


CITY OF SAN DIEGO
M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: October 15, 2015
TO: Historical Resources Board and Interested Parties
FROM: Kelley Stanco, Senior Planner 
SUBJECT: **ITEM 7 – 1845 29TH STREET**

This item was previously heard by the Historical Resources Board on March 27, 2014, at which time staff recommended against designation due to a lack of integrity stemming from a number of modifications, most significantly replacement and alteration of original windows (Attachment 1). The item was continued indefinitely at the applicant's request to allow the applicant time to review the property with the Design Assistance Subcommittee (DAS) and consider restoration options (Attachment 2). The applicant went to the DAS on July 2, 2014, at which time the DAS provided recommendations regarding the restoration of the windows, and in particular a window on the front which had been changed from a rectangular set of paired casements to a smaller hexagonal fixed window at an unknown date (Attachment 3).

In October 2014 the applicant contacted staff informing us that the restoration work was complete and that they wanted to return the item to the HRB. Staff was unaware that restoration work had been undertaken, as no permit had been submitted for the work. Staff informed the applicant that a permit was required, and directed the applicant to submit for the permit prior to docketing. When the application was submitted, staff noted that the restoration work completed was not consistent with the historic photographs. The hexagonal window had been replaced with a pair of rectangular casement windows much smaller than those seen in the historic photograph. Staff provided the applicant with a comparative photo exhibit to illustrate the issue (Attachment 4), and informed the applicant that the window would need to be restored to the correct size in order for a permit to be approved and for staff to recommend designation of the property.

With the historical status of the property uncertain, the applicant is unwilling to restore the window again at this juncture. Instead, the applicant contracted with IS Architecture to prepare a new historic report for the property, which includes an analysis of the building and its eligibility in its current, semi-restored condition. The Historic Resource Research Report (HRRR) prepared by IS Architecture concludes that the property is eligible for designation under HRB Criterion C as a good example of Spanish Eclectic architecture (Attachment 5). This is consistent with the conclusions of the 2013 Johnson & Johnson HRRR (Attachment 6).

While staff certainly understands and appreciates the applicant's efforts to restore the property; unfortunately the most significant restoration item – the front window – was restored without the required review and approvals and was restored inaccurately. Because of this, the original staff recommendation to not designate the subject property at 1845 29th Street due to a lack of integrity remains unchanged.

Attachments: 1.) Staff Report HRB-14-023, dated March 18, 2014. (With Attachments)
 2.) Minutes from the HRB Hearing of March 27, 2014.
 3.) Minutes from the DAS Meeting of July 2, 2014.
 4.) Photo Exhibit Comparing Original Window to Restored Window.
 5.) 2015 HRRR prepared by IS Architecture
 6.) 2013 HRRR prepared by Johnson & Johnson



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
Historical Resources Board

DATE ISSUED: March 18, 2014 REPORT NO. HRB-14-023

ATTENTION: Historical Resources Board
Agenda of March 27, 2014

SUBJECT: **ITEM #10 – 1845 29th Street**

APPLICANT: James and Johannah Valentine represented by Johnson & Johnson

LOCATION: 1845 29th Street, Greater Golden Hill Community, Council District 3

DESCRIPTION: Consider the designation of the property located at 1845 29th Street as a historical resource.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Do not designate the property located at 1845 29th Street under any adopted HRB Criteria, due to a lack of integrity.

BACKGROUND

This item is being brought before the Historical Resources Board in conjunction with the owner's desire to have the site designated as a historical resource. The building is a two story single family home located on the southeast corner of 29th Street and Fir Street, surrounded by residential construction in the Seaman and Choates subdivision.

The building is located on APN 539-226-01-00. The property was located within the boundary of the 2011 Draft Golden Hill Reconnaissance Survey, but was not identified in the survey because the property was not found to be potentially individually eligible, and the property is located outside the boundary of the potential South Park Historic District identified by the consultant. The property was located within the boundary of the 1996 Mid-City Survey, but was not identified or evaluated as part of that survey. Lastly, the property was photo-documented in the late 1980s as part of the development of the Golden Hill Planned District Ordinance. That photo documentation is included in the applicant's report.

ANALYSIS

A historical resource research report was prepared by Johnson & Johnson Architecture, which concludes that the resource is significant under HRB Criterion C. Staff disagrees, and finds that the site not eligible for designation under HRB Criteria, due to a lack of integrity. This determination is consistent with the *Guidelines for the Application of Historical Resources Board Designation Criteria*, as follows.

CRITERION A - Exemplifies or reflects special elements of the City's, a community's or a neighborhood's historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping or architectural development.

