DATE ISSUED: June 20, 2014

ATTENTION: Historical Resources Board
Agenda of June 26, 2014

SUBJECT: ITEM #5 – 3537-3551 Indiana Street

APPLICANT: Tim Wright represented by Legacy 106, Inc
Michael and Janet Domas Trust, Owner

LOCATION: 3537-3551 Indiana Street, Greater North Park Community, Council District 3

DESCRIPTION: Consider the designation of the property located at 3537-3551 Indiana Street as a historical resource.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Do not designate the property located at 3537-3551 Indiana Street under any adopted HRB Criteria.

BACKGROUND

This item is being brought before the Historical Resources Board in conjunction with a preliminary review application submitted by a potential buyer to determine whether or not the building is historically significant as part of a constraints analysis for future development. The owner, who is not the applicant, has been noticed of the Board’s action. The item includes two parcels containing five detached dwellings and two detached garage structures. The properties are located in University Heights Subdivision, and are surrounded primarily by multi-family housing.

The buildings addressed at 3537 Indiana Street and 3545 Indiana Street are located in the University Heights Subdivision on APN 452-362-10-00 (Block 251, Lot 15 and North 13 Feet of Lot 16), along with a detached garage structure; and the buildings addressed at 3547 Indiana Street, 3549 Indiana Street and 3551 Indiana Street are located on APN 452-362-09-00 (Block 251, Lots 17 through 21 and South 12 Feet of Lot 16), also with a detached garage structure, as shown on the annotated aerial photograph provided in Attachment 1 and the Assessor’s Parcel Map provided in Attachment 2.

The property at 3547-3551 Indiana Street (APN 452-362-09-00) was identified in the 2011 Draft North Park Survey as a contributing resource to a potential Residential Court Thematic Historic District, and was given a Status Code of 5D3 (Appears to be a contributor to a district that appears eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation.) The property at 3531-
3545 (APN 452-362-10-00) was not included, and was not identified as a potential resource in the 2011 Draft Survey.

The original ownership and construction history of the subject property is somewhat complicated, and is clarified in the applicant’s “Additional Research Report” dated June 2014. Jessie Brown purchased lots 15, 16 and 17 in February of 1922 (which are assessed to her in the County Lot and Block books beginning in 1922); and her son, Richard Parsons, purchased lots 18, 19, 20 and 21 over the course of 1922 (which are assessed to him in the County Lot and Block books beginning in 1923.) In 1922, Brown built the first house at 3551 Indiana as her own residence, which was located at the rear of APN 452-362-09-00. The house is a vernacular Craftsman bungalow with a modest projecting gable porch. The following year, Brown constructed the two houses sited perpendicularly to the street at the front of APN 452-362-09-00, addressed at 3547 and 3549 Indiana, which were used for rental housing. These two houses also reflect vernacular Craftsman design, but with Colonial influences that can be seen in a simple rounded hood supported on simple brackets over the entry. Also in 1923, Parsons constructed the two vernacular Craftsman bungalows with modest entry porches on APN 452-362-10-00, addressed at 3545 and 3537 Indiana.

**ANALYSIS**

A Historical Resource Research Report dated April 2014 (Attachment 3) and an Additional Research Report dated June 2014 (Attachment 4) were prepared by Legacy 106, Inc., which conclude that the buildings located at 3547 and 3549 Indiana Street are significant under HRB Criteria A and C; and that the buildings located at 3537, 3545 and 3551 Indiana Street, along with the two accessory garage structures, are not eligible for designation under any HRB Criteria. Staff disagrees, and finds that none of the buildings addressed at 3537-3551 Indiana Street are eligible for designation under any HRB Criteria. This determination is consistent with the Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria, as follows.

**CRITERION A - Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City’s, a community’s or a neighborhood’s historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping or architectural development.**

