



City of Arts & Innovation

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
Planning Division

EXHIBIT A

**CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD
CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS**

AGENDA ITEM NO.: 1

WARD: 1

CULTURAL HERITAGE BOARD HEARING DATE: June 19, 2013

I. CASE NUMBER(S): P13-0353

II. PROJECT SUMMARY:

- 1) **Proposal:** Consideration of a Certificate of Appropriateness to approve previously installed vinyl window replacements for fifteen original wood sash windows on an existing single family residence located in the Wood Streets Neighborhood Conservation Area and the R-1-7000, Cultural Resources overlay zone. The proposal is not subject to the California Environmental Quality Act pursuant to Section 21080(b)(5) in accordance with the recommendation for denial.
- 2) **Location:** 3968 Rosewood Place
- 3) **Applicant:** Thomas A. Chorbajian
- 4) **Case Planner:** Teri Delcamp, Historic Preservation Senior Planner (951) 826-2117

III. RECOMMENDATION:

That the Cultural Heritage Board:

DENY Planning Case **P13-0353** based on the findings outlined in the staff report and summarized below, thereby not issuing a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project.

FACTS FOR FINDINGS: (From Section 20.25.050 of the Riverside Municipal Code)

The Board and Historic Preservation Officer shall make findings of the following standards when applicable to approving or denying a Certificate of Appropriateness.

FINDINGS: The application proposal is consistent or compatible with the architectural period and the character-defining elements of the historic building.

FACTS: The project does not comply with this finding. The property is a contributing building to the designated Wood Streets Neighborhood Conservation Area (NCA). The Citywide Residential Historic District Design Guidelines generally call for preservation of “original building materials and architectural features.” Specific guidelines for windows

as a character-defining element of historic buildings, the Design Guidelines say to “repair windows or doors wherever possible instead of replacing them [and] when replacement of windows is necessary, replacements should match the historic windows in style, type, size, shape, arrangement of panes, materials, method of construction, and profile.” With regard to window materials, the Design Guidelines state that “vinyl windows and aluminum sliding windows are not acceptable replacements. They are allowable for replacement or addition only if they already exist in a non-historic residence.” The Design Guidelines acknowledge that “replacement aluminum and vinyl framed windows have become widely available” but note that replacing original wood windows with vinyl windows “can greatly harm the integrity of a historic structure and is strongly discouraged.” One of the reasons is that, “while gridded designs are available in these aluminum and vinyl replacement windows, the gridding is usually sandwiched between panes of glass...” This is evident in this particular case, where the applicant tried to match the original grid pattern but the grids are between the dual panes and, therefore, do not create any discernible profile relief from the glazing. The vinyl material and thickness of stile and rail do not have create the same visual character and appearance as wood sash windows.

FINDINGS: The application proposal is compatible with existing adjacent or nearby Cultural Resources and their character-defining elements.

FACTS: The project does not comply with this finding. The Wood Streets NCA is the existing broader Cultural Resource. The Design Guidelines note that windows are character-defining features of contributing homes within historic districts. Further, vinyl windows, as replacements for existing wood sash windows, are not compatible and affect the integrity of the home and, by extension, the NCA as a whole.

FINDINGS: The colors, textures, materials, fenestration, decorative features and details, height, scale, massing and methods of construction proposed are consistent with the period and/or compatible with adjacent Cultural Resources.

FACTS: The project does not comply with this finding. Vinyl material for windows, as replacements for existing wood sash windows, is not consistent with the period of the home’s construction and is not compatible with the character of the Wood Streets NCA.

FINDINGS: The proposed change does not adversely affect the context 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.

FACTS: The project does not comply with this finding. The vinyl windows that replaced wood sash windows change the relationship of the project to the surrounding Wood Streets NCA due to the loss of historic window materials.

FINDINGS: The proposed change does not adversely affect an important architectural, historical, cultural or archaeological feature or features.

FACTS: The project does not comply with this finding. The use of incompatible vinyl replacement windows has an adverse visual effect on the important historical feature comprised of the Wood Streets NCA and the property itself, which is a contributor to the NCA.

FINDINGS: The project is consistent with the Citywide Residential Historic District Design Guidelines and the separate guidelines for each Historic District.