There is no information provided to illustrate that the subject property exemplifies or reflects special elements of the historical, archaeological, cultural, social, economic, political, aesthetic, engineering, landscaping or architectural development of the City or Golden Hill. Therefore, staff does not recommend designation under HRB Criterion A.

CRITERION B - Is identified with persons or events significant in local, state or national history.

Chain of Title and City Directory research revealed past owners and tenants of the subject building, none of which appear to be historically significant individuals. Therefore, staff does not recommend designation under HRB Criterion B.

CRITERION C - Embodies distinctive characteristics of a style, type, period or method of construction or is a valuable example of the use of natural materials or craftsmanship.

The subject property located at 1845 29th Street is a two story single family home constructed in 1929 in the Spanish Eclectic style and features cross gable roofs with single barrel clay tiles; shallow eaves with simple rafter tails; moderately textured stucco over wood frame construction; and a concrete foundation. The entry porch is set under a broad, medium-pitched front gable with two wide arches and a small arched, slatted attic vent in the gable end. The wide arched openings extend around to the side and rear of the off-set projecting porch. To the right of the entry porch is a single lite arched window set in an arched recess. Above the arched window is a small wood balcony covered by a shed tile roof and accessed by a pair of 10-lite French doors. Scalloped stucco detailing is present just below the balcony. To the left of the balcony, under a small front gable, is an off-set octagonal window; and to the left of that, a two-over-two double hung wood frame and sash window. Fenestration throughout the house consists primarily of two-over-two double hung wood frame and sash replacement windows and single lite non-historic casement windows.

The present owner undertook substantial restoration work after purchasing the property in 2012. The entry porch had been partially enclosed at the north end sometime within the last 20 years, as seen in Section D.1 of the applicant's report. This enclosure has been removed and the full width of the porch restored. The owner also worked to restore the windows on the north and west facades of the house, which front onto Fir and 29th Streets, respectively. The restoration work was presented to the Design Assistance Subcommittee in March of 2013 (Attachment 1) and determined to be consistent with the Standards. The restoration from single lite casement

windows to 2-over-2 double hung wood windows was based upon one surviving window found on the side of the garage.

Some modifications remain. The original entry stairs did not include wing walls, which are present now. The original concrete walkway has been demolished and replaced with a brick walkway which can also be accessed from the Fir Street elevation, and tile has been added at the porch floor. The Residential Building Record indicates the presence of a one-story addition on the rear façade. Lastly, the roof has been replaced with a new clay tile roof and birdstops.

During the February site visit in preparation of this report, staff noted a significant discrepancy between the existing building and a photo included in the applicant's report taken in the late 1980s. This photo shows a pair of 3-lite casement windows centered under the front gable on the second floor of the main façade. Since the photo was taken, these paired casements were infilled, and the small octagonal window added. A comparison has been provided in Attachment 2. According to the consultant, this was done to accommodate a bathroom remodel. This modification was unknown at the time the building was previously reviewed by staff and the DAS during the restoration efforts. The photo also reveals the presence of wrought iron detailing at the fixed arched window on the main façade, which is no longer present. Additionally, staff noted some discrepancies in the treatment surrounding the windows throughout the house. The windows at the upper level behind the chimney are replacement windows which do not have the wooden sill found on the original window and the restored windows. However, these replacements do have a slightly sunken, beveled treatment (also seen in the 1980s photograph), which is missing on the restored windows that are set flush against the wall. This raises concerns regarding the window restorations and whether they were set appropriately and accurately in the building wall.

While the owner has undertaken restoration efforts that have significantly improved the design, materials and feeling aspects of integrity, the recent discovery of the window alteration at the front façade; the removal of the wrought iron detailing; and the questions regarding accurate treatment of window surrounds, taken together with the previously known modifications, result in significant cumulative impacts to the building's integrity related to its original Spanish Eclectic design. Therefore, staff does not recommend designation under HRB Criterion C at this time, due to a lack of integrity.

CRITERION D - Is representative of a notable work of a master builder, designer, architect, engineer, landscape architect, interior designer, artist or craftsman.

The architect (if any) and builder who designed and constructed the home are unknown. Therefore, the property is not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion D.

CRITERION E - Is listed or has been determined eligible by the National Park Service for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or is listed or has been determined eligible by the State Historical Preservation Office for listing on the State Register of Historical Resources.

The subject property has not been listed on or formally determined eligible for listing on the State or National Registers. Therefore, the property is not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion E.

CRITERION F - Is a finite group of resources related to one another in a clearly distinguishable way or is a geographically definable area or neighborhood containing improvements which have a special character, historical interest or aesthetic value or which represent one or more architectural periods or styles in the history and development of the City.

