

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 6, 2009, at 3:00 PM

12th Floor Conference Room 12B

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

## MEETING NOTES

### 1. ATTENDANCE

**Subcommittee Members** Alex Bethke (Chair); Salvador Aréchiga; Gail Garbini; Maria Curry

Recusals None

#### City Staff

HRB Kelley Saunders; Jodie Brown; Jennifer Hirsch; Tricia Olsen

City Attorney Nina Fain

DSD Myra Herrmann

CSD, E&CP George Freiha

#### Guests

Item 3A Not Present

Item 3B Mirosav Znkovl, U.S. Grant; Joe Sebestyen, Unik Custom Glass; Mark Temple, and Jens Raz, TRACO

Item 3C Jan Templin, and Gary Templin, Wind-Dor Inc.; Art Balourdas, Arcadia Group; Jay Wentz, JCG Development

Item 3D Randy Hanna, and Scott Magic, Architects Hanna Gabriel Wells

Item 3E Linda Glaze, Zagrodnik + Thomas; Raulf Polichar, Carlos Wellman and Pete Cox, Ohr Shalom

Item 3F Gina Ell, La Casa

Item 3G David Marshall, and Curtis Drake, Heritage Architecture & Planning

Other Bruce Coons, SOHO; John Eisenhart, SOHO; Paul Johnson; Brian Rickling

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

- John Eisenhart of SOHO's Modernism Committee wanted the public to be aware that the County has not responded to inquiries as to why a Negative Declaration was issued for a project which involves demolition of a modernist building without public comment or input.

## 3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: N/A

Address: Within the boundaries of the San Diego Airport Authority FAA Noise Attenuation Area

Historic Name: N/A

Significance: N/A

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Sjohnna Knack, Quieter Home Program Manager

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Residential buildings located within the noise contour of the San Diego International Airport are eligible to participate in the Quieter Home Program. Through a grant provided by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the airport authority provides noise attenuation of homes within the 65+ decibel level. With the expiration of the existing Programmatic Agreement, city staff is working with the various stakeholders to craft a new Programmatic Agreement. Appendix B Historic Treatment Guidelines addresses potentially historic or designated buildings. The guidelines are being referred to DAS by staff to comment on the proposed treatments.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

**\*\*THIS ITEM WAS NOT HEARD\*\***

▪ **ITEM 3B:**

Listings: Listed on the National Register 8/27/1979

Address: 326 Broadway

Historic Name: U.S. Grant Hotel

Significance: (Registration form not found)

Mills Act Status: No Contract; Redevelopment Area

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Joe Sebestyen, Unik Custom Glass and Mirror

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to remove the existing wood frame and sash windows and replace them with new aluminum windows manufactured by TRACO.

Existing Square Feet: unknown

Additional Square Feet: none

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: Constructed in 1910 by Ulysses S. Grant, Jr. and designed by Harrison Albright, the hotel featured 437 rooms of which 350 had private baths. The building is constructed of reinforced cement in a “U” shape with approximately 8 stories. The

interior features white marble on the main staircase and blue marble for the Belgian base around the lobby. The building also included a roof top garden and a palm court. The building was placed on the National Register in 1979. The current proposal is to replace the existing wood windows with an aluminum product by TRACO. The hotel has had a number of complaints about noise from the street. The majority of the windows on the hotel are one-over-one double hung wood windows with the top floor having arched, true divided-lite, double hung windows. When a major remodel was completed in the 1980's, a number of the windows were replaced with dual pane wood windows. It also appears that the arched windows may have been replaced at that time. Generally, after a site visit, it appears that the replacement wood windows are in need of repair while the original wood windows appear to be in fairly good shape. Staff is concerned that the proposed replacement of all the windows is not in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. Per the Standards, existing historic fabric should be repaired rather than replaced, and if replacement is necessary they should be replaced in-kind. The current proposal for aluminum windows is not an in-kind replacement and not appropriate.

