Certified Local Government Program – 2009-2010 Annual Report
(Reporting period is from October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2010

City of San Diego

Report Prepared by: Historical Resources Board and Staff

Date of commission/board review: January 28, 2010

Minimum Requirements for Certification

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

A. Preservation Laws

- What amendments or revisions, if any, are you considering to the certified ordinance? Please forward drafts or proposals. *(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.)*
  - Provide an electronic link to your ordinance or appropriate section(s) of the municipal code.

No changes to the City's certified historical resources regulations were made during this reporting period. The City Council has directed staff to bring forward an amendment to the certified ordinance to expand the findings under which the Council could overturn a historical resource designation on an appeal. The proposed amendment has been reviewed by OHP. We have started the public hearing process and expect the issue to be heard by the City Council in early 2011.

The current ordinance can be found at the following links:

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

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

- What properties/districts have been locally designated (or de-designated) this past year? For districts, provide a list of resource contributors and noncontributors.

No new districts have been designated or de-designated this reporting period. In addition, there has been no change in status to contributing and non-contributing properties within designated historic districts.

- 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." Have you done this?

The following properties have been designated during the reporting period. Resolutions have been recorded or are pending processing as stated in the chart below.

Property Name/Address	Date Designated/Removed	Date Recorded by County Recorder
John & Caroline Bostick House 2436 Presidio Drive	10/22/2009	12/4/2009
Francis & Dorothy Harvey House 5801 Adelaide Avenue	10/22/2009	12/4/2009
Helen Schnepp Spec House #1 3636 Herbert Street	10/22/2009	12/4/2009
Olmstead Building Company Spec House #1 4276 Trias Street	10/22/2009	12/4/2009
George & Alice Hazzard House 2900 6th Avenue	11/20/2009	2/3/2010
Henry B. Jones House 4040 5th Avenue	11/20/2009	*Appeal Pending*
Charles Jurman Building 1041-1047 University Avenue	11/20/2009	2/3/2010
James A. Wilson Spec House #1 1263 Silverado Street	11/20/2009	2/3/2010
M.B. & Ida Irvin/ Alexander Schreiber Spec House #1 4195 Stephens Street	1/28/2010	3/11/2010
Cecil Roper House 5147 Cape May Avenue	1/28/2010	3/11/2010
Sim Bruce Richards & The Janet Hopkins Richards House 3360 Harbor View Drive	1/28/2010	3/11/2010
Isaac Lyon Building & The Isaac Lyn Rental House 1479 J Street/ 360 15th Street	1/28/2010	3/11/2010
Julia Wilson House 4410 Park Boulevard	2/26/2010	4/5/2010

Della M. Ballard House 4220 Arden Way	2/26/2010	4/5/2010
Ralph Hurlburt/ Alexander Schreiber Spec House #2 3907 Hawk Street	2/26/2010	4/5/2010
Arthur & Caroline Dickerson House 3786 Albatross Street	2/26/2010	4/5/2010
Ralph H. Pratt House 3503 Jackdaw Street	2/26/2010	4/5/2010
Page Manor/ Walter Keller House 3580 Jennings Street	3/25/2010	5/4/2010
David O. Dryden Spec. House #1 3221 Homer Street	3/25/2010	5/4/2010
Quality Building and Securities Company Speculative House #1 3036 Elliott Street	3/25/2010	5/4/2010
Johnson's Wilshire Gas Station 4689 Market Street	4/22/2010	*Appeal Pending*
Wills & Jane Fletcher/ Ralph L. Frank and Milton Sessions House 575 San Gorgonio Street	4/22/2010	6/15/2010
Edward & Eleanor Mastin House 1891 Viking Way	4/22/2010	6/15/2010
Irving & Anna Brockett House 3725 Wellborn Street	5/27/2010	7/1/2010
P.Z. Lund Spec. House #1 4376 Proctor Place	5/27/2010	7/1/2010
Robert O. Peterson/ Russell Forester Residence 567 Gage Street	5/27/2010	7/1/2010
Henry L. Hier Spec House #1 1288 Silverado Street	6/24/2010	8/4/2010
Albert Eugene & Helen Riley House 5141 Marlborough Drive	6/24/2010	8/4/2010
Winslow R. Parsons Spec House #1 3520 28th Street	6/24/2010	8/4/2010
George P. & Carrie Goodman Muchmore House 2825 B Street	7/22/2010	9/14/2010
Thomas J. & Maud B. Brownrigg House 3045 James Street	7/22/2010	9/14/2010

