

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 3, 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	Ann Woods, Todd Pitman
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Jodie Brown; Suzanne Segur
Park & Rec	Charlie Daniels
Guests	
Item 3A	Mike Kelly, Robert Thiele, Charles Daniels
Item 3B	Jim Tanner, Chris Binger, Steven Bossi, Marie Lia
Item 3C	Reena Racki, Jeffrey Racki
Other	Amie Hayes, Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #1, NR

Address: 2080 Pan American Plaza

Historic Name: San Diego Automotive Museum

Significance:

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #:

Project Contact: Michael Kelly; Charlie Daniels

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Reconstruction of four murals above the entrance of the San Diego Automotive Museum.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 0

Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: The San Diego Automotive Museum within Balboa Park would like to re-introduce four exterior murals that were previously removed. There is black and white photographic documentation of how the murals once appeared.

Applicant Presentation: We have hired a mural artist to recreate the panels. They were originally painted fiberboards designed to look like tile. We are proposing to do the project in two phases. The first phase would be to install temporary full sized photos to allow time for fundraising and then install the tile. We would like to know if there are any issues with the proposed colors for the tile and if there is any issue with the use of permanent tile versus the original fiberboards.

The building was designed in the Art Deco form. There were originally Mayan relief decorative elements that framed the murals. We are looking holistically at the building and looking to re-introduce these elements at a later date.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Charles Daniels	Most of the buildings were temporary and now have been reconstructed with more permanent material. There is a precedent in the park of using modern material. This project has also been supported by the Balboa Park Committee.
Bruce Coons	This is a great project and the building is lost without it. There is some dimensionality to the historic tiles. You should be using the 1935 color palette. I would recommend checking with DNM Tile.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How did you come up with these colors?	Research on the objects. The artist felt that they were looking at the greys to get a feel for the possible colors.
These tiles seem more detailed than the historic photo.	It is not intentional.
The permanent display should be as close to the design shown.	We can take a look back at the high resolution photos that we have to clarify.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	The proposed project, both the temporary poster and the permanent tile appear to be consistent with the Standards.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Review the colors of the proposed tile to be consistent with the 1935 palette.

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 #819

Address: 1425-31 Market Street

Historic Name: The Tourist Hotel

Significance: A, C

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #:

Project Contact: Jim Tanner

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Removal of a non historic rear addition and the 1925-26 addition.

Stabilize, protect and remove the original north, east and west facades of the building to an off site location for rehabilitation. Construct new high rise and new structure for the historic exterior walls at the same location as the original.

Existing Square Feet: 2880

Additional Square Feet: -1248

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1632

Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: This property is the Tourist Hotel which was designated in 2007. It was designated under HRB Criteria A and C and constructed in 1888. This project was previously approved by the Planning Commission approximately 10 years ago, but has since expired. The applicant is now working to get the same project approved again. The applicant would like to discuss potential alternatives that should be examined.

Applicant Presentation: We have worked on this project for some time and we were able to develop a design that received unanimous support from the Civic Board. This is the same project with some minor modifications due to code changes, bike parking and storm water. The building is designed to accent the Tourist Hotel and to keep it in place. We have studied moving it off site. It is not feasible to move it off site due to a lack of available lots and the need to have the temporary relocation site for 2 years, so the parking lot can be constructed. We plan to remove the addition and then remove the

outer panels for restoration. When returned to the site, the historic panels would be placed on a new structural system.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	My memory differs from staff's. I like the building designed around the historic building and the airspace above it. We went around about reconstruction or whether it was cheaper to remain on site. I thought it was to move across the street and then CCDC would move back and affordable house would be in the house. The building type is significant and the proposed project is hardly preservation to put it on a new structure. I am disappointed that this is the direction. I am not in favor of the proposed project.
Marie Lia	Please note that this is a SDP which means that the proposed work is not consistent with the Standards.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What are the possible options?	We could do a smaller project that doesn't move at all. We could reconstruct the building in new materials or we could do no project.
Like what you are doing with the design, but are we really putting back?	It is not just the façade we are trying to rehabilitate and we are not putting in new pieces. We plan to take the building apart in larger sections so there are no seams or visible cuts. The inside has been mostly modified.
Any similar projects?	(Jodie Brown) In the permitting process, but nothing completed yet. Some of the buildings stayed in place but have been gutted.
	At Bruce Coons' suggestion we are maintaining the stairs to have them restored.
What is the proposed use?	The second floor would be 2 units and the first floor would be retail. We are also proposing a roof deck.
Could the building be restored first?	It could result in damage to the building during construction. It is a small site and we will be providing 95 units.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
	I would like to clarify the alternatives that need to be evaluated. 1) Construct a smaller project and maintain on the site. 2) Reconstruct in new material. 3) Take off the facades and the stairs, restore them off site and return them to the site on a new frame. 4) Relocate the building to a new permanent site. 5) Relocate the building in its entirety and bring it back to the site
	I am not sure where it would go because there are limited sites. Taking off the façade would be easier to do and it could be restored in storage.
You should also look at doing half of the garage first to maintain on the site and then the other half.	We would have to see if that is possible/feasible.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	There would be 6 alternatives that would need to be evaluated.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Jodie Brown	Lot availability should be reviewed outside of the downtown core. The building could cross trolley lines.
Jodie Brown	Have you looked to move the building to another permanent site? (Yes, early on, but it is not feasible.)

Recommended Modifications: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 #117Address: 246 GravillaHistoric Name: El Pueblo Ribera

Significance: C, D

Mills Act Status: Yes

PTS #:

Project Contact: Reena and Jeffrey Racki

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Construct a third story room at the garage roof deck accessed by existing exterior stairs.

Existing Square Feet: 1362

Additional Square Feet: 149

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1511

Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: This property is located at 246 Gravilla in Pueblo Rivera, HRB Site 117. The site is a multi-story, multi-family property constructed in 1923 and designed by Rudolph Schindler. The property owner is proposing to construct an addition to the third story addition above the garage. The unit in question is located at the rear of the property and will be placed where there is currently a storage unit.

Applicant Presentation: Our unit is at the rear. It is a 1 bed and 1 bath, but a little small for us. The garage is 80' from the street and would not impact the historic structure. Currently, there is an existing shack on the roof that we would take down. The new addition would complement, but not mimic the historic structure. It will be independent. It would have a steel frame clad in porcelain tile and an overhang to protect from the sun.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	Is the addition blocking the clerestory windows? (Yes, at the back of the 2 nd story. We will be adding poly carbonate panels with back lit lights.)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How is it attaching to the existing?	In the garage is a new moment frame which we will be attaching to. There are six columns that will go down through the roof and attach to the moment frame.
Was the 2 nd floor originally open?	Yes, it was designed like that but the owners wanted it enclosed due to the damp weather.
Is the screen on top not original?	Yes, when each was designed they were private, but when they went up they were no fences. Screens were added to introduce privacy.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
I wish you weren't doing it but it meets the Standards. It changes the feel of the house with the scale.	Screens help maintain the feel because of the large condo next door.
It is reversible?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	The project is consistent with the Standards and reversible.

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 5.49 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on June 7, 2017 at 4:00 PM.

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