

# CITY OF SAN DIEGO HISTORICAL RESOURCES BOARD

## DESIGN ASSISTANCE SUBCOMMITTEE

Wednesday, May 7, 2008, at 3:00 PM

12th Floor Conference Room 12B

City Administration Building

202 C Street, San Diego, CA

## MEETING NOTES

### 1. ATTENDANCE

Subcommittee Members	John Eisenhart (Chair); Otto Emme; Paul Johnson;
Recusals	Johnson: 3E, 3F & 3G
City Staff	
HRB	Kelley Saunders; Cathy Winterrowd; Jodie Brown; Jennifer Hirsch; Tricia Olsen
CCDC	Lucy Contreras
City Attorney	Marianne Greene
Guests	
Item 3A	Dan Martorana, architect
Item 3B	Sandy Shapery, owner; Rick Polischuk; Will Rigley
Item 3C	Sandy Shapery, owner; Rick Polischuk; Will Rigley
Item 3D	Sandy Shapery, owner; Rick Polischuk; Will Rigley
Item 3E	Neal Singer, NTC Foundation; Chris Bittner
Item 3F	Neal Singer, NTC Foundation; Chris Bittner
Item 3G	Neal Singer, NTC Foundation; Chris Bittner
Item 3H	Harold Koenig; Mike Koonce
Item 3I	Tony Ciani, architect; David Schroedl, owner
Other	Bruce Coons, SOHO; Jarvis Ross; Ron Boshun (left following Item 2); Cecelia Conover; John Garrison

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

Jarvis Ross: holds a degree in fine art and architectural history. Has a concern with what he feels is a frequent misinterpretation of the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He feels that the Santa Fe Depot addition is a good example of this misinterpretation.

Ron Boshun: feels that public comment means nothing to the decision makers. In his opinion, the richest cultural district in San Diego county is around Peninsula, Old Town and the harbor, and it is being destroyed.

## 3. Project Reviews

▪ **ITEM 3A:**HRB #: 176Address: 625 BroadwayPTS #: n/aProject Contact: Dan Martorana, Architect; on behalf of the owner Emanuel TorbatiTreatment: RehabilitationProject Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to lower 735 linear feet of exterior balustrade at the 14th floor of the San Diego Trust and Savings Bank by 15 inches (from 4 feet 9 inches to 3 feet 6 inches). The project will require that the existing cap and dentil detailing on the balustrade be reconstructed. The main balustrade facade and deco block detail are to remain.Existing Square Feet: unknownAdditional Square Feet: n/aTotal Proposed Square Feet: unknownStaff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes to lower 735 linear feet of exterior balustrade at the 14th floor of the San Diego Trust and Savings Bank by 15 inches (from 4 feet 9 inches to 3 feet 6 inches). The project will require that the existing cap and dentil detailing on the balustrade be reconstructed. The main balustrade facade and deco block detail are to remain. Staff has concerns with this project and consistency with the Standards, as the project would remove and reconstruct historic fabric which does not appear to be deteriorated, and would alter the original historic appearance of the building when such an alteration does not appear to be required for continued use and viability of the resource.Applicant Presentation: The applicant has identified two issues with the existing railing: the spalling of the terra cotta and the plaster; and the height of the railing. The space is very difficult to lease because one cannot easily see over the railing from the inside of the building. The applicant feels that the cap needs to be removed in order to repair the spalling, and so the applicant is looking to reconstruct the railing at a lower height. Renderings were provided to demonstrate the limited perceptibility of the modification from the street. The applicant feels that one would be hard-pressed to tell the difference.Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
What is height of penthouse?	180+' to the balcony railing
How tall is the ceiling in the penthouse?	13'-18'
Motivation for modification is sight-lines?	In part. Spalling is also an issue, as pieces have fallen onto Broadway.
To address sight-lines, raising the floor might be preferable.	Seismic retrofit would be required.
What is the trigger for seismic retrofitting?	Cannot add additional weight without retrofitting.
What is being gained by lowering railing?	Increased views of downtown.
Has the face of the building experienced spalling?	To some extent.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Johnson	The railing is part of the historic fabric. This project would modify the historic envelope for the sake of sight-lines. Takes issue with altering this feature. Repairing the stucco and fascia would be more financially feasible than taking the railing down and reconstructing it.
Emme	The applicant should maintain what they have. The railing wasn't built for views, and he would not be in favor of lowering the railing to achieve a view.
Eisenhart	Would be reluctant to modify the cornice as originally designed. It modifies shadow and dimension and the intent of the design. Would have no issue with modifications to the interior of the building to achieve views, but would not support modifying the railing to achieve views.

