

Title 20 Workshop

City Council, April 23, 2024

Jennifer Gamble, Chair, Cultural Heritage Board

1

1

BACKGROUND

Cultural Heritage Board:

- Reviewed Title 20 beginning August 2021 at board meetings and in subcommittee
- Incorporated best practices and standards set forth by the State Office of Historic Preservation (SHPO)
- Reviewed guidelines/recommendations from
 - National Association of Preservation Commissions
 - National Park Service
 - Los Angeles Conservancy
- Researched more than 20 city municipal codes
- Met with residents to hear concerns and goals

2

2

BACKGROUND

CHB Goals

- Incorporate national and statewide best practices
- Increase public engagement and input
- Support Riverside's historic places
- Protect valuable resources and cultural heritage
- Accommodate sensitive development
- Respond to residents' concerns

3

3

Policy Area 1: Ministerial Project Noticing

- Noticing should be concurrent with existing permit/review process; no additional time.
- Can be implemented once the process can be automated, therefore not requiring additional staff time.
- Increases transparency, public participation, and trust.
- Allows residents to learn of projects in their neighborhoods and get questions answered before the topic goes to CHB, Planning, or Council for a vote.
- Avoids a Council Chamber full of people who feel they have not been informed or heard before a decision is made.

4

4

Policy Area 2: Landmark Nominations

- Allows CHB to consider landmark nomination from any resident
- Many cities do not require owner consent for nominations
- Nomination process is collaborative
 - Owners learn the benefits of designation
- Owners could object to the designation
- Rare, not common; for unique properties of cultural value
- Supreme Court has ruled repeatedly
 - A property owner's personal choice does not outweigh public good
 - Property owners are subject to land use controls

5

5

Policy Area 2: Landmark Nominations

- Previously, Riverside had budgeted funds to survey and designate historic districts.
 - That budget no longer exists.
 - Expecting the community to bear that burden has been challenging.
- Allowing others to nominate landmark designations:
 - gives nonprofits the option to help with the cost of identifying/surveying/designating landmarks
 - could result in historic districts and landmarks outside of Ward 1, giving more of the community access to Mills Act
- CHB use to take on this challenge we no longer offer this service as there is no budget.

6

6

Policy Area 2: Landmark Nominations

- Results:
 - “Increase time for modifications”
 - “Increase cost for modifications”
 - Amortized over time, maintenance and restoration of existing features are less costly than modifications.

7

7

Policy Area 3: Demolition Review

- Clarifies processes, ensures the public is informed, increases transparency and public trust.
- On-site posted notification of potential demolition ensures the public is informed.
- Expanded definition of “demolition” provides clarity for property owners, staff, and the public.
- All items in the Presentation slide 7 "Results" column are things that should already be happening (review time, noticing, maintenance). These are not unreasonable in order to make sure cultural resources and neighborhoods are protected.

8

8

Policy Area 3: Demolition Review

- City is taking on a lot of liability by expecting one staff member, though well-qualified, to know everything about city, state, and cultural history.
 - Without allowing the public time and opportunity to share their knowledge, the city is at risk of making a mistake that cannot be undone.
- Increased time for review is the minimum any city should do
 - Ensures thorough review and that public has a chance to comment
 - Ensures we do not make any mistakes - Demolition is PERMANENT - the time for review is warranted

9


9

Policy Area 4: Preliminary Review

- Early notice of upcoming projects to public and CHB benefits City and Applicant by identifying issues, concerns, and objectives early in the planning process in order to deliver well-planned projects that will garner public support.
- Developers spend a lot of time and money on projects. By the time the CHB and the public see it, it can be very costly to make changes. If developers can receive input earlier, they can address concerns and avoid problems.
- When the public feels uninformed, it becomes the Council's problem. This change would allow CHB to help inform public earlier so residents feel informed and involved.
- Development process is already very long, this should not add any time.

10

10



Questions?