

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, July 2, 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 4:03

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (chair); Gail Garbini; Ann Woods; Tom Larimer
Recusals	
City Staff	
Guests	HRB Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown;
Item 3A	Tabitha McMahon; Micah Parzen; Kitty Vieth
Item 3B	Cindy Blair; Mike Georgopoulos; Ken Lovi; Mark Rojas
Item 3C	Paul Johnson; Sarai Johnson; Jane Valentine
Item 3D	Dieter Fenkart-Froeschl
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: Museum of Man & California Tower

Significance:

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Micah Parzen, Museum of Man; Kitty Vieth, Architectural Resources Group

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes improvements required to make the California Tower accessible to the public once again. Modifications are primarily interior, and include firewalls and compliant hand rails (as well as preservation of historic

handrails). Some exterior modifications are proposed, which include making the existing fixed windows operable for ventilation and modifications to the 8th floor balcony railing.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The Museum of Man is hoping to open the California Tower to the public for tours. For the most part, staff believes that the item is consistent with the Standards with a few items that are areas of concerns. Visitors will be taken up the tower by staff. There will be a number of handrails that are preserved and a number that will be new. The visitation will be through the stairs with alternative visitation in the lobby. DAS is asked to review making the windows operable, the introduction of a new wood railing and the introduction of new barriers.

Applicant Presentation: We are only providing safety upgrades between the 2nd and 3rd floor, there is a non-historic partition wall which will be removed and a new gate will be added that will block access to the tower. Where there are no handrails, we will be adding them for safety. No historic handrails will be removed. We have used the State Historic Building Code to maintain a number of historic features. All of the non-historic features will be replaced with code compliant hand rails. Tour access will be only to the 8th floor. At the 8th floor the railings are a concern. The spacing that currently exists is not to code and the height is slightly shorter than needed. It also appears that a top rail was removed from this area. However, we were able to find a historic photo that shows an upper rail. We are proposing to install a GFRE top rail to replicate the original rail. There were nine windows on the tower that were originally operable based on the historic photo showing an open casement. We are proposing to modify the existing windows to make them operable to provide for ventilation.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	The addition of the wood rails would be the only increase in height? (Yes)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
I see notes about demolishing the existing guard rail?	In the 1960s when they did upgrades they added the rail and we will be removing it.
Is one of the floors accessed by a ladder?	No, it is for maintenance that we will be adding a ladder at the 3 rd floor
Will the windows be replaced with casements?	We will be maintaining the existing windows with hardware and making them operable.
The railing at the 8 th floor balcony will have	It will be added to for height but the

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
a wood addition on top?	material will not be wood. The design will be based on historic photo.
Will you be adding netting to this area?	No, we will be doing load testing for the existing railing.
What time of metal will the bottom railing be?	We have not yet determined the metal.
There is a gate being added? In my opinion the gate design is a little too harsh and should be a little more romantic.	Yes, we could use a more decorative metal mesh. We have looked at different perforated metal mess and have not yet settled on one. I would be happy to investigate different options, but it is necessary to security and safety.
What type of material will the rail be at the balcony be?	Not sure, we are undecided at this point.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	I am OK with everything that you have presented. Would like them to work with staff to find a more appropriate mesh design
Garbini	Looks good
Woods	Looks good
Larimer	The gate at the second floor seems stark/harsh. Make it more compatible. Provide something with dimension to the metal.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Consensus:

- Consistent with the Standards
- Consistent with the Standards if modified as noted (see above)
- 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 #127; National Register Historic District

Address: 527 5th Avenue

Historic Name: Gaslamp Historic District

Significance:Mills Act Status: N/APTS #: N/AProject Contact: KC Steak House LLC; Ocio Design GroupTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: Construct a roof top dining area on a one story non contributing building with a new elevator and retracable awningExisting Square Feet: 6,333Additional Square Feet: 2,450Total Proposed Square Feet: 8,783Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This property is a non-contributor to the Gaslamp Historic District. The building is a one story building front on to 5th Avenue. The owners are proposing to add a roof top terrace that would include an elevator shaft at the front of the property and a retractable awning with the associated framing. The proposed additions would create, in essence a partial second floor which is not consistent with the rest of the district.

