



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO

Historical Resources Board

DATE ISSUED: May 21, 2010 REPORT NO. HRB-10-020

ATTENTION: Historical Resources Board
Agenda of May 27, 2010

SUBJECT: **ITEM 6 –DR. CHESTER TANNER OFFICE BUNGALOW COURT**

APPLICANT: Fourth & Thorn, LLC, property owner, represented by Maria Burke Lia

LOCATION: 3235 and 3255 4th Avenue, 92103, Uptown Community, Council District 2

DESCRIPTION: Review and make a recommendation to the appropriate decision-making authority on those aspects of the development permit pertaining to designated historical resources.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The Historical Resources Board recommend to the Planning Commission adoption of the mitigation measures and findings associated with the site development permit related to the designated historical resource as presented.

BACKGROUND

The City's Land Development Code Section 126.0503(b)(2) requires a recommendation from the Historical Resources Board prior to the Planning Commission decision on a Site Development Permit when a historical district or designated historical resource is present. The HRB has adopted the following procedure for making recommendations to decision-makers (Historical Resources Board Procedures, Section II.B):



City Planning & Community Investment
202 C Street, MS 5A • San Diego, CA 92101-3865
Tel (619) 235-5200 Fax (619) 533-5951

When the Historical Resources Board is taking action on a recommendation to a decision-maker, the Board shall make a recommendation on only those aspects of the matter that relate to the historical aspects of the project. The Board's recommendation action(s) shall relate to the cultural resources section, recommendations, findings and mitigation measures of the final environmental document, the Site Development Permit findings for historical purposes, and/or the project's compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Treatment of Historic Properties. If the Board desires to recommend the inclusion of additional conditions, the motion should include a request for staff to incorporate permit conditions to capture the Board's recommendations when the project moves forward to the decision maker.

The Chester Tanner Office Bungalow court is located at 3235 and 3255 Fourth Avenue in the Uptown Community Planning area. It was designated a historical resource (HRB#828) in August 2007 under HRB Criterion C, as an excellent example of both the Spanish Eclectic architectural style and as an example of a unique 1927-1935 Spanish Eclectic Office Bungalow Court. Although constructed as two separate medical office buildings in 1927, it is apparent that the site was intended to function as an office complex focused on a court. The Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court one-story structures were constructed in the Spanish Eclectic architectural style with stucco exterior wall surfaces over wood frame; shallow-medium pitch clay tile roofing, used both as mansards with a flat roof and as hip roof; clay tile attic vents; wood multi-pane windows in eased recesses with projecting stucco sills, predominantly multi-pane double-hung but also fixed; both flat and full arched door openings with stucco mouldings; arched wood doors, some with glass panels; Spanish-style light fixtures; and wrought iron handrails at entry platform steps. There is a non-historic wrought iron fence and gate at the street that allows the courtyard to be secured at night. Within the offset courtyard, there is a relatively new heavy wood frame trellis as well as mature landscaping. The flooring in the rear of the courtyard is a basket-weave brick pattern and in the front portion of the court the flooring is concrete, modified for disabled ramps.

The project proposes to demolish existing commercial/office structures, temporarily relocate the two designated historic structures, and construct a mixed-use development on the 0.92-acre project site. The project includes a Site Development Permit for the historic buildings and for deviations to the development regulations, as well as a Tentative Map to create 100 condominium units (97 residential and 3 commercial/residential) on three lots. On June 6, 2007, the applicant presented the proposed project to the Design Assistance Subcommittee (Attachment 1). At that meeting, the Subcommittee made several recommendations pertaining to the treatment of the resources that were subsequently incorporated into the project through the Treatment Plan. It was the consensus of the Subcommittee that, with the incorporation of their recommendations, the proposed project would meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

The project applicant will stabilize the two structures prior to relocation. Certain building elements will be protected and remain in place during the temporary relocation and other

elements will be removed for safe storage and later returned to the structures after they have been restored to their original locations. The structures will be internally braced and externally protected for relocation, after which they will be severed from their existing foundations below their bottom floor plate, supported by steel beam stretchers, lifted on to transport vehicles and moved to a temporary storage site where they will be set on storage blocks and protected until the on-site construction has created raised pads on the new foundation at the original site. The structures will then be returned to their new foundation and anchored in place. Permanent structural bracing will be installed, the elements removed for protection will be reinstalled and the buildings will be rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation.

ANALYSIS

The proposed temporary relocation of the designated buildings is by definition a substantial alteration requiring a site development permit, consistent with Municipal Code Section 143.0251. A Treatment Plan describing the project, project team, historical monitoring requirements, and the proposed relocation and rehabilitation of the historical resources (Attachment 2). Documentation of the resources, according to the Historical American Building Survey (HABS), is required prior to their temporary relocation. The HABS Narrative has been completed and is provided as Attachment 3. Impacts related to the proposed relocation would be reduced through implementation of the required mitigation measures found in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (Project No. 105703; Attachment 4) and additional permit conditions #14 and #15 (Attachment 5). Findings for the relocation of a designated historical resource are required for approval of the permit, consistent with Municipal Code Section 126.0504(h.) The three required Supplemental Findings and supporting information are provided in Attachment 6 and are summarized below.

1. There are no feasible measures, including maintaining the resource on site, that can further minimize the potential adverse effects on historical resources.

