

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 4, 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); Linda Marrone; Gail Garbini;
Tom Larimer

Recusals

City Staff

HRB Jodie Brown; Kelley Stanco
Item 3A Marty Turock; Dave Weil; Michael Ruiz; David
 Marshall
Item 3B Jack Carpenter
Item 3C Matthew Welsh; Ricardo Rabine; Taal Safdie
Other Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

None

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #1; National Register Historic Landmark District

Address:

Historic Name: Balboa Park Historic District

Significance:

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Lorie Azar, City of San Diego Environmental Services

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project is a lighting project for the entire length of the Prado, as well as the Organ Pavilion. The project proposes lighting of the building facades using LED lights, as well as use of string lighting and canopy/landscaping lighting. The lighting installations are proposed to be permanent.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: DAS saw this item previously. Staff is concerned about color washing the Organ Pavilion, installing permanent lighting and staying true to the period of restoration. Staff has suggested that the applicants investigate the research done for the lighting at the House of Hospitality.

Applicant Presentation: There was no specific color light information for 1915, but there is information available for 1935. There were no color photos, but descriptions and artistic renderings available. There were violets, greens and blues at the entries. Amber was used on flat building walls per the HABS documentation. Maxfield Parrish paintings were used for inspiration. The proposed approach is more conservative than some of the postcards.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	In the renderings, what is proposed? (Reference the first rendering only). I am concerned about the lighting leading up along the arcades-it looks like it is off in the renderings. (It would be best to project from the arcades.)
Marshall	This will obviously set a precedent. I hope whatever is added is temporary and in addition to, not in place of the historic lighting. (The lights could be mounted on a tripod and the color wash would only be used for special events.)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What is the period of significance for the lighting?	We are not sure.
The Organ Pavilion and the House of Hospitality restored lighting to a specific period, correct?	Yes 1915 and 1935 respectively.
Did the Organ Pavilion ever have colored lights?	Aurora Borealis lights but we are not aware of color washing.
Do we want to have a lighting feature that is different from the historic?	
Color thru out is awesome, but I have seen it done well and poorly.	
How will the lights be attached?	They will not be physically attached, just sitting on a weighted platform.
The park would need a program for every day and one for events.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	The color that is currently used at the park is tasteful and quaint. This work does have the potential to adversely impact the resource. There should be a protocol of when and how color washing should be used.
Marrone	The key word is this is reversible. The Organ Pavilion is perfect venue for color washing, but I wouldn't want to see it color lighting thru out (Disney effect).

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Use warm white colors day to day and color for the special events.

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 #1; National Register Historic Landmark DistrictAddress:Historic Name: Balboa Park Historic DistrictSignificance:Mills Act Status: N/APTS #: N/AProject Contact: Jack Carpenter, Friends of Balboa ParkTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: The Friends of Balboa Park are pursuing several smaller restoration and rehabilitation projects within the park, some of which are proposing alternate materials.Existing Square Feet: N/AAdditional Square Feet: N/ATotal Proposed Square Feet: N/APrior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The Friends of Balboa Park would like to address some maintenance issues around the park. They would like to use alternate materials on a number of the items.

Applicant Presentation: Originally the balustrades surrounding the El Cid statue were wood. Due to the lack of regular maintenance, the rails at the top of the balustrades have deteriorated significantly. We would like to replace the existing rails (which are not original and replaced previously) with concrete or GFRC. We could keep or replicate the balusters, but they would then have to support concrete rails. We could have the rail done in three to four pieces keeping the joints hidden. It is likely that we cannot do the railing in one piece given its current length. I would also like to discuss some proposed work to the guardhouses.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	I have always had concerns with pre-caste concrete having too many joints. I would like to see joints minimized to the greatest extent possible. I hate to lose historic fabric, but I don't have an issue replacing with pre-cast. I would recommend that you keep a sample of the balustrade. I also don't have an issue with integral color as long as it is historically accurate. I would not recommend any fiberglass.
Marshall	Drawings were done when the damage was less, and it has gotten worse. Balustrades are probably originally redwood and may not support concrete, you could use GFRC instead. (GFRC rail would have internal steel)
Coons	Regarding the guardhouses, the finial should be replaced and in fill the door on the north side. I would like to see the aluminum windows replaced with historically appropriate windows. Elastomeric paint needs to look like paint.
Marshall	The north side of the guardhouse has two non-historic doors, I would like to remove 1 if not 2.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Integral color is a good idea.	
The existing profiles appear to be different, why?	One with the trim is likely originally and there was some patching over the years.
It would be good to determine the original appearance and replicate.	
Could a portion of the rail be restored in place?	Possibly, but it deteriorates quickly.
Typically pre-cast is done in no more than 8' sections, so you would be looking at 5 pieces.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	GFRC with integral color matching the historic profile and minimizing the joints is appropriate. Could possibly use paint too.
Garbini	I agree with the work for the guardhouse.
Marrone	Yes, appropriate to infill the door on the north
Larimer	Infill the door on the north
Bethke	Agrees that the door on the north side of the guardhouse should be removed. Elastomeric paint, in my experience, should be removed. Prefer to not have it on the building, maybe a different type of paint.

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 #1062Address: 7761 Eads Avenue and 7762 Bishops LaneHistoric Name: Lillian Lentell CottagesSignificance: A (Special Element)Mills Act Status: N/APTS #: N/AProject Contact: Taal Safdie; Ricardo RabinesTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This project involves moving the cottages of an adjacent property at 817 Silverado. There is an existing 1910 cottage on the site that faces Silverado and a vacant area that is currently being used as a surface lot that fronts Bishops Lane. The proposal is to locate both cottages to the empty portion of the property facing Bishops Lane. A new second story addition, set back from the street, would connect all three buildings.

Existing Square Feet: 1,475Additional Square Feet: 1,260.50Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,736Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The applicant is proposing to relocate two designated houses behind a non-designated house that is over 45 years of age. The non-designated house has not been evaluated by staff as part of the Potentially Historic Resource review. Staff has a number of concerns with the proposed design. The work does not appear to be consistent with the Standards due to the bulk and scale of the proposed addition connecting all three houses.

Applicant Presentation: Applicant prepared a model to show DAS the design and layout of the proposed design.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	I thought you would leave the front cottage in its current location. The smaller cottage gets the most damage. I am not sure how I feel. I would have to walk the lot.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
I am struggling with understanding how we are respecting the historic character by moving and cutting them up. The massing is also a concern, making 3 into 1 by combining into one building.	
Massing is a concern. Moving them is not an issue but they need more separation between them. I would like to see more differentiation between them.	
I agree, this is not consistent with the Standards.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	We are compromising massing, location, and orientation. I don't know what the project achieves for preservation. The project is not consistent with the Standards.

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 5.45 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on July 6, 2014 at 4:00 PM.

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