Staff Comment: NonePublic Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Coons	The project is a clear violation of the Standards. The shadow lines and heft of the railing is extremely important. This building is one of the greatest Italian Renaissance Buildings in San Diego. The applicant could look at adding seating areas which are elevated off of the floor for views.
Ross	Subcommittee members expressed his concern well. Suggested that a platform could be built which wouldn't add significantly to weight.

Recommended Modifications: Any spalling of the concrete should be addressed through patchwork and repairs which result in minimal loss of and impact to historic fabric. Reconstruction of the railing to increase views from the interior of the building would be an adverse impact to the building and would not be supported, although the applicant could explore interior modifications to increase views from the tenant space.

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:**

HRB #: 810

Address: 2211 30th Street

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Sandy Shapery, owner

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project includes reconstruction of deteriorated architectural features, including windows and doors; seismic retro-fit of the URM building; replacement of the roofing; repair of existing masonry; stabilization of the existing brick fireplace; restuccoing; and exterior painting.

Existing Square Feet: 2,250

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,250

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project includes reconstruction of deteriorated architectural features, including windows and doors; seismic retro-fit of the URM building; replacement of the roofing; repair of existing masonry; stabilization of the existing brick fireplace; restuccoing; and exterior painting. Most of this work has been completed, without the required staff review and approval. Staff questions whether or not replacement of some of the original historic fabric, including the original garage doors, is consistent with the Standards, as it appears to have been done to attract future tenants, and not to replace materials which were deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant should elaborate on the condition of the materials that were replaced. Staff also has concerns about the woodwork in the gable end which had been unpainted, exposed wood from the time of construction through the designation until recently when it was painted green.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant bought the subject property and the other two properties (HRB Sites 808 and 809) following the designation. All three structures had been boarded up and had issues of deferred maintenance. All three buildings were repainted, cleaned-up, and had new roofing installed. Windows which were not repairable were replaced on all three buildings. On the Fire Station, the gable end was painted and the existing stucco over the brick, which was present at the time of the designation, was left intact. The applicant wasn't aware they needed review and approval from the City for the work.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
How was it determined that the painting of the wood in the gable end was appropriate?	The applicant, with the aid of Bruce Coons of SOHO, scraped the wood and found the green color, which they matched.
Did Coons examine the brick behind the stucco?	Yes. It was determined that the brick may be damaged by the removal of the stucco (and the sides were always stuccoed), so it was left intact.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Emme	Applicant should work with staff on appropriate lighting, signage, hardscape and landscape.
Eisenhart	Generally, the project is coming along well. He would really like to see the brick on the front of the Fire Station re-exposed. For all three buildings, the applicant should document all of the existing historic fabric and develop a treatment plan that identifies materials that were replaced and materials that were repaired.
Johnson	Concerned about the building department issuing permits without HRB staff review. If the applicant pursues removal of the stucco on the front façade and the restoration of the brick underneath, only a small patch of stucco should be removed to test the condition of the brick and the impact of the stucco removal.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Coons	The gable end in the firehouse was painted early on, and that paint color was replicated.
Ross	May want to include old fire equipment in the firehouse as an interpretive aspect.

Recommended Modifications: The rehabilitation work completed to date appears to be consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If the applicant pursues removal of the stucco on the front façade and the restoration of the brick underneath, only a small patch of stucco should be removed to test the condition of the brick and the impact of the stucco removal.

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:**

HRB #: 809

Address: 2215-2219 30th Street

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Sandy Shapery, owner

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project includes reconstruction of deteriorated architectural features, including windows and doors; reconstruction of missing architectural features, including the storefront; seismic retro-fit of the URM building; replacement of the roofing; repair of existing masonry; stabilization of the existing brick fireplace; restuccoing; and exterior painting.