Norman Kennedy House 716 La Canada	8/26/2010	Pending
Southern Building Company Spec. House #1 4632 Edgeware Road	8/26/2010	Pending
J.W. Harlan & Carl and Matilda Hays Spec House #1 4165 Rochester Road	9/23/2010	Pending
Dr. James & Leona Parker House 4637 Marlborough Drive	9/23/2010	Pending
Glenn A & Ruth Rick House 1439 Brookes Avenue	9/23/2010	Pending
Mattie Bearns House 1455 F Street	9/23/2010	Pending

C. Historic Preservation Element/Plan

- If you address historic preservation in your general plan, is it in a separate historic preservation element or is it included in another element? Provide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s) of the General Plan.
- Have you made any updates to your historic preservation plan or historic preservation element in your community's general plan? If you have, provide an electronic link.
- When will your next General Plan update occur?

The City of San Diego General Plan was updated in March 2008 and will not undergo another comprehensive update for 15 to 20 years. It includes a separate Historic Preservation Element that addresses the identification and preservation of historical resources and historic preservation education, benefits and incentives with specific policies intended to strengthen historic preservation planning, integrate historical resources in the larger planning process, foster government-to-government relationships with the Native American tribes of San Diego, designate and preserve historical resources for future generations, foster greater public participation and education in historic preservation, promote use of incentives and sponsorships to benefit historical resources, and increase opportunities for cultural tourism in San Diego. The General Plan can be found at the following link:
http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/genplan/pdf/generalplan/adoptedhpelem.pdf

D. Review Responsibilities

D.1 Design Review/Certificates of Appropriateness

- Who takes responsibility for design review or Certificates of Appropriateness?
- Do all projects subject to design review go the commission, or are some 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 of the HRB provides informal input to applicants and staff on projects affecting historical sites. Historical Resources staff reviews and approves minor modifications to historical sites that are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If staff approves a project as a minor modification or the Design Assistance Subcommittee's review concludes that a project is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's 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.

D.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?
- 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?

Historical Resources staff reviews all environmental documents for projects that may have an effect on a designated historical resource or on a potentially significant historical resource during the public review period. 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 recommendation on the project and environmental document to the Planning Commission.

D.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?
- 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 CEQA 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 Subcommittee 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

- Who are the current members (and alternates, if applicable)?
- Do they represent a professional discipline or do they represent a public role?
- What is their date of appointment and when does their appointment expire?
- What is their email address?
- Include resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all members. 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? If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position will be filled?

Name	Discipline	Date Appointed	Date Appt. Expires	Email Address
Salvador Aréchiga	Architect	01/28/2009	NA (Resigned)	sal.arechiga@gmail.com
Dr. Michael Baksh	Archaeologist	07/13/2010	03/01/2011	mgbaksh@aol.com
Priscilla Berge	Historian	11/14/2006	03/01/2011	paberge@cox.net
Alex Bethke	Historian	01/28/2009	03/01/2012	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	03/01/2011	ggarbini@garbiniandgarbini.com
Ann Jarmusch	Architectural History/Fine Arts	11/12/2009	03/01/2012	annjarmusch@yahoo.com
John Lemmo	Law	02/11/2008	03/01/2010	jl@prcopio.com
Linda Marrone	Real Estate	10/28/2008	03/01/2011	lmarrone@san.rr.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	03/01/2011	awoods@sandiego.edu

Due to the resignation of Boardmember Aréchiga, the Architect position is currently vacant. We hope to fill this vacancy in early 2011. Resumes and Statements of Qualifications for all Boardmembers and Historical Resources staff are provided in Attachment 1.

B. Commission Staff

- Who are your current commission/CLG staff?
- What are their disciplines, and their dates of appointment/assignment?

- Is the staff to your commission the same as your CLG coordinator?
- Include resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all new staff.
- If the position(s) is not currently filled, why is there a vacancy?

