# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

# DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, December 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 4:05pm

Subcommittee Members Alex Bethke (Chair); Gail Garbini; Ann Woods; Tom

Larimer

City Staff

HRB Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown;

Park & Rec Charlie Daniels

Guests

Item 3A Amy Pat Rigney; David Rue;

Item 3B David Reed; Anthony Ridenhour; Travis Nixon Item 3C David Moty; Nitsuh Abena; Ali Alaeipour

Other Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

# ■ <u>ITEM 3A</u>:

<u>Listings</u>: HRB Site #1 <u>Address</u>: Old Globe Way Historic Name: Balboa Park

Significance: Contributing to the District

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Vicki Estrada and Charles Daniel

Treatment: Rehabilitation

<u>Project Scope</u>: Improvements to Old Globe Way to inlcude new paving, lighting, site furniture, landscaping and irrigation. Existing parking and vehicular circulation will be

reconfigured.

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>: As part of a new project to construct a parking garage on the Zoo land, the applicant is proposing to make improvements to Old Globe Way. The street is located behind the Botanical Gardens and the San Diego Museum of Art. The improvements would include new paving, lighting, site furniture and landscaping. The improved street would allow for access to the proposed parking garage for Zoo employees. The improvements would also include 9 accessible parking spots and the large ficus sycomorus tree would remain in place.

Applicant Presentation: Improvements to Old Globe Way were included in the Precise Plan. The Zoo would like to construct an employee parking lot on Zoo property which would use an existing accessing point. The parking structure would be entirely within the Zoo leasehold. The street from Village Place along Old Globe Way would have the improvements. There are no structures within the area. The new street furniture would be consistent with the Precise Plan, which was approved as consistent with the Standards. An existing sidewalk would be widened. The existing parking lot would be enlarged slightly and the rare ficus tree would be maintained. The roadway will have improved lighting. Sound walls will protect the noise issues for the Old Globe.

#### **Public Comment:**

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	They came before SOHO Board and we support the
	project. We are supporting it because in 1915 there was
	a large addition at the Botanical Garden building. There
	was a road in place at that time. The existing road has
	change substantially since then.

#### Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	Applicant's Response
Looks exciting. Would be nice if we could	We can try, would be an issue if the
bring back the character of the original	city couldn't maintain it.
landscape.	
The one thing that stood out is the ficus tree	Yes, we provided additional space for
that is about 100 years old. I like the fact	the tree too.
that it is being maintained. Is there enough	
space to maintain it?	
Looks great, how big is the parking	650 spaces, but the entrances to the
structure going to be?	garage are spaced apart as employees
	all start at different times. It is 6
	stories.
Is there another access plan?	Just for emergency access not for
	regular access.

# Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	I think it is nicely done.
Garbini	Good plan.
Larimer	Not a lot to comment on. They are not touching the
	architecture but just the landscaping.
Woods	It is great plan.

Staff Co None	<u>mment</u> :
Recomn None	nended Modifications:
Consens	Consistent with the Standards
[ [	<ul> <li>Consistent with the Standards if modified as noted</li> <li>Inconsistent with the Standards and needs revision and additional review</li> <li>Inconsistent with the Standards but is the best feasible alternative</li> </ul>

#### ■ ITEM 3B:

<u>Listings</u>: HRB Site #1 <u>Address</u>: 1649 El Prado Historic Name: Balboa Park

Significance: Contributing to the District

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

**Project Contact**: Anthony Ridenhour and David Reed

Inconsistent with the Standards

Treatment: Rehabilitation

<u>Project Scope</u>: Garden exhibit on the exterior of the building that includes a solar

powered model railroad that would be placed in two existing planters.

Existing Square Feet: 619.75 Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 619.75

Prior DAS Review: N/A

<u>Staff Presentation</u>: The applicant is proposing to construct a miniature railroad within a gated area on the exterior of the building. The exhibit will relate to an interior exhibit and will allow people into the gated area from the museum. The exhibit will be powered by solar panels located on the roof of the building. The panels will be below the existing parapets with no visibility from the street. All panels will be weighted and no penetrations will be through the roof to accommodate the panels.

Applicant Presentation: The project itself is a miniature garden railroad. It is solar powered outdoor model railroad. We are partnering with the Balboa Park Online Collaborative using smart phones to enhance the experience. Additionally, we are working with the Sustainability Committee to work on projects long term. The display will be set up behind the building in two small existing planters. We are not touching the building and a gap will be maintained between the exhibit and the building. We are updating the accessibility, but it will be an exit only. Solar panels are also proposed for the roof at the southwest corner. The panels will be located below the parapet height. The electrical room is located directly below the proposed panel location. To mitigate any damage to the roof, we will not be penetrating the roof system. They will be weighted to the roof.

