

THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO Report to the Historical Resources Board

DATE ISSUED:	January 12, 2017	REPORT NO. HRB-17-009
ATTENTION:	Historical Resources Board Agenda of January 26, 2017	
SUBJECT:	ITEM #13 – Certified Local Government Annual Re	port 2015-2016
APPLICANT:	City of San Diego, Development Services and Plannin	g Departments
LOCATION:	Citywide	
DESCRIPTION:	Consider the Draft Annual Report for transmittal to the Preservation to meet the City's Certified Local Goverr to the Mayor and City Council to meet the Municipal requirements.	nment (CLG) responsibilities and

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Direct staff to forward the Annual Report to the State Office of Historic Preservation and the San Diego Mayor and City Council, or revise the Annual Report and forward as appropriate.

BACKGROUND

This item is being brought before the Historical Resources Board in conjunction with the City's Certified Local Government (CLG) responsibilities. The Annual Report for 2016 also satisfies the requirement for an annual report to be transmitted from the HRB to the Mayor and City Council in accordance with Land Development Code Section 111.0206(d)(7). One of the responsibilities of a CLG is to prepare an Annual Report for the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) summarizing the work of the Board during the reporting period. The report utilizes a standard format for all CLGs and requires an accounting of the Board and staff activities throughout the state's fiscal year (October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016). The Annual Report format was provided by the Office of Historic Preservation and cannot be altered resulting in pagination, tables, and text on different pages and a number of different fonts. Since the Land Development Code Section 111.0206(d)(7) does not specify the period of time covered in the annual report to the Mayor and City Council, staff is utilizing the state's reporting period for that report, as well.

ANALYSIS

The attached document is a draft of the Annual Report that has been prepared by staff. Boardmembers should offer their insight and provide comment to staff regarding any additional information and issues that would be appropriate to include in the final Report.

The organization of the annual CLG report corresponds directly to the five CLG requirement areas: ordinance, commission, survey, public participation, and state requirements. In addition to this information, OHP requests a summary of local preservation programs. The National Park Service (NPS) reporting has also been incorporated into the annual CLG report in Section VI. While Section V also relates to the NPS reporting, it is only used for new CLG programs. The 2009 baseline report to NPS included 17,038 historic properties in the City's inventory prior to September 30, 2008, with an additional 1,495 properties added by 2015 and 42 added this past year to equal a historic resources inventory of 18,575 properties.

HRB activity has remained largely consistent during this reporting period compared to past years. During the current reporting period, the HRB designated 42 new individually significant properties (compared to 35 during the previous reporting period and 41 during the 2013-2014 period). In addition, 50 new Mills Act contracts were completed during this period, compared to 55 new contracts in the last reporting period. Project reviews continue to increase in pace with market demands for property improvements with a total of 3,181 reviews completed during the reporting period, compared to 3,054 in the previous reporting period and 2,847 in 2013-2014.

The most critical preservation planning issue facing the City continues to be the renewed development pressure on historic and potentially historic resources. With a steadily improving economy and increase in permit activity City-wide, staff has noted an increase in applications impacting potentially historic and designated resources. This includes demolition applications for properties over 45 years in age, as well as projects proposing relocation or other substantial alteration of designated historic resources to accommodate new development. Staff continues to work with applicants to educate them on the benefits of historic preservation, and to pursue projects that are consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Additionally, staff provides a free 30 minute consultation, as well as a Preliminary Review process to assist potential buyers during a due-diligence period in understanding the significance or potential significance of a property, how that property could be improved consistent with the Standards, and the historic/permit review process at the City. It is hoped that through this early consultation, staff can assist potential applicants in identifying a property that best suits their needs and goals

The most successful incentive program continues to be the Mills Act. The use of the Design Assistance Subcommittee also continues to be of great benefit to owners of designated sites. In July 2009, the City Council established the Historic Preservation Fund in response to General Plan policies for any and all potential grants, donations, fines, penalties, or other sources of funding for the purpose of historic preservation.

Our single greatest accomplishment during the reporting period was our successful completion of our CLG Grant-funded project to prepare the San Diego LGBTQ Historic Context Statement. Building on the emerging understanding of the history and resources significant to the LGBTQ community that was begun with the cities of San Francisco and Los Angeles and the National Park Service, the newly completed San Diego Citywide LGBTQ Historic Context Statement will allow the City to better identify, evaluate and preserve the LGBTQ resources significant to San Diego.

