

Statewide significance

Motion: Richard Hastings that this is an issue of statewide significance.

Second:

Qualified Historical Building

AD This building has not existed for how many years?

MBL It was built in 1853 and was torn down in 1914 and the reconstruction is almost complete today.

RH How did you determine where the original foundations were located?

MBL On the basis of archeological investigation.

RH That's the right answer.

AD It is a reconstruction of a building that didn't exist for a period of time and it is also in a historic district, and could be looked at as a missing part of a historic district.

MBL Yes

AD Opens meeting for public input.

MBL Review the issues of QHB. It is within the NHR District that includes the SHP and an additional 6 blocks. It is a local historical site designated in 1970. Location of the Casa. Building on that site came under the cities historical board. Relevant that the SIS treatment of historic properties – there are 4 types of treatments – rehabilitation, restoration, preservation and reconstruction. So SIS has recognized reconstructions as historic properties. State Parks had plans to reconstruct this property. In terms of the city building dept. They have allowed the use of alternatives on this building to use the SHBC on three issues. Energy conservation standards, alternative compliance for disabled access and the use of non-tempered glass. Sites are also covered within the CHBC as well a section states that this code is to provide regulations for reconstructions and defines reconstructions.

AD To the Board

KK If this were a site in Old Town Sacto, any building other than a reconstruction would be denied.

GS This is an archeological site. When the designation was made this was a "site". Anything that is constructed there, under the NR criteria may be compatible with but would be a non-contributor to the district. The SIS states that for code, reconstructions are essentially new construction. In the CHBC, non historical additions shall conform to the regular code. In this case this is an addition to the historic district.

AD There is something in the CHBC that addresses reconstructions.

GS if an existing building is damaged or eliminated, if the resource was designated historic is one thing, in this case when the district was created, the building was not present. Designations are made on the conditions at the time. This is adding to that district, something new. Even under the standards there are code considerations for new construction, SIS is providing for protecting any original fabric remaining. In this case there was nothing there.

AD For clarification, we are not here determining if this project meets the SIS. We are determining if it meets the criteria for QHB under the SHBC.

RH Under our code the intention was to allow reconstruction, even if we are allowing displacing the original fabric such as foundations in the ground. To allow these to be brought back. Particularly in the boundaries of a district.

Motion RH I would move that we consider this reconstruction as a historic building.

Second ??

DC Would you take a friendly amendment to say that we recognize this is a QHB.

TB OHP was requested to see what affect this designation would have on the Cal Register. Noted some issues that Cal Register wouldn't recognize a reconstruction a NRD might.

TW Basically, we aren't making a problem for the registers.

?? The city has already allowed that this is a QHB by granting use of the SHBC. I would say that we are going to support that decision.

LW What is the construction?

PJ The original was 24" of adobe, reconstruction is CMU with adobe veneer. And it meets regular code.

AD Call question.

Affirmative majority, opposed GS. Passes.

MBL Verandah wall must project out to protect the end of the building

PJ This space between the buildings is a no-name street. It is used presently as a pedestrian walkway. It is a part of the State Park. The state park bounds on 3 sides. The wall in question is the north wall and its extension on each end that isn't historic.

MBL The projecting wall is very historically inaccurate and in conflict with the reconstruction. We have been trying to figure out a solution. The jurisdiction is saying they won't give a C of O if we haven't done everything we can to avoid having to build that wall. We've asked DPR for an easement, including an open space easement between the city, State Parks and the owner. If State Parks ever built on that space, the owner would install the wing walls and fire devices. There has been no response.

We come back to this board to use an alternative. That is to use a fire sprinkler system to be used in lieu of the wall. We took the issue to the city historical board and they supported the alternative construction.

Nabil The city has determined there are three kinds of historical projects, Rehabilitation or retrofitting, Relocation and Reconstruction.

Continue from tape 2.

End of transcript tape. Tape 3

DC City of San Diego has experience. What's the opposition to an alternate for an exterior exposure sprinkler.

Nabil Perhaps it wasn't brought up to the plan checker.

DC This will be an open space (next to the property line). The sprinkler is a valid interpretation.

Nabil I am just not familiar enough with this project to answer that question. There has been discussion, but since this building wasn't existing before and whether it needs to meet the building code or not, and how much of the historic fabric are we affecting by adding a fire rated wall or not.

RH I don't see the need to sprinkler this situation. This is an open space and State Parks is bound to keep it open.

LW But we can't speak for State Parks.

RR SFM has responsibility to protect state property and property lines are important to the state, we can say nobody will build, but we never know that.

