

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 2, 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; Gail Garbini
Recusals	3C: Johnson
City Staff	HRB Kelley Saunders; Cathy Winterrowd; Jodie Brown; Tricia Olsen
Guests	Item 3A Alec Zier, designer Item 3B Frank Arrington, owner Item 3C Chris Bittner, Architect; Neal Singer, NTC Foundation Item 3D Ed Marks, potential buyer; Robert Zeien, contractor Item 3E none Item 3F Tony Ciani, Architect; David Schroedl, owner Other Bruce Coons, SOHO; Louise Torrio, SESDPC; Sam Dawson

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

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 was reviewed previously by the DAS in March of 2008. The project has been revised per direction given by the DAS and the scope has been reduced to add a one story, 578 square foot addition to an existing 976 square foot cottage in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District.

Existing Square Feet: 976

Additional Square Feet: 578

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,554

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project was reviewed previously by the DAS in March of 2008. The DAS found that both project alternatives were inconsistent with Standards #2 and #9; and directed the applicant to retain the west façade of the original house at least past the front two original windows; limit any second floor addition to the rear half of the structure, stepped in from the story below; integrate any proposed decks into the structure to limit visibility; replace all windows which have been removed since the designation with historically appropriate wood frame and sash windows; and reconstruct the original porch element present at the time of designation based on historic photographs. The project has been revised and the scope has been reduced to add a one story, 578 square foot addition to an existing 976 square foot cottage in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District. Staff has not yet reviewed the revised design, and may have questions or comments on the redesigned project.

Applicant Presentation: The front porch/deck, which was expanded following designation, has been reduced; the original porch cover is being reconstructed; the existing vinyl windows will be removed and replaced with wood; the size of the addition has been reduced; and the deck element has been eliminated, as it did not afford any views.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What are the front windows being changed to?	Wood frame windows to match what was there historically.
Will there be venting in the new gable?	Yes.
The venting should be slightly differentiated.	Acknowledged.
What is being retained and what is being demolished?	12'6.5" of the west (side) façade is being retained and 36'4.75" is being demolished; all of the north (rear) façade is being demolished; the east (side) façade is being retained and the south (front) façade is being retained.
How will demo work impact the rest of the site?	Access will be taken primarily from the rear, but the front fence may be impacted.
The fencing should be reduced and transparency increased.	Agrees
What would prevent them from building a larger front deck?	It's an issue of accurate reconstruction of the original porch which was removed without permits following the designation.
Will the ceilings in the addition be the same height as the original structure?	Yes.
Will there be any structural issues with single wall construction?	No, the new addition will be self-supporting.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee Member	Comments
Garbini	Does not want to comment on project because she was not present for previous reviews.
Eisenhart	Windows on the new construction should be wood, but differentiated from the original portion of the house. Recommends maintaining the original roofline on the existing house and constructing a new, intersecting roof on the new construction with a flat or hipped roof. That would preserve the massing and roofline, and would prevent the addition from overwhelming the historic element. Also recommends that the addition be stepped back an additional 8" to provide more visual relief and light for the original window on the west façade.
Emme	The revised project is a significant improvement.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Brown	Believes the windows on the front façade were historically casement, per the historic photo.

Public Comment: None.

Recommended Modifications: Maintain the original roofline on the existing house and construct a new, intersecting roof on the new construction with a flat, hipped, gable or shed roof equal to or lower than existing ridgeline in order to preserve the massing and roofline and prevent the addition from overwhelming the historic element. The addition should be stepped back an additional 8" to provide more visual relief and light for the original window on the west façade. Windows on the new construction should be wood, but differentiated from the original portion of the house.

