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INTRODUCTION

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The purpose of this Historical Resources Relocation Feasibility Study is to determine the feasibility of establishing a Relocation Receiver Site for designated historical resources within the Downtown Community Planning Area that are threatened with demolition and/or relocation due to redevelopment activities. The project was undertaken at the request of the City of San Diego Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC), and studied the potential of creating a Relocation Receiver Site at 17th Street bounded by F and K Streets in San Diego’s East Village. This document moves forward the goal of creating a “receiver site” program (HP.B.3 of the Historic Preservation Element of the City of San Diego General Plan, adopted March 2008).

The study is divided into three sections: Existing and Historic Character Analysis, Vision for the Project Area, and Economic Feasibility Analysis. Page & Turnbull worked to deliver data about the existing historic and potentially historic resources within the area, and the historic and existing character of the streetscape. PlaceEconomics analyzed nationwide best practices for relocating historic resources. J.R. Conkey created cost estimate templates for relocating historic resources. The London Group completed an economic analysis in order to determine the feasibility of transforming the 17th Street corridor into a Relocation Receiver Site. They also summarized preservation incentives that could be used to encourage investment in the project area.

Existing and Historic Character Analysis tasks included reviewing background material and summarizing relevant information; completing a nationwide historic resource relocation and preservation incentives best practices report; conducting a focused Historic Resources Survey of the project area; appraising the character of the project area and surrounding “Great San Diego Neighborhoods;” conducting a building inventory audit to determine which buildings in the Centre City area would be appropriate for relocation into the project area; attending three Relocation Area Vision work sessions with CCDC, City of San Diego Historical Resources Board staff, and local interest groups; and preparing planning and design guidelines. The Economic Analysis tasks included a building inventory audit for economic development potential, market analysis, relocation programming, study of development potential, and economic feasibility analysis. Relocation cost estimate templates are also included in order to plan for moving certain buildings into the area in the future.

This comprehensive plan works to protect threatened historic resources and help revitalize the relocation area as its existing historic character is enhanced with relocated historic buildings.

METHODOLOGY

Review of Background Information

Page & Turnbull’s review of background information included the Downtown Community Plan (2006), Centre City Planned District Ordinance, City of San Diego Historical Resources Regulations, East Village Historical Surveys, and associated East Village Combined Historical Property Survey Report.

Best Practices Report

PlaceEconomics completed a review of background information for their Good Practices analysis. Their review included technical and academic resources; a basic literature review of the subject; a review of the city planning or historic preservation websites of the 20 largest cities in the US to discern how many mentioned relocation as a ready option; relevant historic preservation ordinances of select cities; and telephone interviews with a variety of participants who responded to a National Trust for Historic Preservation listserv query about experiences with or knowledge of cities that have relocated historic homes. The full report is included in the Appendix.

Survey

Page & Turnbull completed field survey and digital photography of each building over 45 years of age in the project area. Based upon our field work, we expanded our project boundary to include the blocks to the north of G Street and the block bounded by 17th, Interstates 5, J and K streets. Although age-eligible properties were not formally surveyed because they were outside of the original project boundaries, Page & Turnbull determined that the 700 block of 17th has a character consistent with the project area.

Additional reconnaissance was done through the surrounding area to determine the prevalence of historic resources that may be appropriate for relocation into the project area.

DPR Forms

Using California Office of Historic Preservation methodology, Page & Turnbull drafted DPR 523A and B Forms for all properties over 45 years of age in the project area. DPR 523A forms document the existing condition and provide a photo and architectural description of each building. DPR 523B forms summarize the building’s history, construction chronology, and evaluate the building’s historical significance and integrity.

Page & Turnbull completed research of local repositories to determine the developmental history of the project area and individual buildings in order to understand the area and evaluate the historical significance of individual properties. Local repositories consulted included the San Diego History Museum, San Diego County Assessor, City of San Diego Department of Planning and Land Use (Building Division), San Diego Public Library, and various electronic sources. This research was used to complete the DPR 523B forms and summarize a historic context for the area.

Character Appraisal

A reconnaissance survey of surrounding great neighborhoods (Sherman Heights, South Park, Golden Hill, and Little Italy) was completed to determine the facades of these neighborhoods that could be reinforced or introduced into the project area. Page & Turnbull identified the character-defining features of the project area, as well as the character-defining features of these four surrounding great neighborhoods. We identified features that contributed to the sense of place and neighborhood identity for each area and evaluated whether such elements were appropriate to introduce along 17th Street.

Visioning Work Session

Page & Turnbull presented our survey and research results to Lucy Contreras, Brad Richter, CCDC Staff, Cathy Wientroed, HRB Staff, and Bruce Coons, SOHO Executive Director. We were advised on local opinions regarding resource evaluation, and with this team, we hosted a worksession to define a vision for the future of the project area. The two-art session included members of the historic preservation community, property owners, and members of the local design and development community.
Economic Analysis

To be included in later draft

Building Relocation Templates

Page & Turnbull worked with CCDC and J.R. Conkey & Associates to identify typical building and construction types that may be appropriate to relocate into the project area. We then compared this list to buildings that are known to be impacted by new development. Using two different types of buildings, J.R. Conkey & Associates researched the issues that would need to be addressed in order to move the buildings to a new site. A template was developed that will allow for building relocation projects to be planned, scoped, estimated, and managed appropriately.

Public Outreach

To be included in later draft
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

To be included in later draft
**BACKGROUND INFORMATION & PREVIOUS STUDIES**

**DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY PLAN (2006)**

The Downtown Community Plan was completed by the Centre City Development Corporation, and was adopted by the San Diego City Council in March 2006. The document was prepared by the urban planning consulting firm of Dyett & Bhatia. The Downtown Community Plan establishes the vision and policy framework for future development in Downtown San Diego, and is a key document among the system of plans that governs the area. The Plan presents policies on land use, urban design, parks and open space, transportation, community services, historic preservation, and economic development. The Plan also divides downtown into eight districts, each of which has its own neighborhood center, character, and planning goals.

The 17th Street Corridor project area is located in the East Village, and spans both the northeast and southeast quadrants of the East Village. The Downtown Community Plan proposes significant changes to the character of the East Village, which has traditionally been less developed than those closer to the waterfront or central business district. The portion of the East Village around Petco Park has already begun to transition to an entertainment, cultural, and residential district. Low-to mid-intensity residential development with flexible zones to accommodate live industry and live/work lofts is planned for the southeast quadrant, while major new residential development mixed with institutional, hotel, and retail uses is planned for the northeast quadrant.

The following summarizes the policies of the Downtown Community Plan relative to the 17th Street Corridor project area.

**Location**
- 17th Street between F and J streets, at the far eastern edge of the East Village District
- Spans southeast and northeast quadrants of the East Village, with Market Street as the delineator

**Land Use**
- 17th Street north of Market Street is zoned for “Employment/Residential Mixed Use”
- 17th Street south of Market Street is zoned for “Residential Emphasis”

Map of San Diego, showing downtown and surrounding neighborhoods. Downtown Community Plan boundaries & goals also shown. (Page & Turnbull)
Density

- The Downtown Community Plan establishes allowable minimum and maximum FARs, although maximum FARs may not be attainable after applying other height and bulk restrictions contained in the plan. The base FAR of the project area is 3.5 minimum & 6.0 maximum.
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program for parks includes “sending sites” and “receiving sites.” The project area is identified as a “receiving site”: the west side of 17th Street south of G Street is in a +2.0 FAR zone, while the block north of G Street is in a +4.0 FAR zone.
- Total FAR with bonuses is max 6.0 on east side of 17th Street; max 8.0 on west side of 17th Street south of G Street; and max 10.0 on west side of 17th Street north of G Street (see map at left).

Urban Design

- Project area north of Market Street is within “Large Floorplate Area,” which allows large tower floorplates above 180’
- No additional bulk restrictions or design guidelines apply.

Open Space

- No parks/open space proposed within the project boundaries.
- Freeway Lid green space proposed over I-5 between G and J streets (immediately east of project area) to reconnect the East Village to Sherman Heights.

