

Historical Resources Board

DATE ISSUED: January 14, 2015 REPORT NO. HRB-15-007

ATTENTION: Historical Resources Board

Agenda of January 22, 2015

SUBJECT: ITEM #11 – Certified Local Government Annual Report 2014

APPLICANT: City of San Diego, Planning Department

LOCATION: Citywide

DESCRIPTION: Consider the Draft Annual Report for transmittal to the State Office of Historic

Preservation to meet the City's Certified Local Government (CLG) responsibilities and to the Mayor and City Council to meet the Municipal Code Section 111.0206

(d)(7) requirements.

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 2014 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, 2013 through September 30, 2014). 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 1,350 properties added by 2013 and 109 added this past year to equal a historic resources inventory of 18,497 properties.

The City is currently processing amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2). The proposed amendments will impact San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section143.0212, which requires review of all properties 45 years old or older when a construction permit or development permit application is submitted to determine if the property is historically significant. The section will be amended to exempt from the review process in-kind foundation repair and replacement (except for structures with a decorative block or cobblestone foundation) and construction of swimming pools in the rear yard (except on properties that have a likelihood of containing archaeological sites), as these modifications do not have the potential to significantly impact a building or any potential historic significance. The section will also be amended to clarify that a historic report that evaluates the building under all designation criteria shall only be required if the development proposes substantial alteration consistent with SDMC 143.0250(a)(3), meaning that the development is not consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It should be noted that these code amendments apply only to properties 45 years old or older which are not designated historic resources. Designated historic structures continue to be subject to review for compliance with the Historical Resources Regulations.

HRB activity has remained largely consistent during this reporting period compared to past years. During the current reporting period, the HRB designated 41 new individually significant properties (compared to 44 during the previous reporting period and 50 during the 2011/2012 period). In addition, the HRB amended the Mission Hills Historic District to include 68 new contributing resources. Staff continues to work with applicants on several pending district nominations, including the Inspiration Heights Historic District and the South Park Historic District. In addition, 90 new Mills Act contracts were completed during this period, compared to 75 new contracts in the last reporting period.

The most critical preservation planning issue facing the City is 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 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 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 the adoption of updated Community Plans and the associated Historic Preservation Elements for the Ocean Beach and Otay Mesa Community Planning Areas. Guided by Historic Context Statements and cursory windshield surveys completed by the City's historic resources staff, the Historic Preservation Elements will assist in the identification and preservation of the historic resources unique to each community. In addition, the goals and policies of each Element identify future actions which should be taken – such as reconnaissance and intensive-level surveys and development of theme-specific context statements – as well as educational opportunities within each community.

The following historic preservation goals have been identified for the 2014 reporting period:

- 1.) Complete the context statement and finish clean-up of reconnaissance survey data for the Uptown Community Planning Area, which is currently underway as part of the community plan update.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 Neighborhood Code Enforcement staff and the City Attorney's Office on remedies to address unpermitted alteration of potentially historic and designated historic resources.
- 6.) Complete the Historic Preservation Elements for the Uptown, North Park, Golden Hill, Old Town and Midway Community Plan Updates.
- 7.) Complete customizations to the City's CHRID, including direct in-put of surveyed resources and Mills Act monitoring.

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

Attachment: Draft CLG Annual Report 2014 (without attachments)

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

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 co

Date of commission/board review: January 22, 2015

Minimum Requirements for Certification

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

A. Preservation Laws

1. 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. The City is currently processing amendments to the Historical Resources Regulations of the Land Development Code (Chapter 14, Article 3, Division 2). The proposed amendments will impact San Diego Municipal Code (SDMC) Section143.0212, which requires review of all properties 45 years old or older when a construction permit or development permit application is submitted to determine if the property is historically significant. The section will be amended to exempt from the review process in-kind foundation repair and replacement (except for structures with a decorative block or cobblestone).

