

First Name	Last Name	Meeting Date	Agenda Item Number	Position	I would like to speak on the item during public testimony.	Comments	Attachments
------------	-----------	--------------	--------------------	----------	--	----------	-------------

**NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS - Added 8/21/2024**

David	Swarens	8/22/2024	Non-Agenda Comment			<p>Some of us have a concern with the delay in processing the Culverwell &amp; Taggart's proposed Historic District in the Golden Hill Community plan update from October 2016.</p> <p>In the adopted schedule, review and processing of the proposed C&amp;T historic district was promised for 2019, a year before any pandemic related disruptions. It now shows as 2021! (four years ago, rather than six).</p> <p>The entire effort of reviewing all proposed historic districts from the 2016 CPUs was represented by a six year schedule- and we are now going into year eight (out of those six), and barely into year three of that work program</p> <p>With all of the (land use) changes that went into effect with the adoption of the CPUs, and subsequently, this is especially important from a CEQA perspective, and was discussed as such at the Council hearing where the Community Plan update was adopted.</p> <p>Even with a timely schedule (which has now been long abandoned) it was considered advisable to develop an interim protective overlay for all proposed historic districts in both Golden Hill and North Park CPUs, both on general principles as well as to comply with CEQA - Council directed a program be brought back within the year.(for some reason that element of the Council's discussion and action appears to have not made it into the adopted minutes).</p> <p>Coincidentally we have been contacted by Mr. Turgeon in the last hour or so (08/20/2024), and we hope to meet with him on this subject in the near future. His professionalism is always appreciated. But a cynical person might well see evidence of intent and bad faith in this extreme delay.</p> <p>We would implore your support to get this program back on track- and not just for C&amp;T in Golden Hill.</p>	
Bruce	Coons	8/22/2024	Non-Agenda Comment			Please see the attached letter from Save Our Heritage Organization.	<a href="https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_994112/50196/coalitionletterhrb092124c.pdf?access=426885&amp;id=d069e0c4-5569-4e72-be43-2e2bd4265dfb">https://www.sandiego.gov/system/files/webform/webform_994112/50196/coalitionletterhrb092124c.pdf?access=426885&amp;id=d069e0c4-5569-4e72-be43-2e2bd4265dfb</a>

**NON-AGENDA PUBLIC COMMENTS - Added 8/22/2024**

David	Goldberg	8/22/2024	Non-Agenda Comment			<p>I writing to express my support for the recently submitted Neighborhood Historic Preservation Coalition letter regarding the City of San Diego program for the designation and processing of local historic districts. As the letter points out, the City hasn't processed a district designation since 2017. The program is broken and non-functional with no apparent plan to reactivate it anytime in the foreseeable future. This is simply unacceptable.</p> <p>Without a functioning local program, community members are forced to pursue alternate paths for local historic district designation. This is not by choice but out of necessity. All things being equal, it is always better to seek designation through a local program.</p> <p>It's worth noting that the State Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) processes applications for historic districts efficiently, in a timely manner, and with rigor which ensures that only districts that meet their high standards are designated. This program could serve as a model for restarting the program in San Diego.</p> <p>Not only is the lack of a functioning historic district program unfair to local preservation advocates, it is unfair to homeowners, developers, the construction and real estate industries. Uncertainty leads to confusion, delays, concern, increased costs and misunderstandings. No one is well served by this.</p> <p>Moreover, the current situation is contrary to Recommendation 2 in the Independent Budget Analyst Report "Response to Request for Analysis of Potential and Designated Historical Resource Review" dated July 18, 2023. Recommendation 2 states, "A robust historical survey and historical district program should be developed to provide greater certainty to future development and help streamline permit review process."</p> <p>The tripling of application fees also raises concerns as the public was assured that some of the increased revenue would be used to expedite the processing of historic districts. Why hasn't this been done? What has become of the increased revenue generated? Has it been accounted for separately and is it still available for the intended purpose?</p> <p>Please follow up and use your authority to restart a workable historic district designation program that processes historic district designations in an efficient and timely manner. The current situation has festered for far too long and needs to be resolved.</p>	
-------	----------	-----------	--------------------	--	--	---	--

Priscilla Ann	Berge	8/22/2024	Non-Agenda Comment		<p>Mister Chair and Members of the Historical Resources Board:</p> <p>I am Priscilla ann Berge, a resident of Kensington, San Diego. I am speaking today regarding Documentation Requirements in a letter sent to the Board by myself and 3 other people. As I recall, a Board member said he was insulted to have only a few sentences paragraph to read about a house, in a National Historic District nomination because a nomination in this City is over 100 pages.</p> <p>First, assesses a nomination for an individual house for City designation is not the same as reviewing a house within a National Historic District Nomination. Is this a question of comparing apples to oranges?</p> <p>Second, the few sentences paragraph refers to an architectural description of a contributing or non-contributing house within the district nomination. Note: the address; APN; date built; name of the builder or architect, if known, and classification as either a contributor or non-contributor are in the text above each of these paragraphs. These architectural description paragraphs are not meant to stand alone.</p> <p>The rest of the nomination includes multiple paragraphs that describe the methodology for the classification of each house as contributor or non-contributor; information about builders or architects; sources for date built; the character defining features of given architectural style; the justification for the boundaries; the period of significance; historical integrity and historical significance of the district. Can the differences between apples and oranges be seen?</p> <p>Third, only the City of San Diego requires actual copies of references, such as water orders; Subdivision Maps, Sanborn Maps (or blank pages if non-existing); various other maps; deeds; permits, while the National nomination and even other professional reports require only footnotes to the documents. Why all the extra pages, when footnotes are the norm?</p> <p>Fourth, only the City of San Diego requires applicants to report on all HRB criteria, even though only one is necessary. This means more pages, which are not necessary and, certainly, not the norm for other nominations in other cities nor for National nominations. Why?</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
---------------	-------	-----------	-----------------------	--	---	--