

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

June 6, 2007, 3:00 pm – 6:30
4th Floor Conference Room
City Administration Building
202 C Street, San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE

Boardmembers:

David Marshall (Chair), Laura Burnett (arr. 3:45), Delores McNeely, Otto Emme (arr. 3:15) and John Eisenhart
Note: Mr. Marshall recused himself from the Old Globe and Imperial Marketplace items and left at 4:45

Staff:

Nina Fain, City Attorney's Office; Kelley Saunders, Michael Tudury and Cathy Winterrowd, HRB

Guests:

Office Bungalow Court: Marie Lia, attorney; Mike McPhee and Bruce Leidenberger, La Jolla Pacific Development; Lyda Cohen, 4th & Thorn LLC; Faramarz Jabbari, ARK architects

St. Cecelia's Chapel: John Silber, architect; Gary Squier, owner

2535 San Marcos Avenue: Patricia Garland, owner; Kelley Saunders, HRB presenter

Old Globe Theatre, Balboa Park: Lou Spisto, Old Globe; John Petterson, LMN architect; Ted Giesing, Old Globe project manager

Imperial Avenue Marketplace: Alex Zirpolo, Elkins-Zirpolo; Marie Lia, attorney; Cindy Blair, Fehlman LaBarre architects

Other: Louise Torio, Sherman Heights resident and interested party to the Imperial Avenue Marketplace project

2. Public/Staff Comment

- NTC Sellers Plaza: Staff referred the DAS to the following information in the agenda and there were no comments or questions: *Staff met with McMillin project manager Kurt Maier and architect Brian Rickling regarding proposed storefront mullion modifications at buildings 01, 08, 11, 23, 24, 32 and 194. These storefront mullion patterns, at existing openings where non-historic fabric had been removed, were approved by staff as consistent with the character of the original historic fabric and with the Standards. The proposed fountain or fountains at building 1 are still to be addressed/resolved.*

3. Projects

- Dr. Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court at 3235, 45, 51 and 55 Fourth Avenue: This complex was originally scheduled to be considered for designation at the April 26, 2007 HRB meeting and continued to allow the applicant to discuss the related proposed

project with the DAS. HRB staff Mike Tudury introduced the project and summarized the direction given by the DAS at the May 2007 DAS meeting.

Marie Lia and architect Famarz Jabbari discussed the changes made since the last DAS meeting which retain and incorporate the front two street-facing structures in their historic location as part of the proposed project for this site and the adjacent sites to the north and east. Mr Jabbari discussed the redesign of the new structures to accommodate this direction, stating that considerable care was given to step down the structure at the corner that is adjacent to the subject structures in order to present an appropriately-scaled series of facades along 4th Avenue. He also pointed out that the new structures behind the bungalow court structure are set back approximately 15 feet.

Board Comment:

Chair David Marshall stated that he was pleased that the two structures facing 4th Ave. were to be retained in their entirety and in their historic location. He suggested that these structures might be utilized as a clubhouse or community facility for the residents.

Otto Emme reiterated that keeping the structures in their historic location was good.

Mr. Marshall asked about the material of the new structures and the architect stated that the base of the 4th Ave structure was going to be a stone veneer, with stucco above.

John Eisenhart said that the new design “works for me.” He said that the new design respects the most important part of the courtyard. He felt that the massing and relationships of the new project were good. He emphasized that it was important to move the structures whole, not in pieces. Mr. Jabbari stated that that was their intent and that they have identified several locations nearby that might function as the holding site(s). Delores McNeely indicated that the current proposed project was much better and that she liked the stair-stepping up at the new corner building. She reiterated that it was important to move the structures whole.

Chair David Marshall encouraged removal of the non-historic entry trellis and gates in lieu of new gates that are yet to be designed. He indicated that he agreed with the other Boardmembers, and that the consensus was that the proposed project met the Rehabilitation Standards. He indicated that the recommendation of consistency was predicated on the restoration of the exterior of the two buildings per the Standards.

Original windows and doors need to be retained and restored. He suggested that forensic scrapings determine the original building and trim colors, and that these colors be used in the restoration. Mr. Jabbari stated that they have historic photos and they intend to faithfully restore historic elements that have been removed. Mr. Jabbari asked about the courtyard walking surfaces and Mr. Marshall stated that, if possible, the existing brick pavers be salvaged and reused in their historic location, toward the rear of the courtyard. Since the front of the courtyard is concrete, it is appropriate to reconstruct the concrete walkway there, as it was historically.