The following historic preservation goals have been identified for the 2016-2017 reporting period:

- 1. Finalize and adopt the surveys and Historic Preservation Elements associated with the Uptown, North Park, Golden Hill and San Ysidro Community Planning areas.
- 2. Develop new incentives to encourage the preservation and continued use or adaptive reuse of designated historic resources.
- 3. Provide training to staff, Boardmembers and members of the public on resource integrity and eligibility for designation, and the Site Development Permit process.
- 4. Conduct 200 inspections of designated historic resources receiving Mills Act benefits and ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract.
- 5. Continue to work with Code Enforcement staff and the City Attorney's Office on remedies to address unpermitted alteration of potentially historic and designated historic resources.
- 6. Complete customizations to the City's CHRID, including Mills Act monitoring.
- 7. Complete processing of two new historic district nominations and begin processing a third new district nomination.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends that the Board review the information attached, provide input, and approve the report for transmittal to the State Office of Historic Preservation and the Mayor and City Council.

Kelley Stanco Senior Planner/HRB Liaison

KS/el

Attachment: Draft CLG Annual Report 2015-2016 (without attachments)

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

INSTRUCTIONS: This a Word form with expanding text fields and check boxes. It will probably open as Read-Only. Save it to your computer before you begin entering data. This form can be saved and reopened.

Because this is a WORD form, it will behave generally like a regular Word document except that the font, size, and color are set by the text field.

- Start typing where indicated to provide the requested information.
- Click on the check box to mark either yes or no.
- To enter more than one item in a particular text box, just insert an extra line (Enter) between the items.

Save completed form and email as an attachment to <u>Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov</u>. You can also convert it to a PDF and send as an email attachment. Use the Acrobat tab in WORD and select Create and Attach to Email. You can then attach the required documents to that email. If the attachments are too large (greater than10mb total), you will need to send them in a second or third email.

Name of CLG City of San Diego

Report Prepared by: Historical Resources Board and Staff

Date of commission/board review: January 26, 2017

Minimum Requirements for Certification

I. Enforce Appropriate State or Local Legislation for the Designation and Protection of Historic Properties.

A. Preservation Laws

 What amendments or revisions, if any, are you considering to the certified ordinance? Please forward drafts or proposals. **REMINDER**: Pursuant to the CLG Agreement, OHP must have the opportunity to review and comment on ordinance changes prior to adoption. Changes that do not meet the CLG requirements could affect certification status. In April 2016 the City Council adopted minor amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations, specifically Section 143.0212, to clarify that if a Historical Report was required during the processing of an entitlement application, a Historical Report shall not be required again as part of a ministerial application that implements the entitlement. http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter14/Ch14Art03Division02.pdf

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

2. Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal/zoning code. Type here.

http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter12/Ch12Art03Division02.pdf http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter11/Ch11Art01Division02.pdf http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter14/Ch14Art03Division02.pdf http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter12/Ch12Art06Division05.pdf

B. New Local Landmark Designations (Comprehensive list of properties/districts designated under local ordinance, HPOZ, etc.)

1. During the reporting period, October 1, 2015 – September 30, 2016, what properties/districts have been locally designated?

REMINDER: Pursuant to California Government Code § 27288.2, "the county recorder shall record a certified resolution establishing an historical resources designation issued by the State Historical Resources Commission or a local agency, or unit thereof."

Property Name/Address	Date Designated	If a district, number of contributors	Date Recorded by County Recorder
Miguel and Ernestina Platt Lopez House 1845 29th Street	10/22/2015	Type here.	3/7/2016
Ammen and Henrietta Farenholt/ Cliff May House 3626 Hyacinth Drive	10/22/2015		3/7/2016
Joe Kruger Spec House #1 4366 North Talmadge Drive	10/22/2015		3/7/2016
Adolphus Hatcher House 4407 Georgia Street	10/22/2015		3/7/2016
Robert and Laura Ford House 1237 Cypress Court	10/22/2015		3/7/2016
George and Iris Goodman House 5330 Le Barron Road	10/22/2015		3/7/2016
John and Joan Lightner/Roy Drew House 420 Silvergate Avenue	10/22/2015		3/7/2016