The applicant’s report concludes that the buildings addressed at 3547 and 3549 Indiana Street are significant under HRB Criteria A, reflecting special elements of North Park’s development during the 1920s by exemplifying the streetcar bungalow design and period; and for reflecting the Better Homes Movement in San Diego. However, there is no information provided to indicate how the buildings at 3547 and 3549 Indiana exemplify or reflect streetcar bungalow design or the Better Homes Movement to any greater degree than other similarly designed bungalows of the period. The report also does not elaborate on why 3547 and 3549 Indiana Street would be eligible under this context, but 3537, 3545 and 3551 Indiana Street – which were designed and built just one year earlier during the beginning of the Better Homes Movement – are not eligible under this context. The only distinguishing element is the modest Colonial detailing. Regardless, staff finds that the subject property located at 3537-3551 Indiana Street does not exemplify or reflect streetcar suburban development or the Better Homes Movement to any greater extent or with any higher degree of significance than any other bungalow of the period in this area, and staff does not find that the buildings are significant within this context.
Although the applicant does not address Bungalow Court development in the statement of significance for Criterion A, this context is included in the applicant’s discussion of Criterion A. The applicant identifies and briefly discusses six different types or configurations of bungalow courts – Detached Full (Wide) Court, Attached Full (Wide) Court, Detached Narrow Court, Attached Narrow Court, Half Court and Bungalow Court Type Infill. The first five of these types are accepted bungalow court typologies, and are documented in one of the only local articles on the subject (“Bungalow Courts in San Diego” from the Journal of San Diego History), as well as the Bungalow Court Context Statement prepared for the City of Pasadena, where the Bungalow Court is generally acknowledged to have originated. The sixth typology noted in the applicant’s report, Bungalow Court Type Infill, was identified by the applicant based on their field observations. Although “not classified as a true bungalow court but instead related in its design period and development,” the term Bungalow Court Type Infill is used by the applicant to describe properties that originally developed as single family homes and were later modified to include additional bungalow units, either at the front or back of the property.

There are several issues regarding this approach, and with the characterization of the subject property in any configuration as a bungalow court. First, the lay-out of the subject property at 3537-3551 Indiana Street is not consistent with any of the recognized bungalow court configurations. Second, although the 2011 Draft North Park Survey identified the cottages at 3547, 3549 and 3551 as a bungalow court, the information provided in the applicant’s report reveals that these three cottages were not constructed concurrently in the same style as a half court. Rather, 3551 was built as a vernacular Craftsman in 1922, and 3547 and 3549 were built as Colonial-influenced Craftsman bungalows one year later. Third, the construction of the two cottages at 3547 and 3549 Indiana Street together would not be characterized as bungalow court construction because they do not constitute a bungalow court in and of themselves, and did not create a cohesive bungalow court with their construction.

Accepted bungalow court construction must share a number of space and building relationships, such as building configuration, use of a service zone, and focal point created by the central courtyard. The Pasadena Bungalow Court Context and Multiple Property Listing specifically stated in its eligibility discussion that: “All other multi-house lot arrangements should not be considered for the National Register... To be eligible for the National Register, a bungalow court must also constitute a good example of the bungalow court form in terms of integrity. The court must have been designed, planned and built as a bungalow court, within the period of significance (1909-1944). Ad-hoc collections of buildings from widely different times, even if they resemble a bungalow court in site plan, should not be considered.” Although bungalow court development in San Diego has its own developmental context, the idea that a bungalow court must be designed, planned and built as a bungalow court that reflects characteristic space and building relationships is crucial in establishing significance. Otherwise, ubiquitous groupings and collections of buildings throughout the City that do not convey the true historical, social and architectural significance of bungalow court development would be considered within this context.

Therefore, because the property located at 3537-3551 Indiana Street does not exemplify or reflect special elements of the City’s or North Park’s historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping or architectural development, staff does not recommend designation under HRB Criterion A.
CRITERION B - *Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history.*

Research into the owners and tenants of the properties at 3537, 3545, 3547, 3549 and 3551 Indiana Street did not reveal any individuals who could be considered historically significant in local, state or national history. Furthermore, no events of local, state or national significance are known to have occurred at the subject properties. Therefore, the properties are not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion B.

CRITERION C - *Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of natural materials or craftsmanship.*

The applicant’s report concludes that the buildings located at 3547 and 3549 Indiana Street are significant under HRB Criterion C as notable examples of Colonial Influenced Craftsman style bungalow court type homes; and that the buildings located at 3537, 3545 and 3551 Indiana Street are not significant under Criterion C, as they do not reflect bungalow court construction and do not retain integrity as individually significant resources.

The subject property located at 3537-3551 Indiana Street consists of five detached dwelling units and two detached garages. 3537, 3545 and 3551 Indiana are vernacular Craftsman bungalows constructed in 1923 and 1922 as discussed above, and feature medium pitched gable roofs; asphalt roofing shingles; overhanging eaves and rafter tails; decorative brackets; wood lap siding over wood frame construction; and a concrete foundation. Fenestration consists of single and divided lite fixed, casement and double hung wood frame and sash windows. All three cottages have simple covered porches, either a simple gabled roof cover or an open trellis. 3547 and 3549 Indiana Street, constructed in 1923, are largely the same with the exception of the Colonial-style rounded hood over the entry door. Modifications are limited, and include the partial or complete rebuild of the front porch and non-historic railing at 3537 Indiana; replacement of the porch posts and construction of a asphalt roof over the porch pergola at 3545 Indiana; replacement of the entry steps and construction of a connecting roof between 3547 and 3549 Indiana; and reconstruction of the entry porch at 3551 Indiana.

