

#### THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

### Report to the Historical Resources Board

DATE ISSUED: February 9, 2023

ATTENTION: Historical Resources Board

Agenda of February 23, 2023

SUBJECT: ITEM #3 - Certified Local Government Annual Report 2021-2022

APPLICANT: City of San Diego, Development Services and Planning Departments

LOCATION: Citywide

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

Preservation to meet the City's Certified Local Government (CLG) responsibilities and to the Mayor and City Council to meet the Municipal Code Section 111.0206 (d)(7)

requirements.

#### **STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Direct staff to forward the Annual Report to the State Office of Historic Preservation and the San Diego Mayor and City Council or revise the Annual Report and forward as appropriate.

#### BACKGROUND

This item is being brought before the Historical Resources Board in conjunction with the City's Certified Local Government (CLG) responsibilities. The Annual Report for 2021 also satisfies the requirement for an annual report to be transmitted from the HRB to the Mayor and City Council in accordance with Land Development Code Section 111.0206(d)(7). One of the responsibilities of a CLG is to prepare an Annual Report for the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) summarizing the work of the Board during the reporting period. The report utilizes a standard format for all CLGs and requires an accounting of the Board and staff activities throughout the state's fiscal year (October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022). The Annual Report format was provided by the Office of Historic Preservation and cannot be altered resulting in pagination, tables, and text on different pages and a number of different fonts. Since the Land Development Code Section 111.0206(d)(7) does not specify the period of time covered in the annual report to the Mayor and City Council, staff is utilizing the state's reporting period for that report, as well.

#### **ANALYSIS**

The attached document is a draft of the Annual Report that has been prepared by staff. Boardmembers should offer their insight and provide comment to staff regarding any additional information and issues that would be appropriate to include in the final report.

The organization of the annual CLG report corresponds directly to the five CLG requirement areas: ordinance, commission, survey, public participation, and state requirements. In addition to this information, OHP requests a summary of local preservation programs. The National Park Service (NPS) reporting has also been incorporated into the annual CLG report in Section IV. The 2009 baseline report to NPS included 17,038 historic properties in the City's inventory prior to September 30, 2008, with an additional 2,080 properties added by 2020 and 97 added this past year to equal a historic resources inventory of 19,215 properties.

During the current reporting period, the HRB designated 35 new individually significant properties. Additionally, the Inspiration Heights Historic District was added to the National Register of Historic Places which added 62 new properties to the City's inventory of historical resources (19 properties within the district were previously designated on the local register). This year the number of processed Mills Act contracts increased but was significantly lower from previous years. This relatively low number of new Mills Act contracts is likely because no new local historic districts were designated the prior year. Sixty-two contracts were completed during this period, compared to 45 new contracts in the last reporting period. Staff anticipates this number to increase over the next few years. The number of project reviews remained steady with a total of 3,400 reviews completed during the reporting period, compared to approximately 3,900 reviews in the previous reporting period and 3,563 in 2019-2020.

The most critical preservation planning issue facing the City continues to be the renewed development pressure on historic and potentially historic resources. With the need for more housing and increase in permit activity City-wide, staff has noted an increase in applications impacting potentially historic and designated resources. This includes demolition applications for properties over 45 years in age, as well as projects proposing relocation or other substantial alteration of designated historic resources to accommodate new development. Staff continues to work with applicants to educate them on the benefits of historic preservation, and to pursue projects that are consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Additionally, staff provides a free 30 minute virtual consultation, as well as a Preliminary Review process to assist potential buyers during a due-diligence period in understanding the significance or potential significance of a property, how that property could be improved consistent with the Standards, and the historic/permit review process at the City. It is hoped that through this early consultation, staff can assist potential applicants in identifying a property that best suits their needs and goals

The most successful incentive program continues to be the Mills Act. The use of the Design Assistance Subcommittee also continues to be of great benefit to owners of designated sites. In July 2009, the City Council established the Historic Preservation Fund in response to General Plan policies for any and all potential grants, donations, fines, penalties, or other sources of funding for the purpose of historic preservation.

During the reporting period five new boardmembers were appointed to the Historical Resources Board. Other significant accomplishments include the development of historic context statements for the Clairemont, University, Mira Mesa and College Area Communities. These contexts will inform policies associated with Community Plan Updates and provide the basis for future identification, evaluation and designation of resources.

