

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 7, 2012, at 4:00 PM
5th Floor Large Conference Room
City Operations Building, Development Services Department
1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE

Subcommittee Members	Gail Garbini; Linda Marrone; Ann Woods
Recusals	N/A
City Staff	
Guests	HRB Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Cathy Winterrowd
	Item 3A Bob Bauer, Terry Buis
	Item 3B Tony Crisafi, Ed Sutton
	Item 3C Randy Cramer, Marie Burke Lia
	Other Bruce Coons, SOHO

2. Public Comment (on matters not on the agenda): None

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #528

Address: 7890 Torrey Lane

Historic Name: Dr. Harold C. & Frieda Daum Urey/Russell Forester House

Significance: Architecture (Custom Residential Ranch); Master Architect Russell Forrester

Mills Act Status: Yes

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Bob Bauer, Annette and Terry Buis

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This project proposes an addition of 720.5 SF to an existing single family residence at the rear of the principle structure. Conversion of the existing master bedroom into a sitting area for a new master bedroom. Conversion of the existing master bathroom into an internal laundry room. Provide a new master bath and walk-in closet. Install one factory fabricated gas-only fireplace in the new bedroom area. Remodel an existing bedroom with a total remodel of 550 SF. Replace three existing windows and two exterior single light doors, with equivalent wood framed units in the original residence.

Existing Square Feet: 3,126
Additional Square Feet: 721
Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,847
Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The property owner is proposing to construct an addition of 720.5SF at the rear of the house. They are also proposing to convert the existing master bedroom into a sitting area for a new master bedroom. They are also proposing to convert the existing master bathroom into an internal laundry, providing a new master bath and walk-in closet. They are also proposing to install a gas fireplace and replace two windows and two doors.

Applicant Presentation: There are two main reasons that we are proposing to modify this house. The house does not have an internal laundry which is currently located in a breezeway. There is also an existing drainage problem; the closet area and the rear wall of the bedroom have water intrusion problems. We are proposing to elevate a concrete slab at the rear of the building to help the problem. There is also a storage issue. They will be adding storage to the house. Based on a perspective view there is little visibility from the street given that the house sits up from the street.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Are portions of the existing house being removed? (the back wall that has the issue with water intrusion) Are windows and doors being replaced? (the windows and doors in the two bedrooms are being replaced with dual glazing to address a fire issue)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Marrone- Having trouble visualizing it. What is the relationship to the street?	Applicant provided site plan which shows the house is elevated from the street behind the detached garage.
Garbini-Is there a dog run?	It is a walkway to get access to the rear of the property to clear out vegetation
Marrone-On the rear side it is raised 6" but it is set back?	Yes
Marrone- There is a 1968 addition, is that part of the historic designation?	Yes
Woods-Are there any other views of the house from public right-of-ways above?	Not really, from the other houses above but not from the public-right-of-way
Garbini-What were staff concerns with the project?	Staff did not discuss the project with the applicant prior to their submittal to

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
	DAS. Plans were also simultaneously submitted to the city for review.
Woods- Would you be able to see the chimney from the front of the house? I have concerns about it.	No.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Woods	Uncertain about the addition. Concerned about the metal chimney addition.
Garbini	Would like to see the property, is it possible to go out to the site? Would like to visit the site and would like to have reduced copies of what was already seen and have them PDF'ed to me.
Marrone	It is setback and seems to be within the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Stanco	It is possible for the subcommittee members to go out to the site individually to view the site and the applicant can come back to DAS next month or the month after.

Recommended Modifications: The DAS subcommittee members would like to have a copy of the plans available for their review and would like to make a site visit to the property to put the plans into perspective. The applicant has been asked to come back to DAS at the next available meeting to continue to discuss the proposed addition.

Consensus:

- Consistent with the Standards
- Consistent with the Standards if modified as noted
- Inconsistent with the Standards and needs revision and additional review
- Inconsistent with the Standards but is the best feasible alternative
- Inconsistent with the Standards

▪ **ITEM 3B:**

Listings: HRB Site #520

Address: 333 Dunemere Drive

Historic Name: Casa de la Paz / The Dunes

Significance: Cultural Landscape; Historical Person (Philip Barber); Architecture (Spanish Eclectic); Master Builder (Philip Barber)

Mills Act Status: Yes

PTS #: 273017

Project Contact: Tony Crisafi, John and Victoria Miller

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Remodel and addition to the existing guest house over the 2-car garage. The remodel consists of revising the existing one bedroom guest house layout to a new configuration. The addition consists of a new 2 car garage on the first floor adjacent to the existing structure with a new 1 bedroom addition above. The addition will be connected to the existing guest house via an enclosed "bridge" over the external staircase to the second floor. There is also a proposed addition at the rear of the existing guest house accommodate a new bedroom.

Existing Square Feet: 1,192

Additional Square Feet: 1,150

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,342

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The new design retains the staircase and constructs the new addition as an adjacent structure connected to the existing garage through an enclosed hallway at the second floor over the existing stairway. The design also includes demolition of the rear façade of the existing garage at the ground floor, and demolition of nearly the entire rear façade at the second floor. The garage and second floor above will be extended back toward the property line. Staff is concerned about the extent of demolition at the rear façade, primarily at the second floor, and is seeking input from DAS on this aspect of the project scope.

