

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, July 1, 2009, at 4:00 PM

12th Floor Conference Room 12B

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (Chair); Salvador Aréchiga; Maria Curry
Recusals	None
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders; Cathy Winterrowd; Jodie Brown; Joseph Fantone; Andrew Goodrich
CP&CI	Todd Schmit
Park & Rec	Susan Lowery-Mendoza
City Attorney	Nina Fain
Guests	
Item 3A	Daniel Contreras and Felipe Romo, Milano Group
Item 3B	Seth Larson, Lars Construction
Item 3C	James Kidrick, SD Air & Space Museum; Ben Wier
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO; Paul Johnson; Sarai Johnson; Vicki Granowitz, Balboa Park Committee; Judi O'Boyle; Donald Taylor

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

None

Boardmember Comment

Aréchiga: DAS may want to appoint a back-up for the Chair in the event of his absence.

Bethke: Should the issue of historic windows and window replacement to achieve energy efficiency be docketed at DAS?

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #820

Address: 123 East Seaward

Historic Name: Henry Rundell and Amanda Rundell House

Significance: HRB Criteria A (Special Element of Development); C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: No Contract

PTS #: 62496

Project Contact: Felipe Romo, Milano Group; on behalf of the owner, Alejandro Macedo

Treatment: Rehabilitation and Relocation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation and relocation project proposes to relocate a designated historic resource located at 123 East Seaward within the project site to a new location fronting on Beyer Boulevard. The project previously proposed demolition of the resource; however, the applicant was highly encouraged by DAS at the June 11, 2007 meeting to retain and rehabilitate the resource within the project site. The applicant is returning to DAS with a proposal in response to that direction.

Existing Square Feet: 1,988

Additional Square Feet: none

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: 7/11/2007

Staff Presentation: The property is located in San Ysidro and is one of the few resources in San Ysidro. The project was reviewed by DAS previously in July of 2007, at which time the DAS directed the applicant to relocate the house within the project site, and pointed to a location immediately to the west of the house's current site, although a misunderstanding of the plans' orientation led the Subcommittee to say immediately to the north. The revised project has relocated the structure to the far north of the project site off of Beyer Boulevard and has rotated the house so it now sits with its side to the street, as opposed to the front. Staff has concerns with the new location, which is not consistent with prior DAS direction, and the proposed orientation, which will be not be consistent with its historic orientation fronting on a street.

Applicant Presentation: Project originally included 24 units and included demolition of the resource. The applicant wanted to relocate it offsite, but DAS recommended relocation of the resource on site immediately to the west. The applicant is now proposing to relocate the building to the north off of Beyer Boulevard. They felt this would lend the house greater visibility and importance, because East Seaward is a dead-end, and Beyer Blvd is a main thoroughfare. The idea behind reorienting the house to the interior of the lot was to incorporate it into a park setting and increase the visibility of the main façade to passing drivers. The topography of the site, which includes an 8 foot drop, also limits options for siting at this location.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Noted the importance of the Little Landers Colony. If the was always oriented toward a street, it should still be oriented toward the street. If it wasn't on a street during the period of significance, he has less of an issue changing the orientation.
Johnson	Wanted to clarify that it will be used as a single family residence. (Yes)

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
When was it constructed?	c.1912
Is the project over-parked?	No, just meets the requirement.
If you rotated the house would it fit in the park?	Maybe, but it would be tight and there are topography issues.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Aréchiga	Doesn't have a problem with reorienting it toward the interior of the lot.
Curry	The area is very urbanized and conflicted. The setting has been dramatically altered from its agrarian past and is now highly urbanized. Believes the argument the applicant has made for reorienting it and incorporating it into a park is compelling. Is pleased that the house will stay in San Ysidro. It could be better, but it's acceptable.
Bethke	Not sure how significant it is other than architecture, in which case the siting isn't highly important.

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Winterrowd	The project will require a Site Development Permit for relocation, which will include a treatment plan.

Recommended Modifications: The relocated site and orientation is acceptable as proposed.

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 #526-147

Address: 2617 San Marcos

Historic Name: Burlingame District Contributor

Significance: Contributing Element

Mills Act Status: Active Contract, Recorded 2007

PTS #: 182611

Project Contact: Seth Larson, Lars Construction; on behalf of the owners, Peter and Laura Giacalone

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to add a 1,003 square foot two-story addition at the rear of a one-story contributing house to the Burlingame Historic District.

Existing Square Feet: 1,048

Additional Square Feet: 1,003

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,353

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: The property is a contributing resource to the Burlingame Historic District. The house is a colonial cottage with a “U”-shaped floor plan. The cottage is simple with a gable roof with jerkinheads, stucco exterior and multi-lite wood frame windows. The applicant is proposing a two story addition at the rear of the property. Staff has a few concerns about the addition. First, the addition replicates the historic house, which creates a false sense of history. Second, it is highly visible, not subordinate, and sits over the original house. Third, the side patio currently has a temporary enclosure, and the project will create a permanent enclosed space.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant’s goal was to conform to the existing historic house and neighborhood character while gaining extra space. The second floor addition is pulled back from the original to leave the original eaveline and roof form somewhat intact and visible. The applicant has worked on design revisions since meeting with staff and made several changes. They pulled the roof pitch down on the addition and changed the roof form to differentiate from the original house.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Judi O’Boyle	She lives on San Marcos and wants to raise global issues regarding the district. There are no alleys in Burlingame, so second story additions impact neighboring properties to the rear. This is a very unique house and the only one that looks like a cottage. Doesn’t like the project presented today. The neighborhood has seen a number of substantial renovations since becoming a district. Most have been beautiful, but on 30 th Street and San Marcos Avenue there have been a number of second story additions that change the character of the community. The houses adjacent to this are single story. This addition is not hidden and changes the nature of the cottage.
Don Taylor	They are already on a slope way above the sidewalk, so the addition will be very high.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
Was it architect designed, or designed by a designer?	Designer.