Infrastructure

- Market Street is a major boulevard, with mandated commercial use.
- 17th Street, F Street, G Street, and J Street are all residential streets.
- Island Street is a “green street” and is within the Pedestrian Priority Zone.
- Roadway modifications are proposed along G Street.
- Major gateway located at 17th & F streets.
- Minor gateways located at 17th & Market streets and 17th & J streets.
Transportation
- Bus routes currently run through project area along F and G streets
- Proposed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service to follow existing bus routes along F and G streets

Neighborhood Character
- Goals for the East Village (Southeast) include fostering redevelopment with an urban mix of new residents and a variety of housing types, employees, artists, and conventioners, while preserving light industrial and commercial service functions that serve downtown, facilitating development of a Neighborhood Center that provides a focus to the sub-district's residential portion and a roadway connection to the new East Village Green (14th and G streets); and promoting fine-grained development through building articulation, bulk, and scale requirements.
- East Village (Southeast) Neighborhood Center is located just west of the project area along 14th, 15th, Island, and J streets. Main features include a large plaza lined with retail uses on surrounding streets and adjacent buildings, and providing recreational opportunities, linked via a linear park to East Village Green. This will be combined with active frontages along 15th Street.

Historic Resources
- Goals for historic conservation include protecting historic resources to communicate downtown's heritage, encouraging rehabilitation and reuse of designated historic properties, and allowing new development adjacent to designated sites
- Goals for integrating heritage into Downtown's future include integrating historic resources into the downtown fabric while achieving policies for significant development and population intensification, incorporating elements of buildings in new projects to impart heritage, and promoting the use of interpretive programs (walking tours, signage, informational pamphlets, banners, and special events)
- One (1) building in the project area is listed in the Local Register of Historic Places (Evans Home, 421 17th Street, HRB #384)

CENTRE CITY PLANNED DISTRICT ORDINANCE (PDO)

The Centre City Planned District Ordinance (PDO) was established in 2006, and establishes land use regulations and design and development criteria to implement the goals of the Downtown Community Plan. The Gaslamp Quarter and Marina districts are administered through the Gaslamp Quarter and Marina PDOs, respectively, while the remainder of downtown is subject to the Centre City PDO. The Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) administers the planning and zoning functions for the City of San Diego within the district, and with the exception of projects occurring on Port, Navy, and County property, all development in downtown must comply with the regulations set forth in the Centre City, Gaslamp Quarter, or Marina PDOs.

Policies in the Centre City PDO cover a range of topics, including land use, density, building massing, sun access, architectural design, landscaping, streetscaping, parking and transportation, signage, and lighting. The Centre City PDO also includes a brief section on the treatment of historic sites. According to San Diego Municipal Code §§156.031-5(c), the CCDC President reviews all project proposals to alter a designated historic site, or any site containing a structure over 45 years in age, as provided in Section 143.0201 et seq. of the Land Development Code. The CCDC President may approve minor alterations (as determined by the CCDC President) to a designated historical resource in accordance with §§143.02 of the Land Development Code. Non-minor alterations to a designated historic site are reviewed in accordance with §§143.02 of the Land Development Code. (See page 8 for a full description of these regulations).

The 17th Street Corridor project area is located within the boundaries of the Centre City PDO, and any proposed new development in the area would thus be subject to the regulations set forth in San Diego Municipal Code §§156.03.

SAN DIEGO HISTORIC PRESERVATION ELEMENT (2008)

The Historic Preservation Element of the City of San Diego General Plan (adopted March 2008) identifies goals and policies for preservation of the city’s heritage. The 2008 Historic Preservation Element builds upon San Diego’s history of preservation planning. In 1965, San Diego created a Historic Sites Board and adopted its first historic preservation ordinance, which was revised in 1971 to include design review. In 1979, the City of San Diego General Plan was adopted containing a Cultural Resources Management Element. The City of San Diego has also been a Certified Local Government (CLG) under the National Historic Preservation Act since 1986.

The 2008 Historic Preservation Element provides policies for the identification and preservation of historical resources and for education, benefits, and incentives for historic preservation. Policies include:
- Integrate consideration of historical and cultural resources in the larger land use planning process
- Actively pursue programs to identify, document, evaluate, and designate historic resources
- Foster greater public education about the importance of historical resources
- Provide development incentives supporting historic preservation (including Federal Rehabilitation Tax Credits, Mills Act, California State Historical Building Code, Transfer of Development Rights (TDR), Conditional Use Permits (CUPs), City of San Diego facade improvement program, design assistance through Historical Resources Board (HRB), and retention of non-conforming setbacks without a variance)
- Develop a historic preservation sponsorship program (including creation of a historic preservation fund, a “receiver site” program, and an “adopt a resource” program)
- Increase opportunities for cultural heritage tourism

All policies in the 2008 Historic Preservation Element apply to the 17th Street Corridor project area, but policy HP-B.3—which includes the creation of a “receiver site” program that provides relocation sites for historical resources that cannot be preserved on site—is especially relevant to the topics covered in this report.
According to the City of San Diego's Historic Preservation Element (March 2008), the creation of a receiver site for relocated historical resources is an adopted policy:

HP-B3a. Create a “receiver site” program that provides relocation sites for historical resources (buildings, structures, or objects) that cannot be preserved on site. Receiver sites should be located within the community in which the resource was originally located and should maintain a context and setting comparable to the original location. This method of preservation should be limited and used only when other on-site preservation techniques are found not to be feasible.

**SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES REGULATIONS**

**Historical Resources Board (HRB)**

The City of San Diego Historical Resources Board (HRB) is the appointed body with authority over historical resources in the City of San Diego. Duties and responsibilities of the Board, as listed in San Diego Municipal Code §111.0206, include:

- Identifying and designating individual historical resources;
- Establishing historical districts;
- Compiling and maintaining a register of designated historical resources;
- Reviewing development projects that may affect historical resources; and
- Preparing an annual report to the Mayor and City Council on Board activities and decisions.

**Local Landmark Registration Requirements**

The City of San Diego maintains a local register of historic resources, including buildings, sites, and districts. According to San Diego Municipal Code §123.0202, nomination of a resource to become a designated historical resource may originate from the HRB, the City Manager, the City Council, or any member of the public. To be designated as a historical landmark by the HRB, a site must meet any of the following criteria:

- **Criterion A** - Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City’s, a community’s or a neighborhood’s historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping or architectural development.
- **Criterion B** - Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history.
- **Criterion C** - Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of indigenous materials or craftsmanship.
- **Criterion D** - Is representative of the notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist or craftsman.
- **Criterion E** - Is listed or has been determined eligible by the National Park Service for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or is listed or has been determined eligible by the State Historical Preservation Office for listing on the State Register of Historical Resources.

In the project area, only one property is listed as a local landmark. The Evans House (1887) at 423 17th Street was listed as HRB #334 in 1999, and is significant for its architecture. Any applications for development permits involving the Evans House would therefore be subject to review and approval by the HRB.

**Historical Resources Regulations (Summarized by Marie Burke Lia)**

Regulations for development related to historic resources are outlined in San Diego Municipal Code §143.02 and City of San Diego Information Bulletin 580 (entitled Potential Historical Resource Review). The following summary of the regulatory process surrounding historic resources was prepared by Marie Burke Lia, Attorney at Law, on July 15, 2010.

When an application is submitted to the City for a ministerial or discretionary permit, the first inquiry is whether there is a structure on the property that would be affected by the project that is more than 45 years of age. If the answer is yes, SDMC §143.0212 directs City staff to determine whether a potentially significant historical structure exists on the site before any permit can issue. Because of this Code section and the City’s commitment to consider public information in the review of projects affecting properties more than 45 years of age, there is no over-the-counter review.

**Step One – Determination of whether a potential historical resource is present**

The required Historical Resource Review can occur in one of three ways:

**Option (1):** If a project application has been submitted to the City, the applicant can submit plans and other required documents to the Development Services Department and those materials will be forwarded to the Historical Review staff for a determination of the potential historic significance of the property. These items consist of the following:

- A copy of the Assessor’s Building Record for the property, which can only be obtained with a permission letter from the owner of record;
- A copy of the Notice of Completion, if any exists, for the structure(s) at issue. This document can be obtained individually or as part of a researched Chain of Title by local title research firms if one was ever recorded on the property;
- A photographic survey of the property documenting each elevation of each building on the site, views of the front façade(s), views from the street and any additional relevant details. A photographic survey key should be included. The photos should be produced as color prints and also digitally on a CD;
- A Site Plan needs to be included unless the applicant is seeking a Demolition Permit;
- Additional documents are required if a discretionary permit is being sought. These documents include a detailed written description of all aspects of the property, a detailed written description of all alterations, their dates and the architect or builder responsible, a full Chain of Title, a list of occupants since the buildings’ construction, historical photographs, if any can be found, and the Sanborn Maps published for the years since each building’s construction.
The findings required for a SDP for relocation are that: (1) there are no feasible measures, including maintaining the resource on site, that can further minimize the potential adverse effects on the resource, (this finding is usually supported by demonstrating that the resource cannot, as a practical matter, be incorporated into the new development); (2) that the relocation will not destroy the historical or architectural values of the resource and that the relocation is part of a definitive series of actions that will assure preservation of the resource, (this finding is usually supported by the fact that the relocation will comply with the National Park Service guidelines for relocating historical resources and that the post-relocation rehabilitation will comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation); and (3) that there are special circumstances applying to the land, that are peculiar to the land and not of the applicant's making, whereby strict application of the historic preservation regulations would deprive the property owner of reasonable use of the land (this finding is usually supported by the zoning and other entitlement factors that justify significantly more development on the property). A SDP for relocation is usually accompanied by a Mitigated Negative Declaration as the environmental document.