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

foundation) and construction of swimming pools in the rear yard (except on properties that have a likelihood of containing archaeological sites), as these modifications do not have the potential to significantly impact a building or any potential historic significance. The section will also be amended to clarify that a historic report that evaluates the building under all designation criteria shall only be required if the development proposes substantial alteration consistent with SDMC 143.0250(a)(3), meaning that the development is not consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards. It should be noted that these code amendments apply only to properties 45 years old or older which are not designated historic resources. Designated historic structures continue to be subject to review for compliance with the Historical Resources Regulations.

 Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal/zoning code. http://docs.sandiego.gov/municode/MuniCodeChapter12/Ch12Art03Division02.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, 2013 – September 30, 2014, what properties/districts have been locally designated?

Property Name/Address	Date Designated	If a district, number of contributors	Date Recorded by County Recorder
Chaplain Thomas L. Kirkpatrick House 3030 Dumas Street	10/24/2013		1/8/2014
William and Minerva Welton House 3033 Elliott Street	10/24/2013		1/8/2014
James and Mary Clark House 4274 Randolph Street	10/24/2013		1/8/2014
John C. and Marie O. Turner House 4747 Panorama Drive	10/24/2013		1/8/2014

Certified Local Government Program -- 2013-2014 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

Alberta Security Company/Martin V. Melhorn Spec House #3	40/44/0040	0/40/0044
4019 Hawk Street	12/11/2013	3/12/2014
Iver Lawson, Jr. House 3231 Front Street	12/11/2013	3/12/2014
Christian and Gertrude Baer/Dennstedt Company House 4600 Kensington Drive	12/11/2013	3/12/2014
George and Marion Cottrell/Cliff May House 7727-7729 Lookout Drive	1/23/2014	On Appeal
Ruby Snell Cottage 341 Playa Del Sur	1/23/2014	3/12/2014
John and Evelyn Rice/Arthur Keyes House 3565 Third Avenue	1/23/2014	3/12/2014
American Federation of Labor Building 2323 Broadway	1/23/2014	3/12/2014
William and Vera Wylie Spec House #1 4460 Hermosa Way	1/23/2014	3/12/2014
Dr. Charles Brown/Lester Olmstead House 1614 Torrance Street	1/23/2014	3/12/2014
George Gans Spec House #5 3125 Bancroft Street	2/27/2014	4/24/2014
Bay View Hotel 509 Park Boulevard	2/27/2014	4/24/2014
Olaf Norsven Spec House #1 833 Island Court	3/27/2014	On Appeal
Levi and Hannah Lindskoog Spec House #1 2435 Bancroft Street	3/27/2014	5/8/2014
United States Holding Company Spec House 2304 Juan Street	3/27/2014	5/8/2014
Abraham and Mary Scott House 4949 Canterbury Drive	3/27/2014	5/8/2014
Leslie and Louise Atherton House 5001 Canterbury Drive	3/27/2014	5/8/2014
Charles and Hazel Hassell House 2684 Jonquil Drive	4/24/2014	Pending

Certified Local Government Program -- 2013-2014 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

