

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, October 6, 2010, 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); Ann Jarmusch
Recusals	None
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Stanco; Jeffrey Oakley; Terra King
Park & Rec	Susan Lowery-Mendoza;
City Attorney	Nina Fain
Guests	
Item 3A	Susan Lowery-Mendoza, Park & Rec
Item 3B	Marty Rosen, CalTrans; David Marshall, Heritage Architecture & Planning
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO

2. Public Comment (on matters not on the agenda): None

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #1, National Register Landmark District

Address: 2125 Park Boulevard

Historic Name: International Cottages

Significance: Contributing Element

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Kelley Stanco, Historic Resources, CP&CI; Susan Lowery Mendoza, Park and Recreation; Charles Daniels, Park and Recreation

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Security of the International Cottages at Balboa Park is an ongoing issue for both the tenants and the Park & Rec Department. A number of cottages have installed security bars at windows and doors and cottages continue to approach the City with requests to install security bars to prevent break-ins, damage and theft. Staff will be

presenting the issue to the Subcommittee, providing historic photographs which help to document the extent and nature of historic window grilles, and seeking input from the Subcommittee on an appropriate, programmatic approach to security at the cottages going forward.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: Security of the International Cottages at Balboa Park is an ongoing issue for both the tenants and the Park & Rec Department. A number of cottages have installed security bars at windows and doors and cottages continue to approach the City with requests to install security bars to prevent break-ins, damage and theft. In order to ensure consistent treatment of the cottages, staff is seeking to establish a programmatic approach to security at the cottages. Historic photographs and current photographs provided by staff show that approximately half of the cottages have security bars. Few appear to date to the period of significance and reflect different approaches, styles and colors. Staff sees several options, including exterior security bars (the most visually obtrusive option); interior security bars (a less visually obtrusive option); security glass, either laminated or tempered (which would not resolve direct impacts to framing & muntins); and electronic alarm systems.

Susan Lowery-Mendoza, District Manager for Balboa Park noted that there has been several break-ins in last few months, including pins removed from doors, and a broken French door. A lot of damage is caused by break-ins, which are often done in effort to find food in the kitchens. Cottage tenants are concerned about loss of valuables and heirlooms as well as the safety of their volunteers.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Typically preservationists try to remove security bars in historic districts. Usually an electronic alarm system recommended. Laminated glass keeps people from getting in, but not breaking the glass. Security bars located on the inside are almost as visible as bars on the outside and appear as extra muntins. Cottages that do have documented historic bars could reconstruct those bars. Does believe the Germany bar is original and was retrofitted with added bars. Unsure as to whether or not the portal window bars are original. Believes the detailed bars on the House of Ireland and the bars on the House of Ukraine could be original. Alarm systems typically cost \$500 or less to install with a monthly fee, and may cost less than security bars to install.
Marshall	Interior bars are preferred to exterior, but should be painted black. Agrees with Bruce on laminated glass.

Name	Comments
	Tempered is harder to break, but once it does you can get in. This would be a great opportunity to bring back missing wood grilles. The historic grilles were used as sprinklings of something different. Concerned that adding new grilles will take away from the originality and quirkiness of the original bars. Shutters could be made operable and padlocked.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Who will pay for security measures?	Tenants.
Would a uniform solution be agreeable to them?	Believes so.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	Prioritize a list of actions. Alarms and laminated glass are preferred. He noticed that the bars are all different and in some cases take on character of nation, which may be preferable. May be desirable to not allow interior bars and allow exterior bars that reflect the countries that occupy the cottages. Establish "If this, then this" guidelines.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Susan Lowery-Mendoza	Alarms systems cause problems with older volunteers and staff who may not have the security code. (Coons noted that alarms systems come with remote entry options.)

Recommended Modifications: Alarms and laminated glass are the first preference. If other options are pursued, they should be returned to DAS for additional review and discussion.

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 #1, National Register Landmark District

Address: Laurel Street Entrance to Balboa Park

Historic Name: Cabrillo Bridge

Significance: Contributing Element

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Martin Rosen, CalTrans

Treatment: Rehabilitation/Retrofit

Project Scope: This is a Department of Transportation (in conjunction with the City of San Diego) rehabilitation and retrofit project of the Cabrillo Bridge (Laurel ST OC) over State Route 163 (SR-163). The Cabrillo Bridge has been determined to have seismic vulnerabilities and areas of unsound concrete, which have spalled and delaminated due to corrosion of reinforcing steel from moisture damage. The project proposes to: rehab the existing surface concrete that is visible to the public (including the undersides of the bridge) and install new steel doors at all columns; retrofit the internal column sections by adding shotcreted shear walls (adding 10" of thickness); retrofit of the entire superstructure by installing post tensioning, steel shear pipes, and new concrete to restrain the mid-span joints; replacement of some sections of the deck; and installation of accent lighting.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This is a Department of Transportation (in conjunction with the City of San Diego) rehabilitation and retrofit project of the Cabrillo Bridge (Laurel ST OC) over State Route 163 (SR-163). The Cabrillo Bridge has been determined to have seismic vulnerabilities and areas of unsound concrete, which have spalled and delaminated due to corrosion of reinforcing steel from moisture damage. The project proposes to: rehab the existing surface concrete that is visible to the public (including the undersides of the bridge) and install new steel doors at all columns; retrofit the internal column sections by adding shotcreted shear walls (adding 10" of thickness); retrofit of the entire superstructure by installing post tensioning, steel shear pipes, and new concrete to restrain the mid-span joints; replacement of some sections of the deck; and installation of accent lighting. Staff and the applicant are seeking input from DAS on the proposed retrofit.