Name/Title	Discipline	Dept. Affiliation	Email Address
Bennur Koksuz Deputy Director (10/08 to 3/10)	Architecture; Urban Design	City Planning and Community Investment, Urban Form Division	bkoksuz@sandiego.gov
Cathy Winterrowd Principal Planner/CLG Coordinator/Liaison to HRB (12/05 to present)	History & Planning; Ethnography	City Planning and Community Investment, Urban Form Division	cwinterrowd@sandiego.gov
Kelley Stanco (formerly Saunders) Senior Planner (3/06 to present)	History & Planning	City Planning and Community Investment, Urban Form Division Historical Resources Section	kstanco@sandiego.gov
Jennifer Hirsch Senior Planner (2/08 to 8/10)	Architectural History & Planning	City Planning and Community Investment, Urban Form Division Historical Resources Section	jhirsch@sandiego.gov
Jodie Brown Senior Planner (2/08 to 3/10)	History & Planning	City Planning and Community Investment, Urban Form Division Historical Resources Section	jdbrown@sandiego.gov
Tricia Olsen Associate Planner (7/07 to 2/10)	Architectural History & Planning	City Planning and Community Investment, Urban Form Division Historical Resources Section	tolsen@sandiego.gov
Jeffrey Oakley Associate Planner (2/10 to present)	Urban Planning	City Planning and Community Investment, Urban Form Division Historical Resources Section	joakley@sandiego.gov
Shannon Anthony Board Secretary (3/08 to present)	Board Secretary	City Planning and Community Investment, Urban Form Division Historical Resources Section	santhony@sandiego.gov
Nina Fain Deputy City Attorney (10/08 to present)	Deputy City Attorney	Office of the City Attorney Civil Division	nfain@sandiego.gov

C. Attendance Record

- Please attach in chart form for each commissioner and staff member, the attendance records for meetings. Commissions are required to meet four times a year, at a minimum.

See Attachment 2 for Minutes of HRB meetings held during the reporting period
See Attachment 3 for Board Member and staff attendance records for meetings

D. Training Received

- What training has each commissioner and staff member received, including descriptions and dates of training, duration of training, and training provider? 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	Training Provider	Date
Board Members and Staff	Board and Staff Workshop to discuss : • Role of the Board • Staff and Board Procedures and Ranch House Policy	City Staff	Half-day workshop; March 12, 2010
Staff	Sustainability, Energy Efficiency and Historic Preservation Workshop	California Preservation Foundation (CPF) City of Riverside	Full-day workshop; June 30, 2010
Board Members and Staff	Sustainability Myths: How to Make Old Windows and Buildings New Again Workshop	California Preservation Foundation (CPF)	Half-day workshop; September 30, 2010

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

A. Historical Contexts

- Have you initiated, researched, or developed any historic contexts? If you have, list and describe in several sentences each historic context, how it is being used, and the date submitted to OHP (California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts, to OHP.) If you have not done so, submit a copy with this report.

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted
Ocean Beach	A historic context is being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the Ocean Beach community. The context identifies themes significant in the community's development from a resort town to a thriving neighborhood and community.	The context and survey will inform the land use planning process.	December 2010, submitted with this report
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 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 working to finalize 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 survey will inform the land use planning process.	In Process Staff working on context; consultant will complete fieldwork
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 survey will inform the land use planning process.	In Process Consultant Under Contract
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 survey will inform the land use planning process.	In Process Consultant Under Contract
Midway	A historic context and reconnaissance survey are being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the Midway community.	The context and survey will inform the land use planning process.	In Process Consultant Under Contract
San Ysidro	A historic context and reconnaissance survey are being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan update for the San Ysidro community. Themes identified will likely be based on the agricultural roots of the community as well as the relationship of the community to the border.	The context and survey will inform the land use planning process.	Complete October 2010 (CLG Grant)

B New Surveys (excluding those funded by OHP)

- Have you carried out any surveys or re-surveys? If you have, list the area surveyed, level (reconnaissance or intensive), acreage, number of properties surveyed, and the date you submitted the survey to OHP. (California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results including historic contexts, to OHP.) If you have not done so, submit a copy with this report.
- Keep in mind that 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.
- How are you using the survey data?

Area	Context Based-yes/no	Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive	Acreage	# of Properties Surveyed	Date Completed
North Park	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 1,466	Approx 6,500	In Progress Consultant Under Contract
Golden Hill	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 441	Approx 5,000	In Progress Consultant Under Contract
Old Town	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 285	Approx 234	In Progress Consultant Under Contract
Midway	Yes	Reconnaissance	Approx 902	Approx 613	In Progress Consultant Under Contract

C. Changes to Inventories

- Have you made corrections to you inventory of historic properties, or have you identified any corrections that need to be made?
- If you have, what are the reasons for the changes (new information, alteration [approved/not approved], demolition [approved/not approved], etc.)?
- Have you changed the status codes of any properties in your inventory? Submit the changes with this report.

