

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 2, 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 4.05pm

Subcommittee Members Alex Bethke (Chair); Gail Garbini; Linda Marrone;
Tom Larimer

Recusals

City Staff

HRB Jodie Brown

Guests

Item 3A Rita Mahoney, Dan Mullen

Item 3B Todd Robinson, Mark Lyon, Alana Robinson

Item 3C Theresa Clark, Joseph Thome

Other Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #855

Address: 2810 Carleton Street

Historic Name: Kettenburg Boat Works

Significance: A (Special Element); B (Historic Person)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 318441

Project Contact: Rita Mahoney; Starck Architecture

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: As part of the approvals for the new construction at this site, the owners are required to have interpretive signage discussing the history of the site. The applicant would like to have comments on the proposed location and language of the signage.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: 142,710

Total Proposed Square Feet: 142,710

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation:

This site was designated by the HRB in February 2008 under HRB Criterion A. The designation excluded all of the structures on the site. As part of a new development agreement, the developer had to provide a plaque discussing the history of the Kettenberg Boat Works. The applicant would like to present the proposed text and receive feedback from DAS.

Applicant Presentation:

This project entails 36 residential condos, 3 stories and 6 commercial properties. The location of the plaque is determined by where it will get the most pedestrian traffic. The client was interested in having a plaque that is not bronze but more modern in design. The proposed Kettenburg signage will have an Ipe wood fence structure and an etched, glazed, glass plaque. The concrete base has the name Kettenburg. The text discusses the history of the Kettenberg family on the company.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is the text going to be overlaid on the etched boat?	Yes, they will be integrated together.
Is the paving all new around it?	The fire lane on port land was installed within the last year. The remaining will be new as part of the development.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	I think that it looks really nice and there is a lot of meaning behind the text. The text should be expanded on why and what is significant about this person. It might be helpful to have something more technical to see, what the differences are in the different classes of boats—could be noted on the illustration. Does not have to be kept to the basic history, but help to explain it.
Garbini	I like it.
Marrone	In the heading include information as to what was on this site, "On this site...."

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Brown	The text should include historic name and HRB number.

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 3B:**Listings: HRB Site #498Address: 7245 Eads AvenueHistoric Name: The Erling Rhode ResidenceSignificance: C (Architecture)Mills Act Status: YesPTS #: N/AProject Contact: Todd Robinson; Mark LyonTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: Proposed second floor and basement garage to an existing one story single family residence.Existing Square Feet: 1,749Additional Square Feet: 1,695Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,444Prior DAS Review: Sep-13Staff Presentation:

This project was presented at the last DAS meeting. The subcommittee was concerned with the impact of the addition on the north elevation. The subcommittee members wanted Tom Larimer, the architect, to comment on the proposed project and deferred the discussion to the October meeting

Applicant Presentation:

Based on our last meeting we took the comments to heart. We have set back the north wall and at the rear we have removed the cantilevered second story. We have reduced the second story square footage and the room sizes. The square footage of the second story is less than 50% of the original house. Additionally, we have kept the mass behind main ridge.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What was the dialogue from last month?	The addition was too bulky and the shear wall of the second story, overhanging the second story was too much.
It looks like you added a pop-out.	Yes, to accommodate the bath tub.
Has there been any discussion on the color palate?	We have not had any discussion, we are open to colors.
What is the cut out at the front?	That is the double pitch. The larger gable with two smaller gables.
The front portion sits on the main gable of the house?	Yes, the addition sits on the ridge.
The deck appears to be sitting before the existing ridge?	Yes, it is no higher than the high point of the roof and will not be evident from the front. In viewing the house, it is obvious that the house was meant to be viewed from the front. The side and the rear are not that articulated. I think we need to look at the intent of the original architect. We could set back that railing at the ridge to preserve the ridge line.
Does the second story have to be the full width of the house?	We are only adding 800 sq ft so it is less than the original square footage. The rooms would become really small and we are limited on the width. Genter is a sloped road and the house is raised slightly, so it would not be as visible.
It does look like the second floor is set back 20+ feet from the street. Is the massing really what you are going to see from the street?	You will be 12' from the curb with the master bedroom, you are 17' from the property line at the gable.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	<p>My concern is the side view. The tree will hide a lot of the addition from the front. The side view needs the most attention. I don't know that you would be able see from the front based on how far it is set back.</p> <p>I am still concerned and feel that it pushes the line. The front is not really my concern but the side is my concern. Pushing the envelope with the deck, encroaching with the</p>

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	<p>deck and second story is too close to the ridge.</p> <p>I feel that it does not meet the SOI and impacts the character defining features of the house.</p> <p>It is a good design with everything except the massing. It is the site and what you have to deal with at the site.</p>
Garbini	<p>My opinion would always be, would I designate this house? What is the intent of the original designation?</p> <p>I would tend to agree with Alex.</p>
Marrone	<p>I appreciate the modifications that have been completed. When you are looking a plan there is some softening with the hedge and fence.</p> <p>I think the addition keeps with the SOI and they have differentiated the materials. The problem is the site because the side of the house is more visible. I like to see houses grow with families as long it does not take away from the historic character of the house.</p> <p>My first impression was that the addition was large but it is a secondary façade. I would not be opposed to it. This is not the only craftsman with a second story addition. There are numerous others that have additions.</p>
Larimer	<p>I appreciate the attention to detail.</p> <p>The struggle that we are having is it was designated as an example of a 1912 craftsman cottage. It is a conundrum for us on how to preserve that character.</p>

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Board members will visit the site individually to help understand the site and the impact the proposed addition would have on the house.

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 #1110

Address: 3114 Lawrence Street

Historic Name: Captain Manuel Rosa House

Significance: B (Historic Person); C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Thome Family Trust; Theresa Clark

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Garden rehabilitation to include maintaining the existing specimen trees.

Reuse of onsite stone rubble and crushed stone for the garden wall and paths.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 0

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation:

The front yard landscape was included as part of this designation. The HRB discussed the importance of the site and the plantings as it relates to Manuel Rosa and his heritage. The owner would like to discuss some proposed changes to the landscaping.

Applicant Presentation:

We would like to make this site more useable for this family and in so doing we are requesting some changes. We are keeping a number of the landscape elements and the hardscape as well. We are proposing to reuse the stone rubble on the site. We would like to propose a play lawn area that is near the existing avocado trees. The rubble wall will be used as a seating area and a demarcation between the lower lawn and the upper lawn. We are proposing a driveway gate and a trash enclosure along the existing wall.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What are you demolishing?	Weeds, we are not removing anything except the pond in the lawn.
What are you adding?	A trash enclosure, drive way gate and a beach wash off area, under the palm trees we are adding low lying and low water use plants, and one extra olive tree by the trash enclosure.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	I think it is sensitively done. It was a big site and it has been divided but it is good. The hedges are important and the way the property is divided is appropriate and the new trees that are being added are appropriate.
Marrone	Very nice.
Larimer	The plans are very attractive and I appreciate the care and attention given.

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 November 6, 2013 at 4:00 PM.

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