

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 3, 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
Recusals	None
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders; Cathy Winterrowd; Jodie Brown; Jennifer Hirsch; Tricia Olsen; Betsy McCullough
CCDC	None
Park Planning	Todd Schmidt
City Attorney	None
Guests	
Item 3A	David Marshall, Heritage Architecture
Item 3B	Jim Kidrick, SD Air & Space Museum; Ben Wier
Item 3C	Linda Glaze; Carlos Wellman; Ilan Awerbuch
Item 3D	Bill Bohac; John Russo
Item 3E	Not Heard
Item 3F	Tim Martin, Architect; Scott Moomjian, consultant; Gerald and Jan Heidt, owners
Other	None

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

HRB #: 1, Balboa Park

Address: 1350 El Prado

Mills Act Status: No Contract, City Owned

PTS #: 162047

Project Contact: Mari Lyn Salvador, Executive Director, San Diego Museum of Man

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to convert an existing library office to an educational classroom in a previously enclosed 1915 arcade. Most of the work will be interior tenant improvements. The project was reviewed and approved previously by the DAS in February. Staff is referring the item back to the DAS for comment on project details not addressed during the previous review.

Existing Square Feet: 532

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 532

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes to convert an existing library office to an educational classroom in a previously enclosed 1915 arcade. Most of the work will be interior tenant improvements. The project was reviewed and approved previously by the DAS in February, at which time the Subcommittee stressed the importance of simplicity in the design of the infill, and specifically directed the proposed windows and doors to be 10-lite, with five vertical panes and two horizontal panes each. The project as currently submitted provides for 8-lite windows and doors, and proposes a transom with arched muntins, similar to windows found elsewhere in the park. Because of the Subcommittee's specific direction regarding the number of panes and the simplicity of design, staff is referring the item back to the DAS for comment.

Applicant Presentation: The existing windows are not original and were brought in during the 1940's. At the February meeting the DAS directed the applicant to build the new storefront with wood frame, 10-lite windows (5x2). The applicant has provided an exhibit which illustrates their preferred design, which differs slightly from this direction, as well as two alternatives which adhere more strictly to DAS direction. Their preferred design provides 8-lite (4x2) windows and one single pane entry door in the lower part of the arched openings; and multi-lite transoms with arched muntins in the upper part of the arched openings. The design intent is to create a more transparent appearance by reducing the number of muntins and to differentiate from the original Goodhue design (which uses straight muntins) by drawing design influence from windows in other park buildings.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is the fenestration centered in the depth of the arch?	No, it is set flush against the inside face of the wall.
Why the 10" kick on the door?	It's a code issue

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Johnson	Thinks the applicant's preferred design is the best alternative as presented.
Emme	Agrees. The preferred design clearly differentiates. The fewer muntins the better.
Eisenhart	Has no issue with the 4x2 pattern. Still prefers the horizontal and vertical muntins as opposed to the arched muntins, but could support the project either way.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The applicant's preferred design is acceptable and consistent with the Standards. No modifications to the proposed design are required.

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 #: 1, Balboa Park

Address: 2001 Pan American Plaza

Mills Act Status: No Contract, City Owned

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: James Kidrick, San Diego Air and Space Museum

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This project proposes to introduce a 96'-5" tall Atlas 2E Mercury Space Launch vehicle to Pan America Plaza. Two possible locations are proposed: centered in the parking lot of Pan America Plaza, or in front of the Hall of Champions at the corner of Presidents Way and Pan America Plaza. The rocket is currently located at Gillespie Field in El Cajon.

Existing Square Feet: n/a

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: The Air and Space Museum is proposing to introduce a 96' tall Atlas 2E Mercury Space Launch vehicle, currently located at their Annex at Gillespie Field in El Cajon, to Pan America Plaza within the Palisades area of the National Register Landmark. The placement of the Atlas in the park is intended to highlight San Diego's contribution to space exploration and aerospace history, and its positive impact on our region's workforce development. The Atlas would also serve as a tribute to Wally Schirra, a Navay Pilot and NASA astronaut, as well as San Diego resident. Two possible locations are currently proposed by the museum. Staff is seeking the Subcommittee's input on whether or not placing the Atlas within the boundaries of the National Register Landmark District, which has two periods of significance from 1915-1916 and 1935-1936, is consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. This determination will aid staff in identifying the appropriate procedure for processing the project application. The Balboa Park Committee and Park Planning staff have also requested that I clarify that the Balboa Park Committee has not officially reviewed the project and has not provided a recommendation.