Cliff May House	4/24/2014		Pending
4338 Adams Avenue	4/24/2014		Pending
George and Virginia Hayes/Edgar Ullrich House 5905 Camino De La Costa	5/22/2014		7/7/2014
Jessie Brown Spec House #1 and Jessie Brown Spec House #2 3547-3549 Indiana Street	6/26/2014		8/19/2014
Frank and Adelaide Krapp House 7025 Vista Del Mar	6/26/2014		8/19/2014
Martin and Enid Gleich/Henry Hester House 5120 Norris Road	6/26/2014		8/19/2014
Walter and Louise Trible/ Thomas Shepherd House 6025 Folsom Drive	6/26/2014		8/19/2014
The Stafford Cottage 7415 Fay Avenue	6/26/2014		8/19/2014
Mission Hills Historic District Expansion Amendment	6/26/2014	68	Pending
George and Margaretta Heston House 1911 28th Street	7/31/2014		9/25/2014
Edward and Emma Barrett/Charles Tifal House 4156 Middlesex Drive	7/31/2014		9/25/2014
Gray Gables Inn 3530 Promontory Street	7/31/2014		9/25/2014
Josephine Seaman Rental Cottage 1327 Coast Walk	7/31/2014		9/25/2014
C. Wesley and Lucie Hall House 4175 Arden Way	7/31/2014		9/25/2014
Wirt and Maud Smith Apartment House 4574-4576 North Avenue	8/28/2014		11/7/2014
Earle and Helen Brucker/Benjamin Torgerson House 2555 Plum Street	8/28/2014		11/7/2014
Abraham and Anne Ratner House 541 Silvergate Avenue	8/28/2014		11/7/2014
James and Doris Byerly/Russell Forester House 1949 Paseo Dorado	8/28/2014		11/7/2014

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

Burlingame Historic District Contributor 2404 32 nd Street	8/28/2014	11/7/2014
Cornelia Fairbrother House and John Meed Ray Cottage 7224 Fay Avenue and 7224 1/2 Fay Avenue	9/25/2014	11/7/2014
Claus and Hulda Lagerberg House 5058 Westminster Terrace	9/25/2014	11/7/2014
J.B. Speculation House #2 3393 28th Street	9/25/2014	11/7/2014

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."

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
Spreckels Brothers Commercial Company Warehouse 372 Fourth Avenue	3/10/2014
Sanford B. Meyers Spec House #1 1619 J Street	4/29/2014

C. Historic Preservation Element/Plan

1.	Do you address historic preservation in your general plan?	□ No
	✓ Yes, in a separate historic preservation element.	\square Yes, it is included in another element.
	ovide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s) o	
htt	p://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/pdf/generalplan/adop	tedhpelem.pdf
2.	Have you made any updates to your historic preservation pla	n or historic preservation element in your community's
	general plan? ☐ Yes ☑ No If you have, provide	an electronic link. Type here.
2	When will your next General Plan undate occur? 15 to 20 v	ears

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

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

D. Review Responsibilities

\square 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.
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, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

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
Alex Bethke	Historian	03/02/2009	03/01/2014	abethke03@gmail.com
Maria Curry	Historic Architect / Historic Preservation Planner	05/24/2004	03/01/2012	marucurry@yahoo.com
Gail Garbini	Landscape Architect	02/11/2008	03/01/2013	ggarbini@garbiniandgarbini.com

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

Richard Larimer	Architect	04/23/2012	03/01/2014	tlarimer@larimerdesign.com
John Lemmo	Law	02/11/2008	03/01/2014	john.lemmo@procopio.com
Linda Marrone	Real Estate	11/24/2008	03/01/2013	Imarrone@san.rr.com
Evelya Zepeda Rivera	General/Fine Arts	04/23/2012	03/01/2014	erivera@iuvopa.com
Abel Silvas	Native American/ Californio Family Descendant	03/24/2003	03/01/2011	runninggrunion@juno.com
Dr. Ann Woods	Architectural History	11/12/2009	03/01/2013	awoods@sandiego.edu

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all members.

- 1. If your do not have two qualified professionals on your commission, why have the professional qualifications not been met and how is professional expertise being provided? Type here.
- 2. If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled? The HRB currently has three termed-out positions. 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.