Property Name/Address	Additions/Deletions to Inventory	Changes to Status Codes	Reason	Date of Change

The City's inventory of historic properties consists of our register of designated historic sites and the following completed or draft surveys.

- Draft Uptown Historic Architectural and Cultural Landscape Reconnaissance Survey (2007)
- East Village Combined Historical Surveys (2005)
- Downtown Warehouse Survey (2005)
- African-American Heritage Study (2004)
- Historic Site Inventory of the Core for CCDC (1989, 2002)
- Mid-City Survey (1995/1996)
- Uptown Cultural Resource Inventory (1993)
- Barrio Logan Redevelopment Area Historic and Urban Resource Inventory (1990)
- Barrio Logan Historical Resources Survey (2010)
- San Ysidro Historic Resources Survey (1989; updated in 2010)
- La Jolla – A Historical Inventory (1977)

These surveys are on file in the City Planning & Community Investment Department and, although most are more than five years old, are consulted by staff in reviewing projects and may be used as a starting point in preparing intensive surveys for establishing historic districts. Properties are reviewed individually for designation potential as part of the project review process. It is anticipated that completion and adoption of reconnaissance level surveys that are currently underway or anticipated in the new future in conjunction with Community Plan Updates will allow the City to generate an inventory of historic properties to use in the planning process and in the evaluation of a property's historical significance.

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

A. Public Education

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

Item or Event	Description	Date
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 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
Community Planning Group Historical Resources Training Session	City-sponsored training for interested members of community planning groups on the City's historical resources program and regulations. Specific topics included identification and treatment of historical resources, designation criteria and common architectural styles found in San Diego, responsibilities and benefits of historic property ownership, historic contexts, and use of historic surveys in the community plan update (planning) process.	October 29, 2009
Uptown, North Park and Golden Hill community cluster meeting	Staff and historic survey consultant provided background information, preliminary historic context themes, and approach for historic survey component of all three community plan updates.	March 20, 2010
UCSD Extension "Site Analysis: Development Opportunities and Constraints"	Staff was a guest lecturer for a discussion about site planning related to historical and cultural resources. Identification, treatment, and mitigation of impacts under CEQA and NEPA were explained along with a review of other relevant local, State and Federal regulations and guidelines.	April 5, 2010; and September 30, 2010
Balboa Park Committee of 100	Staff presented the history of the Balboa Park designation as a National Historic Landmark and what that means for the treatment and preservation of the district.	May 18, 2010
Golden Hill, North Park and Uptown Historical Resources Open House	Staff presented an update on the historic context and survey work to each community group. Community members were encouraged to share their knowledge and recommendations related to potential historic districts, individual sites and conservation areas.	June 22, 28 and 30, 2010
Burlingame Historic District Homeowners Association	Staff met with the Association to answer questions related to contributing and non-contributing resources, treatment standards for properties within the District, the Mills Act program, and other general questions about the City's historic preservation program.	July 14, 2010
UCSD Extension "Planning & Communications in Urban Development"	Staff was a guest lecturer for a discussion focusing on effective communication involving planning issues related to the environment, sustainability, conservation and historic preservation. The focus was on engaging the public in the process and on communicating issues effectively to decision makers.	July 26, 2010

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

What is the current status of preservation in your community? What are the most critical preservation planning issues?

The City's historic preservation program continues to be an active, vital aspect of the City's planning activities, and remains an area of great interest to many property owners and community members in the City's oldest areas. There is a strong and vocal public constituency that takes an active interest in preservation and preservation planning issues. These groups speak out at various public hearings in support of historic preservation, and are active in both community planning groups and neighborhood preservation groups. There also remains strong political interest in and support of historic preservation on the part of both the Mayor and City Council.

Over the past few years, the most critical preservation planning issue for the City had been development pressure within the City's older communities. While that pressure does remain, current economic conditions have greatly slowed redevelopment and infill projects. Presently, the most critical preservation planning issue for the City is a lack of resources and funding to carry out all aspects of our preservation planning program. With severe financial constraints facing the City, historic resources staff is continually reevaluating historic preservation priorities and the section's work program, striving to make the most of limited resources. Functions that are critical to our role and responsibility as a CLG are a top priority. Historic context statements and reconnaissance surveys associated with active Community Plan Updates remain a high priority as well, and are consuming a considerable amount of staff time as resources for consultant contracting is limited.

