

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

**MINUTES OF REGULAR SCHEDULED MEETING OF
March 22, 2007**

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

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING

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

ATTENDANCE DURING THE MEETING

Chairperson	Robert Vacchi	Present
Vice Chairperson	Otto Emme	Present
Boardmember	Priscilla Berge	Present
Boardmember	Laura Burnett	Present
Boardmember	Maria Curry	Present – Left at 3:55 p.m.
Boardmember	John Eisenhart	Present
Boardmember	Donald Harrison	Present – Left at 3:00 p.m.
Boardmember	David Marshall	Present – Left at 5:00 p.m.
Boardmember	Delores McNeely	Present
Boardmember	Jerry Schaefer	Present
Boardmember	Abel Silvas	Absent

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

Legal Counsel in Attendance: Marianne Greene, Deputy City Attorney

***** SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS*****

HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD SELECTION OF A VICECHAIRPERSON

BOARD ACTION

NOMINATION OF OTTO EMME AS VICE CHAIRPERSON BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE.

Second by Delores McNeely. Vote: 10-0-0. Otto Emme elected as Vice Chairperson.

ITEM 1 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 22, 2007

Boardmember Eisenhart asked to have the word “never” struck from the sentence on the last page which read, “Given that staff’s report recommends designation under Criterion C, he could never vote for designation.”

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER HARRISON MADE A MOTION TO APPROVE THE AMENDED MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 22, 2007.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 10-0-0. Motion passes.

ITEM 2 - PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no speaker slips for Public Comments.

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

Boardmember Silvas called to say that he was out of town, monitoring for archeological resources, so he is unable to attend. Boardmember Harrison advised staff that he has to leave no later than 3:00 p.m. because his presence is required at Old Town San Diego State Park for the final run-through before Friday’s celebration of the 200th Anniversary of Pioneer Lewis Rose. Boardmember Curry notified staff that she will be leaving by 4:00 p.m. today.

OTHER GENERAL INFORMATION

Contents of “Blue Folders:” Letter from Donald Levi on behalf of the owner of 801 University opposed to the designation of Item 5. A number of e-mails on Item 8, the Uptown Survey, an e-mail on Item 9, Islenair, with the property owner requesting a change in a status code. On Item 10, there are four properties, three of which are owned by Wayne Irwin of Groveland. As he is unable to travel to San Diego today, he has requested a continuance of this item.

• GENERAL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Boardmember Harrison invited everyone to attend Friday’s celebration of the 200th anniversary of Lewis Rose, the person for whom Rose Canyon and Roseville were named. It will be held in Old Town in front of the Robinson-Rose House; there will a concert at 10:00 a.m. and various activities to celebrate this pioneer, the founder of the Jewish Community in San Diego.

Boardmember Emme brought some roadmaps of San Diego from the mid-1940’s. The most interesting feature is 805. He said that where one takes the merge to go south to 8, that was the dividing line for the City and County of San Diego, as well as other enclaves

of County-owned property such as Kensington and Normal Heights. He invited any interested parties to come up and take a look at the maps at the break.

B. Conflict of Interest Declarations

Conflicts of Interest - Boardmember Eisenhart asked if Item 10 would be heard today. Ms. Winterrowd said staff is requesting a continuance of that item. Boardmember Eisenhart said he has a conflict of interest on that item and won't be voting when it is heard.

Ex Parte Communications – Boardmember Berge reported that when she was viewing properties in Islenair, she was scolded by a City Code Enforcement official for not having her City ID visible while she was standing on the sidewalk. She did then identify herself as being a member of the Historical Resources Board.

Failure to visit designation sites – There were no failures to visit.

C. Staff Report

Cathy Winterrowd noted for the record that the Uptown Survey is Item #8 on the Agenda, but is erroneously listed as Item #12 on the staff report. We are now accepting nominations for the Board's annual preservation awards. Each year the City's Historical Resources Board recognizes individuals, groups, businesses and agencies who 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, Architectural Rehabilitation, Architectural Restoration, Community History, Cultural Diversity, Cultural Landscape, History, Individual Accomplishment, and Preservation Advancement. Nominations will be accepted through the April 9th Policy Subcommittee meeting. Nomination forms are also available on the Historical Resources website; there are a few forms on the back table. Nomination forms should be mailed or delivered to the attention of Ginger Weatherford. As usual, the awards will be presented at the May HRB meeting. So mark your calendars and plan on attending the celebration on May 24, 2007 at 1:00 pm.

Another reminder that consistent with state law, we are no longer providing printed copies of hearing materials free of charge. In an attempt to reduce the costs to property owners going through the designation process, the City will take on the responsibility of making copies of materials and providing them to members of the public for the cost of reproduction. Based on last year's volume of materials, the average monthly reproduction costs for hearing materials is \$39.00. To receive these materials in the mail or at Will Call on the 4th floor, an individual or group must make a request in writing. We have sent letters to our current distribution list with instructions for requesting an annual subscription or full monthly packet each month. In addition, individual copies of hearing materials can be made at a cost of 25 cents a page.

