

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

**MINUTES OF REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING OF
April 26, 2007**

**COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM – 12TH FLOOR
CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Chairperson Vacchi at 1:01 p.m.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW DEPUTY DIRECTOR

After calling the meeting to order, Chairperson Vacchi introduced Planning Director William Anderson who introduced the new Deputy Director for the Urban Form Division, Garry Papers. The Urban Form Division was recently created to strengthen the urban design capacity, and includes overseeing Park and Open Space Planning, Urban Design, and Historic Resources. Mr. Papers was the manager of Architecture and Urban Design for CCDC for the last three years and was in private practice before that. He has practiced in Portland (Oregon), Tokyo, and Boston. The Roll Call followed.

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING

Chairperson	Robert Vacchi	Present
Vice Chairperson	Otto Emme	Present
Boardmember	Priscilla Berge	Present
Boardmember	Laura Burnett	Absent
Boardmember	Maria Curry	Absent
Boardmember	John Eisenhart	Present
Boardmember	Donald Harrison	Present – Arrived at 1:06 p.m.
Boardmember	David Marshall	Present
Boardmember	Delores McNeely	Present – Returned after recess at 3:22.
Boardmember	Jerry Schaefer	Present
Boardmember	Abel Silvas	Absent

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

Legal Counsel in Attendance: Marianne Greene, Deputy City Attorney

ITEM 1 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MARCH 22, 2007

Deputy City Attorney Marianne Greene stated that she wanted the record to show that the opinion that she gave on the adoption of the historic survey was a “tentative” opinion.

Boardmember Marshall questioned the correctness of the vote on page 6 which listed Ms. McNeely as an abstention on Item 5 - ST JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL ANNEX/FURNITURE STORE; she wasn't listed as having any conflict in the earlier part of the minutes. Ms. McNeely said that the vote should show her as abstaining. Boardmember Marshall also questioned the discussion on page 16, which mentioned SHPO twice. As he had left the meeting earlier, he wondered if SHPO was a typo for SOHO. Cathy Winterrowd said that SHPO was correct, but perhaps the minutes should be changed to show the State's Historic Preservation Office as OHP (Office of Historic Preservation) so that no one else would think that the abbreviation was a typo.

Boardmember Berge said that her name was misspelled on page 6, and on page 11 a comment attributed to her said the “portico entry was lost.” It was the “colonial entry” that was lost.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER SCHAEFER MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE CORRECTED MINUTES.

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

ITEM 2 - PUBLIC COMMENT

Janet O'Dea made a presentation to the Board and public about “loopholes” she had found. On February 22, she and other members of the public met with Development Services (DSD) and the Planning Department about concerns that they had, such as demolitions in their neighborhoods. Ms. O'Dea was concerned about the 45-year rule. On the 27th, she was told by DSD that a lot of the loopholes had been closed. She then showed slides of what she believes to be “loopholes” since April 6.

Boardmember Harrison asked the Chair if the issue of noticing and to whom notices are sent could be discussed in a Policy Subcommittee meeting. Ms. Winterrowd said that currently for designation, staff sends notices to the property owners, the Council District, the Historical Society, and the recognized community planning group. Boardmember Harrison asked if the Chicano Federation and the Jewish Historical Society are notified of properties that are of interest to particular ethnic groups. Chairperson Vacchi agreed that the subject should be placed on the next Policy agenda.

Boardmember Marshall thanked Ms. O'Dea for putting the material together. He agreed that one of our problems as a Board and a City is a lack of monitoring and inability to follow up. If this needs to come before the full board, Boardmember Marshall is in favor of closing loopholes that allow such demolitions or changes to historic fabric to happen.

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

- **ABSENCES**

Boardmember Burnett advised staff that she would be out of town and unable to attend today's meeting. Hers was the only notification received for absences.

OTHER GENERAL INFORMATION

Contents of Blue Folders: Included are: a letter on Item #7 provided on behalf of the owner; a letter on Item #9 in opposition to designation; a request for continuance on Item #10; an e-mail request for continuance on Item #11; and a letter on Item #14 re the El Cortez property.

- **GENERAL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were none.

B. Conflict of Interest Declarations

Conflicts of Interest: Boardmember Eisenhart said that he would be recusing himself on Item #7 as he is a board member of SOHO, the applicant on that item. Boardmember Schaefer said that on Item #14 – 777 Beech Street, he will be recusing himself because the historian from his company is consulting with the proponent on that project. Boardmember McNeely will be recusing herself on Item #6. Boardmember Marshall said he will recuse himself on Item #14 because of a potential new project that his firm may have; it's unrelated but is associated with the ownership. Chairperson Vacchi said he will recuse himself on Item #14 also because the property owner is a client of his firm. Boardmember Schaefer asked if there would be a quorum to hear Item #14. Ms. Winterrowd said that as there were only 5 members at the meeting who could vote, there would not be a quorum unless one of the absent Boardmembers should arrive later.

