AGENDA
SAN DIEGUITO RIVER VALLEY REGIONAL OPEN SPACE PARK
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

10:30 a.m. to 12:15 p.m.
Friday, April 6, 2012

NOTE LOCATION
Turrentine Room, Escondido Public Library
239 S. Kalmia
Escondido, CA 92025

In order to conduct the meetings effectively, the Chair has asked the Citizens Advisory Committee appointees to please sit at the front of the room. Alternates (who are not sitting in for the regular appointee) and others present are invited to sit in the rows behind the committee. Discussion during the meeting will be conducted by the appointees. Alternates and others are welcome to address the committee during the public comment period or if recognized by the Chair during the meeting. Speaker slips are available. It is important that CAC members comply with the Chair's Meeting Procedures and maintain decorum and politeness at all times. A quorum is a simple majority of current members. The Chair cannot start the meeting until a quorum is present. PLEASE ARRIVE BY 10:25 A.M! The CAC may take action on any item listed on the Consent or Discussion/Action agenda, but only when a quorum is present. If a quorum is temporarily lost during the meeting, no further discussion will take place until the quorum is regained. If the quorum is not regained, the meeting will be adjourned. Please advise the Chair at the beginning of the meeting if you must leave before 12:15 p.m.

NOTICE: Agenda packets are distributed by e-mail only. If you do not have an e-mail address, please contact the office at 858 674-2270 to make alternative arrangements.

Roll Call and Introductions
Chair
Late arrivals should speak to staff to make sure their attendance is noted.

Approval of February 3, 2012 Minutes
Chair

Chair's Report

Executive Director’s Report
Staff

Public Comment
Public
DISCUSSION/ACTION

1. Committee Reports
   a. Project Review Committee
      i. Rancho del Mar (page 3)
   b. Trails Committee (oral report)

2. Sikes Adobe Master Plan (page 31)

INFORMATION

3. Project Status

4. Communications An opportunity for any CAC member or the public to bring to the CAC's attention a project or activity not reviewed by the Project Review Committee in their reports.

Adjournment

If you have any questions, please call Dick Bobertz at (858) 674-2270.
TO: CAC

FROM: Project Review Committee

SUBJECT: Rancho Del Mar Project on Prop A Lands

---

PRC RECOMMENDATION:

Request that the JPA Board ask the City of San Diego Land Use & Housing Council Committee to docket this issue for a future meeting to investigate the applicability of Prop A on this property/project and consider a moratorium on processing this and any other development proposals in the NCFUA until a joint LU&H/Planning Commission public workshop is held to review the status and procedures on remaining undeveloped Prop A lands.

---

SITUATION:

At the CAC’s February 3, 2012 meeting, the PRC informed the CAC of a recent City of San Diego Planning Commission decision regarding a proposed project on Via de la Valle called Rancho Del Mar Continuing Care Retirement Community. The PRC reported that the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board had taken an action the evening prior and asked that the CAC and JPA support their action to request the City Attorney revisit the Planning Commission decision. This report provides additional background on this situation and a recommendation by the PRC.

BACKGROUND:

The subject property is a 23.88-acre parcel on the south side of Via de la Valle directly adjacent to the Polo Fields within City of San Diego’s Subarea II of the North City Future Urbanizing Area (NCFUA) and in the San Dieguito River Park’s Focused Planning Area (Attachments 1 and 2). The JPA had at one time identified the parcel (formerly known as the Hu property) for potential acquisition because it is undeveloped, within the FPA and floodplain, and adjacent to City-owned open space (Polo Fields) in the river valley. Since then the property was sold and is now proposed for a high-density continuing care retirement community (residential care facility) called Rancho Del Mar (Attachment 3).

The proposed project is controversial because of its high-density (224 units at 10 units/acre) and location in the river valley floodplain and on wetlands. The parcel is zoned agriculture (AR-1-1) and would accommodate two dwelling units under that zoning and is designated as Open Space in the City’s General Plan. The property is located on Prop A lands; however, the applicability of Prop A on this property is now in contention between the City of San Diego and members of the community. Proposition A was passed by the voters in 1985 and requires a vote of the people before any land in the
FUA can be changed to a more-intensive land use designation. Prop A lands are identified by the City municipal code as “lands characterized by very low density, residential, open space, natural resource based parks or agricultural uses, have the same meaning as the former future urbanizing land designation, and are subject to Proposition A.”

Prior to submitting a project application to the City, the subject applicant had a series of meetings and correspondence with City staff regarding the interpretation of Proposition A on this property with respect to the proposed use as a continuing care facility and the zoning code. The applicant disputed the City staff’s original opinion that the project would require a vote of the people to increase intensity of use on the property beyond what is allowed in the zone (i.e., 20 units). Although prior to Prop A, an “intermediate care facility” was allowed in an agricultural zone with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP), that code was changed after the passage of Prop A to not allow intermediate care facilities in the zone on Prop A lands. However, an “intermediate care facility” was not defined in the code. Finally, City staff determined that the applicant qualified for a “classification of use” determination, which is made by the Planning Commission at a public hearing.

That hearing was held on December 15, 2011 and the Planning Commission determined that “a continuing care retirement community is consistent with the intensity of use of an “intermediate care facility” in the 1984 Municipal Code”. The staff report stated that the use could then be allowed on the parcel with a CUP and without a vote of the people if the applicant was able to amend the code to allow such a use. The Planning Commission did not appear to recognize that the Municipal Code had been specifically amended by the City in 1990 after the passage of Prop A to expressly prohibit high intensity uses (hospitals, intermediate care facilities, and nursing facilities) in the agricultural zone on Prop A lands, which had formerly been allowed with a conditional use permit. Members of the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board attended the hearing and testified that the project is subject to Prop A and the proposed project cannot be allowed without a vote of the people because it is an intensification of use on the property.

Recent JPA Action

The JPA Board on recommendation from the CAC sent a letter to the City on February 17, 2012 questioning the Planning Commission decision on this matter and supporting the CVCPB’s concerns (Attachment 4). At the JPA Board meeting, the project representative submitted a letter to the JPA supporting the Planning Commission’s decision (Attachment 5). The City Attorney’s office responded to the Carmel Valley letter, but the letter left many questions unanswered and did not appear to address this particular situation (Attachment 6). They have not responded directly to the JPA’s letter. Thus, the PRC is recommending that the JPA take further action.

ISSUES:

Proposition A Lands
Initially, City staff’s position was that the proposed use was classified as an intermediate care and nursing facility, which is not permitted in the agricultural zone on Prop A lands and represents an increase in density not allowed under Prop A without a vote of the people. Proposition A was a managed growth initiative that requires a vote of the people before any land in the FUA can be changed to another more-intensive land use designation and requires that “the provisions restricting development in the future urbanizing area shall not be amended except by a majority vote of the people”. After Prop A was enacted the City proceeded to amend the municipal code to implement the provisions of Prop A. One of those municipal code changes was to amend Section 141.0413 of the zoning code (that addresses uses allowed with a CUP) to prohibit hospitals, intermediate care facilities and nursing facilities in the agricultural zone on Prop A lands. Prior to the passage of Prop A those uses were allowed in the agricultural zone with a CUP. The City’s General Plan Land Use and Community Planning Element also addresses Prop A lands and specifies the requirement of a phase shift vote for any intensification of use on Prop A lands that is inconsistent with uses allowed under the existing zone (Attachment 7).

Proposition A did not freeze allowable uses on August 1, 1984. The City was able to make modifications to its land use regulations, as long as the modifications were deemed more restrictive in terms of intensity and density of development. After Proposition A was passed and as directed in the proposition language, the City modified the zoning to be more restrictive and prohibit certain conditional uses which were relatively urban in nature. Such modifications are consistent with Prop A because of making the regulations more restrictive. Modifying the zoning ordinance to go back to allowing those uses does not appear consistent with Prop A. Other existing undeveloped Prop A lands in the FPA could be affected by this recent interpretation possibly leading to other more-intensive land use proposals.

In addition to concerns voiced by the JPA and Carmel Valley Community Planning Board, other members of the community and organizations (Sierra Club, C-3, and Friends of the SDRV) have become concerned about this outcome because of its potentially precedent setting impact and some have already voiced their concerns to the Planning Commission directly. One of the original proponents/writers of Proposition A, Jay Powell, has advised the PRC regarding this issue and has also written the City Attorney. His points are outlined in Attachment 8.

PRC Initial Project Review

The project applicant presented their project to the PRC on several occasions early in the planning process (April 2010) prior to a formal submittal to the City. They also presented to the CVCPB during the same time and received many comments of concern from both groups regarding the high density of the project and other issues. Of major concern besides the intensity of use is the fact that the project would add approximately 15 feet of fill on the property to achieve the height needed to support the project above the
floodplain. At that time, it was believed by the CVCPB and PRC that the project would be subject to Prop A and would require a majority vote of the people for approval.

The San Dieguito River Park’s Concept Plan (1994) does not specifically address the subject property within Landscape Unit B: Gonzales and La Zanja Canyons. Rather, the Design and Development Standards in Appendix B of the Concept Plan would apply, which address several design standards. The PRC identified several conflicts with respect to the proposed project and these standards including filling in the floodplain and wetlands as well as intrusive development in the River Valley that was assumed to be regulated under Prop A as agricultural open space.

Proposed Use as a Continuing Care Retirement Community

Much of the controversy surrounding this project relates to the definition (or classification) of use as defined by the City code. No such definition in the municipal code existed in 1984 (before Prop A was passed) for a “continuing care” facility, nor does one exist today. Instead the code uses the term “intermediate care facility”. Regardless, Prop A and its implementing ordinances clearly intended to restrict intensification of uses on Prop A lands without a vote of the people, and it appears that intent was violated by a decision that will allow the applicant to process their project under a code amendment rather than the requirements of Prop A.

Summary of why further JPA action is recommended:

- The proposed 224-unit retirement facility is an urban use on an agriculturally-zoned property on Prop A land zoned for two units.
- The project is inconsistent with the San Dieguito River Park Concept Plan.
- The municipal code was modified in 1990 consistent with Prop A to prohibit residential care facilities, such as the proposed use, on Prop A lands and in floodplains. Prop A allowed zoning modifications to be more restrictive, not less.
- Because the site is on Prop A land, uses more intensive than what is allowed in the zone cannot be approved without a vote of the people as specified in Prop A and in other city documentation.
- The property has an open space designation under the City’s General Plan and is recognized as open space or low-density as part of the North City Future Urbanization Area Framework Plan.
- The project would require 14 feet of fill in the floodplain to support the level of intensity proposed.

PRC RECOMMENDATION:

Request that the JPA Board ask the City of San Diego Land Use & Housing Council Committee to docket this issue for an upcoming meeting to investigate the applicability of Prop A on this property/project and consider a moratorium on processing this and any other development proposals in the NCFUA until a joint LU&H/Planning Commission
public workshop is held to review the status and procedures on remaining undeveloped Prop A lands.

Attachments:
1. Project Location Map
2. SDRP FPA map
3. Rancho Del Mar site plan
4. JPA letter to City
5. Letter from project representative to JPA Board
6. City Attorney response to CVPB letter
7. Pages from City General Plan
8. Threats to Prop A by Jay Powell
San Dieguito River Park
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February 17, 2012

Kelly Broughton, Director
Development Services Department
City of San Diego
1222 First Avenue, MS 301
San Diego, CA 92101

Mary Jo Lanzafame, Assistant City Attorney
City of San Diego
1200 Third Avenue, Ste. 1620
San Diego, CA 92101

Subject: Classification of the Rancho Del Mar Project in the North County Future Urbanizing Area as a Continuing Care Retirement Community not subject to a Proposition “A” vote.

Dear Mr. Broughton and Ms. Lanzafame:

The JPA Board has been alerted to a December 8, 2011 City of San Diego Planning Commission decision regarding the above-mentioned project, which is proposed at the southeast corner of Via de la Valle and El Camino Real within the North City Future Urbanizing Area (NCFUA) Prop “A” lands and the San Dieguito River Park’s focused planning area. The JPA Board considered points raised in a February 9, 2012 letter from the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board as well as issues voiced by community members regarding the outcome of the Planning Commission hearing regarding this project. Information contained in City planning documents and related material raised concerns regarding the appropriateness of this decision considering that the project site is located on Prop “A” lands within the NCFUA, is within the 100-year floodplain, and is currently designated for agriculture use. Due to these concerns, the JPA would greatly appreciate the City Attorney’s office taking a closer examination of this decision and consider the points outlined below.

The decision to allow the project applicant to process a code amendment for a “continuing care retirement community” without a public vote appears contrary to both Prop A and the current General Plan for the following reasons:

- Proposition A, an initiative approved by San Diego voters in 1985, amended the City’s General Plan and requires a vote of the people before
any land in the FUA can be changed to another more-intensive land use designation and requires that “the provisions restricting development in the future urbanizing area shall not be amended except by a majority vote of the people”.

- Furthermore, Prop A language states that “provisions restricting development in the Future Urbanizing Area shall not be amended except by majority vote of the people, and except for amendments which are neutral or make the designation more restrictive in terms of permitting development”.

- The NCFUA Framework Plan (1992) states in Policy 2.6b “Rezoning and other changes to the provisions restricting development necessary to implement the subarea plans is subject to the requirement for a phase shift and majority voter approval”. The NCFUA Framework Plan was adopted as an amendment to the General Plan, and as such, it has the same force and effect as the General Plan. Thus, irrespective of what was allowed prior to Prop A, the current General Plan for the project site requires a public vote for the proposed change.