Existing Square Feet: 3,200

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 3,200

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project includes reconstruction of deteriorated architectural features, including windows and doors; reconstruction of missing architectural features, including the storefront, which was reconstructed to match the remaining portion of the storefront; seismic retro-fit of the URM building; replacement of the roofing; repair of existing masonry; stabilization of the existing brick fireplace; restuccoing; and exterior painting. Most of this work has been completed, without the required staff review and approval. Staff questions whether or not replacement of some of the original historic fabric, including the original storefront framing, is consistent with the Standards, as it appears that the materials were not deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant should elaborate on the condition of the materials that were replaced.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant bought the subject property and the other two properties (HRB Sites 808 and 810) following the designation. All three structures had been boarded up and had issues of deferred maintenance. All three buildings were repainted, cleaned-up, and had new roofing installed. Windows which were not repairable were replaced on all three buildings. The applicant wasn't aware they needed review and approval from the City for the work. A concrete block building was added to the rear of the Rose Grocery in the 1950's. They were under the impression that the block building was not included in the designation.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
How did the applicant determine what the storefront on the Rose Grocery looked like?	When you looked at the inside, you could see the continuation of the original framing and that was replicated.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Emme	Applicant should work with staff on appropriate lighting, signage, hardscape and landscape.
Eisenhart	Generally, the project is coming along well. The Rose Grocery should be taken back to the Board to have the designation corrected to exclude the 1950's concrete block addition. He expressed some concern about the grocery and the delineation between old and new and the relationship between the casing and the building wall. For all three buildings, the applicant should document all of the existing historic fabric and develop a treatment plan that identifies materials that were replaced and materials that were repaired.
Johnson	Concerned about the building department issuing permits without HRB staff review.

Staff Comment:

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Winterrowd	The concrete block addition was not excluded from the designation, so if the applicant wants to significantly alter it, the site needs to go back before the Board to have that addition excluded from the designation.

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Coons	There was enough of the original framing left on the Rose Grocery to determine what the original appearance likely was, and that was reconstructed.

Recommended Modifications: The rehabilitation work completed to date appears to be consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. If the applicant wants to significantly alter the 1950's cement block addition, the site needs to go back before the Board to amend the designation and have the addition excluded.

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 3D:**

HRB #: 808

Address: 2227 30th Street

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Sandy Shapery, owner

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project includes reconstruction of deteriorated architectural features, including windows and doors; seismic retro-fit of the URM building; replacement of the roofing; repair of existing masonry; stabilization of the existing brick fireplace; restuccoing; exterior painting; and ADA improvements.

Existing Square Feet: 5,250

Additional Square Feet: 0

Total Proposed Square Feet: 5,250

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project includes reconstruction of deteriorated architectural features, including windows and doors; seismic retro-fit of the URM building; replacement of the roofing; repair of existing masonry; stabilization of the existing brick fireplace; restuccoing; exterior painting; and ADA improvements. Most of this work has been completed, without the required staff review and approval. Staff questions whether or not replacement of some of the original historic fabric, including the original windows and garage doors, is consistent with the Standards, as it appears to have been done to attract future tenants, and not to replace materials which were deteriorated beyond repair. The applicant should elaborate on the condition of the materials that were replaced. The applicant is also proposing to modify the rear elevation with a new storefront and ADA access. Staff has concerns regarding these improvements and their consistency with the Standards.

Applicant Presentation: The applicant bought the subject property and the other two properties (HRB Sites 809 and 810) following the designation. All three structures had been boarded up and had issues of deferred maintenance. All three buildings were repainted, cleaned-up, and had new roofing installed. Windows which were not repairable were replaced on all three buildings. The rear of the garage needs to be modified by replacing the old sliding wood door with a code-compliant storefront entry door and wheelchair ramp. The new storefront will not require any modification to the original façade as the new entry will fit within the original door opening. The applicant wasn't aware they needed review and approval from the City for the work.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
On east elevation of the garage, what changes are proposed?	Want to install a storefront in the location of the existing service door.



Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Emme	Applicant should work with staff on appropriate lighting, signage, hardscape and landscape.
Eisenhart	Generally, the project is coming along well. The garage is done quite well. For all three buildings, the applicant should document all of the existing historic fabric and develop a treatment plan that identifies materials that were replaced and materials that were repaired. The mechanism of the sliding service door at the rear of the garage should be retained as a character defining feature.
Johnson	Concerned about the building department issuing permits without HRB staff review. Suggested that the applicant maintain the mechanism and the single service door and install a window in the new door to allow light in when it slides open.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Coons	Suggested that they maintain the service door on the rear of the garage and construct a new storefront behind.