Ex Parte Communications: None were reported.

Failure to visit designation sites (including interiors proposed for designation):

Boardmember McNeely was out of the country and did not visit the courtyard. Ms.

Winterrowd asked if she had seen the exterior and would be able to make a decision based on that examination. Boardmember McNeely replied that she thought so. Vice Chair Emme said that he had not been in the courtyard either and had only viewed it from the outside, but thought that he saw enough to make a decision. Boardmember Berge said the courtyard was locked when she went to view it, but she did view it from the public right-of-way.

C. Staff Reports

Cathy Winterrowd reported that Diane Kane was present to provide the Board and public a brief update on the Uptown Survey, as requested by the Chair at last month's hearing.

Dr. Kane said that she had reviewed SHPO's comments and added material to the survey to explain better how the context was used in evaluating various properties. SHPO had concerns about the evaluations of properties under social and cultural history. Although the context was used in the survey, Dr. Kane said she had not explained very well how it was used. She will add additional discussion on that. Other materials will also be included to meet Federal format requirements as Federal funding was used for a portion of the survey. There were also questions

about how the document will be used in the planning process. This information was included in Chapter 4, but it is possible that SHPO didn't see that as they didn't receive a hard copy of that section, but were referred to the City's Web Site instead. Their comments were probably made on the earlier version. Dr. Kane said that she would be back next month with recommendations and strategies on adoption, its use in the planning process, and ways to update the database.

Announcements by Cathy Winterrowd:

- The California Preservation Conference will be held in Hollywood May 3-6. The Saturday papers on modernism seem really interesting.
- SOHO's Rancho to Ranch House Event in San Diego will be held at the Liberty Station on May 18-20. It will cover 200 years of architecture and design in San Diego.

We are still accepting nominations for the Board's annual preservation awards through Monday, April 30th. The Policy Subcommittee will be meeting on that day, so awards will be accepted until 3:00. Nomination forms should be emailed or delivered to the attention of Ginger Weatherford. As usual, the awards will be presented at the May HRB meeting at 1:00 p.m.

The next DAS meeting will be held on Wednesday, May 2; the next Historic Building Interiors Ad Hoc Subcommittee meeting will also be on May 2. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee is moving right along; the May meeting may be its last. The April Policy Subcommittee meeting was rescheduled to Monday, April 30 at 3:00 p.m.; the May Policy Subcommittee meeting will be held on Monday, May 14; the next Archaeology Subcommittee meeting will be held on May 14.

There is one designation request from the public on today's agenda, in addition to five properties that were continued from previous meetings. There are 59 requests waiting to be reviewed by staff and brought forward for designation. In addition to these individual requests for designation on today's agenda, there are four items referred from Development Services, two items referred from CCDC, the second hearing on the Islenair Historic District, and the Board's review of proposed development adjacent to the historic El Cortez.

D. Requests for Continuances

The owner of Item 10, the Carrie and Horation Farnham Duplex at 3225-3231 Fourth Avenue, has requested a continuance, stating he did not know about the pending designation until receiving a notice of this Board hearing.

The owner of Item 11, the Dr. Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court at 3235, 3245, 3251, and 3255 Fourth Avenue, has requested a continuance of this item to the June HRB hearing.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER BERGE MOVED THAT ITEM 10 BE CONTINUED AS REQUESTED.

Second by Boardmember Harrison. Vote: 8-0-0. The motion passes.

BOARDMEMBER BERGE MOVED THAT ITEM 11 BE CONTINUED AS REQUESTED.

Second by Boardmember Eisenhart. Vote: 8-0-0. The 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:

ITEM 8 – Le Moderne Apartment Complex at 525-531 Nutmeg Street/2650-2680 Sixth Avenue
ITEM 12 – Marie Louise Biggar/Herbert J. Mann House at 409 Dunemere Drive

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL MOVED THAT ITEMS 8 AND 12 BE APPROVED ON CONSENT.

Second by Boardmember Berge.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Vice Chair Emme asked that the motion be divided as he needed to vote no on Item 12. Boardmember Marshall was asked by the Chair to amend his motion.

BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE ITEM 8, LE MODERNE, ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 8-0-0. The motion passes.

BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL MOVED THAT ITEM 12, THE MARIE LOUISE BIGGAR/HERBERT J. MANN HOUSE, BE APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

Second by Boardmember Eisenhart. Vote: 6-2 (Berge, Emme)-0. The motion passes.

Scott Richardson, the Dean of St. Paul's Cathedral, told the Board that he strongly approves the action that the Board took on Le Moderne. It is hoped that St. Paul's will be the owners of Le Moderne in the near future and use that as an affordable housing site.

Judith Newman, the owner of the Marie Louise Biggar/Herbert J. Mann House, thanked the Board for approving the designation. It's the first old house she has owned. As soon as she saw it, she wanted it and she wants to keep it just as lovely as it is now, and in the spirit of its historic aspects.

