

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF MAY 28, 2009
202 C STREET, CITY ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
COUNCIL COMMITTEE ROOM, 12th FLOOR
SAN DIEGO, CA 92101**

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING

◆◆ SPECIAL ORDER OF BUSINESS ◆◆

ANNUAL AWARDS FOR EXCELLENCE IN HISTORIC PRESERVATION

The meeting was called to order by Chair Lemmo at 1:37 PM

Chairperson	John Lemmo	Present
Vice Chairperson	Jerry Schaefer	Present
Boardmember	Salvador Aréchiga	Present
Boardmember	Priscilla Berge	Present
Boardmember	Alex Bethke	Present
Boardmember	Maria Curry	Present
Boardmember	Gail Garbini	Present
Boardmember	Linda Marrone	Present
Boardmember	Abel Silvas	Present

Staff to the Board in Attendance: Shannon Anthony, Board Secretary
Cathy Winterrowd, Senior Planner
Kelley Saunders, Senior Planner
Jennifer Hirsch, Senior Planner
Jodie Brown, Senior Planner
Tricia Olsen, Associate Planner

Legal Counsel in Attendance: Nina Fain, Deputy City Attorney

ITEM 1 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES for March 26, 2009 and April 23, 2009

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMER BERGE TO APPROVE THE MARCH 26, 2009 MINUTES AS AMENDED

Seconded by Boardmember Silvas Vote: 7-0-2 Motion Passes
(Aréchiga, Curry,)

MOTION BY BOARDMEMER BERGE TO APPROVE THE APRIL 23, 2009 MINUTES AS WRITTEN

Seconded by Vice-Chair Schaefer Vote: 9-0-0 Motion Passes

ITEM 2 - PUBLIC COMMENT

Paul Johnson – Vinyl Windows

ITEM 3 - ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

- **ABSENCES**

None

- **OTHER GENERAL INFORMATION**

✓ Motion and Findings Form for Historical Designation

- **GENERAL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

None

B. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

- **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

None

- **EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS**

None

- **FAILURE TO VISIT DESIGNATION SITES (INCLUDING INTERIORS /PROPOSED FOR DESIGNATION)/INVOCATION OF WAIVER**

None

C. STAFF REPORT

- If you have not already seen the historic preservation month exhibit in the lobby, please take some time to do so on your way out. Jodie Brown organized the exhibit this year in addition to the awards. The exhibit includes boards showcasing the preservation award recipients and photographs of designated historical resources throughout the City. Additionally, Jodie prepared a booklet highlighting the work of the Board and staff, based on the latest CLG annual report. Copies of the booklet are available on the back table. We are in the process of translating it into Spanish and both versions with color graphics will be posted to the website shortly.
- Staff would like to thank past and present Boardmembers who attended the City Council meeting on the 1220 J Street appeal. There was a lot of public testimony on both sides but ultimately the Council approved the appeal and overturned the designation.
- The appeal findings issue is scheduled to be heard by the Planning Commission on June 11, 2009. The State Office of Historic Preservation has reviewed the proposal and has recommended no change to the current process. They are in support of the Board's recommendation.
- The next DAS meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, June 3. The Subcommittee will be reviewing the draft QHP Treatment Guidelines as part of a new Programmatic Agreement, the proposed placement of the Atlas missile in Balboa Park near the Air Ford Building, and a proposed relocation of a designated house in San Ysidro. The next Incentives Subcommittee meeting will

be on Monday, June 8 when the subcommittee members will continue discussions on transfer of development rights and other potential incentives identified in the General Plan. The next Policy Subcommittee meeting will be on Monday, June 8. The agenda will include review of the guidelines for applying designation criteria, which has been on hold for some time now, and a brief discussion of designation resolutions. The next Archaeology Subcommittee meeting will be on Monday, July 13 if there are items for the agenda.

- Boardmembers will note today's agenda includes 4 individual homeowner nominations and review and comment on the North Harbor Drive Demolition Project Draft EIR. There are 33 individual homeowner nominations submitted in 2007, 52 individual homeowner nominations submitted in 2008, and 6 homeowner nominations in 2009 that have not been reviewed by staff and brought forward for designation.

D. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

None

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

ITEM 6 – ROBERT & LULU BOLAM HOUSE *located at 4115 Twiggs Street*

ITEM 7 – FRED JARBOE HOUSE #2 *located at 3427 Freeman Street*

ITEM 8 – GILBERT & ALBERTA MCCLURE HOUSE *located at 4044 Hamilton Street*

ITEM 9 – THE IRVINE M. SCHULMAN HOUSE *located at 2540 Presidio Drive*

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Berge pulled Items 7 and 9 off of the Consent Agenda

Boardmember Bethke pulled Items 6 and 8 off of the Consent Agenda

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 5–REMINGTON RAND COMPANY BUILDING

Applicant: Trican Partnership represented by Brant Candelore

Location: 926-928 C Street, 92101, Centre City Community, Council District 2 (**1289 3-B**)

Description: Consider the rescission of the designation of the Remington Rand Company Building located at 926-928 C Street as a historical resource.

Today's Action: Rescind the designation of 926-928 C Street; or do not rescind

Staff Recommendation: Rescind the historical designation of the Remington Rand Company Building as a historical resource.

Report Number: HRB-09-031

ITEM WAS REMOVED FROM THE AGENDA ON THE ADVICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE BECAUSE IT IS ON APPEAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL AND THE HRB NO LONGER HAS JURISDICTION.

ITEM 6 – ROBERT & LULU BOLAM HOUSE

Applicant: Christine Newman represented by Johnson & Johnson Architecture

Location: 4115 Twiggs Street, 92103, Old San Diego Community, Council District 2 (1268 5-F)

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 4115 Twiggs Street as a historical resource.

Today's Action: Designate the property as a historical resource under adopted designation criteria, or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Robert & Lulu Bolam House, excluding the rear detached garage, as a historical resource under HRB Criterion C.

Report Number: HRB-09-032

Staff Report by Tricia Olsen

Testimony Received:

In Favor: None

In Opposition: None

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Bethke agrees with Staff that this property does not qualify for designation under Criterion A. Agrees that this is a Spanish Eclectic home but does not feel that the analysis is there to explain why this is an individually distinctive example of a Spanish Eclectic. He also has problems with the rear addition due to its size and visibility from the public right-of-way.

Boardmember Berge would also like to see more reasoning why it is individually significant.

Boardmember Curry feels that the 1937 photo of the house, showing it as one of the first examples, makes it individually significant. It has historic integrity and characteristics which is sufficient for designation; when considering the whole picture. It is the HRB's purpose to protect these resources thru designation. We can always have more history, but there is enough now to designate under Criterion C.

Boardmember Garbini thinks that Criterion A is interesting if you are looking at the social and economic development of Old Town in the 1820's-1830; shows how open space just outside Old Town was first developed.

Vice-Chair Schaefer supports Staff's recommendation, but does not support designation under Criterion A. Under Criterion C for embodying distinctive characteristics of a particular architectural style, it fits. Property has many of the character defining features of a Spanish Eclectic and he isn't doesn't have any problems with the addition.

Boardmember Bethke's issue isn't that this resource is not eligible for designation, but that the report doesn't adequately support the historical significance of this resource. He wants more analysis in the report before designating.

Boardmember Curry is OK with what Boardmember Bethke is proposing, but also feels that the level of information and analysis might be enough for some of the Boardmembers. She thinks report provides sufficient analysis to designate now and is consistent with guidelines. She would like to see it designated under Criteria A and C.

Chair Lemmo stated that the level of analysis and detail is going to vary depending on the resource. He thinks that the report is sufficient for Criterion C; he does not think it is sufficient to provide what is necessary to even properly evaluate Criterion A. He is supportive of Staff recommendation.

Boardmember Berge agrees with Boardmember Bethke; she also feels there is something missing in the analysis

Boardmember Silvas feels this is heavily under Criterion A and not as significant under Criterion C.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER CURRY TO DESIGNATE ITEM 6 – ROBERT & LULU BOLAM HOUSE UNDER CRITERION A

Seconded by Boardmember Silvas

Vote: 4-5-0

Motion Fails

(Lemmo, Schaefer, Bethke, Berge, Marrone)

MOTION BY VICE-CHAIR SCHAEFER TO DESIGNATE ITEM 6 – ROBERT & LULU BOLAM HOUSE PER STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION

Seconded by Boardmember Berge

Vote: 7-2-0

Motion Passes

(Bethke, Garbini)

ITEM 7 – FRED JARBOE HOUSE #2

Applicant: Padilla Living Trust represented by Kathleen Crawford

Location: 3427 Freeman Street, 92106, Peninsula Community, Council District 2 (**1268 6-C**)

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 3427 Freeman Street as a historical resource.

Today's Action: Designate the property as a historical resource under adopted designation criteria, or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Fred Jarboe House #2, located at 3427 Freeman Street as a historical resource with a period of significance of 1925 under HRB Criteria C and D.