#### **CONCLUSION**

Staff recommends that the Board review the information attached, provide input, and approve the report for transmittal to the State Office of Historic Preservation and the Mayor and City Council.

Suzanne Segur Senior Planner

SS/ss

Attachment: Draft CLG Annual Report 2021-2022 (without attachments)

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

**INSTRUCTIONS:** This a Word form with expanding text fields and check boxes. It will probably open as Read-Only. Save it to your computer before you begin entering data. This form can be saved and reopened.

Because this is a WORD form, it will behave generally like a regular Word document except that the font, size, and color are set by the text field.

- Start typing where indicated to provide the requested information.
- Click on the check box to mark either yes or no.
- To enter more than one item in a particular text box, just insert an extra line (Enter) between the items.

Save completed form and email as an attachment to <a href="info.calshpo@parks.ca.gov">info.calshpo@parks.ca.gov</a>. You can also convert it to a PDF and send as an email attachment. Use the Acrobat tab in WORD and select Create and Attach to Email. You can then attach the required documents to that email. If the attachments are too large (greater than 10mb total), you will need to send them in a second or third email.

#### Name of CLG

City of San Diego

Report Prepared by: Historical Resources Board and City Staff Date of commission/board review: February 23, 2023

#### 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., either as part of this report or under separate cover. *REMINDER: Pursuant to the CLG Agreement*, OHP must have the opportunity to review and comment on ordinance changes prior to adoption. Changes that do not meet the CLG requirements could affect certification status. Type here.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

#### B. New Local Landmark Designations (Comprehensive list of properties/districts designated during the reporting.

1. During the reporting period, October 1, 2021 – September 30, 2022, what properties/districts have been locally designated?

Property Name/Address	Date Designated	If a district, number of contributors	Date Recorded by County Recorder
Alexander and Hannah Schreiber House; 4375 Ampudia Street	October 28, 2021		3/29/2022
Carl and Matilda Hays Speculation House #2; 4849 Canterbury Drive	October 28, 2021		3/29/2022
William S. Birney and Kneeland Jenkins Speculation House; 4268 Hortensia Street	October 28, 2021		3/29/2022
Edwin and Anne Corwin/Pear Pearson House; 5309 Canterbury Drive	October 28, 2021		3/29/2022
Edgar V. Ullrich House #2; 6001 Bellevue Avenue	October 28, 2021		3/29/2022
Delawie #1/Boxcar House; 1773 Torrance Street	October 28, 2021		3/29/2022
Blanche Barry Apartments; 3814 Centre Street	November 18, 2021		3/29/2022
Samuel and Della Campbell Spec House; 2354 Plum Street	November 18, 2021		3/29/2022
Balboa Park Carousel; 1889 Zoo Place	November 18, 2021		3/29/2022
Ruth Dryer Dick/ Richard George Wheeler House; 2354 Pine Street	January 27, 2022		3/29/2022
William and Virginia Calloway/ Sim Bruce Richards House; 10 E. Roseland Drive	January 27, 2022		3/29/2022

# Certified Local Government Program -- 2021-2022 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

William and Frances Sutherland House;	January 27, 2022	3/29/2022
1647 Los Altos Road		
Ben Johnson Spec House;	January 27, 2022	3/29/2022
4831 Hart Drive		
John and Harriet Monahan/ Olmstead Building Company House;	February 24, 2022	3/29/2022
3761 La Cresta Drive		
P-37-012581 (CA-SDI-12581/SDM-W-6);	February 24, 2022	9/1/2022
address restricted		
Vulcan Stream Room and Sauna;	March 24, 2022	On Appeal
805 West Cedar Street		
Jasper Writer Spec House #1;	April 28, 2022	8/25/2022
3611 Hyacinth Drive		
LGBTQ Community/Albert Bell Building;	April 28, 2022	8/25/2022
3780-3786 5 <sup>th</sup> Avenue		
Ervin and Ethel Jesse House;	May 26, 2022	9/6/2022
7402 Eads Avenue		
Jennie Alberta Wales House;	May 26, 2022	9/6/2022
1086 Hayes Avenue		
Verna Werner/A.L. & A.E. Dennstedt Building Company House;	May 26, 2022	9/6/2022
3522 Dumas Street		
Timothy and Thelma Perkins/Ralph L. Frank House;	June 23, 2022	9/6/2022
4165 Miller Street		
Ellis and Nancy Barron House;	June 23, 2022	9/1/2022
6632 Avenida Manana		
Mary Lynch/Frank Hope, Sr. House;	June 23, 2022	9/1/2022
1320 Park Row		
Walter and Margaret Trepte House;	June 23, 2022	9/1/2022
1160 Hunter Street		
Harry and Blanche A. Muns Speculation House;	July 28, 2022	11/30/2022
3529 Dove Court		
Joseph E. Jessop, Sr. House;	July 28, 2022	11/30/2022
414 La Crescentia Drive		

