

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 4, 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	Alex Bethke (Chair); Gail Garbini; Linda Marrone; Ann Woods
Recusals	N/A
City Staff	HRB Jodie Brown; Cathy Winterrowd
Guests	Item 3A Bob Bauer Item 3B Kelly Kincaid, Todd Massure Item 3C Kelly Kincaid, Todd Massure Other Bruce Coons, SOHO; Ashley Christensen, SOHO

2. Public Comment (on matters not on the agenda)

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 #: 272502

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 existng 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: 3/1/2012

Staff Presentation: This project was reviewed at the March DAS meeting. The subcommittee members wanted an opportunity to visit the site on their own time with a copy of the plans to help understand the relationship of the house and the proposed addition to the street.

Applicant Presentation: Concerns from the previous meeting were views of the addition from the public right of way. The reason that the addition/modifications were proposed was to stop water intrusion that has always been a problem for this lot. There is a problem with mold and mildew in the master closet which has resulted in damage to the wood. A question from last month is whether we are removing the rear wall and the answer is yes. We would be raising the foundation 6" and correcting the roof and site drainage. Secondly, the owners would like to have an interior laundry. The owners would also like to have more storage. The new addition would be compatible but it would be distinguished from the older construction.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Ranch houses are designed to be added to over time. Their style is meant to be added on. My concern is the removal of the historic fabric and the inability to restore the original house

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Garbini-It appears that the only thing that you can really see is the garage. I thought you would be able to see more from the street. From the two roads above you cannot really see the building.	
Garbini-How was it designated?	It was designated under Criteria A, B, C, and D.
Bethke-What are the materials of the addition?	Proposing to use Certainteed paneling to make the appearance of board and batten. The original house has overhangs and the addition would not have overhangs and the master bedroom would have a flat roof with parapet walls. Wherever the roof is

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
	new we would be cropping the eaves. Any sightline from the side of the house would not be visible.
Bethke-What about taking the addition back to the property line instead of moving it to the interior of the lot?	There are a number of easements that we have to contend with. The perimeter easement, one that takes that corner, one that cuts through the master bedroom/bathroom. There is also an existing retaining wall. Removal of the retaining wall would be a nightmare with coastal permits, etc. The addition is also in an existing brush management zone.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	It seems that the addition could be a little more linear and back towards that property line. Otherwise, the addition is fine.
Garbini	I don't think that you have significantly altered the interior other than putting a laundry room in a previous bathroom. It meets the Standards from the street view, but it seems that it was not really a clean example of a Russell Forrester designed home. However, it is not designated solely on C.
Marrone	I was familiar with this property, so I had a feeling that the addition was not going to be visible. Even though there have been some additions to the house they are mostly at the rear of the house.
Woods	Agree with Gail. Although not visible from the street, it will no longer be an "L" shaped house and the flat roof at the rear it changes the nature of the house.

Staff Comment:

N/A

Recommended Modifications:

N/A

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 #208-138

Address: 506 22nd Street

Historic Name: Sherman Heights District Contributor

Significance: District Contributor

Mills Act Status: Yes

PTS #: 275476

Project Contact: Kelly Kincaid, Massure & Associates

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Work consists of removal of existing metal siding, restoration of existing wood siding, doors and windows. Remodel of the interior. Upgrade electrical, install water heater in attic, new HVAC, install new gas fireplace insert, remove existing chain link fence, and tree in ROW, remove existing chimney.

Existing Square Feet: 3,186

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,186

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The property owner has a previously approved addition and would like to do additional work to the house. The additional work was done without a permit and the owner is in the process of trying to resolve the code case. The work that would need to be approved would include the removal of the historic chimney and the restoration of the side porch that was previously enclosed.

Applicant Presentation: We are fixing issues related to Code Enforcement. We were approved for a new addition, but the chimney was removed. The owner is requesting to keep the chimney off of the house. If the chimney were to remain it would not be operable.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce	The building was a mess. The question is should it be reconstructed and removed with the addition? A lot of work has been done to the house to restore it.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Bethke-What is the addition that encroaches on that portion of the house?	There is addition at the rear of the house that was previously approved and the chimney is enveloped into the addition. The chimney would only protrude two feet up.
Bethke-Did staff approve the addition?	Yes, it was reviewed and approved by Kelley Stanco in 2009.
Bethke-Is there more than on chimney?	There is only one

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	It is not worth reconstructing the chimney.
Garbini	What would be the purpose of adding a non-functioning chimney?
Marrone	It seems after the fact. It seems that the chimney is dead center and the addition is off to the side.
Woods	It was approved without a chimney in 2009

Staff Comment:

N/A

Recommended Modifications:

N/A

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: HRB Site #208-324Address: 2245 22nd StreetHistoric Name: Sherman Heights District ContributorSignificance: District ContributorMills Act Status: YesPTS #: N/AProject Contact: Kelly Kincaid, Massure & AssociatesTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Proposed addition of new skylights on the west and east side of the roof. Modification to the gable end window to replace the fixed window with either an operable pair of casements or an awning window.

Existing Square Feet: 4,270

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 4,270

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The property owner would like to add additional skylights to the side of the mansard roof. Previously, the property owner was approved for three skylights and they would like to add one more to the rear, two to the side and three to the other side and make the front dormer windows operable.

Applicant Presentation: The space gets up to 100 degrees and it heats up the upper floors. We rely on the skylights to cool the area

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce	I don't think that they should be able to visible from street. Typically, they would have added a roof hatch.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Garbini-How is the space accessed?	Via stairs
Garbini-Is there a basement?	Yes
Garbini-If there was a roof hatch what would be the difference with a skylight?	They would provide the same result, which is air ventilation.
Garbini-What about cross ventilation through some front windows?	We would like to make the dormer windows operable.
Bethke-On the east elevation why are the skylights located towards the front?	On the west side they are on the rear so it provides more cross ventilation by off-setting them.
Marrone-Are there other options?	The eaves are small and not conducive to adding ventilation
Marrone-I think you should investigate the roof hatch. There is no need to go out to the site.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	Investigate the existing front dormer window, and if they were operable they should be repaired. The south elevation extra skylight is fine, but I am not sure how you would not see the additional skylights. My

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	recommendation is not to have the side skylights. I would direct the applicant to look to a roof hatch. I am concerned about cutting into the character-defining feature of the roof. There are other ways to accomplish what you are trying to do. Vegetation should not be something that blocks alterations. Not appropriate to cut into an original feature.
Garbini	You could purchase the hardware for the dormer window and keep the existing frame to repair the windows. I don't have the same issues with skylights. If historically they had roof hatch, then I don't have an issue with skylights they operate in a similar manner.
Marrone	If it had a roof hatch would that be enough? (no because of storage in the attic)
Woods	I would like to look at the site.

Staff Comment:

N/A

Recommended Modifications: DAS recommends that you investigate the roof hatch and the dormer window at the front to determine the operation. The side skylights are not appropriate, but one additional one at the rear is fine.

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 5:23 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on May 2, 2012 at 4:00 PM.

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