Mr. Eisenhart suggested that a square scoring pattern in the concrete, consistent with historic scoring patterns, be used in this location.

Mr. Marshall also stated that, although the restoration of the interiors of these structures was not required, that he expected that the new use(s) would incorporate historical interior elements in order to evidence the historicity of the structures at the interior.

HRB staff Mike Tudury indicated that it was important that the colors of the corner building be complementary and secondary to (background to) the structures to be

retained. He confirmed that both this property and the adjacent Craftsman structure are to be on the June HRB agenda.

Other Comment: None.

- Bradley-Woolman, St Cecilia's Chapel, Historic Site #308, 1620 Sixth Avenue:
Mr. Emme and Ms. Burnett arrived during this item.
HRB staff Mike Tudury introduced the project, summarizing the directions given by the DAS at the May 2007 meeting.
On behalf of the developer, Marie Lia stated the history of the chapel. She indicated that it was designed by architect Theo Kisner and built in 1928 for Claude Woolman, the mortician that had the (now-demolished) Bradley Woolman Funeral Home that was adjacent to the chapel. The funeral home was closed in 1944. Historical photographs of the exterior of the chapel were provided to the DAS for their review.
John Silver, the architect, discussed the redesign of the project to incorporate more of the historic reinforced concrete chapel, including the nave, in the proposed project for this site and the adjacent site to the south. This is in lieu of the proposal at the May 2007 DAS meeting that retained only the front 10-15 foot portion of the chapel. The architect stated that the underground parking was redesigned and no longer extends under the chapel. He indicated that the front of the chapel structure would have the CCDC-required ground floor street-facing retail and that there were three loft rental units in the remainder of the nave beyond. The proposed project is 66 affordable apartment units, and has 6,000 sq. ft. of neighborhood-serving retail space. The housing element of the project is 90% affordable and 10% market rate.
He stated that the adjunct "annex" structure (a hollow clay tile attached structure currently utilized for storage) that is located at the rear of the chapel on the south side was proposed to be removed due to the poor structural capabilities of hollow clay tile, and to accommodate light and access to the loft units. The Sanborn Maps are not clear as to when the adjunct structure was built.

Board Comment:

Chair David Marshall indicated that the redesigned project was a vast improvement over that presented at the May 2007 DAS meeting. He stated that he had no objection to the removal of the non-significant adjunct structure and its garden wall. He noted that the adjunct structure was clearly a secondary element and that the wall had been previously modified. Mr. Marshall's concern was the loss of the ability to view and appreciate the entire nave in the proposed project. He strongly suggested retention of the entire historic resource for a single adaptive reuse since it historically functioned as an open assembly space with ornate high ceilings. He felt that the proposed project didn't meet the Rehabilitation Standards due to the manner in which this space is being altered. He noted that, to the extent appropriate, the existing south wall of the chapel should also be retained and the proposed "porch" be eliminated. Also, the previously removed mission roof tile should be reinstalled.

Delores McNeely agreed, stating that it was OK to lose the adjunct structure. She also felt it was important to retain the ability to see the nave in its entirety.

John Eisenhart stated that he felt the chapel should be retained as a single space. He agreed that the adjunct building was not significant and could be removed.

Otto Emme stated that utilizing the nave as a single volume would be consistent with Standard #1 that states that the space should be used as it was historically (a single volume). He stated that both Standards #2 and #9 would also possibly be at issue.

Laura Burnett agreed with the other DAS members.

HRB staff interjected that it might be possible to place an 8 foot high wall with glass above at the rear of the currently-proposed limits of the chapel retail that would allow visibility of the volume of the nave from the retail, similar to the existing SOLO retail space, with a landscape architecture office beyond, that is located in Solana Beach. He stated that the preferred option, however, is to retain the nave as a single space.

After to the meeting, Chair David Marshall had staff forward a National Park Service bulletin to the applicants called "[Significant Spaces: Preserving Historic Church Interiors.](#)"

Other Comment: None.

- El Pueblo Ribera: Architect Kim Grant was scheduled to propose a roof deck at one of the historically-designated residences at this historic district. However, Ms. Grant was not at the meeting and this item was not heard.

2535 San Marcos Avenue: The owner, Patricia Garland, is proposing a two-story addition to the rear of this historically-designated house. HRB staff Kelley Saunders presented the proposal to the DAS and asked that they comment on it. The owner indicated that there is currently a 1980 second-story addition at the rear of the structure and that she would like to reconfigure that volume and to add a bath and bedroom with a deck in front of the existing volume. The entire pueblo-style house has been previously restuccoed with a sand finish texture. Also, the aluminum windows that existed when the owner purchased the house have been changed out to historically-appropriate wood windows.

