

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, February 6, 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; Otto Emme
Recusals	John Eisenhart, Item 3B & David Marshall, Item 3G
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders; Cathy Winterrowd; Garry Papers; Jennifer Hirsch; Jodie Brown
CCDC	Brad Richter; Sachin Kalbag
City Attorney	Marianne Greene
Guests	
Item 3A	Bethanie Kirby, owner; Steve Bradley, architect
Item 3B	Jonathan Segal, owner/architect; Marie Lia, consultant;
Item 3C	Scott Moomjian, consultant; Ronald Wilson, architect;
Item 3D	Alec Zier, designer
Item 3E	Dan Schmitzer, owner
Item 3F	Dennis Otsuji, ONA
Item 3G	Carmen Pauli, Heritage Architecture; Mari Lyn Salvador; Javier Guerrero; Museum of Man

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

HRB #: 662

Address: 4030 Sunset Road

PTS #: 147127

Project Contact: Steve Bradley, Architect, on behalf of the owner, Beth Kirby

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to add an 89 square foot first floor addition and 1,506 square foot second floor addition to an existing one-story 1,520 square foot Tudor-style designated resource. The project was reviewed previously by the DAS on two occasions in April and May of 2004. The Subcommittee approved the proposed project as consistent with the Standards. The project has been submitted for

building permits. Given the amount of time that has passed, staff is redocketing the item before the DAS to ensure that the project design is consistent with the project reviewed and approved by DAS in 2004.

Existing Square Feet: 1,520 (house) 829 (garage)

Additional Square Feet: 1,595 (house)

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,115 (house); 829 (garage)

Staff Presentation: This project was reviewed by the Subcommittee in April and May of 2004 and determined to be consistent with the Standards. The applicant has submitted an application for a building permit after hiring a new architect and revising the project scope. Staff is seeking the Subcommittee's comment on the revisions, which include thickening the existing wall on the front elevation of the house approximately 12"-18", as well as modifications to a proposed dormer. The applicant is prepared to address the reasoning behind these modifications. The Subcommittee also reviewed the meeting notes from 2004.

Applicant Presentation: The previous architect, Bill Hughes, is no longer with the project due to illness. The project has been revised in response to structural constraints. Two structural columns were required on the east elevation to support the dormer addition. Rather than have the columns exposed and visible, the front wall face has been extended outward 12" to conceal the structural columns. The existing window will be left in place and as a result will be more deeply set. The existing shutters will be attached to the new thickened wall. A brick sill will be used to match the existing. The second modification from the previously approved plans consists of a structural beam under the new dormer on the south elevation which will be exposed 18" unless disguised. The applicant is proposing to create a faux "birdhouse" gable element to disguise it.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How far does the beam stick out and what is its diameter?	The beam will have an 18" reveal and will be 10 ¾" wide.
Which dormers are original to the structure?	They are all new.
How does the project differentiate new construction from original?	The clapboard scalloping is different and all wood on the upper floor is rough-sawn wood.
Is stucco texture and window detailing differentiated?	The windows will be differentiated through the use of a different mullion size.
Is the balcony a new element since the last review?	No, it was proposed in 2004.
Will the existing house be restuccoed?	No, limited repair will be done as needed.
Will the house be re-roofed?	Yes

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Eisenhart	Has no issue with the new structural beam. The vent in the larger gable end on the south elevation is too large and should be reduced.
Marshall	Feels that the project involves significant changes to the historic building, but doesn't think it would be fair to revisit the previously approved design. There is a lot of work, but it is recessed significantly from the street. Does not have an issue pulling the lower wall out.
Emme	The birdhouse and the balcony are not located on a primary elevation so he was comfortable with the changes.

Staff Comment: NonePublic Comment: NoneRecommended Modifications: NoneConsensus:

- 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 #: 277Address: 1907 Kettner StreetPTS #: n/aProject Contact: Marie Lia, consultant; on behalf of the owner, Jonathan SegalTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to relocate and rehabilitate the existing historic house to the east edge of the property facing India Street. The rear one-story addition will be removed and demolished. A portion of the rear of the two-story structure will also be removed and demolished.Existing Square Feet: unknownAdditional Square Feet: unknownTotal Proposed Square Feet: unknownStaff Presentation: The relocation of this structure to a site in Sherman Heights was reviewed and conceptually approved by the DAS in December of 2007. Since that time, the Sherman Heights site has been found to be unsuitable due to contaminants on site.

