

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

MINUTES OF REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING OF

November 30, 2006

COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM – 12TH FLOOR
CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Burnett at 1:32 p.m.

***** SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS*****

FOND FAREWELL TO LONG-STANDING BOARDMEMBERS MARSHA SEWELL AND HOMER DELAWIE - Chairperson Burnett announced that after over eight years of service of educating the other members of the Board and members of the public, Marsha Sewell and Homer Delawie were leaving the Board. She turned the floor over to their colleagues for comments. Boardmember Marshall congratulated them for their great service, pointing out that they clearly made a difference in San Diego. Without them, some historic buildings in San Diego would no longer be here. Boardmember Marshall also stated that his father had worked with Homer Delawie who had given David some sage advice as he was growing up. When he finished college in 1990, he contacted Mr. Delawie, looking for a job, but wasn't hired. (Laughter) Boardmember Emme said it was a honor and a privilege to know Boardmembers Sewell and Delawie. At Design Assistance Subcommittee meetings, when Homer Delawie said a few words, everyone listened - both applicants and subcommittee members. Boardmember Emme thanked him for sharing his wisdom and knowledge. He also reminded us that Marsha Sewell purchased and moved a historic home to save it, and then renovated it. She has won awards for both the exterior and interior of the house. Her expertise and insight, which she shared, meant a lot to the Board.

NEW BOARD MEMBERS - Priscilla Berge, John Eisenhart, and Robert Vacchi were sworn in by the City Clerk. Each of the new members said a few words about themselves. Robert Vacchi is a native of San Diego who attended the University of San Diego. He has a Bachelor's and a Master's degree in history. He worked for the City of San Diego for about ten years, but ended up as a land use lawyer. His first love is history, and he hopes to continue the legacy of the departing board members in the field of preservation. Priscilla Berge has lived in San Diego since 1966. She has a Master's in American Studies from San Diego State University; she was enrolled in a PHD program in American History at UCSD, and has been actively involved as a volunteer with the San Diego Historical Society and with a Community Planning Group. John Eisenhart is an architect in San Diego who resides in Mission Hills and has an office in Mission Hills which was formerly called the Five Points Region. He is active with the Uptown community and SOHO and has a Master's Degree from the University of Michigan. He has lived in Portland, Seattle, and Santa Cruz.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING

Chairperson	Laura Burnett	Present	
Vice Chairperson	Jerry Schaefer	Present	
Boardmember	Priscilla Berge	Present	
Boardmember	Maria Curry	Present	Left at 3:50 p.m.
Boardmember	John Eisenhart	Present	
Boardmember	Otto Emme	Present	
Boardmember	Donald Harrison	Present	
Boardmember	David Marshall	Present	
Boardmember	Delores McNeely	Absent	
Boardmember	Abel Silvas	Absent	
Boardmember	Robert Vacchi	Present	

Staff to the Board in Attendance: Delores Johnson, Board Secretary
 Cathy Winterrowd, Senior Planner
 Kelley Saunders, Senior Planner
 Mike Tudury, Senior Planner/Architect
 Ginger Weatherford, Intern

Nina Fain-Newman, Deputy City Attorney

ITEM 1A - APPROVAL OF MINUTES of September 28, 2006

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL TO APPROVE THE SEPTEMBER 28, 2006 MINUTES.

Second by Boardmember Schaefer. Vote: 6-0-0. (New members did not vote.) Motion passes.

ITEM 1B - APPROVAL OF MINUTES of October 26, 2006

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Board Members had a copy of an e-mail from Boardmember Marshall in which he asked (a) that a revision be made to a conflict of interest statement that he made so that it reads “Boardmember Marshall disclosed that his firm is working with the architect for item #5, Golba Architecture, on another unrelated project. That association won’t influence his opinion, but he wanted to disclose the relationship;”; (b) that comments be added after the voting tallies for Items 9-11 and 13-18B to show that “motion passes” or “motions fails;” and (c) that minutes show for Item 17 that a comment attributed to Boardmember Schaefer was actually made by Boardmember Marshall, or that they agreed on that point.