The lack of a city-wide context and comprehensive survey has limited staff's ability to provide property owners with detailed information regarding the historical significance and development regulations applicable to their property. Additionally, the lack of a city-wide survey has generated concerns by the preservation community about the City's ability to protect and preserve potentially significant historical resources and has resulted in the erosion of contributing resources within potential historic districts.

Another critical issue facing the historic preservation program is the public understanding of these constraints and of the historic preservation program in general. Staff continues public outreach and education efforts; such as, attendance at planning group meetings, workshops, and seminars in an effort to connect with and inform the public on issues related to our program.

What is the single accomplishment of your local government this year that has done the most to further preservation in your community?

The City of San Diego completed a context and reconnaissance level survey of the San Ysidro Community Planning Area during this reporting period. Aided by a CLG grant, the City worked with a consultant to address important historic themes and development patterns represented by the existing built environment and prepared a draft survey report. The survey will be used to prepare the historic preservation element of the updated community plan, putting forth specific goals and policies related to the

identification and protection of historical resources within San Ysidro. A significant component of this survey effort will continue into the next reporting period with public outreach and participation in the final survey document.

In conjunction with the 2008 reforms, City staff performed a comprehensive audit of the Mills Act program. Staff worked with the County Assessor to verify that each property receiving Mills Act benefits had a properly recorded agreement and that property owners were receiving appropriate benefits for all recorded agreements based on City and County records. Approximately 1,000 records were reviewed as part of this audit with fewer than 30 minor corrections needed. Two designated properties receiving benefits without a recorded agreement were identified and have been offered contracts. Additionally, one property with a recorded agreement was not receiving Mills Act benefits. This has been corrected by the County Assessor.

What incentives are you providing for historic preservation in your community, e.g., loan or grant programs, property tax reduction, zoning variances, etc.? What programs are you offering, what is the public utilizing, and how successful are the programs in promoting historic preservation? Please provide a brief overview narrative.

The most successful incentive program continues to be the Mills Act. The use of the Design Assistance Subcommittee 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. The Comptroller was authorized to appropriate funds from the Historic Preservation Fund for the local preservation programs and incentives consistent with the General Plan. The Board's Policy Subcommittee is working to further develop the recommendations provided by the Incentives Ad Hoc Subcommittee in regard to expenditure of fund monies and other incentives such as transfer of development rights, use of variance and conditional use permit to support adaptive re-use of historic properties, and architectural assistance services to low and moderate income historic property owners.

Name or Type of Incentive Program	**How many properties have benefited?**
Mills Act Property Tax Reduction	12 new contracts recorded during the reporting period
Design Assistance Subcommittee Project Review	12 docketed items

What recognition are you providing for successful preservation projects or programs?

In May of each year the City's Historical Resources Board recognizes individuals, groups, businesses and agencies who contribute to the preservation and advancement of San Diego's unique history and heritage. The Board recognizes achievements in the categories of Agency, Archaeology, Architectural Reconstruction, Architectural Rehabilitation, Architectural Restoration, Community History, Cultural Diversity, Cultural Landscape, History, Individual Accomplishment, and Preservation Advancement.

Nominations are accepted from Boardmembers, staff and members of the public from approximately February to April of each year. The Board's Policy Subcommittee then selects a recipient in each category from the nominations received. The award recipients are recognized at the annual awards ceremony in May, where they receive Awards of Excellence and commendations from their respective City Councilmember. 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. This display coincides with the annual awards celebration.

How did you meet or not meet the goals identified in your annual report for last year?

1. Revise the City's Historic District Policy to remove confusing and conflicting language, reduce the number of district types, align district significance with the adopted designation criteria, and provide better guidance to the HRB, staff and the public regarding the processing and designation of historic districts. **THIS GOAL HAS BEEN PUT ON HOLD DUE TO REDUCED STAFFING**

   Revisions to the City's Historic District Policy will include a new Council Policy on the establishment of historic districts, as well as a Historical Resources Board procedure for their establishment. This process requires extensive public hearings, including the Historical Resources Board Policy Subcommittee, the Historical Resources Board, the Planning Commission, the City Council's Land Use & Housing Committee and the full City Council. This goal was not completed during the current reporting period and is currently on hold.