Board Comment:

Otto Emme indicated that it was important that the new addition be clearly differentiated from the historically-designated front portion of the structure, stating that the new addition must also be compatible with the resource. The group agreed that the parapet "ears" of the addition should be removed to simplify the façade.

John Eisenhart was concerned with the balcony mass and stated that it should be reduced in depth from approximately 12 feet to six feet. He also suggested that the balcony railing be more open. He stated that it would be best for the new room elements to not be symmetrical. He suggested keeping the simplicity of the original second story addition. He stated that the windows at the second story should be different than those at the front of the building, perhaps using single lite windows, with no mullions to break them up. Delores McNeely indicated that the new addition should not exceed the height of the existing second story. She stated that she needed more information and detailed plans before she could fully comment on the design.

David Marshall agreed with Ms. McNeely that more information, including plans and elevations, were needed to fully evaluate the project. He felt that the upper floor additions were turning a simple house into a complex grouping of volumes. He reiterated Mr. Emme's comment regarding the need to differentiate the historic from the new. He suggested that the balustrade might be wrought iron.

Mr. Eisenhart indicated that he felt that a wood railing and horizontal balustrade might be more appropriate than wrought iron. Mr. Marshall agreed that this option could be considered. Mr. Eisenhart also reinforced that the overall height of the addition should not be increased.

Other Comment: None.

Old Globe Theatre, Balboa Park:

Chair David Marshall recused himself on this item and the next item, and turned over the chair to Boardmember Otto Emme. Mr. Marshall left the meeting at this time.

The Old Globe Theatre complex is located in the Balboa Park National Register Historic Landmark District. The original 1935 Thomas Wood Stevens-designed structure burned down in 1978 and the existing multi-building complex was reconstructed in 1982. The current Old Globe Theatre is a larger interpretive structure than the 1935 Stevens - designed one lost in the fire, and is not proposed for any change.

The director of the Old Globe Theatre, Louis Spisto, stated that the Old Globe complex was the sixth largest in the U. S.

He stated that there were three actions proposed for the project: the replacement of the second stage theatre (the Cassius Carter theatre); the provision of a new venue for educational programs; and improvement of the plaza.

He stated that the design program given to the architects was to: Utilize the existing structure; Design a structure and a plaza that was consistent with the Standards; Enhance safety for the public and the employees; Better utilize the interior spaces, providing for shared uses; and Relocate the scene shop off-site to a location in Kearny Mesa, which would move 20 employees and their automobile parking out of the park.

He then introduced the architect, John Petterson who presented the project.

Mr. Petterson stated that their goals included: Consistency with the Standards; Consistency with the 1992 Central Mesa Precise Plan; Increasing compatibility with the Park; Following the established Design Guidelines; and Differentiating the historic from the new in a compatible manner.

Mr. Petterson then provided a Powerpoint presentation that showed the following:

- The footprint of the proposed new structure is generally the same as the existing.
- In the plaza, the existing raised planter is a visual and physical impediment and is to be eliminated, as is the existing clock tower. The plaza has been entirely redesigned, with all new hardscape.
- The new multiple gable roof structure is reminiscent of the historical forms and materials and utilizes a faux half-timber design at the façade. The new structure is further differentiated as new by the use of glass and balconies at the front façade.
- The lowest point of the eaves of the existing structure to remain was utilized as a datum line for the roof of the new structure.

- The scale of the new structure is smaller than the existing.
- The front of the structure will accommodate food service windows for patrons that will eat alfresco in the plaza.
- The seating and lighting elements will be per Park Standards. Seating for 150-200 persons will be provided in the plaza.
- The pergola is a wood structure that is to be approximately 50% open.

Board Comment:

John Eisenhart stated that the new proposed design was good architecturally. He felt that it was a good modern interpretation of the Elizabethan style. He questioned the trellis design, indicating that the manner in which the three roof planes intersected seemed awkward. He said that this may be a product of the scale of the model, and felt that this detail would be resolved by the architect.

Delores McNeely stated that she had no issues with the proposal.

Laura Burnett indicated that it was good to see a park user that is proposing to move staff off-site if they did not need to be in the park. She suggested to the architect that the back side of the building, adjacent to the street, warranted further design consideration to address the back-of-the-building feel. She stated that this elevation, although clearly secondary, would be viewed by the public. Ms. Burnett felt that the plaza needs more study and would benefit from the addition of 2-3 large new trees.