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
How long has the family been there?	9 years
What is the existing square footage?	1,048 square feet
How far back is the second floor addition from the front face of the house?	25.5 feet
What is the required rear setback?	13 feet

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Aréchiga	The addition is massive and dwarfs the historic house. Suggests pushing into the rear yard as opposed to going up. The project is currently set back 19.5 feet from the rear property line, that could be reduced to 13' per the zone and the square footage moved to the ground floor. Any second floor addition should be set back as far as possible.
Curry	Looks more like an infill project because of the scale of the house. Agrees with staff in terms of the scale and the false sense of history. The addition should not overwhelm the house or detract from the significance.
Bethke	Agrees with staff and the subcommittee. Would like to see if the additional square footage could be added at the ground floor.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: Reduce the scope of the project as necessary to pull the square footage down to the first floor, and work to differentiate the addition from the original house to a greater degree. The applicant can work with staff to redesign the project per DAS comments.

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 #1; National Register Landmark DistrictAddress: 2001 Pan American PlazaHistoric Name: Balboa Park, Pan-America PlazaSignificance: Contributing ElementMills Act Status: No Contract, City Owned

PTS #: 172811

Project Contact: James Kidrick, San Diego Air and Space Museum

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This project proposes to introduce a 96'-5" tall Atlas 2E Mercury Space Launch vehicle to Pan America Plaza. The item was previously considered by the DAS on September 3, 2008 and June 3, 2009. Locations previously considered include: centered in the parking lot of Pan America Plaza, in front of the Hall of Champions at the corner of Presidents Way and Pan America Plaza, and immediately adjacent to the Air and Space Museum Building. At the last DAS meeting, the Subcommittee indicated that a location behind the museum may be supported. The applicant is returning to DAS to discuss options in more detail.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: 9/3/2008; 6/3/2009

Staff Presentation: This project proposes to introduce a 96'-5" tall Atlas 2E Mercury Space Launch vehicle to Pan America Plaza. The item was previously considered by the DAS on September 3, 2008 and June 3, 2009. Locations previously considered include: centered in the parking lot of Pan America Plaza, in front of the Hall of Champions at the corner of Presidents Way and Pan America Plaza, and immediately adjacent to the Air and Space Museum Building. At the last DAS meeting, the Subcommittee indicated that a location behind the museum may be supported. The applicant is returning to DAS to discuss options in more detail.

Applicant Presentation: The original proposed locations were adjacent to the Hall of Champions and in the center of the parking lot. The revised location brought to DAS last month was immediately adjacent to the Air and Space Museum building. The applicant has provided some perspectives with heights of elements within the park noted. Another proposed location is on the lawn to the north across the road that surrounds the building. The applicant met with SOHO, and SOHO prefers the parking lot location or the lawn to the north of the Air and Space Museum. The applicant noted that the Atlas would be a completely reversible installation. The goal today was to present the DAS with a number of locations and get their feedback. If the selected location is out of the leasehold, the applicant will continue to work with the City to address that. Because the Museum can't have access to every model of the Atlas, they have chosen to configure the Atlas they have with the Mercury capsule to acknowledge its contribution to aerospace.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Vicki Granowitz	Wanted to clarify for the record that the Balboa Park Committee has not reviewed or approved the project. Agrees that it was important artifact of the Cold War. Referenced a NASA spaceflight.com blog concerned that placing the Mercury capsule on top will create a false sense of history as to what the Atlas was.

Name	Comments
Judi O'Boyle	Putting a space capsule on an Atlas intended to launch a warhead is wrong and misinforms the public. It recreates history. The period of significance for the plaza does not relate to the era of the Atlas. It would be a very large addition, and the second largest structure in the park. General Dynamics left San Diego in 1970's and left many people unemployed. The people who worked for them should be honored, but not the company.
Bruce Coons	The Museum has been before SOHO's Preservation Action Committee. Had requested the Atlas be located behind the Museum, which will not work. The artifact is very important to San Diego, and it should be preserved by the Air and Space Museum. The consensus of the Subcommittee was that the site on the lawn to the north near the restroom was the most appropriate site. That area of the park promoted the entrance into the space age and was historically an exhibit space. The subcommittee also found the parking lot location to be appropriate because the Standard Oil Tower was historically in that location. Noted that the Atlas was simply a launch vehicle and could be configured a number of different ways, depending on its mission.
Ben Wier	Representative of the 30,000 people who worked on Atlas. It incorrect to say the Atlas is a missile pointed to the sky ready to shoot someone down. It kept the peace and was never fired in aggression. Astronauts were launched into space on the Atlas, and it was recently launched to take photos of the moon's surface.

Q&A: None

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Aréchiga	Not in favor of placing the Atlas anywhere in the Park. At the last meeting they asked to see a location at the rear with full site plans, topo, etc. and that has not been presented to the Subcommittee.
Curry	Still in favor of placing the Atlas in the park. Thinks the Atlas is very important and part of the history of the U.S. and San Diego. The main issue is location. Agrees that you need to be careful when it comes to putting more objects in the park, but this is a significant artifact that will contribute to the park.
Bethke	Agrees with Curry. Doesn't think their job is to comment on whether or not it is appropriate for the Museum to

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	interpret the artifact the way they are. The location on the lawn to the north away from the building and is acceptable and would not be an adverse impact to the District as a whole.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The location across the road on the lawn to the north near the restroom would not be an adverse impact on the district and would be consistent with the Standards.

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 5:32PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on August 5, 2009 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at KMSaunders@san Diego.gov or 619.236.6545