

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, April 4, 2018, 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	Matt Winter; Ann Woods; Charlie Colvin; Andrew Bowen
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Cathy Winterrowd
CCDC	Brad Richter; James Alexander; Christian Svensk
Guests	
Item 3A	Charles Brinton; Marie Lia;
Item 3B	Soheil Nakhshab; Michael Masi; Marie Lia
Other	Amie Hayes, SOHO; Paul Johnson

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

### 3. Project Reviews

#### ▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB

Address: 1035 and 1045 E Street

Historic Name: Custer Apartments and Dr. Michael and Jane Quinn Duplex

Significance: Site #1291

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 597171

Project Contact: Trent Cloughton; Charles Brinton

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Relocate the designated resources outside of the downtown core. Identify alternatives to study as part of the economic feasibility process.

Existing Square Feet: 8672

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 8,672

Prior DAS Review: N/A

**Staff Presentation:** These two properties were recently designated by the Board. The applicant is proposing to relocate the buildings to 28<sup>th</sup> Street and L Street, so they can construct a new building at the existing site. The relocation of the designated resources would require a Site Development Permit which requires the development of Findings per the San Diego Municipal Code. One of the Findings addresses alternatives to relocation. The applicant would like to discuss alternatives to study.

**Applicant Presentation:** Our base project, which would relocate both buildings, would allow for 365 units. We have developed three alternatives to study: 1) maintain both buildings on site which would be 52% less Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and 159 units; 2) move off the units, construct the underground parking and return the buildings to the site which would have 12.5% less FAR and produce 261 units; and 3) maintaining the buildings on site and constructing around them which would have 24% less FAR and produce 232 units.

**Public Comment:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Amie Hayes	I encourage you to maintain the buildings on site to represent their original construction. 1045 E Street is original to the site and should stay. 1035 E Street could be moved on the site, but both should stay. You should consider cantilevering over the building and look at incentives to maintain it on the site.

**Q&A:**

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Relocate then build up the podium?	Yes.
Reworking the utilities?	Yes, we will need to sprinkler.
All have above level parking? 6 floors of parking?	Yes, we have to do a study. Could be more or less depending on 159 units.
10' for fire clearance could maintain the cantilevered higher up.	Would subdividing the lot be required? Maintaining the distance for light, etc.
Maintaining on site not an SDP?	Correct.
One has been relocated—carries on tradition to be moved. I like smaller buildings facing longer blocks with taller buildings. It is good for urban design.	
Moving off and moving back on has more chance of success.	
I would like to see them in the same neighborhood.	
Moving (1035) on the lot would be OK.	
Leave one on corner rather than interior lot one.	

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Cantilevering should be up high so as to not be obvious.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Winter	Alternatives presented should be studied.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Alternative that maintains the buildings on site, can have the new construction cantilever over the historic buildings.

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

Address: 454 13th Street

Historic Name: John and Mary Wright House

Significance: Site #1278

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Soheil Nakhshab

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Relocate the designated resource outside of the downtown core. Identify alternatives to study as part of the economic feasibility process.

Existing Square Feet: 1350

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,350

Prior DAS Review: 2017

Staff Presentation: The proposed project is a designated resource that was reviewed by DAS last year. At the time, the building was to be relocated to a new site in Mission Hills. The applicant has been working with SOHO to develop a plan that would maintain it on site in the East Village. The new project is considered a Substantial Alteration.

Applicant Presentation: We worked with SOHO to develop a compromise that would maintain the resource on site. The building would be close to public transportation, with affordable and market rate units. There would be no parking for tenants and we would like to create a bazaar on the ground floor. We will be installing a transformer in the basement and have a hatch in the public right of way.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Amie Hayes	Bruce like that it would be maintained.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How tall is the concrete fire wall?	14' feet
Is that the existing wainscoting?	Yes, but it is a hodge-podge.
Possibility of any other lot that it could be moved to?	No.
With the previous one that maintained the façade, could you set back some?	Would lose 7-14 units.
Could the new construction give a little breathing room to the historic building?	It is a limited lot.
The SDGE vault should be in the rendering.	It will be placed in the existing sidewalk.
I think it is critical to get it off the ground. You should provide a gap between the new and the old.	
Could you off set the area over the breezeway?	That will greatly impact the micro apartments.
How do you maintain the southside?	We would refinish and then install it. There is no need to go back to the east side.
You should push back the 2 <sup>nd</sup> floor 10'.	
Don't study just façade option but one that steps back 10' on the second floor.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Winter	Alternatives to study 1) maintain and build behind; 2) move forward and build behind 3) move forward, build above, second floor 10' back; 4) relocate.

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 5.30 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on May 2, 2018 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Jodie Brown at [JDBrown@sandiego.gov](mailto:JDBrown@sandiego.gov) or 619.533.6300