

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 9, 2008, at 3:00 PM

5th Floor Large Conference Room

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

## MEETING NOTES

### 1. ATTENDANCE

Subcommittee Members David Marshall (Chair); John Eisenhart; Laura Burnett

Recusals David Marshall, Item 3H

City Staff

HRB Kelley Saunders

Park & Rec Charlie Daniels

Guests

Item 3A John Carter, architect; Tricia Garland, owner

Item 3B William Boehm, architect; Claudia Metcalfe, owner

Item 3C Julie Riley, owner

Item 3D Bob Bauer, architect; Paige Seeger Strauss, owner

Item 3E Dana Ansell, engineer; Scott Moomjian, consultant;  
Donna Knierim, owner

Item 3F Paul Johnson, architect; Scott and Patty Williams, owners

Item 3G NOT HEARD

Item 3H David Reed, landscape architect; Ricardo Rabines,  
architect; Marin Gertler, architect; Rob Sidner, Mingei  
Museum

Other Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

None.

### 3. Project Reviews

#### ▪ **ITEM 3A:**

HRB #: 526-109

Address: 2535 San Marcos Avenue

PTS #: 141137

Project Contact: John Carter, architect on behalf of owner Tricia Garland

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: A 631 square foot addition consisting of a 182 square foot first floor addition and 449 square foot second floor addition. The project has been reviewed by DAS on two separate occasions. The remaining issue is the construction of a second floor deck at the front of the home. The applicant will provide renderings as requested.

Existing Square Feet: 2,344

Additional Square Feet: 631

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,975

Staff Presentation: This item was reviewed previously and approved with the caveat that the applicant return with renderings should they choose to pursue a deck at the second floor on the street façade. The applicant has prepared the renderings and is seeking approval.

Applicant Presentation: The second floor mass has been simplified by pulling the chimney flush with the wall and eliminating the wood deck railing, which has been replaced by a stucco wall. They have prepared a photo exhibit demonstrating visibility from different points along the right-of-way. The railing would be minimally visible from across the street.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
The side pergola on the ground floor has been removed from the project scope?	Yes
The proposed new windows are wood frame?	Yes
The addition is proposed to be the same paint color as original house?	Yes

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Marshall	The revised project correctly keeps the focus on historic portion of house.
Eisenhart	The proportions are simpler and cleaner.
Burnett	Looks great.

Staff Discussion and Comment: None

Public 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:**

HRB #: n/a

Address: 6206 Waverly Avenue

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: William Boehm, architect on behalf of Claudia Metcalfe, owner

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Alterations to previously altered garage facade.

Existing Square Feet: 3,420

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Proposed Square Feet: 3,420

Staff Presentation: None.

Applicant Presentation: Brought photos of the property prior to the addition and modification to the garage. The applicant extended the garage 3’ toward the street and widened it to accommodate a second floor addition above the garage. The addition created a more enclosed front yard. Three proposals for modifications to the addition have been prepared in order to soften the garage facade. The applicant’s preferred option is to construct additional posts at the balcony to break up the massing; refinish the post between the two garage bays; and add a bracketed trellis element with landscaping above the garage doors. The second alternative only adds the posts. The third alternative removes the stucco parapet and replaces it with an open wood railing. They do not prefer the third alternative because it reduces privacy and it is not consistent with other Shepherd designed homes.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant’s Response</b>
What material are the garage doors now?	Wood
Did the garage get longer and wider during the remodeling?	Yes. 3’ longer and a few feet wider toward the front yard and the interior of the lot.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Marshall	Concerned that the addition of the trellis and landscape calls attention to itself, and is too close to other Shepherd designs. The proposed modifications to the garage post and porch posts are helpful. Likes the brick cap, but would like to differentiate it. The open wood handrail is the friendliest and most aesthetically pleasing of the three options, and doesn’t too closely mimic a Shepherd design. Removing the balcony and creating a hipped

	“mansard” roof above the garage to replicate the original massing may be preferred, but is not plausible. The large stucco band above the garage leading to the parapet is a bit brutalistic, and it would be nice to soften that somehow.
Eisenhart	The issue is massing, regardless of the proposed modifications to it. The “before” photos demonstrate the dramatic change to the massing. The proposed changes soften it, but don’t do much to reduce the impact of the massing. In some ways the addition improved the property by creating a better front yard, but the addition also hurts the resource by changing the massing. He was on the fence leaning toward designation at the hearing, but the information that the garage was expanded width and length-wise might impact his opinion of whether or not the property should be designated, regardless of the proposed modifications.
Burnett	The trellis doesn’t help anything. Is ok with the railing remaining solid.