Applicant Presentation: On the map provided, the hatched area will be impacted by work and equipment, such as scaffolding. Some trails will be closed and re-routed. Grading will be monitored for paleontological resources. The memo is a draft regarding environmental review and Section 106 compliance. A Categorical Exemption for NEPA and CEQA is being sought. The memo includes a bullet list of the project scope; which will rehabilitate those areas of the bridge owned by the City that was not addressed during emergency repair work 5 years ago. Work includes replacement of all exterior concrete in-kind, matching board forming scars, color and texture; and the addition of 10 inches of steel and shotcrete to reinforce interior of the hollow columns. The footings will not be impacted. Seismically, the bridge does not have elasticity because the columns go

deep into the ground. The entire deck will be post-tensioned so that the pieces don't move individually. The decking will be replaced with light weight, historically appropriate concrete. Work will necessitate saw-cutting across the sidewalks to fix the bridge joints. The sidewalks will be replaced in-kind. Drainage in-lets on the deck will be replaced with larger inlets because the existing gets clogged. CalTrans is examining the possibility of rehabbing the light standards on bridge deck. The standards are original, but the globes are not. Final design will take at least another year.

The bridge has drainage problems created by the redwood form boards that have captured water which has entered the columns, causing erosion to the concrete surfaces. Salvage of the redwood form boards has come up a number of times, but CalTrans hasn't figured out if or how redwood would be salvaged and reused. Mesh will be installed over bridge openings to keep pigeons out. Full-height access doors at the base of each column are required. The doors will face out away from motoring traffic. An electrical pedestal about the size of a refrigerator will need to be accessed by SDG&E. They are debating whether or not to install the pedestal on the inside of the bridge or adjacent to the bridge. Accent lighting is proposed to be installed flush with the ground to up-light the bridge. The public at large loves this idea, but the preservation community doesn't favor it because the bridge was never lit historically. CalTrans has discussed installing the wiring for lighting, but not the lighting itself to defer that decision to later. It's difficult to see how lighting compromises the integrity of the bridge. If anything, highway 163 already impacted the integrity and setting of the bridge and created new lighting. The intent of the project is to retrofit and rehab the bridge so that it looks the same or better than it does now. However, the existing vines on the bridge attract moisture and cause deterioration, and will be removed. Goal is to be done for centennial, but minimally the deck will be done.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	The project was presented to the Preservation Action Committee of SOHO. In regard to the lighting, the PAC didn't understand that the lighting would be flush. SOHO would support the lighting if it could be demonstrated that it replicated a historic lighting scheme (i.e. 1935). Otherwise, adding new lighting would be an adverse effect. The concrete at the deck should match existing. In favor of rehabbing the light standards. Installation of the large electrical pedestal (not addressed in presentation to PAC) is an intrusion and should be put inside the bridge.
Marshall	There are 1915 images that show that the light fixtures on the deck are original. The fixtures need to be repaired, and the globes replaced to match the historic photos. Will the exterior column treatment be spot patching, not skinning? (Yes). Will withhold judgment on the up-lighting until he has more info. There could be some benefit to it if it's done well, and it's reversible.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How much larger will new drain inlets be?	Can get you the exact size, but slightly larger.
Is there a problem keeping the electrical box on the interior?	SDG&E has requested to move it to the outside, but CalTrans could push back and insist that it be kept inside the bridge.
The light standards on the deck will be rehabbed and globes replaced?	Can't promise that it will be included in the scope at this point.
Could CalTrans bring the uplighting back to DAS or Board if it's pursued?	They could, but it may be 2 years before that decision is made.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	Agrees with David Marshall on the up-lighting issue. Be sure the memo clearly states that materials will be replaced in-kind.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Overall, the project appears consistent with the Standards. Keep the electrical pedestal inside the bridge and do not locate it outside of the bridge. Be sure the memo and all project documents clearly state that materials will be replaced in-kind.

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 #166Address: 780 Prospect StreetHistoric Name: Wisteria CottageSignificance: Architecture; Person; Master ArchitectMills Act Status: No ContractPTS #: N/AProject Contact: John Bolthouse, La Jolla Historical Society; David Singer, Architect; Diane KaneTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: The La Jolla Historical Society is seeking assistance in developing appropriate treatments for the landscaped grounds of Wisteria Cottage in order to provide

universal access and increase the functionality of the outdoor spaces. The applicant is seeking input on appropriate rehabilitation that preserves the historic site features and setting of the cottage.

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****

4. Adjourned at 5:12 PM

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

For more information, please contact Kelley Stanco at KStanco@san Diego.gov or 619.236.6545