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 #: 659

Address: 1151 Tenth Avenue

PTS #: 149660

Project Contact: Juan Quemado on behalf of the owner, Frank Arrington

Treatment: Relocation

Project Scope: This relocation and rehabilitation project proposes to move a historically designated house located at 1151 10th Avenue to a new location at 2235 K Street, approximately 1.3 miles away. The project was reviewed by the Policy Subcommittee in July 2005 and by the full Board for a recommendation on the Site Development Permit and mitigation in August 2007. At the August meeting, the Board took action to recommend approval of the Site Development Permit and the proposed mitigation; with direction to bring the project to the DAS prior to the issuance of a building permit for reconstruction of the porch, to assure compatibility with the style of the resource based on the investigation of original historic fabric and consistency with the Sherman Heights Design Guidelines. The applicant has prepared a proposed design for the reconstructed porch for DAS review and comment.

Existing Square Feet: 1,040

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,040

Staff Presentation: This relocation and rehabilitation project proposes to move a historically designated house located at 1151 10th Avenue to a new location at 2235 K Street, approximately 1.3 miles away. During review of the Site Development Permit for the relocation, the HRB included a mitigation requirement to bring the project to the DAS prior to the issuance of a building permit for reconstruction of the porch, to assure compatibility with the style of the resource based on the investigation of original historic fabric and consistency with the Sherman Heights Design Guidelines. The applicant has informed staff that a full investigation of the original historic fabric cannot be completed until after the resource has been relocated, and has prepared a an initial proposed design for the reconstructed porch for DAS review and comment.

Applicant Presentation: The relocation will include removal of the commercial portion and the non-historic additions at the rear. The applicant has not been able to complete the investigation of the original historic fabric on the porch because current owner will not let them onto the site. The applicant is very concerned about the ability to relocate the resource at all, given issues with the current owner, who may still wish to appeal the designation. The applicant is asking that the Subcommittee allow them to move the house first, and then examine and reconstruct the porch once the resource is relocated.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Have you examined the porch to see what is underneath?	The owner won't let them on site.
How was the project designed without that investigation?	In concert with other groups. The added porch will be removed and a new porch constructed consistent with the style of the building.
Are the windows and doors on the original front wall (behind the porch) still intact?	Yes.
Who is your historic architect?	Jeffrey Shorn

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee Member	Comments
Emme	He is unable to say that the proposed reconstruction is appropriate without adequate documentation of the resource and what might have been there historically. The applicant should try to get on site to examine the porch.
Eisenhart	Cannot make a determination regarding consistency with the Standards with the information provided. It would be helpful to have the historic architect present.
Johnson	Not enough information for a determination
Garbini	The foundation may give an indication as to original footprint.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Saunders	Can the house be moved with the porch? (yes)

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	The current porch is not the original porch. There may be evidence left, but that won't be known until the porch is deconstructed. The porch roof may be original and the posts may be in there. May be able to do the investigation as the house is ready to be moved.
Louise Torrio	Please do what you can to support Mr. Arrington. Concerned that the current owner is still pursuing the appeal.

Recommended Modifications: The applicant has not provided adequate analysis and documentation for the Subcommittee to comment on the proposed reconstruction of the porch. The Subcommittee would be comfortable with relocating resource first and then conducting analysis if analysis of the resource on its current site is not feasible, provided that adequate analysis and reconstruction of the porch can be enforced.

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 #: 425Address: 2690 Decatur RoadPTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Chris Bittner, Architect; on behalf of the operator, NTC Foundation

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to rehabilitate and convert Building 19 at the Naval Training Center (NTC). The project will include remodeling of the interior of the building; installation of new heating, venting and lighting systems; removal of non-historic additions; repair of the existing roof; installation of a new elevator; and ADA accessibility improvements. The applicant has prepared conceptual level materials for review and direction by the DAS.

Existing Square Feet: 9,172

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 9,172

Staff Presentation: This is a conceptual level review of a rehabilitation project that proposes to rehabilitate and convert Building 19 at the Naval Training Center (NTC). The project will include remodeling of the interior of the building; installation of new heating, venting and lighting systems; removal of non-historic additions; repair of the existing roof; installation of a new elevator; and ADA accessibility improvements. Staff would like the applicant to address how ADA accessibility will be achieved and the impact to historic fabric and appearance; and whether or not the existing building envelope will be altered to accommodate the new elevator.

