

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, July 6, 2011, 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); Gail Garbini
City Staff	
	HRB Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Jennifer Feeley
	CCDC Brad Richter; Mark Caro; Eli Sanchez
Guests	
Item 3A	David Marshall & Curtis Drake, Heritage Architecture & Planning; Doug Macy, Walker/Macy
Item 3B	Paul Johnson and Sarai Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Architecture
Item 3C	Kim Grant, Kim Grant Design
Other	Bruce Coons and Ashley Christensen, SOHO; Jarvis Ross

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #51

Address: 321 Broadway

Historic Name: Horton Plaza and Fountain

Significance: Design; Irving Gill; Kate Sessions

Mills Act Status: N/A (City Owned)

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Curtis Drake, Heritage Architecture and Planning

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes restoration of Horton Plaza Park to the 1910-1930 period of significance. Work to include the restoration of the Irving Gill fountain, including the water pumps and colored light systems, restoration of the primary circulation walkways, lighting, planting, selected monuments, and plaques. The conceptual design includes several rehabilitation elements, including several secondary

walkways bisecting the quadrants perpendicular to Broadway. The project will be incorporated into the new plaza design at Horton Plaza.

Existing Square Feet: 14,325 of park area

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: 14,325 of park area

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: CCDC is looking to create a new public plaza area at Horton Plaza in the location of the old Robinsons May building, which will be demolished. Part of the improvements includes restoration of the historic Horton park area, including restoring the grass, curbs, lighting, etc. In general, staff finds that the proposal is consistent with the Standards, however, there is concern regarding the new pedestrian paths at the north and south sides of the park.

Applicant Presentation: The new plaza will include the historic park, with a new plaza and amphitheater that compliments the historic park. The Horton plaza fountain will be fully restored based on original the original plans by Irving Gill, and the open lawn areas will be restored. It appears that the original 1910 park was altered within the first 10 years. Underground restrooms were installed and used until 1960s. A gateway feature was added as well as planter urns. The urns, which are no longer extant, will be accurately replicated based on historic photos. The original park boarder had a small rounded mow strip with square corners, which will be restored. Curbs were limited to the interior of the park. Paving was originally square with unusually large  $\frac{3}{4}$ " paving joints. They are unsure what the paver material was, but it may have been granite or a tan terra cotta. The existing terra cotta tile is not original. The site will be investigated to see if any of the original paving is intact underneath. The existing stanchions and chains appear to be original or an accurate reconstruction. The sidewalks surrounding park will be some sort of enhanced paving consistent with rest of plaza. In order to activate the park, they want to bring people through the park at the existing nodes with secondary, smaller walkways using decomposed granite (dg) or possibly lawn. A weather kiosk was originally present at one of the nodes. They are looking into the possibility of reconstructing this feature as an informational kiosk. The milestone marker will be moved back.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	Want to see monuments moved back. Has concerns about new pathways. Supports removing the chains and allowing people to walk through at the nodes, but maintaining the lawn. Irving Gill experts at SOHO believe the pavers were 2" or 4" thick terra cotta pavers.
Jarvis Ross	What percent of current park is original? (30% or so.) Concerned about monitoring of homeless. Is there an opportunity to bring the restrooms back? (They will be in the kiosk, not underground.) Concerned that benches will attract homeless. (Unsure if they will be brought back, may use table and chairs instead.)

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Where will benches be?	If they are used they will be at the entrances, but not the fountain.
How wide will new pathways be?	4 feet. Existing entrance walkways are 11feet.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Garbini	Paving could be concrete or terra cotta. Has mixed feelings about squaring the corners along Broadway because it will make it tight for access. The proposed walkways at the south side aren't as troubling as the walkways at north side. Continuing to limiting access will perpetuate an unwelcoming feel. As to the pathways, the lawn would get trodden and would be hard to maintain. Tables and chairs on the lawn is good on a limited basis, but not continuously. Reconstruction the kiosks will draw people in and could be a platform for artwork or a historical display. Supports allowing people to cross grass by having a removable chain, rather than a permanent walkway.
Bethke	Concerned about over-thinking the access issue. The park would be a viable space if restored to its original appearance. Reproduction of the historic kiosk would attract more attention than a new kiosk design. The existing historic walkways should be sufficient, feels that the access issue is exaggerated. Would support trying out the park without walkways first and see how people respond to other improvements.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The proposed restoration/reconstruction elements are consistent with the Standards. New walkways/pathways should not be created; however, a removable chain that would allow people to cross the lawn area would be appropriate.

