

| HRB Meeting of February 27, 2025 | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| First Name | Last Name | Meeting Date | Agenda Item Number | Position | I would like to speak on the item during public testimony. | Comments | Attachments |
| HRB Public Comments - Added 2/25/2025, 2/26/2025 | | | | | | | |
| NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS | | | | | | | |
| Maria | Frase | 2/27/2025 | | | | I am totally in support of designating historic areas! I believe it enhances the attractiveness of our communities and our city. It is short sighted to not protect them! | |
| Ben | | 2/27/2025 | | | | I do not support any actions that undermine the integrity of National Register Districts. It is important to follow the established procedures and ensure local recognition of these districts. National Register Districts should automatically have access to the Mills Act, as is the case in most other municipalities across California. The removal of protection from National Register Historic Districts is detrimental, biased, and discriminatory. Such actions must be avoided. We must prioritize preservation over politics. It is essential to promote, process, and protect all historic districts. I do not endorse the anti-preservation stance advocated by certain YIMBY Democrats and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can and should coexist. Deregulating the housing industry undermines both preservation efforts and the goals of affordability and equity. Historic resources constitute less than 2% of the housing stock. It is crucial to process and protect all historic districts while recognizing National Register Districts at the local level. This approach will provide clarity and certainty for both homeowners and builders .Our beautiful charming neighborhood of Talmadge should be preserved. The streets are winding and narrow and couldn't handle more residents. | |
| Klonie | Kunzel | 2/27/2025 | | | | please see letter attached | https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/item-1-310-san-fernando-st-1.pdf |
| ITEM 1 | | | | | | | |
| Mark | Houghton-Berry | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please see the attached letter for my reasoned arguments against designation. | https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/310-san-fernando.pdf |
| Michael | Robinson | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Support of Item | No | Please find attached our letter in support of the nomination of the designation as a Historic Resource. We do not agree with the City Planning staff's recommendation that the home at 310 San Fernando Street should not be designated as a Historic Resource. | https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/letter-historical-resources-board-february-24.pdf |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|---|--|
| Michael | Panissidi | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Nicole | Panissidi | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please do not designate the single-family residence at 310 San Fernando Street. We urge the Board to accept the City of San Diego staff's recommendation, as the property does not meet any HRB designation criteria and lacks historic integrity required for designation. Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Elizabeth | Panissidi | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Charlie | Bullard | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Natalie | Harris | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please do not designate the single-family residence at 310 San Fernando Street. We urge the Board to accept the City of San Diego staff's recommendation, as the property does not meet any HRB designation criteria and lacks historic integrity required for designation. Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Tom | Chintala | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please do not designate the single-family residence at 310 San Fernando Street. We urge the Board to accept the City of San Diego staff's recommendation, as the property does not meet any HRB designation criteria and lacks historic integrity required for designation. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|--|--|
| Jocelyn | Cherin | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Lily | Panissidi | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Maureen | McGrath | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | The Landmark nomination fails to demonstrate how this house meets the City’s HRB criteria or how its significant alterations are "minimal." The house no longer retains its original red tile roof, wood eaves, front porch, stucco, or windows—all key character- defining features. These are not minor changes. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando St. | |
| Eileen | Deely | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Serina | Roth | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Carl | Lemke | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please do not designate the single-family residence at 310 San Fernando Street. We urge the Board to accept the City of San Diego staff's recommendation, as the property does not meet any HRB designation criteria and lacks historic integrity required for designation. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|--|--|
| Michael | Timon | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please do not designate the single-family residence at 310 San Fernando Street. We urge the Board to accept the City of San Diego staff's recommendation, as the property does not meet any HRB designation criteria and lacks historic integrity required for designation. | |
| Scott | Moomjian | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Dear Chair Hutter & HRB Members: I am well-familiar with the above-referenced property ("Property"), including its history and the various modifications and alterations which the residence and site has sustained over the years. In my professional opinion, I do not believe that the Property qualifies under any HRB Criteria, and therefore, is not eligible for historic site designation. Sincerely. Scott A. Moomjian Attorney at Law | |
