

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, August 5, 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 (arrived at 4:45pm for item 3B)
Recusals	None
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders; Cathy Winterrowd; Jodie Brown;
City Attorney	Nina Fain
Guests	
Item 3A	Jason Larson, Seth Larson and John Klacka of Lars Construction; Laura Giacalone, owner
Item 3B	Neal Singer, NTC Foundation; Chris Bittner, OBR Architecture
Item 3C	Frederick Hensel
Item 3D	None
Item 3E	David Marshall and Cutis Drake, Heritage Architecture and Planning
Other	Paul Johnson; Lewis Dennis

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

- None

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #526-147

Address: 2617 San Marcos

Historic Name: Burlingame District Contributor

Significance: Contributing Element

Mills Act Status: Active Contract, Recorded 2007

PTS #: 182611

Project Contact: Seth Larson, Lars Construction; on behalf of the owners, Peter and Laura Giacalone

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to add a 1,015 square foot two-story addition at the rear of a one-story contributing house to the Burlingame Historic District. The project was reviewed previously by the DAS in July of 2009 and the applicant has requested to return to the Subcommittee with a revised project scope.

Existing Square Feet: 1028

Additional Square Feet: 1015

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2136

Prior DAS Review: July 2009

Staff Presentation: This project was reviewed previously by DAS. Staff spoke with the applicant following the DAS meeting and stated that staff is willing to look at a two-story addition provided it is subordinate to the historic house. The project has been revised to pull the addition off of the original house and reduce the roof pitch on the addition. Staff is still concerned with the project's consistency with the Standards. The roof form and detailing is busy and detracts from the historic resource. The side patio will still be in-filled, but the roof will not be curved and the veneer will not be added.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant did take DAS comments into consideration during the redesign. They moved the addition back, took a chunk out of the roof, and reduced the massing. The setbacks have been completely maxed out to move as much of the massing to the first floor as possible. However, the project cannot be completely contained within a one story addition. The roof pitch is a 6/12 pitch hipped roof. The nook addition has been setback one foot from the façade of the house. The window mullions were changed to differentiate from the original construction (4 lites instead of 8 or 10) and the windows have been popped out to differentiate. The stucco texture and color has also been differentiated.

Public Comment: None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The addition is still partially over the existing house, correct?	Yes, but the existing roof structure will not be impacted.
Rear setback is 13'?	Yes.
The existing fireplace is staying and the new fireplace is being added on the second floor addition?	Correct.
What is on the second story?	Master suite.
What is the elevation difference between the street and the lot?	The grade at the front door of the house is 5'4" higher than the sidewalk.
Is it possible to reorient the stairwell to the rear?	Possibly
What are the staff concerns?	Brown: The new roof is quite a bit

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
	busier than the historic roof, as is the addition itself. Staff is also concerned about the visibility of some portions of the additions, including the pop-outs.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Aréchiga	The addition is much less intrusive than the other plan; but he still feels that it would be preferable to keep the addition at one story.
Garbini	Often times a second story addition looks like it is sitting on the original house. It appears that the issue is the setback, and the Subcommittee needs to focus on that as the issue.
Bethke	The biggest issue is the stairwell. The front of the second story where the stairwell is located is the most intrusive. Reorienting the stairwell to the rear could alleviate that issue.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The project as designed does not comply with Standard 9. The setback to the stairwell should be increased, or the stairwell should be relocated. The pop-out at the second floor, west elevation should also be eliminated.

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 #425

Address: Lot A of NTC Unit 6

Historic Name: Naval Training Center

Significance: Contributing Element

Mills Act Status: No Contract, City Owned

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Neal Singer, NTC Foundation; and Chris Bittner, OBR Architecture

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The rehabilitation project proposes to adaptively reuse the steam exchange building on the former Naval Training Center. Work includes a new wood floor (no floor existing); removal of non-historic louvers at window openings; lowering of window sills

at existing and re-instituted windows; creating a new opening with folding door panels on the north elevations with new wood lintel to replace existing lintel; re-instituted flag standard and downspouts; a new concrete patio and walkways to the public right-of-way; new roofing and exterior painting. Interior surfaces will remain unfinished.

Existing Square Feet: 455

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 455

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The building, centered in the promenade, was a former steam exchange pump room and is a contributing element to the historic district. The applicants are looking to convert the building to a useable space, and staff is concerned with some of the alterations. There will be repairs to vents, etc; but some elements will be altered, including the louvered vents, which will be expanded to accommodate windows. The applicant wants to lower the windows at one elevation. The exterior ladders will be rehabilitated and reinstalled. Staff is concerned about how those ladders will be secured.