The findings required for a SDP for demolition are much harder to make. These findings are that: (1) there are no feasible measures, including a less environmentally damaging alternative, that can further minimize the potential adverse effects on the resource, (this finding must be supported by evidence that relocation of the resource has been attempted but it is economically or practically infeasible); (2) that the deviation from the historic resource regulations is the minimum necessary to afford relief and accommodate development and all feasible measures to mitigate the loss of an portion of the resource, such as HABS documentation, have been provided by the applicant, (this finding is usually supported by the zoning and other entitlement factors that justify significantly more development on the property); (3) that denial of the proposed development would result in economic hardship to the owner in that there is no reasonable beneficial use of the property and it is not feasible to derive a reasonable economic return from the property, (this finding must be supported by an independent economic feasibility analysis). Within the past few years, CCDC staff determined that a reduction of 20% in the projected economic return from a property was insufficient to support this finding.

For additional information about Historical Resources in San Diego, refer to http://www.sandiego.gov/planning/programs/historical/.
EAST VILLAGE HISTORICAL SURVEYS (2005)

The East Village Combined Historical Property Survey was sponsored by the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC) in 2005 as part of the Downtown Community Plan process. The survey report comprises 85 inventoried historical resources and integrates three historical surveys conducted in the East Village between 2001 and 2004 by the office of Marie Burke Lia & Associates on behalf of CCDC: 1988 East Village Survey Update; 1989 Bayside Survey Update; and Over 45s Survey. The East Village Survey Update was an update of a 1988 survey of 109 properties in the area, but through survey boundary adjustments, HRB designations or Note and File decisions, demolitions and relocations, only 69 properties were included in the update. Similarly, of the 27 original properties in the 1989 Bayside Survey, only 11 remained to be documented in the survey update. In preparation for the Downtown Community Plan, CCDC mounted an effort to evaluate all properties in the East Village over 45 years of age that were not previously surveyed. Of the 61 properties formally evaluated, only 14 were found to be eligible for local designation (5S2), and an additional 3 were found to contribute to proposed districts. 42 properties were determined to have no potential for historical or architectural significance (6Z), primarily because of irreversible insensitive alterations.

The East Village Combined Historical Property Survey documented 85 buildings in the area on DPR 523 A & B forms; of these, 17 were in the 17th Street Corridor project area (see table and map at right). A historic context statement that chronicled the historical development of the East Village was also completed in 2005 as part of the East Village Historical Surveys.

### Table Showing Previous Survey Results for 17 Buildings within the 17th Street Corridor Project Area, Including California Historical Resource Status Codes (CHRSC) for Each Property (CCDC, “East Village Historical Surveys,” 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
<th>CHRSC</th>
<th>HRB Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>349-363 17th Street</td>
<td>Saliba Auto Courts</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420-424 17th Street</td>
<td>George Selwyn Residence</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430 17th Street</td>
<td>Henry &amp; Hilda Tomas Residence</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434 17th Street</td>
<td>Theodore Olton House</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470 17th Street</td>
<td>Stewart House</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 17th Street</td>
<td>Norris Rental</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>508 17th Street</td>
<td>Park Avenue Residence</td>
<td>6Z</td>
<td>Note &amp; File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 17th Street</td>
<td>Rinehart Residence</td>
<td>6Z</td>
<td>Note &amp; File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>515 17th Street</td>
<td>William Norris Spec. House #2</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 17th Street</td>
<td>William E. Robinson Residence</td>
<td>6Z</td>
<td>Note &amp; File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 17th Street</td>
<td>William Norris Spec. House #3</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 17th Street</td>
<td>Norris House</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>532-534 17th Street</td>
<td>Julian L. Johnson Residence</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>568 17th Street</td>
<td>Norris Cluster Apartments</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619-1623 Island Avenue</td>
<td>Julia Stewart House</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1635 Island Avenue</td>
<td>E.B. &amp; Ella Harvey House</td>
<td>6Z</td>
<td>Note &amp; File</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1619] Street</td>
<td>R.B. Meyers House</td>
<td>5S2</td>
<td>A, C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map of East Village showing previous survey results, with 17th Street Corridor outlined in gray (CCDC, “East Village Historical Surveys,” 2005)
HISTORIC CONTEXT

NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORY

Early Development: 1869-1910

The 17th Street corridor is located in the East Village neighborhood of San Diego, and was part of Sherman’s Addition, an early subdivision. Sherman’s Addition, named for owner Captain Matthew Sherman, one time Customs Collector and later Mayor of San Diego, was bounded by 15th and 24th streets, between Market and Commercial streets, and is one of the oldest subdivisions in San Diego. The area was subdivided in 1869. The first residence in the southeastern section of San Diego was Sherman’s own home, a small cottage near the northwest corner of 19th and J streets.

In 1885, the California Southern Railroad, a subsidiary of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe line, established a line from San Diego to San Bernardino, establishing the city’s first transcontinental connection. San Diego’s population tripled and the city underwent a building boom. According to the East Village Combined Historical Property Survey Report, “Simple Victorian single-family cottages were erected on 16th and 17th avenues [now streets] to accommodate laborers, porters, clerks and other blue collar workers.”

The 1906 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows modest single family cottages from this period. The one non-residential building in the project area is the Lowell Public school at the southwest corner of 17th and Market Street. The buildings constructed during this time were predominantly wood frame cottages completed in the Folk Victorian, Queen Anne, and Folk National architectural styles.

1910s-1920s

During the 1910s and 1920s, the area remained a small-scale residential area. According to City Directories, residents were employed as laborers, clerks, and by the US Navy. In addition to single family residences, this time period saw the development of more intensive multiple family residences. This new pattern included both small-scale purpose-built apartment buildings, and multiple detached dwellings situated on a single lot. The buildings constructed during this time were wood frame buildings completed in a variety of styles including simplified Craftsman and Early Prairie style.

Sanborn Fire Insurance Map, 1906

Lowell School, built 1887 at Market & 17th streets, circa 1920 (San Diego Historical Society)

454 17th Street, constructed 1890 (Page & Turnbull)

768 17th Street, 1913 (Page & Turnbull)

1704 Market Street, constructed 1924 (Page & Turnbull)
1920s–1940s

During the 1920s and through the beginning of World War II, the density of development in the project area increased. The area’s residential character remained intact. Buildings constructed during this time period were purpose-built multiple family residences including courtyard apartments and modest workers cottages that were influenced by the popularity of Bungalow Courts.

**Bungalow Court/Worker’s Cottages**

According to the East Village Combined Historical Property Survey Report, “The Bungalow court flourished from the 1910s-1930s, with construction virtually halting during the 1940s… Morse Courts (1704 Market Street) from 1924 represent the Craftsman aesthetic, with several tiny bungalows regularly arranged on a lot with limited landscaping.” The property’s small scale units and limited open space resembles low cost worker’s cottages instead of a traditional bungalow court with a landscaped common area. “The 1940 Saliba Auto Courts [349 17th Street] present a Streamline Moderne version that fans out around a central common area.” Both the Morse Court and Saliba Auto Courts are typical modest working class examples of the courtyard apartment building type in East Village.

**World War II – 1960s**

San Diego’s importance in the World War II effort was expressed in the project area through the intense development of multiple family residences during the period. According to City Directories, many residents were employed by the Army, Navy, and the defense industry. The buildings constructed during this time were utilitarian multiple family residential buildings including workers cottages such as those at 651 17th Street. Historic photographs of 17th Street dating from this period show the area was heavily built out, with the vast majority of lots occupied, many with multiple buildings.

Downtown San Diego’s commercial and industrial sectors boomed during World War II and in the years after. This development generally spread from south to north and west to east. Due to the project area’s location at the far eastern edge of downtown San Diego, the 17th Street corridor was isolated from development and retained its residential character. According to the East Village Combined Historical Property Survey Report, “by 1956 residential uses [in East Village] have been all but eliminated by the expanding commercial and industrial sectors.” Therefore, as early as the mid-1950s, the 17th Street Corridor was a rare small scale residential enclave in downtown San Diego.