Applicant Presentation: San Diego has a significant history in the aerospace industry. Tens of thousands of people participated in the development and construction of the Atlas, and the men and women of San Diego put the Atlas, which paved the way for American space exploration, in space. The San Diego Air and Space Museum is seeking to inspire San Diego's youth to seek careers in aerospace through the installation of the Atlas in Balboa Park, which continues to evolve as a cultural center. The applicant favors location 1 in the parking lot and noted that while the Atlas with Mercury capsule is tall, the footprint is rather small.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
When did the Atlas program begin?	Early 1950's.
Did the program start in San Diego?	Yes.
Where specifically?	Building 4 at Lindburgh Field c. 1950's, and then moved to Kearney Mesa.
When did the program end?	It did not end. In the mid-1990's the space division was sold to Lockheed-Martin and it continues there.
What is the height of the Ford Building?	90'.
What would the support system for the rocket look like?	The base will be 23' in diameter with a rebar and concrete and will allow the rocket to withstand 85 mph winds and seismic activity.
Any FAA issues?	Securing an FAA permit separately.
Would relocating the rocket behind the museum affect the glide path?	No, but they would prefer to put it in front of the museum.
This isn't a memorial to anyone is it?	Configuring the Atlas with the Mercury would demonstrate the best of the Atlas program and would be a type of tribute to Wally Schirra without being a memorial.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Emme	Has difficulty seeing the connection of the Atlas to Balboa Park. Feels that the project does not meet Standards 1, 3 and 10. The height and scale is out of proportion with the surrounding buildings. May be more appropriate on Federal lands (i.e. a base). If it must be located in the district, it should be pushed closer to the museum.
Eisenhart	He is fascinated by the Atlas, and noted that the aerospace industry is one of the great technology accomplishments in the City. The proposed locations for

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	the Atlas are problematic. The introduction of too many new elements begins to break down and interrupt the spatial relationships within the district. He supports the overall concept, but would like to see the Atlas located near the Air and Space Museum, perhaps on one side of the building or the other.
Johnson	The Atlas is tall and skinny, whereas the buildings are short and squat. The Atlas may not be any more obstructive than a tree. The visual impact could be reduced in location two surrounded by trees, but that moves it farther away from the museum. One of the preservation doctrines is reversibility. Should the area revert to park, the foundation and Atlas would need to be removed.

Staff Comment: None.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
John Russo	Sounds interesting.
David Marshall	Obviously the Atlas is very important to the history of San Diego. The Palisades is a National Register Landmark District. The height is not as big an issue as the siting of the Atlas, which could block views of the building. There is discussion of relocating the parking in Pan America Plaza elsewhere and returning the area to park as it was historically. He would hope that this project wouldn't preclude that. Location 1 gets it closer to where it needs to be, closer to the museum, but could impact removal of the parking. Location 2 is farther away, but perhaps better located among the trees.

Recommended Modifications: The placement of the Atlas within the National Register Landmark Boundary could be determined to be consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards, provided that it is sited appropriately with minimal impact to the district. The Subcommittee would prefer that it be located immediately adjacent to the Air and Space Museum, and would like the applicant to return with additional siting options in that area.

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; California Register Site

Address: 2512 Third Avenue

Mills Act Status: No Contract, Religious Institution

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Linda Glaze of Zagrodnik + Thomas Architects; on behalf of the owner, Ohr Shalom Synagogue

Treatment: Rehabilitaton

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes rehabilitation and a second floor addition at the central connecting portion of the building between the Sanctuary and the Social Hall; reconfiguration of the entry to the Social Hall to allow a sloped walkway for ADA access; reconfiguration of the exterior stairs leading to the Sanctuary for safety and limited accessibility; some exterior work to maintain the historic fabric of the building; and interior remodeling.

