



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Report to the Planning Commission

DATE ISSUED: October 30, 2025

REPORT NO. PC-25-051

HEARING DATE: November 6, 2025

SUBJECT: Preservation and Progress Package A

SUMMARY

Issue: Should the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council approval of Preservation and Progress Package A?

Proposed Actions:

1. RECOMMEND to the City Council APPROVAL of a resolution adopting the amendments to the Historic Preservation Element and Appendix F of the General Plan (Attachment 1).
2. RECOMMEND to the City Council APPROVAL of an ordinance amending the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) by amending Chapter 11, Article 1, Division 2; Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2; and Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 10 (Attachment 2).
3. RECOMMEND to the City Council APPROVAL of a resolution amending the purpose and intended use of the City's Historic Preservation Fund to advance equity in historic preservation through the identification and preservation of historical resources important to traditionally underrepresented and marginalized communities, including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ+) communities, and to provide financial assistance to very low- and low-income owners of historic properties to help fund maintenance and restoration work (Attachment 3).

Fiscal Considerations: N/A

Code Enforcement Impact: N/A

Housing Impact Statement: Preservation and Progress will update the City's Historic Preservation Program to provide clear pathways for permitting more new homes and other uses on properties with historic and cultural resources while more effectively preserving and adaptively reusing these resources; provide opportunities for new homes and other uses that benefit our communities, while identifying and protecting resources that tell a shared story important to the City's architectural, historical and/or cultural history and identity and encouraging its continued progress and evolution; and support adaptive reuse of existing buildings and provides clear pathways for permitting new homes and other uses in areas located near transit.

Community Planners Committee Recommendation: The Community Planner's Committee reviewed Preservation and Progress Package A at their meeting of October 28, 2025. The Community Planners Committee voted 28-0-0 to oppose Preservation and Progress Package A and recommend that the proposed de novo "Findings Not Supported" appeal finding be removed, that the voting requirements for the Historical Resources Board be changed to a simple majority to designate, and that the ability to appeal Historical Resources Board decisions to not designate a property be added back into Package A.

Historical Resources Board Recommendation: The Historical Resources Board reviewed Preservation and Progress Package A at their meeting of October 23, 2025, for the purpose of providing a recommendation to the City Council. As described in greater detail at the end of the Discussion section of this report, two motions by the Board failed and the item concluded without a recommendation to the decision maker.

Environmental Impact: The City Planning Department has reviewed Preservation and Progress Package A and conducted a consistency evaluation pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15162. A consistency evaluation memo provided as Attachment 4 evaluates the consistency of the Preservation and Progress: Package A with these previously certified environmental documents pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines section 15162. Implementation of this project's actions would not result in new significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts over and above those disclosed in the previously certified environmental documents:

1. Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Land Development Code (DEP No. 96-033/SCH No. 1996081056) certified by the San Diego City Council on November 18, 1997 (Resolution R-289458);
2. Final Program EIR (PEIR; SCH No. 2021070359) for the Blueprint SD Initiative, Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment to the Uptown Community Plan, and University Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Update (Blueprint SD), certified by the San Diego City Council on July 23, 2024 (Resolution No. R-315701);
3. Consistency Memorandum for the General Plan Amendment to add the Environmental Justice Element, certified by the San Diego City Council on March 5, 2024 (Resolution No. R-315512);
4. Addendum to the General Plan PEIR for Climate Resilient SD (SCH No. 2006091032), certified by the San Diego City Council on December 17, 2021 (Resolution No. R- 313850); and
5. Final PEIR for Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices (SCH No. 2019060003) certified by the San Diego City Council on November 9, 2020 (Resolution R- 313279)

BACKGROUND

Preservation and Progress is a comprehensive update to the City's Heritage Preservation Program that will streamline processes for new homes and other uses while protecting places of historic, architectural and cultural importance and encouraging their adaptive reuse. It has been over two decades since the City's established Heritage Preservation Program was comprehensively updated. Over that period of time, best practices within the field of historic preservation have changed, including the importance of acknowledging harmful past practices in zoning and preservation, their

lasting impacts, and how we can build a more inclusive and equitable heritage preservation program that serves everyone. Other significant changes that affect the heritage preservation program include a local and statewide housing crisis, and the adoption of many State and local laws aimed at addressing it. Six goals guide the Preservation and Progress program updates:

- **Advance equity in preservation** and prioritize protection of resources important to BIPOC, LGBTQ+ and other historically marginalized communities.
- **Evaluate the Mills Act program** to ensure the program is equitable and incentivizes the protection and restoration of important places in a fiscally responsible manner.
- **Identify and protect historical properties and districts** that are important to the City's history and culture, with a focus on historic districts.
- **Reform permit processes** to better encourage the adaptive reuse of historical buildings on their original sites.
- **Adopt design standards** for historical properties and districts to provide clear, objective requirements and by-right approval for additions and new development.
- **Remove regulations** that unnecessarily impact properties that lack historical or cultural importance.

To accomplish these goals, Preservation and Progress is taking a comprehensive look at all of the policy and regulatory documents that guide the City's Heritage Preservation Program. This includes the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan, the Designation Procedures and Historical Resources Regulations in the Land Development Code, the Historical Resources Guidelines in the Land Development Manual, City Council Policy, and a number of Historical Resources Board policies and procedures.

Preservation and Progress will be processed in two packages of amendments. Package A includes items that are not significantly complex and that do not involve amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations or Historical Resources Guidelines, as any amendments need to be addressed more comprehensively. Package B includes updates that are more complex in nature, that include amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations and/or Historical Resources Guidelines, or that may require more extensive environmental analysis. When the outline of Preservation and Progress amendments was developed, it was anticipated that updates to the City's Mills Act program would be processed in Package A; however, those amendments have been pushed back and will be processed in Package B.

Package A, which is the subject of this report and is scheduled for adoption by the end of January 2026, includes the following items:

- Minor updates to the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan
- Updates to the historical designation appeal process
- Amendments to Complete Communities Housing Solutions to clarify that thematic historical district boundaries are limited to contributing resources

- Repurpose the Historic Preservation Fund to serve primarily as a source of small grant funding for preservation work in traditionally underrepresented and marginalized communities
- Educational materials on the benefits of preservation, how to maintain and improve historic resources in a sustainable manner, and how to incorporate new housing in a streamlined manner

Package B, which is scheduled for consideration by Fall 2026, includes the following items:

- Updates to the City's Mills Act Program to ensure equitable and fiscally responsible implementation
- Amendments to the 45 Year Review (SDMC Section 143.0212) process to transition away from reactive individual property reviews to proactive preservation that protects important resources and districts
- Amendments to address automatic regulation and/or listing of National and State Register resources
- Comprehensive update to the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual
- Establishment of a commemorative designation program to celebrate history of properties ineligible for historic designation
- Create a Multiple Property Listing framework to more efficiently evaluate and designate properties with shared significance
- Develop objective design standards for improvements or additions (including ADU homes) to historic resources and districts
- Streamline and incentivize preservation and adaptive reuse of historical resources
- Strengthen and clarify enforcement, penalties, and fines around demolition by neglect and unpermitted alteration of historic resources
- Better address sustainability and the use of substitute materials, utilizing updated federal preservation guidance

An overview of the City's existing Heritage Preservation program, benchmarking of the program against other jurisdictions, and updates included in Preservation and Progress was presented to the Land Use and Housing Committee of the City Council as an informational item in March 2025. The materials presented and the video recording the presentation are included as Attachment 5.

DISCUSSION

The elements of Preservation and Progress Package A requiring recommendations by the Planning Commission and adoption by the City Council can be grouped into three main categories:

- Amendments to the General Plan

- Amendments to the Land Development Code of the San Diego Municipal Code
- Amendments to the purpose and use of the Historic Preservation Fund

The proposed amendments are summarized below and provided in the attachments to the report.

General Plan Amendments

Preservation and Progress Package A includes amendments to the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan as well as Appendix F, which provides a summary of the history of San Diego. The amendments to the Historic Preservation Element include updates to Federal and State regulations related to historic preservation; removal of language that repeats or summarizes the City's local historic preservation regulations and inclusion of the appropriate references; revision to discussion of areas that do not meet designation criteria but exhibit a history and quality important to the community; language updates; and new and revised policies addressing tribal resources and consultation, equity, sustainability, resilience, public outreach, and education and interpretation.

Appendix F of the General Plan provides a summary of San Diego history that was developed in 2008 when the General Plan was adopted. The City Planning department is in the first year of a multi-year effort to prepare a Citywide historic context statement addressing the overall historical themes and development patterns across the city. Once the Citywide historic context statement is complete, Appendix F would be comprehensively updated to reflect that work. In the interim, amendments are proposed to Appendix F to better address tribal history, prehistory, and the impact of past zoning and lending practices on segregation and lack of infrastructure investment. A reference and link to Housing Element Appendix A, which provides a more detailed historical summary of these practices and their impacts, is also included.

Land Development Code Amendments

Amendments to the Land Development Code of the City's Municipal Code included in Preservation and Progress Package A include revisions to Chapter 11, Article 1, Division 2 related to appointments to the Historical Resources Board; revisions to Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2 related to noticing, appeals of decisions by the Historical Resources Board to designate or not to designate a property, and clarification of the Historical Resource Board's role in reviewing National Register nominations; and clarifying revisions to Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 10 related to the application of Complete Communities Housing Solutions within Emerging Historical Districts and Thematic Historical Districts.

The proposed amendments related to noticing and the Board's role in reviewing National Register nominations are minor clarifying amendments. The proposed amendments related to the Historical Resources Board would extend the deadline for the Mayor to appoint an HRB chair to better align with Historical Resources Board docketing timelines and would provide flexibility in appointing board members to fill the required technical expertise seats when a qualified volunteer cannot be found. The proposed amendments add that if a qualified volunteer cannot be found to fill one of the five professional seats, that seat may be filled by a second professional from one of the other four historic preservation-related disciplines. However, no more than two professional seats should be filled by professionals in the same historic preservation-related field. This flexibility will allow the Board to

continue to carry out its duties and functions when a qualified volunteer from a specific technical field cannot be found without sacrificing the overall level of technical expertise on the Board.

Preservation and Progress Package A also includes amendments to the appeal process for historical designations. Under the current regulations, a decision by the Historical Resources Board to designate a historical resource can be appealed to the City Council; however no other decisions, including a decision to not designate a property, can be appealed. Currently, a decision by the Historical Resources Board to designate may be appealed to the City Council based on factual errors in information presented to the Board, violation of bylaws or hearing procedures by the Board or individual member, or new information. When the current appeal process was established during development of the comprehensive Land Development Code update in the late 1990s, the City Council at the time decided to rest the decision regarding significance with the Historical Resources Board as the land use advisory board tasked with identifying and preserving the City's important historical resources. The City Council only retained oversight of those actions based on limited grounds of factual errors, violations of bylaws or hearing procedures, or new information. In recent years, the City Council has expressed interest in revisiting their authority in hearing appeals of Historical Resources Board actions to designate to add a finding allowing the City Council to reconsider the merits of the designation itself. The proposed amendments add a fourth finding to the appeal of Historical Resources Board actions to designate a property that would allow the City Council to consider whether the evidence in the record supports the findings made by the Historical Resources Board when designating the property as a historical resource. The finding is similar to the "findings not supported" appeal finding for development permits and other land use discretionary decisions. The City Council's consideration of whether the findings made by the Board are supported by the record would be required to continue to be in accordance with the City's designation criteria and designation criteria guidelines.

As originally proposed, Preservation and Progress Package A also included an amendment that would allow an applicant or interested person to appeal a Historical Resources Board decision to not designate a property to the City Council. Through the review process with the Policy Subcommittee of the Historical Resources Board, the proposed amendments were revised to limit the ability to appeal decisions to not designate to the property owner, which was included in the amendments presented to the Historical Resources Board at their hearing on October 23, 2025. Staff has heard varying input from the public on this amendment item. Some members of the public do not want the ability to appeal a Historical Resources Board decision to not designate a property added to the Code, some want the ability added but limited to property owners, and others want the ability added and available to applicants and interested persons. There was significant public comment and Board discussion on this issue at the Historical Resources Board hearing. Concerns were raised regarding the fairness of allowing property owners, but not interested members of the public, to appeal a Historical Resources Board decision to not designate a property. The Historical Resources Board voted on two motions, one that would recommend adoption of the amendment as presented to limit the ability to appeal a Historical Resources Board decision to not designate to the property owner and one that would remove the amendment altogether, maintaining the status quo for Historical Resources Board decisions to not designate. Both motions failed. Considering the varied positions on this amendment item, Preservation and Progress Package A has been updated to remove the proposed ability to appeal a Historical Resources Board decision to not designate, which will maintain

existing regulations and process when the Historical Resources Board does not designate a property and provide finality for decisions not to designate.

Other amendments related to appeals are minor in nature and include clarifying amendments that detail what must be submitted with an initial appeal filing as well as the introduction of a deadline for docketing appeals of historic designations before the City Council.

The last Land Development Code amendment is a clarifying amendment regarding the applicability of Complete Communities Housing Solutions program within emerging and thematic historic districts. The proposed amendments clarify that the Complete Communities Housing Solutions Regulations apply in Thematic and Emerging Historic Districts if the property is not a contributing resource to the historical district. The proposed amendments do not change how Emerging Historical Districts and Thematic Historical Districts have always been regulated by the City and is consistent with the Historical Resources Board Procedure on Establishing Historic Districts, which was last updated in 2011. The Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District includes beach cottages constructed between 1887 and 1931 within the original subdivision of Ocean Beach that have been volunteered by the property owner for designation. Currently, 72 properties are designated as contributing resources to the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District, which has a boundary that encompasses 3,000 parcels. Regarding the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District, the Historical Resources Board Procedure on Establishing Historic Districts states:

*"A complete intensive survey was never completed, and therefore all eligible contributing properties are not known. Owners of properties which fall within the context statement and period of significance may bring their properties forward for designation as contributors to the district. **Only those properties identified and designated as contributors are currently regulated.** Because the Ocean Beach Cottage district does not have a full intensive survey, is based on a context statement and period of significance, and is limited to those properties that fall within the context and period that are volunteered by the property owner for designation, conversion of this district to a standard geographic district is not feasible... Therefore, the district will continue to be regulated under the prior policy. Property owners may continue to bring properties forward for designation under the established context and period of significance, and the district shall remain voluntary in nature." (emphasis added)*

To provide more clarification on this issue, the proposed amendment clearly provides that Complete Communities Housing Solutions can be utilized on properties within the boundaries of the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District and Chinese Asian Thematic Historical District if the property is not a contributing resource to the district, since only contributing resources are regulated in Emerging Historical Districts and Thematic Historical Districts. The proposed amendments will not impact other historical districts.

Historic Preservation Fund Amendments

In 2009, the City Council adopted Resolution R-305067, which established the Historic Preservation Fund for the purpose of funding local historic preservation programs and incentives, including but

not limited to, architectural assistance programs, archaeological site protection plans, or other historic preservation programs or incentives consistent with the City of San Diego General Plan and Action Plan. The resolution also required that all expenditures from the fund go to Council through the budget process before any funds are expended. Since its creation, the Historic Preservation Fund has received limited funds primarily through code enforcement actions and mitigation requirements and expenditures have also been limited. The current balance of the fund is a little over \$100,000.

Preservation and Progress Package A would amend the purpose and focus of the Historic Preservation Fund to advance equity in historic preservation through the identification and preservation of historical resources important to traditionally underrepresented and marginalized communities, including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ+) communities, and to provide financial assistance to very low- and low-income owners of historic properties to help fund maintenance and restoration work. Regarding the identification and preservation of historical resources important to traditionally underrepresented and marginalized communities, the funds could be utilized by the City to fund efforts such as culturally focused historic context statements and surveys or provide grants to community-based organizations that do that work.

Regarding the financial assistance to very low- and low-income owners of historic properties to help fund maintenance and restoration work, the City could establish a grant or similar program, with either up-front or reimbursement funding, to assist very low- and low-income owners of historic properties with maintaining and restoring their home consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. This financial assistance would be particularly needed if a Mills Act contract is expected to yield little or no property tax savings for the property owner. Lastly, the Historic Preservation Fund would be amended to authorize the Comptroller to expend funds consistent with the resolution, to ensure efficient, ongoing, and timely investment of the funds in furtherance of the stated equity goals.

Historical Resources Board Review and Recommendation

Preservation & Progress Package A was presented in three parts to the Policy Subcommittee of the Historical Resources Board at the Subcommittee's meetings in July, August and October of 2025. Links to Policy Subcommittee meeting agendas and staff memos are provided in Attachment 6. Members of the Policy Subcommittee heard public comment and asked questions but had limited suggested modifications to the proposed amendments. As stated in the Discussion section, when draft amendments to allow an appeal of properties not designated by the Historical Resources Board was presented to the Subcommittee, the ability to appeal was not limited to the property owner. Following public testimony and Subcommittee discussion, the general consensus of the Policy Subcommittee was that the ability to appeal properties that are not designated should be limited to the property owner, and those amendments were presented to the Historical Resources Board to reflect that consensus.

The Historical Resources Board reviewed Preservation and Progress Package A at their meeting of October 23, 2025. Information presented to the Board and a recording of the Board meeting are provided in Attachment 8. Board discussion focused primarily on two aspects of the proposed

amendments to the Land Development Code - the addition of the new "Findings Not Supported" appeal finding for Board actions to designate a property as a historical resource, as well as whether the ability to appeal a Board decision to not designate a property as a historical resource should be added and if so, by whom. In regard to addition of the new "Findings Not Supported" appeal finding for Board actions to designate a property as a historical resource, some Board members expressed concern that adding the finding undermined their authority as a subject matter expert land use advisory Board. In regard to the proposed ability to appeal decisions by the Board to not designate a property as a historical resource, some Board members expressed that the ability to appeal should be open to applicants and interested persons (the same as actions to designate) while other Board members expressed that the proposed ability should be removed altogether if there are concerns about the fairness of limiting the right to appeal to the property owner.

Some members of the public also provided comments regarding the number of votes required to designate a resource. The Land Development Code requires an affirmative vote by 6 of the 11 members of the Historical Resources Board to designate a property, regardless of how many board members are in attendance, and some members of the public want the number reduced to a simple majority of members present at the hearing. There was limited discussion by the Board on the issue since it was not noticed or agendaized to be included in Package A, and some discussion of whether the issue should be included in Preservation and Progress Package B.

A motion and second to adopt the staff recommendation to recommend to the City Council adoption of the amendments to the General Plan, Land Development Code and Historic Preservation Fund as presented failed with a vote of 4 in favor and 6 opposed. A follow up motion and second to adopt the staff recommendation with the exception of the proposed ability to appeal Board decisions to not designate a historical resource, which should be removed entirely from Package A, and to request that a discussion regarding the number of votes required to designate a resource be included in Preservation and Progress Package B failed with a vote of 5 in favor, 4 opposed, and 1 abstention. There were no additional motions and the Board's consideration of Preservation and Progress Package A concluded without a recommendation.

Public Outreach

Staff presented information items in November 2024 and January 2025 on the City's existing Heritage Preservation Program and the results of a benchmarking of the City's program against that of other jurisdictions; an information item to the Historical Resources Board in February 2025 that included an overview of the updates included in Preservation and Progress; an information item to the Land Use and Housing Committee of the City Council in March 2025 that included an overview of the City's existing Heritage Preservation program, benchmarking of the program against other jurisdictions, and the updates included in Preservation and Progress; three presentations to the Policy Subcommittee of the Historical Resources Board on Preservation and Progress Package A in July, August and October 2025; and a live public webinar on Preservation and Progress Package A on October 8, 2025. In addition, the public has been invited to provide comment and feedback through the [online portal](#) on the [Preservation and Progress website](#) throughout the process. A majority of the comments received were supportive of historic preservation in general, with concern expressed regarding any changes to the Heritage Preservation program and in particular the Mills Act program.

Other public comments expressed equity concerns and impacts to housing production. Comments specific to Preservation and Progress Package A focused primarily on historic designation appeals, as discussed earlier in this report. Lastly, as discussed previously, the number of votes required to designate a property as a historical resource has also been raised, although this item is not included in Preservation and Progress at this time. Staff has received input and refined policy and regulatory language in response to the comments received from the public.


Certified Local Government

Certified Local Governments (CLG) are municipalities that have demonstrated, through a certification process, a commitment to local preservation and saving the past for future generations. The City of San Diego is one of the three oldest CLGs in the state and joins the 14 other largest cities in the nation in maintaining CLG status and a commitment to preserving historic places consistent with professional standards and best practices. As a CLG, the City is required to submit changes to its historic preservation ordinance to the California State Office of Historic Preservation for review and comment. City staff has maintained regular communication with the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) on Preservation and Progress and has reviewed the amendments included in Package A with OHP staff. OHP staff has confirmed that their office has no objection to the proposed changes and supports the City's efforts (Attachment 9.)

