

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 1, 2017, 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 | Todd Pitman (Chair); Matt Winter; Ann Woods; Tom Larimer |
| City Staff | |
| | HRB Jodie Brown; |
| Guests | |
| Item 3A | Christina Willis; Rachel Rowe; Alison Mandelbaum; Mark Daitch; Diego Velasco |
| Item 3B | Bridget Flecky; Tessie Bersamin |
| Other | Bruce Coons, SOHO; Courtney Coyle |

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #525

Address: 4061 Fairmount Avenue

Historic Name: DeWitt C. Mitchell Memorial American Legion, Post 201

Significance: A, B, D

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 535323

Project Contact: Christina Willis; Diego Velasco

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Demolition of an existing designated resource and the construction of a four story residential building.

Existing Square Feet: 7,100 SF

Additional Square Feet:

Total Proposed Square Feet:

Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: The property is located at 4061 Fairmount Avenue in City Heights. The property was designated in 2002 and is listed as the DeWitt C. Mitchell Memorial American Legion, Post 201, HRB Site #525. The property was determined significant under HRB Criteria A, B, and D. The project proposes to demolish the historic building and replace it with affordable units. Demolition of a historic resource is not consistent with the US Secretary of the Interior's Standards and would require a Site Development Permit for substantial alteration. Staff is requesting a discussion of potential alternatives that the development team should evaluate.

Applicant Presentation: The property is located in City Heights and it is our mission to improve the quality of life. Our approach to improving quality of life includes developing infrastructure and providing resources for the residents and the community. Price Charities has developed multiple projects in the area. We do not rely on public funds for the projects.

Public Comment:

| Name | Comments |
|----------------|---|
| Bruce Coons | The alternatives proposed for study are reasonable. The front section seems the most important. There are other alternatives where you could do more attachments or span over the ballroom section. I wouldn't be opposed to spanning over the ballroom as an alternative. |
| Courtney Coyle | We need to look to why it was designated to understand the mitigation. |
| Amie Hayes | There are not too many properties that are designated in City Heights. |
| Courtney Coyle | We saw a recent SDP which had no parking. Why does parking have to be available with these units? It would be helpful to understand the requirements/needs for parking. (We are taking advantage of the density bonuses and have a number of reduced spaces. This is also a transit rich area, but it is also not an employment center and people are going outside of the area to work.) |

Q&A:

| Subcommittee-member Issue or Question | Applicant's Response |
|---|---|
| How tall is the one-story space on the historic building? | 20' with a dropped ceiling. |
| What is the height restriction of the site? | 50' under the Affordable Housing Care Act and going up to 60' for this project. |
| | Under the alternative #1 the entire building would be preserved. We could set the new construction 10' away from the historic building. |

| Subcommittee-member Issue or Question | Applicant's Response |
|--|---|
| | Parking could be on the 1 st floor instead of underground. We would have to look into how it would be screened. At the rear of the historic building it juts out and we might be able to come right up to it as there are no windows in this location. |
| How would you program the historic building? | The historic building has 6,000 SF +. We are not sure if we need or could use that much space. |
| Would there be any restoration of the building under alternative #1? | We have not yet determined the costs. |
| | Under alternative #2 which would maintain the 2-story portion and incorporate it into the leasing space and demolish the 1-story portion. It could be used as a leasing office or a lounge space. It would be possible to open the rear of the building and connect it to the new construction. As a third alternative, we would also be evaluating relocation. |
| Why couldn't you embrace the building? It seems that other buildings could be used for amenities. | The cost of retro-fitting plumbing in the 2-story section is high, but we could look at community uses in the building. |
| How many of the units could be added to another floor? | Adding another floor would increase costs and would be out of character for the neighborhood. |
| Any new programs should be in the historic building and new units could take up the proposed community space. | The space in the historic building is more community space than we had anticipated. You would be putting everything in one area of the building instead of spreading it out since the space is so large. |
| Another alternative would be to go look at putting parking underground. | |
| Under alternative #1, the drive aisle could have 90 degree parking, storage could go into the community room and free up space for parking, possibly 10-12 spaces. | Storm water regulations are driving some of the parking. |
| How much of the historic material remains at the interior? | The wood stage flooring and plaster which is rather plain. |
| Robotic parking solutions should be looked at. | |

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

| Subcommittee-member | Comments |
|----------------------------|--|
| Pitman | A study of the alternatives that were discussed as #1 which preserves the entire building and #2 which retains the two story portion as well as relocation appear 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 #208

Address: 2436 Market Street

Historic Name: Sherman Heights Historic District

Significance: Non-Contributor

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 508703

Project Contact: Brigitte Browning; Bridget Flecky

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Construction of a 2-story commercial building on a previously developed lot with one existing commercial building to remain. The building to be constructed replaces an existing metal warehouse. The proposed new construction has been designed to compliment the Spanish style of the existing building.

Existing Square Feet: 6,552 SF

Additional Square Feet: 1,750 SF

Total Proposed Square Feet: 8,302 SF

Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: The property is located within the boundaries of the Sherman Heights Historic District and listed as a non-contributor. The applicant is proposing to construct a new building on site. Sherman Heights Historic District has codified design guidelines for the district that both contributors and non-contributors must adhere to. Staff has

reviewed the plans and requested some modifications. Since the projects includes new construction, staff has requested that the property owner present the project to DAS.

Applicant Presentation: This is a local labor union building. There is an existing metal warehouse building and we are replacing it with a new building. The new construction will be a 2-story building with assembly space on the 1st floor and offices on the 2nd floor. We are looking to maintain the existing building.

Public Comment:

| Name | Comments |
|-------------|--|
| Bruce Coons | The proposed project does not meet the guidelines. It is a more modern design. Stucco used isn't in the Spanish vernacular. The windows are squat, looks like any office building. The front of the building plane should be broken up with a shed roof or a bay window. |
| | |

Q&A:

| Subcommittee-member Issue or Question | Applicant's Response |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Does the building have stepped planes? | Yes. |
| Is the building 3 stories? | Yes. |
| Are the windows going to be operable? | They could be. |
| Landscaping should be provided. Street trees would provide for a better street presence. There is an area in front of the fence that could be used. | That is a parking row. |
| I think this is a missed opportunity. Market Street is a zero lot line area. This building could have been more prominent with parking at the rear. This design makes the area more of a thoroughfare. It is not pedestrian friendly. | |
| What is the height of Market Street? | 30' |
| Feels more commercial. There is a level of detail that is missing in fenestration, cornices, etc. It is very plain and ordained. | |

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

| Subcommittee-member | Comments |
|----------------------------|---|
| Pitman | Provide more detailing on the building. |

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 at 5:26PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on April 5, 2017 at 4:00 PM.

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