

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, August 20, 2008, at 3:00 PM

12th Floor Conference Room 12B

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	3E: Paul Johnson
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders; Cathy Winterrowd; Jodie Brown; Jennifer Hirsch
City Attorney	Marianne Greene
Guests	
Item 3A	None
Item 3B	Matt Reno
Item 3C	None
Item 3D	Deborah Smithton, CityMark; Barbarella Fobos, HOA
Item 3E	Sarai Johnson; Scott Williams, owner
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

HRB #: 821, Mission Hills District

Address: Mission Hills District

Mills Act Status: n/a, public right-of-way

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Janet O'Dea, applicant

Treatment: n/a

Project Scope: The applicants for the Mission Hills Historic District are interested in installing identification signage within the District and have some conceptual level ideas of the proposed signage to share with the Subcommittee.

Existing Square Feet: n/a

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: The applicants for the Mission Hills Historic District, designated by the Board last July, have secured funding to install identification signage within the boundary of the Mission Hills Historic District. The applicant's package includes a general mock-up of the proposed sign and an example of a sign from the Hacienda Park Historic District in Pasadena. The applicant is proposing that the signs be installed in two locations at the east and west ends of the district along Sunset Boulevard. The applicant is requesting DAS comment on the proposed signage.

Applicant Presentation: None

Q&A: None

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Johnson	The shape of the proposed sign is very odd. The Pasadena sign shape would allow for more text and is more versatile. A finial would be a nice touch.
Garbini	Something more similar to the Pasadena sign would be better and would result in less guessing as to the symbolism of the sign.
Emme	Likes the Pasadena sign. Would prefer that the sign be mounted on a nicer metal post or wood post.
Eisenhart	Does not oppose the location or the concept; but would like a neutral design, shape, font and content that would work in every district regardless of the district's era or theme. Would prefer that districts not design something of their own. Would like the issue referred to the Policy Subcommittee to address standardized signage.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Brown	Phoenix has standardized district identification in blue above the street sign at every street in the district so that you could roughly identify the boundary of the district.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	Thinks it's a great idea. San Diego is one of the few cities that doesn't provide signage in historic districts. Maybe the same font could be used for consistency.

Recommended Modifications: Standardized signage (neutral in design and color) should be developed which could be used in every District. DAS referred the issue to the Policy Subcommittee, and recommended that the Subcommittee look at other options as well, including those used in Phoenix.

Consensus: Referred to Policy Subcommittee

▪ **ITEM 3B:**

HRB #: 794, M.B. and Ida Irvin Spec House #1

Address: 3960 Alameda Place

Mills Act Status: No Contract, Eligible

PTS #: 108252

Project Contact: Ted Shultz, architect; on behalf of the owner, Matt Reno

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to expand the scope of a staff-approved project to include replacement of all windows with new wood frame windows to match and restucco of the house for weather-proofing purposes. The previously approved project included construction of an 800 square foot second story addition, but did not include wholesale replacement of the windows or restuccoing of the existing house.

Existing Square Feet: 1,200

Additional Square Feet: 800 (approved)

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,000

Staff Presentation: This property was referred to the Board by Development Services during review of a permit application to substantially alter the building. The property was designated by the Board in October 2006 under HRB Criterion C. Following the designation, the applicant worked with staff to substantially revise the project to bring it into consistency with the Standards. Due to significant site limitations on expansion of the existing footprint, the footprint and existing exterior walls of the building were left intact, and an 800 square foot second story addition set 12 feet back from the front façade was approved. The project approval did not include replacement of the existing wood frame windows or the replacement of the exterior stucco. This rehabilitation project proposes to expand the scope of a staff-approved project to include replacement of all windows with new wood frame windows to match and restucco of the house for weather-proofing purposes. If the existing conditions do not provide for adequate water-proofing of the structure, staff acknowledges that replacement of the existing stucco may be required. However, staff is not supportive of wholesale replacement of the windows unless they are all deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant has requested that DAS review the project and provide comment and direction.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant is asking the Subcommittee to look at the existing conditions and allow him to replace the existing windows and plaster finish to match. He would be happy to do a mock-up of the plaster finish if needed. The applicant provided a photo survey of the existing conditions and construction, which he walked the Subcommittee through. The house has very unusual construction consisting of 12x12 hollow clay tile stacked and mortared in place with wires tying the tile to 2x4's with 1x6 shiplap siding. There is no building paper present. The construction consists simply of stacked hollow clay tiles over wood frame, tied to the frame, with a plaster finish. The plaster itself is not water-tight, and there has been water intrusion through the plaster. The metal ties connecting the tile to the framing have rusted away, and the tiles have separated from the house. The exterior windows are true divided-lite, double hung (most) with lead weights. He is not sure that he can water-proof the existing window assembly. He brought Marvin Window Company shop drawings he can show which would be exact replicas of what's there.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is the issue with the tile pulling away from the wall isolated?	They have only opened the wall in one location.
The proposal is to remove tile?	Yes, and build out with new framing to re-create the depth.
Is there documentation of water intrusion into the windows?	Documentation of general water damage in the title report.
Why was the roofing removed for the first 12' of the house?	Efficiency of framing.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Johnson	Has seen this type of framing system several times, especially in Mission Hills. The tile is not pulling away from the framing, it was built that way. You will have water penetration through the plaster and the tile. The gap between the tile and the framing was intentional to allow for condensation and moisture to drain. Seismic retrofitting will be required, but waterproofing could be achieved through clear sealants which would provide water proofing but would need to be reapplied every 3-5 years. (Reno noted that the system is not working as intended, and water is seeping in). As far as the windows, Johnson stated that the windows will require periodic maintenance, but the existing windows could remain and be water proofed. (Reno: how would it be water proofed when the plaster abuts the window?) Caulking.
Emme	Concerned about a loss of integrity, and if the windows go, it's a complete reconstruction. What percentage of the wood is rotted? (Reno: mostly the sills) Are they restuccoing? (Reno: not if they maintain the existing walls... another option could be to put paper over the existing plaster and stucco over that, although that could add up to an inch to the thickness of the wall).
Eisenhart	The approved remodel retains the integrity of the resource. The plaster and windows are in good condition. Hasn't seen this system, but the brick veneer systems on the east coast are similar. The tile could be tied back into the framing from the inside. The historic fabric that is left needs to be retained and repaired. Waterproofing needs to be achieved through a surface application.