Otto Emme said that he agrees with what the other Boardmembers have suggested, indicating that he would like to see more landscaping in the plaza. He suggested to the landscape architect that they consider wisteria at the trellis.

- Imperial Avenue Marketplace (Farmers Market/Barrio Logan):

David Marshall recusal.

The applicant for this multi-block project, Cindy Blair of Fehlman LaBarre Architects, presented this proposed mixed use project at the May 2007 DAS meeting. The proposed project is located on the full block bounded by Imperial and Commercial Streets (north and south), and 21st and 22nd Streets (west and east), as well as portions of the blocks to the west, north and east of the full block site. The proposed project would have underground parking for approximately 874 cars, 69,685 sq. ft. of commercial uses and 517,438 sq. ft. of residential. There are 481 residential units proposed, 105 of which would be affordable. Ms. Blair has responded to the DAS request for additional information and would like to present new information. The applicant's team for this multi-block project, Marie Lia, attorney, Cindy Blair of Fehlman LaBarre Architects and Alex Zirpolo, one of the owners, discussed the proposed mixed use project and indicated that their intent was to have the project meet the Standards.

Mr. Zirpolo noted that he and his partners purchased the property in 1988, and that the team has been working diligently with the Barrio Logan community to assure that the project was what they wanted. The owners originally considered a warehouse use for many of the structures, but the community stated that the area needed retail. The owners have also met with a co-op of businessmen in the area and the established community groups.

Marie Lia stated that the property was originally owned by Matthew Sherman, and later the San Diego Poultry Association. The construction of the buildings on the full-block

site started in 1920, and since then, there are many modifications and permits. The current owners wish to do an open retail and commercial development, with associated housing.

Cindy Blair stated that the proposal will require many permits and processes, among them: a Sherman Heights permit; a SESD permit; a rezone to the proposed Urban Village zone; a Community Plan Amendment; and an amendment to the Imperial Avenue Master Plan. She noted that mixed use development is not currently allowed in this area. She indicated that the intent is to create an Urban Village here, and that is why the development extends to adjacent blocks as well.

She stated that there would be a market in this development, estimated to be in the range of 35,000-40,000 sq. ft.

The three partial blocks and the single full block proposed for development have been labeled A, B, C and D. Block A is the central full block where the majority of the development is expected to occur. Block B, to the north of the full block will have a public/private plaza and park that will be patrolled by security when open during the day, and would be closed at night. Block B also has an over-45 CMU structure that is proposed for demolition. Block C, located to the east of Block C, has the "Auto Zone" metal structure that is proposed for demolition. Block D, located to the west of Block C, is currently an open parking lot. Two levels of subterranean parking are proposed for the full central block. The full block A design is proposed to have a "veneer" of retail opening out to the street, with the open "farmers market" at the interior. An important issue is the pedestrian connectivity of the project with Sherman Heights and with the East Village.

Ms. Blair stated that the project design kept the new structures to 6-8 stories in height to assure that the height of the new development would be lower than the potentially historic silos that were going to be retained as part of the project. She also indicated that the development proposes to either keep or reconstruct brick facades that are potentially historic.

At this meeting, photos of all buildings on the proposed project site were shown and keyed to the properties. The DAS members reviewed the photographs and agreed that the buildings on the surrounding partial blocks B, C and D were not potentially historic. The demolition of these buildings would not be at issue.

Having addressed the surrounding blocks, the applicant and the DAS focused on the central full block A. The applicant presented two color-coded plans.

The first plan showed the results of a structural evaluation, noting primary building materials of the buildings and differentiating the hollow clay tile walls from the double wythe brick walls as well as other walls.

The second plan showed the dates of progression of construction on the full block site. On the eastern side of the site from its southern boundary progressing northward, the buildings were built in 1920, 1926 and 1940. On the western side of the full block site the buildings dated from 1949, 1963 and 1965. The metal silos were built in 1965. The applicant indicated that all of the structures underwent extensive modifications, including new street-facing openings to accommodate the evolving uses.

Board Comment:

John Eisenhart stated that there was a need to consider retaining not only facades but volumes as well. He reiterated that the potentially historic resources on the project are more an opportunity than a constraint. Mr. Eisenhart indicated that, although the silos date from 1965, they are clearly the most important community-recognized form on the site and he was pleased that the applicant intended to retain these as part of the project design. He agreed with the applicant that the railroad tracks and loading platform are also important to be retained.