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

Omar and Sarah Gray House;	August 25, 2022	11/30/2022
3116 McKinley Street		
The John and Zelda Schelling/ William Wahrenberger House;	August 25, 2022	11/30/2022
4277 Cosoy Way		
Allie A. Knox Speculation House;	August 25, 2022	11/30/2022
3353 Goldsmith Street		
The North Parker/Jonathan Segal Building;	August 25, 2022	11/30/2022
3000 Upas Street		
Arklow Cottage;	September 22, 2022	11/30/2022
7425 Fay Avenue		
El Cantorral Court;	September 22, 2022	11/30/2022
2454-2474 Adams Avenue		
MUT KULA XUY/ MUT LAH HOYA SITE #11;	September 22, 2022	11/30/2022
address restricted		
W.C. and Irene Everett Building;	September 22, 2022	On Appeal
3093-3095 El Cajon Boulevard		

**REMINDER**: Pursuant to California Government Code § 27288.2, "the county recorder shall record a certified resolution establishing an historical resources designation issued by the State Historical Resources Commission or a local agency, or unit thereof."

2. What properties/districts have been de-designated this past year? For districts, include the total number of resource contributors?

Property Name/Address	Date Removed	Reason
Dr. Roy and Herma Ledford/ Charles	May 23, 2022	Designation was Overturned by the City
Salyers Building		Council
2851-2881 4 <sup>th</sup> Avenue		

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

C.	Historic	Preservation	Element/Plan
----	----------	--------------	--------------

<ol> <li>Do you address historic preservation in your general plan?</li> <li>         ∑ Yes, in a separate historic preservation element.     </li> </ol>	<ul><li>□ No</li><li>□ Yes, it is included in another element.</li></ul>
Provide an electronic link to the historic preservation section(s) of the Genttps://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/planning/genplan/pdf	
D. Review Responsibilities	
1. Who takes responsibility for design review or Certificates	of Appropriateness?
☐ All projects subject to design review go the commission	n.
review and full-commission review? The City of San Die historical sites. The HRB has authority for recommen historical resources. The Design Assistance Subcom applicants and staff on projects affecting historical reapproves minor modifications to historical resources	idations on projects that may have adverse impacts on imittee (DAS) of the HRB provides informal input to

major community interest may go forward to the full HRB for review and comment.

#### 2. California Environmental Quality Act

 What is the role of historic preservation staff and commission in providing input to CEQA documents prepared for or by the local government? Historical Resources staff reviews all environmental documents for projects prepared for the City that may have an effect on a designated historical resource or on a potentially significant historical resource during the public review period. Historical Resources staff prepares the Historical Resources section of environmental documents prepared by the City of San Diego.

consistent with the Standards, the full HRB would not normally consider the project, although projects with

What is the role of the staff and commission in *reviewing* CEQA documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? **Draft CEQA documents are reviewed and approved by Historical**Resources staff prior to public review when a designated historical resource would be impacted by a

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

proposed project. The final CEQA document for projects affecting designated historical resources is formally reviewed by the HRB in association with review of a site development permit for the substantial alteration of a historical resource. In this circumstance, the HRB makes a formal recommendation on the project and the environmental document, specifically the adequacy of the proposed mitigation measures, to the Planning Commission.

