

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, September 6, 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; Sonnier Francisco
Guests	
Item 3A	Jalal Wells; Ron Handcox
Item 3B	Michael Masi; Soheil Nakhshab
Item 3C	John Anderson; Robin Madaffer
Other	Bruce Coons; Amie Hayes SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #217-39

Address: 2653 K Street

Historic Name: Grant Hill Park Historic District

Significance: HRB Criterion F

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 557120

Project Contact: Jalal Wells

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Replacement of the existing windows with vinyl windows and the maintenance of the non historic stucco.

Existing Square Feet: 900

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 900

Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: The subject property is a contributor to the Grant Hill Park Historic District. Similar to the Sherman Heights Historic District, this district has codified design guidelines. The design guidelines require certain paint colors, wood windows, and particular types of exterior materials. The property owner replaced windows on the property which is not consistent with the design guidelines and was notified by Code Enforcement of working without a permit. When staff viewed the site, it was apparent that the wood siding had also been stuccoed. There are multiple buildings on the site, but the only building called out on the DPR form was the front building. Staff has discussed replacing select windows with wood on the front building and maintaining the other windows.

Applicant Presentation: We took possession of the property after my brother became ill. I am not aware of any of the work that was done to the property under his management. I was not aware that the property was historically designated until we submitted a permit through DSD. We had the property appraised in 2000 and at that time the windows were aluminum and the exterior was stuccoed. We believe that it is not OK to ask us to reverse the look of the house to the 1925 appearance. We only upgraded the windows.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Code issue? On windows and stucco?	On the windows.
It is being permitted to fix the issues?	Yes.
Is the Mills Act available?	Yes, but they likely would not save money due to the length of time that they have owned the property. (staff)
Would the Mills Act be available to a future owner?	Yes. (staff)
My concerns are the bulk/scale not the bits and pieces. It still feels like a neighborhood contributor.	
Actions previously degraded the resource.	
I would be OK with replacing windows at the front and not removing the stucco.	
Yes, replace 2 windows with wood.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	The two front windows should be replaced with wood to match the original design.

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: N/A

Address: 454 13th Street

Historic Name: N/A

Significance: N/A

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 0

Project Contact: Soheil Nakhshab

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Relocation of a potentially historic resource.

Existing Square Feet: 900

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 900

Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: The property owner has purchased this property and would like to relocate it to Mission Hills. The property is not currently designated, but it will be going to the HRB shortly. If the property is designated by the HRB, relocation will require a Site Development Permit (SDP). The proposed relocation site is near Presidio Park and it would front on to a street allowing for visibility of the resource. Consistent with our new policy of bringing potential SDPs to DAS, staff is requesting input on the proposal.

Applicant Presentation: We purchased this site and are trying to incorporate it into a new development, but the site is very restrictive. We evaluated keeping it on the site, but could not meet the minimum requirements. We are not interested in chopping up building to accommodate new development. We own a lot in north Missions Hills where we would like to relocate the building. As part of the relocation, we would be removing the rear addition that was done in the 1940s. Once on the new lot, the building would be visible from Presidio Park. The floor is rotted and in bad condition. The front porch has also been altered. We are looking to give new life to the building in a new space to be appreciated.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	This is an important building downtown. There were only a few pre-fab buildings built during this time frame. The Standards state that moving a building out of context is not consistent. The building should not be moved.
Amie Hayes	I support Bruce's comments.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The problem is with the base design, I think you can make an argument to move it from the site. You could demo it which we would not want to happen. Are you facing Harney?	Yes.
I would rather see something moved than gone.	
I think your comments about context are spot on. It doesn't say much about its history in Mission Hills. I would like to see the context to maintain it on site.	One of the first things that we do is evaluate it.
I believe relocation is not consistent with the Standards. The context is important.	
I have a hard time saying so without a larger context. It should be flushed out in a historic report and the findings should be clear.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	We need a context for the site to understand it better.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

A Historical Resources Research Report should be prepared to flesh out the historicity of the site and property in greater detail.

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 #1203Address: 1702 Camino Del Rio NorthHistoric Name: May Company/William Lewis, Jr. BuildingSignificance: HRB Criteria A, C and DMills Act Status: NoPTS #: 0Project Contact: John Alderson; Don L.Treatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: Introduce a new escalator and elevator at the southeast corner of the building.Existing Square Feet: 320,000Additional Square Feet: 0Total Proposed Square Feet: 320,000Prior DAS Review: No

Staff Presentation: This property is the Macy's building at Mission Valley Mall. It was designated in 2016 and is currently on appeal. Westfield, the property owner, is working to redesign the building to allow for multiple tenants. In an effort to access the second floor, they are proposing an escalator and elevator at the southeast corner of the building. Staff has some concerns about the visibility of the corner as this is a primary elevation.

Applicant Presentation: We are trying to embrace the historic nature, but make the building commercially viable. It is difficult to find one tenant for 350,000 SF. At UTC, tenants only want 3,000 SF or less. We also need to introduce signage and easy access to the 2nd floor. We are working to make the escalators/elevator distinct and new.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	I agree that it is difficult to find a tenant for so much square footage. My main concern is the proposed location. This is the last place to construct an escalator per the Standards. I think the best place is the west side which has a blank wall behind it. On the proposed side, the escalator does not bother me. For the elevators, the wall on the east side should be maintained and the elevators should be inside the wall. A new opening could be added underneath the escalators. The color

Name	Comments
	should go back to the color. (Access to parking is key and the elevator space takes leasable space away.)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
This is my favorite building. I am OK with the structure and pulled off the building. Feels like it is distinct. The biggest issue is the cover that goes under the folded plate roof. Make that float away from the space to let the folded plate roof stand out.	
I agree. I don't like how the roofs interact.	
I am happy to see someone doing something with it. Landscape would be nice to see it consistent with historic landscapes.	
The cover from the elevator to the building?	It could be removed.
Could the cover over the escalator be removed?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	The extra covers over the escalator and from the elevator to the building at the second floor should be removed.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Remove the covers noted above.

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 5.42 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on October 4, 2017, 2012 at 4:00 PM.

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