Applicant Presentation: The window replacement proposal is the result of repeated complaints from guests regarding street noise along Broadway. The two predominant window types are present on the U.S. Grant, one-over-one double hung windows and arched, multi-lite-over-multi-lite single hung windows. All windows surveyed by the applicant were damaged or problematic, with evidence of termite damage, air infiltration, dry-rot and inoperable hardware. The third floor windows were replaced in 1985 with dual pane wood frame and sash windows, which are already showing signs of deterioration. The applicant is proposing to replace all windows in-kind in terms of size, shape and operation, but not material. Custom high-grade architectural aluminum windows manufactured by TRACO will be used. Aluminum was chosen because current commercially available wood windows are not as resilient and would not be in-kind in terms of durability. TRACO has retrofitted a number of significant landmarks with aluminum frame windows, and can replicate milling and design, as well as interior features and detail.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Why is in-kind replacement not possible?	New products are not as durable unless you go to a custom millwork shop, which is cost-prohibitive. Concerned with termite damage in the future as well.
How many windows need to be replaced?	Entire building, approx 1,000 windows.
All windows are damaged?	Yes.
Were you able to survey all windows?	No, only 89 rooms out of 270.
Main complaint is noise?	Yes, noise, wind and dirt.
What is the material from the 1985 rehab?	Pine.
What will happen to the original windows?	Will be disposed of in accordance with lead abatement requirements.

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Marshall	The U.S. Grant is a very important building. He sees two issues: should the windows be replaced, and if so, with what? Hasn't seen sufficient evidence that the windows are not repairable, and the applicant should only replace windows that are beyond repair. There are ways to repair windows with termite damage. If they do need to be replaced, then the Standards require like-for-like replacement, which would be wood, regardless of the wood species.
Coons	New reports from building industry indicate that once a portion of the new replacement window goes bad, you have to replace the whole unit. He hasn't seen a significant difference in price between custom windows, regardless of the material. Most wood windows are sugar pine in pre-1920's buildings, which can still be obtained. The existing sashes appear to be deep enough to accommodate double pane windows.
Johnson	Newer timber is a poor quality, and old growth lumber is readily available. With decent weather stripping, you can get very good noise and weather performance with wood. He noted that if the applicant didn't have good noise attenuation performance with the existing replacement wood windows that may be due to pane thickness.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Curry	Replacing all of the windows is a significant impact on the historic character of the building. She would like to look at buildings in similar situations and what they've done to address noise issues. The windows have already lasted 100 years, and could last 100 more with proper rehab. Windows could be replaced on a more limited basis based on exposure and wear, but replacement must be in-kind with wood.
Garbini	One probably wouldn't notice the change visually. She noted that some rehab projects leave one room or one area of the hotel intact to show what was there historically.
Bethke	Agrees with staff that the proposal is not consistent with the Standards. It's a stewardship issue; maintenance is required when you're dealing with a historic resource. The photos of existing conditions indicate that maintenance hasn't been done.

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Arechiga	Does not feel that the applicant has demonstrated that all windows are deteriorated beyond repair.

Staff Comment: None.

Recommended Modifications: A comprehensive conditions assessment report must be prepared which objectively evaluates the condition of each window and provides recommendations regarding repair and replacement, if warranted. The report must examine alternative methods of sound attenuation which preserves the historic wood windows, including adding a second pane and the installation of laminated glass. The report must be submitted to staff for review, and forwarded to the Subcommittee as appropriate.

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:**

Listings: HRB Site #319

Address: 2223 El Cajon Boulevard

Historic Name: Imig Manor

Significance: Designated for its political, social and cultural significance, particularly with respect to the African American Community; and as a landmark hotel on El Cajon Blvd

Mills Act Status: No Contract; Redevelopment Area

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Art Balourdes, on behalf of the owner, Hampstead Lafayette, LLC.

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to remove the 7 remaining wood frame and sash windows and all existing aluminum frame and sash windows and replace them with composite windows in the original wood frame sash and trim along the street facades (128 windows), and vinyl windows within the existing openings along the non-street facing elevations (122 windows).

Existing Square Feet: 40,000

Additional Square Feet: none

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: Constructed in 1945, the Imig Manor was designated in September 1993. The building is significant for its association with Lawrence Imig, a major builder/developer in San Diego and for its association with the African-American community. The first regional NAACP Conference and the first Ebony Fashion Fair were held at the hotel. The building is a four story, red brick Neo-Classical structure with a full height entry porch.

Three story wings extend from the main building and create a “U”-shaped court. Several smaller buildings associated with the hotel were originally located behind the main building, but were demolished for an affordable housing project. The current project is receiving redevelopment funds to rehabilitate the building. The property owners propose replacement of the non-historic aluminum windows with composite windows. Staff is concerned that the proposed window material is not consistent with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. The Standards allow for replacement with an alternate material if the design of the original window can be matched, however the proposed windows do not match the historic appearance in design. Staff is also concerned that installing with sash into the existing frame will create the appearance of an over-large jamb.