The retention and restoration or reconstruction of the 1965 silos and the adjacent tower serves to acknowledge their potential historicity, calls attention to these iconic forms as a symbol of the community history, and serves as mitigation for the loss of the interior volumes of the potentially-historic 1920 and 1926 (and possibly the 1940) brick structures along the eastern edge of the full block site.

As the applicant progressed through the proposed street elevations, the DAS commented on the design.

Beginning with the south-facing elevation of the full block, the DAS was OK with the design with the exception that the new concrete-frame and glass café structure on the easterly end should have a taller glass façade in order for the curved cornice line of the existing 1920 brick building facade to be visible to the public. The Boardmembers liked the retention of the 1920 south/street-facing brick facade, the loading dock and the rail lines in this area.

Progressing to the west street-facing elevation, as these buildings were more recent and of hollow clay tile which is structurally worthless, initially there were no objections.

The Boardmembers were pleased to hear that the silos were to be retained.

However, after discussion with the applicant, Mr. Eisenhart felt that the tall concrete tower volume to the north of the silos should also be retained or reconstructed (with stucco facing complementary to but differentiated from the concrete texture if cost is a substantial concern) in order to anchor the project and to convey the iconic historic character of the site to future generations. This element at the southwest corner is the iconic massing/form that has "Farmers Market" on it. Mr. Eisenhart indicated that fenestration could be incorporated into the façade of the tower as long as the tower continues to convey its form and strength. He further stated that Mr. Zirpolo said that the structural engineer HTK had evaluated the tower element and said that the tower was basically a honeycomb of vertical bins that was used for grain sorting and mixing, and that it could not be adaptively reused. He indicated that they would study the reconstruction of the tower volume and that volume's use in the project.

At the north elevation, the DAS had no objections to the proposed street-facing elevation. The DAS also agreed with the architect that it was appropriate to "turn the corner" with a new brick façade that worked with the north-facing façade.

At the east street-facing elevation, the DAS indicated that the 1920 and 1926 and possibly the 1940 brick street-facing facades should be considered for retention. Since these facades have been extensively modified with other openings in the recent past, the Boardmembers stated that adding openings in these walls could be considered, but the locations would need to be reviewed.

Mr. Eisenhart indicated that the east façade was a strong composition and suggested that the historical photos be consulted for guidance to the storefront openings. He questioned

the need to gut the interior and the applicant said that would preclude the needed underground parking.

Otto Emme noted that the architecture in the proposed project was more in character with the development near the ballpark than the immediate neighborhood.

In general, Delores McNeely and Laura Burnett agreed with the DAS comments regarding the proposed project.

At the end of the review, Mr. Eisenhart questioned the philosophy of saving any brick-block facades. He stated that the committee has dealt with the pieces of the project in each elevation, but should consider the larger issue of whether saving 8" thick facades conveys the historic resource's essential qualities. In conclusion, he felt confident that the historic character could be conveyed by simply saving the southwest corner massing-form elements. The other elevations/ structures were not significant and the applicant could design as need be. Only from an urban design position (outside HRB's purview) he hoped the applicant would retain/ rebuild the other elevations as discussed. He asked for input on this opinion, but no comment was made.

Other Comment:

Louise Torio, a resident of Sherman Heights and a preservationist, discussed her and her neighbor's participation in this development process/proposal. She stated that, although the project was not in Sherman Heights, it was directly across Commercial Street from it. She stated that it was important for the project to have community-serving commercial on all four sides of the full block portion of the proposed project. She said that the community wanted to keep the memorable portions of the existing site development including the silos, the loading dock and the train tracks in order to retain the history of the site. She noted that since the project is on the trolley line (but not adjacent to a trolley stop), she considered this development and the proposed Com 22 project across Commercial to be transit-oriented development. She specifically stated that it is intended that this project and Com 22 are going to help retain the younger people and bring back the middle-class to the neighborhood.

HRB staff Mike Tudury noted that 10% affordable housing is a small amount for the project, and that although it is not the HRB's purview, he hoped the developer would consider a larger percentage. He noted that in this area, affordable housing would in essence be available for persons that have the middle-class incomes. Ms. Blair said that they were working with the Planning Department (Myles Pomeroy) and the Housing Commission staff to address this issue.

4. Adjourned at 6:30

The next DAS Meeting is scheduled for July 11, 2007 at 3:00 p.m.