| Sean | Kennedy | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Carly | Kennedy | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Please do not designate the single-family residence at 310 San Fernando Street. We urge the Board to accept the City of San Diego staff's recommendation, as the property does not meet any HRB designation criteria and lacks historic integrity required for designation. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Joseph | Ghio | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>1. Please do not designate the single-family residence at 310 San Fernando Street. We urge the Board to accept the City of San Diego staff's recommendation, as the property does not meet any HRB designation criteria and lacks historic integrity required for designation.,</p> <p>2. The Landmark nomination fails to demonstrate how this house meets the City's HRB criteria or how its significant alterations are "minimal." The house no longer retains its original red tile roof, wood eaves, front porch, stucco, or windows—all key character defining features. These are not minor changes. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street.</p> <p>3. 310 San Fernando Street is not a good example of Prairie-style architecture and lacks historic integrity—which is essential for designation under the City's HRB Guidelines. Ignoring the clear loss of integrity due to numerous renovations would undermine 310 San Fernando Street HRB Board Meeting – February 27, 2025 existing precedent and set a dangerous standard for future, baseless historic claims. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street.</p> <p>4. This structure is 109 years old and is in need of major renovations and modifications to even possibly comply with Historic requirements. I have recently viewed the interior and exterior of the subject property. It is my opinion that, modifications/alterations have been performed over the past 109 years and the age & type of wood frame/stucco construction used in this structure has reached the end of it's expected lifespan. It would require major electrical, plumbing, roof, stucco and window replacement, plus structural and foundation repairs and modifications to bring this home back to serviceable condition after which it would likely still not comply with all historic designation guidelines / requirements. If the city approves historic designation of this structure it would be placing an undue financial burden on the owner forcing a complete rehab of a structure that has exceeded its lifespan. My qualifications to make these comments are, I am a former Licensed General Contractor, Home Inspector, and current CA licensed real estate broker. I live in Point Loma Heights and believe in protecting our neighborhoods and the wonderful diverse architectural gems of the area. I do however look at the homeowners burden of cost to restore a property to historical originality that has been previously modified and lacks historic significance. I have represented buyers and sellers with Historical home sales and purchases. I have a reasonable experience with historic designated homes.</p> | |
| Natalie | Harris | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa's fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street.</p> | |
| Stuart | Hartley | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Please see attached letter</p> | <p>https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/310-san-fernando_0.pdf</p> |
| Steven | Untiedt | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Support of Item | Yes | <p>I am submitting my letter dated today, and I would like to briefly speak at the meeting tomorrow, in support of designating 310 San Fernando Street as a historical resource under Criteria A and C.</p> | <p>https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/untiedt-letter-to-the-historical-resources-board-9109227.2.pdfhttps://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/exhibit-a-2019-photo-of-310-san-fernando-street.pdfhttps://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/exhibit-b-1916-photo-of-la-playa.pdfhttps://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/310-san-fernando-street-the-la-playa-trail-assn-comments_0.pdf, https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/310-san-fernando-soho-comments.pdf</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|---------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|-----|--|--|
| Marcie | Rothman | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | Yes | I look forward to speaking to the Board on this important matter. | https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/310-jean-yap-2.9.25.pdf , https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/rothman_hartley-letter-re-310-san-fernando-street-1.pdf , https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/rothman_prj-1127900-310-san-fernando-st.pdf |
| Felix | Tinkov | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Support of Item | Yes | I will make public comment tomorrow orally. | https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/bolton_tinkov.pdf , https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/epp.pdf |
| Jane | Hamlin | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Natalie | Harris | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street. | |
| Bill | Hamlin | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I used to own a property just up the street from this one, at 360 San Gorgonio and have since moved to Loma Portal. This property does not fit the historic criteria from my understanding. Please do not designate the single-family residence at 310 San Fernando Street. We urge the Board to accept the City of San Diego staff’s recommendation, as the property does not meet any HRB designation criteria and lacks historic integrity required for designation.</p> <p>Point Loma already has over 164 designated historic resources, including at least 14 in La Playa. The City is protecting structures that truly deserve historic designation—310 San Fernando Street is not one of them. This property does not represent a rare or significant piece of San Diego history and its designation would distract from preserving buildings that are truly important. The house is not associated with La Playa’s fishing, boating, or historical development. Please do not designate 310 San Fernando Street.</p> | |