ACTION ITEMS**ITEM 5 -- ISLENAIR HISTORIC DISTRICT (2nd HEARING)**

Before the presentation of this item, Boardmember Harrison stated that he had heard the tape of the first hearing, and found it clear and easy to understand, and stated that Kelley was fantastic. Her presentation was clear and easy to follow even without pictures.

Applicant: City of San Diego

Location: Various addresses within study area boundaries, defined by the properties along the north side of Isla Vista Drive to the north; the homes along the east side of Isla Vista Drive to the east; the

Isla Vista cul-de-sac and the properties at 3203 and 3204 Belle Isle Drive to the south; and Euclid Avenue to the west, Mid-City: City Heights Community, Council District 7

Description: Second hearing to consider the designation of the Islenair Historic District as a Historical Resource.

Today's Action: Review the Islenair Geographic/Traditional Historic District nomination; take public testimony; consider the level of owner support for the establishment of the district; consider modification of the Status Code of the property located at 3306 Isla Vista Drive and the Status Code and classification of the property at 3324 Isla Vista Drive; and consider the designation the Islenair Geographic/Traditional Historic District and the contributing resources within the District.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Board take the following actions:

1. Change the Status Code of the property at 3306 Isla Vista Drive from 5D3 to 5B.
2. Change the Status Code of the property at 3324 Isla Vista Drive from 5D3 to 6L and the status from Contributing to Non-Contributing.
3. Designate the Islenair Historic District under
 - a. HRB Criterion A as a special element of San Diego's historical, social, economic and architectural development:
 - i. reflecting the evolution of the small house movement which focused on quality design and construction in a compact, efficient layout from the Post-World War I through Post-World War II period;
 - ii. reflecting architectural trends from Spanish Eclectic to Minimal Traditional and Ranch styles, visually illustrating and encapsulating the booms, busts, and trends in working-class suburban development in San Diego from 1926 through 1952;
 - iii. reflecting middle and working class subdivisions which allowed families the opportunity to invest in homeownership in a neighborhood which utilized and expressed modern planning and subdivision principles;
 - iv. reflecting the patterns of local, early auto-oriented suburban development as advances in transportation technology made development in outlying communities both affordable and practical; and
 - v. reflecting the planning philosophy of adapting the design and layout of a subdivision to the natural topography on which the subdivision is to be located.
 - b. HRB Criterion C, as it embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type and period of construction:
 - i. Style: Spanish Eclectic and Minimal Traditional.
 - ii. Type: "small house" and "minimum house" construction types.
 - iii. Period: San Diego's development of Automobile Suburbs between 1926 and 1952 (Post-WWI through Post-WWII).
4. Designate all identified Contributing Resources under HRB Criterion F.
5. Direct staff to return to the Board with the Islenair District Development and Design Guidelines following input from the community.

Report Number: 07-021

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders.

Public Testimony Opened

In Favor: Patty Vaccariello, Mary Vaccariello, Jim Varnadore, Teem Osborn, Christa Hansen, and Mike and Kit Lynch (did not speak)

Opposed: No One

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

Vice Chair Emme asked about public outreach, such as public workshops. He also asked if other individual contributors would come back before the Board. Ms. Saunders said that in terms of community support, the district has been in process since 2002. There was a workshop in November 2002 with the property owners. They expressed support for the district. When processing was resumed this year, there was another workshop on March 10 which received a good turn-out and response. The neighbors have circulated petitions door-to-door, trying to inform property owners, and letters have been given out with information regarding responsibilities and benefits. Letters were sent to property owners who don't actually live in the neighborhood; they were encouraged to contact staff if they had questions. There was considerable community outreach on the part of the City and the neighbors themselves. There are 51.8% of the property owners in support, with a large percentage not responding at all.

Ms. Saunders said that where property was identified as 5B and the owner wants to have property individually designated, although there is no additional benefit, a full research report would have to be prepared and brought before the Board. Staff does not anticipate such actions. This is not a voluntary district; all the contributors are being designated now. If a property is currently identified as 6L, a property with potentially reversible modifications, and therefore not designated, the owner could meet with staff to discuss how prior modifications to the property could be reversed. They could then come before the Board after they complete the restorations. There won't be routine updates such as those with Burlingame and Ocean Beach.

Vice Chair Emme asked how would the future Design Guidelines be enforced. Ms. Saunders responded that we have development guidelines with a number of our existing districts. In addition to the Secretary of Interior standards, when staff reviews a project associated with a district (whether the property is a contributor or non-contributor), the design guidelines would be followed, just as they are now in other districts. When asked how an owner would know that these guidelines apply, the response was that the historic designations are recorded against the property, so new owners would know. Ms. Winterrowd said that authority for those guidelines is in the Land Development Code. All properties in districts are regulated by the Land Development Code and must comply with Secretary of Interior standards and any other district standards that are adopted.

