

---

-----Original Message-----

From: Timothy Swenson <[swenson\\_t@sbcglobal.net](mailto:swenson_t@sbcglobal.net)>

Sent: Sunday, January 14, 2024 7:55 PM

To: Mark Hungerford <[mhungerford@fremont.gov](mailto:mhungerford@fremont.gov)>

Subject: Sunderer Building (PLN2023-00285)

Here is my comments for this issue for the HARB meeting on January 18:

Looking at the HISTORIC RESOURCES section of the City of Fremont city code, here is what it says about demolition:

-----  
18.175.300 Demolition of register/potential register resources.

(b) The applicant shall, as a prerequisite to consideration of the application, provide evidence that they have explored alternatives and the proposed demolition is consistent with the city's approach to historic preservation as stated in Section 18.175.200.

-----  
18.175.200 Approach to historic preservation.

It is the goal of the city to retain historic resources in their original context and setting. Should retention of an historic resource in its original context and setting prove infeasible or be disproportionate to its historical significance and functional value, the city will evaluate .....

-----  
Note the section "be disproportionate to its historical significance."

I've seen nothing in the structural analysis that has any discussion of the historical significance of the building.

The staff report does mention historical significance with this line;

"costs that are disproportionately great for a building of the Sunderer Boot Shop / Wells Fargo Station's size, function, and overall import."

I'm guessing that "overall import" is referring to the historical significance. There is nothing else in the staff report or the structural reviews that discusses the historical significance and what will be lost historically if the building is to be demolished.

By City Code, the historical significance is supposed to be part of the equation, but it has been left out. Is there a reason that this part of the City Code was ignored?

Tim Swenson

## Trish Cordova

---

**From:** Kelsey Camello <kelsweems@yahoo.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 17, 2024 10:59 PM  
**To:** Mark Hungerford; Joel Pullen; harb  
**Cc:** Museumoflocalhistory Info; patricia schaffarczyk  
**Subject:** Copy of --Save Sunderer Boot Shop from demolition  
**Attachments:** Copy of --Save Sunderer Boot Shop from demolition.pdf

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

Hello HARB and City Planners,

The November meeting of the Historic Resources Committee regarding the Sunderer Boot Shop demolition was followed by a December meeting with the owner (a representative) of the property, the Fremont City Planner Mark Hungerford, Al Minard, Bob Tavares, and Patricia Schaffarczyk.

The committee was not able to speak with the owner, and no understanding was reached.

The HARB meeting to review this application is set for Thursday, Jan. 18th, 2024 (tomorrow) at 6:30 pm in the Niles Conference Room in the city offices at 39550 Liberty Street.

Please see the below letter.

Thank you!

**Kelsey Camello**

*President, Washington Township Museum of Local History*  
190 Anza Street, Fremont, CA 94539  
510-623-7907

<http://www.museumoflocalhistory.org/>

Sent from my iPhone

**This letter is to stop the demolition of the Sunderer Boot Shop/Wells Fargo Station and instead to restore this building to its pre-fire historical exterior significance.**

1. The Sunderer Boot Shop / Wells Fargo Station (43341 Mission Blvd.) is a City of Fremont Register Resource (from the 2006 inventory) that is recognized as a significant historical resource that needs to be protected. Its significance is chronicled in Informational Item No. 1, the DPR record. (see: <https://www.fremont.gov/home/showdocument?id=14837&t=638406716291421349>)

2. The fire caused damage to a building that was already in need of upgrades and that the owner should have been aware of prior to the purchase of the property.

The pre-existing conditions include (as stated in Page 6 of Information Item #2): The lateral bracing system is not up to present code compliance, and lacks anchor bolts or shear transfer to the foundation, faulty foundation, accessibility requirements not met - other structural code upgrades are mentioned. These preconditions are not the reason for the request for demolition, therefore it seems reasonable these items should be extracted from the estimated building cost to repair and only the fire damage cost should be considered.

(see:

<https://www.fremont.gov/home/showdocument?id=14837&t=638406716291421349>)

The cost of the fire damage repair should stand alone. It is noted that the owner had insurance on the structure.

3. The Fremont Historical Building Code or FHBC is adopted from the 2019 California Historical Building Standards Code (CHBC) without amendments (Ord. 10-2019 -13, 11-5-19)  
[Section 8-703 of the California Historical Building Standards Code / Structural Survey (Page 5 of Exhibit Item #2 ) states:  
8.703.1

When a structure or portion of a structure is to be evaluated for structural capacity under the CHBC, it shall be surveyed for structural conditions by an architect or engineer knowledgeable in historical structures.

Therefore, a historical architect or engineer knowledgeable in historical structures needs to evaluate the property. Neither of the engineers used presented such credentials.

4. The owner is asking for an emergency demolition. However, as stated in the summary, Zoning Compliance p. 6 ... the building is not in immediate danger of collapse. its diminished structural integrity could be further impacted by potential inclement fall/winter weather. (One could say the same for any structure). Is this observation based on the hole in the roof?
5. The Sunderer Boot Shop /Wells Fargo Station is a part of an approved development project known as Villa Ellsworth. This project proposal states: The Sunderer Boot Shop /Wells Fargo Station and the adjacent building, Steyer's Lyons Brewery Depot... remain in place, unmodified. (page3 of the summary report.)

Change or demolition of this structure would seemingly require a re-submission and re-approval of new plans for the Villa Ellsworth development.

6. Based on these concerns it would seem the property has not been thoroughly researched and evaluated to support a demolition at all.