The proposed project has been designed to permit the development of this private property, in accordance with its current zoning and community plan designation, while also providing for the rehabilitation and reuse of two designated historical resources (HRB #828) on their original site. A Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) has been created for the project with measures that would reduce the potential adverse impacts to below a level of significance. As documented within the MMRP, these structures are proposed to be removed from the site while subterranean parking is created, then relocated back to the site and incorporated into the full project design as residential units. The temporary relocation of the two structures will protect them during construction. Once returned to their original location, the two historic buildings will be rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, making them suitable for reuse. They will retain their status as designated historical landmarks of the City of San Diego. The proposed project was designed to protect the structures, avoid adverse effects and maintain them on their original site, as protected historical resources, for decades to come. Therefore, there is no feasible measure that can further minimize the potential adverse effects on historical resources.

2. The proposed relocation will not destroy the historical, cultural or architectural values of the historical resource and the relocation is part of a definitive series of actions that will assure the preservation of the designated historical resource.

The project applicant has agreed to comply with all rules, regulations and ordinances pertaining to the designation status and the Site Development Permit for the temporary relocation, rehabilitation and reuse of the two designated structures as required by the San Diego Municipal Code. The project applicant has prepared a Treatment Plan and Historical American Building Survey of the property. Prior to relocation, the buildings will be internally braced and externally protected, after which they will be severed from their existing foundations below their bottom floor plate, supported by steel beam stretchers, lifted on to transport vehicles and moved to a temporary storage site where they will be set on storage blocks and protected until the on-site construction has created raised pads on the new foundation at the original site. The structures will then be returned to their new foundation and anchored in place. Permanent structural bracing will be installed, the elements removed for protection will be reinstalled and the buildings will be rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. A qualified historical architect monitor will supervise the temporary relocation and rehabilitation of the historical resources. These measures ensure that the proposed relocation and reuse will not destroy the historical, cultural, or architectural values of the historical resource and the temporary relocation will be part of a definitive series of actions to ensure the preservation of the designated historical resources.

3. There are special circumstances or conditions apart from the existence of the historical resource, applying to the land that are peculiar to the land and are not of the applicant's making, whereby the strict application of the provisions of the historical resources regulations would deprive the property owner of reasonable use of the land.

The proposed project is within the Uptown Community Plan area. The Summary of Recommendations from the Uptown Community Plan includes the following: "The overall concept of the plan is to shift higher residential density away from the more isolated, lower scale neighborhoods and focus development instead on the major transportation corridors. Mixed-use development is encouraged in selected areas with residential use over street level retail use." In terms of Development Intensity, the plan identifies the project site as within the High Density Node Corridor of Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Avenues north of Maple Street, permitting Mid to High Rise structures of 4 to 12 stories in height. The zoning of the project site is split between the eastern, CV-1 zone allowing a height up to 150 feet and the western, NP-1 zone, allowing a height up to 60 feet. The project site is 0.92 acre and its permitted development, per the Community Plan and existing zoning, is consistent with that proposed by the project. This permitted level of development is peculiar to the land and not of the applicant's making and the strict application of the historical resources regulations, that would not allow the temporary relocation of the designated structures in order to permit the development of the property in accordance with the Community Plan and existing zoning, would deprive the property owner of reasonable use of the land and a deviation is warranted.

CONCLUSION

Staff concurs that the proposed mitigation measures and permit conditions as provided to the HRB are sufficient to reduce the identified impacts to the Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court (HRB #828) and recommends that the Historical Resources Board recommend the Planning Commission approve Site Development Permit No. 352760 for the relocation of the Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court and adopt the mitigation measures and findings associated with the site development permit.



Cathy Winterrowd
Principal Planner/HRB Liaison

Attachments:

1. Design Assistance Subcommittee Meeting Notes from July 6, 2007 (pages 1-3)
2. Treatment Plan
3. HABS Narrative
4. Final Mitigated Negative Declaration (Project No. 105703) under separate cover
5. Draft Site Development Permit No. 352760
6. Draft Planning Commission Resolution

DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

June 6, 2007, 3:00 pm – 6:30
4th Floor Conference Room
City Administration Building
202 C Street, San Diego, CA

MEETING NOTES

1. ATTENDANCE

Boardmembers:

David Marshall (Chair), Laura Burnett (arr. 3:45), Delores McNeely, Otto Emme (arr. 3:15) and John Eisenhart
Note: Mr. Marshall recused himself from the Old Globe and Imperial Marketplace items and left at 4:45

Staff:

Nina Fain, City Attorney's Office; Kelley Saunders, Michael Tudury and Cathy Winterrowd, HRB

Guests:

Office Bungalow Court: Marie Lia, attorney; Mike McPhee and Bruce Leidenberger, La Jolla Pacific Development; Lyda Cohen, 4th & Thorn LLC; Faramarz Jabbari, ARK architects

St. Cecelia's Chapel: John Silber, architect; Gary Squier, owner

2535 San Marcos Avenue: Patricia Garland, owner; Kelley Saunders, HRB presenter

Old Globe Theatre, Balboa Park: Lou Spisto, Old Globe; John Petterson, LMN architect; Ted Giesing, Old Globe project manager

Imperial Avenue Marketplace: Alex Zirpolo, Elkins-Zirpolo; Marie Lia, attorney; Cindy Blair, Fehlman LaBarre architects

Other: Louise Torio, Sherman Heights resident and interested party to the Imperial Avenue Marketplace project

2. Public/Staff Comment

- NTC Sellers Plaza: Staff referred the DAS to the following information in the agenda and there were no comments or questions: *Staff met with McMillin project manager Kurt Maier and architect Brian Rickling regarding proposed storefront mullion modifications at buildings 01, 08, 11, 23, 24, 32 and 194. These storefront mullion patterns, at existing openings where non-historic fabric had been removed, were approved by staff as consistent with the character of the original historic fabric and with the Standards. The proposed fountain or fountains at building 1 are still to be addressed/resolved.*

3. Projects

- Dr. Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court at 3235, 45, 51 and 55 Fourth Avenue: This complex was originally scheduled to be considered for designation at the April 26, 2007 HRB meeting and continued to allow the applicant to discuss the related proposed

project with the DAS. HRB staff Mike Tudury introduced the project and summarized the direction given by the DAS at the May 2007 DAS meeting.

