

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Tuesday, February 8, 2011, 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); Gail Garbini
Recusals	None
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown
Redevelopment Agency	Eliana Barrieros
City Attorney	None
Guests	
Item 3A	LaMont Newman, Ashton Awnings
Item 3B	Sandy Shapery, owner; Ron May, Legacy 106, inc.; Molly Enos and Keith Muller, ENS Projects; David Marshall, Heritage Architecture & Planning
Item 3C	Jim Gabriel, Architects HGW; Wendy Tinsley-Becker, Urbana; Jorge Riquelme, Bayside Community Center; Ivar Leetma, MRW
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #263

Address: 1743 India Street

Historic Name: Auto Body Co./Retail Building

Significance: Architecture (Mediterranean)

Mills Act Status: No Contract (Redevelopment Area)

PTS #: 227457

Project Contact: LaMont Newman, Ashton Awnings; on behalf of the owner Araceli Fuller

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to replace existing awnings above each window with one continuous awning of greater depth across the façade. City staff and the project team are seeking input from the Subcommittee on the project's consistency with the Standards.

Existing Square Feet: Unknown

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: A project has been submitted for an awning on a designated site constructed in 1927. Mimmo's restaurant occupies the building. Currently there is an awning at each window with outdoor café seating. The proposal is to replace the three existing awnings with one continuous awning across the front, which disrupts the appearance of the three bays. The purpose of the continuous awning is to protect the outdoor café. Staff has determined that the proposed awning is not consistent with the Standards because it obscures the architectural detail and character defining features of the building.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant presented a picture of how the awnings appear now, along with a rendering of the proposed awning. An alternative would be to paint the awning at two points the same color as the wall behind in order to break up the awning visually. The President of the Little Italy Association approved the proposal.

Public Comment: None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How deep is the proposed awning?	8.75 feet deep
What was staff's concern?	Staff: The awnings will obscure the appearance of the original bays and the lines and forms of the building.
How wide are the columns?	Just under 4 feet wide. Not covering those areas impacts seating capacity.
Applicant: What if the striped areas were a clear vinyl?	The character of the three separate awnings is important.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	Concerned about the proposal to paint the awning, because that illusion will only work head-on. It will break up the awning, but will only appear as a stripe. The three separate awnings should remain. A large single awning becomes an architectural statement.
Bethke	Agrees with Garbini, but doesn't necessarily feel that the new awning is quite an architectural statement.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The awnings should be installed as three separate awnings consistent with the character of what might have been there historically. There is no issue with making the awning deeper to provide more coverage.

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: N/A (Currently Pursuing National Register Listing)

Address: 509 Park Boulevard

Historic Name: Bay View Hotel

Significance: Not Evaluated

Mills Act Status: N/A (Not Locally Listed, within Redevelopment Area)

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Molly Enos; on behalf of the owner, Sandor Shapery

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project includes the reconstruction of the two towers along the western façade (built in 1889 and later destroyed); reconstruction of the former third floor on the north-east wing (originally built in 1869); and various other façade restorations of the three-story Victorian hotel, returning it to its former appearance. The proposed rehabilitation is based on photo documentation and existing physical evidence. Interior improvements include reconstruction of deteriorated architectural features such as interior doors and wood trim; addition of a bird-cage elevator in the lobby where there is no elevator; bathrooms and kitchens in every guest room; upgraded electrical/plumbing/mechanical/fire sprinkler systems; and ADA improvements for the rehabilitation as an extended-stay hotel. City staff and the project team are seeking input from the Subcommittee on the project's consistency with the Standards.

