

**CITY OF SAN DIEGO
HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF JANUARY 24, 2008
202 C Street, City Administration Building
Council Committee Room, 12th Floor
San Diego, CA 92101**

CHRONOLOGY OF THE MEETING

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chairperson Schaefer at 1:10 pm

Vice Chairperson	Jerry Schaefer	Present
Boardmember	Priscilla Berge	Present
Boardmember	Laura Burnett	Present
Boardmember	Maria Curry	Present
Boardmember	John Eisenhart	Present
Boardmember	Otto Emme	Absent
Boardmember	David Marshall	Present
Boardmember	Abel Silvas	Present (<i>left at 4:35</i>)

Staff to the Board in Attendance: Brian McGarrigle, Interim Board Secretary
Cathy Winterrowd, Senior Planner
Kelley Saunders, Senior Planner
Tricia Olsen, Intern

Legal Counsel in Attendance: Marianne Greene, Deputy City Attorney

ITEMS 1A, 1B and 1C - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Minutes of September 27, 2007, November 8, 2007 and November 29, 2007 were not available for approval.

ITEM 2 - PUBLIC COMMENT

Ione Stiegler, architect, expressed concerns with the lagtime in getting Mills Act contracts processed, and with the proposal that there be a placement of changes to the Mills Act, which was discussed at the January 14th Policy Sub-committee meeting.

Amber Eck, homeowner, believes that Staff's failure to complete their Mills Act contract in a timely manner led to them missing the deadline for the 2008 tax year, their home was designated in September 2007, would like Staff extend the deadline so that they can receive the benefits for the 2008 tax year.

Valerie Willis, homeowner, also believes that Staff's failure to complete her Mills Act contract in a timely manner led to her missing the deadline for the 2008 tax year, her home was designated in August 2007, would also like Staff extend the deadline so that she can receive the benefits of the Mills Act for the 2008 tax year.

Elizabeth Courtier, real estate agent, has heard several complaints in the past week from clients with regards to the proposal to make changes to the Mills Act discussed at the Policy Sub-committee meeting, believes that the City is setting the stage for canceling the Mills

Act altogether. Also three-day notice is not enough time to properly notify the people affected by these changes.

Hedges Capers, homeowner, concerned that under the proposed changes to the Mills Act, he would not qualify for the Mills Act.

ITEM 3 - ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS

A. BOARD ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS AND GENERAL INFORMATION

- **ABSENCES**

Boardmember Emme notified Staff that he would not be available for this meeting due to work conflicts.

- **OTHER GENERAL INFORMATION**

None

- **GENERAL BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Boardmember Schaefer mentioned that the Saturday, January 19th, issue of the San Diego Union Tribune; had an article regarding the Little Italy House. He also mentioned that he heard on news that the Mengei Museum in Balboa Park has been raided by the FBI today.

B. CONFLICT OF INTEREST DECLARATIONS

- **CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

Boardmember Marshall will be recusing himself from Item 12, Western Saltworks, he is a sub-consultant on the master plan for that site.

- **EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS**

None

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

Boardmember Silvas failed to visit Items 10 and 13, but read the reports.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL TO INVOKE WAIVER FOR THE SITE VISITS FOR ITEMS 10 AND 13

Seconded by Boardmember Berge

VOTE: 7-0-0

Motion Passes

C. STAFF REPORT

- Introduce Brian McGarrigle as Acting Board Secretary; permanent staff expected in 30 to 60 days
- New Board Members appointed by the Mayor: Gail Garbini, Landscape Architect, Paul Johnson, Architectural Historian, and John Lemmo, Attorney and new Chair effective

March 2008. Anticipate confirmation by the City Council in time for them to be seated on the HRB by the February meeting.