Applicant Presentation: The NTC Foundation has stewardship over 26 buildings at NTC. Building 19 is a former barracks building. No additional square footage is being added. The project is an adaptive re-use project. The upper balcony was enclosed C. 1940s and the applicant is proposing to maintain it as enclosed. The project will remove the interior walls built to accommodate offices and return the floor plan to an open floor plan consistent with the original use as barracks. Accessibility is being provided at the east elevation in the form of poured concrete. To accommodate the elevator, they may need to penetrate the roof at the flat roof portion, and are trying to stay below the line of the existing parapet. The elevator will be on the opposite side of the building than is shown on page 19.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The exterior façade is being maintained and improved?	Yes. The roof tiles will be removed, restored and put back one by one.
How high is the existing parapet on the flat roof?	4" – 12". The elevator will definitely be above the parapet at this point, up to about 1'.
What is the issue with ADA accessibility if the grade is flat?	The doorway is 3" off of grade. A small amount of concrete will be poured, no ramps will be required.
None of the other barracks buildings have an elevator?	No.
Can't install an elevator without penetrating the roof?	Not enough head height.
Does the DAS have authority over the	Staff: the interior was not identified as

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
interiors?	significant in the NTC Guidelines. The interior staircases will be maintained.
Will fixtures be reused?	Yes, whenever possible.
Will there be equipment on the roof?	No. All mechanical and ventilation will be done in the interior.
The second floor arcade will remain enclosed?	Yes
Any thought given to restoring the second floor arcade?	No. The records are questionable as to when it was done. Feels it is part of the historic character.
Any steam pipes left? Will they be salvaged?	Yes. No.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee Member	Comments
Emme	Does not have an issue with the elevator if it is a very low profile above the parapet. The ADA "ramp" will be minor.
Garbini	Pretty straightforward project.
Eisenhart	Floor plan is sympathetic to the original design. ADA and elevators are fine. Elevator should not touch the original parapet.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Saunders	How are the floors on the former exterior walkways being raised? (Plywood and carpet)

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	ADA ramps are consistent with the Guidelines. Why not move the elevator to the interior of the stairway? (Did not want to impact the historic lobby). Would suggest that they paint out the elevator as much as possible.

Recommended Modifications: The elevator must have as limited visibility as possible, and should not touch the existing parapet.

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 #: 531

Address: 4656 North Avenue

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Ed Marks, potential buyer

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The property at 4656 North Avenue was designated by the HRB in July 2002 in a somewhat deteriorated state. Since that time, the property has fallen into further disrepair and has been subject to unpermitted modifications and demolition. An active code enforcement case (NC 112378) is pending. The property is currently for sale, and a prospective buyer has hired a contractor to assess the conditions at the site and the viability of the historic fabric. The prospective buyer is seeking direction from the DAS at a conceptual level regarding appropriate rehabilitation of the structure and the reuse of historic materials.

Existing Square Feet: 2,600

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,600

Staff Presentation: The property at 4656 North Avenue was designated by the HRB in July 2002 in a somewhat deteriorated state. Since that time, the property has fallen into further disrepair and has been subject to unpermitted modifications and demolition. An active code enforcement case (NC 112378) is pending. The property is currently for sale, and a prospective buyer has hired a contractor to assess the conditions at the site and the viability of the historic fabric. The prospective buyer is seeking direction from the DAS at a conceptual level regarding appropriate rehabilitation of the structure and the reuse of historic materials.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant does not feel that the current design reflects the original design. The applicant asserts that house was originally an “A” frame house that was modified. The header above the porch posts is only a 2”x4”. The house appears to have been built and modified in three stages. Wants to know whether taking the building down and reconstructing it is an option. The contractor feels that the house is not stable for an earthquake and is beyond repair.

