

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, February 4, 2015, 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 4.02PM

Subcommittee Members      Ann Woods; Tom Larimer

City Staff

HRB    Jodie Brown; Joseph Castro

Guests

Item 3A    Matthew Welsh

Item 3B    Justin Mandelbaum

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

### 3. Project Reviews

#### ▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #1062

Address: 7762 Bishops Lane

Historic Name: Lillian Lentell Cottages

Significance: A (Special Element)

Mills Act Status: No

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Matthew Welsh; Taal Safdie; Ricardo Rabines

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: Relocation of property at 7762 Bishops Lane to an adjacent lot.

Construction of two-car garage with second story studio, between relocated cottage and 817 Silverado.

Existing Square Feet: 435

Additional Square Feet:

Total Proposed Square Feet:

Prior DAS Review: Jun-14

Staff Presentation: The project was previously seen in May 2014, when the applicant proposed to move both of the Lillian Lentell Cottages to the 817 Silverado site. DAS

determined the project was not consistent with the Standards. With this new project, the applicant is proposing to relocate the house at 7762 Bishops Lane to the parcel with 817 Silverado. The applicant would place the designated resource at the rear of the lot and in-between the two buildings, construct two stories with a garage and unit above it.

Applicant Presentation: There are two cottages that were designated known as the Lillian Lental Cottages. We would like to relocate the rear cottage behind 817 Silverado and construct a parking garage in between them.

Public Comment:

N/A

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
If you maintain the eave at the front will you run out of head room?	No I will have 7' so the head room will be preserved.
So it is the rear window that would be removed-buried beneath the stairs?	Yes.
Are you taking off the exterior material to accommodate the stairs?	We are still figuring out.
How is this project consistent with the Standards?	The house is only moving 11' over and we are preserving the house with the exception of a few minor changes.
But you are removing a portion of the house to accommodate the new stairs?	Yes.
How will the deck be supported?	It has not yet been engineered.
Will be it moved altogether to another property?	Yes, it will be 10' off the alley.
Beside the view, we will be losing public view of the side of the house?	Yes, it is not a public side, but you will be gaining view of the other side.
What is supporting the staircase? Will you lose the function of a window?	It could have a wall under it. It will be located in the garage.
You are removing the upper eave? And the attic vents	Yes in the back. The vents would still be there.
I have concerns that the stairs are getting close to the side of the building. You will lose the functionality of the window if you were to support the building from below, and not engage the house.	The stairs could be supported by themselves but the deck is the issue.
On the deck you are carving out of the roof and support structure and changing the roof line and structure.	What about if the deck is eliminated, but the eave is clipped to still accommodate the stairs?

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
What is the period of significance?	1913-1915

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Larimer	I think that this should be brought back to the March meeting. Given the context of the other properties that have been relocated, I will have a little more comfort with the alterations to this house. When you come back think about the historicity of the structure and how you are engaging it.

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 #1125Address: 7727 Lookout DriveHistoric Name: George and Marion Cottrell/Cliff May HouseSignificance: C (Architecture); D (Master Architect)Mills Act Status: NoPTS #: 378372Project Contact: Justin Mandelbaum; Tony CrisafiTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: Introduction of a new sliding kitchen window in the interior courtyard area.Existing Square Feet: 3178Additional Square Feet: 0Total Proposed Square Feet: 3178Prior DAS Review: Dec-14

Staff Presentation: The applicant was previously seen by DAS regarding the kitchen window in December 2014. DAS members had questions about the proposed design and requested the muntin pattern of the proposed window be re-visited.

Applicant Presentation: We remodeled the kitchen and would like to remove the small window that was previously located in a bathroom. We would like to make the window operable to make it accessible from the kitchen to the interior courtyard which is not visible from the public right of way. Our original proposal was to keep it single light, but at the last meeting you wanted to see some other light patterns. Cliff May actually put a single light sliding glass door on his own home, so our original proposal was single light window. It will present as a new element. There are other windows and doors on the house that are also single light and this design would be consistent with this design.

Public Comment:

N/A

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
So it will slide into a pocket?	No, it will slide on a track on the outside face.
I like the one with the 16 lights. It seems more complementary.	
I appreciate that you have taken the time to study the different light patterns. I agree with Ann and like the 16 light window, but understand the desire to have the single light.	
I think that the approach that you are taking, either approach is consistent with the Standards.	
So this would be a wood window?	Yes

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Larimer	The proposed design, as a single light window is appropriate.

Staff Comment:

N/A

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

4. Adjourned at 5.09 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on March 4, 2015 at 4:00 PM.

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