Certified Local Government Program -- 2015-2016 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Alberta Security Company/Martin V. Melhorn Spec House #4 3917 Alameda Drive	11/20/2015	3/7/2016
Alexander Schreiber Spec House #7 1429 Dale Street	11/20/2015	3/7/2016
Nathan and Hattie Rigdon Spec House #2 1809 West Montecito Way	11/20/2015	3/7/2016
May Company/William Lewis, Jr. Building 1702 Camino Del Rio North	1/28/2016	On Appeal
Abelardo Rodriguez/Louis Gill House 4379 North Talmadge Drive	1/28/2016	6/27/2016
Royal Brown House 3643 Grim Avenue	1/28/2016	6/27/2016
Justin and Anastasia Evenson/Ralph L. Frank House 1041 Cypress Avenue	1/28/2016	6/27/2016
William and Cynthia Hall House 4180 3rd Avenue	1/28/2016	6/27/2016
Frank and Frances Young House 4476 Granger Street	3/24/2016	5/23/2016
John and Grace Danner House 4608 Vista Street	3/24/2016	5/23/2016
Joseph Sr. and Therese Strasser House 4416 Georgia Street	3/24/2016	5/23/2016
W.G. Reinhardt Apartments 1425 and 1431 C Street	3/24/2016	5/23/2016
Casper Kundert/David O. Dryden Spec House #1 3049 Palm Street	3/24/2016	5/23/2016
Lawrence and Dorothy Michel Spec House #1 4842 Biona Drive	3/24/2016	5/23/2016
Thomas Faulconer House 4152 Ibis Street	3/24/2016	5/23/2016

Certified Local Government Program -- 2015-2016 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Thomas Russell House	3/24/2016	5/23/2016
1611 Myrtle Avenue		
Lloyd and Edith Gray/Wurster Construction Company House	4/28/2016	12/01/2016
2324 Pine Street		
Norman and Elizabeth Maw House	4/28/2016	12/01/2016
3235 Freeman Street		
Louis Buray Spec House #1	5/26/2016	12/01/2016
552 Rushville Street		
Ada and Paul Hunt House	5/26/2016	12/01/2016
3738 Lotus Drive		
Silverado Ballroom	5/26/2016	12/01/2016
4007 Euclid Avenue and 4750-4756 University Avenue		
Harry and Eva Hill House	5/26/2016	12/01/2016
1079 Devonshire Drive		
Enrique and Esperanza Aldrete/Carl B. Hays House	5/26/2016	12/01/2016
5232 Marlborough Drive		
Frank and Johanna Linder/Louise Severin Spec House #1	6/23/2016	12/01/2016
4220 Norfolk Terrace		
A.F. and Ruby Cornell House	6/23/2016	12/01/2016
140 Quince Street		
Truax House	7/28/2016	9/30/2016
2513-2515 Union Street		
Ernest and Margaret Leighton House	7/28/2016	9/30/2016
4126 Hilldale Road		
The Rock House	7/28/2016	9/30/2016
3920 Adams Avenue		
Jackson Johnson III/ Lloyd Ruocco & Homer Delawie House	7/28/2016	9/30/2016
8272 El Paseo Grande		
J.W. and Dora Fleming/Hurlburt and Tifal House	8/25/2016	9/30/2016
2925 Cedar Street		

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Alberta Security Company/Martin V. Melhorn Spec House #5 4774 Panorama Drive	8/25/2016	9/30/2016
Gladys Benson House 1617 West Montecito Way	9/20/2016	12/8/2016
Rodney Eales/Sim Bruce Richards House 391Catalina Blvd	9/20/2016	12/8/2016
John and Elsa Pearson/John Pearson Spec House #1 3435-3435 ½ Texas Street	9/20/2016	12/8/2016
Edgar and Carrie Coleman Residence 7510-7516½ Draper Avenue	9/20/2016	On Appeal

2. What properties/districts have been de-designated this past year? For districts, include the total number of resource contributors.

Property Name/Address	Date Removed
None	Type here.

C. Historic Preservation Element/Plan

1. Do you address historic preservation in your general plan? \Box No

Yes, in a separate historic preservation element.	\Box Yes, it is included in another element.
Provide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s) of	the General Plan.
http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/pdf/generalplan/adopte	<u>edhpelem.pdf</u>

- 2. Have you made any updates to your historic preservation plan or historic preservation element in your community's general plan? □ Yes ☑ No If you have, provide an electronic link. Type here.
- 3. When will your next General Plan update occur? 15 to 20 years

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

D. Review Responsibilities

1. Who takes responsibility for design review or Certificates of Appropriateness?

□ All projects subject to design review go the commission.

☑ Some projects are reviewed at the staff level without commission review. What is the threshold between staff-only review and full-commission review? The City of San Diego has a three-tiered system of design review for historical sites. The HRB has authority for recommendations on projects that may have adverse impacts on historical resources. The Design Assistance Subcommittee (DAS) of the HRB provides informal input to applicants and staff on projects affecting historical resources. Historical Resources staff reviews and approves minor modifications to historical resources that are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If staff approves a project as a minor modification or if the DAS review concludes that a project is consistent with the Standards, the full HRB would not normally consider the project, although projects with major community interest may go forward to the full HRB for review and comment.

