| HRB Meeting of October 23, 2025 | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **First Name** | **Last Name** | **Meeting Date** | **Agenda Item Number** | **Position** | **I would like to speak on the item during public testimony.** | **Comments** | **Attachments** | **Attachments (Additional)** |
| **HRB Public Comments - Added 10/21/2025, 10/22/2025, 10/23/25** | | | | | | | | |
| **ITEM 3** | | | | | | | | |
| Jennifer | Macdonald | jdmac.architect@gmail.com | 45953 | Agenda Comment | 3 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please see letter attached here. https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_994112/119317/jmacdonald-letter-for-hrb-25-049.pdf?access=456323&id=393bc5bc-f4bf-40e4-b9cf-f9086ff3ed92 |
| Chris | Neighbors | 10/23/2025 | 3 | In Support of Item | No | I respectfully disagree with the proposed historic designation for the property at 2660 First Avenue and strongly support staff's recommendation. <br><br>From a policy and procedural standpoint, staff cleared the building multiple times. Designation at this point is counter to multiple decisions this board and city staff have already made, and a reversal would come without any meaningful new information. Furthermore, a decision cannot be made based on the building's future use which the opposition leverages in their argument. The argument for designation is meritless. I urge you to agree with staff's recommendation.<br><br>Additionally, the HRB's discretion is meant to navigate the less tangible aspects of community planning, elements that sometimes exist between policy. While I value preservation and am a supporter of its benefits, including community identity, adaptive reuse, and social cohesion, I am disappointed to see the designation process is clearly being used against a minority group who followed the correct land use processes. I am from the area and walk down the street nearly every day taking my daughter to school. The building is a common property type in San Diego and does not stand out in the community.<br><br><br>It is a deep irony that a tool like historic preservation would be used against the betterment of Indigenous peoples. As a Native American myself, my family and I have relied on SDAIHC's services, and their community programming benefit all who visit Balboa Park. It is a bright spot in Indian Health Services. Infringing on this success by entertaining a meritless argument would only continue a shameful tradition of colonization.<br><br>Thank you for your consideration | | |
| Todd | Pitman | 10/23/2025 | Item #3 2660-2666 First Ave | In Opposition to Item | No | The Millman Campbell Medical Building is a rare and early example of the partnership between master architects Lloyd Ruocco and Homer Delawie. Designed in December 1958, it represents the earliest known extant example of their collaborative work and the only extant example of their commercial architecture within the City of San Diego. Notably, the building embodies the design vernacular of both architects. The sunshade and trellis elements recall features characteristic of Ruocco's earliest work from the 1930s, while the use of standardized construction methods and materials reflects the emerging approach that would define much of Delawie's later career. As a composition this building illustrates the evolution of regional modernist architecture in San Diego and appears to qualify for designation under both criterion C and D. | | |
| Ginger | Weatherford | 10/23/2025 | 3 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please see attached letter | https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_994112/119488/item-3-2660-2666-first-avenue.pdf?access=456402&id=107196ec-5e87-48e2-af2a-ce06d9334ea6 | |
| Roy | McMakin | 10/23/2025 | 2660-2666 First Ave is Agenda Item #3 | In Opposition to Item | No | The Millman Campbell Medical Building by important San Diego architects Lloyd Ruocco and Homer Delawie is a treasure of Bankers Hill. It was respected and cared for until recently, and appeared to be in original condition. It is architecturally interesting from both 1st Ave and the bottom of Maple Canyon Open Space. It makes no sense to allow it to be torn down as it is on a steep slope and undoubtedly falls under the codes and regulations that limit development. Therefore this building may be as large as would be allowed to be developed. It makes way more sense to restore this building. There are plenty of other sites with buildings that don't need to be saved. So lets save this one. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ronald | May | 10/23/2025 | 3 | In Opposition to Item | No | This commercial building directly addresses one of the goals of the Mid-Century Modernism Historic Context Statement by respecting the landform. In fact, this is an excellent example of design to keep the roof low and construct the structure below the First Avenue grade. The ribbons of windows were clearly designed to capture the afternoon breezes and to look out over Maple Canyon. One can easily attain a feeling this structure respects the sloping hillside of Maple Canyon. This Lloyd Ruocco-Homer Delawie-designed 1959 commercial building is a rare example of their early collaborative architecture. Finding such a property in such intact condition is very unusual and should be preserved. This property still retains many of the original architecturally defining features of Mid Century Modern Custom-designed, Organic Geometric style, Post and Beam style commercial building. The building is in the same location as when it was built. The design, setting, materials, feeling, and workmanship are all integrity defining aspects that have been met with this building as it was prior to the illegal demolition.This building should be evaluated in the state it was when it was first brought to the City's attention, as the illegal demolition has changed the building. But those unpermitted changes should not be be considered in a decision to designate this building historic, per the City Attorney's decision letter referenced as "Lark Street Decision." | https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_994112/117069/4004_lark_mol-1.pdf?access=455438&id=f6d9cc8d-105f-4224-9e3f-42d03533fc0d | |