- The City’s General Plan and Progress Guide identify the site as Prop A lands “characterized by very low-density, residential, open space, natural resource-based park, and agricultural uses”.

- The vast majority of the proposed project is consistent with a residential care home for the aged as that use existed in 1984 and is not consistent with “intermediate care”. Residential care homes for the aged were not allowed in agriculturally zoned land prior to Prop A. Thus, the change represents an intensification of use that triggers a Prop A vote. Although portions of the proposed “Rancho Del Mar continuing care retirement community” project appear to be a use that may be defined as “intermediate care” (i.e., skilled nursing component), the primary use of the project is high-density residential in nature and appears inconsistent with the NCFUA and Prop “A” lands designation and regulations.

The JPA is concerned that the proposed project may not meet the intent under Policy 2.6B of the community plan that would require a vote of the people under Proposition A, as articulated in the Carmel Valley Community Planning Board letter. Therefore, we are requesting clarification from the City Attorney’s office on the decisions made regarding this project and its relation to Prop A and the current General Plan.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Olga Díaz, Escondido Councilmember
JPA Board Chair
February 15, 2012

Board of Directors
San Dieguito River Valley Joint Powers Authority Regional Open Space Park
18372 Sycamore Creek Road
Escondido, California 92025

Agenda Item 8 of the February 17, 2012 JPA Board Meeting

Honorable Chair and Members of the Board:

I represent the owner of the Rancho Del Mar property. I recently became aware that your Board has been asked to consider this property at its February 17, 2012, meeting. I will be out of the country and unable to attend.

First of all, I request prior written notification of any discussion or action affecting the Rancho Del Mar property. Second, it is our understanding that your Board is being asked to discuss a legal issue, which previously has been analyzed by the San Diego Office of City Attorney. (Please see attached City Attorney Memorandum of Law dated June 7, 1990 regarding “Legal Evaluation of Proposed Revisions affecting the Future Urbanizing Areas of the City of San Diego” and see City Attorney Memorandum of Law dated December 4, 1995 regarding “Subarea V Specific Plan Proposal”.) Also please note that the 1984 General Plan which is the subject of Proposition A, contains the following footnote:

“Open spaces are located throughout the urbanized, planned urbanizing, and future urbanizing areas. Open space that is not publicly owned will be preserved through regulatory devices and these areas will be permitted to develop in a manner consistent with the zoning that is applied to them.”

We are at the beginning of a long review process for this project. We would appreciate the opportunity to work with your staff as the project goes forward. We, therefore, request that your direction to staff be to meet with us to hopefully resolve any issues relevant to this project and the San Dieguito River Regional Open Space Park.

Sincerely,

Ali Shapouri AICP CEP
Principal

Attachments
MEMORANDUM OF LAW

DATE: June 7, 1990

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: City Attorney
SUBJECT: Legal Evaluation of Proposed Revisions Affecting the Future Urbanizing Areas of the City of San Diego

As an element of the Growth Management Program, the City Council is considering amendments to City policies and ordinances which would affect the development potential of land located in the Future Urbanizing areas of the City and zoned A-1 (Municipal Code section 101.0404). In the event of a change from Future Urbanizing to any other land use designation, such action would be subject to the provisions of Proposition A, approved by the voters on November 4, 1985, a copy of which is attached as Enclosure 1.

This office has been asked to determine whether the amendment or repeal of Council Policy 600-29, amendments of the FW zone (Municipal Code section 101.0403), A-1 zone (Municipal Code section 101.0404), Planned Residential Development ordinance (Municipal Code section 101.0901) or Conditional Use Permit ordinance (Municipal Code section 101.0510) are legally permissible.

Turning first to the council policy, it is our opinion that the Council, as the legislative body of the City, has the authority to enact or repeal council policies. Council policies establish municipal policies to guide the various functions of the City and, where necessary, to establish procedures by which functions are performed (Council Policy 000-01). In the case of Council Policy 600-29, the City Council, on July 20, 1981, expressed its policy concerning the maintenance of Future Urbanizing areas as an Urban Reserve and followed that with the adoption of implementing amendments to the zoning regulations applicable to the A-1 zone and Planned Residential Development ordinances. If the Council determines that Council Policy 600-29 no longer represents the majority position of the Council relating to the matter covered by the policy, the Council may clearly rescind or modify the council policy without causing the City to incur any liability.

The second issue to be addressed relates to proposed amendments to the FW, A-1, Planned Residential Development and
Conditional Use Permit ordinances identified above. These ordinances represent legislative enactments by the City Council which are authorized by the provisions of Article XI, Section 7 of the California Constitution which provides that "a county or city may make and enforce within its limits all local, police, sanitary and other ordinances and regulations not in conflict with general laws." Pursuant to this authority, referred to as the police power, The City of San Diego has enacted Municipal Code section 101.0203 which provides:

Section 101.0203 Procedure for Zoning -- Requirements

Whenever the public necessity, convenience or general welfare, or good zoning practice justifies such action, and after due consideration and report on the same by the Planning Commission, the City Council may, by ordinance, include or place any property within The City of San Diego into any zone as established, created and defined in Chapter X, Article 1 of the San Diego Municipal Code, subject to the restrictions designated in Section 101.0208.

In addition, The City of San Diego has enacted Municipal Code section 101.0510, Conditional Use Permit, which provides:

A. PURPOSE AND INTENT

Certain classes of land use are not permitted by right in some or all zones of the City, but are nevertheless recognized as being desirable to the full function of the City under appropriate circumstances. It is the purpose of the Conditional Use Permit regulations to provide a means whereby proposals for such land uses may be examined on a case by case basis to determine whether, and under what conditions, these uses may be approved at a given site.

It is intended that when these classes of land use are approved, each proposal will be developed so as to fully protect the health, safety, and general welfare of all persons who live or work in the area. It is further intended that proposals developed under a Conditional Use Permit will incorporate the highest standard in the site planning, architecture, environmental protection, and sensitivity to the neighborhood character.

It is intended that in exchange for the development and land use privileges extended under
a Conditional Use Permit, the permittee will agree to abide by all conditions which the City may require. It is intended that both these privileges and conditions shall constitute a covenant which runs with the lands, and in addition to binding the permittee shall likewise bind each successor in interest.

This section identifies those classes of land use for which a Conditional use Permit may be granted and establishes the legal framework for the administration of permits.

The City of San Diego has also enacted Municipal Code section 101.0901, Planned Residential Developments, which provides:

A. PURPOSE AND INTENT

The purposes of the Planned Residential Development regulations are to facilitate development of areas designated for residential use (including Mobile Home Parks as defined in Chapter X, Article 1, Division 10 of the San Diego Municipal Code) in adopted community plans with the exception of projects in the R-1 zones or projects combining areas containing R-1 and any other zone permitting residential uses, within the Urbanized Communities as defined in the General Plan; to encourage imaginative and innovative planning of residential neighborhoods offering a wide variety of dwelling unit types and site arrangements with well-integrated community facilities and services; to use for development in areas which include steep slopes, particularly HR zoned properties, in such a manner to achieve minimum disturbance of the natural terrain and vegetation; to permit utilization of this concept in low-density development in agricultural zones; and to permit greater flexibility in design of residential neighborhoods than is possible through strict application of conventional zoning and subdivision regulations.

All of these ordinances represent actions of The City of San Diego under its police power. Since the enactment of these ordinances represent proper exercises of the police power, it follows that the repeal or amendment of these ordinances would represent proper actions under the police power if the City Council finds it is in the interest of the public health, safety
and general welfare to do so. Cal. Constitution, article XI, section 7. It must be borne in mind that the provisions relating to Planned Residential Development and Conditional Use Permits represent possible uses of land that are in addition to the uses of land authorized by the provisions of the A-1 zones. While the removal of the opportunity to seek a Planned Residential Development or Conditional Use Permit may frustrate the plans of a property owner, a property owner does not have a present right to a future use of property. Avco Community Developers, Inc. v. South Coast Regional Commission, 17 Cal.3d 785, 793, 132 Cal.Rptr. 386 (1976). This is similar to the situation where land is rezoned to a zone that is more restrictive. The distinction between the situations relates to the fact that Planned Residential Development and Conditional Use Permits are discretionary while the permitted uses of the land allowed by the underlying zone remain as they were before the enactment of the provisions in question.

We have reviewed the proposals contained in Planning Report 90-158 relating to amendments to Council Policy 600-29, A-1 zone, Planned Residential Development ordinance, Conditional Use Permit ordinance and the FW zone. It is our opinion that none of these proposals contain provisions that cannot be legally enacted provided the City Council finds that doing so promotes the public health, safety and general welfare of the citizens of the City of San Diego.

It has been suggested that development in the Future Urbanizing area under the current provisions of Council Policy 600-29 and the Planned Residential Development ordinance requires a vote of the people based on the provisions of Proposition A. It is our opinion that a vote of the people is not required by Proposition A.

Proposition A, Section 1, requires a vote of the people before land may be changed from Future Urbanizing to Planned Urbanizing as those areas are depicted in the Progress Guide and General Plan or before the provisions restricting development are "amended." The term "amended" is defined in Section 2(c) to mean any proposal to amend the text or maps of the Progress Guide and General Plan affecting the Future Urbanizing designation as the same existed in the Progress Guide and General Plan on August 1, 1984, or the land subject to said designation on August 1, 1984, except amendments which are neutral or make the designation more restrictive in terms of permitting development.

Proposition A addressed the subject of shifting land from the Future Urbanizing designation to any other designation.
Utilization of land pursuant to Council Policy 600-29 and the Planned Residential Development ordinance does not require a shift of designation. The subject of Council Policy 600-29 is the "Maintenance of Future Urbanizing area as an Urban Reserve." Proposition A makes no reference to this subject. On the other hand, Council Policy 600-30 addresses the subject of "General Plan Amendments to Shift Land from the Future Urbanizing to Planned Urbanizing Area." Following approval of Proposition A by the voters, the City Council amended Council Policy 600-30 to incorporate the requirement that changes from Future Urbanizing to Planned Urbanizing be approved by the voters. This action was mandated by Sections 3 and 4 of Proposition A. The provisions of Council Policy 600-29 and the ordinances in question were in effect at the time that Proposition A was prepared and petitions circulated. Had the drafters of Proposition A intended to cause changes of existing ordinances or a policy other than that relating to changes from Future Urbanizing to any other land use designation, such matters could have been included in Proposition A, but were not. In the absence of such changes being included in Proposition A, development can occur utilizing the provisions of Council Policy 600-29 and the ordinances in question, subject to any changes that may be made to Council Policy 600-29 and the ordinances.

JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney
Frederick C. Conrad
Chief Deputy City Attorney

FCC:lc:600(x043.2)
Enclosure
ML-90-69
MEMORANDUM OF LAW

DATE: December 4, 1995

TO: Jeff Washington, Deputy Director, Planning Department

FROM: City Attorney

SUBJECT: Subarea V Specific Plan Proposal

Question Presented

On October 11, 1995, a workshop was conducted at the Land Use and Housing Committee (the "Committee") of the City Council to consider various alternatives for utilizing a specific plan process to develop Subarea V of the Future Urbanizing Area. At the conclusion of the workshop, the Committee directed City staff to prepare a specific plan for Subarea V in accordance with Government Code section 65450. The Committee further directed staff to prepare the specific plan consistent with Alternative B, one of the three proposed development alternatives presented by staff. Alternative B was conceived by a group of Subarea V property owners. The proposal calls for calculating the maximum number of residential units permissible within Subarea V under the constraints of City of San Diego Proposition A ("Prop. A") approved on November 5, 1985, and then allocating the majority of that density within the Subarea to a portion of the Subarea to be designated for a higher concentration of development.

At the Committee's direction, our office was asked to analyze the legality of the Alternative B specific plan proposal and to provide that legal guidance to Planning Department staff. In particular, we were asked to comment about whether Alternative B complies with the mandate of Prop. A and whether it violates any property rights of owners of land within the Subarea.

Background

In 1979 the Progress Guide and General Plan of The City of San Diego (the "General Plan") was extensively amended and a section titled "Guidelines for Future Development" was added to implement the Urban Development Program. The Urban Development Program consists of classifying land within our planning jurisdiction into three phased development categories: Urbanized, Planned Urbanizing and Future Urbanizing ("FUA"). The definition of these categories and the designation of property within them is reflected in the text and maps contained in the General Plan. General Plan at 23-40.
On November 5, 1985, the citizens of San Diego approved the ballot initiative measure known as Prop. A (Attachment 1) which amended the Guidelines for Future Development section of the General Plan. The Urban Development Program now contains a provision which, under certain circumstances, requires a vote of approval from the citizens before property is removed from the FUA category. Prop. A does allow the City Council to adopt changes to the General Plan applicable to the FUA when those changes "are neutral or make the designation more restrictive in terms of permitting development." Id. at 37.

