

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 3, 2009, at 4:00 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; Joseph Fantone
CP&CI	Todd Schmit
City Attorney	Nina Fain
Guests	
Item 3A	Sjhonna Knack, San Diego Airport Authority; Brian Rickling and Elizabeth Hammack, Heritage Architecture and Planning; James Clinnin, Jones Payne
Item 3B	None
Item 3C	Jim Kidrick, San Diego Air and Space Museum;
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO; Judy Swink, C-3; Thomas Ledford, County of San Diego

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

None

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: N/A

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

Historic Name:

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

Staff Presentation: The San Diego Airport Authority has a noise attenuation program for properties within the flight path. The Airport Authority's consultant reviews properties within the program for potential historic significance as part of the Section 106 Review process and Programmatic Agreement. Typically, as part of the noise attenuation they replace windows, doors, HVAC and related plumbing and mechanical systems. Currently staff is working on a new Programmatic Agreement with the Airport Authority that includes treatment guidelines. The guidelines are expanded beyond those from the original Programmatic Agreement and staff is seeking DAS comment on the treatment guidelines. Staff and the Airport Authority have had conversations with SHPO on designated properties. Staff was not comfortable with wholesale replacement of windows proposed by Airport Authority. SHPO is comfortable with wholesale replacement if it is like-for-like, in-kind replacement. This applies only to locally or nationally designated properties, not properties which are simply determined eligible for listing. The Programmatic Agreement is also incorporating language that participation in the program does not ensure designation.

Applicant Presentation: The program began in 2001 and is funded through grants by the FAA. The program is done across the nation including Minneapolis, Philadelphia and San Jose. A noise level reduction of 5 decibels is required, which necessitates replacement rather than simple retrofitting. A fresh air system is also provided. It is a voluntary program, and participation is not required. The current Programmatic Agreement has been in effect for nine years and has been used as a model by other airports. The treatment guidelines started as a three page document and have been expanded to a seven page document by adding a lot more information. The treatment section was expanded to provide a better understanding of the treatment options. One major change was that the treatments will encompass the entire structure. Previously, non-visible facades on eligible structures had the option of using vinyl; now all facades will be treated appropriately. Much of the details of the treatments remain the same. Windows will be replaced like-for-like, with the exception of steel widows, which do not provide required attenuation and will be replaced with aluminum. Treatment of designated properties will not be included in the federal document, but will be worked out with the City.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Muntins have not accurately replicated original muntins in the past. French windows replacements also rarely accurately replicate the original. SOHO provided the Airport Authority with steel window manufacturers who could produce attenuating windows, but haven't gotten response. Concerned about buildings that don't currently meet designation criteria, but could with restoration. Doesn't want to see them further degraded.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Steel windows are not provided by QHP?	No. Steel windows are very expensive, and they do not accurately replicate the historic appearance due to the thicker glazing. No STC steel frame window is currently available on the market. The aluminum product that is being used has been accepted during Section 106 process for replacement of steel windows.
Who approves replacements?	Staff.
Who approved the use of aluminum in lieu of steel?	Went to DAS in 2000, and worked with staff during the development of the original Programmatic Agreement.
Steel doesn't reduce sound enough?	Correct, but it is also the way the window is built. Steel windows that are fixed can be re-glazed to meet requirements, but operable windows cannot.
What about using storm windows?	Tried utilizing storm windows at the beginning of the program, but most homeowners do not want interior storm windows.
How do the storms look?	Add an extra depth to the window, but they are reversible.
To understand the process, when a homeowner applies, the Airport Authority determines whether or not the building is significant, but only at the federal level?	It's a hybrid. Looking at eligible properties, national register eligible districts and their contributors, and locally designated historic resources. Also using existing local surveys to identify potentially significant resources.
What area is covered?	Generally, on the west to Nimitz and

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
	Famosa and to the east out to Southpark.
Who is reviewing the surveys?	Staff.
How does the process start?	Airport Authority sends out a mailer soliciting interest. Homeowners need to apply.
Are property owners aware that participation in the program could impact their eligibility for designation?	Yes, they are informed and they sign an acknowledgement.
How many per year?	300-600, depending on funding levels.
Concerned about accurately replicating muntin thickness.	Airport Authority is constantly reexamining vendors to find the most historically appropriate product. Replacement windows always replicate the historic appearance as closely as possible, and are the thickness they need to hold the glass they are required to install.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Curry	The Treatment Guidelines have a lot of detail, and they appear appropriate. Issues with the Treatment Guidelines may not be apparent until they are implemented. Overall, the guidelines are acceptable. Some of the words are more subjective, such as "close". Not certain if that needs to be addressed.
Bethke	The guidelines cover what they need to cover. Thinks the application of the Guidelines is up to staff, but the language is there. Feels that the Guidelines are adequate for adoption. The DAS can look at how those guidelines are implemented at a later date.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Brown	As staff identifies site-specific issues not addressed in the Treatment Guidelines, staff works those issues out with the Airport Authority and brings them before DAS as needed for review and comment.

Recommended Modifications: The Treatment Guidelines as presented are acceptable. The DAS would like to look at how those Guidelines are implemented, including samples of window products and examples of finished projects, at some point in the future.