| **ITEM 6** | | | | | | | | |
| Monica | Villarreal | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | •The “super majority” requirement of San Diego Municipal Code Section 123.0203(e), requiring an affirmative vote of six historic resources board members in order to designate a property historic, should be amended to merely require a majority vote of members present. The “supermajority” voting requirement stacks the deck against designation and other major California cities do not have this requirement.•The right to appeal a non-designation decision should not be limited to only record owners of the property as the proposed amendments provide; rather, that same right should also be extended to interested parties. Limiting the right to appeal a non-designation to record owners is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of Land Development Code to ensure fairness and encourage public participation.•Adding a new ground for appeal on the basis that the HRB’s findings to designate are not supported by information provided to the HRB, potentially subjects the designation process to the political whims of City Councilmembers. This proposed amendment should be rejected.•The proposed changes to allow developments to non-contributing resources in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District under Complete Communities should be rejected. Instead, the City should simply process the district so that it is a traditional historic district, which would eliminate the need to amend the municipal code. | | |
| Whitney | Markowitz | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | The right to appeal a non-designation decision should not be limited to only record owners of the property as the proposed amendments provide; rather, that same right should also be extended to interested parties. Limiting the right to appeal a non-designation to record owners is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of Land Development Code to ensure fairness and encourage public participation. | | |
| David | Schmerler | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | The “super majority” requirement Rd of San Diego Municipal Code Section 123.0203(e), requiring an affirmative vote of six historic resources board members in order to designate a property historic, should be amended to merely require a majority vote of members present. The “supermajority” voting requirement stacks the deck against designation and other major California cities do not have this requirement.The right to appeal a non-designation decision should not be limited to only record owners of the property as the proposed amendments provide; rather, that same right should also be extended to interested parties. Limiting the right to appeal a non-designation to record owners is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of Land Development Code to ensure fairness and encourage public participation.Adding a new ground for appeal on the basis that the HRB’s findings to designate are not supported by information provided to the HRB, potentially subjects the designation process to the political whims of City Councilmembers. This proposed amendment should be rejected.The proposed changes to allow developments to non-contributing resources in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District under Complete Communities should be rejected. Instead, the City should simply process the district so that it is a traditional historic district, which would eliminate the need to amend the municipal code. | | |
| Helen | Hodges | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | Don’t make historical designation more difficult.Allow community input for appeals | | |
| Robin | Greene | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | Dear HRB, As a citizen who values historic resources and historic community features I am saddened that none of our requested amendments were included in the package that has reached your board for a vote today. I urge you all t vote against adoption of package A unless these revisions are adopted and incorporated. 1. The “super majority” requirement of San Diego Municipal Code Section 123.0203(e), requiring an affirmative vote of six historic resources board members in order to designate a property historic, should be amended to merely require a majority vote of members present. The “supermajority” voting requirement stacks the deck against designation and other major California cities do not have this requirement. This is wrong and unfair in many ways. 2. The right to appeal a non-designation decision should not be limited to only record owners of the property as the proposed amendments provide; rather, that same right should also be extended to interested parties. Limiting the right to appeal a non-designation to record owners is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of Land Development Code to ensure fairness and encourage public participation.3. Adding a new ground for appeal on the basis that the HRB’s findings to designate are not supported by information provided to the HRB, potentially subjects the designation process to the political whims of City Councilmembers. This proposed amendment should be rejected outright. 4. The proposed changes to allow developments to non-contributing resources in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District under Complete Communities should be rejected. Instead, the City should simply process the district so that it is a traditional historic district, which would eliminate the need to amend the municipal code. Simpler = better in this case. The four simple and fair amendments that are being advocated for by our organized historical associations make sense if you are truly in the business of protecting historical resources. Development should not be placed in competition with preservation. These resources can never be recreated once lost. The loss to our communities is irreversible. It saddens me to feel like the leaders and staff who wrote this plan are against preservation and fairness. Thank you, R. Greene | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gail | Friedt | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Support of Item | No | I support all the reforms being voted on today. For too long, historical review has been used to block new housing and to promote segregation. Yes, we need to preserve historical resources, but the process has needed review and changes for some time. Vote yes on the “Amendments and Recommendations for Package A” of the City's Preservation & Progress Initiative, and recommend approval of these amendments to City Council. As drafted, Package A strengthens historic preservation. Vote Yes. | | |