Staff Comment: None.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	The project didn't leave much of the house, and now they want to remove what is left. If they are allowed to remove the clay tile and build out the walls there would be ample opportunity to install new flashing and waterproofing for the existing windows. He is going back and forth in his mind about the hollow clay tile because it could cause problems later on. Separation from the walls is a bigger issue than the waterproofing because of the potential for seismic activity.

Recommended Modifications: The existing exterior walls and plaster need to be left intact, and an external water sealant applied over the existing plaster. The Subcommittee noted that the chosen sealant could be approved by staff. The existing windows are in good shape and must be retained. Waterproofing can be achieved by sealing them with caulking.

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 #: 127-060, San Diego Hardware

Address: 840 Fifth Avenue

Mills Act Status: No Contract, Redevelopment Area

PTS #: 162210

Project Contact: David Freeto; on behalf of the owner, 840 Fifth Ave LLC.

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to replace a store-front window at the north end of the main façade of the San Diego Hardware building with a frameless glass door in order to provide access to new electrical utilities.

Existing Square Feet: 21,000

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 21,000

** THE APPLICANT WAS NOT PRESENT. THIS ITEM WAS NOT HEARD **

▪ **ITEM 3D:**

HRB #: 351, Egyptian Theatre

Address: 3812 Park Boulevard

Mills Act Status: No Contract, Eligible

PTS #: 160897

Project Contact: Mike Touma, architect; on behalf of the owner, CityMark Properties

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to adaptively re-use the lobby space of the Egyptian Theatre as a restaurant. Although the footprint of the building will not be increased, existing exterior space within the courtyard of the building (beginning at the columns) will be enclosed with glass walls (with no vertical mullions) as part of the project scope to increase the useable square footage. The project scope also includes installation of a 4'-6" fence and gate at the property line to provide outdoor dining; replacement of one existing window facing the courtyard with a door; removal of the doors on either side of the ticket booth; and removal of one playbill case to accommodate new shelving.

Existing Square Feet: 1,485

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,485

Staff Presentation: The propylon is the only designated element on the project site. Although the footprint of the building will not be increased, existing exterior space within the courtyard of the building (beginning at the columns) will be enclosed with glass walls (with no vertical mullions) as part of the project scope to increase the useable square footage. The project scope also includes installation of a 4'-6" fence and gate at the property line to provide outdoor dining; replacement of one existing window facing the courtyard with a door; removal of the doors on either side of the ticket booth; and removal of one playbill case to accommodate new shelving. Staff has concerns with the outdoor café (enclosing an open courtyard with a glass railing) and the removal/alteration of the doors and windows.

Applicant Presentation: The Egyptian Theatre was completely reconstructed based on historic photographs. The first two sheets of the plans show the existing conditions. They are proposing 1) an addition of the glass storefront system in front of the columns, which will be constructed without mullions; 2) an outdoor café enclosed by a low glass wall; 3) removal of a window to be replaced by a door to provide access. On the interior, two doors will be removed from their hinges to allow freedom of movement; and the playbill will be removed (with the recess maintained) to allow for shelving. This tenant is the first in five years to be willing to move into the space.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The existing doors to the left and right of the ticket booth... what is the function of that space behind?	It's all part of this tenant space.
The entire exterior is a reproduction?	The upper portion is original; the lower portion is reconstructed with the exception of the outermost side walls.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Emme	Since it is a reconstruction, some latitude should be given. The outdoor cafe should stay within the property line and not extend out into the right-of-way (it does). Will the lighting on the columns be removed? (no) He is opposed to the tall glass wall at the columns, but may be able to support the wall behind the columns. Not opposed to the low glass wall enclosing the courtyard, but would be opposed to anything else which clutters the space and converts it from an outdoor space to an indoor space (i.e. heating, lighting, canopies, etc.) Is comfortable with removing and retaining the playbill & two interior doors.
Garbini	The columns are very much a part of the architecture and should stay prominent, not behind glass.
Johnson	Agrees that the glass in front of the columns is a problem... placing the glass behind or between them may be ok. The glass railing in front is clearly new, but posts and chains may be less visually obtrusive. He does not have an issue with removal of the doors if they keep them and store them.
Eisenhart	Putting the glass behind the columns would be satisfactory. The integrity of the construction is lost with the glass in front. As far as the low glass wall, he objects to having anything there because it was a quasi-public space, and it's important to maintain that space without a barrier. A temporary barrier like a bollard with a rope or some other portable barrier would be permissible.