| Marcie | Rothman | 2/27/2025 | 1 | In Opposition to Item | No | The earlier attachments are from the community and indicate their concerns about this issue. And attached is my letter to the community. Thanks. | https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/310-eric-law-2.5.25-2.pdf |

| ITEM 3 | | | | | | |
|---------|----------|-----------|---|-----------------------|----|--|
| Patrick | Noonan | 2/27/2025 | 3 | In Support of Item | No | <p>Dear Members of the Historical Resources Board,</p> <p>I am writing to express my support for the application to grant historical designation to the Spanish Colonial home at 7964 Roseland Dr in La Jolla. As a lifelong San Diego resident and a La Jolla real estate professional, I believe the features of this residence being considered are vital to our local heritage and community. Located near public access to La Jolla Shores beach and the village of La Jolla, this home is a visible landmark admired by many residents and visitors. Its Spanish Colonial features reflect the rich cultural history of San Diego and enhance the neighborhood's character. Preserving this property through historical designation will allow future generations to appreciate its significance and craftsmanship. Protecting such landmarks fosters pride among residents and strengthens our connection to our shared history. The visibility of the historical features at issue amplify its community impact, inviting passersby to engage with San Diego's architectural heritage. Designating it as a historic resource will promote awareness and appreciation of our city's rich cultural history. I urge the board to support the application for historical and cultural significance for 7964 Roseland Dr. Its preservation will be a valuable asset to our community and enhance the cultural fabric of San Diego for years to come. Thank you for your consideration. Sincerely, Patrick Noonan, Esq. Patrick@lajollahomes.com www.lajollahomes.com 858-349-6621</p> |
| Lauren | Lockhart | 2/27/2025 | 3 | In Support of Item | No | <p>See letter attached.</p> <p>https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/lambert-spec-house-1-los.pdf</p> |
| ITEM 4 | | | | | | |
| Monique | Muther | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support the attack on National Register Districts. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally. National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do. Do not remove protection from National Register Historic Districts. This is punitive, biased and discriminatory. Put preservation over politics! Promote, process and protect all historic districts. I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity. Historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock! Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! This will create certainty for homeowners and builders alike.</p> |
| Gregory | Aarons | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do. Do not remove protection from National Register Historic Districts. This is punitive, biased and discriminatory. I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity.</p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|---|---|
| Susan | Dean | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>The memorandum provided by the City states that San Diego is unique among its peers in having a designation criterion that provides for local listing of a resource listed on the National or State registers. This ignores the fact that different CLGs extend protections and incentives differently than San Diego does. For example, Pasadena allows contributors to National/State Register listed historic districts to apply for Mills Act benefits, while San Diego does not. Apples and oranges.</p> <p>Also, the report discusses the number of Mills Act contracts, and lack of competitive process or limit on property value - and oddly notes the number of MA contracts is second only to LA (SD is second only to LA in size). But so far, the City has not provided an updated analysis of the financial impact of Mills Act Contracts.</p> <p>The only analysis of which I am aware is a 2008 study by Andrew Narwold which concluded that, due to the halo effect on surrounding properties, Mills Act designations may have a positive effect on net property tax revenue. This report is still listed on the City's website as an illustration of the benefits of historic districts.</p> <p>The City should do its homework on real, current financial impacts of the Mills Act before making adjustments.</p> | |
| Lynn | Mercer | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support the attack on National Register Districts. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally.</p> <p>Historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock! Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! This will create certainty for homeowners and builders alike.</p> | |
| LAURA | HENSON | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>In Package B it states, "Amendments to address, automatic regulation and/or listing of National/State register resources to align with other jurisdictions, as well as National Park service and California office of historic preservation requirements"</p> <p>It appears that Deputy Director Stanco is now suggesting that National Register Districts should not get regulatory protection from the Municipal Code. She has denied us access to Criterion E and therefore the Mills Act incentives stating that we had regulatory protection from the municipal code and therefore did not need local designation. Now she is proposing denying us both Mills Act incentives and historic regulatory protection. What has happened to Historic Preservation? It appears that anti-preservation and anti-regulation YIMBY policies have found an even more comfortable home within Heritage Preservation leadership. This is bad for historic preservation, communities, affordability and equity. See the attached Conclusion In the Perils of Land Use Deregulation.</p> | https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/the-perils-of-land-use-deregulation.pdf |
| Roger | Anderson | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Less than 2% of the housing stock is represented by Historic Resources. Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! Once these areas are destroyed- there are so few of them left - they can NEVER return. Do not destroy our history!</p> | |