The applicant is now looking to relocate the structure on site and incorporate the resource as part of the redesigned new building.

Applicant Presentation: The Sherman Heights site fell through due to contaminants. The resource is now being retained on site, relocated to front on India Street and incorporated into the overall project, hopefully as a café. The original house is about 31' long from the porch to the back of the house. The applicant is requesting to remove 3'-6" from the rear of the original house to accommodate a sheer wall for the new construction and the parking layout below. Removal of the rear 3'-6" allows the sheer wall to be built behind the structure, providing a courtyard and physical relief between the two buildings (ideally they would like to take an additional 2' off the back). The project also proposes a pair of French doors at the side facing the courtyard for ADA access. There are also plans to clear out the interior and remove the upper floor to create one high space. The applicant feels the proposal respects the house, providing light, air and physical relief. The new site also keeps the house in Little Italy.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What are the proposed materials on the adjacent walls of the new buildings?	Glass, concrete, and dark, smooth metal.
Will the Little Italy Assoc. lease the structure?	Not as of now. The applicant would prefer an active use such as a cafe.
Are there any windows on the rear façade?	There is one infilled opening of some kind on the upper floor of the house.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Emme	This is the best project you could hope for given the circumstances. Agrees that the loss of 3'-6" is minimal. Noted that, given the contemporary nature of the project, it would be nice to incorporate some traditional elements in the landscaping and hardscape surrounding the house.
Marshall	Thinks it's great that the house is staying in Little Italy. The house is no longer facing the water, but that's a minor issue. Comfortable with the overall composition, but not with the proposal to gut the building. The second floor should be retained and used as an office or loft for the coffee shop. The applicant should look into adaptive reuse of the interior in order to retain original walls and other characteristic features. Given that the house was historically elevated from the street, there should be at least two risers leading the building entrance from the sidewalk. The building's exterior should be restored to its period appearance and the paint colors identified and restored to the Gothic period.
Eisenhart	Recused.

Staff Comment:

Name	Comments
Cathy Winterrowd	Plaques identifying the original site location and interpretive signage explaining the significance of the resource should be incorporated into the project as mitigation for the relocation.

Public Comment: NoneRecommended Modifications: NoneConsensus:

- 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 #: n/aAddress: 7961 Saint Louis TerracePTS #: 147006Project Contact: Marie Lia and Scott Moomjian, consultants and Ronald Wilson, architect; on behalf of the owner, Lee CarsonTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project involves a single family home which is not currently designated as a historical resource, but is actively seeking designation. Staff has reviewed the historical resource research report and the property appears eligible for designation. The project proposes to add 498 square feet of habitable space, which will be located primarily behind the existing residence. A small portion of this addition will be added along the interior (northwest) facade as "pop-outs". A 121 square foot storage addition will be constructed between the garage and the new habitable area.

Existing Square Feet: 1,840 (house); 360 (garage)Additional Square Feet: 498 (house); 121 (storage)Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,338 (house); 360 (garage); 121 (storage)

Staff Presentation: The property owner has prepared a historic research report which concludes that the property is eligible for designation. The applicant is seeking input from the DAS on the proposed project's consistency with the Standards. Staff has reviewed the project and finds that it is generally consistent, with some concern regarding the "pop-outs" on the interior façade. It should be noted that this site has the potential for archaeological resources, and that the scope of the project may need to be modified in the future to address any impacts to such resources.

Applicant Presentation: The project proposes addition to the rear and side of the structure. There is a mature palm at the rear of the site in the location of the proposed storage. They have examined the possibility of relocation of the tree on site, but have found that it is not feasible.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is the garage is original to the house?	Believes it is, former staff member Tudury felt that it was not.
Does the house have only one primary (or street) façade?	Yes
Will all additions have flat roofs?	Yes
Will the new windows be differentiated from the original?	Yes; currently proposed as single pane, non-divided lite windows.
What material will the new windows be?	Wood
What type of garage door is proposed?	A sectional (roll-up) wood panel door.
Will the garage be modified otherwise?	No
Are any changes proposed to the existing house?	One window in the front is in bad shape and may require a new sash.
Any proposed landscape modifications?	No, other than the removal of the palm.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Marshall	In general, the approach seems well thought-out. The new additions have a low profile and are minimally visible from the main (south) façade. The flat roof was a good choice for the additions. Inquired as to whether the other subcommittee members objected to the detached garage being connected to the house (response was no).
Eisenhart	No objections to the proposed project. Glad that the additions are one story and minimally visible. Feels that the project conforms to the Standards, but recommends that the new windows be recessed 2" into the wall.
Emme	Agrees with Eisenhart.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Recess the windows on the new construction 2"+ into the face of the wall.