Existing Square Feet: 346,222

Additional Square Feet: 3630

Total Proposed Square Feet: 38,252

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The Bay View Hotel located at 509 Park Boulevard is not currently designated on the local, State or National Registers. The property was evaluated as part of the East Village Combined Surveys in 2005 and was given a status code of 3S (eligible for State or National Registers). The owner is currently pursuing listing on the National Register. The building was constructed in 1869 and 1889, and was subsequently altered with the removal of the former third floor towers and painting of the exposed brick. The owner is looking to rehabilitate the property, including reconstruction of missing historic

features and construction of new, non-historic elements. Because this property is not currently designated, it will be reviewed as a property 45 years old or older when a permit is submitted and staff will be looking at the project and its consistency with the Standards. A project has not yet been submitted, and staff has only preliminarily reviewed the proposed rehabilitation. Staff has not identified any significant issues, only minor concerns related to the visibility and differentiation of the new addition, and both staff and the applicant are looking for the Subcommittee's input on consistency with the Rehabilitation Standards.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant provided historic photos documenting the evolution of the building. In 1887, the original two-story 1869 hotel was relocated and the current building was constructed. The Sanborn maps illustrate the site changes, and the historic photos illustrate some of the original building buried in the existing building. A fire took off the upper floor and attic area. The project will reconstruct those elements. The only new element is an exterior staircase. For the site, a new ADA ramp will be built off of Island Avenue, which will re-activate that entrance. A sidewalk café will be located at the corner of Island Avenue and Park Boulevard. A 42" wrought iron railing will be added at the ground floor suites to create a patio area. Some windows have been changed to a new style window, which will be reconstructed to match the existing historic windows. The north and south end towers will be reconstructed. A new wood stair and exterior walkway will be added at the rear. The original brick has been painted, and the paint will be removed with a low-chemical paint remover. Wood trim and elements will be painted a historically appropriate color. The Island Avenue lobby will be re-opened and restored based on historic photos. That will become the main entrance with valet drop-off. A new bird-cage elevator will be installed through the center of the open square staircase and will serve all floors (currently there is no elevator). The elevator has been designed to be as transparent as possible. Various ADA accessibility improvements are also proposed. At the second floor, enclosed windows currently in the interior will be restored with shadow-boxes behind. The staircases that led up to the towers are still there and will be re-opened. The pony walls for the towers are still extant, providing evidence of the size and location of each tower. An original corbel was found on site and will be reconstructed. The ridge cresting at the roof will also be reconstructed, based on a surviving piece. Various interior improvements and remodeling will occur. Paint analysis will also be undertaken to determine the historic colors.

Public Comment: None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Do plans exist to reconstruct?	Only photos.
How is the original floor plan for each unit being altered for the kitchen and bath?	No changes to configuration to the primary suites, just adding a bath and kitchen within the old bedroom. Sitting room will be used as bedroom.
What doors will be restored?	The 1869 doors will be reproduced and installed in the appropriate

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
	locations, as will the 1889 doors. The doors have been documented and a door schedule is included in the plans.
What is the period of significance?	1889, when the 1869 building was relocated and the new construction was built around. The idea is to restore the building to how it looked in 1889. Elements of 1869 that were still present in 1889 will be restored to the 1869 period. Elements of 1869 that were changed in 1889 will be restored to the 1889 period.
Was there thought about putting the elevator where the front desk is going?	That will result in the loss of rooms.
Concerned about losing the depth of the front desk by shifting it over.	Could move the desk forward so that the depth is maintained and the elevator is behind.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	The elevator will be similar to the one in the Marston Building. It's a shame the entry desk will need to be relocated, but the location of the new elevator is appropriate.
Bethke	None

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Move the front desk forward and keep the elevator behind. The ADA access and exterior terrace should receive a more historic treatment.

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 (Will be Pursuing Local Listing)

Address: 6905-6921 Linda Vista Road

Historic Name: Linda Vista Tenant Activity Building

Significance: Potentially Eligible at National, State and Local Level for Association with Wartime Community Development Patterns and Type/Method of Construction

Mills Act Status: N/A (Not Locally Listed)

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Jim Gabriel, Architect; on behalf of the City of San Diego

Redevelopment Agency

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to adaptively reuse the Linda Vista Tenant activity Building as part of a redevelopment project funded by the City's Redevelopment Agency and the Bayside Community Center. The building is not currently listed, but a draft Historic Resource Research Report has determined that the building is eligible for listing on the Local, State and National registers. The project will rehabilitate and adaptively reuse the Tenant Activity Building, and will include new construction on the subject property and adjacent vacant lot. The project is being designed consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards under guidance from a historic preservation consultant. City staff and the project team are seeking input from the Subcommittee on the project's consistency with the Standards.