**Freeways**

During 1962 and 1963, Interstate 5 and Interstate 94 were constructed immediately east of the project area. According to the East Village Combined Historical Property Survey Report, the construction eliminated the remaining modest cottages on 18th and 19th streets, and severed this area’s ties to Sherman Heights. Today, the project area is the sole remnant of early housing stock that was dispersed throughout downtown San Diego.

**Social Services**

Social Services have long been associated with this area of San Diego, and the Volunteers of America Mission was listed in City Directories at 1637 Market Street from 1940–1955. Other social service institutions have located in this portion of the East Village neighborhood. Current social service institutions in the area adjacent to the project area include: the Bishop Maher Center, God’s Extended Hand, the New Good Day Center, St. Vincent de Paul, and the City of San Diego’s winter shelter.

**Modern Infill Construction**

Infill completed after the 1960s includes automobile-related commercial buildings, and light industrial buildings. These buildings are typically concrete boxes with little architectural interest and detract from the historic residential character of the area.
Existing Conditions

The five blocks facing 17th Street, from F Street to K Street, are the last remnants of a working class residential neighborhood that grew up at the southeast edge of downtown San Diego. It is the last remaining evidence of the transitional zone between the commercial and industrial buildings of downtown and the middle class residential area of Sherman Heights. The corridor is made up of modest, small-scale single and multiple family residential buildings dating from the 1870s to the 1940s. While some new uses have been introduced, the corridor retains a predominantly small-scale, modest residential character.

17th Street is one of the few areas in San Diego that has a high density of working class residential housing dating from the 1880s through the 1940s, and represents the housing stock that was historically dispersed throughout downtown San Diego. Due to the extreme scarcity of working class resources dating from the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in downtown San Diego, these buildings represent a rare building type; and integrity thresholds for these resources should be somewhat less stringent than for other historical resources.
HISTORIC RESOURCE SURVEY RESULTS

Area Development and Resource Types

The historic resources survey of the 17th Street corridor found that the majority of properties dated to pre-1950. All historic properties were purpose-built residential, and remain in residential use. Most pre-1940s single family residential buildings were small-scale, modest one and two-story, wood frame, single family dwellings. Pre-1940s multiple family residential buildings were typically small, modest workers cottages or small residences on a single lot. World War II-era construction was dominated by modest, higher density multiple family residential buildings including both workers cottages and the area’s first apartment buildings. Infill typically dates from the 1960s and introduced new commercial and light industrial uses to the historically residential area.

Concentration of Resources

The highest concentration of historic resources is located on the block bounded by Market Street, Island Avenue, 17th Street, and Interstate-5.

The highest concentration of detractors is located on the block bounded by F Street, G Street, 17th Street and Interstate-5.

Survey Analysis

We surveyed all properties over 45 years of age, completed an evaluation of each property’s historic significance and integrity, and assigned each historic property a California Historical Resources Status Code.

Total Properties Surveyed: 41, of which 21 had been previously surveyed or documented.

California Historical Resource Status Codes

Properties listed or under review by the State of California Office of Historic Preservation are assigned a California Historic Resource Status Code (CHRSC), which assigns a rating of “1” to “7” to properties in order to establish their historical significance in relation to the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources. The CHRSC designation system came into effect in August 2003, and replaced the existing National Register Status Code designation system that was previously used by the State. Properties with a listing of “1” or “2” are eligible for listing in either California Register or the National Register -or- are listed on one or both of the two registers. Properties with a “3” or “4” appear to be eligible for listing in either register, but normally require more research to support this rating. Properties with a “5” are typically locally significant or are of contextual importance. Designations of a “6” or “7” mean that the property is not eligible for listing in either register or is not of historical importance.

- 5S1: Individual Property that is listed or designated locally: 2 properties
- 5S3: Appears to be individually eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation: 15 properties
- 5D3: Appears to be a contributor to a district that appears eligible for local listing or designation through survey evaluation: 10 properties
- 6L: Determined ineligible for local listing or designation through local government review process; may warrant special consideration in local planning: 4 properties (The 6L Status Code was assigned to properties that with rehabilitation could be contributors to the 17th Street corridor)

The non-historic properties within the survey area were classified depending upon their impact to the area’s cohesion:

- Determined to be Non-Historic (neutral effect on area): 3 properties
- Determined to be Detractors (negative effect on area): 7 properties
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APN</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ownership (type)</th>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>Surv. Year</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>DPR Form</th>
<th>Contributor?</th>
<th>Status Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53540601</td>
<td>349-363 17th St Trust Bungalow Court (8 units)</td>
<td>EV Survey 1940</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>November</td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40393044</td>
<td>349-363 17th St Trust Bungalow Court (8 units)</td>
<td>EV Survey 1940</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Novemeber</td>
<td>Designated</td>
<td>S01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53540103</td>
<td>445 17th Street Private Individual SF Residence ---</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>RE New Rehab 6L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53540104</td>
<td>429 17th Street Trust Duplex ---</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>RE New Contributor 5D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53540108</td>
<td>465 17th Street Private Corporation Commercial (Auto) ---</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>RE N/A Detractor ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53540107</td>
<td>1720 J Street Private Individual SF Residence ---</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>RE New Contributor 5D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53540106</td>
<td>405 17th Street Trust SF Residence ---</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>RE N/A Detractor ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539313</td>
<td>470 17th Street Institution SF Residence (3 of 3) EV Survey</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539313</td>
<td>1619-1625 Island Institution Duplex (2 of 3) EV Survey ca. 1887</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539313</td>
<td>1635 Island Institution SF Residence (1 of 3) EV Survey ca. 1888</td>
<td>RE Update Contributor 5D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539311</td>
<td>454 17th Street Private Corporation SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539310</td>
<td>440 17th Street Private Corporation SF Residence ---</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>RE New Contributor 5D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539309</td>
<td>430 17th Street Private Corporation SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539308</td>
<td>424 17th Street Private Corporation SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>RE Update Rehab 6L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539307</td>
<td>420 17th Street Private Corporation SF Residence (2 of 2) EV Survey</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539307</td>
<td>1646 J Street Private Corporation SF Residence (1 of 2) ---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RE N/A Non Historic ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539306</td>
<td>1632 J Street Private Corporation SF Residence ---</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>RE New Contributor 5D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539305</td>
<td>1633 Market St. Private Individual Commercial (Auto) ---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RE N/A Detractor ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539304</td>
<td>532-534 17th St. Private Individual* SF Residences (2 units) EV Survey</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>RE Update Contributor 6L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539303</td>
<td>518 17th Street Trust SF Residence (4 of 4) EV Survey</td>
<td>ca. 1877</td>
<td>RE Update Non Historic 6Z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539303</td>
<td>512 17th Street Trust SF Residence (3 of 4) EV Survey</td>
<td>ca. 1900</td>
<td>RE Update Contributor 5D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539303</td>
<td>508 17th Street Trust SF Residence (2 of 4) EV Survey</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>RE Update Contributor 5D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539303</td>
<td>1626 Island Ave. Trust Apartments (1 of 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539302</td>
<td>525 14th St. Private Individual* SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539301</td>
<td>545 17th Trust* SF Residence ---</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>RE New Contributor 5D3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539300</td>
<td>1715 Market St. Private Individual SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539299</td>
<td>549 17th Trust* SF Residence ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539298</td>
<td>541 17th St. Trust* SF Residence ---</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>RE New Rehab 6L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539297</td>
<td>515 17th St. Private Individual* SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539296</td>
<td>531 17th St. Trust* SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539295</td>
<td>505 17th St. Trust SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539294</td>
<td>510 17th St. Trust SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539293</td>
<td>505 17th St. Trust SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>RE Update Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539292</td>
<td>768 17th St Private Individual* SF Residence EV Survey</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>RE Not in scope Individual 5S3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539291</td>
<td>701 16th St Private Corporation Commercial Local HRB #709</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>RE Not in scope Designated 5S1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539290</td>
<td>707 17th St Private Corporation Commercial (Auto) ---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RE Not in scope Detractor ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539289</td>
<td>765 17th St Trust Apartments ---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RE Not in scope Detractor ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53539288</td>
<td>737 17th St Private Individual Commercial (Auto) ---</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>RE Not in scope Non Historic ---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DESCRIPTION:**

- **E 1/2 OF BLOCK BOUNDED BY ISLAND AVENUE, 16TH, AND 17TH STREETS:**
  - **53539303 1633 Market St. Private Individual Commercial (Auto) ---**
  - **Typical 6L (Ineligible; could be eligible as a contributor with rehabilitation)**
  - **Typical 5D3 (Contributor)**
  - **Typical 5S1 (Individually Designated)**

**INSTRUCTIONS:**

- **Owner Occupied**
- **ES = Employment/Residential, Mixed Use**
- **HRB = Historic Resources Board"
CHARACTER-DEFINING FEATURES

The Project Area is located at the far southeast edge of downtown San Diego. This 17th Street corridor was historically a working class neighborhood and is made up of modest, small-scale single and multiple family residential buildings dating from the 1870s to the 1940s. While some new uses have been introduced, the corridor retains a high-density, predominantly small-scale, modest residential character.