#### **Public Comment:**

Name	Comments
Charlie Daniels	Is the inverter going to be in the basement? (Yes. There
	will be no conduit on the exterior. You are correct.)

# Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	Applicant's Response
So you go through the museum, will the	We would like it to be a tease to come
exhibit be accessed from the interior? I am	in to the museum. We have talked
wondering if it will be an attractive	about using an expanded metal, so that
nuisance. Should it be shielded from view?	people could not reach through. The
	total height of the fence is 8'.
Part of the issue, is it is a small area so you	We wanted to make it feel like a patio.
don't want to make is seem like a fortress.	
The area is a secondary access point. Are	We could not have it open. The
you concerned about it being open?	material is expensive and we would
	not want it to be damaged by
	vandalism. Cameras would alert us to
	any issues.
I am concerned about the gate with the	We have looked at using a plexi-glass
metal mesh.	on the gate which would allow no one
	to poke through. This is reminiscent
	of the mesh used on the bridge. We
	could adjust the design. We are not
	married to the design just the use.
Based on the levels provided for the trains,	Yes
if I bring my young nephew would they be	
able to see it.	
What is the wall going to be made of?	The outer wall will be stucco. And we
	will be introducing art rock into the
	exhibit.
If I have a vote on the fence I prefer the	
fence with the rounded top.	

# Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	Cool project. It almost seems like too small of a space.
	Adding the historical aspect it is very exciting.
Garbini	I think it is great project.
Larimer	I think it looks great. Love the idea of model trains.
	Looks like you are introducing a train that is based on the
	historic trolley.
Woods	Great project.

taff Comment: Ione
ecommended Modifications:
fone
onsensus:
☑ 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**:

<u>Listings</u>: HRB Site #422 Address: Talmadge Area

Historic Name: Talmadge Gate Historic District

Significance: Contributing to the District

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

<u>Project Contact</u>: Ali Alaeipour Treatment: Rehabilitation

<u>Project Scope</u>: In conjunction with the Utilities Undergrounding Program, the City is updating ADA curb ramps at various locations. Specific upgrades will impact the

designated resources.

<u>Existing Square Feet</u>: N/A

<u>Additional Square Feet</u>: N/A

<u>Total Proposed Square Feet</u>: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

<u>Staff Presentation</u>: HRB staff has had concerns about the proposed ramp upgrades taking place and impacting designated historic resources. The Talmadge Gate Historic District is a number of gates that show the historic entrance to the neighborhood. They are predominantly located near existing ADA ramps. As part of the street repaving and ramp upgrades, the designated Talmadge gates would have Federal Yellow truncated domes

added to the base of the gates on the existing ramps. Staff is concerned with the impact of the color on the historically black gates. We have suggested that different colors for the truncated domes are evaluated to determine if there is another color that would meet the requirements of contrast but also provide a more suitable alternative for the gates.

Applicant Presentation: ADA is a big component of the work that we do. This project has 114 ramps that need to be replaced. There are only 10 ramps within the 114 that are impacted because of the gates. The testing that we completed for Juan Street as recommended at the direction of the Old Town Design Review Board. This area is the same as Juan Street which is why we suggested Federal Yellow. The city is currently preparing to resurface the area. If we do not complete the ramps prior to the resurfacing we will not be able to address them again for 5 years.

# **Public Comment:**

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	There are seven or eight approved colors. There is not a contrast requirement, it is a tactile. We just worked with the County and used the medium grey. The truncated domes don't have to be colored it is a tactile thing.

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

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	Applicant's Response
The requirement is that areas where there is	When you are off the public streets
vehicle hazards it has to be a tactile warning	you can use other colors. When you
strip. There is nothing that notes colors.	are in the city streets you use federal
Yellow is an easy color but there should be	yellow. We have had many
other colors to look at.	discussions regarding the colors.
There are yellow on all of the other	It is a city color. Federal code is not
sidewalks. I have noticed in other parts of	dictating the color.
the country that they are using other colors.	
What color is mandating yellow?	
There is precedent that has been set by	
SOHO.	

# **Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:**

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	There are options that should be reviewed.
Garbini	
Larimer	It not a matter of color, but the tactile nature of the truncated domes. I would recommend that you re-read the requirement about the visual contrast. It is not stated what the amount of contrast is required. I would recommend that Wayne Donaldson is also contacted.
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 addi	tional review
Inconsistent with the Standards but is the best feasible altern	native
Inconsistent with the Standards	
<del></del>	

# 4. Adjourned at 4:17 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on January 8, 2014 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.