2. California Environmental Quality Act

• What is the role of the staff and commission in *providing input* to CEQA documents prepared for or by the local government? Historical Resources staff reviews all environmental documents for projects prepared for the City that may have an effect on a designated historical resource or on a potentially significant historical resource during the public review period. Historical Resources staff prepares the Historical Resources section of environmental documents prepared by the City of San Diego.

What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* CEQA documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? *Draft CEQA documents are reviewed and approved by Historical Resources staff prior to public review when a designated historical resource would be impacted by a proposed project. The final CEQA document for projects affecting designated historical resources is formally reviewed by the HRB in association with review of a site development permit for the substantial alteration of a historical resource. In this circumstance, the HRB makes a formal*

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

recommendation on the project and the environmental document, specifically the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures, to the Planning Commission.

3. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

- What is the role of the staff and commission in providing input to Section 106 documents prepared for or by; the local government? Historical Resources staff reviews and approves the Historical Resources section of all Section 106 documents for projects prepared for the City that may have an effect on a National Register eligible resource prior to the public review period. Historical Resources staff prepares the Historical Resources section of Section 106 documents prepared by the City of San Diego
- What is the role of the staff and commission in reviewing Section 106 documents for projects that are proposed within
 the jurisdiction of the local government? The Section 106 consultation process is completed before the
 Section 106 document is distributed for public review. The HRB reviews all of the information for
 projects on which they make a recommendation. The HRB along with its Policy and Design
 Assistance Subcommittees and/or appointed ad hoc committees also participates in Section 106
 consultations initiated by other agencies for federal projects affecting National Register eligible
 sites, including negotiations on any Programmatic Agreements.

II. Establish an Adequate and Qualified Historic Preservation Review Commission by State or Local Legislation.

A. Commission Membership

Name	Professional Discipline	Date Appointed	Date Term Ends	Email Address
Dr. Michael Baksh	Archaeologist	07/13/2010	03/01/2013	mgbaksh@aol.com
Priscilla Berge	Historian	11/22/2006	03/01/2013	paberge@cox.net
Maria Curry	Historic Architect / Historic Preservation Planner	05/24/2004	03/01/2012 Served until 7/19/2016	marucurry@yahoo.com
Gail Garbini	Landscape Architect	02/11/2008	03/01/2013 Served until 7/19/2016	ggarbini@garbiniandgarbini.com

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Richard Larimer	Architect	04/23/2012	03/01/2014	tlarimer@larimerdesign.com
John Lemmo	Law	02/11/2008	03/01/2014 Served until 7/19/2016	john.lemmo@procopio.com
Linda Marrone	Real Estate	11/24/2008	Resigned 2/2016	Imarrone@san.rr.com
Abel Silvas	Native American/Californio Family Descendant	03/24/2003	03/01/2011 Served until 7/19/2016	runninggrunion@juno.com
Dr. Ann Woods	Architectural History	11/12/2009	03/01/2017	awoods@sandiego.edu
Courtney Coyle	Fine Arts/Law	07/19/2016	03/01/2018	courtcoyle@aol.com
Amy Strider- Harleman	Real Estate/Law	07/19/2016	03/01/2017	ash@petersonprice.com
Tim Hutter	Law	07/19/2016	03/01/2018	thutter@allenmatkins.com
David McCullough	Landscape Architect	07/19/2016	03/01/2017	david@mlasd.com
Todd Pitman	Landscape Architect	07/19/2016	03/01/2017	tdpitman@ucsd.edu
Matt Winter	Architect	07/19/2016	03/01/2018	mwinter@bnim.com
Vacant	General			

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all members.

- 1. If you do not have two qualified professionals on your commission, explain why the professional qualifications not been met and how professional expertise is otherwise being provided. Type here.
- If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled? The HRB currently
 three termed-out positions and one vacancy. The Mayor's office and CLG staff are actively recruiting
 knowledgeable individuals to fill these positions. The termed-out Boardmembers continue to serve until
 they are replaced.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

🗌 No

B. Staff to the Commission/CLG staff

- 1. Is the staff to your commission the same as your CLG coordinator? 🗹 Yes
- 2. If the position(s) is not currently filled, why is there a vacancy? Type here.

