

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, December 5, 2007, at 3:00 PM

4th Floor Large Conference Room

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

## MEETING NOTES

### 1. ATTENDANCE

Boardmembers:

David Marshall (Chair), and Otto Emme

(Note: Mr. Marshall recused on the Ford Building)

Staff:

Kelley Saunders, HRB; Cathy Winterrowd, HRB; Lucy Contrares, CCDC; Sachin Kalbag, CCDC; Mike Rodrigues, City Park and Rec; Charlie Daniels, City Park and Rec

Guests:

4247 Saint James Place: George Vano, Bill Gonzales

Ford Building in Balboa Park: Jim Kidrick, Darryl Hein

340 7th Avenue: Fritz Ahern, Marie Lia

1907 Kettner (HRB Site #277), Little Italy: Marie Lia, Jonathan Segal

Carnation Building Complex , 369 10th Avenue, (HRB Site #289):

David Thompson, Arch Bundy & Thompson

Other Members of the Public: Bruce Coons, SOHO

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

### 3. Various Issues:

- 4247 Saint James Place:

The house is a contributing structure to the Fort Stockton Line Historic District. The DAS conceptually approved the applicant's request to extend a staff-approved retaining wall to their Fort Stockton Line frontage, but directed the applicant to return to DAS with plans for the proposed wall.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant has brought dimensioned drawings and elevations which reflect the DAS comments from the meeting last month. Max height would be 48" at the corner of Fort Stockton Drive and Saint James Place, and will slope down from the intersection on either side with a low point of 30"-32". The new walls will transition into the existing steps leading to the house, and cobble will be added to the top of the existing walls flanking the steps. The bottom of the house is 6' above the adjacent sidewalk, so

the wall will not obscure visibility of the house. The wall will be finished with real cobble and a pitched or sloped pre-cast concrete cap.

Subcommittee Discussion: Subcommittee members expressed a preference for a curved corner at the intersection of Fort Stockton Drive and Saint James Place as opposed to a sharp corner or blunt angle. Subcommittee-member Marshall stated that 48" is a little higher than he would be comfortable with. However, if the wall was built to 48" in order to level out the yard, he would have an issue with it; but seeing as the yard still slopes 2 feet from the base of the house to the retaining wall, the wall height seems to be a reasonable compromise. He also stated that the materials are key, and that DAS approval of the proposed wall is contingent upon use of actual cobble.

Bruce Coons of SOHO stated that he likes that the applicant is using cobble. He asked if the seams on the pre-cast caps would be visible. Subcommittee-member Marshall responded that DAS requested pre-cast caps to differentiate the wall as new. Mr. Coons noted that the pre-cast cap should overhang the wall by at least 2"-2.5" to maintain the historic character. He also stated that he would hate to see the site graded significantly and noted that 48" is a little high. However, he acknowledged that the house is so elevated that the height of the wall may not be a big issue, other than pedestrian sensitivity.

Consensus: A wall along Saint James Place and Fort Stockton Line, curved at the intersection with a maximum height of 48" is permissible provided that the wall is finished with real cobble stone and pre-cast concrete caps with a 2"-2.5" overhang.

- Ford Building in Balboa Park:  
The San Diego Air and Space Museum is proposing to add a portable, semi-permanent kitchen on the rear patio and convert an existing, historic planter in the center plaza to a seating area.

(David Marshall recused from this item and stepped away at 3:21 PM)

Applicant Presentation: Jim Kidrick, president of the Air and Space Museum presented the project, which includes a portable kitchen placed on the back patio. The scope of the project has been revised to retain the planter and not add the seating. The only aspect of the project remaining is the portable kitchen, which will not be visible from the ground level and will not require any modification or changes to the building itself. The kitchen will be loaded onto the patio from the rear parking lot using a crane, and will rest flat on the patio surface without wheels.

Subcommittee Discussion: Subcommittee-member Emme asked if the kitchen would be connected to water, electricity and gas. The applicant responded that the kitchen will be self contained with no modifications to the building or installation of utilities. Subcommittee-member Emme asked about size of the kitchen and whether or not it will be screened. The kitchen will be 8' wide x 20' long and 7'-8' high. Plants and shrubs will be used to screen the kitchen. HRB staff asked if the kitchen will be used for food

preparation, or if customers will be able to purchase food directly from it. The applicant responded that it will be used for food preparation only. Staff inquired as to whether any lighting or heating fixtures will be added to the patio surrounding the kitchen. The applicant responded that all lighting and heating fixtures used on the patio during events are temporary and not permanently affixed and used only during an event.