Recommended Modifications: The rehabilitation work completed to date appears to be consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The mechanism of the sliding service door at the rear of the garage should be retained as a character defining feature. The applicant could maintain the mechanism and the single service door and install a window in the new door to allow light in when it slides open.

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 3E:**

HRB #: 425

Address: Woodworth Way

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Robert Gehrke, RBF consulting; on behalf of the operator, NTC Foundation and its representative Neal Singer

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to add 29 parking spaces along Woodworth Way to serve the Officer's Quarters.

Existing Square Feet: n/a

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: This rehabilitation project proposes to add 29 parking spaces along Woodworth Way to serve the Officer's Quarters. The project will require altering and covering the drainage swale along portions of Woodworth Way. Portions of the drainage swale at the north and south will be maintained. Also looking at increasing the radius of the cul-de-sac at the end of Woodworth Way near the golf course.

Applicant Presentation: Additional parking is required to serve the officer's quarters. The Navy did have a private garage along Woodworth Way. A drainage ditch along Woodworth Way which catches run-off from the Officer's gardens will be impacted. The existing garages and semi-circular driveways will not be altered.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Will the improved cul-de-sac be concrete?	Yes.
What is the proposed use of the officer's quarters?	A music group will be leasing one.
Will any significant foliage be removed?	No.
Any other areas of NTC that have these drainage swales?	No.
What about the other parking lots?	Adjacent lots are set aside for the buildings they are associated with.
Any alternative locations for parking?	No.
Would modifications be reversible?	Yes. Interlocking block will be used for spaces and the ramp over the swale could be removed.
Will the drainage swale still be operable?	Yes.
No ability to move the fence and put the parking on the other side of the road?	No.
No parking on Rosecrans?	No.
Did the historic gardens go down to the road (Woodworth Way)?	Yes.
Were the gardens formal planted gardens or grass?	The gardens varied over time, but were very formal at times.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Emme	The parking spaces are a reversible modification which impacts a small fraction of the resource (the district). The project needs parking for successful adaptive reuse, and he thinks the additional parking spaces are ok.
Eisenhart	Traditionally Woodworth Way was an access for parking. The greenspace is largely retained, and the parking is broken up and not contiguous. Grasscrete should be used which shows only grass and no concrete surface (such as "Grasspave2" by Invisible Structures, Inc). The project does not detract from the buildings. Concerned about the actual need for parking, but notes it's a minimal impact, provided that the parking is grasscrete with no perceptible paving.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Coons	A garden study is underway for this area of NTC. Feels that this project is premature before the garden study is complete and the uses in the Officer's Quarters are identified. Also concerned about the drainage swale. If the ditch is covered up in large areas, run-off will flow into the street.
Ross	The landscape is historically designated and should be preserved and not turned into more parking lot. They should not build more surface parking. A garage should be built and a shuttle service should be implemented. Functions have been held there successfully already without additional parking.
Cecelia Conover	Would be concerned about a parking structure at NTC (referring to the Rosecrans Street parking lot).

Recommended Modifications: The parking spaces are a reversible modification which impacts a small fraction of the resource. Grasscrete should be used which shows only grass and no concrete surface (such as "Grasspave2" by Invisible Structures, Inc).

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 3F:**

HRB #: 425

Address: 2790 and 2765 Truxton Road

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Chris Bittner, Architect; on behalf of the operator, NTC Foundation and its representative Neal Singer

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to adaptively reuse Barracks Buildings #2 and #3. Interior remodeling and ADA improvements are proposed, as well as a 2,785 square foot glass and steel enclosure on each building.

Existing Square Feet: 9,172 (each)

Additional Square Feet: 2,785 (each)

Total Proposed Square Feet: 11,957 (each)

Staff Presentation: The applicant has requested that this project be brought before the DAS for a conceptual level discussion regarding rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the structure. The applicant would like to discuss possible design alternatives which would allow use of the building by a tenant, possibly a museum, which requires additional floor area and display space.