Applicant Presentation: Most of the original wood sash windows were replaced with aluminum frame sashes in the 1980’s before the building was designated. The existing frames are wood, just the sashes were replaced. The applicant is proposing to replace only the sash again, this time with a composite/fiberglass material. They will be replacing the rear windows which have no street visibility with vinyl, which staff has approved. The applicant noted that the building was designated for its historical significance, not for its architectural significance. The applicant believes that wood window replacements are not economically feasible, but the applicant does not want to leave the aluminum windows in place.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Eisenhart	Does the proposed profile match the profile of the original wood windows? (Applicant: only the sash will be replaced, not the frame) The muntins on the sash do not appear to match the historic profile. He thinks the TRACO product could create a more appropriate profile.
Johnson	Are the 7 remaining windows on the front? If so, they could be used as the basis for reconstruction. (Applicant: the 7 remaining windows are fixed, not operable)
Marshall	The profile is the most important. The material is up to the DAS, although the preference is always wood. Cost of custom wood may not be more significant than custom vinyl or composite. (Applicant: cost comparison provided in the submittal package)
Coons	Has an issue with simulated divided-lites. True divided-lites make a significant difference. The Standards don’t allow simulated divided-lites. When you have an opportunity to replace no-historic windows, it should go back to the way it was historically.

Q&A: None

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Curry	Concerned that the economic situation is creating too great a focus on the economics of the replacement. Recommends that the Subcommittee follow the Standards, and does not believe that vinyl is a good idea. The applicant may need to replace windows in phases to accommodate the cost of wood window replacements.
Bethke	Inclined to stick with the staff recommendation. When non-historic windows are replaced, every effort should be made to replace them with historically appropriate materials.
Arechiga	If you have funding for rehabilitation, why not use that funding to replace the windows with historically appropriate materials?

Staff Comment:

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Saunders	In regard to the rear windows, staff's position is that given that the designation was not based on the architecture and the windows are only visible to hotel guests standing in the rear courtyard; vinyl windows along this rear elevation is an appropriate compromise.

Recommended Modifications: The composite material proposed is not appropriate and could not accurately re-create the profile of the original windows. All replacement windows, including those along the rear elevation, should be wood frame and sash that replicate the historic size, operation, profile and appearance.

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:**

Listings: HRB Site #562; 442-065

Address: 4801 Santa Monica Avenue

Historic Name: Ocean Beach Library

Significance: HRB Criteria A (Cultural Landscape); C (Architecture); F (District Contributor)

Mills Act Status: No Contract; City-owned

PTS #: 173411

Project Contact: Scott Magic of Hanna Gabriel Wells Architects; on behalf of the owner, City of San Diego

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to add 9,428 square feet of new library space directly adjacent to the existing library on an adjacent site acquired by the City.

The existing building will be preserved, but will be re-planned on the interior. An addition to the original library constructed in the 1960's will be removed and the entire site will be re-landscaped. The current project has been significantly redesigned from a prior approval which expired.

Existing Square Feet: 4,572

Additional Square Feet: 9,428

Total Proposed Square Feet: 14,000

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The library was constructed in 1928 by Robert Snyder, as associate of William Templeton Johnson, in the Spanish Colonial/Monterey style. The building was designated in 2002 under HRB Criteria A and F. It was one of the first cultural institutions in the seaside resort community, and is located in the Ocean Beach Cottage Emerging Historical District. The building is a "L" shaped stucco over wood-frame structure. The original wood windows were changed to anodized aluminum. The original wood shake roof was replaced with dimensional asphalt shingles. Staff is concerned with the addition, which is substantial and not consistent with the architecture of the existing building. In addition, the expansion requires almost complete demo of rear wall, which is not a reversible alteration.

