

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 4, 2016, at 4:00 PM

6th Floor Large Conference Room

Executive Tower

1010 2nd Avenue, San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE 4.02pm

Subcommittee Members Gail Garbini; Ann Woods

City Staff

HRB Jodie Brown;

Guests

Item 3A Ricardo Perez

Item 3B Earl Penny, Tim Hoffman

Item 3C Marie Lia, A. Churchill, Jim Nicholas, James
Churchill, Scot Frontis

Other Bruce Coons, Amiee Hayes, SOHO

2. Public Comment (on matters not on the agenda)

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #208

Address: 2430 K Street

Historic Name: Sherman Heights Historic District

Significance: Non Contributor

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 454260

Project Contact: Dalila Sotelo; Ricardo Perez

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Proposed construction of a two story residence at the rear of an existing house with a two car garage.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: 3190

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3190

Prior DAS Review: None

Staff Presentation: The owner is proposing to build a second single family residence at the rear of an existing residence. The existing house is a non-contributor to the district.

Applicant Presentation: The property owner would like to build a second unit on the property. It is a three bedroom house with a two car garage. You will access from the alley. There is a 6' difference between the alley and where the house is located.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	I like the vertical windows on the side and it is far enough on the back that it should be pretty compatible

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is there any existing landscaping?	There are two trees out there. There is one at the front and two at the sides.
Access is off the alley?	Yes
There is parking on the driveway?	Yes there are four spots indicated—two in the garage and two in the drive.
Are the houses on either side of the house designated?	Not sure.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	Looks like it is appropriate.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

None

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 #486, NRAddress: 530 SlivergateHistoric Name: RosecroftSignificance: B, C, DMills Act Status: YesPTS #: 418166Project Contact: Scott Clifton; Earl PennyTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: The applicant is proposing to split the lot to create a 1 additional building at the lot.Existing Square Feet: 0Additional Square Feet: 0Total Proposed Square Feet: 0Prior DAS Review: None

Staff Presentation: The property is listed both locally and on the National Register. The property is significant under HRB Criteria B, C, and D. The property owner is proposing to split the lot. This designated site was originally much larger and it is significant for its association with a horticulturist. When the site was designated it was the current size. While none of the historically significant structures would be impacted the lot split, it allows for structures at the rear in the future. New structures would visually impact the relationship of the house and the site. Staff believes that the proposed lot split would need a Site Development Permit for Substantial Alteration consistent with SDMC 126.0504 (i).

Applicant Presentation: We are proposing to create one additional building site. The existing zoning is 10,000SF and we are proposing 3,500SF lot. We are increasing the side yard setbacks to 20. We set the lot line 20' back from the existing gym to give the house some room. There are no gardens at the rear. There are two Torrey Pines at the rear on the proposed new lot, but the bulk of the trees were planted in the 1970s.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	I have some concerns without a historic landscape specialist evaluating the gardens and reducing the lot size. There may be a way to protect the trees, but there is some concern without looking at the trees.
Hayes	Concern about the cultural landscape of the property.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Worried about the proposal. Directives to maintain spatial relationship for the property. If it is developed	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	When it was divided it will reduce the significance. Should be reviewed by the HRB and the SHPO to understand impact. You could have a survey done via a Historic American Landscape Survey. When you subdivide a lot it is critical that you know what it means. The proposed project would require a SDP.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

None

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/AAddress: 3780 Park Blvd.Historic Name: N/ASignificance: N/AMills Act Status: NoPTS #: 443724Project Contact: James Nicholas; Scot FrontisTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: The applicant is proposing to restore the exterior of the building and construct two additional levels.Existing Square Feet: 7683Additional Square Feet: 4564Total Proposed Square Feet: 12247Prior DAS Review: None

Staff Presentation: This property is not currently designated, but staff has had quite a bit of back and forth with the owner to come up with a design solution. Staff has a report that deems the property not significant; however staff does not concur and believes that the site is significant for its LGBTQ association. There have been some modifications to the front of the building over the years. The owner would like to restore the front façade

and construction residential units on the top. Staff has some concerns about the placement of the residential units and their proximity to the front façade.

Applicant Presentation: I am the owner of the Egyptian Court and 27 years after that purchase, I was able to purchase the Flame. I would like to restore the Flame and add six units on top. The bar would be reduced from 6000SF to 2000sf. We plan to have roll up doors on the front with a translucent door at the bottom portion and opaque glass. We would have two floors with six units. The focus of the new is to focus on the signage. The building is set back 14' from the wall. And the bedrooms project out 6' from that and would not encroach on the sign. The materials are stucco and the material and color are complementary to the existing. The portion behind the sign is stucco with expansion joints to play off the existing. We would like to reuse the redwood at the exterior of the bedrooms that protrude out. The building would be setback 14' with an 18" eave project forward.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	We have been working with them for some time to come up with a project that meets the Standards. Originally the setbacks were not as far back. We feel that the 14' is a good setback. We believe that this is a modest addition and that there were enough tradeoffs with the façade restoration. On the roll up doors we had asked the opaque doors be colored to match the original design. There is a great community interest in the building.
Hayes	I concur

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
In the rendering it seems that the third floor is dark and far forward.	A white color would draw your eye there and the black helps it to fade away.
What is the yellow on?	It was originally on the building
I think that I like it. There is a good balance with the new and the old.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	I think that I like it. There is a good balance with the new and the old.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

None

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 June 1, 2016 at 4:00 PM.

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