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER HARRISON TO APPROVE THE OCTOBER 26, 2006 MINUTES WITH THE REVISIONS.

Second by Boardmember Marshall. Vote: 6-0-0. (New members did not vote.) Motion passes.

ITEM 2 - PUBLIC COMMENT

Alan Hazard had a planned presentation to address the issue of too many historical homes being lost every month. When some owners apply for a demo permit, they don't tell the truth about the age of the property (e.g., a house built in 1923 is claimed to be less than 45 years old). New homes are often bigger than the old homes that they replace or two-story homes replace one-story homes, changing the character of the community. This also reduces the amount of affordable housing.

ITEM 3 - ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS**A. Board Administrative Matters and General Information**

- **ABSENCES**

Staff received notification that Boardmember Silvas would be out of town on business and Boardmember McNeely had to attend to a personal issue.

- **OTHER GENERAL INFORMATION**

Contents of "Blue Folders:" Included were: A green sheet that lists the schedule for 2007 HRB hearings and subcommittee meetings; copies of e-mails about protecting the history of University Heights, Golden Hill, and the Uptown area; a letter from Scott Moomjian requesting a continuance of Item 7; an e-mail from a community member on Item 7, supporting the Uptown Survey, an e-mail from Maria Lia requesting a continuance of Item 7, and identifying some issues that she has with that.

- **GENERAL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Boardmember Emme said that he received an invitation for November 9 concerning the historical site of the restored North Chapter at NTC. He attended a service there. The preservation by C. W. Clark, Inc. was beautifully done. The most intriguing element was that next to the altar was a bathtub for complete-submersion baptisms. There was a choir loft in the back. The interior was reminiscent of the architecture seen in Balboa Park. Large timbers, with a span of over 20 feet, were used in the restoration.

B. Subcommittee Reports

The Design Assistance Subcommittee met on November 1, 2006 to continue consideration of the proposed demolition of HRB site #294 at 921, 925 and 927 Coast Blvd South, part of the Colonial Inn Project Sites, in order to construct a proposed new building which would provide parking and additional hotel rooms to serve the existing historical hotel complex on the property; the front street façade of a non-designated brick warehouse at 1310 K Street within the Warehouse District Survey area; proposed changes in the Lafayette Hotel design to make visual connections between the existing historic resource and the proposed new structures by means of detail, color and/or materials to ensure that the new structures will be complementary to the historic resource; design of a project at 1701 National Avenue in Barrio Logan that includes a potentially historic brick commercial structure; design alternatives that would preserve some portion of the designated Manuel Frietas House at 3035 Lawrence Street, while adding new units in the rear of the parcel, with the intent of meeting the Standards; and proposed changes to the non-historic storefront at the historic Pickwick Hotel. The next regularly scheduled Design Assistance Subcommittee meeting

will be on Wednesday, December 6, 2006 at 3:00 PM. There will be a special DAS meeting (on the fourth floor) immediately following this HRB meeting today to discuss a time-sensitive proposal to place information kiosks within the National Landmark portion of Balboa Park.

The Policy Subcommittee met on November 13, 2006 to discuss HRB Subcommittee appointments, considering the appointment of new board members; Designation Criteria Guidelines focusing on the application of HRB Criterion A, including addressing the issue of historic deed restrictions, with an overall discussion of all designation criteria; and proposed changes in policy related to historical districts. The next Policy Subcommittee meeting will be on Monday, January 8, 2007, at 3:00 PM. There is no December Policy Subcommittee meeting.

The Archaeology Subcommittee met on November 13, 2006 to continue discussion of resource needs for the creation of archaeological districts and suggested district areas with a focus on the proposed revisions to the HRB District Policy. The next Archaeology Subcommittee meeting will be on Monday, January 8, 2007 at 4 PM, also not meeting in December.

