

CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 19, 2010, at 4:00 PM

5th Floor Large Conference Room

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE

Subcommittee Members	Alex Bethke (Chair); Gail Garbini
Recusals	None
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders
City Attorney	Nina Fain
Guests	
Item 3A	John Eisenhart, Union Architects; Eva Thorn, Union Architects
Item 3B	James Middleton, Andaz San Diego; Marie Burke Lia, Attorney
Item 3C	Ione Stiegler, IS Architecture; Brandy Dewhurst, IS Architecture; Julie Sullivan; Bob Sullivan
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO; Ashley Christensen, SOHO; Paul Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Architecture

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

3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #218

Address: 643 26th Street

Historic Name: Frank Zinnel House

Significance: Architecture (Mission Revival)

Mills Act Status: Active Contract Effective 1996

PTS #: 205228

Project Contact: John Eisenhart, Architect; on behalf of the owner

Treatment: Restoration/Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This restoration and rehabilitation project proposes to resolve outstanding code enforcement and Mills Act violations related to deferred maintenance and

unpermitted modifications that have adversely impacted the structure. The project has been submitted to the Development Services Department and is under review by historic resources staff. Due to the extent of the deferred maintenance and unpermitted modifications, staff is requiring the preparation of a treatment plan, and review of the restoration project by DAS.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This restoration and rehabilitation project proposes to resolve outstanding code enforcement and Mills Act violations related to deferred maintenance and unpermitted modifications that have adversely impacted the structure. The project has been submitted to the Development Services Department and is under review by historic resources staff. Staff has requested clarification of some of the restoration work, the need for replacement materials and the new materials proposed. Due to the extent of the deferred maintenance and unpermitted modifications, staff is requiring the preparation of a treatment plan, and review of the restoration project by DAS.

Applicant Presentation: The original house was designed in the Mission/Prairie style with a rear unit and a porte cochere between. A duplex was constructed at the back of the lot over the old garage. There is severe water penetration into the eaves, which project 30 inches beyond the face of the wall. Water was building up and the eaves and stucco have begun to fail. The eaves, including the structural members and stucco, will therefore be replaced. The exterior stucco is deteriorated and falling down in places. At the porch, dry rot and termites have damaged it to the extent that it needs to be reframed and the stucco re-done. The determination regarding what materials can and cannot be salvaged can't be made until the walls are opened up and the framing revealed. These determinations will therefore be made in the field, which will be incorporated into the treatment plan. The owner wants to maintain access to a deck above the porch. A glass railing will be required to provide minimum railing height and will be set behind the parapet, not on top of it.

The windows are boarded up, but every window appears to be in place and will be re-installed. No window alterations will occur, with the exception of the rear laundry room area, where one window opening will be in-filled. At the duplex, the original window openings will be restored and the unpermitted vinyl windows will be replaced with wood frame and sash. The foundation was constructed of rubble rock c. 1912. There is deterioration of the foundation wall and in some places no foundation at all. One foundation wall in the best condition will be kept and the other three sides will need to be replaced. The applicant is proposing right-of-way improvements, including a site wall that will tie structures together, provide a useable courtyard and sound attenuation from 94 freeway.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Evaluated the building 8 or 9 years ago and there was a lot of damage and rot then. Everything sounds good with

Name	Comments
	the exception of the glass on the parapet. Concerned about the reflection. Black painted railing with thin bars may be more appropriate.
Stiegler	There is an identical house on Sunset in Mission Hills, if they need a point of reference.
Johnson	If you went with a black railing instead of glass, it would have 4” separation and might have a Venetian blind effect.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant’s Response
What Treatment are you looking at, Restoration or Rehabilitation?	Restoration for main house and apartment, Rehabilitation for the duplex.
What is the height of the historic parapet at the porch?	Just under 2’
Concerned about the landscaping.	The wall will screen the house from the 94 fwy and will provide security.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	If the applicant is using the Restoration Standards, the railing at the balcony wouldn’t be appropriate, but could be permitted through Rehabilitation Standards. Not too concerned with the details as long as the Treatment Plan adequately addresses treatment of the materials consistent with the Standards.

Staff Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: None. Proceed with Treatment Plan as outlined in the presentation and the submitted materials.

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 #701

Address: 612 F Street

Historic Name: Maryland Hotel

Significance: Criterion C (Neoclassical Architecture with Italian Renaissance Revival elements) and Criterion D (Master Architect William Sterling Hebbard)

Mills Act Status: No Contract; Redevelopment Area

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Michael Marks, Kelly Capital; Marie Burke Lia, Attorney

Treatment: Restoration

Project Scope: The painted “Maryland Hotel” sign that was located on the north masonry wall of the hotel was inadvertently painted over with a much larger black background Ivy Hotel sign. At the October 2007 DAS meeting options were discussed regarding incorporating a copy of the historic Maryland Hotel sign as part of or in the area of the new large Ivy Hotel sign, but the issue was not resolved. The issue was discussed at DAS again in February 2010, at which time DAS directed the applicant to repaint the original sign. The DAS further stated that incorporation of new signage between the "Hotel" signage could be considered. The applicant is returning to DAS with a proposal for restoration of the original sign and incorporation of new painted signage.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: N/A

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: February 2010; October 2007