Existing Square Feet: 29,003

Additional Square Feet: 8000

Total Proposed Square Feet: 37,003

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The Tenant Activity Building located at 6905-21 Linda Vista Road is not currently designated on the local, State or National Register; however, a HRRR has determined that the building is eligible for listing on all three registers. The building is currently owned by the City's Redevelopment Agency, who is working with a development team to adaptively reuse the building in a manner consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. The project will return the main vaulted building to a community resource and construct new buildings on both the building site and the adjacent vacant site. The contemporary nature of the new construction is a contemporary reference back to the War-time industry that brought new development and residents to Linda Vista. The applicant is working under the guidance of Urbana Preservation and Planning, who is developing a Historic Structures Report (HSR). A project has not yet been finalized or submitted, and staff has only preliminarily reviewed the proposal thus far. Both staff and the applicant are looking for the Subcommittee's input on the project's direction and consistency with the Rehabilitation Standards.

Applicant Presentation: The Redevelopment Agency adopted the Linda Vista Redevelopment Area in 1976 and acquired several parcels as part of that effort. There are a few parcels they are still working to improve, including the two subject parcels. The long-term tenant has made most of the existing improvements. They issued a RFQ/RFP for a project that would be consistent with the Standards. Wendy Tinsley-Becker with Urbana Preservation has assessed the building and determined that the building is eligible for listing for association with War-time development and architecture. Despite integrity challenges, research has discovered that the building type is extremely rare. Approximately 208 such buildings would have been constructed for the war, and

approximately 193 were demolished afterward. The goal is to use the project to celebrate the history of Linda Vista. The library is adjacent, and this project will provide an opportunity for the two sites to interact. Some significant remaining features include the wood laminated trusses and vault, 3 original wood louvered vents, incinerator wall, exterior building materials, and projector room. The courtyard has been removed, but the incinerator wall remains. Because of property lines, there is no opportunity reconstruct the original courtyard.

The developer is partnering with Bayside Community Center, who operates across the street and needs to expand their space to continue their service to the community. The project is looking to add 8,000 square feet of additional space. Initially, their proposed design was intended to primarily celebrate the vault. With the benefit of additional research and understanding of the building, the design has evolved. The preservation and expansion of retail and commercial was an important aspect of the project design, as was connecting the site through from the corner to library. The proposed project will demo portions of the south wall, which are original, but maintain the incinerator wall.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	What is the proposed treatment of the south wall now? (It's still very conceptual, but the need for natural light and ventilation is pressing, so they are proposing to demo the wall except the incinerator and build a glass wall, maintaining the louvered vents.) Are there any original materials on east and west walls? (No, the east wall is older than the west, but not original – c.1970s.) On the north elevation, are the battered planters original? (No, the preliminary recommendation is to remove them if they are not serving a structural purpose.) Has two concerns: first, the incinerator wall, where the exterior will be interior and the interior will now be exterior. They should look at an option to maintain it in place, as it is one of the few character defining features. The other concern is the second story on the western side, which obscures the view of the vault mass from the street. He is not as concerned about view from the east. (They are looking at options... there is precedent for these structures having two floors with the clerestory...)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What are the arches made of?	37 layers of glue laminated wood.
What was the original purpose of the building?	Community services and civic uses.
Was the Tenant Activity Building meant to	No, it was intended to permanent. It

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
be temporary?	was modeled on drill halls and field houses. It pre-dates the shopping center.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment: Subcommittee members found it difficult to identify the significant character defining features and comment on the project's consistency with the Standards based on the level of information provided regarding the building's history and significance. It was agreed that in order to properly review for consistency with the Standards, the Subcommittee required a better understanding of the building history, significance, character defining features, alterations and integrity. Ideally, the property would be considered by the Board for designation prior to additional review.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: In order to properly review for consistency with the Standards, the Subcommittee requires a better understanding of the building history, significance, character defining features, alterations and integrity. Ideally, the property would be considered by the Board for designation prior to additional review.

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 6:16 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on March 2, 2011 at 4:00 PM.

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