The next DAS meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 4; the next Historic Building Interiors Ad Hoc subcommittee meeting will also be held on April 4; the next Policy Subcommittee meeting will be held on April 9; and the next Archaeology Subcommittee

meeting will be held on May 14. There are two designation requests consisting of five individual properties from the public on today's agenda. These requests were submitted in November 2005 and February 2006. There are 60 requests waiting to be reviewed by staff and brought forward for designation. In addition to these individual requests on today's agenda, there are two items continued from previous meetings, one referral from Development Services, the Uptown Survey, and the Islenair Historic District.

D. Requests for Continuances

Staff is requesting a continuance of Item 10 – South Park Commercial Properties: Burlingame Garage, Rose Grocery, Fire Station No. 9, and 2141 and 2143 30th Street. One of the two property owners lives in Northern California and is unable to travel to San Diego this month due to health reasons. He has requested the item be heard in April 2007.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER MARSHAL MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE ITEM 10 – SOUTH PARK COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 9-0-1(Eisenhart). Motion passes.

ITEM 4 - REQUESTS FOR ITEMS TO BE PLACED ON CONSENT AGENDA

Both of the requests for items to be placed on the Consent Agenda were pulled at the request of Boardmember Berge and will be heard.

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 5 – ST JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL ANNEX/FURNITURE STORE

Applicant: Marie Lia and Kathleen Crawford on behalf of Mayasuki Ueda, potential developer (Owner: Donald A. Levi Trust); referred by City of San Diego, Development Services Department (DSD)

Location: 801-803 University Avenue, Uptown Community, Council District 3

Description: The structure is a two-story with loft, flat roofed, wood frame commercial structure built in 1919 and moved to its current location in 1927 resting on a concrete foundation.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate St. Joseph's Hospital Annex/Furniture Store at 801-803 University Avenue as a historical resource under Criterion A for its association with St. Joseph's Hospital and its contribution to the historical, social and economic development in Hillcrest, under Criterion B regarding its association with the historical Sisters of Mercy, and under Criterion C as a good example of early 20th Century Commercial architecture.

Report Number: HRB-07-014

Staff Report by Mike Tudury.

Public Testimony Opened

In Favor: Sarai Johnson, Bruce Coons, Kristin Harms, Mary Windorf, Nancy Moors, Paul Johnson, Ann Garwood, Ernestine Bonn and Ron May. (The last two did not speak.)

Opposed: Marie Lia and Donald Levi
Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

As a result of having two hearings on this item, Boardmember Marshall stated that he was glad to get additional information, especially the photos. After viewing the photos it was clear that the building had been designed to match the hospital's structure. As there is no other documented remnant of St. Joseph's hospital complex anywhere, the relocation of the building across the street one block or a half block away maintains much of the contextual relationship that the original building had. The Board has heard from the community today, and they consider it a landmark. It's highly visible, it's recognizable and people know and love the building. Boardmember Curry thought this building's interior, especially the surgery, was intact and this adds to its historical significance. Boardmember Berge, who said the building should be designated under all three criteria, with emphasis on A, to acknowledge the Hillcrest community's economical and commercial aspects of the spread of business beyond the trolley line with the impact of the automobile farther down University. The modifications of the windows reflect that this is a significant part of the commercial development, in addition to its significance prior to being moved. Boardmember Schaefer also supported staff's recommendation, noting that the photos show that the front of the building was so close to the hospital that the function of the façade was not meant to make it look larger than it was. The photos show that the three sides that were historically visible are the back and the sides and they do retain much historical integrity. He reported that when he visited the second floor, he saw that the glass in the windows had the irregularities and air bubbles that are consistent with original historic glass, not something that has been replaced. Some of the framing of windows on the first floor has been replaced, but they are consistent with what they originally looked like. He asked the first speaker where the archives of the Sisters of Mercy are located. The reply was that they are at Scripps Mercy Hospital in the administration center. Boardmember Schaefer felt that the original documentation in those archives would support the historical importance of this building. Referring to the 1987 decision by this Board, he said there are many examples of reevaluations of property having different outcomes based on the composition of the Board, the experience of the Board members, and looking at many buildings over time. Boards often have additional information, which makes it appropriate for different Boards to reach different conclusions. Boardmember Harrison reiterated that although this building was moved, the clock started ticking again and it has now been at its present location far longer than the 45-year-threshold typical for a historical designation. He said he was delighted to hear the story of the Bennington. He visited the monument many times at Fort Rosecrans and this now adds to his understanding of local history to know that this is where the victims of that terrible explosion were treated. He stated that the Schulman family has contributed quite a bit to San Diego. We can trace the Hebrew Home for the Aged to that family, as well as the United Jewish Federation. He is sorry that they didn't get involved before the 1970's because their involvement with this building is after its period of historicity. He would have been happy to name this building after them, despite the opposition of some members of their family, as they were great contributors to our community.

BOARD ACTION

VICE CHAIR EMME MADE A MOTION TO DESIGNATE THE ST. JOSEPH'S HOSPITAL ANNEX/FURNITURE STORE UNDER CRITERIA A, B, AND C (STAFF RECOMMENDATION).

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 9-0-1(McNeely)

ITEM 6 – HOWARD AND MAUDE BROWN HOUSE (Continued From February 22, 2007)

Applicant: IS Architecture, on behalf of Susan and Len Comden, owners, referred by City of San Diego, Development Services Department (DSD)

Location: 7126 Monte Vista, La Jolla Community, Council District 1

Description: The house located at 7126 Monte Vista Avenue is a one and two story Spanish Eclectic style home built in 1929 on a corner lot.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Howard and Maude Brown House, located at 7126 Monte Vista Avenue, as a historical resource under HRB Criterion C, as a good example of Spanish Eclectic architecture. In addition, staff recommends that the stucco garden wall, rear patio enclosure, and the 1988 alcove addition be excluded from the designation and Mills Act Agreement.

