

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 6, 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; Ann Woods;
Recusals	None
City Staff	
	HRB Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Jane Kang
Guests	
	Item 3A Tim Wright, Paul Davis
	Item 3B Kiley Wallace, Ruth Churchill, Jim Stafford
	Item 3C Scott Andrews, Martin Schwartz, Nathan Cadieux
	Item 3D Vicki Estrada, Ghassan Saudi, Stuart Sawasaki, David Marshall
	Other Bruce Coons and Amie Hayes SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #1141

Address: 3525-3547 Indiana Street

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

Significance: C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Tim Wright; Chris Veum

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Remove 3 existing one-story wood structures 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 to the 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: April 15, 2015

Staff Presentation: This item is returning to the DAS at the request of the subcommittee. Outstanding issues from the previous meeting include landscape design and materials, and looking at options to allow the new construction across from the historic cottages to better relate to the historic structures through the incorporation of materials and/or design features. The applicant is presenting new materials to address the outstanding issues and comments.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant has developed the planting plan and adjusted the renderings so that the finished landscape plan can be seen. A context for surrounding landscape development has also been provided. In regard to how the new buildings relate to the old, they are proposing control joints and reveals in the stucco to evoke the feeling of wood lap siding without introducing a material that the North Park Planning Committee specifically requested not be included (fiber cement siding). As a side note, they have found buyers for 2 of the 3 buildings that will be removed from the site, and those buildings will be going to Jamul.

Public Comment: None

Q&A: None

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	The landscape helps a lot. Looks really good.
Woods	Looks good.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The project is consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation as proposed.

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: Not currently designated

Address: 1079 Devonshire Drive

Historic Name: N/A

Significance: N/A

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Andy and Ruth Churhill; Kiley Wallace

Treatment: Restoration

Project Scope: Restoration of the front windows based on the historic and transistional photos.

Existing Square Feet: 2200

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2200

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The applicant would like to restore the windows on the house in an effort to bring the property forward for designation. The property owners were able to locate photo from the 1929 newspaper, but it is not very clear.

Applicant Presentation: The house was built in 1927. A 1929 historic photo reveals that the house is largely intact with the following exceptions: 1.) A single French door on the second level facing the side was in-filled and the owner is proposing to restore the French door with a multi-lite wood door. 2.) The front door was originally a square opening and has had an arch added. 3.) Front windows on ground floor are currently composite. The applicant is proposing to replace them with single lite wood.

Public Comment: None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How many lites on the French door?	8 or 10 lite

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	Agrees with applicant, it appears most windows were single lite and that the front door was squared.
Woods	(None)

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Stanco	Staff wanted to remind the applicant that the comments and recommendations of the DAS do not pre-dispose the Board to any future action, and that restoration of the

Staff Member	Comments
	house as discussed as the DAS does not guarantee designation.

Recommended Modifications: The restoration work should include single-lite wood frame and sash windows on the ground floor; reconstruction of the French door at the second floor in an 8 or 10 lite configuration; and restoration of the squared header at the front door.

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 #425; NR

Address:

Historic Name: Naval Training Center Historic District

Significance:

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Nathan Cadieux; Martin Schwartz

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The current Liberty Station Sign Plan was created using the old city sign code. The applicant would like to update the sign plan to allow better wayfinding strategies. McMillian is looking to get some initial feed back on the sign concepts.

Existing Square Feet:

Additional Square Feet:

Total Proposed Square Feet:

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: In 2007 a Sign Plan was approved for NTC that speaks to where signs are placed, how, design, etc. Now that the Sign Plan has been in effect for some time and tenants have moved in, there is a distinct difference between north and south ends of the Historic District in terms of signage. The new organizations and entities that are coming in are looking for signage that is more descriptive. Visitors have a hard time finding their way around. The revisions are looking to provide more way-finding signs. Staff has initially reviewed the Sign Plan and has some concerns. This is an initial discussion for feedback as the Sign Plan is developed and refined.