In 1992, the City Council exercised its legislative prerogative consistent with Prop. A to adopt growth management guidelines applicable to the Future Urbanizing Area in the North City Area. The guidelines are known as the Framework Plan for the North City Future Urbanizing Area ("Framework Plan"). They were adopted as an amendment to the General Plan but specifically require voter approval prior to implementation of any increased development rights. Now, as incorporated into the General Plan, the Framework Plan has the same force and effect under the law as the General Plan and Prop. A itself. The Framework Plan is applicable to Subarea V. It contains both "Guiding Principles" and "Implementing Principles" which allow for development in the North City Future Urbanizing Area. The Framework Plan envisions that interim short term development can proceed in accordance with regulations in place as of August 1, 1984, the effective date of Prop. A. Additionally, a process is established within the Framework Plan for the creation of long range Subarea Plans which designate development within five different Subareas of the North City Future Urbanizing Area at urban intensity levels. As required by Prop. A, the Framework Plan provides for a phase shift vote prior to implementation of any Subarea Plan.

Analysis

The Alternative B proposal does not remove Subarea V from the FUA designation which is the basic prohibition under Prop. A. It is intended to be a neutral regulatory amendment which would permit development within Subarea V at an overall intensity which does not exceed that which was allowed by regulations existing upon the passage of Prop. A. Development may occur within the FUA without a vote if that development proceeds in accordance with regulations in place on the effective date of Prop. A. This rule is derived by the express terms of Prop. A itself, which simply precludes amendments to the General Plan to change the designation from Future Urbanizing and precludes amending the text or maps of the General Plan to allow additional development rights, without first getting the approval of a majority of the electorate.

The regulations applicable to Subarea V at the time of passage of Prop. A, as set forth in City Council Policy 600-29, included: the A-1 zoning regulations, the Rural Cluster Development Regulations and the
Planned Residential Development ("PRD") Regulations. However, to understand the Alternative B proposal, it is important to recognize that Prop. A did not freeze the existing regulatory scheme in place upon its passage. By its express terms, Prop. A allows amended or alternative development regulations or processes within the FUA, so long as those regulations "are neutral or make the designation more restrictive in terms of permitting development." A specific plan, as proposed in Alternative B, is defined in Government Code section 65450 et seq. And, while Government Code section 65451 requires that a specific plan must include a statement of the relationship of the specific plan to the General Plan, a specific plan is not in itself a modification of a General Plan.

The Alternative B proposal calls for first calculating the maximum density yield obtainable from land within the entire Subarea as permitted by the regulations in place upon passage of Prop. A. This is a hypothetical exercise which assumes for purposes of the calculation that the entire Subarea is in single ownership. As reflected in the planning documents created by City staff in connection with this project, there are approximately 240 acres within Subarea V currently zoned A-1-1. This gross acreage yields 240 dwelling units, applying the equation of 1 dwelling unit per acre. There are 1,795 acres zoned A-1-10 within Subarea V. This gross acreage yields 448 dwelling units, applying the equation of one dwelling unit per four acres, pursuant to the PRD regulations as they existed on August 1, 1984. Therefore, the total dwelling units permitted over the entire gross acreage in Subarea V is 688 dwelling units.

The Alternative B concept then clusters the maximum amount of dwelling units within the specific plan to an area designated for higher concentration of development, as intended by the PRD and Rural Clustering Regulations. Public land which is owned by The City of San Diego and zoned A-1-10 (412.8 acres) and zoned A-1-1 (20 acres) would be reflected in the specific plan as open space devoid of development potential. All of the dwelling unit yield calculated from this land, 123 dwelling units, would be clustered into the development area. Public land owned by the State and County (119 acres zoned A-1-10) and all other private land zoned A-1-1 and A-1-10 and outside the clustered development area would retain minimum development rights pursuant to applicable underlying zone, i.e. one unit per 10 acres. The retention of these minimum development rights results in the subtraction of 268 dwelling units from the units available for clustering within the development area. Therefore, of the 688 units available within the Subarea as a whole, approximately 420 could be clustered within acreage set aside for more concentrated development.

Conclusion

If the process set forth above is followed to create the specific
plan, adoption and implementation of such a plan would be consistent with the authority delegated to the City Council in Prop. A. It would amount to a neutral regulatory amendment which would not require a phase shift vote. It can be expected that some of the property owners within the Subarea who own land outside of the clustered development area may complain that "rights" are being taken away from them. However, our office has previously opined that while the removal of the opportunity to seek a PRD or Conditional Use Permit may frustrate the plans of a property owner, a property owner does not have a present right to a future use of property. Op. San Diego City Att'y 729 (1990). See generally, Avco Community Developers, Inc. v. South Coast Regional Commission, 17 Cal. 3d 785, 793 (1976).

Finally, as with any land use action, there is some legal risk associated with approving the development. In this case, City Council Policy 600-29 exists as a longstanding policy which addresses allowable development within the FUA. Although this policy is not binding as regulation and may be freely changed at the discretion of the Council, since the passage of Prop. A it has expressed the desire and intent of the Council to "prohibit development at urban intensities" within the FUA until a phase shift occurs. Therefore, we believe it will be easier to defend the adoption of the specific plan as a reasonable exercise of the legislative prerogative delegated to the Council under Prop. A if the specific plan for Subarea V results in a plan for development which retains rural qualities of the area, distinguishable in character, scope and scale from other Planned Urbanized or Urbanized areas of the City.

JOHN W. WITT, City Attorney
By
Richard A. Duvernay
Deputy City Attorney
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February 23, 2012

Mr. Frisco White  
Chair, Carmel Valley Community Planning Board  
6025 Edgewood Bend Court  
San Diego, CA 92130

Re: Planning Commission Hearing of December 15, 2011 Item 13, Classification of Use for Continuing Care Retirement Communities in the Prop “A” Lands of the North City Future Urbanizing Area

Dear Mr. White:

This letter is in response to your letter of February 9, 2012, in which you requested an interpretation of Proposition A, the Managed Growth Initiative of 1985 (Prop A), and the ability for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation on the appropriate use category for the Rancho Del Mar project. While this Office is prohibited from providing legal advice to private parties such as planning groups, we can provide a public Report that was issued to the Planning Commission explaining the application of Prop A. See RC-95-6, attached. The Report is consistent with this Office’s current interpretation.

With respect to the Planning Commission’s recommendation on the appropriate use category, the Staff Report for the above referenced item indicates that the request for the Planning Commission interpretation of the appropriate zoning use category was made pursuant to Land Development Code section 131.0110(b). See Report No. PC-11-107. Staff’s request for the Planning Commission’s interpretation of use was not improper under the Municipal Code or Prop A. In accordance with Council Policy 600-24, the Development Services Planning Division Staff is available to advise your planning group on issues relating to its operations and implementation of Prop A. Thus, please contact Planning Division Staff, Bernard Turgeon, at 533-6575 for more guidance, if needed.

JAN I. GOLDSMITH, City Attorney

By

Nina M. Fain  
Deputy City Attorney

NMF:js  
cc: Kelly Broughton, Director, Development Services  
Eric Naslund, Chair, Planning Commission
January 27, 1995
REPORT TO PLANNING COMMISSION

NORTH CITY FUTURE URBANIZING AREA -
PROPOSED AUTHORIZATION TO USE SPECIFIC PLAN

At the December 8, 1994, Planning Commission meeting, the Commission reviewed a proposed amendment to the North City Future Urbanizing Area ("NCFUA") framework plan. The amendment would add the option of preparing a "specific plan" as an alternative to preparing a "subarea plan."

After some discussion, the Commission requested the City Attorney to report back as to whether specific plans can be used in the Future Urbanizing Area ("FUA") without violating the terms of Proposition A, a 1985 initiative, which basically limits development in the FUA. The Commission also requested our comments as to whether making the specific plan option available in only one portion of the FUA would violate the legal concept of "equal protection."

Our conclusions, as noted below, are that specific plans can be used in the FUA without violating Proposition A; and that the use of specific plans can be limited to one or more parts of the FUA without violating the right of equal protection.

"Specific plans" are authorized under California Government Code section 65450 et seq.

Under Proposition A, a specific plan could be implemented without voter approval only if the uses and density do not exceed the authorized uses and density which existed in 1984, the Proposition A date. Proposition A basically froze uses and density in the future urbanizing area and requires a majority vote of the electorate to increase uses and density.

Under the Government Code, a specific plan must include text and diagrams which specify all of the following in detail:

1. The distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land, including open space, within the area covered by the plan.
2. The proposed distribution, location, and extent and intensity of major components of public and private transportation, sewage, water, drainage, solid waste disposal, energy, and other
was passed. My conclusion is, therefore, that the specific plan concept is not legally inappropriate and is not inconsistent with the provisions of Proposition A.

Another issue which arose at the December 8, 1994, commission hearing is the City Manager's proposal to limit the availability of the specific plan process to less than all of the subareas in the NCFUA. A legal representative of one property owner indicated that he felt that limiting the availability of the precise plan tool to one subarea would violate the legal doctrine of "equal protection." I do not agree. The City Council does not have to officially approve the use of specific plans in all areas of the City, or all parts of the NCFUA, if it determines to allow the utilization in one area of the City. In addition, it is my understanding that there are in fact significant distinctions between subarea 5, which the Manager has now proposed be the sole subarea presently allowed to utilize the precise plan process, and the adjacent subareas.

However, it does seem important, from a legal standpoint, to make it clear in the framework plan amendment, that the limitation regarding precise plans to one or more specific areas is subject to change at any time and is merely a "guideline." Owners of property in other subareas will continue to have the right to request additional amendments to the guideline to allow potential future use of precise plans in other subareas.

In summary, since specific plans could have been utilized with regard to development of the future urbanizing area at and prior to the effective date of Proposition A, the City Council may continue to utilize specific plans in the area. With regard to "equal protection," it is legally permissible for the City Council to indicate a willingness to consider specific plans in one or more portions of the City or in one or more portions of the FUA. Such action would not violate the legal concept of "equal protection."

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN W. WITT
City Attorney

HOV:ps:600
Attachment
RC-95-6
c. Promote environmental education including principles and issues of environmental justice (see also Conservation Element, Section N).

d. Use sustainable development practices (see also Conservation Element, Section A).

LU-I.14. As part of community plan updates or amendments that involve land use or intensity changes, evaluate public health risks associated with identified sources of hazardous substances and toxic air emissions (see also Conservation Element, Section F). Create adequate distance separation, based on documents such as those recommended by the California Air Resources Board and site specific analysis, between sensitive receptor land use designations and potential identified sources of hazardous substances such as freeways, industrial operations or areas such as warehouses, train depots, port facilities, etc. (See also Appendix C, EP-2)

LU-I.15. Plan for the equal distribution of potentially hazardous and/or undesirable, yet necessary, land uses, public facilities and services, and businesses to avoid over concentration in any one geographic area, community, or neighborhood.

LU-I.16. Ensure the provision of noise abatement and control policies that do not disenfranchise, or provide special treatment of, any particular group, location of concern, or economic status.


Goal

♦ Future growth and development that is consistent with current land use intensity or that is subject to a “phase shift” process to approve increased intensity.

Discussion

The Managed Growth Initiative

In 1985, the electorate approved Proposition A, an initiative amending the Progress Guide and General Plan (1979 General Plan) to require approval of a majority vote of the people for shifting land from the Future Urbanizing to the Planned Urbanizing Area phase of growth or development. The ballot measure further provided that the “provision restricting development in the Future Urbanizing Area shall not be amended except by majority vote of the people, and except for amendments which are neutral or make the designation more restrictive in terms of permitting development.” The full text is included in Appendix B, LU-3.

By 2005, phase shifts, per Proposition A and the 1979 General Plan, have occurred for the land determined to be appropriate for more urban levels of development within the planning horizon of this General Plan. The City also completed planning efforts to address land use in the remainder of the Future Urbanizing Area subject to its jurisdiction. The City Council adopted a
comprehensive update to the San Pasqual Valley Plan that requires the preservation of the San Pasqual Valley for agricultural use, open space, and Multi-Habitat Planning Area (MHPA) (see Conservation Element for more detail). Additionally, the City adopted a specific plan for Del Mar Mesa that severely limits residential development to rural densities and sets aside over half of the plan area as MHPA. Furthermore, federal, state, county, and other jurisdictions have participated with the City in planning for open space and habitat preservation in the San Dieguito and Tijuana River Valley. Proposition A lands also include military and other lands not subject to the City’s jurisdiction. In the past, the City Council has chosen to follow the development intensity restrictions and the requirement for a vote of the people to approve an amendment to shift the area from Future to Planned Urbanizing Area as specified in Proposition A, upon receipt of jurisdiction over former military installations.

As described, the phased development areas system has, for the most part, become an outdated system to address future growth and development. The City has grown into a jurisdiction with primarily two tiers, see Figure LU-4, Proposition A Lands Map:

- Proposition A Lands – (as previously defined) characterized by very low-density, residential, open space, natural resource-based park, and agricultural uses; and
- Urbanized Lands – characterized by older, recently developed, and developing communities at urban and suburban levels of density and intensity.

As of 2006, communities formerly known as Planned Urbanizing were largely completed according to the adopted community plan, and of that group, the oldest were beginning to experience limited redevelopment on smaller sites. For information on how the tier system was linked to public facilities financing, see the Public Facilities Element Introduction and Section A.

**Policies**

**LU-J.1.** Identify non-phase shifted lands as Proposition A lands and no longer refer to them as Future Urbanizing Area.