| Aileen | Teague | 10/23/2025 | #6 | In Opposition to Item | No | Package A weakens historic preservation. <br><br>Historic preservation fosters a sense of community and sense of pride, increases home values, provides character to the city, maintains the history of that area. <br><br>Amendments and Recommendations for Package A:<br><br>(1) the "supermajority" requirement for designation should be abandoned, <br>(2) the proposed new asymmetrical appeal rights for non-designations should be revised to allow other interested parties to appeal non-designations, and <br>(3) the new overly broad "de novo" grounds for appeals should be rejected.<br><br>Reasoning:<br> | | |
| Jennifer | Machian | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | The right to appeal a non-designation decision should not be limited to only record owners of the property as the proposed amendments provide; rather, that same right should also be extended to interested parties. Limiting the right to appeal a non-designation to record owners is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of Land Development Code to ensure fairness and encourage public participation. | | |
| Susan | Dean | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please take this opportunity to eliminate the super-majority requirement for historic designations - and replace with a simple majority.  There is no defensible reason for requiring a super-majority and it unfairly burdens historic designations. <br><br>Also, please allow any interested party to appeal a non-designation. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Jeana | Preston | 10/23/2025 | #6 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please make these changes:<br>Using a supermajority process is unnecessary should be amended to be a simple majority.<br>I believe appeals to non-designations should be allowed for other interested entities.<br>"De nova" grounds for appeals should be rejected.<br>Thank you,<br>Jeana Preston | | |
| Priscilla Ann | Berge | 10/23/2025 | Item #6: Preservation and Progress Package A | In Opposition to Item | No | In support of the Neighborhood Preservation Coalition, I recommend the following:<br>(1) Supermajority Vote – SDMC §123.0202(e): Recommend a simple majority of Historical Resources Board members present to designate a resource.<br>(2) Appeals Process – SDMC §123.0203(a) and (b): Recommend equal appeal rights for property owners and "interested parties" in both non designations and designations.<br>(3) Submission of Additional Evidence – SDMC §123.0203(e): Recommend adding language to clarify that no new information may be submitted by the appellant 90 days after the date the appeal was filed until.<br>(4) New Grounds for Appeal – SDMC §123.0203(a)(3) and (b)(3): Recommend striking out the new grounds of appeal or revising the language to align with the Findings required by the Historical Resources Board in either their decision to designate or not to designate.<br>(5) Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District – SDMC §143.1002: Recommend removing the proposed change applying Complete Communities regulations to the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District and recommend prioritizing the completion of the process to designate a traditional historic district. | https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_994112/119471/hrb-item-no-6-oct-23_2025-comment-p-berge_1.pdf?access=456398&id=a7d258da-9eeb-4c52-a527-9fc70dd893a4 | |
| John | DeSantis | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | The proposed amendments to the Municipal Code would significantly weaken San Diego's historic preservation process and should be rejected. The "super majority" requirement for Historic Resources Board designations should instead require only a simple majority of members present, consistent with other major California cities. The right to appeal a non-designation should extend to interested parties, not just property owners, to ensure fairness and public participation. Adding a new appeal ground that allows the City Council to question the HRB's findings invites politicization of what should remain an expert-driven process. Finally, rather than allowing development under Complete Communities in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District, the City should finalize its designation as a traditional historic district. | | |
| Lauren | Carter | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | The "super majority" requirement of San Diego Municipal Code Section 123.0203(e), requiring an affirmative vote of six historic resources board members in order to designate a property historic, should be amended to merely require a majority vote of members present. The "supermajority" voting requirement stacks the deck against designation and other major California cities do not have this requirement.<br><br>The right to appeal a non-designation decision should not be limited to only record owners of the property as the proposed amendments provide; rather, that same right should also be extended to interested parties. Limiting the right to appeal a non-designation to record owners is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of Land Development Code to ensure fairness and encourage public participation.<br><br>Adding a new ground for appeal on the basis that the HRB's findings to designate are not supported by information provided to the HRB, potentially subjects the designation process to the political whims of City Councilmembers. This proposed amendment should be rejected.<br><br>The proposed changes to allow developments to non-contributing resources in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District under Complete Communities should be rejected. Instead, the City should simply process the district so that it is a traditional historic district, which would eliminate the | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Debbie | Quillin | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | Historical designation processes should stay the same. BECAUSE IT IS THE HISTORY OF OUR HOMES, OUR CITY AND PREVIOUS GENERATIONS OF ARCHITECTS AND OWNERS. PROTECT IT! | | |