Boardmember Harrison asked where does the report footnote the CC&R's. Ms. Saunders said that those restricted CC&R's are in the historic context itself of the nomination of the district. She said there were deed restrictions. Boardmember Schaefer was in support of staff's recommendation of the district. This is a good opportunity to provide potential for preservation for some of these minimal traditionals. He said that he would sure like to see the scrapbook Patty Vaccariello described and read from in her public testimony. Perhaps it could be donated to the San Diego Historical Society to be preserved for the city as a whole.

Boardmember Berge asked how many pages were in the scrapbook. Ms. Vaccariello used her hands to indicate the thickness of the scrapbook and said that it consisted of cards, photographs, condolences, and thank you notes; it covers the period from 1936 to 1978. She doesn't own it, but has transcribed it. The pages are very brittle. Boardmember Berge suggested that the scrapbook be scanned, and a copy given to City Planning and Community Investment. She also praised Ms. Saunders' report. Boardmember Berge had some brief comments about the use of

the word “period.” She also made suggestions about the use of continuation sheets. She asked if a statement of significance will be used on the DPR forms. Ms. Saunders said a standardized statement of significance will be on the DPR forms.

Boardmember Harrison asked that the Board not remove the concept of the automobile liberating people, allowing them to move farther from the City core, as that is a significant part of the history of Islenair. He doesn’t particularly care which term is used, whether it be period or era. Vice Chair Emme asked how DSD would be informed of this new district. Ms. Saunders said the district boundaries would be forwarded to DSD through the Geographic Information System so they will know the exact location of the district. Properties located within designated districts are automatically sent to HRB staff for review. No review is done by DSD on these properties.

Boardmember Schaefer wanted to accept the district and the report just the way it was written. He read a statement, “Islenair is also significant under Criterion C as it embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, Spanish Eclectic and Minimal Tradition type, small house and minimal house and period, San Diego’s development of automobile suburbs between 1926 and 1952 . . . and period of construction.” Construction could be removed. Though it may be valid for scholars and historians to do future research and have dialogue about defining aspects; that can go on forever. As a district nomination, what is written works here; the document does its job. Boardmember Schaefer said that Ms. Saunders has done an excellent job in nailing it pretty well.

Boardmember McNeely agreed that Ms. Saunders did a great job of clarifying questions raised in the last meeting. There are now bullet points to help one follow her points.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE ITEM #5, THE ISLENAIR HISTORIC DISTRICT, UNDER ALL OF STAFF’S RECOMMENDATIONS LISTED.

Second by Boardmember Harrison.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Boardmember Berge said that she is in full support of nominating the district.

Vote: 8-0-0. The motion passes.

ITEM 6 – AUGUST AND MABEL BLAISDELL SPEC HOUSE #1 (Continued from February 22, 2007)

Applicant: Ruth Alter, on behalf of Miguel and Gabriela Vasquez, owners, referred from the City of San Diego Development Services Department

Location: 4004 Lark Street, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: The house is a one story, 984 square foot rectangular Craftsman bungalow on a concrete foundation built in 1924 on the northwest corner of Lark Street and Washington Place.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate the August and Mabel Blaisdell Spec House #1 under HRB Criterion C as a good example of Craftsman bungalow architecture.

Report Number: HRB-07-004 and Supplemental Staff Memos dated 2/8/2007 and 4/12/2007
Staff Report by Kelley Saunders.

A memo dated April 18, 2007, from Deputy City Attorney Marianne Greene, was distributed in advance, advising that the Board should consider the condition of the property at the time of permit submittal, i.e., prior to the unauthorized partial demolition, in its consideration for designation.

Public Testimony Opened

In Favor: Janet O'Dea

Opposed: Scott Moomjian, Randy Whaley, and Miguel Vasquez (The last two did not speak.)

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Berge said that she thought that the Board needs to waive the site visit. As it is physically impossible to visit the site as it was in the past, she feels that a determination can be made by looking at the photographs. She feels that what is shown in the photos is a property that is historic in its own right. Relying on residential building records, it meets the 45-year rule. Chairperson Vacchi, after consulting with the Deputy City Attorney, said the Board has been deprived of seeing the site in its original condition, so no waiver is needed. The site has been visited in its current condition and the Board has other evidence. Boardmember Harrison said that he for one had not heard of the Code Compliance case until the project came before the Board, and at that time Mr. Moomjian commented on the case, so he's not sure about the claim of prejudice. However, he is certain that the Boardmembers are required to go to the sites and look at them. Before Mr. Moomjian brought it up, Boardmember Harrison had asked himself how he could ethically vote on something that he has never seen, on what is essentially hearsay. He has no reason to disbelieve staff, but he feels it was his duty as a Boardmember to inspect it himself. He is uncomfortable with the idea that though we are unhappy with the possibility that someone could avoid historical designation by somehow destroying a property, and that as a Board we want to protect ourselves from that. Boardmember Harrison said because he is uncomfortable with this idea, he will be voting against designation. As his vote might prevent resolution since not all members are present today, he would like to have this item continued.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER HARRISON MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE THIS ITEM.