Applicant Presentation: The previously approved project was larger and proposed a 15,000 square foot addition wrapping around the building. The current project proposes an 8,000 square foot addition. Existing modifications to the building include changes to the original windows and window openings, and a 1960's addition that will be removed. Stylistically, they are trying to build something of its time which complements the building, rather than mimicking it. The existing two story building to the west will be demolished and replaced with the tall one story library addition. The existing entry will remain intact and continue to serve as the entry. The existing building will be dedicated to children's uses and services. The addition will be connected to the building at the rear wall with a building joint, rather than a direct connection, which will preserve the roofline. This connection will require removal of existing windows. Landscape will be brought back, with the introduction of a new plaza area off of Santa Monica. Parking will be off the alley.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Eisenhart	Was the 1960's resource evaluated by staff? (Herrmann: Yes, it was evaluated and determined not to be significant.) Appreciates the Modern vocabulary, but why a shed roof? (Applicant: feels it reaches out to the community, as opposed to a flat roof. Doesn't think a hipped roof is appropriate.) Thinks that the roof form could be softened. The variety of materials and fenestration style introduced detract from the resource.



<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Marshall	The separation between the old and new is done very well. The taller roof-form in the middle is a little jarring.
Coons	Thinks the architecture is good. It does feel as an adjacent building rather than an addition. The center section is troublesome. The area would have been a courtyard historically, and the center addition really fills that. (Applicant: trying to meet LEED, the center section allows light and air.) Sloping the roof the other direction may help. (Applicant: that would create a southern exposure which would require tinted glass or louvers.)

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Are the roofs slanted at the same degree?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Garbini	The impact of the center addition may be reduced by flattening the roof a little.
Curry	Believes it is important for an addition not to diminish the importance of the historic structure. If the angled roofs were flattened a little, it would reduce the visual impact to the historic structure.
Bethke	Doesn't think it will undermine the design to slope the center roof in the other direction, and would like to see a rendering of what that would look like.
Arechiga	Likes the project and doesn't have a problem with the height, but would like to see alternative roof designs.

Staff Comment:

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Herrmann	The original project did not have the center section. The significant change to the project design raised issues for EAS staff as well.

Recommended Modifications: The project distinguishes the addition from the resource in a sensitive and compatible, yet differentiated way. However, the applicant should return to the Subcommittee with alternatives for the center roof section which reduces visual impacts to 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 3E:**

Listings: n/a; California Register Site (Determined Eligible for NR)

Address: 2512 Third Avenue

Historic Name: Temple Beth Israel

Significance: National Register Criteria A (Social History) and C (Architecture and Architect)

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. The project is returning to DAS with revisions to the project based on prior direction.

Existing Square Feet: 18,800

Additional Square Feet: 1,500

Total Proposed Square Feet: 20,300

Prior DAS Review: 9/23/2008

Staff Presentation: The structure was designed by William Wheeler and constructed in 1926. It was determined eligible for the National Register and listed on California Register under Criteria A and C. Some character defining features were called out in the nomination; but the back two facades were not called out as significant. The project was reviewed by DAS previously, and the Subcommittees prior direction is reflected in the September 23, 2008 meeting record. The main entrance is no longer being reconfigured. The entrance to the social hall will be altered by the addition of a ramp, but the existing stairs will not be removed and the ramp is reversible. The center, one-story section will be altered by the addition of a second story that will be stepped back. The setback of the second story is consistent with previous DAS direction. The entrance and windows in the center section at the first story will be removed and replaced with a central, double frameless glass door.

Applicant Presentation: The modifications to the main entry are no longer proposed. The second story addition will be set back 3 feet from the façade below. Both the original one story connection and the second floor addition will be finished with a Jerusalem stone façade.

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Marshall	Thinks this is a better solution than the previous design. Would prefer to keep the second floor addition in transparent in glass, with the first floor maintained in stucco. (Applicant: looked at glass on the second floor, but that felt more jarring than stucco).

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Does widening the existing door not meet the applicant's needs?	No, it does not.
Jerusalem stone is gold, correct?	Yes

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Curry	Acknowledges that the applicant needs to change an original element to meet a new need, but wonders if there is another solution. Noted that the original windows have arches, and the windows in the addition break that pattern, providing differentiation. Suggested leaving the second floor addition as a blank façade and utilizing skylights for daylight.
Bethke	Feels that the addition mimics too much while taking away from the original. There is no indication that the addition is a new structure.
Garbini	Having the second story in glass would solve a lot of issues. The Jerusalem stone, although beautiful, does not provide a lot of differentiation. All stucco would be appropriate, as would or stucco on bottom with glass on top. The 3 foot setback is good.

Staff Comment:

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Hirsch	Wanted to ensure that the Subcommittee is comfortable with the dramatic alteration to the fenestration on the existing one story connection. (The consensus was that alteration of the door and fenestration on the connection was not a significant issue.)