Existing Square Feet: 18,800

Additional Square Feet: 1,500

Total Proposed Square Feet: 20,300

Staff Presentation: The building is not designated locally, but has been determined eligible for National Register and listed on California Register under Criteria A and C. Ohr Shalom is the current owner and is proposing a rehabilitation project. At the main entry, the applicant is proposing to relocate the sanctuary entry and demo the stairs. New stairs would be constructed which would extended out into the sidewalk in order to enlarge the landing. The main entrance would move to the center section, which would be demoed and replaced with a two story glass structure accessed by a new stair and landing. The entrance to the social hall would be altered by demolishing the stairs and constructing a sloped walkway without handrails. Along the side, the existing door would be demolished and replaced by double doors and windows. Staff is most concerned about modifications to the entrance to the sanctuary (demolishing the stairway and constructing a new one with a deeper landing); and the demolition of the central section of the building.

Applicant Presentation: The project is seeking to achieve two primary goals: add a second story to provide additional space, and create a new entry which is larger and safer. The building is essentially two structures: the two-story sanctuary and the two-story social hall with a one-story connecting piece. In order to provide additional space, the one story portion will be replaced with a new two-story portion which connects the sanctuary to the social while providing additional space as well as seismic retrofitting to help stabilize the two hallow clay tile buildings. The applicant is attempting to differentiate the addition from the original building through the use of glass. Restoration of the historic fabric is also planned through removal of the window air conditioners and installation of central air, rehabilitation of the stained glass, and repair of the existing stucco.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Construction date for various parts of the building?	All 1906

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The reason for pulling the stairs into ROW is an egress issue?	The existing stairs are pretty steep with a minimal landing. Handrails were added at some point.
How will north elevation change?	Yes, a new door system will be added, as well as some window modifications
What is adjacent to north elevation?	A school. The space is accessed off of Third Avenue and is not readily visible.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Eisenhart	Troubled by the glass connection. He would not want to see demolition of original wall, but would be comfortable reconfiguring it in some way to accommodate a new entry. He would not have an issue with a second floor addition above the space stepped back slightly from the main façade (maybe 8 feet or so). Does not support removing the stairs leading up to the sanctuary, which is a character-defining feature of the resource. Does not have an issue adding a ramp to the stairs leading to the social hall, but would like to see the stairs retained and the ramp added to the side. Does not have an issue with modifications to north façade, which is not a public façade.
Johnson	Likes the idea of saving the connecting space and altering the stairs and doors to allow for a new main entrance in order to preserve the original main entrance.
Emme	Agrees with prior comments.

Staff Comment: None.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
John Russo	The stairs is the only issue for him.
David Marshall	Has been in the building and knows it has some maintenance issues. Doesn't have an issue with stairs and ramps. However, the use of glass for the second and first floor gives the impression that the buildings were never connected, which is not accurate. Leaving the first floor intact and building the second floor addition above and behind using glass for the second floor only would be better. Also noted that while the Board does not have much purview over the interior, it would be a shame to lose too much of the interior fabric.

Recommended Modifications: The original, existing main staircase leading to the sanctuary must be retained. The original one-story connection between the sanctuary and the social hall must also be maintained, but the fenestration may be altered to accommodate a new main entry. A second floor addition above this area may be added, but should be stepped back from the main façade (approximately 8 feet) and must be differentiated from the original construction in some way. The sloped walkway at the entrance to the social hall is fine, but should be added to the side of the existing stair, rather than demolishing and replacing the existing stair. The modifications proposed to the north elevation and other secondary elevations are consistent with the Standards.

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 #: 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

Staff Presentation: 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. This issue was addressed by CCDC's preservation consultant, Heritage Architecture and Planning, who determined that such a modification to the storefront would not be consistent with the Standards. Copies of communication from Heritage to CCDC is being provided. Staff shares the same concern regarding the impact to the historic store-front and its inconsistency with the Standards. The applicant has requested that DAS review the project and provide comment and direction.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant is in the process of upgrading the electrical system in the San Diego Hardware building in order to support the air conditioning, elevator, and other improvements. SDG&E is requiring that the main disconnect for the upgraded utilities be accessible within the first 10 feet from the exterior of the building. As the Fifth Avenue façade is the only publicly accessible façade, the applicant is proposing to

modify the plate glass window at the north end of the façade with a frameless glass door that locks at the bottom. No other option is acceptable to SDG&E.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The curved section of the window will be maintained?	Yes
Can't be located on the alley?	There is no alley. This is the only publicly accessible façade.
Will you remove the arched glass?	No. The flat 6' wide pane of glass at the northern end will be split into two 3' panes, one fixed and one operable.
The bottom lock assembly will be a metal assembly?	Yes.
The door will only have a glass header?	Yes, the door will extend to the top of the frame and will not have a visible header or transom.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Johnson	This may be a good item to appeal to State Board under the State Historic Building Code.
Eisenhart	Does not have an issue with the project, which seems to be the best way to satisfy SDG&E's requirements.