The subject property is not located within a designated historic district; therefore the property is not eligible for designation under HRB Criterion F.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS


If the property is designated by the HRB, conditions related to restoration or rehabilitation of the resource may be identified by staff during the Mills Act application process, and included in any future Mills Act contract.

CONCLUSION

Based on the information submitted and staff's field check, it is recommended that the property located at 1845 29th Street not be designated under any HRB Criteria, due to a lack of integrity. Designation brings with it the responsibility of maintaining the building in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The benefits of designation include the availability of the Mills Act Program for reduced property tax; the use of the more flexible Historical Building Code; flexibility in the application of other regulatory requirements; the use of the Historical Conditional Use Permit which allows flexibility of use; and other programs which vary depending on the specific site conditions and owner objectives.



Kelley Stanco
Senior Planner



Cathy Winterrowd
Deputy Director/HRB Liaison

KS/cw

Attachments:

1. Design Assistance Subcommittee Meeting Record of March 2013
2. Photo Comparison of Late 1980s and 2014.
3. Applicant's Historical Report under separate cover

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, March 6, 2013, 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 4:03PM

Subcommittee Members	Gail Garbini; Ann Woods; Tom Larimer
Recusals	
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown; Sarah Vonesh
Guests	
Item 3A	Ron May, Robert McLeod, Kiley Wallace
Item 3B	James Valentine, Paul Johnson, Sarai Johnson
Other	

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ ITEM 3A:

Listings: N/A

Address: 4019 Hawk Street

Historic Name: N/A

Significance: N/A

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Robert McLeod; Ron May

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Obtain input on the presence or absence of battered boxed columns on the partial width side gabled front porch. Based on other Martin Melhorn-designed homes, the consultant believes that the columns were original boxed. The un-boxed columns are visible in a photo from 1921 were exposed well into the 1970s. When the house was restored the area around the columns were investigated and there was evidence of paint and nail scarring. Based on that evidence the columns were boxed. The owner would like input on whether they should remain boxed or they should be unboxed.

Existing Square Feet: 1,000

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	I think it is a character-defining feature and it shows fairly clearly in the photo.
Woods	
Larimer	I would suspect that the columns were exposed when the home was built, which is supported by photos. If it was a battered box you would see a different shadow. I can only form an opinion on the information provided. It is attractive with boxed columns but they were not boxed in 1921. My recommendation is to remove the boxing to return it to un-boxed.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Columns should be un-boxed to reflect the 1921 photo.

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/AAddress: 1845 29th StreetHistoric Name: N/ASignificance: N/AMills Act Status: NoPTS #: N/AProject Contact: James Valentine; Paul JohnsonTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Obtain input on the correct window replacements. The majority of the windows have been replaced. There is an original window in the garage and there is a older photo that shows two of the seven windows that are not original. Is it acceptable to use the original garage window and the older photo of two of the windows to model the other five windows?

Existing Square Feet: N/AAdditional Square Feet: N/ATotal Proposed Square Feet: N/APrior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This property has come forward to staff seeking designation. Staff had concerns about some of the existing window replacements and some of the proposed replacements.

Applicant Presentation: We have a great photo of the original garage window. In some older photos we can see 2 original windows. We are proposing to take the two good photos of the windows and use them as a reference. We would like to do a dual pane, double hung window with simulated divided lights. The window openings on the existing windows are close to the original sizes. The stucco around the windows is slightly disturbed but we believe that it was done for the purpose flashing. We weren't able to locate any evidence of the original windows.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
If they were casements how would they have looked?	They would be oddly proportioned, so we believe they would not have been casement windows.
Any casements on the house originally?	No.
Are the large windows on the second floor fixed or operable?	They are currently casement-not original to the house.
Could you go with either double hung or casement?	We have existing double hung windows on the house.
How many windows total would you be replacing?	Seven

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	Having something slightly different, but similar is appropriate.
Woods	
Larimer	I think that it is OK to replace with double hung, simulated divided light 2/2 windows.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Stanco	All seven windows on the west and the south sides would receive the same treatment? (Yes)

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 4:49 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on April 3, 2013 at 4:00 PM.

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

1845 29TH STREET
Photo Comparison of Late 1980s and 2014



Late 1980s



2014

Today's Action: Designate the property as a historical resource under adopted designation criteria, or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Wise Cottage located at 1400 Virginia Way as a historical resource with a period of significance of 1914 under HRB Criteria A and C. The designation includes the mature pine tree at the corner of the lot near Virginia Way and Exchange Place. The designation excludes the attached casita and detached garage constructed in 1993.

