

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 7, 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; Ann Woods; Matt Winter
Recusals	
City Staff	
	HRB Jodie Brown; Camille Pekarek
	CCDC Aaron Hollister; Brad Richter
Guests	
	Item 3A Sonya Sparks; TJ Sparks; Benetta Buell-Wilson
	Item 3B Justin Mandelbaum; David Mandelbaum; Marie Huff; David Schroedl;
	Item 3C Gulla Jonsdottirai; Elie Samaha; Marsha Sewell
	Other Amie Hayes; Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: N/A

Address: 4357 Argos Drive

Historic Name: N/A

Significance: N/A

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #:

Project Contact: Benetta Buell-Wilson; Kiley Wallace

Treatment: Restoration

Project Scope: The owners wish to restore this house and looking for guidance on stucco, roof repair and replacement of the non-historic windows.

Existing Square Feet: 1,836 SF

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,836 SF

Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: This property is not currently designated. The property owner would like to do some restoration work on the property in order to have it designated at a later date. They have specific questions for DAS members.

Applicant Presentation: The property is a 1926 Tudor Revival in Kensington. It has quite a bit of deferred maintenance. We have questions about stucco, asphalt shingles, and some window replacement. We would like to restore the windows back to wood double hung windows. We would like to know if it is OK to use acrylic stucco with integral color. The roof is currently asphalt shingles, and we would like to know if it is OK to replace the shingles with a similar product? Also, there are currently bay windows on the house and we would like to restore the original double hung windows.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The roof shingles in asphalt is not an issue.	
I think there is little concern over the use of acrylic stucco.	
If the windows match the original in the original opening per the studs there is no issue.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	There are no stucco issues or window issues with what is proposed.

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 #1125, CR

Address: 7727 Lookout

Historic Name: George and Marion Cottrell/Cliff May House

Significance: C, D

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #:

Project Contact: Justin Mandelbaum; Lisa Kriedeman

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Review of the conceptual re-design of the initial plan to develop Parcel 4 located to the north of the designated house. Proposed design seeks to preserve the viewshed from the historical structure.

Existing Square Feet: 2,400

Additional Square Feet: 3,000

Total Proposed Square Feet: 5,400

Prior DAS Review: 12.2.2015

Staff Presentation: This project is a re-design of a property located adjacent to a designated resource. The project proposes to construct 3 new houses on lots adjacent to the designated resource. In the previous version, there was a one story portion that allowed visibility from the historic resource. This re-design still allows for visibility but re-designs the space.

Applicant Presentation: The new design extends the patio of the historic house out over the proposed new construction. The lot slopes down allowing for the living room, dining room, kitchen and garage to sit below the patio.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	This design seems better than the last one.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
It was the view from the resource out that was significant?	Yes.
There will be an easement to maintain that Cliff May patio?	Yes.
What is the roof past the patio?	There will be no roof, just the patio.
So there will be an actual easement, so they can't build anything in the future?	No.
What's the difference?	The previous design blocked other views. The living area was also impacted by the other design.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	It appears to be consistent with the Standards.

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: Non-contributor

Address: 701 5th Avenue

Historic Name: Gaslamp Historic District

Significance:

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #:

Project Contact: Samaha Elie; Gulla Jonsdottir

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Renovate the existing Gaslamp Theatre constructed in 1997. New uses will include ground level restaurants; a new theatre and a roof top deck.

Existing Square Feet: 66,180

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 66,180

Prior DAS Review: 7.6.2016

Staff Presentation: The proposed project will re-design the exterior of a non-contributing resource within the Gaslamp. The original building was a movie theater and the proposed use will be a luxury theater with restaurants at the ground floor.

Applicant Presentation: This theater is associated with the Grauman Theater in Los Angeles. We will be providing 8 luxury theaters and three restaurants on the ground floor. The exterior of the building will be re-branded to reference the Grauman Theater. There exterior will be painted white. Exterior drapes will be added to the 5th Avenue side. The ground floor will be opened up for access to the restaurants.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Marsha Sewell	How will you be comply with the land use ordinance? The sign does not comply with the PDO.
Bruce Coons	I was not fond of the previous building. I did like the stone. Per the Standards, you should match the cornice, rhythm of the openings, etc. Prior buildings built to respect the lots. I am not telling you to replicate, but you should respect the design. The corner appears to be primarily signage. I am not aware of any ordinance that will allow it. The colors are regulated but should relate to the surrounding. Concentrate on rhythm on the bays—they should be more open on the 1 st floor. (There are brace frames, so we are limited.) Transoms should be used and the cornice behind the drapes should be maintained.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Glad to see you open up the south façade.	
Great. Minor revisions. It will help to activate the street.	
I think the building is terrible. It minimizes the other building. The tower is a little heavy handed. There should be a quieter way to convey.	
The tower is the biggest change. The mass got bigger as it is now squared off. This element could be improved.	We could lower this 3'-4'.
A blade sign would be better.	The blade is for signage. We would not do the dragon as a blade sign.
The cornice should be visible.	The drapes can be placed below the cornice.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	The drapes should be more open to make the windows behind them more visible. The marble should be Carrera marble. The height of the tower should be reduced. The hand and foot imprints are fine at the interior and the exterior.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Open up the drapes and place them below the cornice. Reduce the height of the tower.
Use Carrera marble at the exterior.

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 5.45 PM

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

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