Applicant Presentation: The approval process for the NTC Sign Plan will require a Neighborhood Use Permit (NUP), and in addition to historic review, review by the planning group is also required. Design Guidelines for NTC addresses the need for

signage. When the Sign Plan was originally developed, the future uses where unknown and how the spaces would be used were not well understood. Now that they know what the demands are, revisions to the Sign Plan are needed. This presents an opportunity to make NTC a national destination and a tourist attraction.

In regard to some of the details of the Sign Plan, on page 7, a free-standing welcoming sign is proposed to create a sense of identity at the entry arch at the north end. On page 9, a large monument sign with flags and sculpture is proposed at the north end to the left of the entry gate. On page 12, another large monument sign is proposed at the corner of Lytton and Rosecrans. Identity archways are proposed across Roosevelt. Another monument sign is proposed at North Harbor. A monument “project identity” sign with flags and seating is proposed at plaza. “District” signage (referring to distinct spaces within the Historic District, not the Historic District itself) are proposed to define areas that have different uses, to address the issue created by the size of NTC (i.e “North End”, “Marketplace” across the arcade, at the Park, etc.) The new Sign Plan proposes to unify tenant signage so that it is not so chaotic, and make it consistent in its aesthetic with the way-finding signage. Directory signage with maps are also proposed.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	The biggest global issue is the wood elements on the signs, which are not consistent with the character of NTC. Adobe colored stucco would be better. The free standing “blade” signs and some vehicle signs are too tall, and should not be so much taller than a person. Biggest single issue is the big Marketplace sign on top of the building. There needs to be another approach. It’s too big and out of place. I like the black and white palette, which brands the site well. I am ok with the other big signs, but would like to see a rendering of what the north arch sign looks like on the back. A bronze green might be a better alternative than the copper elements proposed.
David Marshall	Good quality to the sign plan. Two biggest issues are the north gateway sign (which currently appears much as it did historically) and the rooftop Marketplace sign, which is very large. No issue with new gateway signs.

Q&A: None

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	Likes everything that they’ve done. However, the sign on top of the north gate doesn’t relate to anything else in District. Needs something more timeless than the wood, which is very current. Stucco or concrete would be

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	better. Pedestrian signage feels a little “mall” like, which may be the result of the height. More interpretative signage would be helpful to explain the history. For the Marketplace sign, make is smaller and set it back.
Woods	Likes the anchor logo with the date. Agrees with Jodie’s comments regarding the circus atmosphere of the exposed bulbs. Agrees with Coons about the wood on signage. Agrees generally with all public and staff comments.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Charlie Daniels	The park is City Park & Recreation property, and their staff would need to be involved. There are Park & Rec sign standards that need to identify the park as a City Park. Durability and maintenance is an issue. Kids may climb on it, which may be a concern. Maintaining a small strip of turf in front of the sign is difficult.
Jodie Brown	There is additional signage proposed that staff has not seen before. When north gateway sign was originally proposed, it was attached to the original arch, which staff had an issue with. Staff recommended setting something back past the arch on the grass beyond. The exposed bulbs were not seen historically in NTC, and staff has a lot of concern about that, which creates more of a party atmosphere. The monument sign to the left of the guardhouse was not previously seen by staff. Another concern was the entrance sign off of Rosecrans, which originally proposed to impact original stucco columns – but that has been revised. Another concern was the North End sign across the street. This type of signage was not seen in NTC historically. The last issue was the rooftop Marketplace sign – placing it on-top of the arcade impedes the stepped massing of the buildings and arcade. The last concern is the extensive use of “Liberty Station” and no mention of historic name Naval Training Center.
Stanco	Have you explored the development of a way-finding app to reduce the amount of signage? (applicant: Exploring) Will signage be replaced at once or phased out? (applicant: Entryway signs are proposed for immediate replacement, hopefully this year, then pedestrian way-finding signs and vehicular signage. Tenant signage is more tricky, which tenants have rights to. If they can pay for comprehensive replacement, they

Staff Member	Comments
	will.) If large tenant signs such as “VONS” will remain, the renderings need to show that signage remaining and how that will relate to the new signage such as the “Marketplace” sign.

