

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, June 6, 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	Todd Pitman (Chair); Ann Woods; Andrew Bowen; Matt Winter
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Jodie Brown;
CCDC	James Alexander
Guests	
Item 3A	Alex Shah; Ben Shah; David Marshall; Tom Saunders; Kipp Gstetterbyer
Item 3B	Dan Hayden; Jim Gates; Paige Sims; Aaron Hawkins
Item 3C	Cristina Bonilla; Michelle Islas; Michalel Geogopoulos
Other	Bruce Coons, Amie Hayes SOHO; Paul Johnson

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB #56, NR, CR

Address: 1050 Kettner Blvd.

Historic Name: Santa Fe Depot

Significance:

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Kipp Gsteteenbauer; David Marshall

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: In addition to seismic stabilization and restoration work, several modifications are being considered, including the possibility of reconstructing a version of the original forecourt that was demolished in 1954. Looking for feedback on revised conceptual plans.

Existing Square Feet: 24300

Additional Square Feet: TBD

Total Proposed Square Feet: TBD

Prior DAS Review: May-18

Staff Presentation: The Santa Fe Depot was reviewed by DAS last month. The applicants have made adjustments to the plans based on the feedback provided and would like to present the changes to you.

Applicant Presentation: We want to activate the station and make it economically viable. We have addressed a number of comments after meeting with you and with staff. In the arches we will be using butt glazing to make the storefronts more transparent. We have removed the balcony in front of the original building, but have maintained the balconies on the new forecourt area. These balconies cannot be seen from the exterior. At the interior, we have shortened the catwalk and reduced the number of openings to two. We show a metal railing, but we would prefer to do a glass railing. At the lounge area above the Amtrak offices, there is no impact to the glass. The new Amtrak offices at the rear will be separated by 8'.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	This design is a lot better. Huge improvements. The new Amtrak office at the rear is fine. On the interior, not having as many openings is good. Doing the lower balcony in light weight steel is easily reversible. Excited in the past about the project. This is so short, and there are additional modifications, so it is no longer a reconstruction. Maybe this is not the place to have an addition. I am still mulling it over.
Amie Hayes	I share Bruce's concern. At what point is it an addition vs. reconstruction.
Bruce Coons	If the front façade of the forecourt was reconstructed and not connected to the building, so it was a standalone element, then it would not feel like it was shortened. (The arches on the side is retail space and strikes the balance between revenue and reconstruction.)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
I feel it is going in a good direction. I wish there was a way to acknowledge the original 8 bays.	
I appreciate all the changes. I am worried about the massing at the forecourt to the historic façade. The shortened forecourt at Broadway will be closer and impact the view.	If something is to be built here, this is the best way to tell the story. Best possible solution given the constraints.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Tell me about the header height vs. the door frame at the Broadway façade in the middle.	We have it at the top of the door, which is now frameless.
The glass at the storefront should be same as the railing and as clear as possible.	Yes, that is the intent.
The balconies look really skinny.	It is structural steel. It may need brackets.
If the balcony is there, I don't mind the windows and doors.	Bruce Coons—that is the loss of a lot of historic fabric.
The connection to Broadway is more important than being discussed. The trolley is not always there. While access from Broadway is restricted, we should address interior blockage and signage.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	Looks a lot better. The only thing that gives me pause it is looks more like an addition and not reconstruction.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Jodie Brown	Is this addition a SDP? (No.)

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 3B:**Listings: HRB #127-086, NRAddress: 402-424 Market StreetHistoric Name: Gaslamp Historic District--Broker's BuildingSignificance:Mills Act Status: NoPTS #: N/AProject Contact: Paige Sims; Jim GatesTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: The applicant is proposing construction of 4,685 SF of new gross floor area, not to exceed 60 feet in height, along with a deck, on the rooftop to be used as office space.

Existing Square Feet: 40000

Additional Square Feet: 4,685

Total Proposed Square Feet: 44,685

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The applicant is proposing to construct an addition on the top of the Broker's building located at the corner of Market and 4th Avenue. The addition will have limited visibility from the street.

Applicant Presentation: We expect to have a restaurant on the bottom floor and offices on the upper floors. The penthouse will allow for the project to be economically viable. The third floor was added early in the life of the building. We propose to use the original columns to hold the weight of the new addition. On at least one façade you will not see the addition. On the other façade the visibility will be limited. The office will have a very subtle design. We have lowered the floor so as to not impact the windows on the third floor. There will be a deck that goes all around, but we can use the existing parapet. If a railing is needed it would be glass and would be set back 2'.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	I have been looking at it awhile. I appreciate the reduced awning profile. It has minimal visibility.
Paul Johnson	Is the exterior URM? (It is brick.)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Will you be adding brace frames?	Yes, in the windows. They will be very small.
Does the basement have a use?	Currently the Haunted Hotel, but it may be gone by the time the project is done.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	This appears to be consistent.

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: HRB #127-023, NRAddress: 437 J StreetHistoric Name: Gaslamp Historic District--Grand Pacific HotelSignificance:Mills Act Status: NoPTS #: N/AProject Contact: James Bolt; Rodolfo OcioTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: The applicant is proposing construction of 2,025 SF of new gross floor area, along with a deck, on the rooftop to be used for a new restaurant/bar/lounge.Existing Square Feet: 11042Additional Square Feet: 2,025Total Proposed Square Feet: 13,067Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This project is located at the corner of 5th Avenue and J Street in Gaslamp. The building is a contributor to the district and referred to as the Grand Pacific Hotel. The applicant is proposing to activate the roof top by adding a bar and seating. Additionally, two elevators and stairwells will access the roof.

Applicant Presentation: We are proposing an interior remodel that would include retail on the 1st floor, offices on the 2nd and 3rd floor and roof top kitchen/restaurant. We will be making the building ADA compliant which would include adding the two elevators. The facades will be restored and maintained. We dropped the roof line and moved the elevator along 5th Avenue as far back as possible. You can see about 3' of it now from across the street.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Bruce Coons	It did have one of the last interiors. The elevator is way to visible. The glass railing is too visible. (We are bringing it down. It will only be 24" tall.)
Amie Hayes	I believe it historically had cresting. (That was a different building in the photo.)
Bruce Coons	The elevator can't be towards the front of the building. It is very jarring. (We will be doing 4-sided glass on the elevator to reduce visibility.)

Name	Comments
Amie Hayes	Can you reduce the awning at the elevator? (It provides protection from the elements.)
Paul Johnson	You have a note about the windows? (They are currently vinyl windows that will be restored to wood windows.)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
You have played around with the placement of the elevator?	Yes.
Shaft needs to be that height?	We changed it to a friction based system which reduced the height 3'. We are looking at a pit that would lower it an additional 2'.
Is the glass at the parapet there for sound?	Yes, the parapet is 2' wide and the glass would be located at the backside of the parapet.
The stair at the side is from the 80s or 90s is not historic?	No.
You could remove this stoop and clean up the façade.	
Could the backflow preventer be removed?	We would have to discuss and research.
The trash area is glass. I would rather not see blackout film.	We could do blinds or curtains there.
I am concerned about the awning cantilevering out and impacting the bay windows.	We could break it up and put one at the door.
Are you shotcreting the rear wall?	Yes.
Could the dimensions on the glass elevator match the dimensions on the historic windows?	Yes.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	Research the pit to reduce the height of the elevator along 5 th Avenue as much as possible.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:Research the pit to reduce the height of the elevator along 5th Avenue as much as possible.

Consensus:

- ☐ Consistent with the Standards
- X 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 5:50 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on July 11, 2018, 2012 at 4:00 PM.

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