- We appreciate Vice-Chair Schaefer filing in for the Chair in the mean time. It is likely that Subcommittee membership will be addressed after all these changes have occurred.
- The City Council unanimously turned down the appeal of the Mission Hills Historic District earlier this week, citing the significant property owner support for the district and lack of procedural errors by the Board or new information.
- The HPE of the General Plan Update will be discussed at the January 30, 2008 City Council Committee on Natural Resources and Culture.
- Earlier this month the Policy Subcommittee was presented with some specific recommendations for changes to the City's current Mills Act Program. There was a significant amount of public interest and concern expressed at the meeting. The issues that are being reviewed include an annual limit on new agreements, the addition of specific eligibility requirements in addition to historic designation for a property to qualify for a Mills Act agreement, a change in the application due date, establishing a formal inspection or monitoring program for existing agreements, and fees that would result in recovery of the costs for new agreements and monitoring of new and existing agreements. These recommendations are still in the draft working stage and will continue to be addressed in public workshops and hearings over the next several months.
- Next DAS meeting will be held on Wednesday, February 6, 2008. The next Policy Subcommittee meeting will be held on Monday, February 14, 2008. The next Archaeology Subcommittee meeting will be on Monday, March 10, 2008

Boardmembers will note today's agenda includes three referrals from Development Services, two referrals from CCDC, a CCDC development permit review, two individual homeowner nominations, and a nomination from SOHO. There are two items that were continued from the November 29, 2007 meeting. There were 23 individual homeowner nominations submitted in 2006 and 77 individual homeowner nominations submitted in 2007 that have not been reviewed by staff and brought forward for designation. In addition, there have been four individual homeowner nominations submitted so far in 2008.

D. REQUESTS FOR CONTINUANCES

- **ITEM 5 – 4167 & 4169 Jackdaw Street:** the property owners have requested an indefinite continuance in writing.
- **ITEM 8 – KETTENBURG BOATS WORKS at 1271 Scott Street and 2810 Carleton Street:** the property owner, represented by Marie Lia, has requested a continuance in writing.
- **ITEM 15 – ANNUAL CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CLG) REPORT:** Staff is requesting a continuance; were unable to complete report in time for today's meeting.
- **ITEM 12 – WESTERN SALT COMPANY SALT WORKS at 1470 Bay Boulevard:** the San Diego Airport Authority, property owner, has requested a continuance.

Bruce Coons, SOHO, would like to know the reason the Airport Authority is requesting a continuance on Item 12, they have known about this for years.

Ted Anasis, Airport Authority, responded that there weren't given correct notification of this hearing and has not had the opportunity to review and confer this application with the current tenant and the operator of the facility, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Mr. Coons agreed to the continuance.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BERGE TO CONTINUE ITEMS 5, 8, 12 AND 15

Seconded by Boardmember Curry

VOTE: 7-0-0

Motion Passes

E. INFORMATION ITEMS

Update on Native American Issues Related to Consultation and Involvement in the Development Review Process.

No action of the Board is required on this item.

Beth Murray, Assistant Chief Operating Officer for Land Use and Development and the Mayor's Tribal Liaison will present a summary of recent efforts on the City's part to improve procedures and practices related to Native American consultation and involvement in the City's development review process.

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

The following items are non-controversial, with all parties agreeable to the staff recommendation, and the Board may wish to approve them on consent:

- **ITEM 10 – CLYDE HUFBAUER HOUSE at 1821 Torrey Pines Road**
- **ITEM 14 – HISTORIC BUILDING INTERIORS IMPLEMENTATION OF AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Marshall is supporting Item 10, since Clyde Hufbauer actually occupied the residence, why isn't it also under Criterion B. Staff responded that Criterion B was considered, but there was not enough information to support it. Boardmember Marshall asked if as they can request the tall hedge in front home be reduced to improve visibility as a requirement for the Mills Act, if the owner chooses to apply for one. Staff responded that since visibility is a requirement for the Mills Act, it would include pruning.

Boardmember Berge wanted to address the naming of Item 10. Staff responded that a property is named for the first resident and any master architect associated with the property. In this case since the property owner and the master architect were the same, the name was only used once, the wife was also an owner. Ms. Winterrowd suggested that when the Policy Sub-committee reviews the naming policy issues like this should be discussed.

