## CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 6, 2013, at 4:00 PM 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Large Conference Room City Operations Building, Development Services Department 1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA

# **MEETING NOTES**

#### 1. ATTENDANCE 4:03PM

Subcommittee Members Gail Garbini: Ann Woods: Tom Larimer

Recusals

City Staff

HRB Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Sarah Vonesh

Guests

Item 3A Ron May, Robert McLeod, Kiley Wallace Item 3B James Valentine, Paul Johnson, Sarai Johnson

Other

- 2. Public Comment (on matters not on the agenda)
- 3. Project Reviews

### **■ ITEM 3A**:

Listings: N/A

Address: 4019 Hawk Street

<u>Historic Name</u>: N/A <u>Significance</u>: N/A Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Robert McLeod; Ron May

Treatment: Rehabilitation

<u>Project Scope</u>: Obtain input on the prescence or absence of battered boxed columns on the partial width side gabled front porch. Based on other Martin Melhorn-designed homes, the consultant believes that the columns were original boxed. The un-boxed columns are visible in a photo from 1921 were exposed well into the 1970s. When the house was restored the area around the columns were investigated and there was evidence of paint and nail scarring. Based on that evidence the columns were boxed. The owner would like input on whether they should remain boxed or they should be unboxed.

Existing Square Feet: 1,000

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,000

Prior DAS Review: N/A

<u>Staff Presentation</u>: This property recently came to staff requesting designation. Staff had several concerns about the number of alterations that have been completed on the property. The primary concern is the modification of the porch posts. During the rehabilitation of the property, the owner consulted with Bruce Coons who stated that due to paint markings the columns should be boxed. The historic photo of the house was not located until after the rehabilitation work. Staff believes that the house should have unboxed columns per the historic photo.

Applicant Presentation: When we met with staff, three primary issues were raised. The purlins were removed from the front of the house and we are in the process of restoring them. There was tile on the front steps and we are also in the process of removing it. The third issue is the porch columns. When the house was being restored, Bruce Coons guided the restoration. He saw a line of paint which is why they boxed the columns. The owner would like to get a read from DAS before he removes the paneling, he would like to know if he should do it.

#### **Public Comment:**

None

#### **Q&A**:

| <b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>   | Applicant's Response                  |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| You can make out the edge of the column in     | No, but I don't know of any other     |
| the photo. We don't know how it was built      | Melhorn house constructed with un-    |
| in 1919. If there is another house that is     | boxed columns.                        |
| boxed were they originally boxed?              |                                       |
| Boxed is appropriate for the era. It begs the  | I have never seen any like that       |
| question, because it is unusual, could it have | Melhorn.                              |
| been the particular design?                    |                                       |
| Boxed, exactly what do they look like?         | As presented.                         |
|  | It is not a simple matter of removing |
|  | the covering. We would have to do     |
|  | extensive work because it has been    |
|  | tampered with-a sign was added at one |
|  | point.                                |
| When was the sign added?                       | In the 1970s                          |

## Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

| Subcommittee-member | Comments   |
|---------------------|--|
| Garbini             | I think it is a character-defining feature and it shows  |
|                     | fairly clearly in the photo.   |
| Woods               |  |
| Larimer             | I would suspect that the columns were exposed when the home was built, which is supported by photos. If it was a battered box you would see a different shadow. I can only form an opinion on the information provided. It is attractive with boxed columns but they were not boxed in 1921. My recommendation is to remove the boxing to return it to un-boxed. |

| Staff | Comment: |
|-------|----------|
| Starr | Comment. |

None

### **Recommended Modifications:**

Columns should be un-boxed to reflect the 1921 photo.

### Consensus:

|              | Consistent with the Standards  |
|--------------|--|
| $\checkmark$ | 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: N/A

Address: 1845 29th Street

<u>Historic Name</u>: N/A <u>Significance</u>: N/A <u>Mills Act Status</u>: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: James Valentine; Paul Johnson

Treatment: Rehabilitation

<u>Project Scope</u>: Obtain input on the correct window replacements. The majority of the windows have been replaced. There is an original window in the garage and there is a older photo that shows two of the seven windows that are not original. Is it acceptable to use the original garage window and the older photo of two of the windows to model the other five windows?

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

<u>Staff Presentation</u>: This property has come forward to staff seeking designation. Staff had concerns about some of the existing window replacements and some of the proposed replacements.

<u>Applicant Presentation</u>: We have a great photo of the original garage window. In some older photos we can see 2 original windows. We are proposing to take the two good photos of the windows and use them as a reference. We would like to do a dual pane, double hung window with simulated divided lights. The window openings on the existing windows are close to the original sizes. The stucco around the windows is slightly disturbed but we believe that it was done for the purpose flashing. We weren't able to locate any evidence of the original windows.

#### Public Comment:

None

### <u>Q&A</u>:

| <b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b> | Applicant's Response                 |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| If they were casements how would they        | They would be oddly proportioned, so |
| have looked?                                 | we believe they would not have been  |
|  | casement windows.                    |
| Any casements on the house originally?       | No.                                  |
| Are the large windows on the second floor    | They are currently casement-not      |
| fixed or operable?                           | original to the house.               |
| Could you go with either double hung or      | We have existing double hung         |
| casement?                                    | windows on the house.                |
| How many windows total would you be          | Seven                                |
| replacing?                                   |                                      |

## **Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:**

| Subcommittee-member | Comments  |
|---------------------|---|
| Garbini             | Having something slightly different, but similar is |
|                     | appropriate.  |
| Woods               |   |
| Larimer             | I think that it is OK to replace with double hung,  |
|                     | simulated divided light 2/2 windows.                |

### **Staff Comment:**

| Staff Member | Comments  |
|--------------|---|
| Stanco       | All seven windows on the west and the south sides would |
|              | receive the same treatment? (Yes)                       |

| Recommended Modifications:   |
|--|
| None   |
| <u>Consensus</u> :   |
| ☑ 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 4:49 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on April 3, 2013 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Jodie Brown at <a href="mailto:JDBrown@sandiego.gov">JDBrown@sandiego.gov</a> or 619.533.6300