#### 3. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act

- What is the role of the staff and commission in providing input to Section 106 documents prepared for or by; the local government? Historical Resources staff reviews and approves the Historical Resources section of all Section 106 documents for projects prepared for the City that may have an effect on a National Register eligible resource prior to the public review period. Historical Resources staff prepares the Historical Resources section of Section 106 documents prepared by the City of San Diego.
- What is the role of the staff and commission in reviewing Section 106 documents for projects that are proposed within the jurisdiction of the local government? The Section 106 consultation process is completed before the Section 106 document is distributed for public review. The HRB reviews all of the information for projects on which they make a recommendation. The HRB along with its Policy and Design Assistance Subcommittees and/or appointed ad hoc committees also participates in Section 106 consultations initiated by other agencies for federal projects affecting National Register eligible sites, including negotiations on any Programmatic Agreements.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

#### II. Establish an Adequate and Qualified Historic Preservation Review Commission by State or Local Legislation.

#### A. Commission Membership

Name	Professional Discipline	Date Appointed	Date Term Ends	Email Address
Bruce Abrams	Law	4/12/2022	3/1/2023	esqbma@att.net
Andrew Bowen	Architect	8/04/2017	3/01/2018 Served until 3/15/2022	andrewbowen@cox.net
Kristi Byers	Architect	3/15/2022	3/1/2024	kb@kristibyersaia.com
Lilly Cheng	History	3/15/2022	3/1/2023	lilly.cheng@sdchm.org
Dr. Diana Cordileone	History	4/26/2017	3/01/2019 Served until 3/15/2022	dianacordileone@pointloma.edu
Courtney Ann Coyle	Fine Arts/ Law	7/19/2016	3/1/2018	CourtCoyle@aol.com
Carla Farley	Real Estate	3/15/2022	3/1/2023	carla@corbanrealty.net
Tim Hutter	Law	7/19/2016	3/1/2024	Thutter@allenmatkins.com
David McCullough	Landscape Architect	7/19/2016	3/1/2023	David@mlasd.com
Todd Pitman	Landscape Architect	7/19/2016	3/1/2019 Served until 3/15/2022	tdpitman@ucsd.edu
Cindy Stankowski	Archaeologist	4/26/2017	3/1/2019 Served until 3/15/2022	c.stankowski@att.net
Michael Taylor	Archaeologist	3/15/2022	3/1/2025	mtaylor@nwbenvironmental.com
Matthew Winter	Architect	7/19/2016	3/1/2018	MWinter2000@gmail.com
Ann Woods	Architectural History	11/12/2009	3/1/2017	acwoods@ucsd.edu

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

Attach resumes and Statement of Professional Qualifications forms for all members.

- 1. If you do not have two qualified professionals on your commission, explain why the professional qualifications have not been met and how professional expertise is otherwise being provided. Type here.
- 2. If all positions are not currently filled, why is there a vacancy, and when will the position be filled? During this reporting period the HRB had two vacancies and one termed-out position. The Mayor's office and CLG have been able to secure five new Boardmembers; however, one vacancy still remains which is actively being recruited for. The termed-out Boardmember will continue to serve until they are replaced.

#### B. Staff to the Commission/CLG staff

- 1. Is the staff to your commission the same as your CLG coordinator? ⊠ Yes □ No If not, who serves as staff? Click or tap here to enter text.
- 2. If the position(s) is not currently filled, why is there a vacancy? Type here.

Name/Title	Discipline	Dept. Affiliation	Email Address
Shannon Anthony Senior Planner (6/2018-Present)	Library Science & Information	Development Services Department, Land Development Review Division	SAnthony@sandiego.gov
Megan Bacik Assistant Planner (1/2019 to 1/2022)	History	Development Services Department; Land Development Review Division	MBacik@sandiego.gov
Caroline Garcia Board Secretary (6/2021-Present)	Board Secretary	Development Services Department, Project Submittal and Management Division	CarGarcia@sandiego.gov
Emma Haggerty Senior Planner/Mills Act Coordinator (8/2018 to 11/2021)	Planning/ Historic Preservation	Development Services Department; Land Development Review Division	EHaggerty@sandiego.gov
Lea Kolesky Junior Planner (1/2020 to 1/2022)	History	Development Services Department; Project Submittal and Management Division	LKolesky@sandiego.gov

