
CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines

Document/Draft: California Heights Historic District Design Guidelines

Commenter: Resident of 3714 Cerritos Ave

Response Codes:
A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify)
B = Will Not Incorporate
C = No Change Needed

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Gina Casillas, Nick Vasuthasawat (Long Beach Development Services),
Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments (Public Meeting Comment & Feedback Worksheet 11/10/18)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	N/A	[What design guidelines would you like to see included in the final guidelines?] Allow artificial turf for front yard, requiring maintenance as required	B	City regulations require 50% live plantable in the front yard area, and the artificial turf is not considered a historically compatible material. Please see Section 1.6 for guidance on Landscaping.
2	N/A	[What changes should be made to the draft guidelines?] Allow artificial turf	B	Please see response above and Section 1.6 for guidance on Landscaping.

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

Project:	Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines	Document/Draft:	California Heights Historic District Design Guidelines
Commenter:	No contact information given	Response Codes:	A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify). B = Will Not Incorporate C = No Change Needed
Addressed By:	Alejandro Plascencia, Gina Casillas, Nick Vasuthasawat (Long Beach Development Services), Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)		

Response to Comments (Public Meeting Comment & Feedback Worksheet 11/10/18)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	N/A	<p>[What changes should be made to the draft guidelines?]</p> <p>The description of “fences” does not make reference to the old state law was completely replaced</p> <p>~2016 “Good Neighbor Fence” law</p>	C	<p>These historic guidelines do not replace or supersede any portion of existing State laws or City zoning codes, and any of these laws/regulations will still apply.</p> <p>The intent of the design guidelines is to inform what is historically compatible within California Heights, e.g., height, materials.</p>

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines

Document/Draft: California Heights Historic District Design Guidelines

Commenter: Resident of 3556 Lime

Response Codes: A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify).
B = Will Not Incorporate
C = No Change Needed

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Gina Casillas, Nick Vasuthasawat (Long Beach Development Services),
Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments (Public Meeting Comment & Feedback Worksheet 11/10/18)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	1.3 Driveways	<p>[What changes should be made to the draft guidelines?]</p> <p>I'd like to see an appropriate brick or non-contemporary paver option in lieu of concrete. Concrete is not attractive and does not reflect a specific architectural period.</p>	B	<p>The use of concrete for sidewalks, walkways, and driveways was commonplace for largescale subdivisions like California Heights in the early twentieth century as it was an inexpensive material. Brick/historic paver driveways are usually seen accompanying larger, high-style residences or in much earlier neighborhoods.</p> <p>The use of concrete in California Heights is therefore historically compatible and encouraged, particularly in a dual ribbon configuration.</p> <p>The use of brick or pavers could be conjectural in this setting if it did not exist historically; however, the guidelines allow for the use of another compatible material if there is evidence to suggest it existed historically (please see Section 1.3.3)</p>
2	N/A	<p>[If you have any other thoughts or suggestions regarding the draft guidelines, please include them here:]</p> <p>Introduce procedure to apply for deviation of guideline</p>	C	<p>Please see page 27 of Chapter 1 for an outline of the Certificate of Appropriateness process, available online at:</p> <p>http://www.lbds.info/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=6379</p> <p>In the event of a disagreement on the interpretation of the guidelines, Section 2.63.100 of the Long Beach Municipal Code also outlines the appeals process for any staff level or Cultural Heritage Commission decision.</p>

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines **Document/Draft:** California Heights Historic District Design Guidelines

Commenter: Resident of 3655 Rose **Response Codes:** A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify).
B = Will Not Incorporate
C = No Change Needed