Staff Discussion and Comment: None

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Proceed with the proposed modifications to the garage post; the re-spacing of the posts at the balcony; and the addition of a brick cap at the balcony parapet. The applicant will pursue landscaping to soften the stucco parapet above the garage at the balcony. The Chair noted that the DAS cannot guarantee that these modifications will ensure designation of the resource once completed.

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:**

HRB #: 526-023

Address: 3106 Maple Street

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Jorge Segoviano, designer on behalf of owners Mr. and Mrs. Riley

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The applicant is returning to DAS with a dramatically reduced project scope which includes only enlargement of the existing, historically designated garage.

Existing Square Feet: 1,585 (house); 324 (garage)

Additional Square Feet: 1,585 (house); 476 (garage)

Proposed Square Feet: 1,585 (house); 800 (garage)

Staff Presentation: A project associated with this site was reviewed recently by the DAS. The project scope was reduced dramatically to eliminate all additions to the house and confine the additions and modifications to the garage. Staff has concerns regarding consistency with the Standards given the extent of the proposed modifications to the garage, which is included in the designation of the resource.

Applicant Presentation: Reduced the scope of the work dramatically. Looking to construct an office above the garage, which is built at the property line. In order to enlarge the garage, it needs to be pushed toward the front yard and the interior of the back yard. Only 1/3 of the garage is visible from the street. The front wall of the garage will be brought forward and the existing garage doors will be reused. The garage space will be divided into a garage and a laundry room. The second floor will be used as an office.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Garage connected to the house?	No
Second floor addition set back 3' from first?	Yes
Will the doors operate the same?	Yes
Will there be a deck behind second floor?	Would like to build a deck, but setbacks are an issue.
Constructing basement underneath?	Yes
Will it be a new building?	That's the issue. The garage is in pretty poor shape.
Staff: Could the small addition to the house which is proposed to be removed be replaced with the office?	No

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Marshall	The peak at the second floor roof line should be differentiated and not incorporate a Japanese influence. The shingling on the second floor should also be differentiated.
Eisenhart	The importance is the front façade and maintaining the roofline and garage doors as they are, so he can't support the project as proposed. The barge rafter, garage door and wall should remain the same. The gable roof should remain and not be converted to a hipped roof. The new addition should jog back at the side 2' from main façade to maintain the historic appearance of the front wall. The proposed windows are also out of proportion. The second

	floor addition should be set back a minimum of 4' from the front of the garage. If the garage could be moved forward in its entirety and the new construction built behind and to the side, that may be preferable.
Burnett	A flat roof at the second floor addition may even be preferable.

Staff Discussion and Comment: Staff will look into permit options that would allow the existing previously conforming garage to be retained in place or moved in its entirety to accommodate new construction.

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Maintain the original front garage wall (pulling it forward may be ok); the historic garage doors should remain; the addition to the interior yard façade should be setback 2' back from the front façade of the garage; the addition above the garage should be setback at least 4' and could be gabled or flat roofed. The peak at the second floor roof line should be differentiated and not incorporate a Japanese influence.

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 3D:**

HRB #: n/a

Address: 3065 Union Street

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Bob Bauer, architect on behalf of the owners

Treatment: Restoration

Project Scope: The owner would like DAS input on the potential for restoration of the altered front porch, front upstairs dormer, and various windows in order to pursue historic designation of the house.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: unknown

Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: The owner would like DAS input on the potential for restoration of an altered home.

Applicant Presentation: Applicant is looking to restore the porch on a property which is not currently designated. The house was built in 1906 and the owner is interested in

pursuing designation. The original entry porch was enclosed in the 1950's with large plate glass windows. The porch framing as well as many original materials were left intact. A bay window at the living room was removed and will be reconstructed. The entry will be returned to its original location. The jalousie windows will be removed and the historic casement windows will be reconstructed. The aluminum windows in the dormer were wood frame tripartite fixed flanked by double-hung. The other dormer (with the shed roof) is original, but the roofline was extended out when the balcony was enclosed. The venting for the underfloor furnace runs next to the chimney and is covered with siding. It will be removed. A non-historic sky-light will also be removed and replaced with a solar tube tucked between the existing dormers and hidden from view.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
What is proposed for the extended dormer?	The owner would like to keep it as an enclosed porch. It is the only modification that will be retained. However, the aluminum sliders will be replaced with either 2 wood frame fixed or 4 (2x4) wood frame double-hung windows.
The evidence as to the appearance of the bay window is limited. What is proposed?	All other windows in the living room are double hung with consistent window heights. That will be replicated.
The original sleeping porch at the dormer would have been about 8' deep and 12' wide?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Marshall	No issue to what they're proposing for the shed roof dormer. The fixed windows make sense in this location to differentiate. Encourages the applicant to discover and replicate the original paint scheme.
Eisenhart	Agrees with Marshall. Single pane fixed or awning windows would be appropriate at the shed roof dormer. The retention of this modification is not a significant impact as it has been modified for at least 60 years. Recommended that the post at the enclosed balcony be removed and the window pattern be modified to pick-up on the 3-part appearance of the balcony.
Burnett	Agrees with the comments of the other subcommittee members.