Applicant Presentation: Largely the same renovations as the review from the previous month on Building 19, with one exception: the enclosure of the area between the two small wings on the ground floor with a glass enclosure. The enclosure will be recessed from the primary façade. Whereas Building 19 sat by itself, these buildings have relationships to each other, so they are proposing improvements in the area between Buildings 2 and 3.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant’s Response</b>
The need for these improvements is to attract tenants?	Yes

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Eisenhart	Concerned about the impact to negative spaces and destroying the basic character and relationship between the buildings. Opposes infill of any kind. A temporary canopy may be supportable, but impacts to the voidal space alters the character of the building too much and is not consistent with the Standards. Would not be supportive of infill at any of the buildings. Does not have an objection to “enclosing” the interior space on each of the two small wings since the building envelope would not be altered. Any infill in these wings should utilize a maximum amount of glazing with a minimal amount of structural support.

Subcommittee-member	Comments
Emme	The glass infill could be removed, but agrees with Eisenhart about the impact of the infill and the fact that it is not consistent with the Standards. Would not be opposed to enclosing the interior space on the two small wings either, but not on all buildings. Paving in the courtyard must be consistent with the Guidelines. Low-rise shrubs would be attractive.

Staff Comment: None.

Public Comment:

Name	Comments
Coons	Will the façade be demolished? (the project would maintain 2 out of 7 arched bays). The demo if that wall is the most troubling aspect of the project. This is the oldest part of the base, and is one of the most significant aspects of the district. Hardscape should be simple and consistent with the Guidelines (scored concrete with brick trim). Benches should be consistent with others in the district. Doesn't like the idea of filling-in the arched wings. Building #3 is the worst candidate for this type of infill because it is the most visible, and is visible from the street.
Ross	Understands the argument of adaptive reuse, but there are potential tenants who would use the buildings as they are, if they are affordable. Supports Eisenhart's position.

Recommended Modifications: Those aspects of the project consistent with the modifications to Building #19 (reviewed April 2008) would be acceptable. Enclosure of the exterior space within existing walls of the two small wings could be supported, provided that the in-fill was done with a maximum amount of glazing and a minimal amount of structural support. In-fill between the bays or in-fill which expands the structural envelope is not consistent with the Standards and will not be supported.

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 3G:**

HRB #: 425

Address: 2725 and 2695 Truxton Road

PTS #: n/a

Project Contact: Richard Cornelius Architect; on behalf of the operator, NTC Foundation and its representative Neal Singer

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to adaptively reuse Barracks Buildings #5 and #18. The project proposes 14,400 square feet of in-fill construction between the two buildings, connecting them. The new construction will be 30 feet in height. The existing barracks buildings are 36 feet in height.

Existing Square Feet: 9,172 (each)

Additional Square Feet: 14,400

Total Proposed Square Feet: 32,744 (combined)

Staff Presentation: The applicant has requested that this project be brought before the DAS for a conceptual level discussion regarding rehabilitation and adaptive reuse of the structure. The applicant would like to discuss possible design alternatives which would allow joint use of Barracks Buildings #5 and #18, possibly through glass in-fill construction.

Applicant Presentation: SDG&E has approached them to put an energy resource center between Buildings 5 and 18. The enclosure shown is purely a concept, and is not being proposed at this time. The scenario would only be a possible in two locations. Buildings 17 and 19 have the same orientation to one another, and could illustrate the way buildings 5 and 18 related to one another historically.

Q&A: None

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Eisenhart	The infill is not appropriate. It terminates the historic axis. The infill alters the character defining features and spatial relationships between the structures. Building within the courtyards is not consistent with the Standards.
Emme	Not consistent with the Standards.

Staff Comment: None

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Coons	A radical change that destroys the historic character.

Recommended Modifications: The in-fill scenario presented is not consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Consensus:

- Consistent with the Standards
- Consistent with the Standards if modified as noted
- Inconsistent with the Standards and needs revision and additional review
- Inconsistent with the Standards but is the best feasible alternative
- Inconsistent with the Standards

▪ **ITEM 3H:**

HRB #: 865

Address: 4100 block of Adams Avenue

PTS #:

Project Contact: Harold Koenig and Mike Koonce

Treatment: Rehabilitation/Reconstruction

Project Scope: The applicant is requesting that the DAS provide direction regarding appropriate treatment of the Kensington sign. The applicant has concerns regarding the conditions of the existing materials and the continued use of the existing sign. A detailed conditions assessment of the sign is pending. The purpose of this meeting is to present the applicant's concerns and receive initial feedback from the DAS regarding the preferred treatment, before returning to the subcommittee with the conditions assessment and options for rehabilitation and/or reconstructing the sign.