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Gina Casillas, Nick Vasuthasawat (Long Beach Development Services),
Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments (Public Meeting Comment & Feedback Worksheet 11/10/18)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	N/A	[What design guidelines would you like to see included in the final guidelines?] Please address solar panels and air conditioning on roof. Please address fake grass.	C	Please see section 2.3 for guidance on solar panels and air conditioning equipment. City regulations require 50% live plantable in the front yard area, and the artificial turf is not a historically compatible material. Please see Section 1.6 for guidance on Landscaping.
2	N/A	[What changes should be made to the design guidelines?] Please be specific regarding what's allowed (or not) rather than using words like "encouraged"	C	The design guidelines are intended to be inclusive and as flexible as possible in order to reasonably accommodate the wide array of property types, needs, and situations that may arise while also maintaining historic compatibility.
3	N/A	[If you have any other thoughts or suggestions regarding the draft guidelines or draft style guides, please include them here:] Please reconsider limiting residents to installing only wood frame windows. If the guidelines are too restrictive regarding allowable materials, it will be cost prohibitive to make improvements.	C	Windows made of materials such as vinyl are not historically or visually compatible and are unlikely to be given a Certificate of Appropriateness for their installation from staff or the Cultural Heritage Commission. Wood or steel windows (depending on the style of the house) are the most appropriate for a district like California Heights and should be replaced in kind. Please see the Window Referral list on the Long Beach Historic Preservation website for experienced practitioners: http://www.lbds.info/civica/filebank/blobdload.asp?BlobID=6638

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines

Document/Draft: California Heights Historic District Design Guidelines

Commenter: Resident of 3546 Olive

Response Codes:
 A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify).
 B = Will Not Incorporate
 C = No Change Needed

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Gina Casillas, Nick Vasuthasawat (Long Beach Development Services),
 Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments (Public Meeting Comment & Feedback Worksheet)				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	N/A	<p>[What design guidelines would you like to see included in the final guidelines?]</p> <p>Our house was built 1948, it is a Minimal Traditional, basically a postwar box. We are in need of new fencing and would like to go with a horizontal style (our current fence is horizontal). According to these standards only vertical is permitted. I would like to see standards for postwar home have their own set of style standards that fit that style as they are not Spanish or Craftsman.</p>		<p>The style guides provide a variety of different fence style options specific to each architectural style.</p> <p>For additional information on specific styles, including Minimal Traditional, please see Chapter 4: Architectural Style Guides.</p>
2	N/A	<p>[What changes should be made to the design guidelines?]</p> <p>Allow more appropriate style standards for postwar homes that are not Spanish or Craftsman.</p> <p>Consider allowing front yard fences as long as they are appropriate and approved.</p> <p>Allow [horizontal] style fences.</p>		<p>For additional information on specific styles, including Minimal Traditional, please see Chapter 4: Architectural Style Guides.</p> <p>Historically, California Heights did not have front fencing and the front yards were left open, which is a character-defining feature of the historic district. Therefore, in order to preserve this character, front fencing is not being allowed.</p> <p>The City's preference is for vertical fencing in the rear in historic districts.</p>

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines **Document/Draft:** California Heights Historic District Design Guidelines

Commenter: Karen Highberger **Response Codes:** A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify).
B = Will Not Incorporate
C = No Change Needed

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Gina Casillas, Nick Vasuthasawat (Long Beach Development Services),
Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	1.4.2	Regarding attachment of garages. I do not think they should be attached under any circumstances. That has been the standard for years and allowing attachment of garages will affect the scale and massing in the neighborhood in an adverse way. If they want to allow it in some cases, there should be strict parameters on what will be allowed. As written, the guidelines are too vague.	C	<p>The language, “unless the property owner is able to demonstrate that there is no feasible option to increase usable space” is intended to indicate that attaching historically detached garages would be allowed on a case-by-case basis. As each project and property varies, it would be difficult to provide such strict parameters that would apply to each case.</p> <p>The prevailing guidance is still to keep garages detached, and this would only be considered in unique instances.</p>
2	2.3.2	This section applies to the "screening from view" mechanical items such as HVAC units on roofs. These recommendations need to be tightened up to provide more detail to residents. The proliferation of roof mounted units in Cal Heights is not so nice to look at. There are low profile units available, usually at a higher cost unfortunately.	C	<p>The prevailing guidance is to install any equipment on the ground level; installation of equipment on the roof would only be appropriate for certain roof forms or on certain locations of the roof.</p> <p>As each property is different, each property would have a most appropriate/least visible location for equipment to be installed.</p> <p>Staff always encourages the use of smaller units or mini splits, particularly when space is limited.</p>