Staff Discussion and Comment: None

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The proposed restorations are consistent with the Standards. The DAS recommends that the post at the enclosed second floor balcony be removed and the window pattern be modified to pick-up on the 3-part appearance of the balcony.

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 3E:**

HRB #: 507

Address: 4335 Avalon Drive

PTS #: 141552

Project Contact: Scott Moomjian, on behalf of owners, Louis and Donna Knierim

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Construction of two 5' retaining walls and one 4' retaining wall terraced from the rear corner of the property fronting on Arcadia Drive. The retaining walls are proposed to be keystone walls, tan in color and staggered.

Existing Square Feet: n/a

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: Staff has reviewed the proposed project and has determined that the project is not consistent with the Standards, as the materials are not consistent with the historic character of the resource.

Applicant Presentation: At the time the building was designated the remnants of a keystone wall were existing on site. The project proposes to replace the existing keystone wall with a masonry wall and construct two terraced keystone walls above. The project is necessitated by grading work on the adjacent property. The proposed walls are 50' and 15' below the building pad. The construction of the walls do not directly impact the resource. Dana Ansell, the engineer and contractor on the project, presented the plans, which include one existing 4' wall to be replaced with a new 5' masonry wall, and two proposed walls (one 5' wall and one 4'), terraced back from the street. The area will be landscaped to conceal the walls. Keystone walls were selected because the soil is undocumented fill. The walls will allow drainage.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Will the fence remain?	Yes
The note above the north arrow identifies the outer wall as a keystone wall. Will it be masonry?	Yes, it will be reconstructed as masonry. They wanted a secure wall at that location.
Will the CMU wall match existing CMU walls?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Burnett	Thinks there are other materials that would suit the neighborhood better... an unfaceted or split-faced block, rectangular in appearance, that creates a more historic appearance. Would like to see the planting plans. Would prefer that the flat masonry wall have a cobble veneer, but would be comfortable with landscaping to cover it. Would encourage the applicant to set the wall back one foot from the street to get more substantial plantings in as opposed to vines (applicant was planning on letting vines grow down, not up). Covering the new CMU wall with stucco and a non-clinging vine would be a better alternative for the resource.
Eisenhart	Likes Burnett's recommendations regarding flat surface block. Doesn't see how the walls impact the resource. Has no issue with a textured block
Marshall	Stucco would be most compatible, but is comfortable with split-faced flat CMU block for the lower wall and the split-faced flat keystone for upper retaining walls to maintain a consistent appearance.

Staff Discussion and Comment: NonePublic Comment: NoneRecommended Modifications: Modify the walls to provide a split-faced flat CMU block for the lower wall and split-faced flat keystone for the upper retaining walls.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 3F:**

HRB #: 233

Address: 3850 Narragansett Street

PTS #: 142243

Project Contact: Paul Johnson, on behalf of owners Scott and Patty Williams

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Repair of existing porte cochere and construction of a new enclosed space above the porte cochere.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: unknown

Proposed Square Feet: unknown

Staff Presentation: Staff reviewed the addition and determined that it is not consistent with the Standards due to its bulk, scale and inappropriate location. The applicant is appealing staff's decision to the DAS.

Applicant Presentation: Attempting to make the addition as transparent as possible. The balusters currently on the roof of the porte cochere were added in the 1990's as a temporary feature and are not historic. The addition will feature three new columns stepped inside of the existing columns below and the parapet. A 3' glass guardrail will be built behind the parapet with removable windows above and a flat roof under the cornice line of the existing resource. The profile will be minimized and cornice will incorporate design elements from house.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
How will the space function once enclosed? Will it still serve as a pseudo-outdoor space?	Yes. Some furniture will be placed out there.
Where is the greatest visibility of the resource?	Along Narragansett.
Will column widths match those below?	The applicant is flexible on that issue.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Eisenhart	Looking for smaller proportions above a porte cochere. The proposed columns are hurting the design and should be minimized. The impact on the resource is minute, it's a matter of correcting the proportions. Columns could be constructed as lattice and steel frame windows could be used to create something visually light. A glass cube would be interesting. The lid should be completely below cornice line and fascia.
Marshall	Agrees with the idea of a visually lighter appearance.