Marie Lia and architect Faramarz Jabbari discussed the changes made since the last DAS meeting which retain and incorporate the front two street-facing structures in their historic location as part of the proposed project for this site and the adjacent sites to the north and east. Mr Jabbari discussed the redesign of the new structures to accommodate this direction, stating that considerable care was given to step down the structure at the corner that is adjacent to the subject structures in order to present an appropriately-scaled series of facades along 4th Avenue. He also pointed out that the new structures behind the bungalow court structure are set back approximately 15 feet.

Board Comment:

Chair David Marshall stated that he was pleased that the two structures facing 4th Ave. were to be retained in their entirety and in their historic location. He suggested that these structures might be utilized as a clubhouse or community facility for the residents.

Otto Emme reiterated that keeping the structures in their historic location was good.

Mr. Marshall asked about the material of the new structures and the architect stated that the base of the 4th Ave structure was going to be a stone veneer, with stucco above.

John Eisenhart said that the new design “works for me.” He said that the new design respects the most important part of the courtyard. He felt that the massing and relationships of the new project were good. He emphasized that it was important to move the structures whole, not in pieces. Mr. Jabbari stated that that was their intent and that they have identified several locations nearby that might function as the holding site(s). Delores McNeely indicated that the current proposed project was much better and that she liked the stair-stepping up at the new corner building. She reiterated that it was important to move the structures whole.

Chair David Marshall encouraged removal of the non-historic entry trellis and gates in lieu of new gates that are yet to be designed. He indicated that he agreed with the other Boardmembers, and that the consensus was that the proposed project met the Rehabilitation Standards. He indicated that the recommendation of consistency was predicated on the restoration of the exterior of the two buildings per the Standards.

Original windows and doors need to be retained and restored. He suggested that forensic scrapings determine the original building and trim colors, and that these colors be used in the restoration. Mr. Jabbari stated that they have historic photos and they intend to faithfully restore historic elements that have been removed. Mr. Jabbari asked about the courtyard walking surfaces and Mr. Marshall stated that, if possible, the existing brick pavers be salvaged and reused in their historic location, toward the rear of the courtyard. Since the front of the courtyard is concrete, it is appropriate to reconstruct the concrete walkway there, as it was historically.

Mr. Eisenhart suggested that a square scoring pattern in the concrete, consistent with historic scoring patterns, be used in this location.

Mr. Marshall also stated that, although the restoration of the interiors of these structures was not required, that he expected that the new use(s) would incorporate historical interior elements in order to evidence the historicity of the structures at the interior.

HRB staff Mike Tudury indicated that it was important that the colors of the corner building be complementary and secondary to (background to) the structures to be

retained. He confirmed that both this property and the adjacent Craftsman structure are to be on the June HRB agenda.

Other Comment: None.

- Bradley-Woolman, St Cecilia's Chapel, Historic Site #308, 1620 Sixth Avenue:
Mr. Emme and Ms. Burnett arrived during this item.

HRB staff Mike Tudury introduced the project, summarizing the directions given by the DAS at the May 2007 meeting.

On behalf of the developer, Marie Lia stated the history of the chapel. She indicated that it was designed by architect Theo Kisner and built in 1928 for Claude Woolman, the mortician that had the (now-demolished) Bradley Woolman Funeral Home that was adjacent to the chapel. The funeral home was closed in 1944. Historical photographs of the exterior of the chapel were provided to the DAS for their review.

John Silver, the architect, discussed the redesign of the project to incorporate more of the historic reinforced concrete chapel, including the nave, in the proposed project for this site and the adjacent site to the south. This is in lieu of the proposal at the May 2007 DAS meeting that retained only the front 10-15 foot portion of the chapel. The architect stated that the underground parking was redesigned and no longer extends under the chapel. He indicated that the front of the chapel structure would have the CCDC-required ground floor street-facing retail and that there were three loft rental units in the remainder of the nave beyond. The proposed project is 66 affordable apartment units, and has 6,000 sq. ft. of neighborhood-serving retail space. The housing element of the project is 90% affordable and 10% market rate.

He stated that the adjunct "annex" structure (a hollow clay tile attached structure currently utilized for storage) that is located at the rear of the chapel on the south side was proposed to be removed due to the poor structural capabilities of hollow clay tile, and to accommodate light and access to the loft units. The Sanborn Maps are not clear as to when the adjunct structure was built.

Board Comment:

Chair David Marshall indicated that the redesigned project was a vast improvement over that presented at the May 2007 DAS meeting. He stated that he had no objection to the removal of the non-significant adjunct structure and its garden wall. He noted that the adjunct structure was clearly a secondary element and that the wall had been previously modified. Mr. Marshall's concern was the loss of the ability to view and appreciate the entire nave in the proposed project. He strongly suggested retention of the entire historic resource for a single adaptive reuse since it historically functioned as an open assembly space with ornate high ceilings. He felt that the proposed project didn't meet the Rehabilitation Standards due to the manner in which this space is being altered. He noted that, to the extent appropriate, the existing south wall of the chapel should also be retained and the proposed "porch" be eliminated. Also, the previously removed mission roof tile should be reinstalled.