Recommended Modifications: Maintaining the historic stucco texture and finish on the original one story connecting element is important. The second story addition could be glass or stucco. The use of Jerusalem stone on the first floor is not appropriate, but may

be possible on second floor addition. Provided that the revised project is consistent with this direction, it may be approved by staff without returning to the Subcommittee.

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:**

Listings: HRB Site # 208-268

Address: 2200 Island Avenue

Historic Name: Sherman Heights District Contributor

Significance: Contributing Resource

Mills Act Status: No Contract

PTS #: 170453

Project Contact: Gina Ell, on behalf of the owner, La Casa for Autism

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project is the result of a code enforcement action for an unpermitted enclosure of first and second floor balconies at the rear of the home. The applicant is requesting DAS input on appropriate reconstruction of the balcony, given that there is no available photographic record of the original balconies.

Existing Square Feet: 3003

Additional Square Feet: none

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project is the result of a code enforcement action for an unpermitted enclosure of first and second floor balconies at the rear of the home. The applicant and staff are requesting DAS input on appropriate reconstruction of the balcony, given that there is no available photographic record of the original balconies.

Applicant Presentation: None. Presented a proposal to reconstruct the balconies with clapboard walls and exterior stairs.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Sleeping porches were probably there historically, which would have had a shed roof with 2x4 railings at the upper floor and solid lap-sided walls on the first floor. There should be other examples in the district to borrow from.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Front balcony is original?	Yes

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Curry	Reference balconies on the house or in the neighborhood.
Bethke	Would like to see examples of other balconies in the neighborhood. Comparison of other homes with similar sleeping porches would be helpful. Would recommend against mimicking the porch at the front.

Staff Comment: None.

Recommended Modifications: Look at other examples of rear sleeping porches in the neighborhood and work with staff to develop a design solution.

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:**

Listings: HRB Site #1; National Register Landmark District

Address: 1350 El Prado

Historic Name: Balboa Park - California Building

Significance: Contributing Resource

Mills Act Status: No Contract; City-owned

PTS #: 177043

Project Contact: David Marshall, Heritage Architecture and Planning

Treatment: Preservation

Project Scope: This preservation project proposes replacement of all built-up roofing on the Museum of Man (MOM) and MOM Administration Building; repairs to the cast-stone ornamentation on the main dome; repairs to the dome dormer and lantern wood windows; and cleaning and repair of the small tiled domes at each corner of the MOM. The main dome tile shall remain as-is, and the dome will need to be scaffolded. Additional repairs include removal and reinstallation of the clay tile roofing on the South Archade and repairs to the ends of wood log beams; as well as removal and reinstallation of the clay tile roofing over the rear parking area between the MOM and the Administration Building, which will include in-kind replacement of the wood beams and posts.

Existing Square Feet: 12,528

Additional Square Feet: none

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The project is a preservation/restoration project which proposes to restore and reconstruct and number of decorative elements on the building, as well as other needed repair, including roofing. It is the longstanding practice of Historic Resources staff to bring all projects within the National Register Historic District to the Design Assistance Subcommittee for review and comment.

Applicant Presentation: This project is a continuation of the project completed last year which restored the frontispiece on the building. This project focuses on the roof. The flat roof portions have already been re-roofed. The project area includes the Administration building, the main building with the dome, and the carport and arcade. The vaulted portions of the roof are now metal, but the original roof was closer to the color of the building. They will be replacing the metal roofing with a Tri-Polymer Alloy roof in a tan color. All existing wood windows will be restored. The finials on the dome were replaced in 1976 with fiberglass, which are in pretty good shape and won't need much work. The original cast stone finials along the back side of the building are spalling and need to be replaced. The original cast concrete that needs to be replaced will be replaced in-kind with cast concrete. A clear coat applied to the dome at some point is tarnishing and needs to be removed, which can be done easily with a solvent. Some limited replacement and repair needs to be done for some damaged tile. On the arcade, the roof will be repaired and the same tile re-used. The 1915 vigas are suffering some disrepair and will be repaired.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Will it go to Balboa Park Committee?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment: No Issues.

Staff Comment: None.

Public Comment: None.

Recommended Modifications: The project is consistent with the Standards as proposed.

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 6:40 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on June 3, 2009 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at [KMSaunders@sandiego.gov](mailto:KMSaunders@sandiego.gov) or 619.236.6545.