Boardmember Schaefer suggested adding just the wife's name, Arabelle, making the new name The Clyde & Arabelle Hufbauer House, as opposed to the Clyde & Arabelle Hufbauer/Clyde Hufbauer House to avoid redundancy.

BOARD ACTION:

- **MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL TO APPROVE STAFF RECOMMENDATION OF CONSENT ITEM 10 – THE CLYDE & ARABELLE HUFBAUER HOUSE AND ITEM 14 – HISTORIC BUILDING INTERIORS IMPLEMENTATION OF AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Seconded by Boardmember Eisenhart

Vote: 7-0-0

Motion Passes

Would the owners of the sites that were just now designated like to address the Board?

ACTION ITEMS

ITEM 5– 4167 & 4169 JACKDAW STREET

(Continued from November 29, 2007)

Applicant: IS Architecture on behalf of Michael Terry and Garth Howe, owners

Location: 4167 & 4169 Jackdaw Street, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of 4167 & 4169 Jackdaw 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: Do not designate the property at 4167-4169 Jackdaw Street under any HRB Criteria.

Report Number: HRB-07-092

Staff Report by Tricia Olsen

ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED AT THE REQUEST OF THE OWNERS.

ITEM 6 – 1433 MARKET STREET (GEM CAFÉ)

(Continued from November 29, 2007)

Applicant: Marie Burke Lia on behalf of Bahia View Condominiums, LLC, owner

Location: 1433 Market Street, Centre City Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of the Gem Café located at 1433 Market 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: Do not designate the Gem Café located at 1433 Market Street under any adopted HRB criteria.

Report Number: HRB-07-089

Staff Report by Cathy Winterrowd

Testimony Received:

In Favor: Marie Lia

In Opposition: None

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Schaefer does not feel that this property has a significant contribution to the African –American history. There has not been any new information provided by Karen Huff, Black Historical Society. He also is in support of Staff’s recommendation.

Boardmember Berge also supports Staff’s recommendation, given the information they have

Boardmember Curry feels that the site has character and is related to an important group of people that is under represented. She prefers to wait for more information. This property is old enough and has both value and integrity.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER EISENHART TO NOT DESIGNATE ITEM 6 UNDER ANY CRITERION, PER STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Seconded by Boardmember Berge

Vote: 6-0-1

Motion Passes

(Curry)

ITEM 7 — 1335 J STREET (WORKMAN HOTEL)

Applicant: Larry Pierson of Brian F Smith and Associates, on behalf of the owner Workman Hotel LP

Location: 1335 J Street, Centre City Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of the Workman Hotel located at 1335 J 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: Do not designate the property located at 1335 J Street under any adopted HRB criteria.

Report Number: HRB-08-001

Staff Report by Cathy Winterrowd

Testimony Received:

In Favor: Larry Pierson

In Opposition: Bruce Coons

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Eisenhart asked the applicant if there was any research done regarding historic photos of this property. Mr. Pierson responded that they made the effort at the San Diego Historical Society and didn’t find anything. Boardmember Eisenhart asked if the first floor modifications were structural. Mr. Pierson said that they were partially structural and partially cosmetic. Boardmember Eisenhart asked what items were structural. Mr. Pierson responded that the removal of the old storefront windows and the wooden

framing for the new façade. Boardmember Eisenhart then wanted to know if there were any structural upgrades to the property. Mr. Pierson mentioned that there were some steel reinforcements at the roofline. Boardmember Eisenhart then asked if all of the original sash windows were replaced with metal. Mr. Pierson responded that just the second floor windows were replaced.

Boardmember Marshall feels that there is not enough information provided to determine whether to designate or not, and integrity is the main issue for him. First floor storefronts are often changed, but without any documentation of modifications or floor plans. He will be asking for a continuance.

Boardmember Berge also agrees with Boardmember Marshall that more information is needed before making a decision.