Applicant Presentation: We have been through several different associations for the second story. The challenge is the elevator shaft. It is located at the front of the building and the retractable awning which was suggested to address the noise. We are asking about recommendations to make this work.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	It would be better if it could be moved back. Not sure about the L shape. It looks out of place with rest of the district.
Coons	I recommend pushing it back and wrapping it with the awning.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What is the point of the L shaped roof?	When you come off of the elevator you would have a solid enclosure all the way back to the bathroom.
Could you push the elevator back 15'?	It would impede on the existing bathroom. The staircase would need to wrap around the elevator shaft.
Is there a way to reverse the stairs and the elevator?	There would still be a projection on the second floor
I agree regarding the massing and there would be nice to have relief from that	
I believe that the spacing of the awning supports should line up with the posts below	Yes, we can make that happen.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Push it back and break up the mass with a different material and eliminate the L shape.	
What color is the awning?	It could be gray or red and would be retractable.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	My concern is the solid addition at the front façade. It should be moved back and maybe the elevator should be glass. To soften lines. It should be far back as possible. If it is too modern on top, it would be too stark next to the historic building. I think that we would need something to soften the glass. You could do brick pillars in between the glass.
Garbini	I like the second story restaurant. I have concern about the glass rail.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications: That the elevator is set back and perhaps it is glass. The glass rail has brick pillars in between

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:Address: 1845 29th StreetHistoric Name:Significance:Mills Act Status: N/APTS #: N/AProject Contact: James and Johannah Valentine; Paul JohnsonTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Seeking assistance on remediation of window replacements. The existing windows were replaced with wood framed casements. This replacement action was reviewed by the Design Assistance Subcommittee. After completion of the window replacement work, a photo was found which brings into question the accuracy of the wood window replacement.

Existing Square Feet:

Additional Square Feet:

Total Proposed Square Feet:

Prior DAS Review: Mar-13

Staff Presentation: You saw this property when they were doing some window restoration for designation. They are coming back to discuss the front octagonal window and the side windows and how they were set in the wall plane.

Applicant Presentation: We had an existing window on the garage that we were basing all of the restoration work on. The question came about with a historic photo that shows an octagonal window which will be restored. The real question is how the windows splay in the historic photo and on the south side. The windows were replaced and we believe that the splay happened when they windows were replaced and it was a typical flashing method.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	It looks like it was set back to me which would cause the splay. Sometimes the windows had the same treatment to make the walls appear thicker like adobe.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What were the concerns in the original report?	Aside from the central window, the wrought iron detail, the treatment of the window surrounds without the wood sills and the bevel treatment.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	I would recommend that you use the existing window on the garage that is original.
Garbini	We don't have any evidence that it was inset, so we should go with what we know what was there. I would go with the physical evidence.
Larimer	The bathroom would appear that it is set in the wall. I would restore to the slight inset.
Woods	I would go with the garage one that is not inset.
Bethke	Reasonable to restore to the garage appearance/setting.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Windows should be set flush.

Consensus:

- Consistent with the Standards
- X 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 3D:**

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

Address: 1450 El Prado

Historic Name: Balboa Park Historic District

Significance:

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Dieter Fenkart-Froeschl; Craig Voss

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The museum would like to replace an existing fabric awning with hard shell canopy. The new hard shell canopy will not impact or change park views or the historic 1960s modernistic addition, and the hard shell canopy will be lower in height than the existing canopy.

Existing Square Feet:

Additional Square Feet:

Total Proposed Square Feet:

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This item involves the sculpture garden. The SDMA currently has a cover over the garden which has not fared well. The canopy was installed in 1993. They would like to replace with a sturdier canopy.

Applicant Presentation: Between 2003 and 2011, the canopy has failed 3 times and was tweaked with each repair. We are proposing nothing that will change the park views and is reversible. The truss system will be very sleek and will not impact the exterior views. The existing canopy is 6' above the height of the roof and proposed will be only 4' above the roof.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Do you have a cleaning process? (we can power wash)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
---------------------------------------	----------------------

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is this a contributor to the district?	No, it is not within the period of significance.
How is that draining?	It sheets off to the existing roof.
Is the roof tile?	It is concrete with roofing material on top.
Is this meant to be with a bronze tinting?	Yes
It would be nice if the supports align with the columns below.	Yes they will.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	I think it looks great. It fits within the district.
Larimer	I think it is a great idea.

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 5.40 PM

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

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