

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, July 11, 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; Tom Larimer
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Cathy Winterrowd
Park & Rec	Todd Schmidt,
Engineering and Capital Projects	Kerry Santoro, Brad Johnson, Mark Giandoni
Development Services	Myra Herrmann
Guests	
Item 3A	Jack Gallagher, Daniel Bertao
Item 3B	Jim Frost, Nathan Johnson, Ione Stiegler
Other	John Eisenhart

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

John Eisenhart-would like to compliment the Board who voted 7 to 0 to deny the Plaza de Panama project.

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #564

Address: 2600 Golf Course Drive

Historic Name: Balboa Park Municipal Golf Course Clubhouse

Significance: A (Cultural Landscape); B (Historical Event); C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Todd Schmidt and Jack Gallagher

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The existing clubhouse building will be incorporated into the golf course Master Plan with the design and construction of new golf clubhouse facilities. The program calls for additional functions and spaces which would more than double the size of the existing clubhouse. A Historical Report recommends the demolition of various clubhouse additions that were constructed out of character with the original historical period of 1934-1940.

Existing Square Feet: 9,400

Additional Square Feet: 16,000

Total Proposed Square Feet: 25,400

Prior DAS Review: None

Staff Presentation: The current clubhouse is historically designated, but does not meet the needs of the Parks and Recreation Department. The department would like to expand the clubhouse in an effort to provide better amenities. The project is in the conceptual phase and the applicant is looking for feedback on the initial phase of development. It is anticipated that the project will come back to DAS as the design progresses.

Applicant Presentation: The goal of the project is to limit and mitigate a host of issues related to the existing building-circulation, code issues, kitchen, etc. We would like to construct a new facility to have the ability to make the club house more viable for future events. The previous renovation was 75 years ago and the existing building is out of date. Site Option F connects the existing building with the new clubhouse. This option would allow the kitchen to remain in the existing building. Option E would allow a new separate campus and the kitchen would be located in the new building. We are looking for feedback on the two options and would be coming back at a later date once the programming is established. This is a rehabilitation of the existing building. On the north end of the clubhouse we are removing an addition, we are restoring the west end and the south end we are keeping the kitchen addition.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
John Eisenhart- Concrete block from the 1960s, why are you keeping that?	It is over 50 years old. Reading the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards (SOI) it is distinguished from the original building. The historical report says to add board and batten siding does not seem proper. When the work was done in the 60s there was extensive work done to the foundation. To reverse it would be extensive. A lot of people appreciate the terraces provided by the addition.
Will the major room of the clubhouse be restored?	There are seismic issues that need to be addressed but we should be able to work it so there is minimal alteration to the interior.
I believe that Option E is the better option, but I am concerned that the	We have discussed this at length with staff. Tobey's overlooks the 19 th hole with views of the city. We would maintain it as public space possibly a Pro Shop.

Name	Comments
main room would not be used as Tobey's which has been there for some time.	

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Larimer-The service yard is no. 28 for the service yard, is that for the kitchen?	Yes
Bethke-It appears that it is mostly a preservation of the existing building. Nothing jumps out that is adverse.	We should note that staff would like to elevate the grade at the rear of the building. The grade is brought up just above where it says Balboa GC.
Larimer-Why are you making this change? Is it for structural issues?	A lot of the landscaping has been lost over time. We would like to reintroduce it. The cart path is being eliminated. It is additional landscape screening at this location. We would like to discourage public access to this side of the clubhouse. Opinion of the golf director that it is pretty harsh area. There would be no need for a retaining wall but there would be far less of the existing wall to be seen.
Bethke-Would the retaining wall touch the existing wall?	There would probably be a one inch air space between them

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	I would go towards Option E. The separation of the new additions. It does not appear that the additions on F would adversely impact the historic resource but it is difficult to tell in plan. I think E works well to complement the existing building and creates a campus like experience. I am not concerned with the functionality of the space and but the character-defining features should be preserved and maintained.
Garbini	I like E since it separates the buildings. It seems like it would be better to build the retaining wall slightly further away. You don't need a retaining wall to break the space. You could accomplish with landscape. You are doing it to use the soil level to minimize the height of the building instead of landscape.
Marrone	What caught my eye is the significance is the interior

