

# 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: JANUARY 20, 2021 AGENDA ITEM NO.: 5

# **PROPOSED PROJECT**

Case Numbers	DP-2020-00240 (Certificate of A	ppropriateness)
Request		Appropriateness for the construction of an gazebo and six free-standing restaurant booth
Applicant	Antonie Maalouf of the Historic Mission Inn Corporations	
Project Location	3649 Mission Inn Avenue, on a full city block between Mission Inn Avenue and Sixth Street, and Orange and Main Streets.	' John John John John John John John John
APN	214-090-013	
Ward	1	
Neighborhood	Downtown	
Historic District	Mission Inn; Seventh Street	MISSION INN
Historic Designation	National Historic Landmark; National Register Site; California Historic Landmark #761; County Landmark; City Landmark #1; District Contributor	N MN N
Staff Planner	Scott Watson, Historic Preservati 951-826-5507 swatson@riversideca.gov	ion Officer

# **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Staff recommends that the Cultural Heritage Board:

- DETERMINE that the project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) review pursuant to Sections 15311 (Accessory Structures) and 15331 (Historic Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation), as it constitutes the construction of small accessory structures that is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties; and
- 2. **APPROVE** Planning Case DP-2020-00240 (Certificate of Appropriateness), based on the findings outlined and summarized in the staff report and subject to the recommended conditions (Exhibit 1).

Page 1

# **BACKGROUND**

The subject property is located at 3649 Mission Inn Avenue. Occupying a full city block, the 11,0476 square foot subject property was developed with the Mission Inn Hotel by Frank Miller over a period of several decades. The existing hotel was constructed in four phases that include the Mission Wing, 1902-1908; the Cloister Wing, 1910-1912; the Spanish Wing, 1913-1928; and the Rotunda, 1929-1931.

The Mission Wing was designed by Arthur Benton in the Mission Revival Style of architecture. Character-defining features of this wing include, but are not limited to: an U-shaped ground plan with a central courtyard; a variety of roof forms with wide open eaves and brackets; scalloped parapets with an arched opening ornamented with a bell; textured stucco cladding with half-timbering accents; several exterior stucco clad chimneys; wood double casement windows with divided lights; and balconies with decorative wrought iron railing.

The proposed project was first presented to staff on October 19, 2020. Staff provided feedback on the proposed design, including roof forms, light fixtures, and decorative elements. The applicant and staff continued discussions on the design and the proposed project was formally submitted on December 1, 2020.

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The applicant is requesting approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for an approximately 325 square foot gazebo and six free-standing restaurant booth enclosures (Exhibit 3) at the southeast corner of the property. The proposed project will provide additional outdoor seating for the Las Campanas Restaurant and includes:

- 1. A 12-foot 9-inch tall, 18-foot wide square gazebo located in the courtyard adjacent to the corner of Mission Inn Avenue and Orange Street. The gazebo will consist of:
  - a. A square domed roof topped with red tile and ornamented with a hemispherical finial.
  - b. Segmented arched openings with multi-pane metal and glass panels within the arches, on all four elevations.
  - c. A decorative cornice wrapping the structure.
  - d. Textured stucco clad posts with tile accents and hanging light fixtures.
  - e. A large metal chandelier hanging from the domed ceiling.
  - f. Relocation of an existing tree within the courtyard area.
- 2. Six freestanding hemispherical restaurant booths consisting of:
  - a. Teak wood half-circle bench seating with outdoor cushions upholstered in blue and nectarine colors.
  - b. An open, hemispherical bamboo constructed enclosure structure on top of the bench seating.

## **PROJECT ANALYSIS**

# **FACTS FOR FINDINGS**

Pursuant to Chapter 20.25.050 of Title 20 (Cultural Resources) of the Riverside Municipal Code, the Cultural Heritage Board and Historic Preservation Officer must make applicable findings of specific standards when approving or denying a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Staff was able to make the applicable findings for the project as follows:

Chapter 20.25.050 - Principles and Standards of Site Develo	Chapter 20.25.050 – Principles and Standards of Site Development and Design Review			
The application proposal is consistent or compatible with the architectural period and the character-defining elements of the historic building.		Consistent	Inconsistent	
		$\checkmark$		
Facts:				
<ul> <li>The proposed project incorporates character-defining f the Mission Revival style of architecture, including stucce</li> </ul>				
openings, a tile capped domed roofs, and simple	e light	fixtures. Th	ne proposed	
freestanding booths will be compatible with the archit through the use of natural wood materials.	tectura	al period of	the structure	
The application proposal is compatible with existing adjacent or nearby Cultural Resources and their character-defining elements.		Consistent	Inconsistent	
Facts:				
<ul> <li>The commercial areas of the Mission Inn and Seventh Street Historic Districts consist of a variety of architectural styles, including Mission Revival, Colonial Revival, Italianate, and Art Deco. Because of the varied architectural styles in the District, compatibility with</li> </ul>				
Cultural Resources is obtained through compatibility with				
<ul> <li>The proposed project will be compatible with the character-defining feature of the Mission Inn's original wing as previously discussed; therefore, the proposed project will be compatible with nearby and adjacent Cultural Resources.</li> </ul>				
The colors, textures, materials, fenestration, decorative features	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent	
and details, height, scale, massing and methods of construction proposed are consistent with the period and/or compatible with adjacent Cultural Resources.		$\checkmark$		
Facts:				
<ul> <li>The proposed project will be compatible with the height, scale, and massing of the existing residence and adjacent Cultural Resources. The gazebo will be 12-feet 9-inches in height, which is less than the adjacent 4-story structure.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>The projects proposed materials, such as stucco cladding, red tile roofing, and decorative wall tiles, will be compatible with the materials of the existing historic building.</li> </ul>				
The proposed change does not adversely affect the context	N/A	Consistent	Inconsistent	
considering the following factors: grading; site development; orientation of buildings; off-street parking; landscaping; signs; street furniture; public areas; relationship of the project to its surroundings.		<b>V</b>		
Facts:				
<ul> <li>The proposed project will not alter the orientation of the historic building and will serve to enhance an existing, under-used courtyard. The gazebo and seating booths will be small in scale, therefore, limiting the visual impact to the historic building from the public right- of-way. The existing tree within the project area will be relocated on site.</li> </ul>				

