



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: June 07, 2021

TO: Historical Resources Board and Interested Parties

FROM: Megan Bacik, Junior Planner, Historical Resources, Development Services
Department

SUBJECT: **ITEM 04 - 3714 Nimitz Boulevard**

The property at 3714 Nimitz Boulevard was previously docketed for review by the Historical Resources Board on May 27, 2021, at which time staff recommended against under Criterion C for the property's Mission Revival style, as determined most appropriate by Staff, nor the Spanish Eclectic style as proposed by the applicant. Staff could not support using neighboring properties as reference for the replacement of the vinyl windows. Staff also found the worm stucco texture, and it's location on the underside of the porch's roof, as not common for the Mission Revival style, therefore questioned it's originality.

At the hearing for the item, the applicant requested a continuance to the following Historical Resources Board meeting on June 24, 2021.

The applicant provided additional information for Criterion C and the property's Mission Revival style. New information was provided in the form of photos. Photos 1, 2 and 3 are from circa 1956. Photo 4 is from circa 1965. Photos 6, 7, 8, and 9 are circa 2003. With the new information provided by both the 1956 and 2003 photographs staff has been able to determine that the side facades' vinyl windows replaced what were originally two lite, three lite and four lite wood casement windows. This new information absolves staff's concern about the restoration the resource's side façades' windows creating a false history.

The 1956 photograph of the front façade shows the resource's front porch looking near the same as it does today, with the worm stucco texture being visible in the image. Noticeable differences include a more ornamental light fixture and an attached pot in the wing wall where the square niches with cantilevered platforms and the internal drain spout opening currently exist. These alterations are not significant. Because the 1956 photograph is of the resource 28 years after its construction, staff's original concern about the stucco's originality due to its worm stucco texture and it's location on the underside of the porch's roof has not been resolved.

The top of one of the decorative light caps that stands above the stucco cover short wall extending out to property line is visible in the 1956 front façade photograph. The light cap's existence in that photograph supports the determination that the wall and decorative light caps were built in the early 1950s.

The new information provided did not provide a resolute answer on if the current stucco texture is original as the photographs provided are of the resource 28 years and 75 years. Therefore, staff recommendation under Criterion C has not changed. Staff continues to recommend to not designate the property located at 3714 Nimitz Boulevard under any adopted HRB Criteria.



Megan Bacik
Junior Planner



Suzanne Segur
Senior Planner/HRB Liaison
Development Services Department

MB/ss

Attachments: 1. Staff Report HRB-17-018 dated May 13, 2021
2. The Applicants Addendum dated June 2, 2021
3. Addendum Photos dated June 2, 2021



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Report to the Historical Resources Board

DATE ISSUED: May 13, 2021 REPORT NO. HRB-21-031

HEARING DATE: May 27, 2021

SUBJECT: **ITEM #07 – 3714 Nimitz Boulevard**

RESOURCE INFO: [California Historical Resources Inventory Database \(CHRID\) link](#)

APPLICANT: Daniel Codd; represented by Daniel Codd

LOCATION: 3714 Nimitz Boulevard, Peninsula Community, Council District 2
APN 449-362-19-00

DESCRIPTION: Consider the designation of the property located at 3714 Nimitz Boulevard as a historical resource.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Do not designate the property located at 3714 Nimitz Boulevard under any adopted HRB Criteria.

BACKGROUND

This item is being brought before the Historical Resources Board in conjunction with the owner's desire to have the site designated as a historical resource. The property is a one-story Mission Revival style single family residence that was constructed in 1928

The property has not been identified in any historic surveys, as the subject area has not been previously surveyed.

ANALYSIS

A Historical Resource Research was prepared by Daniel Codd, which concludes that the resource is significant under HRB Criterion C. Staff disagrees and finds that the site is not significant under any HRB Criteria. This determination is consistent with the [Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria](#), as follows.

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

The subject resource is a one-story, single family residence constructed in 1928. The house consists of an irregular massing that is topped by a flat roof with a parapet and is covered in a worm stucco exterior. The resource features both rectangular and arched wood casement windows on three of the four facades, rectangular single doors ways on the front and back facades, a front porch which consists of a rounded entry, a concrete base, a gable roof covered in variegated red tiled and a stucco covered wing wall on both sides. The wing walls act as a break between the street and the front facade's two tripart arched windows, which consist of a fixed center and casements on either side. Gutters are inset to the stuccoed fascia of the sides of the front porch's roof, and drain spouts are routed internally through the wing walls to exit at ground level. Both wings have one round light fixture attached to the walls' highest point, arched openings with metal grills over them, square niches with cantilevered platforms, and metal rails connect the wings to the house while encircling the porch's floor. From both side facades a stucco cover short wall extends out to property line. On the southern side of the front façade the wall breaks for a wood gated entry to the back yard. To each side of the gate is stucco cover posts topped with decorative light caps. Behind the wall is simple stucco cover chimney. Behind the house is a detached two car garage with a modern rolling garage door, a single rectangle door, and two double hung vinyl windows.