| Jennifer | Homer | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Hello, please Do Not remove protection from National Register Historic Districts.This is punitive , biased and discriminatory.</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|--|---|
| Janet | O'Dea | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>If I am unable to attend please comment on this matter. Thank you</p> <p>Subject: Ensuring Majority Representation by the Historic Resources Board Members presentDear Historic Resources board and staff,I appreciate the benchmarking efforts staff has provided to evaluate processes and programs from other jurisdictions as you reconsider the historic preservation program in the city of San Diego. However, I noticed that the review did not address how other cities handle voting procedures for historic designations by the Historic Resources Board.</p> <p>Recently, a historic designation was lost for a bungalow court despite a majority of attending board members voting in favor (5 members), simply because 2 members voted against it. This outcome, where a minority of board members determines the result, is fundamentally anti-democratic—especially given that the board consists of volunteers, many of whom are serving beyond their terms.</p> <p>Additionally, there is no proxy process for absent board members, meaning decisions can be made without full representation. As changes to the program are being considered, I urge the city to update the voting requirements to ensure that:</p> <p>A designation decision is based on the majority of members present when there is a quorum.</p> <p>A proxy process could also be established for members unable to attend.</p> <p>These changes will help guarantee that the majority viewpoint is properly reflected for historic designation decisions. Thank you for considering this important issue.</p> <p>Sincerely, Janet O'Dea</p> | https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/2025-02/hrb-board-majority-rule.pdf |
| Lisa | Mortensen | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity. Historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock! Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! This will create certainty for homeowners and builders alike.</p> | |
| Danna | Givot | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>In San Diego, National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do. I do not support the attack on National Register Districts. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally. To remove protection from National Register Historic Districts in San Diego is punitive, biased and discriminatory. San Diego should be ashamed of having not processed an historic district since 2018. The anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Gloria is a transparent delay tactic and political maneuver to undermine historic preservation in our beautiful and well worth preserving city. Put preservation over politics! Promote, process and protect all historic districts. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity. Historic resources represent less than 2% of the city's housing stock! Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! It is unconscionable not to do so</p> | |
| MARY | Brown | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support the attack on National Register Districts. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally. National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do. Do not remove protection from National Register Historic Districts. This is punitive, biased and discriminatory. Put preservation over politics! Promote, process and protect all historic districts. I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity. Historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock! Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! This will create certainty for homeowners and builders alike.</p> | |
| Misha | Moore | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support the attack on National Register Districts. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally. National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do. Do not remove protection from National Register Historic Districts. This is punitive, biased and discriminatory. Put preservation over politics! Promote, process and protect all historic districts.</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|---------|-----------|---|-----------------------|----|---|--|
| Jeana | Preston | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | I support the preservation of San Diego's historic homes and neighborhoods. Responsible development is possible without destroying our historical communities. Historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock. Please protect our historic districts and also recognize National Register Districts locally. Homes in these districts should also have access to the Mills Act. I ask that you put preservation for San Diego neighborhoods over politics! | |
| Ann | Kilrain | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Dear San Diego Historical Resources Board,</p> <p>You play a critically important role in evaluating, promoting and protecting our city's historic resources and districts. No other individuals or boards hold this privilege and responsibility. I strongly urge you to uphold the integrity of San Diego's historic district regulations and work to align rather than segregate local from state/national regulations.</p> <p>Historic districts make up less than 2% of San Diego's housing stock, yet they provide an irreplaceable connection to our city's past. They are also a rich souce of naturally occuring affordable housing. Despite this, San Diego has not designated a local historic district since 2018, leaving the state and national designation process as the only viable and legitimate path for recognition and preservation by residents who continue to invest, support and preserve their historic homes and neighborhoods. Designation criteria and processes are almost identical whether the state/national or local path is undertaken with the exception of the time required to come before the respective boards. It is imperative that the SD Historical Resources Board upholds it responsibilities to protect both local and national districts—not weaken the regulations that safeguard one over the other or create what would ultimately be a secondary and unnecessarily duplicative and costly designation process.