Applicant Presentation: The building frames the north promenade. They are looking to lower the sill heights on some of the windows because the sills are 6 feet off the ground and they want to make the space comfortable and well-lit. The proportions of the altered windows mimic those on building 12 on the other end of the promenade. The lead paint will be abated as part of the hazmat clean-up. The applicant walked the Subcommittee thru A3.0 and first of the as-built historic sheets to illustrate the restorations and changes:

- Elevation 1 (north) on A.3: A flag standard that was part of the original building is being restored. The downspouts are being restored. The existing wood lintel is retained. The three windows, which have already been altered, will be replaced with an enlarged opening with the same width, but a greater height containing three sliding panels under the restored lintel.
- Elevation 2 (south) on A.3: There were three windows with a 6' sill height. The vents will be restored and the ladder will be restored. The only modification would be to enlarge the opening by dropping the sill height from 6' to 3'.
- Elevation 3 (east) on A.3: The existing door is not historic. It will be replaced with a wood door that will match original. Transom is in place and will be repaired. No other changes to that elevation.
- Elevation 4 (west) on A.3: The façade contains two windows and ladder. The ladder will be rehabbed and fitted with a locking plate, and the window sill heights will be reduced 6' to 3'.

Public Comment: None.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What is the proposed use?	Coffee shop or flower shop.
The louvers are not original?	No, they are not. The original windows were replaced with louvers.
Why create a new floor?	Violation of ADA to leave the floor at

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
	a lower level.
Why not put patio outside? Why all seating inside?	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Curry	Concerned with the changes to the buildings. Altering it to this extent will isolate it from the other buildings.
Garbini	Because the building was a pump station, it should still look like a pump station from a historic preservation perspective. The pump use is significant to the operations of the NTC. From an adaptive reuse perspective, the door openings may be fair game. Recommends skylights to bring in additional light.
Bethke	Altering too many character defining features. Should re-examine the function and make it viable without using the interior space.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Saunders	The applicant is presuming that a future tenant will not need any wall space. Lowering all sill heights from 6' to 3' will eliminate wall space within the tenant space. This modification may be premature.
Brown	If the window on the south and west façade were retained/restored, then three sides of the building would remain unaltered. The north façade faces inward to the street and the entrance would be recessed. Skylights could provide additional light.

Recommended Modifications: If the windows on the south and west façades were retained/restored, then three sides of the building would remain unaltered. The north façade faces inward to the street and the entrance would be recessed. Skylights could provide additional light.

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: N/A

Address: 3839 8th Avenue

Historic Name: N/A

Significance: N/A

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: 182545

Project Contact: Frederick Hensel, owner

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This project is being brought before the Design Assistance Subcommittee by staff, who has determined that the house is potentially historically significant during a project review for a property 45 years old or older. The applicant proposes to enclose the front porch with lattice, a window and a door. Staff has determined that the modifications are not consistent with the Standards and would adversely impact the structure. Staff is seeking recommendations from the Subcommittee on ways in which the project could be revised to be consistent with the Standards.

Existing Square Feet: Unknown

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: Unknown

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This project came to staff as a code enforcement action and 45 year review. Staff determined that the house, built in 1910, is potentially significant. The porch enclosure is not consistent with the Standards because it alters the character defining porch feature and alters spatial relationships. Staff has met with the owner several times and tried to work out a solution, but has not been able to reach an agreement. The city allows screening and plastic to enclose a porch without a permit. This exceeds that and triggers a permit. Staff has suggested options including increasing the height of the fence, and/or leaving the lattice at the sides. Staff cannot reach an agreement with the owner and has brought the issue to DAS for suggestions.

Applicant Presentation: Has owned and lived in the house for 40 years and built the enclosure because of people trespassing on the property. The Standards are a philosophy for saving old houses, and don't provide specifics. The porch modifications are consistent with the intent of the Standards, which is to save historic houses. The modification rehabilitates the house in a manner which provides security and allows them to use the porch. The historic look is altered, but the historic functionality is restored. The new windows use older glass, the door uses tempered glass, and the lattice provides an enclosure without permanently enclosing the porch.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Paul Johnson	This area has several buildings which have strong architectural character and the area has integrity of setting. This modification impacts that setting.
David Marshall	Agrees with staff on the project's impact to the building.

Name	Comments
	The low wall provides some privacy and separation.

Q&A: None

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Aréchiga	(no opportunity for comment)
Curry	Understands his concerns about security issues. The enclosure creates a type of indoor/outdoor space which is equivalent to an addition. The design is nice, but it does not fit in with the character of the building. A porch is a porch and needs to remain that way. Would like to see it restored.
Garbini	(no opportunity for comment)
Bethke	(no opportunity for comment)

APPLICANT LEFT THE ROOM AT 5:43

Staff Comment:

Recommended Modifications: Enclosing the porch is not 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**:

Listings: HRB Site #1; National Register Landmark District

Address: 2001 Pan American Plaza

Historic Name: Balboa Park, Pan-America Plaza

Significance: Contributing Element

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 rehabilitation project proposes installation of permanent plumbing upgrades to a portable kitchen facility on the rear patio of the San Diego Air and Space Museum. The installation of the portable kitchen was reviewed by DAS on December 5, 2007 and determined to be consistent with the Standards. During their review, the Subcommittee asked for clarification as to whether or not the kitchen would require

connections to water, electricity and gas. The applicant responded that the kitchen would be self contained with no modifications to the building or installation of utilities. Given the revision to the project scope, staff is returning the item to the Subcommittee for review.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes installation of permanent plumbing upgrades to a portable kitchen facility on the rear patio of the San Diego Air and Space Museum. The installation of the portable kitchen was reviewed by DAS on December 5, 2007 and determined to be consistent with the Standards. During their review, the Subcommittee asked for clarification as to whether or not the kitchen would require connections to water, electricity and gas. The applicant responded that the kitchen would be self contained with no modifications to the building or installation of utilities. Given the revision to the project scope, staff is returning the item to the Subcommittee for review. Park and Rec staff has asked me to note that the applicant is also looking to add a grease trap on the deck as well as a full size water heater.