FACTS: The project does not comply with this finding. As noted above, the project is not consistent with the Citywide Residential Historic District Design Guidelines due to the use of vinyl windows which are specifically noted as unacceptable replacements for original wood sash windows that “can greatly harm the integrity of a historic structure.”

FINDINGS: The project is consistent with the Principles of the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties.

FACTS: The project does not comply with this finding. The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties call for the retention and preservation of the historic character-defining features and materials of a property. Distinctive materials are to be preserved; deteriorated features are to be repaired rather than replaced, or if replaced, they are to match the original in design and materials. The associated Guidelines also do not recommend “changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials...which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration...or the appearance of the frame.” As evidenced in the findings above, the project does not preserve the historic character-defining features and materials of a property and affects the historic character and integrity of the historic property and surrounding Wood Streets NCA.

IV. BACKGROUND/HISTORY:

The subject property is within the Wood Streets Neighborhood Conservation Area (NCA), and is a contributor to the NCA. The site is situated on the southeasterly side of Rosewood Place, approximately 500 feet southwest of Brockton Avenue. The single-family home was built in 1921 by owner/builder J.W. Snow. The residence is a single-story, frame California Bungalow style structure on a rectangular groundplan. The home features a clipped gable (jerkinhead) main roof with slant-cut rafter tails, covered in composition asphalt shingles. A subordinate offset porch roof projects from the front façade and features a matching clipped gable; a vertical slatted vent fills the space under the gable end. The porch roof is supported by two pairs of square posts resting on a concrete porch that is accessed by two steps from the driveway at the left side. The front door is to the left of center under the porch. The home originally had wood sash windows throughout, including a one-over-one window to the left of the front door, and a one-over-one window flanked by ten-lite windows on both sides located to the right of the front door. The home is clad in narrow wood siding with endboards. The front yard features a mature tree, lawn and a planter with foundation shrub plantings in front of the porch. The driveway has been done in pavers. A detached garage is located at the end of the driveway and has a matching roof form, materials and features aside from the changed out garage door. Permit records indicate that the house and single car garage were built at the same time. The only other permit on record is an electrical service upgrade in 2004.

V. DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The Certificate of Appropriateness (COA) application is the result of a code enforcement complaint. The applicant is requesting to be allowed to retain the 15 vinyl windows that he installed prior to May 2011. Vinyl windows have been installed throughout and replaced the home’s original wood sash windows. As noted in the findings, the request is not consistent with the Citywide Residential Historic District Design Guidelines or the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. Title 20 allows for administrative approvals for the “in-kind replacement of historically-correct architectural features or building elements, including windows.” Since the project does not include in-kind, historically-correct wood windows, the COA must be considered by the Cultural Heritage Board.

VI. LOCATION/SURROUNDING LAND USES:

	Existing Land Use	General Plan Designation	Zoning Designation
Project Site	Single Family Residence	MDR, Med. Density Res.	R-1-7000-CR, Single Family Residential, Cultural Overlay
North	Single Family Residence	MDR	R-1-7000-CR
East	Single Family Residence	MDR	R-1-7000-CR
South	Single Family Residence; School	MDR; PF, Public Facility (School)	R-1-7000-CR; PF, Public Facility (School)
West	Single Family Residence	MDR	R-1-7000-CR

VII. PROJECT ANALYSIS:

- **Compliance with section 20.25.050 of the City of Riverside Municipal Code:**


As noted above, the request does not meet the required findings in Section 20.25.050 of the Municipal Code. Staff discussed options with the owner prior to the application submittal that would allow staff to consider the COA, including changing the front, visible windows back to the original wood sash. However, the owner cited the cost factor associated with custom wood windows to match the original when he has already made a significant outlay on the vinyl windows, and his perspective that many other homes within the Wood Streets NCA have replaced original wood windows with vinyl. While staff acknowledges that streets within Wood Streets do have homes with vinyl window replacements, these would not have been done with City approval except under extraordinary circumstances such as an appeal of a decision, or if the original wood windows had already been removed prior to the NCA designation. It has been standard Planning practice to address prior inappropriate alterations that were not approved when an owner submits a COA for new alterations on a home.