The property has undergone a several alterations to the exterior of the house and detached garage since it was first constructed in 1928. Both the house in 2019 and detached garage at an unknown date had an asphalt composite roof added to their flat roofs, in 2019 a solar thermal collection system was installed on top of the roof of the house, and in 2016 the down spouts were modified in an unknown manner to be replaced with rain collection cisterns. The garage originally had carriage doors, as evidenced by the hinge mortises, that were replaced at an unknown date with its current two car width rolling garage door. These alterations do not significantly impair the resource's integrity.

Prior to 1951 stucco covered brick walls were added to either side of the house. The majority of the windows on the resource's back and side facades were replaced with vinyl casement and double hung windows prior to 2008. In 2017 the wood arched tripartite windows on the front façade were replaced in kind, and in 2020 the vinyl windows on the side facades were replaced with wood multi-lite windows based off of neighboring residences constructed by the same builder. Both window replacements were done without guidance from historic documentation or input from Historical Resources staff. The replacement of the vinyl windows without evidence of the original lite pattern does not meet Standard Tree of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation where under standard three "changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken." While most of these changes do not have an impact on the resource's integrity, the inappropriate replacement of the vinyl windows significantly impairs integrity of design as it relates to HRB Criterion C.

The front facade shows several examples of undated alterations, including the replacement of the porch roofing material with variegated tiles, globe light fixtures on top of the wing walls and the stuccoing of the underside of the porch's roof. The worm stucco texture itself, and it's location on the underside of the porch's roof, is not common for the Mission Revival style. The Historical Resources Research Report uses neighboring properties, one of which has been significantly altered, that were constructed by the same builder, Thomas H. Thornton, to argue the originality of the variegated roof tiles and the worm stucco. Currently Thornton is not a Master Builder and his work

has not fully been evaluated. It is not concluded that variegated tile roofs and worm stucco texture identifying features of his work, and using neighboring properties as reference does not meet the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation where under standard three "changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or architectural elements from other buildings, shall not be undertaken."

These modifications and the lack of information about them negatively impacts the resource's the architectural integrity of the house by creating a false sense of history through a lack of differentiation between the original and the new, therefore staff does not recommend designation of the property under HRB Criterion C.

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

The applicant's request for designation for the property located at 3714 Nimitz Boulevard did not include information to support a determination under HRB Criterion D; therefore, staff has not made a determination regarding eligibility under Criterion D at this time. Eligibility under this criterion may be reevaluated at a future date pending submittal of additional information and analysis.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Designation brings with it the responsibility of maintaining the building in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The benefits of designation include the availability of the Mills Act Program for reduced property tax; the use of the more flexible Historical Building Code; flexibility in the application of other regulatory requirements; the use of the Historical Conditional Use Permit which allows flexibility of use; and other programs which vary depending on the specific site conditions and owner objectives. If the property is designated by the HRB, conditions related to restoration or rehabilitation of the resource may be identified by staff during the Mills Act application process, and included in any future Mills Act contract.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information submitted and staff's field check, it is recommended that the property located at 3714 Nimitz Boulevard not be designated under any HRB Criteria due to a lack of integrity.



Megan Bacik
Junior Planner



Suzanne Segur
Senior Planner/ HRB Liaison
Development Services Department

MB/SS

Attachment(s):

1. Draft Resolution
2. Applicant's Historical Report under separate cover

June 2, 2021

3714 Nimitz Blvd
San Diego, CA

RE: 3714 Nimitz Blvd Historical Nomination Addendum

Dear City of San Diego Historical Resources Staff:

Thank you for the response and constructive feedback on our historical nomination report entitled "Historical Nomination Report of the Thomas H. and Lena L. Thornton House, 3714 Nimitz Boulevard, Point Loma Heights Community – San Diego, California."

In response to the Report to the Historical Resources Board No. HRB-21-031 dated May 13, 2021 and staff's comments incorporated therein, we respectfully submit the attached historical and transitional photographs obtained from the Williams family, owners of the subject property for five decades.

We are thrilled to finally have the photographic documentation of the home's original features to support the nomination. These features are aligned with the side elevation window replacement and SOHO's submitted analysis. Additionally, responses to and concerns with items as identified in the staff report are noted below.

Please feel free to contact us via email, phone or in person for any clarifications or questions.

Sincerely,

Danny & Cheryl Codd
danny.codd@gmail.com
760 855-8627

Description of attached photos

Image number	Description	Areas of note
1	Front façade, c. 1956 Grandparents & baby	Original variegated tile, tripartite window, stucco on/under porch, porch light fixture
2	Rear façade, c. 1956 Baby in pool	Original sash 4-lite glazing pattern with horizontal muntins
3	Rear façade, c. 1956 Grandmother & baby	Original casement pair sash 4-lite glazing pattern with horizontal muntins
4	Front façade, c. 1965 Father & children	Original variegated tile, tripartite window
5	Front façade, c. 2003	Original variegated tile, tripartite windows, stucco on/under porch, porch light fixtures (note left glass globe shade is now missing cap and cage)
6	Front façade, c. 2003	Original variegated tile, tripartite windows, stucco on/under porch, porch light fixtures (note left glass globe shade is now missing cap and cage)
7	Side (south) façade, c.2003	Original round arch window on left (still intact); original 4-lite horizontal muntin casement pair with center stop flanking fireplace
8	Side (north) façade, c.2003	Original horizontal muntin casement windows, 2- and 4-lite
9	Rear façade, c.2003	Original horizontal muntin casement windows, 3- and 4-lite

