

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, December 5, 2012, 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 4:00PM

Subcommittee Members Gail Garbini; Ann Woods; Tom Larimer

Recusals

City Staff

HRB Jodie Brown; Sarah Vonesh, Camille Pekarek

Guests

Item 3A Hilary Backman, Daniel Bertao, Jack Gallagher, Todd Schmidt, Kevin Oliver

Item 3B Soheil Nakhshab

Item 3C Janet O'Dea

Other

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #564

Address: 2600 Golf Course Drive

Historic Name: Balboa Park Municipal Golf Course Clubhouse

Significance: A (Cultural Landscape); B (Historical Event); C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Todd Schmidt and Jack Gallagher

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: The existing clubhouse building will be incorporated into the golf course Master Plan with the design and construction of new golf clubhouse facilities. The program calls for additional functions and spaces which would more than double the size of the existing clubhouse. A Historical Report recommends the demolition of various clubhouse additions that were constructed out of character with the original historical period of 1934-1940.

Existing Square Feet: 9,400
Additional Square Feet: 16,000
Total Proposed Square Feet: 25,400
Prior DAS Review: 7/11/2012

Staff Presentation: Today's discussion is a continuation of the July DAS meeting. The consultants and the Parks and Recreation Department would like to present the latest design information on the project.

Applicant Presentation: At the July meeting we brought two potential designs with a new building attached to the existing clubhouse and the other not attached. At the meeting you expressed desire to keep the buildings detached. Our proposed design keeps the new building detached. On the existing clubhouse, we are proposing a rehabilitation. We are not doing any additions. On the north façade there is an existing non-historic addition which we are proposing to take down. We are also proposing to reconstruct the planters that are shown in the historic photos. We are restoring the porch and the pergola on the west elevation. The beams and fireplace will remain and be restored.

On the new building we have a design that is very campus like and consistent with the Ranch design similar to Cliff Mays design. Large event space and cantilevered over hanging deck. The building is long and has a strong indoor/outdoor feel with a very long and linear feel.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Soheil Nakhshab	I like the existing clubhouse. It is nice to eat and enjoy the view.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What is the connection with the historic building?	It is left alone. We wanted to pay homage to the existing building but go in a new direction.
It looks like you got away from the retaining wall that was an issue before.	Yes, we took your comments to heart and eliminated the retaining wall.
At the last meeting there was discussion about retaining the restaurant use.	It will be relocated to the new building.
What date are you restoring the property to?	After reading the consultant's report, we are proposing the recommendations in the report. The starter room from the 1960s will be removed and the building will be restored to the 1930s.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Larimer	They are essentially not really touching the historic building and restoring the original building. It is exciting to see the introduction of the Cliff May style. I like the design and work to the historic building is appropriate.
Garbini	Really exciting.
Woods	I agree with Tom's comments.

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: HRB Site #278

Address: 1620 State Street

Historic Name: Ordway Residence

Significance: C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Soheil Nakhshab

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Rehabilitation and relocation of the existing residence to the front of the lot. Construction of a new 4-story addition at the rear of the existing historic house. New building will consist of 15 new units.

Existing Square Feet: 708

Additional Square Feet: 17,500

Total Proposed Square Feet: 18,208

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The property at 1620 State Street has received a lot of interest for since it went on the market. The existing proposal would maintain the house on the lot and relocated it to the front of the lot to accommodate new construction at the rear of the lot. The new construction is compatible but distinguished by its design.

Applicant Presentation: We want to do a loft style living proposal. If you look at the aerial we are essentially keeping the building in tact with the exception of the rear non historic addition. We are proposing to remove the non historic additions. At the front we will have to remove deteriorated floor which will be addressed with the relocation. We want to add a green wall to the side of the commercial building. On the new construction, we will complement the historic building with the use of similar siding. There is an internal courtyard, so if the neighboring site is ever redeveloped there will always be natural light. We can maintain surface parking and do not need to go below ground. There are currently two entry doors into the house. We are proposing that the door to the left is the entrance to the house. The other door will access the other units. The mailboxes will also be within this area that would lead to a podium.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
The front of each of the four neighboring houses all line up? How far forward will you move it?	Yes, we will move it about 13 ' to the front
How far to the left?	Approximately, 8' to the left
Is there a reason that you decided to move it away from the historic buildings?	I wanted to highlight the elevation on the right side/entrance.
What is the height of the run of stairs going to the main level?	The podium is going to be 9 to 9.5 at most. The ceiling is 11' with 4' in the attic.
Can you make the stair work without altering the roof?	We may have to cut the back of the roof. We could also put the stairs on the outside of the cottage.
How many units in the building?	16 including the house

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Larimer	We have a home that is designated historic. I don't feel comfortable with moving the home and altering the home to accommodate the stairs. I don't feel comfortable altering the setback that is consistent with the other four homes altering the historic character of the four homes. Raising it off the ground may be a visual benefit but not a contextual benefit.
Garbini	I think I would not have a problem if the building was raised a little. I too have an issue with the neighbors. It would be good to keep the streetscape relationship. The

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	addition will impact the historic house next door. I have less of a concern about moving the house. The relationship between this and the neighboring house is critical. It is necessary to look at the mass of the yellow house and the white house and balance them.
Woods	Concerned about the separation this property and the other designated historic resources.

Staff Comment:

None

Recommended Modifications: The house could be move forward, but it should be placed closer to the other historic homes to maintain the streetscape. The house should also not be placed forward of the neighboring homes.

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 #487Address: 1824 Sunset Blvd.Historic Name: The Meyers House (John S. Graves Speculation)Significance: C (Architecture)Mills Act Status: YesPTS #: N/AProject Contact: Janet O'Dea; Allen Hazard; Jim StaffordTreatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Replace the aluminum window that was installed in the laundry room addition with a wood window and trim that would be proportional in size to the adjacent kitchen window. The window would either be double hung or casement to differentiate it from the original windows.

Existing Square Feet: 1,330Additional Square Feet: 0Total Proposed Square Feet: 1,330Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The owner has an addition with a metal window which she would like to replace with a wood framed window. The owner would like to discuss the replacement window with the subcommittee.

Applicant Presentation: The laundry room is an addition. It currently has an aluminum window and we think we could make it look better. We have restucco the house and thought that we would do the window at the same time.

Public Comment:

None

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
When was the laundry room constructed	In the 1970s. The original exterior door is still in place.
Would the window be a double hung?	Yes, the molding would be the same and closer to the sloping roof line by four inches.
Which window would it match?	It would match the living room window.
Have you done any investigations for the overhead space?	We have not.
The size and shape of the window suggest a casement, have you looked at it?	Yes, I am open to a casement window.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Garbini	The window should be a single or dual casement window with the molding to match the historic windows.
Marrone	
Woods	

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 5:28PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on January 2, 2013 at 4:00 PM.

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