Boardmember Silvas agrees the report is awesome as far as prehistoric, and wouldn't mind finding out what is beneath the building. He also agrees that more information is needed on the building itself.

Boardmember Burnett strongly supports the designation of the building right now with the current information, but will support asking for more information.

Boardmember Curry also supports designation now with the current information provided. This building was constructed for low income workers and its history is important.

Boardmember Schaefer feels that it meets the standards of Criterion A; these types of hotels for workers in downtown San Diego were distinctive and characteristic elements of socio-economic history.

Boardmember Marshall is in support of the continuance, but also wanted to know if they should go forward with the designation under Criterion C, and ask for additional information in regards to Criterion A.

Danny Dabby, one of the owners, denies that there is any intent to demolish building, and is not sure what additional information can be provided. Would like to know what people and what history are we trying to preserve? If you are already planning on designating then do it today and then they can go forward with the appeal to the City Council or if the Board is really going to consider the new information, then they will try to provide that.

Deputy City Attorney Green wanted to mention that if the Board designated the property today, then any new information found would be a significant basis for an appeal.

Boardmember Eisenhart wants to go forward with the motion to continue, feels that the report is incomplete and cannot make his decision today based on the information provided.

Boardmember Marshall will also support the continuance because the Board is not here to ambush anyone and the report is incomplete, and worried that this building was slipping through, also wanted to state that there are no guarantees to the direction that the board will vote with the new information. It would be fair to give applicant additional time to get more information.

Boardmember Burnett feels that the applicant and Ms. Green both expressed that a decision today would be an additional method to encourage the owner to produce additional

information. Ms. Green stated that if a decision was made today any additional information would be basis for an appeal. Ms. Winterrowd also stated that CCDC would need a decision on designation prior to issuing a demolition permit.

Mr. Dabby wanted to know how the Board was going to advise them as to what information the Board wanted; would it be specific and all at one time or piece by piece?

Boardmember Schafer responded that yes it would be specific and all inclusive.

Boardmember Silvas wanted to reiterate that the Workman Hotel, these are workers who worked in San Diego, they don't have to be famous people they are vernacular people, and the fact that they are not famous people does not mean that they are not important to San Diego.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER ESIENHART TO REQUEST A CONTINUENCE AND DIRECT APPLICANT IN REGARDS TO CRITERION C: TO LOOK AT THE BUILDING FAÇADE AND RECONSTRUCT IT IN DRAWING FORM OF WHAT IT APPEARED LIKE AND WHAT IT IS TODAY, TO HELP UNDERSTAND THE STRUCURAL AND NONSTUCTURAL MODIFICATIONS. TO REINVESTIGATE ANY OTHER HISTORIC PHOTOS THAT MIGHT BE AVAILABLE. AND IN REGARDS TO CRITERION A: INCLUDE ANY SIGNIFICANCE OF THE BUILDING IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE HISTORY OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.

Seconded by Boardmember Curry

Vote: 5-2-0

Motion Passes

(Curry, Silvas)

ITEM 8 — KETTENBURG BOATS WORKS

Applicant: Marie Lia on behalf of Prism Investments Inc, applicant and Dean Wilson Living Trust, owner (Referred from the City of San Diego Development Services Department)

Location: 1271 Scott Street and 2810 Carleton Street, Peninsula Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of the properties at 1271 Scott Street and 2810 Carleton Street, consisting of Lots 1 – 11 of Block 29 in the Roseville Subdivision (Map 4956) 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 Kettenburg Boat Works site, located at 1271 Scott Street and 2810 Carleton Street and consisting of Lots 1 – 11 of Block 29 in the Roseville Subdivision (Map 4956), under HRB Criterion A as a special element of San Diego's maritime history; and HRB Criterion B, for its association with the Kettenburg family, who played a significant role in San Diego's maritime industry. The designation encompasses all of lots 1 – 11 of Block 29, including the structures at 1271 Scott Street and 2810 Carleton Street and excluding accessory sheds and other structures.