C. Conflict of Interest Declarations

Conflicts of Interest: Boardmember Marshall stated that his firm was involved on Item 11 – the Gaslamp Quarter Planned District Design Ordinance and Guidelines; he will recuse himself on that item. Chairperson Burnett stated that she and her firm contributed to the preliminary technical work on Item 7 – the Uptown Historic Survey. As they were paid over 12 months ago, she believes that it is appropriate to participate in the action on that item. Boardmember Eisenhart stated that he won't participate on Item 6 as he was the architect for the addition that's up before the board on the designation today.

Ex Parte Communications: None.

Failure to visit designation: There were no failures to visit. All Boardmembers present were able to visit the sites on today's agenda.

D. Staff Report

Cathy Winterrowd reported that there is only one designation request from the public on today's agenda. This request was submitted in 2006 and is being processed now in conjunction with a permit. A total of 63 designation requests have been submitted by the public to date in 2006, of these 6 have already been acted on by the Board because of associated building permits. It is anticipated that additional requests will be submitted throughout December; however, consultants need to understand that staff will not be available from December 26th through the 29th. Staff will resume accepting requests again on January 2, 2007.

E. Requests for Continuances

Cathy Winterrowd reported that staff is requesting a continuance of Item 7 – Uptown Historic Survey. However, staff would like to make a staff presentation and have the Board take public comment and provide direction to staff on the survey and recommendations, staff feels that there are some clean-up edits, revisions to some mapping boundaries, and text reorganization that is needed prior to formal adoption by the Board. There were two requests from the public for continuance of this item. Staff would be prepared to return to the HRB in January.

Staff also requested a continuance of Item 9 – Guidelines for the Application of HRB Designation Criteria. Staff was unable to prepare the necessary materials for this meeting. There is no staff report for this item. Staff would be prepared to return to the HRB in January.

BOARD ACTION

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER EMME TO CONTINUE ITEMS 7 AND 9.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 9-0-0. Motion passes.

ITEM 4 - REQUESTS FOR ITEMS TO BE PLACED ON CONSENT AGENDA

The following items are non-controversial, with all parties agreeable to the staff recommendation, and the Board may wish to approve them on consent:

- **ITEM 6 – NATHAN RIGDON SPEC HOUSE #2 at 2121 Fort Stockton Drive**
- **ITEM 10 – COMPOSITION OF THE HRB STANDING SUBCOMITTEES**

BOARD ACTION

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO PLACE ITEMS 6 AND 10 ON THE CONSENT AGENDA AND APPROVE PER STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION.

Second by Boardmember Schaefer. Vote on Item 6: 8-0-1(Eisenhart). Motion passes.
Vote on Item 10: 9-0-0. Motion passes.

Ron de Frates, owner of the house at 2121 Fort Stockton Drive, thanked the Board for considering and approving their property for designation.

INFORMATION ITEMS:

A. CALENDAR YEAR 2007 WORK PROGRAM

Cathy Winterrowd said that this item speaks for itself, and invited anyone who didn't have a copy, but wanted one, to contact her. The Work Program outlines the constant work there is for the section and highlights some important tasks that staff is trying to complete during 2007.

Boardmember Harrison asked if the question of historic signs and the concept of trying to increase the participation in putting up such signs was on the Work Program. Cathy Winterrowd said it is on the Long-Range Policy Subcommittee Agenda. Although larger policy issues on their agenda had pushed this back, she expects to be able to work with them on this in 2007.

Boardmember Marshall had a question about a term used in reference to the Land Development Code revision: "Relaxed need for hardship findings and expanded use of conditional use permit process for historical properties." Cathy said that currently when a variance is required for a historical property, in order to obtain it, you have to make a finding that there is a hardship, namely the designation. Staff wants to get away from that finding, as we seem to be saying that you have to acknowledge that

designating a property creates a hardship. But staff doesn't share that belief. There should be more appropriate findings, such as that in order to preserve the designated site, it is necessary to go forward with the variance. That language appears as a policy direction in the new General Plan update as well.

Vice Chair Schaefer stated that after reading the exhaustive list, he felt exhausted. The work program shows how much work staff does and takes upon itself. There are anticipated completion dates for some of the major tasks on the last pages. Vice Chair Schaefer asked if there is something that Board members can monitor and ask about. Cathy said, "Absolutely." She added that staff would be happy to report back to the Board or to subcommittees. Some dates were pretty optimistic, while others were very realistic, but there is now more staff. Cathy said that when staff does more work, it means more work for the Board. The Board may be asked to come in early for some meetings or stay late.