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines

Document/Draft: California Heights Historic District Design Guidelines

Commenter: Manuel Valenzuela

Response Codes: A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify).
B = Will Not Incorporate
C = No Change Needed

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Gina Casillas, Nick Vasuthasawat
(Long Beach Development Services), Amanda Yoder Duane
(GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	Garages	<p>I agree with Karen regarding the garage issue, but would like to take this a step further. When we developed Glendale’s Historic District Design Guidelines, we included language such as “Historic garages should be retained when possible and feasible,” “moving a historic garage from its original location should be avoided,” and “a replacement garage door, on a historic garage, should be similar to those traditionally used for the style of architecture” [Notice how “should” is used instead of “shall,” providing a little leeway if necessary]</p> <p>Link to Outbuildings:https://www.glendaleca.gov/home/showdocument?id=12964</p>	C	<p>Common alterations were addressed, and moving the garage was not an alteration that is typically encountered by planning staff; however, planning staff feels that relocating the garage on the property could feasibly be accomplished in conformance with the guidelines if it were to arise.</p> <p>9.3.1 also discusses demolition of contributing properties, which would consist of the house and its garage.</p> <p>Replacement garage doors are addressed in more detail in <i>Chapter 4: Architectural Style Guides</i>.</p> <p>The guidelines recognize that sensitive changes may need to take place at times—expansion of garages, additions to rear, etc—and the intention is to provide a framework on how to make these changes in the most sensitive way possible while retaining the overall character of the property/district.</p>

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

		Long Beach's Draft Guidelines cede the argument as to whether expanding a garage for expansion's sake is an historic preservation issue or not – is this appropriate?		
2	9.3.2	<p>Very concerned with 9.3.2 regarding Accidental Fire. I don't remember ever seeing language like this spelled out in other cities' Historic District Design Guidelines – Karen, John? If someone was distraught over Long Beach turning down his or her remodel request, they might be inspired to do something with such lines as “the historic property does not need to be recreated unless desired” and “this replacement property will not be considered a contributor to the district.”</p> <p>Obviously if new construction occurs, it will be treated as infill construction that must adhere to Long Beach Zoning Code, etc. I sound paranoid, but would rather not spell out the obvious. It may give distraught people false encouragement to do something drastic. Historic homes and properties have been torched and illegally demolished before in Los Angeles, or in the case of Johnny's Broiler in Downey, mostly demolished with the gas still turned on!</p>	C	<p>In the event a situation arises in which an accidental fire destroys a contributing and the owner decides to rebuild, they would still need to comply with the guidelines described in Section 9.3.3.</p> <p>This guidance outlines that new construction should be compatible with existing contributing buildings in size, scale, setback, height, massing, design, materials and architectural style to protect the overall character of the historic district.</p> <p>Also, any new construction would need to be reviewed and approved by the Cultural Heritage Commission for compliance with these Guidelines.</p>
3	1.7.2 1.7.3	I have a question/concern regarding 1.7.2 and 1.7.3 Rear fencing -- will it be a requirement that new block walls facing the alley be stuccoed? Is this really necessary?	C	This approach will help ensure that the material is visually compatible with most historic style and that instances of the wall will be uniform throughout the district.