****THE APPLICANT COULD NOT ATTEND AND THE ITEM WAS NOT HEARD****

▪ **ITEM 3E:**

Listings: HRB Site #1; National Register Landmark District

Address: 1350 El Prado

Historic Name: Balboa Park, California Building and Tower

Significance: Contributing Element

Mills Act Status: No Contract, City Owned

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: David Marshall and Curtis Drake, Heritage Architecture and Planning

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes seismic enhancement of the California Tower and the Main Rotunda of the California Building. The seismic work is entirely interior except for the fortification of the existing steel braces within the upper three tiers of the ornamented portion of the Tower which are viewed through openings.

Strengthening of the lower part of the tower is entirely interior and will not change the appearance of interior spaces. The Main Dome will not be affected, the end-walls of each transept under the barrel vaulted roofs will be strengthened by removal of interior plaster-surfaced hollow clay tile and replacement with a plaster surfaced shotcrete wall.

Preservation of some interior elements will be required. The purpose of this presentation to the DAS is to introduce the project, provide an overview of the retrofit scope and how it will comply with the Standards, and to get preliminary feedback from the Subcommittee on the project's approach. It is anticipated that this item will return to the Subcommittee for additional review and comment once the development of the retrofit project is further along.

Existing Square Feet: 12528

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: 12528

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes seismic enhancement of the California Tower and the Main Rotunda of the California Building. The City has received grant funding to study the California Tower and Rotunda and develop plans for seismic retrofit of the building. The retrofit is not required and is a voluntary upgrade to the building. Funding for the construction of the retrofit project has not yet been identified. The purpose of this presentation to the DAS is to introduce the project, provide an overview of the retrofit scope and how it will comply with the Standards, and to get preliminary feedback from the Subcommittee on the project's approach. It is anticipated that this item will return to the Subcommittee for additional review and comment once the development of the retrofit project is further along and formally submitted for a public project assessment.

Applicant Presentation: Built in 1915 using a concrete frame and built as a permanent structure. A retrofit was completed in the late 1960s which included a steel frame in the tower. The only element visible from the outside would be the reinforcement in the tower, which would be minimally visible. A second diagonal brace would be added to the existing bracing. Alternately, the existing bracing may be replaced. The base of the tower, which is not used or habitable, will receive additional shotcrete. In the lobby and main rotunda space the inner hollow clay tile wall will be removed, replaced with concrete, and re-plastered. At the entry foyer, interior tile wainscoting will be impacted. The tiles will be removed and reinstalled. The Mayan calendar is original and will be impacted, but it will be saw-cut, removed and reinstalled in the same location. Cast concrete corbelled brackets are located in the location of the retrofit, but they will be avoided. Painted wall murals on canvas will need to be removed and reinstalled. A plaster cornice at the north wall will be removed and reinstalled. If it cannot be reinstalled, it can be reconstructed. A small decorative crown molding is located under the balcony and will either be removed and reinstalled or reconstructed. The scored concrete mail to look like tile at the mezzanine will be impacted by horizontal ties. It will be saw-cut, and patched to match scoring and refinished to original color.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Johnson	Project needs to be done.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is the tower showing any cracking?	Hasn't seen a significant earthquake.
Removing the tile wainscoting won't damage them?	Don't think so. Plan to test it; if it does, then they will saw-cut the wall to preserve the tile.
Murals will be kept in the same location?	Yes
Is this required?	No

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Have there been any earthquakes in San Diego which has damaged buildings? Is this a real threat? Is the retrofit truly necessary or urgent?	No. Rose Canyon fault is capable of a 7.2 earthquake. In the last 100 years we haven't had much, but over 10,000 years we had several.
Is tower open to public?	By invitation only.
Were there not revisions to the seismic maps recently which showed that San Diego was not a high risk area?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Aréchiga	Looks good
Curry	Concerned about the necessity of the retrofit and the impact to the tower. Budgetary concerns could result in more impacts to the character defining features.
Garbini	Looks good
Bethke	Looks good

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Saunders	Concerned about the removal of portions of the original hollow clay tile construction system. (The applicant noted that only 40-50% of the hollow clay tile walls will be removed, and that the building couldn't be retrofitted otherwise. Noted that the construction methods are well documented. The DAS was not concerned.)

Recommended Modifications: The project appears to comply with the Standards. The project will return to the DAS for a more detailed review as construction documents are developed.

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 6:15 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on September 2, 2009 at 4:00 PM.

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