</p> <p>As stewards of San Diego's heritage, you have the privilege and duty to ensure that preservation remains a priority. I urge you to stand firm against the attempts guised as “Preservation and Progress” that will erode protections for San Diego's duly recognized national historic districts. All of which were supported by this HRB. Please resist the political influence and pressures from developers and others who will prioritize personal gain over the well-being of our city's historic and cultural assets and do what makes sense, what's right for San Diego. Instead, please actively promote policy updates that strengthen preservation for future generations by aligning local regulations with State/National and Department of the Interior Standards. To do anything less would be a disservice to our shared history and community and a dereliction of your responsibilities.</p> | |
| Susan | Nowak | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | I do not sport the attack on the National Register. It not only negatively affects the value of my home but the integrity of our community. I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity. | |
| Jeana | Preston | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | I support the preservation of San Diego's historic homes and neighborhoods. Responsible development is possible without destroying our historical communities. Historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock. Please protect our historic districts and also recognize National Register Districts locally. Homes in these districts should also have access to the Mills Act. I ask that you put preservation for San Diego neighborhoods over politics! | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|-----------|---|-----------------------|----|--|--|
| Karen | Austin | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Support of Item | No | <p>Historic preservation is crucial for maintaining community character and preserving cultural heritage for future generations. Talmadge is an excellent example of an iconic San Diego neighborhood and should be an approved historic district.</p> <p>Making it a historic resource will help maintain the unique character and identity of the community, and create a strong sense of pride and belonging. Preserving existing homes and buildings in this historic district will reduce the need for new construction, will conserve resources, reduce waste and other negative impacts. It is the sustainability the City of San Diego has set goals to achieve.</p> <p>Single family homes in a charming neighborhood like Talmadge are one very important and desirable housing type. These homes need to be maintained using the appropriate materials to safeguard their architectural significance. Please help homeowners preserve these beautiful homes, so that they can enjoy the benefits now and can also ensure future community members can own these homes with room for kids to play, room to garden, room for pets and many other wonderful attributes.</p> <p>I urge you to promote and protect our San Diego history by setting strong preservation guidelines so places like the Talmadge Historic District will be approved and cherished decade after decade by residents near and far.</p> | |
| Debbie | Sanders | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>The history of our City is rich on multiple levels - culture, architecture, military, and aeronautics to name a few. Much of that history is represented in communities and preservation of these communities is vital to ensure San Diego retains its sense of heritage, uniqueness and special place to live.</p> <p>The updated 'Preservation and Progress' Program being presented today MUST include consideration of the impact to well established neighborhoods that exist throughout our City. Many of these communities have proactive planning groups and their voice(s) deserve attention - they consist of reasonable, cooperative volunteers that understand both a need for housing and preservation of historical value.</p> <p>Interaction with the various communities and their constituents can achieve long lived, well minded housing plans. Our City is full of under-utilized corridors that should be used for development. Well thought out housing in those corridors can provide the same aesthetics that are sought out in the established neighborhoods. This form of development ensures a blend of new housing and preservation of existing housing.</p> <p>Our City must strive to achieve an actual true compromise if it desires to maintain itself as "America's Finest City".</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> | |
| Diana | Carnahan | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I oppose the attack on National Register Districts!</p> <p>We need to support National Register Districts locally. National Historic Districts should have access to the Mills Act. Do not remove protection from National Historic Districts. I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic districts can co-exist.</p> <p>Thank you Diana Carnahan</p> | |
| Jayna | McLeod | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Do not remove protection from national register, historic districts. This is punitive, biased, and discriminatory! National register district should have access to the Mills act automatically as most other municipalities within California do.</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|--|--|
| Kurt | Stolle | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability, and equity. DO NOT remove protection from National Register Historic Districts. This is punitive, biased and discriminatory. | |
| Cindy | Yurkovich | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | I do not support the attack on National Register Districts. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally. National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do. Do not remove protection from National Register Historic Districts. This is punitive, biased and discriminatory. | |