Existing Square Feet: n/a

Additional Square Feet: n/a

Total Proposed Square Feet: n/a

Staff Presentation: The applicant is requesting that the DAS provide direction regarding appropriate treatment of the Kensington sign. The applicant has concerns regarding the condition of the existing materials and the continued use of the existing sign. Staff has directed the applicant to provide a detailed conditions assessment of the sign, which is pending. The purpose of this meeting is to present the applicant's concerns and receive initial feedback from the DAS regarding the preferred treatment, before returning to the subcommittee with the conditions assessment and options for rehabilitation and/or reconstruction of the sign.

Applicant Presentation: The first page of the packet shows the two designs for new signage approved by members of the community. California Neon told them that the inside of the sign was rusted out, but they haven't verified that. The poles supporting the sign have started to bend in because they don't have any guide wires pulling them back, as currently required by code. If they were to install guide wires, those wires would encroach into the walkway of the library on one side and into the sidewalk on the other. The sign is currently supported by four cables attached at each corner. This form of suspension adds additional tension on the poles. The third page provides a schematic of the proposed signage. The dimensions, color, font style, font color and neon are all intended to be recreated. The lamp post was an idea for supporting it, but they are not

against installing simple poles. The cobble base is intended to complement the neighborhood. The plaque shown on the cobble base is for those who donated over \$100. The last two pages provide a discussion as to why they feel the sign needs to be replaced. The codes have changed dramatically since the signs went up. Signs today require more steel to support the signage. Since tension mounting does not appear feasible due to the guide wire issue, a truss mounting seems more feasible. The sign company they are working with has told them that the existing sign cannot be remounted on a truss because the existing sign was designed to be tension mounted and cannot be simply mounted to a truss. The existing sign could be restored as best as possible and displayed elsewhere, perhaps the Automotive Museum.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Is an architect is involved?	A sign firm is involved.
What building code are they using?	Universal
Historic Building Code should be used now that the sign has been designated. It provides latitude and may eliminate the requirement to conform to current code (i.e. guide wires).	
Have they considered going back to the community and asking if they approve of rehabilitation/repair?	The community is divided, and donors are asking for their money back for both reasons (some want to keep the existing sign, others want the new sign). They may go to City Council to appeal, and if the designation is upheld, they will need to abandon the project and maintain the sign as-is.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Johnson	As proposed it does not maintain the setting. The sign no longer floats and the character is altered.
Emme	Not convinced that the sign is deteriorated beyond repair. Doesn't appear to have been well maintained since 1990. A new support structure may be able to cradle the sign.
Eisenhart	Feels that the applicant is putting the cart before the horse, and that the condition of the existing sign and its rehabilitation and reuse need to be explored first. Understands where they're coming from and appreciates the efforts of the community, but the proposal creates a false history. He is convinced that the sign can be maintained and rehabilitated. The Standards are not meant to replicate something that can be rehabilitated. If it must be replicated, it needs to be replicated in-kind.



Staff Comment:

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Saunders	Clarified that staff informed the applicant that historic resource regulations require that all projects be consistent with the Standards, or a Site Development Permit is required to process the project.
Winterrowd	The applicant was informed of the review process.

Public Comment:

<b>Name</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Coons	The applicant should talk to the sign company that maintains the Majorette sign. Believes that the findings for an appeal could not be met.
John Garrison	Location of the sign is important. The design is too radical a change to be consistent with the Standards. Believes the sign can be structurally sound with larger poles and stronger cables. Thinks community members will want to contribute to preserve the sign. Although river rock is used in the community, it wasn't present on the sign historically.
Celia Conover	Does not appear to have a rust issue from the exterior, but has not seen photos of the interior. Originally constructed of galvanized steel and has held up well. Maintaining the simplicity of the mounting is important. Was told by Ron Roberts' office that they would be open to amending the contract and the grant. Has a hard time believing that rehabilitation of the sign would cost as much as construction of the new sign.