Report Number: HRB-07-008 and Supplemental Staff Memo dated March 8, 2007

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Berge asked questions about recent exclusions from the Mills Act. Ms. Saunders said that within the last year, the Board has called out resources, whether attached or detached, which don't contribute to the significance of the structure if added after the period of significance, even though they may be consistent with the standards, making it clear that those elements are not included in the designation as it is not part of the historic fabric. Those portions have been excluded from the Mills Act property tax reduction. Whether or not there is a Mills Act on the property, any additions must be consistent with the standards. Otherwise, a site development permit would be required. Ms. Winterrowd added that during the last year there were a number of properties, where either staff recommended or the Board included a request in the motion to exclude portions of the property from the Mills Act. This practice is consistent with the actions of the Board over at least the last 13 or 14 months. Boardmember Berge said that although she is new to the Board, she views this as a shift. She was struck by tax incentives on commercial buildings. She thinks there should be input from consultants, attorneys, and others in the community before the Board routinely excludes certain portions of property from the Mills Act when the additions meet the Secretary of Interiors standards.

Public Testimony Opened

In Favor: Ione Stiegler.

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Marshall said he too was a little concerned about this process as well. His recollection is that when the Board excluded portions of a building for a Mills Act, it was generally a garage structure or some other detached building. He agreed with Boardmember Berge and said that when the Federal government gives rehabilitation tax credits, they provide the credits for the entire building or project. An example is the old Police Headquarters. They are rehabilitating the original building, but also doing several additions which meet the standards. He thinks that if the additions to a building are compatible with the standards, we should deal with a house or building as a whole, not start blocking out corners and saying, "This piece is; this piece isn't." He does see some properties that come before DAS that add significant square footage to historical properties. Perhaps the Policy Subcommittee or staff could put in a square footage cap that might be allowed as additions as part of the Mills Act. This is a more modest addition which is pretty well done; the homeowner shouldn't be punished for having a well done addition. Even if the addition is not now historic, in a matter of years, it may become historic because alterations to buildings are designated all the time. Boardmember Emme felt it was the responsibility of the Board to split hairs. Does this house need to be preserved? Yes. Does it need to be preserved right now? No, it's in great shape. It is our responsibility to exclude newer additions. We should be able to sanction off parts of a home, whether a garage, an annex, or a room. You now see 15,000-square-foot homes next to 5,000-square-foot homes. It's a privilege, not a right to have a Mills Act. Boardmember McNeely agreed with Boardmember Marshall that this should be discussed in Policy Subcommittee. She also agrees that this is a modest portion of the home. Boardmember Curry said she thinks there should be a full board workshop. She thinks that each case is unique and should be treated with care – not try to create a recipe. She reminded the Board that we are trying to preserve historical properties. Chairperson Vacchi asked staff if this is a shift in policy or not. Ms. Winterrowd responded that she has been part of HRB staff for 14 months and portions of properties have been excluded from designations during the time she has been working with the Board. If an area is excluded from the designation, then it is excluded from the Mills Act, whether the Board comments or not. Although she can't remember each case, the Board has been fairly consistent with agreeing to the exclusions. It may not have been done over a period of several years, but it has been recently. Walls, portions of homes that have additions, and staircases have been excluded. She remembers exclusion of a portion of a house which was not a separate addition. She also stated that the Tax Assessor's office doesn't decide what is to be excluded. There have been discussions about what is to be excluded, and she and the person who assesses the properties agree that if an exclusion is in the Mills Act contract, then no reduction in taxes will be given for that portion of the property. Mike said that during the five years before Cathy's arrival, staff definitely excluded portions of houses from designation. He remembers one 50% addition which was done in a contemporary manner to a home in Mission Hills. It wasn't resolved during a Board meeting, but was definitely excluded. Bits and pieces that were clearly not of the historic fabric were often excluded. Boardmember Harrison said that in some cases homes are modified to such an extent that they are disqualified from becoming designated as historic, and they are thrown out completely. In other cases, modifications are made in such a way that they retain their historicity. Then there is a third level of homes which have never been modified and are clearly historical. This home falls into the second category of a house that was modified in

such a way that it has not been eliminated as a historical house. However, this particular addition isn't over 45 years old; it's a fairly new addition. We are just saying that we are not giving you credit for what you did in 1988, but you didn't disqualify the property which is deemed historic. He likes the term used earlier of "architectural welfare." We can encourage architectural preservation without also giving the benefit of a tax break on a 1988 addition.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER HARRISON MOVED TO ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO DESIGNATE THE HOWARD AND MAUDE BROWN HOUSE, WITH THE EXCLUSION OF THE STUCCO GARDEN WALL, REAR PATIO ENCLOSURE, AND THE 1988 ALCOVE ADDITION FROM THE DESIGNATION.