The 2011 Draft North Park Survey provides eligibility thresholds for property types that reflect the theme of “Development of North Park: 1907-1929.” These property types include single family residences and bungalow courts, as well as apartment buildings. The subject property does not fit neatly into any of these property types. The applicant’s report contends that 3537, 3545 and 3551 Indiana are a collection of single family homes, while 3547 and 3549 Indiana is a bungalow court. As stated in the discussion of Criterion A, staff does not believe that the property qualifies as a bungalow court, as historical evidence indicates they were not purposely designed as such, nor do they reflect any of the accepted bungalow court typologies. As a collection of detached dwellings, the buildings do not reflect the apartment building housing type. If considered as a grouping of single family residences, the 2011 Draft North Park Survey states that,

“Single-family residences constructed in the first three decades of the 20th century are abundant in North Park. For this reason, integrity thresholds have been set relatively high for this property type. Only those examples with high integrity should be considered for individual designation… A single-family residence from this period may be significant:
As an excellent example of an early-20th century bungalow court (Criterion A: Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's, a community's or a neighborhood's historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping or architectural development)

- As an excellent or rare example of a particular architectural style associated with the period (Criterion C: Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship)

- As the work of a significant architect or designer (Criterion D: Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist or craftsman)

- For its association with a significant person or event (Criterion B: Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history)

Properties that are significant under Criteria A, C, or D must retain integrity of Location, Design, Materials, and Setting. Properties that are significant under Criterion B must retain integrity of Location and Association.”

All of the buildings reflect a minimal number of Craftsman characteristics and limited design execution. While the buildings exhibit gable roofs, lap siding, multi-lite windows and modest porches; they lack the distinct and meaningful entry porches so characteristic of Craftsman design. Additionally, the porches that are present on 3537, 3545 and 3551 Indiana have been altered and rebuilt, significantly impacting the integrity of one of the primary features of the buildings. The bungalows at 3547 and 35479 Indiana exhibit minimal Colonial detailing, with the rounded entry hood being the only nod to Colonial design.

Therefore, because the buildings do not reflect bungalow court type construction and do not exhibit the distinctive characteristics of Craftsman and Colonial-influenced Craftsman design as required by the 2011 Draft North Park survey and the Board’s Criteria Guidelines, staff does not recommend designation of any of the buildings at 3537-3551 Indiana Street under HRB Criterion C.

CRITERION D - Is representative of a notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist or craftsman.

The architect (if one was obtained) and builder of the properties at 3537, 3545, 3547, 3549 and 3551 Indiana Street could not be identified. Therefore, the properties are not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion D.

CRITERION E - Is listed or has been determined eligible by the National Park Service for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or is listed or has been determined eligible by the State Historical Preservation Office for listing on the State Register of Historical Resources.

The properties at 3537, 3545, 3547, 3549 and 3551 Indiana Street have not been listed on or determined eligible for listing on the State or National Registers. Therefore, the properties are not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion E.
CRITERION F - Is a finite group of resources related to one another in a clearly distinguishable way or is a geographically definable area or neighborhood containing improvements which have a special character, historical interest or aesthetic value or which represent one or more architectural periods or styles in the history and development of the City.

The properties at 3537, 3545, 3547, 3549 and 3551 Indiana Street are not located within a designated historic district. Although the property addressed at 3547, 3549 and 3551 Indiana Street was identified in the Draft 2011 North Park Survey as a contributing resource to a potential Residential Court Thematic District, no such historic district has been designated. Furthermore, with the amendment of the District Policy in October 2011 to eliminate Thematic Districts and replace them with Multiple Property Listings consistent with State and Federal preservation practice, the buildings would no longer be eligible as contributors to a district, and must be considered as individually significant resources within the context of residential court development under other designation criteria. Therefore, the properties at 3537, 3545, 3547, 3549 and 3551 Indiana Street are not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion F.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

If the property is designated by the HRB, conditions related to restoration or rehabilitation of the resource may be identified by staff during the Mills Act application process, and included in any future Mills Act contract.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information submitted and staff’s field check, it is recommended that the property addressed at 3537-3551 Indiana Street not be designated under any HRB Criteria. Designation brings with it the responsibility of maintaining the building in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The benefits of designation include the availability of the Mills Act Program for reduced property tax; the use of the more flexible Historical Building Code; flexibility in the application of other regulatory requirements; the use of the Historical Conditional Use Permit which allows flexibility of use; and other programs which vary depending on the specific site conditions and owner objectives.

Kelley Stanco  Cathy Winterrowd
Senior Planner  Deputy Director/HRB Liaison

KS/cw

Attachments:
1. Aerial Photograph Showing Location and Address of Each Building
2. Assessor’s Parcel Map
3. Applicant's Historical Report dated April 2014 under separate cover
4. Applicant’s Additional Research Report dated June 2014 under separate cover
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