

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

August 1, 2007, 3:00 pm – 5:30
4th Floor Conference Room
City Administration Building
202 C Street, San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE

Boardmembers:

David Marshall (Chair) from 4:00 to 5:30, Delores McNeely from 3:00 to 4:00, and John Eisenhart from 3:00 to 5:30

Note: Mr. Marshall recused himself from the 1479 J/360 15th St and Imperial Marketplace items heard during the first hour

Staff:

Marianne Greene, City Attorney's Office; Michael Tudury, HRB

Guests:

1479 J Street and 360 15th Street: Jack Ferris, Wakefield Development; Mark Steele and Scott Glazebrook, architects; Barry Gitsel

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

3175 Maple Street, Burlingame: Mrs. Belanger, owner

1504 Grove Street, Golden Hill: Thomas Kohina and wife, owners
1261 and 1263 Cave Street Relocation, La Jolla: Jeffrey Shorn, architect; Marie Lia, attorney

633 20th Street, Sherman Heights: Jeanne Pezzi, owner; architect

Other: Bruce Coons, SOHO

2. Public/Staff Comment: None

3. Projects

- 1479 J Street and 360 15th Street, Centre City:

David Marshall recusal due to consultation on an unrelated project with architect M.W. Steele.

Mark Steele, together with Jack Farris of Wakeland Housing and Development Corporation presented photos of the potentially historic existing 1880s structures as well as information regarding their current condition. They indicated that the very poor condition of the structures precludes their retention and reuse.

They then presented a site plan, floor plans and elevations depicting how a new structure would incorporate the existing architectural elements of the corner structure into a new three-story building (with stepped-back fourth and fifth floors) to be located on the corner in lieu of the existing two-story hotel building. The new structure would be an extension of the adjacent Lilian Place affordable housing project and would accommodate 18 new affordable housing units. The underground parking would be extended beneath the

proposed new structure. The design of the proposed new structure would utilize the same cornice height and details of the original structure, and would provide a corner bay to recall the existing corner bay of the existing hotel. Mr. Steele indicated that the proposal only works as an extension of the adjacent existing Lillian Place project .

They indicated that they would offer to sell either or both of the existing structures, to be relocated. Mr. Steele felt that the smaller 664 sq. ft. Victorian style single story residence would be a good candidate for relocation, as the two similar adjacent residential Victorian structures no longer exist and the extant house has lost its context. He indicated that the developer would be willing to do full HABS building photo and drawing documentation.

Board Comment:

As the existing structures are not currently historically designated, the Boardmembers made their comments based on the possibility that they may be designated. It was noted that either or both of the structures may not be designated. At this time, the structures are anticipated to be considered for designation at the August 23, 2007 HRB meeting.

Acting Chair John Eisenhart asked about the zoning limitations of the site. He learned that the site has an FAR of 10 and a height limit of approximately 150 feet.

Mr. Eisenhart indicated that the primary preference is always to retain a historic resource on its original site. However, due to the loss of its original context as one of three adjacent Victorian houses, he would be supportive of the relocation of the house to an alternative site. He felt strongly that the two-story hotel structure should be retained on its corner site as it anchors the corner and contributes to the neighborhood. He also felt that the structure was a good candidate for reconstruction.

Boardmember Delores McNeely agreed with Mr. Eisenhart's comments regarding allowing relocation of the house, stating that a lot of the historic fabric of the house is already gone. She concurred with Mr. Eisenhart regarding retaining the corner structure in situ.

Public Comment:

Bruce Coons of SOHO stated that SOHO has identified the corner structure as a key building in the area and a contributor to the historic J Street corridor. He noted that, unlike San Francisco which has many angled bay corner buildings, this 1888 two-story angled bay corner building is the only extant example in San Diego. He stated that he believed that the ground floor of this structure would well accommodate a commercial use such as a restaurant. He also noted that the house structure is likely older than the corner building and, although it has lost of some of its historic fabric due to a restoration project that was not fulfilled, it is a good example of a small 1880s Victorian house.

- Imperial Avenue Marketplace (Farmers Market/Logan Heights, not Barrio Logan):
David Marshall recusal due to consultation on an unrelated project with architect Fehlman LaBarre.

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 430 residential units proposed, *not 481 units as previously stated*. 10% of the units would be affordable, *not 105 units as previously stated*.

