



L64A-003A

Project Information

Project Nbr: **610128** Title: Bonair Sea Apartments Remodel
Project Mgr: Delgado, Antonio (619) 446-5329 Adelgado@sandiego.gov



Review Information

Cycle Type: 19 Hist.Site Specific Stdy Determ	Submitted: 04/03/2019	Deemed Complete on 04/03/2019
Reviewing Discipline: Plan-Historic	Cycle Distributed: 04/03/2019	
Reviewer: Haggerty, Emma (619) 236-7173 EHaggerty@sandiego.gov	Assigned: 04/05/2019	
	Started: 04/24/2019	
Hours of Review: 3.00	Review Due: 04/17/2019	
Next Review Method: Hist.Site Specific Stdy Determ	Completed: 05/01/2019	COMPLETED LATE
	Closed: 05/01/2019	

- . We request a 4th complete submittal for Plan-Historic on this project as: Hist.Site Specific Stdy Determ.
- . The reviewer has requested more documents be submitted.
- . Last month Plan-Historic performed 320 reviews, 88.4% were on-time, and 95.4% were on projects at less than < 3 complete submittals.

062518

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	1	The property located at 305-309.5 Bonair Street, is not an individually designated resource and is not located within a designated historic district. However, San Diego Municipal Code Section 143.0212 requires City staff to review all projects impacting a parcel that contains a structure 45 years old or older to determine whether a potentially significant historical resource exists on site prior to issuance of a permit. (Info Only, No Response Required) (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	2	The property was previously reviewed in accordance with SDMC Section 143.0212 under PTS Application Number 540025. During that review, it was determined that the property appeared eligible for designation under one or more HRB designation criteria. The scope of work proposed under the prior application was determined consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and the applicant was advised that any future projects submitted would require review by Plan-Historic staff under the 45-year review (SDMC 143.0212). (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	3	Based on the prior determination, all modifications and additions must be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties. If the proposed project is not consistent with the Standards, the applicant may redesign the project or prepare a historic report that evaluates the building's integrity and eligibility under all designation criteria. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4	The current project application proposes the following scope of work: Building, mechanical, electrical, plumbing permits for a remodel at an existing two-story, 4 unit apartment complex and a detached SDU. Work to include new landscape, stair and guardrails replacement, new gas furnace and water heaters, new lighting.. (Info Only, No Response Required) (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	5	The project proposed is not consistent with the Standards for the following reasons: removal of original fabric. (From Cycle 1)

305 Bonair Street

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6	The unpermitted work and the demolition of 305 Bonair is not consistent with the Standards. Provide additional information on the building to help understand the resource. Provide the following documents. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7	Provide a copy of the Notice of Completion, available at the County Assessor's Office (County Administration Center, 1600 Pacific Highway, Room 103, San Diego CA 92101.) If a Notice of Completion cannot be located, provide the following note on a sheet of paper along with the date: "Notice of Completion cannot be located." (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	8	Provide detailed information regarding any modifications to buildings on the property. This should include any permitted work (include copies of the permits), and any work that was completed under a permit exemption (i.e. window and door replacements; re-roofing; stucco/siding work and replacement, etc.) If the applicant has photos of the building prior to modifications, please include them. (From Cycle 1)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	9	Written description of the property including architectural style, materials, features, setting & related structures; written description of any alterations including dates & the architect/builder associated with the alterations; Chain of Title; City Directory listing of occupants; historic photographs; and Sanborn Maps. (From Cycle 1)