**LU-J.2.** Follow a public planning and voter approval process consistent with the provisions of this Land Use Element for reuse planning of additional military lands identified as Proposition A lands, and other areas if and when they become subject to the City’s jurisdiction.
Figure LU-4

Proposition A Lands

- Planning Area Boundaries
- Military Use
- Proposition ‘A’ Lands
- Urbanized

PLANNING AREAS
1 Balboa Park
2 Barrio Logan
3 Black Mountain Ranch
4 Carmel Mountain Ranch
5 Carmel Valley
6 City Heights*
7 Clairemont Mesa
8 College Area
9 Del Mar Mesa
10 Downtown
11 East Elliott
12 Eastern Area*
13 Encanto Neighborhoods**
14 Fairbanks Country Club
15 Greater Golden Hill
16 Greater North Park
17 Kearny Mesa
18 Kensington-Talmadge*
19 La Jolla
20 Linda Vista
21 Los Penasquitos Canyon Preserve
22 Midway-Pacific Highway
23 Mira Mesa
24 Miramar Ranch North
25 Mission Bay Park
26 Mission Beach
27 Mission Valley
28 Navajo
29 Normal Heights*
30 North City Subarea 2
31 Ocean Beach
32 Old San Diego
33 Otay Mesa
34 Otay Mesa-Nestor
35 Pacific Beach
36 Pacific Highlands Ranch
37 Peninsula
38 Rancho Bernardo
39 Rancho Encantada
40 Rancho Penasquitos
41 Sabre Springs
42 San Pasqual
43 San Ysidro
44 Scripps Miramar Ranch
45 Serra Mesa
46 Skyline-Paradise Hills
47 Torrey Hills
48 Southeastern San Diego**
49 Tierrasanta
50 Tijuana River Valley
51 Torrey Highlands
52 Torrey Pines
53 University
54 Uptown
55 Via De La Valle

* Mid-City Community Plan
** Southeastern San Diego Community Plan

PROSPECTIVE ANNEXATIONS
A 4S Ranch
B Davis Ranch Island
C Southeastern County Island
D East Otay Mesa
Summary of Threat to Proposition A, the 1985 Managed Growth Initiative - March 2012

In November of 1985 voters in the City of San Diego approved an initiative set forth by a coalition known as San Diegans for Managed Growth to require that voters must approve any shifts of predominantly agriculturally zoned land from a Future Urbanizing Area (FUA) to a Planned Urbanizing designation in the 1979 Progress Guide and General Plan.

Since that date policies and ordinances to outline procedures for implementation of this initiative have been put in place. In 1994 a ballot measure to open up the entire North City FUA was rejected by voters. Subsequent proposals for development of portions of designated Sub Areas within the North City FUA were approved by voters after achieving significant support from a variety of stakeholders.

In July 2011 an application was submitted by a land owner to the City Development Services Department (DSD) to develop 224 units of housing as a so-called “Continuing Care Residential Community” on 20 acres in the floodplain of Sub Area II in the North City FUA. The developer had been working behind closed doors with City staff for the preceding two years to find a way to circumvent the requirement that this urban level development receive an affirmative city wide vote as required by Prop A.

The result of this manipulation has been a determination by City staff that a “continuing care residential community use” is consistent with an “intermediate care facility” use that was in the land development code in 1984, and therefore, once the code is amended, the project can proceed to be processed and approved without the Prop A vote of the electorate.

Their conclusion is based on an incorrect interpretation of the meaning of the August 1, 1984 effective date of Prop A – that developers are somehow entitled to develop at whatever intensity of use was in place as of that date. That interpretation ignores the succeeding restrictions placed on development by the City Council as a result of the explicit direction in Prop A for “the City Council, City Planning Commission and City staff … to take any and all actions…reasonably necessary to carry out the intent and purpose of the (Prop A) initiative measure.”

The City staff interpretation creates an artificial benchmark entitlement date of August 1, 1984 when, in fact, municipal code ordinances enacted in 1990 expressly prohibit intermediate care facilities within Prop A Lands.

( continued )
Summary of Threat to Proposition A, the 1985 Managed Growth Initiative  (continued)

If the change to the land development code requested by the developer is carried forward and approved by the City Council, the DSD City staff can process and approve this development without a vote of the electorate. A violation of the intent and purpose of Proposition A.

Make no mistake. This is an urban level of development in the floodplain of the North City FUA.

The City Council must step forward and assert the necessity for this project to be processed as an urban development requiring a review by the Planning Commission as such and a recommendation whether the City Council will even consider whether this meets the threshold of need for a land shift to an urbanizing status. If they were to determine that it does meet that threshold, it would then have to be put on the ballot and achieve approval from City voters.

Without the requirement for a city wide vote, the developer will likely be able to proceed with a project that will cover 20 acres of the San Dieguito River Valley with 14 feet of fill covered by buildings and parking spaces. The development is referred to as “high quality” which means high cost and high profit. The public benefits, if there are any, are not apparent.

The processing of the application in this way by this project would set the stage for more manipulation of the land code and more attempts to circumvent the Prop A vote requirement. If the provisions of Prop A are not enforced, there will surely be additional exploitation of the remaining open space and imposition of adverse impacts from inappropriate urbanization and building in areas such as floodplains. Prop A has worked well to encourage dialogue and provide more public benefits when development proposals are brought forward in the FUA.

The City Council must act now to tell the City staff to bring forward through the Planning Commission a request for a threshold determination to determine if this development warrants being placed on the ballot for voter approval. This will restore the trust in the City commitment to the Prop A citizens initiative and discourage future attempts to circumvent Prop A.

Prepared by HC Jay Powell, hcjpowell@cox.net, (619) 813-8485  (Rev March 2, 2012)
TO: CAC

FROM: Staff

SUBJECT: Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead Master Plan

RECOMMENDATION:

Receive information and provide input.

At today’s meeting, Anne Cooper, Sikes Adobe Museum Manager, will give a presentation on the Master Plan - what it includes, what changes are proposed from the existing conditions and what the process is for completing the Plan.

The Master Plan will have chapters covering the topics below. Drafts of some of the chapters have been written and are attached.

1. Vision Statement
2. Executive Summary
3. Organization and Existing Conditions – see attached draft.
4. Historical Context - see attached draft.
5. Preservation Plan – see attached draft.
6. Development Plan - see attached draft and graphic.
7. Interpretive Plan
8. Business Plan - see attached draft.

On March 22nd, an informational presentation was made to the City of San Diego Historic Resources Board. The HRB, which awarded Sikes Adobe a “Phoenix Rising” award last year, was pleased with the progress and direction in which the Sikes Adobe is going.

Informational presentations will also be given to the San Pasqual Planning Group and the Rancho Bernardo Planning Board.
The Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead is a 5.742 acre site owned by the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority. The site was owned by the City of San Diego Water Department from 1925 until 2008, when the County of San Diego, at the recommendation of Supervisor Pam Slater-Price, provided the funds to the SDRP to purchase the site from the City. Even while the site was still owned by the City, SDRP had been intensively involved with the Farmstead over a number of years as described below.

**Background:**

The Farmstead is located within the Focused Planning Area for the San Dieguito River Park. One of the SDRP goals is to preserve, protect and interpret the cultural resources of the San Dieguito River Valley. SDRP began implementation of this goal by applying to the State Historic Resources Board in 1992 to have the site designated a State Point of Historic Interest. It had already been designated a City of San Diego Historic Site (Historic Site No. 231). The State Historic Resources Office approved the application on May 7, 1993, designating the site as State Point of Historic Interest SDI-013. Concerned that the building was deteriorating rapidly, SDRP arranged to have a new roof installed in the mid-nineties. Nonetheless, the farmhouse and auxiliary outbuilding (known as “the creamery”) were in very bad repair. Using State grant funds from the California Arts Council, at the recommendation of then assemblywoman Charlene Zettel, and a trust fund at the City of San Diego established by then councilwoman Abbe Wolfsheimer, SDRP hired a historic preservation team in 2002 to prepare a Historic Structures Report, with the goal of restoring the building. The historic preservation team was composed of Ione Stiegler, IS Architecture, serving as the lead Historic Preservation Architect, along with Stephen Van Wormer, Historian, Vonn Marie May, historical landscape consultant and Laura Burnett, landscape architect with Wallace Roberts & Todd. Their research concluded that the appropriate period of significance for the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse was from 1869-1891 when it was built, owned and occupied by the Zenas and Eliza Sikes Family.

Augmenting the work of the consultants, SDRP worked with the San Diego Committee of the California Chapter of the Colonial Dames of America who did additional research in the area of period furnishings and Sikes genealogy. Led by Jeri Scudder, Marilen Sedlock, Perrin Coman and Martha McCarter, the Colonial Dames also researched manta ceilings, analyzed the layers of wallpaper found in the house to determine which layer had been contemporary during the period of significance, and paid to have the manta ceiling and wallpaper recreated and installed. The Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse was restored by Mark Sauer Construction in 2003/2004, and was opened to the public for free docent-led tours following a Grand Opening Ceremony on January 31, 2004.
In October 2007, the newly restored Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse was destroyed in the Witch Fire that burned 62% of the San Dieguito River Park. All that remained standing in the farmhouse after the fire was the four adobe walls of the kitchen. The adobe room had been the first room in the house that was built when the Sikes Family arrived at the property in 1869, and it was the only “room” remaining after the fire. The rest of the house had been built of wood, which burned. Because the Witch Fire was declared a national emergency, FEMA stepped in with emergency funds to stabilize the adobe walls so that they wouldn’t fall completely down or disintegrate in the winter rains due to their exposure. At this time, SDRP purchased the site from the City of San Diego as described above. The City had insured the building prior to the fire, and the insurance coverage was transferred to the SDRP as part of the purchase agreement, enabling SDRP to rebuild the farmhouse with the insurance that had been in place when the site burned. The insurance company permitted the original restoration team – IS Architecture and Mark Sauer Construction – to rebuild the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse, using the house plans that had been created as part of the original research. The restoration of the farmhouse was completed in June of 2010. The creamery, which had not been restored prior to the fire was a total loss. The windmill, which had been restored by the Escondido and Rancho Bernardo Sunrise Rotary Clubs in 2005, was not substantially damaged in the fire.

Site:

The 5.742 acre site is in the jurisdiction of the City of San Diego. It is bounded on the north by Sunset Drive in the City of Escondido, on the east by Kit Carson Creek, on the west by Sunset Drive and I-15, and on the south by the Mule Hill Trail. South of the Mule Hill Trail the land transitions into a low-lying area forming the eastern portion of Lake Hodges.

Interpretive Boundary:

A portion of the site surrounding the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse is designated the “Interpretive Boundary”. The purpose of the “Interpretive Boundary” is to demarcate the area that is to be restored and maintained for its historical authenticity. That boundary is intended to enclose the historic features of the farmstead, the farmhouse, the windmill, the creamery, the berry and kitchen gardens, the picket fence and the ornamental gardens. All of these features are known to have been on the site and have been or will be rebuilt to the period of significance. Other features, such as the privy or corral, may also be restored inside the Interpretive Boundary.

Existing Site Features:

At the south end of the Interpretive Boundary, next to the Mule Hill Trail, is a native plant garden. North of the Interpretive Boundary is a trailer occupied by the volunteer hosts. The volunteer hosts live on the site free of charge in return for 20 hours a week groundskeeping responsibilities. The volunteer hosts also provide security due to their presence at the site. A portable toilet is located just to the west of the Interpretive Boundary adjacent to the Mule Hill Trail. North of the volunteer hosts’ trailer is a grassy swale. A gated parking area is located
north of the swale. It is bounded by Sunset Drive on the north, Kit Carson Creek on the east, the
swale on the south, and a gated dirt drive (“access road”) on the west. The gate at the parking
area is set on an automatic timer to open at sunrise and close at dusk. West of the gated dirt
driveway is an area that was previously used for cattle grazing during the 20th century. Although
the fencing burned in the Witch Fire, some of it remains. This area is currently a vacant, weedy
patch but is planned as an Activity Zone in this Master Plan.

Organizational Structure:

The San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority was established in 1989 by the County of
San Diego and the Cities of Del Mar, Escondido, Poway, San Diego and Solana Beach to create
a natural open space park that preserves and interprets the natural and cultural resources of the
San Dieguito River Valley. The Board of Directors of the San Dieguito River Park JPA adopted
a Concept Plan for the entire River Park in 1993, and updated it in 2002. The Concept Plan
includes themes and concepts for each area of the Park. It also includes design guidelines for
Park development. It is intended that the Sikes Adobe Master Plan will be consistent with the
Concept Plan.

As part of its mission with respect to cultural resources, the JPA from its earliest days took an
interest in the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse as described above. Once the farmhouse was
restored, the JPA continued to budget funds for operation and maintenance including installation
and operation of a burglar/fire alarm, recruited and trained docents, and hired a half-time
Museum Manager to direct future development and program activities, and found a volunteer
host to serve as groundskeeper and for additional security.

The JPA intends to continue to operate and maintain the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead as
described in this Master Plan, funded primarily or exclusively from revenue produced on site as
presented in Chapter 8 “Business Plan”.