| JL | Foltyn | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | PRESERVATION OVER POLITICS. i do not support the attack on National Register Districts, which are an important part of the city of San Diego's history. Protect them. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally, which comprise 2% of housing. National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do. Do not remove protection from National Register Historic Districts. This is punitive, biased, pro developer agenda item, promoted by mayor Gloria, who has no interest in our San Diego history, has never owned property in san diego, does not value single family neighborhoods, historic houses or historic districts, and is only interested in campaign contributions to finance his political aspirations. Disgusting! | |
| Ann | Garwood | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | San Diego's historical resources should be valued and maintained. Please don't dilute what we have left. "Preservation and progress" is neither. Sincerely, Ann Garwood President of the Hillcrest History Guild | |
| Hoan | Nguyen | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity. | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|---|--|
| Lott | Hill | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support revisions to San Diego's preservation program. For San Diego to remain a world class city, you must follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally.</p> <p>National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do. Do not remove protection from National Register Historic Districts. Doing so will have a negative impact on the future of San Diego and the unique nature of our city.</p> <p>I urge you to promote, process and protect all historic districts. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity.</p> <p>Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! This will create certainty for homeowners and builders alike.</p> | |
| Brent | Gutekunst | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Subject: Public Comment on Item-4 – Recognition of National Register Districts</p> <p>Dear Members of the Historic Resources Board,</p> <p>I urge the Board to formally recognize National Register Historic Districts at the local level and follow the established procedures for their designation and treatment. In many municipalities across California, properties within these districts are automatically granted access to the Mills Act and other preservation incentives, acknowledging their historical significance without additional barriers.</p> <p>San Diego should align with these best practices by ensuring that properties in National Register Districts receive the same consideration locally as they do at the state and national levels. This recognition is essential for preserving our city's historic fabric and providing property owners with the incentives needed to maintain and restore these significant structures.</p> <p>I respectfully ask the Board to take the necessary steps to follow the procedures already in place and ensure National Register Historic Districts are properly recognized within San Diego's historic preservation framework. Thank you for your time and dedication to protecting our city's historic resources.</p> <p>Sincerely, Brent Gutekunst</p> | |
| Celia | McIntosh | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Hello,</p> <p>I am writing in opposition to certain updates outlined in the Staff Memorandum for the Preservation and Progress Workshop for February 27, 2025 (the "Memo"). In general, my comments align with the correspondence letter from the Save Our Heritage Organization dated February 26, 2025.</p> <p>While some of the proposals in the Memo make sense to me, my worry lies in the ability for a de novo hearing of appeals before the City Counsel and its potential to remove existing or prevent new historical designations that are recommended by the Historic Resources Board. I'd also like to see more analysis around San Diego vs. other California city designations.</p> <p>My husband and I recently purchased a contributing property in Talmadge where we now live with our toddler. Part of our decision to invest in Talmadge was based on its federal historic preservation status and I am reluctant to support anything that jeopardizes it.</p> <p>Please pause proposed updates and amendments until the PlaceEconomics memo has been published.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Celia McIntosh</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|-----------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|---|--|
| Scott | Case | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support the proposed changes.</p> <p>a. San Diego needs to follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally.</p> <p>b. National Register Districts should have access to the Mills Act automatically as most other municipalities within California do.</p> <p>c. Do not remove protection of our local historical districts from National Register Historic Districts.</p> | |
| Donna | Knierim | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Please put Preservation over politics !</p> | |
| Susan | Nowak | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not sport the attack on the National Register. It not only negatively affects the value of my home but the integrity of our community. I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity.</p> | |
| Lauren | Westlundv | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>Regarding the memorandum, historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock! Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! This will create certainty for homeowners and builders alike.</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---------|-----------|---|-----------------------|----|--|--|
