

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

SPECIAL OFF-SITE MEETING OF THE DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Monday, April 7, 2008, at 11:00 AM

7755 Sierra Mar Drive
San Diego, CA 92037

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Subcommittee Members | John Eisenhart (Chair); Otto Emme; Paul Johnson; Gail Garbini |
| Recusals | None |
| City Staff | |
| HRB | Kelley Saunders |
| Guests | |
| Item 3A | John Oleinik, Architect; Phil Stewart, owner |

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

3. Project Reviews

- ITEM 3A: Estimated time 1 hour

HRB #: n/a

Address: 7755 Sierra Mar

PTS #: 146914

Project Contact: John Oleinik, Architect on behalf of owner, Phil Stewart

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project was reviewed previously by the DAS in March 2007 and March of 2008. At the March 2008 meeting, the DAS found that the project, as designed, was inconsistent with Standards #2 and #9. The subcommittee directed the applicant to reduce, or redistribute the proposed square footage to reduce its massing; set the second floor additions back behind the existing structure, or at the very least step the additions back (25' or more at the northeast corner) so that the massing recedes; reduce the tower element at the rear; and simplify and lower the bridge structure (which should not have a roof and should be limited to a simple railing). The DAS requested an on-site meeting to better understand the site and the project's impacts. At this meeting, the applicant will present a revised project scope to address the subcommittee's concerns and direction.

Existing Square Feet: 5,279

Additional Square Feet: 9,621

Total Proposed Square Feet: 14,627

Staff Presentation: None

Applicant Presentation: Since the previous review by the DAS, the applicant has made a number of changes to the project scope to address the Subcommittee's concerns and direction. The bridge connecting the two wings has been pushed back 16' and the roof structure has been removed (although the applicant would like the Subcommittee to consider allowing the roof structure due to the lack of visibility); the top level of the square tower was removed and is no longer a tower; the addition at the southwest corner of the house was pulled back behind the carport; and the addition at the northeast corner of the house was pulled back 24' and behind the ridgeline. The applicant would like the Subcommittee to consider allowing a shed roof cover over the proposed balcony at the northeast corner.

Q&A:

| Subcommittee-member Issue or Question | Applicant's Response |
|---|--|
| What is the height of the new second story ridgeline vs. the ridgeline on the original house? | 28' vs. 17' |
| Will the original house be re-stuccoed or re-roofed? | It has already been partially re-roofed due to leaking. The tiles were carefully removed and reused. |
| Will the ivy on the north face of the house be removed? | No |
| Will the original palm trees be removed? | No |
| How will the overgrown landscaping at the property line be treated? | It will be trimmed back, but retained. |
| How will the interiors be impacted? | The living room, foyer and dining room will be left as is (with the exception of the floors). The kitchen and the butler pantry will be remodeled. |
| Will the grading and excavation be minimal? | Yes. |
| Will the second floor addition over the existing first floor on the south elevation be stepped back from the original façade? | No. |
| What is the pitch of the new roofs? | 4:12. |
| Will the existing wall fountain in the interior courtyard be retained? | Yes. |

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

| Subcommittee Member | Comments |
|----------------------------|--|
| Emme | Pushing the bridge back is a vast improvement. Concerned that the height of the additions, especially at the northeast corner, |

| Subcommittee Member | Comments |
|----------------------------|---|
| | will overwhelm the original house and turret. Expressed concern that the bridge might impact views of the turret from the hills to the east (the architect noted that the elevation point of the bridge will be higher due to topography, but that they will be a similar height, and views should not be significantly impacted). In regard to the south elevation, he has no issue with the large proposed window or the ornamental detailing around the window. |
| Johnson | Also concerned that the bridge might impact views of the turret from the hills to the east. He would also want to ensure that the railing on the proposed balcony at the northeast corner will be kept below the ridgeline. Recommended that the new second floor walkway and balcony on the interior courtyard either be cantilevered over the existing shed tile roof, or that the balcony and walkway be reduced and portions of the shed tile roof be retained. Concerned about impacts to the original pool house from the new garage and would like to see some separation between the garage and pool house to preserve the façade. |
| Eisenhart | While the massing and location of the second floor additions are ok, he is concerned about the height, and suggested the possibility of lowering grade and finished floor at the new one and two story portions of the house to reduce the height. The roofline on the northeast corner addition should be changed from a front-facing gable to a hipped roof to reduce the visual impact of the addition (other Subcommittee members strongly agreed). Slight visibility of the proposed balcony railing to the north beyond the existing roofline is ok. A transparent glass wall/railing may be more appropriate. More of the existing site wall at the south elevation should be retained as it curves and heads inward along the driveway to preserve the original aesthetic and sense of enclosure. Very concerned regarding the impacts of the new garage on the existing pool house, and suggested ways of pulling the garage back away from the pool house, lowering the ceiling height and perhaps flattening the roof. (After much discussion, the owner indicated that this garage was not a critical component of his project, and would be willing to eliminate it from the project scope to address the Subcommittee's concerns and reduce impacts to the resource.) |
| Garbini | Noted that the lava rock wall in the rear yard is original, and likely a feature added by Milton Sessions. The owner indicated that the rock wall would not be retained due to its location. The Subcommittee agreed that documentation of this feature (photos and as-built drawings) would be adequate. |

Staff Comment: None.

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Overall, the massing and siting of the additions is acceptable; however the applicant should attempt to reduce the height of the additions by 2 feet. The roofline at the northeast addition should be changed from a front-gable roof to a hipped roof to minimize the visual impact. Portions of the shed tile roof on the interior courtyard should be maintained on either side of the new cantilevered balcony. The roof structure over the bridge is acceptable, but should be as low as possible with simple wood posts and corbels as opposed to stucco arches. The requested shed roof over the proposed balcony at the northeast corner of the property is not consistent with the Standards. The site wall along the rear and south elevations shall be maintained (at a minimum) from the entry gate at the street to the point just after the first ogee and wall height change. From this point on it shall curve inward as required for clearance (backing-up distance for the new proposed garage.) The proposed 3rd garage adjacent to the original pool house shall be removed from the project scope to preserve the spatial relationship between the house and the pool house. The pool house shall be maintained as is, and the relationship of the house to the original (filled-in) pool shall remain. The outline of the original pool should be preserved.

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 1:00 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on May7, 2008 at 3:00 PM.

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