The JPA encourages the formation of an independent, non-profit Friends group to provide
financial and leadership assistance to the JPA and to the Sikes Adobe Museum Manager. This
Master Plan envisions that the Friends group could raise funds to pay for additional educational
programs, for desired improvements within or outside the Interpretive Boundary, and for
unfunded maintenance needs, over and above the items identified in the annual operations
budget. The Friends group could also assume responsibility for various aspects of the work
duties at Sikes, including but not limited to scheduling and development of monthly public
programs and events; documentation regarding artifacts found at the site and museum
furnishings; operating the wedding/party rental scheduling; planting/harvesting the wheat field
and/or operating the Gift Shop. They could publish materials about Sikes, pioneer farming,
agricultural history, etc. The extent and level of support by the Friends would be determined by
the Friends themselves over time, working in coordination and cooperation with the Sikes Adobe
Museum staff, provided that their activities are consistent with this Master Plan. The Friends
would raise money for their operations through membership fees, publications and fundraising events.

**Current Status:**

The Board of Directors of the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority directed at their meeting of July 16, 2010 that a Master Plan should be developed for the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead that would have as a goal that the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead would be financially self-supporting, while protecting the historic integrity of the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse. As part of developing this Master Plan, a number of ideas for accomplishing these goals have been considered. Chapter 8 “Business Plan” shows how the proposals in this Master Plan will ensure that the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead is self-supporting. Other chapters in this Plan provide guidelines to ensure that the historic integrity of the site is maintained.

While the Master Plan process has been underway, a trial program of activities including wagon rides, pony rides, a farmers’ market, and other ideas were pursued and the results have informed this document.
CHAPTER FOUR – Historical Context

Introduction

The historical context of the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead spans the changes witnessed by those living in the San Pasqual Valley from the time when the Rancho San Bernardo was first subdivided in 1868 to the continuing development of San Diego’s North County communities and neighborhoods, only forty years ago. It is representative of the “classic” story of pioneer settlement in California, dating to the period immediately following the Gold Rush and statehood. This history has been addressed in great detail in the “Sikes Adobe Farmhouse and Landscape Historic Structures Report, Appendix A: Historic Report” prepared by Walter Enterprises, Stephen Van Wormer and Susan Walter, historians, in July 2002. The text of “Appendix A: Historic Report,” without the tables and end notes, is included here as Appendix ___. The tables represent extensive research and transcriptions of the archival record of the Sikes family as discovered in “Probate Case 26.” This primary source is available to researchers at the San Diego History Center’s Research Archives. The existence of these archives provides a detailed glimpse into the affairs of the Sikes family and has informed the current interpretation of the site.

One aspect of our understanding of history is that however extensively researched, there are often changes resulting from new or further research. At the time the “Historic Report” was written, researchers believed that Zenas Sikes and his wife, Eliza, traveled from their eastern origins to California together, as man and wife. The source of this erroneous information was the July 1913 obituary of Eliza Sikes, printed in the San Diego Union. Later research revealed that this was not the case; that indeed, Zenas and Eliza met after they had both arrived in California.

Chronicle

The following treatment of the Sikes Adobe farmstead’s history is meant to provide an encapsulation of events from the time of Zenas Sikes, Jr.’s purchase of land in San Diego County to its purchase by the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority. For a narrative of the history, please refer to the Walter Enterprises “Historic Report” in Appendix ___.

- Zenas Sikes, Jr. born 1829 in Massachusetts.
- Eliza Burrell born 1834 in Ohio.
- 1849: California Gold Rush. As a result, Zenas and Eliza travel to the West Coast, Zenas by the Overland Route with his brothers; and Eliza with her stepmother aboard ship, around Cape Horn.
- 1853: Zenas and Eliza marry in Santa Clara County, California.
- 1868-1872: Zenas Sikes purchases 2,400 acres of the former Rancho San Bernardo in San Diego County, and moves there with his wife and their six children. They build a one-room adobe and begin farming wheat.
1870: San Diego is a city of 2,300 inhabitants.
1870: Poway post office application filed.
1872-74: Rooms added to the adobe. Zenas Sikes becomes first postmaster of the new town of Bernardo in 1872. Mr. Sikes elected first Master of the Bernardo Grange in 1874.
1874: Sikes daughter, Ida, marries Thomas Duncan.
1874-1881: Farmhouse expands to seven rooms. Eventual six room plan created by restoring a divided room to a single room, located on the southeast corner.
1876: Sikes daughter, Eva, marries James Cassidy.
1876: Patrick Graham, native of Ireland, purchases two acres from Zenas Sikes, that include the site of Graham’s general store for twenty-five dollars.
1877: Sikes daughter, Kate, marries Augustus Cravath.
1878: Sikes son, Harry, marries Tillie Bevington.
April 1881: Zenas Sikes dies at home following surgery at the age of 51, having been kicked by a horse on a previously injured leg. Eliza uses insurance payments to extensively remodel her house and upgrade furnishings. She also continues to farm wheat with her sons and sons-in-law.
1882: Eliza and Sikes daughter, Charlotte, move to San Jose, California, leasing the farmstead to G. E. Gabrielson. While in San Jose, Eliza remarries, becoming Mrs. H. M. Magnes.
1883: Patrick Graham builds an addition to his store at Bernardo.
1884: Eliza and Charlotte Sikes return to Bernardo.
1885: Eliza divorces Harry Magnes; Charlotte marries G. E. Gabrielson.
1886: Estimated population of Bernardo is 400.
1881-1896: Sikes Family finances decline as wheat production becomes less profitable. They take up fruit cultivation, dairying. Debts pile up.
1888: City of Escondido incorporated.
1892: Eliza leases farmstead to daughter, Eva and Eva’s second husband, William Thompson.
1894: Dissatisfied, Eliza brings suit to evict the Thompsons. Thompsons remain in Bernardo until at least 1895.
1897: Eliza mortgages her remaining property to Augustus Barnett, an officer of the San Diego Savings Bank and Ramona farmer.
1899: Eliza loses the property to foreclosure.
1899-1904: Now known in Barnett family as the “Bernardo Ranch,” land which includes the farmhouse, is rented to Charles Domenigoni.
1906: Augustus Barnett dies; title passes to his son, Melancton Barnett.
1908-1917: Melancton Barnett listed as resident of Bernardo, though primary residence was San Dieguito Ranch, near Del Mar.
1912: M. Barnett places order with Escondido Plumbing Company for lavatory and water closet.
1913: Eliza Sikes dies in Escondido.
1917: Barnett’s Bernardo Ranch purchased as part of Lake Hodges reservoir.
1919: Escondido Road rerouted to address formation of Lake Hodges. Orientation of access to the farmhouse changed.
1922: Land is purchased by the San Dieguito Mutual Water Company.
1925: San Dieguito Mutual Water Company leases reservoir to the City of San Diego.
1920s-1930s: Farmhouse and surrounding property sublet or rented out by City of San Diego. One of these tenant families was that of Frank and Yolande Hopkins.
1940s: Farmhouse rented or leased by Mitchell family.
post-World War II: Leased by cattle rancher, Hans Starr. The cattle were pastured in the San Pasqual Valley, gathered at the ranch and shipped out, as many as 1,000 to 1,500 head at a time. The corral fencing, gates and cattle chutes on the property date to this time.
1970s: Lease taken over by the San Jacinto Packing Company. Cattle ranchers continued to lease the property and use the farmhouse through the 1980s.
1980: City of Poway incorporated.
1988: Designation of Zenas Sikes Adobe as City of San Diego Historic Landmark No. 231
1989: Formation of the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park administered by a Joint Powers Authority, consisting of the County of San Diego and Cities of San Diego, Poway, Escondido, Del Mar and Solana Beach.
1993: Listing as California Point of Historical Interest No. SDI-013.
2007: Witch Creek Fire burns farmhouse and much of surrounding landscape.
2010: Reopening of restored and reconstructed Sikes Adobe farmhouse.

Significance

The Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead’s significance lies in its survival as an example of history in multiple contexts. These contexts include the pioneer experience, a family’s saga, the evolution of late 19th century agriculture and experimentation, and the interrelationship between a farmstead, its nearest town (Bernardo) and its nearest city (San Diego). Many visitors to the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead will say, on entering the farmhouse, “This reminds me of my grandmother’s house,” or “My grandparents had a house just like this in Iowa!” Visitors exclaim about the sound of their feet as they tread across the floors “I haven’t heard that sound in years!” The Sikes Adobe allows all who visit a chance to reconnect with their past, particularly when that past was one which encompassed a rural experience. In order to better develop that connection, the history of the Sikes Adobe requires further research and interpretation.
Among the goals of the Master Plan will be to apply for the Sikes Adobe’s inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

The “Sikes Adobe Farmhouse and Landscape Historic Structures Report” addressed the question of the site’s eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places in 2002. In order to qualify for nomination, a property must meet the criteria for listing on the National Register, which state that

the quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling and association, and

a. that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or

b. that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or

c. that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, method of construction or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or

d. that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history (National Register Bulletin 16 U.S. Department of the Interior 1986:1).

The “Sikes Adobe Farmhouse and Landscape Historic Structures Report” (HSR) states regarding potential eligibility that the Sikes Adobe and remaining grounds “. . . appear to be potentially eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places” (HSR 2002: 55). Supporting statements were made that the Sikes Adobe would be considered potentially eligible under criteria a, b, c and d.

Criterion Rationale

A The importance of the Sikes’ pioneering in early San Diego agriculture, in particular the California wheat bonanza era (1874-1902) and
a) – it represents the ‘American Period’ pioneer settlement pattern in the West
b) – it represents the displacement of the Native American peoples from the valleys where the lived for thousands of years
c) – the adobe farmhouse represents a blend of adobe and Frontier Victorian that was indicative of the American period transitioning around California statehood (1850)
d) – landscape features represent a strong Victorian ethic of exotic plant introductions and environmental placement.

B Zenas Sikes not only settled, planted, and harvested wheat during a significant period in California history but was also the postmaster for the town of Bernardo and ‘Master’ of the Bernardo Agricultural Grange, founded in direct response to the wheat bonanza era.

C Based on extant resources of the period and method of construction;
- the adobe farmhouse is one of the oldest structures in San Diego County
- it is one of the few remaining adobes in the County
- the farmhouse and grounds demonstrate a high level of integrity nearly 130 years after the initial construction and subsequent ‘in period’ modifications
- the adobe farmhouse structure represents typical folk architecture and its economy of design.

D The materials and construction techniques used in the building of the Sikes Farmhouse document its architectural evolution and the adaptation of folk vernacular building design by pioneer farmers. It is likely that the site could yield more information because an intensive archaeological investigation was not undertaken and the site is next to an ancient floodplain area. Attempted interviews and historical research also were conducted to determine the whereabouts of the privy, associated with the 1870’s Sikes era, but has to date been unsuccessful (HSR 2002: 55-56).

Some adjustments are suggested to this assessment due to changes which have occurred since it was made in 2002. These adjustments apply to the findings for criteria C and D, only. Regarding criterion C, the architectural integrity of the restored farmhouse might be questioned due to its second restoration and reconstruction following the Witch Creek fire of 2007. The second restoration and reconstruction followed the initial restoration of the house to the letter, encompassing and utilizing historic materials and methods wherever possible. The extent of that effort has been recognized on the local and state levels through awards received for the project in 2011.
The National Register addresses such situations under the category of “reconstructed historic buildings” by noting that they would ordinarily not be considered eligible for the National Register.

However, such properties will qualify . . . if they fall within the following categories: . . .

e. A reconstructed building when accurately executed in a suitable environment and presented in a dignified manner as part of a restoration master plan, and when no other building or structure with the same association has survived (National Register Bulletin 16 U.S. Department of the Interior 1986).

With respect to criterion D, archaeological investigations of a more extensive nature were undertaken in 2008 and 2009, in order to mitigate potential impacts to the archaeological record prior to the post-fire restoration and reconstruction of the house. With floors no longer extant, sensitive archaeological materials, deposits and floor surfaces were exposed. These were addressed within the immediate footprint of the farmhouse in 2008. Limited testing and further excavations were conducted outside the footprint of the farmhouse in 2009. These revealed a concentration of material which may or may not represent a deposit dating to the Sikes era. Excavation of the trash feature was not completed, but had to be terminated due to the imminent reopening of the farmhouse to visitors, in June of 2010. At that time, materials dating to 1915 +/- 5 years were being recovered, with further material below the exposed deposit. The privy has not yet been located, though part of the testing included the use of ground penetrating radar.
CHAPTER FIVE – PRESERVATION PLAN

Introduction

The purpose of this Preservation Plan is to protect the cultural resource defined by the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead. The site’s most recent history, since its recognition and designation as a historic resource by the City of San Diego, has been one of encroachment by surrounding development. Through the efforts of the San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park, the 5.742 acre parcel on which the farmhouse rests has been retained. The goal of the Preservation Plan is to allow the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead to become a sustainable resource within this new environment while fulfilling its stated mission of preservation and education.

Background and Prior Investigations

The first steps taken toward the preservation of what is now the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead occurred in July 1988, when the “Zenas Sikes Adobe” was listed as a historic resource by the Historic Resources Board of the City of San Diego. Prior to that time, the City of San Diego’s Public Utilities Department, as owner, took steps toward the preservation of the site.

The Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead was surveyed by the volunteer members of the San Diego County Archaeological Society in 1988. It was assigned the site number CA-SDi-12650H, the ‘H’ designating it as a historic site. It is part of the statewide cultural resources information system, with the San Diego County properties listed and recorded at the South Coastal Information Center, San Diego State University.