Boardmember Emme asked if the items on the list would require Council action. The answer was only if there is a change to the Municipal Code. He also asked if policies and guidelines would require Council action. Cathy said no, those are up to HRB, as well as the historic preservation plans. The Land Development Code revisions would require going through the Planning Commission, and ultimately City Council. Surveys and Districts are HRB. Staff procedures are approved by staff and will be reported to HRB. The Historic Preservation Plan was adopted by the Board in 1991, so some of those elements may require updating, and would come back to the Board. Most of the items will be taken through subcommittees and involve the public, but for the most part it is all HRB staff work.

Chair Burnett thanked both the good, new staff and the great, older staff for working to get all these things accomplished.

B. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO HRB HISTORIC DISTRICT POLICY

Kelley Saunders presented the report on this information item. Although most members of the Board have seen the draft policy through Policy or Archaeological subcommittee meetings, today is an opportunity to present it to the entire board to review the policy, and provide a forum for discussion, without having to make a determination on adoption. The existing policy has been amended numerous times.

- The existing policy provides five district types: Geographic/Traditional; Thematic; Emerging; Archaeological; and Voluntary/Traditional. The new policy has only two district types: Geographic and Thematic. Archaeological Districts can be folded into those two types.
- The existing policy identified 11 criteria for establishing a district. The five established Board Criteria for designation are proposed to simplify establishing a district.
- The old policy required "a substantial number or a majority" of the property owners to consent to the establishment of the district. The proposed policy requires a majority of the property owners in the proposed district to object to the establishment of the geographic district via petition.
- The old policy had no explicit requirement for community workshops and outreach. The proposed policy requires at least one community workshop.

The revised district policy was first distributed for public review and comment on August 14, 2006, again on October 26 and for the third time on November 9, 2006. Following each draft and review,

staff reviewed public comment. The drafts were also presented at Archaeology and Policy subcommittee meetings. Public comments and subcommittee comments were reviewed and incorporated into later drafts as appropriate. The draft policy was sent to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on October 31. A couple of minor corrections were received, but the two main issues raised had also been raised by members of the public. They are 1) defining “exceptional local significance” when determining that districts should be established despite objections from a majority of the property owners and 2) Thematic Districts should be replaced with multi-property listings, which requires individual significance of the property.

As SHPO’s reply was received on November 21, there was not enough time to completely change staff’s written report and distribute it. However, staff has reviewed the comments and would like direction from the Board on the two issues raised. In terms of special local significance, staff is proposing to eliminate the caveat that districts be established where resources are threatened by development, but maintain the local significance exception if a resource has formerly been placed on a state or national register. As the State doesn’t recognize thematic district types, staff plans to modify its proposal. As resources such as Victorian homes are becoming rarer and more scattered as development takes place, staff will take public comment, and Board direction, while continuing to refine the policy. Staff is still awaiting a formal position from the Mayor’s office. They are interested in where staff and the Board are going with this policy adoption.

PUBLIC COMMENT

In Favor: Bruce Coons, Janet O’Dea

In Opposition: Matt Peterson, Matt Adams, Jerome Navcerra, Lin Martin, Marie Lia, Mitchell Berner, David Hazan, Robert Wright, and Scott Moomjian

Public testimony closed.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Harrison said that although the language used through the hearing has been “51%,” the actual draft proposal says “a majority.” This means we are arguing essentially about two votes. Why shouldn’t we give the burden of proof back to the people for the matter of two votes? Boardmember Harrison believes in persuasion rather than coercion. We should switch this around so that it’s not a matter of government imposing something on people and making them resentful. Instead, we should give them the right to the two votes. Secondly, we have protection on every piece of property over 45 years old; the board has a chance to look at it. If people in a potential district don’t want a district, the issue isn’t over for any particular property. People can still feel secure that historical preservation won’t be ignored, regardless of the vote.