Consensus: An easily reversible modification with no impact to the structure and no false sense of history.

(David Marshall returned at 3:31 PM following the discussion of this item)

- 340 7th Avenue:

The owner demolished the front, side and rear walls without a permit during seismic retrofit work. The property was reviewed by HRB in 1999 and cleared. However, it was identified as part of the Warehouse Survey and would have to go back to the Board for reconsideration since it has been more than 5 years and there is potential new information. Rather than return to the Board for designation consideration, the owner would like to get input from DAS on the appropriate reconstruction of the facade consistent with the Standards.

(David Marshall noted that his office is a paid consultant for CCDC on historic issues and he has previously reviewed this project for them. Marshall has been told by the City Attorney's office that there is not a conflict of interest if he participates as a DAS member since his roles with CCDC and DAS are both of behalf of the City.)

Applicant Presentation: The applicant is pursuing a restoration/reconstruction under the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. CCDC is seeking specific recommendations, including materials, regarding the restoration. The applicant has drafted sketches that show reconstruction of the parapet, multi-light windows and folding doors, with brick walls.

Subcommittee Discussion: Subcommittee-member Marshall asked if the original brick was retained. The applicant responded that it was, but the brick on the face of the building is different than the brick on the remainder of the building. Marshall stated that the public façade is the most important in terms of reconstruction, and the original face brick should be re-used. The applicant stated that some of the face brick was destroyed and there is not enough remaining to reconstruct the entire front façade. Marshall feels that using new brick that looks like the original would be preferable to using the original, now heavily damaged brick, which means that the project would be considered a reconstruction, not a restoration. Subcommittee-member Emme stated that if the prior plans could be used to reconstruct the building with new, historically appropriate brick, that would be the best scenario. The owner feels that the photo from the 1970's reflects the original historic façade. Marshall questioned whether adequate documentation exists to properly reconstruct the building (i.e. brick dimensions, height of building, detail of parapet, etc). In concept he is okay with the proposed project, but more detailed drawings are needed. He noted that the storefront can be differentiated as new and suggested the

applicant walk around downtown to look at other historic buildings to see how the bulkheads are detailed.

Bruce Coons asked what condition the brick was in when it was removed. The applicant stated that it was previously sandblasted and damaged, and there was black mortar binding the bricks. Mr. Coons stated that the brick and original grouting/mortar should be matched.

Subcommittee-member Marshall noted that the building could never be individually designated because it will be a reconstruction, but could still be a contributor to the warehouse district if it is ever brought forward for designation.

Consensus: More detailed plans are required along with sufficient documentation to demonstrate that the project meets the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Reconstruction.

- 1907 Kettner (HRB Site #277), Little Italy:

The proposed project is known as "The Q." The property was designated in 1990. The resolution states "In addition, the Board indicated that it would favorably consider the relocation of the structure (preferably to a nearby site) as part of a plan to preserve the house but allow for redevelopment of the present site." The designated historic resource is proposed for relocation and the HRB is scheduled to review the permit at the November 29, 2007 meeting. A relocation site has not been determined as of now. The permit will indicate the need for the Board to approve the site and the owner would like to get input from DAS on the appropriate relocation site and treatment of the resource and the property prior to the relocation.

Applicant Presentation: The Board supported a Little Italy location at their meeting on November 29<sup>th</sup>. Since that time, the applicant has learned that the lot in Little Italy is not owned by the City. The lot is owned by the Hook and Ladder Company, and the Little Italy Association worked with the owner to try to come to an agreement, but the owner is not interested in receiving the house. The alternate site in Sherman Heights, located at 19<sup>th</sup> Street and Island, appears to be the only feasible location. The applicant brought Sanborn maps of the existing site and the Sherman Heights site to illustrate how both lots with their associated development were configured. The applicant is proposing to set the house close to the interior property line, similar to its configuration on its present site. The owner is looking at either maintaining the proposed site with only the relocated house, including a second house on the lot, or subdividing the lot with a house on each lot.

Subcommittee Discussion: Subcommittee-member Emme asked if it can be moved to that location given the location east of the freeway. The applicant hasn't investigated that; however, an alternate site at 13<sup>th</sup> and G poses an issue with the Trolley line. Emme asked how relocation to the Sherman Heights site impacts the ability to restore the house, given that there is no longer an identified tenant to restore it. The Segal indicated that he will be completing the restoration himself. Emme stated that it is unfortunate that the Little Italy site is no longer feasible, but the Sherman Heights site seems appropriate and he

appreciates the applicant's willingness to invest in the relocation of the property. The orientation on the lot is not terribly significant given that it will be moved so far from its original location. The applicant asked how the chimney would be moved. Subcommittee-member Marshall responded that it would need to be boxed and reinforced prior to moving the house, but should be able to be relocated with the house to its new site.