Second by Boardmember Eisenhart.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Scott Moomjian asked permission to discuss the motion. He stated that this item which was referred by DSD first appeared before the Board in January. It was fast-tracked because, in many ways, development projects need to be fast-tracked. As this item is no further along than it was four months ago, on behalf of the property owner, he strenuously objected to a continuance.

Boardmember Schaefer pointed out that there were seven members present, but only six are needed to designate. Boardmember Harrison attempted to withdraw his motion, but was told that once a motion was made and seconded, a vote was required.

Vote: 1-6-0. The motion fails.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Marshall said it was not the choice of the Board or staff to have only photographs for referral. This situation was created by the homeowner. As an architect who works with historic structures, he said photographs are considered a primary source of information, as they are one of the most reliable sources of information. If you have drawings, the building may not necessarily have been built that way. If you have interviews or written data, there is never the detail you need. He thought that the number of photographs that the Board has are more than enough to tell us what we need to know as a Board. He said that the photographs on the screen were a clear indication that this house's condition prior to the non-approved alterations by the homeowner were very characteristic of at least 15 or 20 other properties that were designated during his time on the Board. As the Board has very clear direction from the City Attorney's office on how to judge this project, in his opinion it would be a mistake to say that we cannot vote for designation because of unapproved alterations done by a particular homeowner.

Vice Chair Emme said that he never heard of the 4004 Lark Street property before it came before the Board. He found it difficult to look at the photos and determine whether the site meets the criteria. Although the location hasn't changed, the design, setting, materials and workmanship have. The feel and association are gone. The Board is trying to take a leap into the past, but there is no level of integrity at this time.

Boardmember Schaefer commended Ms. Greene for a well researched, clearly reasoned memorandum of law on this situation and whether there is an obligation to evaluate this building as it existed at the time of permit application. He said he was troubled by exposing the Board to people who deliberately, or otherwise, hamper the Board in its duties, by virtue of demolition, neglect, or deliberate defacing of a building prior to the Board's seeing it. He thinks the memorandum provides a remedy to overcome those types of situations. He stated that he feels comfortable evaluating the building in its condition before the demolition started.

Boardmember Marshall strongly disagreed with Mr. Emme's earlier remarks. The Board was instructed by the Deputy City Attorney that the "existing condition" is defined as the condition when the permit process began. The Vice Chair's integrity issues were based on the present conditions, not the conditions the Board was advised to judge. It's perfectly fine not to designate if you feel that the prior existing condition did not have integrity. But it's not alright to base a decision on the current condition that we were instructed to disregard in a four-page legal memo.

Vice Chair Emme asked how one can visit a site last fall or make a forensic leap into the past. Boardmember Berge asked for clarification on the issue of whether or not we need a waiver on the site visit. Ms. Winterrowd asked if Boardmember Berge had visited the site. The answer was yes, but she felt a waiver was required. Deputy City Attorney Greene said that it was a moot point to ask for a waiver as the demolition made it impossible to visit the site in its former condition. Ms. Winterrowd read from the procedures, "Only Board members who have

physically visited each site to be considered for designation may vote on the designation unless a site specific waiver is approved by the Board.” Everyone had visited the site.

Boardmember Schaefer said that Boardmembers had the Archeos report with them. The document had more than enough information, photographs, and description to assess what this building was like before the changes occurred.

Boardmember Harrison stated that Ruth Alter said that the chimney and front porch were already removed before she looked at the house. He asked what the Board would do if someone voluntarily came before the Board with an application and said, “Would you designate this? By the way, I took away my chimney and porch.” He said this Board would be reluctant to do so. We have a report that said this occurred; we have a staff report that says this didn’t occur before a specific date. How can the Board verify what the situation was? The Board is placed in the position of either believing the staff report or the consultant’s. We are dealing with two very honorable groups. Boardmember Harrison said he has no way of determining whether the porch or chimney were there at the appropriate time. Though the Deputy City Attorney says that we can go back to the time that the process started, we still don’t know what that time is. If we can’t touch it or feel it ourselves, we have to rely on other people’s opinions. Boardmember Harrison doesn’t believe this is the way to conduct this business.

Boardmember Berge said that she thinks the photos have helped her assess the site, especially the reference to the chimney. She thinks that the chimney looks as though it were an addition to make the house look more like a Craftsman Bungalow.

BOARDMEMBER EISENHART MADE A MOTION TO DESIGNATE THE AUGUST AND MABEL BLAISDELL SPEC HOUSE #1 UNDER HRB CRITERION C AS A GOOD EXAMPLE OF CRAFTSMAN BUNGALOW ARCHITECTURE.