Q&A: The applicant had questions regarding permit processing and what would be required for a historic resource preservation standpoint, which were answered by staff.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee Member	Comments
Eisenhart	Demolition and reconstruction of the resource is not an option. The main façade must be maintained. Any additions to the rear that do not date to the period of significance could be removed. The historic fenestration should be maintained in its historic configuration. Options for additional fenestration on side and rear facades could be explored. Noted that all suggestions from the DAS are general guidance until more information is provided.

Subcommittee Member	Comments
Emme	A historic preservation architect may need to be retained to prepare an appropriate analysis and treatment plan. This is a very sensitive resource.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Saunders	Staff will work with the applicant on questions related to permit processing and Code Compliance requirements.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	Offered to assist the owner in the rehabilitation of the resource.

Recommended Modifications: A historic preservation architect should be retained to prepare an appropriate analysis and treatment plan.

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 #: 449

Address: 7857 Eads Avenue

PTS #: 150047

Project Contact: Ione Steigler, Architect; on behalf of the owners Rolf and January Knoke

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to add 287 square feet to an existing 2,162 square foot house. A discretionary variance application to partially enclose a front deck with glass was reviewed and approved previously by HRB staff. The applicant is processing the building permit associated with that variance and has expanded the scope of work to include additions at the first and second floors. HRB staff has determined that the expanded scope of work is not consistent with the Standards, as the addition will be located along a highly visible side façade and will result in alteration of character defining features and spatial relationships.

Existing Square Feet: 2,162 (House); 766 (Garage/Office)

Additional Square Feet: 287 (House); n/a (Garage/Office)

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,449 (House); 766 (Garage/Office)

***The applicant notified staff prior to the meeting that they would not be in attendance and requested to be docketed for the May 7th meeting of the DAS.**

▪ **ITEM 3F:**

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 project was reviewed previously by the DAS in March 2008, at which time the applicant received direction to revisit the siting, massing, design, and materials for the new structure; and explore options for reducing the horizontal massing, stepping the massing to respond better to the topography, opening views to the resource from Amalfi, and revising the design to incorporate more natural materials and simplified forms which tie into the historic resource. In addition, the DAS directed the applicant to reconstruct the trellis within the the property line, not on an easement, preferably 5' or more away from the new property line. The applicant is returning to the DAS for additional review.

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 house on the second lot. The project was reviewed previously by the DAS last month, at which time the applicant received direction to revisit the siting, massing, design, and materials for the new structure; and explore options for reducing the horizontal massing, stepping the massing to respond better to the topography, opening views to the resource from Amalfi, and revising the design to incorporate more natural materials and simplified forms which tie into the historic resource. In addition, the DAS directed the applicant to reconstruct the trellis within the the property line, and not on an easement, preferably 5' or more away from the new property line. It is staff's understanding that the applicant has provided additional materials, which staff has not had an opportunity to review, and staff may have questions or comment.

The status of the portion of "Amalfi Street" behind the property was brought into question at the prior DAS meeting. HRB staff has confirmed with a Senior Civil Engineer at the Development Services Department that the land is owned by the City, but is not a dedicated public right-of-way and will not be dedicated as a public right-of-way due to inadequate width for improvements. Although the property is not a dedicated public right-of-way, the City, as the landowner, has not restricted public access to this land, although it could theoretically choose to do so in the future. For this reason, the applicant is currently pursuing an access easement to ensure his own access to his land-locked parcel in perpetuity.

One final note regarding the permitting. Upon further consideration, staff feels that the lot-line adjustment itself would not necessarily constitute an adverse impact to the resource, and that it is the lot line adjustment in concert with the proposed development that poses a potentially adverse impact. Therefore, staff feels that if the proposed project can be

