

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

**April 5, 2006, 3:00 pm – 6:45**

4<sup>th</sup> Floor Large Conference Room

and

12<sup>th</sup> Floor Closed Session Room

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

## MEETING RECORD

### Part 1 of 2

3:00 – 5:15

4<sup>th</sup> Floor Large Conference Room

#### 1. ATTENDANCE

Boardmembers: David Marshall (Chair), Marsha Sewell, Otto Emme, Homer Delawie

Staff: Cathy Winterrowd, Kelley Saunders, Michael Tudury

Guests: NTC Building 193 Renovation: Kurt Maier, McMillin; Norman Luker, Architect; Brian Rickling, Heritage Architecture

HRB Site #130-054: Bob Bauer, Architect; Douglas Holbrook, owner

Cunningham Residence: John Eisenhart, Architect

Carnation Building: Jim Tanner, Architect; Byron Wallace, Restoration Windows; Mike Kerry, project manager

NTC Sign Plan: Kathi Riser, McMillin; Ruben Andrews, Graphic Solutions

Other: David Swarens, SOHO; Beverly Schroeder and Brad Richter, CCDC; Debbie Bruins, Rita Collier, General Public/El Cortez; Charles Adair, Attorney

#### 2. Public Comment

None

#### 3. NTC Building 193 Renovation:

Background: Kurt Maier, McMillin and Norman Luker, Architect presented proposed modifications to this building, a contributing historic structure within the NTC Historic District. The proposed building use is to be restaurants/retail on the front side of the

structure facing Dewey, and an Ace Hardware on the rear of the building facing the parking lot. The original historic use was a theatre and other facilities for enlisted men. On the front of the structure facing Dewey, an added disabled ramp (to the left side of the main entry stair) would lead to proposed raised 10 foot deep x four foot height decks with handrails that would occur between the main central entry stair and the existing flanking unchanged historic entries. At these decks, it was proposed to change two pairs of windows on each side to double doors to access shops/restaurants. In addition, located on the sides of the structure near Dewey, there would be new 15 foot deep decks extending out from the ends and in alignment with the front elevation. These decks are anticipated to be outdoor dining for restaurants.

Also on the sides, on the right (facing the structure from Dewey), there is a screened loading dock that serves Ace Hardware and, on the left side, an open sales area for Ace Hardware that has an 8 foot height wrought iron fence.

It was noted that although the Dewey Street façade was clearly the front of the structure with its primary historic fabric intact, that the building actually had a second entry façade facing the rear and the parking lot. This parking lot is large and intended to provide for parking for not only Building 193 but also several buildings in the vicinity. It also provides parking for the proposed Ace Hardware that would face the parking lot.

#### Boardmember Comments:

Chair David Marshall recused himself from discussion of this item, indicating that his firm, Heritage Architecture, was a design consultant to this project. He stated that he was not personally involved in the project, but that, he felt he should recuse.

Marsha Sewell and the other Boardmembers noted that the proposal for the four pairs of windows on Dewey to be converted to double doors was not consistent with the Secretary of Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The Boardmembers felt that, since each of the windows was approximately 42" inches width, an appropriate solution would be to have two single doors where each of these paired windows are located.

Ms. Sewell and the Boardmembers also agreed that low stucco arches should be added in the recessed entry to the Ace Hardware, and at the side entries in the fenced/gated recess at the Garden Center. They also felt that the trellis in this area should be of a minimal design.

#### Public Comment:

David Swarens agreed with the Boardmembers. Mr. Swarens was concerned about the associated signage and was told that the signage would be consistent with the approved NTC Sign Plan. David also suggested, and the Boardmembers agreed, that the metal trellis and non-historic replacement metal windows in the Ace Hardware garden court have an applied paint finish in a historic color, not utilizing a finish similar to medium

bronze anodized aluminum. The architect, Norman Luker, said that he would specify a painted “Kynar” finish with a color to match the original color to the extent possible.

4. HRB Site #130-054: 838 25<sup>th</sup> Street

Background: This site is a contributor to the Golden Hill Historical District and is a code compliance case/Mills Act site. This site has been before the DAS three times in 2004 (Oct, Nov and Dec). The use for the site has changed from mixed-use to single family and the project has been changed to reflect the new use. Mr. Bauer noted that in April of 2005, there was an arson fire that destroyed the non-historic shed and damaged the historic carriage house. He stated that the owner, Mr. Holbrook, intended to reuse the portion of the carriage house that was not damaged. He also noted that the North and West elevations were unchanged from the drawings previously approved by the DAS. On the East side (25<sup>th</sup> Street), there is a new external stair that is set back from the street. Mr. Bauer stated that the new proposed project addresses all code enforcement issues.

