



Downtown Community Planning Council San Diego

CHAIRPERSON'S REPORT

PRE-DESIGN SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING OF THE DOWNTOWN COMMUNITY PLANNING COUNCIL

TUESDAY JULY 10, 2018
5:15 PM

CIVIC SAN DIEGO
401 B STREET, SUITE 400
SAN DIEGO, CA

1. Roll Call at 5:15pm. DCPC Members in Attendance: Nancy Wilson Ramon, Ned Lachman, Conor Brown, Dan Wery, Ned Lachman, Jon Baker, Claudia Escala. Also joined the meeting Gordon Summer (Community Member), LC Cline (Downtown Residents Group) Kathleen Hallahan (East Village Residents Group)
2. Public comments on non-agenda items. None
3. Report from Chairperson: A couple members are not in attendance due a community meeting by Councilmember Chris Ward taking place at the same time.
4. **Action items**
 - Third & A (north side of A Street between Third and Fourth avenues) – Centre City Development Permit/Centre City Planned Development Permit No. 2018-16 – Preliminary Design Review – Cortez Neighborhood of the Downtown Community Plan Area ~ Brad Richter

Claudia Escala & Conor Brown recused themselves and Dan Wery acted as chair for this portion of the meeting.

The project is comprised of 270 dwelling units and approximately 4,000 SF of ground floor retail space. There will be 282 parking spaces located in 3 underground levels and 3 above grade levels.

Design Issues and Considerations

- Overall Massing: Does the proposed design sufficiently breakdown the building's massing consistent with the Downtown Design Guidelines.
- Architecture: Does the tower design exhibit superior architecture as required to grant the requested PDP deviations?
- Lot Coverage: Is the proposed increase in lot coverage compatible with the surrounding neighborhood?
- Street Level Design. Does the Project's ground floor provide sufficient transparency and pedestrian interest along Third Avenue?
- Existing Building Wall: Should additional treatment be provided to the 100 – foot long black wall of existing building along Third Avenue?

Presentation by Applicant The Hanover Co. - Erik Kenney and Architect Carrier Johnson Inc.– Alex Kacur

Hanover operates nationwide with a lot of development work in San Diego. Projects built in San Diego include Current, Strata and 13th & Market over a period of 15 years. Hanover builds apartments and mixed use rather than condominiums.

The proposed project is one block south of the future St Joseph's Park. The design parti offers an extension of the future open green space into the project by proposing a building that steps up from north to south respecting the solar envelope and articulating a series of green terraces. Green terraces are planned for levels 4,10,19 and 21 and



will have amenities that include lounges, fire places, pool, etc. that will encourage indoor and outdoor activities and offer breathtaking views of Balboa Park, Banker's Hill, the bay and downtown. The project's design process started with a large mass that peels away from the future park. The large mass is broken into a series of smaller tower like components. The core element is used on the south elevation to create an additional break. Using a vertical fin capping the amenity space at the very top the massing composition is stitched together. The clad columns at the roof define exterior rooms with nanawalls. Main materials are concrete and glass with more enhanced materials at the base. 70% of the units have balconies which is more than the required 50%. The base of the building right at the lobby entrance is enhanced with planters for a warmer homey feel. Charcoal stone and a white stone add texture using the vents/screen materials to provide further articulation at the base of the building. Retail spaces are located at the corner of 3rd & A and between the driveway entries along 3rd Avenue.