When initially surveyed in September 1988, the Sikes Adobe (SDi-12650H) consisted of the adobe and wood frame house, a corrugated metal “barn” and attached shed, having a metal roof; and the adobe outbuilding initially labeled as the “chicken house.” The metal barn was mapped at a distance of 41.7 feet north from the northeast corner of the house. The adobe outbuilding lay at a distance of 35.5 feet west from the northwest corner of the house. Fence lines defining corrals were also mapped, as well as a cattle chute, located at the north end of the property. A “wall remnant” was also noted alongside the trace of the creek, the creek itself having been measured at a distance of 50 feet from the southeast corner of the fence line on the east side of the house (Fig. __).

This survey, recorded by Michael Sampson of the SDCAS, was referenced by the Historic Resources Board, City of San Diego, in their determination to register the Zenas Sikes Adobe as a local historic landmark. As noted in a letter dated September 1989, Susan Hector, writing in her capacity as a member of the Historical Site Board states that “no site boundaries were drawn” at the time of the volunteer survey. She further noted that site boundaries “should be drawn to
include not only features and artifacts mapped by SDCAS, but also the pasture and corral areas to preserve the historic setting” (Appendix __).

According to the earliest recording of the site (California Department of Parks and Recreation [DPR] form 523), [Frank Lorey, 1992, updated 1993], the structures noted included the farmhouse, being an adobe structure with wood frame additions. The site form was subsequently updated by Andrew Pignolio in 1999 for Tierra Environmental, which had been contracted to perform a survey of cultural resources prior to the creation of the Mule Hill/San Pasqual Valley Trail. Mr. Pignolio noted a “depression . . . located outside of the project alignment to the north suggesting the possibility of features in the area, but features or cultural material were not located within the project alignment.”

Designation

In its designation of the Zenas Sikes Adobe as a historic site, the Historical Site Board Register form notes that

This site is significant as one of the oldest structures in the county and one of few remaining adobes. It is representative of San Diego county’s rancho history and of the history of the Rancho Bernardo area. The Sikes family are representative of the earliest American ranchers who settled in California. The site also has potential as an archaeological site (Appendix __).

In the section addressing site significance, there is a statement that “The significance of this site lies mainly in its age and method of construction.”

Although the site was now designated, no further action was taken by the City of San Diego, which owned it. The San Dieguito River Valley Open Space Park Joint Powers Authority, established in 1989, took steps to protect the site by applying for it to be listed as a State Point of Historical Interest in 1992. The initial application, authored by Susan Carter, was revised in April 1993, and the Sikes Adobe was appointed State Point of Historical Interest No. SDI-013 in May of that year (Appendix __). The effects of this designation, according to the California Department of Parks and Recreation, Office of Historic Preservation include “limited protection (environmental review may be required under CEQA if property is threatened by a project).” Further, “Resources listed as Points of Historical Interest are concurrently listed in California Register.”

The application notes some changes to the conditions at the site which would had occurred between the initial survey in 1988 and 1993:

A high fence has been placed around the farmhouse itself to protect it from vagrants and vandalism. The large tree which was growing into the house
and posed the danger of falling into the house was removed in 1992.

The condition of the “chicken house” was also noted as being “... in a more deteriorated condition than the farmhouse itself.” The 1988 survey noted the presence of a “barn” which the Point of Historical Interest Application states “... was in reality a metal shed.” Its date of construction is unknown, and by 1992-'93 it no longer existed. Police requested its removal in 1992, as it was being used by vagrants. The City of San Diego’s Planning Department was consulted as to its potential for historic significance prior to its demolition, and it was deemed insignificant.

With respect to the surrounding grounds, the 1992-'93 application mentions the presence of the earlier corrals and cattle chute, as well as the presence of mature trees, including *Platanus racemosa*, *Phoenix canariensis* and *Schinus molle* (Appendix __). At the time of its listing as a Point of Historical Interest, the boundaries of the site were given such that both the farmhouse and “chicken house” were proposed for designation. In a clarification of the establishment of the proposed boundaries, Carter stated:

> That land which was most closely associated with the farmhouse, and which has not been built upon or put in a long term lease for agriculture, is included in a lease from the City of San Diego Water Utilities Department to the San Dieguito River Park JPA for the restoration and interpretation of Sikes adobe. ... The north boundary is Sunset Drive. One corner of the west boundary coincides with the Escondido Water Treatment Plant. The east boundary is coterminous with the creek which lies between the Sikes property and the North County Farmer’s Market field. The west, east and south boundaries are coterminous with the lease to the San Dieguito River Park from the City of San Diego Water Utilities Department which owns the properties south and east of the adobe (Appendix __).

**Further Investigations**

In February 1999, a field survey of what is essentially now the Sikes Adobe parcel, (APN ________) was conducted by Sue Wade, then of Heritage Resources of Ramona, for a proposed Farmer’s Market project. The project area, as described in a letter to the City of San Diego’s Planning and Development Review, traced the boundaries as identified above, but terminated at the chain link fence, which had been installed by the City of San Diego around the Sikes house itself. Ms. Wade described the historic land uses of the project area and the results of her field survey by stating that:

> Because of the realignment of roads and drainages adjacent to the property, it is not possible to precisely relate mapped locations of historic structures...
with the still-standing Sikes house. It is very likely that now-demolished historic structures were located north of the Sikes house and on the current Farmer’s Market [proposed] property (Wade 1999:6).

The Wade letter further notes in the “Conclusions and Recommendations” that “... historic photographs suggest that archaeological remains of early outbuildings, now demolished, may still exist on the property.” Ms. Wade’s 1999 recommendations included the following:

- the landscape trees associated with the Sikes occupation should not be removed or impacted
- the corrals and other permanent ranch improvements be preserved for incorporation into the horse-related uses planned by the San Dieguito River Park
- any new structures [built for the proposed Farmer’s Market] be designed with compatible scale and appearance to the Sikes house.

A mitigation and monitoring plan would be required as mitigation for potential impacts to significant archaeological resources.

In the fall of 1999, the San Dieguito River Park hired Tierra Environmental Services to prepare a “Cultural Resources Survey for the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority Coast to Crest Trail Mule Hill/San Pasqual Segment, City of San Diego, California.” The Sikes Adobe as site SDi-12650H was again included in this report. The report was mentioned earlier in conjunction with the updating of the original DPR form filed by Frank Lorey in 1992-'93. It is noted that “Although the project alignment passes near the adobe, no cultural material was observed within the proposed trail alignment” (Pigniolo and Baksh 1999: 43).

Prior to its restoration efforts, the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority requested an archaeological survey of the approximately five acre parcel “... to search for additional resources that might be present in association with the adobe” (Pierson 2000: 1). This field survey was conducted in May 2000, and resulted in the conclusion that, “... aside from the standing structures, no other structural resources were visible within the project area” (Pierson 2000: 1). Pierson did note that the corral fencing, lying west of the existing driveway, should be retained and that the area it enclosed should be archaeologically monitored if any grading within that area were proposed (Pierson 2000: 15).

Restoration

The San Dieguito River Park JPA determined to restore the site of the Sikes Adobe beginning with a grant received for that purpose and guided by the “Sikes Adobe Farmhouse and Landscape Historic Structures Report” (hereafter referenced as the “HSR”), which was
completed in July 2002. The restoration of the adobe and wood frame farmhouse went forward in 2003, and was completed with its Grand Opening to the public in January 2004. Additional information regarding the historic preservation team and the course of the restoration efforts, please refer to Chapter 3 of the Master Plan.

Reliance on the Historic Structures Report

The HSR presents a wealth of information regarding the history of the Sikes Adobe and the probable nature of the surrounding associated historic land use. The “period of significance” was identified as 1881, a pivotal year in the fortunes of the Sikes family. Regarding the fields which would have been under cultivation by the Sikes for the raising of their wheat crop, the “Landscape Site History” states that

Because of the nature of dry wheat farming there is no evidence on site that any flumes or ditches used to divert water for irrigation or any other types of water infrastructure was needed or were ever constructed (HSR 2002: 17).

Closer to the farmhouse itself, the HSR team of historians produced a description of “Outbuildings and Structures” in Table #1 (HSR 2002: 24-28). Table # 1 is included here as Appendix ___. Of the structures listed, some have locations within the Interpretive Boundary. These include the well, windmill, (water?) tank and frame, and the creamery outfit and building. There is still some uncertainty regarding the actual historic locations of these structures; but their current placements and interpretations are as near to the historic record, as provided by documentation presented in the HSR, as possible.

The locations of other structures listed in Table # 1 are less certain, but their existence is based on primary sources, vouchers for labor, receipts, letters, bills of sale and the like. These include the derrick and windmill (documentation for which occurs five years after that related to the above windmill), butcher shop, pump, horse track, cow barn, shed, water pipes, fences and pre-1919 driveway bridge. With the exception of the cow barn, which appears to be visible in the 1928 aerial photograph, and the pre-1919 bridge, these other structures have undetermined locations. The barn’s presumed location, based on the rectilinear outline visible in the 1928 aerial photograph, northwest of the farmhouse, will coincide with that of the new barn to be built in Phase 2 of the Master Plan (Chapter Six – Development Plan).

As a designated historic resource, any planned activities resulting in the disturbance of ground surface or subsurface areas within the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead (the 5.742 acre parcel) should follow the directives of the City of San Diego’s “Land Development Code – Historical Resources Guidelines, 1999, as amended 2000 and 2001.” This is in keeping with the 1994 “San Dieguito River Valley Regional Open Space Park Concept Plan’s recommendations for the
treatment of cultural resources within the San Dieguito River Park. Such measures would also fulfill the “Policies” and “Specific Proposals” provided by the “San Pasqual Valley Community Plan,” adopted in 1995 and amended in 1996 and 2005.

Archaeological survey and consultation of previous research would be required during the planning stages and prior to the placement of any permanent structure on the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead resulting from the adoption of the Master Plan. Archaeological monitoring would be required during the construction phase for any permanent structures on the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead, with data recovery following any significant findings. A significant finding would be defined as one which had the potential of furthering our understanding of the placement of, or relationship between, any outbuildings which appeared to date to the established period of significance.

Archaeological Investigations of 2008-2009

Following the Witch Creek Fire in the fall of 2007, the remains of the previously restored farmhouse presented an unusual archaeological opportunity, in that the wood flooring covering the footprint of the house had been burned away, exposing the partially burned joists within the original adobe room. The central and southern sections of the house were gone, as were the porches adjoining the adobe, on its east and west sides. A full surface survey after the fire was not feasible, due to the attention required by the need for immediate stabilization of the adobe walls of the farmhouse. However, an informal survey along the west bank of the creek bottom was conducted by the Sikes Adobe Museum Manager, accompanied by Stephen Van Wormer and Susan Walter of Walter Enterprises, in January 2008.

Limited archaeological testing within the adobe, and within the footprint of the wood frame portions of the house, was conducted in June 2008, to determine the potential for recovery of artifacts after the fire. It should be noted that Walter Enterprises had excavated a portion of the area under the adobe room as part of the 2003 restoration, when the northern third of the flooring in that room was deemed unsalvageable. The excavation recovered artifacts which were recorded, catalogued and subsequently stored at the office of the San Dieguito River Park. The office location also burned in the Witch Creek Fire, and these historic objects from the Sikes Adobe were lost to debris removal, subsequent to the fire.

During the 2008 fall semester, students of the Archaeological Certification Program offered through the Anthropology Department of Palomar College, under the co-direction of Dr. Phil Debarros and Anne P. Cooper, Sikes Adobe Museum Manager, conducted a full excavation of the northern portion of the farmhouse, including the adobe, its porches, and the Sitting Room. Material below the outline of the bedrooms and hallway in the southern portion of the house had very little depth, but this was also screened.
In the fall of 2009, student volunteers returned to the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead to test the grounds immediately surrounding the farmhouse, as post-fire restoration/reconstruction was then underway. Testing revealed a concentration of artifacts on the east side of the house, which would be best described as a “trash dump.” The feature was partially excavated through the establishment of two and one half, one meter square units. Excavation of this feature could not be completed in a single semester. Volunteers continued to excavate sporadically into the spring of 2010, but the units had to be backfilled with the imminent reopening of the farmhouse to the public in June 2010.

The presence of the “trash dump” feature indicates that the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead may yet yield further information regarding the Sikes family, their use and occupation of the land; or historic land uses which followed the identified period of significance. Other features within or outside the interpretive boundary may yet be uncovered.

The items recovered from these investigations have been preliminarily catalogued using Access software. As yet, no formal report of the excavations has been written. Some of the objects found are displayed in the farmhouse. The rest are being temporarily stored at the San Dieguito River Park office.

Recommended Steps Toward Implementation of Preservation Plan

A. Collections Management Plan – The Collections Management Plan will be guided by a Collections Policy which will reflect the overall goal of presenting visitors with an opportunity to experience life on the Sikes Adobe farmstead as it was ca. 1880. To that end collections will be driven by furnishings which will assist with active interpretation of farm life during that period.

1. All transportable items, whether interior or exterior to the farmhouse, will eventually be accessioned using the museum software, PastPerfect. The San Dieguito River Park purchased a single-user package of PastPerfect 4.0 in 2008. To date, 99% of the objects within the farmhouse have been photographed for this purpose, and their descriptions are being completed as time allows. The only items not yet photographed are those which have been acquired within the past few months, via donation.