Delores McNeely agreed, stating that it was OK to lose the adjunct structure. She also felt it was important to retain the ability to see the nave in its entirety.

John Eisenhart stated that he felt the chapel should be retained as a single space. He agreed that the adjunct building was not significant and could be removed.

Otto Emme stated that utilizing the nave as a single volume would be consistent with Standard #1 that states that the space should be used as it was historically (a single volume). He stated that both Standards #2 and #9 would also possibly be at issue.

Laura Burnett agreed with the other DAS members.

HRB staff interjected that it might be possible to place an 8 foot high wall with glass above at the rear of the currently-proposed limits of the chapel retail that would allow visibility of the volume of the nave from the retail, similar to the existing SOLO retail space, with a landscape architecture office beyond, that is located in Solana Beach. He stated that the preferred option, however, is to retain the nave as a single space.

After to the meeting, Chair David Marshall had staff forward a National Park Service bulletin to the applicants called "[Significant Spaces: Preserving Historic Church Interiors.](#)"

Other Comment: None.

- El Pueblo Ribera: Architect Kim Grant was scheduled to propose a roof deck at one of the historically-designated residences at this historic district. However, Ms. Grant was not at the meeting and this item was not heard.

2535 San Marcos Avenue: The owner, Patricia Garland, is proposing a two-story addition to the rear of this historically-designated house. HRB staff Kelley Saunders presented the proposal to the DAS and asked that they comment on it. The owner indicated that there is currently a 1980 second-story addition at the rear of the structure and that she would like to reconfigure that volume and to add a bath and bedroom with a deck in front of the existing volume. The entire pueblo-style house has been previously restuccoed with a sand finish texture. Also, the aluminum windows that existed when the owner purchased the house have been changed out to historically-appropriate wood windows.

Board Comment:

Otto Emme indicated that it was important that the new addition be clearly differentiated from the historically-designated front portion of the structure, stating that the new addition must also be compatible with the resource. The group agreed that the parapet "ears" of the addition should be removed to simplify the façade.

John Eisenhart was concerned with the balcony mass and stated that it should be reduced in depth from approximately 12 feet to six feet. He also suggested that the balcony railing be more open. He stated that it would be best for the new room elements to not be symmetrical. He suggested keeping the simplicity of the original second story addition. He stated that the windows at the second story should be different than those at the front of the building, perhaps using single lite windows, with no mullions to break them up. Delores McNeely indicated that the new addition should not exceed the height of the existing second story. She stated that she needed more information and detailed plans before she could fully comment on the design.

David Marshall agreed with Ms. McNeely that more information, including plans and elevations, were needed to fully evaluate the project. He felt that the upper floor additions were turning a simple house into a complex grouping of volumes. He reiterated Mr. Emme's comment regarding the need to differentiate the historic from the new. He suggested that the balustrade might be wrought iron.

Mr. Eisenhart indicated that he felt that a wood railing and horizontal balustrade might be more appropriate than wrought iron. Mr. Marshall agreed that this option could be considered. Mr. Eisenhart also reinforced that the overall height of the addition should not be increased.

Other Comment: None.

Old Globe Theatre, Balboa Park:

Chair David Marshall recused himself on this item and the next item, and turned over the chair to Boardmember Otto Emme. Mr. Marshall left the meeting at this time.

and is not proposed for any change.

The director of the Old Globe Theatre, Louis Spisto, stated that the Old Globe complex was the sixth largest in the U. S.

He stated that there were three actions proposed for the project: the replacement of the second stage theatre (the Cassius Carter theatre); the provision of a new venue for educational programs; and improvement of the plaza.

He stated that the design program given to the architects was to: Utilize the existing structure; Design a structure and a plaza that was consistent with the Standards; Enhance safety for the public and the employees; Better utilize the interior spaces, providing for shared uses; and Relocate the scene shop off-site to a location in Kearny Mesa, which would move 20 employees and their automobile parking out of the park.

He then introduced the architect, John Petterson who presented the project.

Mr. Petterson stated that their goals included: Consistency with the Standards; Consistency with the 1992 Central Mesa Precise Plan; Increasing compatibility with the Park; Following the established Design Guidelines; and Differentiating the historic from the new in a compatible manner.

Mr. Petterson then provided a Powerpoint presentation that showed the following:

- The footprint of the proposed new structure is generally the same as the existing.
- In the plaza, the existing raised planter is a visual and physical impediment and is to be eliminated, as is the existing clock tower. The plaza has been entirely redesigned, with all new hardscape.
- The new multiple gable roof structure is reminiscent of the historical forms and materials and utilizes a faux half-timber design at the façade. The new structure is further differentiated as new by the use of glass and balconies at the front façade.
- The lowest point of the eaves of the existing structure to remain was utilized as a datum line for the roof of the new structure.
- The scale of the new structure is smaller than the existing.
- The front of the structure will accommodate food service windows for patrons that will eat alfresco in the plaza.

- The seating and lighting elements will be per Park Standards. Seating for 150-200 persons will be provided in the plaza.
- The pergola is a wood structure that is to be approximately 50% open.