B. Staff to the Commission/CLG staff

1.	Is the staff to your commission the same as your CLG coordinator? ✓ Yes	☐ No
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	Planning Department;	SAnthony@sandiego.gov
Board Secretary		Environmental & Resource	
(03/2008 to present)		Analysis Division	
Jodie Brown	History & Planning	Planning Department;	JDBrown@sandiego.gov
Senior Planner		Environmental & Resource	
(02/2008 - 03/2010;		Analysis Division	
10/2010 to present)			

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

Camille Pekarek	Art History	Planning Department;	CLPekarek@sandiego.gov
Junior Planner		Environmental & Resource	
(7/2012-Present)		Analysis Division	
Kelley Stanco	History & Planning	Planning Department;	KStanco@sandiego.gov
Senior Planner		Environmental & Resource	
(03/2006 to present)		Analysis Division	
Cathy Winterrowd	History & Planning;	Planning Department;	CWinterrowd@sandiego.gov
Deputy Director	Ethnography	Environmental & Resource	
CLG Liaison		Analysis Division	
(12/2005 to present)			

Attach resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for staff.

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	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Dr. Michael Baksh		V	No Meeting	V	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$					$\overline{\square}$	V	V
Priscilla Berge			No Meeting								\checkmark	
Alex Bethke		V	No Meeting						V		V	V
Maria Curry			No Meeting									V
Gail Garbini		V	No Meeting								V	V
Richard Larimer			No Meeting	$\overline{\checkmark}$					V			V
John Lemmo		V	No Meeting						V		V	V
Linda Marrone		V	No Meeting						V			V
Evelya Zepeda Rivera	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	V	No Meeting	V	V	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$		V		V	
Abel Silvas	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	V	No Meeting	$\overline{\checkmark}$	$\overline{\checkmark}$	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$			V		V	

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

Dr. Ann Woods	V	V	No Meeting		$\overline{\checkmark}$		$\overline{\checkmark}$			$\overline{\checkmark}$		V
Shannon Anthony Board Secretary	V	V	No Meeting	V	Ø	V	V	V	Ø	V	V	V
Jodie Brown Senior Planner	V	V	No Meeting	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Camille Pekerek Junior Planner	V	V	No Meeting	V	Ø	V	V	V	Ø	V	V	V
Kelley Stanco Senior Planner		V	No Meeting	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
Cathy Winterrowd Deputy Director	V	V	No Meeting	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	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	Duration of Training	Training Provider	Date
Boardmembers & Staff	Ethics Training	1 Hour	Stacey Fulhorst, Executive Director, City of San Diego Ethics Commission	1/23/2014
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	1.5 Hours	HRB Staff	3/26/2014

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

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

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 Process. Staff is working to finalize the draft context.
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 Process. Draft context finalized, awaiting public hearing process. Submitted to OHP in 2011.
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 Process. Draft context finalized, awaiting public hearing process. Submitted to OHP in 2011.
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. Staff is working to finalize the draft context.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted to OHP
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. Staff is working to finalize the draft context.
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.	In Process. Draft context finalized, awaiting public hearing process. Submitted to OHP in August 2013.

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.

California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts, to OHP. If you have not done so, submit a copy (electronic format preferred) with this report.

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 Process. Draft survey finalized, awaiting public hearing process.	Submitted to OHP in 2011.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

Golden Hill	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 441	Approx 5,000	In Process. Draft survey finalized, awaiting public hearing process.	Submitted to OHP in 2011.
Old Town	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 285	Approx 234	In Progress. Draft survey report under review by staff.	
Midway	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 902	Approx 613	In Progress. Draft survey report under review by staff.	

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 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	Additions/Deletions to	Status Code Change	Reason	Date of Change
Name/Address	Inventory	From - To		

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

| 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
Radio Interview – AM 1700	Jodie Brown, City of San Diego Mills Act Coordinator, participated in an on-air interview regarding the City's Mills Act program, the process, its benefits and the responsibilities.	4/22/2014
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

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

•	NOTE: OHP will forward this information to the NPS on your behalf. Guidance for completing the Baseline Questionnaire is
	located at www.nps.gov/history/hpg/local/2013CLG GPRA/FY2012 Baseline Instructions2014.doc.

A. CLG Inventory Program

1. What is the net cumulative number of historic properties in your inventory as of September 30, 2014? 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.	

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

- 1. As of September 30, 2014, 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, 2013? Type here.