Conclusion:

Package A advances the goals of Preservation and Progress to advance equity in preservation and identify and protect historical properties and districts. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council adoption of Preservation and Progress Package A, which includes amendments to the Historic Preservation Element and Appendix F of the General Plan; amendments to the Land Development Code related to Historical Resources Board appointments, noticing of designation actions, the appeal of decisions by the Historical Resources Board to designate, review of National Register Nominations, and clarifying amendments related to the application of Complete Communities Housing Solutions in Emerging and Thematic Historic Districts; and amendments to the purpose and intended use of the City's Historic Preservation Fund.

Respectfully submitted,



Kelley Stanco
Deputy Director
City Planning Department

Attachments:


1. Draft Amendments to the Historic Preservation Element and Appendix F of the General Plan
 - 1a. Draft Amendments

- 1b. Draft Resolution
- 2. Draft Amendments to the Land Development Code of the San Diego Municipal Code
 - 2a. Draft Amendments
 - 2b. Draft Ordinance
- 3. Draft Resolution for amendments to the Historic Preservation Fund
- 4. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Consistency Determination Memo
- 5. Preservation and Progress Informational Presentation to the Land Use and Housing Committee on March 6, 2025 (links only)
 - 5a. [Staff Report](#)
 - 5b. [Staff Presentation](#)
 - 5c. [Video Recording](#) (time stamp at 38:40)
- 6. Historical Resources Board Policy Subcommittee Meetings (links only)
 - 6a. July 9, 2025 Meeting: [Agenda and Staff Memo](#), as well as [public comments](#)
 - 6b. August 11, 2025 Meeting: [Agenda and Staff Memo](#), as well as [public comments](#)
 - 6c. October 13, 2025 Meeting: [Agenda, Staff Memo](#), as well as [public comments](#)
- 7. Virtual Public Workshop on October 8, 2025 (links only)
 - 7a. [Staff Presentation](#)
 - 7b. [Draft Amendments Presented](#)
 - 7c. [Video Recording](#)
- 8. Historical Resources Board Meeting of October 23, 2025 (links only)
 - 8a. [Staff Report](#)
 - 8b. [Staff Memo](#)
 - 8c. [Public Comments](#) and [Correspondence](#)
 - 8d. [Video Recording](#) (time stamp at 2:07:09)
- 9. Communication from the California State Office of Historic Preservation

This Page Intentionally Blank



Historic Preservation Element



Page intentionally blank

Table of Contents

Introduction	HP-5
A. Identification and Preservation of Historical Resources	HP-17
B. Historic Preservation, Education, Benefits, and Incentives	HP-25
 List of Tables	
Table HP-1 Regional History	HP-13





Casa del Prado
1820 El Prado

Introduction



Introduction

PURPOSE

To guide the preservation, protection, restoration, and rehabilitation of historical and cultural resources and maintain a sense of the City. To improve the quality of the built environment, encourage appreciation for the City's history and culture, maintain the character and identity of communities, and contribute to the City's economic vitality through historic preservation.

INTRODUCTION

No city can hope to understand its present or forecast its future if it fails to recognize its past. By tracing and preserving its past, a city can gain a clear sense of the process by which it achieved its present form and substance. San Diego's rich and varied historical and cultural resources include buildings, structures, objects, sites, landscapes, districts, archaeological sites, and traditional cultural properties that possess historical, scientific, architectural, aesthetic, cultural, or ethnic significance. Although not always easily distinguishable, these resources, with their inherent ability to evoke the past, represent important aspects of the history of San Diego and the region. They include evidence from the time before and during European contact with Native Americans of this area, examples from the boom and bust periods of development of the City's core, early transportation routes and the spread of development outward, through both world wars and the continued military presence. They also document the advent of the automobile, increased leisure time, and the recent past. The identification, evaluation, registration, and protection of these resources, and thereby the preservation of San Diego's past for its current and future residents, are the essential components of San Diego's historic preservation program.

Historical and cultural resources include elements from the built environment such as buildings, structures, objects, and districts; landscape features, including significant trees and plantings, hardscape, fountains, lighting, sculptures, signs and other natural or designed features; interior elements and fixtures designated in conjunction with a property; significant archaeological sites; and traditional cultural properties.

Legal Basis for Historic Preservation

Federal Law

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), enacted in 1966, established the National Register of Historic Places, authorized funding for state programs with participation by local governments, created the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and established a review process for protecting cultural resources. The NHPA provides the legal framework for most state and local preservation laws.

The National Register of Historic Places is the nation's official list of cultural resources worthy of preservation. It is part of a national program to coordinate and support public and private efforts to identify, evaluate, and protect historic and archeological resources.

The NHPA was amended in 1980 to create the Certified Local Government (CLG) program, administered through the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP). This program allows for direct local government participation and integration in a comprehensive statewide historic preservation planning process. Cities and counties with CLG status may compete for preservation funds allocated by the Congress and awarded to each state.



Cabrillo Bridge and Balboa Park



Mission San Diego de Alcalá

State Law

The California Register of Historical Resources was established in 1992, through amendments to the Public Resources Code. It serves as an authoritative guide to be used by state and local agencies, private groups, and citizens to identify the state's historical resources and to indicate what properties are to be protected from substantial adverse change. The California Register includes resources that are formally determined eligible for, or listed in, the National Register, State Historical Landmarks numbered 770 or higher; Points of Historical Interest recommended for listing by the State Historical Resources Commission (SHRC); resources nominated for listing and determined eligible in accordance with criteria and procedures adopted by the SHRC, and resources and districts designated as City or county landmarks when the designation criteria are consistent with California Register criteria.

With establishment of the California Register and the SHRC, the state legislature amended the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in 1992 to define historical resources as a resource listed in (or determined eligible for listing in) the California Register; a resource included in a local register of historical resources or identified as significant in a historical resource survey that meets certain requirements; and any object, building, structure, site, area, place, record, or manuscript which a lead agency determines to be significant. Generally, a resource is considered to be historically

significant if it meets the criteria for listing in the California Register. However, a lead agency under CEQA is not precluded from determining a resource is significant that is not listed in (or determined eligible for listing in) the California Register, not included in a local register, or identified in a historical resources survey as a historical resource, as defined in the Public Resources Code.

CEQA was further amended to clarify that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. While demolition and destruction are obvious significant impacts, it is more difficult to assess when change, alteration, or relocation crosses the threshold of substantial adverse change. The state CEQA guidelines provide that a project that demolishes or alters those physical characteristics of a historical resource that convey its historical significance, (i.e., its character-defining features), can be considered to materially impair the resource's significance. However, a project that conforms to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties can generally be considered to be a project that will not cause a significant impact.

The Certified Local Government (CLG) program is a partnership among local governments, the State of California Office of Historic Preservation, and the National Park Service. The CLG program integrates local governments with the national historic preservation program through activities that strengthen decision-making regarding historic places at the local level. The program encourages the direct participation of local governments in the identification, evaluation, registration, and preservation of historic properties within their jurisdictions and promotes the integration of local preservation interests and concerns into local planning and decision-making.

Several state laws address the importance of Native American involvement in the development review process and provide requirements for the treatment of human remains and grave goods and protection of cultural places. Among these laws is the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 2001, which was amended and strengthened in 2018 and 2020. This Act is consistent with the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and was put in place to ensure that all California Indian human remains and cultural items are treated with dignity and respect. In addition, sections of the California Health and Safety Code address the discovery of human remains outside a dedicated cemetery and provide requirements for consultation with appropriate Native American individuals for disposition of the remains. The Public Resources Code establishes the Native American Heritage Commission and the State's Sacred Places List.

The requirements for local agencies to consult with identified California Native American Tribes, as part of the general plan adoption or amendment process and prior to the dedication of open space, are provided in Government Code Sections 65352.3, 65352.4, 65562.5, and others collectively referred to as Senate Bill (SB)18. Assembly Bill (AB) 52, which amended CEQA in 2014 and was strengthened in 2025, established Tribal Cultural Resources as a distinct category for review under Appendix G. AB 52 also created a formal

consultation process between lead agencies and California Native American Tribes which is outlined in California Public Resources Code Section 21080.3.1. As regulations are frequently updated, the CEQA handbook should be consulted prior to any project impacting resources.

City of San Diego Municipal Code

Chapters 11, 12 and 14 of the Municipal Code establish the Historical Resources Board authority, appointment and terms, meeting conduct, and powers and duties; the designation process including the nomination process, noticing and report requirements, appeals, recordation, amendments or rescission, and nomination of historical resources to state and national registers; and development regulations for historical resources. The purpose of these regulations is to protect, preserve, and, where damaged, restore the historical resources of San Diego. ~~The historical resources regulations require that designated historical resources, important archeological sites and traditional cultural properties be preserved unless deviation findings can be made by the decision-maker as part of a discretionary permit. Minor alterations consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards are exempt from the requirement to obtain a separate permit but must comply with the regulations and associated historical resources guidelines. Limited development may encroach into important archaeological sites if adequate mitigation measures are provided as a condition of approval.~~

The Historical Resources Guidelines, located in the City's Land Development Manual, provide property owners, the development community, consultants and the general public explicit guidance for the management of historical resources located within the City's jurisdiction. These guidelines are designed to implement the historical resources regulations and guide the development review process. The guidelines also address the need for a survey and how impacts are to be assessed, available mitigation strategies, and report requirements. They also include appropriate methodologies for treating historical resources located in the City.

Certified Local Government

The City of San Diego became a Certified Local Government (CLG) in 1986 under the provisions of the NHPA. All CLGs must comply with five basic requirements:

- Enforce appropriate state and local laws and regulations for the designation and protection of historic properties, including adoption of a historic preservation plan or inclusion of a historic preservation element in the General Plan;
- Establish a historic preservation review commission by local ordinance;
- Maintain a system for the survey and inventory of historic properties;
- Provide for public participation in the local preservation program; and
- Satisfactorily perform responsibilities delegated to it by the state.

The benefits derived from being a CLG include the prestige and credibility of associating the local preservation program with time-tested state and national preservation

programs. Other benefits include technical assistance offered by knowledgeable staff at OHP and statewide CLGs; ability to compete for annual Historic Preservation Fund grants; direct participation in the nomination of historic properties to the National Register; and ability to perform other preservation functions delegated by the OHP under the NHPA. These may include the responsibility to review and comment on development projects for compliance with federal and state environmental regulations, including such activities as review under Section 106 of the NHPA, review of National Register nominations, and review of rehabilitation plans for projects seeking Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credit.

San Diego Register of Historical Resources

Any improvement, building, structure, sign, interior element and fixture, feature, site, place, district, area, or object may be designated a historical resource by the City's Historical Resources Board (HRB) if it meets one or more of the following City's adopted designation criteria: The designation criteria can be found in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the City of San Diego's Land Development Manual.

- ~~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.~~
- ~~B. Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history.~~
- ~~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.~~
- ~~D. Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist, or craftsman.~~
- ~~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.~~
- ~~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 first site designated as a historical resource by the City of San Diego was Balboa Park's El Prado in 1967. As of ~~2006~~ 2025, more than ~~750~~ 1550 buildings, structures, objects, districts, cultural landscapes, and archaeological sites have been designated by the City's HRB.

San Diego History

The history of a region provides the context for the identification, evaluation and management of historical resources. The history of San Diego begins more

than 12,000 years ago, with ~~thousands of years~~ 10,000 years of prehistoric occupation by Native American people, followed by several hundred years of initial and ongoing contact between these local Native Americans and European clergy, militia, and settlers, and several hundred years of growth from a small town to one of the largest cities in the country. Summarized from the City's Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual, and Appendix EE, the following timeline is offered in Table HP-1, Regional History. It provides a concise reminder of the long history of San Diego and the origins of the cultural diversity that are at the center of our history and that continue to enrich our City today. Several historical resources representative of each period have been designated by the HRB.

Examples of every major period and style remain in San Diego, although few areas retain older substantial neighborhood-level architectural integrity due to several major building booms, when structures were demolished, prior to preservation movements and stricter regulations regarding historic structures. Among the recognized architectural styles in San Diego are Spanish Colonial, ~~Pre-Railroad New England, National Vernacular,~~ Victorian Italianate, Stick, Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Neoclassical, Shingle, Folk Victorian, Mission Revival, Craftsman, Prairie, French Eclectic, Italian Renaissance, Spanish Colonial Revival, Spanish Eclectic, Egyptian Revival, Tudor Revival, Contemporary, Modernistic and International.



Victorian



Craftsman

Significant elements of our historic built environment include San Diego's railroad and maritime history, development in relationship to the automobile, the role of recreation in the development of specific industries, as well as the design and implementation of major regional planning and landscaping projects. The role of international fairs on architecture, landscape architecture and City buildings and the development of industrial and military technologies between the two world wars are other significant elements of our history. The relationship between climate, terrain, native plant material and local gardening and horticultural practices; planning and subdivision practices from the turn of the century to

the present day; and the post-war period of suburbanization are also important.

Table HP-1 Regional History

<i>Prehistoric Period (≤8500 BC to AD 1769)</i> • Native American people lived throughout San Diego continuously • Subsistence changed from more nomadic hunting to a focus on coastal marine and inland food sources with native plant gathering to a semi-sedentary lifestyle with limited horticulture • Significant time markers include changes in stone tools, mortuary practices, and the introduction of pottery • Spanish exploration begins	<i>Designated Historical Resources</i> • Village of Ystagua • Spindrift Archaeological Site • Gordon-Hooper Archaeological Site • Ocean Beach Gateway Archaeological Site
<i>Spanish Period (1769 to 1821)</i> • Arrival of Spanish missionaries and explorers • Presidio and Mission San Diego de Alcalá established • Spanish occupation and mission system profoundly changed lives of the Kumeyaay people • Early house lots and garden plots in what would become Old Town	<i>Designated Historical Resources</i> • Fort Guijarros • Franciscan Garden Site • Old Mission Dam and Flume
<i>Mexican Period (1821 to 1846)</i> • Mexico wins independence from Spain and San Diego becomes part of the Mexican Republic • Rancho system of extensive land grants to individuals • Secularization of the San Diego Mission • Mexico granted San Diego official pueblo (town) status • Native American population continued to decline	<i>Designated Historical Resources</i> • Johnson-Taylor Adobe • El Cuervo Adobe • Casa de Machado-Stewart • Fort Stockton • Old Spanish Cemetery • San Pasqual Battlefield

American Development (1846-Present)

- Americans assumed formal control under the Treaty of Guadalupe- Hidalgo in 1848
- William Heath Davis founded the earliest American development of “New Town” in 1850
- Alonzo Horton arrived in 1867 and helped San Diego develop into an active American town
- Expansion of trade brought an increase in the availability of building material
- Active African-American and Chinese communities lived and worked downtown
- Urban growth spurred by industrial capitalism and land speculation and early private infrastructure investment
- Chinese, German, Swiss, Italian, Portuguese, and other immigrants owned businesses and worked throughout San Diego, as do their descendents today


Designated Historical Resources

- Davis-Horton House
- Rosario Hall
- Villa Montezuma
- Sunnyslope Lodge
- Cleremont Hotel/Coast Hotel
- Chinese/Asian Thematic Historic District
- El Prado at Balboa Park
- El Cortez Hotel
- Wheeler J. Bailey Library
- Salk Institute
- Chicano Park

DRAFT

Page intentionally blank





A

Identification and Preservation of Historical Resources

Identification and Preservation of Historical Resources

Goals

- Identification of the historical resources of the City.
- Preservation of the City's important historical resources.
- Integration of historic preservation planning in the larger planning process.

Discussion

The backbone of any historic preservation program is an understanding of the number, location and significance of historical resources. A comprehensive inventory that identifies those resources, and that can be updated as new information is developed, is critical to this understanding. Historic contexts are often prepared as part of the survey effort to organize information based on a cultural theme and its geographical and chronological limits. They describe the significant broad patterns of development in an area that may be represented by historical and cultural resources. The evaluation of historical resources is closely tied to how the resource relates to the context statement.

Surveys are enhanced and the results are more meaningful when consultation with diverse cultural ethnic and racial groups, traditionally underrepresented communities, historic preservation groups, and community and neighborhood groups and leaders are included as part of the background research and context statements. In addition to identifying important individual historical resources and potential historical districts, a survey can identify conservation areas that retain original community character in sufficient quantity and quality that warrants review prior to demolition or substantial alteration of individual properties or attention to the retention of certain established characteristics buildings and areas that may not meet criteria for designation, but nevertheless have a history and quality that is important to the community. Such areas may warrant unique urban design requirements or interpretation efforts to acknowledge and celebrate the history of the building or area.

The City of San Diego has a long history of historic preservation planning and has made significant achievements in terms of protecting its historic and cultural heritage. In 1965, San Diego created the Historic Sites Board and adopted its first ordinance to identify, designate, and preserve properties that are historically and architecturally significant to the community. The ordinance was amended in 1971 to allow a review of demolition or substantial alteration of historic sites and a delay prior to issuance of a demolition permit. In 1979, City of San Diego Progress Guide and General Plan (General Plan) was adopted containing a Cultural Resources Management Element. San Diego was one of only a few cities to include a separate element addressing historic preservation at that time. The General Plan identified shortfalls within the existing ordinance and historic preservation program. These shortfalls included the lack of a comprehensive citywide survey of historic and cultural resources, the need for a written historic preservation plan to systematically guide historic preservation efforts, and the need for a stronger organizational framework with adequate personnel to adequately implement management activities in a comprehensive manner. The General Plan further stated as a major goal, the enactment of local regulations that would ensure effective protection and management of historical resources.

In response to identified problems with historic resource regulations, a comprehensive historic preservation plan consisting of an inventory element, an education element, an incentives element, and a draft historical resources ordinance was developed in 1991. While the inventory, education and incentives elements were adopted by the City Council, considerable controversy surrounded the proposed historical resources ordinance. Various efforts to address the need for regulations consistent with sound historic preservation principles balanced by the rights of private property owners culminated in new historical resources regulations that became effective January 1, 2000. These regulations and associated guidelines have proven to be effective in the protection and management of historical resources in San Diego.

Various state laws and local practices include the need to consult with local Native American groups in order to determine the cultural significance of places and sites within the City's jurisdiction. To be effective, consultation between the City and Tribal entities needs to be carried out in a timely manner with careful consideration of each other's views, mutually respectful of each other's sovereignty and ultimately strive toward achieving agreement. Native American groups and individuals often have unique knowledge of the importance of identified cultural places and hold a special interest in the protection of these places. The City recognizes the need for confidentiality with respect to places that have traditional cultural significance so that these places do not become vandalized or harmed in other ways. Tribal views toward protection and preservation of ancestral human remains, including discoveries of human remains during project construction, should be respected. Conservation easements to protect a cultural place may be voluntarily granted to a California Native American Tribe to aid in the protection of these significant cultural places.

The continuing challenge is integrating effective historic preservation into the larger planning process. As future growth in San Diego has shifted ~~shifts~~ attention from building on open land to a ~~focus on~~ reinvestment in existing communities, historical and cultural resources will be increasingly viewed as sites with opportunity to redevelop, both in the Centre City area and surrounding older communities. This development pressure will present new challenges in incorporating new development with historic resources and districts and could result in threaten both the built environment ~~(including the potential loss of historical buildings and structures negatively affecting neighborhood character) and archaeological resources, by redevelopment of areas using more extensive subsurface grading techniques to provide subterranean parking, pools, undergrounding of power lines, etc.~~



California Tower

Policies

HP-A.1 Strengthen historic preservation planning.

- a. Maintain Certified Local Government (CLG) status ensuring San Diego's direct participation in federal and state historic preservation programs.
- b. Utilize benefits of the CLG program including grant funding available from the California Office of Historic Preservation.
- c. Update the Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan historic preservation work plan regularly. The plan is intended to guide, with specificity, historic preservation efforts in future years, including measures to implementation measures General Plan and Community Plan policies related to, inventories, incentives, education and regulations.
- d. Participate in regional efforts to strengthen historic preservation planning.

HP-A.2 Fully integrate the consideration of historical and cultural resources in the larger land use planning process.

- a. Promote early conflict resolution between the preservation of historical resources and alternative land uses.
- b. Encourage the consideration of historical and cultural resources early in the development review process by promoting the preliminary review process and early consultation with property owners, community and historic preservation groups, land developers, Native Americans, and the building industry.
- c. Include historic preservation concepts and identification of historic buildings, structures, objects, sites, neighborhoods, and non-residential historical resources in the community plan update process.
- d. Conservation areas that are identified at the community plan level, based on historical resources surveys, may be used as an urban design tool to complement community character (see also Urban Design Element, Policy UD-A.7). Consider the inclusion of Urban Design elements to interpret and celebrate the history of buildings and areas that do not meet the City's criteria for designation but nevertheless have importance to the community.
- e. Make the results of historical and cultural resources planning efforts available to planning agencies, the public and other interested parties to the extent legally permissible.