Boardmember Marshall understands the property rights concerns of the owners, but the reality is that there is very good documentation that buildings and properties within historical districts increase in value. Although most historical districts are residential, Gaslamp Quarter properties have also increased in value. . It is a mistake to say that it will be an economic hardship on the owners. The Burlingame District, which started as a voluntary district with a lot of homeowners not on board, has now gotten such a positive response that it now has enough properties to be made into a traditional district. It started slowly, but increased in momentum once the property owners understood the reality of the situation. Boardmember Marshall says that getting 51% is prohibitive

for either side; not even our last few presidential election winners got 51%. He agrees with staff's direction. It is more in line with SHPO's policy. Our previous district policies were very convoluted and inconsistent. This is a chance to make it simple and consistent with what other cities have done.

Boardmember Curry said that the districts are little pieces of history of the entire city. HRB looks at the interests of everybody in the community. Problems occur because of land values. However, people want to live in homes with character, such as the ones in Mission Hills. Boardmember Curry requested all property owners to join us, to make it better. That will benefit them economically and the community benefits.

Boardmember Berge said she is encouraged by staff's report today. She requested a written version of the PowerPoint presentation that staff made on Historic District Policy, and that it be made available to the members of the Board and the public. Chairperson Burnett said that she thought it would be appropriate to have a summary of what staff intends to have available for the Board before the January meeting.

Boardmember Emme said that property owners should have a voice and that it should be 51%. Surveys are meant to be broad and general. You toss things out and look at it again. There is a finite quantity of historic properties and we are losing many of them downtown. We can't deviate too far from what the State wants; we do need to notify the owners. As far as historic preservation downtown he doesn't know if the public wants to see row after row, block after block, of brand new structures everywhere. There are examples of historic preservation (such as the California Theater) as well as allowance for high-rises (e.g., 44-story high-rise at the foot of Broadway).

Boardmember Vacchi asked for the reason for switching from a majority of those in favor to a majority of those opposed. Kelley Saunders said there is an issue with non-response holding up district efforts for a long period of time. To have people actively object is consistent with other jurisdictions' policies, as SHPO has pointed out. It's not as though staff would send out notices at the last second, just before districts are established. There would be an extensive process for months before a district is established in notifying property owners during public outreach, initial noticing, second hearing notices, and property owners would definitely have an opportunity to receive all the information and voice their objections. It wouldn't happen in a week or two while they were out of town. Boardmember Vacchi said he is concerned about the public's perception of this changing from a policy of approval to one of opposition. Switching from consent to opposed feels wrong to him. Everyone is entitled to the absolute golden degree of notice and the ability to come in and speak prior to an action's being taken. Perhaps there's another way of noticing with response and still getting consent. It's important to give everyone an opportunity to be heard. Boardmember Vacchi would like specific findings on the threshold that it would take to override non-consent. In regard to East Village, he feels that at some point, a deal is a deal. Once a decision has been made to exclude a specific property, then the property should be excluded in the future. The Board should consider how they will apply the new policy to the existing districts. We need to be extra careful as these policies will affect citizens all over San Diego.

Vice Chair Schaefer said that HRB has been operating for decades with the policy that properties can be designated individually without the owners' consent. He wondered why it would be

considered much of a deviation from existing policy to have properties as contributors to a district without the owners' consent. We don't have enough good, solid districts under our belt that aren't the result of special conditions in history and circumstances. It would be nice to get a little history of the origins of the Ocean Beach District. It was a very unconventional and sullied process. It was the result of a political process, not necessarily the result of objective and well thought out preservation planning issues. When Mission Hills comes about, that will probably be a model that can be used in going forward with other districts because it has so many of those characteristics that one likes to see in a district, as well as public support. The East Village and Warehouse districts were a result of litigation that came out of the ball park planning. Those are not good examples of what we should use as precedents. It doesn't seem that the Gaslamp National Register District has suffered downtown from its designation in terms of redevelopment around it. If other districts in redevelopment areas are defined, it is hoped that there could be that level of balance. There should be an awful lot of cooperation from HRB to accommodate infilling and development within historic areas where the historic character is maintained. We shouldn't be fearful of districts because they are very useful tools in terms of defining what is important historically and what isn't. We do need to show some restraint in defining the boundaries of districts and the aspects of integrity. They would benefit the most from a district approach, instead of a case-by-case. Vice Chair Schaefer was very interested in the SHPO comments and the approach of using multiple property listings. The Feds discarded thematic a long time ago. The Board would benefit from some discussion or presentation from staff on the differences between the two. We should look at these districts as useful as a way of avoiding degradation by attrition.