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 #: 442-008

Address: 5044 Del Monte Avenue

PTS #: 139624

Project Contact: Alec Zier, designer; on behalf of the owner, John Eberst

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to add a 1,082 square foot one and two story addition to an existing 976 square foot cottage in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District. The project is being referred to the DAS by staff to address bulk and scale as well as proposed materials.

Existing Square Feet: 976

Additional Square Feet: 1,082

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,058

**The applicant was present and stated that they are currently working on design alternatives and are not ready to present the project to the subcommittee. The applicant requested that the item be redocketed for the March 5, 2008 DAS meeting.

▪ **ITEM 3E:**

HRB #: 208-321

Address: 2120 K Street

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Johnson & Johnson Architecture, on behalf of the owner, Dan Schmitzer

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project is being brought before the DAS by staff as the result of a code compliance action. The applicant is seeking direction regarding the appropriate design of a front porch and balcony to replace an older, but not original, porch and balcony which was demolished recently.

Existing Square Feet: 3,365

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,365

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project is being brought before the DAS by staff as the result of a code compliance action. The porch and balcony which was present on the house at the time of designation was recently demolished by the previous property owner. The porch and balcony, which was a Spanish style, appears to have been on the house for some time, but is likely not original to the 1912 Prairie style home. No historic photographs have been found to indicate what may have been on the house originally. Examination of the house failed to give any clear indication of what may have been on the house originally. However, lattice elements on the upper balcony may be original. The applicant has prepared drawings which depict the current site conditions. Currently,

the stair element from the Spanish style porch and balcony remains, but the porch and balcony have been replaced with a wood balcony on posts with an open wood railing. The applicant is open to DAS direction regarding the appropriate course of action. An exterior stair and upper balcony are required to access the upper unit. Staff has referred the item to the Subcommittee for input regarding the preferred alternative for the construction of a new porch and balcony. Without adequate documentation of what was on the house originally, one option would be to reconstruct what we know existed for some time based on historic documentation, although this element is likely not original to the house and obscured the original design and appearance of the house. A second option would be to construct something clearly new and differentiated that is compatible with and respectful of the historic character of the house.

Applicant Presentation: None.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Staff's Response
Why was the porch/balcony removed?	The reason is unknown. The work was done by the previous owner.
Did it serve as a balcony historically?	Uncertain, but it appears that there were not doors there historically.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Eisenhart	Inclined to agree with staff that it should be restored to "historic" appearance when it was designated unless documentation can be found which illustrates the original appearance. Agrees with Marshall that a new design consistent with the Standards and the Prairie style would also be appropriate. A stairway in the rear to access the upper unit may be preferable. Does not think the lattice element is original.
Marshall	Surprised it was a contributor because it was so heavily altered. Feels that the porch element likely dates to the 1930's or 1940's. Does not like what is there now and feels it is not consistent with the style or the Standards. Does not particularly care for the arched porch/balcony, but acknowledges that it was associated with the house for a long period of time. Additional research would be helpful, and noted that there may be similar buildings in the area which could provide a design reference. Feels that it was likely not originally a balcony, was simply a covered porch, and was added to provide secondary access. Agrees that without appropriate documentation of the original construction, it would be appropriate to reconstruct what we know was there for most of the

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	history of the house. Another alternative is to design something new and consistent with the Standards and the design of the house. Providing a landscaped front yard would be an improvement as well. Does not think the lattice element is original. Preference would be a compatible remodel in character with other buildings of the original period.
Emme	The brick chimney is painted, and appears to have been exposed originally. Speculates that the improvements were done to sell the house.