Name/Title	Discipline	Dept. Affiliation	Email Address
Shannon Anthony	Board Secretary	Development Services;	SAnthony@sandiego.gov
Board Secretary		Project Submittal and	
(03/2008 to present)		Management Division	
Jodie Brown	History & Planning	Development Services;	JDBrown@sandiego.gov
Senior Planner		Project Submittal and	
(2/2008 – 3/2010; 10/2010 to present)		Management Division	
Jane Kang	History & Planning	Planning Department;	JKang@sandiego.gov
Planning Intern		Environmental & Resource	
(3/2015 to 3/2016)		Analysis Division	
Elyse Lowe	Management	Development Services;	ELowe@sandiego.gov
Deputy Director		Project Submittal and	
(7/2016 to present)		Management Division	
Camille Pekarek	Art History	Development Services;	CLPekarek@sandiego.gov
Associate Planner		Project Submittal and	
(7/2012 to Present)		Management Division	
Suzanne Segur	History & Planning	Development Services;	SSegur@sandiego.gov
Assistant Planner		Project Submittal and	
(5/2016 to Present)		Management Division	
Alyssa Muto	Management	Planning Department;	AMuto@sandiego.gov
Deputy Director		Environmental & Resource	
(4/2016 to 7/2016)		Analysis Division	
Kelley Stanco	History & Planning	Planning Department;	KStanco@sandiego.gov
Senior Planner/CLG Liaison	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	Environmental & Resource	
(3/2006 to present)		Analysis Division	

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for staff.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

C. Attendance Record

Please complete attendance chart for each commissioner and staff member. Commissions are required to meet four times a year, at a minimum.

Commissioner/Staff	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Dr. Michael Baksh	\checkmark	\checkmark	No Meeting	\mathbf{N}	No Meeting	$\mathbf{\Sigma}$	\checkmark	\checkmark	$\mathbf{\Sigma}$			\checkmark
Priscilla Berge	V	$\mathbf{\nabla}$	No Meeting	M	No Meeting	V	\checkmark	\checkmark	\mathbf{N}	N	V	\checkmark
Maria Curry	V	$\mathbf{\nabla}$	No Meeting	M	No Meeting	\mathbf{V}	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark			
Gail Garbini	V	V	No Meeting	V	No Meeting	V	V	V	\checkmark			
Richard Larimer	V		No Meeting	M	No Meeting	\mathbf{V}		\checkmark	\checkmark	\mathbf{V}		
John Lemmo	V	\checkmark	No Meeting	V	No Meeting	\mathbf{V}	\checkmark	\checkmark				
Linda Marrone			No Meeting	V								
Abel Silvas	V	V	No Meeting	M	No Meeting	\mathbf{V}	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark			
Dr. Ann Woods	V	V	No Meeting	V	No Meeting	V	V		\checkmark	V	V	V
Courtney Coyle										\checkmark	\checkmark	V
Amy Harleman										\checkmark	\checkmark	
David McCullough										\checkmark	\checkmark	V
Todd Pitman										V	V	V
Matt Winter											V	V
Shannon Anthony Board Secretary	V	V	No Meeting	Ń	No Meeting		V	V		\mathbf{N}		V
Jodie Brown Senior Planner	V	V	No Meeting	\mathbf{V}	No Meeting		V	V		$\mathbf{\nabla}$	V	V

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Jane Kang Planning Intern		V	No Meeting		No Meeting							
Camille Pekerek Associate Planner	V	V	No Meeting	V	No Meeting	ą	V	V	\mathbf{N}	V	V	\mathbf{V}
Suzanne Segur Assistant Planner								V	V	V	V	V
Kelley Stanco Senior Planner	V	V	No Meeting	V	No Meeting	V	V	V	\mathbf{V}	\checkmark	\checkmark	V

D. Training Received

Indicate what training each commissioner and staff member has received. Remember it is a CLG requirement is that all commissioners and staff to the commission attend at least one training program relevant to your commission each year. It is up to the CLG to determine the relevancy of the training.

Commissioner/Staff Name	Training Title & Description (including method presentation, e.g., webinar, workshop)	Duration of Training	Training Provider	Date
Boardmembers	 Local Designation Requirements and Process, with focus on: The Historical Resources Board's Authority Designation Procedures Application of Local Designation Criteria HRB's Administrative Procedures 	3.5	HRB Staff	7/22/2016
Boardmembers & Staff	Ethics Training	1 Hour	Stacey Fulhorst, Executive Director, City of San Diego Ethics Commission	8/25/2016

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Boardmembers & Staff	Brown Act Training	30 minutes	Inga Lintvedt, Deputy	8/25/2016
			City Attorney, Office of	
			the City Attorney	

III. <u>Maintain a System for the Survey and Inventory of Properties that Furthers the Purposes of the National Historic</u> <u>Preservation Act</u>

A. Historical Contexts: initiated, researched, or developed in the reporting year NOTE: California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts to OHP. If you have not done so, submit a copy (PDF or link if available online) with this report.

