

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 4, 2013, 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 | Linda Marrone; Ann Woods           |
| Recusals             |                                    |
| City Staff           |                                    |
| HRB                  | Jodie Brown; Camille Pekarek       |
| Guests               |                                    |
| Item 3A              | Mike Gehl; Sharon Gehl; Dick Bundy |
| Item 3B              | Mark Lyon; Todd Robinson           |
| Item 3C              | Rusty Middleton; Clay Walker       |
| Other                | Bruce Coons, SOHO                  |

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

None

### 3. Project Reviews

#### ▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #621

Address: 4301 Hermosa Way

Historic Name: Barr-Rigdon-Robinson Spec House #1

Significance: C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: Yes

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Mike and Sharon Gehl; Richard Bundy

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This project will rehab the interior and establish public spaces on the first floor and private bedroom spaces on the second floor. The rear portion of the second floor has low ceilings that are not to code. The project will maintain the general roofline but will raise the sill line to create a minimum 8' head clearance in the rear.

Existing Square Feet: 2414

Additional Square Feet: -34

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2380

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation:

This house was originally constructed in 1910 as a one and a half story single family residence and in 1925 it was converted to a two story duplex. The current owners are in the process of converting the property back to a single family residence and would like to make some changes to accommodate current ceiling heights. The rear shed dormer has a low clearance and the owners would like to raise the pitch to accommodate a higher ceiling plate. The modification would be visible from the street due to its location.

Applicant Presentation:

To provide an outline of the project, the house is on a triangular lot, the back of the house shows how they added to the rear of the house and enclosed a sleeping porch. In the rear, the porch was built and enclosed as part of the 1925 addition and has a low head height. We are proposing to take that roof and raise it to create additional head height of 7.5 to 8 foot height. The existing house has a 3/12 slope and the proposed would have a 2 2.3/12 pitch. In the rear it would look basically the same with the change to some windows in the rear. The existing windows are sliders and screens. The only roof slope changing is the middle and it will have little visibility from the street.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

| <b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>   | <b>Applicant's Response</b>  |
|--|--|
| There was a single door at the rear and the upper will have French doors leading to a balcony? | Yes. We would like to make the back entrance wheel chair accessible. |
| What was staff's concern?  | The change in the pitch.   |
| On the Hermosa side, is there a garage there that screens this side?                           | Yes  |
| Could you go down and then go out?   | Yes, but that introduces a new line to the house.                    |
| Are the windows on the rear sliders?   | No, they are fixed.  |

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

| <b>Subcommittee-member</b> | <b>Comments</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Garbini                    | It is character defining with the low roof and the line of windows, so it is a matter of what to do with that area. |
| Marrone                    | It appears that all the changes are at the rear. Accept for a little higher elevation.                              |

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Modify the trim so it does not match the existing.

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 #498

Address: 7245 Eads Avenue

Historic Name: The Erling Rhode Residence

Significance: C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: Yes

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Todd Robinson; Mark Lyon

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Proposed second floor and basement garage to an existing one story single family residence.

Existing Square Feet: 1749

Additional Square Feet: 1817

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3566

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation:

The property is located at the corner of Eads and Genter. It is a one story low lying bungalow. It originally had a rear detached garage, but the lot was subdivided prior to the designation and the garage was removed and replaced with a new two story structure. With the removal of the garage, the house lost its parking. The owners would like to construct a garage below the house and a second story addition. While the garage appears to be consistent with the Standards, staff is concerned about the scale and massing of the second story addition.

Applicant Presentation:

The property is located on the southeast corner of Genter and Eads. It is a one story structure from 1912. Most of the materials on the front of the house are historic with the exception of the roof. In 1986, the house was subdivided and parking was removed from the lot. There are two components of this project. There is an 832 subterranean garage that is away from the street corner. The second component is a 980 sf second story. We have tried to maintain the context by pushing back the addition behind the main ridgeline. There will be no historic fabric removed with the exception of the roofing material. The only main change will be an internal staircase. The driveway will be located in the

corner of the lot away from the corner. The new addition will be of the same style of distinct.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

| <b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>  | <b>Applicant's Response</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Do you think that there would be enough of the character left that if it came to the HRB, that it could be designated with this addition?   | Linda-I don't know.         |
| What is the total square footage of the addition?   | 980 SF                      |
| With the trees and the set back I don't know that it will impact the front of the house much, but the side will be very visible. The character of the north side will be very impacted. |                             |
| The garage is interesting, people are being more innovative with parking.   |                             |

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

| <b>Subcommittee-member</b> | <b>Comments</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Woods                      | No issue with the subterranean garage addition, but we are concerned with the second story addition specifically the impact to the north elevation. The massing is too much and takes away from the character of the house. We would like to have this presented at the next DAS meeting to get Tom's take on the proposed project. |
| Marrone                    | I am very familiar with the house and glad that you were able to achieve parking. There are other houses that have second story additions, but similar to this design.  |

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 #701

Address: 600 F Street

Historic Name: The Maryland Hotel

Significance: C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: IA Lodging, San Diego, LLC; Non Verbal Communication

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Replacement of the existing non historic blade sign with a new blade sign using the existing connection points.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 0

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation:

The applicant would like to remodel the blade sign at the corner of the building. The previous blade sign was reviewed and approved by DAS and historically there was a blade sign at this location. The new proposal would use the existing connection points and supports.

Applicant Presentation:

The vendor that did this sign is the same one that did the sign in 2007. In the dark, the sign would be internally lit. The sign would be similar to the original. The color would match the existing awnings at the site. We only have to work out how the sign is lit whether it will be internal or external. Our goal is just to have the name and the top lit.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

| <b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>              | <b>Applicant's Response</b> |
|---|-----------------------------|
| When the current sign was completed, it was all approved? | Yes.                        |
| So only the lettering and the material is changing?       | Yes.                        |

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

| <b>Subcommittee-member</b> | <b>Comments</b>   |
|----------------------------|---|
| Woods                      | I think a number of issues would seem to have been addressed with the previous approval. It looks fine to |

| Subcommittee-member | Comments   |
|---------------------|--|
|                     | me.  |
| Marrone             | The structure is there and still conveys its historic character. |

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 4:54 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on October 2, 2013 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Jodie Brown at [JDBrown@sandiego.gov](mailto:JDBrown@sandiego.gov) or 619.533.6300