Report Number: HRB-08-002

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders

ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED AT THE REQUEST OF THE OWNERS.

ITEM 9 — 4069 ALBATROSS STREET

Applicant: Scoot Moomjian, on behalf of the owner Steve Appel

Location: 4069 Albatross Street, Uptown Community, Council District 2

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 4069 Albatross 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: Do not designate the property at 4069 Albatross Street under any HRB Criteria.

Report Number: HRB-08-003

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders

Testimony Received:

In Favor: Scott Moomjian, Bruce Kleege

In Opposition: None

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Marshall mentioned that enclosure of a porch would not have been reflected on the Sanborn Map; the enclosed porch was not used for living space but more as a sun porch, and was constructed some time in the early to mid 30's. The only other element that was not original was the chimney, which had been stuccoed, had a more of a negative impact on the home. He does not feel that the porch, on its own, would keep the house from being designated.

Boardmember Eisenhart agrees with Boardmember Marshall on the porch enclosure, he is more concerned with the setting of the house and the integrity of the neighborhood. This is an average example of a bungalow and the setting has been compromised too much; supports Staff's recommendation.

Boardmember Berge was troubled by the enclosed porch and agrees that the construction was done in the 30's. She would like to hear comments from other Boardmembers.

Boardmember Burnett strongly supports designation

Boardmember Schaefer agrees with Boardmember Eisenhart, the integrity is compromised, and it is a mundane example of a Craftsman Bungalow; supports Staff's recommendation.

Boardmember Silvas is on the fence; this is one of the last, close to historic, homes remaining in that neighborhood.

Boardmember Marshall was also not decided, and appreciated hearing other Boardmembers comments. He agrees that this could be part of a district, but not as an individual contributor, and story of the porch was not represented accurately. He is leaning towards Staff's recommendation.

Boardmember Curry does not agree with the Criteria, but it is there. She feels that scarcity makes it more important, it is historic, and that it is not necessary for it to be a part of a district to be considered for designation. She is in support of designation.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER EISENHART TO NOT DESIGNATE ITEM 9 UNDER ANY CRITERION, PER STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Seconded by Boardmember Marshall Vote: 4-3-0 Motion Passes
(Burnett, Curry, Silvas)

ITEM 10 – CLYDE HUFBAUER HOUSE

Applicant: Vonn Marie May, on behalf of the owner David Schroedl

Location: 1821 Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla Community, Council District 1

Description: Consider the designation of the Clyde Hufbauer House, located at 1821 Torrey Pines Road, 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 Clyde Hufbauer House, located at 1821 Torrey Pines Road under HRB Criterion C as a good example of Modern Post-and-Beam architecture, and Criterion D as the work of Master Architect Clyde Hufbauer.

Report Number: HRB-08-004

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders

Board Discussion:

Renamed THE CLYDE AND ARABELLE HUFBAUER HOUSE

BOARD ACTION:

ITEM PASSED ON CONSENT

ITEM 11 -- TOURIST HOTEL DEVELOPMENT PERMIT REVIEW

Applicant: Steve Gordon, on behalf of Bahia View Condominiums LLC, owners

Location: 1425-1433 Market Street, Centre City Community, Council District 2

Description: Review and make a recommendation to the appropriate decision-making authority on those aspects of the development permit pertaining to designated historical resources.

Today's Action: Recommend to the Planning Commission adoption of the mitigation measures and findings associated with the site development permit as presented or recommend inclusion of additional permit conditions or denial of the permit related to designated historical resources.

Staff Recommendation: Recommend to the Planning Commission approval of the Site Development Permit mitigation measures and findings for Scenario #1, which would allow demolition of both the Tourist Hotel and Gem Café. The facades and primary staircase of the 1888 portion of the Tourist Hotel would be reconstructed in all new

materials compatible with Type I construction (Alternative #1). Recommend to the Planning Commission the following additional mitigation measures:

1. The reconstruction of the facades and primary staircase of the 1888 portion of the Tourist Hotel be consistent with the California Historic Building Code, as appropriate;
2. Historic materials be incorporated into the reconstruction to the maximum extent feasible; and,
3. The proposed exterior finishes related to the reconstruction be reviewed and approved by the Historical Resources Board Design Assistance Subcommittee prior to approval of a permit to demolish the subject buildings.