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, responded to the June 2007 DAS request for additional information and presented a revised design for the proposed mixed use project. They noted that although the structures on site are only identified as potentially historic and are not currently historically designated, their goal was to have the proposed project meet the Standards.

Cindy Blair stated corrections regarding the many permits and processes that the proposal will require: a Rezone to the proposed Urban Village zone; a Community Plan Amendment; a Site Development Permit; a Planned Development Permit; and a Tentative Map. 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.

The applicant has previously presented this proposed mixed use project at the May and June 2007 DAS meetings. The structures on the adjacent partial blocks were determined by the DAS and HRB staff to not be potentially historic and may be demolished. The review at the June 2007 DAS meeting and this meeting focused only on the existing structures and related proposed project on the central full block site.

Ms. Blair stated that the project design kept the new structures to 6, 8 and 10 stories in height to assure that the height of the new development would be in keeping with the existing potentially historic silos that were going to be retained as part of the project. She reconfirmed that the development proposes at this time to retain the brick facades that are potentially historic.

Ms. Blair then compared the central block volumes and street elevations to those presented at the June 2007 meeting, indicating how the new changed volumes and street elevations responded to the previous DAS comments.

South Elevation: Ms. Blair noted that, at the south elevation, the new "Station Café" was reduced from three stories to a single story and made more transparent, allowing the full cornice of the existing potentially-historic brick façade to be viewed. The raised platform of the railroad tracks is to be retained. The upper loading dock level was removed to allow the raised railroad track platform to expand into this area for use as outdoor seating for the café.

East Elevation: The 1920 and 1926 brick facades are to be retained and incorporated into the project street façade. As the openings in these facades have been changed on numerous occasions, there will be minor modifications and additions to these openings.

North Elevation: This façade was previously accepted as all new. It was pointed out that the new north façade wraps around the east corner, showing a full building volume at this corner.

West Elevation: Again, this façade was agreed to be all new, with the retention (if possible) or reconstruction of the metal silos at the southern end of this façade. The adjacent mid-rise housing to the north of the silos emulated the rectangular volumes that exist there now.

Board Comment:

John Eisenhart stated that “almost everything” looked great. He liked the development of the café, the new structure that wraps around the northeast corner as well as and the retention of the potentially-historic brick facades at the east elevation. He discussed strengthening the rectangular housing unit volume directly to the north of the silos, stating that, south of the elevator tower, it would be appropriate to increase the height of this element 1-2 stories. He noted that the southern portion of this mass should be stepped out (or the northern portion stepped back), in order to further recall the vertical mass that exists there now. He indicated that it was important to carry the iconographic massing of this tower element vertically to the ground as exists in the current massing. Ms. Blair indicated that that would be studied and anticipated that it could be done. It is anticipated that this detail would be addressed by HRB staff consistent with the DAS direction. In general, Mr. Eisenhart felt that with these changes, the project would meet the Standards.

Delores McNeely indicated that she fully concurred with Mr. Eisenhart’s comments and thanked the applicant for responding well to the previous DAS comments.

Other Comment:

Bruce Coons of SOHO asked if the brick facades were to be retained or reconstructed, noting that it was impossible to retain the patina of age with reconstructed facades, even using the original bricks. Mr. Zirpolo indicated that it was his intention to retain the existing brick facades in situ. Mr. Coons indicated that he was pleased with the proposed project and wanted the proposed project to be scheduled to be presented to the SOHO Board.

Delores McNeely left the meeting at this time, and Chair David Marshall entered the meeting, after having recused himself on the first two items.

- 3175 Maple Street, Burlingame:

This house was considered for designation in January 2007. The designation was denied due to changes that previous owners had made to the porch columns and chimney. The current owners, Mr. and Mrs. Belanger, wished to discuss possible changes that might allow the house to be reconsidered for designation. Mrs. Belanger showed the DAS a historic photo of the house, noting the differences from the existing conditions, in particular the addition of the cobblestone bases of the chimney and porch columns.

Board Comment:

Chair David Marshall focused on the chimney mass, indicating that the cobblestones needed to be removed, and the stucco above needed to be carried down to the ground level. The cobblestones were too prominent as non-historic features of the façade. He

also indicated that the stucco should be a darker color. The existing “suede” finish noted by the owner is acceptable as long as the finish was relatively smooth and not too wavy. John Eisenhart stated that, per the historic photo, the porch columns were larger, but without a cobblestone base, which should also be removed at this location. Mr. Marshall concurred.