Second by Boardmember Marshall.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Boardmember Eisenhart said that he had viewed the house many times in the previous eight years as it in his neighborhood, so his recommendation and motion is based on actual physical observation. He says that based on the opinion from the City Attorney’s Office, the home retains its integrity. Chairperson Vacchi said that he doesn’t think that the vote either way will set a precedent for the Board as it doesn’t operate on precedent, but on a case-by-case basis where conditions are weighed against the criteria. He also pointed out that the photos, which may have been taken several months before the application, were submitted by the applicant. If the applicant makes that submission with the application, he must rely on the interview and analysis done by staff and the Board. Chairperson Vacchi thinks that this closes one of the loopholes and prevents applicants from going out and modifying structures after the application. When it comes to the vote, when looking at the actual construction, whether before or after the modifications, the Chair doesn’t believe the structure meets the criteria for designation and will vote against it. Boardmember Marshall said that he isn’t concerned about the Board creating a precedent with this vote, but he is concerned that we are creating a blueprint for property owners who don’t want to follow the rules, and don’t care about preservation. The Chairperson said he agreed that if you go with the term “present integrity” you open a door. The application date

gives you a fixed point in time. If someone starts demolition without an application and Code Enforcement issues a Stop Work order, at that point, that becomes the date, and once again you have a sliding scale. We may have a policy discussion on how to set rules to prevent this from happening.

Vote: 3-4-1 (McNeely). The motion fails.

BOARDMEMBER BERGE MOVED THAT ITEM 6 BE DESIGNATED UNDER CRITERION A AS REFLECTING THE ARCHITECTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE MISSION HILLS NEIGHBORHOOD AT THE PERIOD OF TIME THAT THE SHINGLES WERE ADDED TO BE MORE CRAFTSMAN.

Second by Boardmember Schaefer.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Boardmember Eisenhart asked for clarification of the motion. Boardmember Berge said she was basing her motion on the appearance of the house in the pictures. The shingles, not the clapboard siding, are visible. She believes this was a common vernacular expression of the architectural development of the Mission Hills neighborhood, with an emphasis on Craftsman. Boardmember Harrison said that he can't follow that reasoning as he doesn't know the historical record. Boardmember Berge said that vernacular expression was often without an architect.

Vote: 2-4-2 (Marshall, McNeely). The motion fails.

Chairperson Vacchi announced, before a ten-minute recess, that as there were still three absent Boardmembers, as well as recusals on Item 14, that item will be trailed to the next meeting. The meeting reconvened at 3:11 p.m.

ITEM 7 – SOUTH PARK COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES: BURLINGAME GARAGE, ROSE GROCERY, FIRE STATION NO. 9, AND 2141 AND 2143 30TH STREET (Continued from March 22, 2007)

Applicant: Ronald V. May of Legacy 106 for Save Our Heritage Organisation (not the property owner)

Location: 2227 30th Street; 2215-2219 30th Street; 2211 30th Street; and 2141 and 2143 30th Street, Greater North Park Community, Council District 3

Description: The Burlingame Garage is a one-story, Mission Revival style commercial structure of hollow clay fired tile with stucco, and wooden barrel vaulted roof constructed in 1914. The Rose Grocery, constructed in 1923, is a one-story, Mission Revival style commercial structure of hollow clay fired tile with stucco finish and wooden barrel vaulted roof. The Fire Station No. 9 is a Craftsman style rectangular structure with front gabled roof and fired hollow clay tile sidewalls constructed in 1913. The small, rectangular structure at 2141 and 2143 30th Street, constructed in 1925, exhibits a low gabled roof, wood frame and clapboard siding on a concrete deck.

Today's Action: Designate each of the listed properties individually under one or more established HRB Criteria or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Burlingame Garage and Rose Grocery as individual historical resources under Criterion A for their association with the historical, social and economic

development of the South Park neighborhood and under Criterion C as good examples of Mission Revival architecture expressed in a commercial structure. Designate the Fire Station No. 9 as an individual historical resource under Criterion A for its association with the historical and social development of the South Park neighborhood and under Criterion C as a unique and good example of Craftsman architecture expressed in a municipal building. Do not designate the structure located at 2141 and 2143 30th Street as a historical resource under any HRB Criteria due to a lack of integrity from its 1925 period of significance.

Report Number: 07-018

Staff Report by Cathy Winterrowd.

Public Testimony Opened

In Favor: Ron May, Dale May (did not speak), Ernestine Bonn (did not speak), Bruce Coons, Robert McLeod, and Janet O'Dea

Opposed: Tim Monahan and Penelope Farmer Ward

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Marshall supported staff's recommendation for designating three of the four sites. Boardmember Berge agreed with the designation of the three, but felt that the gas station should also be designated. She considered the small commercial office representative of its time.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER HARRISON MOVED THAT THE BOARD VOTE ON THE SITES INDIVIDUALLY.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 7-0-1(Eisenhart). The motion carries.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Harrison said that preserving these three or four structures which are close together tells an important story. He said that what owners plan to do with a property is not a subject before this board. This board is charged with determining whether properties are historical, not whether they could be sold at a higher rate or whether a community would be better off having the property developed. Perhaps the City Council could determine which values are most important to the City, but not this Board.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL MOVED TO APPROVE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION THAT THE BURLINGAME GARAGE AT 2227 30TH STREET BE DESIGNATED UNDER CRITERION A AND CRITERION C.