Streetscape
- Predominantly Residential Area
- Prominent intersection at 17th and Market streets
- Sunken freeway (I-5) immediately adjacent
- Approximately 10’ setback from sidewalk
- 10’ space between buildings
- Buildings typically set on small lot with front lawn
- Few garages and curb cuts, little off-street parking
- Tall (over four foot) security fences at lot line; typically wrought iron with narrow spacing between posts
- Underground utilities
- Sidewalk separated from street by planting zone
- Street trees include palm trees and small deciduous trees

Lighting
- Pedestrian-scaled acorn street lights
- Cobra Head street lights along Market Street

Neighborhood Identity
- N/A

Buildings
- Small-scale residential – single and multiple family residences
- 1-2 story buildings
- Vernacular form with no architectural style
- Predominantly date from ca 1880s; 1930-1940s
- Bungalow courts; multiple structures on one lot
- Wood frame construction
- Wood or stucco cladding
- Hipped and gable roofs
- Minimal ornamentation

Infill
- Infill is predominantly auto-related commercial and light industrial built after World War II. Most infill buildings are large-scale, one story, steel and concrete construction with flat roofs

Corner of Market and 17th Street, view northeast, 2010 (Page & Turnbull)
PROJECT BOUNDARIES

The boundary outlined in the CCDC rfp for this project may not be of sufficient size to accommodate large buildings that may need to be relocated to this area, and it excludes the historic resources south of J Street. All alternative boundaries include the bungalow court south of J Street, determined by this study to be an individually eligible local historic resource. The preferred project boundary provides the most parcels; provides an area north of G Street where larger buildings could be moved to detractor parcels; and incorporates two historic buildings that reinforce the character of the neighborhood. Introducing additional historic character along or north of G Street could serve to expand the sense of 17th Street as a historic corridor.

Alternate Boundary 1 excludes the area north of G Street but includes parcels on the east side of the 600 block of 17th Street that could be redeveloped as receiver sites which could reinforce the character of this block and unite it fully with the two historic blocks to the south.

Alternative Boundary 2 excludes non-historic and detractor parcels on the 600 block of 17th Street, while still allowing for historic character reinforcement at the Market and 17th Street intersection. This boundary may not be of sufficient size to receive large buildings that may need to be relocated to the area, nor may it have enough parcels to receive a sufficient number of buildings over time.
The Sherman Heights neighborhood is located to the east of the project area. The 17th Street corridor was part of the original 1869 Sherman’s Addition subdivision which was bounded by 15th and 24th streets, between Market and Commercial streets. Sherman Heights is a high-density mid-scale residential neighborhood with predominantly single family historic homes. In comparison to the 17th Street corridor, the Sherman Heights neighborhood is characterized by a quiet residential feel and features larger single family homes with discernable architectural styles.

### Streetscape
- Residential area
- Approximately 10 foot setback from sidewalk
- Buildings typically set on medium lots with front lawn, small side setbacks
- Some off-street parking
- Low (four foot) fences at lot line; typically chainlink or other materials that maintain visibility

### Streetscape (cont.)
- Sidewalk separated from street by planting zone
- Street trees include palm trees and small deciduous trees

### Lighting
- Pedestrian-scaled paired acorn street lights
- Vehicular scale modern street lights

### Neighborhood Identity
- City of San Diego neighborhood signage
- Community involvement & strong social component
- Festivals

### Buildings
- Small-scale residential – single and multiple family residences
- Bungalow courts
- 1-2 story buildings
- Wood frame construction
- Wood or stucco cladding
- Hipped and gable roofs
- Variety of architectural styles: Craftsman, Queen Anne, Classical Revival, Gothic Revival
- Higher Level of architectural detail
- Community Buildings – schools and religious buildings

### Infill
- Predominantly residential
- Scale in keeping with existing neighborhood

### Surrounding Neighborhoods
- **Sherman Heights**
  - The Sherman Heights neighborhood is located to the east of the project area. The 17th Street corridor was part of the original 1869 Sherman’s Addition subdivision which was bounded by 15th and 24th streets, between Market and Commercial streets. Sherman Heights is a high-density mid-scale residential neighborhood with predominantly single family historic homes. In comparison to the 17th Street corridor, the Sherman Heights neighborhood is characterized by a quiet residential feel and features larger single family homes with discernable architectural styles.

### Streetscape
- Residential area
- Approximately 10 foot setback from sidewalk
- Buildings typically set on medium lots with front lawn, small side setbacks
- Some off-street parking
- Low (four foot) fences at lot line; typically chainlink or other materials that maintain visibility

### Streetscape (cont.)
- Sidewalk separated from street by planting zone
- Street trees include palm trees and small deciduous trees

### Lighting
- Pedestrian-scaled paired acorn street lights
- Vehicular scale modern street lights

### Neighborhood Identity
- City of San Diego neighborhood signage
- Community involvement & strong social component
- Festivals

### Buildings
- Small-scale residential – single and multiple family residences
- Bungalow courts
- 1-2 story buildings
- Wood frame construction
- Wood or stucco cladding
- Hipped and gable roofs
- Variety of architectural styles: Craftsman, Queen Anne, Classical Revival, Gothic Revival
- Higher Level of architectural detail
- Community Buildings – schools and religious buildings

### Infill
- Predominantly residential
- Scale in keeping with existing neighborhood
The Golden Hill neighborhood is located to the northeast of the project area. Golden Hill is predominantly residential, with many historic single family homes. The area has rolling hills and views and vistas of downtown and the bay. The area was an early suburb, originally subdivided in 1870, and was largely developed by the 1920s. The area is a high-density mid-scale residential area with predominantly single family historic homes. In comparison to the 17th Street corridor, the Golden Hill neighborhood is characterized by a quiet residential feel and features larger single family homes with discernable architectural styles.

**Streetscape**
- Residential area
- Rolling hills, vistas & views
- Approximately 10 to 20 foot setback from sidewalk
- Buildings typically set on large lots with front lawn & larger side setbacks
- Garages and off-street parking are common
- Utilities are underground and above

**Streetscape (cont.)**
- Sidewalk separated from street by planting zone
- Street trees include palm trees and small deciduous trees

**Lighting**
- Pedestrian-scaled multiple globe acorn street lights

**Neighborhood Identity**
- Banners

**Buildings**
- Mid- and large-scale single family residential
- 1-3 story buildings
- Wood frame construction
- Wood or stucco cladding
- Hipped and gable roofs
- Variety of architectural styles: Craftsman, Minimal Traditional, Classical Revival, Mediterranean Revival
- Higher Level of architectural detail

**Infill**
- Predominantly residential
- Scale in keeping with existing neighborhood
The Little Italy neighborhood is located to the northwest of the project area. Little Italy has been associated with San Diego’s Italian-American community since the 1920s. The area is a pedestrian-friendly, high-density mixed use neighborhood with historic resources and contemporary mid- and high-rise development. The area’s ties to the Italian-American community are strong, and the neighborhood’s identity is expressed through signage, banners, interpretive plaques, and public art. In comparison to the 17th Street corridor, the Fir Street Cottages of Little Italy are characterized by a lively mixed use feeling, with heavy foot traffic and a strong neighborhood identity.

**Streetscape**
- Mixed Use Area, with Commercial Corridor on India Street
- Little to no setback from sidewalk
- Commercial buildings have no side setbacks; some residential buildings have small side setbacks.
- Few garages, little off-street parking
- Traffic calming devices

**Streetscape (cont.)**
- Wide sidewalks
- Sidewalk cafes & street culture
- Street trees include small deciduous trees; other landscaping includes planters

**Lighting**
- Pedestrian-scaled multiple globe acorn street lights

**Neighborhood Identity**
- Very strong identity. Ties to Italian-American community; signage, banners, & interpretive signage

**Buildings**
- Mixed use – commercial and residential
- Both purpose-built commercial & residential converted to commercial use
- 1-2 story buildings
- Wood frame construction
- Wood or stucco cladding
- Flat, gable & hipped roofs
- Commercial buildings with Mediterranean Revival ornament; early twentieth century commercial buildings
- Residential buildings: Victorian-era vernacular cottages, Craftsman cottages

**Infill**
- Mixed use: contemporary design, using modern materials, 2-5 stories (larger than historic buildings)
The South Park neighborhood is located at the southeast corner of Balboa Park. South Park is predominantly residential with commercial areas at Beech Streets, along 30th and Fern north of Beech, and on Juniper between 31st and Fern. The majority of residential buildings were constructed between 1906 and the 1930s. The area is a high-density mid-scale residential area with single and multiple family residences. In comparison to the 17th Street corridor, the South Park neighborhood is characterized by a residential feel with pedestrian friendly commercial corridors. The commercial corridors at Beech, 30th and Juniper Streets feature vibrant street frontages with heavy foot traffic and a strong neighborhood identity.