Board Comment:

John Eisenhart stated that the new proposed design was good architecturally. He felt that it was a good modern interpretation of the Elizabethan style. He questioned the trellis design, indicating that the manner in which the three roof planes intersected seemed awkward. He said that this may be a product of the scale of the model, and felt that this detail would be resolved by the architect.

Delores McNeely stated that she had no issues with the proposal.

Laura Burnett indicated that it was good to see a park user that is proposing to move staff off-site if they did not need to be in the park. She suggested to the architect that the back side of the building, adjacent to the street, warranted further design consideration to address the back-of-the-building feel. She stated that this elevation, although clearly secondary, would be viewed by the public. Ms. Burnett felt that the plaza needs more study and would benefit from the addition of 2-3 large new trees.

Otto Emme said that he agrees with what the other Boardmembers have suggested, indicating that he would like to see more landscaping in the plaza. He suggested to the landscape architect that they consider wisteria at the trellis.

- Imperial Avenue Marketplace (Farmers Market/Barrio Logan):

David Marshall recusal.

The applicant for this multi-block project, Cindy Blair of Fehlman LaBarre Architects, presented this proposed mixed use project at the May 2007 DAS meeting. The proposed project is located on the full block bounded by Imperial and Commercial Streets (north and south), and 21st and 22nd Streets (west and east), as well as portions of the blocks to the west, north and east of the full block site. The proposed project would have underground parking for approximately 874 cars, 69,685 sq. ft. of commercial uses and 517,438 sq. ft. of residential. There are 481 residential units proposed, 105 of which would be affordable. Ms. Blair has responded to the DAS request for additional information and would like to present new information. The applicant's team for this multi-block project, Marie Lia, attorney, Cindy Blair of Fehlman LaBarre Architects and Alex Zirpolo, one of the owners, discussed the proposed mixed use project and indicated that their intent was to have the project meet the Standards.

Mr. Zirpolo noted that he and his partners purchased the property in 1988, and that the team has been working diligently with the Barrio Logan community to assure that the project was what they wanted. The owners originally considered a warehouse use for many of the structures, but the community stated that the area needed retail. The owners have also met with a co-op of businessmen in the area and the established community groups.

Marie Lia stated that the property was originally owned by Matthew Sherman, and later the San Diego Poultry Association. The construction of the buildings on the full-block site started in 1920, and since then, there are many modifications and permits. The current owners wish to do an open retail and commercial development, with associated housing.

Cindy Blair stated that the proposal will require many permits and processes, among them: a Sherman Heights permit; a SESD permit; a rezone to the proposed Urban Village zone; a Community Plan Amendment; and an amendment to the Imperial Avenue Master Plan. She noted that mixed use development is not currently allowed in this area. She indicated that the intent is to create an Urban Village here, and that is why the development extends to adjacent blocks as well.

She stated that there would be a market in this development, estimated to be in the range of 35,000-40,000 sq. ft.

The three partial blocks and the single full block proposed for development have been labeled A, B, C and D. Block A is the central full block where the majority of the development is expected to occur. Block B, to the north of the full block will have a public/private plaza and park that will be patrolled by security when open during the day, and would be closed at night. Block B also has an over-45 CMU structure that is proposed for demolition. Block C, located to the east of Block C, has the "Auto Zone" metal structure that is proposed for demolition. Block D, located to the west of Block C, is currently an open parking lot. Two levels of subterranean parking are proposed for the full central block. The full block A design is proposed to have a "vener" of retail opening out to the street, with the open "farmers market" at the interior. An important issue is the pedestrian connectivity of the project with Sherman Heights and with the East Village.

Ms. Blair stated that the project design kept the new structures to 6-8 stories in height to assure that the height of the new development would be lower than the potentially historic silos that were going to be retained as part of the project. She also indicated that the development proposes to either keep or reconstruct brick facades that are potentially historic.

At this meeting, photos of all buildings on the proposed project site were shown and keyed to the properties. The DAS members reviewed the photographs and agreed that the buildings on the surrounding partial blocks B, C and D were not potentially historic. The demolition of these buildings would not be at issue.

Having addressed the surrounding blocks, the applicant and the DAS focused on the central full block A. The applicant presented two color-coded plans.

The first plan showed the results of a structural evaluation, noting primary building materials of the buildings and differentiating the hollow clay tile walls from the double wythe brick walls as well as other walls.

The second plan showed the dates of progression of construction on the full block site. On the eastern side of the site from its southern boundary progressing northward, the buildings were built in 1920, 1926 and 1940. On the western side of the full block site the buildings dated from 1949, 1963 and 1965. The metal silos were built in 1965. The applicant indicated that all of the structures underwent extensive modifications, including new street-facing openings to accommodate the evolving uses.

Board Comment:

John Eisenhart stated that there was a need to consider retaining not only facades but volumes as well. He reiterated that the potentially historic resources on the project are more an opportunity than a constraint. Mr. Eisenhart indicated that, although the silos date from 1965, they are clearly the most important community-recognized form on the

site and he was pleased that the applicant intended to retain these as part of the project design. He agreed with the applicant that the railroad tracks and loading platform are also important to be retained.

The retention and restoration or reconstruction of the 1965 silos and the adjacent tower serves to acknowledge their potential historicity, calls attention to these iconic forms as a symbol of the community history, and serves as mitigation for the loss of the interior volumes of the potentially-historic 1920 and 1926 (and possibly the 1940) brick structures along the eastern edge of the full block site.

As the applicant progressed through the proposed street elevations, the DAS commented on the design.