Second by Boardmember Eisenhart.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Boardmember Eisenhart, as an architect, said that there is always the question of not doing harm to the original fabric. If the applicant is lucky enough, maybe 45 years later that portion can be designated. He thinks this is a wise policy, and should be applied on a case-by-case basis. Boardmember Berge asked if this motion fails, can another motion be made. Chairperson Vacchi said that if this motion fails, another motion can be made.

Vote: 7-3(Berge, Marshall, McNeely)-0. The motion passes.

ITEM 7 – ANNE AND EDWARD LINDLEY HOUSE

Applicant: Scott Moomjian on behalf of Joan Greenhood, owner

Location: 4319 Arista Street, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: The house located at 4319 Arista Street is a one story Spanish Eclectic style home built in 1935 at the corner of Arista Street and an alley.

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

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Anne and Edward Lindley House, located at 4319 Arista Street, as a historical resource under HRB Criterion C as a good example of Spanish Eclectic architecture. In addition, staff recommends that the replacement of the aluminum window on the main façade with a wood window, as recommended by DAS, be included as a condition of the Mills Act contract.

Report Number: HRB-07-015

Staff Report by Ginger Weatherford.

Public Testimony Opened

In Favor: Scott Moomjian

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Berge was concerned with the walkway and steps. She thinks the steps should be excluded as they diminish the architectural significance of what was going on during this period. Mr. Moomjian said that his client has requested designation of the home only. It was staff's recommendation to include the concrete-and-small-stone-embedded walkway. The client would be satisfied whether or not the walkway was included. Cathy said that whether or not the walkway is designated would not affect the Mills Act as there would be no exclusion for the walkway. Boardmember Marshall didn't see the walkway on his site visit as it was not visible from the sidewalk. However, looking at the PowerPoint photo, it appears to him to be a 60's or 70's addition. He would support either inclusion or exclusion of the walkway. Boardmember Emme agreed that this flatwork blended in; it didn't detract.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER EMME MOVED TO ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION ON ITEM 7, THE ANNE AND EDWARD LINDLEY HOUSE AT 4319 ARISTA STREET AND DESIGNATE IT UNDER HRB CRITERION C.

Second by Boardmember Curry.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Boardmember Schaefer said that this technique of embedding pebbles in concrete is an ancient Roman method and a common Mediterranean method. He has excavated some Roman floors which had that technique. Our Mediterranean architecture is directly descended from Roman styles. This walkway is perfectly compatible with this style. Boardmember Berge said that she too will go along with the motion. She does believe the home warrants designation.

Vote: 10-0-0. The motion passes.

The owner, Joan Greenhood, thanked the Board for designation of her home.

ITEM 10 – SOUTH PARK COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES: BURLINGAME GARAGE, ROSE GROCERY, FIRE STATION NO. 9, AND 2141 AND 2143 30TH STREET

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

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

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

constructed in 1925, exhibits a low gabled roof, wood frame and clapboard siding on a concrete deck.

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

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

Report Number: 07-018

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER MARSHAL MADE A MOTION TO CONTINUE ITEM 10 – SOUTH PARK COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.

Second by Boardmember Berge. Vote: 9-0-1(Eisenhart). Motion passes.

ITEM 11 — 1520 FT. STOCKTON DRIVE HOUSE (Continued from February 22, 2007)

Applicant: Scott Moomjian/Dr. Ray Brandes, on behalf of Michael and Elysia Cooke, previous owners and new owner is Ms. Tina Hardley.

Location: 1520 Ft. Stockton, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: The house located at 1520 Fort Stockton Drive is a one story Craftsman style house built in 1920.

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

Staff Recommendation: Do not designate 1520 Fort Stockton Drive as a historical resource under any HRB Criteria due to the substantial alteration of a character-defining element, inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Report Number: HRB-07-009 and Supplemental Staff Memo dated March 15, 2007

Staff Report by Mike Tudury.

Public Testimony Opened

Opposed: Scott Moomjian

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Burnett asked if the owner had plans for the 1991 enclosure that might prove that this is a removable feature. Mr. Moomjian didn't know. Boardmember Emme recommended that the applicant make the modifications and then come back in two years to reapply. He felt that at this time it was not worthy of designation. Boardmember Berge

agreed that the character-defining feature of the resource is the entryway. It is an exciting little building but the colonial entry is lost and doesn't warrant designation today.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER CURRY MADE A MOTION TO ADOPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION NOT TO DESIGNATE THIS PROPERTY AT 1520 FT. STOCKTON DRIVE.

Second by Boardmember Berge.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Boardmember Burnett asked if this property is in the Uptown Historic Architectural and Cultural Landscape Reconnaissance Survey as a potential contributor. The reply was yes. Boardmember Eisenhart said that the scale of the house is so small that the element becomes overriding and the defining characteristics of the bungalow is hampered by that. He would probably be more sympathetic to designation if this were a larger scale house. Boardmember McNeely said the enclosed area is in the center of the house and draws attention to it.

Vote: 10-0-0. The motion passes.

The meeting was recessed at 3:55 and reconvened at 4:06.

