

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, July 11, 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; Charlie Colvin; Matt Winter
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Jodie Brown; Michelle Sokolowski; Suzanne Segur; Sonnier Francisco
Guests	
Item 3A	David Marshall; Trevor Pollard; Kim Brewer; Tom Fitzpatrick; Jennifer Roy
Item 3B	Marie Lia; Charles Brinton
Item 3C	Marie Lia; Paul Benton; Ryan Ferguson; Fred Pririer
Other	Amie Hayes, SOHO

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB #1203

Address: 1640 Camino Del Rio North

Historic Name: May Company/William Lewis, Jr. Building

Significance: HRB Criteria A, C, D

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Tom Fitzpatrick;

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The current building is three levels with a basement and was originally a single use retail box. The scope of the project will be to demise the interior of the building to permit multiple tenants in the basement, at grade, and on the second and third level. In

order to lease to prospective tenants, we need to alter the existing at-grade level to permit the new uses.

Existing Square Feet: 363054

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 363,054

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This property was designated involuntarily by the Board in 2016 and is currently on appeal. Prior to the designation, staff worked with Westfield on the proposed project. The subject property was originally designed as a single tenant space, but the owner would like to divide the space for multi-tenants. While the upper “honeycomb” pattern will be largely preserved, the first floor is proposed for multiple openings. Previously staff had indicated that the north façade which fronts on to the alley way and the west façade that fronts on to the mall could be modified, but that there were concerns with modifying the south and the east which front on to the parking lot. Staff is concerned with the number of the openings being proposed and the loss of the original tile at those locations. It should also be noted that upper management indicated that the covered walkways at the southwest corner could be removed.

Applicant Presentation: This property was built in 1961 and vacated by Macy’s in 2017. The building is 360,000 SF and has three levels with a basement. We are looking for an opportunity to have multiple tenants. With this proposal we are focusing on the ground level, the upper level and the folded plate roof will remain intact. Shops on the west side will be removed and portals will be added to some of the new openings to create a greater presence for the tenant. The columns on the covered walkway have the same design as the support columns at the folded plate roof area. Doors will also be added to the area under the folded plate roof and the flat roof area to the east of the folded plate roof will be increased in height to create a potential outdoor seating area.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Amie Hayes	Glad to see the escalator gone. I appreciate that the main horizontal line is being maintained. The new pop out for the entrances maintains the horizontal band across. (The band is at 10’ and would be maintained on the interior.)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
This is my favorite building in San Diego. I have an issue with the pop-outs. They change the visual expression. The horizontal band is being eliminated. I would rather see more openings rather than the loss of the horizontal band. I would rather see the pop-	

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
outs protrude out further but at 10' or lower and popped-out.	
Any light wells?	It has been discussed.
What's the level?	It is all shear walls. We don't know exactly where the tenants are going, so we need flexibility.
It should not be an issue to retro-fit the interior, but the question is how to retro-fit the structural.	We have done some preliminaries with Structural. Chances are not all openings would be utilized but we are just showing the possibilities.
Not touching the "honeycomb" makes me happy.	
On the roof deck, it appears to blend very well like it is creating a false sense of history.	We would use a reveal or change the material to differentiate.
I love the "honeycomb" and the color. I regret losing the warm tone, but it is not a deal breaker. You mentioned columns?	The lower level columns at the 1 st floor of the folded plate roof are the same as the colonnade that will be removed.
To keep the continuity, you could do a light feature to highlight it at night.	We could look at the brow.
That you are not damaging the "honeycomb" outweighs the new openings.	
I agree with Matt about the raised elements at the entrances. It does impact the view of the bottom of the "honeycomb."	
Looks good. I looked at it more holistically. I don't mind the pop-up and pop-out. It creates something new and different.	
It is unfortunate that the colonnade will be removed. This was an outdoor space to be comfortable. Without them it will be stark.	We did remove the design elements. For this submittal we were just focusing on the building. There will be vegetation at the site.
I like how you did signage.	
The sign on the corner should be equidistance from the corner. You will need to fix the linearity.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	I feel strongly about the color. It is not a contemporary building it is historic. The pop-outs and the overhanging shadow line should be thought through more thoroughly to create a larger shadow line.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications: The color should be reconsidered. The pop-outs and the proximity to the overhanging "honeycomb" should be thought through.

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

▪ **ITEM 3B:**

Listings: HRB #1291

Address: 1035/1045 E Street

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

Significance: HRB Criterion C

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 600329

Project Contact: Trent Claughton; Charles Brinton

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Relocate both buildings to 2810 L Street. Provide comment on the placement of the buildings at their new location.

Existing Square Feet: 0

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 8,248

Prior DAS Review: Apr-18

Staff Presentation: The subject properties are located at 1035 and 1045 E Street. They were designated earlier this year. The alternative discussion came through DAS a couple of months ago. The question today is the placement of the buildings on the new site at 28th and L Streets. Staff has recommended that the buildings are placed closer to the property line to replicate the existing relationship to the street.

Applicant Presentation: We are looking at two different options for the placement of the buildings on the new site. The first site plan shows the parking at the top of the lot and allows for green areas. This is the option that the owner prefers. The C sheet moves the buildings up to the property line with parallel parking at the rear.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Amie Hayes	SOHO supports Alternative 2. I agree with staff, but the context is entirely changed so either plan would be fine.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Is the lot currently a parking lot? If it is removed isn't it considered more permeable?	No.
What will they be?	1045 is in good condition and will remain a multi-family building. 1035 needs more work and will be micro-units.
Is this temporary till they go back?	This will be permanent.
Why can't we have parking at the side and the buildings pushed up to the front.	There are set back issues.
I would be less inclined to support having the buildings up at the property line. They should fit in with the neighborhood.	
If you want to be comfortable in the home, green space would increase quality of life. It is practicable to have the parking off the alley.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	The new buildings should fit into the neighborhood in regards to the setbacks.

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 #84

Address: 1241, 1245, 1249 Coast Blvd.

Historic Name: Green Dragon Colony

Significance: HRB Criterion A

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: 599696

Project Contact: Paul Benton

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Change the exterior material of the previously permitted project from wood siding to fiber cement siding.

Existing Square Feet: 7545

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 7,545

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This project involves new construction on a designated site. The original buildings on the site were demolished in approximately 1990. After the buildings were demolished, the exterior materials were evaluated and the Coastal Commission developed a list of exterior materials that would need to be included in any new construction. When the project was originally being approved through the Site Development Permit process, the exterior wall sheathing was noted as wood siding, wood shingles or wood board and batten. After evaluating the material, the applicant would like to use a fiber cement product rather than wood. I should note that the Coastal Commission did not have the word wood noted on the siding, it was only called out as wood in the plans for the proposed work.

Applicant Presentation: This project has had a long life. As we have gone through construction fire standards have changed. I think this is a good thing to consider. Would it be appropriate to use new material? This is a large-scale project, so it is not insignificant amount of material. We would like to use materials that will last longer.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Amie Hayes	Not a reconstruction. No rehab. No issues.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Zero problem with new material.	
Install individually?	Yes.
Agree, no problem.	
It's weird. The idea of longevity does not fly. I will defer to everyone else though.	

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Pitman	Proposed work is 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

4. Adjourned at 5:40PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on August 1, 2018 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Suzanne Segur at SSegur@sandiego.gov or 619.236.6139.