**Streetscape**
- Mixed Use, with Commercial Corridor on Fern & Juniper streets
- Little to no setback from sidewalk
- Commercial buildings have no side setbacks
- Residential buildings have small side setbacks
- Few garages, little off-street parking
- Wide sidewalks

**Streetscape (cont.)**
- Sidewalk separated from street by planting zone
- Street trees include small deciduous trees

**Lighting**
- Pedestrian-scaled acorn street lights

**Neighborhood Identity**
- Banners
- Strong social component

**Buildings**
- Mixed use – commercial & residential
- 1-2 story buildings
- Brick or wood frame
- Wood or stucco cladding
- Flat, gable & hipped roofs
- Commercial buildings with Mediterranean Revival ornament
- Early twentieth century commercial buildings
- Residential buildings: Victorian-era vernacular, Craftsman

**Infill**
- Commercial & residential: modern design, scale in keeping with existing neighborhood.
VISION FOR PROJECT AREA

This section presents a vision for creating a vibrant neighborhood centered on the 17th Street corridor that is as popular with residents and visitors as the successful surrounding neighborhoods. This vision reinforces the goals of the Downtown Community Plan, and draws on the existing character of surrounding areas in downtown San Diego. Character-defining features from other neighborhoods which should be introduced into the project area include:

- Neighborhood Identity – Based upon community involvement, define and reinforce the neighborhood’s identity and introduce signage, graphics, and interpretation to reinforce the area’s unique identity.
- Small-scale mixed use area (e.g. Little Italy’s Fir Street Cottages)
- Focus on area’s community history

GOALS

- The 17th Street Corridor represents San Diego’s last remaining collection of original housing stock that was once dispersed throughout the downtown
- 17th Street will remain a living, breathing neighborhood that contributes to the diversity and vitality of San Diego
- The historic character along 17th Street will be reinforced by the preservation of its historic structures, the appropriate rehabilitation of existing buildings that contribute to this character
- Retain existing residential scale and uses and preserve its fine-grained character
- Establish 17th Street as a walkable and safe part of East Village
- Define and represent neighborhood identity
- Introduce mixed use character that reuses existing residential buildings. Uses could include residential, small-scale boutique retail or offices
- Reintegrate 17th Street into the adjacent Sherman Heights neighborhood
- Create a heritage tourism site – that focuses on area’s community history
- Develop 17th Street as a receiver site for threatened historic resources. Note that in San Diego, relocation of a historic resource that is in its original location is only acceptable as a last resort. However, if threatened, small residential and commercial buildings within CCDC’s boundaries could be moved to the project area.

ACTION ITEMS

**Historic Preservation**

- Educate community about historic significance of the 17th Street corridor and individual resources
- Encourage the preservation of designated and eligible historic resources with incentives
- Incentivize the rehabilitation of properties that with rehabilitation could become contributors to the 17th Street corridor
- Proactively incentivize the replacement of detractor sites with threatened historic resources that need a new site rather than be demolished

**Define Neighborhood Identity**

- Based upon work sessions with community groups and area residents, define the neighborhood’s identity. Decide if it is part of Sherman Heights or part of East Village or if it is a unique neighborhood. Give a name to the district (17th Street, Sherman Annex, Far East Village, etc.)
- Define gateways to 17th Street per the Downtown Community Plan
- Introduce signage, banners and graphics to reinforce the area’s unique identity
- Develop interpretive plans and public art to help reinforce neighborhood identity and give visitors and residents an understanding of the neighborhood’s history, development, and place within San Diego’s story.
- Provide City of San Diego neighborhood street signs
- Develop interpretive plan to give visitors and residents an understanding of the neighborhood’s history, development, and place within San Diego’s story.
Infrastructure Improvements
- Construct proposed freeway lids over Interstate-5 to connect 17th Street and downtown to Sherman Heights
- A sidewalk repair program is currently underway, maintain and repair sidewalks as necessary.
- Retain historic sidewalk widths, separation of sidewalk from street with planting zone, scoring patterns, sidewalk stamps
- Street trees should be inspected and replaced if necessary. Street tree species should be consistent with historic species and also make a connection to the street trees in Sherman Heights (e.g., palm trees, jacaranda trees).

Architecture and Land Use
- Encourage period and architectural style. Tall (over four foot) security fencing and chain link fencing should be discouraged.
- Encourage period fencing, based upon the associated building's historic period and architectural style. Tall (over four foot) security fencing and chain link fencing should be discouraged.
- Remove incompatible uses (auto-related commercial and light industrial) over time.
- Introduce new uses and buildings that reinforce the areas as a fine-grained boutique-type neighborhood
- Retain historic sidewalk widths, separation of sidewalk from street with planting zone, scoring patterns, sidewalk stamps
- Remove or redevelop detractor and 6Z properties
- Rehabilitate 6Z properties
- Preserve SS1, SS3 and 5D3 properties
- Keep historic lot sizes and streetfront rhythms apparent

POTENTIAL CHALLENGES & CONSTRAINTS
This section analyzes the constraints and obstacles facing the project area with regard to implementing the proposed vision. While the area has a high concentration of historic resources, it is isolated from the remainder of downtown, is economically disadvantaged, and has a high rate of drug-related crime. These conditions present constraints to implementing the proposed vision that need to be considered, including:

- Lack of owner-occupants: Since there is a lack of long term investment in the neighborhood and a lack of community identity and activism, it may prove difficult to mobilize the residents and owners of the neighborhood mobilized in support of a revitalization program.
- Social Services in Immediate Area: The surrounding area is home to a number of social service agencies providing necessary services to homeless and disadvantaged citizens. The presence of these services and the homeless and transient population may prove a challenge to encouraging investment in the area.
- Adjacency to Interstate 5: The area's location immediately west of Interstate 5 and associated noise and pollution may prove a challenge to the revitalization of the area.
- Safety concerns: Due to the area's relative seclusion, lower income population, and easy access to the freeway, it has become a center of drug-related crime. Drug-related crime and high concentrations of social services in the area may prove the area less safe, and may prove a challenge to revitalizing the area.
- Current Zoning: The project area is zoned for high density development and is located within a large floorplate area of the Downtown Community Plan. Preservation of the area's character will need to be reconciled with the development goals of the Plan.
- Fault Lines: A number of earthquake fault lines run through the project area, limiting development potential.
- Lack of community involvement/engagement: The owners and residents of the 17th Street Corridor are not actively engaged as a neighborhood and overall do not have a high level of community involvement; this sets the area apart from both the East Village and Sherman Heights which have high levels of community involvement. The lack of engagement in the planning process may prove a challenge to getting community support for the proposed vision.

Map of challenges in the 17th Street Corridor project area, including fault lines, homeless & social service organizations, large floorplate zoning, and absentee ownership (Page & Turnbull)
RELOCATING HISTORIC BUILDINGS

SAN DIEGO’S RELOCATION HISTORY

It is recognized that in San Diego relocation of a historic resource that is in its original location is only acceptable as a last resort. However, San Diego and the 17th Street corridor have a history of relocating buildings for a variety of purposes. Historically, relocation of buildings was a practical means of retaining scarce resources such as lumber and stone and brick. Later, relocation of buildings has been implemented as a means to protect threatened historic resources and preserve architectural heritage.

Previous Relocations

Examples of relocation in San Diego include Heritage Park which includes Victorian-era buildings that were acquired, relocated, and restored in a park-like setting near Old Town. CCDC was involved in the relocation of Rosario Hall (which had been moved in the early 1900s from its original site) in 2001 and the Showley Brothers Candy Factory in 2003 to make way for Petco Park. See adjacent table and map for a complete list of known relocations.

