

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 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 4.01pm

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (Chair); Gail Garbini; Linda Marrone; Ann Woods;
Recusals	N/A
City Staff	HRB Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Cathy Winterrowd
	Park & Rec Howard Greenstein
Guests	Item 3A Withdrawn Item 3B David Marshall, Jim Kitrick, Vincent Rivera Item 3C Curt Drake, Ellen Jenne, Stephen Alvarez, Karen Crafts, Lou Melendez Other Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

None

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A: WITHDRAWN**

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: 7/11/2012

▪ **ITEM 3B:**

Listings: HRB Site #1

Address: 2001 Pan American Plaza

Historic Name: San Diego Air and Space Museum

Significance: Contributing to District

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Jim Kidrick and David Marshall

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Proposed addition to the San Diego Air and Space Museum adjoining the San Diego Automotive Museum. The addition includes an approved expansion area behind the Automotive Museum per the Central Mesa Precise Plan. An additional one-story connecting wing would take advantage of existing topography and landscape screening to reduce its mass. The wing would be constructed using a frameless glass curtain wall to reduce its visual impact. The physical impact to existing historic resources would be minimal. The design is still conceptual and the applicant seeks DAS feedback before developing the design further.

Existing Square Feet: 150,000

Additional Square Feet: 82,000

Total Proposed Square Feet: 232,000

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The applicant presented the proposal to staff about a month and half ago. It is an expansion from the Air and Space Museum to the automotive museum. They are proposing a connection of glass on a slope slightly behind the buildings. With the transparency of the glass and preservation of the restrooms, staff still has concerns about the height and the impacts to the canyon and historic Highway 163. Staff has provided feedback that the proposed design is not inconsistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. We need to continue to work through the design. The proposal has not been vetted through Park and Recreation Department, so this is a preliminary meeting.

Applicant Presentation: This is a conceptual design. We are getting a gage for the design with your feedback. We would like to know if it would be possible to merge the two museums. The proposed design would allow us to expand our current displays. Currently, when adding to the collection, the space is limited and when new items are added something else has to be removed. Our plan will require an amendment for the

Master Plan although 50% of the expansion has already been approved. The addition will be on the side in between the pilasters behind the restroom building and then connecting to the side of the Automotive Museum. We are proposing a two story portion at the rear of the Automotive Museum. On the Air and Space Museum we are 23’ below grade, 23’ above on the Automotive Museum, and 5’ below the existing basement level on the Air and Space Museum. On the two walls that are exposed it would be all glass. It would be 85’ back from the front corner of the Automotive Museum. The proposed design is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior’s Standards 9 and 10. The other component of the project is the addition of the Atlas Rocket. The rocket is proposed for the park in front of the proposed addition. There is already precedence for rather tall elements in the park with the 1935 Standard Oil Building which was equally as tall.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Our board has not seen the proposal yet, but they are interested. This is our greatest Art Deco building in San Diego. Any treatment needs to be taken with great care. Even with glass on the addition, it will still render as a building. I think I need to do a little more research. It is more visible than I thought it would be. I am concerned about the spatial relationships between the buildings. I have discussed with Jim about making the roof system a little less substantial but understand that it is used to support planes.
Alvarez	The aspects of Highway 163 are important to us (Caltrans) which is also a designated site. The reflective glass could be a concern for traffic safety. And the views from 163 impact the scenic byway.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
Concerned about the impact to 163. Where does the boundary end for the district?	300 feet south of Laurel Street Bridge. The project is outside of the 163 designation boundaries
Concern about the spacing and the massing of the addition. I would lean to making the depth less.	Part of the challenge is that we have big things and that is why we need the space. We need the space to move objects around and provide the space to have large objects to maintain the world class status. We felt that this design met the Standards. This is the 1935 section of the exposition and this was identified as the area for expansion.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
I like the idea of the glass but all the examples that we saw had a glass ceiling and not a hard ceiling. I see problems on the northwest side, there is not enough screening material. Seems like if you want the square footage you will have to drop it down. The eucalyptus trees that you are relying on are slowly being removed from the park, so you are losing some screening trees. I think that it would be a draw to the area with the addition to view the area beyond and the downtown skyline.	The area between the curve and the 2 story portion will be an open deck space for events. The area at night will be dynamic. We are not doing wholesale removal of the wall space and it is reversible.
Would the façade be visible on the interior?	Yes the existing exterior walls will be visible on the interior.
Could the wall on the rear open like a hanger opening?	We would have an access to the rear but it would not be something that would be open on a daily basis.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	It worries me; we are seeing all the glass and not the roof. The Ford building reads as gears and if you add all the glass will that change the concept of the building.
Garbini	N/A
Marrone	I like the glass addition, it helps with the massing
Woods	N/A
Larimer	I like the sensitivity that you showed to the massing. I like that it is fairly well masked by existing buildings. Sensitive to the massing from the plaza. I don't know that there is a big visual impact from Highway 163 since everybody is looking at the road.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Stanco	Clarify that the depth should be pushed further from where? Staff is concerned about the proximity to the plaza either it should be pushed further back or narrowed.

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 3C:**

Listings: HRB Site #1

Address:

Historic Name: Cabrillo Bridge

Significance: Contributing to District

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Stephen Alvarez and Kenny Mah

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Project will install accent lighting on both City and State of California ROW on and near State Route 163 at the Laurel Street/Cabrillo Bridge. The accent lighting consists of LED white light fixtures-16 large, 20 extra large installed at the base of each bent or group of columns. The light fixtures will be located between the columns and tilted up so as not to be visible to the motorists on the main lanes of the highway. The intent is to accentuate the three-dimensional bridge forms of the outer arch and inner arch of the bents. The light emitted will be contained completely within the arch to avoid light pollution.

Existing Square Feet: 19,687

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 19,687

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The Subcommittee previously saw a lighting concept that would light the bridge on the outside face at the base of each arch. The Subcommittee asked that Caltrans return with additional information on the lighting once more detail was developed. The applicant has revised the proposal to provide lighting on the interior of the arches. Staff and Caltrans are seeking the Subcommittee's input on the revised lighting proposal and consistency with the Standards.

Applicant Presentation: We had a lighting expert come out to the site and analyze the bridge. They looked at a way to light the bridge that is a different approach to the previous review. We looked at various architectural aspects including the environmental/glare/light pollution etc. issues related to each concept. On September 10th we had a mock lighting ceremony to show the proposed concept. Most of the people who saw the lighting preferred the warmer lighting. We believe that the lighting is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. There are no major changes to the historic fabric or landscaping, and it is easily reversible. The fixtures are hidden on the bridge itself.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Our committee reviewed this proposal. Historically, it was lit from the lights in the cactus garden. The proposed bright lights were overly bright. The lower light was better and not as bright. We felt that it presented a non historic look since it was not originally lit.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How is the bridge lit now?	Just ambient light from the top
I like that idea that the LED allows for the potential to change the light color.	Concerned that SHPO would not approve it.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	Think that two are leaning toward option 1 with Linda maybe also leaning in that direction
Garbini	I would lean toward option 1. I agree with what Tom said. I don't think it will affect the integrity of the structure.
Marrone	Interesting comment that Bruce made. When you look at the pictures, the arch lighting looks more historic than the façade lighting. Softer lighting is better.
Woods	I understand about light pollution, it makes the bridge look different. It highlights elements that you don't normally see. I like the façade lighting.
Larimer	I like option 1. Lighting it from the inside. Like the mystery that it provides. Lean toward the softer warmer light.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Winterrowd	I saw with lighting the arch. And did not like the façade lighting.

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 5:00PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on November 7, 2012 at 4:00 PM.

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