

Cultural Heritage Board Memorandum

Community & Economic Development Department Planning Division 3900 Main Street, Riverside, CA 92522 | Phone: (951) 826-5371 | RiversideCA.gov

> CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD MEETING DATE: SEPTEMBER 18, 2019 **AGENDA ITEM NO.: 3**

PROPOSED PROJECT

Case Numbers	P19-0534 (Certificate of Approp	oriateness)
Request	To consider a Certificate of Ap the E.T. Wall Packing House.	propriateness for the exterior rehabilitation of
Applicant	Rick Scott of 3rd and Vine, LLC	\$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$
Project Location	3280 Vine Street, situated on the northwest corner of Third and Vine Streets	
APN	213-060-027	
Ward	1	
Neighborhood	Hunter Industrial Park	7
Historic District	N/A	NORTH
Historic Designation	City Landmark #138	7/ / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / / /
Staff Planner	Scott Watson, Historic Preservat 951-826-5507 swatson@riversideca.gov	ion Officer

RECOMMENDATIONS

Staff Recommends that the Cultural Heritage Board:

- 1. DETERMINE that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) pursuant to Sections 15301 (Existing Facilities) and 15331 (Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation) of the CEQA Guidelines, as the project constitutes a minor alteration to an existing facility and Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation, consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties; and
- 2. APPROVE Planning Case P19-0534 (Certificate of Appropriateness), based on the findings outlined and summarized in the staff report and subject to the recommended conditions (Exhibit 1).

Page 1 September 18, 2019 P19-0534

BACKGROUND/HISTORY

The subject 21,475 square foot property was developed as a two-story packinghouse, with basement, for the Los Angeles and Salt Lake Railroad in 1921-1922. Soon after construction, the structure was purchased by citrus growers Edgar T. Wall and Arthur McDermont.

Character-defining features of the structure include: stacked concrete construction; Western False Front style stepped parapet walls on the east and west elevations; a saw-toothed roof with clerestory windows; and wood trim around the existing window openings. Most original windows are no longer extant. The two-story, wood-framed stucco office/administration addition on building's the north elevation was constructed in the 1930s. The windows on the addition have been replaced with vinyl-framed double-hung windows within the original openings. The west canopy was enclosed in 1952.

Surrounding land uses include industrial and commercial retail (Exhibit 2).

On December 4, 2018, the City Council approved the request by the property owner to designate the E.T. Wall Packing House as a City Landmark.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for exterior rehabilitation including 1) the removal of non-historic features; 2) installation and/or replacement of windows; 3) installation and/or replacement of new doors; and 4) addition of a new exterior elevator shaft to provide accessible access to all floors of the building. The building is currently vacant and the proposed exterior rehabilitation project will help facilitate future reuse of the structure, as permitted within the BMP - Business and Manufacturing Park Zone.

The proposed exterior rehabilitation project is as follows:

- 1. Removal of Non-Historic Features
 - a. North elevation The existing non-original loading dock, including stairways, concrete platform, and wood walkway will be removed
- 2. Installation and/or Replacement of Windows
 - a. North elevation Five pedestrian doors will be removed and infilled. Three will be replaced with new windows to match the fenestration pattern, window type, material, and wood trim of the existing windows.
 - b. South elevation Eight single-hung, fiberglass-framed windows will be installed within the original openings. The pane configuration of the new windows will match that of the building's existing windows.
- 3. Installation and/or Replacement of Doors
 - a. North elevation A new fully glazed, wood pedestrian door at grade level will be added to serve as the primary interest to the building.
 - b. South elevation The existing wood double doors will be removed and replaced in-kind. The doors will be non-operable but will maintain the existing look and placement of the doors.
 - c. East elevation The northern most metal roll-up door will be removed. The opening will be infilled with a new metal pedestrian door and a stucco wall. New exterior stairs will be added to provide access to the new pedestrian door.
- 4. Addition of New Exterior Elevator Shaft
 - a. The elevator will be constructed within the existing enclosed canopy on the building's west elevation, but six-feet, six-inches will project above the canopy's roof.
 - b. The proposed elevator shaft will be clad in smooth stucco and topped with a ribbed metal, shed roof to match the enclosed canopy.