Chairperson Burnett asked for feedback from staff. Kelly thanked the Board for their comments and said staff would be working on a revised draft and staff report to be distributed for the January hearing. She also invited members of the public to submit written comments by the end of December. The draft will be posted on the Web about two weeks before the January meeting. Diane Kane, after listening to Board comments, said that she was unsure of which way the Board was leaning on the 51%. The Chairperson said she was too, and thought that comments from the public should be given to staff earlier, within two weeks from today so that staff would have time to incorporate them into the report.

Boardmember Harrison said that he would like staff to lay out the election process so everyone would know how the public would hear about it, the length of time for response and so forth so that everyone concedes that it is a fair election and representation of what is happening in the district. Chairperson Burnett wanted information about the noticing. Boardmember Curry agreed with the idea of if you don't turn it in, it's no. Boardmember Emme also said that if you have a proxy on Wall Street and don't turn it in, you are voting yes. Boardmember Vacchi wanted to know if any other options had been looked at from a procedural standpoint. Is there some other way to get the needed response without changing it from a majority consent to a majority opposed. Cathy Winterrowd said that staff would put together the answers to all of these questions and formulate a recommendation. The Board can then debate it in January and either go with staff's recommendation or go with something else. Staff will provide different options and will talk to the Mayor's policy staff.

Vice Chair Schaefer suggested that staff should look at how Development Services notices people re zoning changes, developments, etc. From his experience, if he doesn't send in something in

opposition, he is, de facto, going along with it. Boardmember Berge wanted clarification on how long has it been since we had voluntary districts that required owners' consent. Would we be changing back to something we had in the past? Boardmember Eisenhart wanted to know if a district had 100 properties, and the vote was 50/50, would the boundaries be redrawn. Kelley said that the boundaries would not be redrawn to get a certain percentage of contributing structures. The boundaries are established based on the historical context and significance of the district.

Boardmember Curry said that the policy was different because conditions were different. The proposal to make changes is based on the conditions of today – the pressure over land in historical districts. We are now facing huge development and densification; that's why we are looking for changes to protect what we still have.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 5 – 801 UNIVERSITY AVENUE – THIS ITEM TRAILED TO A FUTURE HEARING DATE AT THE REQUEST OF THE PROPERTY OWNER

No Staff Report

ITEM 6 – NATHAN RIGDON HOUSE SPEC HOUSE # 2

Applicant: Christine Knoop & Beth Montes on behalf of Ron & Tobi de Frates, owners

Location: 2121 Fort Stockton Drive, Uptown Community, Council District 3

Description: The house is a two-story wood shingle and horizontal wood siding over wood frame Craftsman style house designed and built by Master Builder Nathan Rigdon in 1915.

Today's Action: Designate under one or more established HRB Criteria or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Nathan Rigdon Spec House #2 under HRB Criterion C as an excellent example of the Craftsman style, and Criterion D as the work of Master Builder Nathan Rigdon. The designation shall include the garage and cobblestone retaining walls.

Report Number: HRB-06-083

BOARD ACTION

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO PLACE ITEM 6 ON THE CONSENT AGENDA AND APPROVE PER STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION.

Second by Boardmember Schaefer. Vote: 8-0-1(Eisenhart). Motion passes.

The Chairperson suggested that Item 11 be taken out of order so that the issues could be addressed. As Boardmember Marshall had recused himself on Item 11, he left on a break.

