

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 5, 2014, 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

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (Chair); Ann Woods; Tom Larimer
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Jodie Brown;
Item 3A	Mike Morrison; Vance Walker; David Perry; Bobby Hrdina; Laura Giacalone; Steve Saars
Item 3B	Mark Lyons; Todd Robinson
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #526

Address: 3150 Maple Street

Historic Name: Burlingame Historic District

Significance: Burlingame Historic District Non Contributor

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Mike Morrison; Robin Franklin

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Construction of a 2 story single family residence on a vacant lot.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: 1,673

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,673

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The project is for construction of a new house on an empty lot within the Burlingame Historic District. The applicant is proposing a one and two story residence in the Spanish Eclectic style.

Applicant Presentation: I have provided a number of photos of the properties within the district to show that it is eclectic stylistically. We checked with zoning and conform to the setbacks and went with minimal square footage of 1,700 SF. With landscaping we are going with all drought tolerant plants and with the typical Spanish colonial colors. We will have fine sand finish stucco.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Vance Walker	In the previous design, I was not pleased. On this design we feel that it is a good fit.
Steve Saars	We were concerned about the slope. Will you do a raised foundation? How will it fit into the neighborhood with the materials?
Laura Giacalone	Are you bringing in dirt to accommodate the site/elevation? (No, that is not our intent.)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Looking at the site plan, the closest house is 15 feet?	20 feet with the setback
Overall, it is a very attractive design. For the windows, it shows a splayed window.	They are going to be bull nosed with 1.5 inch recess.
Color scheme is appropriate, the pop-out for the bathroom, where you show raised parapet with the new pop-out, more attention should be paid to them and their articulation.	OK
Regarding the sun, in late December the house will shadow the fence to the north?	Yes
What about the light pattern on the windows?	Staff has already suggested a simple 1/1 pattern

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	I agree. It looks good and good idea to go with the Spanish style.
Woods	It looks fine to me. It is scaled to the lot and looks appropriate.

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 #498

Address: 7245 Eads Avenue

Historic Name: The Erling Rhode Residence

Significance: C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: Yes

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Mark Lyon; Todd Robinson

Treatment: Rehabilitation

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

Existing Square Feet: 1,749

Additional Square Feet: 1,529

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,278

Prior DAS Review: Feb-14

Staff Presentation: The property was previously viewed by the subcommittee at the February meeting. The subcommittee members requested a 3D rendering to better understand the impact of the proposed addition.

Applicant Presentation: We have provided the 3D image of the design and provided a comparison of the current proposed design and the design without the den area.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The design is very attractive. I think you have done a lot to be sympathetic to the home. The materials are appropriate. And the 3D design helps to understand the impact from	No, it is an older designation.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Genter. Are the character-defining features called out in the original designation report?	
But massing is also part of the integrity. The tangible elements are being preserved.	
The beauty of the Craftsman style is that you can add parts over time. There is always the assumption that it will evolve over time. I think the massing is respecting the character of the home.	
I noticed that we are replicating the kicker on the addition. Is that appropriate to have them there?	You bring up a good point. As I shrink the addition, those elements get bigger. I could bring the gable sequence down and cut down the overhangs from 3' to 2'. The brackets could be tapered back to make them smaller.
I actually am on the fence with the proposal. Looking at the north elevation on A3.3. At some point there is no point of retaining a historic home if there have been a number of additions. I think in the prior designs that the 2 nd story over powered the 1 st story and what is the point of preserving it. Looking at the north perspective, the 2 nd story addition is not what immediately jumps out at you. The northeast perspective seems a little over whelming.	
I am on the fence. It is really set back.	
The primary concern was the view from Genter. It seems that with more of the massing being pushed back that it is appropriate.	
Reducing the overhang and the size of the outriggers would be reduced is appropriate.	
What about making divided light patterns on the upper windows?	It would compete with the lower floor

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	Recommend, but pull back the overhang so it is proportional and reduce the size of the brackets.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Approve the design and reduce the size of the overhang and the brackets to be more proportional to the size of the addition.

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

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on April 2, 2014 at 4:00 PM.

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