Responses to concerns identified in staff report

Staff report text	Response
<p>“... the front facade’s two tripart arched windows, which consist of a fixed center and casements on either side.”</p>	<p>As noted in the nomination report, the front façade consists of two arched window focal groupings: the focal windows consist of large rounded arch picture windows flanked by smaller arched multi-pane fixed windows. All front fenestration is fixed sash. No prior evidence of casement hardware or modification is noted on the stained mahogany interior sash/casing/stool.</p>
<p>“Prior to 1951 stucco covered brick walls were added to either side of the house.”</p>	<p>As noted in the nomination report, the garden walls projecting from each side of the front façade are likely original to the period of significance. The north wall, which wraps westward along the alley, is clay hollow brick construction with matching original stucco texture with localized patches clearly visible. The south garden/patio wall attached to the house was rebuilt with stucco concrete block, and exhibits a differentiated texture. Continuing southward across the driveway, the wall resumes the original hollow clay block construction with matching original stucco texture.</p>
<p>“In 2017 the wood arched tripartite windows on the front façade were replaced in kind”</p>	<p>Clarifying the nomination report, 2017 work to the front focal window groupings consisted only of re-puttying selected panes with fixed sash in place, along with new paint. Linseed-oil based putty was used for the restoration.</p>
<p>“...in 2020 the vinyl windows on the side facades were replaced with wood muti-lite windows based off of neighboring residences constructed by the same builder.”</p>	<p>As noted in the nomination report: Proportions and dimensions of the reproduction sash were obtained from existing window, jamb and sill measurements. Physical evidence from the subject property was used to define the designs: (casement hardware and center stop mortises on the original jambs/sills/stools, intact sash details as measured from the existing original casement windows on the north elevation). These designs were then verified, as a sanity check, with neighboring properties from the same period of significance – but not prescriptively as interpreted in the staff report.</p> <p>This is consistent with Standard Six of the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, where replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.</p> <p>The William’s family pictures of the original side elevation windows shows perfect agreement.</p>

<p>“Both window replacements were done without guidance from historic documentation or input from Historical Resources staff.”</p>	<p>Guidance was indeed solicited from Historical Resources staff for the 2020 side elevation window replacement by email, phone and in-person requests, beginning in November 2019.</p>
<p>“The front facade shows several examples of undated alterations, including the replacement of the porch roofing material with variegated tiles, globe light fixtures on top of the wing walls and the stuccoing of the underside of the porch’s roof.”</p>	<p>As noted in the “SOHO May 27, 2021 agenda correspondence,” after a detailed site visit, SOHO concludes the variegated tile roof is appropriate for the period. Nearby Naval Training Center (now Liberty Station), c.1923, has the same tile.</p> <p>SOHO also concludes the lighting fixture electrical and bases appear original, and the current glass globes are not inappropriate. The original fixture shades (as evidenced by the attached Williams’ family photos) were lost over the years and it is our intention to replicate them in the future.</p> <p>SOHO concludes the stucco is original, with one layer over a base coat. The stucco texture on the porch ceiling matches the wall texture exactly, indicating application concurrent with the walls. Attempts to match original texture for garden wall and repairs do not match; the porch ceiling is an exact match and lends credence to being original.</p> <p>Lastly, SOHO concludes the original garage is also intact and contributes to significance under Criterion C.</p> <p>Williams’ family photos confirm the original variegated tile, textured stucco on the underside porch, and porch light fixtures.</p>

Description of attached photos

Image number	Description	Areas of note
1	Front façade, c. 1956 Grandparents & baby	Original variegated tile, tripartite window, stucco on/under porch, porch light fixture
2	Rear façade, c. 1956 Baby in pool	Original sash 4-lite glazing pattern with horizontal muntins
3	Rear façade, c. 1956 Grandmother & baby	Original casement pair sash 4-lite glazing pattern with horizontal muntins
4	Front façade, c. 1965 Father & children	Original variegated tile, tripartite window
5	Front façade, c. 2003	Original variegated tile, tripartite windows, stucco on/under porch, porch light fixtures (note left glass globe shade is now missing cap and cage)
6	Front façade, c. 2003	Original variegated tile, tripartite windows, stucco on/under porch, porch light fixtures (note left glass globe shade is now missing cap and cage)
7	Side (south) façade, c.2003	Original round arch window on left (still intact); original 4-lite horizontal muntin casement pair with center stop flanking fireplace
8	Side (north) façade, c.2003	Original horizontal muntin casement windows, 2- and 4-lite
9	Rear façade, c.2003	Original horizontal muntin casement windows, 3- and 4-lite











3714