ITEM 11 – GASLAMP QUARTER PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE AND GASLAMP QUARTER PLANNED DISTRICT DESIGN GUIDELINES

Applicant: Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC)

Location: Gaslamp Quarter Historic District, Centre City Planning Area, Council District 2

Description: Proposed changes to the Gaslamp Quarter Planned District Ordinance and Gaslamp Quarter Planned District Design Guidelines

Today's Action: Review the proposed changes to the Gaslamp Quarter Planned District Ordinance and Gaslamp Quarter Planned District Design Guidelines and make recommendations to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Staff Recommendation: Recommend adoption of the proposed Gaslamp Quarter Planned District Ordinance and Gaslamp Quarter Planned District Design Guidelines to the Planning Commission and City Council

Report Number: CCDC Report dated November 14, 2006

Staff Report by Beverly Schroeder of CCDC

BOARD DISCUSSION:

Boardmember Emme asked if the storefront display windows at the University Boot Shop and San Diego Hardware are going to be preserved. Beverly Schroeder of CCDC said that those are two really important buildings in the Gaslamp. This has been to DAS numerous times, and it has been to the State. Certain changes had to be made because of exiting from the building and the number of people that might be within the building with the change of use. There will be some change to one side of the store to have a larger exit. The San Diego Hardware building will have an entrance where an elevator will have to be put. The windows are still the curved windows. Boardmember Emme asked how many buildings in the Gaslamp can have a height increase. Beverly Schroeder said there are three sites where the height could potentially be raised to 75 feet. The buildings that can raise their height to 125 feet already have development permits and have been processed up through City Council. There are no new sites. Boardmember Emme commented on the conditions that he considered horrendous. No old photos show sidewalk cafes. He feels that it gives a false sense of history to have all those sidewalk "cafes" in the district, and the Gaslamp District will continue to be the biggest bar scene in San Diego. Many of them don't even serve food; some people use them as areas to sit and smoke. Vice Chair Schaefer said that in the 19th century, there were brothels and opium dens and pigs running wild in the dirt streets. It was a rough, wild, by-the-docks district. It's been gentrified now and the guidelines are useful in trying to maintain as much of the historical character as possible. In response to a question from Vice Chair Schaefer, Beverly Schroeder said the Gaslamp Planned District Ordinance are the laws and the Guidelines illustrate how to do some of the ideas in the PDO. There is a process where if something like a sign or awning is to be added, the historic preservation consultant reviews it. The Gaslamp Quarter Association has a Land Use and Planning Committee which reviews plans and the letter from the Historic Preservation consultant. If there is anything that makes them uncomfortable, then it is brought over to HRB or to DAS for help.

PUBLIC COMMENT

In Favor: Jimmy Parker and Marsha Sewell

Public testimony closed.

BOARD ACTION

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO ADOPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND REPORT REGARDING THE TWO COEXISTING, HAND-IN-HAND PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE AND GUIDELINES FOR THE GASLAMP PLANNED DISTRICT.

Second by Vice Chair Schaefer. Vote: 8-0-0. Motion passes.

The Chairperson asked for patience regarding Item 7, and then placed Item 8 ahead of it.

ITEM 8 – HISTORICAL RESOURCES RESEARCH REPORT GUIDELINES

Applicant: City of San Diego, City Planning and Community Investment Department, Historical Resources Section

Location: Citywide

Description: Revised Historical Resource Research Report Guidelines and Requirements, Appendix E, Part 2 of the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (Land Development Manual).

Today's Action: Adopt the revised Historical Resources Research Report Guidelines and Requirements as proposed or return to staff with direction for revisions.

Staff Recommendation: Adopt the revised Historical Resource Research Report Guidelines and Requirements as proposed.

Report Number: HRB-06-078

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Emme said that staff's report showed a lot of research effort, and the new guidelines are needed. Many reports received by the Board are boiler plate. Some consultants don't focus in on the property such as the actual structure of the house and modification; the reports are very Spartan and cursory. Kelley stated that there are still reports from 2006 that will be heard this year; the new guidelines won't apply to them, but she has high hopes for hearings in 2008.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY VICE CHAIR SCHAEFER TO ADOPT THE REVISED HISTORICAL RESOURCE RESEARCH REPORT GUIDELINES AND REQUIREMENTS AS PROPOSED.