Question: Exposure protection is a deluge system which is quite expensive.

DMeyers Deluge systems are no longer manufactured, and can't be made any more. SHBC allows it but there is not equipment listed to do that.

PJ All of the buildings on the site are completely sprinklered.

TW One of the things that you will notice in the SHBC is that we don't cite any listings. When alternates are brought there is not listing cited or implied.

RR SFM requires that all equipment for fire systems be listed. State Law mandates that all fire alarm systems be listed by SFM there is no exemption listed under the law. I'd like to know where your law cites that your are exempted from SFM law.

TW 18956 (Section, Health and Safety Code)

AD If there is a system in a historic building that is not required

RR It must be SFM approved

AD if it is not required

RR Absolutely

DougM There is an interpretation on that, voluntary systems.

?? That walkway has been open for a long time. I don't think it will be eliminated. First I don't think there needs to be a requirement on that site. I would propose two thoughts. We don't know what's going to happen on that site and alternately if the city of San Diego thinks something will be done the city can require a deluge system.

Nabil We had a property where we allowed no protection on such a situation, the Caltrans property, after some years they came in and built a building adjoining that unprotected wall.

??LW Then you are sprinklering the buildings?

MBL Yes, the interior, not the exposure.

?? Why don't you increase the regular sprinkling and call it good?

AD It looks like 80% of this wall has been taken care of. The only portions left are the windows away from the property line.

LW so what we are looking at is only the verandah openings.

DC Would the city be willing to offer the C of O if a building is built within that open space you will require the fire sprinkling if something is constructed.

Nabil not done before, but it doesn't look that serious. We sort of look at it as not being that serious, if a sprinkler system was put on it, it would probably be OK.

LW This is similar to parapet ordinances. Jurisdictions don't demand protection of parapets adjacent to taller buildings, but if the adjacent building is removed, the parapet must be strengthened or removed.

RR SFM isn't against alternate means, I would say that it needs to be a listed system. Staff counsel should rule on that issue.

AD Public hearing closed.

TB Has tom talked to Roni Clark, Superintendent of State Parks?

TW I am aware that discussions have been ongoing with DPR/Roni Clark and the owners of the property.

AD Motion?

DC Roof, What kind?

PJ Wood

DC Motion that the board rule that the protection wall at the exterior verandah be allowed to be omitted in lieu of one of two options: 1) Comply with the prescriptive requirements of CHBC 402.1 exterior exposure sprinklers; 2) or at the discretion of the city some kind of condition on the Certificate of Occupancy. At the discretion of the building official or fire official.

The condition that this open space area known along San Diego as an unnamed street remain as a pedestrian way and at such time as combustible construction takes place the building official would revoke the C of O or require a fire wall to be constructed along those verandahs.

Loring Second

Discussion

RR I would support that based on any construction, not non-combustible.

DC I wouldn't consider that a friendly amendment.

RR If you build a building there, it would need to be fire protected.

DC My concern is that some a building is build that is combustible. A masonry building or drinking fountain is not a hazard.

RR So a State Park masonry building along the property line wouldn't kick in the requirement?

DC I wouldn't be concerned about it.

RR I would be concerned that State Parks be protected

DC No comment.

Nabil So that requirement is in addition to the sprinkler

DC One or the other.

Loring I have a problem that the second part of the motion is at the discretion of the jurisdiction. Where the city has never done this before, but is routine in other jurisdictions to do retro active requirements. If the city doesn't go along there is no alternative.

AD I agree with Loring, if there is no fire marshal approved system, there is no alternative.

Loring I don't see any problem with this, but the State Park is a different jurisdiction and it won't come to the city building department.

RR The city would never see that project. We should just demand to protect both properties.

AD I am swayed by the fact that the Casa is fully sprinklered and that is not required.

PJ The sprinklers were added as a alternative using the SHBC.

Fred Turner We have a verandah constructed of wood. What is the potential of fire spread from landscaping to the construction.

PJ There is a landscaping plan restricting landscaping to minimal, or historic types. The verandah is sprinklered.

DC Withdraw the motion

Can the Chair make a motion?

K Yates The chair can make a motion or second.

DC That the SHBSB recognize that the presence of an existing NFPA 1313 fully sprinklered building including the verandah be equivalent to the required property line protection of CHBC 402.1. The appeal be upheld.

Loring Second

DC Findings: The building is open on all sides with limited exposure to vegetation 2) no adjacent proximity to buildings 3) the risk is rather low if the sprinklers fail.

Question

No opposed, passes

Tim Brandt abstains.