Boardmember Comments:

Boardmember Otto Emme stated that the lot is zoned for commercial and mixed-use, and that for a single family residence, there is too much parking. In particular, he noted the 30 foot wide curb cut that is out of character with other residential curb cuts in the area. Boardmembers concurred and, for the open parking space to the right of the garage, Mr. Marshall suggested mitigating the paved area by using landscaping or turf-block.

Marsha Sewell indicated that the new addition appeared too bulky and reiterated the above comments regarding the overly-wide curb cut.

David Marshall stated that the enclosed stair makes the addition appear larger, and that, if needed, an open stair may be more appropriate. He felt that the addition to such a large house seems unnecessary for residential use, as opposed to the previously-planned office use. Mr. Marshall stated that the Historic Building Code should obviate the need for a required second exit stair and that this should be explored. He also stated that historically, carriage houses were detached structures.

All Boardmembers including Mr. Emme and Mr. Delawie indicated that the project should return to the DAS for further review, with emphasis on how the project meets the Golden Hill Design Guidelines, and that these guidelines should be made available at the DAS meeting. Finally, the Boardmembers stated that Lewis Dennis, the Code Enforcement Officer involved with this project, should be at the DAS meeting to address how this project meets the code enforcement issues.

Public Comment:

David Swarens of SOHO stated that the residence is perhaps the earliest Irving Gill structure in the city and that this, together with its location at the “Gateway to Golden Hill” makes this a very important structure. He concurred with the criticism of the

excessively large driveway and curb cut, and stated that he felt that the new addition was too large and needed to be scaled back.

5. Cunningham Residence: 1860 Law Street, Pacific Beach.

Background: Architect John Eisenhart presented his proposal to add to the side/rear of this potentially historic 1895 two-story residence, and to relocate and rotate 180 degrees an existing garage structure (off the alley).

Boardmember Comments:

Chair David Marshall noted that the structure may not be eligible for designation due to the many changes that have occurred over the years. Regarding the proposed addition, Mr. Marshall felt that the addition needed to be a “quieter” and less visually dominant addition, with simpler details such as non-turned balusters and without wood shingles. In particular, the addition of the ornate balcony and porch railings and a “Palladian” window at the attic of the original structure is not consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation. Ms. Sewell concurred with using a simpler window of a size and shape that was originally utilized. Mr. Marshall also indicated that the architect might consider a simpler, more modern addition so that it would be recognized as clearly new.

Mr. Marshall also stated that he had no objection to the retention and rotation of the carriage house in its original location.

Boardmember Emme stated that he was very familiar with the structure and may even have a copy of real estate listings for the property. He stated that the property has undergone many alterations in the past and that in its current condition and appearance it would not be a good candidate for historic designation. He felt that any historic integrity that it may have had has been removed.

In order to have the structure considered for historic designation, it would be critical to obtain historic photographs to determine what degree of the original historic fabric exists and to assure that any changes to the original 1895 structure would help return the structure to its historic character.

Public Comment:

David Swarens concurred with the above.

6. Glass Residence: 2228 29<sup>th</sup> Street, South Park.

Background: Architect Ione Steigler wished the DAS to comment on the structure’s potential historicity and to advise regarding an early garage addition and the manner in which the structure should be expanded.

Mrs. Steigler called HRB staff to state that she was able to obtain historic photographs, and wished to postpone this item. DAS Boardmembers concurred.

7. Ed Fletcher Real Estate Office: 1018 9<sup>th</sup> Ave, HRB Site #655.

Background: This site was designated under Criterion B only, for Mr. Fletcher. The owner wished to discuss options regarding incorporating the façade of the structure in the proposed project. The architect of the proposed project was to be in attendance.

Marie Lia contacted HRB staff on behalf of the owner and requested a continuance. DAS Boardmembers concurred.

8. Carnation Building:

Background: HRB staff distributed an email from CCDC's historical consultant David Marshall regarding the windows.

Sound-rated windows are being requested at this historically-designated structure. Architect Jim Tanner discussed the issue with the DAS. Mike Kerry, the project manager stated that the existing windows were approximately 50% original, with various other windows added over time. He stated that some of the windows were only nine years old. He also stated that all of the windows had no acoustic value and were leaking. He said that he was concerned about liability, having tenants attempt to operate the original windows.