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:**Listings: HRB Site #820Address: 123 East SeawardHistoric Name: Henry Rundell and Amanda Rundell HouseSignificance: HRB Criteria A (Special Element of Development); C (Architecture)Mills Act Status: No ContractPTS #: 62496Project Contact: Felipe Romo, Milano Group; on behalf of the owner, Alejandro MacedoTreatment: Rehabilitation and Relocation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation and relocation project proposes to relocate a designated historic resource located at 123 East Seaward within the project site to a new location fronting on Beyer Boulevard. The project previously proposed demolition of the resource; however, the applicant was highly encouraged by DAS at the June 11, 2007 meeting to retain and rehabilitate the resource within the project site. The applicant is returning to DAS with a proposal in response to that direction.

Existing Square Feet: 1,988Additional Square Feet: noneTotal Proposed Square Feet: N/APrior DAS Review: 7/11/2007****THIS ITEM WAS NOT HEARD****▪ **ITEM 3C:**Listings: HRB Site #1; National Register Landmark DistrictAddress: 2001 Pan American PlazaHistoric Name: Balboa Park, Pan-America PlazaSignificance: Contributing ElementMills Act Status: No Contract, City OwnedPTS #: 172811Project Contact: James Kidrick, San Diego Air and Space MuseumTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This project proposes to introduce a 96'-5" tall Atlas 2E Mercury Space Launch vehicle to Pan America Plaza. The item was previously considered by the DAS on September 3, 2008, at which time 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 DAS directed the applicant to return with

options for siting the Atlas adjacent to the Air and Space Museum. The applicant is returning with possible locations adjacent to the Air and Space Museum, as directed. 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

Prior DAS Review: 9/3/2008

Staff Presentation: This item is returning to the Subcommittee and was previously reviewed on September 3, 2008. 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 District, which has periods of significance from 1915-1916 and 1935-1936. The Subcommittee previously considered the applicant's proposal to place the Atlas at two prominent locations within the Plaza. The Subcommittee found both locations to be inconsistent with the Standards, but stated that 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 stated at the September 2008 meeting that their siting preference would be immediately adjacent to the Air and Space Museum, and asked the applicant to return with additional siting options in that area. The applicant's proposal today reflects that direction. Staff is seeking the Subcommittee's input on whether or not the new proposed location of the Atlas 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.

Applicant Presentation: Staff summarized the issue well. The new location is consistent with DAS direction and is within the museum's leasehold.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Judy Swink, Chair of C3 Parks Committee	The Committee has taken a position. Agrees the Atlas is significant to San Diego, but disagrees that it should be in Balboa Park. The Atlas that they are proposing to relocate to the park was not even the model developed in San Diego used for project Mercury (provided handout).
Bruce Coons	The newer position is certainly better than the previous locations. SOHO feels that the best location is behind the museum.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
All of the sites proposed by the applicant are within the District, correct?	Correct.
What is the interpretation method?	There will be interpretive signage

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
	around the Atlas.
How far from the building?	Don't have exact dimensions, but it will be on a 20'x20' foundation placed on the 40'-50' wide space between the building and the road.
No trees will be impacted?	Correct.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Aréchiga	Agrees with Garbini's concerns that the Atlas does not belong in the District. The missile being relocated did not carry anything related to space, it carried warheads. The museum already has a few planes in front of the building, and the Atlas will add more elements. The new proposed location is significantly better, but he still feels that it does not belong in the park. If you have to put it in Balboa Park, this location is much more appropriate than the previous locations.
Curry	The exhibits in the museum include objects from different eras, and the Atlas cannot be located within the museum because it won't physically fit inside the building and must be placed outdoors. Believes the situation would be different if the Museum was proposing to add an addition or a new structure, but the Atlas is a piece of the museum's collection which can only be placed outdoors. Thinks that the Atlas could be placed in the proposed location and not adversely impact the district because it is not an architectural addition. These elements draw more visitors and create more interest. The prior subcommittee direction was not that the Atlas should not be located within the district, just where it should (or should not) be located.
Garbini	Over the years, there has been continuing pressure to add new cultural elements to the park. The period of significance for the District is 1915-1916 and 1935-1936, which is the guideline for placing new elements in the park. It may be that the Atlas is not appropriate in this location because it is in Balboa Park. Concerned that the profile of the buildings will be lost to the exhibit features. Not to say that the exhibits are not significant, but siting them within the park may not be appropriate. Thinks that exhibits should be grouped away from the building in a new area, perhaps behind the gymnasium.
Bethke	Agrees the placing the Atlas in the rear is ideal, but not

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	ideal for the museum. Agrees with Curry, this is part of the exhibit. Doesn't think you can limit everything within Balboa Park to the Period of Significance. The previous locations imposed on the spatial relationship. As a cultural institution for learning, changes which compliment the district without necessarily relating to it are appropriate. Agrees with Garbini, spatial relationships are still an issue. There may not be enough room.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The proposed option is better than the previously proposed locations, but it still impacts the spatial relationships. Look at options for siting the Atlas at the rear of the museum.

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 5:40 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on July 1, 2009 at 4:00 PM.

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