ITEM 9 – ISLENAIR HISTORIC DISTRICT (1st Hearing)

Applicant: City of San Diego

Location: Various addresses within study area boundaries, defined by the properties along the north side of Isla Vista Drive to the north; the homes along the east side of Isla Vista Drive to the east; the Isla Vista cul-de-sac and the properties at 3203 and 3204 Belle Isle Drive to the south; and Euclid Avenue to the west, Mid-City: City Heights Community, Council District 7

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

Today's Action: Review the Islenair Geographic Historic District nomination; take public testimony; consider the level of owner support for the establishment of the district; provide direction to staff regarding the content of the nomination, including the district boundary, historical context, statement of significance, period of significance, classification of all contributing and non-contributing resources, and design guidelines; determine whether the district nomination is complete based upon this direction; and forward to a second HRB hearing for designation as a historic district. If the Board cannot find that the nomination is complete, it should be returned to staff with direction.

Staff Recommendation: Provide direction to staff regarding the content of the nomination, find that the nomination is complete, and direct staff to bring forward the district nomination for historical designation at the next available HRB meeting.

Report Number: 07-017

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders.

Public Testimony Opened

In Favor: Beatrice Avina (didn't speak), Mr. and Mrs. Lynch (didn't speak), Jim Varnadore, Christa Hansen, Patty Vaccariello, and Mary Vaccariello (didn't speak).

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Schaefer said this district nomination has well defined, defensible boundaries and a high percentage of contributors with a high level of integrity, as well as a high level of community support. Many of the buildings meet the context statement very specifically. The property owners are very proud of their homes and are keeping them up very well. Boardmember Berge supports the district. In her opinion, its strongest point lies in being a local reflection of the national small-house movement post-World War I to post-World War II and qualifies under A. It is relevant today if you are studying the role of government and private industry, and providing affordable housing. It is the forerunner of the Katrina Cottage movement. These homes also qualify under district criteria "d" and "j", in Boardmember's Berge opinion. In response to one of Boardmember Berge's questions, Ms. Saunders said that most of the zoning in the area is conducive to redevelopment of single-family homes. The original deeds did allow semi-business uses along a portion of Euclid Avenue. There are no Sanborn maps for the area. Boardmember Marshall said that the half-block on Euclid stands out most. As none of those seven parcels are contributing properties or potential properties, he wondered if the boundaries could be reconfigured to leave them out. The result would be 78% contributors instead of 73% contributors. Because of a topographical change, they don't even seem to be physically related. Ms. Saunders said that staff did look at a number of different options, but no matter how they carved out properties in that area, it only changed the contributing properties a few percentage points. Staff decided to keep the original subdivision boundaries as the boundary for the district because they were more defensible and provided a good opportunity for appropriate in-fill. Boardmember Marshall said that he agreed with the use of Criterion C as the properties represent the architecture of the period. He thinks A is the primary reason, but C is also compatible and brings a greater depth to the district. There were two contributors that he has trouble with: 3329 Belle Isle Drive and 3329 Euclid Avenue. It appears that the roof extension over the enclosed porch of 3329 Belle Isle, rather than being a U-shape plan, is an addition and the apparent railing is a pretty prominent feature which obscures a lot of the real glass. Ms. Saunders said that although they had their suspicions, they were unable to pull residential building records in terms of the porch posts and railings. It is something that she would classify as mildly impairing integrity. When such modifications are identified, it is her intention to incorporate restoration of the features into the Mills Act. If the owner wants to enter into a Mills Act contract, staff would look into putting a more appropriate porch railing in its place as a condition of the agreement. Boardmember Marshall said that it appeared that the windows at the front of 3329 Euclid were changed out to vinyl ones and the block wall tends to separate the house from the street. Ms. Saunders said staff had noted the same modifications. In terms of landscape features such as the site wall, they were classified as mildly impairing integrity. They don't impair the integrity of the resources or historic fabric. Staff did note that they would want the wall modified as part of a Mills Act contract. The new windows used the original openings, so they would be considered moderately impairing, and they would ask for replacements via a Mills Act condition. Therefore it was

left in as a contributor. Boardmember Marshall complimented staff on an excellent report. In response to a question from Boardmember Burnett regarding the Development and Design Guidelines, Ms. Saunders said that the community had expressed an interest in working with staff to develop the Guidelines more fully. If staff is not able to meet with the community to work on the Guidelines prior to the second hearing, they will be removed from the nomination and returned to the Board for adoption at a later date. Boardmember Eisenhart emphasized that the strength of this community lies in the historic buildings and the footprint of each building. He hopes that we can keep one-story buildings from becoming two-story buildings in this community. He asked how many commercial buildings were on Euclid Avenue in 1952. Ms. Saunders responded that there was only one, Sunshine Liquor and Market, but commercial uses were allowed along Euclid Avenue. Mr. Varnadore said that was incorrect, and that Euclid Avenue is a residential street in a residential neighborhood, with residential zoning on both sides. There are a lot of grandfathered commercials which the neighborhood accepts. Ms. Sanders clarified that she was uncertain what the actual zoning was historically, but the original deeds from the 20's allowed mixed uses along Euclid Avenue, and the current zoning allows both low density residential and low intensity commercial uses. Boardmember Eisenhart also inquired as to the status of the property located at 3324 Isla Vista, which appears to have undergone a number of changes since the survey in January. Ms. Saunders responded that staff is aware of the window replacement, which may have been done without the required permits. Boardmember Eisenhart stated that the modifications included not only the window, but replacement of the clay tile roof with composite shingle and the removal of the decorative wood elements from the bay window. Ms. Saunders stated that staff will re-survey the property and provide an updated recommendation regarding the classification of that property for the second hearing.

