

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, December 3, 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 4.10pm

Subcommittee Members	Gail Garbini; Linda Marrone; Ann Woods; Tom Larimer
City Staff	
Guests	HRB Jodie Brown;
Item 3A	Nathan Cadieux; Leslie Cusworth; Mike Arduino; Carlos Wellman; Adolfo Fastlicht; Sandy Perlaffi
Item 3B	Nathan Cadieux, Phil Cudaback; Lucas Reeve
Item 3C	David Mandelbaum, Desiree Kellogg, Diane Kane
Other	Bruce Coons,

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

### 3. Project Reviews

#### ▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #425; NR

Address: 2620 Truxton Road

Historic Name: Naval Training Station

Significance: District Contributor

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 285926

Project Contact: Nathan Cadieux; Carlos Wellman

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Remodel the Luce Auditorium to become a 6 screen theatre with a proposed exterior deck and patio.

Existing Square Feet: 20,844

Additional Square Feet: 3,961

Total Proposed Square Feet: 24,805

Prior DAS Review: Nov-14

Staff Presentation: This project was most recently reviewed by DAS at the November 2014 meeting. At that meeting, DAS expressed concerns about the patio cover and the paint color. The applicants have revised their plans to appropriately address the meeting comments.

Applicant Presentation: There were a number of requests at two meetings with staff and DAS. We tried to address the concerns and minimize the impact of the structure. We have also addressed the color.

The color was a very important issue. We have revised the color to be more consistent with the district, we removed the landscape and we have reduced the impact of the patio cover but we would like to maintain the NanoWall system.

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Bruce Coons	I think it is a better design, but I am not wild about the pavilion out front. I do think that the glass enclosure should be eliminated. Since it is up front and center, it does not meet the SOI at all. I have less objections to the overall the design than last time.
Sandy Comatti	We are very much in support of the efforts and their design.
David Mandellum	I think that it is a changed and contemporary use, meeting the SOI.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
So the top is aligned with the top of the arcade?	Yes
Will the doors be open the majority of the time or will they be closed?	They will be open majority of the time. Like most other venues at NTC, they have an indoor space and an outdoor space, and we would like to have those options too. We are going as thin as we can, and as high as we can. At night it would be shut down and closed up. We also only have one entrance to simplify the design.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Larimer	It does not detract from the historic building. It steps

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	back and allows the historic building to be visible.
Marrone	Thank you for taking our comments into consideration. I think this is quite an improvement and probably the best solution.
Woods	Looks great. I was excited with the design of the last time, and you seem to have taken all the previous comments.

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 #425; NRAddress: 2855 Perry RoadHistoric Name: Naval Training StationSignificance: District ContributorMills Act Status: NoPTS #: N/AProject Contact: Nathan Cadieux; Phipip CudabackTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: Additon of exterior cooking facilities; two shipping container and site work.Existing Square Feet: 3,300Additional Square Feet: 0Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,300Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The applicants would like to introduce a restaurant space at the former fire station at NTC. The restaurant would maintain the driveway, but would add a number of elements to the rear of the building include re-purposed storage containers, pergolas, paving, firepits and built-in seating

Applicant Presentation: We have a number of restaurants and stores that have opened. The restaurants are very neighborhood centric. We met with staff and have made some

initial changes based on the meeting with staff. We have also reduced the overhang on one of the storage containers. We want any of the new work that we do to pay homage to the existing building. We also wanted to make sure that the building took precedent. We provided a contrast between the new and the historic. We have pulled the container on the right side back and we have left the driveway alone. The other container has also been pulled back. A trellis is proposed for over the driveway on the east elevation. The storage containers will be open as possible with a shade structure. There will also be a display kitchen along one wall of the historic building. All of the elements that are being added to the site are all reversible.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	I am not sure I can make a full decision about the proposed work. It is at the ceremonial entrance, and has two flanking buildings that are very important. I would prefer an elevation that shows the area dead center. It appears like a sensitive design, but it is difficult to say without an elevation to comment on the containers and the trellis. The biggest issue I have is the western outdoor cooking area. Even if it is not attached, it will impact the building. The entrance should not be placed at the front.
Nathan Cadieux	We spent a lot of time working on this with the tenant and working with staff. The east side is a non historic portion of the building with the mechanical equipment. On the east side, we attempted to protect the driveways and the entrances. We pushed it back to protect these areas.
Bruce Coons	I like that there are no walls surrounding the place

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
My concern is with the form. If you look at the containers, do they not convey a false sense of history? However, is it the right thing for this space? It is a very radical departure. I am concerned it may be too far from what is right with the district. Containers have been a trend over the last few years; I have concerns about their placement at the entrance of NTC. The spacing of the trellis is awkward.	The shade structure was a quick rendering, but I envision a rough sawn wood. The containers will have the sides cut out and not look like containers
Are there any colonnades that you can draw from?	Yes, there are colonnades throughout, but we wanted to keep with a modern use.
I think that you are headed in the right direction, but it is just not quite there. The	