Members Questions

Q. What kind of development could go on the site used for Transfer of Development Rights? **A.** Could have retail on the ground level with 6 levels of office space and not require parking. **Q.** Is project meeting 40% minimum. **A.** Yes there is active commercial space proposed meeting 40% requirement. **Q.** Is project meeting 60% of ground floor transparency? **A.** Team used a different interpretation which equals to 88% transparency based on retail frontage only but are not meeting 60% transparency overall but looking at making some adjustments with the utilities to meet the requirement. Will ask applicant to be utilities should be perpendicular to street to get more transparency **Q.** It is not clear if garage entry is obscured by 80%. **A.** Per Civic SD loading doors need to be solid and driveways can only be 20% open. The purpose it to avoid looking at open grilles into a cavernous garage. **Q.** On above ground parking level what will be the effect of head lights? **A.** Ramp is on exterior face so no headlamps at exterior walls. Vertical vents help break the scale are decorative and don't let light go through. **Q.** What is the property line set back? **A.** Per Civic SD there is an error in the report but the distance to the interior property line is 15 feet which can be accepted through design review. It will impact the adjoining site by an additional 5' as 40 feet is needed away from towers. **Q.** Any discussion about the concrete wall on the existing building? **A.** Team is considering punching some openings or adding graphics **Q.** At level 4 garage there is parking at half a floor. Is the applicant using any type of glass to screen the cars? **A.** No vision glass proposed even in the area for motorcycle parking and the spandrel to be used will look like vision glass. Will get one of the elevations that is currently showing vision glass corrected. **Q.** On the 0.9 FAR to be purchased the existing owner will not have that FAR available to them correct? **A.** Correct. but they would still have 7.5 FAR available with bonuses. **Q.** Can applicant cover the sun exposure? **A.** An additional 8' will be shaded. **Q.** How many days of the year are we going to beyond what is allowed. **A.** The additional area will be shaded only in the winter months. **Q.** For the small building to the north what is the plan for that parcel? **A.** The Hanover Company had numerous conversations with Mr Aminpour. The building is historic. He has a 5,000 SF lot and the potential to build 40,000SF. The Owner believes he can build a project above the historic residence.

Public Comments

Gary Smith (President of Downtown Residents Group) - Neutral Does not see anything appearance wise that would be offensive to anyone except the 3 story concrete blank wall. The dog space at Level 5 is as far away from the elevator as possible. No loading dock really shown. Looks like retail spaces have no access to the loading area or the trash rooms meaning everything will go in and out on the Right of Way. No easy access to bicycle storage. The park impact is minimal for 3 months of the year but results in and additional 800 SF in the shade. If the same type of impact is allowed on all side it would equal 2,400SF

DCPC Member comments

Jon Baker- It is a nice development. The planning looks good. Compositionally maybe over the course of time it will be refined, but the scale of the development seems random. There is a start to an idea. The project could improve by diminishing the massiveness. Encourages the architect to continue to develop the composition The building could be more successful and he has complete confidence in the architect. All pieces are there but need to avoid becoming too monolithic. The Arxhitect should work on forms and edges and proportions. The size of the steps in height and proportion appear random and lack the finesse of other projects by Carrier Johnson.



Rand Barbano Likes the overall project but is concerned with the two entries to the parking garage along 3rd avenue. Dan Wery: Could use more distinction in the massing. Looks flat and would like to see more articulation. Base levels leave him cold with the white band. Maybe perforate it a little more. Alex Kacur noted that the building is sitting right on the property line and there is no permission from the Owner to do anything on that wall

Michael Johnson with Carrier Johnson added that the North elevation offers the most interesting part in the composition. It is overall a very sustainable building. The lower mass facing the park is almost all glass which can be done because it faces north. The design team is trying not to get too cute with breaking too much the facade

Non DCPC Member comments

LC Cline: He had previously received the presentation when the project went in front of CHARG. Really likes the development as he can see that a lot of thought went into creating the proposed project. Would like to see the material board. It is a very well composed building and thanks the team for proposing the ecco roof.

- 10th & E (south side of E Street between 10th and 11th streets) – Centre City Development Permit/Site Development Permit (CCDP/SDP) No. 2017-46 – Preliminary Design Review – East Village Neighborhood of the Downtown Community Plan Area ~ Brad Richter

This Project proposes the construction of a 6-38 story (approximately 72-394 foot tall) residential development consisting of approximately 365 DU, and 2,572 SF of ground floor retail space. There will be 315 parking spaces located in 3 subterranean levels and six levels above grade. The Project will provide 16 affordable dwelling units restricted to tenants with the very-low incomes which equates to 11% of the Base Maximum FAR units.

