

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 2, 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 4.03pm

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (Chair); Ann Woods; Tom Larimer
Recusals	N/A
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Cathy Winterrowd
Guests	
Item 3A	William and Jenny Nunnink
Item 3B	Christine Cunning, James Cunning, Paul Johnson, Sarai Johnson

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

### 3. Project Reviews

#### ▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #526-039

Address: 2460 32nd Street

Historic Name: Burlingame Historic District Contributor

Significance:

Mills Act Status: Yes

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: William and Jennifer Nunnink

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Proposed addition of a new fireplace chimney to the north side of the historic portion of the house.

Existing Square Feet: 1,414

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,414

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The property is a contributing resource to the Burlingame Historic District with a Mills Act in place. The property sits at the corner of 32<sup>nd</sup> Street and Laurel Street. The property owner is proposing to construct a chimney and fireplace on the side of the house fronting Laurel Street. The chimney would be clearly visible from the public right of way. When staff met with the property owner previously to discuss the plans, concern was expressed that the chimney would be located on the historic portion of the house and would create a false sense of history in its placement.

Applicant Presentation: We would like to construct a chimney on the north side of our house. Out of 36 of the Spanish Colonial style homes in Burlingame 91.6% of the homes have chimneys historically. Our chimney will be built in the integrity of the house. It will be constructed in the manner in which if it is removed the house can be restored to its original configuration. We have offered several options to distinguish the building which include placing a plaque on the chimney, different stucco or vegetation to disguise it. The chancellor's house in La Jolla is using vegetation to hide its alteration and if this is acceptable for this house we believe it is acceptable for our house. We believe that the house deserves a wood burning fireplace that is consistent with the style of the house (the owner provided representations of other properties that have additions that are visible from the public right of way).

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Sarai Johnson	Have you explored placing it on an interior wall?— (Applicant) No it cannot be placed elsewhere due to built ins and porches
Paul Johnson	The chimney for this style of house could be a character defining feature. Landscape will survive or not. There are nets that could be attached to the chimney to allow vines grow that would disguise it. I would also be concerned about the setback and whether it is allowable.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Ann-Is there some way to distinguish it? I am concerned about constructing it and don't want to match the historic house.	We could have a different stucco texture or put a plaque of the chimney noting that it is not historic.
Alex-What about demolishing the vent?	The vent will remain behind the chimney.
Tom-I am concerned about the chimney. Adding the fireplace in a manner that was consistent with the 1927 would be creating a false sense of history. Some other means to provide the fireplace would be with a gas flue. If the house was not designated then	The house is deserving of the fireplace and it would be fake to have a gas fireplace. We are willing to distinguish the chimney in a number of ways.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
the fireplace would not be an issue but the house is designated, so we would like to maintain the history	
Alex- Adding a chimney to this façade does not meet the Standards. Standard #9 would break up the spatial relation and covering the vent is a major character defining feature. You need to work with us and you may not be able to burn wood and use a gas fireplace instead.	Can you tell me the standard?  We have offered compromises and your compromises are essentially nothing.
Tom- The wood fireplace begins to tell a story that is new to the house. Research a wood pot bell fireplace or pellet burning fireplace that would have a less impact on the exterior of the house.	We have no place to put a pot belly stove. We are stuck with what we really need. Had we known we would have this issue, we would have built it before the district was designated.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	The side is a character defining feature of the house. By adding the chimney it is character defining. Adding a prominent part, whether matching or differentiating it will make an impact on this façade.
Larmier	My recommendation is that I have a hard time agreeing with a wood burning fireplace, but I would like to work with you on other alternatives.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

The applicant should consider other alternatives that will have less of an impact on the exterior of the house. The subcommittee has suggested that they research a gas fireplace, a pot bell stove, or a pellet burning fireplace.

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 #1021

Address: 3574 7th Avenue

Historic Name: Alice Lee/ Irving J. Gill/ Hazel Wood Waterman House

Significance: B (Historic Person)

C (Architecture)

D (Master Architect/Builder)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 225893

Project Contact: Paul Johnson, Christine Cunning

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Approval of a design change to the non historic portions of the house.

The proposed design involves moving a portion of the North most second floor wall Northward 3'6". This movement of the wall would occur only between gridlines B and E on the plans, leaving the two story wall between E and I as it is currently. The proposed roof over the Master Bath Suite and Bath 3 would be a hipped roof. The new roof would be sympathetic by not using tile on the hips and having a 2'6" overhang instead of a 3' overhang. The new and old roofs would have the same pitch and the same roofing material.

Existing Square Feet: 3,522

Additional Square Feet: 65

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,587

Prior DAS Review:

Staff Presentation: The property was designated recently and they are working on a substantial rehabilitation. They are working on a roof element on a non-historic portion of the house. Previously DAS approved a flat roof on this portion of the house.

Applicant Presentation: Basically the existing end of the house has a one car garage. We are proposing to bump out over the garage. Previously, it was a flat roof over the garage and we are proposing to do a hip roof. We believe that the hipped roof is much more complementary. We are differentiating with smaller rafter tails, shorter overhang, and there would be Hardie Board on the underside of the overhang. The change would add 64 SF. There is a possibility of a future elevator and the massing of the hipped roof helps to hide the housing of the elevator.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Tom- Are you removing some windows?	Yes, we are moving some windows around, but they are not historic windows.
Tom- Bring me up to speed on previous	It is on our side. We took a longer

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
conversations. Was there some comment that has you coming back?	look at it now that it is open. The owner is rather tall and he could not stand up straight with the shed roof.
Alex- How different is the new roof?	The new overhang will be 2.5' vs.3', the soffit would be solid with the Hardie siding. The rafter tail spacing will be 24" vs. 32" originally and smaller in dimension.
Tom- The roof form is set back how many feet? So the plane will read closely as the original and the distinguishing feature will be the tile on the ridge line?	The new roof would be set back 6". Yes a distinguishing feature would be the tile on the roof line.
Tom-What about setting back the wall plane of the master bath to help offset the plane and the roof line?	This is an area of a previous addition, not original to the house.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Bethke	My concern is that the new hipped roof is not differentiated enough. It does not call out the original roof line. I am willing to go with it. I agree with Kelley that the previous one is preferred. I think the new roof can also meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, but the flat roof meets it better. If there were some way to differentiate, not with material. The ridge tile is helpful.
Larmier	I feel like the roof line is close to the front, but I think that it meets the Standards and it addresses the façade.
Woods	No problem, the addition is sympathetic to house.

Staff Comment:

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Stanco	Given that portion they are modifying is a later addition staff has no problem with additional square footage. The flat roof lets the addition stand out a little more and it is a cleaner differentiation but the hipped roof could also be considered differentiated
Stanco	Pushing down the truncated hip allows the chimney to read and is a possibility.

Recommended Modifications:

None

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 5.02 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on June 6, 2012 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Jodie Brown at [JDBrown@saniego.gov](mailto:JDBrown@saniego.gov) or 619.533.6300