Page 3 January 20, 2021 DP-2020-00240

Chapter 20.25.050 – Principles and Standards of Site Development and Design Review			
The proposed change does not adversely affect an important architectural, historical, cultural or archaeological feature or features.		Consistent	Inconsistent
Facts:			
<ul> <li>The proposed project will be detached from the historic structure and the existing concrete paving in the courtyard is not original; therefore, there will be no adverse effect to important architectural and historic material.</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>No grading will occur; therefore, there will be a less than significant potential for impact to archaeological features.</li> </ul>			
The application proposal is consistent with the Citywide Residential Historic District Design Guidelines and the separate guidelines for each Historic District.		Consistent	Inconsistent

#### Facts:

- The project is located within the Downtown Specific Plan Raincross District. As there are no specific guidelines for either the Mission Inn or Seventh Street Historic Districts, the Design Standards and Guidelines for the Raincross District apply to this project. These quidelines specify the following:
  - o Design of improvements for courtyards should be traditional and related to the signature buildings.
  - o New buildings should not necessarily be stylistically "historic," but should be compatible with their historic neighbors in terms of massing, modulation, height, and setbacks. New buildings should be contemporary interpretations using the signature buildings as a source of design inspiration
  - o Roof design should reflect/complement significant buildings in the area.
  - o Muted earth tones and traditional materials should prevail, with brighter colors limited to trim areas.
- The proposed project is consistent with these guidelines as follows:
  - o The proposed gazebo and seating booths will be contemporary interpretations of historic architectural design features found within the adjacent historic
  - o The roof of the gazebo will be a square dome, which was common in Mission Revival architecture.
  - o The gazebo and booths will make use of traditional materials, such as wood, stucco, and clay tile, and will match the colors of the adjacent historic structure.

Page 4 January 20, 2021

The application proposal is consistent with the Principles of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic		Consistent	Inconsistent
Properties.		$\overline{\checkmark}$	

#### Facts:

- The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation specify:
  - The new work will be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.
  - New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.
- The proposed project is consistent with the Standard as follows:
  - The proposed project will not alter the special relationship of the historic building to the surrounding neighborhood.
  - The proposed gazebo and booths are smaller in scale and massing than the historic building.
  - The proposed project exhibits similar design features as the adjacent historic structures but will be differentiated through the use of new material, such as the multi-pane glass and metal panels in the arches of the gazebo.

#### **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 proposed accessory building is compatible with the massing, size, scale, materials, and use of architectural features of the residence.		
<ul> <li>The proposed gazebo is one-story in height adjacent to a four-story building; therefore, the proposed accessory structures will be subordinate to the historic structure.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>Proposed materials such as stucco cladding, tile roofing, and decorative tiles can be found throughout the historic structure.</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>The proposed light fixtures will be simple in design, matching the design themes of the Mission Revival style of architecture.</li> </ul>		

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

The proposed gazebo and seating booths are minor accessory structures and are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties and therefore is categorically exempt from the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), pursuant to Sections 15311 (Accessory Structures) and 15331 (Historic Resource Restoration/Rehabilitation) of the CEQA Guidelines.

Page 5 January 20, 2021

# **PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENTS**

Public notices were mailed to property owners adjacent to the site. As of the writing this report, staff received one phone call in opposition and one email in support of the project.

# APPEAL INFORMATION

Actions by the Cultural Heritage Board, including any environmental finding, may be appealed to the Land Use, Sustainability and Resilience Committee (formerly the Land Use Committee) within ten calendar days after the decision. Appeal filing and processing information may be obtained from the Planning Division by calling 951-826-5371.

# **EXHIBITS LIST**

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

Prepared by: Scott Watson, Historic Preservation Officer

Reviewed by: David Murray, Principal Planner Approved by: Mary Kopaskie-Brown, City Planner

Page 6



## COMMUNITY & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTDEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION

# EXHIBIT 1 – STAFF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

PLANNING CASE: DP-2020-00240 MEETING DATE: January 20, 2021

#### CASE SPECIFIC CONDITIONS

Prior to Release of Occupancy:

1. Upon completion of the project, a Cultural Heritage Board (CHB) 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 swatson@riversideca.gov.

# **GENERAL CONDITIONS**

- 2. There is a one-year time limit in which to secure the necessary building permits required by this Certificate of Appropriateness.
- 3. The project must be completed in accordance with the CHB's Certificate of Appropriateness approval, including all conditions listed. Any subsequent changes to the project must be approved by the CHB or CHB staff.
- 4. 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.
- 5. 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.