# Certified Local Government Program -- 2021-2022 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

Alvin Lin Assistant Planner (2/2021 to Present)	Urban Studies	Development Services Department, Land Development Review Division	AMLin@sandiego.gov
Anna McPherson Program Manager (8/2018 to Present)	Management	Development Services Department; Project Submittal and Management Division	AMcPherson@sandiego.gov
Rocio Mejia Interim Board Secretary (3/2022 to 6/2022)	Board Secretary	Development Services Department, Project Submittal and Management Division	RMejia@sandiego.gov
Sheila Santos Interim Board Secretary (6/2018 to 6/2022)	Board Secretary	Development Services Department, Project Submittal and Management Division	SantosS@sandiego.gov
Suzanne Segur Senior Planner/HRB Liaison (5/2016 to Present)	American Studies/ Historic Preservation	Development Services Department, Land Development Review Division	SSegur@sandiego.gov
Elizabeth Shearer-Nguyen Program Manager (6/2022-Present)	Management	Development Services Department, Project Submittal and Management Division	EShearer@sandiego.gov
Kelley Stanco Deputy Director/CLG Liaison (3/2006 to Present)	History & Planning	Planning Department; Historic Preservation Planning Section	KStanco@sandiego.gov
Bernard Turgeon Senior Planner (3/2017 to Present)	Planning	Planning Department; Historic Preservation Planning Section	BTurgeon@sandiego.gov
Megan Walker Associate Planner (2/2022-Present)	Urban Studies & Political Science	Development Services Department, Land Development Review Division	MEWalker@sandiego.gov
Andrew Wood Junior Planner (6/2022-Present	Anthropology	Development Services Department, Land Development Review Division	ADWood@sandiego.gov

Attach resumes and Statement of Professional Qualifications forms for staff.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

#### C. Attendance Record

Please complete attendance chart for each commissioner and staff member. Commissions are required to meet four times a year, at a minimum. If you haven't met at least four times, explain why not.

Commissioner/Staff	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep
Bruce Abrams							$\boxtimes$		$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$		
Andrew Bowen	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No Meeting	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$						
Kristi Byers							$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	
Lilly Cheng								$\boxtimes$			$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$
Dr. Diana Cordileone		$\boxtimes$	No Meeting		$\boxtimes$							
Courtney Ann Coyle	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No Meeting	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$		$\boxtimes$		$\boxtimes$
Carla Farley							$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$		$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$
Tim Hutter	$\boxtimes$		No Meeting	$\boxtimes$		$\boxtimes$						
David McCullough	$\boxtimes$		No Meeting	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$			$\boxtimes$		$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$
Todd Pitman	$\boxtimes$		No Meeting		$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$						
Cindy Stankowski	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No Meeting	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$						
Michael Taylor							$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$		$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$
Matthew Winter	$\boxtimes$		No Meeting	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$		$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$
Dr. Ann Woods	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No Meeting	$\boxtimes$								

# Certified Local Government Program -- 2021-2022 Annual Report (Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

Chaman Antham												
Shannon Anthony						$\boxtimes$						
Senior Planner												
Megan Bacik	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$										
Assistant Planner												
Caroline Garcia	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No	$\boxtimes$							$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$
Board Secretary			Meeting									
Emma Haggerty	$\boxtimes$											
Senior Planner												
Sheila Santos	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$			
Interim Board Secretary			Meeting									
Rocio Mejia					$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$			
Interim Board Secretary												
Sabrina Custer			No							$\boxtimes$		
Legislative Recorder			Meeting									
Alvin Lin	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No	$\boxtimes$								
Assistant Planner			Meeting									
Lea Kolesky	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$										
Junior Planner												
Suzanne Segur	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No	$\boxtimes$								
Senior Planner/HRB Liaison			Meeting									
Elizabeth Shearer-Nguyen						$\boxtimes$						
Program Manager												
Kelley Stanco			No		$\boxtimes$							
Deputy Director/CLG Liaison			Meeting									
Bernard Turgeon						$\boxtimes$						
Senior Planner												
Megan Walker												$\boxtimes$
Associate Planner												
Andrew Wood											$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$
Junior Planner											_	
Anna McPherson	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	No	$\boxtimes$								
Program Manager			Meeting	_								