HRB staff noted that the Site Development Permit for the relocation will be brought to the full Board for a recommendation. The applicant stated that they are looking to go to the Planning Commission on January 31, 2008 for approval. Staff is concerned about the timeline, and identified the need for a concerted effort to work out the details of the relocation, the Mitigated Negative Declaration, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, and the permit conditions.

Marshall stated that it would be appropriate to require a historic plaque with the original location identified as part of the permit requirements and mitigation.

Bruce Coons noted that Hanson has moved similar structures with unreinforced masonry chimneys, and that it can probably be moved in place connected to the house. He is not opposed to the relocation, but is concerned that there are only two other Gothic style houses remaining in the city, one in Little Italy and one at 17<sup>th</sup> and Island, and is concerned that Little Italy is losing a Gothic house.

- Carnation Building Complex , 369 10th Avenue, (HRB Site #289):  
Architect David Thompson wishes to discuss proposed changes to the northwest corner of this designated resource. In September the DAS provided comments that the proposal was not consistent with the Standards, specifically related to the northwest corner window treatment and the roof equipment. The applicant has made some revisions to the original proposal. Staff would like to get input from DAS on the revised project prior to building permit approval.

Applicant Presentation: The DAS identified several issues at prior meeting: the rooftop equipment, the window treatment, and retention of an overhead door. The remaining issues will be addressed one by one.

#### ROOFTOP EQUIPMENT

The DAS had expressed concern regarding the visibility of the rooftop equipment, which is proposed in a rooftop penthouse enclosure originally designed on the barrel of the roof. Three alternatives have been developed to reduce visual impact:

1. Moving the penthouse and equipment to the east to sit on the flat portion of the roof. This option leaves the equipment completely enclosed, as requested by CCDC. This option lowers the height 1'.
2. Moving the penthouse and equipment to the east to sit on the flat portion of the roof. This option removes the roof of the penthouse and lowers the height another 1' (2' total).
3. The final option is unenclosed equipment.

Subcommittee Discussion: Subcommittee-member Marshall asked if the option of multiple smaller mechanical units was examined. The applicant responded that it was, but that the proposed profile is smaller. Marshall noted that a taller building behind the Carnation building provides a backdrop, and that the mechanical enclosures would not be set against sky. The applicant stated that the enclosure will be pre-finished aluminum with a champagne color. Marshall noted that in all likelihood the public will only be seeing the top half, and likes the idea of moving it back and lowering it 2' -2.5' by eliminating the lid. He asked if the door on the north side could be moved to the south side. The applicant stated that he was unsure, and is limited by the layout of the equipment.

Bruce Coons noted that he prefers the unenclosed equipment.

#### WINDOW

The owner wants to be able to get air in through the window. The objective was to create a window system over the existing window by utilizing a track system. The glass in the upper part of the window would be removed to allow air through the mullions. A sliding glass pane would be applied over. Signage would be applied to the track, not the building.

Subcommittee Discussion: Subcommittee-member Marshall felt that it is reversible and clearly contemporary with an industrial flavor and addresses the comments of the DAS. Subcommittee-member Emme agreed.

Bruce Coons was comfortable with the modification, as it is reversible.

#### OVERHEAD DOOR

The applicant stated that it is impossible to retain the door with the staircase landing in its currently proposed location. The proposed windows will utilize black-finish steel with a horizontal emphasis as opposed to the vertical emphasis of the historic windows.

Subcommittee Discussion: Subcommittee-member Marshall stated that he can accept the loss of roll-down door. The jog in the storefront to accommodate the stairway is awkward, but not inconsistent with the Standards.

Consensus: Rooftop Equipment: Option 2, moving the penthouse and equipment to the east to sit on the flat portion of the roof and removing the roof of the penthouse to lower the height 2' -2.5' total is preferred. Window: consistent as proposed. Overhead door: loss of the door is ok, and the proposed storefront is consistent with the Standards.

#### 4. Adjourn 4:58 PM

Due to the holidays, the next subcommittee meeting will be January 9, 2008 at 3:00 PM, on the second Wednesday of the month.

For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at (619) 533 6508