Design Issues and Considerations

- Does the project overall mass, scale and height constitute a compatible development with existing development and with the overall neighborhood context?
- Does the Project's architectural expression for both the tower and the podium, present a unique, desirable, contemporary architectural expression as well as meet the intent of the Downtown Design Guidelines?
- Does the Project's podium integrate successfully with both street frontages and the tower above?
- Has the southern podium wall received adequate treatment given its six story height?

Presentation by Architect AVRP Charles Brixton

The developer is a canadian company named Capexco. The mural on south side is a place holder. The stained concrete will be in a rust color and that elevation will still be further developed. The design composition includes the podium and the building spine with two toned metal panel and punched openings as well as all glass window wall systems. The yellow glazing is denoting where the amenities occur in the project. The podium portion masking the above grade parking is conceived as a warehouse building. The solid portions are proposed in a board formed finish concrete structure with weathered steel lintels and glazed openings that will be opaque to conceal parking. Glass is planned to be backlit to create a light box. The canopy in this area will also be in a weathered metal. The design team is aware this are needs more refinement so will continue to work on it. Garage doors will be perforated in weathered steel as well. There is also a smaller glazed garage door for the bike storage area.

Members Questions

Q. Can Civic SD go through the numbers again?. **A.** 16 affordable housing units are calculated over the base FAR.
Q. Weathered metal is it corten steel? **A** With the staining issues associated with corten steel the design team is still researching weathered metal options. **Q.** Is there no connection between parking ramps? **A.** None **Q.** Was this area part of the College District? **A.** Per Civic SD prior to 2006 it could have been part of the Community College Neighborhood. **Q.** Thematically could anything be done to tie to it? **A.** Per the 2006 community plan this is supposed to be a very high dense area. Civic SD is very pleased with this type of project moving forward. **Q.** Less than one



parking space per unit?. Residents will probably have a car. **A** The 0.5 parking space requirement per unit is a state mandate allowed for that specific Average Median Income level. **Q.** Unit SF are pretty small. How many one bedrooms are over 1,000 and how many 2BDs are over 2,000? **A.** Upper floors contain the largest units. Based on a market analysis the smaller studio units. are popular for people entering the work force. **Q.** Can applicant further explain the options for the disposition of historic buildings? **A.** The applicant's preferred option is to move them out of downtown to Sherman Heights.. Another option is to keep one of the historic buildings on site but this significantly limits the project size, eliminates driveway off 11th and will require parking to go further below grade. **Q.** Retail spaces to be divided or planning to keep it as one large space?. **A.** Keeping flexibility. **Q.** How many parking spaces for the large units and how many units without parking? **A.** One parking space is designated for the 2 BDs. The ratio is 315 parking spaces to 365.units. **Q.** Is it possible to break the blank wall and use fire rated glass to break the monotony of the wall? **A.** It can be studied. **Q.** Any plans for E Street? **A.** Yes, per Civic SD the green street is planned on the north side of E Street and traffic lanes will be limited to two. **Q.** Still will there be an entry to the Interstate 5 on E Street? **A.** Yes **Q.** Not convinced car ownership is a fleeing trend. Supports ideas that perimeter area can be converted to other uses. If there is enough retail created through the program could the City purchase the parking for public use? **A.** Yes parking district could purchase a parking easement. There are a few examples of this scenario in downtown like at the First National Bank where the city recorded an easement. Same for the Cedar Gateway project. It is possible but also complicated **Q.** The yellow glass shown in the renderings will it be that yellow in reality? **A.** No, it will be less intense. **Q.** Regarding the reveals in the metal panel system is it a dry system or will the reveals be caulked? They are part of the window wall and will be caulked. The project is proposing using two different metal panel colors. Different hues in the gray family.

