there was an email from the developer that the plaque is in the process of getting installed.

INFORMATION ONLY REPORTS/ITEMS

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Johnson adjourned the meeting at 9:18 PM.