VIII. PUBLIC NOTICE AND COMMENTS:

Public notices were mailed to property owners adjacent to the site. No comments have been received to date.

IX. EXHIBITS:

1. Location map
2. Aerial Photo
3. Applicant's Letter
4. Photos of Site and Surrounding Area




P13-0353, Exhibit 1 - Location Map





P13-0353, Exhibit 2 - 2012 Aerial Photo



To whom it may concern,

I wouldn't and didn't replace the windows in our home knowing I was supposed to go through the PLANNING Department. We love the age and uniqueness of the homes in the WOODS STREETS.

I'm being told my new windows are not appropriate as the material they are made of isn't original to the home. The windows do not harm the appearance or integrity of the age of the house while they do increase the beauty and value. As for originality, these old houses didn't come with TV antennas let alone satellite dishes. I don't believe they came with air conditioners but we see room air conditioners in windows and coolers on roofs. I think all of us who live in the WOODS STREETS love and enjoy the old homes but I think we should be allowed to enhance the desirability of where we live and our quality of life.

I read in the PRESS ENTERPRISE that the City of RIVERSIDE is touting being environmentally friendly. I can tell you first hand that these windows require a lot less electricity to run the air conditioner. The RIVERSIDE Public Utilities and the Federal GOVERNMENT are giving us rebates for the efficiency of the windows. It might be time to rethink the requirements in situations like this.

I believe the new windows make my house more appealing and look more period correct while allowing me to live more comfortably while doing my part in energy conservation.

THANK YOU,

Thomas A. Chubb

THE STYLE of the new windows MATCH those that they replaced and the new screens look far more period correct than the thin aluminum framed screens that they replaced. The frames on the windows are still wood. The only parts replaced were the window inserts.



With the fresh paint and new windows and screens, I think our bungalow looks amazing and period correct.

I hope you agree

We are quite proud of our home and invite you to visit and take a closer look.





3968 Rosewood Place, 2013



3968 Rosewood Place, 2013

P13-0353, Exhibit 4
Site Photos



Window left of front door



Window right of front door

P13-0353, Exhibit 4
Site Photos



Left side of home



3968 Rosewood Place, 1979 survey

P13-0353, Exhibit 4
Site Photos



Rosewood Place in Wood Streets NCA

P13-0353, Exhibit 4
Surrounding Area


M. CARNAHAN
21245 Jefferson
Spokane, WA
99203-1243

14 JUN 2013 PM 1 L

Distributed at CHB: 6-19-13
Agenda item 1



City of Riverside
Planning Division
Attn: Teri Delcamp - P13-0353
3900 Main Street
Riverside, CA 92522



Response to Public Notice

Any information submitted on this form is public record and can be viewed by any member of the public upon request.

Please note that public comment for this project closes at the Public Meeting on June 19, 2013

Please enter any comments you may have about this proposal below. (Please print or type all information):

COMMENTS:

Hi Terri:

Reference# P-13-0353

In response to your "Notice of Public Hearing":

My home is across Rosewood from Tom's home. When I look out the front window or go on front porch, or front yard or driveway I can see his place directly. There are no hedges, fences, large trees, or bushes to block my view. It is a very good looking property/neighborhood.

I have seen his new windows. They look good to me. The old ones looked okay, but the new ones look better. Tom keeps his house and yard in very good condition. It is one of the best on the block of Rosewood.

The city seems to want homeowners to make their house's more energy efficient. I expect this was Tom's main reason for the change/lower energy use and cost.

The downside for all homeowners is:

- 1) The city increases the utility rates we pay in order to keep their income up.
- 2) As one improves the home the assessor increases the value of property and all the owners in the area pay more property tax.

This is been more of a concern for those of us retired and living on fixed income. At some time in the future I would like to upgrade some, or all of my windows. However, with the increase of rates, possible increase in property taxes, and the expense of the windows, I may just add clothing in the winter, and take it off in the summer.

As far as I am concerned the new windows improve the looks of Tom's property, the general appearance of the street, and value of Rosewood properties.

Thanks.

P13-0353, Exhibit B