307-309.5 Bonair Street

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	10	The application can be approved if the project is revised as follows: repair and maintenance of the existing exterior material. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	11	The existing railings, stairs and wood screens should be repaired and maintained. If they cannot be repaired provide information on why they cannot be repaired any replacements should be done in-kind. Provide specifics on how the elements will be repaired and specifically which items will need to be replaced. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	12	The original windows and doors should be repaired and maintained. If they cannot be repaired, provide documentation on why they cannot be repaired. Any windows and doors should be replaced in-kind. Provide a manufacturer's spec sheet for the new windows/doors (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	13	Plans indicate that the exterior will be stuccoed. Only portions of the exterior are stuccoed. The wood siding on the exterior should be repaired and maintained. If select pieces of siding need to be replaced, they should be noted on the plans and replaced in-kind. Additionally, stucco should just be repaired rather than replaced all over. Indicate where repair will occur, how it will be repaired and the finish. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	14	Staff would like to work with the applicant on ways in which the project can be revised to be consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Please contact the reviewer listed in bold at the top of this cycle issues report to set up a meeting to discuss the project and possible revisions. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	15	Alternatively, the applicant may choose to submit a historic report that provides a complete evaluation of the building's integrity and eligibility under all designation criteria. If it is determined upon review of the report that the building is not eligible for designation, the project can proceed as proposed. If it is determined that the building is eligible for designation, it will be forwarded to the HRB for action, consistent with SDMC 143.0212(d). HOWEVER, staff would strongly encourage a meeting with the applicant to discuss the project prior to preparation of a historic report. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	16	Guidelines for the preparation of the report can be found on the City's website: For building permits: https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/hrbreport.pdf For discretionary permits: https://www.sandiego.gov/sites/default/files/hrbtechreport.pdf If the applicant is interested in hiring a consultant to complete the report, a list of consultants can be provided upon request. Please contact the "Reviewer" identified at the top of this cycle issues report. (From Cycle 1)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	17	Once the revisions are complete or the report is prepared, resubmit your project to the Development Services Department for routing and review. Should you have any questions regarding these comments, please contact the "Reviewer" listed in bold at the top of this cycle issues report. (From Cycle 1)

3.15.19

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	18	The applicant has submitted a Historic Resource Technical Report prepared by Scott Moomjian dated December 2018. The report concludes that the properties are not historic. (From Cycle 14)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	19	The report cannot be deemed complete at this time. The following revisions are required: (From Cycle 14)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	20	Under the Significance Evaluation, please separately evaluate both structures under every aspect of integrity. (From Cycle 14)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	21	Under Design, please clarify the "alterations" that occurred in 1925-1937 to 305 Bonair. For 307-309 1/2 Bonair, please clarify if/when the original window openings were modified as well. (From Cycle 14)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	22	Under the Materials section, please clarify what is meant by "the materials which have gone into the construction of the Properties are both original and non-original." The properties should be separately evaluated and assessed prior to their unpermitted work. The non original materials that were added prior to the unpermitted work should be called out in this portion. (From Cycle 14)





L64A-003A

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	23	Within the Application of San Diego HRB Register Significance Criteria, separate and evaluate each property under every criterion. For 305 Bonair, please include how La Jolla's beach cottages are a finite resource which are significant under Criterion A for their historical, cultural, social, economic, aesthetic, and architectural development and explain how this resource does not fit within that criteria. (From Cycle 14)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	24	On page 25 the report states "the home (305 Bonair) has been modified and altered over the years to the extent that it lacks original integrity" Please clarify what those exact modifications/ alterations are and if they occurred prior to the unpermitted work. (From Cycle 14)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	25	Please provide larger, brighter photographs. If possible, please provide a clear copy of the first page under the construction/building permit section. It is impossible to read. (From Cycle 14)

4.24.19

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	26	The applicant has resubmitted an updated Historic Resource Technical Report prepared by Scott Moomjian dated March 2019. The report concludes that neither property is potentially historic. (New Issue)

305 Bonair St

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	27	Staff concurs with the report's conclusion that the building is not eligible for designation under any HRB Criteria. No further review by Plan-Historic staff is required. This determination is good for 5 years. Because the property is not eligible for individual designation, the plans have not been stamped by Plan-Historic staff. No Plan-Historic stamps are required for permit issuance. Should you have any questions regarding this review, please contact the "Reviewer" listed at the top of this cycle issues report. (Info Only, No Response Required) (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	32	Prior to the unpermitted work, 305 Bonair Street did not rise to the level of individual designation under HRB Criterion C. Additionally the property was not found to be one of the named beach cottages. (New Issue)

307-309 1/2 Bonair St

<u>Cleared?</u>	<u>Issue Num</u>	<u>Issue Text</u>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30	Staff concurs with the report's conclusion that the building is not eligible for designation under any HRB Criteria. No further review by Plan-Historic staff is required. This determination is good for 5 years. Because the property is not eligible for individual designation, the plans have not been stamped by Plan-Historic staff. No Plan-Historic stamps are required for permit issuance. Should you have any questions regarding this review, please contact the "Reviewer" listed at the top of this cycle issues report. (Info Only, No Response Required) (New Issue)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	31	Although the property was built by Master Architect Russell Forester it is not a notable example of his work making it ineligible under HRB Criterion D. The property also does not rise to the level of individual designation under HRB Criterion C. (New Issue)