Byron Wallace of Restoration Windows (Chicago), the independent expert hired to evaluate the windows, stated that it was his original intent to provide a bid to rehabilitate the original windows but, after a detailed site evaluation, he stated that because the windows were deteriorated and "out of plane", that the only way to rehabilitate the original windows would be to remove them, flatten and straighten them back to "true" and reinstall them. In essence, the windows would need to be completely rebuilt. He reiterated the fact that only 50% of the windows are original, and that there were four other types of new windows. He concluded by saying that the condition of the windows were not suitable for restoration.

Jim Tanner stated that steel replacement windows of a similar design but double-glazed and well-fitting are available and that he would like to use these new windows. These windows would have a similar look and profile of the original windows, but would require a slightly larger fixed frame. He stated that the use of replacement windows would allow the new windows to match the original function (inward-tilting hopper) and would unite the windows to be of a single type, in lieu of the multiple window types that exist now due to the changes over time.

Boardmember Comments:

Mr. Marshall recused himself on this item.

Marsha Sewell stated that the historic designation of the Carnation Building was extremely lenient with respect to the anticipated development and that the only requirement was to retain the original windows and doors. She felt strongly that the existing windows should be retained.

Mr. Delawie reserved comment.

Mr. Emme stated that the historic structure was an industrial building, with appropriate windows, and that he was not convinced that the windows needed to be replaced.

The option of adding interior “storm windows” (an additional new layer of glazing at the interior) was briefly explored but, due to the inward-opening function of the existing windows was dismissed as not viable.

Public Comment:

David Swarens stated that SOHO reviewed this issue and officially concurred with the DAS regarding retaining the existing windows. He also stated that the applicant should do exploratory work to determine the original color of the windows and that the windows should be returned to this color.

**9. NTC Sign Plan:**

Background: Kathi Riser of McMillin and Ruben Andrews of Graphic Solutions presented the final unresolved issues of the NTC Sign Plan for discussion and consensus confirmation.

Regarding Monument Signage design, Mr. Andrews stated that since the two final monument designs (Stucco, and metal plate with open metal arch above) were found to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, that the applicant’s final choice was to use the metal plate with open metal arch above. This solution was the solution preferred by the majority of the DAS at the last DAS meeting.

Regarding the location of the monument signs, all locations were previously agreed to with the exception of the proposed monument sign at the golf course at the corner of Lytton and Rosecrans.

Mr. Andrews also presented freestanding pole-mounted “VONS” and “Brookstone” (15 foot tall +/-) signage. The metal poles are located adjacent to structure’s entrances, approximately five feet from the face of the building, but on the building side of the roadway. The signage itself is supported by light horizontal members spanning between the poles that “frame” the signage.

Boardmember Comments:

David Marshall recused himself from this item and was not in the room during the discussion.

Regarding the design of the monument signs, Marsha Sewell (and Laura Burnett at the previous DAS meeting) were pleased that the metal sign with metal arch above was selected by the applicant. HRB staff concurred. Boardmember Delawie felt that better design could be accomplished. Boardmember Emme restated that the stucco sign was acceptable to him. Since all Boardmembers agreed at the last DAS meeting that either sign design, stucco or metal, would be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, this issue is closed.

Regarding the location of a monument sign at the golf course at the corner of Lytton and Rosecrans, the DAS was split 2-2 regarding supporting a monument sign at this location. Specifically, Ms. Sewell restated that she felt a sign at this location was not appropriate. Boardmember Laura Burnett stated at the last DAS meeting that the golf course landscaping alone was more appropriate to identify the NTC. Mr. Emme indicated that he was OK with a monument sign at this location. Mr. Delawie was OK with a monument sign at this location, but felt that this "identity" sign should be of a higher quality of design. He suggested that a design competition be held to determine the final design for this location.

All Boardmembers agreed that the metal pole support design for the "VONS" and "Brookstone" signs was a good solution and consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Public Comment:

