

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, August 1, 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; Tom Larimer
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Camille Pekarek
Guests	
Item 3A	Dominic Alessio; Gordon Carrier; Marie Lia
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO; John Eisenhart; Eva Thorn; Dan Soderberg

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: N/A

Address: 2550 5th Avenue

Historic Name: Mr. A's

Significance: N/A

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 266533

Project Contact: Alessio Investment Co., Carrier Johnson + Culture, Marie Lia

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Continued discussion on the proposed replacement of the exterior metal panels on the tower portion of the building (floors 5-12) of this 1964 building. DAS reviewed the proposal and noted that the panels appeared to be a character-defining feature of the building and that the proposed replacement panels should more accurately reflect the verticality of the lower portion of the building. The current panels were damaged in repainting and cannot be salvaged. Newly-designed panels are the only option because the technology no longer exists to replicate the 1964 version. The

proposed replacement panels have been re-designed in response to DAS and HRB staff input.

Existing Square Feet: 524,930

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 524,930

Prior DAS Review: 3/7/2012

Staff Presentation: At the last DAS meeting, the applicant proposed to replace the deteriorated panels with a flat panel. The subcommittee felt that the existing pattern was a character-defining feature. The applicant has a mock-up to address the DAS concerns and would like the subcommittee to comment on the proposals.

Applicant Presentation: The original panels and color still exist on the parking booth. The first approach was a flat panel with color to match the original. DAS said that the modulation and verticality were character-defining features, so we worked to develop a proto-type that was painted the original color. We have provided an informational packet with pictures of each side with the last page showing the different options. We have also provided cost estimates for the various panel options. We are proposing to proceed with option B2. We believe that the warranty is important in the whole scheme of everything. The existing panels are steel with a baked porcelain enamel done in a pressed process. To make the B2 proto-type the panel is a raised pattern instead of a recessed pattern to create the shadow line.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
John Eisenhart	Baked enamel and the stamping pattern are very important. The panels should be able to be painted. If this is not feasible, then you should investigate another panel. The proposed panel is not appropriate. It is hard to believe that there is only a 1 year warranty for painting.
Dan Soderberg	Could see pattern clearly with the soft lines. Don't see the same with the proposed panel. SOI should be followed, the proposal does not closely match the existing.
Bruce Coons	Pattern is essential. If they are porcelain enamel why weren't they stripped back to the metal? If they were going to be reproduced in aluminum and powder coated why not pursue re-enamel. I would like to see a stripped panel.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Marrone-Exhibit B2 photo, which one is it?	It is the center one.
Larimer- What are the materials of the first	Aluminum with a kynar finish.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
two options?	
Garbini-Do the panels currently have a baked finish?	Yes.
Larimer-What is the size of the panels?	3' wide and approximately 6' tall
Larimer-Is that just scored?	It is a raised panel.
Marrone- It looks to narrow. I haven't seen research to see if there are other options. It also seems like the existing panel has wider dividers.	The reveal could be wider. Existing panels would be a bending process versus a pressed panel.
Larimer-Could another porcelain enamel be baked on again?	No, because it was etched when the repainted several years ago. Option B3 is not a porcelain process but really just painting.
Larimer-I am curious, could the existing panels be powder coated?	I suspect that the previous preparation was inconsistent which is why the paint is not adhering.
Garbini-Is it possible to recreate the original look of the panel with today's technology?	The issues are cost and warranty.
Marrone-Are you interested in designation?	No.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	<p>Character of the panel is the concern with the soft edge on it. B2 is similar but a little more extreme. Option 1 was discussed last time and it is off the table. Option 2 has delineation, but does it meet the SOI? On Option 3, you can't just remove the paint. It will not go back to what it was originally.</p> <p>Good proposals but we need a tighter response to Option B4. We are not recommending B1. Option B2 has issues with the reveal and it is not consistent with the Standards. On Option B3, the re- enamel process should be revisited.</p>
Marrone	
Larimer	<p>The soft recess with the slight bow and scallop effect stand out on the existing panel. The options presented do not have the same refinement and detail. I have use FRP to create a similar look on other projects. I am confused about what direction to take.</p> <p>I like the effort to turn it into 6 panels but it does not mimic the original enough to be consistent.</p> <p>I am familiar with FRP and you would not need to re-engineer because they are very light weight. You could get a close replica with soft reveals. It would allow for a</p>

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	similar look with a different material. Should continue to consider both Options 3 and 4.

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

4. Adjourned at 5:08 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on September 5, 2012 at 4:00 PM.

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