Report Number: HRB-09-033

Staff Report by Jodie Brown

Testimony Received:

In Favor: None

In Opposition: None

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Berge would like know if we could include why it is a notable example in the resolution instead of just saying it is a “notable example”.

Chair Lemmo responded that it can be included in the motion

Vice-Chair Schafer would also like to see the full list included in the resolution.

Chair Lemmo suggested that the Board refer to the elements description on page 1 of 7 on the DPR form; for the list of attributes.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO DESIGNATE ITEM 7 – FRED JARBOE HOUSE #2 PER STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION AND INCLUDING IN THE RESOLUTION THE LIST OF ATTRIBUTES THAT MAKE THIS IS A NOTABLE EXAMPLE.

Seconded by Boardmember Bethke

Vote: 9-0-0

Motion Passes

ITEM 8 – GILBERT & ALBERTA MCCLURE HOUSE

Applicant: Julio A. Arroyo Trust represented by Christianne Knoop

Location: 4044 Hamilton Street, 92104, Greater North Park Community, Council District 3 (1269 5-D)

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 4044 Hamilton Street as a historical resource.

Today's Action: Designate the property as a historical resource under adopted designation criteria, or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Gilbert & Alberta McClure House, excluding the apartment building at the rear of the property, as a historical resource under HRB Criterion C.

Report Number: HRB-09-034

Staff Report by Tricia Olsen

Testimony Received:

In Favor: Christianne Knoop, Julio A. Arroyo

In Opposition: None

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Bethke would like clarification on whether or not the 2nd/3rd story is an addition or not.

Boardmember Berge was overwhelmed from the front to see such a delightful Storybook/Tudor Revival house. She is in support of Staff’s recommendation.

Boardmember Marrone commented that since there are photos from 1952 that show the addition; historic homes can have additions, it doesn’t make it insignificant. We just gave an award to a home in La Jolla that had an addition done to it. It has all of the qualities of a Tudor Revival that are distinctive.

Chair Lemmo is also supportive of Staff’s recommendation.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO DESIGNATE ITEM 8 – GILBERT & ALBERTA MCCLURE HOUSE PER STAFF’S RECOMMENDATION WITH A CHANGE IN THE ARCHITECTURAL STYLE TO TUDOR REVIVAL ARCHITECTURE WITH STORYBOOK INFLUENCES

Seconded by Boardmember Marrone

Vote: 7-2-0

Motion Passes

(Bethke, Garbini)

ITEM 9 – THE IRVINE M. SCHULMAN HOUSE

Applicant: Frances & Sammye Winstead represented by Vonn Marie May

Location: 2540 Presidio Drive, 92103, Uptown Community, Council District 2 (1268 4-F)

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 2540 Presidio Drive as a historical resource.

Today's Action: Designate the property as a historical resource under adopted designation criteria, or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Irvine M. Schulman House located at 2540 Presidio Drive as a historical resource with a period of significance of 1938 under HRB Criterion C.

Report Number: HRB-09-036

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders

Testimony Received:

In Favor: None

In Opposition: None

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Berge pulled this item with questions on the architectural style. Resource is missing a primary characteristic of Art Moderne, the flat roof. She can't see it as being anything other than Colonial Revival with Art Moderne influences; she can't support it with Staff's recommendation on the architectural classification.

Boardmember Bethke isn't sure this is a Colonial Revival, this resource combines a lot of styles; can we just apply vernacular to the style.

Boardmember Curry likes Art Moderne with Traditional Accents

Vice-Chair Schaefer also had trouble with the style; had to go back to the consultant report for more information. Consultant report does a good job of defining the style; i.e. "eclectic mix".

Boardmember Berge is open to modifying her motion; change the focus to period, mid-century modern period, rather than architectural style.

Boardmember Curry this is an early example of one style, with influences of another; transitional style

Boardmember Garbini thought that the owner must have been comfortable with mixing styles; overall form of the house is beautiful; she would suggest excluding the walls down by the curb from the designation.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE DESIGNATE ITEM 9 – THE IRVINE M. SCHULMAN HOUSE UNDER CRITERION C FOR ITS DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS THROUGH THE RETENTION OF CHARACTER DEFINING FEATURES OF THE COLONIAL REVIVAL STYLE WITH ART MODERN STYLISTIC FEATURES AND RETAINS A GOOD LEVEL OF ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY FROM ITS PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE WITH THE CONSTRUCTION DATE OF 1938

