

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

November 7, 2007, 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm  
4<sup>th</sup> Floor Conference Room  
City Administration Building  
202 C Street, San Diego, CA

### MEETING NOTES

#### 1. ATTENDANCE

Boardmembers:

David Marshall (Chair), Otto Emme, Delores McNeely and John Eisenhart (Mr. Eisenhart recused himself from 4276 Trias Street).

Staff:

Kelley Saunders, HRB staff; Garry Papers, Deputy Director, Urban Form; Marianne Greene, City Attorney's Office;

Guests:

373 San Gorgonio: Marc Tarasuck; Michael Atwell; Tracy DeBello, owner

House of Hospitality Restaurant Heaters: None

Ivy (Maryland Hotel) Signage: None

2411 Second Avenue: None

4276 Trias Street: Eva Thorn, Union Architecture

4247 Saint James Place: George Vano, owner

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

1261 and 1263 Cave Street Relocation:

HRB staff provided a copy of an email from Mike Tudury indicating that, as staff directed, if the DAS directions were followed by architect Jeffrey Shorn, staff could act on their behalf.

#### 3. Various Issues:

- Proposed Project at 373 San Gorgonio Street:

Architect Marc Tarasuck is proposing additions and modifications to the Ella Strong Dennison House, City of San Diego Historic Site #400. The applicant is proposing a 300 s.f addition above an existing garage, add a new 594 s.f. garage, and construct a 1,200 s.f. addition at the rear of the property, not readily visible. Existing residence is built at the property line.

Subcommittee Comment: Subcommittee-member Emme asked how the project would be differentiated. The applicant responded that the hipped roof lines would be extended, which does not occur elsewhere on the property. Subcommittee-member McNeely asked about roof materials. The applicant responded that the new roofing would be tile, subtly differentiated from the original. Subcommittee-member Marshall asked what would be done with the existing garage. The applicant responded that the existing garage will serve as parking for one car. Marshall asked if the existing garage extend to the property line.

The applicant responded that it does. McNeely asked if the house will be restuccoed and painted, which it will. Emme asked about new exterior lighting. The applicant stated that new recessed lighting will be focused on the garage. Emme asked if the new garage is attached. The new garage will be set back 6'-14', but will be connected to original garage. Emme feels the setbacks are fine and that the new construction doesn't overshadow the existing, noting that the roofline and garage are differentiated. He feels the project meets Standards 1, 9 and 10. McNeely agrees, and asked what is currently on top of garage, to which the applicant responded a deck. McNeely asked what is currently in the location of the proposed garage. The applicant stated that this area currently contains a parking area behind a fence.

Eisenhart inquired as to the house's original architect, the date of construction and any known additions or modifications. The applicant responded that the house was built by Herbert Palmer c 1926, and 6 years ago Ione Stiegler enclosed part of the original balcony at the front façade. The original railing was retained and will be reinstalled. Eisenhart inquired as to the function of the addition above the garage, which will serve as a bedroom for their daughter. Eisenhart feels the addition competes with the historic home and would prefer to see a flat roof as opposed to a hipped roof that would be even with or lower than adjacent the cornice line. The applicant stated that the garage steps up and that it would not be possible to lower the addition. Eisenhart asked how much lower it would be with an 8' ceiling, to which the applicant responded 18". Eisenhart feels that the addition will result in a different feeling, which is compounded by the previously approved enclosure. The arches are too busy and also compete. Marshall asked if the plans show round columns below the arches, which they do; however, the arches are just a façade treatment, and there is no balcony at this location.

McNeely asked how tall the parapet is on the existing garage. The applicant responded that the parapet is 18". Eisenhart suggested tearing out the floor joists and pushing the floor of the addition down into the garage. The applicant stated there is difficulty with intersecting masses. Eisenhart felt comfortable with the addition surpassing the cornice line, but not the existing ridgeline. The applicant would like to provide some articulation through a hipped roof as opposed to a flat roof. Eisenhart stated that the other aspects of project are fine, but has issues with the addition. Marshall agreed with Eisenhart, and asked that the façade treatment be minimized or eliminated so that the addition does not compete, but there was no consensus on this issue. Marshall feels it should be simplified, but that the applicant may be able to retain hipped roof. For the new garage, Marshall asked that the applicant explore the possibility of a contemporized version of the original garage doors. He does have some concern that the public façade is dominated by the garage, and would like to see a Photoshopped view or rendering to give a better sense of perspective from the street. He felt that some of the Subcommittee's concerns may go away with that visual information. The Subcommittee asked if turf-block could be used in front of garage in lieu of concrete. The applicant indicated that it could for about half of the driveway.

Consensus: Lower and simplify second floor addition, visually tie the new garage doors into existing building and provide a photo or rendering of the new street façade for review at a future DAS meeting.

Other Comment: None

- House of Hospitality Restaurant Heaters:

DAS members agreed to visit the outdoor courtyard of the House of Hospitality restaurant to view the heaters there, so that they might give final direction on these non-historic elements.

The applicants for the project were not in attendance. This item was not considered by the Subcommittee but will be heard at a future DAS meeting.