2. Once the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead is supported by a non-profit organization, such as the “Friends of Sikes Adobe” with its own Board, a Collections Management Policy, similar to that published in Registration Methods for the Small Museum, and also available online at: http://www.aaslh.org/smplpol/Museum_Collections_Policy.pdf will be recommended for adoption. The “Example of a Museum Collection Policy for a Museum with Professional Staff” has been included as Appendix ____.
B. The farmhouse, as restored and reconstructed, will be maintained to standards established for museums accredited by the American Association of Museums. As funding develops, the grounds will also be maintained in their current condition, or improved through the expansion of the kitchen and berry gardens, the installation of the ornamental garden, foot paths around the house and connecting to the Mule Hill Trail. The landscaping will continue to meet the requirement of the specifications for a brush management zone.

C. Archaeological field work during the summer and fall of 2008 and the fall of 2009 indicates that the area immediately around the house is archaeologically sensitive. The fall 2009 excavations revealed a deposit of trash and the probable existence of a leach field or septic system constructed using metal drums and pipes. The trash pulled from this area (a depression east of the farmhouse) includes artifacts which date from the 1950s back to at least 1915, if not earlier. Excavation within this area has not been completed, and the potential for the recovery of older artifacts exists. If this area is to be disturbed by installation of the ornamental garden or other improvements, it is recommended that a data recovery program be developed for this location, due to its high yield of artifacts and for the information which those artifacts are likely to provide for further and more accurate interpretation of the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead.

D. Additional research required to more fully understand history of the house and its occupants so that preservation of elements key to its integrity will not unwittingly be lost.

E. Application for National Register status to be initiated and completed, if it is determined that the fire of 2007 necessitating the reconstruction of much of the house has not compromised it potential eligibility.

1. Currently listed as California Point of Historic Interest

2. Currently listed as a City of San Diego Historic Resource

F. Research and pursue possibility of creation of “Heritage Corridor” between San Pasqual Battlefield State Park and the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead, with historic points enroute to include Mule Hill, the Bernardo town site, the boulder outcroppings used for Escondido signage, and potentially the East San Pasqual Valley Schoolhouse.

Preservation Plan

A. Inside the Interpretive Boundary

That portion of the 5.742 acre parcel which is the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead which lies within the interpretive boundary must be viewed as a window to the period of significance, to the greatest possible extent. Prior to the 2007 fire, the farmhouse was a restored historic structure. After the fire, it became a restored/reconstructed structure. Decisions regarding the addition of electric outlets in some rooms (where they had not been prior to the fire) and the installation of an irrigation system which includes above and below ground poly vinyl chloride pipe connecting
the windmill and water tank to the kitchen and berry gardens, currently represent two of three visible non-period elements within the interpretive boundary. The third representation is the San Dieguito River Park JPA’s compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. This requirement meant that the reconstructed southern portion of the house, which is above grade, had to be accessed by a powered lift. No new construction, unless documented historically through primary sources or historic photographs (such as the adobe outbuilding known as the “Creamery”) will be allowed within the interpretive boundary. Exceptions would be removable items such as picnic tables, or the establishment of irrigated gardens (in compliance with the Brush Management Zone), or interpretive signage for outdoor historic objects or interpretive plantings, such as a wheat farm exhibit.

B. Outside the Interpretive Boundary

Beyond the interpretive boundary, there are two distinct areas:

1. the area where parking currently takes place, known as the “Staging Area,” which lies north of the farmhouse and east of the driveway, and

2. the area northwest of the farmhouse, which was fenced and identified as the “corral” in earlier documentation of the site.

The first area has been described as consisting primarily of fill material, possibly brought onto the site in conjunction with the construction of Hwy. 395, or other surrounding projects. The second area holds higher potential for the presence of significant resources, and it is within this area that construction of a barn is suggested. The phased approach to the Master Plan allows for the construction of the barn in conjunction with other newly introduced features which will respect the historic character of the site, in terms of its agricultural heritage and its potential for education alongside revenue production and sustainability.
Phase One. Existing Conditions.

Site Improvements:

Interpretive Boundary: Within the Interpretive Boundary, the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse has been restored and furnished, although several components proposed for the Interpretive Boundary have not yet been completed. These include the creamery and period ornamental gardens. Interpretive exhibits (interior and exterior) have been installed. A picket fence encloses the interpretive boundary. Raised vegetable gardens are planted and tended by the Volunteer Host (see below). There are two picnic tables near the house. To meet sanitary service needs, there is an ADA portable toilet at the site that is used by trail users as well as visitors to the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse. A shed was installed by a Scout directly north of the Sikes Adobe. In the shed, equipment is stored that is used to maintain the site.

Outside and to the north of the Interpretive Boundary, an old driveway runs north-south through the center of the site. To the east of the driveway is a large, graded, fenced parking area (East Activity Zone). West of the driveway is a disturbed field, known as the West Activity Zone. On Sundays from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. a Farmers Market is located here. The Farmers Market offers locally grown produce, flowers, eggs, honey, prepared foods, breads, and hand-made crafts. Additional portable toilets are provided near the Farmers Market to comply with County Health Code requirements. Just north of the Interpretive Boundary around the farmhouse is a fenced enclosure that contains the Volunteer Host’s trailer. The Volunteer Host lives at the site rent-free in return for groundskeeping, maintenance duties, and security presence approximately 20 hours a week.

A native plant garden is located at the south end of the Interpretive Boundary.

Operations

Interpretive Boundary – The Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse is open 10-1 p.m. on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, and from 10 a.m. – 4 p.m. on Sundays during the Farmers Market for docent-led tours. No fee is charged, but a $3 donation per person is suggested. Special arrangements are made for larger groups and school groups. The school group tours are customized with the school teachers to provide lesson plans that tie into school curricula. Relevant curriculum standards include: Grade 3, Social Studies – Communities, Towns, Growth of Cities; Grade 4, Social Studies – California History (Gold Rush, Mexican-American War); Grade 5, Social Studies – U.S. History (Mechanization of farming, populism, grange movement, technology, Mexican-American War); Grade 8, Social Studies – U.S. History (Mechanization of farming, populism, grange movement, technology, Mexican-American War). Six to 12 events
for the public per year are scheduled at the Farmhouse, for a modest fee that pays for supplies. These include events such as a Valentine’s Day Tea, Spring Social and Ice Cream Social and hands-on activities such as a candle-making workshop and holiday decorating. The Museum Manager and docents host small student groups and home schooled children for programs that demonstrate how pioneer families lived. Opportunities are present under the Existing Conditions to teach students and members of the public how certain activities, such as milking and butter-making were done in the past during the Sikes Family days, and how they are done in modern farms. Pioneer farmstead themed birthday parties and rustic weddings are encouraged to be held at the Farmhouse for a fee.

Activity Zones – A Farmers Market was tested starting in Fall 2010. It was initially located in the parking area (East Activity Zone). In April 2011, a qualified Market Manager was contracted to operate the Farmers Market under a profit-sharing arrangement with the San Dieguito River Park. It is offered every Sunday from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. (3 p.m. in the winter) in the West Activity Zone. Also in the West Activity Zone, a concessionaire, Happy Trails Livestock Company, provided pony rides and trail rides from January 2011 to July 2011. With the rising cost of hay and other costs, it was determined by the concessionaire that the business was not viable, and the pony rides and trail rides were discontinued. Other activities proposed during this phase have included an exhibition farm, farm animals for petting, a produce stand, a community garden, and a group picnic area.

4H activities and Field Days, and similar agriculture-based programs, are encouraged to occur in the Activity Zones under the Existing Conditions.

In the existing condition phase, staffing for the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead is composed of one half-time Sikes Adobe Museum Manager, and the Volunteer Host who performs groundskeeping activities, approximately 20 hours a week, in exchange for free rent. The Farmers Market is hosted by a concessionaire.

Operational Constraints

- Various activities (such as weddings) that have been proposed for the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead would be more attracted to the site when various improvements are made, such as permanent restrooms and potentially a covered pavilion or barn. These are proposed for Phase Two.

- Operations are also constrained by the current limited staffing arrangements. Staffing requirements will be increased in subsequent phases.

- Operation of the Farmers Market is constrained by poor conditions in the West Activity Zone where the Market is held, and in the East Activity Zone where the parking is located. During rain events the parking lot becomes very muddy, with large puddles that discourage visitor use. During the summer months dust and wind cause problems at the
Market site, reducing the number of vendors who choose to participate. The parking lot should be re-graded, and the low places filled with compacted decomposed granite. The Farmers Market concessionaire obtained deliveries of free mulch which was spread out at the Farmers Market site to reduce the dust and mud.

- Signage is currently inadequate, and needs to be improved so that the visitor knows where the interpretive boundary is and where the activity zones are.

- Location of the volunteer host trailer is not ideal. It was located specifically to provide a deterrent to a break-in at the Sikes Adobe Farmhouse, but it is quite noticeable, and therefore detracts from the historic ambience of the Farmhouse. It would be desirable to incorporate living quarters for the volunteer host into the proposed barn in Phase 2 or interpretive center in Phase 3 and eliminate the trailer from the site.

- ADA parking access is needed close to the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse.

- To the north of the site is a self-storage facility and two gas stations. To soften this visual impact, some street trees have been planted along Sunset Drive. In addition, a few large trees have been planted directly south of the Sikes Adobe to provide more shade. Original plans called for planting wheat fields north of the Sikes Adobe, which would evoke the way the site may have looked when the Sikes family lived there and was in the wheat farming business. Current plans call for activities in the Activity Zones which would reduce the area potentially available for growing wheat.

- The elaborate ornamental garden plan that was originally designed exceeds the ability of management staff to install and maintain.

**Summary of Recommendations in Phase One:**

**Grants/Implementation**

- Revise the ornamental garden design to scale it back to a more easily managed scope, while maintaining its period feel and retaining the existing historic palm and pepper trees.

- Seek grant funds to complete restoration of the features inside the Interpretive Boundary (adobe creamery, ornamental garden), and the permanent restroom outside of the Interpretive Boundary, possibly in the barn that is proposed in Phase Two.

- Complete restoration of the adobe creamery and the ornamental gardens in the Interpretive Boundary.

- Seek grant funds to move an old barn, or build a new barn, at the West Activity Zone to hold the Farmers Market, conduct historic period activities for educational purposes, exhibit 4-H animals, and also hold events appropriate to the period such as quilt shows,
square dances and Bluegrass festivals, and revenue generating events such as weddings. If building a new barn, have a community “barn-raising” event.

- Research, fabricate and install new rotating interpretive exhibits to provide additional information and encourage visitors to return.

**Operations**

- Maintain access road (between West and East Activity Zones) for ADA access to the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse. Provide a couple of ADA parking spaces between the Volunteer Host home and the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse. Put sign at entrance that ADA parking is available.

- When the barn with a permanent restroom is constructed on site, the existing portable toilet adjacent to Sikes Adobe should be relocated to the Sunset Drive staging area trailhead or removed entirely. Sikes Adobe visitors and docents will use the restroom at the barn.

- Identify funds to regrade and recompact staging area (East Activity Zone).

- Improve directional and identification signage.

- Extend planting of street trees eastward along the site to soften the buffer at the street edge.

- Plant large, native, shade trees in the West Activity Zone and other areas to provide shade for animals in pens and for picnic tables and other activities, screen the view of the facilities on the other side of Sunset Drive (gas stations and self-storage facility) and assist in blocking sound from the nearby I-15 freeway.

- Plant native, shade trees such as cottonwoods along one or both sides of the access road to enhance the entry to the Farmhouse from the north.

- Create an improved trail leading from the parking area to the Farmhouse, including a small wooden bridge over the swale.

- Create a trail parallel to Sunset Drive leading from the parking area westward toward the two trailheads (Mule Hill Trail and North Shore Lake Hodges Trail) at the cul de sac.

- Convert venting for iron stove in kitchen so that it is operable as a stove/oven and can be used for cooking demonstrations or as otherwise needed.

- Plant wheat in areas of the Activity Zones not otherwise being used.
• Explore feasibility of establishing a Community Garden on part of the West Activity Zone.

• Explore feasibility of introducing beekeeping operation on site for honey production.

• Explore the feasibility of establishing a produce stand at the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead to sell produce that is primarily grown on site, and jams and jellies produced and made on site.

• Expand Gift Shop operations, in particular making use of space opportunity in the Farmers Market

• Expand picnic areas

• Plant fruit tree orchard.

Activities/Programs/Partnerships

• Seek partnerships with 4H groups, FFA groups, Grange groups, etc., to carry out activities that match the mission of the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead and to develop an exhibition farm.

• Seek partnership with Master Gardener group to implement and maintain the planned historic ornamental gardens.

• Continue Certified Farmers Market, emphasizing organic produce, home-made food products and hand-made crafts, as long as it is financially viable and attracts visitors to the Sikes Adobe.

• Seek concessionaire to host Craft Fairs, Harvest Festivals and other annual events for the public that match the goals of the San Dieguito River Park and Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead.

• Seek concessionaire to use Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead as a destination for fee-based tourism/convention events such as barbecues, dinners, wine-tastings, etc., that match the goals of the San Dieguito River Park and Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead.

