

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 1, 2015, at 4:00 PM

5th Floor Large Conference Room

City Operations Building, Development Services Department

1222 First Avenue, San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE

Subcommittee Members Gail Garbini; Linda Marrone; Ann Woods

City Staff

HRB Kelley Stanco

Guests

Item 3A Tim Wright

Item 3B Matthew Welsh

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ ITEM 3A: Estimated time 25 Minutes

Listings: HRB Site #1141

Address: 3537-3547 Indiana Street

Historic Name: Jessie Brown Spec House #1 and Jessie Brown Spec House #2

Significance: C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: 396980

Project Contact: Tim Wright; Chris Veum

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Remove 3 existing one-story wood structure and two detached garages. Scope is to remove rather than demolish. Structures will be hauled away in sections and reconstructed as low-income housing. Construct 2 Type VA wood frame apartment buildings. The smaller building will front Indiana Street, is set opposite the two existing bungalows (to be preserved) and will contain 5 units. This building will complete the bungalow court which began with the construction of the two preserved buildings. The larger buildings is set tot he east side of the property adjacent to the alley and contains 17 units and a shared roof deck over subterranean parking.

Existing Square Feet: 1270

Additional Square Feet: 38875

Total Proposed Square Feet: 40145

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: Subcommittee members may recall the designation of this property not long ago. The overall project site contains 5 structures, two of which were designated under HRB Criterion C. The project proposes to retain the two historic structures in place, remove the 3 existing one-story non-historic wood structures and two detached garages, and construct 2 wood frame apartment buildings. The removed structures will be hauled away in sections and reconstructed as low-income housing elsewhere. Of the two new buildings, the smaller building will front Indiana Street, opposite the two existing historic bungalows to be preserved, and will contain 5 units. The larger building is set to the east side of the property adjacent to the alley and contains 17 units and a shared roof deck over subterranean parking. Staff has determined that the project is largely consistent with the Standards, and is seeking the Subcommittee's input on the project and material details.

Applicant Presentation: We are trying to preserve the buildings and the canyon while working to keep the scale at the street low and pushing the taller massing to the rear. We have tried to "complete" the bungalow court by placing the two story building across from the historic houses. We met with Bruce Coons and are proposing to paint the trim on the bungalows black or charcoal. The allowable density at the site is 32 units of affordable, the site cannot hold that. There will be parking in the garage and the new materials will be simple. We have called out the deviations on the plans—pedestrian access, roof form, side and rear setbacks, height of the stairs and the elevator for the penthouse

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Great that the canyon is preserved. The black trim on the bungalows seems odd, maybe the grey....	
How will the bungalows be used?	Fixed up and rented. They are nice, intact and have original features.
The building seems so large from the canyon.	It is the parking for 28 units.
What type of landscaping will be in front of the structure?	It will be a planted wall.
Nice design, but a little brutal/stark contrast. Is there an opportunity for trees? Board on	

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
board fencing that could tie into the bungalows and modern construction.	
What about incorporating wood?	We would like to, but we can't because of fire issues.
Is the city requiring street trees?	Yes
More landscaping to soften the transition between old and new would be helpful. The Ficus in front of the bungalow will pull up the foundation. I would not use Brazilian Pepper Tree. I will attract bees and be a mess. Acacia is very bad for allergies. The pine has cones that could kill you. Chinese Elm and Jacaranda is beautiful. The Palm for the tree is great.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	Come back for siding, fencing, landscape and screening. Show the hardscape in the rendering when you return.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Stanco	What about painted fiber cement panels (hardie board)? (applicant—We could look at that again.)
Stanco	On the two story, are there covers over the entries to reference back to the bungalows? (steel canopies to contrast and reference.)

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: Estimated time 25 MinutesListings: HRB Site #1062Address: 7762 Bishops LaneHistoric Name: Lillian Lentell CottagesSignificance: A (Special Element)Mills Act Status: N/APTS #: N/AProject Contact: Taal Safdie; Ricardo Rabines; Matthew WelshTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Relocation of the property at 7762 Bishops Lane to an adjacent lot. Construct two car garage with second story studio between the relocated cottage and 817 Silverado.

Existing Square Feet: 435

Additional Square Feet:

Total Proposed Square Feet:

Prior DAS Review: Feb-15

Staff Presentation: This item, which proposes to relocated the property at 7762 Bishops Lane to an adjacent lot and construct a two-car garage with second story studio between the relocated cottage and 817 Silverado, was previously heard by the Subcommittee in February 2015. This is a continuation of that discussion.

Applicant Presentation: I am proposing to move the Bishop's cottage over 11' and attach it to the house that fronts on to Silverado with a garage and a studio above the garage.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Generally done sensitively, but the stair that wraps Silverado is a bit jarring. Otherwise I like the project.	
Staff should look at the dormer issue.	
Pull the horizontal wood at the stair railing down to the ground on the Silverado cottage or the brick stoop. Project would be much better.	
No concern about the eave impact to the Bishops house.	
Good solution.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	Staff should talk about the dormer and the brick stoop at the rear stair with the applicant. Staff review only on any follow ups.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Stanco	The proposed dormer looks like is adversely impacts the resource.

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

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on May 6, 2015 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Jodie Brown at JDBrown@sanidiego.gov or 619.533.6300