designed in a manner consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards per DAS and staff review, a Site Development Permit for adverse impacts to a historic resource may not be required.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant provided a copy of a letter from the City Attorney's office regarding Amalfi Street. An aerial photograph was provided to illustrate general neighborhood character. A section was provided to illustrate the relationship of the proposed house to the historic resource. The applicant explored options for reducing the horizontal massing and increasing the vertical massing, but that would exceed height limitations. As revised, the reconstructed trellis will be 30 inches from the new property line at the corner of the trellis (10' below the pool on the lot above). An enlargement of the original Haufbauer plans was also provided. The applicant will rebuild the trellis per the plans and adjust the property line so that the trellis is contained entirely within the property. In response to the DAS concerns regarding massing, the applicant provided a shaded floor plan to illustrate the off-setting planes. The applicant stated that they interpret the Standards as relating to community character, and that the proposed design is consistent with the diverse character of the community.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Any change to the proposed footprint?	No
Any change to the property line?	Yes
How were the lot sizes determined?	Dictated by the project design.
Has the metal fenestration changed?	They are proposing to respond to the environment in the selection of materials. Considering wood frame windows, colored aluminum frame windows, etc. Are looking at ensuring a minimally-reflective material.
How is the house modulated to reflect Haufbauer house?	Pointed to some off-setting planes. Feels that the curvilinear line of the footprint is the real concern for the DAS, and what makes the building appear to be so different from the Haufbauer house.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee Member	Comments
Johnson	Very happy with the design, which continues the contemporary theme of the Haufbauer house. The only concern he has is the vertical height, which may be concealed with landscaping. Agrees with the idea of selecting more natural colors and textures.
Emme	Noted that not much has changed. Does not have an issue with the property line if there is a minimum of 30 inches between the trellis

Subcommittee Member	Comments
	and the property line. The proposed house has a lot of bulk and massing that dwarfs the historic house. His comments haven't changed, but he does support the idea of flattening the proposed roofline. The current design does not have his support.
Garbini	The profile of the Haufbauer house will be overwhelmed by the new house behind. Landscaping may help to soften that impact.
Eisenhart	If the retaining wall adjacent to the trellis shown in the historic photos is not still there, it should be reconstructed as part of the reconstruction of the trellis, as an integral component of this feature. Would like to see more relief between the trellis and the pool (at least 5 feet), perhaps by curving the pool wall. The applicant should also look at pushing the pool down a few feet. There has been no change to the massing on the project from what was reviewed previously, and he understands that they're trying to maximize their FAR. The proposed house needs to relate to the historic house because the designation extends to the entire parcel. Will not press the issue of views to the resource from Amalfi. Would like to see reduction of the massing at the southeast corner, but feels it won't significantly impact the resource. Would like to see a materials and colors board. Feels wood frame windows should be used, and that a darker color palette be used to minimize visual impacts. With regard to the metal roof, the roofing should be darker, perhaps a dark grey. The applicant should break up the roof massing with negative space, similar to the way the Haufbauer house breaks up its roof massing through the use of the trellis. The new house should serve as a backdrop, integrated into the hillside. Landscaping in front of the Haufbauer house which would obscure the resource should not be pursued.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	Would have been more comfortable with an angular house with flat roofs and eave overhangs to reference historic house. Would have liked more information on the original landscaping.

Recommended Modifications: Inconsistent with the Standards as currently designed. The lot line must be at least 2.5 feet from the trellis. The original retaining wall must be rebuilt as part of the trellis and contained entirely on the lot. An additional buffer of 5 feet between the pool and the property line must be provided. Materials must be natural (i.e. wood windows) and dark colors should be used so the house recedes into the hillside. The roof can be metal, but should be darker and earthier. The roof massing should be broken

up, possibly incorporating trees or referencing the Haufbauer house in its roof modulation. The pool must be curved backward, angled into the hillside and set back at least 5 feet from the property line. Shrubs and trees over 10 feet should be used to provide a buffer between the two houses and provide a backdrop for the Haufbauer house. A materials and color board, renderings and revised landscape plans must be provided at the next meeting. The use of a sound-attenuating glass wall along Torrey Pines Road can be supported.

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 6:04 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on May 7, 2008 at 3:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at KMSaunders@sandiego.gov or 619.533.6508