Report Number: CCDC Memorandum dated December 26, 2007

Staff Report by Suzanne Drolet of CCDC

Testimony Received:

In Favor: Jim Tanner

In Opposition: Bruce Coons

Board Discussion:

Correction to CCDC Report: Recommendation is for **Alternative 2**, *recommend to the Planning Commission approval of the Site Development Permit for Scenario #2, which would allow demolition of both the Tourist Hotel and Gem Café, with construction of a new Type I substrate and reinstallation of restored front and sidewalls. The front staircase would be reconstructed as well. If any of the materials (exterior walls, window frames, and architectural details, or interior stair) are deteriorated and cannot be rehabilitated, and/or are not permitted to be reinstalled by The City of San Diego building officials, they may be recreated of new materials with the prior approval of the materials and execution methods by the Design Assistance Subcommittee.*

Staff is also in support of Alternative 2

Boardmember Marshall is concerned that this project has been represented as something that DAS has blessed, and that is not the case. He is also concerned that Staff did not prove a recommendation in writing and that CCDC has a different agenda. He also wanted to point out the definition of reconstruction, what is being proposed, is for “non-surviving” buildings only, this building is very much intact. If this building is approved for what is being recommended today, it would no longer be considered historic and would be removed from the Local, State and National Registries. This building is a very rare example and is in very good condition. He was disappointed that the DAS minutes, from were not included in the package that they received. Two years ago when this was presented to the HRB, Mr. Tanner had said that there intention was to rigorously follow the Secretary of Interiors Standards for rehabilitation, not reconstruction, which is what is be proposed today. As part of the rehabilitation is was said that the original materials would be used. The addition to the building was built in 1906, not in 1920 as stated, and the entire building was designated. Two items were requested at the hearing 2 years ago and have never been provided and would be useful today; 1) Period of significance be

determined and 2) Historic Structures Report. The bottom line is that the proposal is for demolition, the only alternative that he would consider would be Alternative 4, and it would be for the entire building. He strongly opposes approval and asks applicant to go back to DAS.

Boardmember Curry also opposes the project for the same reasons discussed. She would like to listen to the tapes of the discussion when it was designated.

Boardmember Eisenhart stated that the historic resource occupies approx 13% of the site, it is reasonable to ask the owner not to touch that 13%. He agrees with Boardmember Marshall that the Board is not here for reconstruction but for restoration. He wants the 1888 Hotel kept as is, might consider allowing it to be moved off site and then back on. The duty of the Board is to protect resources, and this proposal does not do that.

Boardmember Berge wanted to weigh in on the onsite restoration, which is very important and would like to hear comments from other Boardmembers. She also feels that this needs to go back to DAS and opposes what is being proposed before them. She agrees with Boardmember Marshall that the Secretary of Interior Standards on rehabilitation is not being considered.

Boardmember Schaefer wanted to know if the interior was going to be preserved or reconstructed or if this permit was just the exterior façade. Ms. Drolet answered that the front interior stair of the original building was going to be reconstructed as well.

Ms. Lia stated that the third part of the hotel does not show up on the 1921 Sanborn Maps, meaning that it was built after 1921. She also wanted to remind the Board that they are just making an advisory recommendation to the Planning Commission for a site development permit and not determining whether or not this meets the Secretary of Interior Standards criteria, only mitigation recommendations are being sought today.

Boardmember Eisenhart said that it is very important to keep this plan intact as much as possible to maintain the integrity of the building.