BOARD ACTIONS

BOARDMEMBER BERGE MADE A MOTION TO ACCEPT STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION OF THE BOUNDARIES OF THE POTENTIAL ISLENAIR HISTORIC DISTRICT.

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

BOARDMEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT AS WRITTEN AS COMPLETE AND COMPREHENSIVE.

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

BOARDMEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE STATEMENT OF SIGNIFICANCE AS WRITTEN AS COMPLETE AND COMPREHENSIVE.

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

BOARDMEMBER SCHAEFER MOVED TO ACCEPT THE PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE MODIFIED TO 1926 THROUGH 1952 TO REFLECT THE FILING OF THE SUBDIVISION MAPS AND THE INSTALLATION OF IMPROVEMENTS, WITH THREE SPECIFIC PHASES OF DEVELOPMENT OCCURRING FROM 1927 TO 1952.

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

BOARDMEMBER BERGE MOVED THAT THE CLASSIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTING RESOURCES BE SIMPLY 5D3.

Second by Boardmember McNeely.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Boardmember Marshall asked staff if changing the codes would create extra work for staff. Ms. Saunders said the codes are ones used at the State level. In the chart, she may or may not have made it clear that we are not designating properties with a 5B status code as individual resources at this time. Individual designation of these properties would require a site specific historic resource research report and a separate Board action. She will add that explanation to the chart.

SUBSTITUTE MOTION

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO ACCEPT THE STATUS CODES AS CLASSIFIED BY STAFF, BUT PUT INTO THE TEXT A FULLER EXPLANATION THAT PROPERTIES IDENTIFIED AS 5B ARE NOT INDIVIDUAL DESIGNATIONS AT THIS TIME AS THAT REQUIRES A MORE INTENSIVE HISTORIC RESOURCE REPORT.

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

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL TO MOVE THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3329 BELLE ISLE FROM THE CONTRIBUTING TO THE NONCONTRIBUTING LIST WITH A STATUS CODE OF 6L DUE TO SUBSTANTIAL ALTERATIONS.

Second by Boardmember McNeely. Vote: 3(Marshall, McNeely, Eisenhart)-5-0. The motion fails.

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL TO MOVE THE PROPERTY LOCATED AT 3329 EUCLID FROM THE CONTRIBUTING TO THE NONCONTRIBUTING LIST WITH A STATUS CODE OF 6L DUE TO SUBSTANTIAL ALTERATIONS.

Second by Boardmember McNeely. Vote: 4(Marshall, McNeely, Eisenhart, Vacchi)-4-0. The motion fails.

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BURNETT TO ACCEPT STAFF'S CLASSIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTING AND NON-CONTRIBUTING PROPERTIES WITH THE CAVEAT THAT STAFF WILL FOLLOW UP ON 3324 ISLA VISTA TO DETERMINE THE EXTENT OF RECENT MODIFICATIONS AND WHETHER OR NOT THE STATUS CODE AND CLASSIFICATION OF THE PROPERTY SHOULD BE MODIFIED.

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

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BURNETT TO DECLARE THE NOMINATION COMPLETE AND TO HAVE A SECOND HEARING AT THE APRIL MEETING.

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

ITEM 8 — UPTOWN HISTORIC SURVEY – CONTINUED FROM NOVEMBER 2006

Applicant: City of San Diego,

Location: Uptown Community, Council Districts 2 and 3

Description: Reconnaissance survey of the Uptown Community Plan Area, identifying significant architectural and cultural landscape resources.

Today's Action: Review the Uptown Historic Survey and forward it to the City Council with a recommendation either in favor of adoption, or opposed to adoption, of the survey for use in the planning process.

Staff Recommendation: Recommend to the City Council adoption of the Uptown Historic Survey for planning purposes, including the recommendations for implementation of the survey findings.

Report Numbers: HRB-07-020 – Please note that the Staff Report identifies this item as Item #12 rather than Item #8.

Staff Report by Diane Kane.

Public Testimony Opened

Opposed: Janet O'Dea with a request from Leo Wilson (who had to leave) to let him speak at the next hearing and to place the item earlier in the day, Kristin Harms representing the Uptown Historic Preservation Coalition, Mary Wendorf and Ernie Bonn representing the University Heights Historical Society with an organized presentation, Barry Hager and Janet O'Dea representing Mission Hills Heritage with an organized presentation, Nancy Moors (had to leave, but left a written record), Maria Lia, Bruce Coons representing SOHO, Mitch Berner representing individual Uptown property owners, Ron May representing Legacy 16, Inc, Ann Garwood (didn't speak)s, Scott Molloy representing the Business Industry Association and Urban Council, Linda Canada, and Sarai Johnson (didn't speak).

In Favor: Vonn Marie May

Public Testimony Closed

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Burnett asked what had changed between the November 2006 submittal and today's to get the community so upset. Dr. Kane said that the removal of the conservation areas probably played a major part. She explained that the city really has no such thing as a conservation area. If it did exist, HRB would not be the body that would have jurisdiction over it. The second change was the suggestion to go to Council. The code is unclear as to how surveys are to be adopted, and since this is so controversial, it was decided to refer it to Council for the final decision. Ms. Winterrowd said she doesn't think the Municipal Code is unclear - a part of the Board's powers and duties is to recommend to the Council the use of the survey for planning purposes. All the previously adopted surveys have all been located in

CCDC and have been adopted by the CCDC Board. In response to a statement made by one of the speakers that the status codes had been changed, Dr. Kane said that no status codes were changed between the first and second versions of the survey.