Public Comments

Amy Hayes (SOHO) - Neutral. Appreciates the property owner is recognizing the historical significance of the existing buildings. Understands that retaining the historical resources on site poses restrictions to the parking component and size of amenity spaces. SOHO believes 1035 property should remain at its original location and would prefer that both 1035 & 1045 be retained on site

Kaye Benton Neighbor immediately adjacent to the proposed project. Lives in a building built in 1933. The proposed project would take all the light from the existing condos. Their building currently depends on the existing parking lot for their guests. There is a Ballpark with insufficient parking. There is a beautiful mural on the north side of the adjacent building that was painted in 1998 by one of her neighbors. Finds it extremely distressing that the mural would be covered by the proposed project

Gary Smith (Downtown Residents Group) – Neutral. Allowing podiums for parking is a financial thing. This is the biggest 7 stories tall. The proposed LED glow for people living across the street. will not be pleasant. At the corner of 11th & E two pieces of concrete are coming together just interrupted by a piece of metal. Does not consider that to be good architecture. That part of the city is intended to get high density. Does not see a dog area and believes loading as shown will be impossible. USPS is also not working,. In an apartment building the garage is a profit center. Someone in a penthouse could pay for 4 parking spaces.

DCPC Member comments

Conor Brown: Enjoys the massing and thinks the enhanced materials will feel good walking down the street. Concerned with the large podium feeling dark and empty but otherwise he really enjoys the building.

Jon baker: Believes this is a really well crafted project and appreciates the use of board formed concrete, The metal panel fits well with the East Village grit. Would be good not to be looking into dark windows at the above grade parking. Dark windows will feel like an empty office space which is not desirable. Instead of the proposed mural for the blank wall recommends treating it similar to the garage with fire rated glass. Agrees both historical buildings should be preserved. An alternative concept of hanging a tower over a historic building would look awkward.

Claudia Escala: Concerned that all the different sizes of metal panel creating a pattern on the façade up the tower may be value engineered at some point so cautioned the applicant not to reduce its pattern in the process of developing the documents. The warehouse concept for the above grade parking works. A good example of lighting an above grade parking is the Solamar Hotel. Understands the constraints posed by the historic buildings but would love the buildings not to move to Sherman Heights but remain in the neighborhood. A successful example of this



approach is The Q building in Little Italy that relocated a historical home to a different part of the same site. Also in Little Italy the historic building from Piazza Famiglia was successfully relocated to Amici Park and refurbished as public bathrooms. The building has many different window patterns that may not work on other projects but are working on this one. The project as designed does not need the yellow glass.

Rand Barbano: Echoes comments from other members about leaving buildings in place and building over. Does not like single yellow bump out on the side.

Dan Wery: Overall likes massing and articulation. Likes board formed concrete. We have several examples of bright yellow and red on buildings. Would like to discourage the yellow. With such an elegant building the yellow is not needed. Metal coming down looks good at the tower but coming down to the ground level leaves him cold. Maybe include some planting to warm it up. Overall main concern is that there is no people till we get to the 7th floor. In the upcoming Planned Development Ordinance plan update DCPC should not be favoring all this parking above ground.

Non DCPC Member comments

Kathleen Hallahan (President East Village Residents Group). Finds the massing and building quite attractive. Appreciates board formed concrete specifically strong when sun hits it. The south side would be optimal. Concerned about south side, Very rare does she think a mural is successful, Is there ever an easement to achieve over a neighbor's property? Something 3 dimensional that works with the sun for that wall would be more interesting. Concerned with the garage façade. Applicant should consider fire rated glass. It is going to be tricky to get it right. The historical buildings would be wonderful to keep them. Not sure how the economics will work. Looks like the entry for the parking has not been addressed. Thinks of fluorescent lights inside the parking will not be seen as a strong element from the outside.

LC Cline (Downtown Residents Group) Overall finds the building visually exciting. The warehouse style façade has been exercised in various areas of East Village successfully. Moving buildings to Sherman heights is a wonderful idea. On the streetscape a lot of wonderful glass area. Developer should start working with different vendors, retailers to get storefronts activated.

Meeting adjourned at 7:44 PM