Recommended Modifications: The following signs are problematic in design and placement: the “Liberty Station” sign at the north gate, the “Marketplace” sign at the old Barracks buildings, the “NTC Park” sign and the signs suspended across the roads. Additionally, in regard to design, the wood bases and accents should be removed and replaced with concrete or stucco. The height of the pedestrian and vehicular way-finding signs should also be reduced to be more compatible with a pedestrian scale and the historic character of the District.

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 3D:**

Listings: HRB Site #1; NR

Address:

Historic Name: Balboa Park Historic District

Significance: Contributing to the district

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Casey Smith; Vicky Estrada

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The House of Pacific Relations is in the process of gaining approvals for the expansion of the international village cottages to include five new cottage buildings that will be the home of nine new countries. The new buildings will consist of four duplex building with an average footprint of 1184SF. The one single building will have a foot print of 630SF. The cottages will be grouped together in to seperate areas. One duplex and the single unit will be located at the north of the existing village. The second cluster will be located to the south of hte existing village and will include three duplex buildings.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: 5365

Total Proposed Square Feet: 0

Prior DAS Review: January 2012

Staff Presentation: The Subcommittee may remember that this item was heard a few years back. At that time there was concern about the placement of the cottages, which were located between the historic cottages and the parking lot, and had the potential to block views to the historic cottages. Since then, the applicant has redesigned the project to site three new duplex buildings to the south of the existing cottages, on the grassy knoll in front of the Balboa Park Club; and two new duplex buildings and one single cottage at the north end of the existing cottages. Staff is still reviewing the project and has not made a determination regarding consistency with the Standards. As part of that review, staff and the applicant are seeking the input of the DAS. Staff has prepared a packet of historic photographs and maps showing what was located on the area south of the cottages historically.

Applicant Presentation: The original Precise Plan allowed for a certain level of expansion of the cottages, which has been reached, which is why the amendment is required. The project is proposing two new buildings with three cottages at north end and three new cottages with six cottages at the south end. The area to the south is already somewhat worn. A number of mature trees will be kept, and some eucalyptus will be removed, which Park & Rec has requested. The new cottages will not have individual courtyard walls due to maintenance issues and vagrancy. The new cottages front new, small courtyards and each cottage opens up on to the new courtyard. New ADA compliant walkways will be created. The existing historic cottages are characterized by troweled stucco, French doors, divided-lite windows, clay tile roofing, decorative iron and wood grille work, solid wood doors, flagstone, etc. The new cottages will draw design influences and will incorporate decorative grilles, possibly including perforated stucco/cement grilles. To differentiate, the new cottages will not include arches, round window, patio walls, built-in seating, clipped eaves, shutters, or multi-lite windows. Proposed roofing tile may have varied colors. Below-grade basements will be added to provide storage. Restrooms and basement stairs will be shared.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	Likes this version better than the original proposal. Creating different roof levels between each unit would help to break them up more. Hates single pane windows, and would like to see a different mullion treatment. If the new cottages will have eaves, they should be exposed rafter tails, not boxed eaves.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
Where is the closest public restroom?	Across the street.
What about the color?	Could be the same, or a different shade. Warm white.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	The roof looks a little flat, which is the graphics program. The new courtyards that the new cottages front on to are really interesting. Likes the seating area at the north end. Size and placement is consistent with the Standards. The original Palisades Courtyard was a more public use, which is consistent with the current proposal. Project creates good sense of entrance on the south side, which doesn't really have a sense of entrance currently. Might want to look at opening up the north end by removing some trees that enclose that area, creating a more inviting entrance area.
Woods	The new cottages look very modern.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Charlie Daniels	Misses the arches found on the other cottages. The new cottages look too plain. Windows without mullions look too plain. The grille work helps. Balboa Park is defined by arches, incorporating them somewhere would help. Perhaps arches on windows with no mullions and mullions on squared windows.

Recommended Modifications: The size and placement is consistent with the Standards, but need to work out details.

Consensus:

- Consistent with the Standards (In size and placement. More details are needed.)
- 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 6:05 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on June 3, 2015 at 4:00 PM.

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