Boardmember Marshall is very disappointed in the HRB Staff, and wanted to restate that if what is planned goes through, than this building would no longer be historic and would have to be removed from the local register and that would be unfortunate. Ms. Winterrowd wanted to clarify that HRB Staff never determined that this project was consistent with the Secretary of Interior Standards, and that added language and a recommendation to return to DAS was added to the report.

Deputy City Attorney Greene informed the Board that it is OK for them to consider in making a determination on whether the mitigation is adequate or whether the permit is recommended based on the Secretary of Interior Standards. She is concerned about questions on whether the report was prepared in violation of a settlement agreement which has not been finalized.

Brad Richter, CCDC, wanted to clarify that the settlement agreement addresses how projects are processed within the Centre City area are processed in accordance to the Land Development Code of Historic Guidelines. It is an open settlement agreement. The issue

before the Board today is a Site Development Permit for proposed substantial alterations to a designated resource.

Ms. Greene is still not comfortable with resolution of the settlement agreement issue, this could have a bearing on the Board as to whether or not they can consider the report if it has not been prepared by the proper parties.

Mr. Richter restated that there is no settlement agreement in place, it is still being negotiated.

Boardmember Marshall is still concerned that the Planning Commission, who will be making the decision, will be receiving incorrect information. DAS has not seen drawings in over 2 years, and there was no general acceptance of a reconstruction, it was always about rehabilitation. Also there is no place in the document that states when this work is completed the building would no longer be considered historic.

Boardmember Schaefer is OK with taking it back to the 1888 structure, but this is not historic preservation or rehabilitation. There needs to be a statement from the HRB to reflect the sentiments as to which of the alternatives the Board will support.

Boardmember Eisenhart is not comfortable with any of the scenarios presented. Here are a few general recommendations: 1) restoration of the entire 1888 portion of the Tourist Hotel, 2) Historic materials be incorporated into the restoration, 3) proposed restoration will be reviewed and approved by the DAS prior to approval of a permit, 4) air rights above the entire 1888 portion be retained, and that no new building can impact the air rights, 5) (which is up for discussion) the option of moving the resource off site during construction and allowing underground parking be built and the resource be returned to its exact location when construction is completed.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER MARSHALL TO REJECT THE ALTERNATIVES AS PRESENTED BY CCDC; THE ALTERNATIVE THE BOARD WILL SUPPORT WOULD BE; 1) THE RESTORATION OF ENTIRE BUILDING (1888 AND 1914 PORTIONS) NOT JUST FAÇADE SO THE SIDE RETURNS BACK TO A REASONABLE LOCATION PER DAS, 2) REHABILITATION BE DONE PER THE SECRETARY OF INTERIOR STANDARDS WHICH WOULD INCLUDE RETAINING HISTORIC MATERIALS, 3) DRAWINGS AND DESIGN AS REVISED BE BROUGHT BACK TO DAS TO SIGN OFF, 4) IT IS PERMISSIONABLE FOR THE BUILDING TO BE TEMPORARILY MOVED OFFSITE IN ORDER TO BUILD A SUBSTRUCTURE OR GARAGE BUT IT NEEDS TO BE BROUGHT BACK TO ITS ORIGINAL LOCATION, AND 5) THE PROJECT MUST MAINTAIN THE CURRENT HISTORIC STATUS OF THE BUILDING AND NOT DAMAGE ITS ELIGIBILITY FOR FUTURE STATE OR NATIONAL DESIGNATIONS, WHICH IT HAS BEEN PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS BEING ELIGIBLE FOR.

Seconded by Boardmember Burnett

Vote: 7-0-0

Motion Passes

ITEM 12 – WESTERN SALT COMPANY SALT WORKS

Applicant: Save Our Heritage Organization (SOHO), the property is owned by the San Diego Airport Authority

Location: 1470 Bay Boulevard, Otay Mesa-Nestor Community, Council District 8

Description: Consider the designation of the Salt Works located at 1470 Bay Boulevard 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 Salt Works located at 1470 Bay Boulevard under HRB Criterion E. The resource shall be listed as an individually significant resource, with the eleven elements identified as “contributing” included in the designation as character defining elements of the resource; and the four elements identified as “non-contributing” excluded from the designation as non-character defining elements.

