

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, August 7, 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 4.05PM

Subcommittee Members	Gail Garbini; Linda Marrone; Ann Woods; Tom Larimer
Recusals	None
City Staff	
	HRB Jodie Brown
Guests	
	Item 3A Stephen Hoffman
	Item 3B Hector Moreno; Jeannette Phillips
	Item 3C Stephen Russell; Coselyn Goodrich; Yovanna Hana
	Item 3D Leslie Davis; Siavash Khajezadeh
	Other Bruce Coons, SOHO; Ashley Christensen, SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #169

Address: 136 Redwood Street

Historic Name: The Ernest & Ileen White Residence

Significance: C (Architecture), D (Master Architect)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Joseph Milchen

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The owner is currently rebuilding a retaining wall along 2nd Avenue.

There are three juniper trees 6' north of the wall. The retaining wall has been impacted by the tree roots and the reconstruction of the wall will require their removal.

Additionally, the owner would like to remove an avocado tree and a dwarf orange tree.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation:

This property is historically designated and staff recently worked with the owner to reconstruct the retaining wall. Some of the damage to the retaining wall was from the Juniper trees directly adjacent to the wall. The owner has expressed interest in removing the trees to avoid any future damage to the new retaining wall. Staff brought this to DAS to discuss the significance of the trees. Several of the trees were noted in the designation.

Applicant Presentation:

I am Steve Hoffman and I work with Joe Milchen. The retaining wall is being impacted by the three Juniper trees that the owner would like to remove. OSHA requires a certain cut back to construct the wall. The Juniper trees are not in good condition. We do not plan to have a large blank spot where the trees were located; we intend to have new shrubbery in this area. There is a cluster of four larger and better shape junipers on the 2nd avenue side that we intend to maintain. We would also like to remove a dwarf orange and an avocado.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
I drove by to look at the house. The trees do not date from that period and look to be from the 1950s. The avocado and the citrus were planted recently. The camphor trees are the most significant.	
Will the camphor tree will be maintained?	Yes
How far out of plum is the wall? Is it out of plum throughout? I think the problem is unreinforced masonry that is being impacted by the landscape. If the brick is put back in the same configuration then that is appropriate. The camphor trees are beautiful and if the junipers are causing the problem then they should be removed.	(Staff) The owner worked with staff to reconstruct the wall. The existing brick will be reinstalled as a veneer in the same pattern with the same mortar joint.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Larimer	
Garbini	I think it is not a problem to remove the Juniper, but the area should be replaced by a low shrub.

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Marrone	
Woods	

Staff Comment:

None

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

▪ **ITEM 3B:**Listings: HRB Site #208Address: 2686 Island AvenueHistoric Name: Grant Hill Park Historic DistrictSignificance: Non-ContributorMills Act Status: NoPTS #: 298472Project Contact: Hector Moreno; Phillips ArchitectureTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The owner is proposed a rear single story addition which includes 2 bedrooms, a bathroom, and a laundry room. The owner is proposing to use aluminum window rather than wood windows are required by the Sherman Heights and Grant Hills Historic District Guidelines.

Existing Square Feet: 1460Additional Square Feet: 708.5Total Proposed Square Feet: 2168.5Prior DAS Review: N/AStaff Presentation:

This property is a non contributor to the district. The house currently has aluminum windows. The Sherman Heights & Grant Hill Park Historic District Guidelines state that any new windows within the historic district have to have wood framed windows, regardless if the property is a contributor or a non-contributor. The owners would like to discuss installing an aluminum window that is consistent with the other windows on the house.

Applicant Presentation:

We are proposing to add a rear addition to this house. We are a non contributing property to the historic district. The house currently has a stucco finish with barrel tile and aluminum windows. We would like to match the existing house with the new addition. We should not be classified as “New Development.” This addition is in the rear and you will not be able to see the addition from the alley or the front of the house. We are submitting the colors and the materials shall match the surrounding neighborhood. Both the neighbor to the east and the west of the residence have stucco exteriors and aluminum windows. The request of the wood windows makes it a hardship for the owners.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
You have a structure that you are building that is new so it does fall under the new development guidelines.	
To maintain continuity, I can see maintaining the wood windows. If it is at the back where it is not seen then it is different. But you are building to the back property line, so you will see the addition.	With the drop off of the road you will not be able to see the addition.
I think the guidelines are important but since this is a non-contributor and the elements are already there they should be able to put them in. If you put wood windows in then it seems that it would be creating a false sense of history.	
What is the date of the home?	1913

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Larimer	
Garbini	The aluminum window are fine for a non contributor
Marrone	
Woods	

Staff Comment:

None

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

▪ **ITEM 3C:**

Listings: HRB Site #1; National Historic Landmark

Address: 1350 El Prado

Historic Name: Balboa Park-Museum of Man

Significance: Contributing to the District

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 330886

Project Contact: Yovanna Hanna; Sandy Gramley

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Voluntary ADA barrier removal. The project needs to address the non compliance of the Museum of Man threshold at the main entrance.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation:

The applicant would like to discuss voluntary ADA upgrades to the Museum of Man. The threshold at the entrance is not in compliance and the applicant would like to discuss some options for bringing it into compliance.