Seconded by Boardmember Silvas

No Vote Taken

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO AMEND HER PREVIOUS MOTION

Seconded by Chair Lemmo

Vote: 9-0-0

Motion Passes

AMENDED MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE DESIGNATE ITEM 9 – THE IRVINE M. SCHULMAN HOUSE UNDER CRITERION C FOR ITS DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS THROUGH THE RETENTION OF CHARACTER DEFINING FEATURES OF THE MID-CENTURY MODERN PERIOD REFLECTING ART MODERN AND CLASSICAL STYLISTICALLY INFLUENCES AND RETAINS A GOOD LEVEL OF ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY FROM ITS PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE WITH THE CONSTRUCTION DATE OF 1938

Seconded by Boardmember Silvas

No Vote Taken

MOTION BY VICE-CHAIR SCHAEFER TO DESIGNATE ITEM 9 – THE IRVINE M. SCHULMAN HOUSE UNDER CRITERION C FOR ITS DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS THROUGH THE RETENTION OF CHARACTER DEFINING FEATURES OF THE ART MODERNE STYLE WITH COLONIAL REVIVAL ACCENTS AND RETAINS A GOOD LEVEL OF ARCHITECTURAL INTEGRITY FROM ITS PERIOD OF SIGNIFICANCE THE MID-CENTURY MODERN WITH THE CONSTRUCTION DATE OF 1938

Seconded by Chair Lemmo

Vote: 9-0-0

Motion Passes

ITEM 10 – 2701 NORTH HARBOR DRIVE DEMOLITION PROJECT DRAFT EIR

Applicant: N/A

Location: 2701 North Harbor Drive, San Diego Unified Port District

Description: Review and Comment on Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Project.

Today's Action: Review the Draft EIR prepared by the San Diego Unified Port District as lead agency under the California Environmental Quality Act and address comments to the lead agency.

Staff Recommendation: Provide comments to staff for transmittal to the lead agency prior to the close of the public review period on June 10, 2009.

Report Number: HRB-09-030

Staff Report by Cathy Winterrowd

Testimony Received:

In Favor: Bruce Coons

In Opposition: None

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Bethke doesn't think that the purpose and need is adequately stated in the report; it seems the Port had already their made up their mind. They didn't make the case that the buildings are contaminated. Why are all the buildings proposed for demolition, can't some buildings be remediated without demolition.

Boardmember Aréchiga thinks that they are looking at the easy way to mitigate. Some buildings retain particular architecture style; they could be incorporated into a new development. Get rid of the contamination and maintain the buildings for the future.

Vice-Chair Schaefer commented on the fact that they are not remediating the soil suggests the contamination isn't so bad. He thinks that they are using this as a generic excuse to clear site for a future undefined development; "potential" development(s) could incorporate rehabilitation as an element in project.

Boardmember Silvas mentioned that a similar situation happened in Los Angeles where the ground was contaminated below two designated buildings; they used an air-pumping system to remove the contaminants and were able to save the buildings.

Boardmember Berge thinks that buildings 180, 180a and 181 warrant preservation; moving or preserving on site. It doesn't make sense with the mitigation that they will salvage when everything is contaminated and needs to be demolished.

Chair Lemmo thinks that buildings 180, 180a, 181 and 183 are set up perfectly for an adaptive reuse for any conceivable airport project that would occur there. The Port's project is defined as the demolition of these buildings. Recommend that we have Staff direct those comments to the Port.

Vice-Chair Schaefer agrees with Chair Lemmo and would preface the comments with a statement that we do not consider HABS/HAER to be adequate mitigation and even with HABS/HAER demolition would be a significance adverse effect.

Boardmember Curry wanted to add that by demolishing those buildings; they are removing any testimony of San Diego history at that site. They need to look at alternative treatments to remove the contamination.

Vice-Chair Schaefer wants the specifics about what is actually contaminated; can you save the building and still remediate the contamination. Absent another project after demolition; he doesn't see how they can totally neglect the potential for rehabilitation adaptive for some of this.

Boardmember Bethke thinks that it is hard to come up with substantial recommendations when they essentially preempt every recommendation we might provide to make it less significant.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY CHAIR LEMMO TO DIRECT STAFF TO PREPARE A COMMENT LETTER CONSISTENT WITH THE BOARDS DISCUSSION THIS AFTERNOON

Seconded by Boardmember Aréchiga

Vote: 9-0-0

Motion Passes

REMINDER:

NEXT BOARD MEETING DATE: June 25, 2009

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

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 4:10 PM