

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, August 4, 2010, 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); Gail Garbini; Ann Jarmusch
Recusals	None
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Stanco; Jeffrey Oakley; Terra King; Kiley Wallace
City Attorney	Nina Fain
Guests	
Item 3A	None
Item 3B	David Marshall and Elizabeth Hammack, Heritage Architecture & Planning; Brian Daugherty; Cindy Larson
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

### 3. Project Reviews

#### ▪ **ITEM 3A:**

Listings: HRB Site #960

Address: 1288 Silverado Street

Historic Name: Henry L. Hier Spec House #1

Significance: HRB Criterion C (Architecture)

Mills Act Status: No Contract

PTS #: 209855

Project Contact: Brandy Dewhurst and Ione Stiegler, IS Architecture; on behalf of the owners, Michael and Deborah Lancaster

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to construct a 690 square foot addition at the rear of the house starting 18'-0" back from the front facade; and a second-

story addition of 789 square feet that begins 18'-0" back from the front facade. The lot constraints complicates the siting of the addition.

Existing Square Feet: 1,049

Additional Square Feet: 1,472

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,521

Prior DAS Review: N/A

\*\*\*\* THIS ITEM WAS NOT HEARD \*\*\*\*

▪ **ITEM 3B:**

Listings: HRB Site #952

Address: 3221 Homer Street

Historic Name: David O. Dryden Spec. House #1

Significance: HRB Criterion D (Master Architect)

Mills Act Status: No Contract

PTS #: N/A

Project Contact: Elizabeth Hammack and David Marshall, Heritage Architecture & Planning; on behalf of the owners, Cindy and David Larson

Treatment: Restoration

Project Scope: This restoration project consists of reconstructing the missing front porch of the Craftsman style residence at 3221 Homer Street. The work is the final step in restoring the residence to its original appearance. The proposed design is based on physical investigations of the existing resource and historic photographic evidence. The proposed design calls for the repair and stabilization of the existing porch walls. The missing porch columns and roof will be constructed as close to the original design as possible. Prior work by the owner includes facade restoration to remove inappropriate Federal style details, uncovering the original wood shingle siding, and selecting a historically appropriate paint.

Existing Square Feet: N/A

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: N/A

Prior DAS Review: N/A

Staff Presentation: This restoration project consists of reconstructing the missing front porch of a designated historic resource. The reconstruction will be based on available historic photographs. Staff and the applicant are seeking DAS comment on the reconstruction approach and consistency with the Standards.

Applicant Presentation: The house was designated as the work of Master Builder David Dryden. Non-historic Federal style elements were introduced and have since removed. The shingle siding has been restored. The current owners have contact prior owners and obtained historic that show the original porch. The applicant believes the porch was removed in the mid 1950's. The historic photos show porch from almost every angle. The ground level of the porch is original and intact, with the exception of stucco applied over the brick. The stucco can be removed, or minimally painted red. A gable end with

decorative vent was located above entry stair. Rafter tails and brackets are visible in the photos and will be reconstructed. Groupings of three wood posts support the porch. The only remaining issue in question is whether the porch roof extended across the entire façade, or stopped a few feet short. The Sanborns show the roof stopping short, but the photos seem to show it extending across. Either scenario is possible. Architecturally it may make sense for it to stop short so that it does not bisect the house. However, one photo seems to show porch extending to the end. The applicants intend to complete the restoration and return to the Board to confirm designation.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Appears to be one more row of shingles between vent and beam on the porch than shown on the plans. Posts should be true 4" square posts. Did the applicant look at the upstairs windows to see if they were multi-lite or 1-over-1? Also, it appears rafter tails at upper floor were exposed.

Q&A:

Subcommittee-member Issue or Question	Applicant's Response
Any other Dryden house like this?	No.
Will the rafter tails at upper floor be re-exposed?	Trying to address porch at this point and address rafter tails at upper floor at a later date as part of a Mills Act agreement.
How did you determine it was three posts and not four?	Based on configuration of porch floor and the oblique angles of some photos which would have shown fourth post.
Is it possible to do a photo rendering to recreate historic photo and determine porch roof width?	Possible through photo rendering, but expensive. Could also do story poles.
Could we agree that the exact point of where the porch ends is not critical?	Won't make or break, but we should come to a consensus.
Would applicant prefer to construct short or long? Which would be easier to correct in the construction phase?	Could plan to construct to end of the wall and change during framing if needed.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Jarmusch	Research has been excellent. Thinks length of porch is critical and believes it went to the end of the wall.
Garbini	Believes the porch roof went to the end of the wall.
Bethke	Complete work according to Sanborn, which is the best we know; and if it is short by 2 feet, then that's not the

Subcommittee-member	Comments
	end of the world. Agrees that true 4x4 should be used and that there are more shingles between the vent and the beam. Proceed with the roof as drawn (stopping short).

Staff Comment:

Staff Member	Comments
Oakley	Shadow effect in photo of little girl and the geraniums shows that it went to the end. (General agreement between most people that that is the case.)

Recommended Modifications: Construct the porch to end of the wall and reassess during framing. Modify the porch if necessary during construction. True 4x4 posts should be used at the porch and the drawings must be revised to accurately show more shingles between the vent and the beam.

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 4:50 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on September 1, 2010 at 4:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Kelley Stanco at [KStanco@sandiego.gov](mailto:KStanco@sandiego.gov) or 619.236.6545