Report Number: HRB-08-005

Staff Report by Kelley Saunders

ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED AT THE REQUEST OF THE OWNER

ITEM 13 – 2851 IVY STREET

Applicant: Janet O’Dea, on behalf of the owners Gary and Laurie Petill

Location: 2851 Ivy Street, Greater Golden Hill Community, Council District 3

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 2851 Ivy 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: Do not designate the property at 2851 Ivy Street under any HRB Criteria

Report Number: HRB-08-006

Staff Report by Tricia Olsen

Testimony Received:

In Favor: None

In Opposition: Janet O’Dea, Gary Petill, Laurie Shaw, Ron May, Dale Ballou May

Board Discussion:

Board Member Silvas was not present for this item

Boardmember Berge believes the architectural style of these homes when they were built to be California Colonial; this is a fascinating home, but does not like the garage door. She feels that Benjamin M. Torgerson is an important builder, and on the cutting edge for modern architecture.

Boardmember Burnett agrees with Boardmember Berge that this house is interesting with the garage and the split level, and an excellent example of what needs to be designated in San Diego.

Boardmember Curry also agrees that it should be designated.

Boardmember Eisenhart rejects criterion D; this home is not indicative of a master builder, also rejects criterion B; residence is not significant, as for Criterion C; it is not a good example of Monterey Style, and does not rise to level of designation.

Boardmember Marshall understands both sides, but is leaning towards supporting designation under Criterion C.

Boardmember Schaefer agrees with Boardmember Eisenhart, such a mix of styles that is doesn't fit the criteria for C, and as for the individuals, they were active in their community, but not to the level of local historical significance personage.

Boardmember Berge sees there is confusion over the architectural style and that the consultant needs to do more research on this.

Boardmember Curry believes that Torgerson is an important builder, it is transitional, and in the principles of preservation you don't look at the unity of style, but it is accepted that there is not just one style, and you see it over history.

Boardmember Burnett thinks this is a good example that would meet Criterion A.

Boardmember Eisenhart feels that as a composition it is not significant whatever style it is.

Ms. O'Dea requested a continuance to provide more information for Staff and the Board.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY BOARDMEMBER BURNETT TO CONTINUE ITEM 13 AT THE REQUEST OF THE OWNERS

Seconded by Boardmember Berge

Vote: 4-2-0

Motion Passes

(Schaefer, Eisenhart)

ITEM 14 — HISTORIC BUILDING INTERIORS IMPLEMENTATION OF AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

Applicant: City of San Diego, City Planning & Community Investment Department

Location: Citywide

Description: Review the revised documents proposed to implement the recommendations of the Historic Building Interiors Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

Today's Action: Approve the revised documents proposed to implement the recommendations of the Historic Building Interiors Ad Hoc Subcommittee or return to staff with specific direction for additional work.

Staff Recommendation: Approve the revised documents proposed to implement the recommendations of the Historic Building Interiors Ad Hoc Subcommittee.

Report Number: HRB-08-007

Staff Report by Cathy Winterrowd

BOARD ACTION:

ITEM PASSED ON CONSENT

ITEM 15 – ANNUAL CERTIFIED LOCAL GOVERNMENT (CLG) REPORT

Applicant: City of San Diego, City Planning & Community Investment Department

Location: Citywide

Description: The Historical Resources Board Annual Report to the State Office of Historic Preservation, Mayor and City Council consistent with the City's Certified Local Government (CLG) responsibilities and Municipal Code Section 111.0206 (d)(7) requirements.

Today's Action: Review, comment and approve the Annual Report.

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

Report Number: HRB-08-008

ITEM HAS BEEN CONTINUED AT THE REQUEST OF STAFF.

REMINDER:

NEXT BOARD MEETING DATE: February 28, 2008

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

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:05 PM