None

## CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

### DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

**April 5, 2006, 3:00 pm – 6:45**

4<sup>th</sup> Floor Large Conference Room

and

12<sup>th</sup> Floor Closed Session Room

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

## MEETING RECORD

### Part 2 of 2

5:15-6:45

12<sup>th</sup> Floor Closed Session Room

#### **ATTENDANCE**

Boardmembers: David Marshall, Marsha Sewell, Otto Emme, Homer Delawie

Staff: Cathy Winterrowd, Kelley Saunders, Michael Tudury

Guests: El Cortez Proposed Project: Peter Janopaul, owner; Tuwana Moss and

April Moriset, J. Peter Block Co.; Rob Walker, KMA Architects

General Public: Elizabeth Alonso, Ramon Alonzo, Marcela Beck, Greg

Bolton, Jan Borkum, Brian Borkum, Debbie Bruins, Barry Bruins, Cathy

Casey, D. M. Coates, Pat Cook, Rita Collier, Tina Dameron, Vince

Dwyer, Stefan Grafstern, Holly Higgins, Jay Jones, Charles Kaminski,

Gino Kane, Dan Kenney, Larry Kenny, Lucy Kim, Kim Marks, Monica

Lamb, Carol Marino, Dan McCullar, Allan McGann, Edward Mock, Ben

Norton, Stephen Powell, Donna Rahe, Jane Robinson, Dale Robinson,

Thomas R. Smith, Parimah Spurlock, R. Wood, Ben Xavier

Other: Beverly Schroeder and Brad Richter, CCDC

**10. El Cortez Hotel: 777 Beech Street**

Background: HRB Staff stated that the period of significance for the El Cortez is 1927, the year it was completed, and that the now-demolished Caribbean Wing of the El Cortez was constructed in 1954. The Caribbean Wing at the northern end of the lot was not part of the designation. Staff noted that the original local historical designation report discussed the El Cortez tower, but did not reference the structures to the rear that were



constructed after 1927. Staff also noted that when the El Cortez was locally designated, it was on a single legal parcel which included the entire block. Staff confirmed that the El Cortez is also designated at the National Register level.

At the beginning of the DAS meeting, HRB staff distributed to Boardmembers an email from Kay DiFrancesca and a letter from Kimi Sugeno, both dated March 31, 2006. They stated that they would not be able to attend the meeting and that they were in opposition to the proposed project.

Peter Janopaul briefly discussed the major 1997 rehabilitation of the El Cortez tower. He then discussed the proposed project for the separate lot, and the proposed new structure's relationship to the historically-designated El Cortez Hotel. (The lot upon which the multi-unit project is proposed was established at the same time as the creation of the individual condominium parcels within the El Cortez tower.)

Mr. Janopaul stated that the proposed new 7-8 story 20,000 sq. ft. multi-family structure does not touch the historically-designated El Cortez tower. The separation between the proposed new structure and the El Cortez tower is approximately 49 feet at its closest point. The height of the proposed new structure would be slightly below the height of the lowest tier of the El Cortez tower. The proposed new development would include two and one-half levels of parking for approximately 135 cars.

Mr. Janopaul stated that the average unit size for the proposed new project is approximately 850 sq. ft., and the units are anticipated to sell for \$300-350,000 which, in today's market, is "affordable".

In response to a question from Boardmember Sewell, Mr. Janopaul stated that the proposed new project is in approximately the same location as the now-demolished Caribbean Wing and is similar in height and massing but the proposed new structure has a larger footprint than the demolished structure.

Finally, Mr. Janopaul noted that the Save Our Heritage Organization (SOHO) Preservation Action subcommittee voted 6-2 to approve the new building with some modifications. The subcommittee recommended that the proposed new project go to the full board of SOHO for their recommendation. Mr. Janopaul is a Boardmember of SOHO.

Boardmember Comments:

Chair David Marshall disclosed that his architecture firm once had a contract with Mr. Janopaul on an unrelated single-family residential project and they were also both Boardmembers of SOHO at the same time. Mr. Marshall has not had any communication with Mr. Janopaul for about two years. He also stated that although his firm was the historic architect consultant for the Centre City Development Corporation (CCDC), they had not been asked by CCDC to comment on the El Cortez proposal. Nor had Mr. Marshall had any prior communication with Mr. Janopaul or his employees regarding the

project. Since there were no conflicts of interest, Mr. Marshall chose not to recuse himself.

Boardmember Marsha Sewell disclosed that she currently lives within 500 feet of the El Cortez, but did not feel that it was necessary to recuse herself.

Mr. Marshall discussed the relevance of the Secretary of Interior's Standards to the proposed "addition" project. He specifically read Standard 9 of the Rehabilitation Standards for the record. He noted that, of the 10 Rehabilitation Standards, not all would apply.

Chair David Marshall then requested comment from the public prior to Board discussion.

Public Comment:

As Vice President of the El Cortez Home Owners Association (HOA) Barry Bruins provided an organized presentation that addressed several concerns:

- He stated that there were seismic concerns, in particular associated with the excavation and shoring required for the underground garage. He was concerned that the excavation might impact the original foundations of the El Cortez tower.
- He pointed out that any change in the area of the proposed new structure would require the rerouting of infrastructure for the El Cortez including piping and conduit.
- He noted that the HOA is currently in litigation with Mr. Janopaul regarding construction defects.
- He discussed the spatial relationships and visibility issues that the proposed new project creates for the El Cortez tower. He noted that the new structure would impact views of the tower from aircraft landing at Lindbergh, from the pedestrians on Cabrillo Bridge in Balboa Park, and from vehicles.
- He stated that the Mills Act tax reduction, which is scheduled to be terminated within 10 years, needs to be retained for the condominium owners. He noted that the HOA expenses are more than originally anticipated.
- He stated that Mr. Janopaul has already recognized a good return on his investment, and that, in his opinion, there is no need for another building.
- Finally, he stated that many of the condominium residents believed that Mr. Janopaul had agreed that he would not build anything on the block until 2025.