Second by Boardmember Schaefer. Vote: 7-0-1(Eisenhart). The motion passes.

BOARDMEMBER HARRISON MOVED TO DESIGNATE THE ROSE GROCERY AT 2215-2219 30TH STREET UNDER CRITERIA A AND C.

Second by Boardmember McNeely.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Boardmember Schaefer commended the report as it contained fascinating community history, especially in relationship to the trolley. He asked if the home of the Roses is still preserved across the street. Ron May responded that it is just up the block, about a minute's walk. Boardmember Schaefer said that you see a lot of this style with the shaded walkway in Imperial Valley.

Vote: 7-0-1(Eisenhart). The motion passes.

BOARDMEMBER BERGE MOVED THAT FIRE STATION #9 BE DESIGNATED AS AN INDIVIDUAL RESOURCE UNDER CRITERION A FOR ITS ASSOCIATION WITH THE HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOUTH PARK NEIGHBORHOOD AND UNDER CRITERION C AS A UNIQUE AND GOOD EXAMPLE OF CRAFTSMAN ARCHITECTURE EXPRESSED IN A MUNICIPAL BUILDING.

Second by Boardmember Marshall.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION:

Boardmember Schaefer said he was blown away by the building. If the brickwork under the stucco is re-exposed, it will be just amazing. The preservation of the woodwork on the upper floor, the pediment area, is very good. It has all the integrity that you could ask for and is unique in every sense. Boardmember Marshall added that there was a lot of discussion on the Interiors Subcommittee about public buildings. Unfortunately, the Boardmembers were not given access to the interior of this building. If there are elements of historic fabric inside, maybe they can be evaluated and designated at a future date to protect the original interior.

Vote: 7-0-1(Eisenhart). The motion passes.

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL REQUESTING THAT STAFF INVESTIGATE OR WORK WITH THE APPLICANT TO DETERMINE IF THERE ARE INTERIOR COMPONENTS THAT ARE SIGNIFICANT AND WORTHY OF SEPARATE DESIGNATION AND TO LOOK AT THE POSSIBILITIES OF STATE OR NATIONAL DESIGNATION.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 7-0-1(Eisenhart). The motion passes.

BOARDMEMBER BERGE MOVED THAT THE BUILDING TYPE LOCATED AT 2141 AND 2143 30TH STREET BE DESIGNATED UNDER HRB CRITERION C AS A GOOD REPRESENTATIVE OF A PARTICULAR TYPE OF COMMERCIAL OFFICE BUILDING FROM THE PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE, THE MID 1920'S.

There was no second. The motion fails.

ITEM 8 – LE MODERNE APARTMENT COMPLEX

Applicant: Marie Burke Lia on behalf of the Robert P. Sedlock Jr. and Marilen H. Sedlock Trust, owner and The Cathedral Church of St. Paul, developer

Location: 525-531 Nutmeg Street/2650-2680 Sixth Avenue, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of the Le Moderne Apartment Complex, located at 525-531 Nutmeg Street/2650-2680 Sixth Avenue, as a historical resource.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Le Moderne Apartment Complex located at 525-531 Nutmeg Street/2650-2680 Sixth Avenue under HRB Criterion C, as an excellent example of the Art Deco architectural style, evidencing many of the characteristics of the style.

Report Number: HRB-07-015

Staff Report by Mike Tudury.

BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE ITEM 8, LE MODERNE, ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 8-0-0. The motion passes.

ITEM 9 – 2761-2765 FIFTH AVENUE

Applicant: Marie Burke Lia on behalf of Nutmeg & Olive LLC, owner and The Cathedral Church of St. Paul, developer

Location: 2761-2765 Fifth Avenue, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 2761-2765 Fifth Avenue as a historical resource.

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

Staff Recommendation: Do not designate 2761-2765 Fifth Avenue under any HRB Criteria.

Report Number: HRB-07-016

Staff Report by Mike Tudury.

Public Testimony Opened

In Favor: Marie Lia and Dean Scott Richardson

Opposed: Ernestine Bonn (did not speak)

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER HARRISON MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION NOT TO DESIGNATE THIS SITE.

Second by Boardmember Eisenhart.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Boardmember Eisenhart said that the main criterion for courtyard topography usually is individual entrances on both the second and first floors. The stairs here are clearly in violation of that. Staff has duly noted this overriding integrity. Boardmember Marshall added that he

approached the building from the side and was admiring the exposed beams, the tiles and all the original windows, but when he turned the corner, he found he was looking at a 1970's motel. He believes there were modifications and that this building is no longer representative of what it started as. Boardmember Berge agreed with Boardmember Marshall. She feels that the modifications in that courtyard which are visible from the public right-of-way are extensive.