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted to OHP
Uptown	A new historic context with limited field work is being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the Uptown community. Themes identified included the influence of the subdivision boom, streetcar development, suburbanization and the automobile.	The context and limited field work will inform the land use planning process.	In Public Hearing Process. Will be adopted Nov/Dec 2016.Resubmittal to OHP pending adoption of final survey.
Golden Hill	A historic context and reconnaissance survey are being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the Golden Hill community. The context focuses on the development of Golden Hill as one of the earliest residential districts located outside of downtown.	The context and limited field work will inform the land use planning process.	In Public Hearing Process. Will be adopted Oct/Nov 2016.Submitted to OHP in 2011. Resubmittal to OHP pending adoption of final survey.
North Park	A historic context and reconnaissance survey are being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the North Park community.	The context and limited field work will inform the land use planning process.	In Public Hearing Process. Will be adopted Oct/Nov 2016.Submitted to OHP in 2011.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted to OHP
			Resubmittal to OHP pending adoption of final survey.
Old Town	A historic context and reconnaissance survey are being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the Old Town community.	The context and limited field work will inform the land use planning process.	In Process. Draft context finalized, awaiting public hearing process which is anticipated to conclude late 2017.
Midway	A historic context and reconnaissance survey are being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the Midway community.	The context and limited field work will inform the land use planning process.	In Process. Draft context finalized, awaiting public hearing process which is anticipated to conclude late 2017.
Southeastern San Diego	A historic context is being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the communities of Southeastern San Diego and Encanto Neighborhoods.	The context and limited field work will inform the land use planning process.	Adopted October 2015. Submitted to OHP in August 2013. Final document included with this report.

B. New Surveys or Survey Updates (excluding those funded by OHP)

NOTE: The evaluation of a single property is not a survey. Also, material changes to a property that is included in a survey, is not a change to the survey and should not be reported here.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Survey Area	Context Based- yes/no	Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive	Acreage	# of Properties Surveyed	Date Completed	Date Submitted to OHP
North Park	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 1,466	Approx 6,500	In Public Hearing Process. Will be adopted Oct/Nov 2016.	Submitted to OHP in 2011. Resubmittal to OHP pending adoption of final survey.
Golden Hill	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 441	Approx 5,000	In Public Hearing Process. Will be adopted Oct/Nov 2016.	Submitted to OHP in 2011. Resubmittal to OHP pending adoption of final survey.
Old Town	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 285	Approx 234	In Progress. Draft survey finalized, awaiting public hearing process.	
Midway	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 902	Approx 613	In Progress. Draft survey finalized, awaiting public hearing process.	
Uptown	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 2,700	Approx 11,000	In Public Hearing Process. Will be adopted Nov/Dec 2016.	Submitted to OHP in 2006. Resubmittal to OHP pending adoption of final survey.

How are you using the survey data? These surveys are conducted as part of a community plan update process within each community. The community plan constitutes the land use element of the City's General Plan

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

for the subject area and is used to make land use and planning decisions for 10 or more years. The community plan survey, guided by a historic context, will be used as a planning tool to inform the plan update by making it possible to evaluate resources for land use planning purposes and to identify important aspects of community character. Areas identified as potential historic districts or as containing potentially significant individual resources are reviewed to determine whether or not the land use designations and zoning would have the potential to apply development pressure within these areas and adversely impact these resources. Second, potential historic districts are mapped and flagged for future intensive survey. Third, potentially significant individual resources are evaluated at the project level when a permit application is submitted.

C. Corrections or changes to Historic Property Inventory

Property Name/Address	Additions/Deletions to Inventory	Status Code Change From _ To_	Reason	Date of Change
Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.	Type here.

IV. Provide for Adequate Public Participation in the Local Historic Preservation Program

A. Public Education

What public outreach, training, or publications programs has the CLG undertaken? Please provide copy of (or an electronic link) to all publications or other products not previously provided to OHP.

Item or Event	Description	Date
La Jolla Historical Society Workshop on Historical Designation	Staff provided information on the City's regulations, designation report requirements and criteria for listing a property on the City's Register	3/12/2016

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Item or Event	Description	Date
Brown Act Training	The Board's required training on compliance with the Brown Act was open to the public.	8/25/2016
Ethics Training	The Board's required training on compliance with ethics laws was open to the public.	8/25/2016
Potential Historical Resource Review – Public Working Group	The Potential Historical Resource Review (SDMC 143.0212) requires that staff determine if a potentially significant historical resource exists on site prior to the approval of a construction or a development permit. A working group led by Historical Resources staff and comprised of individuals from local community planning groups and historical organizations participates in this review process by providing input to staff on the history and potential significance of a property under the adopted HRB criteria, prior to staff approving a project.	Ongoing
Individual meetings with historic property owners	To review the potential for historic designation. Initial design review for projects involving designated historic resources and potential historic resources. To review specific conditions and responsibilities of property owners with new Mills Act Agreements.	Ongoing

V. National Park Service Baseline Questionnaire for new CLGs (certified after September 30, 2015).

• NOTE: OHP will forward this information to the NPS on your behalf. Guidance for completing the Baseline Questionnaire is located at http://www.nps.gov/clg/2015CLG_GPRA/FY2013_BaselineQuestionnaireGuidance-May2015.docx.