| Ione | Stiegler | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | See attached letter. | https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_994112/119519/october-2025-hrb_item-6_ione-stiegler-public-comment.pdf?access=456407&id=b2980dc8-aa5d-4b38-a846-e6070a013d4c | |
| Christie | Dunning | 10/23/2025 | 6 | | | Please support the removal of the supermajority requirement of SDMC §123.0202(e),1 a revision that preservation groups and community members have repeatedly advocated in favor of during the comment period without response from City staff. Because application of the supermajority requirement frequently results in non-designation of meritorious resources, which under the current proposed amendments is only appealable by record owners, it is appropriate to consider the continued validity of the requirement alongside the appeal process amendments. | | |
| Jennifer | Wright | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | The “super majority” requirement of San Diego Municipal Code Section 123.0203(e), requiring an affirmative vote of six historic resources board members in order to designate a property historic, should be amended to merely require a majority vote of members present. The “supermajority” voting requirement stacks the deck against designation and other major California cities do not have this requirement.<br><br>The right to appeal a non-designation decision should not be limited to only record owners of the property as the proposed amendments provide; rather, that same right should also be extended to interested parties. Limiting the right to appeal a non-designation to record owners is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of Land Development Code to ensure fairness and encourage public participation.<br><br>Adding a new ground for appeal on the basis that the HRB’s findings to designate are not supported by information provided to the HRB, potentially subjects the designation process to the political whims of City Councilmembers. This proposed amendment should be rejected. | | |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| John | DeSantis | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | The proposed amendments to the Municipal Code would significantly weaken San Diego's historic preservation process and should be rejected. The "super majority" requirement for Historic Resources Board designations should instead require only a simple majority of members present, consistent with other major California cities. The right to appeal a non-designation should extend to interested parties, not just property owners, to ensure fairness and public participation. Adding a new appeal ground that allows the City Council to question the HRB's findings invites politicization of what should remain an expert-driven process. Finally, rather than allowing development under Complete Communities in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District, the City should finalize its designation as a traditional historic district. | | |
| Shawn | Dooley | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | I feel we should be doing more to save the historic feel and nature of our beautiful historic neighborhoods in which have unfortunately already lost too many beautiful homes and buildings to poor planning of development. The San Diego Municipal Code Section 123.0203(e), requiring an affirmative vote of six historic resources board members in order to designate a property historic, should be amended to merely require a majority vote of members present. The "supermajority" voting requirement stacks the deck against designation. Other major California cities do not have this requirement. World class cities such as Paris, Prague, London, Barcelona, and Rome embrace their history. Shouldn't we embrace our history including the few historic places we have left? Thank you for your consideration. | | |
| Danna | Givot | 10/23/2025 | 6 | In Opposition to Item | No | Recommendation: Preservation and Progress Initiative hasn't had due diligence – not ready for consideration.<br><br>The City has not completed the due diligence necessary to move this initiative forward. Specifically:<br>• The preservation community has not been properly consulted.<br>• No independent, professional, and unbiased study—like the one conducted in Los Angeles—has been commissioned to analyze San Diego's preservation program.<br>• The City has not waited for PlaceEconomics to finish its economic analysis of preservation in San Diego.<br><br>A responsible city waits for the facts.<br>San Diego's planning department appears to be under political pressure from the "Strong Mayor" system and the influence of the building industry.<br>Preservation should not be sacrificed for politics.<br><br>Preservationists are not the problem—we are part of the solution. | | |
| Jennifer | Machian | 10/23/2025 | Agenda Comment | 6 | In Opposition to Item | The right to appeal a non-designation decision should not be limited to only record owners of the property as the proposed amendments provide; rather, that same right should also be extended to interested parties. Limiting the right to appeal a non-designation to record owners is arbitrary and inconsistent with the intent of Land Development Code to ensure fairness and encourage public participation. | | |