HP-A.3 Foster government-to-government relationships with the Kumeyaay/Diegueño tribes of San Diego.

- a. Regularly meet with local Tribal governments to discuss issues of mutual concern.
- b. Formally consult with identified California Native American tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of the General Plan or specific plan or the designation of open space.
- c. Maintain confidentiality concerning locations of traditional cultural places that are identified through the consultation process and otherwise.
- d. Support Tribal governments holding conservation easements over land voluntarily set aside for the protection of cultural places.

HP-A.4 Actively pursue a program to identify, document and evaluate the historical and cultural resources in the City of San Diego.

- a. Develop a Citywide historic context statement to guide future survey work as well as the preparation of subject-specific context statements specific to areas being surveyed.
- b. Complete and regularly update a comprehensive citywide inventory of historical and cultural resources in conformance with state standards and procedures. Include community, neighborhood, cultural, and historic preservation groups, property owners, land developers, and the building industry in planning and implementing historic surveys.
- c. Conduct project-specific Native American consultation to ensure culturally appropriate and adequate treatment and mitigation for significant archaeological sites with cultural or religious significance to the Native American community in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations and guidelines.
- d. Require that archaeological investigations be guided by appropriate research designs and analytical approaches to allow recovery of important prehistoric and historic information.
- e. Conduct project-specific investigations in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations to identify potentially significant tribal cultural and archaeological resources.
- f. Ensure adequate data recovery and mitigation for adverse impacts to archaeological and Native American sites as part of development, including measures to monitor and recover buried deposits from the tribal cultural, archaeological and historic

periods, under the supervision of a qualified archaeologist and a Native American Kumeyaay monitor.

d.g. Require the permanent curation of archaeological artifact collections and associated research materials, including collections held by the City, unless State or Federal law or consultation with a Most Likely Descendant specifies another treatment such as repatriation. Support the permanent archiving of primary historical records and documents now in public institutions.

e.h. Include Native American monitors during all phases of the investigation of archaeological resources including survey, testing, evaluation, data recovery, and construction monitoring.

f.i. Treat with respect and dignity any human remains discovered during implementation of public and private projects within the City and fully comply with the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and other appropriate laws.

j. Ensure that preservation efforts recognize and celebrate the histories of all communities, including underrepresented groups.

k. Support local organizations in documenting and preserving neighborhood histories.

HP-A.5 Designate and preserve significant historical and cultural resources for current and future generations.

a. Due to their importance, designate historical resources using the City's adopted designation criteria, State Register criteria, and National Register criteria.

b. Establish historical districts where concentrations of buildings, structures, sites, landscapes, and objects are identified. Adopt guidelines when necessary to guide preservation and rehabilitation of the overall district character and significance and apply the *U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties* for review of alterations and new construction in designated historical districts.

c. Protect and preserve historic sidewalk stamps, street signs, lampposts, street trees, and other hardscape and cultural landscape elements, in addition to designated historical buildings, structures, and sites that contribute to the historic character of a neighborhood.

d. Enforce the Historical Resources Regulations and Guidelines of the Land Development Code that are aimed at identifying and preserving

historical resources. Update these regulations and guidelines as needed to maintain adequate protection of historical resources.

- e. Encourage continued use and adaptive reuse of designated historical resources through application of the *U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards* and Guidelines for rehabilitation, reconstruction, and restoration as well as objective design requirements based on the *U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards* to provide clear guidance for adaptive reuse and new development.
- f. Require that all City-owned designated historical resources be maintained in a manner that is consistent with the *U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.
- g. Consider eligible sites for listing on the City's Historical Resources Register, any significant archaeological or Native American cultural sites that may be identified as part of future development within the community and refer sites to the Historical Resources Board for designation as appropriate. Consideration should be given to any sites identified by a future Cultural Resources Report as having been previously evaluated as eligible for listing.

HP-A.6 Integrate Historic Preservation Practices with Climate Resilience Goals

- a. Promote the use of sustainable materials and practices in the restoration of historic buildings.
- b. Identify historical resources vulnerable to climate change impacts and develop mitigation strategies.





B

**Historic
Preservation,
Education,
Benefits, and
Incentives**

B Historic Preservation Education, Benefits, and Incentives

Goals

- Public education about the importance of historical resources.
- Provision of incentives supporting historic preservation.
- Cultural heritage tourism promoted to the tourist industry.

Discussion

The successful implementation of a historic preservation program requires widespread community support. Creating support for historic preservation requires public understanding of the significant contributions of historical resources to the quality and vitality of life, aesthetic appeal, and cultural environment of the City. In order to better inform and educate the public on the merits of historic preservation, information on the resources themselves, as well as the purpose and objectives of the preservation program, must be developed and widely distributed.



Burlingame Historic District

The City's commitment to historic preservation through maintaining Certified Local Government (CLG) status results in multiple economic benefits beyond the opportunity to compete for CLG grants. It is widely recognized that where preservation is supported by local government policies and incentives, designation can increase property values and pride of place. Revitalization of historic downtowns and adaptive reuse of historic districts and buildings conserves resources, uses existing infrastructure, generates local jobs and purchasing, supports small business development and heritage tourism and enhances quality of life and community character.

Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits provide a ten or twenty percent tax credit on rehabilitation spending for income producing properties eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. California's State Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit is available to resources listed on or determined eligible for listing on the State or National registers. It provides a 20% credit for qualified rehabilitation costs, or 25% if the structure meets specified criteria, such as if the property is used to house lower-income households or is on surplus federal land, among others. Facade and conservation easements offer income tax deductions for the donation of a specified portion of a designated historical or cultural resource. The Mills Act is implemented through Council Policy 700-46 and can provides property tax relief to help rehabilitate and maintain designated historical resources. ~~The California Cultural and Historical Endowment was created to administer Proposition 40 funds dedicated to preservation of historical and cultural resources. These funds are available to government and non-profit organizations through a competitive grant application process.~~

Historic preservation enriches the lives of all San Diegans by boosting the local economy through increased heritage tourism and fostering reinvestment in historic properties through tax savings. Beyond economic benefits, historic preservation strengthens community identity, promotes sustainable development, fosters education and civic pride, and preserves the City's diverse history. All San Diegans enjoy the benefits of historic preservation through an increased historic tourism economy and reinvestment

of individual property tax savings into historical properties. San Diego is rich with opportunities for cultural heritage tourism. Visitors to San Diego can find first-class museums and year- round cultural events in Balboa Park. Other historic offerings include the Maritime Museum docked at San Diego Bay; period architecture, walking tours, and cultural events in Old Town, and walking tours of the Asian Pacific Historic District and the Gaslamp Quarter National Register Historic District.

Enacted in 1972, the Mills Act legislation grants participating local governments the authority to enter into contracts with owners of qualified historic properties who actively participate in the restoration and maintenance of their historic properties while receiving property tax relief.

Numerous historical organizations, such as the San Diego History Center, La Jolla Historical Society, Black Historical Society of San Diego, San Diego Archaeological Center, and Save Our Heritage Organisation, actively contribute to these efforts. These groups offer walking tours of historic neighborhoods, operate small museums and bookstores, and host events that celebrate San Diego's vibrant past. Through these initiatives, historic preservation ensures that future generations can continue to experience and appreciate the city's rich cultural heritage. In addition, San Diego historical organizations include the San Diego Historical Society, La Jolla Historical Society, Black Historical Society of San Diego, San Diego Archaeological Center, and Save Our Heritage Organisation, to name a few. These and other historical societies provide walking tours of historic neighborhoods, maintain small museums and bookstores, and sponsor historic and cultural events celebrating San Diego's history.

Policies

HP-B.1 Foster greater public participation and education in historical and cultural resources.

- a. Encourage public attendance at monthly Historical Resources Board meetings through increased notification of agenda items on the City's website.
- b. Encourage the participation of the City's rich diversity of ethnic cultural groups in efforts to preserve historical and cultural resources through the preparation of culturally-focused historic context statements, outreach to historical societies and individuals in traditionally underrepresented communities, interviews to document oral histories, and inclusion of ethnic culturally significant resources on the City's Register of Designated Historical Resources.
- c. Engage the public when creating "context statements" by adopting an oral history component of historical survey work.
- d. Participate in National Historic Preservation Week and California Archaeology Month. Each year in May recognize those individuals, groups or businesses that have made a significant contribution to the preservation, protection or restoration of historical or cultural resources.
- e. Foster educational opportunities using designated historical and cultural resources, including placement of plaques as a way to identify important historical resources throughout the City.
- f. Encourage the involvement of educational institutions in preservation programs and activities.
- g. Encourage the use of local history themes in some public art projects.
- h. Encourage active community involvement in preservation efforts through resource sponsorship programs.
- i. Collaborate with schools to incorporate local history into educational programs.
- j. Host events and workshops to educate residents about the value of historic preservation.
- k. Create a repository of publicly submitted locations that the public feels have historic value, whether or not they meet designation standards.
- l. Develop GIS-based tools that allow users to explore historical sites and districts interactively.

HP-B.2 Promote the maintenance, restoration, and rehabilitation of historical resources through a variety of financial and development incentives. Continue to use existing programs and develop new approaches as needed. Encourage continued private ownership and utilization of historic structures through a variety of incentives.

- a. Encourage owners of historical resources to utilize federal incentives including Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits, façade and conservation easements and others.
- b. Encourage preservation, maintenance, rehabilitation, and restoration of designated historical resources through use of available incentives offered by the state of California for achieving this goal. These incentives include the Mills Act, the California Cultural and Historical Endowment, and others.
- c. Create incentives to encourage the protection and preservation of designated historical buildings, structures, and objects and important archaeological sites.
- d. Use the flexibility provided in the California State Historical Building Code Title 24 in meeting code requirements for historically-designated buildings.
- e. Encourage the use of Transfer of Development Rights to preserve historical and cultural resources in situ, particularly in areas zoned for high-density development.
- f. Take advantage of the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process for historical resources, to gain flexibility in the application of some development regulations.
- g. Foster preservation and adaptive reuse of designated historical buildings and structures by allowing retention of non-conforming setbacks without requiring a variance or hardship finding. Allow the use of a Neighborhood Development Permit with a finding that the proposed reuse does not adversely affect the community plan or General Plan because it would be beneficial in this regard.
- h. Provide architectural assistance service to help owners design rehabilitation and/or adaptive reuse plans, or feasibility studies for historically-designated buildings, structures, and objects. Maintain the City's current façade improvement program for historic commercial properties.
- i. Continue to provide design assistance for owners of historical resources

through the Historical Resources Board.

- j. Offer tax credits or grants to property owners who adaptively reuse historic buildings for modern purposes, such as housing or commercial spaces.
- k. Simplify permitting for adaptive reuse projects to encourage the preservation of historic structures.

HP-B.3 Develop a historic preservation sponsorship program.

- a. ~~Create a~~ Promote the historic preservation fund that provides a monetary source for local preservation incentives such as an architectural assistance program and archaeological site protection plan. The fund may be supported through grants, private or public donations, or other sources.
- b. Create a “receiver site” program that provides relocation sites for historical resources (buildings, structures, or objects) that cannot be preserved on site. Receiver sites should be located within the community in which the resource was originally located and should maintain a context and setting comparable to the original location. This method of preservation should be limited and used when other on-site preservation techniques are found not to be feasible.
- c. Establish an “adopt a resource” program that encourages the public and local businesses to become involved in the protection and preservation of historical and cultural resources by sponsoring preservation of individual properties, which may include archaeological sites to the extent legally permissible.
- d. Create a sponsorship program to encourage the public and local businesses to become involved in curation of existing archaeological artifact collections that have no current funding mechanism.

HP-B.4 Increase opportunities for cultural heritage tourism. Additional discussion and policies can be found in the Economic Prosperity Element, Section I.

- a. Collaborate with other public, private, and non-profit entities to create a sustainable cultural heritage tourism program within the overall travel industry.
- b. Promote the history of San Diego and the many designated historical buildings, structures, districts, and landscapes to attract cultural heritage travelers.
- c. Focus the development of cultural heritage programs on quality and authenticity.

Page Intentionally Blank

General Plan: Appendices







F

Appendix F: Historic Preservation Element

City of San Diego San Diego History

The history of a region provides the context for the evaluation and management of historical resources. The history of San Diego can be divided into four prehistoric periods, one ethnohistoric period and three historic periods. These periods are discussed below as summarized in Rosen (1994) and Van Wormer (1995). For a detailed discussion of San Diego's history, visit the San Diego's City Planning [online archive of contexts and surveys](#), see for example, the Historic Properties Background Study for the City of San Diego Clean Water Program (Brian F. Mooney Associates n.d.).

Tribal Cultural History (Pre-European Contact)

Tribal cultural history is reflected in the history, beliefs and legends retained in songs and stories passed down through generations within Native American tribes. There is also an ethnohistoric period of events, traditional cultural practices and spiritual beliefs of indigenous peoples recorded from the post-European contact era. The traditional origin belief of the Yuman-speaking peoples in Southern California reflects a cosmology that includes aspects of a mother earth and father sky, and religious rituals were tied to specific sacred locations. A pre-historic material culture is contained in the archaeological record and reflects subsistence practices and settlement patterns over several prehistoric periods.

The cultural history presented below is based on documentation from both the archaeological and ethnographic records and represents a continuous human occupation in the region spanning the last 10,000 years. While this information comes from the scientific reconstructions of the past, it does not necessarily represent how local indigenous groups see themselves. While the material culture is contained in the archaeological record, their history, beliefs, and legends have persevered and are retained in the songs and stories passed down through the generations. It is important to note that Native American aboriginal lifeways did not cease at European contact.

Two indigenous groups are described from the ethnohistoric period as inhabiting San Diego County: the Luiseño and the Kumeyaay. The present-day boundaries of the City of San Diego are part of the ancestral homeland and unceded territory of the Yuman-speaking Kumeyaay, which stretched approximately from the Pacific Ocean to the west, El Centro to the east, Escondido to the north, and the northern part of Baja California, Mexico to the south.

The ethnohistoric period in San Diego began with the arrival of Europeans and continued through the Spanish, Mexican, and early American periods.

When the Mission San Diego de Alcalá was founded in 1769, it brought major changes to the Kumeyaay way of life. Many were forced to join the mission, and new diseases greatly reduced their population. Early records about Native life often came from limited or biased sources. More recently, Native people and researchers have worked together to better understand Kumeyaay history, culture, and language. Today, the Kumeyaay are recognized as the Most Likely Descendants of any Native remains found in San Diego.

The Kumeyaay traditionally lived in small, semi-permanent, politically autonomous seasonal camping spots or villages, often located near local springs and water sources. Larger villages were located in river valleys and along the shoreline of coastal estuaries. Houses were typically made with tule or California bulrush. At the time of Spanish contact, the Kumeyaay had villages across Southern California, southwestern Imperial County, and parts of northern Baja California.

Subsistence cycles were seasonal and generally focused on an east-west or coast-to-desert route based around the availability of vegetal foods, while hunting and shellfish harvesting added a secondary food source to gathering practices. The Kumeyaay migrated to the mountains during certain seasons of the year to harvest acorns and grain grasses, as well as to trade with neighboring tribes to the east. The general route of today's Kumeyaay Highway (Interstate 8), follows the route of historic waterways through Alvarado Canyon and was one route used by the Kumeyaay to travel between the coast and the interior.

Several important Kumeyaay villages were located in or near modern-day San Diego including, but not limited to, Cosoy near today's Old Town San Diego, Jamo (Rinconada) near Mission Bay, Nipaguay, along the San Diego River, Las Chollas, near Chollas Creek, and Ystagua, along Penasquitos Creek.

Estimates for the population of the Kumeyaay vary substantially: Scholars speculate anywhere from 3,000 to 19,000 people lived in the region prior to the establishment of the Spanish missions in 1769. However, by the mid-nineteenth century, the Kumeyaay population had dwindled to a few thousand, with many living on reservation lands.

PREHISTORIC PERIODS

Systematic archaeological studies in San Diego County began with the work of Malcolm J. Rogers of the San Diego Museum of Man in the 1920s and 1930s. Rogers (1929, 1945, 1966) developed a three part chronologic sequence of prehistoric cultures for the region which was subsequently built upon by Claude Warren (1967, 1968). More recent studies have sought to further refine (Cárdenas 1986, 1987; Moratto 1984; Moriarty 1966, 1967; True 1970, 1980, 1986; True and Beemer 1982; True and Pankey 1985; Waugh 1986) or criticize (Bull 1983, 1987; Gallegos 1987) this sequence. The prehistory

of the region is divided into three ~~four~~ major periods: Early Prehistoric Period, ~~Early Man~~, ~~Paleo-Indian~~, Early Archaic Period, and Late Prehistoric.

EARLY PREHISTORIC MAN PERIOD (BEFORE 8500 BC-6000 BC)

The Early Prehistoric Period represents the time period of the first known inhabitants in California and in San Diego. No firm archaeological evidence for the occupation of San Diego County before 10,500 years ago has been discovered and our understanding of occupation during this time period is from tribal cultural knowledge and stories. ~~The myths and history that is repeated by the local Native American groups now and at the time of earlier ethnographic research indicate both their presence here since the time of creation and, in some cases, migration from other areas. There are some researchers who advocate an occupation of southern California prior to the Wisconsin Glaciation, around 80,000 to 100,000 years ago (Carter 1957, 1980; Minshall 1976). Local proposed Early Man sites include the Texas Street, Buchanan Canyon and Brown sites, as well as Mission Valley (San Diego River Valley), Del Mar and La Jolla (Bada et al. 1974; Carter 1957, 1980; Minshall 1976, 1983, 1989; Moriarty and Minshall 1972; Reeves 1985; Reeves et al. 1986). However, two problems have precluded general acceptance of these claims. First, artifacts recovered from several of the localities have been rejected by many archaeologists as natural products rather than cultural artifacts. Second, the techniques used for assigning early dates to the sites have been considered unsatisfactory (Moratto 1984; Taylor et al. 1985).~~

Careful scientific investigation of any possible Terminal Pleistocene (pre-10,000 years ago) and the Early Holocene (beginning 10,000 years ago) Early Man archaeological remains in this region would be assigned a high research priority. Such a priority would reflect both the substantial popular interest in the issue and the general anthropological importance which any confirmation of a very early human presence in the western hemisphere would have. ~~Anecdotal reports have surfaced over the years that Early Man deposits have been found in the lower levels of later sites in Mission Valley. However, no reports or analyses have been produced supporting these claims.~~

PALEO-INDIAN PERIOD (8500-6000 BC)

The Early Prehistoric Period is associated with the Big-Game-Hunting activities of the peoples of the Last Ice Age. Most evidence for Big-Game-Hunting peoples during this time period derives from finds of large, fluted spears and projectile points (Fluted-Point Tradition). At least three isolated flute point occurrences have been found in San Diego County. While there have been isolated occurrences of fluted points in the San Diego area, the earliest archaeological sites documented to be circa 10,000 years old belong to the San Dieguito Tradition (Warren et al. 2008; Warren and Ore 2011). The San Dieguito Tradition, with an artifact assemblage distinct from that of the Fluted-Point Tradition, has been documented mostly in the coastal area in San Diego County, as well as in the

southeastern California deserts (Carrico et al. 1993; Rogers 1939, 1966; Warren 1966, 1967; Warren and True 1961). The San Dieguito Complex was reclassified as the San Dieguito Tradition in 1968. This tradition is characterized by an artifact inventory consisting almost entirely of flaked stone biface and scraping tools but lacking the fluted points associated with the Fluted-Point Tradition.

Diagnostic artifact types and categories associated with the San Dieguito Tradition include elongated bifacial knives, large leaf-shaped projectile points, distinctive scraping tools, crescentics, and, in the desert, Silver Lake and Lake Mojave projectile points (Knell and Becker 2017; Rogers 1939, 1966; Vaughan 1982; Warren 1966, 1967; Warren and True 1961). The earliest generally-accepted archaeological culture of present-day San Diego County is the Paleo-Indian culture of the San Dieguito Complex. This complex is usually assigned to the Paleo-Indian Stage and dated to about 10,500 years ago. It would therefore appear to be contemporary with the better-known Fluted Point Tradition of the High Plains and elsewhere and the Western Pluvial Lakes Tradition of the Desert West. The San Dieguito Complex, is believed to represent a nomadic hunting culture by some investigators of the complex (Davis et al. 1969; Moriarty 1969; Rogers 1929, 1966; Warren 1966, 1967), characterized by the use of a variety of scrapers, choppers, bifaces, large projectile points and crescentics, a scarcity or absence of milling implements, and a preference for fine-grained volcanic rock over metaquartzite.