Second by Boardmember Marshall. Vote: 8-0-0.

AMENDMENT TO THE MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO INSERT ON DPR FORM 523B UNDER B6: "LIST ALTERATIONS THAT AFFECT THE RESOURCE'S ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY. NOTE ASPECTS OF HISTORICAL INTEGRITY ARE ANALYZED UNDER B 10." AND INSERT UNDER B10: "PROVIDE AN ANALYSIS OF THE ASPECTS OF HISTORICAL INTEGRITY UNDER THE APPLICABLE HRB CRITERIA."

Second to Amended Motion by Boardmember Harrison: Vote: 8-0-0.

ITEM 7 – UPTOWN HISTORIC SURVEY (CONTINUED UNTIL JANUARY 25, 2007)

Applicant: City of San Diego,

Location: Uptown Community, Council Districts 2 and 3

Description: Reconnaissance survey of the Uptown Community Plan Area, identifying significant architectural and cultural landscape resources.

Today's Action: Review the Uptown Historic Survey and recommendations and adopt it or do not adopt it.

Staff Recommendation: Adopt the Uptown Historic Survey for planning purposes, including the recommendations for implementation of the survey findings.

Report Numbers: HRB-06-077

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Harrison raised the question of whether Boardmembers can later vote on issues discussed at a hearing from which they were absent, or if they could vote after listening to tapes of previous hearings. That question was referred to the Deputy City Attorney. Boardmember Harrison said he was concerned about having a report and testimony today and a Board vote at a later date. If absent Boardmembers could not vote after listening to a tape of a meeting they had missed, or if they are unable to listen to the tape, then members of the public who give testimony for one side or the other might be disadvantaged by those Boardmembers' inability to vote. He expressed the opinion that it might be less of a disadvantage for the public to return for a meeting at which both public testimony and Board action would be taken on the same day. Deputy District Attorney Nina Fain said that a Boardmember needs to review the tape if not present for the testimony before voting on an item.

BOARD ACTION

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL TO CONTINUE. ANY PRESENTATION OR DISCUSSION TO BE TAKEN AT THE SAME MEETING AS THE MEETING FOR THE VOTE.

Second by Boardmember Eisenhart. Vote: 8-0-0. Motion carries.

ITEM 9 – GUIDELINES FOR THE APPLICATION OF HRB DESIGNATION CRITERIA (CONTINUED UNTIL JANUARY 25, 2007)

Applicant: City of San Diego, City Planning and Community Investment Department, Historical Resources Section

Location: Citywide

Description: Guidelines for the Application of HRB Designation Criteria, Appendix E, Part 1 of the City of San Diego Historical Resources Guidelines (Land Development Manual).

Today's Action: Adopt the Guidelines for the Application of HRB Designation Criteria as proposed or return to staff with direction for revisions.

Staff Recommendation: Adopt the Guidelines for the Application of HRB Designation Criteria as proposed.

Report Number: HRB-06-079

No Staff Report

ITEM 10 – COMPOSITION OF THE HRB STANDING SUBCOMMITTEES

Applicant: HRB Policy Subcommittee

Location: N/A

Description: Appointments to the HRB Standing Subcommittees

Today's Action: Ratify the HRB Policy Subcommittee's appointments to the HRB Policy, Design Assistance and Archaeology Subcommittees or do not ratify the appointments and return the item to the Policy Subcommittee with comments.

Staff Recommendation: Ratify the HRB Policy Subcommittee's appointments to the HRB Subcommittees

Report Number: HRB-06-082

BOARD ACTION

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO PLACE ITEM ON THE CONSENT AGENDA AND APPROVE PER STAFF RECOMMENDATION.

Second by Boardmember Schaefer. Vote on Item 10: 9-0-0. Motion passes.

REMINDER:

NEXT BOARD MEETING DATE: January 25, 2007

LOCATION: City Administration Building
12th Floor, Council Committee Room

The meeting was adjourned at 4:26 p.m.