# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

# DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 3, 2014, 2012, 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 4:05

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (Chair); Linda Marrone; Ann Woods
Recusals	

City Staff

HRB	Jodie Brown;
CCDC	Lucy Contreras;

Guests

Item 3A Dennis Rogers; James Ardizzore; Kate Fellini Other Bruce Coons, SOHO

- 2. Public Comment (on matters not on the agenda) None
- 3. Project Reviews

#### • <u>ITEM 3A</u>:

Listings: HRB Site #127-075 Address: 743 5th Avenue Historic Name: Gaslamp Historic District Significance: District Contributor Mills Act Status: No PTS #: 384391 Project Contact: The Briad Group; ACM Architects Treatment: Rehabilitation Project Scope: Proposed construction of a new 119 room hotel with the incorporation of a Galleria Building historic façade on 6th Avenue. The project is subject to the Gaslmap Planned District Ordinance (GQPDO) and the Gaslamp Quarter Design Guidelines. The applicant is requesting approval of an increase in height from 60' to 75' allowed under the GQPDO. The applicant is also seeking direction on a proposed facade rehabiliation along 6th Avenue. Existing Square Feet: 0 Additional Square Feet: 0 <u>Total Proposed Square Feet</u>: 65,876 <u>Prior DAS Review</u>: N/A

<u>Staff Presentation</u>: The applicant is proposing to construct a new multi-story hotel in Gaslamp Historic District. The hotel would front on to  $5^{th}$  Avenue and would be located in place of the existing TGI Fridays. The hotel would extend to  $6^{th}$  Avenue where there is currently a historically designated façade. The 2-story façade would be restored and the new construction would be setback slightly.

<u>Applicant Presentation</u>: We are proposing to put a new hotel in the place of the TGI Fridays. It is a boutique hotel with 119 rooms and a restaurant on the first floor and a pool lounge on the upper floor. We have added transoms to the storefront area to unify the look. On the upper floors we have added a horizontal element to create a punched look opening. We had a couple of additional doors. We cleaned up the store front and still have the glass garage door, but we are open to a different style door. Regarding colors, we simplified the colors.

Name	Comments
Bruce	It looks better than the second version. I think with more
	detailing the 5 <sup>th</sup> avenue façade could work better. It will
	read as the tallest building on the block. The side
	facades will be visible up and down the street. The extra
	floor should not be visible and should be set back. The
	historic façade, should be modified to more closely
	resemble the photos. The new façade should be set back
	from the historic façade. It does not appear to be a
	reasonable set back. It should maintain the feeling of a
	building. When viewed from the side it will still look
	like a painted on façade.

Public Comment:

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

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Curious about the current addition on the $6^{th}$	Approximately 2'.
Avenue side-what is the set back?	
What are the setbacks per the Standards?	It is not specifically called out. There
	is no Standard. It is open to
	interpretation and we have to
	determine whether it detracts from the
	integrity.
Now that there is a photograph of the $6^{th}$	
Avenue façade it should conform more to	
that for any work.	
The garage door is innovative and a unique	

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
approach. On the 6 <sup>th</sup> Avenue side, we	
should get back to what is shown in the	
historic photo. The question is then how to	
put the garage in with a unified approach.	
On the 5 <sup>th</sup> Avenue side, the height is	It is recessed somewhat if you look at
something that will jarring to the adjacent	page 26.
buildings. The setback on the 5 <sup>th</sup> Avenue is	
more important next to the one story	
building to the north. It is a one story	
building. I believe it impacts the integrity	
of the adjacent buildings. That might be	
where the brick might help.	
Are the windows on the side?	No, they can't be placed there per the
	building code.
You might want to consider a mural on the	
vacant wall. Something of relevance to that	
building.	
So it is a 2' set back on 6 <sup>th</sup> Avenue, but the	They could be pulled back. The intent
balconies cantilever out?	is that they are Juliette balconies. If
	you look at page 28 it shows the
	dimension.
So there is a building in between Friday's	No, it is the same building.
and the theater?	

### Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	The trick with the setback on 5 <sup>th</sup> Avenue is the treatment
	with the adjacent building should be setback on the left
	side. It is important on how the blank wall is treated.
Woods	On the 6 <sup>th</sup> Avenue side there should be some sort of
	setback. Maybe not exactly 10' but some sort of setback.

#### Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Lucy	We can review the PDO, but there should be a discussion
	in there on blank walls.

<u>Recommended Modifications</u>: Set back the new construction on the  $6^{th}$  Avenue and consider a mural on the blank wall along  $5^{th}$  Avenue.

#### 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

4. Adjourned at 4:38 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on October 1, 2014 at 4:00 PM.

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