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	space. It is nice that it will be restored. Difficult to make many comments on it at this point.
Woods	I agree with what Alex said.
Larimer	

Staff Comment: N/A

Recommended Modifications:

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 #325

Address: Georgia Street Bridge over University Avenue

Historic Name: Georgia Street Bridge

Significance: A (Event); C (Design); D (Information)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Kerry Santoro

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Rehabilitation and seismic retrofitting for the Georgia Street Bridge.

Existing Square Feet: 2,100

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,100

Prior DAS Review: None

Staff Presentation: City has been working on this bridge project for a while. There were some pretty drastic proposals to seismically retrofit. There has been a lot of public outreach to do the work per the SOI. We believe that the current proposal meets the SOI.

Applicant Presentation: We are happy to bring an alternative that meets the SOI. It has been difficult to work with the concerns from Caltrans and HRB. Objectives are to make the bridge safe, extend the service life for 50 more years, minimize potential impacts to the bridge and surrounding wall. The bridge looks fine, but if you look close there are a number of deficiencies and function issues. The guard rail was filled in over the years. It was pretty thin and the concrete was not properly covering the rebar. They applied a heavy spray texture on the railing and the walls. This work will hopefully bring back some of the historic character of the bridge. Not all of it can be brought back because of poor initial design and modern safety standards. We will bring back the lampposts, on the guardrails we will bring back the profile, but not the lip on the interior for fear the cars will get caught underneath in a crash. The surface will change from tar to concrete.

The arches will remain. The spandrels will appear the same, but they will need to be rebuilt. The open center on the bridge will be closed for a shear wall, but it will have a reveal with a different concrete texture. Currently, the arch is too close to road bed and vehicles continually hit it. They plan is to lower the road bed 18" to 20" from the historic road bed. The side walls are unsafe and need to be addressed, so we are proposing to retrofit the walls at the same time that the roadbed is being lowered. We initially thought to rebuild in the same location, but due to existing buildings on top we propose to use the existing wall as a buttress and reface the wall, so it would be 9" closer.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
John Eisenhart	What is the height of the balustrade and the opening? The height is important, how is being treated?

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Garbini-If you have a 9" facing on the wall how will the balustrade be treated?	It will also move out 9" to keep the historic appearance.
Larimer-What is the height of the rail?	It was historically 42" and that meets current code.
Bethke-You are essentially demolishing the bridge and rebuilding?	It is a large scale reconstruction on top of some historic fabric. The main arch is to remain and the existing foundations.
Larimer-Are the openings different on the balustrade?	We are beveling the opening so the narrow as you go in. We would like to have it go bevel into 6" width for the exemption.
Woods-Are the number of openings changing on the balustrade?	Yes, Clatrans has standards that (Texas Classic) requires crash tested barriers to comply. We started with the crash tested barriers and modified it to fit close to the historic design.
Woods-What is the balustrade going to look like on the interior	It has a little base detail that goes straight up with a minor relief at the top. Important for pilasters to look like the original.
Larimer-The arches will remain in place and the concrete will be removed and concrete reapplied? Will the shear wall with the slip joint remain?	Yes, the center joint with shear wall will remain. The deck replacement will also help to stabilize the bridge.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	So Caltrans believes this is a no-adverse affect. It is essentially a facadomy. Are we really talking about a no adverse affect? Is there something to talk about the original conditions and discuss how it has changed. Something for Caltrans to keep in mind that there may be a request for mitigation. It would be important to have some interpretation for the site. Explaining why the change was necessary and why it was structurally unsound. It would help provide insight into the original construction.
Garbini	
Marrone	It is nice that they took the effort to restore the bridge.
Woods	
Larimer	

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Winterrowd	Because there are federal monies involved it will have SHPO review with NEPA

Recommended Modifications: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 5:10 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on August 1, 2012 at 4:00 PM.

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