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

Project: Long Beach Historic District Design Guidelines **Document/Draft:** California Heights Historic District Design Guidelines

Commenter: John Moreland **Response Codes:** A = Accept Comment (correct, add, clarify).
B = Will Not Incorporate
C = No Change Needed

Addressed By: Alejandro Plascencia, Gina Casillas, Nick Vasuthasawat (Long Beach Development Services),
Amanda Yoder Duane (GPA Consulting)

Response to Comments				
Comment No.	Page or Section No.	Comment	Response Code	Response
1	Garages	<p>I have not read the guidelines yet and plan on going through it this weekend hopefully...I'll have my comments by Thanksgiving on this for sure. However, I do have concerns about the attachment of garages. I am assuming that this section identifies how a detached garage becomes an attached..if it is a blanket guideline about attached garages not being allowed, that would be very concerning. For the most part, houses were developed with detached garages, but in the late 30s, the trend slowly went to attached garages. There are a good handful of houses with attached garages, especially those that front onto cross streets (36th, 37th, Bixby, Wardlow). My house and Juliana's house are examples of houses built in the 40s/50s with an attached garage. Those conditions should be allowed to continue.</p> <p>With that said, I even think attaching an existing garage would not be an issue as there are a few</p>	C	<p>Historic conditions will always be encouraged to remain. In the rare circumstance that a detached garage project is the only feasible way to increase space, the project will be expected to be compatible with the style, size, and massing of the existing house and garage.</p>

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

		examples where garages have been attached with simple roof forms that do not impact massing. I think it could be handled with some strict guidelines such as: the roof pitch and material must be consistent with both the garage and the house, the proposed attached roof form shall not be higher than the peak of the roof of the garage, the proposed roof form must be consistent with the roof form of the architectural style of the home.		
2	9.3.2	<p>Regarding accidental fire, I think that needs to remain. Building codes now are really strict. If a home is damaged more than 50%, it has to be built per current code requirements. Cal Green will require the garage to be pre-plumbed with EV charging, Title 24 requirements will limit the size of the windows that can be used, tankless water heater would be required, garages would need to be a minimum of 20x20 interior clear. It would be a new rebuild. Although it should fit into the neighborhood, it is really difficult to fully recreate the old style. Also, it has to be demonstrated that it was an "accidental" fire, rather than a deliberate fire. It should spell out this difference, though.</p> <p>Manny Valenzuela: Fair enough on the accidental fire section. Perhaps it could be beefed up to remind residents that new construction is much more tedious to build.</p>		<p>With Historic Building Code exemptions, a property could feasibly be recreated in the event of fire or other damage.</p> <p>9.3.1 discusses intentional damage to property.</p> <p>This is an incredibly rare scenario and can be addressed on a case-by-case basis.</p>
3	Page 6, paragraph 1	I would include a description of Craftsman as one of the period revival architectural styles as it is a predominate style within the district.	A	The information about style was inadvertently repeated (also see response to comment 6, below); Craftsman was included as one of the styles in the second instance of this information. The first has been removed to avoid repetition, and Craftsman has been included earlier in the paragraph.

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

4	Page 6, paragraph 2	extra spacing.	C	<p>Thank you for your careful review. This is a rough draft formatting wise, and is intended to present the content/text only at this time.</p> <p>Once all public comments have been addressed and the content has been finalized, the guideline content will be entered in a more polished layout format with page numbers, stylized headings, illustrations, etc.</p> <p>Examples of these layouts can be found on the City's website.</p>
5	Page 6, paragraph 3	parkways are predominately 5'	C	<p>Survey of the Cal Heights area indicates it ranges from 5 to 7 depending on the width of the sidewalk; the text was intended to capture an approximate range to describe the area and its character-defining features.</p>
6	Page 7	the two paragraphs about the styles in the district and common alterations seem out of place. It's accurate info, though.	A	<p>The style paragraph was inadvertently repeated and the two instances were combined on page 6 (also see response to comment 3, above). The common alterations information has been included for each district.</p>
7	Page 7, Section 1	Section 1: Site Layout. Although a majority of contributing structures may have a detached garage on the named streets, on the numbered streets and Bixby, about half, if not more of the units have existing attached garages. They also have smaller lots along these streets as well. This should be mentioned as there are other layouts not mentioned within this text.	A	<p>Attached garages and smaller lots will be added to the Site Layout summary.</p>
8	Page 9: Sec. 1.3	The text makes it sound like that are only two types of driveways within this district, when in fact, there are more options. I would recommend to list other options such as just drive aprons (e.g. 5' garage setback), dual car width driveways with attached garages, no	A	<p>Text revised to: "Some of the most common driveway configurations properties within the California Heights Historic District include a side driveway that leads to a detached garage to the rear of the lot, or rear access to their garages from an alley. Other configurations throughout the district include short driveways with</p>