Mr. Janopaul responded to this final comment, stating that the original CCDC agreement document had been amended three times, one of which allowed the conversion to condominiums and the development of the northern lot.

Tina Dameron read a two-page letter from her husband Robert Dameron, Civil Engineer, in which he stated that, in his professional opinion, additional seismic studies were needed, and that any new construction of this nature would add seismic risk to the El Cortez tower.

Rita Collier read the wording of the National Register designation (2002) that Peter Janopaul had applied for. She also read an excerpt from the San Diego Journal of History, Winter 2000, Volume 46, Number 1, regarding the significance of the El Cortez.

Charles Kaminski stated that he didn't live on Cortez Hill, but was at the meeting to better understand "what is historic" relative to the entire block, and how this determination might apply to the Salk Institute site.

Greg Bolton stated that he did not feel that the Secretary of the Interior's Standard #9 for Rehabilitation was being adhered to.

Donna Rahe indicated that she was a resident of the El Cortez and stated that a "CCDC engineer" had told her that nothing more could be built on the block.

Dan McCullar indicated that he is a swimmer and was told that the existing swimming pool was historic. The current proposal does not include a swimming pool.

Peter Janopaul responded to the previous comment, stating that the swimming pool was constructed in 1956, well outside of the 1927 period of significance, and that the pool was not a part of the historic designation. He stated that it may be possible that in the context of the proposed new project a new pool could be constructed, but that the HOA had not responded to Mr. Janopaul's suggestion.

Boardmember Comments:

Boardmember Otto Emme felt that there were problems with the proposed design, stating that it reminded him of a "Canadian" design solution, referring to the articulation of the structure. He felt that the bulk and height of the proposed new design were OK. Mr. Emme stated that the architecture of the proposed new structure does not complement the historic El Cortez tower. He also stated that more information was needed regarding the view impact of the new structure on the historic resource from all four sides. David Marshall agreed that it was important to learn of the view impact of the new structure on all four sides, and that this issue may require a smaller structure. Mr. Emme stated that the scale and proportion of the new structure did not seem right.

Mr. Emme requested that CCDC provide the Board with information regarding the number of "skyscrapers" that are currently being proposed in Centre City.

Boardmember Marsha Sewell thanked all of the public (36 members) for their participation in the process. Ms. Sewell indicated that the issue is the spatial relationship between the proposed new and the historic resource. Specifically, she stated that with regard to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation that apply, she felt that at this time, she does not believe that the proposed new project meets Standards #1, #2 and #9 with regard to spatial relationships.

Standard #1 states “A property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.”

Standard #2 states “The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.”

Standard #9 states “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic material, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.”

Ms. Sewell stated that with respect to the only other Standard that applied, #10, that the proposed project meets that standard.

Standard #10 states “New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Boardmember Homer Delawie stated that at this time, there were too many unknowns to comment.

Chair David Marshall asked the applicant what was on the site of the proposed project during the period of significance in 1927. Mr. Janopaul stated that there were a series of 2-3-4 story Victorian mansions/townhomes.

Mr. Marsall commented on the proposed new structure, stating that he was appreciative of the fact that the design of the parcel was not being “maxed out”. He further stated that the proposed new structure needed a compatible architectural vocabulary that says that the new building is appropriate on that block and that the proposed design does not currently reflect that. Mr. Marshall felt that the proposed 7-8 story building does not appear to significantly impact the view of the historic resource because it is located away from the two primary elevations. He felt that, since the footprint of the new building fell outside of the 1927 development area, no “historic resource or fabric” needed to be removed, which was a positive thing.

He indicated that, although the proposed massing and concept were OK, a smaller structure would be preferred. Mr. Marshall stated that he agreed with Boardmembers Sewell and Emme that, from an architectural design standpoint, the currently-proposed project does not meet the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Mr. Marshall also mentioned that it would be appropriate to attempt to retain or rebuild some of the site elements that are proposed to be changed or removed, including the swimming pool.

- 11.** Next Subcommittee Meeting is May 3, 2006 at 3:00 pm
- 12.** Adjourned at 6:45 pm