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

#### D. Training Received

Indicate what training each commissioner and staff member has received. Remember it is a CLG requirement 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 (including method presentation, e.g., webinar, workshop)	Duration of Training	Training Provider	Date
Boardmember Coyle	Commission Assistance and Mentoring Program (CAMP)	6 Hours	National Alliance of Preservation Commissions	October 2021
Staff	Project Submittal and Issuance Staff training on the Historical Review Process and Regulations	1 Hour	HRB Staff	10/22/2021
Boardmembers	New Boardmember Orientation	3 Hours	City Staff	4/21/2022
Staff	Project Submittal and Issuance Staff training on the Historical Review Process and Regulations	1 Hour	HRB Staff	7/8/2022
Staff	Telecom and Utilities Division Staff training on the Historical Review Process and Regulations	1 Hour	HRB Staff	8/10/2022
Boardmembers	Ethics Training	1 Hour	Sharon Spivak and Ryan O'Conner; City of San Diego Ethics Commission	8/25/2022
Staff	Webinar: Historic Sites and Revitalization: A Toolkit for Northern Californians; Part I: Making the Case for Historic Preservation	1.5 Hours	California Preservation Foundation – Various Speakers	9/27/2022

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

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

A. Historical Contexts: initiated, researched, or developed in the reporting year (excluding those funded by OHP)

NOTE: California CLG procedures require CLGs to submit survey results, including historic contexts, to OHP. (If you have not done so, submit an electronic copy or link if available online with this report.)

Context Name	Description	How it is Being Used	Date Submitted to OHP	
Clairemont Community Planning Area Historic Context Statement	A historic context statement is being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan Update for the Clairemont Community to assist in the identification of historic resources important to that community.	The historic context statement will inform the policies of the Clairement Community Plan Update and the analysis in the associated EIR, and will provide the basis for future identification, evaluation and designation of resources in Clairement.	In development	
University Community Plan Area Historic Context Statement	A historic context statement is being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan Update for the University Community to assist in the identification of historic resources important to that community.	The historic context statement will inform the policies of the University Community Plan Update and the analysis in the associated EIR, and will provide the basis for future identification, evaluation and designation of resources in the University Community.	In development	
Mira Mesa Community Plan Area Historic Context Statement	A historic context statement is being prepared in conjunction with a Community Plan Update for the Mira Mesa Community to assist in the identification of historic resources important to that community.	The historic context statement will inform the policies of the Mira Mesa Community Plan Update and the analysis in the associated EIR, and will provide the basis for future identification, evaluation and designation of resources in Mira Mesa.	In development	

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

College Area Historic Context	A historic context statement is being	The historic context statement will	In development
Statement	prepared in conjunction with a Community	inform the policies of the College	
	Plan Update for the College Area	Area Community Plan Update and	
	Community to assist in the identification of	the analysis in the associated EIR,	
	historic resources important to that	and will provide the basis for future	
	community.	identification, evaluation and	
	-	designation of resources in the	
		College Area Community.	

#### B. New Surveys or Survey Updates (excluding those funded by OHP)

**NOTE:** The evaluation of a single property is not a survey. Also, material changes to a property that is included in a survey, is not a change to the survey and should not be reported here.

Survey Area	Context Based- yes/no	Level: Reconnaissance or Intensive	Acreage	# of Properties Surveyed	Date Completed	Date Submitted to OHP
University Community Plan Area Focused Reconnaissance Survey	Yes	Reconnaissance	8,500	TBD	In progress	N/A
Mira Mesa Community Plan Area Focused Reconnaissance Survey	Yes	Reconnaissance	10,500	TBD	In progress	N/A
Hillcrest LGBTQ+ Historic Context Statement & MPL Survey	Yes	Intensive	380	TBD	In progress	N/A

How are you using the survey data? These surveys are conducted as part of a community plan update process within each community. The community plan constitutes the land use element of the City's General Plan for the subject area and is used to make land use and planning decisions for 10 or more years. The community plan survey, guided by a historic context, will be used as a planning tool to inform the plan update by making it possible to evaluate resources for land use planning purposes and to identify and preserve significant historical resources. Areas identified as potential historic districts or as containing potentially significant individual resources are reviewed to determine whether or not the land use designations and zoning would have the potential to apply development pressure within these areas and adversely impact these resources.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

Second, potential historic districts are mapped and flagged for future intensive survey. Third, potentially significant individual resources are evaluated at the project level when a permit application is submitted.