• Partner actively with new “Living History Circle” or Friends of Sikes Adobe organization

• Expand docent program to keep the farmhouse open as much as possible, including potential use of docents for educational outreach.
Phase Two: Partial Build-Out (Near-Term)

Site Improvements:

In Phase Two, a large, rustic, timber barn with doors oriented north/south will be constructed or moved onto the West Activity Zone as shown on the Site Plan for Phase Two. See illustration below for how the barn may look. The barn would consist of a main section (60 ft. by 32 ft.) plus two lean-to’s – one on each side of the main section. Each lean-to is 60 ft. by 12 ft. The barn would include a loft covering half of the main section and is 30 ft. by 32 ft. in size. The total size of the barn and loft would be 4,320 sq. ft. The design of the barn will be similar to those used by settlers in the west in the mid to late 1800s, but it will be evident that the barn itself is not a historic structure authentic to the period, as the farmhouse is. Historic records (aerial photographs from 1928) reflect that a barn was located generally northwest of the farmhouse at that time, and more than likely existed at the site while the Sikes Family lived there because there would have been a need for such a structure. However, no barn remains, and a replacement structure is required. The barn will enable additional events to be held at the site, such as weddings, square dances, and music festivals, in addition to the weekly Farmers Market and other events such as classroom and 4H Field Day activities. A portion of the barn will be used for interpretive exhibits about agricultural history and for storage of farm and garden equipment. A permanent restroom will be installed for use by Sikes visitors in the barn. The existing portable unit near the farmhouse will be removed. The barn will be rustic and unfinished on the inside, but it will contain plumbing for the restroom and caterer’s kitchen and electricity for lighting. The barn will be built on a concrete pad.
Well-designed signage that is appropriate to the resource will help visitors navigate the site. Relatively permanent, shaded pens will be installed for livestock, including sheep, goats, chickens, etc. Additional picnic tables will be installed to provide an attractive seating area for visitors and on Market Days, for shoppers who buy prepared foods from vendors. Those tables that are not shaded by trees will have lattice covers constructed to provide shade. Additional landscaping, in particular shade trees, to enhance the historic ambience of the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse will be installed. Wheat will be planted on the unused portions of the West Activity Zone. A community garden will be in use by community gardeners on the western portion of the West Activity Zone.

Activities:

Interpretive Boundary – The Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse will continue to be open 10-1 p.m. on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays, and from 10 a.m. – 4 p.m. on Sundays during the Farmers Market for docent-led tours. Special arrangements are made for larger groups and school groups. The school group tours are customized with the school teachers to provide lesson plans that tie into school curricula. Relevant curriculum standards include: Grade 3, Social Studies – Communities, Towns, Growth of Cities; Grade 4, Social Studies – California History (Gold Rush, Mexican-American War); Grade 5, Social Studies – U.S. History (Mechanization of farming, populism, grange movement, technology, Mexican-American War); Grade 8, Social Studies – U.S. History (Mechanization of farming, populism, grange movement, technology, Mexican-American War). More of these school groups can be accommodated than in Phase One, because in Phase Two, the Sikes Adobe Museum Manager is a full-time position, funded through fee-based activities, market concessions and private rental events held at the site. Twelve to 24 events - social, educational and craft-making - are held for the public at the Farmhouse during the year, for a modest fee.

Activity Zones - A Farmers Market continues to be held in the West Activity Zone, using the barn as a protection from wind, dust and rain, although it may spill out from the barn itself on nice days. 4H activities and Field Days are encouraged to occur in the Activity Zones. The Sikes Adobe Museum Manager will work with the San Diego County Agriculture Department Cooperative Extension Agent to develop these programs. Opportunities are present to teach students and members of the public how certain activities, such as milking and butter-making were done in the past during the Sikes Family days, and how they are done in modern farms. 4H students are encouraged to build shaded pens for their animals at a designated area on the farmstead so that their animals may be kept on site. The Volunteer Host provides a security presence for that purpose. A Community Garden attracts local gardeners.

A produce stand sells home-grown produce, including Sikes honey, jams and jellies, on non-Farmers Market Days.
Annual Harvest Fairs, Craft Fairs, and Wine-Tasting events are encouraged. These events will be organized and promoted by a private concessionaire, with a percentage of revenues provided to the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead.

With the permanent restroom and barn in place, the site becomes an attractive venue for historically-themed, rustic weddings, and larger events such as Barbecues, Harvest Fairs, Craft Fairs, Music Festivals, and Square Dances can be regularly scheduled.

Operations

In Phase Two, staffing for the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead is composed of one full-time Sikes Adobe Museum Manager, and the Volunteer Host who performs groundskeeping activities approximately 20 hours a week in exchange for free rent. The Volunteer Host receives compensation for additional 20 hours work each week in Phase Two, in order to assist with the increased activity level.

Operational Constraints

The Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse offers educational programming for Grades 3, 4, 5 and 8 in San Diego County because of its unique history and relevance to California and United States history. However, as a furnished house museum, Sikes Adobe does not have classroom seating space and has limited space available for class activities. Therefore, this type of educational programming is necessarily limited. In addition, the ability of the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse to offer educational programming to adults is limited by the size and constraints of the facility. The Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse is ideal as a representative farmhouse to show how the Sikes Family lived in the late 1800’s. But it is not the ideal venue for elaborating on the story of pioneer farming history, mechanization of farm equipment, the changing face of agriculture, social movements such as the grange movement, the evolution from wheat growing to dairy to fruit, the settlement of San Diego and dependence on local agriculture markets, the history of the Town of Bernardo, lives of children in pioneer farming families, and more. These stories should be fully explored in a separate facility, which could be the barn or a separate Interpretive Center with exhibit space and classroom and meeting facilities that would be built on the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead site, but not within the Interpretive Boundary.

Summary of Recommendations in Phase Two.

- The Sikes Adobe Museum Manager position should be moved from half-time to full-time.

- The Volunteer Host position should be moved from half-time (in exchange for living space) to full-time (partially in exchange for living space and partially as a paid position).

- Seek grant funds for Interpretive Center and infrastructure improvements to support it. In the meantime, use the barn for educational programming and class-room activities.
**Phase Three: Full Build-Out (Long-Term)**

**Site Improvements**

This phase includes the construction of a six-thousand square foot Interpretive Center at the north of East Activity Zone, as shown on Figure xx, to more fully describe pioneer farming history and the role of agriculture in San Diego County, and other educational information described above. See Figure xx. This is a design of the future Interpretive Center as proposed by students at the New School of Architecture. It is proposed that the volunteer host living accommodations will be incorporated into an apartment in one wing of the Center, if the living quarters have not already been moved into the barn. This will free up other space at the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead by removing the existing trailer, and would be an aesthetic improvement over current conditions. Construction of the Interpretive Center will include reconfiguration of the site to incorporate permanent parking spaces for 60 cars and 5 equestrian rigs and buses. As shown on Figure xx, parking would be removed from the East Activity Zone, and instead aligned along the north edge of the property near the street. An inviting covered arbor walkway will lead from the parking area to the Interpretive Center. Another walkway links the Interpretive Center with the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse, partially along the existing access road.

**Activities**

Interpretive Boundary – In full build-out, there will be more demand for tours of the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmhouse. It will therefore be open weekdays and Saturdays 10-1 p.m. and from 10 a.m. – 4 p.m. on Sundays during the Farmers Market for docent-led tours. Special arrangements are made for larger groups and school groups.

Activity Zones – The Interpretive Center will be open to the public 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. Tuesday – Sunday.

If the Farmers Market is still held at the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead, it will be held in the barn in the West Activity Zone. Other activities, including 4H activities and special events such as weddings, Harvest Fairs and Craft Fairs will be expanded in full build-out.

**Operations**

In Phase Three, staffing for the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead is composed of one full-time Sikes Adobe Museum Manager, and the Volunteer Host who performs groundskeeping activities 20 hours a week in exchange for free rent. The Volunteer Host also receives compensation for additional 20 hours work each week. The Interpretive Center has additional staffing of one full-time ranger. This position is supplemented by the Sikes Adobe Museum Manager and volunteers.
Operational Constraints

It can be assumed that staffing for the Interpretive Center will have to be augmented further as it moves into full operational status. There will be increasing demand for programming, lectures, exhibits and events.

Summary of Recommendations in Phase Three

- Conduct subsequent environmental review and analysis pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act to address construction of the proposed Interpretive Center at the site.

- Seek funding for additional staff to operate the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead and the Interpretive Center.
As stated in Chapter Three, in 2010 the Board of Directors of the San Dieguito River Park Joint Powers Authority established the goal that the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead should become self-supporting.

This chapter analyzes the uses proposed for the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead in Phase One and Phase Two of this Master Plan to determine whether and how soon they lead to the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead becoming self-supporting. This chapter does not address Phase Three, which is a long-term plan, and not anticipated for full build-out in the near future.

Table 1 indicates that the Farmstead can become self-supporting by Year 3 (assuming that Year 0 is the year this Master Plan is adopted) if additional investment is made as soon as possible at Sikes to build a large, old-fashioned barn with a restroom. The reason is that the barn would become a venue for revenue-generating events, such as weddings, barbeques, dances, musical concerts, and more. It would also enable the existing Farmers Market to grow and provide a revenue stream. As described in other chapters, the barn has many other useful purposes that will benefit the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead such as supporting agriculture, providing capacity for educational programming, interpretation, and partnering opportunities. For the purposes of this chapter the focus is on its revenue-generating capacity.

Financials and Resource Requirements

Assumptions

Visitor Assumptions

- Year 1: Average 30 visitors per week. Visitors increase by 10% annually.

Revenue Assumptions

- A membership program is not included here. We propose that the Friends of Sikes Adobe or similar group institute a membership program and utilize those revenues for their operations.
- Donations at Door: $3 per person is suggested. At 1,560 visitors the first year, if 60% of the visitors make the donation, the income would be $2,808. However, traditionally, the donations at the door have been used by the Sikes docents for items they have identified as priorities. Therefore, this income has not been included in Table 1.
- Weddings. These will begin in a small way in Year 1, but will not provide substantial income until the barn with its indoor restroom are built, and the Museum Manager is more than half-time. It is envisioned that the site would be rented on a venue only basis. The wedding party would be responsible for all additional costs: catering, wedding planning and coordination, rental of chairs, tables, music, etc. In Year 1, if there are a half-dozen weddings at Sikes, at a rate of $2,000 per 5 hour time block, the income would be $12,000. Table 1 assumes that the barn will be available in Year 2, therefore the rental rate would be increased to $3500 and it is expected that 12 weddings a year would be held, for income of $42,000. As the venue becomes known in subsequent years, weddings will be more frequent.
- Square Dances and Other Country Dances. These will not occur until the barn is built. It is
not known how much of a revenue source these are likely to be. These events would be hosted by a concessionaire and would not require financial advances by the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead. Table 1 assumes 6 events at $500 a year.

- **Barbecues, Wine-Tastings.** These will begin in a small way in Year 1, but will not really get going until the barn and restroom are built and the Museum Manager position is more than half-time. These events would be hosted by a concessionaire and would not require financial advances by the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead. Table 1 assumes that in Year 1 there would be 4 events in the year, at $400 revenue each, and in Year 2 there would be 5 events at $1000 each.

- **Concerts (such as a Bluegrass Festival).** These will not occur until the barn is built. It is not known how much of a revenue source these are likely to be. These events would be hosted by a concessionaire and would not require financial advances by the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead. Table 1 assumes 6 events at $500 a year.

- **Harvest Fairs, Craft Fairs.** These will begin in a small way in Year 1, but will not really get going until the barn and restroom are built and the Museum Manager position is more than half-time. These events would be hosted by a concessionaire and would not require financial advances by the Sikes Adobe Historic Farmstead. Table 1 assumes that in Year 1 there would be 4 events in the year, at $500 revenue each, and in Year 2 there would be 5 events at $1000 each.

- **Farmers Market.** It is assumed that the existing Farmers Market will continue to operate on Sundays from 10 – 4 p.m. The MOU that is in place says that Sikes will receive 25% of gross sales above $13,000 per quarter. It is assumed that the Market will not achieve gross sales above $13,000 per quarter until the barn and restroom are built. Having the barn will reduce the effects of rain, dust, mud and wind, and will enable the Farmers Market to expand.

- **Gift Shop/Bookstore revenue – will increase each year as a percentage of visitorship.** Currently there is no room to display items except in a cabinet in the sitting room of the Farmhouse. The Gift Shop/Bookstore will be expanded once the barn is built.

- **Student Fees – Table 1 assumes that in Year 1 there would be a dozen school groups numbering about 20 students visiting Sikes Adobe at $3 apiece. In Year 2 and above it assumes there would be two dozen school groups numbering about 20 students visiting Sikes Adobe at $3 apiece.**

- **Neighborhood Business Donations – Local businesses (North County Fair and Hodges Golf Improvement Center are located nearby) will provide some small contributions each year, starting in Year 2 when the Museum Manager is working more than half-time.**

- **“Pioneer Farmstead Birthday Parties” will be charged at $150 per party, with 1 party or picnic expected per month, resulting in $1,800 annual revenue.**

- **Produce Stand – It is not known how much income might be available through this source. Table 1 assumes no revenue from this source until Year 3.**

**Staffing Assumptions**

- Table 1 assumes that in Year 0 and Year 1 that staffing level is maintained at the status quo
(1/2 time Museum Manager and unpaid Volunteer Host). In Year 2, the Museum Manager would be ¾ time and the Volunteer Host would be paid for 20 hours work a week. In Year 3, the Museum Manager would be a full-time position and the Volunteer Host would continue to be paid for 20 hours work a week.

(Pro Forma to be attached)