	The glass railing (ala Ivy Hotel) will work. The guardrail should be held to 36". Would prefer a more temporary or seasonal shade structure (trellis or canvass) as opposed to a hard lid. (Applicant is concerned about a canvass canopy's ability to withstand coastal winds.)
Burnett	Agrees with the comments of the other subcommittee members.

Staff Discussion and Comment: None

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Eliminate the proposed columns, explore options for creating a visually lighter addition, possibly a glass cube.

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 the best feasible alternative
- Inconsistent with the Standards

▪ **ITEM 3G:**

HRB #: 1

Address: 1549 El Prado, Suite 12, Japanese Friendship Garden, Balboa Park

PTS #: 144590

Project Contact: Dennis Otsuji, ONA

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The project proposes an expansion of the Japanese Friendship Garden east of the existing Friendship Garden and Tea Pavilion in the approximate location of "Gold Gulch" from the 1935 Exposition. Proposed improvements include removal of some existing vegetation; grading on the slope leading down to the canyon with a series of stepped retaining walls; construction of a 28' tall, 4,448 square foot pavilion building; a 20'6" tall, 2,442 square foot kitchen and bathroom facility; a 22' tall, 1,581 square foot maintenance and storage facility; an outdoor amphitheater; modifications to the adjacent parking lot; and expansion of the Friendship Garden consisting of walkways, a pond, waterfall features, pedestrian bridges and landscaping which span from the canyon area north of the Tea Pavilion to the east just past the parking lot behind the Casa de Balboa building, south to the small parking lot just southeast of the existing Friendship Garden, and west to the area south of the existing Garden Office and Activity Center.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: unknown

Proposed Square Feet: unknown

\*THE APPLICANT HAD A SCHEDULING CONFLICT AND THIS ITEM WAS NOT HEARD.

▪ **ITEM 3H:**

HRB #: 1

Address: 1439 El Prado, Mingei International Museum, Balboa Park

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Marin Gertler of Safdie Rabines, on behalf of Charlotte Cagan and the Mingei International Museum

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The project proposes site improvements to the House of Charm for the Mingei Museum that includes reconfiguration of landscape and hardscape fronting on the Plaza; relocation of existing sculptures; addition of outdoor dining space; glass enclosure of two recessed alcoves; new signage; and new doors. The project has been reviewed by the DAS previously and many aspects of the project have received approval. Outstanding issues include the amount of hardscape, removal of the wrought iron railings in some of the arcade openings, and the renaming of the building. Staff will report to the Subcommittee on issues related to the railing and the naming.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: unknown

Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: The project has been reviewed by the DAS previously. Outstanding issues include the amount of hardscape and removal of the wrought iron railings in some of the arcade openings. The naming of the building is no longer an issue.

Applicant Presentation: Additional landscaping has been added since the prior review. Palms and junipers are the primary material with some other low-growing shrubs. The Museum is open to either providing hardscape or landscape at the north end of the parking lot in front of the Museum. Charlie Daniels of Park and Rec indicated that he would prefer removing the planters and hardscape at the north end of the parking lot and replacing it with lawn, which could be reversed if the plaza were restored per the Precise Plan in the future. The niches will be framed in with frameless glass for a display area. Minimal use of steel is provided for structural support and access, and a false floor will be constructed to facilitate lighting directed up at display. Only three of the seven railings will be removed and they will be stored by the Mingei. The doors leading to the rooftop deck will be removed and stored and replaced with doors with three divided lights for viewing out to the deck. Finally, the applicant is looking to add redwood decking at the rooftop deck.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
What is represented in orange on the plans?	Concrete. It will be replaced in-kind.
Rooftop deck will be a floating deck?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Eisenhart	Agrees with the consultant's assessment of the new lawn as not consistent with the Standards.

Burnett	Supports removing the hardscape north of the lot and replacing it with lawn.
Marshall	Recused

Staff Discussion and Comment: None

Public Comment: Bruce Coons, of the Save Our Heritage Organization stated that the proposed lawn area north of the parking lot is located in the plaza area which was not historically landscaped. He wanted to ensure that the plants on the rooftop deck will not be visible from below.

Recommended Modifications: The proposed framing-in of the niches; the removal and storage of three wrought iron railings along the arcade; and removal and storage of the doors leading to the rooftop deck to be replaced with doors with three divided lights; and the addition of redwood decking at the rooftop deck is consistent with the Standards. However, the lawn should not be extended into the plaza area and it should be retained as hardscape.

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 5:35 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on February 6, 2008 at 3:00 PM.

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