2. Complete the ordinance revisions proposed for designation appeals process. **IN PROCESS**

   This goal is expected to be completed in the early part of 2011. Public meetings and hearings were held between January and June 2009, to consider a proposed amendment to the City's appeal process to broaden the circumstances under which the City Council may overturn a designation by the Historical Resources Board. Currently, the grounds for appeal are defined in the Code and are limited to factual errors presented to the Board, violations of Board procedures, and new information. The proposed amendment would add a fourth basis that the findings used to designate a property are not supported by the facts presented to the Board. OHP reviewed the proposal in April 2009 and sent an email stating support for the Board's recommendation to maintain the current process. The Report to the Planning Commission dated June 18, 2009 can be found at the following link: http://www.sandiego.gov/planning-commission/pcreports/2009/pdf/09048.pdf. It includes a summary of the issues related to the amendment, various recommendations, and the proposed strikeout/underline ordinance amendment.

3. Complete the pending Dryden North Park historic district submitted by the local neighborhood history group. **IN PROCESS**

   Staff began review of the Dryden North Park historic district in 2008 and 2009, at which time staff worked with the applicants on revisions to the nomination. Processing of the nomination was placed on hold in late 2009 and 2010 to allow the historic

resource consultant working on the context statement and survey for North Park to provide input on the proposed district within the larger context of the larger North Park community. That input has been received, and staff has resumed processing the nomination. Staff anticipates completion of the nomination process and designation of the district in May 2011.

4. Begin reconnaissance survey work associated with Community Plan Updates in Uptown, North Park, Greater Golden Hill, Midway, Old Town, San Ysidro, and Skyline/Paradise Hills. **GOAL MET**

5. Develop and bring forward additional incentives for historic preservation through the work of the Incentives Ad-Hoc Subcommittee and staff, including a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program and variances for deviations from base zone regulations to facilitate preservation of historic resources. **THIS GOAL HAS BEEN PUT ON HOLD DUE TO REDUCED STAFFING**

6. *Develop and obtain City Council Approval of a programmatic approach to the expenditure of monies from the City's Historic Preservation Fund for use and activities which foster, promote and incentivize historic preservation.* **IN PROCESS**

7. Begin development of City-wide design guidelines for designated historic districts. **THIS GOAL HAS BEEN PUT ON HOLD DUE TO REDUCED STAFFING**

8. Update the Historical Resources section website to provide better, more readily accessible and current information on the City's preservation program. **GOAL MET**

9. Establish the City's CHRID and begin the process of transferring data and making it available to the public via the City's website. **GOAL PARTIALLY MET/IN-PROCESS**

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

What are our local historic preservation goals for 2010-2011?

1. Complete surveys and reports in support of the Uptown, North Park, and Greater Golden Hill community plan updates.
2. Complete the ordinance revisions proposed for designation appeals process.
3. Complete the pending Dryden North Park historic district submitted by the local neighborhood history group.

4. Develop and obtain City Council Approval of a programmatic approach to the expenditure of monies from the City's Historic Preservation Fund for use and activities which foster, promote and incentivize historic preservation.
5. Conduct 200 inspections of designated historic resources receiving Mills Act benefits and ensure compliance with the terms and conditions of the contract.
6. Establish the City's CHRID and begin the process of transferring data and making it available to the public via the City's website.

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? In what subject areas would you like to see training provided by the OHP? How you like would to see the training conducted (workshops, online, technical assistance bulletins, etc.)?

Our staff would be interested in training related to identification and preservation of historical resources from the recent past.

Would you be willing to host a training working workshop in cooperation with OHP?

Unfortunately, due to highly limited financial resources, the City of San Diego will not be able to host a workshop in the 2011 reporting period. However, we would be interested in providing training in a different format such as a podcast or PowerPoint presentation that can be made available on the City's website.

XII Attachments

Resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for **all** commission members/alternatives and new staff
Minutes from commission meetings
Attendance records of commissioners and staff
Electronic link to historic preservation ordinance/section of municipal code (see link on Page 1)
Electronic link to historic preservation section(s) of the General Plan (see link on Page 4)
Ocean Beach Historic Context

[This page intentionally left blank.]