- Ivy (Maryland Hotel) Signage:

The blade sign issue was addressed at the last DAS meeting and it was agreed by the owner that she would consult with the designer of the sign in order to provide some containment/closure or weighting at the bottom of the sign. In addition, the painted “Maryland Hotel” sign that was located on the north masonry (party) wall of the hotel was to remain. However, it was inadvertently painted over with a much larger black background Ivy Hotel sign. Options were discussed regarding incorporating a copy of the historic Maryland Hotel sign as part of or in the area of the new large Ivy Hotel sign. The owner indicated that she would discuss this issue with her graphic designer. Ms. Kelly will report on these two issues.

The applicant indicated to staff prior to the hearing that they would not be in attendance due to production difficulties resulting from the recent fires. This item was not considered by the Subcommittee and will be rescheduled.

- 2411 Second Avenue Office Building:

This Modern style one-story office structure is located at the northeast corner of Second Avenue and Kalmia Street as offices for the well-known modernist architectural firm of Tucker Sadler. The structure is clearly potentially historic. New owner Robin Offner has made exterior modifications to the structure, some of which are consistent with the Standards, and some of which were not. The outstanding issues of the north trellis and the required disabled access were discussed with contractor Doug Cook. Mr. Cook indicated that he would study the options discussed and return to the DAS with his proposal(s) in order to assure that all of the work is consistent with the Standards.

The applicant indicated to staff prior to the hearing that they would not be in attendance and wished to withdraw the item from the DAS agenda until further notice. This item was not considered by the Subcommittee and will be rescheduled.

- 4276 Trias Street: A new entry area is proposed for this potentially historic 1935 Spanish Colonial house. Removing existing 60’s carport. The house is rather small, and the applicant is adding a new pop-out entry. Moving a window. Relocating the entry.

Removing rough stucco and replacing with smooth coat stucco. The materials at the new entry will be plaster, but could be a different finish.

(John Eisenhart recused due to his firm's involvement in the project and left the room at 4:01 PM.)

Subcommittee Comment: Subcommittee-member Marshall is generally comfortable with the project, but is concerned about loss of the side window, relocation of the door, and bringing the new foyer flush with the adjacent wall. He stated that the applicant should try to find the original stucco texture and replicate it. Subcommittee-member McNeely likes that they are reusing existing windows. She personally likes the door where it is currently, but understands why it is being relocated. Marshall felt that the new foyer should be differentiated at the roofline as well. He asked the subcommittee if they felt there should be a scoreline in the stucco at the location of the old door to indicate that the door had been there. Mr. Papers offered the suggestion of a bead-board below the window. Marshall felt that some reference to the old doorway is important. Subcommittee-member Emme suggested leaving the light fixture outside the former door. He also recommended that the owner photograph the project to document changes in case a future owner wishes to restore the home to its historic appearance.

Other Comment: None

Consensus: The Subcommittee is comfortable with the proposed modifications, provided that the applicant make an effort to replicate the historic stucco, incorporate some reference to the historic location of the entry door, and photo-document the changes.

- 4247 Saint James Place: The house is a contributing structure to the Fort Stockton Line Historic District. The applicant is seeking to extend a staff-approved retaining wall to their Fort Stockton Line frontage. Staff approved low 3' high retaining wall along St. James, but felt it was important to retain the historic relationship of the house to Fort Stockton Drive. The applicant is proposing 40" high wall from the sidewalk at its highest point.

Subcommittee Comment: Subcommittee-member Eisenhart asked what materials would be used. The applicant stated that they would like to use stone cobble, but have not priced it yet. Cinder block will not be used. Eisenhart stated that the cobble should be real, not cast-concrete. Subcommittee-member Emme asked if fencing or landscaping will be installed above the wall. The owner stated that the primary concerns are creating a safe, relatively flat area for their kids to play, and to keep the public from walking up the lawn to the house. Marshall asked if the height of grade at the base of the house will remain and what the grade change is from the sidewalk to the floor of the house. The applicant stated that the grade at the base of the house will be maintained and that the house is approximately 6.5' above the adjacent sidewalk. Marshall stated that the materials should be plain stucco or ideally cobble with a pre-cast pyramidal cap as opposed to a cast-in-place flat cap to make clear that the wall is not historic. Eisenhart stated that he is ok with wall, as long as it is limited to 40" with no fencing or anything set on top of the wall. The

lawn should slope down to the wall so that there is about 1' clearance from the lawn to the cap. Subcommittee members did not have an issue with locating a wall on Fort Stockton Drive. Subcommittee-member McNeely asked if the wall would be the same height on Ft. Stockton and St. James. The applicant responded that the wall height would vary based on adjacent grade. Emme stated that cobble is preferable, but a stucco wall with a cap is fine. The wall should be simple, with no lighting, addressing, etc. The applicant inquired if plantings between the wall and the grass would be acceptable. Subcommittee members responded that low flowers would be ok, but no hedges or ivy which would begin to block the view.

Other Comment: None

Consensus: The Subcommittee was comfortable with a wall along Fort Stockton Drive. A real stone cobble finish is preferable, but stucco with a simple cap is ok. The wall should be no higher than 40", and should not have a rail or fence on top. The Subcommittee asked to see the project again with more detailed plans.

4. Adjourn 4:21 PM

Next Subcommittee Meeting will be on December 5, 2007 at 3:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at [kmsaunders@sandiego.gov](mailto:kmsaunders@sandiego.gov) or by phone at 619.533.6508