A. CLG Inventory Program

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

1. What is the net cumulative number of historic properties in your inventory as of September 30, 2015? This is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or your best estimate of the number) in your inventory from **all** programs, local, state, and Federal. Type here.

Program Area	Number of Properties
Type here.	Type here.

B. Local Register (i.e., Local Landmarks and Historic Districts) Program

- 1. As of September 30, 2015, did your local government have a local register program to create local landmarks/local historic districts (or a similar list of designations created by local law?
 Yes
 No
- 2. If the answer is yes, what is the net cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties (i.e., contributing properties) locally registered/designated as of September 30, 2015? Type here.

C. Local Tax Incentives Program

- 1. As of September 30, 2015, did your local government have a local historic preservation tax incentives program (e.g. Mills Act)?
- 2. If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties whose owners have taken advantage of those incentives as of September 30, 2015? Type here.

D. Local "Bricks and Mortar" Grants/Loans Program

- 1. As of September 30, 2015, did your local government have a locally-funded, historic preservation grants/loan program for rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? Type here.
- 2. If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties assisted by these grants or loans as of September 30, 2015? Type here.

E. Local Design Review/Regulatory Program

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

- 2. If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties that your local government has reviewed under that process as of September 30, 2015? Type here.

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

- As of September 30, 2015, did your local government by purchase, donation, condemnation, or other means help to acquire or acquire itself some degree of title (e.g., fee simple interest or an easement) in historic properties?
 Yes
- If the answer is yes, what is the cumulative number (or your best estimate of the number) of historic properties with a
 property interest acquisition assisted or carried out by your local government as of September 30, 2015?
 Type here.

VI. Additional Information for National Park Service Annual Products Report for CLGs

NOTE: OHP will forward this information to NPS on your behalf. **Please read** "Guidance for completing the Annual Products Report for CLGs" located <u>http://www.nps.gov/clg/2015CLG_GPRA/FY2014_AnnualReportGuidance-May2015.docx</u>.

A. CLG Inventory Program

During the reporting period (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) how many historic properties did your local government **add** to the CLG inventory? This is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or your best estimate of the number) added to your inventory **from all programs**, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting year. These might include National Register, California Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG surveys, and local designations.

Program area	Number of Properties added
National, State and Local Designations	42

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

B. Local Register (i.e., Local Landmarks and Historic Districts) Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) did you have a local register program to create local landmarks and/or local districts (or a similar list of designations) created by local law?
- If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been added to your register or designated since October 1, 2015? 42

C. Local Tax Incentives Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) did you have a Local Tax Incentives Program, such as the Mills Act? 🗹 Yes 🗌 No
- 2. If the answer is yes, how many properties have been added to this program since October 1, 2015?

Name of Program	Number of Properties Added During 2015-2016	Total Number of Properties Benefiting From Program
Mills Act	50	1400

D. Local "bricks and mortar" grants/loan program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) did you have a local government historic preservation grant and/or loan program for rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? □Yes ☑No
- 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) **after** October 1, 2015? Type here.

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
Type here.	Type here.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

E. Design Review/Local Regulatory Program

- 2. If the answer is yes then, since October 1, 2015, how many historic properties did your local government review for compliance with your local government's historic preservation regulatory law(s)? **3,181**

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2015-September 30, 2016) did you have a local program to acquire (or help to acquire) historic properties in whole or in part through purchase, donation, or other means? Yes No
- 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) **since** October 1, 2015?

Name of Program	Number of Properties that have Benefited
Type here.	Type here.

VII. In addition to the minimum CLG requirements, OHP is interested in a Summary of Local Preservation Programs

A. What are the most critical preservation planning issues? As with the last reporting period, with a steadily improving economy and increase in permit activity City-wide, staff has noted an increase in applications impacting potentially historic and designated resources. This includes demolition applications for potentially historic properties, as well as projects proposing relocation or other substantial alteration of designated historic resources to accommodate new development. Staff continues to work with applicants to educate them on the benefits of historic preservation, and to

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

pursue projects that are consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Additionally, staff provides a free 30 minute consultation, as well as a Preliminary Review process to assist potential buyers during a due-diligence period in understanding the significance or potential significance of a property, how that property could be improved consistent with the Standards, and the historic/permit review process at the City. It is hoped that through this early consultation, staff can assist potential applicants in identifying a property that best suits their needs and goals.