| Alan | Baia | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Support of Item | No | <p>I strongly oppose the proposed designation of Talmadge as a historic district. As a homeowner in this community for over 20 years, I do not want my property's status changed or unnecessary restrictions imposed on me that would impact my ability to maintain and improve my home. Such a designation would have significant negative consequences for homeowners, including increased costs, restricted property rights, and diminished future property value.</p> <p>One of the primary concerns is the loss of freedom to modify and upgrade my property as I see fit. Becoming part of a historic district would mean that any changes to my home, including renovations, repairs, or improvements, would need to comply with rigid regulations set by the historical society. These rules could dictate the type of materials, design elements, and construction methods I must use, severely limiting my ability to modernize my home in a way that suits my needs and preferences. The additional oversight would also lead to bureaucratic red tape, requiring approvals that could delay projects and add unnecessary costs.</p> <p>Furthermore, historic district designation would increase the financial burden on homeowners. Any future projects would likely become more expensive due to the requirement to use historically accurate materials and follow preservation guidelines. These constraints could force homeowners to spend significantly more on upgrades and repairs than under current zoning regulations. Additionally, the added regulatory requirements would discourage property investment and create obstacles for homeowners looking to improve their homes.</p> <p>Another primary concern is the impact on property values. While some argue that historic designation enhances a community's appeal, the reality is that it can also limit a home's marketability. Prospective buyers may be deterred by the restrictions that come with historic preservation, as they may not want to be subjected to strict oversight when making changes to their property. A home that cannot be easily modernized or modified according to a buyer's preferences may ultimately reduce value, limiting the homeowner's ability to sell the property at its full market potential.</p> <p>Additionally, the historic designation process disregards homeowners' rights by imposing regulations not in place when many purchased their homes. Property owners should have the right to make investment decisions without interference from external entities seeking to enforce preservation policies. The move to designate Talmadge as a historic district is an overreach that undermines property rights and unfairly burdens homeowners who do not wish to participate in such a program.</p> <p>In conclusion, the historic district designation for Talmadge is unnecessary and detrimental to homeowners' rights and financial interests. It will lead to increased costs, bureaucratic hurdles, restricted design choices, and potential decreases in property value. I urge decision-makers to respect homeowners' rights and reject this designation, allowing residents to control their properties completely.</p> | |
| Katherine | Picano | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Support of Item | No | <p>Please remove the neighborhood of Talmadge from the protection of the National Register Historic Districts. This is punitive, biased, and discriminatory. I've lived in Talmadge for about 21 years and am in the process of permitting an ADU garage conversion. One unit will be affordable. The request from the US Secretary of the Interior's Standard for Rehabilitation DO NOT makes sense. It states, " New additions, exterior alternations, or related new construction will not destroy historic material, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work must be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the property." A visually appealing roof was designed, and the historic team is asking to change it so it does not match the primary home. I was advised to differentiate the existing structure, the roof of the new construction should be lowered to a hip or flat roof. I believe a flat roof is less appealing visually and can cause flooding. It makes no sense why I can't keep a roofline similar to the primary home. The requests from the DSD Historic team are incredibly frustrating. The requests increase costs to the project. For example, DSD Historic is requesting aluminum / wood / sash windows frames instead of vinyl. The comments from DSD historic team are requesting that the exterior siding must be different from the historic home. The historic home is just stucco. What must the ADU addition be different and more costly? DSD Historic team is requesting a schedule detailing window / door details such as type of material, dimensions, operation panes. They are requesting any new windows to be different than the historic. They must be simpler than the historic. The primary home does not have historic windows. They have already been updated and are vinyl. This is request makes no sense. Housing construction should be deregulated. It's destroying the affordability to construct which limits supply and increased rental housing prices.</p> | |
| Jan | Taylor | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>I do not support the anti-preservation movement promoted by YIMBY Dems and Mayor Todd Gloria. Responsible development and historic preservation can co-exist. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity.</p> <p>Historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock! Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now!</p> | |
| Louise | Rehling | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | <p>It's common sense for the city to automatically register national districts as local historic districts. The city's slow-walking of historic districts isn't about either progress or preservation; it's obviously only about politics.</p> | |

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|---------|-----------|---|-----------------------------|----|--|--|
| TERRENCE | HANCOCK | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | Dear Board Members. I am writing to express my opposition to this proposal. This is a political, biased attack on National Register Districts. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally. Quit trying to destroy San Diego's neighborhoods! Do your job! Protect Historical Districts like Talmadge. | |
| Aileen | Teague | 2/27/2025 | 4 | In Opposition to Item | No | I do not support the attack on National Register Districts. Follow the procedures in place and recognize National Register Districts locally. Deregulating the housing industry destroys preservation, affordability and equity. Historic resources represent less than 2% of the housing stock! Process and protect all historic districts and recognize National Register Districts locally now! | |