Careful scientific investigation of San Dieguito Complex/Tradition sites in the region would also be assigned a high research priority. Major research questions relating to the Early Prehistoric-Paleo-Indian Period include continued confirmation of the presence of the Fluted Point Tradition in San Diego County (Davis and Shutler 1969); better chronological definition of the San Dieguito Complex; determination of whether the San Dieguito assemblages do in fact reflect an early occupation, rather than the remains from a specialized activity set belonging to an Early Archaic Period culture; clarification of the relationship of the San Dieguito Complex, if it represents a separate culture, to the subsequent Early-Archaic Period cultures; determination of the subsistence and settlement systems which were associated with the San Dieguito Complex; and clarification of the relationship of the San Dieguito Complex to similar remains in the Mojave Desert, in northwestern and central California, in southern Arizona and in Baja California. The San Dieguito Complex was originally defined in an area centering on the San Dieguito River valley, north of San Diego (Rogers 1929).

EARLY-ARCHAIC PERIOD (6000 BC-AD 0)

As a result of climatic shifts and a major change in subsistence strategies, a new cultural pattern assignable to the Archaic Stage is thought by many archaeologists to have replaced the San Dieguito culture before 6000 BC. A large number of archaeological site assemblages dating to this period have been identified at a range of coastal and inland sites. This appears to indicate that a relatively stable, sedentary hunting and gathering

complex, possibly associated with one people, was present in the coastal and immediately inland areas of what is now San Diego for more than 7,000 years.

These assemblages, designated as the La Jolla/Pauma complexes, are considered part of Wallace's (1955) "Early Milling Stone Horizon" and of Warren's (1968) "Encinitas tradition." These complexes are characterized as a gathering culture which subsisted largely on shellfish and plant foods from the abundant littoral resources of the area.

In general, the content of these site assemblages includes manos and metates; shell middens; terrestrial and marine mammal remains; burials; rock features; bone tools; doughnut stones; discoidals; stone balls; plummets; biface points/knives; beads made of stone, bone, or shell; and cobble-based tools at coastal sites and increased hunting equipment and quarry-based tools at inland sites (True 1958, 1980). As originally defined by True (1958), the "Pauma complex" aspect of this culture is associated with sites located in inland areas that lack shellfish remains but are otherwise similar in content to the La Jolla complex. The Pauma complex may, therefore, simply represent a non-coastal expression of the La Jolla complex (True 1980; True and Beemer 1982)

~~This new pattern, the Encinitas Tradition, is represented in San Diego County by the La Jolla and Pauma complexes. The coastal La Jolla Complex is characterized as a gathering culture which subsisted largely on shellfish and plant foods from the abundant littoral resources of the area. The La Jolla Complex is best known for its stone-on-stone grinding tools (mano and metate), relatively crude cobble-based flaked lithic technology and flexed human burials. Inland Pauma Complex sites have been assigned to this period on the basis of extensive stone-on-stone grinding tools, Elko Series projectile points and the absence of remains diagnostic of later cultures.~~

Among the research questions focusing on this period are the delineation of change or the demonstration of extreme continuity within the La Jolla and Pauma complexes; determination of whether coastal La Jolla sites represent permanent occupation areas or brief seasonal camps; the relationship of coastal and inland Archaic cultures; the scope and character of Archaic Period long-range exchange systems; the role of natural changes or culturally-induced stresses in altering subsistence strategies; and the termination of the Archaic Period in a cultural transformation, in an ethnic replacement or in an occupational hiatus in western San Diego County.

LATE PREHISTORIC PERIOD (AD 0-1769)

The Late Prehistoric Period in San Diego County is represented by two distinct cultural patterns, the Yuman Tradition from the Colorado Desert region and the Shoshonean Tradition from the north. These cultural patterns are represented locally by the Cuyamaca Complex from the mountains of southern San Diego County and the San Luis Rey Complex of northern San Diego County. The people of the Cuyamaca and San Luis Rey

complexes are ancestral to the ethnohistoric Kumeyaay (Diegueño) and Luiseño, respectively. Prehistorically, the Kumeyaay were a hunting and gathering culture that adapted to a wide range of ecological zones from the coast to the Peninsular Range. A shift in grinding technology reflected by the addition of the pestle and mortar to the mano and metate, signifying an increased emphasis on acorns as a primary food staple, as well as the introduction of the bow and arrow (i.e., small Cottonwood Triangular and Desert Side-notched projectile points), obsidian from the Obsidian Butte source in Imperial County and human cremation serve to differentiate Late Prehistoric populations from earlier peoples. Pottery is also characteristic of the Cuyamaca Complex, but is absent from the San Luis Rey Complex until relatively late (post AD 1500).

Explanatory models applied to Late Prehistoric sites have drawn most heavily on the ethnographic record. Notable research opportunities for archaeological sites belonging to the Late Prehistoric period include refining chronology, examining the repercussions from environmental changes which were occurring in the deserts to the east, clarifying patterns of inter- and intra- regional exchange, testing the hypothesis of pre-contact horticultural/agricultural practices west of the desert, and testing ethnographic models for the Late Prehistoric settlement system. Hector (1984) focused on the Late Prehistoric Period to examine the use of special activity areas within large sites typical of this period. At issue was whether activities such as tool making, pottery manufacturing and dining were conducted in specific areas within the site, or whether each family unit re-created these activity areas throughout the site. Her findings indicated that no specialized areas existed within Late Prehistoric sites, and furthermore that tools made during this period served a variety of functions.

Late Prehistoric sites appear to be proportionately much less common than Archaic sites in the coastal plains subregion of southwestern San Diego County (Christenson 1990:134-135; Robbins-Wade 1990). These sites tend to be located on low alluvial terraces or at the mouths of coastal lagoons and drainages. Of particular interest is the observation that sites located in the mountains appear to be associated with the Late Prehistoric Period. This suggests that resource exploitation broadened during that time, as populations grew and became more sedentary.

ETHNOHISTORIC PERIOD

The founding of Mission San Diego de Alcalá in 1769 by Father Junípero Serra and Mission San Luis Rey de Francia in 1798 by Father Lasuén brought about profound changes in the lives of the Yuman-speaking Kumeyaay (Diegueño) and Shoshonean-speaking Luiseño of San Diego County. The coastal Kumeyaay and Luiseño were quickly forced brought into their respective missions or died from introduced diseases. Ethnographic work, therefore, has concentrated on the mountain and desert peoples who were able to retain some of their ~~aboriginal~~ culture. As a result, ethnographic accounts of the coastal Kumeyaay and Luiseño are few. Today the descendants of the Kumeyaay bands are

divided among 12 reservations in the south county; the descendants of the Luiseño bands among five reservations in the north county.

The Kumeyaay are generally considered to be a hunting-gathering society characterized by central-based nomadism. While a large variety of terrestrial and marine food sources were exploited, emphasis was placed on acorn procurement and processing as well as the capture of rabbit and deer. Both traditional knowledge and the archaeological record (Shipek (1963, 1989b)) suggests that the Kumeyaay, or at least some bands of the Kumeyaay, were practicing proto-agriculture at the time of Spanish contact. ~~While the evidence is problematic, the Kumeyaay were certainly adept land and resource managers with a history of intensive plant husbandry.~~

Kumeyaay houses varied greatly according to locality, need, choice and raw materials. Formal homes were built only in the winter as they took some time to build and were not really necessary in the summer. Summer camps needed only a windbreak and were usually located under convenient trees, a cave fronted with rocks or an arbor built for protection from the sun. During the summer, the Kumeyaay moved from place to place. Research suggests bands would return to the same summer camping spots annually, camping wherever they were. In the winter they constructed small elliptically shaped huts of poles covered with brush or bark. The floor of the house was usually sunk about two feet into the earth. In the foothills and mountains hiwat brush or deer broom was applied in bundles tied on with strands of yucca. In cold weather the brush was covered with earth to help keep the heat inside. Bundles of brush were tied together to make a door just large enough to crawl through.

Most activities, such as cooking and eating, took place outside the house. The cooking arbor was a lean-to type structure or four posts with brush over the top. Village owned structures were ceremonial and were the center of many activities. Sweathouses were built and used by the Kumeyaay men. They were built around four posts set in a square near a river or stream and usually had a dug-out floor. The sweathouse was also used sometimes as a place for treating illnesses.

As with most hunting-gathering societies, Kumeyaay social organization was formed in terms of kinship. The Kumeyaay had a patrilineal type of band organization (descent through the male line) with band exogamy (marriage outside of one's band) and patrilocal marital residence (married couple integrates into the male's band). The band is often considered as synonymous with a village or rancheria, which is a political entity. Almstedt (1980:45) has suggested that the term rancheria should be applied to both a social and geographical unit, as well as to the particular population and territory held in common by a native group or band. She also stressed that the territory for a rancheria might comprise a 30 square mile area. ~~Many households would constitute a village or rancheria and several villages were part of a larger social system usually referred to as a consanguineal kin group called a cimul. The members of the cimul did not intermarry~~

because of their presumed common ancestry, but they maintained close relations and often shared territory and resources (Luomala 1963:287-289).

Territorial divisions among Kumeyaay residential communities were normally set by the circuit of moves between villages by cimul's in search of food. As Spier (1923:307) noted, the entire territory was not occupied at one time, but rather the communities moved between resources in such a manner that in the course of a year all of the recognized settlements may have been occupied. While a cimul could own, or more correctly control, a tract of land with proscribed rights, no one from another cimul was denied access to the resources of nature (Luomala 1963:285; Spier 1923:306); since no individual owned the resources, they were to be shared.

The Kumeyaay practiced many forms of spiritualism with the assistance of shamans and cimul leaders. Spiritual leaders were neither elected to, nor inherited their position, but achieved status because they knew all the songs involved in ceremonies (Shipek 1991) and had an inclination toward the supernatural. This could include visions, unusual powers or other signs of communication with the worlds beyond. Important Kumeyaay ceremonies included male and female puberty rites, the fire ceremony, the whirling dance, the eclipse ceremony, the eagle dance, the cremation ceremony and the yearly mourning ceremony (Spier 1923:311-326).

Important areas of research for the Ethnohistoric Period include identifying the location of Kumeyaay settlements at the time of historic contact and during the following 50 years of the Spanish Period; delineating the effects of contact on Kumeyaay settlement/subsistence patterns; investigating the extent to which the Kumeyaay accepted or adopted new technologies or material goods from the intrusive Spanish culture; and examining the changes to Kumeyaay religious practices as a result of contact.

HISTORIC PERIODS

San Diego history can be divided into three periods: the Spanish, Mexican and American periods.

SPANISH PERIOD (AD 1769- 1822)

While Juan Rodriguez Cabrillo visited San Diego briefly in 1542, the beginning of the Spanish colonization of Alta California (now San Diego) is generally given as 1769. In spite of Juan Cabrillo's earlier landfall on Point Loma in 1542, the Spanish colonization of Alta California did not begin until 1769. Concerns over Russian and English interests in California motivated the Spanish government to send an expedition of soldiers, settlers and missionaries to occupy and secure the northwestern borderlands of New Spain. This was to be accomplished through the establishment and cooperative inter-relationship of

three institutions: the Presidio, Mission and Pueblo. In 1769 a land expedition led by Gaspar de Portola reached San Diego Bay, where they met those who had survived the trip by sea on the San Antonio and the San Carlos. Initially camp was made on the shore of the bay in the area that is now downtown San Diego. Lack of water at this location, however, led to moving the camp on May 14, 1769, to a small hill closer to the San Diego River and near the Kumeyaay village of Cosoy. Father Junípero Serra arrived in July of the same year to find the Presidio serving mostly as a hospital. The Spanish built a primitive mission and presidio structure on the hill near the river. The first chapel was built of wooden stakes and had a roof made of tule reeds. Brush huts and temporary shelters were also built.

Tensions ~~Bad feelings~~ soon developed between the native Kumeyaay and the soldiers, resulting in construction of a stockade whose wall was made from sticks and reeds. By 1772 the stockade included barracks for the soldiers, a storehouse for supplies, a house for the missionaries and the chapel, which had been improved. The log and brush huts were gradually replaced with buildings made of adobe bricks. Flat earthen roofs were eventually replaced by pitched roofs with rounded roof tiles. Clay floors were eventually lined with fired brick.

In August 1774, the Spanish missionaries moved the Mission San Diego de Alcalá to its present location six miles up the San Diego River valley (modern Mission Valley) near the Kumeyaay village of Nipaguay. Begun as a thatched jacal chapel and compound built of willow poles, logs and tules, the new Mission was sacked and burned in the Kumeyaay uprising of November 5, 1775. The first adobe chapel was completed in October 1776, and the present church was begun the following year. A succession of building programs through 1813 resulted in the final rectilinear plan that included the church, bell tower, sacristy, courtyard, residential complex, workshops, corrals, gardens and cemetery (Neuerburg 1986). Orchards, reservoirs and other agricultural installations were built to the south on the lower San Diego River alluvial terrace and were irrigated by a dam and aqueduct system.

In 1798 the Spanish constructed the Mission San Luis Rey de Francia in northern San Diego County. They also established three smaller mission outposts (asistencias) at Santa Ysabel, Pala and Las Flores (Smythe 1908; Englehardt 1920; Pourade 1961). The mission system had a great effect on all Native American groups from the coast to the inland areas and was a dominant force in San Diego County.

Life for the new settlers at the San Diego Presidio was isolated and difficult. The arid desert climate and aggressive Native American population made life hard for the Spanish settlers. They raised cattle and sheep, gathered fish and seafood and did some subsistence farming in the San Diego River Valley to generate enough food to keep the fledgling community of a few hundred Spaniards and hundreds of Native American neophytes alive. The situation for Spanish Period San Diegans' was complicated by the

Spanish government's insistence on making trade with foreign ships illegal. Although some smuggling of goods into San Diego was done, the amounts were likely small (Smythe 1908:81-99; Williams 1994).

Significant research topics for the Spanish Period involve the chronology and ecological impact caused by the introduction of Old World plants and the spread of New World domesticates in southern California; the differences and similarities in the lifeways, access to resources and responses to change between different Spanish institutions; the effect of Spanish colonization on the Kumeyaay population; and the effect of changing colonial economic policies and the frontier economic system on patterns of purchase, consumption and discard.

MEXICAN PERIOD (AD 1822- 1846)

In 1822 the political situation changed. Mexico won its independence from Spain and San Diego became part of the Mexican Republic. The Mexican Government opened California to foreign ships, and a healthy trade soon developed, exchanging the fine California cattle hides for the manufactured goods of Europe and the eastern United States. Several of these American trading companies erected rough sawn wood-plank sheds at La Playa on the bay side of Point Loma. The merchants used these "hide-houses" for storing the hides before transport to the east coast (Robinson 1846:12; Smythe 1908:102). As the hide trade grew, so did the need for more grazing lands. Thus the Mexican government began issuing private land grants in the early 1820s, creating the rancho system of large agricultural estates. Much of the land came from the Spanish missions, which the Mexican government secularized in 1833. The mission system, however, had begun to decline when the Mission Indians became eligible for Mexican citizenship and refused to work in the mission fields. The ranchos dominated California life until the American takeover in 1846 (Smythe 1908:101-106; Robinson 1948, Killea 1966, Pourade 1963). The Mexican Period brought about the continued displacement and acculturation of the native populations.

Another change in Mexican San Diego was the decline of the presidio and the rise of the civilian pueblo. The establishment of Pueblos in California under the Spanish government met with only moderate success and none of the missions obtained their ultimate goal, which was to convert to a Pueblo. Pueblos did, however, begin to form, somewhat spontaneously, near the California Presidios. As early as 1791, presidio commandants in California were given the authority to grant small house lots and garden plots to soldiers and their families (Richman 1911:346). Sometime after 1800, soldiers from the San Diego Presidio began to move themselves and their families from the presidio buildings to the tableland down the hill near the San Diego River. Historian William Smythe noted that Don Blas Aguilar, who was born in 1811, remembered at least 15 such grants below Presidio Hill by 1821 (Smythe 1908:99). Of these 15 grants, only five within the boundaries of what would become Old Town had houses in 1821. These included the retired commandant

Francisco Ruiz adobe (now known as the Carrillo Adobe), another building later owned by Henry Fitch on Calhoun Street, the Ybanes and Serrano houses on Juan Street near Washington Street, and a small adobe house on the main plaza owned by Juan Jose Maria Marron (San Diego Union 6-15-1873:3). By 1827, as many as 30 homes existed around the central plaza and in 1835, Mexico granted San Diego official pueblo (town) status. At this time the town had a population of nearly 500 residents, later reaching a peak of roughly 600 (Killea 1966:9-35). By 1835 the presidio, once the center of life in Spanish San Diego, had been abandoned and lay in ruins. Mission San Diego de Alcalá fared little better. In 1842, 100 Indians lived under the care of the friars and only a few main buildings were habitable (Pourade 1963:11-12, 17-18). The town and the ship landing area (La Playa) were now the centers of activity in Mexican San Diego.

Adobe bricks were used as the primary building material of houses during the Mexican Period because wood was scarce and dirt and labor were plentiful. The technique had been brought to the New World from Spain, where it had been introduced by the Moors in the Eighth Century. Adobe bricks were made of a mixture of clay, water, sticks, weeds, small rocks and sand. The sticks, weeds and small rocks held the bricks together and the sand gave the clay something to stick to. The mixture was poured into a wooden form measuring about 4 inches by 11 inches by 22 inches and allowed to dry. A one-room, single-story adobe required between 2,500 and 5,000 bricks. Walls were laid on the ground or built over foundations of cobblestone from the riverbed. To make walls the adobe bricks were stacked and held together with a thick layer of mortar (mud mixed with sand). Walls were usually three feet thick and provided excellent insulation from the winter cold and summer heat. To protect the adobe bricks from washing away in the rain, a white lime plaster or mud slurry was applied to the walls by hand and smoothed with a rock plaster smoother. The lime for the lime plaster was made by burning seashells in a fire. The lime was then mixed with sand and water. Once the plaster had dried, it formed a hard shell that protected the adobe bricks. The roof was usually made of carrizo cane bound with rawhide strips. Floors were usually of hard packed dirt, although tile was also used.

The new Pueblo of San Diego did not prosper as did some other California towns during the Mexican Period. In 1834 the Mexican government secularized the San Diego and San Luis Rey missions. The secularization in San Diego County had the adverse effect of triggering increased Native American hostilities against the Californios during the late 1830s. The attacks on outlying ranchos, along with unstable political and economic factors helped San Diego's population decline to around 150 permanent residents by 1840. San Diego's official Pueblo status was removed by 1838, and it was made a subprefecture of the Los Angeles Pueblo. When the Americans took over after 1846, the situation had stabilized somewhat, and the population had increased to roughly 350 non-Native American residents (Killea 1966:24-32; Hughes 1975:6-7).

Two important areas of research for the Mexican Period are the effect of the Mexican

rancho system on the Kumeyaay population and the effect of changing colonial economic policies and the frontier economic system on patterns of purchase, consumption and discard.

AMERICAN PERIOD (AD 1846-PRESENT)

When United States military forces occupied San Diego in July 1846, the town's residents split on their course of action. Many of the town's leaders sided with the Americans, while other prominent families opposed the United States invasion. A group of Californios under Andres Pico, the brother of the Governor Pio Pico, harassed the occupying forces in Los Angeles and San Diego during 1846. In December 1846, Pico's Californios engaged U.S. Army forces under General Stephen Kearney at the Battle of San Pasqual and inflicted many casualties. However, the Californio resistance was defeated in two small battles near Los Angeles and effectively ended by January 1847 (Harlow 1982; Pourade 1963).

The Americans raised the United States flag in San Diego in 1846, and assumed formal control with the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848. In the quarter of a century following 1848, they transformed the Hispanic community into a thoroughly Anglo-American one. They introduced Anglo culture and society, American political institutions and especially American entrepreneurial commerce. By 1872, they even relocated the center of the City and community to a new location that was more accessible to the bay and to commerce (Newland 1992:8). Expansion of trade brought an increase in the availability of building materials. Wood buildings gradually replaced adobe structures. Some of the earliest buildings to be erected in the American Period were "Pre-fab" houses which were built on the east coast of the United States and shipped in sections around Cape Horn and reassembled in San Diego.