- B. What is the single accomplishment of your local government this year that has done the most to further preservation in your community? Our single greatest accomplishment during the reporting period was our successful completion of our CLG Grant-funded project to prepare the San Diego LGBTQ Historic Context Statement. Building on the emerging understanding of the history and resources significant to the LGBTQ community that was begun with the cities of San Francisco and Los Angeles and the National Park Service, the newly completed San Diego Citywide LGBTQ Historic Context Statement will allow the City to better identify, evaluate and preserve the LGBTQ resources significant to San Diego.
- C. What recognition are you providing for successful preservation projects or programs? In May of each year the City's HRB recognizes individuals, groups, businesses and agencies who positively contribute to the preservation and advancement of San Diego's unique history and heritage. The Board recognizes achievements in the categories of Agency, Archaeology, Architectural Reconstruction, Rehabilitation, Restoration, Community History, Cultural Diversity, Cultural Landscape, History, Individual Accomplishment, and Preservation Advancement. Nominations are accepted from Boardmembers, staff and members of the public between February and April each year. The award recipients are recognized at the annual ceremony in May, where they receive their Awards of Excellence from the Board and commendations from various City Councilmembers. Additionally, during the last two weeks of May, posters and photographs, brochures, and exhibits are displayed in the lobby of the City Administration Building to highlight historic preservation in San Diego. The display coincides with the annual awards celebration.
- D. How did you meet or not meet the goals identified in your annual report for last year? Goals were met as follows:
 1.) Finalize and adopt the surveys and Historic Preservation Elements associated with the Southeast,

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

Uptown, North Park, Golden Hill and San Ysidro Community Planning areas. (GOAL PARTIALLY MET. Southeast was completed and adopted. Uptown, North Park, Golden Hill and San Ysidro will be complete and adopted by then end of calendar year 2016.

2.) Provide training to staff, Boardmembers and members of the public on resource integrity and eligibility for designation, and work with the San Diego AIA to present a workshop on San Diego Modernism. (GOAL NOT YET MET. Training was postponed until new Boardmembers were seated, which occurred at the end of July 2016. Staff is currently developing a training program in conjunction with the HRB.)

3.) In conjunction with NPS, hold an all day workshop with City workers, lease holders, and non-profits on NHL stewardship best practices as they apply to the historically significant buildings and cultural landscape of Balboa Park. (GOAL NOT YET MET.)

4.) Conduct 200 inspections of designated historic resources receiving Mills Act benefits and ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract. (GOAL MET)

5.) Continue to work with Neighborhood Code Enforcement staff and the City Attorney's Office on remedies to address unpermitted alteration of potentially historic and designated historic resources. (GOAL NOT YET MET, ongoing)

6.) Complete the Historic Preservation Element for the Midway Community Plan Update. (GOAL MET)

7.) Complete customizations to the City's CHRID, including Mills Act monitoring. (GOAL NOT YET MET, ongoing)

8.) Complete the San Diego LGBTQ Historic Context Statement. (GOAL MET)

E. What are your local historic preservation goals for 2015-2016? **Goals for 2016-2017**:

1.) Finalize and adopt the surveys and Historic Preservation Elements associated with the Uptown, North Park, Golden Hill and San Ysidro Community Planning areas.

2.) Develop new incentives to encourage the preservation and continued use or adaptive reuse of designated historic resources.

3.) Provide training to staff, Boardmembers and members of the public on resource integrity and eligibility for designation, and the Site Development Permit process

4.) Conduct 200 inspections of designated historic resources receiving Mills Act benefits and ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

5.) Continue to work with Code Enforcement staff and the City Attorney's Office on remedies to address unpermitted alteration of potentially historic and designated historic resources.

6.) Complete customizations to the City's CHRID, including Mills Act monitoring.

7.) Complete processing of two new historic district nominations and begin processing a third new district nomination.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016)

- F. So that we may better serve you in the future, are there specific areas and/or issues with which you could use technical assistance from OHP? National Historic Landmark Stewardship
- G. In what subject areas would you like to see training provided by the OHP? How you like would to see the training delivered (workshops, online, technical assistance bulletins, etc.)?

Training Needed or Desired	Desired Delivery Format
Cultural Landscapes	Workshop or Webinar
Postmodernism	Workshop or Webinar

- H. Would you be willing to host a training working workshop in cooperation with OHP? \square Yes \square No
- G. Is there anything else you would like to share with OHP?

XII Attachments

Resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for **all** commission members/alternatives and staff

Minutes from commission meetings

Drafts of proposed changes to the ordinance

Drafts of proposed changes to the General Plan

Public outreach publications

Final Historic Context Statement for Southeastern and Encanto

Email to Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov