

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 5, 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	John Eisenhart (Chair); Otto Emme; Paul Johnson; David Marshall
Recusals	Johnson (Item 3A); Marshall (Item 3D)
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders; Cathy Winterrowd; Jodie Brown; Jennifer Hirsch; Tricia Olsen
City Attorney	Marianne Greene
Guests	
Item 3A	None
Item 3B	Jeffrey Shorn, Architect
Item 3C	Ione Steigler, Architect
Item 3D	Curtis Drake, Architect; Jim Nicholas, owner
Item 3E	Alec Zier, designer; John Eberst, owner
Item 3F	John Oleinik, Architect
Item 3G	Tony Ciani, Architect; David Schroedl, owner
Other	Joseph Stanco, DSD

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

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. The project was reviewed by the DAS in February 2008. The applicant is returning to the DAS with a proposal to construct a new, yet historically appropriate and compatible porch and balcony element consistent with the Standards.

Existing Square Feet: 3,365

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,365

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project was reviewed previously by the DAS last month, at which time the applicant was directed to either: 1) reconstruct the porch and balcony as it existed at the time of designation; 2) reconstruct the original porch and balcony based on photos which depict the appearance of the house at the time of construction (if available); or 3) construct a new porch and balcony consistent with the style of the house and the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Because historic photographs cannot be found, the applicant is opting to reconstruct the porch which was present at the time of the designation.

Applicant Presentation: None.

Q&A: None. (The Subcommittee moved directly into Discussion and Comment)

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Marshall	His preference was something new, yet compatible with the architecture and consistent with the Standards; but reconstruction of the arched element was presented as an option. We know it was there for a good portion of the building's history. Landscaping in the front yard should be incorporated as part of the project scope.
Eisenhart	Cast in-place concrete preferred for stairs and landing, if that was the historic material and construction method.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The reconstruction of the arched porch and balcony present on the house at the time of designation is consistent with the Standards. Landscaping in the front yard should be incorporated as part of the project scope.

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 #: 463

Address: 1261 and 1263 Cave Street

PTS #: 110287

Project Contact: Jeffrey Shorn, Architect; Marie Lia, Consultant; on behalf of the owner Allison-Zongker

Treatment: Relocation

Project Scope: This relocation and rehabilitation project proposes to move two historically designated cottages located at 1261 and 1263 Cave Street to a new location at 2503 Ardath Road, approximately 1.5 miles away. The project was reviewed by the DAS on three prior occasions. The applicant is returning to DAS to finalize plans for the relocation and rehabilitation prior to submitting for the required permits.

Existing Square Feet: 704 (Guest House); 1,576 (Main House)

Additional Square Feet: 209 (Guest House); 376 (Main House)

Total Proposed Square Feet: 913 (Guest House); 1,952 (Main House)

Staff Presentation: This relocation and rehabilitation project was reviewed previously by the DAS on three prior occasions. The project proposes to move two historically designated cottages located at 1261 and 1263 Cave Street to a new location at 2503 Ardath Road, approximately 1.5 miles away. Based upon review of the prior DAS meeting records and the most recent plan submittal, the project appears to comply with prior direction from DAS and staff does not see any significant outstanding issues. The project will require a Site Development Permit for the relocation of a designated historic resource, and that permit and associated environmental document will be reviewed by the full Board for a recommendation to the decision maker.

Applicant Presentation: Since the last review by the DAS, the structures have been off-set by five or more feet; the existing garage will be removed and replaced with a new garage in a more appropriate location; and the siding and shingles on the new addition have been modified to be differentiated from the historic resource.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The site has not changed since you were last here?	No. The revisions are just refinements to the project reviewed last time.
What has changed?	Guest house has been set back an additional 5'; the existing garage will be demoed and new garage set back and accessed off of Ardath; they will save all trees they can on-site; and pathways connecting the houses have been provided. The additions are proposed in the same locations, and the new windows in the addition will be differentiated.
What is the height of the new retaining wall next to the garage?	Less than 3'.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Wood windows in the addition?	Yes.
Are there any issues moving property?	None that they are aware of. There appears to be sufficient clearance to move the house intact.
What is the history of the designated houses?	The two houses designated are the last cottages on Cave Street and were designated for their architecture. The current neighborhood has been redeveloped with higher densities and the context has been lost.
Will the detailing of the garage be differentiated?	Yes.
Neither of the houses will need to be cut into sections?	As far as they are aware, they can be moved whole.
Does any exterior historic fabric need to be removed prior to relocation.	Only the exterior additions and chimney.
Can the chimney be rebuilt to the historic height?	The chimney will need to be rebuilt to meet safety requirements.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Emme	Good plan. This location is an easier move.
Marshall	DAS issues have been addressed: The guest house has been moved more than 5' back and the design of the garage is appropriate.
Eisenhart	Pleased with the siting of the buildings on the new location and the differentiation between historic and new construction.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Although relocation is not consistent with the Standards, this project proposes to relocate the resources and preserve them on a new site with a similar orientation and relationship. The applicant has addressed the Subcommittee's concerns and the proposed relocation is the best feasible alternative for the continued preservation of the resource.

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 #: n/a

Address: 3351-3371 30th Street

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Ione Steigler, Architect; on behalf of the owner Leland

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project involves the rehabilitation of several cottages, built at different times and centered around a central courtyard. The project was reviewed by the DAS in January of 2007 to address removal of the non-historic stucco and restoration/reconstruction of deteriorated decorative elements. The applicant is returning to the DAS for direction regarding the appropriate replacement of non-historic windows. The applicant is interested in pursuing designation upon completion of the rehabilitation project.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project involves the rehabilitation of several cottages, built at different times and centered around a central courtyard. The site is not currently designated, but the applicant is interested in pursuing designation upon completion of the rehabilitation project. The project was reviewed by the DAS in January of 2007 to address removal of the non-historic stucco and restoration/reconstruction of deteriorated decorative elements. The applicant is returning to the DAS for direction regarding the appropriate replacement of non-historic windows. The applicant is proposing fiberglass windows with dual panes. Two of the replacement windows will need to replicate a divided lite pattern. Because the applicant is proposing dual pane windows, the divided lite pattern cannot be accurately recreated unless applied divides are used as opposed to true divides. The applicant is seeking the subcommittees' input and direction on the use of fiberglass as opposed to wood, and the use of applied divides as opposed to true divides to create a more authentic appearance.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant provided a site plan illustrating where existing historic windows will be retained; where non-historic windows will be replaced with historically appropriate windows; and where non-historic windows will remain. Currently, the owner is looking to replace non-historic windows which face the street and the courtyard (the publicly visible facades). The applicant provided several sample windows for the Subcommittee to consider. In order to provide dual pane windows in the four locations where divided-lite windows were present historically, the applicant is proposing to use a wood frame and sash window with an applied aluminum divide made by Kolbe. The use of an applied aluminum divide would allow replication of the historic muntin pattern and thickness. True divided-lite dual pane windows result in very thick muntins which do not accurately recreate the historic appearance. Both the wood frame/sash and the aluminum divides would be paintable. In the other locations where non-historic windows are being removed and replaced with historically appropriate single-pane double-hung (1-over-1) windows, the applicant is proposing to use a wood window clad in fiberglass made by Milgard. The fiberglass material is paintable.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Has there been any more research on the soap factory on site?	Yes, it has been heavily altered on several sides by additions.
Are there any plans to remove the soap factory from the site?	No.
How do we know that the Spanish style buildings did not have divided-lites?	Only one window, a picture window present at the corner of each cottage, has divided-lites. The other historic windows remaining are 1-over-1, and are the same width as the missing or replaced windows.
The applicant is only replacing the non-historic windows that are publicly visible?	Correct
How many historic windows remain?	16 original windows remain out of a total of 64 windows.
Are the replacement windows on the front façade based on historic windows on other facades?	Yes, they are 1-over-1 double hung windows.
What year were these cottages constructed?	1920's ('24 Craftsman, '26, Spanish)
Are the original windows wood frame?	Yes.
Do the applied muntins closely replicate width of the historic muntins?	Yes.
Is the fiberglass paintable? Is the aluminum paintable?	Yes. Yes
Does the jamb-liner show much from the outside on the fiberglass window?	Not much.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Johnson	Worries about long-term durability of fiberglass. The true life-cycle cost of wood is better than fiberglass. For the divided-lite windows he prefers the applied aluminum muntin.
Marshall	He would support double-hung "low-E" windows as long as they have the same appearance. Fiberglass fades quite a bit. Wood would be the default preference, and would prefer wood windows over the fiberglass.
Emme	Would be fine with either wood or fiberglass for the single-pane 1-over-1 windows. The work should be done prior to the designation.
Eisenhart	Agrees with Marshall. The windows should be wood, not fiberglass. In our climate, wood windows work well and there is not a huge maintenance issue. The cost

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	difference is not that significant. He would like to see the southeast corner window on the Spanish cottage addressed as 3369 replaced with wood and all windows on the west wall of rear building addressed as 3371 replaced with wood. In addition, if the windows on the east wall of the Craftsman cottage addressed as 3359 are visible from the courtyard, these windows should be replaced as well. He asked if subcommittee members if they preferred single or double pane (Marshall: has no preference; Johnson: has mixed feelings, 30 th St is noisy; Emme: feels dual pane is fine)

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Brown	Kolbe offers another energy efficient alternative (1/4" laminate), but the munitn pattern is not as thin.

Public Comment: None.

Recommended Modifications: For the four divided-lite windows on the Craftsman cottage, the applicant may use Kolbe's dual pane wood frame and sash window with an applied aluminum divide that replicates the historic appearance of the original windows. For all other single-pane double-hung (1-over-1) window replacements, the applicant may use dual pane wood frame and sash windows which replicate the frame and sash profiles of the original historic windows. Fiberglass-coated wood windows shall not be used. Based on agreement between the Subcommittee and the applicant's representative, the following non-historic windows shall be replaced with historically appropriate wood frame and sash windows:

Unit	Windows to be Replaced
3357	(1) 3040 1-over-1 dh window at the north end of the west façade.
3359	(4) 2040 divided-lite dh windows on the north façade; (1) 1030 window at the north end of the east façade (if visible from the courtyard); (1) 3040 1-over-1 dh window at the south end of the east façade (if visible from the courtyard).
3363	(1) 2630 and (1) 3030 1-over-1 dh window at the north end of the west façade.
3365	(2) 21040 1-over-1 dh windows at the south façade.
3367	(2) 21040 1-over-1 dh windows at the south façade.
3369	(2) 21040 1-over-1 dh windows at the south façade; (1) 4040 1-over-1 dh window at the south end of the west façade; (1) 2030 1-over-1 dh window at the south end of the east façade.
3371	(3) 2040 1-over-1 dh windows at the west façade; (1) 2626 1-over-1 dh window at the north end of the west façade.

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/aAddress: 4082 Saint James PlacePTS #: 144086Project Contact: Curt Drake, Architect, on behalf of the owner, James NicholasTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to remove a non-historic porch and balcony modification made to a Prairie style home in 1962 and restore the original porch and balcony based on historic photographs. The project also includes a 16 square foot addition to the kitchen at the northwest corner of the property fronting on Sheridan Avenue. The goal of the project is to restore the property to its historic appearance and pursue designation of the home. The project was reviewed conceptually by the DAS in November 2004.

Existing Square Feet: 3,313Additional Square Feet: 16Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,129

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes to remove a non-historic porch and balcony modification made to a Prairie style home in 1962 and restore the original porch and balcony based on historic photographs. The project also includes a 16 square foot addition to the kitchen at the northwest corner of the property fronting on Sheridan Avenue. The goal of the project is to restore the property to its historic appearance and pursue designation of the home. Staff has reviewed the plans and the project appears to accurately reconstruct the porch and balcony. However, staff would like to call the subcommittees' attention to the elevation note on Sheet A-4 which states that the reconstructed eave line will be either stucco on foam or wood shape. It is staff's position that the eavline should be reconstructed with wood, not stucco over foam, and would like the subcommittees' input on this issue.

Applicant Presentation: The house was built in 1913 and modified in 1962. The historic photograph on which the restoration is based was taken in the 1950's. The porch and balcony are being reconstructed and a small kitchen addition is proposed at the rear along the Sheridan elevation. The applicant thinks the tile brow on the front of the porch in the historic photo is a plant-on and therefore will not be reconstructed. All existing windows will remain. Some windows which were removed previously are in the possession of the owner and will be reinstalled. The porch floor and steps are original and will be retained.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is the house located on a corner lot?	Yes. St. James is front, Sheridan is street side.
Please address the cornice issue.	Reconstructing the cornice based on photos and the existing conditions at the rear. It may be possible that the cornice is intact under the addition, and if it is, it will be retained.
The only addition is the kitchen?	Yes.
Are there plans for the existing garage?	It will not be altered other than the replacement of the door with a sectional door.
Is the current garage door wood?	Yes, single acting.
Will the entire house be restuccoed?	Yes, with a smoother, historically appropriate finish.
How will the kitchen "pop-out" addition be differentiated?	May use a reveal line to differentiate.
Will stucco over foam be used to replicate the cove at the cornice?	Yes

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Johnson	To differentiate the addition from the house, he recommended using a stucco band at the sill line which wraps around the sides of the addition.
Emme	The contemporary wall and fence around the house and the entry trellis detract from the resource.
Eisenhart	Concerned about replication of the cornice line; adequate differentiation of the addition; and landscape features. Needs to see a current photo of the perimeter wall to assess the impact of the wall on the resource. The applicant may need to reduce or eliminate the wall and restore the sloping lawn adjacent to the steps in order to make the wall more consistent with the Standards.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Saunders	The property was owned by MB Irvin, who built several homes in Mission Hills which incorporated odd decorative shed tile roof elements. The applicant should re-examine whether or not it is original.

Public Comment: None.

Recommended Modifications: The rehabilitation project could be found to be consistent with the Standards if the applicant better differentiates the kitchen addition from the original house through the use of a reveal line or a stucco band at the sill line. If intact, the original cornice line should be restored. If it is no longer present, reconstruction of the cornice using plywood, foam and stucco would be acceptable. The applicant may need to address the existing perimeter site wall and reduce its visual impact to the resource prior to bringing the property forward for designation, per Standard #2 of the Rehabilitation Standards. Integration of the structure with the landform and topography is indicative of the Prairie style. The existing site walls disrupt this relationship and create an engineered, as opposed to gentle landform. The Subcommittee would be happy to assist in providing recommendations for modifying 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 3E:**

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

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes to add a large one and two story addition to an existing 976 square foot cottage in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District. Staff's review of the initial project design raised issues regarding bulk, scale, materials, and the amount of demo involved in the project. The project was docketed at the last DAS meeting, but the applicant requested that the item be redocketed in order to provide time to develop design alternatives. Staff has not had an opportunity to review any of the alternatives proposed by the applicant, and may have comments related to the project designs following Board comment. It should also be noted that, based on photos of the house from the time the property was designated, it appears that the original windows on the front façade have been replaced and the porch cover removed and replaced with a much larger trellis since the designation. There is no record of HRB staff review or approval of these changes, and staff has informed the applicant that these changes will need to be addressed and reversed as part of this permit application.

Applicant Presentation: The owner is looking to add additional square feet for his own residence. He rents out the duplex in the back of the property. The original project design was a little overwhelming. The project has been revised and the applicant is providing two design alternatives. “Project 1” adds approximately 1,082 square feet in a one and two story addition to the existing residence. “Project 2” limits the addition to one story and approximately 500+ square feet. The single story alternative is not the owner’s preference. Both project alternatives propose to remove the existing trellis structure at the front of the house and replace it with a smaller front-gabled element. The applicant is open to stucco or lap siding on the new addition.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
How would be lap siding be differentiated?	By using a different width.
Will the proposed roof be tile?	No.
Will the bargeboards remain?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Marshall	Both projects propose substantial demolition of the original house, but the one-story alternative retains more of the original house. The second story alternative (“Project 1”) differentiates too much, is too far forward and overwhelms the house. The second story alternative would need a lot of work to bring into compliance with the Standards. The single story alternative (“Project 2”) is much more consistent. It retains more of the original house and has a lesser impact. He is unsure of the wide gable roof shown on the addition. The chimney needs to be lowered and simplified. The proposed entry element is not consistent and should be simplified (ideally returned to its historic appearance at the time of designation).
Eisenhart	Ocean Beach is characterized by the simple cottages with front porches and yards. The original house should be retained at least past the two original windows on the west side. A second floor would need to be stepped back, limited to the rear half of the structure, and stepped in from the story below. A deck would be preferable on the backside, but could be on the front if integrated into the structure and not highly visible. The windows should be restored and the porch element shown in the DPR form should be reconstructed.
Emme	The proposed porch element is not appropriate. The single story alternative is preferable, but a second story addition may be possible.
Johnson	A second floor addition is a possibility if pushed back and stepped in to reduce its massing.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Saunders	Staff is requiring that the windows which have been replaced since the designation be replaced with historically appropriate wood frame and sash windows, and that the original porch element present at the time of designation and subsequently removed be reconstructed.

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Both alternatives as presented are inconsistent with the Standards, specifically Standards #2 and #9. The original house should be retained at least past the two original windows on the west side. A second floor addition would need to be stepped back, limited to the rear half of the structure (no less than 25' from the front elevation), and stepped in from the story below. A deck would be preferable on the backside, but could be on the front if integrated into the structure and not highly visible. All windows which have been replaced since the designation must be replaced with historically appropriate wood frame and sash windows and the original porch element present at the time of designation (and subsequently removed) must be reconstructed based on historic photographs.

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 #: n/aAddress: 7755 Sierra Mar DrivePTS #: 146914Project Contact: John Oleinik, Architect on behalf of owner, Phil StewartTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to add 9,444 square feet to an existing 5,279 square foot, potentially historic home. The applicant has prepared a historic research report and is pursuing designation of the home. The project was reviewed previously by the DAS in March 2007. The project is being referred back to DAS by staff due to concerns related to bulk and scale, competing architectural elements and features, and placement of the new construction.

Existing Square Feet: 5,279Additional Square Feet: 9,444Total Proposed Square Feet: 14,723

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes to add 9,444 square feet to an existing 5,279 square foot, potentially historic home. The applicant has prepared a historic research report and is pursuing designation of the home. The property appears to be eligible for designation under HRB Criteria B, C and D and is the work of Master Architect Herbert Palmer and Master Landscape Architect Milton Sessions. The project was reviewed previously by the DAS in March 2007. The project is being referred back to DAS by staff due to concerns related to bulk and scale, competing architectural elements and features, and placement of the new construction. Specifically, staff has the following issues and concerns which staff would like the Subcommittee to discuss and consider: 1) Although staff agrees that there is not a “magic number” in regard to maximum square footage, the project proposes to triple the size of the house, which seems excessive and raises concerns for staff regarding the overall massing of the project. 2) The second story addition over the existing one-story portion of the house at the northeast corner of the property is overwhelming and inconsistent with the Standards. Staff feels that the addition should be stepped back considerably from the historic façade, and ideally built over the new construction and not the original one story portion of the house. 3) The new two story open arcade and bridge between the “U” shaped wings of the house is overly ornate, too tall and inconsistent with the historically open “U”-shape of the house. 4) The square tower element at the rear of the property should be eliminated and no new tower elements should be incorporated which compete with the historic elements of the house.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant provided a model of the proposed project. The house is located on a one acre lot characterized by a large lawn and plantings at the front. In designing the project, the applicant felt it was important to maintain the landscaping and restrict the additions to the rear of the property. Any views to the ocean would be limited to the second story; therefore a second story addition is being added above the existing house at the northeast corner and new two-story elements are being added at either end of the “U”-shaped building. The northeast corner of the property is not visible from the street, and the second story is set back 44’ from the Sierra Mar as it wraps around the property. The bridge connecting the two wings of the house would barely be visible from the street due to the topography. The well-established courtyard is being maintained. The square footage of the proposed addition has been reduced by 2,000 square feet since the project was last reviewed by the DAS.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
Is it safe to assume that all second story elements are new with the exception of the turret at the front?	Yes.
What types of spaces are being added?	Bedrooms, library, guest, etc.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Emme	Feels that the additions will be overwhelming and overshadow the historic structure. Doesn’t think the additions should be built over the existing structure.

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Marshall	The project feels larger than what was reviewed previously. Concerned that it doesn't meet the Standards because of the amount of square feet being added. The applicant has done a good job keeping the additions away from the street. However, the new construction is more ornate than the original and the historic house is becoming subordinate to the new construction. He is most concerned about the addition over the existing house at the north, which encroaches onto the front. He is also concerned about the bridge, which is loud, and asked whether it will be open or enclosed (it will be open). The second floor addition should be pulled back 20'-25' to the backside of the house in-line with the courtyard. The bridge structure should not have a roof and should be limited to a simple railing as opposed to an arcade. The addition over the garage should be pulled back so that it recedes. The tower at the rear is a dominant feature, is highly visible, and should be reduced. The second (new) courtyard competes with the historic courtyard and has eliminated the possibility of limiting the addition to one story. Eliminating the new courtyard could allow some square footage to be reallocated from the second floor to the first, thereby reducing the overall massing.
Eisenhart	Thinks a site visit would be appropriate to better understand the site and the impact of the project on the resource. Agrees with other subcommittee members in regard to the massing. The vocabulary of the architecture is competing with the very simple nature of the original home. The addition should be differentiated, but restrained. He is on the fence about the tower element.
Johnson	Agrees with the general approach of putting the massing at the back. Agrees that the second story addition over the existing first floor at the northeast corner and the addition over the garage should be set/stepped back.

Staff Comment: None.

Public Comment: None.

Recommended Modifications: As currently proposed, the project is inconsistent with the Standards, specifically Standards #2 and #9. The project adds too much massing, which overwhelms the resource and competes with its relatively simple expression of Spanish Eclectic architecture. The square footage will need to be reduced, or at the very least redistributed to reduce its massing. The second floor additions over the existing structure should ideally be set back behind the existing structure, but at the very least stepped back so that the massing recedes. At the northeast corner this may require stepping the addition back 25' or more. The tower at the rear is a dominant feature, is highly visible, and should be reduced. The bridge structure should be simplified and lowered. Preferably, the

bridge should not have a roof and should be limited to a simple railing as opposed to an arcade. A publicly-noticed on-site meeting will be arranged to better understand the site and the project's impacts.

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 #: 854

Address: 1821 Torrey Pines Road

PTS #: 59455

Project Contact: Tony Ciani, Architect; on behalf of the owner David Schroedl

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to split a lot containing a historically designated house and build a new house on the second lot. The project does not propose any modifications to the existing, historically designated house. The existing lot is 19,790 square feet and would be split into a 8,792 square foot lot fronting onto Torrey Pines Road containing the 2,155 square foot historically designated property; and a 10,998 square foot lot fronting onto City land (an extension of Amalfi Street) containing a new (roughly) 6,000 square foot single family home. The project is being referred to the DAS by staff over concerns related to the proposed lot line and the impact of the new house on the historically designated house as perceived from Torrey Pines Road.

Existing Square Feet: 2,155 (historic house)

Additional Square Feet: 6,000 (new house)

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,155 (historic house); 6,000 (new house)

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes to split a lot containing a historically designated house and build a new (approx 6,000 s.f.) house on the second lot. The project does not propose any modifications to the existing, historically designated house. Staff has determined that, due to the impact to the resource's setting, the lot split will require a Site Development Permit, which could be supported provided that the project is otherwise consistent with the Standards. As currently proposed, the lot split would prohibit the reconstruction of a substantial beam patio structure which was removed prior to the designation. As staff had indicated that the reconstruction of the patio structure would be a condition of any future Mills Act agreement, a lot line configuration which would prohibit this reconstruction will not be supported by staff. The applicant has been directed to redesign the project to allow reconstruction of the patio structure, which may be incorporated as a mitigation measure for this project. Staff also has concerns regarding the massing of the proposed house and the impact of the new house on the historically designated house as perceived from Torrey Pines Road. The applicant has been directed to provide a rendering or perspective to better illustrate the relationship between the structures and the the impact of the new structure on the resource. Finally, although staff has not mentioned this

issue to the applicant, staff would like to see the project revised to incorporate natural materials, such as wood, which reference or tie into the historic structure.

Applicant Presentation: The current project architect, Tony Ciani, was not responsible for the design currently before the Subcommittee. The applicant provided photographs of the site from Torrey Pines Road, as well as site lines from Torrey Pines Road to demonstrate what would be visible from the public right-of-way. The rough perspectives developed illustrate that the building will not be highly visible from Torrey Pines due to sight-lines and landscaping. Thematically, the proposed structure is consistent with the historic home (both are contemporary to their period). The applicant feels that the project meets the purpose and intent of the Standards.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is this design being pursued?	Yes
What about the property line?	Looking at an easement option to retain the property line as proposed.
Aluminum windows on the new house?	The material has not been determined.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Eisenhart	The massing of the proposed house might be a little too big from Amalfi, and he is concerned about impacts to the view of the resource. Is there an opportunity to open up views to the historic house from Amalfi (this is not a critical issue)? In regard to the proposed materials: wood windows would be more sympathetic to the adjacent resource (he is concerned about reflectivity of the proposed windows); stucco siding could be used, but wood siding would be preferable. Overall, the new house is set far enough back from the historic house and won't adversely impact the resource in terms of proximity. However, a flat roof on the new house may be preferable to further reduce massing/visual impacts. Landscaping should be utilized to buffer the structures and screen the retaining wall. The trellis should be reconstructed as designed and built and should be on the historic property, not on an easement on the adjoining property. The new property line should be at least 5' away from the trellis.
Marshall	The project design is not as sensitive as it could be. It's not a particularly deep lot, and the house was designed near the center of the site, leaving little room for new construction at the rear. The new construction is too shoe-horned in. The southwest corner of the property seems to be the better location for the new construction. Doesn't believe the project was designed with the Standards in mind. The fact

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	that the project has maxed out the FAR shows. Maxing FAR and complying with the Standards may not be realistic in this situation. A structure of that size will adversely impact the resource. He would prefer that the architect take a second look at the site and the possibility of re-siting and redesigning the project. He would not be adverse to additional height if it resulted in less horizontal massing. The current design is not his preferred expression of contemporary design, but agrees it should be a modern design. The roofline seems arbitrary, and he recommends using a flat roof to minimize visual impacts.
Johnson	The overall design of the project is in the spirit of contemporary architecture. Sees minor issues with color and texture. The landscape backdrop will help to mask the massing of the structure. As far as public views of historic resources, a website could mitigate for loss of public views.
Emme	Agrees with Marshall. Size, scale and massing is overwhelming. Feels it does not meet the Standards. Landscaping is not adequate to screen the building. Owners who have views do not want them obscured with tall vegetation.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: As currently proposed, the project is inconsistent with the Standards, specifically Standards #2 and #9. The applicant should revisit the siting, massing, design, and materials for the new structure. Reducing the horizontal massing, stepping the massing to respond better to the topography, opening views to the resource from Amalfi (not a public right-of-way but City owned land), and revising the design to incorporate more natural materials and simplified forms which tie into the historic resource should all be explored. The trellis needs to be reconstructed and be contained within the property, not on an easement. The new property line should be at least 5' away from the trellis. The project must return to DAS for additional review.

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 6:30 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on April 2, 2008 at 3:00 PM. For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at KMSaunders@sandiego.gov or 619.533.6508