Staff Comment: NonePublic Comment:

Name	Comments
Barbarella Fobos	A resident in the building and a member of the HOA. Has been waiting for three years for a tenant to occupy that space. The glass wall would protect the building.
Bruce Coons	Has been watching the project from the beginning. Thinks the restaurant use is good. Doesn't have an issue with the window being changed to a door; but feels that the glass should be behind the columns, not in front; and that the low glass wall should be replaced with simple posts and chains. (The applicant indicated that they need a 48" barrier per code for sidewalk café and liquor license). Another option would be to use seamless glass panels (butt glass) so that there is no vertical intrusion.

Recommended Modifications: After additional discussion, the DAS concluded that the project could be determined consistent with the Standards if the glass wall is moved from the front of the columns to between the columns; and if the low glass railing is modified to a free-standing railing not attached to the building.

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 #: 233, Sefton/Campbell Estate

Address: 3850 Narragansett Street

Mills Act Status: Active Contract, Recorded 1996

PTS #: 142243

Project Contact: Johnson & Johnson Architecture, on behalf of owners Scott & Patty Williams

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project was reviewed previously by the DAS in January of 2008. At that time the applicant proposed to enclose the area above the porte cochere with a glass guardrails, columns and removable windows, topped with a flat roof. The applicant was direct by DAS to pursue a visually lighter, more transparent design that eliminated the columns (a glass cube was suggested). The revised project proposes to enclose the space with windows set in wood frame and stucco.

Existing Square Feet: 6,726

Additional Square Feet: 367

Total Proposed Square Feet: 7,093

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project was reviewed previously by the DAS in January of 2008. At that time the applicant proposed to enclose the area above the porte cochere with a glass guardrails, columns and removable windows, topped with a flat roof. A copy of the proposal reviewed in January, along with the meeting record, has been made available to the Subcommittee. The applicant was direct by DAS to pursue a visually lighter, more transparent design that eliminated the columns, and a glass cube was suggested. The revised project proposes to enclose the space with windows set in wood frame and stucco. HRB staff continues to feel that the proposed location is not appropriate for an addition. However, at the very least, staff feels that the revised design does not appear to be consistent with the direction given by the DAS at the January meeting.

Applicant Presentation: The house was built in 1913 by William Sterling Hebbard for the Sefton family. At the last DAS meeting, an addition utilizing a lot of glazing was proposed. The owner would prefer to have a less translucent enclosure with more traditional wall space. Brackets have been added for visual interest, but have been

differentiated from the existing brackets. To support the new addition, they are proposing a flagpole system with footings in the grade, up through the columns to the enclosure in order to support it with a minimal amount of visible support. They are proposing to use the windows they have already bought which match the existing windows, but modify them by removing the mullions in the upper pane. The existing balustrade is plastic and was added c. 1988 when the house was a showcase house and has been removed.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Material for the windows is wood?	Yes, they are wood.
The drawings show a flat roof but a hipped roof has been constructed?	Yes, the existing roof will be removed and a flat roof will be installed.
The current photos show existing half-finished construction, but that construction is not part of this proposal?	Correct.
How did you avoid sheer-walls?	With the flag pole footing.
Will the area around the windows be stucco?	Yes
What type of windows are they?	Casement.
Soffit and bracket material will be wood?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	Fine with the project as proposed.
Emme	Supports what's been said.
Eisenhart	Generally, he feels it conforms, but is a little troubled by the amount of stucco on the south elevation. It would be nice to keep a minimum of 12"-16" of stucco at the corners. He recommended increasing the stucco on the east elevation and decreasing the stucco on the south elevation to create a more consistent ratio of stucco to glazing. Would also be comfortable leaving the south elevation as proposed and simply increasing the stucco on the east elevation, possibly by placing the windows together, either centered or shifted as far toward the house as possible, and eliminating the stucco in-between.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	Doesn't have a problem with it as redesigned. The project differentiates enough.

Recommended Modifications: The applicant should endeavor to keep a minimum of 12"-16" of stucco at the corners. This could be achieved either by increasing the stucco on the east elevation and decreasing the stucco on the south elevation to create a more consistent ratio of stucco to glazing; or by leaving the south elevation as proposed and simply increasing the stucco on the east elevation, possibly by placing the windows together (either centered or shifted as far toward the house as possible) and eliminating the stucco in-between.

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 5:07 PM

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

For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at KMSaunders@saniego.gov or 619.236.6545