Report Number: HRB 14-021

ITEM WAS CONTINUED TO THE APRIL 24, 2014 AGENDA AT STAFF'S REQUEST

ITEM 10 – 1845 29th STREET

Applicant: James and Johannah Valentine represented by Johnson & Johnson

Location: 1845 29th Street, 92101, Greater Golden Hill Community, Council District 3 (1289 1-E)

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 1845 29th Street as a historical resource.

Today's Action: Designate the property as a historical resource under adopted designation criteria, or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Do not designate the property located at 1845 29th Street under any adopted HRB Criteria, due to a lack of integrity.

Report Number: HRB 14-023

Report by Kelley Stanco

Testimony Received:

In Favor: None

In Opposition: Paul Johnson, Sarai Johnson, Johanna Valentine

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Berge recommends that it goes back to DAS for further review.

Boardmember Silvas thought Miguel Lopez was a contractor.

Boardmember Bethke is not troubled by the window, he has seen worse. Questioned why it is significant, he is on the fence.

Boardmember Larimer thinks the octagonal window is troublesome, but wasn't sure if it was enough to detract from home.

Vice-Chair Garbini asked about the front walls.

Chair Lemmo thinks the octagonal window is strikingly odd and was surprised it didn't come up at DAS. He doesn't like doing analysis of significance on the spot, but supports designation under Criterion C.

Boardmember Curry thinks that it may be significant under Criterion A. Property still has integrity, supports designation.

Boardmember Baksh stated that it is a nice house and appreciates all of the work. He supports Staff's recommendation.

Boardmember Woods also commends the owner; she is on the fence for designation under Criterion C. May be possible to designate under Criterion A.

Boardmember Rivera was in support of Staff's recommendation but is not sure now if it just comes down to a window.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY CHAIR LEMMO TO CONTINUE ITEM 10 – 1845 29TH STREET INDEFINITELY TO GIVE THE APPLICANT AN OPPORTUNITY TO LOOK MORE AT THEIR PROPERTY AND GO TO THE DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Seconded by Boardmember Berge

Vote: 10-0-0

Motion Passes

ITEM 11 – LEVI AND HANNAH LINDSKOOG SPEC HOUSE #1

Applicant: Joshua and Brooke Hesseltine represented by Johnson & Johnson

Location: 2435 Bancroft Street, 92104, Greater North Park Community, Council District 3 (1289 1-F)

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 2435 Bancroft Street as a historical resource.

Today's Action: Designate the property as a historical resource under adopted designation criteria, or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the Levi and Hannah Lindskoog Spec House #1 located at 2435 Bancroft Street as a historical resource with a period of significance of 1929 under HRB Criterion C.

Report Number: HRB 14-024

Report by Kelley Stanco

Testimony Received:

In Favor: None

In Opposition: None

Board Discussion:

Boardmember Rivera questioned where the file was. The removal of the side entry door is significant. The addition of the exterior walkway tile and site wall also impacts the integrity of the original home.

Boardmember Berge is not troubled by the removal of the secondary door and new site wall.

Boardmembers Woods, Baksh, Curry, Garbini, Larimer, Bethke, Silvas and Berge expressed support for the staff recommendation.

BOARD ACTION:

MOTION BY CHAIR LEMMO TO DESIGNATE ITEM 11 – LEVI AND HANNAH LINDSKOOG SPEC HOUSE #1 PER STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION

Seconded by Boardmember Woods

Vote: 9-1-0

Motion Passes

(Rivera)

ITEM 12 – THE UNITED STATES HOLDING COMPANY SPEC HOUSE

Applicant: Charles and Sally Stovall represented by Jaye MacAskill

Location: 2304 Juan Street, 92103, Uptown Community, Council District 3 (1268 5-G)

Description: Consider the designation of the property located at 2304 Juan Street as a historical resource.

Today's Action: Designate the property as a historical resource under adopted designation criteria, or do not designate.

Staff Recommendation: Designate the United States Holding Company Spec House located at 2304 Juan Street as a historical resource with a period of significance of ca. 1953 under HRB Criterion C.