Beginning with the south-facing elevation of the full block, the DAS was OK with the design with the exception that the new concrete-frame and glass café structure on the easterly end should have a taller glass façade in order for the curved cornice line of the existing 1920 brick building facade to be visible to the public. The Boardmembers liked the retention of the 1920 south/street-facing brick facade, the loading dock and the rail lines in this area.

Progressing to the west street-facing elevation, as these buildings were more recent and of hollow clay tile which is structurally worthless, initially there were no objections.

The Boardmembers were pleased to hear that the silos were to be retained.

However, after discussion with the applicant, Mr. Eisenhart felt that the tall concrete tower volume to the north of the silos should also be retained or reconstructed (with stucco facing complementary to but differentiated from the concrete texture if cost is a substantial concern) in order to anchor the project and to convey the iconic historic character of the site to future generations. This element at the southwest corner is the iconic massing/form that has "Farmers Market" on it. Mr. Eisenhart indicated that fenestration could be incorporated into the façade of the tower as long as the tower continues to convey its form and strength. He further stated that Mr. Zirpolo said that the structural engineer HTK had evaluated the tower element and said that the tower was basically a honeycomb of vertical bins that was used for grain sorting and mixing, and that it could not be adaptively reused. He indicated that they would study the reconstruction of the tower volume and that volume's use in the project.

At the north elevation, the DAS had no objections to the proposed street-facing elevation. The DAS also agreed with the architect that it was appropriate to "turn the corner" with a new brick façade that worked with the north-facing façade.

At the east street-facing elevation, the DAS indicated that the 1920 and 1926 and possibly the 1940 brick street-facing facades should be considered for retention. Since these facades have been extensively modified with other openings in the recent past, the Boardmembers stated that adding openings in these walls could be considered, but the locations would need to be reviewed.

Mr. Eisenhart indicated that the east façade was a strong composition and suggested that the historical photos be consulted for guidance to the storefront openings. He questioned the need to gut the interior and the applicant said that would preclude the needed underground parking.

Otto Emme noted that the architecture in the proposed project was more in character with the development near the ballpark than the immediate neighborhood.

In general, Delores McNeely and Laura Burnett agreed with the DAS comments regarding the proposed project.

At the end of the review, Mr. Eisenhart questioned the philosophy of saving any brick-block facades. He stated that the committee has dealt with the pieces of the project in each elevation, but should consider the larger issue of whether saving 8" thick facades conveys the historic resource's essential qualities. In conclusion, he felt confident that the historic character could be conveyed by simply saving the southwest corner massing-form elements. The other elevations/ structures were not significant and the applicant could design as need be. Only from an urban design position (outside HRB's purview) he hoped the applicant would retain/ rebuild the other elevations as discussed. He asked for input on this opinion, but no comment was made.

Other Comment:

Louise Torio, a resident of Sherman Heights and a preservationist, discussed her and her neighbor's participation in this development process/proposal. She stated that, although the project was not in Sherman Heights, it was directly across Commercial Street from it. She stated that it was important for the project to have community-serving commercial on all four sides of the full block portion of the proposed project. She said that the community wanted to keep the memorable portions of the existing site development including the silos, the loading dock and the train tracks in order to retain the history of the site. She noted that since the project is on the trolley line (but not adjacent to a trolley stop), she considered this development and the proposed Com 22 project across Commercial to be transit-oriented development. She specifically stated that it is intended that this project and Com 22 are going to help retain the younger people and bring back the middle-class to the neighborhood.

HRB staff Mike Tudury noted that 10% affordable housing is a small amount for the project, and that although it is not the HRB's purview, he hoped the developer would consider a larger percentage. He noted that in this area, affordable housing would in essence be available for persons that have the middle-class incomes. Ms. Blair said that they were working with the Planning Department (Myles Pomeroy) and the Housing Commission staff to address this issue.

4. Adjourned at 6:30

The next DAS Meeting is scheduled for July 11, 2007 at 3:00 p.m.

TREATMENT PLAN FOR 5TH & THORN PROJECT (No. 105703)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The subject property on Fourth Avenue is occupied by a cluster of single story Spanish Eclectic style buildings constructed between 1927 and 1935, known as the Dr. Chester Tanner Office Bungalow Court. The property is part of a larger project known as Fifth & Thorn, which proposes a large scale residential development with underground parking, and proposes to retain and rehabilitate the two bungalows at 3235 and 3255 Fourth Avenue. (San Diego Historical Landmark No. 828, designated 8/23/07). Basis of designation: excellent example of both the Spanish Eclectic architectural style and as an example of a unique 1927-1935 Spanish Eclectic Office Bungalow Court.

To facilitate development of the Fifth & Thorn project, 3235 & 3255, the two designated structures, are to be moved off site to a predetermined storage location, then moved back to their original location after development of the larger project. The remaining two structures not designated at 3245 and 3251 Fourth Avenue are to be demolished, as are the existing courtyard structures (trellis, fence, and gate).

PROJECT TEAM:

DEVELOPER:	La Jolla Pacific Development Group Bruce Leidenberger
PROJECT ARCHITECT:	ARK Architects Inc. Faramarz Jabbari, AIA, NCARB
PRESERVATION ARCHITECT:	Martin Architecture Tim Martin, AIA
ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIAN:	Union Architecture John Eisenhart
HISTORICAL CONSULTANT:	Marie Burke Lia
HOUSE MOVER:	John T. Hansen Enterprises
GENERAL CONTRACTOR:	To be determined

HISTORICAL MONITORING:

Monitoring of the preparation, moving, storage, relocation, and rehabilitation shall be performed by the Architectural Historian. The Architectural Historian, the Preservation Architect, and the Historical Consultant shall attend the Pre-Con Meeting.