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

#### A. Public Education

What public outreach, training, or publications programs has the CLG undertaken? How were the commissioners and staff involved? Please provide an electronic link to all publications or other products not previously provided to OHP.

Item or Event	Description	Date
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
Ethics Training	The Board's Ethics training was open to the public.	8/25/2022
La Jolla Masterminds Meeting	Historical Resources staff met with real estate professionals to discuss the advantages and potential challenges of the historical review process and Mills Act Agreements.	9/8/2022

#### <u>ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ANNUAL PRODUCTS REPORTS FOR CLGS</u>

#### NOTE: OHP will forward this information to NPS on your behalf.CLG Inventory Program

During the reporting period (October 1, 2021-September 30, 2021) how many historic properties did your local government **add** to the CLG inventory? This is the total number of historic properties and contributors to districts (or your best estimate of the number) added to your inventory **from all programs**, local, state, and Federal, during the reporting year. These might include National Register, California Register, California Historic Landmarks, locally funded surveys, CLG surveys, and local designations.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

Program area	Number of Properties added
National, State and Local Designations	97

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

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2021-September 30, 2022) did you have a local register program to create local landmarks and/or local districts (or a similar list of designations) created by local law? 

  □ No
- 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been added to your register or designated from October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022? 35

#### C. Local Tax Incentives Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2021-September 30, 2022) did you have a Local Tax Incentives Program, such as the Mills Act? ⊠ Yes □ No
- 2. If the answer is yes, how many properties have been added to this program from October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022? Click or tap here to enter text.

Name of Program	Number of Properties Added During 2021-2022	Total Number of Properties Benefiting From Program
Mills Act	62	1823

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

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2021-September 30, 2022) did you have a local government historic preservation grant and/or loan program for rehabilitating/restoring historic properties? □Yes ☒No
- 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) from October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022? Type here.

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

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

#### E. Design Review/Local Regulatory Program

1.	During the reporting period (October 1, 2021-September 30, 2022) did your local government have a historic
	preservation regulatory law(s) (e.g., an ordinance) authorizing Commission and/or staff review of local government
	projects or impacts on historic properties? ⊠ Yes □ No

2. If the answer is yes, how many historic properties did your local government review for compliance with your local government's historic preservation regulatory law(s) from October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022? 3,400

#### F. Local Property Acquisition Program

- 1. During the reporting period (October 1, 2021--September 30, 2022) did you have a local program to acquire (or help to acquire) historic properties in whole or in part through purchase, donation, or other means? □Yes ⊠ No
- 2. If the answer is yes, then how many properties have been assisted under the program(s) from October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022 Type here.

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

## <u>IN ADDITION TO THE MINIMUM CLG REQUIREMENTS, OHP IS INTERESTED IN YOUR FEEDBACK ABOUT THE RECENT</u> CAMP TRAINING

- Did anyone from your local government participate in the free CAMP training opportunities in Fall 2021?
   Yes, Suzanne Segur and Shannon Anthony both attended the September 16 &17 session. Boardmember Coyle also attended in October 202.
- Whether or not you were able to take advantage of any of the CAMP trainings in 2021, would you like to see OHP to provide free additional CAMPs in the future?

Yes, the training was very informative and additional trainings would allow more boardmembers and staff to attend.

(Reporting period is from October 1, 2021 through September 30, 2022)

- What are your top three topics for future training?
  - Strategies for making local preservation programs more equitable
  - Strategies for incorporating new housing and development laws into local historical resources regulations
  - Designing consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards

#### XII Attachments (electronic)

Resumes and Statement of Qualifications forms for all commission members/alternatives and staf
Minutes from commission meetings
Drafts of proposed changes to the ordinance
Drafts of proposed changes to the General Plan
Public outreach publications

Email to: <a href="mailto:info.calshpo@parks.ca.gov">info.calshpo@parks.ca.gov</a>