In 1850, the Americanization of San Diego began to develop rapidly. On February 18, 1850, the California State Legislature formally organized San Diego County. The first elections were held at San Diego and La Playa on April 1, 1850 for county officers. San Diego grew slowly during the next decade. San Diegans attempted to develop the town's interests through a transcontinental railroad plan and the development of a new town closer to the bay. The failure of these plans, added to a severe drought which crippled ranching and the onset of the Civil War, left San Diego as a remote frontier town. The troubles led to an actual drop in the town's population from 650 in 1850, to 539 in 1860 (Garcia 1975:77). Not until land speculator and developer Alonzo Horton arrived in 1867 did San Diego begin to develop fully into an active American town (MacPhail 1979).

Alonzo Horton's development of a New San Diego (modern downtown) in 1867 began to swing the community focus away from Old Town. After the county seat was moved in 1871 and a fire destroyed a major portion of the business block in April 1872, Old Town rapidly declined in importance.

Several intersecting and overlapping factors impacted patterns of segregation and integration over the course of the City's History. These factors include White flight; housing costs; access to well-paying jobs and economic mobility; racially and economically restrictive covenants within real estate deeds; redlining; discriminatory real estate practices; zoning; freeway construction; ballot initiatives; and public resistance to increased housing and density. A high-level overview of how these factors have shaped the city is provided in the City's [Housing Element Appendix A](#), which includes an "Integration and Segregation" section that includes a narrative history under "Other Relevant Factors".

American Period resources can be categorized into remains of the frontier era, rural farmsteads and urban environments, with different research questions applicable to each category. Important research topics for the frontier era include studying the changing function of former Mexican ranchos between 1850 and 1940, and investigating the effect on lifestyles of the change from Hispanic to Anglo- American domination of the pueblo of San Diego. Research domains for rural farmsteads include the definition of a common rural culture, comparing the definition of wealth and consumer preferences of successful rural farm families versus middle and upper- middle class urban dwellers, definition of the evolution and adaptation of rural vernacular architecture, and identification of the functions of external areas on farmsteads.

Research questions for urban environments include definition of an urban subsistence pattern; definition of ethnic group maintenance and patterns of assimilation for identifiable ethnic groups; identification of specific adaptations to boom and bust cycles; definition of a common culture for working, middle and upper-middle class urban residents; identification of adaptations to building techniques, architectural styles, technological change and market fluctuations through analysis of industrial sites; and investigation of military sites to relate changes in armament technology and fortification expansion or reduction to changing priorities of national defense.

ARCHITECTURE

The built environment, including structures and landscapes, is a vital source of historical evidence on past lifeways, work, ideas, cultural values and adaptations. The built environment is neither a product of random events, nor a static phenomena. The rearrangement of structural features and land use are part of the way in which people organize their lives. Landscapes are lands that have been shaped and modified by human actions and conscious design to provide housing, accommodate production systems, develop communication and transportation networks, designate social inequalities and express aesthetics (Rubertone 1989).

Vernacular architectural studies have demonstrated that pioneer farmers and urban dwellers used folk styles to meet specific needs. Analyses of these house types illustrate

adaptation by households as a result of changing needs, lifestyle and economic status. Studies of structural forms at military complexes have documented changes in technology and national defense priorities, and industrial site studies have documented technological innovation and adaptation. The spatial relationships of buildings and spaces, and changes in those relationships through time, also reflect cultural values and adaptive strategies (Carlson 1990; Stewart-Abernathy 1986).

San Diego's built environment spans over 200 years of architectural history. The real urbanization of the City as it is today began in 1869 when Alonzo Horton moved the center of commerce and government from Old Town (Old San Diego) to New Town (downtown). Development spread from downtown based on a variety of factors, including the availability of potable water and transportation corridors. Factors such as views, and access to public facilities affected land values, which in turn affected the character of neighborhoods that developed.

During the Victorian Era of the late 1800s and early 1900s, the areas of Golden Hill, Uptown, Banker's Hill and Sherman Heights were developed. Examples of the Victorian Era architectural styles remain in those communities, as well as in Little Italy.

Little Italy developed in the same time period. The earliest development of the Little Italy area was by Chinese and Japanese fishermen, who occupied stilt homes along the bay. After the 1905 earthquake in San Francisco, many Portuguese and Italian fishermen moved from San Francisco into the area; it was close to the water and the distance from downtown made land more affordable.

Barrio Logan began as a residential area, but because of proximity to rail freight and shipping freight docks, the area became more mixed with conversion to industrial uses. This area was more suitable to the industrial uses because land values were not as high: topographically the area is more level and not as interesting in terms of views as the areas north of downtown. Various ethnic groups settled in the area because their land ownership was available to them.

San Ysidro began to be developed at about the same time, the turn of the century. The early settlers were followers of the Littlelanders movement. There, the pattern of development was lots designed to accommodate small plots of land for each homeowner to farm as part of a farming-residential cooperative community. Nearby Otay Mesa-Nestor began to be developed by farmers of Germanic and Swiss background. Some of the prime citrus groves in California were in the Otay Mesa-Nestor area; in addition, there were grape growers of Italian heritage who settled in the Otay River Valley and tributary canyons and produced wine for commercial purposes.

At the time downtown was being built, there began to be summer cottage/ retreat development in what are now the Beach communities and La Jolla area. The early structure

in these areas was not of substantial construction; it was primarily temporary vacation housing.

Development spread to the Greater North Park and Mission Hills areas during the early 1900s. The neighborhoods were built as small lots, a single lot at a time; there was not large tract housing development of those neighborhoods. It provided affordable housing away from the downtown area, and development expanded as transportation improved.

There was farming and ranching in Mission Valley until the middle portion of the 20th century when the uses were converted to commercial and residential. There were dairy farms and chicken ranches adjacent to the San Diego River where now there are motels, restaurants, office complexes and regional shopping malls. There was little development north of the San Diego River until Linda Vista was developed as military housing in the 1940s. The federal government improved public facilities and extended water and sewer pipelines to the area. From Linda Vista, development spread north of Mission Valley to the Clairemont Mesa and Kearny Mesa areas. Development in these communities was mixed-use and residential on moderate size lots.

San Diego State University was established in the 1920s; development of the state college area began then and the development of the Navajo community was an outgrowth from the college area and from the west.

Tierrasanta, previously owned by the U.S. Navy, was developed in the 1970s. It was one of the first planned unit developments with segregation of uses. Tierrasanta and many of the communities that have developed since, such as Rancho Peñasquitos and Rancho Bernardo, represent the typical development pattern in San Diego in the last 25 to 30 years: uses are well segregated with commercial uses located along the main thoroughfares, and the residential uses are located in between. Industrial uses are located in planned industrial parks.

Examples of every major period and style remain, although few areas retain neighborhood-level architectural integrity due to several major building booms when older structures were demolished prior to preservation movements and stricter regulations regarding historic structures. Among the recognized styles in San Diego are Spanish Colonial, Pre-Railroad New England, National Vernacular, Victorian Italianate, Stick, Queen Anne, Colonial Revival, Neoclassical, Shingle, Folk Victorian, Mission, Craftsman, Monterey Revival, Italian Renaissance, Spanish Eclectic, Egyptian Revival, Tudor Revival, Modernistic and International (McAlester and McAlester 1990).

Research interests related to the built environment include San Diego's railroad and maritime history, development in relationship to the automobile, the role of recreation in the development of specific industries, as well as the design and implementation of major regional planning and landscaping projects, the role of international fairs on

architecture, landscape architecture and City building; the development of industrial and military technologies between the two world wars; the relationship between climate, terrain, native plant material and local gardening and horticultural practices, planning and subdivision practices from the turn of the century to the present day and the post-war period of suburbanization.

DRAFT

REFERENCES CITED

Almstedt, Ruth

- 1980 Ethnohistoric Documentation of Puerta La Cruz, San Diego County, California. Prepared for the California Department of Transportation, District 11.

Bada, Jeffrey L., Roy A. Schroeder and George F. Carter

- 1974 New Evidence for the Antiquity of Man in North America Deduced from Aspartic Acid Racemization. *Science* 184:791-793.

Bull, Charles S.

- 1983 Shaking the Foundations: The Evidence of San Diego Prehistory. *Cultural Resource Management Center Casual Papers* 1(3): 15-64. Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.
- 1987 A New Proposal: Some Suggestions for San Diego Prehistory. In *San Dieguito - La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy*. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.

Cárdenas, D. Seán

- 1986 Avocado Highlands: An Inland Late La Jolla and Pre-ceramic Yuman Phase Site from Southern San Diego County. *Cultural Resource Management Center Casual Papers* 2(2): 59-84. Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.
- 1987 Some Thoughts on the Origins of Late Prehistoric Populations in San Diego County. Paper presented at the 21st Annual Meeting of the Society for California Archaeology, Fresno.

Carlson, Shawn Bonath

- 1990 The Persistence of Traditional Lifeways in Central Texas. *Historical Archaeology* 24(4):50-59.

Carter, George F.

- 1957 *Pleistocene Man at San Diego*. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press.
- 1980 *Earlier Than You Think: A Personal view of Man in America*. College Station: Texas A & M University Press.

Christenson, Lynne E.

- 1990 The Late Prehistoric Yuman People of San Diego County, California: Their Settlement and Subsistence System. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, Arizona State University.

City of San Diego

- 1989 Progress Guide and General Plan. Revised and updated.

- 1991 "Mitigation Monitoring & Reporting Program."
- 1995 San Diego Land Development Code.
- Various [Online Archive of Historic Context Statements](#)
- Davis, Emma Lou, Clark W. Brott and David L. Weide
- 1969 The Western Lithic Co-Tradition. San Diego Museum Papers No. 6.
- Davis, Emma Lou, and Richard Shutler, Jr.
- 1969 Recent Discoveries of Fluted Points in California and Nevada. Nevada State Museum Anthropological Papers 14:154-169.
- Englehardt, Fr. Zephyrin
- 1920 San Diego Mission. San Francisco: The James H. Barry Co.
- Gallegos, Dennis R.
- 1987 A Review and Synthesis of Environmental and Cultural Material for the Batiquitos Lagoon Region. In San Dieguito - La Jolla: Chronology and Controversy. San Diego County Archaeological Society Research Paper No. 1.
- Garcia, Mario T.
- 1975 Merchants and Dons: San Diego's Attempt at Modernization 1850- 1860. Journal of San Diego History 21 (Winter):52-88.
- Harlow, Neal
- 1982 California Conquered: The Annexation of a Mexican Province 1846-1850. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hector, Susan M.
- 1984 Late Prehistoric Hunter-Gatherer Activities in Southern San Diego County, California. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Anthropology, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Hughes, Charles
- 1975 The Decline of the Californios: The Case of San Diego 1846-1856. Journal of San Diego History 21 (Summer):1-32.
- Jackson, R., M. Boynton, W. Olsen and R. Weaver
- 1988 California Archaeological Resource Identification and Data Acquisition Program: Sparse Lithic Scatters. Sacramento: Office of Historic Preservation.
- Killea, Lucy L.
- 1966 The Political History of a Mexican Pueblo: San Diego from 1825-1845. Journal of San Diego

History 12 (July):5-35.

Luomala, Katharine

1963 Flexibility in Sib Affiliation among the Diegueño. *Ethnology* 2(3):282- 301.

MacPhail, Elizabeth C.

1979 The Story of New San Diego and of its Founder, Alonzo E. Horton. Revised edition, San Diego: San Diego Historical Society.

McAlester, Virginia and Lee McAlester

1990 A Field Guide to American Houses. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Minshall, Herbert L.

1976 The Broken Stones: The Case for Early Man in California. La Jolla: Copley Books.

1983 Geological Support for the Age Deduced by Aspartic Acid Racemization of a Human Skull Fragment from La Jolla Shores, San Diego, California. *Cultural Resource Management Center Casual Papers* 1(3):65-75. Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.

1989 Buchanan Canyon: Ancient Human Presence in the Americas. San Marcos: Slawson Communications.

Mooney, Brian F., Associates

n.d. Historic Properties Background Study for the City of San Diego Clean Water Program. Ms. on file with the City of San Diego Development and Environmental Planning Division, San Diego.

Moratto, Michael

1984 California Archaeology. Orlando: Academic Press.

Moriarty, James R.

1966 Cultural Phase Divisions Suggested by Typological Change Coordinated with Stratigraphically Controlled Radiocarbon dating in San Diego. *Anthropological Journal of Canada* 4(4):20-30.

1967 Transitional Pre-Desert Phase in San Diego, California. *Science* 155:533-556.

1969 The San Dieguito Complex: Suggested Environmental and Cultural Relationships. *Anthropological Journal of Canada* 7(3):2-17.

Moriarty, James R., III, and Herbert L. Minshall

1972 A New Pre-Desert Site Discovered near Texas Street. *Anthropological Journal of Canada* 10(3):10-13.

Neuerberg, Norman

- 1986 The Changing Face of Mission San Diego. The Journal of San Diego History 32(1):1-26.
Newland, James D.
- 1992 The Americanization of the Cultural Landscape of Frontier San Diego 1846-1872.
Unpublished M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.
- Office of Historic Preservation
- 1989 Archaeological Resource Management Reports (ARMR): Recommended Contents and
Format. Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 4(a). Sacramento.
- 1991 Guidelines for Archaeological Research Design. Preservation Planning Bulletin No. 5.
Sacramento.
- 1995 Instructions for Recording Historical Resources. Sacramento.
- Pourade, Richard F.
- 1961 The History of San Diego: Time of the Bells. San Diego: UnionTribune Publishing Co
- 1963 The History of San Diego: The Silver Dons. San Diego: UnionTribune Publishing Co.
- Reeves, Brian O.K.
- 1985 Early Man in the Americas: Who, When, and Why. In Woman, Poet, Scientist: Essays in New
World Anthropology Honoring Dr. Emma Louise Davis, edited by Clark W. Brott, pp. 79-104.
Socorro: Ballena Press.
- Reeves, Brian O.K., John M.D. Pohl and Jason W. Smith
- 1986 The Mission Ridge Site and the Texas Street Question. In New Evidence for the Pleistocene
Peopling of the Americas, edited by Alan L. Bryan, pp. 65-80. Orono: Center for the Study of
Early Man.
- Richman, Irving
- 1911 California Under Spain and Mexico. Boston: Houghlin-Mifflin Company.
- Robbins-Wade, Mary
- 1990 Prehistoric Settlement Patterns of Otay Mesa, San Diego County, California. Unpublished
M.A. thesis, Department of Anthropology, San Diego State University.
- Robinson, Alfred
- 1846 Life in California. New York: Wiley & Putnum.
- Robinson, W.W.
- 1948 Land in California. Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Rogers, Malcolm J.
- 1929 The Stone Art of the San Dieguito Plateau. American Anthropologist 31:454-467.

- 1945 An Outline of Yuman Prehistory. *Southwestern Journal of Anthropology* 1:167-198.
- 1966 *Ancient Hunters of the Far West*. San Diego: Union-Tribune Publishing.
- Rosen, Martin D.
- 1994 125-South Historic Properties Survey Report, 11-SD-125, 0.0/9.6, 11221/926475, 9.6/11.2, 11221/001400 (4 vols.). San Diego: California Department of Transportation.
- Rubertone, Patricia E.
- 1989 Landscape as Artifact: Comments on "The Archaeological Use of Landscape Treatment in Social, Economic and Ideological Analysis". *Historical Archaeology* 23(1):5-54.
- San Diego Union
- 1873 June 15, 1873 Issue.
- Secretary of the U.S. Department of Interior
- 1995 "Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation."
- Shipek, Florence
- 1963 Kumeyaay (Diegueño-Kamia) Land Use and Agriculture. Report to Attorneys' Docket 80, Mission Indian Land Claims Case.
- 1989 An Example of Intensive Plant Husbandry: The Kumeyaay of Southern California. In *Foraging and Farming*, edited by Davis R. Harris and Gordon C. Hillman. London: Uniwin Hyman.
- Spier, Leslie
- 1928 Southern Diegueño Customs. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology* 20:292-358.
- Smythe, William E.
- 1908 *The History of San Diego 1542- 1908: An Account of the Rise and Progress of the Pioneer Settlement on the Pacific Coast of the United States*. San Diego: The History Company.
- State of California
- 1992 CEQA: California Environmental Quality Act Statutes and Guidelines. Office of Planning and Research, Office of Permit Assistance, Sacramento.
- Stewart-Abernathy, Leslie C.
- 1986 Urban Farmsteads: Household Responsibilities in the City. *Historical Archaeology* 20(2):5-15.
- Taylor, R.E., L.A. Payen, C.A. Prior, P.J. Slota, Jr., R. Gillespie, J.A.J. Gowlett, R.E.M. Hedges, A.J.T. Jull, T.H. Zabel, D.J. Donahue and R. Berger

- 1985 Major Revisions in the Pleistocene Age Assignments for North American Skeletons by C-14 Accelerator Mass Spectrometry: None Older than 11,000 C-14 Years B.P. *American Antiquity* 50:136-140.
- True, D.L.
- 1970 Investigation of a Late Prehistoric Complex in Cuyamaca Rancho State Park, San Diego County, California. *Archaeological Survey Monographs No. 1*. University of Great Basin Anthropology 4:233- 261.
- 1980 The Pauma Complex in Northern San Diego County: 1978. *Journal of New World Archaeology* 2(4:1-39).
- 1986 Molpa, a Late Prehistoric Site in Northern San Diego county: The San Luis Rey Complex, 1983. In *Symposium: A New Look at Some Old Sites*, edited by Gary S. Breschini and Trudy Haversat, pp. 29-36. Salinas: Coyote Press.
- True, D.L., and Eleanor Beemer
- 1982 Two Milling Stone Inventories from Northern San Diego County, California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 4:233-261
- True, D.L., and R. Pankey
- 1985 Radiocarbon Dates for the Pauma Complex Component at the Pankey Site, Northern San Diego County, California. *Journal of California and Great Basin Anthropology* 7:240-244.
- U.S. Department of Interior, National Park Service
- 1986 National Register Bulletin 16. Guidelines for Completing National Register of Historic Places Forms.
- Van Wormer, Stephen R.
- 1995 "Test Excavations of the Suspected Location of the Juan Maria Marron Adobe, Old Town San Diego, California." Ms. on file, Planning and Development Review Department, City of San Diego.
- Warren, Claude N.
- 1966 The San Dieguito Type Site: Malcolm J. Rogers' 1938 Excavation on the San Dieguito River. *San Diego Museum Papers No. 5*.
- 1967 The San Dieguito Complex: A Review and Hypothesis. *American Antiquity* 32:168-185.
- 1968 Cultural Tradition and Ecological Adaptation on the Southern California Coast. In *Archaic Prehistory in the Western United States*, edited by C. Irwin-Williams. *Eastern New Mexico Contributions in Anthropology* 1(3): 1-14.
- Waugh, Mary Georgie
- 1986 Intensification and Land-use: Archaeological Indications of Transition and Transformation

in a Late Prehistoric Complex in Southern California. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation,
Department of Anthropology, University of California, Davis.

Williams, Jack

1994 Personal interview with James D. Newland (September 16, 1994).

DRAFT

RESOLUTION NUMBER R-_____

ADOPTED ON _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN
DIEGO AMENDING THE GENERAL PLAN HISTORIC
PRESERVATION ELEMENT AND APPENDIX F RELATING
TO THE PRESERVATION AND PROGRESS INITIATIVE.

RECITALS

The Council of the City of San Diego (Council) adopts this Resolution based on the following:

- A. The General Plan is the constitution for development and foundation for all land use decisions in the City of San Diego.
- B. The General Plan was adopted in 2008 and was subsequently amended in 2010, 2012, 2015, 2018, 2021, 2022, and 2024.
- C. The General Plan includes a Historic Preservation Element that that establishes goals to identify the historical resources of the City, preserve the City's important historical resources, and integrate historic preservation planning in the larger planning process, and includes a suite of policies that further those goals.
- D. Preservation and Progress is a comprehensive update to the City's Heritage Preservation program that will streamline processes for new homes and other uses while protecting places of historic, architectural and cultural importance and encouraging their adaptive reuse.
- E. The goals of Preservation and Progress are to advance equity in preservation and prioritize protection of resources important to BIPOC, LGBTQ+ and other historically marginalized communities; evaluate the Mills Act program to ensure the program is equitable and

incentivizes the protection and restoration of important places in a fiscally responsible manner; identify and protect historical properties and districts that are important to the City's history and culture, with a focus on historic districts; reform permit processes to better encourage the adaptive reuse of historical buildings on their original sites; adopt design standards for historical properties and districts to provide clear, objective requirements and by-right approval for additions and new development; and remove regulations that unnecessarily impact properties that lack historical or cultural importance.

F. To advance the comprehensive update in a timely and thoughtful manner, Preservation and Progress has been divided into Package A and Package B.