Table of past relocations in San Diego (Marie Burke Lia, Attorney at Law)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Original Address</th>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Relocation</th>
<th>Destination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grow Cottage</td>
<td>7631 Ivanhoe St</td>
<td>2/1979</td>
<td>12/1979</td>
<td>7210 La Jolla Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showley Candy</td>
<td>305-307 Eighth Ave</td>
<td>5/1982</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Ballpark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A W Pray Rental</td>
<td>1907 Kettner Blvd.</td>
<td>8/1990</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>East on same site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton-Mertz House</td>
<td>1525 Torrey Pines Rd</td>
<td>4/1993</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Mt. Woodson, Ramona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corey Residence</td>
<td>7520 Draper Ave</td>
<td>3/1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7210 La Jolla Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosario Hall</td>
<td>1143-1145 K Street</td>
<td>3/1999</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1250 J Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Jolla Reading Room</td>
<td>7590 Draper Ave</td>
<td>10/2000</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Bishop’s School Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar Ullrich House</td>
<td>1746 Kearnsage Road</td>
<td>1/2006</td>
<td>1/2009</td>
<td>Downhill on same site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marks Residence</td>
<td>1037 15th Street</td>
<td>3/1975</td>
<td>Pending</td>
<td>2644 Island Avenue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table of past relocations in San Diego (Marie Burke Lia, Attorney at Law)

Map of past relocations in downtown San Diego (Page & Turnbull)
The 17th Street Corridor is an excellent example of the historic precedent for relocating buildings in downtown San Diego. The following are properties that were relocated in the project area:

- 505 17th Street, constructed ca. 1887, moved to current location ca. 1921-1940, original location unknown.
- 508 17th Street, constructed ca. 1887, moved to current location ca. 1921-1940, original location unknown.
- 512 17th Street, constructed ca. 1900, moved to current location ca. 1921-1940, original location unknown.
- 515 17th Street, constructed ca. 1900, moved to current location ca. 1921-1940, original location unknown.
- 518 17th Street, constructed ca. 1887, moved to current location ca. 1901-1921, original location unknown.
- 525 17th Street, constructed circa 1869-1887, moved to current location ca. 1921-1940, original location unknown.
- 1715 Market Street, constructed 1881, moved to current location ca. 1921-1940, original location: corner of 12th Avenue and G Street.

Current Relocation Policies

According to the City of San Diego’s Historic Preservation Element (March 2008), the creation of a receiver site for relocated historical resources is an adopted policy:

**HP-B3a.** Create a “receiver site” program that provides relocation sites for historical resources (buildings, structures, or objects) that cannot be preserved on site. Receiver sites should be located within the community in which the resource was originally located and should maintain a context and setting comparable to the original location. This method of preservation should be limited and used when other on-site preservation techniques are found not to be feasible.

As previously described on page 9, if a proposed project for a site containing a potential historic resource cannot retain or incorporate that resource into the new development, there are two further processes that must occur:

1. A complete Historical Resources Research Report, meeting the City’s guidelines, must be submitted to HRB staff for designation consideration by the Board. In this instance, the application must be brought before the Board as soon as is practical. If the Board decides that the property does not meet the criteria for listing on the local Register, the property will be cleared for development. This decision is not appealable.

2. A Site Development Permit (SDP) for either relocation or demolition has to be obtained pursuant to SDMC §126.0504(h) (for relocation) or §126.0504(i) (for demolition) to remove the designated structure from the property. A SDP for relocation is easier to obtain and a SDP for demolition cannot be obtained unless the applicant can prove that relocation has been attempted but is infeasible. There have been 12 such permits issued for the relocation of designated historical resources since 1983 and 1 more permit has been approved and is in process. Note that 5 of these permits have pertained to Centre City properties.

The findings required for a SDP for relocation are that: (1) there are no feasible measures, including maintaining the resource on site, that can further minimize the potential adverse effects on the resource, (this finding is usually supported by demonstrating that the resource cannot, as a practical matter, be incorporated into the new development); (2) that the relocation will not destroy the historical or architectural values of the resource and that the relocation is part of a definitive series of actions that will assure preservation of the resource, (this finding is usually supported by the fact that the relocation will comply with the National Park Service guidelines for relocating historical resources and that the post-relocation rehabilitation will comply with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation) and (3) that there are special circumstances applying to the land, that are peculiar to the land and not of the applicant’s making, whereby strict application of the historic preservation regulations would deprive the property owner of reasonable use of the land (this finding is usually supported by the zoning and other entitlement factors that justify significantly more development on the property).

A SDP for relocation is usually accompanied by a Mitigated Negative Declaration as the environmental document.
MOVING HISTORIC HOUSES: GOOD PRACTICES ANALYSIS SUMMARY

Place Economics with Page & Turnbull prepared an analysis of historic building relocation strategies entitled “Moving Historic Buildings: A Good Practices Analysis from American Cities that have Done it,” for Page & Turnbull as part of this feasibility study. The full report is included as an appendix under separate cover.

The analysis is built around fourteen “good practices examples,” which consist of organizations throughout the United States that have successfully implemented historic building relocation projects. Their experiences are presented as case studies and a synthesis of the commonalities among their approaches is the basis for the ten principles of good practice presented by the analysis.

Because the good practices examples are so diverse and provide cases influenced by a wide range of variables, the analysis concludes that a concrete set of “best practices” is impossible to formulate; however, a set of “good practices” can be provided as a general guide for other building relocation undertakings. Variables such as reasons for relocation, local policies being fulfilled, groups and organizations involved, financial backing, character of buildings and receiving sites, and extent of work to be undertaken strongly influence each individual case. Therefore, every undertaking should be addressed on a case-by-case basis to determine the best approach. Following the ten principles of good practice can give any building relocation project a good foundation for success, however.

The good practices analysis studies the decision making process that occurs when the relocation of a historic building is considered. It includes questions like:

- Why is the building endangered in its current location?
- What makes it a candidate for relocation?
- What public policy would be advanced by the relocation?
- What criteria should be used for selecting a new site?
- What parties will be involved and what are their responsibilities?

When these questions were thoroughly addressed and the answers understood and accounted for, the good practices analysis concluded that the resulting projects were most successful.

The good practices analysis focused on the relocation of historic buildings primarily as a tool for urban revitalization. Relocation programs were considered a success for both the building and the receiving neighborhood because they simultaneously saved endangered historic buildings and contributed to the revitalization of low-income, neglected and often blighted neighborhoods. Other effects of successful relocation programs included:

- Renewed interest in neighborhood history and identity which often led to better maintenance of homes and streets
- Upward demographic shifts in property ownership towards middle income families and young couples
- Retention of visual cohesion in receiving neighborhoods
- Minimal differentiation between houses that had been built on site and buildings relocated to the neighborhood

To achieve these positive results, the ten principles of good practice were determined to be:

1. **Relocation only as a last resort**
   In nearly every example, the decision to relocate the historic building was not taken until all other alternatives had been considered and found infeasible. Whether or not the entity ultimately responsible for the decision was a preservation organization, this basic preservation tenet was followed.

2. **Thorough documentation**
   Good practice communities thoroughly documented not just the buildings to be moved (including their site conditions, orientation, and other non-building components of the original location), but also the buildings that fell short of the threshold established to qualify for relocation.

3. **Establishment of design guidelines**
   In most cases the neighborhood to which a historic building was relocated was a historic district. In some cases the district was created after the building moving strategy was adopted, in others it was a pre-existing district. But whether or not a historic district was present, there were consistently design guidelines in place that affected both the building(s) to be moved and future infill construction.

4. **Ensuring appropriateness of relocated building in new neighborhood**
   As has been repeatedly noted above, good practice examples took considerable care to ensure that the relocated building fit seamlessly into its new context.

5. **Ensuring appropriateness of relocated building to new site**
   Principle number 4 discussed the fit between the relocated building and the urban and architectural context of the neighborhood into which it was moved. Similarly, the fit between the building and its specific site was given considerable thought in the good practice examples. This evaluation included such historic and aesthetic considerations as orientation and lot size similarity, but also practical criteria such as access, neighborhood disruption, and minimization of demolition.

6. **Gaining formal or informal assistance from the preservation community**
   Moving historic structures is generally not regarded favorably by the preservation community, and is only considered acceptable when all other alternatives have been exhausted. However, in almost every successful example, the preservation community was either a direct participant in the relocation efforts and/or actively engaged in designing the strategy. Because of this involvement at the time, there was a strong retrospective perception of project success by preservationists.

7. **Gaining community support for the strategy**
   It is important to get support for a historic building relocation strategy from the broader community, particularly those who will be the neighbors of the relocated building. In general there seemed to be neighborhood support for these efforts, particularly when they were used to “complete” the neighborhood by developing vacant lots, and when the age, scale, size and use of the moved building were harmonious with the existing neighborhood context.

8. **Achieving a sale price within range of neighborhood market**
   As was noted in the Measures of Success section, the strategy of moving historic buildings was often combined with an ownership strategy. Because of this, except in the most unusual of circumstances, the targeted price point for the sale of the relocated building was within the range of values in the neighborhood. In some cases this required a significant subsidy.