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

Address: 2335 Juan Street

Historic Name: N/A

Significance: Not Determined

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Paul Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Architecture; on behalf of the owner, Iman Mikhail

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The application to designate this property as a historic resource was considered by the Board at the April 28, 2011 hearing, at which time staff was recommending against designation due to a lack of integrity. The item was continued at the applicant's request to allow time to explore options that would improve the building's integrity. The applicant is proposing restoration of the windows, shutters and garage doors and modification of the second floor addition to better differentiate it from the original house.

Existing Square Feet: Unknown

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The application to designate this property as a historic resource was considered by the Board at the April 28, 2011 hearing, at which time staff was recommending against designation due to a lack of integrity, including window replacements, garage door replacements, alteration of windows at garage, removal of shutters, and a ground floor addition second floor addition between house and garage. The item was continued at the applicant's request to allow time to explore options that would improve the building's integrity. The applicant is proposing restoration of the windows, shutters and garage doors and modification of the second floor addition to better differentiate it from the original house. The proposal for addition is painting and restucco, and staff's position is that this is not sufficient to differentiate and bring into consistency with the Standards.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant is looking for the Subcommittee's direction on what needs to be changed and when, i.e., what character defining features need to be restored prior to designation? The owner is willing to restore the doors and windows based on historic photographs. The garage doors can be restored, but they are unsure if there is enough detail to restore stenciling. As to the addition, the applicant is suggesting it be stuccoed and painted differently. Other options could include framing it or off-setting it by bumping it out. The scarring around the windows noted by staff in the staff report is caused by flashing around the new window assembly.

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Bruce Coons	Could shave the stucco back on addition to provide relief from the parapet below. Could also re-side the addition with wood.
Jarvis Ross	Vinyl can be painted. The wood shutters should be restored and termite treated.
Kim Grant	Removal of white gutters would help.

Q&A: NoneSubcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Garbini	The garage doors are such a big piece of the house and should be restored. If the stenciling can be recreated based on the documentation, great. As to the addition, the enclosure of the space below the arched stairway is the most troubling, as it eliminates light and air quality. The key is to bring back the asymmetrical profile of the building. (Applicant believes they can achieve that by changing color and texture of the addition).
Bethke	The windows, darker color paint, and shutters are all character defining features. The windows that are obviously not original should go back to original appearance. Dark, contrasting trim is important, and the shutters should be put back. The entry door is fine as is, and the applicant shouldn't speculate as to possible stenciling at this location. Would be comfortable with the applicant's opinion on whether or not sufficient detail exists to restore stenciling at the garage. As for the addition, the one story portion and deck was such a character defining feature of the building, and the current addition results in a loss of a major design element. The addition does not fit the style. Doesn't believe cosmetic changes to the addition would make it consistent with the Standards. Changing the planes would help, but the open space was essential to original design. Glass enclosure would be going more in the right direction.

Staff Comment:

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Brown	Should windows be done before going back to Board? (Yes)
Stanco	Wanted to remind everyone that the recommendations of

Staff Member	Comments
	the Subcommittee cannot predispose the Board to a future action. The Subcommittee can comment on the character defining features of the home, whether or not existing modifications are consistent with the Standards, and whether or not the proposed modifications would bring the existing modifications into consistency with the Standards. However, the Subcommittee cannot state that completion of this work would be sufficient for designation. The owner will need to decide if he is willing to complete the work without the assurance of designation.

Recommended Modifications: The proposed window and shutter restoration is consistent with Standards. The proposed modifications to the addition do not bring it into compliance 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 3C:**

Listings: N/A

Address: 1627 29th Street

Historic Name: N/A

Significance: Not Evaluated

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Kim Grant, Kim Grant Architecture; Scott Moomjian, Consultant

Treatment: Restoration

Project Scope: This restoration project proposes to restore an entry porch and stairs that were removed from the building. The prospective buyer is looking to restore the home and pursue designation. However, restoration may require some modification of original dimensions to comply with code requirements.

Existing Square Feet: Unknown

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N.A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: There was an unexpected resolution to this issue just prior to the DAS meeting. The applicant met with engineering staff at the Development Services Department, who stated that in order to resolve the code enforcement case, the porch,

stairs and balcony could be constructed exactly as it was before, or brought into compliance. The applicant intends to construct it exactly as it was.

Applicant Presentation: Exact reconstruction was approved by engineering because it was a code violation. She plans to reconstruct it as it was, and perhaps add a railing of some sort behind the original railing at the balcony for safety.

Public Comment: None

Q&A: None

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Garbini	If a new railing as added at the balcony, mesh or a cable rail is preferred to glass to eliminate glare.
Bethke	Agreed.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: If a new railing as added at the balcony, mesh or a cable rail is preferred to glass to eliminate glare.

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 5:57 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on August 3, 2011 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Kelley Stanco at [KStanco@sandiego.gov](mailto:KStanco@sandiego.gov) or 619.236.6545