G. Package A includes amendments to the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan that updates information regarding relevant Federal and State legislation; removes summaries of the City's historic preservation regulations; and updated policies that address tribal cultural resources, equity, the identification and preservation of culturally significant resources, the need for objective design requirements, and sustainability and climate resilience.

H. Package A includes amendments to the summary of San Diego history in Appendix F of the General Plan to update and expand the discussion of tribal cultural history and prehistory, and to add information regarding the factors that led to segregation and integration of race and socio-economic status, with a reference to the more detailed discussion provided in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.

H. The Planning Commission recommended adoption of Preservation and Progress Package A.

I. On XXXX XX, 2026 the City Council held a public hearing to consider amendments to the General Plan and other actions.

J. The City Council has considered the Planning Commission record and recommendation as well as the maps, exhibits, and written documents contained in the file for these updates on record in the City and has considered the oral presentations given at the public hearing.

K. The Office of the City Attorney has drafted this resolution based on information provided by City staff with the understanding that this information is complete and accurate.

ACTION ITEMS

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of San Diego:

1. The Council hereby adopts the amendments to the Historic Preservation Element and Appendix F of the General Plan a copy of which is on file in the office of the City Clerk as Document No. RR-_____.

2. That before becoming effective, this Resolution shall be submitted to the San Diego County Regional Airport Authority serving as the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) for a consistency determination.

3. That if the ALUC determines that this resolution is consistent with the Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans (ALUCPs) for Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Miramar, Naval Air Station (NAS) North Island, Naval Outlying Field (NOLF) Imperial Beach, San Diego International Airport, Montgomery Gibbs Executive Airport, Brown Field and Gillespie Field, this resolution shall take effect and be in force on the thirtieth day from and after the finding of consistency.

4. That if the ALUC determines that this resolution is inconsistent or conditionally consistent subject to modifications with the ALUCPs for MCAS Miramar, NAS North Island, NOLF Imperial Beach, San Diego International Airport, Montgomery Gibbs Executive Airport, Brown Field, and Gillespie Field, the Resolution shall be submitted to the City Council for reconsideration.

5. That if the ALUC determines that this resolution is conditionally consistent with the ALUCPs for MCAS Miramar, NAS North Island, NOLF Imperial Beach, San Diego International Airport, Montgomery Gibbs Executive Airport, Brown Field, and Gillespie Field, but that consistency is subject to proposed modifications, the City Council may amend this Resolution to accept the proposed modifications and this Resolution shall take effect and be in force on the thirtieth day from and after the finding of consistency.

6. That a proposed decision by the City Council to overrule a determination of inconsistency or to reject the proposed modifications for a finding of conditional consistency shall include the findings required pursuant to California Public Utilities Code section 21670 and require a two-thirds vote. The proposed decision and findings shall be forwarded to the ALUC, the California Department of Transportation, Division of Aeronautics, and the airport operators for MCAS Miramar, NAS North Island, NOLF Imperial Beach, San Diego International Airport, Montgomery Gibbs Executive Airport, Brown Field, and Gillespie Field. The City Council shall hold a second hearing not less than 45 days from the date the proposed decision and findings were provided, at which hearing any comments submitted by the public agencies shall be considered and a final decision to overrule a determination of inconsistency by the ALUC shall require a two-thirds vote.

7. That if the City Council makes a final decision to overrule a determination of inconsistency, this Resolution shall take effect and be in force on the thirtieth day from and after the finding of consistency by the ALUC.

APPROVED: CITY ATTORNEY: HEATHER FERBERT, City Attorney

By:

DRAFT

Page Intentionally Blank

Preservation and Progress: Package A
DRAFT Land Development Code Amendments
October 27, 2025

§111.0206 Historical Resources Board

- (a) [No change in text.]
- (b) Appointment and Terms
 - (1) The Historical Resources Board shall consist of 11 members, each appointed by the Mayor and subject to confirmation by the City Council. Each member shall serve a 2-year term without compensation and shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed. No member shall serve more than 4 consecutive terms. The members shall be appointed so that the terms of not more than 6 members will expire in any year. The expiration date of all terms of appointment shall be March 1. The Mayor may designate 1 member as Chairperson during March of each year. If the Mayor has not designated a chairperson by April 15³⁰, the Board shall elect a Chairperson from among its members.
 - (2) At least one Board member shall be appointed from among professionals in each of the following five historic preservation-related disciplines as required to meet the “Certified Local Government” criteria of the State Office of Historic Preservation, as established by the National Historic Preservation Act: architecture, history, architectural history, archaeology, and landscape architecture. If a qualified volunteer cannot be found to fill one of the five professional Board positions, that Board position may be filled by a second professional from one of the other four historic preservation-related disciplines. However, no more than two professional Board positions should be filled by professionals in the same historic preservation-related field. Other Board members appointed may have experience or background in law, real estate, engineering, general contracting, finance, planning, or fine arts and should reflect diverse neighborhood representation and have demonstrated a special interest in historical preservation. No more than three owners of *designated historical resources* shall serve at any time.
- (c) through (d) [No change in text.]

§123.0202 Designation Process for Historical Resources

- (a) [No change in text.]
- (b) Public Notice to ~~Owner~~Record Owner. ~~The owner of a property being considered for designation by the Historical Resources Board shall be notified~~ The City Manager shall mail a notice to the *record owner* of the property being considered for designation at least 10 *business days* before the Board hearing. Notice to the ~~owner~~ *record owner* shall contain information about the potential impacts of designation; the date, time, and place of the Board hearing; a brief description of the general procedures concerning the conduct of the Board hearing; the procedures and requirements for filing an appeal; and how ~~and a request~~ to contact the Board's administrative staff regarding information for making a presentation to the Board on the proposed designation. No action shall be taken by the Board to designate a *historical resource* except at a public hearing that provides all interested parties an opportunity to be heard.
- (c) Adequacy of Research Report. The decision on whether or not to designate a historical resource shall be based on the information in a research report, as specified in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual. If the Board determines, either by public testimony or other documentary evidence presented to it, that the research report is not adequate to assess the significance of the historical resource, the Board may continue its consideration of the property for up to two regular meetings and direct that a research report be prepared by the *applicant* with specific direction from staff as to the inadequacies of the original report. The revised research report may be prepared by City staff or volunteers, with a copy provided to the *record owner* at least 10 business days before the next Board meeting at which the designation will be considered. If a final decision is not made within 90 calendar days ~~of receipt of a nomination for designation~~ from the first Historical Resources Board meeting in which the designation is considered, the consideration of the property for designation by the Board shall terminate unless a continuance has been granted at the request of the ~~owner~~record owner.
- (d) through (g) [No change in text.]

§123.0203 Appeal From Historical Resources Board Decision

A decision by the Historical Resources Board to designate a property may be

appealed to the City Council in accordance with this section. No other actions of the Board may be appealed.

(a) The Historical Resources Board's action to designate a property may be appealed to the City Council by an *applicant* or an *interested person* on any of the following grounds:

(1) Factual Error. The materials or information provided to the Historical Resources Board at the designation hearing were inaccurate; or

(2) New Information. New information relevant to the property's eligibility for historic designation is available to the *applicant* or the *interested person* that was not available through that person's reasonable efforts or due diligence at the time of the designation hearing; or

(3) Findings Not Supported. The Board's stated findings to designate in accordance with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Register historic designation criteria as specified in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual and the Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria in the appendices of the Historical Resources Guidelines are not supported by the information provided to the Board; or

(4) Violation of bylaws. In making the designation decision, the Board or an individual member did not adhere to the Board's bylaws or hearing procedures.

(ab) ~~The action of A decision by the Historical Resources Board in the designation process to designate a property is final 11 business days following the decision of the Board unless an appeal to the City Council is filed with the City Clerk no later than 10 business days after the action decision of the Board. The decision of the Historical Resources Board may be appealed by an *applicant* or an *interested person*. An appeal shall be in writing and shall specify wherein there was error in the decision of the Board. The City Council may reject designation on the basis of factual errors in materials or information presented to the Board, violations of bylaws or hearing procedures by the Board or individual member, or presentation of new information.~~

(c) An application for an appeal shall be submitted to the City Clerk in writing and contain the following information:

(1) The name, address, and telephone number of the person filing the appeal and information that establishes the basis on which the appellant is an *interested person*;

- (2) The name of the *record owner*;
 - (3) The name of the *applicant*;
 - (4) The decision being appealed and the date of the decision;
 - (5) The specific grounds, clearly identified, upon which the appellant is filing the appeal. All grounds must be specified in the appeal.
 - (6) Any information or exhibits supporting the appeal that are available at the time the appeal is filed.
- (b~~d~~) Upon the filing of the appeal, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing ~~as soon as is practicable~~ no later than 180 calendar days after the date on which the application for appeal is filed and shall give written notice by mail to the ~~property owner~~ *record owner* and the appellant of the location, time and date set for the hearing; as well as a brief description of the general procedures concerning the conduct of the appeal hearing. Failure to hold the hearing within the time frames specified above shall not limit the authority of the City Council to consider the appeal. At the public hearing on the appeal, the City Council may by resolution affirm, reverse, or modify the determination of the Board and shall make written *findings* in support of its decision.
- (e~~e~~) The appellant may withdraw an appeal at any time prior to the commencement of the public hearing before the City Council. The withdrawal of the appeal must be in writing and filed with the City Clerk. If the appellant withdraws an appeal, no appeal hearing will be conducted. The withdrawal of an appeal does not entitle the appellant to any refund of appeal-related costs or fees incurred as of the date of the withdrawal.

§123.0206 State and National Register

- (a) Upon receipt of a request from the California Office of Historic Preservation, the Historical Resources Board shall review a nomination for inclusion of a resource in the National Register of Historic Places and shall provide a recommendation whether the nominated resource meets the criteria for listing in the National Register. The recommendation shall be provided to the City Manager for conveyance to the State Historic Resources Commission consistent with the City's obligations as a Certified Local Government and the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act.
- (b) If a nomination to the National Register of Historic Places or

California Register of Historical Resources is prepared by the City of San Diego, the City Council shall may consider endorsing the nomination prior to submittal to the State Office of Historic Preservation of a *historical resource* for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places upon recommendation of the Historical Resources Board.

§143.1002 Application of Complete Communities Housing Solutions Regulations

- (a) [No change in text.]
- (b) The regulations in this Division shall not apply to the following types of *development*:
 - (1) through (5) [No change in text.]
 - (6) *Development* located within a designated *historical district* ~~or subject to the Old Town San Diego Planned District.~~ with the following exceptions:
 - (A) *Development* on properties that are not designated as contributing resources to the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District; and
 - (B) *Development* on properties that are not designated as contributing resources to the Chinese Asian Thematic Historical District.
 - (7) *Development* that is subject to the Old Town San Diego Planned District.
 - ~~(7)~~(8) *Development* that includes visitor accommodation, except an SRO hotel.

(c) through (f) [No change in text.]

Page Intentionally Blank

ORDINANCE NUMBER O-_____ (NEW
SERIES) DATE OF FINAL PASSAGE _____

ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 11, ARTICLE 1,
DIVISION 2 OF THE SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL CODE
BY AMENDING SECTION 111.0206(b); AMENDING
CHAPTER 12, ARTICLE 3, DIVISION 2 BY AMENDING
SECTIONS 123.0202, 123.0203 AND 123.0206; AND
AMENDING CHAPTER 14, ARTICLE 3, DIVISION 10
BY AMENDING SECTION 143.1002, RELATED TO
PRESERVATION AND PROGRESS PACKAGE A

RECITALS

The Council of the City of San Diego (Council) adopts this Ordinance based on the following:

A. By Ordinance O-18451 (Dec. 9, 1997), the Council adopted a comprehensive update to the Land Development Code, which included regulations specifying the composition, powers and duties of the Historical Resources Board in Chapter 11, Article 1, Division 2, as well as the procedures for designating historical resources in Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2.

B. By Ordinance O-19526 (Aug. 6, 2006) and Ordinance O-19557 (Dec. 15, 2006), the Council amended Chapter 11, Article 1, Division 2 and Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2 relating to the composition of the Historical Resources Board.

C. By Ordinance O-21275 (Dec. 9, 2020), the Council adopted the Complete Communities: Housing Solutions Regulations, codified in Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 10, to provide a floor area ratio-based density bonus incentive program for development within Transit Priority Areas that provides housing for very low income, low income, or moderate income households and provides neighborhood-serving infrastructure amenities.

D. By Ordinance O-21416 (Jan. 27, 2022), Ordinance O-21528 (Sep. 21, 2022), Ordinance O-21618 (Mar. 7, 2023), Ordinance O-21758 (Jan. 16, 2024), Ordinance O-21836 (Jul. 22, 2024), the Council amended the Complete Communities: Housing Solutions Regulations codified in Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 10.

E. Preservation and Progress is a comprehensive update to the City's Heritage Preservation program that will streamline processes for new homes and other uses while protecting places of historic, architectural and cultural importance and encouraging their adaptive reuse.

F. The goals of Preservation and Progress are to advance equity in preservation and prioritize protection of resources important to BIPOC, LGBTQ+ and other historically marginalized communities; evaluate the Mills Act program to ensure the program is equitable and incentivizes the protection and restoration of important places in a fiscally responsible manner; identify and protect historical properties and districts that are important to the City's history and culture, with a focus on historic districts; reform permit processes to better encourage the adaptive reuse of historical buildings on their original sites; adopt design standards for historical properties and districts to provide clear, objective requirements and by-right approval for additions and new development; and remove regulations that unnecessarily impact properties that lack historical or cultural importance.

G. To advance the comprehensive update in a timely and thoughtful manner, Preservation and Progress has been divided into Package A and Package B.

H. Package A includes amendments to the City's Land Development Code that 1) address the timing of the selection of a Chairperson by the Historical Resources Board in the absence of a Mayoral appointment; 2) provide flexibility in the Board appointment process if a qualified volunteer cannot be found to fill one of the five professional Board positions by allowing the position to be filled by a second professional from one of the other four historic preservation-related disciplines; 3) modify the historic designation appeal process by adding a new finding that would expand the authority and discretion of the City Council in hearing an appeal, and allow the appeal of decisions to not designate by the record owner; and 4) clarify that in regard to thematic historic districts, the Complete Communities: Housing Solutions Regulations are not applicable only on contributing resources to the thematic historic district.

I. The Office of the City Attorney has drafted this Ordinance based on the information provided by City staff with the understanding that this information is complete and accurate.

ACTION ITEMS

Be it ordained by the Council of the City of San Diego:

Section 1. Chapter 11, Article 1, Division 2 of the San Diego Municipal Code is amended by amending section 111.0206, to read as follows:

§111.0206 Historical Resources Board

- (a) [No change in text.]
- (b) Appointment and Terms
 - (1) The Historical Resources Board shall consist of 11 members, each appointed by the Mayor and subject to confirmation by the City Council. Each member shall serve a 2-year term without compensation and shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed. No member shall serve more than 4 consecutive terms. The members shall be appointed so that the terms of not more than 6 members will expire in any year. The expiration date of all terms of appointment shall be March 1. The Mayor may designate 1 member as Chairperson during March of each year. If the Mayor has not designated a chairperson by April 30, the Board shall elect a Chairperson from among its members.
 - (2) At least one Board member shall be appointed from among professionals in each of the following five historic preservation-related disciplines as required to meet the “Certified Local Government” criteria of the State Office of Historic Preservation, as established by the National Historic Preservation Act: architecture, history, architectural history, archaeology, and landscape architecture. If a qualified volunteer cannot be found to fill one of the five professional Board positions, that Board position may be filled by a second professional from one of the other four historic preservation-related disciplines. However, no more than two professional Board positions should be filled by professionals in the same historic preservation-related field. Other Board members appointed may have experience or background in law, real estate, engineering, general contracting, finance, planning, or fine arts and should reflect diverse neighborhood representation and have demonstrated a special interest in historical preservation. No more than three owners of *designated historical resources* shall serve at any time.
- (c) through (d) [No change in text.]

Section 2. Chapter 12, Article 3, Division 2 of the San Diego Municipal Code is amended by amending sections 123.0202, 123.0203 and 123.0206, to read as follows:

§123.0202 Designation Process for Historical Resources

- (a) [No change in text.]
- (b) Public Notice to *Record Owner*. The City Manager shall mail a notice to the *record owner* of the property being considered for designation at least 10 *business days* before the Board hearing. Notice to the *record owner* shall contain information about the potential impacts of designation; the date, time, and place of the Board hearing; a brief description of the general procedures concerning the conduct of the Board hearing; the procedures and requirements for filing an appeal; and how to contact the Board's administrative staff regarding information for making a presentation to the Board on the proposed designation. No action shall be taken by the Board to designate a *historical resource* except at a public hearing that provides all interested parties an opportunity to be heard.
- (c) Adequacy of Research Report. The decision on whether or not to designate a historical resource shall be based on the information in a research report, as specified in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual. If the Board determines, either by public testimony or other documentary evidence presented to it, that the research report is not adequate to assess the significance of the historical resource, the Board may continue its consideration of the property for up to two regular meetings and direct that a research report be prepared by the *applicant* with specific direction from staff as to the inadequacies of the original report. The revised research report may be prepared by City staff or volunteers, with a copy provided to the *record owner* at least 10 business days before the next Board meeting at which the designation will be considered. If a final decision is not made within 90 calendar days from the first Historical Resources Board meeting in which the property is considered, the consideration of the property by the Board shall terminate unless a continuance has been granted at the request of the *record owner*.
- (d) through (g) [No change in text.]

§123.0203 Appeal From Historical Resources Board Decision

A decision by the Historical Resources Board to designate a property may be appealed to the City Council in accordance with this section. No other actions of the Board may be appealed.

- (a) The Historical Resources Board's action to designate a property may be appealed to the City Council by an *applicant* or an *interested person* on any of the following

grounds:

- (1) Factual Error. The materials or information provided to the Historical Resources Board at the designation hearing were inaccurate; or
 - (2) New Information. New information relevant to the property's eligibility for historic designation is available to the applicant or the interested person that was not available through that person's reasonable efforts or due diligence at the time of the designation hearing; or
 - (3) *Findings* Not Supported. The Board's stated findings to designate in accordance with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Register historic designation criteria as specified in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual and the Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria in the appendices of the Historical Resources Guidelines are not supported by the information provided to the Board; or
 - (4) Violation of bylaws. In making the designation decision, the Board or an individual member did not adhere to the Board's bylaws or hearing procedures.
- (b) A decision by the Historical Resources Board to designate a property is final 11 *business days* following the decision of the Board unless an appeal to the City Council is filed with the City Clerk no later than 10 *business days* after the decision of the Board.
- (c) An application for an appeal shall be submitted to the City Clerk in writing and contain the following information:
- (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the person filing the appeal and information that establishes the basis on which the appellant is an *interested person*;
 - (2) The name of the *record owner*;
 - (3) The name of the *applicant*;
 - (4) The decision being appealed and the date of the decision;
 - (5) The specific grounds, clearly identified, upon which the appellant is filing the appeal. All grounds must be specified in the appeal.
 - (6) Any information or exhibits supporting the appeal that are available at the time the appeal is filed.
- (d) Upon the filing of the appeal, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing no later than 180 calendar days after the date on which the application for appeal is filed and shall give written notice by mail to the *record owner* and

the appellant of the location, time and date set for the hearing as well as a brief description of the general procedures concerning the conduct of the appeal hearing. Failure to hold the hearing within the time frames specified above shall not limit the authority of the City Council to consider the appeal. At the public hearing on the appeal, the City Council may by resolution affirm, reverse, or modify the determination of the Board and shall make written *findings* in support of its decision.

- (e) The appellant may withdraw an appeal at any time prior to the commencement of the public hearing before the City Council. The withdrawal of the appeal must be in writing and filed with the City Clerk. If the appellant withdraws an appeal, no appeal hearing will be conducted. The withdrawal of an appeal does not entitle the appellant to any refund of appeal-related costs or fees incurred as of the date of the withdrawal.

§123.0206 State and National Register

- (a) Upon receipt of a request from the California Office of Historic Preservation, the Historical Resources Board shall review a nomination for inclusion of a resource in the National Register of Historic Places and shall provide a recommendation whether the nominated resource meets the criteria for listing in the National Register. The recommendation shall be provided to the City Manager for conveyance to the State Historic Resources Commission consistent with the City's obligations as a Certified Local Government and the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act.
- (b) If a nomination to the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources is prepared by the City of San Diego, the City Council may consider endorsing the nomination prior to submittal to the State Office of Historic Preservation.