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The existing, unpermitted modifications are not consistent with the house or the Standards. The applicant has three options: 1) conduct additional research to determine the original appearance of the house and reconstruct the porch to its original historic appearance; 2) design and construct a new porch/balcony which is consistent with the style of the house and the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards, possibly drawing design influences from other Prairie style homes or a similar style in the area; 3) reconstruct the Spanish style porch/balcony which was in place at the time of designation (likely constructed C. 1930's) based on available historic photographs. The applicant should work with staff to select a preferred course of action. Option 2 would require the applicant to return to the DAS.

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 #: 1

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

PTS #: 144590

Project Contact: Dennis Otsuji, ONA

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation 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: 8,471

Total Proposed Square Feet: unknown

Staff Presentation: The project proposes to add a substantial amount of square footage to the existing Japanese Friendship Garden. The Balboa Park Precise Plan, which was reviewed by the HRB at the time of its adoption, does identify future expansion of the Japanese Friendship Garden into the canyon, but not in any detail. The proposed expansion is located in the approximate location of the “Gold Gulch” Old West town from the 1935 Exposition. It is staff’s understanding that no elements or historic fabric remain from the Gold Gulch exhibit. Therefore, the proposed project would not directly impact any historic fabric. However, the new construction is located within the historic district and would impact the setting, feeling and spatial relationships within the district. Whether or not these impacts are significant and inconsistent with the Standards is the issue before the Subcommittee. Staff has detailed construction drawings available for review, and the applicant is prepared to provide sketches and renderings and answer any questions the Subcommittee may have.

Applicant Presentation: The presence of a Japanese Tea House in Balboa Park dates back to the 1915 Exposition (although in a different location with a different design). Phase I and Phase II of the project were completed in the 1990’s. The current phase consists of 9 acres containing a nursery, a tea and herb garden, a camellia and azalea garden, a cherry tree garden, a waterfall and stream, trails, and three new structures. The applicant has worked with the Balboa Park arborist to identify significant trees within the project site, primarily oak and eucalyptus, and will be preserving those. The vast majority of existing vegetation is diseased eucalyptus, which will need to be removed. Existing access for police and fire will remain. The proposed buildings consist of a 28’ tall, 4,448 square foot pavilion building; a 20’6” tall, 2,442 square foot kitchen and bathroom facility; and a 22’ tall, 1,581 square foot maintenance and storage facility. All buildings are designed in the Japanese Sukiya style with wood post and beam construction. The new architecture will be consistent with the existing structures on the Japanese Friendship Garden site. A traditional tea house (very small and largely ornamental) may be incorporated at a future date. A viewing deck accessible to all park visitors will overlook the garden at the northwest corner of the site. A new water feature runs through the garden from the north. Retaining walls will be set into the canyon and will be finished with boulders, cobbles and stacked stones.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
What is the elevation differential between existing structures and the proposed at the base of the canyon?	Approximately 30’+

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is ADA access provided?	ADA access via sloping walkways is provided from the area just north of the garden office, down to the area between the existing exhibit house and the new pavilion, as well as from the parking area.
What percentage of paths will have handrails?	Approximately half. The handrails will not be traditional handrails, and the preferred material is bamboo.
Is there a perimeter fence?	Yes. There are 2-3 types of fencing proposed: bamboo and wood fencing throughout the garden; and vinyl-coated chain link at the perimeter, which is needed for security to protect the site from vandalism.
What type of lighting is proposed?	Low-voltage lighting will be used throughout. Preferably the lighting will be incorporated into the trees to shine subtly on the paths.
Describe exterior of the Pavilion building.	Stucco walls; copper tile roofing; wood trim and accents.
Is there disabled parking in the existing lot?	Yes
Is the project confined within the leasehold?	Primarily yes, with the exception of the southwest corner. Currently in negotiations to incorporate that area into their leasehold.
Is the viewing deck wood?	Yes
How loud will the waterfall be?	The amount of water is flexible, and it will flow over three tiers.
Did the Precise Plan anticipate new buildings as part of this project?	Yes, but there was not a great amount of detail in the Precise Plan as to location, number or size.
What is the capacity of the open air amphitheater?	Approximately 100
Will the garden be a mix of Japanese and existing plantings, or will it be exclusively Japanese?	The perimeter will be maintained with existing plantings; followed by a transitional area with a mix of existing/historically appropriate plantings and Japanese elements and plantings; with the Japanese garden contained inside.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Marshall	A character-defining feature of the canyon was the dense groves of trees, which limited or contained views from various points along the canyon rim. He is concerned that at times the garden encroaches too closely to the Casa del Rey Moro Garden area and opens views and vistas which were traditionally more closed. The sense of enclosure and discovery could be lost. (The applicant responded that existing trees in that location at the north end of the garden will be preserved whenever possible and that new trees will be planted to provide that screening and enclosure). Thinks the placement of the buildings and the treatment of the walkways are good. Would like to see the waterfall be more muted and subtle so no roaring waterfall distracts from the historic surroundings. The overlook deck should be small and discreet. Would also like perimeter fencing to be limited and carefully done.
Emme	Thinks the project is sensitive to the views and is hidden and unobtrusive. The waterfall is inviting. The project is within the boundaries of the leasehold and was identified (conceptually) in the Precise Plan. Believes it is a good project, but agrees with Eisenhart's comments regarding the deck.
Eisenhart	The footprint of the buildings, the paths, etc. are all sensitively done. The impact to the park is quite minimal and will not have a significant impact. The one exception is the view deck area. Favors an overlook, but would prefer that it be something that you would need to seek out so that the spaces are separate and distinct. Also supports visually separating the garden from adjacent park features.

Staff Comment:

Name	Comments
Papers	Concerned that the area immediately adjacent to the Casa del Rey Moro Garden area should not contain fencing or Japanese garden elements which are immediately visible, in order to maintain the setting and feeling of the main Prado area. The deck should be more in character with the Mission Revival style, as opposed to the Japanese style, so that it relates to the park and not the garden below.

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: A buffer should be maintained between the Prado, Casa del Rey Moro Garden and garden through the use of existing and historically appropriate landscaping. Chain link fencing should not be visible in this location and may not be required, given the topography of the site. The deck should be subtly sited and consistent with the character of the Prado, and if possible, visually separated from Prado area so that the spaces are separate and distinct.

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 3G:**

HRB #: 1

Address: 1350 El Prado

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Javier Guerrero, Director of Operations, San Diego Museum of Man

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to convert an existing library office to an educational classroom in a previously enclosed 1915 arcade. Most of the work will be interior tenant improvements. The only exterior alterations are at the previously infilled arches where a new door pair is proposed. A small ADA ramp may also be required. The applicant is seeking preliminary input from the DAS.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes to convert an existing library office to an educational classroom in a previously enclosed 1915 arcade. The only exterior alterations are at the previously infilled arches where a new door pair is proposed. Historic photos provided by the applicant show that the arches in question were open at the time of construction.

Applicant Presentation: The project proposes to create one classroom inside an existing library space which is located in a previously enclosed arcade (c. 1950's). The windows currently in the infilled arcade are similar to the historic windows, but are C. 1950's. Both infilled archways will be modified to remove the infill (including the stucco) and construct new windows and doors (all glazing within the openings). The applicant is looking for direction from DAS regarding whether it would be appropriate to remove one or more of the windows and install divided lite glazing; or leave the infill in place and install a door at the south end of the enclosure. Grade will need to be raised slightly to provide ADA access.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Are the proposed windows operable or inoperable windows?	Inoperable.
Will the interlocking pavers be reused once the grade is altered?	Yes

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Eisenhart	Would be in favor of bringing the arches back with glazing infill. The door should be located in the northern opening farther away from the Prado. The windows and doors should be wood frame and should maintain the 10-lite appearance (5 vertical x 2 horizontal). Would prefer a single door as opposed to a paired door. Would not have an issue opening the southern wall as an alternative if the opening was restored in its entirety and infilled with glass with wood frame. The first preference would be to open the eastern façade, the second preference would be to open the southern façade. Any effort to remove non-historic walls and provide transparency (either wood/glass or open as original arcade) is a favorable solution.
Emme	Likes that they're opening the arches. Would prefer all glazing in the opening with no stucco remaining.
Marshall	Recused.

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The door should be located in the northern opening on the east façade farther away from the Prado so that grade will be minimally altered to provide ADA access. The existing infill should be removed completely (including the stucco) and infilled with glazing. The windows and doors should be wood frame and should maintain the 10-lite appearance (5 vertical x 2 horizontal). The door should be a single door as opposed to a paired door. The existing pavers should be reused once grade is altered to provide access.

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 5:36 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on March 5, 2008 at 3:00 PM. For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at KMSaunders@sandiego.gov or 619.533.6508.