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
form needs refinement. The trellis needs to be refined, and I don't know if they are appropriate. I would suggest looking at the outdoor bar areas at the Hotel Del.	
I have less problems with the shipping containers. I do have concerns about the height of the trellis and cuts across the opening of the fire station. I also have concerns about the east side kitchen. The kitchen is large and changes the look of the building.	The east side is where the bathroom windows are located and is a secondary side of the building.
What am I seeing on page 3, what is facing the lawn?	There is no change to the main façade. We will also be adding art to the front façade that will draw your eyes to the north façade. You don't really see the north façade coming in and usually skirt the sides.
I don't have an issue with the shipping containers, but would like to see a primary elevation to see how it all works together.	I believe that the northeast and northwest corners are the primary views of the building.
I am concerned about the height of the trellis.	We did not want the trellis to dominate so we kept it low.
I think you will need to be careful with the artwork.	
Everything on the site is very linear and the proposed design is more aerodynamic, more linked to the 1950s and 1960s. I don't have an issue with the shipping containers but I like the idea of Hotel Del.	
Why is the fireplace in this location?	So we can draw people to that corner. You will come in through the front door and be drawn to the back.
Providing elevations would be helpful. I think that the shape of the containers is linked to the original openings, but elevation would be helpful.	
Landscape should be more traditional.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Larimer	Providing elevations would be helpful. I think that the shape of the containers is linked to the original openings, but elevation would be helpful.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Brown	Staff did not have the opportunity to review the pergola proposed over the driveway. Staff recommends that the driveway is free and clear of an obstructions.

Recommended Modifications:

Revisions per the comments

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 #1125Address: 7727 Lookout DriveHistoric Name: George and Marion Cottrell/Cliff May HouseSignificance: C (Architecture); D (Master Architect)Mills Act Status: NoPTS #: 395630Project Contact: Justin Mandelbaum; David Mandelbaum; Tony CrisafiTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: Introduction of a new sliding kitchen window in the interior courtyard area.Existing Square Feet: 3,178Additional Square Feet: 0Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,178Prior DAS Review: Oct-14

Staff Presentation: This project was previously reviewed by DAS in October 2014. This aspect of the project proposes to enlarge a kitchen window within the courtyard to accommodate a sliding window.

Applicant Presentation: When we acquired the house, we worked with staff to enlarge the kitchen. There is currently a small window that is the only kitchen window into the courtyard. We are proposing to enlarge the window opening and make it a sliding window to allow access from the kitchen to the interior courtyard. We believe that this is a new contemporary use and consistent with the Standards. The courtyard is not visible from the public right of way. Cutting new openings on secondary elevations is provided for by the SOI.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Desiree Kellogg	I continue to be concerned about the integrity of the property and the cumulative impacts to the property.
Bruce Coons	Both Gail and I live in Cliff May houses that were constructed before this one. It is the first full courtyard and they were developed based on the adobe homes. The plaster used on building is unique and removal of the plaster is removal of character defining features. There are original windows there with original shutters. There are no windows of this design on a Cliff May house that I know of, and I don't believe that it is not consistent with the Standards. We were liberal with the other side of the courtyard and that should have not been allowed.
Diane Kane	I would disagree that this is a secondary elevation. When we were in Sacramento, the architect stated this was a primary elevation. I have spoken with Wayne Donaldson, who agrees this is a very important property. Removal of the stucco and adding a contemporary use is not consistent with the SOI.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
For staff, what was the concern with the window?	The enlargement of the window opening and the cumulative changes.
The window is original fabric and I don't believe it is consistent with the Standards.	We have primary and secondary, we cannot have primary and primary. You can't have a courtyard without access.
Are there guidelines that address interior courtyards?	No. The parcel is designated and we review any work to the designated parcel.
If the window was replaced and enlarged, would we not be able to identify the house as a Cliff May house? Is it detrimental to replace and enlarge this window? It seems that we are over-reaching for an interior courtyard?	
I have been in a number of Cliff May houses that have enlarged the kitchen but maintained the exterior, but now you are left with a small bathroom window in the kitchen. Ideally, it would be more in character of the window.	
You have already opened Pandora's box with the kitchen remodel, so you would need to address the window issue.	

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
So the window was a 3030, so the new window will be about one foot taller?	Yes
Why aren't you proposing a full height window for visibility?	The kitchen is set at this point and if possible would have done it in the beginning.
I think it is within the guidelines to change the window.	
I think it goes back to the overall integrity and removing historic fabric.	
I would recommend that you reduce the size. It does not have to be the same size as the existing but consider the height versus the width?	We are trying to make it livable.
What about the shutters?	It would be odd to include those and possibly create a false sense of history.
Does the original window next to it have shutters?	No, it has a grille.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Larimer	Maybe the mullion pattern is a four x four to mimic the larger windows.
Garbini	I would like to see something that is akin to the original character.

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 6:13 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on January 7, 2015 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Jodie Brown at [JDBrown@sanidiego.gov](mailto:JDBrown@sanidiego.gov) or 619.533.6300