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

		driveways, or revise to text to say that the ones identified are the predominant condition and others exist.		aprons for garages that are closer to the property line, or no driveway at all.”
9	Page 9: Sec. 1.3	If it's demonstrated that driveways have been altered from their historic state, they should be allowed to be relocated, modified, enlarged/reduced to reflect their historic condition. For example, my house was built in the 1940s. In the 1980s, my driveway was widened, a salt-splash was added, and brick ribbons were added. An owner should be able to restore this or similar non-historically appropriate conditions.	C	Any alteration that is supported by historic documentation would be compatible and appropriate, and the original driveway was likely similar to that described in the guidance in Section 1.3.2.
10	Page 12: Section 1.5	Walkway materials and location. Similar to driveways, if the location/material can be demonstrated that it does not conform to what was historically done on the property. The text in Section 1.5.4 is good and should be repeated in the beginning of the section.	C	Any alteration that is supported by historic documentation would be compatible and appropriate. The language is already included, and staff will provide any additional guidance and clarify the guidelines where necessary.
11	Page 17, Sec.1.8.2	extra space and period.	C	Thank you for your careful review. This is a rough draft formatting wise, and is intended to present the content/text only at this time. Once all public comments have been addressed and the content has been finalized, the guideline content will be entered in a more polished layout format with page numbers, stylized headings, illustrations, etc. Examples of these layouts can be found on the City's website.
12	Page 20, Sec. 2.3.2	although roof-mounted equipment needs to be demonstrated as the last option, guidelines for screening of the equipment should be added.	C	As each property is different, each property would have a most appropriate/least visible location for equipment to be installed.

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

				Staff always encourages the use of smaller units or mini splits, particularly when space is limited.
13	Page 21	Dormers. I would add that dormers may not be appropriate for all architectural styles. Dormers must be consistent with the architectural style of the house.	C	The suggestion that dormers must be consistent with the architectural style of the house is captured in the final sentence of Section 2.4. Additional information about architectural styles is included in Chapter 4, and property owners are encouraged to refer to Chapters 3 and 4 when planning a project.
14	Page 23 Sec. 3.3	Sub sections 1 and 2 appear to be duplicated. Also, the type of stucco finish preferred should be consistent within this section. Also, I am a little confused if smooth stucco is acceptable. Smooth was identified as an acceptable finish in this early part of this section, then extremely smooth stucco is identified as not acceptable later. Some of the homes in the district have more of a smooth finish (with a more of a Mission) type influence. My experience is that this style as a very smooth finish. I am not sure how this is distinguished from "extremely smooth."	A	<p>Section 3.3.2 will be reworded to avoid confusion.</p> <p>The most historically appropriate finish for stucco would be a fine to medium dash or float finish stucco that may appear smooth at a distance and have a rough or sandy texture up close.</p> <p>The very/extremely smooth stucco finishes in question are contemporary, typically seen on new construction or incompatible alterations, and would not be considered historically appropriate for a home in a historic style such as Spanish Colonial Revival.</p>
15	Page 31, Porch Steps	Porch Steps. If porch steps can be demonstrated that they have been altered from the historic condition, removing and replacing to the historic condition is encouraged (similar to other language in the document and porch foundations on the same page).	A	This language will be added to Porch Steps.
16	Section 5.1.2, Aluminum windows	Aluminum windows. More of a global design guideline note. As historical districts and buildings expand to include post WWII construction, inclusion of other materials beyond steel and wood should be considered (such as aluminum), as long as they are period-appropriate and compatible (in both form and	C	<p>Specific window types for each style are addressed in Chapter 4: Architectural Style Guides. The Ranch Style Guide includes a note that later examples did have aluminum windows originally.</p> <p>Contributing buildings within historic districts are subject to the state historic building code and may not</p>