- 1504 Grove Street, Golden Hill: This house is not currently historically designated, but the owner, Thomas Kohina, wishes to have the house considered for designation in the immediate future. At this time, he discussed making several modifications regarding removal of a non-historic second and first floor landing that existed to accommodate a since-removed stair that was needed when the structure was used as two units. He and his wife indicated that the house will be returned to its historic single-family use. He asked about either retaining the non-historic door at the second level, but in a fixed condition, or infilling it with a solid wall. He also indicated that he would like to provide a horizontal trim at the second floor level at this level that matches the historic trim at the other side of the house. He felt that these proposed changes would restore some of the original historic fabric and character and hopefully allow the HRB to designate the structure.

Board Comment:

Mr. Marshall indicated that, in general, the changes that were being proposed were consistent with the Standards. He stated that it was important to return the non-historic second-level door to a wood window to match the original tripartite historic window. He noted that local firms, such as the San Diego Sash Company, could replicate the window. Mr. Marshall stated that if it was desired to have a solid wall at this location, that the window could be a false window with a solid wall at the interior. He stated that the best solution might be to place a functional window at this location and paint the interior of the glass black, allowing for future use. Mr. Eisenhart concurred.

- 1261 and 1263 Cave Street Relocation: The originally-proposed relocation site for these structures has fallen through. However, the owner, Allison Zonger has purchased a site in La Jolla at 2053 Ardath (Frontage) Road and is committed to the relocation of these two structures to the new property. Marie Lia and Jeffrey Shorn presented the proposal for the placement of the historic structures on the proposed new site. Mr. Shorn noted that the new placement would retain the same N/S orientation as exists on its original site. Mr. Shorn indicated that the site was in La Jolla Shores, which has no defined setbacks, but requires consistency with setbacks of houses in the immediate vicinity of the site. Mr. Shorn noted that there was an existing non-historic two-car garage on the site that was to be retained, but that the structure was found to have drainage problems, and was now slated for removal. A new two-car garage structure is proposed to be constructed south of the existing garage site.

Board Comment:

Mr. Marshall stated that the primary structure of the two historic structures should be forward of the secondary structure, to be achieved by either moving the primary one forward five feet or moving the secondary one back five feet. Mr. Shorn indicated that

the primary one would be moved forward. The committee noted that it was good to remove the existing garage as it was currently located in a position that would compete with the historic resources. It was stated that the new garage structure, located behind the site of the garage to be removed, should be designed in a complementary, but clearly new manner, perhaps recalling a carriage house. Mr. Shorn agreed.

Mr. Eisenhart asked if the structures were each to be relocated in a single piece. Mr. Shorn indicated that that was the intention. He also indicated that the path of travel has yet to be established, and that this may impact this issue.

633 20th Street, HRB Site #160, Sherman Heights Historic District:

The owner, Jeanne Pezzi, and her designer discussed a proposed project that would require a SESD Planned District Permit and a Variance to allow the reconstruction of a garage with unit that burned down. The garage, with a small dwelling unit above, was constructed in 1980 without permits by a previous owner.

Board Comment:

As the garage with unit was constructed in 1980 without a permit, DAS cannot support the reconstruction of the dwelling unit in the two-story structure. However, as the Sanborn Maps indicate that there was a garage (carriage house?) located at the rear of the lot, DAS can support the needed variance for FAR and setbacks to allow for the construction of a two-car, one-story garage at the location proposed. The constraints of the small lot also mitigate for the garage use to allow for a use that is afforded to other adjacent property owners.

Both Mr. Marshall and Mr. Eisenhart indicated that the applicant should provide two single garage doors in lieu of the proposed double garage door in order to retain the character of the Sherman Heights Historic District.

Mr. Eisenhart suggested that the designer should also consider offsetting the building planes at these two doors.

Mr. Marshall indicated that a hipped roof would be OK at the proposed new garage, but that a flat roof with a parapet to allow for a roof deck above the garage would also be consistent with the Sherman Heights Design Guidelines. He stated that 4" horizontal shiplap siding would consistent with the Standards as it is complementary and different than the siding at the historic house. He confirmed that the garage would have no windows. If the roof deck is desired, the location of the stair on the north side of the house is appropriate.

Mr. Eisenhart indicated that the garage doors could have a cross-brace X motif.

4. Adjourned at 5:30

The next DAS Meeting is scheduled for September 5, 2007 at 3:00 p.m.