Recommended Modifications: The proposed design is not consistent with the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The conditions assessment of the existing sign will determine whether or not the sign can be rehabilitated and re-used using stronger poles and guide-wires; or if reconstruction of the existing sign per the U.S. Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Reconstruction will be required due to the deteriorated condition of the sign. The applicant should return to DAS once the conditions assessment is complete.

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 3I:**

HRB #: 854

Address: 1821 Torrey Pines Road

PTS #: 59455

Project Contact: Tony Ciani, Architect; on behalf of the owner David Schroedel

Treatment: Rehabilitation

Project Scope: This rehabilitation project proposes to split a lot containing a historically designated house and build a new house on the second lot. The project does not propose any modifications to the existing, historically designated house. The project was reviewed previously by the DAS in March 2008, at which time the applicant received direction to revisit the siting, massing, design, and materials for the new structure; and explore options for reducing the horizontal massing, stepping the massing to respond better to the topography, opening views to the resource from Amalfi, and revising the design to incorporate more natural materials and simplified forms which tie into the historic resource. In addition, the DAS directed the applicant to reconstruct the trellis within the the property line, not on an easement, preferably 5' or more away from the new property line. The applicant is returning to the DAS for additional review.

Existing Square Feet: 2,155 (historic house)

Additional Square Feet: 6,000 (new house)

Total Proposed Square Feet: 2,155 (historic house); 6,000 (new house)

Staff Presentation: At the last meeting, the DAS directed the applicant to: relocate the proposed lot line at least 2.5 feet from the trellis; reconstruct the original retaining wall as part of the trellis (within the lot); provide an additional buffer of 5 feet between the pool and the property line; incorporate natural materials and dark colors on the new construction so the house recedes into the hillside; break up the roof massing, possibly incorporating trees or referencing the Haufbauer house in its roof modulation; and curve the proposed pool backward, angled into the hillside and set back at least 5 feet from the property line. The Subcommittee also directed that shrubs and trees over 10 feet should be used to provide a buffer between the two houses and provide a backdrop for the Haufbauer house. A materials and color board, renderings and revised landscape plans are to be presented at this meeting.

Applicant Presentation: The property line has been adjusted as required (now 6' from the property line to the pool) and the lot line was adjusted to keep the same lot area as before. The exterior material has been changed to wood (ipê) with dark tones. The siding will be horizontal (in contrast to the vertical boards on the Haufbauer house). Two mature palms will be relocated. The roof will be dark gray zinc, the windows will be anodized bronze aluminum and the balcony railings will be thin metal railing. Rather than poking landscape through the roofline, they are proposing a backdrop of landscaping along Amalfi.

Q&A:

<b>Subcommittee-member Issue or Question</b>	<b>Applicant's Response</b>
Has a window manufacturer been identified?	Not that far along.
What was the reason for aluminum windows instead of wood?	Maintenance.

Subcommittee Discussion and Comment:

<b>Subcommittee-member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Emme	The lot line is acceptable compared to what was proposed before. The materials have improved the appearance and help the house to blend into the hillside.
Johnsnon	Applicant has complied with the DAS requests.
Eisenhart	Glad that the palm is being moved. Would like to see more plantings between the houses. Likes the idea of landscaping as a back-drop, but the landscaping should be mature. Aluminum windows are fine, but they should be a darker color, completely non-reflective, with a matte finish.

Staff Comment:

<b>Staff Member</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Saunders	Landscape back drop must be on or abutting the property, not across Amalfi.

Public Comment: None

Recommended Modifications: The applicant has responded well to DAS direction. The proposed lot line provides adequate buffer between the historic structure and the new house and provides for the reconstruction of the trellis and retaining wall. The redesigned project is consistent with the Standards, provided that the aluminum windows are a darker color and completely non-reflective with a matte finish; and that the landscaping used to buffer and reduce the impact of the new structure be mature at the time of planting and be located entirely on or abutting the subject properties.

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 6:15 PM

The next regularly-scheduled Subcommittee Meeting will be on June 4, 2008 at 3:00 PM.

For more information, please contact Kelley Saunders at [KMSaunders@sandiego.gov](mailto:KMSaunders@sandiego.gov) or 619.533.6508