RECONSTRUCTION:

Should reconstruction be required as a result of damage during this program, it shall be undertaken in accordance and conformance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Reconstruction as a permitted Treatment of Historic Properties.

STANDARDS FOR REHABILITATION:

1. The property will be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and special relationships:
Although the structures will no longer be used as medical offices, their use as a support facility to the residential development of which it is a part will not require any alterations to the exterior of the structures.
2. The historic character of the property will be retained and preserved:
The two designated structures are being temporarily removed, then relocated to their exact previous location, in the same orientation and context.
3. Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use:
The structures will be rehabilitated in the same location and context as their original placement.
4. Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be maintained:
No such changes have been identified.
5. Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques will be preserved:
All exterior materials, including stucco, clay roof tile, and wood doors and windows will be preserved and rehabilitated.
6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced.
All exterior materials, including stucco, clay roof tile, and wood doors and windows will be preserved and rehabilitated.
9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and special relationships that characterize the property:
There will be no additions or exterior alterations to these structures. All new construction will be below or apart from the historic structures and their context.
10. New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

PROPOSED TREATMENT:

PREPARATION/RELOCATION OF STRUCTURES:

The two structures to be retained (3235 & 3255 Fourth Avenue) are each of raised floor construction, resting on perimeter concrete stem walls with interior wood girders, posts, and concrete piers. Both are wood framed with stucco exterior wall finish and two piece barrel clay tile roofing. As they are each connected to another structure at the rear, the structures not designated and not being retained (3245 & 3251 Fourth Avenue) are to be surgically dismantled and removed.

Preparation of the buildings for relocation is to be photo documented by the Architectural Historian to demonstrate compliance with the Treatment Plan. Clay tile roofing is to be carefully removed and boxed, saved for reinstallation after the structures are returned to the project site, and a temporary roof membrane is to be installed in its place. Exterior stucco is to remain in place. Door and window sash, jambs, and frames are to be

numbered and catalogued by the Contractor; sash are then to be removed and stored in a secure location, leaving jambs and frames in place. Steel beams will be threaded through the existing window openings creating a “stretcher” at each structure. Diagonal bracing will then be installed as required at the interior of the structures. The portion of walls exposed by removal of other structures and all window and door openings are to be boarded up. Building walls will then be cut from the existing floor framing between the bottom plate and the subfloor. The buildings will then be lifted off their respective floors/foundations onto transport vehicles and moved to their secure temporary storage site, where they will be temporarily set on blocks.

Two alternative storage sites have been identified, both primary and secondary. The site selected is dependant on availability at the time of project construction. While housed at this storage site, the buildings are to be secured and protected from damage, including weather intrusion and vandalism.

PRIMARY STORAGE SITE A:

North side of Grape Street between 5th and 6th Avenues, San Diego, CA

SECONDARY STORAGE SITE B:

Southeast corner of 5th Avenue and Nutmeg Street, San Diego, CA

RELOCATION/REHABILITATION OF STRUCTURES:

New development of the Fifth & Thorn project will commence and continue thru substantial completion. Underground parking facilities will be constructed under the original location of the two bungalows. The concrete roof deck over the parking structure will serve as a ground level terrace. This concrete deck will be formed with two raised pads to serve as the foundations for the two bungalows, in the same location, orientation, elevation and context as before relocation.

When sufficient new construction has been completed, the bungalows will again be lifted on their “stretchers” and transported back to their original home, set on the raised concrete slabs and anchored in place. The interiors will then be stripped of all interior plaster, wiring, plumbing, and ductwork. Interior partitions will be removed or relocated per new plan and new electrical, plumbing, mechanical systems and insulation will be installed. The structures will then receive permanent structural bracing internally, including shear walls, hold downs, anchor bolts, and other structural hardware as required by the project structural engineer, before new drywall interior wall and ceiling finishes are installed.

Exterior stucco is to remain on the buildings to the extent feasible and repaired and rehabilitated in place (6). A new waterproof roof membrane will be installed, followed by reinstallation of the clay roof tile to match the original form and texture (6). Door and window frames, which have remained in place, are to be rehabilitated in place, and the exterior doors and window sash previously removed and stored are to be rehabilitated and reinstalled (6,7).

BUILDING SYSTEMS AND MATERIALS:

Foundation: The existing foundations and stem walls will be demolished after the designated structures are temporarily removed from the site. A new concrete slab foundation will be formed and poured raising the floor level above the adjacent terrace to match its original context (9,10).

Exterior Walls: All exterior stucco will be protected to the extent feasible, repaired and rehabilitated in kind (5,6). Note there are no existing or proposed chimneys.

Roof: The existing two piece clay tile roofing will be removed and packaged before building is removed from site, then reinstalled after relocation back to the original site, matching the original placement, texture, and pattern. Damaged tile shall be repaired if possible. Replacement tiles shall match size, style, and color to the extent possible and shall be placed in the least visible portion of the roof (5,6).

Doors and Windows: The existing wood doors and double-hung wood windows will be removed from their frames (which are to remain in place), rehabilitated to the extent feasible, (replaced with replicas only when necessary), and reinstalled in their original frames (6,7).

Exterior Colors: Historical photos or paint scrapings will be used in order to replicate the original colors and appearance of the structures (6).