Section 3. Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 10 of the San Diego Municipal Code is amended by amending section 143.1002, to read as follows:

§143.1002 Application of Complete Communities Housing Solutions Regulations

- (a) [No change in text.]
- (b) The regulations in this Division shall not apply to the following types of *development*:
 - (1) through (5) [No change in text.]
 - (6) *Development* located within a designated *historical district* with the following exceptions:
 - (A) *Development* on properties that are not designated as contributing

resources to the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District;
and

(B) *Development* on properties that are not designated as contributing
resources to the Chinese Asian Thematic Historical District.

(7) *Development* that is subject to the Old Town San Diego Planned District.

(8) *Development* that includes visitor accommodation, except an SRO *hotel*.

(c) through (f) [No change in text.]

Section 4. The Council dispenses with a full reading of this Ordinance before its passage because a written copy of this Ordinance was made available to the Council and the public before the date of its passage.

Section 5. This Ordinance will take effect and be in force on the thirtieth day from and after its final passage.

APPROVED: HEATHER FERBERT, City Attorney

STRIKEOUT ORDINANCE

OLD LANGUAGE: ~~Struck-Out~~

NEW LANGUAGE: Double Underline

ORDINANCE NUMBER O-_____(NEW
SERIES) DATE OF FINAL PASSAGE _____

ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 11, ARTICLE 1,
DIVISION 2 OF THE SAN DIEGO MUNICIPAL CODE
BY AMENDING SECTION 111.0206(b); AMENDING
CHAPTER 12, ARTICLE 3, DIVISION 2 BY AMENDING
SECTIONS 123.0202, 123.0203 AND 123.0206; AND
AMENDING CHAPTER 14, ARTICLE 3, DIVISION 10
BY AMENDING SECTION 143.1002, RELATED TO
PRESERVATION AND PROGRESS PACKAGE A

§111.0206 Historical Resources Board

- (a) [No change in text.]
- (b) Appointment and Terms
 - (1) The Historical Resources Board shall consist of 11 members, each appointed by the Mayor and subject to confirmation by the City Council. Each member shall serve a 2-year term without compensation and shall continue to serve until a successor is appointed. No member shall serve more than 4 consecutive terms. The members shall be appointed so that the terms of not more than 6 members will expire in any year. The expiration date of all terms of appointment shall be March 1. The Mayor may designate 1 member as Chairperson during March of each year. If the Mayor has not designated a chairperson by April 15~~30~~, the Board shall elect a Chairperson from among its members.
 - (2) At least one Board member shall be appointed from among professionals in each of the following five historic preservation-related disciplines as required to meet the “Certified Local Government” criteria of the State Office of Historic Preservation, as established by the National Historic Preservation Act: architecture, history, architectural history, archaeology, and landscape architecture. If a qualified volunteer cannot be found to fill one of the five professional Board positions, that Board position may be filled by a second professional from one of the other four historic preservation-related disciplines. However, no more than two professional Board positions should be filled by professionals in the same historic preservation-related field. Other Board members appointed may have experience or background in law, real estate, engineering, general contracting, finance, planning, or fine arts and

should reflect diverse neighborhood representation and have demonstrated a special interest in historical preservation. No more than three owners of *designated historical resources* shall serve at any time.

(c) through (d) [No change in text.]

§123.0202 Designation Process for Historical Resources

(a) [No change in text.]

- (b) Public Notice to ~~Owner~~Record Owner. ~~The owner of a property being considered for designation by the Historical Resources Board shall be notified~~ The City Manager shall mail a notice to the record owner of the property being considered for designation at least 10 business days before the Board hearing. Notice to the owner record owner shall contain information about the potential impacts of designation; the date, time, and place of the Board hearing; a brief description of the general procedures concerning the conduct of the Board hearing; the procedures and requirements for filing an appeal; and how and a request to contact the Board's administrative staff regarding information for making a presentation to the Board on the proposed designation. No action shall be taken by the Board to designate a historical resource except at a public hearing that provides all interested parties an opportunity to be heard.
- (c) Adequacy of Research Report. The decision on whether or not to designate a historical resource shall be based on the information in a research report, as specified in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual. If the Board determines, either by public testimony or other documentary evidence presented to it, that the research report is not adequate to assess the significance of the historical resource, the Board may continue its consideration of the property for up to two regular meetings and direct that a research report be prepared by the ~~applicant~~applicant with specific direction from staff as to the inadequacies of the original report. The revised research report may be prepared by City staff or volunteers, with a copy provided to the ~~owner~~record owner at least 10 business days before the next Board meeting at which the designation will be considered. If a final decision is not made within 90 calendar days of receipt of a nomination for designation from the first Historical Resources Board meeting in which the property is considered, the consideration of the property by the Board shall terminate unless a continuance has been granted at the request of the ~~property owner~~record owner.

(d) through (g) [No change in text.]

§123.0203 Appeal From Historical Resources Board Decision

A decision by the Historical Resources Board to designate a property may be appealed to the City Council in accordance with this section. No other actions of the Board may be appealed.

(a) The Historical Resources Board's action to designate a property may be appealed to the City Council by an *applicant* or an *interested person* on any of the following grounds:

- (1) Factual Error. The materials or information provided to the Historical Resources Board at the designation hearing were inaccurate; or
- (2) New Information. New information relevant to the property's eligibility for historic designation is available to the applicant or the interested person that was not available through that person's reasonable efforts or due diligence at the time of the designation hearing; or
- (3) Findings Not Supported. The Board's stated findings to designate in accordance with the City of San Diego Historical Resources Register historic designation criteria as specified in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual and the Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria in the appendices of the Historical Resources Guidelines are not supported by the information provided to the Board; or
- (4) Violation of bylaws. In making the designation decision, the Board or an individual member did not adhere to the Board's bylaws or hearing procedures.

(ab) ~~The action of A decision by the Historical Resources Board in the designation process to designate a property is final 11 business days following the decision of the Board unless an appeal to the City Council is filed with the City Clerk no later than 10 business days after the action decision of the Board. The decision of the Historical Resources Board may be appealed by an *applicant* or an *interested person*. An appeal shall be in writing and shall specify wherein there was error in the decision of the Board. The City Council may reject designation on the basis of factual errors in materials or information presented to the Board, violations of bylaws or hearing procedures by the Board or individual member, or presentation of new information.~~

(c) An application for an appeal shall be submitted to the City Clerk in writing and contain the following information:

- (1) The name, address, and telephone number of the person filing the appeal and information that establishes the basis on which the appellant is an *interested person*;
- (2) The name of the *record owner*;
- (3) The name of the *applicant*;
- (4) The decision being appealed and the date of the decision;
- (5) The specific grounds, clearly identified, upon which the appellant is filing

the appeal. All grounds must be specified in the appeal.

6) Any information or exhibits supporting the appeal that are available at the time the appeal is filed.

- (bd) Upon the filing of the appeal, the City Clerk shall set the matter for public hearing ~~as soon as is practicable~~ no later than 180 calendar days after the date on which the application for appeal is filed and shall give written notice by mail to the ~~property owner~~ record owner and the appellant of the location, time and date set for the hearing; as well as a brief description of the general procedures concerning the conduct of the appeal hearing. Failure to hold the hearing within the time frames specified above shall not limit the authority of the City Council to consider the appeal. At the public hearing on the appeal, the City Council may by resolution affirm, reverse, or modify the determination of the Board and shall make written *findings* in support of its decision.
- (ee) The appellant may withdraw an appeal at any time prior to the commencement of the public hearing before the City Council. The withdrawal of the appeal must be in writing and filed with the City Clerk. If the appellant withdraws an appeal, no appeal hearing will be conducted. The withdrawal of an appeal does not entitle the appellant to any refund of appeal-related costs or fees incurred as of the date of the withdrawal.

§123.0206 State and National Register

- (a) Upon receipt of a request from the California Office of Historic Preservation, the Historical Resources Board shall review a nomination for inclusion of a resource in the National Register of Historic Places and shall provide a recommendation whether the nominated resource meets the criteria for listing in the National Register. The recommendation shall be provided to the City Manager for conveyance to the State Historic Resources Commission consistent with the City's obligations as a Certified Local Government and the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act.
- (b) If a nomination to the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historical Resources is prepared by the City of San Diego, the City Council shall may consider endorsing the nomination prior to submittal to the State Office of Historic Preservation of a ~~historical resource~~ for inclusion in the California Register of Historic Resources and the National Register of Historic Places upon recommendation of the Historical Resources Board.

§143.1002 Application of Complete Communities Housing Solutions Regulations

- (a) [No change in text.]
- (b) The regulations in this Division shall not apply to the following types of *development*:

(1) through (5) [No change in text.]

(6) *Development* located within a designated *historical district* ~~or subject to the Old Town San Diego Planned District.~~, with the following exceptions:

(A) *Development* on properties that are not designated as contributing resources to the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District; and

(B) *Development* on properties that are not designated as contributing resources to the Chinese Asian Thematic Historical District.

(7) *Development* that is subject to the Old Town San Diego Planned District.

~~(7)~~(8) *Development* that includes visitor accommodation, except an SRO *hotel*.

(c) through (f) [No change in text.]

Section 4. The Council dispenses with a full reading of this Ordinance before its passage because a written copy of this Ordinance was made available to the Council and the public before the date of its passage.

Section 5. This Ordinance will take effect and be in force on the thirtieth day from and after its final passage.

APPROVED: HEATHER FERBERT, City Attorney

RESOLUTION NUMBER R-XXXXXXX

ADOPTED ON _____

A RESOLUTION OF THE SAN DIEGO CITY COUNCIL
AMENDING PORTIONS OF THE SPECIAL INTEREST-
BEARING HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND RESOLUTION
(R-305067)

RECITALS

The Council of the City of San Diego (Council) adopts this Resolution based on the following:

- A. The General Plan is the constitution for development and foundation for all land use decisions in the City of San Diego.
- B. The General Plan was adopted in 2008 and was subsequently amended in 2010, 2012, 2015, 2018, 2021, 2022, and 2024.
- C. The General Plan includes a Historic Preservation Element that that establishes goals to identify the historical resources of the City, preserve the City's important historical resources, and integrate historic preservation planning in the larger planning process, and includes a suite of policies that further those goals.
- D. As adopted in 2008, the General Plan Historic Preservation Element includes policy HP-B.3a to: "Create a historic preservation fund that provides a monetary source for local preservation incentives such as an architectural assistance program and archaeological site protection plan. The fund may be supported through grants, private or public donations, or other sources."

E. By Resolution R-305067 (July 7, 2009), the Council of the City of San Diego adopted Resolution 305067 which 1) authorized the Comptroller to establish a special interest-bearing fund, titled “Historic Preservation Fund,” for any and all potential grants, donations, fines, penalties, or other sources of funding for the purpose of historic preservation; 2) authorized the Comptroller to appropriate funds from the Historic Preservation Fund for the purpose of funding local historic preservation programs and incentives, including but not limited to, architectural assistance programs, archaeological site protection plans, or other historic preservation programs or incentives consistent with the City of San Diego General Plan and Action Plan; and 3) required that monies shall go to Council through the budget approval process before any funds are expended.

F. Preservation and Progress is a comprehensive update to the City’s Heritage Preservation program that will streamline processes for new homes and other uses while protecting places of historic, architectural and cultural importance and encouraging their adaptive reuse.

G. The goals of Preservation and Progress are to advance equity in preservation and prioritize protection of resources important to BIPOC, LGBTQ+ and other historically marginalized communities; evaluate the Mills Act program to ensure the program is equitable and incentivizes the protection and restoration of important places in a fiscally responsible manner; identify and protect historical properties and districts that are important to the City’s history and culture, with a focus on historic districts; reform permit processes to better encourage the adaptive reuse of historical buildings on their original sites; adopt design standards for historical properties and districts to provide clear, objective requirements and by-right approval for additions and new development; and remove regulations that unnecessarily impact properties that lack historical or cultural importance.

H. To advance the comprehensive update in a timely and thoughtful manner, Preservation and Progress has been divided into Package A and Package B.

I. With Package A, the City desires to utilize the Historic Preservation Fund to advance the identification and preservation of historical, archaeological, cultural and tribal cultural resources important to traditionally underrepresented and marginalized communities, including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ+) communities; to provide financial assistance to very low and low income owners of historic properties to help fund maintenance and restoration work; and other activities that support and advance the identification, preservation and celebration of the history and resources important to traditionally underrepresented and marginalized communities.

J. This activity has been reviewed for consistency with and is adequately addressed in the Consistency Memorandum for the General Plan Amendment to add the Environmental Justice Element, which was certified by the San Diego City Council on March 5, 2024 (Resolution No. R-315512). This is part of a series of subsequent discretionary actions and, therefore, is not considered to be a separate project for purposes of CEQA review, as defined in State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15378(c) and 15060(c)(3). Pursuant to CEQA Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, there is no change in circumstance, additional information, or project changes to warrant additional environmental review.

K. Under Charter section 280(a)(2) this resolution is not subject to veto by the Mayor because this matter requires the City Council to act as a quasi-judicial body and where a public hearing was required by law implicating due process rights of individuals affected by the decision and where the Council was required by law to consider evidence at the hearing and to make legal findings based on the evidence presented.

L. The Office of the City Attorney has drafted this resolution based on information provided by City staff with the understanding that this information is complete and accurate.

ACTION ITEMS

Be it resolved by the Council of the City of San Diego amends Resolution R-305067 as follows:

1. The Historic Preservation Fund shall be used to advance the identification and preservation of historical, archaeological, cultural and tribal cultural resources important to traditionally underrepresented and marginalized communities, including Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) and Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (LGBTQ+) communities; to provide financial assistance to very low and low income owners of historic properties to help fund maintenance and restoration work; and to support other activities that advance the identification, preservation and celebration of the history and resources important to traditionally underrepresented and marginalized communities.

2. The City Council authorizes expenditure of the funds by the City Planning Department and the Comptroller in accordance with purposes specified in this Resolution, consistent with applicable city policies and procedures.

3. An annual report summarizing all disbursements made under this authority shall be submitted to the City Council and made available to the public.

APPROVED: HEATHER FERBERT, CITY ATTORNEY

By _____



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: October 29, 2025

TO: Kelley Stanco, Deputy Director, City Planning Department

FROM: Jordan Moore, Senior Planner, City Planning Department
Zaira Marquez, Associate Planner, City Planning Department

SUBJECT: Preservation and Progress: Package A – CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 Evaluation

The City Planning Department has completed a California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 15162 consistency evaluation in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21166 for Preservation and Progress: Package A (“the Project”). This evaluation was performed to determine if conditions specified in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 would require preparation of a subsequent environmental document.

As outlined in this memo, the City Planning Department has determined that the Project is consistent with the following certified environmental documents:

1. Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Land Development Code (LDC) (DEP No. 96- 033/SCH No. 1996081056) certified by the San Diego City Council on November 18, 1997 (Resolution R-289458);
2. Final Program EIR (PEIR; SCH No. 2021070359) for the Blueprint SD Initiative, Hillcrest Focused Plan Amendment to the Uptown Community Plan, and University Community Plan and Local Coastal Program Update (Blueprint SD) certified by the San Diego City Council on July 23, 2024 (Resolution No. R-315701);
3. Consistency Memorandum for the General Plan Amendment to add the Environmental Justice Element, certified by the San Diego City Council on March 5, 2024 (Resolution No. R-315512);
4. Addendum to the General Plan PEIR for Climate Resilient SD, certified by the San Diego City Council on December 17, 2021 (Resolution No. R- 313850); and
5. Final PEIR for Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices (SCH No. 2019060003) certified by the San Diego City Council on November 9, 2020

(Resolution R- 313279).

Implementation of Preservation and Progress: Package A would not result in new or more severe significant impacts over and above those disclosed in the previously certified environmental documents.

Background

The City's Historic Preservation Program is responsible for the City's long range planning efforts, including the development of new historic preservation ordinances and regulations, and the implementation of these policies and regulations through permitting.

The Historic Preservation Program is tasked with the development of long-range planning policies and implementing regulations; the development of new historic contexts and surveys; the designation of new historic districts; the review of projects impacting designated and potential historic resources; the designation of individually significant historic resources; the City's Mills Act program; and staffing the City's Historical Resources Board and its subcommittees.

Project Description

Preservation and Progress is a comprehensive update to the City's Heritage Preservation Program that will streamline processes for new homes and other uses while protecting places of historic, architectural and cultural importance and encouraging their adaptive reuse.

The goals of Preservation and Progress are to advance equity in preservation and prioritize protection of resources important to BIPOC, LGBTQ+ and other historically marginalized communities; evaluate the Mills Act program to ensure the program is equitable and incentivizes the protection and restoration of important places in a fiscally responsible manner; identify and protect historical properties and districts that are important to the City's history and culture, with a focus on historic districts; reform permit processes to better encourage the adaptive reuse of historical buildings on their original sites; adopt design standards for historical properties and districts to provide clear, objective requirements and by-right approval for additions and new development; and remove regulations that unnecessarily impact properties that lack historical or cultural importance.

To advance the comprehensive update in a timely and thoughtful manner, Preservation and Progress has been divided into Package A and Package B.

Package A includes amendments to the City's Land Development Code that 1) address the timing of the selection of a Chairperson by the Historical Resources Board (HRB) in the absence of a Mayoral appointment; 2) provide flexibility in the Board appointment process if a qualified volunteer cannot be found to fill one of the five professional Board positions by allowing the position to be filled by a second professional from one of the other four historic preservation-related disciplines; 3) modify the historic designation appeal process by adding a new finding that would expand the authority and discretion of the City Council in hearing

an appeal; and 4) clarify that in regard to thematic historic districts, the Complete Communities: Housing Solutions Regulations are not applicable only for contributing resources to the thematic historic district.

Package A also includes amendments to the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan to provide updated information regarding relevant Federal and State legislation; remove redundant summaries of the City's historic preservation regulations; and update policies that address Tribal Cultural Resources, equity, the identification and preservation of culturally significant resources, the need for objective design requirements, and sustainability and climate resilience. Lastly, Package A includes amendments to the summary of San Diego history in Appendix F of the General Plan to update and expand the discussion of Tribal cultural history and prehistory, and to add information regarding the factors that led to segregation and integration of race and socio-economic status, with a reference to the more detailed discussion provided in the 2021-2029 Housing Element.

Previously Certified CEQA Documents

Final EIR for the Land Development Code (1997)

The LDC EIR analyzed the environmental effects associated with adoption and implementation of the proposed LDC, related regulations, amendments, and appeals. The LDC EIR identified significant unmitigated impacts in the following issue areas: Land Use, Biological Resources, Landform Alteration, Historical Resources, Paleontological Resources, and Human Health and Public Safety. Cumulative impacts were also identified to Soils/Erosion Hazard, Air Quality, Hydrology/Water Quality, Biological Resources, Land Use, Transportation/Circulation, Landform Alteration, Historical Resources, and Paleontological Resources. A Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) was adopted with the LDC EIR to reduce potentially significant impacts.

Final EIR for Blueprint SD Initiative (2024)

The Blueprint SD PEIR concluded that the project would result in significant environmental impacts to Aesthetics, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Noise, Hydrology, Public Services, Recreation, Transportation, Tribal Cultural Resources, Utilities and Service Systems, and Wildfire. All other impacts analyzed in the EIR were determined to be less than significant. An MMRP was adopted with the Blueprint SD PEIR to reduce potentially significant impacts.

Consistency Memorandum for the General Plan Amendment to add the Environmental Justice Element (2024)

The Final PEIR for the General Plan found that, although significant impacts could be mitigated through a review of discretionary projects, implementation of the General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geologic Conditions, Health and Safety, Historical Resources, Hydrology, Land Use, Mineral Resources, Noise, Paleontological Resources, Population and Housing, Public Facilities, Public Utilities, Transportation/Traffic/Circulation/Parking, Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character, and Water Quality as site-specific details of future

development projects are unknown at this time. An MMRP was adopted with the General Plan Final PEIR to reduce potentially significant impacts.

The Final PEIR for the Climate Action Plan (CAP) found that implementation of the CAP would result in significant effects to Land Use, Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character Resources, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gases, Historical Resources, and Traffic and Circulation. While some of these impacts could be mitigated, there would be significant and unavoidable impacts relating to: Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character, Air Quality, Historic Resources, and Transportation and Circulation. The Addenda to the CAP found that adoption of the CAP Update and associated implementing actions would not result in an increase in the severity of the impacts or in new significant impacts beyond those identified in the Final PEIR for the CAP.

The Consistency Memorandum for the General Plan amendment to add the Environmental Justice Element found that the addition of an Environmental Justice Element to the General Plan would not result in new or more severe significant impacts than what was previously analyzed in the General Plan PEIR or the CAP PEIR.