Page 2 September 18, 2019

PROJECT ANALYSIS

FACTS FOR FINDINGS

The Board and Historic Preservation Officer shall make findings of the following standards wher applicable to approving or denying a Certificate of Appropriateness. (From Section 20.25.050 of the Riverside Municipal Code)			
The application proposal is consistent or compatible with the	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent
architectural period and the character-defining elements of		\overline{V}	
the historic building.			
Facts:			
Removal of Non-Historic Features			
a. North elevation - The loading docks and stairs to			
the building and are not considered character-defining features of the building.			the building.
Installation and/or Replacement of Windows North playeting. The deeps to be removed.	ط النبيد	a raplaced	by windows
 a. North elevation – The doors to be removed will be replaced by windows matching the existing windows. 			
b. South elevation - The proposed windows will	he wi	thin the orio	wobniw lanir
opening and compatible with the style of the or			jiriai wiiraow
3. Installation and/or Replacement of Doors	igii iai	viii a a vis.	
a. North elevation - The proposed pedestrian do	or will	be utilitariar	in style and
compatible with the architectural period of the building.			3
b. East elevation - The proposed pedestrian door will be utilitarian in style and			in style and
compatible with the architectural period of the building. The proposed steps to			•
the new door will be utilitarian in design with limited visibility from the public right			e public right
of way.			
4. Addition of New Exterior Elevator Shaft			
a. West elevation - The proposed elevator shaft will be simple in design, have no			
decorative features, and topped with a shed roof to match the western enclosed canopy.			
The application proposal is compatible with existing adjacent	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent
or nearby Cultural Resources and their character-defining			
elements.	\checkmark		
Facts: NA - The property is not located within an historic district and there are no adjacent			
Cultural Resources.			-

September 18, 2019 P19-0534 Page 3

The colors,	textures, materials, fenestration, decorative	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent
construction	d details, height, scale, massing and methods of proposed are consistent with the period and/or with adjacent Cultural Resources.		V	
Facts:				
1. Remo	oval of Non-Historic Features – N/A			
2. Instal	lation and/or Replacement of Windows			
а	. North elevation - The proposed windows will ma		e existing wind	dows in terms
	fenestration pattern, type, material, size, and tri	m.		
b	. South elevation - The original wood window			
	proposed windows, single-hung with a divided within the original window opening as approp			
	proposed windows will be fiberglass-framed win			
	look of wood-framed windows.		J	
3. Instal	lation and/or Replacement of Doors			
а		will be	a fully glazed	I, wood door,
	with divided lights, and is compatible with the h			
b	. East elevation - The proposed pedestrian door w			
	proposed steps to the new door will be co		ted of meta	ıl. Both are
4 0 -1 -1'	compatible with the utilitarian design of the buil	ding.		
	tion of New Exterior Elevator Shaft	م ما الا	lad in smaatl	a studed and
a	. West elevation - The proposed elevator shaft w			
The property	topped with a ribbed metal roof to match the v			
	d change does not adversely affect the context	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent
_	the following factors: grading; site development; of buildings; off-street parking; landscaping; signs;			
	re; public areas; relationship of the project to its	$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$		
surroundings				
Facts:			l	
	- No changes proposed will alter the building orie	ntatio	n or its relation	onship to the
site.	The changes proposed the area the banding end			0.101.11p 10 1.10
The propose	d change does not adversely affect an important	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent
	I, historical, cultural or archaeological feature or]
features.	,		lacksquare	
Facts:			l	
	oval of Non-Historic Features			
a		orical.	or cultural fe	atures will be
impacted by removing the non-original loading docks and stairs.				
2. Installation and/or Replacement of Windows				
a. North elevation - The doors to be removed will be replaced by new windows				
with no impact to important architectural, historical, or cultural features.				
3. Instal	lation and/or Replace of Doors			
а	. East elevation - The roll-up door to be remove	ved w	rill be infilled	with a new
pedestrian door and stucco wall with no impact to important architectural,				
historical, or cultural features will be impacted.				
4. Addition of New Exterior Elevator Shaft				
a. A small amount of historic material will be removed on the roof on the western				
enclosed canopy for the elevator shaft.				
b. There are no known archaeological features in the vicinity. The proposed				
project, specifically the digging of a pit for an elevator shaft, is unlikely to have				
	any impact to archaeological features on the	site d	eveloped sir	nce the early
	1920s.			