C. Local Tax Incentives Program

- 1. As of September 30, 2014, did your local government have a local historic preservation tax incentives program (e.g. Mills Act)?

 Yes

 No
- 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, 2013? Type here.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

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

- 1. As of September 30, 2014, 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, 2014? Type here.

E. Local Design Review/Regulatory Program

	1.	As of September 30, 2014, did your local government have a historic preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance requiring Commission/staff review of 1) local government undertakings and/or 2) changes to or impacts on properties with a historic district? Yes No
	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, 2013? Type here.
F.		Property Acquisition Program As of September 30, 2013, 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 □No
	2.	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, 2013? Type here.

VI. Additional Information for National Park Service Annual Products Report for CLGs (certified before October 1, 2013).

NOTE: OHP will forward this information to NPS on your behalf. **Please read** "Guidance for completing the Annual Products Report for CLGs" located http://www.nps.gov/history/hpg/local/2013CLG_GPRA/FY2013_Annual_Instructions2014.doc.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

A. CLG Inventory Program

During the reporting period (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014) 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	111

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

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014) 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? ✓ Yes ✓ No
- 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been added to your register or designated since October 1, 2013? 109

C. Local Tax Incentives Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014) 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, 2013?

Name of Program	Number of Properties Added During 2013-2014	Total Number of Properties Benefiting From Program
Mills Act	90	1,295

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

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

1.	During the reporting period (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014) 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, 2013? Type here.

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

E. Design Review/Local Regulatory Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014) did your local government have a historic preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance requiring Commission and/or staff review of 1) local government undertakings and/or 2) changes to, or impacts on historic properties? ✓ Yes □ No
- 2. If the answer is yes then, since October 1, 2013, how many historic properties did your local government review for compliance with your local government's historic preservation regulatory law(s)? 2,847

F. Local Property Acquisition Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2013-September 30, 2014) 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, 2013? Type here.

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

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

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? 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 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 the adoption of updated Community Plans and the associated Historic Preservation Elements for the Ocean Beach and Otay Mesa Community Planning Areas. Guided by Historic Context Statements and cursory windshield surveys completed by the City's historic resources staff, the Historic Preservation Elements will assist in the identification and preservation of the historic resources unique to each community. In addition, the goals and policies of each Element identify future actions which should be taken such as reconnaissance and intensive-level surveys and development of theme-specific context statements as well as educational opportunities within each community.
- 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

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

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.) Complete the context statement and finish clean-up of reconnaissance survey data for the Uptown Community Planning Area, which is currently underway as part of the community plan update. (GOAL NOT YET MET, WORK WILL BE COMPLETED IN 2014-2015)
 - 2.) Complete the pending Mission Hills Expansion historic district submitted by members of the community in 2011. (GOAL MET. The district was designated in June 2014.)
 - 3.) 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, we hope to provide this training in 2015.)
 - 4.) 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)
 - 5.) Conduct 200 inspections of designated historic resources receiving Mills Act benefits and ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract. (GOAL MET)
 - 6.) 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)
- E. What are your local historic preservation goals for 2014-2015? **Goals for 2014-2015**:
 - 1.) Complete the context statement and finish clean-up of reconnaissance survey data for the Uptown Community Planning Area, which is currently underway as part of the community plan update.
 - 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.
 - 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.
 - 4.) Conduct 200 inspections of designated historic resources receiving Mills Act benefits and ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014)

- 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.
- 6.) Complete the Historic Preservation Elements for the Uptown, North Park, Golden Hill, Old Town and Midway Community Plan Updates.
- 7.) Complete customizations to the City's CHRID, including direct in-put of surveyed resources and Mills Act monitoring.
- 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.)?

Workshop or Webinar
L
rkshop in cooperation with OHP? $oxdot Q$ Yes $oxdot$ No
r all commission members/alternatives and staff

Email to <u>Lucinda.Woodward@parks.ca.gov</u>