9. **Consideration of all contributing factors affecting a relocation**
   Good practice examples involved far more than simply asking, “Can we move that building?” and “Do we have a site to move it to?” A more comprehensive
set of variables was considered including the cost of the move, the route of the move, disruption to the new neighborhood, and others. The aforementioned “fit” between the building to be moved and the context of the new neighborhood was also a less tangible, but paramount factor to be considered.

10. Acceptance that time and effort must be invested before project is considered successful

On rare occasions the relocation of a historic building gives the impression of instant success. After all, a long-vacant lot suddenly enhanced by a fully built (if as of yet un-rehabilitated) structure is a positive change. However, that impression of instant success is an exception and is more common when a single building has been moved into a neighborhood as is rather than when a comprehensive strategy involving multiple structures is undertaken. The more typical measure of success is concluded 5 to 10 years after the buildings have been moved. Because there is frequently a significant subsidy required to implement the strategy, it is only after neighborhoods have been stabilized, property taxes are being paid, and levels of ownership have increased, that there is the ability to confidently consider the efforts a success.

These principles concern both immediate and secondary actions in undertaking a historic building relocation. The good practices analysis concludes that moving historic buildings should continue to be a “last resort” strategy, taken only after all other avenues of retaining a building in place have been exhausted. However, when that point has been reached, the good practice examples that were studied prove that relocation strategies can be successful if they are supported by historic preservation advocates and advance both preservation and public policy goals.

The good practices analysis includes appendices that contain a description of methodology, detailed explanations of each of the good practices examples’ undertakings, and citations of National Register for Historic Places policy language and sample language from various local ordinances regarding the relocation of historic buildings.

Financial Impacts

The case studies provided a variety of funding examples that included private, public, and non-private entities. The costs involved in relocating properties are significant and several of the entities that took primary responsibility in relocating the properties ended up absorbing losses. In those cases, success is measured in achieving certain milestones with regard to community development and the saving of the resource itself. In terms of funding, projects where the private and public sectors combined efforts often resulted in creative funding that included tax credits, attractive mortgages, and revolving funds. This sort of collaboration also allows for shared costs that can add to the success of the project.

RELOCATION APPROACH & GUIDELINES

The following section presents an approach and guidelines for establishing the 17th Street Corridor project area as a potential receiver site for relocated historic resources. Note that in San Diego, relocation of a historic resource that is in its original location is only acceptable as a last resort. However, if threatened, small residential and commercial buildings within CCDC’s boundaries could be moved to the 17th Street Corridor project area.

- CCDC should purchase all properties identified in the relocation study as “Detractors” within the project area. If relocations of historic resources become necessary, it would be possible to quickly demolish these non-historic properties in order to create a receiver site and simultaneously preserve historic properties that reinforce the character of the project area.
- CCDC should enact policies that enable these activities to happen quickly.
- Maintain the existing small-scale modest residential character of the project area.
- Historic buildings that have compromised integrity should be rehabilitated or adaptively reused.
- Appropriate buildings for relocation: The vast majority of historic buildings within CCDC’s boundaries would be appropriate for relocation into the project area. A variety of buildings with high and low styles, commercial and residential would all be appropriate for this neighborhood.
- Preferred building types for relocation include small-scale, modest, wood-frame, one- and two-story residential buildings dating from the 1870s through 1940s.
- Buildings previously evaluated in the East Village Combined Historic Resources Survey but found to be non-historic due to lack of integrity would be good candidates to move into the study area.
- Priority is for residential building types to be relocated within this district. It is appropriate for residential buildings to be converted to mixed or commercial use, but the area was and should remain predominantly residential in character.
- Preferred location by building type:
  - Commercial buildings should be located at the corners of Market and 17th and G and 17th streets.
  - Small scale residential buildings should be located at mid-block, and on all block fronts south of Market Street.
  - Larger scale residential buildings should be located at corner lots, and north of G Street.
  - Priority zones for accepting relocated buildings: The block of 17th Street between Market and Island streets should accept the first wave of buildings; the block between Island and J streets is the second priority; the block between G and Market streets is the third priority. The block between F and G streets is the last priority unless large buildings that do not fit contextually on other parcels need to be relocated to this area.
  - Relocated building should be sited to maintain and reinforce existing streetscape character including:
    - Small lot frontages
    - Approximately 10 foot setback from sidewalk
    - Buildings typically set on small lot with front lawn
    - Few garages, little off-street parking
    - Corner buildings on corner lots
    - Historic fences
    - Sidewalk separated from street by planting zone
    - Street trees (including palm trees and small deciduous trees)
  - Rezone and revise all applicable city plans and ordinances to enable the goals of this study.
  - CCDC should purchase some vacant lots in Sherman Heights to receive residential buildings that may be too large, too high-style, or need larger parcels than may be appropriate for the 17th Street area.
  - All relocated buildings should follow the principles and guidelines presented in Moving Historic Houses: A Good Practices Analysis from American Cities that have Done It and the City of San Diego Historic Preservation Element (2008) as well as National Park Service guidelines.
### BUILDING RELOCATION TEMPLATES (J.R. CONKEY & ASSOCIATES)

Summary to be included in later draft

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BLDG</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>$ CONSTRUCTION COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING 26 - 719 14TH STREET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$1,010,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING 24 - DATE STREET &amp; STATE STREET</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>$467,543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ESTIMATE WORKSHEET

**CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT CORP**

**BUILDING: 20**

**PROJECT:** RELOCATION OF HISTORICAL BUILDINGS - SAN DIEGO, CA

**FLOOR AREA:** 3,772

**PHASE:** FEASIBILITY STUDY (PRELIMINARY)

**ESTIMATE DATE:** JUNE 21, 2010

**PREPARED BY:** J.R. CONKEY & ASSOCIATES

---

**A. SITE WORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. UTILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. BASEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**D. FOUNDATIONS/CONSTRUCTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL HARD COSTS:** $773,277

**ESTIMATING CONTINGENCY:** 15.0% $115,842

**TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COSTS:** $888,119

---

**MARK-UPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT PRICE</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE:** $1,010,717

---

Building description to be included in later draft.
### ESTIMATE WORKSHEET

**CENTRE CITY DEVELOPMENT CORP**

**BUILDING: 24**

**PROJECT:** RELOCATION OF HISTORICAL BUILDINGS - SAN DIEGO, CA

**PHASE:** FEASIBILITY STUDY (PRELIMINARY)

**ESTIMATE DATE:** JUNE 21, 2010

**BID DATE:** UNKNOWN

**PREPARED BY:** J.R. CONKEY & ASSOCIATES

#### SITE WORK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>PREPARE NEW SITE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>CLEAR &amp; GRUB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3</td>
<td>BUILDING PAD</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 4</td>
<td>BASEMENT EXCAVATION / EXPORT</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 5</td>
<td>FOUNDATIONS</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>BASEMENT</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UTILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL SERVICE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>GAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 3</td>
<td>SEWER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 4</td>
<td>WATER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 5</td>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RELOCATION OF HISTORICAL BUILDING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>CARRIER BEAMS</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>UPTO LOAD</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>TRANSPORT TO NEW LOCATION (MEDIUM DISTANCE)</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 4</td>
<td>COORDINATION FOR EXISTING UTILITIES / TRAFFIC, ETC.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>11,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 5</td>
<td>SET BUILDING AT NEW LOCATION</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 6</td>
<td>REHAB (E) BUILDING IN NEW LOCATION (ALLOWANCE)</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>91.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### BUILDING SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 1</td>
<td>FIRE PROTECTION</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2</td>
<td>PLUMBING</td>
<td>1,053</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 3</td>
<td>HVAC</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>30.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 4</td>
<td>ELECTRICAL</td>
<td>2,106</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### MARK-UPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARK-UPS</td>
<td>GENERAL CONDITIONS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK-UPS</td>
<td>OVERHEAD &amp; PROFIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARK-UPS</td>
<td>INSURANCE &amp; BONDS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TOTAL HARD COSTS

$357,244

#### CONTINGENCY

$53,387

#### TOTAL CONSTRUCTION ESTIMATE:

$410,631

---

Building description to be included in later draft.
ECONOMIC ANALYSIS (THE LONDON GROUP)

Included under separate cover, but will be included here in later draft.
RECOMMENDATIONS & NEXT STEPS

CCDC IMPLEMENTATION
To be included in later draft

LOCAL PRESERVATION COMMUNITY
To be included in later draft

PUBLIC OUTREACH (WADE COMMUNICATIONS)
To be included in later draft
APPENDIX

To be included in later draft