Page 4 September 18, 2019

The application proposal is consistent with the Citywide	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent
Residential Historic District Design Guidelines and the separate guidelines for each Historic District.	V		
Facts:			
 N/A - The property is not within an historic district. 			
The application proposal is consistent with the Principles of the	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent
Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.		\checkmark	
 Facts: The proposed project is consistent with the Standards for The proposed project will allow the reuse of the build distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relation The proposed project will retain the historic character of the New architecture features will be compatible with the method, style and design, but will be slightly differentiate the original design 	ding with the post of the post	ith minimal c s. property. storic buildin	change to its

AUTHORIZATION AND COMPLIANCE SUMMARY

Regulatory Codes	Consistent	Inconsistent
Historic Preservation Code Consistency (Title 20)		
The proposed project is consistent with section 20.25.050 of the City of Riverside Municipal Code because the project is compatible with the existing building in terms of style, detailing, and material.		
 Removal of Non-Historic Features - The loading dock, including stairways, concrete platform, and wood walkway are not original to the building and their removal is consistent with Title 20. Installation and/or Replacement of Windows - Proposed windows are compatible with the existing windows in terms of type, size, material, fenestration pattern, and pane configuration. Installation and/or Replacement of Doors - Proposed doors are utilitarian in design and compatible with the style and historic period of the building. The proposed steps to the new door elevation will be utilitarian in design and are compatible with the design of the building. Addition of New Exterior Elevator Shaft - The elevator shaft addition will match the cladding and roofing of the existing western enclosed canopy. 	V	

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Minor additions and alterations to historic resources, consistent with the Secretary of the Interiors Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, are categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Section 15301 (Existing Facilities) of the CEQA Guidelines and Section 15331 (Historical Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Page 5 September 18, 2019

PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENTS

Public notices were mailed to property owners adjacent to the site. As of the writing this report, no comments have been received by Staff.

APPEAL INFORMATION

Actions by the City Planning Commission, including any environmental finding, may be appealed to the City Council within ten calendar days after the decision. Appeal filing and processing information may be obtained from the Planning Department Public Information Section, 3rd Floor, City Hall.

EXHIBITS LIST

- 1. Staff Recommended Conditions of Approval
- 2. Aerial Photo/Location
- 3. Project Plans (Site Plan, Floor Plans, Demolition Plans, Demolition Elevations, Proposed Elevations, Color Elevation, Materials Board)
- 4. Site Photos

Report and Recommendations Prepared by: Scott Watson, Historic Preservation Officer

Patricia Brenes, Principal Planner Report and Recommendations Reviewed by: Report and Recommendations Approved by: Mary Kopaskie-Brown, City Planner

Page 6 September 18, 2019



COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTDEPARTMENT

PLANNING DIVISION

EXHIBIT 1 – STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

CASE NUMBER: P19-0534 MEETING DATE: September 18, 2019

GENERAL CONDITIONS

- 1. The project must be completed in accordance with the Cultural Heritage Board's approval, including all conditions listed below. Any subsequent changes to the project must be approved by the Cultural Heritage Board or the Cultural Heritage Board staff.
- 2. There is a one year time limit in which to secure the necessary building permits required by this Certificate of Appropriateness. Approval will expire on September 18, 2020.
- 3. This approval for the Certificate of Appropriateness is for design concept only and does not indicate the project has been thoroughly checked for compliance with all requirements of law. As such, it is not a substitute for the formal building permit plan check process, and other changes may be required during the plan check process.
- 4. The granting of this Certificate of Appropriateness shall in no way exclude or excuse compliance with all other applicable rules and regulations in effect at the time this permit is exercised.

PROJECT SPECIFIC CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Prior to Release of Occupancy:

5. Upon completion of the project, a Cultural Heritage Board staff inspection must be requested to ensure that the approved plans have been executed and that all conditions have been implemented. Contact Scott Watson at (951) 826-5507 or swatson@riversideca.gov.

EXHIBIT 1 - STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL Page 7