Staff Comment: None.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
David Marshall	Feels that the door is a minor issue. Because they're upgrading the service they need to provide access. Preservation of the curved windows and the original doors is the most important issue. A frameless door on the flat portion of façade may not be that obtrusive and is the best possible option given the requirement.

Recommended Modifications: None.

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 #: 821-58: Mission Hills District Contributor

Address: 1895 Sunset Boulevard

Mills Act Status: No Contract, Eligible

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Sharon Duckham, owner

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project is returning to the DAS for additional review following a conceptual level review of a proposed window opening enlargement on the street-side yard elevation, as well as construction of new sitewalls and walkways.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: n/a

** THIS ITEM WAS NOT HEARD **

▪ **ITEM 3F:** Estimated time 20 minutes

HRB #: N/A

Address: 610 Rosecrans

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: 155052

Project Contact: Tim Martin, Architect

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This project scope includes a remodel and addition to a Ranch house designed by architect Ralph Frank, who has been established by the HRB as a Master. The project and site came to staff as part of the City's review of projects impacting properties 45 years old or older. Staff has determined that the property appears eligible for designation as an individually significant resource, and are seeking input from DAS regarding the project's consistency with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: unknown

Total Proposed Square Feet: unknown

Staff Presentation: This property was brought to staff's attention during the City's review of a project impacting a property 45 years old or older. Staff reviewed the property under the HRB's adopted Ranch policy and Modernism Context and determined that it is eligible for designation as it retains all of its character defining features and was designed by Master Architect Ralph Frank. Staff has reviewed the project and determined that it is not consistent with the Standards due to wholesale window replacement, relocation of windows, infill of porch spaces, and construction of a new belvedere. Staff is seeking DAS input on possible modifications to the project scope which would bring it into compliance with the Standards.

Applicant Presentation: The project architect stated that he did not feel that historic significance would be an issue with this project, and designed a complete remodel without consideration for the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The project will

infill the covered porch and entry; infill a small recess on the main façade; and infill an exterior patio on the rear of the building facing the bay. In addition to comments regarding consistency with the Standards and suggestions for revising the project, the applicant is seeking DAS comment on the property's eligibility for designation as well.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What materials are proposed?	The steel casement windows will be replaced with dual pane, aluminum-clad wood windows.
New siding will be different from the existing stucco and board and batten?	Yes, they are proposing beveled horizontal siding.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Eisenhart	The Subcommittee's role is to review a proposed project for consistency with the Standards, and not whether or not a building is eligible for designation. He believes that if the property is designated, the applicant could largely achieve what they want with some relatively minor modifications to the project. The addition at the front is problematic as designed, but could be modified to keep the roofline and posts and enclose it with glass walls. The belvedere is a different vocabulary and is inconsistent with the Ranch style. The rear addition is not a significant impact, but the addition of a new porch may not be supportable. The introduction of large columns at the entry is more Colonial than Ranch, but he doesn't necessarily have an issue shifting the entry. The roofline should remain the same from Rosecrans. The project would need to retain the existing exterior materials and windows to be consistent with the Standards.
Emme	The additions from the publicly visible façade are the most important and the purview of the Subcommittee. Doesn't know whether or not it is a good example of the style. The project is a significant remodel.
Johnson	Would need a site visit to get a sense for the site and the impact of the project. Storm windows could be used for sound attenuation and energy efficiency.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
David Marshall	Doesn't sound like there's a lot of work being done, but the work at the entry is significant if the house is designated and would need to be revised.
Owner	Feels that there is a misconception as to what is the front and the back of the building. The back fronts onto the street.

Recommended Modifications: If the building is designated by the Historical Resources Board, the project will need to be revised to be consistent with the Standards if the project is to be processed ministerially. The comments of the Subcommittee can be used as a guide to revise the project if the applicant chooses to do so.

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 5:58 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on October 1, 2008 at 3:00 PM.

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