Courtyard Paving: The existing brick pavers are to be salvaged if possible and reused in their historic location, toward the rear of the courtyard. New courtyard paving and walkway is to be concrete to match the original concrete paving, including the scoring pattern (6).

Interior finishes: All interior finishes will be removed, and after incorporation of plywood shear panels, wiring, plumbing, ductwork and insulation, replaced.

Mechanical and Electrical: All systems will be completely replaced.

Exterior Lighting: None of the original decorative light fixtures have survived. New light fixtures will be compatible with those in use when the buildings were originally constructed (7).

Accessibility: As the buildings will remain elevated approximately 21" above the courtyard, ramps are proposed at each building. To minimize the impact on the existing building exteriors, a ramp will be installed along the east side of 3235 4th Avenue, leading to a new opening where the building is currently connected to the adjacent structure to be demolished. A ramp will be installed along the south side of 3255 4th Avenue, leading to the existing (eastern) secondary entrance (9,10).

**HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY
DR. CHESTER TANNER OFFICE BUNGALOW COURT**

Location: The west 60 feet of Lot B and the west 50 feet of Lot C in Block 385 of Horton Addition Lockling, in the City of San Diego, County of San Diego, State of California, according to map thereof filed in the Office of the County Recorder of San Diego County

Address is 3235 and 3255 Fourth Avenue, San Diego, California, 92101, USGS 7.5" Quad Point Loma

Assessor's Parcel Nos. 452-555-26 and 452-555-28

Present Owner: Fourth & Thorn, LLC

Present Use: Offices

Significance: These two buildings are considered both an excellent example of the Spanish Eclectic architectural style and an example of a unique 1927-1935 Spanish Eclectic Office Bungalow Court

PART 1 HISTORICAL INFORMATION

Physical History

This commercial office complex originally contained four individual buildings, addressed as 3235, 3245, 3251 and 3255 Fourth Avenue, that were constructed between 1927 and 1935. The 3235 and the 3245 buildings were constructed in 1927 on the southern lot, Lot C. The 3235 building was on the street frontage and the 3245 building was constructed behind it on the same lot. The 3255 building was also constructed in 1927 on the street frontage on the northern lot, Lot B, and the 3251 building was constructed behind it on the same lot in 1935.

The buildings were constructed for medical office purposes by Dr. Chester Tanner who came to San Diego in 1919 and joined the staff of St. Joseph's Hospital shortly thereafter. He remained on the staff after that hospital transitioned to Mercy Hospital until his retirement in the late 1950s. He was also on the staff of the San Diego County Hospital, which became the UCSD Medical Center, until his retirement. Dr. Tanner was active in the San Diego County Medical Society and the San Diego Board of Health. Dr. Tanner owned the subject property and he and other investors had these building built as investments. He did not practice here until the end of his career, from 1952 to 1959, when he practiced at 3255 Fourth Avenue. Dr. Chester Tanner was not determined to be a historically significant individual and this property was not designated on the basis of its association with him.

Physical Description:

Of the above described four buildings, only two were considered to merit local designation that they were the two facing Fourth Avenue, at 3235 and 3255. Therefore only these two buildings

will be described. Both buildings are rectangular although their floor plans vary. 3235 consists of approximately 1,458 square feet and contains a lobby, six offices or treatment rooms, two reception areas, hallways, one kitchen and two restrooms. It has a primary entrance on its north façade, a secondary entrance on its south façade and outside access from the office at its southeast corner. 3255 consists of a lobby, a reception room, eight offices or treatment rooms, a common room, a storage room, hallways and two restrooms. It has two entrances, both on its south façade.

The two buildings are separated by a courtyard, the 3235 building is south of the 3255 building. They are one story and were designed in the Spanish Eclectic style. They are set upon a concrete foundation and feature stucco exteriors, hipped and/or flat roofs with exposed rafters and red, Mission tile. The courtyard is fenced with a metal fence and gate and a wood trellis style roof area. The windows vary in size, shape and placement around the facades but are primarily wood-framed, multi-light, double hung sash style. Doorways into the units are single, arched, wood doors that are recessed into the building and are accessed by small concrete porches with metal railings. Wrought iron light fixtures continue the Spanish motif.

Historical Significance:

The two designated resources and the other two structures on this site were evaluated in a Historical Assessment prepared by Historian Scott Moomjian, Esq., in May of 2005 and revised in March 2007. An Addendum to that Assessment was also prepared by Mr. Moomjian in March of 2007. This property was also evaluated by Historical Resources Board's Senior Planner Michael Tudury. Mr. Tudury recommended that all four buildings on the property be designated under Historical Resources Board Criterion C as an excellent example of both the Spanish Eclectic architectural style and an example of a unique 1927-1935 Spanish Eclectic Office Bungalow Court. The Historical Resources Board found that only the front two buildings, 3235 and 3255, merited designation under that Criterion and description.

Sources:

Historical Assessment of the 3235, 3245, 3251 & 3255 Fourth Avenue Buildings, San Diego California 92103, May 2005 and March 2007

Addendum to the Historical Assessment of the 3235, 3245, 3251 & 3255 Fourth Avenue Buildings, San Diego California 92103, March 2007

Historical Resources Board Staff Report by Michael Tudury, April 2007

Design Assistance Subcommittee Meeting Notes, June 6, 2007

Historical Resources Board Minutes of the Meeting of August 23, 2007

Completed by:

Marie Burke Lia, Historical Property Consultant, May 2010