Boardmember Burnett asked Dr. Kane if she thought the public noticing and participation had been appropriate. She replied that she had asked SOHO and Mission Hills Heritage in University Heights to look at various components of the survey. Because of the late release of the information and getting it up on the Web where everybody could take a look at it, there were things that were not caught because of time constraints and the technology. There was a good workshop that gave people a glimpse at what the total product was, as well as a chance to look at the data behind the product and go through it with a fine-tooth comb. Ms. Winterrowd said that when this was taken to Uptown Planners a year ago, there was a huge turn-out at that meeting and discussion of the findings, but not the detailed status codes. The survey was taken to Policy Subcommittee; several members of the community attended that and were provided information. During the last year, there have been several opportunities for the public to participate and get information. Dr. Kane said that she thinks the difference was that the database wasn't up on the Web so that people could look at the data behind the recommendations until recently. Boardmember Burnett asked if OHP's opposition could be summarized. She is shocked that OHP hadn't expressed opposition earlier. She asked what is to be done; it seems such a waste to throw so much planning and effort out the window. Perhaps we bit off more than we could chew, but that was a bold move. Do we need to get the Planning Director in here; do we need to meet with the Planning Commission? How do we go about taking surveys; how can we use historical resources as an effective tool if we get so much opposition from both sides? Some of the best consultants in the state worked on this for years.

Boardmember Emme said that it resonated with him that there would be conflicts in the multi-family and commercial zones. There will always be. Single-family residences in areas like Mission Hills get taken care of. He asked if all the owners of record were notified. The reply was no; there is no requirement to notify owners of a survey. If a zoning issue evolves, there are requirements for notification and for environmental review. Boardmember Emme asked in what way did the East Village Survey differ from this one; were the owners notified? Dr. Kane said they were, but that was an intensive survey; this is a reconnaissance level survey. For the East Village Survey, CCDC asked for the properties to be designated or not as the property owners wanted certainty. The owners were notified because it was a designation action. That would have gone to City Council if there had been an appeal. In response to another question from Boardmember Emme, Dr. Kane said that all this survey does is flag properties for research. At this point every property that is 45 years or older needs to go through a review for historical significance if there is a discretionary permit. The people who make this determination are the intake staff in Development Services. They ask people for photographs and information on the age of the building. Based on that, they decide whether a report needs to be prepared and then, depending on the results of the report, whether it should be sent to HRB for review and perhaps brought to the Board for designation. This survey was trying to assist the people in making the initial decision. All this does is help answer the question, "Does it require a report?" We were attempting to put the DPR forms on the Web. Surveys are normally accompanied by these State forms. This was done electronically, but there is a particular link between the database and photographs.

However, in this case, the database was placed on line instead of the DPR forms because of technical problems. For the near-term future, the best we can do is to provide a link to the electronic photo files. Ms. Winterrowd said that DSD doesn't really need the DPR form. The survey boundaries will become a GIS layer on the system that all of DSD has access to. They won't have a hard paper copy, but they will have access to the data. Instead of providing the form that normally accompanies such surveys, we provided the information that would go on the form.

Boardmember Eisenhart said that he was excited about seeing the Courtyard Apartments – Thematic District. It's very special in Southern California and San Diego. Two thematic districts that he has trouble understanding are the Modern and the Victorian. Dr. Kane said that she is currently preparing a context statement for Modernism in San Diego, with the aid of a grant. A number of properties were identified as modern resources; the plan is to go back through those and cull them once we have a context for modernism. There is concern that we are losing these properties because they are not well understood nor well documented. With a recon survey, you use it as a sorting and filtering mechanism for more intensive studies. There are two types of districts – geographic and thematic. The thematic would require a very well developed context statement with a list of contributors. Then those people would be notified for designation. Ione Stiegler said that after the development of the streetcar which allowed home-owners to move out from the center of town, people were able to build Victorian homes that closely followed the path of this public transportation, and had easy means of transportation, pre-automobile. For that reason, Victorian homes are not all in one geographic location. A lot of Victorian homes were lost through that same pattern after infill started. So there is nothing that would hold together as a geographic district for Victorian homes. They represent an era of our heritage which has been lost and needs to be identified, thereby preventing the loss of even more such homes. At the opposite extreme, we have the Modernism. There is a whole swath of early 60's work that is being left out of the survey. As the 45-year date rolls around, we would be able to identify homes of that era. Dr. Kane said that another reason for the Modernism Thematic is that a number of these properties are located on canyon lots that developed after the concentration of homes in the districts. Ms. Stiegler said that the whole Park Boulevard row, the north end above El Cajon Boulevard should be a commercial core district. By being asked to view only one side of that due to the boundary given between North Park and the Uptown Survey, she felt it was difficult to get that to hold together. If you look at just one side at a time, there are too many gaps. She is open to looking at the Hillcrest urban core again. Technically, according to a subdivision map, Hillcrest was only about four square blocks. In the 2003 context statement, there is a mechanism for saying there is a context involved in this neighborhood for the gay, lesbian, and transgender community. There are over 30 oral interviews in the report. However, its time has not yet come as we have not reached 45 years. There is also no particular architectural style associated with the community. Boardmember Eisenhart asked if the status of properties in the reconnaissance survey would change. Dr. Kane said yes, absolutely. There was a great deal of building going on while the survey took place. If one went back to an area six months later, whatever was there would be changed or gone completely. It's a very fluid situation out in the field. Dr. Kane said she is grateful for the community input and very receptive to doing any needed clean-up work. At the end of the workshop in Balboa Park, members of SOHO gave her a list of buildings and the database was double-checked. The information wasn't included in the report because it would have