Staff Presentation: This project has been reviewed by the DAS on two occasions, most recently in February 2010, at which time DAS directed the applicant to repaint the original sign. The DAS further stated that incorporation of new signage between the "Hotel" signage could be considered. The applicant is returning to DAS with a proposal for restoration of the original sign and incorporation of new painted signage.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant has provided an outline of the history of the hotel and its name and uses over the years. The first photo in the packet from 2005 is the only known photo that shows the painted Maryland sign. The second photo shows the Ivy Hotel signage. The third attachment is the DAS minutes from October 2007. The fourth attachment is a photo of the current condition of the sign. The fifth attachment is a rendering of the proposed signage. The last attachment is a copy of the Standards for Reconstruction and Rehabilitation. The applicant is proposing to repaint the “Maryland” sign, recreating the brick detailing; and add a new painted sign below for the Andaz Hotel. The black border on the “Hotel” sign in the 2005 photo is clearly painted over the “Maryland” sign, indicating that it is not original.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Better than the last project. The name appears to have been Maryland since the hotel’s opening. Believes the proposal is a reasonable alternative. The “Hotel” signs in

Name	Comments
	the 2005 photo are clearly a later sign.
Eisenhart	The signage is fine as proposed. Might suggest a banner for the new hotel name to differentiate and make the new hotel name stand out.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
To Coons: Could the original signage be determined through paint analysis?	Coons: Yes.
New Andaz sign would be painted?	Yes
Isn't it likely that "Hotel" was painted under "Maryland", because if it wasn't, why paint the wall black before adding "Hotel" below?	Ms. Lia suspects "Hotel" was painted over when the building was used as a retirement home.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	Feels it is odd to have "Maryland" painted on the building without "Hotel". This proposal is definitely better than what was previously proposed. It might be better to restore one of the "Hotel" signs to provide better context, understanding that it is not original. Context is important to understand what "Maryland" referred to.
Garbini	In an ideal world, you could do the paint analysis, but that would be a restoration, and is that really what we want to require? The documentation of the "Maryland" sign is adequate to reconstruct that portion of the sign. No clear evidence of whether or not "Hotel" was there originally or what it looked like originally.

Staff Comment: None.Recommended Modifications: The proposal provided by the applicant is acceptable.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 #892

Address: 7015 Vista Del Mar

Historic Name: Jean P. Hampton/A.L. & A.E. Dennstedt Building Company Spec House #1

Significance: Criterion C (Spanish Eclectic) and Criterion D (A.L and A.E. Dennstedt)

Mills Act Status: No Contract

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Ione Steigler, Architect; on behalf of the owner

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project involves a historically designated 1,807 square foot house and 368 square foot detached garage. A 267 sq. ft. addition at the ground floor and 1,019 square foot addition at the second floor is proposed for the back of the house. The existing detached garage does not meet current codes for clearances for a two-car garage, so the applicant is proposing to increase the depth by 1'-0" & the width by 2'-6", so that the garage can meet the minimum dimensions for a two-car garage.

Existing Square Feet: 2,175

Additional Square Feet: 1,413

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,588

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project involves a historically designated 1,807 square foot house and 368 square foot detached garage. A 267 sq. ft. addition at the ground floor and 1,019 square foot addition at the second floor is proposed for the back of the house. Staff has reviewed the proposed addition to the house and have determined that it is consistent with the Standards. The remaining issue and area of disagreement between staff and the applicant is the garage. The existing detached garage does not meet current codes for clearances for a two-car garage, so the applicant is proposing to increase the depth by 1'-0" by extending the garage forward & the width by 2'-6" by extending the garage toward the yard, so that the garage can meet the minimum dimensions for a two-car garage. The garage door opening would be widened as well. Staff has an issue with these modifications to the front façade of the garage.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant provided photos of the house along the street frontage. The interior garage dimensions do not meet the requirements for a contemporary parking space. The current garage doors are sliders that don't open sufficiently. The driveway and gate will need to be widened and the garage doors will need to be re-worked. The driveway apron will need to be re-sloped at an angle that will not result in the car bottoming out. Therefore, the scope of work is to grade and pave the driveway; reconstruct gate; widen and deepen the garage; and rework the doors in a larger opening and convert them to lift doors that appear to be sliding doors. Some modifications have already occurred to garage. The roofing tiles are new, which is the primary character-defining feature of the garage. The applicant provided a simulation of their interpretation of staff's recommendation to park one car in the garage and construct a trellis in front for covered parking.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Doesn't like the trellis. Wouldn't be able to see modifications very readily from the street. A decent solution to a tough problem. Likes the off-set door appearance, even if they can't function that way.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Re-opening the original porch?	Yes.
Will need to shift the gate columns?	Yes, 2'+ Will re-use gate with material at either side.
Could the Hollywood drive be maintained?	Could be repaved as a Hollywood drive when the driveway is re-graded. Could be acid washed to create wear.
What kind of differentiation is proposed on the stucco?	The house is light sand finish. Would recommend medium sand finish or a Santa Barbara finish. Prefers Santa Barbara finish. There will be other opportunities for differentiation in windows, rafters, etc.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Bethke	Has a concern with differentiating, and would like staff to keep that in mind when reviewing it. Not sure a subtle stucco differentiation would be appropriate. Maintaining the Hollywood drive appearance is an important issue.
Garbini	Moving the garage forward 1' is not an issue. Troubled by trying to contrive an operation that doesn't exist anymore. If it will lift, why make it look like a slider?

Staff Comment: None.

Recommended Modifications: The proposed garage modifications are appropriate. Ensure that differentiation is adequate and maintain the Hollywood driveway.

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 5:24 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on July 7, 2010 at 4:00 PM.

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