

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, January 13, 2010, at 4:00 PM

5th Floor Large Conference Room

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

## MEETING NOTES

### 1. ATTENDANCE

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (Chair); Salvador Aréchiga; Gail Garbini
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders; Jodie Brown
City Attorney	Nina Fain
Guests	
Item 3A	John Eisenhart, Union Architecture; Jim Galvin, Environmental Consultant; Marie Lia, Attorney; Dave Potter; Thomas Fine, Community College District
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO; Paul Johnson

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

### 3. Project Reviews

#### ▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #887

Address: 1037 15<sup>th</sup> Street

Historic Name: Stephen B. and Fannie Marks House

Significance: C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: None

PTS #: 197604

Project Contact: Marie Lia, on behalf of the owner San Diego Community College Dist.

Treatment: Relocation and Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Relocate the existing building to a new site at 2644 Island Avenue in the Grant Hill Park Historic District. The applicant is seeking input from the Subcommittee on the appropriateness of the site and building placement prior to processing a Site Development Permit for the relocation.

Existing Square Feet: 1,236

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,236

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This house was designated last year under HRB Criterion C. The applicant is proposing to relocate the building from its current location to the Grant Hill Park Historic District. The project will require a Site Development Permit for relocation of a designated historic resource and review by the full HRB. Staff and the applicant are requesting that DAS review the relocation proposal for appropriateness.

Applicant Presentation: Utilizing the process for relocating a designated historic resource through a Site Development Permit, which requires an appropriate relocation site and treatment plan. The applicant has received preliminary comments from staff on the treatment plan and will address that. Jim Galvin will discuss relocation site, John Eisenhart will address the treatment plan. The relocation site is a vacant site with existing structures on either side. The relocation site has a curb cut and drive way and existing cobble wall. The cobble wall be deconstructed and reconstructed in a slightly different location and configuration, closer to the street with the entry through the retaining wall shifted to line up with the new walkway. They are proposing to site the house in the approximate location of the house that was on the site until a few years ago. The grade on the relocation site slopes slightly from side to side, while the lot that the building currently sits on slopes more dramatically from front to back, requiring a number of stairs off the back to access the house. The new lot is much flatter front to back, which will result in fewer stairs.

The house is in good shape and relocation should not pose any structural issues. The front porch has a few non-historic modifications. It will be restored with original historic fabric, including a wood column, still in the owner's possession. Vinyl windows currently present in original openings will be replaced with historically appropriate wood frame and sash windows. The rear porch, which retains no historic integrity, will be redone. The chimney is currently non-operable. The roof may have had some wrought iron cresting, but there is no evidence of that, so it is not included in the treatment plan. The existing 8" shiplap is original and will be retained. The boards at the base of the house had been replaced with T1-11 over time and will be replaced. The house can be removed in its entirety, but if it needs to be cut, the rear appendage can be removed. The existing tenant would like to see the existing house colors (gray body, white trim) remain after relocation.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Johnson	Appreciates the way the house has been relocated with appropriate grading.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How deep is the lot?	140'

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
The original foundation was concrete?	Originally a pier system which has been retrofitted. No original foundation elements are left.
New foundation will be poured concrete?	Yes, but it will not be visible. It will be finished with 8" board.
Any new openings on the façade? Are there currently 2 doors?	There are currently 3 doors. Unsure whether one of the 3 existing doors is original. No new openings proposed.
The relocation site is located within the historic district?	Yes.
Did staff have an issue with the orientation change?	No. Originally fronted onto a residential street and will continue to as part of the relocation.
Will the access ramp at the front still be needed?	No.
There is a wood gate proposed at the front. Will the driveway be functional in the future?	Required to remove the driveway by transportation planning. Incorporating the gate as a reference to the historic driveway/vehicular access.
Will be the oldest house in the area, but the scale is consistent with others in the neighborhood.	(N/A)
What will the new porch railings look like?	Simple 2.5" painted wood picket with wood handrail.
How will the plumbing and piping be replaced at the new site?	Will need to relocate some of the features, but all plumbing will be on the inside. (2x4 construction, not single-wall.)
Will any landscaping from the current site be moved to the relocation site?	No.
What is the depth of the current lot?	100'.
How was this site chosen?	A number of sites were examined over a year and a half. Looked for an appropriate neighborhood and one that the tenant would like to live in.
Will the applicant be removing the wrought iron security bars on the windows?	Yes.
What is solar orientation?	Front is currently facing west and will be facing south at the new site.
Does the company relocating the house have experience relocating historic structures?	Yes. It will be a requirement of the bid that the company doing the relocation have such experience.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Aréchiga	The proposed color is acceptable. The change in orientation is acceptable.
Garbini	The landscape plan looks nice and the scale is good even though the plant species aren't identified. Plantings should be drought tolerant. Appreciates the siting.
Bethke	The proposed color is acceptable. Only concern is the solar orientation, which should be similar.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: No issues with the proposed relocation site or treatment plan.

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 4:52 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on February 3, 2010 at 4:00 PM.

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