meant redoing every chart and table in the initial report and there wasn't time for that. She felt as a result of this hearing, there would be additional information forth-coming and a clean-up would be done when they had everything.

Boardmember Schaefer said that he has seen a lot of extensive modifications over the years in the area where he lives, and believes that a lot of the properties which are listed as being potential historical resources will fall out because they no longer have integrity. The area of Park Boulevard just south of Adams looks historical but 15 years ago it was a very different area. The survey will be very useful; he would like to see more work done with the photographs and the database, in terms of being able to manipulate it. Then when evaluations take place, a 10-block radius can be looked at to see if a building is representative of a particular style and where does it fit in. In terms of an overlay with zoning, that would probably be OK.

Boardmember McNeely said preservation really is absolutely key, but she worries about moving forward too soon before we have everything we need. She really heard the testimony from the community about conflicts and fiscal impacts.

Boardmember Berge said she is concerned about not hearing the response from the State Office of Historic Preservation. Dr. Kane said she received preliminary feedback yesterday. That information will be available at the next hearing. Boardmember Berge asked if we have received a written opinion from the City Attorney's office on whether or not the Board can adopt the survey.

BOARD ACTION

BOARDMEMBER BURNETT MOVED THAT THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE SURVEY OF THE POTENTIAL HISTORIC RESOURCES FOR PLANNING PURPOSES AND THAT WE RECOMMEND THAT THE COMMUNITY CONDUCT AN INTENSIVE LEVEL SURVEY OF THE NON-SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES.

There was no second.

BOARDMEMBER BERGE MOVED THAT THE HISTORIC RESOURCES BOARD ADOPT THE UPTOWN HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL AND CULTURAL LANDSCAPE RECONISSANCE SURVEY FOR PLANNING PURPOSES WITH THE CALIFORNIA STATE STATUS CODES REVISED ON PAGES 18 AND 19 OF THE SURVEY TO ALIGN VERBATIM WITH THE STATE OFFICE OF HISTORIC PRESERVATION DEFINITIONS OF THE STATUS CODES IN APPENDIX D OF THE SURVEY.

Second by Boardmember Burnett.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Deputy City Attorney Greene said that the Land Development Code, Section 111.0206(d)9 enables the Board to recommend to City Council and Planning Commission procedures to

use the historical resource inventory results in the planning process. Deputy City Attorney Greene said that it was her tentative opinion that the duties do not include the power to adopt the historical resources survey. The Board can provide for a historical resource inventory of properties within the city and recommend procedures to use the historical resource inventory results in the planning process. Boardmember Berge said the same section begins with “to establish criteria” as well as to provide. So the Board can at least establish the criteria. Deputy City Attorney Greene said that she had just given an oral, not a written, opinion. There is no time to provide a written opinion between the motion and the vote.

BOARDMEMBER BERGE WITHDREW HER MOTION AS STATED TODAY.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Boardmember Schaefer said that getting SHPO’s comments today is typical, but it is an improvement over the usual time of getting them two months after you’ve made your final decision. He asked if they have any beneficial application to making revisions to this document. Ms. Winterrowd said their comments vary; some refer to the formatting, some are related to having reviewed the document without the final chapter so they commented on our not having any implementation there and how it’s to be used. Another comment was that there was no Executive Summary. The comments right now are very preliminary. She thinks it’s a matter of staff talking with them and answering their questions or telling them where to find information that’s in the survey. Ms. Winterrowd said staff would respond before it goes to City Council, regardless of what the Board does today. The Deputy City Attorney said her opinion was a tentative opinion.

Chairperson Vacchi said that given the tentative opinion, the Board should give this back to staff to respond to comments from the state, and then bring it back. Perhaps the Board can be provided with an update next month, detailing what the next steps are and a timeframe for getting back on track. In response to some of the comments made by the public today, he stated that he views the report as a planning tool. It doesn’t take the place of the 45-year review. A member of the audience read a portion of the report aloud, to which Chairperson Vacchi responded that clearance comes from the Development Services Department (DSD). In the Chairperson’s view, using this is really more beneficial than the 45-year review because you get the added benefit of the work that’s been done through HRB staff, in addition to DSD staff. He does want to make sure that the material in the survey is accurate and can be updated. He wants to know how it will be applied to the 45-year rule, how it will be updated, and how it will be used by DSD. There is also concern over notice to property owners and how it will be adopted. Historical preservation transcends zoning. The survey doesn’t have to be absolutely consistent with zoning; it’s a different element. He would like staff to respond to themes brought up in public testimony next month.

REMINDER:

NEXT BOARD MEETING DATE: April 26, 2007

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

ADJOURNED AT 7:02 P.M.