Report Number: HRB 14-025

ITEM PASSED ON CONSENT

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, July 2, 2014, 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 4:03

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (chair); Gail Garbini; Ann Woods; Tom Larimer
Recusals	
City Staff	
Guests	HRB Kelley Stanco; Jodie Brown;
	Item 3A Tabitha McMahon; Micah Parzen; Kitty Vieth
	Item 3B Cindy Blair; Mike Georgopoulos; Ken Lovi; Mark Rojas
	Item 3C Paul Johnson; Sarai Johnson; Jane Valentine
	Item 3D Dieter Fenkart-Froeschl
	Other Bruce Coons, SOHO

2. Public Comment (on matters not on the agenda) None

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #1; National Register Historic Landmark District

Address:

Historic Name: Museum of Man & California Tower

Significance:

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Micah Parzen, Museum of Man; Kitty Vieth, Architectural Resources Group

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes improvements required to make the California Tower accessible to the public once again. Modifications are primarily interior, and include firewalls and compliant hand rails (as well as preservation of historic

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Push it back and break up the mass with a different material and eliminate the L shape.	
What color is the awning?	It could be gray or red and would be retractable.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee member	Comments
Bethke	My concern is the solid addition at the front façade. It should be moved back and maybe the elevator should be glass. To soften lines. It should be far back as possible. If it is too modern on top, it would be too stark next to the historic building. I think that we would need something to soften the glass. You could do brick pillars in between the glass.
Garbini	I like the second story restaurant. I have concern about the glass rail.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications: That the elevator is set back and perhaps it is glass. The glass rail has brick pillars in between

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:

Address: 1845 29th Street

Historic Name:

Significance:

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: James and Johannah Valentine; Paul Johnson

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Seeking assistance on remediation of window replacements. The existing windows were replaced with wood framed casements. This replacement action was reviewed by the Design Assistance Subcommittee. After completion of the window replacement work, a photo was found which brings into question the accuracy of the wood window replacement.

Existing Square Feet:

Additional Square Feet:

Total Proposed Square Feet:

Prior DAS Review: Mar-13

Staff Presentation: You saw this property when they were doing some window restoration for designation. They are coming back to discuss the front octagonal window and the side windows and how they were set in the wall plane.

Applicant Presentation: We had an existing window on the garage that we were basing all of the restoration work on. The question came about with a historic photo that shows an octagonal window which will be restored. The real question is how the windows splay in the historic photo and on the south side. The windows were replaced and we believe that the splay happened when they windows were replaced and it was a typical flashing method.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	It looks like it was set back to me which would cause the splay. Sometimes the windows had the same treatment to make the walls appear thicker like adobe.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What were the concerns in the original report?	Aside from the central window, the wrought iron detail, the treatment of the window surrounds without the wood sills and the bevel treatment.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	I would recommend that you use the existing window on the garage that is original.
Garbini	We don't have any evidence that it was inset, so we should go with what we know what was there. I would go with the physical evidence.
Larimer	The bathroom would appear that it is set in the wall. I would restore to the slight inset.
Woods	I would go with the garage one that is not inset.
Bethke	Reasonable to restore to the garage appearance/setting.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications:

Windows should be set flush.

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 3D:

Listings: HRB Site #1; National Register Historic Landmark District

Address: 1450 El Prado

Historic Name: Balboa Park Historic District

Significance:

Mills Act Status: N/A

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Dieter Fenkart-Froeschl; Craig Voss

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The museum would like to replace an existing fabric awning with hard shell canopy. The new hard shell canopy will not impact or change park views or the historic 1960s modernistic addition, and the hard shell canopy will be lower in height than the existing canopy.

Existing Square Feet:

Additional Square Feet:

Total Proposed Square Feet:

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This item involves the sculpture garden. The SDMA currently has a cover over the garden which has not fared well. The canopy was installed in 1993. They would like to replace with a sturdier canopy.


Applicant Presentation: Between 2003 and 2011, the canopy has failed 3 times and was tweaked with each repair. We are proposing nothing that will change the park views and is reversible. The truss system will be very sleek and will not impact the exterior views. The existing canopy is 6' above the height of the roof and proposed will be only 4' above the roof.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Do you have a cleaning process? (we can power wash)

Q&A:


Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
---------------------------------------	----------------------



The header of the new window lines up with the header of the window to the left and the French doors to the right, as it should. However, the bottom sill of the new window only extends down just below the upper sash of the window to the left, and the length of 1-2/3 panes on the French doors.

The width of the new window extends out just over the length of 1 roofing tile on either side of the gable peak.

Additionally, the right side of the window is set just inside the outside wall of the porch; and the left side of the window lines stops just short of the fifth roofing tile.



The bottom sill of the original window extended down approximately half-way down the lower sash of the window to the left, and the length of 2-1/2 panes on the French doors.

The width of the original window extends out the length of nearly 2 roofing tiles on either side of the gable peak.

Additionally, the right side of the window is set just outside of the outside wall of the porch; and the left side of the window extends into the fifth roofing tile.

Although the roofing has been replaced since this photograph, the same number of tiles are present along the roof-wall junction, indicating replacement with the same size tile.