Applicant Presentation: The garage originally had three bays when it was relocated and turned 90 degrees and then relocated 100' away. We are proposing to remodel the interior space of the existing garage which would require demolition of the rear wall on the garage to accommodate a new bedroom. We would maintain the external staircase, but it would become an internal staircase. We have made some modifications to the new structure to change the look and we have stepped back the new addition. The two windows on the side would be impacted and half of the existing porch. We would also like to remove the decorative tile that is non historic on the garage.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Explain the bump-out. (The building will serve as a guest house for the grandchildren and children. The way the windows are currently configured will not accommodate the internal space needed to fit everything; which required them to bump out to the back.
Coons	What was the house designated under? (A,B,C,D). If you allow the addition, it is not reversible and you would be releasing them from that Standard.
Moomjian	There are a number of window modifications on the main house already.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Marrone: Will the existing staircase and porch still be there?	The windows will remain and door opening.
Marrone: Because they were moving an original wall is that why staff is concerned?	Yes, try to discourage large sections of demolition.
Garbini-Were there windows there before? Their views are not any different?	Yes, No
Garbini: From the other property, they would have a view of the addition if there were no vegetation?	Yes
Garbini: What is between the fence line and the rear of the building?	There is just a small strip of land where there is just some storage/tile
Marrone-Is Tom Sheppard associated with the property?	He is associated with an addition to the main house

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	It appears that the proposed addition is consistent with the Standards.
Marrone	It is at the rear of the property and will not have an impact on the view from the public right of way. It is good that staff requested that the staircase be saved and a portion of the balcony will remain. I feel that it is a modest addition and will not impact the view for the public.
Woods	Defer to Linda, but I am comfortable with it

Staff Comment: NoneRecommended Modifications: The proposed addition appears to be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards as proposed.Consensus:

- Consistent with the Standards
- Consistent with the Standards if modified as noted
- Inconsistent with the Standards and needs revision and additional review
- Inconsistent with the Standards but is the best feasible alternative
- Inconsistent with the Standards

▪ **ITEM 3C:**Listings: N/AAddress: 2550 5th AvenueHistoric Name: Mr. A'sSignificance: N/A

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: 266533

Project Contact: Carrier Johnson + Culture; Alessio Investment Co.

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Replace the exterior metal panels on the tower portion of the building.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This is not designated, but came to staff through the Over-45 process to replace the metal panels on the exterior of the tower portion of the building. Staff has identified the building as potentially historic. With the initial review staff determined that the replacement of the exterior panels was not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The applicant has informed staff that there are some issues with the existing panels; staff does not have an issue with replacement, but the pattern should be replicated. The proposed replacement does not replicate the existing pattern.

Applicant Presentation: The building was constructed in 1964. We are only proposing work on the tower portion of the building which is essentially the same on all sides. The panels were painted about 3-4 years ago. The paint is peeling, but we would like to fix them. Panels are made of stamped steel with porcelain enamel, which is technology that was used in the 50s and 60s but is no longer manufactured. When the panels were made in 1964 they were made of 6 pieces with a line down the middle so they would not warp or bend. There is a failure on the connection points which makes repair infeasible. It is not economically feasible to replicate the panels or to have them cleaned. We would like to install a single panel with a Kynar finish. The technology today allows for one flat piece without the need for the cross-members. All you would see is a flat surface.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	The panels are a character defining feature of the building. This building should go through the whole review and be taken to the board for a determination. It is easy to clean and you can still put porcelain on any surface. It is very easy to clean this surface with select products and re-fabricate those that need to be replaced. (CA Sheet Metal told the applicant that they could not replicate the panels)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
Garbini-The architecture is so streamline that the panels are very character defining.	Not a simple matter of cleaning the panels. They would have to remove

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
If the panels are smooth then the look will change. I would recommend that they not be removed but cleaned. I also think that it should go to the Historical Resources Board for review.	the panels to remove the paint and not sure how it was originally painted. Believe that it was the technology at the time and was not a design feature.
Marrone-Would it be helpful to bring info to staff to see other ways to restore the panels.	Yes we could bring more technical information to staff.
Marrone-Could you research other options-to remove is labor intensive	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	I understand that at the time that it was the only way to manufacture the panels. That may be the case it still becomes a character defining feature.
Marrone	Agree. If this was a historic building, they would have to maintain the appearance.
Woods	Echoes the look of the lower portion of the building. Impacts the character of the building. Should go to the Historical Resources Board.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: If the building is considered architecturally significant, the panels appear to be a character-defining feature, and that replacing the panels with new panels that did not replicate the pattern would significantly alter the character and appearance of the building. If the existing panels cannot be retained or accurately replaced, the DAS recommended HRB review of the building to determine significance.

Consensus:

- Consistent with the Standards
- Consistent with the Standards if modified as noted
- Inconsistent with the Standards and needs revision and additional review
- Inconsistent with the Standards but is the best feasible alternative
- Inconsistent with the Standards

4. Adjourned at 5:19 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on April 4, 2012 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Jodie Brown at JDBrown@sandiego.gov or 619.533.6300