Vote: 8-0-0. The motion passes.

ITEM 10 — CARRIE AND HORATIO FARNHAM DUPLEX (Continued to June 28, 2007)

Applicant: Marie Burke Lia on behalf of the Barrett Family Trust, owner and Bruce Leidenberger, developer

Location: 3225-3231 Fourth Avenue, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of the Carrie and Horatio Farnham Duplex, located at 3225-3231 Fourth Avenue, as a historical resource.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Carrie and Horatio Farnham Duplex at 3225-3231 Fourth Avenue, as a historical resource under HRB Criterion C, as an excellent example of the Craftsman architectural style, exhibiting many of the characteristics of that style.

Report Number: HRB-07-022

Staff Report by Mike Tudury.

ITEM 11 — DR. CHESTER TANNER OFFICE BUNGALOW COURT (Continued until June 28, 2007)

Applicant: Marie Burke Lia on behalf of Fourth & Thorn LLC, owner and Bruce Leidenberger, developer

Location: 3235, 3245, 3251 and 3255 Fourth Avenue, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of the Dr. Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court, located at 3235, 3251 and 3255 Fourth Avenue as a historical resource.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Dr. Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court at 3235, 3245, 3251 and 3255 Fourth Avenue as a historical resource under HRB Criterion C, as an excellent example of both the Spanish Eclectic architectural style and as an example of a unique 1927-1935 Spanish Eclectic Office Bungalow Court.

Report Number: HRB-07-023

Staff Report by Mike Tudury.

ITEM 12 – MARIE LOUISE BIGGAR/HERBERT J. MANN HOUSE

Applicant: Vonn Marie May, on behalf of Judith Newman, owner

Location: 409 Dunemere Drive, La Jolla Community, Council District 1

Description: The house is a one-story, Pueblo Revival style, single-family residence built by Philip Barber in 1923 and remodeled by Herbert J. Mann in 1931.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Marie Louise Biggar/Herbert J. Mann House, located at 409 Dunemere Drive, as a historical resource under HRB Criterion C as an excellent example of the Pueblo Revival style and under Criterion D as the work of Master Architect Herbert J. Mann.

Report Number: HRB-07-024

Staff Report by Ginger Weatherford.

BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL MOVED THAT ITEM 12, THE MARIE LOUISE BIGGAR/HERBERT J. MANN HOUSE, BE APPROVED ON THE CONSENT AGENDA.

Second by Boardmember Eisenhart. Vote: 6-2-0. The motion passes.

ITEM 13 – JOSEPH IRELAND BUILDING, 1479 J STREET & JOSEPH IRELAND RENTAL PROPERTY (historic name to be confirmed), 360 15th STREET

Applicant: Kathleen Crawford on behalf of Kenneth Cummings, owner, referred from the City Centre Development Corporation.

Location: 1479 J Street & 360 15th Street, Centre City Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider subject properties for historic designation.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Joseph Ireland Building and the Joseph Ireland Rental Property (historic name to be confirmed pending complete title report) under HRB Criterion C as rare examples of Victorian commercial and residential vernacular in downtown San Diego.

Report Number: HRB-07-025

Staff Report by Diane Kane.

A question of proper noticing was raised on behalf of the owner. A five-minute break was allowed by the Chair for a check on the noticing. The meeting reconvened at 4:16. Although a notice was sent to the property owner of record, Beverly Schroeder of City Centre Development Corporation said that the owner needs to be called. She was unable to contact him to tell him about the meeting. A request for continuance was requested by Ms. Schroeder until the May 26 meeting.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE ITEM 13, THE JOSEPH IRELAND BUILDING, TO THE MAY MEETING.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 8-0-0. The motion passes.

ITEM 14 – PROPOSED PROJECT AT 777 BEECH STREET, ADJACENT TO THE EL CORTEZ HOTEL, HRB SITE #269 (Trailed to the May 26, 2007 HRB Meeting)

Applicant: Centre City Development Corporation

Location: 777 Beech Street, Centre City Community, Council District 2

Description: Review proposed project for compliance with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The specific Standards for Rehabilitation that apply to the proposed new structure are Standards 2, 9 and 10.

Today's Action: Determine whether or not the proposed construction at 777 Beech Street meets the U.S. Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with respect to the adjacent historically-designated El Cortez.

Staff Recommendation: Find that the proposed 777 Beach Street project is not consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation with respect to the adjacent, historically designated El Cortez building, located at 702 Ash Street.

Report Number: HRB-07-026

Staff Report by Mike Tudury.

REMINDER:

NEXT BOARD MEETING DATE: May 24, 2007

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

The meeting was adjourned at 4:21 p.m.