Applicant Presentation:

We are proposing to some voluntary upgrades to the Museum of Man. We have the original concrete landing with a skim coat that is deteriorating. There is also a historic plaque at the entrance. There are two approaches where you either lower the threshold or raise the exterior. If we change the threshold we will get new aluminum doors to accommodate.

If you grind off the threshold we would then remove the interior tile and install a rubberized mat that would address the differential. We would polish and seal the threshold. We could also cover the exterior platform with a gently sloping concrete. The historic plaque would be impacted and this is not our preferred method.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	Don't like option number 2. Within ADA you have 2" inches in the standard. I would grind the front or the whole thing up to the tile. The transition seems like

Name	Comments
	more work. At the front angle do a shallower angle, I would eliminate the rubberized mat.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
I am intrigued by both solutions. The first option would be the least impactful. The 3/8" would be in excess of the requirements. I don't know that you will be able to make up a foot in that distance.	We can go to the 3/8".
Is the Saltillo tile original?	The installation is somewhat crude but we do not have documentation as to when it was installed.
The other solution about feathering out the concrete on the exterior is interesting, but it would impact the plaque. If there was a means to keep the modification within the existing opening that would be preferable.	We could possibly do it within 5' but the city engineer could reject it.
How large is the rubber mat? How many tiles would be removed?	40 tiles
Would you cut the existing tile?	We would like to go with the grout lines.
If you are removing the tile will they not come out intact?	No

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	I also like option 1. The Saltillo tile seems sloppy and not original. I like the idea of doing as little as possible by grinding down. I would recommend option 1. I would recommend that you take some photos when the tiles are removed to see what was there originally.
Marrone	
Woods	We have to comply with ADA and the least invasive is option 1 taking some of Bruce's comments in to consideration.
Larimer	

Staff Comment:

None

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

▪ **ITEM 3D:**Listings: HRB Site #166Address: 7846 Eads AvenueHistoric Name: Wisteria CottageSignificance: B (Significant Person), C (Architecture)Mills Act Status: NoPTS #: N/AProject Contact: Heath Fox, Siavash KhajexadehTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Restoration of all windows and doors, restoration of the front trellis, relocation of the exterior electrical panel, change the existing single panel french door leading to the courtyard to double french doors, install granite pavers in the courtyard and granite steps, construct 24" high cobblestone at the entry to protect the entry door and to provide a flat area for accessibility.

Existing Square Feet: 576Additional Square Feet: 0Total Proposed Square Feet: 576Prior DAS Review: NAStaff Presentation:

The applicant would like to make Balmer Annex ADA accessible. The changes would impact a single French door and a patio area. Staff is concerned about the enlargement of the doorway and the impact to the building. Additionally, they are proposing to add paving to the patio area that appears inconsistent with the surrounding pavement. They are also proposing to construct a retaining wall that will use cobblestone similar to the historic retaining walls.

Applicant Presentation:

We are trying to make the Blamer Annex ADA accessible. We have to create a 5'x5' clear access in front of the entry. In order to do so we have to create a retaining wall to protect the area. We would like to widen a single 2'6" wide door and replace with a pair of French doors that match the existing single door. We have an existing door that will need to be replaced due to deterioration. We are also proposing to remove an electrical panel that is currently located in front of the window. We will be moving it so that it does not block the windows.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	SOHO has a façade easement on the property. We also have a view shed easement across the property. We reviewed and had similar issues as HRB staff, but felt the paving was differentiated but compatible. We like the relocation of the electrical panel. We felt that the doubling of the doors was the least invasive.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Are you leveling out the grass?	We are compiling and keeping the same slope. We are installing a grass-crete product.
The French doors concern me.	
The existing site walls. They are original to the site and we are concerned when proposing to replicate the walls.	We are proposing to add more grout so not as much stone will be visible.
What about the cap on the retaining wall?	We are going to use granite that would extend over the wall. People would then be able to sit on it.
Would it be an indigenous material? Would it match in color and shape as the existing?	I would say they are also granite material, a real granite stone.
Is the walkway per the city's ADA standards?	Yes, we have gone through the city's ADA process.
One of the concerns previously was that the walkway was too prominent, so this addition seems to be a good solution. I think that trying to comply with ADA requirements by widening the door is a concern. Perhaps if the trim were different it would work to differentiate.	We don't even know if windows at the front are original.
The cobblestone wall with the heavier mortar. Could that start to replicate the stem wall? If that is the best and most appropriate, do you want to find granite pavers?	That is the bad base that is being restored. There was bad concrete work done. We felt that it was too distinct.
Seems that more mortar is more for a foundation and not a site wall.	
If you are adding that granite cap, is that enough to distinguish? I believe that the granite cap will help distinguish and the elevation can be the same as existing.	
Will the new wall be adjacent to any of the original walls?	No.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
You will be doing a sample pattern?	No.
The granite in the courtyard are they square? Could they also do brick?	Yes, they are in sand due to drainage issues. It was previously brick but they were not historic and removed.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Larimer	
Garbini	The work appears to be consistent.
Marrone	
Woods	

Staff Comment:

None

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 5:30 PM

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

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