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

		material) with the architectural style of the house. However, ever increasing Title 24 requirements need to be evaluated with availability of wood and steel windows for Title 24 compliance (I'm not sure about 2019 requirements).		need to follow such stringent energy requirements under the current energy code.
17	Section 5.3, Window surrounds	Window surrounds. For whatever reason, a previous owner of my house added vinyl and wood surrounds around my windows, but not all windows had surrounds, nor were they consistent. When I started removing some of them, I discovered that my house originally did not have surrounds (original house color was on the stucco underneath). Provisions within this section should be allowed to alter, remove, modify existing surrounds so that it is consistent with the architectural style of the house and if it can be demonstrated that the existing surrounds are not period-appropriate.	C	Any alteration that is supported by historic documentation would be compatible and appropriate.
18	Section 5.4, Screens.	Aluminum screens should only be discouraged on contributing structures. Post-WWII structures commonly used aluminum.	C	Aluminum frames are generally discouraged; however, their use would depend on the age of the building. If their use is appropriate for the age of the building, it would be acceptable.
19	Section 5.6.1, Awnings.	Awnings. The second paragraph is awkwardly worded. Please revise. Also, if it could be demonstrated that there used to be awnings installed on a house (assuming it's appropriate to the style), it should be encouraged to be restored with a style-appropriate awning.	A	The paragraph will be revised. The appropriateness of awnings for each style are addressed in <i>Chapter 4: Architectural Style Guides</i> . Any alteration that is supported by historic documentation would be compatible and appropriate.
20	Section 6.3, Door Surrounds.	Door Surrounds. Same comment as window surrounds, above.	C	Any alteration that is supported by historic documentation would be compatible and appropriate.

CALIFORNIA HEIGHTS

21	Section 6.4.1 Screen/Storm Doors.	Screen/Storm Doors. Same comment as above regarding window screens. My house (1946 construction), if using period-appropriate materials would have used steel or aluminum.	C	Aluminum screen/storm are generally discouraged; however, their use would depend on the age of the building. If their use is appropriate for the age of the building, it would be acceptable.
22	Section 6.5.1. Security doors.	Security doors. Like vinyl windows, I would request to increase the requirement for this section and state that these should be removed as part of the CofA. I would change the language to say these are not permitted instead of not recommended.	A	Currently, security doors are required to be removed as part of the CofA process. We can change this language to 'discouraged' from 'not recommended' to allow flexibility where needed but to demonstrate that they are not a preferred treatment.
23	Section 8.4, Second-Story additions.	Second-Story additions. I would include provisions that not all properties should be considered for two-story additions. Spanish Colonial Revival design with an existing flat roof and mid-Century styles should not be allowed add a second story of an existing one-story home. The second-story addition needs to be appropriate for the architectural style of the house.	C	Any second-story addition will automatically require an additional layer of review by the Cultural Heritage Commission. These instances will then be reviewed on a case-by-case basis for compatibility. The prevailing guidance is that second-story additions are discouraged in California Heights, as most contributors are just one story.
24	N/A	There are a number of spacing and other formatting errors that I did not comment on throughout the document as well.	C	Thank you for your careful review. This is a rough draft formatting wise, and is intended to present the content/text only at this time. Once all public comments have been addressed and the content has been finalized, the guideline content will be entered in a more polished layout format with page numbers, stylized headings, illustrations, etc. Examples of these layouts can be found on the City's website.