Addendum to the General Plan PEIR for Climate Resilient SD (2021)

The Final PEIR for the General Plan found that, although significant impacts could be mitigated through a review of discretionary projects, implementation of the General Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to Agricultural Resources, Air Quality, Biological Resources, Geologic Conditions, Health and Safety, Historic Resources, Hydrology, Land Use, Mineral Resources, Noise, Paleontological Resources, Population and Housing, Public Facilities, Public Utilities, Transportation/Traffic/Circulation/Parking, Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character, and Water Quality as site-specific details of future development projects are unknown at this time. An MMRP was adopted with the General Plan Final PEIR to reduce potentially significant impacts.

The Addendum to the General Plan PEIR for Climate Resilient SD found that implementation of Climate Resilient SD would not result in new or more severe significant impacts than what was previously analyzed in the General Plan PEIR.

Final PEIR for Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices (2020)

The Final PEIR for Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices found that implementation of the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to Air Quality; Biological Resources; Historical, Archaeological, and Tribal Cultural Resources; Hydrology and Water Quality; Noise; Public Services and Facilities; Transportation; Public Utilities and Infrastructure; Wildfire; and Visual Effects and Neighborhood Character.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 Criteria

CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 states:

- (a) When an EIR has been certified or a negative declaration adopted for a project, no subsequent EIR shall be prepared for that project unless the lead agency determines,

on the basis of substantial evidence in the light of the whole record, one or more of the following:

- (1) Substantial changes are proposed in the project which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects;
- (2) Substantial changes occur with respect to the circumstances under which the project is undertaken which will require major revisions of the previous EIR or negative declaration due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects; or
- (3) New information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known with the exercise of reasonable diligence at the time the previous EIR was certified as complete or the negative declaration was adopted, shows any of the following:
 - (A) The project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR or negative declaration;
 - (B) Significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR;
 - (C) Mitigation measures or alternatives previously found not to be feasible would in fact be feasible, and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative; or
 - (D) Mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR would substantially reduce one or more significant effects on the environment, but the project proponents decline to adopt the mitigation measure or alternative.

Based upon a review of Preservation and Progress: Package A, none of the situations described in Section 15162 of the State Guidelines apply. Implementation of the Project will not result in new significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts over and above those disclosed in the above-mentioned environmental documents. Alternatively, the changes would not be subject to CEQA as they would not result in any physical changes to the environment, as described in this memorandum.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 Consistency Evaluation

The City Planning Department reviewed the following proposed amendments and conducted a 15162 consistency evaluation with the previously certified environmental documents described above. This evaluation substantiates the conclusion that no

subsequent document is required.

Final EIR for the LDC (1997)

The LDC provides the City's regulations for the development and use of property within the City of San Diego and provides information on zoning, subdivisions, grading and other related land use activities. The Final EIR for the LDC anticipated that regular updates of the LDC would need to occur to improve the clarity of the regulations; ensure objectivity, consistency, and predictability in the regulations; and allow for flexibility in tailoring the regulations.

The following proposed Preservation and Progress: Package A amendments are consistent with the LDC:

- Updating the San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section 111.0206 to address the timing of the selection of a Chairperson by the Historical Resources Board in the absence of a Mayoral appointment, and to provide flexibility in the Board appointment process if a qualified volunteer cannot be found to fill one of the five professional Board positions by allowing the position to be filled by a second professional from one of the other four historic preservation-related disciplines.
- Clarifying amendments to SDMC Section 123.0202(b) related to noticing required for historic designation, to be consistent with language used for other City noticing requirements. Noticing pursuant to SDMC Section 123.0202(b) shall include information about the Board hearing and procedures and requirements for filing an appeal. In addition, the amendment specifies that (c) the final decision should be made within 90 calendar days from the first Historical Resources Board meeting in which the property is considered.
- SDMC Section 123.0203(a) is also proposed to be amended to include the addition of a de novo finding that would allow the City Council to reconsider the merits of the designation.
- Additionally, the proposed amendment to SDMC Section 123.0203 specifies that the (b) decision from the Board to designate property is final 11 business days following the Board decision unless an appeal is filed with the City Clerk no later than 10 business days after the Board's decision. The amendment also proposes (c) to update specific details that must be included in the appeal, such as contact information, names of involved parties, and the decision date; and requires submission of any available supporting exhibits at the time of filing. Under (d), the City Clerk must schedule the hearing within 180 days of receiving this information and give notice to the record owner and appellant. Even if deadlines are missed, the City Council retains authority to hear the appeal.
- Updating Section 123.0206 to clarify that (a) the Historic Resources Board's review and recommendation must be submitted to the City Manager for forwarding to the State Historic Resources Commission, ensuring alignment with the National

Historic Preservation Act; and (b) allowing for City Council to consider endorsement of nominations prior to submittal to the State Office of Historic Preservation.

- The Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan is also being updated to reflect changes in laws and regulations for Tribal Cultural Resources; remove redundant historical resources regulations references from the municipal code; remove language on designation criteria to be referenced in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual; and update data on historical resources and San Diego history.
- Modification to Historic Preservation Element policy HP-A.4 (a) amended to develop a Citywide historic context statement to guide future survey work as well as the preparation of subject-specific context statements, rather than being specific to the areas being surveyed.
- Addition of policy HP-A.4 (c) which proposes to conduct Native American consultation to ensure culturally appropriate and adequate treatment and mitigation for significant archaeological sites with cultural or religious significance to the Native American community in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations and guidelines.
- Addition of policy HP-A.4 (e) which proposes to conduct project-specific investigations in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations to identify potentially significant tribal cultural and archaeological resources.
- Addition of policy HP-A.4 (f) to ensure adequate data recovery and mitigation for adverse impacts to archaeological and Native American sites as part of development, including measures to monitor and recover buried deposits from the tribal cultural, archaeological and historic periods, under the supervision of a qualified archaeologist and a Native American Kumeyaay monitor.
- Modifications to policy HP-A.4 (g) which is amended to require permanent curation of archaeological collections unless State or Federal law or consultation with a Most Likely Descendant specifies another treatment such as repatriation.
- Addition of policy HP-A.5 (g) to consider eligible sites for listing on the City's Historical Resources Register, any significant archaeological or Native American cultural sites that may be identified as part of future development within the community and refer sites to the Historical Resources Board for designation as appropriate. Consideration should be given to any sites identified by a future Cultural Resources Report as having been previously evaluated as eligible for listing.
- Appendix F of the Historic Preservation Element is also being updated to include a Tribal Cultural History section, revisions to the archaeological chronology in San Diego, and the incorporation of a reference to the Housing Element's Appendix A in the recent history section.

The proposed amendments fulfill the goals of the LDC and improve the clarity of the regulations; ensure objectivity, consistency, and predictability in the regulations; and allow for flexibility in tailoring the regulations, as was anticipated in the original LDC. Thus, they would not result in new or more severe significant impacts than what was previously identified in the Final EIR of the LDC.

Final EIR for Blueprint SD Initiative (2024)

Blueprint SD was a comprehensive amendment to the General Plan to better align the City of Villages Strategy to reflect the latest goals, policies, and plans for housing, mobility and transit, environmental protection, and climate change adaptation and sustainable growth.

The proposed Preservation and Progress: Package A policies listed below are consistent with the Blueprint SD initiative:

- Modifications to Historic Preservation Element policy HP-A.1 (c) to rename the Comprehensive Historic Preservation Plan to the “historic preservation work plan” and add a new reference to General Plan and Community Plan policies.
- Revision of policy HP-A.2 (d) to consider the inclusion of Urban Design elements to interpret and celebrate the history of buildings and areas that do not meet the City’s criteria for designation but nevertheless have importance to the community.
- Modification to policy HP-A.4 (a), which is amended to develop a Citywide historic context statement to guide future survey work as well as the preparation of subject-specific context statements, rather than being specific to the areas being surveyed.
- Addition of policy HP-A.4 (c) which proposes to conduct Native American consultation to ensure culturally appropriate and adequate treatment and mitigation for significant archaeological sites with cultural or religious significance to the Native American community in accordance with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations and guidelines.
- Addition of policy HP-A.4 (e) which proposes to conduct project-specific investigations in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations to identify potentially significant tribal cultural and archaeological resources.
- Addition of policy HP-A.4 (f) to ensure adequate data recovery and mitigation for adverse impacts to archaeological and Native American sites as part of development, including measures to monitor and recover buried deposits from the tribal cultural, archaeological and historic periods, under the supervision of a qualified archaeologist and a Native American Kumeyaay monitor.
- Modifications to policy HP-A.4 (g) which is amended to require permanent curation of archaeological collections unless State or Federal law or consultation with a Most Likely Descendant specifies another treatment such as repatriation.
- Modifications to policy HP-A.5 (e) to clarify that in the continued use and adaptive

reuse of designated historical resources, objective design requirements based on the *U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards* may provide clear guidance for adaptive reuse and new development.

- Addition of policy HP-A.5 (g) to consider eligible sites for listing on the City's Historical Resources Register, any significant archaeological or Native American cultural sites that may be identified as part of future development within the community and refer sites to the Historical Resources Board for designation as appropriate. Consideration should be given to any sites identified by a future Cultural Resources Report as having been previously evaluated as eligible for listing.
- Modification to policy HP-B.1 (b) to include the preparation of culturally-focused historic context statements, in consultation with individuals in traditionally underrepresented communities. The policy also revises the term "ethnic" to "cultural" groups.
- Addition of policy HP-B.1 (j) to host events and workshops to educate residents about the value of historic preservation.
- Addition of policy HP-B.2 (j) to offer tax credits or grants to property owners who adaptively reuse historic buildings for modern purposes, such as housing or commercial spaces.
- Addition of policy HP-B.2 (k) to simplify permitting for adaptive reuse projects to encourage the preservation of historic structures.

In addition to these proposed policies, Preservation and Progress: Package A contains other updates that are consistent with Blueprint SD. These include:

- Updates to the Historic Preservation Element to reflect changes in laws and regulations for Tribal Cultural Resources; remove redundant historical resources regulations references from the municipal code; remove redundant language on designation criteria to be referenced in the Historical Resources Guidelines of the Land Development Manual; and update data on historical resources and San Diego history.
- Minor updates to the Historic Preservation Element section A Goals Discussion, including incorporating traditionally underrepresented groups as a source for consultation; clarification that when a resource does not meet the nomination criteria, the history of such resource can still be acknowledged and celebrated; and clarifying language on development pressures on historic resource and districts.
- Minor updates to the Historic Preservation Element of the General Plan section B Goals Discussion, including clarification of the Federal and State Rehabilitation Tax Credits and Mills Act information; updates to the City goals of historic preservation; and clarifying the goals of local historical organizations in regard to historic preservation.

- Updates to Appendix F of the General Plan's Historic Preservation Element to include a Tribal Cultural History section, revisions to the archaeological chronology in San Diego, and the incorporation of a reference to the Housing Element's Appendix A in the recent history section.

The proposed amendments follow the regulatory setting, policies, and mitigation framework outlined in the Blueprint SD PEIR to reduce potential impacts to Historical Resources and provide consistency with the Historical Resources Regulations in ensuring protection and adequate treatment of Historical Resources. Thus, they would not result in new or more severe significant impacts than what was previously identified in the Final PEIR for the Blueprint SD Initiative.

Consistency Memorandum for the General Plan Amendment to add the Environmental Justice Element (2024)

The City's Environmental Justice Element is intended to address the imbalances in our communities by including policies and regulations that affect the quality of the environment, such as mobility, parks, open space, public space, public services, and use of land. Preservation and Progress: Package A amendments that align with the Environmental Justice Element include:

- Minor updates to the Historic Preservation Element section A Goals Discussion, including incorporating traditionally underrepresented groups as a source for consultation; clarification that when a resource does not meet the nomination criteria, the history of such resource can still be acknowledged and celebrated; and clarifying language on development pressures on historic resource and districts.
- Modification to Historic Preservation Element policy HP-A.4 (j) to ensure that preservation efforts recognize and celebrate the histories of all communities, including underrepresented groups.
- Modification to policy HP-B.1 (b) to include the preparation of culturally-focused historic context statements, in consultation with individuals in traditionally underrepresented communities. The policy also revises the term "ethnic" to "cultural" groups.
- Utilizing the Historic Preservation Fund to primarily serve as a source of small grant funding to low-income and traditionally marginalized communities to evaluate and designate new resources or rehabilitate/restore/improve designated resources.

The proposed amendments fulfill the goals of the Environmental Justice Element by encouraging and supporting inclusive public engagement in City decisions for underrepresented communities, and working to address the imbalances in our communities caused by past discriminatory actions that have resulted in segregated development patterns and inequitable investment. Thus, they would not result in new or more severe significant impacts than what was previously identified in the Consistency Memorandum of the Environmental Justice Element.

Addendum to the General Plan PEIR for Climate Resilient SD (2021)

Preservation and Progress: Package A also includes a proposed amendment that aligns with Climate Resilient SD, which is the addition of Policy HP-A.6 to integrate historic preservation practices with climate resilience goals, such as to (a) promote the use of sustainable materials and practices in the restoration of historic buildings; and (b) identify historical resources vulnerable to climate change impacts and develop mitigation strategies.

This proposed amendment is consistent with the goals and policies set forth in Climate Resilient SD, which found Historic and Tribal Cultural Resources to be highly vulnerable to most climate change hazards and identifies that it is critical to implement policies and adaption strategies to protect these resources. Incorporating Policy HP-A.6 would not result in new or more severe significant impacts than what was previously identified in the Addendum to the General Plan PEIR for Climate Resilient SD.

Final PEIR for Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices (2020)

The Final PEIR for Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices analyzed the environmental impacts associated with implementing the City's Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Complete Communities: Mobility Choices programs.

Preservation and Progress: Package A includes a proposed update to the SDMC Section 143.1002 to clarify that the regulations in this Division shall not apply to the following types of development: (6) Development located within a designated historical district with the following exceptions: (A) Development on properties that are not designated as contributing resources to the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District; and (B) Development on properties that are not designated as contributing resources to the Chinese Asian Thematic Historical District.

The proposed amendment clarifies that the exclusion of development in these districts from the application of Complete Communities Housing Solutions regulations does not apply to all properties within the boundaries of these districts, but only to those designated as contributing historical resources, as this was the understanding that was analyzed in the FEIR.

As was summarized in the HRB's *Procedure on Establishing Historical Districts* in its discussion of the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District, "Owners of properties which fall within the context statement and period of significance may bring their properties forward for designation as contributors to the district. Only those properties identified and designated as contributors are currently regulated...the district shall remain voluntary in nature."

The proposed amendment incorporating clarifying language on historical districts is consistent with the Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices programs and would not result in new or more severe significant impacts than what was previously identified in the Final PEIR for Complete Communities: Housing Solutions and Mobility Choices.

Conclusion

Overall, implementation of the Project would not result in any significant direct, indirect or cumulative impacts over and above those disclosed in the previously adopted environmental documents.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jordan Moore". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jordan Moore
Senior Planner, City Planning Department

JM/zm

Cc: Rebecca Malone, Program Manager, City Planning Department



[EXTERNAL] Re: City of San Diego Historic Preservation Program Updates

From Pries, Shannon@Parks <Shannon.Pries@parks.ca.gov>

Date Thu 10/23/2025 8:50 AM

To Stanco, Kelley <KStanco@sandiego.gov>

****This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.****

Good morning, Kelley,

It was a pleasure speaking with you on Monday evening to discuss the items in Preservation and Progress Package A.

You are correct; the City of San Diego has met the CLG obligation to consult with the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) on the proposed changes to the ordinance. OHP has no objection to the proposed changes and supports the City's efforts.

All the best,

Shannon Lauchner Pries

Supervisor, Cultural Resources Programs
Local Government & Environmental Compliance Unit
California Office of Historic Preservation
shannon.pries@parks.ca.gov
www.parks.ca.gov

From: Stanco, Kelley <KStanco@sandiego.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 6:36 PM

To: Pries, Shannon@Parks <Shannon.Pries@parks.ca.gov>

Subject: Re: City of San Diego Historic Preservation Program Updates

Hi Shannon,

Just wanted to follow-up on the email below. Thank you!

Kelley Stanco

(she/her)

Deputy Director
Climate, Preservation + Public Spaces Division
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.236.6545

KStanco@sandiego.gov

sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.

From: Stanco, Kelley <KStanco@sandiego.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 4:44 PM
To: Pries, Shannon@Parks <Shannon.Pries@parks.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: City of San Diego Historic Preservation Program Updates

Hi Shannon,

Thank you so much for taking the time to meet with me to review and talk through the various items in Preservation and Progress Package A. Per our conversation, I want to confirm that our obligations to consult with the California Office of Historic Preservation on changes to our preservation ordinance have been met, and that there are no issues with the proposed amendments related to our status as a Certified Local Government.

Thank you so much, and have a wonderful evening.

Kelley Stanco
(she/her)
Deputy Director
Climate, Preservation + Public Spaces Division
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.236.6545
KStanco@sandiego.gov
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.

From: Pries, Shannon@Parks <Shannon.Pries@parks.ca.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2025 3:09 PM
To: Stanco, Kelley <KStanco@sandiego.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] Re: City of San Diego Historic Preservation Program Updates

****This email came from an external source. Be cautious about clicking on any links in this email or opening attachments.****

Hi Kelley,

I would love to meet and discuss things before your proposed program changes are heard by the Commission on October 23rd. I am available next Monday, 10/20, from 1-2PM and from 3:30- 4:30PM. Tuesday, 10/21, I am free any time after noon, and Wednesday, 10/22 I have a chunk of free time between 1 and 3PM. Please feel free to send a meeting invite for any available time that works well for you.

I look forward to chatting.

Have a wonderful weekend!

Shannon

Shannon Lauchner Pries

Supervisor, Cultural Resources Programs
Local Government & Environmental Compliance Unit
California Office of Historic Preservation
shannon.pries@parks.ca.gov
www.parks.ca.gov

From: Stanco, Kelley <KStanco@sandiego.gov>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2025 11:45 AM
To: Pries, Shannon@Parks <Shannon.Pries@parks.ca.gov>
Subject: Re: City of San Diego Historic Preservation Program Updates

Hi Shannon,

I wanted to reach out to see if you would be available for a 30-minute conversation before the middle of next week?

Thank you,

Kelley Stanco
(she/her)
Deputy Director
Climate, Preservation + Public Spaces Division
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.236.6545
KStanco@sandiego.gov
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

This electronic mail message and any attachments are intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is privileged, confidential and exempt from disclosure under applicable law. If you are not an intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible for delivering this e-mail to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you received this e-mail message in error, please immediately notify the sender by replying to this message or by telephone. Thank you.

From: Stanco, Kelley
Sent: Friday, October 10, 2025 10:02 AM
To: Shannon Pries <Shannon.Pries@parks.ca.gov>
Subject: City of San Diego Historic Preservation Program Updates

Hi Shannon,

I hope you're doing well! I am reaching out because we are beginning to take the first grouping of updates to our historic preservation program through the public hearing process. [Preservation and Progress](#), which is the comprehensive update to our Heritage Preservation program, is being processed in two parts, Package A and Package B. Package A includes items that are not significantly complex and that do not involve amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations or Historical Resources Guidelines, as any amendments need to be addressed more comprehensively. Package B includes updates that are more complex in nature, that include amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations and/or Historical Resources Guidelines, or that may require more extensive environmental analysis.

Package A, which includes updates to the City's General Plan Historic Preservation Element and Appendix F; Municipal Code updates related to Historical Resources Board appointments, appeals of historic designation actions to the City Council, and a clarifying amendment related to the use of a local affordable housing/density bonus program - Complete Communities Housing Solutions - within two of our Emerging and Thematic historic districts; and finally, repurposing our Historic Preservation Fund to advance equity in preservation by funding the identification and preservation of resources important to traditionally underrepresented and marginalized groups as well as a grant program to assist very low- and low-income historic property owners with maintenance and restorations.

Package A is set to be heard by our Historical Resources Board for a recommendation to the City Council at the October 23rd meeting. It will then proceed to Planning Commission on November 6th, the Land Use & Housing Committee of the City Council in December, and the full City Council in January.

The [Report to the Historical Resources Board](#) provides a detailed discussion of the proposed amendments, with the amended documents in strikeout/underline attached to the report. If you are able to review and provide comments back on Preservation and Progress and Package A prior to the HRB meeting on October 23rd, that would be wonderful, but if additional time is needed just let me know. If you would like to meet to go through the amendments or ask any questions, I would be happy to do so.

Thank you so much Shannon, and I look forward to hearing from you!

Kelley Stanco
(she/her)
Deputy Director
Environmental Policy & Public Spaces Division
City of San Diego
City Planning Department

T 619.236.6545
KStanco@sandiego.gov
sandiego.gov/planning

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION